The International Theological Library.

EDITED BY

STEWART D. F. SALMOND, D.D.,
Professor of Systematic Theology and New Testament Exegesis, Free Church College, Aberdeen;

AND

CHARLES A. BRIGGS, D.D.,
Edward Robinson Professor of Biblical Theology, Union Theological Seminary, New York.

A HISTORY OF CHRISTIANITY IN THE APOSTOLIC AGE.
BY ARTHUR CUSHMAN McGIFFERT, PH.D., D.D.

THE INTERNATIONAL THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY.

THE following eminent Scholars have contributed, or are engaged upon, the Volumes named:—

An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament.	By S. R. DRIVER, D.D., Regius Professor of Hebrew, and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford. [*Seventh Edition.* 12s.
Christian Ethics.	By NEWMAN SMYTH, D.D., Pastor of the First Congregational Church, New Haven, Conn. [*Third Edition.* 10s. 6d.
Apologetics.	By the late A. B. BRUCE, D.D., Professor of New Testament Exegesis, Free Church College, Glasgow. [*Third Edition.* 10s. 6d.
History of Christian Doctrine.	By G. P. FISHER, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Ecclesiastical History, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. [*Second Edition.* 12s.
A History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age.	By ARTHUR CUSHMAN MCGIFFERT, Ph.D., D.D., Professor of Church History, Union Theological Seminary, New York. [12s.
Christian Institutions.	By A. V. G. ALLEN, D.D., Professor of Ecclesiastical History, Episcopal Theological School, Cambridge, Mass. [12s.
The Christian Pastor.	By WASHINGTON GLADDEN, D.D., Pastor of Congregational Church, Columbus, Ohio. [10s. 6d.
Theology of the New Testament.	By GEORGE B. STEVENS, Ph.D., D.D., Professor of Systematic Theology in Yale University, U.S.A. [12s.
The Ancient Catholic Church.	By ROBERT RAINY, D.D., Principal of The New College, Edinburgh. [*Just published.* 12s.
Theology of the Old Testament.	By the late A. B. DAVIDSON, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Hebrew, The New College, Edinburgh.
The Literature of the New Testament.	By S. D. F. SALMOND, D.D., Principal, and Professor of Systematic Theology and New Testament Exegesis, United Free Church College, Aberdeen.
Old Testament History.	By H. P. SMITH, D.D., late Professor of Biblical History and Interpretation, Amherst College, U.S.A.
Canon and Text of the New Testament.	By CASPAR RENÉ GREGORY, Ph.D., Professor in the University of Leipzig.
The Latin Church.	By ARCHIBALD ROBERTSON, D.D., Principal of King's College, London.
Encyclopædia.	By C. A. BRIGGS, D.D., Professor of Biblical Theology, Union Theological Seminary, New York.
Contemporary History of the Old Testament.	By FRANCIS BROWN, D.D., Professor of Hebrew and Cognate Languages, Union Theological Seminary, New York.
Contemporary History of the New Testament.	By FRANK C. PORTER, Ph.D., Yale University, New Haven, Conn.
Philosophy of Religion.	By ROBERT FLINT, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Divinity in the University of Edinburgh.
The Study of the Old Testament.	By the Right Rev. H. E. RYLE, D.D., Lord Bishop of Exeter.
Rabbinical Literature.	By S. SCHECHTER, M.A., Reader in Talmudic in the University of Cambridge.
The Life of Christ.	By WILLIAM SANDAY, D.D., LL.D., Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity, and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford.
The Christian Preacher.	By JOHN WATSON, D.D. ('IAN MACLAREN'), Sefton Park Presbyterian Church of England, Liverpool.

EDINBURGH: T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET.

INTERNATIONAL THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY

A HISTORY OF CHRISTIANITY

IN THE

APOSTOLIC AGE

BY

ARTHUR CUSHMAN McGIFFERT, PH.D., D.D.

WASHBURN PROFESSOR OF CHURCH HISTORY IN THE UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, NEW YORK

EDINBURGH
T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET
1897

PRINTED BY
MORRISON AND GIBB LIMITED,
FOR
T. & T. CLARK, EDINBURGH.
LONDON: SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, HAMILTON, KENT, AND CO. LIMITED.
NEW YORK: CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS.

To the Memory of my Father

JOSEPH NELSON McGIFFERT, D.D.

PREFACE

THE scope of the present volume is sufficiently indicated by its title. It has been my endeavor in writing a history of Christianity in the Apostolic Age to treat the theme as a unit, and to trace the development so far as possible in its totality. The volume necessarily contains much that falls properly within the province of special works upon New Testament literature, exegesis, or theology; for the Apostolic Age is the age of the New Testament, and in the pages of the latter are found the thoughts and deeds of the leading actors in the history. But it has been my constant aim to subordinate all such special subjects to the common end, and to deal with them only in so far as they constitute a vital part of the larger whole. This aim, I hope, will serve to explain the arrangement and to some extent the selection of material. At the same time, there are some matters, not vitally connected with the development as a whole, a discussion of which is looked for in a work on the Apostolic Age, and which I have not felt at liberty, in view of the general purpose of the series of which this book forms a part, to neglect altogether; and so in the selection of material I have departed occasionally from my own ideal. But even in such cases the attempt has been made to keep the main subject well to the fore, and to let it control the entire treatment.

Many of the questions discussed in this volume have been the subject of controversy for generations, and the most various positions have of course had their champions. To state and endeavor to refute all such divergent views

would have been neither practicable nor desirable, and the temptation to enter into extended controversy which presented itself at many points has been strenuously resisted. My aim throughout has been positive and not negative, constructive and not destructive.

Where the literature is so voluminous, and where so many of the results of modern scholarship have long been common property, it is impossible to indicate or even estimate my indebtedness to others. But it is hardly necessary to say that among all the admirable books dealing with the Apostolic Age as a whole, or with one or another phase of it, I have found the great work of Weizsäcker (*Das apostolische Zeitalter der christlichen Kirche*), in spite of many radical and far-reaching differences between his conclusions and my own, most helpful and suggestive. The two well-known books of my friend, Professor Ramsay (*The Church in the Roman Empire* and *St. Paul, the Traveller and the Roman Citizen*), have been found especially valuable for the light they throw upon the travels of Paul. The recent monumental work on the chronology of early Christian literature (*Die Chronologie der altchristlichen Litteratur bis Eusebius*, Erster Band) by my honored teacher, Professor Harnack, in which he discusses, with his characteristic thoroughness and candor, some of the literary questions that have received attention in this volume, came into my hands after my own book was in press and too late to be utilized in any way. This is the less to be regretted, as I find myself, I am happy to say, in general agreement with Harnack in most of the matters upon which he touches; as for instance in the chronology of Paul's life, in the interpretation of the purpose of the Epistle to the Hebrews, in the general estimate of the pastoral Epistles, in the conviction that Second Peter is the only really pseudonymous work in the New Testament, in the treatment of the Book of Acts as based in the main upon trustworthy sources. On the other hand,

where Harnack's views differ from those presented in this volume, — as for instance, his acceptance of the North Galatian theory, and of the second imprisonment of Paul, and his rejection of the Ephesian residence of the Apostle John, — I find no reason, after a careful study of his arguments, to modify the conclusion which I have already expressed.

To my colleagues in the Faculty of Union Theological Seminary, especially to Professor Francis Brown, D.D., and to the librarian of the Seminary, the Rev. Charles R. Gillett, I desire finally to express my hearty and affectionate thanks for the generous assistance they have rendered me in many ways.

ARTHUR CUSHMAN McGIFFERT.

UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
April 15, 1897.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

CHAPTER II

CHAPTER III

CHAPTER IV

CHAPTER V

CHAPTER VI

A HISTORY OF CHRISTIANITY IN THE APOSTOLIC AGE

CHAPTER I

THE ORIGIN OF CHRISTIANITY[1]

In attempting to explain historically the origin of Christianity, it is necessary to take account of two factors: on the one hand, Judaism, in the midst of which Jesus of Nazareth was born and bred, and whose influence he felt throughout his life; on the other hand, his own unique religious personality.

1. Judaism[2]

All-controlling in the religious thought and life of the Jews was their consciousness of standing in a peculiar relation to the Covenant God of Israel. Though he was the Creator and Lord of all the world, he was believed, not by the prophets alone, but by the people in general,

[1] It is impossible in a volume on the apostolic age to discuss in any adequate and thoroughgoing way the subject of the present chapter. The chapter is intended solely as an introduction to the history which follows, and it has been my endeavor to confine myself exclusively to those features in Judaism and in the life and work of Christ which seem to me essential to an understanding of the rise and early development of Christianity, and to treat them in as summary a manner as possible. A complete picture would of course contain much, both in the first and third sections, at which I have not even hinted.

[2] See Schürer: *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi* (Eng. Trans., *A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ*); Wellhausen: *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte*; Toy: *Judaism and Christianity*; Bruce: *Apologetics*, Bk. II.; O. Holtzmann: *Das Ende des jüdischen Staatswesens und die Entstehung des Christenthums* (in Stade's *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, Bd. II.); also *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte*.

graciously to have chosen from among the nations of the earth the children of Abraham to be his own peculiar possession, and to be the recipients of his choicest blessings. This consciousness of national election, emphasized even by the earlier prophets, and growing ever more vivid since their day, made it impossible for a true Israelite to believe that God would ever forget and desert his people. And yet nothing could be plainer in the later days of the Hebrew monarchy, than that the actual condition of Israel was far from what might be expected of a people enjoying the divine care and protection. Few evidences remained of the presence and favor of the Almighty. He seemed utterly to have forsaken those whom he had once so signally blessed. But the true Israelite could not believe that he had forsaken them forever. It must be that in the future, if not now, he would again turn his face in favor upon his people and bestow upon them in abundant measure the blessings so long withheld. Thus was born in Israel the Messianic hope, the hope of a better, brighter, happier, and more glorious future for the Jewish nation, a hope that sustained them in the darkest days of exile, growing year by year more vivid and controlling.

But it was not enough that God would one day bless again his chosen people. Why had he ever neglected them? The answer was not far to seek. In that they found it and gave it vigorous utterance, lay the great ethical and religious service of the Hebrew prophets to their own people and to all peoples. The God of Israel is a righteous God, and he cannot bless an unrighteous nation. He has chosen Israel and entered into covenant with his elect people, but he has covenanted to show them favor and give them prosperity only on condition that they faithfully serve and worship him. Thus is explained abundantly God's desertion of his people, and thus, at the same time, is declared the condition upon which alone God's favor can be regained. It is a remarkable evidence of the strength and vitality of the national consciousness of God's election that the great prophets, even in the darkest days of Israel's history, even when they recognize

most clearly and denounce most vigorously the national sins, never lose faith in Israel nor falter in their conviction that the nation will yet repent and work righteousness and enjoy the promised blessing.

Out of the experiences of the exile the returning Israelites brought the unalterable conviction of the truth of the preaching of the great prophets: national apostasy resulting in national disaster; national righteousness securing divine blessing and bringing prosperity, peace, and plenty. Apostasy had borne its legitimate fruit; the people were now one in their desire to promote and maintain national righteousness. But righteousness had come to mean something else than it had meant to the prophets. In post-exilic Judaism, it was God's holiness or sanctity that received especial emphasis. It was his separateness from all that is low and base, and his transcendent elevation above things of sense, that seemed particularly to characterize him in contrast with the gods of the heathen. It was under the influence of this conception of God that there was developed the Levitical law in all its ceremonial and ritual completeness, — a law which gave clearest utterance to the national belief in God's sanctity, and which aimed to raise the national life above all that could corrupt and degrade, and thus to make the people fit for God. The purity aimed at by a large proportion of the Levitical rites was not so much ethical as physical. Many natural objects and processes were regarded as essentially impure and as defiling in their influence, quite independently of any fault or sin on the part of the person affected. The result was a tendency to lose sight of the great moral principles of human life under the pressure of the constant and anxious care required to maintain ceremonial cleanness and to restore it when violated.

The law accomplished its purpose in so far as it rendered apostasy and idolatry practically impossible to an Israelite, and created a nation bent above all else on showing honor to God and on preserving his name inviolate. But it secured this at a heavy expense, for the observance of the law led not unnaturally to the substitution of hard and

cold formalism for the heart service of the prophets. To the Pharisees, who after the Maccabean wars were the strictest and most consistent representatives of the religious spirit of the age, righteousness meant the complete and minute performance of all the duties prescribed in the law, whether in the written Torah or in the great body of traditional precepts which had grown up about it. In that law, as commonly conceived, the moral and ceremonial elements stood on one plane. The distinction between them was lost sight of. The universal moral law as such did not enter into consideration. Its most sacred obligations were binding only because they constituted a part of the national code; and that code embraced a far larger body of ritual than of ethical requirements. The obligation to be helpful, merciful, and charitable was, to be sure, always recognized, but if the exercise of charity and mercy, or the performance of acts prompted by filial and fraternal devotion, involved the violation of any of the innumerable prescriptions touching Sabbath observance, purification, fasting, or tithing, it must be dispensed with. The letter of the law, even in its smallest and most trivial enactments, must be obeyed at all hazards. And this minute and literal observance of the entire law was not left to the scribes and Pharisees alone; it was demanded of all the people, and the demand was very generally met. As has been well said, "All zeal for education in the family, the school, and the synagogue aimed at making the whole people a people of the law. The common man was to know what the law commanded, and not only to know, but to do it. His whole life was to be ruled according to the norm of law; obedience thereto was to become a fixed custom, and departure therefrom an inward impossibility. On the whole, this object was to a great degree attained. So faithfully did most of the Jews adhere to their law, that they willingly incurred even torture and death itself in consequence."[1]

Along with this change in the conception of righteousness went also a change in the idea of the covenant which

[1] Schürer, *l.c.* II. S. 387 (Eng. Trans., Div. II. Vol. II. p. 90).

God had entered into with his chosen people. It was now more and more widely conceived in a commercial sense, as a mutual agreement by which both the contracting parties were legally bound: the nation to observe the law given by God; God to pay the promised recompense in proportion to its performances.

But not only had the religious and ethical ideals of the Jews undergone a modification, the hopes which they had inherited from the days of the prophets, and which constituted an ever more prominent element in their thinking, likewise experienced a manifold development. These hopes found expression, from the days of Antiochus Epiphanes on, in numerous apocalyptic works, in which the era of future blessedness is pictured in all sorts of forms and colors. The appearance of these works is an index of the tendency of the times. The thinking of the Jews was centring more and more in the future, and was taking on an increasingly eschatological character.[1]

But of still greater significance is the fact that their thought was concerning itself to a degree not true before with the future of the individual and with his relation to the Messianic age. In earlier centuries the prophetic hope of a better time to come had reference only to the nation as a whole. The pious Israelite looked to the present for his personal reward, finding it in health, in happiness, and in long life. In the future he saw Israel glorious, but he did not think of himself as personally participating in that glory. But in the period succeeding the exile, under the pressure of present misfortune, the desire arose of sharing in the promised blessings which were ere long to be poured out upon God's people. The result was the development of a belief in the resurrection of pious Israelites, in order that they might enjoy the felicity of the Messianic age. And with the belief in a resurrection went naturally, hand in hand, the expecta-

[1] Upon the Messianic ideas of the Jews in the centuries immediately preceding the coming of Christ see, in addition to the works already referred to, Baldensperger: *Das Selbstbewusstsein Jesu im Lichte der Messianischen Hoffnungen seiner Zeit*, Erster Theil, Die Messianischen Hoffnungen des Judenthums; and Briggs: *Messiah of the Gospels*, Chap. I.

tion of a judgment, by which should be determined the future of each individual; by which it should be determined whether he was to have a part in the coming prosperity. For wicked Israelites there was no hope. The people at large had become so impressed with the importance of righteousness, that the unrighteous Jew was generally regarded as no better than a Gentile, and as without hope for the future. The thought of some did not go beyond this. It was enough that the unworthy should be excluded from the felicity of the faithful. But the belief became increasingly common that there would be a resurrection of the wicked as well as of the good, and that the former would suffer the penalty for their sins in the fires of Gehenna.

But this growing emphasis upon the individual's relation to the future meant, of course, a growing emphasis upon the connection between reward and performance. If his participation in the coming blessings depended upon his own conduct, then there was additional reason for keeping the law in all its strictness; not in order to show his gratitude and devotion to God; not because he hungered and thirsted after righteousness; not even, as in earlier days, with the patriotic and, in part at least, unselfish desire to promote the welfare of the nation as a whole and to hasten the consummation of its hopes, — but in order to win for himself the promised reward. Righteousness in order to future happiness now became more and more generally the watchword of believing Israelites, and the commercial idea of the covenant between God and his people had full scope to work out to the uttermost its baleful effects. It is clear that the observance of the law must become increasingly a matter of pure calculation; not how much can I do for the God that loves me and has so signally blessed me, but how little may I do and yet secure the reward I seek. The controlling conception is that of creditor and debtor, and the inevitable tendency is for the debtor to regard his creditor not with love and devotion, but with fear, and almost repulsion; to push him as far away as possible,

and to pay him only so much as may be exacted.[1] This spirit was of course not absolutely universal in the Judaism of the period with which we are dealing. There were undoubtedly many who were thoroughly in earnest in their effort to serve God, not merely for the sake of reward, but because of their love for him and their innate desire to do his will. But they were certainly the exception, not the rule; and even such faithful souls found commonly in the observance of the law the only expression for their devotion.[2]

Concerning the nature of the future happiness and blessedness for which all pious Israelites were looking, opinions differed more or less widely; but all agreed that the blessings were to be national blessings, that God was to establish his kingdom, and that in that kingdom, and in it alone, the promised felicity was to be realized.[3] That felicity was pictured in the most glowing colors by the apocalyptic writers of the period with which we are dealing. Not only were the Jews to be freed from all foreign domination and to be raised to a position of supremacy over all the earth, the Messianic age, the age of the kingdom, was to be a period of unexampled fruitfulness, of unmeasured health and prosperity, of unbroken peace and joy. But more than that, it was to be a time of perfect holiness and righteousness, when law and temple service should be observed with scrupulous and unvarying exactness, and all should be pure and upright in God's sight. Upon this feature of the coming kingdom the greatest stress was naturally laid, and it was widely believed that

[1] This tendency is clearly revealed in the efforts of the scribes to make the observance of the law easier, without neglecting or violating its letter.

[2] Not a few passages in Jewish literature show that it was possible for the law, in spite of the formalism to which its observance led on the part of the people in general, to meet and satisfy the religious needs of many devout souls and to nourish a profound type of piety. Compare, *e.g.*, Psa. i., xix., cxix. For an admirable though somewhat one-sided presentation of the religious value of the law, see Montefiore's Hibbert Lectures (1892) on *The Origin and Growth of Religions, as illustrated by the Religion of the Ancient Hebrews*, especially Lect. IX.

[3] Other peoples might sometimes be thought of as sharing in the national felicity, but only as they recognized the God of Israel and observed his law and became incorporated into the elect race.

such perfect and permanent holiness would be secured through the influence of the divine Spirit, who would then be poured out upon the faithful and would guide and control all their activities. The presence of the Spirit is represented in many Jewish writings as a characteristic mark of the Messianic age, which was thus to be distinguished from the present æon with its merely human powers and energies.

The anticipation of the coming era of blessedness frequently included the expectation of a Messiah, who should lead God's chosen people to victory and bear rule in the consummated kingdom. At the same time, that expectation was not universal and did not constitute a part of the original Messianic hope. Some of those that dwell most upon the approaching period of felicity are entirely silent respecting a Messiah. All agreed that the kingdom was to be God's kingdom, and that his authority would be supreme; and consequently it was possible to think of it without any other head than Jehovah himself, and of its establishment by his own hand without the agency of another. And yet during the century, or century and a half, preceding the birth of Christ, there can be no doubt that the conception of a Messiah, and the anticipation of his coming, were growing more and more common. The earlier Sibylline Oracles, the Psalter of Solomon, the Book of Enoch, all refer to the advent of a Messianic king, and many passages in the Gospels and in Josephus indicate the general prevalence of the idea.[1]

[1] By those who thus looked for the coming of a personal Messiah, it was commonly supposed that he would be, not a divine, but a human being; in constitution a man, but a man endowed by God (or by the Holy Ghost according to the Psalter of Solomon) with extraordinary gifts and powers which should fit him to lead God's chosen people to victory, and to rule his kingdom in wisdom, holiness, and righteousness.

The idea of the Messiah's pre-existence was not wholly unknown; and though by most he was regarded as a mere man, born like other men, and passing through the same stages of development with them, he was by some invested with supernatural features which raised him above the level of ordinary humanity. Still it is to be noticed that there was a tendency among the Jews to attribute pre-existence to all things that had religious worth, as for instance to the Torah, to the temple, and to Jerusalem, and, therefore, the ascription of pre-existence to the Messiah does not necessarily involve the ascription to him of divinity in any sense. The basis of the idea of the Mes-

At the opening of the Christian era the belief was widespread that the time was ripe for the establishment of the Messianic kingdom, and that the long-expected consummation was near at hand. The troublous times in which the Jews had been living since the beginning of the second century before Christ seemed to indicate the approach of the great crisis when judgment should be passed upon all the enemies of Israel, and the oppressed children of God be released from their long bondage. Though there were still some unrighteous Jews that did not fear God and obey his commands, yet on the whole his law was observed with remarkable punctiliousness by the great body of the people, and it was felt that God could not long leave the national virtue unrewarded, could not long withhold the promised peace and blessedness. The Assumption of Moses, a work written about this time, represents the kingdom as just on the eve of establishment, and calls attention to the numerous signs which were heralding its coming. We learn also from Josephus, that many pretended Messiahs appeared during this period, and succeeded in leading multitudes away after them. Evidently the hope of the speedy establishment of the kingdom was very widespread, and the people at large were all expectancy.

2. John the Baptist

Just at this juncture, John the Baptist began his preaching. Of the early life of John we know practically nothing.[1] He appeared suddenly from the wilderness, in the garb of an ascetic, announcing the immediate coming of the kingdom of God, and summoning his countrymen to

siah's pre-existence may be found in Micah v. 2, which can easily bear that interpretation, and in Daniel vii. 13-14, where it is necessary only to interpret "Son of Man" as referring to the Messiah, in order to get his pre-existence, and thus the Book of Enoch actually does interpret the phrase. On the idea of pre-existence, see especially Harnack, *Dogmengeschichte*, 3te Auflage. I. S. 755 sq.

[1] Luke, after speaking of John's birth, says only that "the child grew and waxed strong in spirit, and was in the deserts till the day of his shewing unto Israel" (Luke i. 80).

repentance. The burden of his preaching was judgment. If the kingdom of God is at hand, the expected judgment must be impending, and hence the necessity of repentance unto the remission of sins. It is fully in accord with his character, as revealed in his ascetic mode of life, that his thought dwells rather upon the obligation entailed by the approach of the kingdom than upon the blessings involved in it, that he feels himself called to warn rather than to cheer and comfort.

But John did not content himself with the announcement of the coming of the kingdom and with the preaching of repentance. According to the testimony of all our Gospels, he also foretold the advent of the Messiah; for none other than the Messiah can be referred to in the words: "There cometh one that is mightier than I, the latchet of whose shoes I am not worthy to unloose. He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire; whose fan is in his hand, thoroughly to cleanse his threshing-floor, and to gather the wheat into his garner; but the chaff he will burn up with unquenchable fire."[1] The imagery is suggested by Isaiah and Malachi, the only advance upon them lying in the fact that John represents the judgment as conducted by the Messiah instead of by God himself; but in this he only reproduced an opinion that was doubtless common in his day.[2] In fact, his thought respecting the Messiah and his work moved wholly along traditional lines. His conceptions were based apparently not upon a special revelation of his own, received directly from God, nor upon any personal knowledge that he had of Jesus. How different indeed his idea of the Messiah's work was from Christ's idea, is shown by the message that Jesus sent him in reply to his question as to whether he was the Messiah: "Go your way and tell John what things ye have seen and heard; the blind receive their sight, the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed and the deaf hear, the dead are raised up, the poor have good tidings preached to them. And blessed

[1] Luke iii. 16, 17; cf. Mark i. 7, 8; Matt. iii. 11, 12; John i. 26, 27.
[2] Cf. The Book of Enoch, 45, 55, 61, 69.

is he whosoever shall find none occasion of stumbling in me."[1]

It is a significant fact that John represented himself neither as the Messiah nor as his expected forerunner. When the rulers of the Jews sent a delegation to inquire about his person and his purposes, he distinctly denied not only that he was the Christ, but also that he was either Elijah or "The Prophet."[2] Evidently he conceived his connection with the coming kingdom not in any sense as official or peculiar, and his work as a work belonging to himself alone. He was convinced of the nearness of the great crisis, and he simply felt himself called to summon the people to prepare for it. He was in his own esteem a preacher merely, not a prophet, and he did not claim, as did the Old Testament prophets, to be giving utterance to a divine revelation. He was doing what any one else might have done; he was, in fact, doing what, for aught he knew, many more might do, and do as well, or even better, than himself.[3]

[1] Luke vii. 22, 23; Matt. xi. 5, 6. This inquiry addressed to Jesus by John, according to Matthew, after John had been cast into prison, seems to show that up to this time Jesus was not known by John to be the Messiah; and that even now when the fame of his teaching had reached him he was in doubt whether Jesus was really the expected one or only a preacher of righteousness like himself. This episode makes it difficult to regard John's earlier recognition of Jesus' Messiahship, to which reference is made in the first chapter of the fourth Gospel, and perhaps in Matt. iii. 14–15, as historical. There is no hint in our original sources that John knew, while he was still preaching, that the Messiah was already come, or that he had any idea where and when he would appear. It is very significant that though, perhaps, some of John's disciples later became followers of Jesus (cf. John i. 37), not all of them did. Indeed, they continued to maintain their separate and independent existence as a sort of Johannine sect, for many years (Matt. ix. 14; Acts xviii. 25 and xix. 1 sq.); and almost a generation after their leader's death, some of them at least were still expecting the Messiah of whom he had spoken. It can hardly be supposed in the face of these facts, that John had told them that Jesus was the one to whose coming both he and they had been looking forward.

[2] John i. 21. The words must be authentic, for no Christian would have thought of inventing them and putting them into Christ's mouth when he had so distinctly declared John to be the expected Elijah (Matt. xi. 14, xvii. 12; Mark ix. 13).

[3] The rite of baptism which John performed is not to be regarded as an official thing. He apparently employed it quite informally and simply as a symbol, with the purpose of impressing vividly upon his hearers the need of that purification of life which he was preaching.

In his belief that the kingdom of God was at hand, John was not alone, as we have seen. He only voiced what was at the time a widespread conviction, and for that very reason his announcement found ready credence. And yet his influence seems to have been confined largely to the common people. They flocked to him in great numbers, but the leaders of the nation, the "chief priests and the scribes and the elders," appear to have held aloof. There is nothing surprising in this. If the kingdom was approaching, it was well enough for the publicans and sinners to repent of their sins and endeavor to prepare themselves for it, but no duty of the kind devolved upon the religious aristocracy among the chosen people. Having satisfied themselves that John was not the Messiah, and that he had no definite information to impart respecting him, there was no reason why they should concern themselves further with him, any more than with any one else who might declare the kingdom to be approaching and emphasize the need of purity and righteousness on the part of the people at large. And so we are not surprised to find that our sources contain no indication that they ever took any steps against him. They seem to have treated him in the main, as was to have been expected, with utter indifference. But this goes to confirm the impression made by our sources, that John did not concern himself with political affairs. There is no trace of a political purpose in any of his recorded utterances, and his advice to the soldiers, who asked him what they should do, apparently thinking that there might be some special work for them to perform in connection with the approaching kingdom: "Do violence to no man, neither exact anything wrongfully, and be content with your wages,"[1] certainly does not indicate that he was looking for a political and social revolution; nor do his words addressed to the people in general: "Begin not to say within yourselves, We have Abraham to our father; for I say unto you that God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham,"[2] sound as if his mind were occu-

[1] Luke iii. 14. [2] Luke iii. 8.

pied with the national aspects of the kingdom which he preached. It is significant, in fact, that John has nothing whatever to say about the nature of the future kingdom, that he draws no pictures of it, and refers to it only as a reason for his exhortation to repentance. He was concerned not with future conditions and developments, but only with present reformation, which he felt to be the immediate and pressing need of the hour in view of the nearness of the judgment.

That reformation, as John preached it, concerned not mere external observance, but the heart as well. It involved the exercise of mercy, justice, honesty, fidelity, and humility.[1] And yet there is no clear assertion in his recorded utterances of a general religious and ethical ideal of such a character as to effect a thorough reconstruction of the prevailing notions of the age. Evidently he felt very keenly the artificiality and externality of the religious and ethical ideals of his countrymen, and yet he seems not to have been prepared to enunciate a clean-cut and thoroughgoing principle which should effectually modify them. It is also noticeable, and the fact may throw light upon his failure to enunciate such a principle, that in his recorded utterances he never criticises nor questions in any respect the validity of the Jewish law, written or unwritten, nor is he ever accused of doing so. It would seem, indeed, that he resembled the Pharisees in his emphasis upon the strictest observance of that law, if we may judge from the habits of his disciples, who, in distinction from the disciples of Jesus, fasted often.[2]

The preaching of John was not of such a character as to leave any lasting impression upon the Jews. It was neither far-reaching enough nor sufficiently radical to effect a genuine and permanent reformation. He had nothing to offer the people which could arouse their enthusiasm and enlist their devotion. His announcement of the coming of the kingdom attracted their attention, and they went out to him, hoping doubtless that they might actually witness its establishment, or at least

[1] Cf. Luke iii. 10-14. [2] Mark ii. 18; Matt. ix. 14; Luke v. 33.

learn all about it. But John could not show them the kingdom, nor could he give them any very explicit information respecting it; and time passed, and still the kingdom whose approach he had proclaimed, and in which the interest of his hearers chiefly centred, did not reveal itself, and all remained as it had been. Save for a quickened sense of moral responsibility, and possibly a heightened conception of ethical values, which he can hardly have failed to impart to some at least of those to whom he spoke, the condition of the people at large, their life, their hopes, their ideas and ideals, were apparently about the same after he had passed off the scene as before he began his work. That some were prepared by his preaching for the preaching of Jesus, there can be no doubt. Though his work was not of a character to abide, some must have found it easier to understand Jesus because of the moral sentiments that John had succeeded in arousing. And this Jesus recognized, and because of it he was led to pay John the tribute and to show him the honor which alone have made him immortal.

But one thing the experience of John abundantly proves, if in the presence of the numerous apocalyptic writings of the age any proof be needed, and light is thrown by it upon the career of Jesus. No religious teacher could hope to attract the attention and to hold the interest of the Jewish people in general at the time of which we are speaking, unless his teaching related itself to the expected kingdom of God; unless he had something of importance to communicate respecting it, or something of importance to do in connection with its establishment. No religious reformation could have any hope of success, except as it rooted itself in the people's thought and hope of that kingdom. It was as a preacher of the kingdom that John first attracted notice, and it was as a preacher of the kingdom that Jesus first riveted attention upon himself.

3. Jesus[1]

The Gospel of Mark opens its account of Jesus' ministry with the words: "Now after that John was delivered up, Jesus came into Galilee, preaching the gospel of God, and saying, The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand: repent ye and believe in the gospel."[2] It was thus as a preacher of the kingdom that Jesus began his public career; and it is only as we recognize this fact that we can understand him at all. But in order to realize what it meant to him to be a preacher of the kingdom, we must go back a little. Our knowledge of Jesus' early life and training is very meagre. It is not altogether without significance that his youth was passed in Galilee, where the influence of the scribes and doctors of the law was less controlling than in Jerusalem, and where, though the law itself and the traditions of the elders were observed on the whole with reasonable punctiliousness, such observance did not to the same extent as in Judea dominate the thought and life of the people. Galilee was regarded by the doctors of Jerusalem as much less genuinely and thoroughly Jewish than the southern portion of the Holy Land, and it received from them the contemptuous appellation of the "Court of the Gentiles." It was looked upon, moreover, as inferior to Judea not simply in religious devotion, but also in general culture. The schools were fewer and poorer, and rabbinic learning much rarer, than in the south. Educated in Galilee, therefore, it was hardly to be expected that Jesus would feel the influence

[1] See in addition to the Lives of Christ and the general works on New Testament theology, Wendt: *Lehre Jesu* (Eng. Trans. of Vol II. in two volumes, *The Teaching of Jesus*); Baldensperger: *Das Selbstbewusstsein Jesu im Lichte der Messianischen Hoffnungen seiner Zeit*, Zweiter Theil, Das Selbstbewusstsein Jesu; Toy: *Judaism and Christianity;* Cone: *The Gospel and its Earliest Interpretations;* Briggs: *The Messiah of the Gospels;* and the numerous works on the kingdom of God which have appeared in recent years, among them, Bruce: *The Kingdom of God;* Schmoller: *Die Lehre vom Reiche Gottes in den Schriften des Neuen Testaments;* Issel: *Die Lehre vom Reiche Gottes im Neuen Testament;* J. Weiss: *Die Predigt Jesu vom Reiche Gottes;* Schnedermann: *Jesu Verkündigung und Lehre vom Reiche Gottes.*

[2] Mark i. 14, 15.

of rabbinic methods and of the traditions of the schools to the same extent that he must have done had he lived in Jerusalem. There is no trace of anything of the kind in his recorded utterances, and he was never accused, so far as we can learn, of being a renegade scribe or Pharisee.

An interesting and very instructive incident of his boyhood has been preserved, which throws welcome light upon his religious development, and does much to explain his subsequent career. The incident is recorded in Luke ii. 44 sq. From that passage we learn that already, at the age of twelve years, Jesus had the conviction that God was his father, and that that conviction controlled him to such an extent that it seemed quite natural and right to him, upon the occasion in question, to allow what he regarded as his filial duty to his divine father to take precedence of his ordinary duty to his human parents. How and when this epoch-making conviction came to him, it would be idle to conjecture. Under the influence of the Hebrew Scriptures, with which he was very familiar, he might have been led to conceive of God as the father of the Jewish nation, for that idea finds at least occasional expression in those writings which he most loved to quote; but the far more remarkable fact that God's fatherhood was interpreted by him as of individual and not simply national significance, that it meant to him not merely Israel's divine sonship, but his own, can find its ultimate explanation only in his own unique religious personality.

But in whatever way and at whatever time Jesus gained the consciousness of his divine sonship, once gained, it must have dominated his thought and life, and he must have found in it more and more life's chief blessedness. And as he grew older, and learned more of the religious condition of his people, as he saw how small a place the idea of God's fatherhood occupied in contemporary thought, and to what superficiality, selfishness, formality, and hypocrisy the lack of it had led, he must have felt increasingly the importance of it, and his countrymen's supreme need of its uplifting and ennobling power.

At the same time that he was finding unfailing joy in

his sense of God's fatherly love and favor, his study of the Old Testament and the surroundings in which he lived must have conspired to fill his mind with the thought of the better and brighter future in store for God's chosen people. He could not help sharing in the Messianic hopes that were cherished by all about him. Those hopes were most vivid not among the scribes and doctors of the law, but among the more devout and humble of the common people, who found their religious nourishment chiefly in the prophets and in the numerous apocalyptic writings of the age. There can be little doubt, then, that Jesus, like so many of his compatriots, including John himself, was looking for the speedy establishment of the Messianic kingdom; and John's proclamation of that kingdom must have found quick response in his heart. The profound impression which the great preacher made upon him is shown in his own utterances concerning him at a later time, and the emphasis which John laid upon the necessity of repentance and righteousness as the true preparation for the approaching crisis, could not fail to meet with his hearty approval. That he should enroll himself among John's disciples, and receive baptism at his hands, was the most natural thing in the world. The act was simply an expression of his own expectation of the speedy coming of the kingdom to which John was giving such vigorous utterance, and of his own preparedness therefor.

It was in connection with his baptism that Jesus seems to have received for the first time the revelation of his own Messiahship, of his own intimate and peculiar relation to the kingdom for whose coming he was looking. The words that he is reported to have heard spoken from heaven on that occasion: "Thou art my beloved son, in thee I am well pleased,"[1] imply nothing less than his conviction of his Messiahship, for they combine two familiar prophetic utterances, which were at that time commonly regarded as referring to the Messiah;[2] and that he had not previously reached that conviction is rendered probable

[1] Mark i. 11; Luke iii. 22; cf. Matt. iii. 17.
[2] Psa. ii. 7; Isa. xlii. 1.

by the fact that the temptation immediately followed.[1] That experience can be understood only in its relation to Jesus' Messianic consciousness; and if that consciousness had come to him at an earlier time, the remarkable scene described in such poetic form by Matthew and Luke must have taken place then. What that temptation meant, if it was, as it must have been, a real temptation, we can hardly doubt. Our knowledge of Jesus' character forbids the supposition that he was tempted to use his Messianic calling and power for merely selfish purposes. And yet through the whole scene runs the conflict of a lower ideal with a higher, the conflict apparently of the common Messianic ideal of his countrymen, who were looking for the bestowal upon Israel of earthly plenty, earthly glory, earthly power, with the higher ideal of man's supreme blessedness which his own religious experience had given him. That Jesus had shared the common Messianic ideals of his people, the temptation itself seems to show, though we cannot believe that he had seen in improved earthly conditions the only, or even the chief, blessing of the coming kingdom. But the Messianic call brought him face to face with the question, not whether earthly prosperity and a life of conscious divine sonship are theoretically compatible, but whether he could, consistently with his own character and experience, devote himself to the fulfilment of the common earthly hopes of his countrymen; whether he could be true to himself and yet be the kind of Messiah they expected. When he had reached the conviction that he could not be, that there was nothing in him to respond to their demands, that loyalty to God, whose fatherhood had been so clearly revealed to him through the experience of years, forbade the use of his powers for any but a single end, and that the very highest, there may perhaps have pressed upon him the temptation to doubt the reality of his Messianic call. Of such a temptation, most natural under the circumstances, the repeated taunt of the Devil, "If thou be the Son of God,"

[1] On the baptism and temptation of Jesus, see especially Wendt, *l.c.*, II. S. 65, sq. (Eng. Trans., Vol. I., p. 96, sq.).

seems to contain at least a suggestion. But Jesus prevailed over the tempter, and his victory meant the assured and permanent conviction not only of his own Messiahship, but also of his call to be not an earthly prince and conqueror, but the revealer to all his brethren of the fatherhood of God; the mediator to them of the blessedness of divine sonship which he had himself for so long enjoyed, and which he knew to be man's highest possession. But, of course, in this conviction was involved a changed conception of the nature of the expected Messianic kingdom. If Jesus, being the Messiah, was called not to secure for Israel earthly plenty and earthly power, but to be the medium for the impartation of purely spiritual gifts, the Messianic kingdom was to be a kingdom marked by the possession of spiritual blessings, and in it were to be fully realized God's fatherhood and man's divine sonship. It is such a kingdom that Jesus proclaimed, according to all our sources; and it must have been such a kingdom that he had in mind at the very beginning, when "after John was delivered up, he came into Galilee, preaching the gospel of God, and saying the kingdom of God is at hand."[1]

But we must not suppose that in preaching thus Jesus was proclaiming any other than the promised Messianic kingdom to which the Jews had so long been looking forward. Our sources make it very clear that he believed himself to be not an unannounced and unheralded messenger of God, but the Messiah of the prophets, and the kingdom of God which he proclaimed, the kingdom foretold by them. This being the case, Jesus was not concerned, as he must otherwise have been, to turn the thoughts of his contemporaries from the kingdom of their hopes to another kingdom, and to deny the coming of the former in order to clear the way for the latter. He began with the announcement of the approach of that for which they were all looking, and throughout his ministry it was this kingdom, and none other, of which he spoke. It is very significant that Jesus nowhere sets over against the

[1] Mark i. 14, 15.

pictures of the kingdom drawn by the apocalyptic writers and current among the people, a new picture, or description, or definition of it. He dwells with constant insistence upon the spirit and the life which characterize the kingdom, and which must characterize all within it, upon the state of heart without which a man cannot enter it; but beyond that he rarely goes. And so when we seek to determine his conception of it, we are left to formulate it for ourselves as best we can, upon the basis chiefly of parables which were employed by him for another purpose, the practical purpose of bringing those who heard him into the right attitude toward God their father. It has been supposed by many that Jesus adopted the phrase "kingdom of God" simply as a convenience, and that he employed it in his preaching only because he could thus best secure the attention of his countrymen and convey to them his divine message. But the supposition is unwarranted. There can be no doubt that he believed profoundly in the kingdom, and that his career was moulded to no small degree by that belief. Much of his teaching can be understood on no other supposition. It was not simply a Gospel that he had to preach, it was the Gospel of the kingdom. And so the conditions of realizing one's divine sonship were conceived by him as conditions of entering the kingdom, and the actual realization of that sonship as life within the kingdom. All the way through the thought of the kingdom dominates.

But the combination of the idea of God's fatherhood, the fruit of Jesus' own religious experience, with the conception of the kingdom of God, which he owed to his Jewish birth and training, led him gradually, perhaps, but inevitably, to regard that kingdom as a present and not simply a future thing.[1] If the realization on man's

[1] See the parables of the wheat and the tares, of the leaven and of the mustard seed, of the hid treasure, of the pearl, and of the net, recorded in Matt. xiii. Compare also Matt. xi. 11, 12, xii. 28; Mark xii. 34; and Luke xvii. 20, 21. It is noticeable that these utterances do not belong to any particular period of Jesus' life. So far as we are able to judge, he spoke thus at various times, both early and late. He must have realized from the beginning to the end of his ministry that the kingdom which he preached was a present reality, for conscious fellowship with God was already possible.

part of his filial relation to his father God, with all that it implies, is the chief blessing of the Messianic kingdom, if it is indeed the only blessing which the Messiah feels himself called to mediate, it cannot be that the kingdom is wholly future and will come into existence only after the close of the present æon; for even here and now its supreme privilege may be realized by others, as it has been already realized by the Messiah himself. Thus bringing to his brethren the Gospel of God's fatherly love, and awakening in their hearts an answering love and devotion, Jesus felt that the kingdom was really come; and he saw in those who accepted his message, and associated themselves with him as his disciples, not simply heirs of a future inheritance, but citizens of a kingdom already set up on earth. In thus regarding the kingdom as a present reality, Jesus departed in a most decisive way from the conceptions entertained by his countrymen. In fact, nowhere is the vital difference between his view and theirs revealed more clearly than here. Others might regard righteousness, and even fellowship with God, as the supreme blessing of the kingdom, but no one else, so far as we know, took the step taken by Jesus and declared that kingdom already here.

But Jesus thought of the kingdom of God at the same time as a future reality, existing in the midst of a new and changed environment, after the end of the present world. This appears not simply in the apocalyptic discourses gathered together in the later chapters of our Synoptic Gospels, but also in various utterances belonging apparently to different periods of his ministry. Such, for instance, are the following:

"Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, did we not prophesy by thy name, and by thy name cast out devils, and by thy name do many mighty works? And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you: depart from me, ye that work iniquity."[1] "And I say unto you, that many shall come from the east and the west, and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of

[1] Matt. vii. 21, 22.

heaven: but the sons of the kingdom shall be cast forth into the outer darkness: there shall be the weeping and gnashing of teeth."[1] "For whosoever shall be ashamed of me and of my words, of him shall the Son of man be ashamed, when he cometh in his own glory, and the glory of the Father, and of the holy angels."[2]

Indeed, in the light of such passages as these, it is clear that his proclamation of the coming of the kingdom, with which Jesus began his ministry, had reference not chiefly to the formation of a company of disciples, by which the kingdom was made a present reality, but to the final consummation, for which it behooved every one to prepare himself by repentance.

Jesus' conception of the future kingdom was doubtless due in part to Jewish influence, but in still larger part to his own experience. His all-controlling consciousness of the fatherly love of God, not simply for Israel as a nation, but for himself and his brethren as individuals, and his conviction of man's divine sonship, must have invested with a new and profound significance the common belief in personal immortality. He must have found the chief value of the future life in the fact that it was to open to the individual the perfect knowledge of his divine father's will and the privilege of intimate and unbroken communion with him. But when at the time of his baptism and temptation Jesus reached the conviction that in the realization of man's divine sonship consists the essence of the Messianic kingdom, he must have reached the farther conviction that in the complete and perfect and eternal realization of that sonship, which was to be the characteristic mark of the future life with God, the Messianic kingdom would also find its complete and perfect and eternal realization. Thus he was led to look forward to a time of consummation, and thus he was able to do it without involving himself in the material and sensuous ideas of his countrymen.[3]

[1] Matt. viii. 11, 12. Cf. Luke xiii. 28, 29.

[2] Luke ix. 26. Cf. Matt. xvi. 27. See also the parables of the kingdom which close with a reference to the future.

[3] How widely Jesus' idea of the future kingdom differed from that of most

But it is conceivable that Jesus might have looked forward to the complete and perfect realization of the kingdom in the future life with God without picturing a crisis separating the future from the present, such as was expected by the Jews in general. It is possible, indeed, that in the earlier days of his ministry that crisis was not in his mind. But however that may be, he cannot have preached long without discovering that there were many of his countrymen who would not repent in response to his appeals and live the life of God's sons, and who therefore could not share in the eternal blessedness of the kingdom which he proclaimed. When he was convinced of this, the necessity of a judgment, by which should be determined man's fitness for the Messianic kingdom, was of course apparent. Jesus cannot have preached long, moreover, without realizing that the hostility of the authorities, so early manifested, would result in his speedy execution.[1] But when he saw that he was to die before the nation was won, and consequently before the time was ripe for the consummation, it was inevitable, unless he were to give up his belief in his own Messiahship, as of course he could not do, that he should think of himself as coming again to announce the consummated kingdom and to fulfil in preparation therefor the office of Messianic judge. The imagery of a return upon the clouds of heaven is taken from the Book of Daniel; but though that book may have colored Jesus' thought upon the subject, and though his belief in his own return and in his exercise of judgment may have found confirmation

of his countrymen appears in the significant answer which he gave the Sadducees: "In the resurrection they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels in heaven" (Matt. xxii. 30). In the light of such an utterance as this, and also of the general tendency of Jesus' teaching, it seems necessary to interpret the passages in which eating and drinking in the kingdom of the future æon are spoken of (Luke xiii. 29, xxii. 30; Mark xiv. 25) in a figurative sense. See Wendt, *Lehre Jesu*, II. S. 169 sq. (Eng. Trans., I. p. 219 sq.).

[1] Whether Jesus foresaw his execution from the beginning, or whether the realization of it grew upon him gradually, we cannot certainly tell. See on the one side Haupt, *Die eschatologischen Aussagen Jesu in den synoptischen Evangelien*, S. 107 sq., and on the other side, Wendt, *Lehre Jesu*, II. S. 504 (Eng. Trans., II. p. 218).

in Scripture and tradition,[1] that belief had its ultimate basis in his own Messianic consciousness.

Jesus distinctly disavows, in reply to his disciples' questions, a knowledge of the date of his return, informing them that God alone is cognizant of it.[2] And yet it is evident that he expected it to take place at an early day.[3] There are some passages, indeed, which, taken as they stand, represent him as prophesying that the consummation would come even before the death of those to whom he spoke. But it is difficult from such passages to determine with assurance exactly what he thought and said; for the extended apocalyptic discourses, which contain most of his declarations upon the subject, are made up of numerous detached sayings, very likely uttered on different occasions and referring perhaps to various events. They are brought together by the Evangelists in such a way that they seem to have been spoken at one time, and to refer to the same event. We cannot be certain, therefore, that Jesus declared that the Son of Man would return within the lifetime of some of those whom he addressed. But the Evangelists, and with them the early Christians in general, believed that he did;[4] and though they may have misunderstood him, they could hardly have done so unless he had given expression to his expectation at least of an early consummation, an expectation which was entirely in line with all we know of his conception of the kingdom.

The conditions of entrance into the kingdom of God

[1] The Messiah is represented as judge in Enoch, c. 45, 55, 61, 69; and John the Baptist also thought of him as such, so that there can be no doubt that the idea was common. At the same time the belief that God was himself to act as judge was also widespread. Cf. IV. Esdras vi. 1 sq., vii. 33; Enoch xc. 20, and the Assumptio Mosis, Chap. X.

[2] Mark xiii. 32.

[3] It is true that there are some utterances which apparently imply the lapse of a considerable interval before the consummation; as, for instance, the parables concerning the growth of the kingdom, and especially Mark xiii. 10, where it is said, "the gospel must first be preached unto all the nations." But such utterances are not absolutely irreconcilable with Jesus' expectation of a speedy return, and our sources contain so many indications of that expectation that it is difficult to question it.

[4] Cf., *e.g.*, Luke ix. 27; Matt. xxiv. 3–34.

were phrased by Christ in various forms, but a careful analysis of all his utterances upon the subject makes it plain that he regarded as the essential and all-embracing condition the true spirit of sonship toward the father God. The emphasis was always laid by him upon the heart rather than upon the external act. The act might be proper and right enough, but it had value in his eyes only as the disposition which prompted it was what it ought to be, only as it was the disposition of a son of God. And so when he summoned men to repentance, as we are told that he did at the very beginning of his career, it was not primarily to a repentance for unrighteous words and deeds, but for the lack at any time and in any degree of the spirit and purpose of the true son.

It is in the light of this fact that Jesus' attitude toward the Jewish law must be interpreted. That law was a divine law to him as truly as to any of his countrymen, and the obedience which he insisted upon as an essential part of the conduct of a true son of God included its observance. As he inculcated the most absolute and thoroughgoing conformity to God's will,[1] so he inculcated the most absolute and thoroughgoing conformity to the law, a conformity which should far surpass that of the Pharisees.[2] The trouble with them was that they observed the law not too much, but too little. Their boasted righteousness was immeasurably below the standard which he set. Not only in their practices, but also in their precepts, they were far from what they ought to be. They were hypocrites, for they did not practise what they preached;[3] and they were at the same time blind leaders of the blind, for they taught a false observance of the law, which defeated the very purpose for which it had been given.[4] A large part of Jesus' energy was devoted to the undoing of the mischief which they had done. It was his great endeavor to interpret the law properly and to show the people what true obedience of it meant. The principle of interpretation he found in love for God and man. In

[1] Cf. Matt. vii. 21; Mark iii. 35.
[2] Matt. v. 17 sq.
[3] Matt. xxiii.
[4] Matt. xv. 14, xxiii. 16, 24.

the word "love" the spirit and conduct of the true son are fully expressed, and in that word the law, which is nothing else than God's revealed will for the government of his children's lives, may be comprehensively summed up.[1] But the application of that principle meant an entire change of emphasis and a new estimate of values. It meant that the external rites and ceremonies, which constituted so large a part of the Jewish law, were not an end in themselves, but only a means to a higher end, and that they had value only because they expressed and promoted the true attitude of a man toward God and his fellows. Thus the offerings and the sacrifices, the tithes, the fasts, and the Sabbath observances were significant only because of the spirit of true worship that voiced itself in them and was nourished by them. Jesus did not mean that the external rites and ceremonies were to be neglected, but that they were to be used as aids and instruments only, and that they were therefore to be subordinated, whenever they came in conflict with them, to the weightier matters of the law, to judgment and mercy and faith.[2] This principle made it possible for Jesus to exercise a large measure of liberty in connection with the law, while at the same time maintaining its divine character and inculcating its faithful observance.[3] That he anticipated that the law would ever be done away there is no sign. He saw no inconsistency between it and the exercise of love toward God and man, and it seems never to have occurred to him that the time would yet come for its abrogation. He certainly observed it faithfully himself, and he spoke and acted in such a way that his disciples did not think of any other course as legitimate or possible.

The fact that Jesus thus maintained a conservative attitude toward the law does not indicate that he meant to exclude Gentiles from the kingdom of God. It is true

[1] Matt. xxii. 37.

[2] Matt. xxiii. 23: "Ye tithe mint and anise and cummin, and have left undone the weightier matters of the law, judgment and mercy and faith: but these ye ought to have done, and not to have left the other undone." Cf. Luke xi. 42; Matt. v. 23; Mark vii. 10 sq.

[3] See Matt. xvii. 26; Mark ii. 27 sq. and parallels.

that during the earlier part of his ministry he seems to have had only his own countrymen in mind,[1] but before his death, when he realized that his Gospel would be rejected by the nation at large, he distinctly contemplated the entrance of foreign peoples into the kingdom.[2] And yet even then he said nothing of an abrogation or neglect of the Mosaic law, for had he done so, we should certainly find some trace of his words, either in the records of his life or in the conduct of his followers. He perhaps thought of the Gentiles as worshipping and serving God in the same way that the Jews did, and as taking their place with the latter, or instead of the latter,[3] in the existing household of faith. But though Jesus thus remained throughout his life a genuine Jew, both in precept and practice, he nevertheless gave utterance to a principle which must revolutionize the prevailing conception of the law, and which must make possible an attitude toward it very different from that of the Jews in general. If the law was a means only, and not an end in itself, the time might come when its usefulness would be outlived and when it would need to be done away in order that the higher end which it was meant to serve might be promoted and not hindered. That time did not come during Jesus' life, and he gave no clear indication that he expected it ever to come; but the subsequent history of Christianity would not have been what it was had not his principles made its coming possible.

It has been seen that the supreme condition of entrance into the kingdom of God, according to the teaching of Jesus, is the true spirit of sonship. To this one condition he adds no other. Even the passages in which he emphasizes the importance of a man's belief in, or attachment to himself, when rightly interpreted, are seen to involve nothing more or different. It is significant that during the early part of his ministry, according to the account of Mark, who reproduces most accurately the true order

[1] Matt. x. 5; Mark vii. 27.

[2] Matt. viii. 11 sq., xxi. 43. Compare also Matt. xxviii. 19, and John x. 16, whose authenticity is less certain.

[3] Cf. Matt. viii. 12, xxi. 43, xxiii. 37.

of events, Jesus said nothing of the necessity of coming into fellowship with himself. Only after the clear declaration of his Messiahship at Cæsarea Philippi[1] did he begin to bring his own personality forward and speak of a man's relation to him as determining in any way his character or destiny. This reticence, however, remarkable as it may seem at first sight, was entirely in line with his policy respecting the announcement of his Messiahship. Though he already believed himself to be the Christ, he began his ministry not with any reference to his own character or commission, but with the preaching of the kingdom of God, and he systematically refrained for a considerable period from declaring himself to be the Messiah, and even forbade others to proclaim him as such. The incident at Cæsarea Philippi marked an epoch in his ministry, for it was then that he first distinctly acknowledged his Messianic calling to his disciples, and even then he charged them that they should tell no one else.[2] His first public admission that he was the Messiah seems to have been made only at the very close of his life, upon the occasion of his final visit to Jerusalem. Evidently Jesus had a purpose in thus concealing his Messiahship for so long a time. Conscious, as he was, of the difference between his own mission and work, and the ideal cherished by the majority of his countrymen, he doubtless feared that a premature declaration would arouse false hopes respecting his mission, would precipitate an immediate crisis, and would make it impossible for him to prepare his countrymen as he wished to prepare them for the coming of a spiritual kingdom. Only when he realized that he was not to succeed in influencing any great number of the people, and that, on the contrary, his speedy death was inevitable, does he seem to have deemed it necessary to declare himself clearly, in the first place to his disciples, in order to prepare them for the impending crisis, and finally to the people at large. And so when he was executed, it was as a distinct claimant to the Messianic dignity.

[1] Mark viii. 27 sq. and parallels. [2] Mark viii. 30.

In view of the policy pursued by Jesus in this matter, it is not at all surprising that he should have refrained during the earlier months of his ministry from emphasizing the importance of a man's attachment to himself, and from making recognition of himself a condition of entrance into the kingdom of God. But there are in our Synoptic Gospels some utterances, belonging, according to Mark, to the latter part of Jesus' life, in which, though nothing is said about faith in him, a man's ultimate salvation is brought into some kind of connection with his attitude toward Christ. These passages are not numerous, but some of them are very striking. Among the strongest of them are such as the following: "Whosoever shall lose his life for my sake and the gospel's shall save it."[1] "Whosoever shall be ashamed of me and of my words in this adulterous and sinful generation, of him also shall the Son of man be ashamed when he cometh in the glory of his Father with the holy angels."[2] "Whosoever shall confess me before men, him will I confess also before my Father which is in heaven. But whosoever shall deny me before men, him will I also deny before my Father which is in heaven."[3] "Every one that hath left houses, or brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, or children, or lands for my name's sake, shall receive an hundredfold and shall inherit eternal life."[4] To these are to be added those Johannine passages in which Jesus connects eternal life with belief in himself. In regard to all these utterances it is to be observed that it is not the failure to believe in Christ, or the failure to take a certain attitude toward him, that is condemned by Jesus, and is said to involve the loss of future salvation, but only the cowardly denial of him by his followers, or the wilful refusal to receive his message by those to whom he utters that message. While in many other passages in which a man's relation to Jesus is spoken of, it is his relation to God which is made the important thing, and belief in Christ, or the acceptance of him, is emphasized because it means

[1] Mark viii. 35. [2] Mark viii. 38. [3] Matt. x. 32, 33.
[4] Matt. xix. 28, 29. Compare also Matt. viii. 22, xix. 21.

belief in or acceptance of the God who sent him and whom he reveals. It would seem in the light of these facts that when Jesus speaks of a man's relation to himself as determining his future destiny, he is not enunciating a new condition of salvation in addition to the general condition already described; is not requiring something more than the life of a true son of God, but is thinking of a man's connection with himself, because through him he may acquire a knowledge of his father God and come into intimate fellowship with him. In assuming as unquestioned the presence of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven,[1] Jesus intimates the possibility of man's coming into fellowship with God without coming into relation to the Messiah. At the same time, he evidently believes, and indeed in a number of cases, according to John, he distinctly and unequivocally asserts, that no true son of God can deny him or refuse to receive his message, for every true son of God that comes into contact with him will inevitably recognize him as God's messenger and revealer. We may conclude, then, that Jesus' emphasis of faith in or acceptance of himself, is throughout an emphasis not of his personality but of his message, and thus simply a reassertion of filial trust in, devotion to, and service of God, as the essential and sufficient condition of an eternal life of blessedness with God in heaven.

Thus did Jesus in all his teaching endeavor to prepare the minds and hearts of his countrymen for the kingdom of God, whose approach he announced. Nor were his efforts entirely without effect. Many were attracted by him, and he speedily gathered about him quite a company of disciples, who did not, however, regard him as the Messiah, at least for some time, perhaps the majority of them not until almost the close of his life. Those that followed him, so far as they were not actuated by mere curiosity, or by the desire to enjoy the benefit of his miraculous power, did it very much for the same reason that so many had followed John the Baptist, because he announced the coming of the kingdom of God, and because they believed

[1] Matt. viii. 11.

that from him they could learn the time and the conditions of its establishment, and in his company could best prepare themselves for it. But before he died Jesus distinctly and publicly avowed himself to be the Messiah, and thus his work took on an aspect very different from that of John the Baptist. Even after his death John was regarded as a prophet by the great mass of the people; but when Jesus died, he left behind him only those, on the one hand, who believed him to be nothing but the worst of impostors, and those, on the other hand, who believed him to be the Messiah in spite of his death. The bond that thenceforth bound his disciples together was therefore very different from that which united John's followers. The latter were no better off than any pious Israelites who might be looking for the coming of the kingdom. But the disciples of Jesus were awaiting the return of a king whom they already knew and loved, and who had withdrawn himself only for a brief season from the public gaze. And so, though Jesus failed to secure for his Gospel of the kingdom the acceptance of the people as a whole, as he had once hoped to do; though he left behind him only a small company of disciples, whose numbers were doubtless sadly reduced by his execution, his life was not a failure, and he knew that it was not; for he had succeeded in convincing them at least, if not others, that he was actually the promised Messiah, and that the Messianic kingdom was to find in him its founder and its head. He had thus given them a bond of union which he knew would serve to keep them his until the consummation, and would nerve and inspire them to carry on till then the work of preparation which he could not live to complete. The secret of his historic significance lies just in this fact.

Jesus Christ has been thought of almost from the beginning as the incarnation of deity and as the perfect and ideal man. But it was not upon his deity, nor yet upon the perfection of his humanity, that his disciples founded the Christian Church. The men whom he gathered about him regarded him in neither of these

aspects. They thought of him only as the Messiah, and the fact that he left a church behind him, instead of a mere name, and that he is known to history as the founder of a religion, and not as a mere sage or prophet, is historically due not so much to any uniqueness either in his character or in his nature, as to the conviction which he succeeded in imparting to his followers that he was the one who had been promised by the prophets and long awaited by the fathers. The power of his wonderful personality is revealed in his success in impressing that belief upon them in spite of the difficulties with which it was beset. But he might have been all that he was as a teacher, and as a wonder-worker, and yet have accomplished little more than John the Baptist did, had he not stepped into the place which had for so long been waiting to be filled, and become the centre of the accumulated hopes and expectations of centuries. The Gospel of the fatherhood of God which he preached is eminently fitted to reform and beautify and save the lives of men, but the preaching of that Gospel would not itself have resulted in the Christian Church. Only the belief in Jesus' Messiahship could effect the great historic movement which bears, not his personal, but his official name.

It was doubtless because of Jesus' conviction that he would be put to death before the full accomplishment of the work to which he had been devoting himself, that he turned his especial attention, during the latter part of his ministry, to his disciples, endeavoring to equip them for the important duty that was to devolve upon them after his departure. It was during this period that he warned them repeatedly of the difficulties and dangers which they would have to face; that he cautioned them to be firm and steadfast, and encouraged them with the promise of a speedy consummation, when their faith and patience should have their full reward. It was then, also, that he promised that the Holy Spirit should be sent to instruct and assist them, and that he himself would return and abide with them. It is to be doubted whether Jesus meant to separate sharply his own coming and the coming of the

Spirit. It is more probable that he thought of the Spirit of God as mediating his fellowship with his disciples, as the power enabling them to see him with their spiritual vision, to be conscious of his abiding presence, and to live in constant communion with him. His promise, then, began to find fulfilment, not when the Spirit came at Pentecost, but long before Pentecost, when, after his death and the season of despair that followed, his disciples became convinced that he still lived and again entered into joyful fellowship with him, a fellowship permanent and unbroken.[1]

And so Jesus did not regard his death as putting a stop to his work, or as involving the destruction of the cause for which he had lived and labored. Indeed, before the end came, he had learned to look upon his death as a positive advantage to the cause so dear to his heart and as a means of advancing the interests of the kingdom of God. He told his disciples distinctly, according to John's Gospel, that it was better for him to die, because then the Spirit could come, and his coming would prove a greater blessing than their master's continued bodily presence. He saw that only when he was gone from them, could their earthly ideas and ideals be finally done away, and they understand fully the spiritual conceptions

[1] There is no indication in our sources that Jesus thought of the coming of the Spirit as instituting a new stage in the Kingdom of God, or as constituting the establishment of the Kingdom in any sense. He thought, so far as our sources enable us to judge, of only two stages of the Kingdom; the one already begun with the gathering of disciples about himself on earth, the other to be ushered in by his return in glory at the end of the present æon. Through the Spirit his continued fellowship with his disciples was to be made possible, and he was thus to be in his Kingdom on earth as truly after his death as before. The dispensation of the Spirit therefore is not to be distinguished from the dispensation of Christ. He himself was in the Spirit when on earth; his possession by the Spirit was in fact one of the most notable features of his life and work (cf. Matt. iii. 16, iv. 1, xii. 18; Mark i. 10, 12; Luke iv. 1, 14, 18; John i. 32, 33; also Matt. xii. 28, where Jesus says, "If I by the Spirit of God cast out devils," while in the parallel passage, in Luke xi. 20, the phrase "finger of God" is used. Compare also the impression produced by Jesus upon his enemies, who declared that he was possessed of a devil; Mark iii. 22, 30; Matt. ix. 34; John viii. 48, x. 20; see Gunkel: *Wirkungen des heiligen Geistes*, S. 37). And so after his death Jesus simply continued to abide with his disciples in the Spirit. This at any rate is the impression produced by the words of Jesus recorded in John, who reproduces his utterances upon the subject most fully, and doubtless with substantial accuracy.

and appreciate the spiritual values of which he had been endeavoring to tell them. Thus he believed that bodily separation would bring about a closeness of communion such as he and his disciples had not hitherto enjoyed, and would enable them to testify of him with a power and wisdom not hitherto possible.

But Jesus was not only convinced that his death would thus lead to good results, he also believed that it possessed a real value and significance of its own. When he saw that death was inevitable, he seems also to have realized at the same time that it was the consistent carrying out of that principle of the kingdom to which he gave such frequent utterance, — the principle of self-denying, self-renouncing service, — and to have believed that the sacrifice of his life, as the supreme act of service, would inevitably redound to the good of all his disciples, of all those for whose sake that sacrifice was made. It is significant that in connection with the first announcement of his death, Jesus emphasized self-denial as a condition of discipleship, and even went so far as to say, "Whosoever shall lose his life for my sake and the gospel's, shall save it."[1] Both then and later, when he spoke of the cup which he had to drink and of his life given for the ransom of many, he made his own ministry, even unto death, an example for his followers, and pointed to it as the strongest kind of an expression of the principle of service which he preached. But Jesus represented his death not simply as an act, and the supreme act, of service, but also, at the time of the last supper, as a sacrifice offered for the sealing of the covenant which God made with his disciples, just as the earlier covenant had been sealed by a sacrifice at Horeb.[2] This idea of the significance of his death can hardly have been in Jesus' mind from the beginning, for he makes no other reference to such a covenant, and his earlier allusions to his death indicate that he found the reason for it in the principle of service, and not in the

[1] Mark viii. 35.

[2] Ex. xxiv. 1-12. Cf. Briggs: *Messiah of the Gospels*, p. 120 sq. See also p. 69, below.

need of a covenant sacrifice. The fact of his impending death, however, once accepted and accounted for, he might easily see in it another significance which would give it an increased value; might interpret it in the light of Jewish history, and thus make it of added worth in its bearing upon the future. As the call of the Jewish nation to be God's peculiar people, and to enjoy peculiar favors from his hand, had been sealed by a covenant sacrifice, so it seemed most natural that the call of a new people to be heirs of the eternal blessings of the future should likewise be sealed by a sacrifice. Thus Jesus believed that his death meant, in more than one way, not evil but good to the kingdom of God. Thus he could go to his death not only with calm resignation, but with exultation, for he knew that ultimate and eternal victory lay that way, not for him alone, but for the great cause of his father God.

CHAPTER II

PRIMITIVE JEWISH CHRISTIANITY

1. The New Beginning

The immediate effect of Jesus' crucifixion, according to our earliest sources, was the dispersion of his disciples.[1] In spite of the fact that he had endeavored so to prepare them for his approaching death that they should not be thrown into confusion by it, but should immediately take up the work which he had begun and carry it on without interruption, when his death came it found them unprepared, and it left them apparently demoralized. Our sources do not warrant us in asserting positively that his disciples had no idea that he would die,[2] but they make it clear that they were distressed and bewildered by his death. If it be assumed, then, that they did expect it, we must conclude that they had supposed it would be immediately followed by such a manifestation of God's power as should vindicate their faith in Jesus, and introduce the consummation of the kingdom for which they were looking, and upon which all their hopes were centred. We must conclude, in other words, that they believed his death would be but his translation into the heavenly sphere, in order that he might at once appear in glory as the conquering Messiah. For a death unaccompanied by any such manifestation they were certainly not prepared. Nor were they prepared for his bodily resurrection after three days and for his reappearance in the same form which he had worn before his execution. There are, it is true, a number of passages in our sources in which

[1] Matt. xxvi. 31, 56; Mark xiv. 27, 50.

[2] But Luke xxiv. 21 certainly points in that direction.

Jesus is represented as explicitly telling his disciples that he would rise from the dead after three days.[1] But it is clear, in the light of their subsequent attitude, that they must have interpreted his words, if they attached any meaning to them, not as a promise of his reappearance to them in his old form, but as an assurance of his immediate entrance after death upon the glorious career of the conquering and reigning Messiah.[2]

But though the disciples seem not to have been prepared for either the death or the resurrection of Jesus, nothing is more certain than that within a few days, or at most within a few weeks, after his execution, they reached the assured conviction that he still lived. Moreover, there can be no question that the basis of this confidence was found in appearances of the risen Lord, which were of such a character as to convince his followers of their absolute reality. A number of manifestations are mentioned in our sources, but the accounts differ so widely, that it is impossible to construct a consistent narrative which shall include all the details.[3] But we shall

[1] In Mark we have uniformly μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας (viii. 31, ix. 21, x. 34); in Matthew and Luke ἐν τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ (Matt. xvi. 21, xvii. 23, xx. 19; Luke ix. 22, xviii. 23). The former is evidently the original form, the phrase of Matthew and Luke being an effort to make the statement more precise. Compare also Mark ix. 9 and Matt. xvii. 9, where the resurrection is referred to without a reference to the "three days."

[2] It is significant that Jesus in none of the passages in question makes his resurrection a bodily resurrection, or speaks of his bodily reappearance to his disciples. He simply refers to a resurrection without more nearly defining its nature, and it was therefore quite possible for his disciples to interpret his words as a promise of his immediate entrance after death upon his Messianic career. Mark and Luke, who, of course, when they wrote their Gospels, interpreted the words in question as referring to Jesus' bodily resurrection and reappearance to his disciples, distinctly say that the latter did not understand what his words meant (Mark ix. 10, 32; Luke xviii. 34).

It is not necessary to suppose that the words "after three days" were used by Jesus or understood by his disciples as referring to a fixed and definite interval, for the phrase was a proverbial one to denote a very brief period of time, and might therefore have been employed in the present case simply to emphasize the immediateness of his restoration to life. Compare Hos. vi. 2; Mark xv. 29; Luke xiii. 32; John ii. 19; and see Weiss, *Biblische Theologies*, 6te Auflage, S. 67 (Eng. Trans., Vol. I. p. 90), and Wendt, *Lehre Jesu*, II. S. 545 (Eng. Trans., Vol. II. p. 269).

[3] An appearance to Mary Magdalene is recorded by the Gospel of John and the appendix of Mark's Gospel; to Mary Magdalene and another Mary by the Gospel of Matthew. But Paul in 1 Cor. xv., where he enumerates various

doubtless be nearest the actual facts if we assume that the great majority of Jesus' disciples, dismayed by his awful death, fled in fear and discouragement to Galilee, where most of them had their homes, and that they there became convinced that their Master still lived, and, with this conviction already established, made their way back speedily to Jerusalem. It is here that we find them in the opening chapter of the Acts, which represents Jesus as appearing and conversing with them during a period of forty days, after which "he was taken up, and a cloud received him out of their sight."[1]

This is the most explicit account of the ascension to be found in the New Testament. The Gospels, with the exception of the appendix of Mark, contain no record of it.[2]

manifestations of the risen Jesus, does not mention such an appearance, nor do the Gospel of Mark and the recently discovered Gospel of Peter. The Gospel of Luke, though it refers to the presence of the women at the sepulchre and the angels' announcement of Jesus' resurrection, evidently knows nothing of his manifestation to them (cf. Luke xxiv. 5, 22). Paul, in the epistle already referred to, which constitutes a source of the first rank and whose account of the resurrection is of indisputable trustworthiness, mentions first of all an appearance of the risen Lord to Peter, as if he knew of no earlier ones or considered them of no importance. Of such an especial manifestation to Peter we have no record in our Gospels except in Luke xxiv. 34, where the disciples of Jerusalem are represented as saying, "The Lord is risen indeed and has appeared unto Simon." But there is some confusion in our sources not only as to the persons to whom the risen Jesus appeared, but also as to the place where his appearances took place. Matthew and Mark agree in sending the disciples to Galilee for a meeting with the Master there (Matt. xxviii. 7, 10; Mark xvi. 7; cf. also Matt. xxvi. 32; Mark xiv. 28), and that meeting is described by Matthew in xxviii. 16 (cf. also the Gospel of Peter). On the other hand, while Matthew records appearances both in Galilee and Jerusalem, the appendix of Mark, Luke, and John (if John xxi., which is a later addition to the Gospel, be left out of sight) report such appearances only in Jerusalem and its vicinity. There is no reason to suppose that John was ignorant of the Galilean meeting; the closing verses of chap. xx. may include Galilee as well as Jerusalem, and the episode related in chap. xxi., though not recorded in the original Gospel, implies an acquaintance in John's immediate circle with an independent tradition of days spent in Galilee. Of Luke, however, less can be said. His silence both in the Gospel and in the Acts can be explained only on the supposition that he knew nothing of a post-resurrection visit to Galilee. Indeed, the account given in the Gospel is so constructed as to seem to exclude such a visit (cf. especially xxiv. 36, 44, and 49).

[1] Acts i. 9.

[2] The *textus receptus* of Luke xxiv. 51, 52 is untrustworthy, for the words καὶ ἀνεφέρετο εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν and προσκυνήσαντες αὐτόν are wanting in the best manuscripts, and are bracketed by Westcott and Hort. The Gospel of John, though it does not record the ascension, refers to it indirectly by anticipation in vi. 62 and xx. 17.

But the exaltation of Jesus to the right hand of God, from whence he is to come again, forms an integral part of the earliest Christian tradition, and is referred to in many passages.[1] Of course, such exaltation presupposes an ascension, but the stress is commonly laid upon the former rather than upon the latter. Indeed, it may fairly be assumed from the silence of Matthew and Mark, that in the earliest form of the Gospel tradition, the ascension was not reported at all, and that Luke, in his account, follows, as in so many cases, an independent source. It may well be that in the beginning the act of ascension was looked upon as of minor importance; given the resurrection and the exaltation, the ascension followed as a matter of course, and testimony to the event was quite superfluous. We may perhaps go still further, and say that originally the disciples did not draw a sharp line of distinction between the numerous sudden departures of Christ, when he "vanished from their sight," and such a final departure as is recorded in the first chapter of Acts. The latter may have been marked off from the others as unique and of especial significance only after reflection upon the exaltation of Christ and upon his second coming, both of which were so prominent in the minds of the early believers.[2]

We should hardly expect, after what has been said, to find any very exact data as to the length of time during which the risen Jesus appeared to his disciples. Matthew's account implies a period of at least some days;[3] John's involves a week, and with the appendix some time longer; while the Book of Acts, which represents at this point the latest stage of development, fixes the time at forty days. The accounts given in the appendix of Mark and in Luke's Gospel necessitate but a single day, and

[1] Acts ii. 33, v. 31, vii. 56, ix. 5; Eph. i. 20; 1 Tim. iii. 16; Heb. i. 3, x. 12, etc. Also in Jesus' apocalyptic discourses recorded in the Synoptic Gospels.

[2] Compare the words "This Jesus which was received up from you into heaven shall so come in like manner as ye beheld him going into heaven" (Acts i. 11), where the manner of the ascension is emphasized. One might almost think that these words were the result of reflection upon the second coming.

[3] This is true also of the Gospel of Peter.

all the events recorded by the latter seem on their face to have taken place within that time. This, however, cannot be pressed, and we are not justified in asserting that in the Acts Luke contradicts, either intentionally or unintentionally, his account in the Gospel. He may have come into possession of new information since writing his earlier work, but had he regarded it as contravening the statements of that work, he could hardly have let those statements go uncorrected.[1] There is thus no adequate ground for denying that the manifestations of the risen Jesus continued for at least some weeks, as recorded in the first chapter of Acts, and as a matter of fact the appearances referred to by Paul in the fifteenth chapter of First Corinthians can hardly be crowded into a shorter period.

The effect upon Jesus' disciples of his death and of the remarkable events that followed was very great. It could not be otherwise than that a change in their thinking and living should be wrought by such occurrences. That change was most momentous in its consequences. There are many indications in our Gospels that during his lifetime the followers of Jesus were looking forward to his speedy establishment of an earthly kingdom. Even his announcement of his death does not seem to have changed their expectations in this regard. If they believed he would die, they evidently believed, as has already been remarked, that his death would only usher in the consummation, and that he would immediately appear upon the clouds as the conquering Messiah, to set up his kingdom on earth

[1] Luke's words in Acts i. 2 seem really to indicate that he regarded the account given in his Gospel as covering the entire post-resurrection period. Whether the "forty days" mentioned in the Acts represent a common and widespread tradition among the early disciples we do not know. The absence of all reference to the number of days in other early documents argues against the general prevalence of such a tradition, and it is interesting to notice that the author of the Epistle of Barnabas was not acquainted with it, or at least did not accept it, for he says in chap. xv., "wherefore also we keep the eighth day with joyfulness, the day also on which Jesus rose from the dead and was manifested, and ascended into heaven" (the English translation of this passage in the Edinburgh and American editions is incorrect). Here the ascension is distinguished from the resurrection and yet put on a Sunday, either the Sunday of the resurrection, as seems probable, or on some subsequent Sunday. In either case Barnabas disagrees with the first chapter of Acts, unless the "forty days" mentioned here are to be taken simply as a round number.

and to assert his dominion over all peoples. Even after his resurrection, they seem still to have held for a time substantially the same idea.[1] His death, unaccompanied as it was with convincing evidence of his Messiahship, had bewildered and distressed them, but his reappearance had revived all their old hopes in an unchanged form, and they expected now the immediate accomplishment of that for which they had so long been looking. His resurrection they thought must be for this and for no other purpose. But it was not for this purpose, and they speedily discovered the fact. He reappeared, indeed, only to leave them again and ascend to heaven. His departure, then, must mean one of two things: either their hopes were vain and the kingdom upon earth for which they had been looking was never to have an existence, or the time for its establishment was not yet come. It is of the greatest historic moment, that the disciples adopted not the former but the latter alternative. Our sources show that they, and almost the entire early church after them, continued to believe that an earthly kingdom was yet to be founded by Christ. But if the time for its establishment was postponed by Jesus' departure from the earth, it was evident that the work of preparation must still go on, and thus there was thrust upon the disciples a new and unexpected duty. Upon them rested the responsibility of carrying on, until the consummation, the work which Jesus had begun. They felt themselves now called to take up the task which he had laid down; called to enter upon a new mission, which was not to cease until he returned in glory upon the clouds of heaven. Up to the time of Jesus' death they had been simply followers; now they were to be leaders. While he was with them, they had simply to learn of him, to attend him, to be his faithful adherents, that they might be ready to share with him in the glory of the coming kingdom. Now there fell to them another task: they must seek to prepare others for

[1] Cf. Acts i. 6: "Lord, dost thou at this time restore the kingdom to Israel?" where not only the earthly but the national character of their hopes is clearly revealed. The question is of too primitive a character to suppose it the invention of a later generation.

the consummation, as he had prepared them; they must gather disciples into the kingdom, as he had done; they must, if they could, secure for him the adherence of the Jewish nation, which had rejected him, that the nation as a whole might become the kingdom of God.

It was this sense of a new duty and responsibility that led them back from Galilee to Jerusalem. In Jerusalem, the political and religious centre of Judaism, where were gathered the leaders and teachers of the people, and where every movement that claimed to be of national significance must finally be vindicated or condemned; in Jerusalem itself, where their Master had met his fate, they must bear their testimony and proclaim him openly as the Messiah. The disciples' return to the city with this determination constitutes an epoch in the history of Christianity. It marks a new beginning, a resumption of the great work which had been begun by Jesus, but had been interrupted by his crucifixion. The cause for which he had given his life was hanging in the balance during the dark days succeeding his death. Was his work to be all for naught? Was his memory to perish from the earth? That Christianity has had a history is due to the fact that these disciples did not go back disheartened to their old pursuits and live on as if they had never known him, but that, on the contrary, filled with the belief that their Master still lived, and conscious of holding a commission from him, they banded themselves together with the resolve of completing his work and preparing their countrymen for his return. Their resolve, put into execution when they left Galilee and returned to Jerusalem, marks the real starting-point in the history of the church.

But this was not all. The resurrection and exaltation of Jesus had yet another important effect upon his disciples. Originally they seem to have thought of him as only a prophet; as a preacher of the kingdom of God, but not its founder. But gradually they became convinced that he was himself the Messiah, and that he would yet assume his Messianic dignity. His resurrection and exaltation then could hardly mean anything

else to them than his assumption of that dignity. When they had found their way back to Jerusalem, they testified not merely to what they believed or hoped, but to what they had seen. It was not that Jesus was to become the Messiah when he returned upon the clouds of heaven, but that he had become the Messiah when he entered into heaven.[1] He would return not with a new glory that was not yet his, but with a glory which he already possessed and which they had witnessed. That he had not already ushered in his kingdom and begun his reign, was not because he lacked Messianic authority and power, but because his people were not yet prepared. The heavens must receive him for a little while until they repented and were ready to welcome his return.[2]

There is no reason to suppose that in the thought of Jesus his resurrection and ascension marked such a crisis as it did in the thought of his disciples. Our Gospels indicate that he regarded himself as already fulfilling Messianic functions even during his earthly life. His assumption of the power to forgive sins, where it is evidently a Messianic forgiveness that he dispenses; his constant exercise of authority over demons, which he cites as a proof that the kingdom is already established, and his delegation of that authority to his disciples; his avowed Lordship over the Sabbath; his tacit acceptance of the title of king, with which his followers hail him upon his entrance into Jerusalem, and his express adoption of that title in the presence of Pilate, — all go to show that he looked upon himself as already the reigning and not simply the teaching Messiah. Moreover, it should not be overlooked that his conception of service was such that he found in his ministering life and death on earth the most genuine exercise of his Messianic sovereignty, and we should make him untrue to himself, if we assumed that he saw in his heavenly existence, or in his continued presence with his disciples after death, or in his guidance

[1] In Acts ii. 36 Peter says: "God hath made (ἐποίησεν) this Jesus both Lord and Christ." Thus according to Peter's view Jesus assumed his Messiahship when he ascended to heaven. Cf. also Acts v. 31.

[2] Acts iii. 21.

of them through the Holy Spirit, or even in his exercise of judgment at his final advent upon the clouds of glory, an enthronement higher or more truly Messianic than he already enjoyed. To say, then, that the disciples of Jesus regarded his departure from earth as his induction into the office of Messiah does not mean that Jesus himself looked upon it thus. But historically the important fact is, that whatever Jesus may have thought, his followers distinguished sharply between his earthly and heavenly existence, and saw in his entrance upon the latter the assumption of Messianic authority, and thus the pledge and guarantee of his return to exercise that authority on earth.

It was therefore as witnesses, prepared by what they had themselves seen, to testify to the Messiahship of Jesus, that these disciples returned to Jerusalem with the purpose of convincing others of the truth which meant so much to them. That some days should be spent before their public work began, in gathering together their scattered forces, and in fitting themselves by prayer and mutual converse for the task that lay before them, was but natural, and there is no reason to doubt the general accuracy of the account of those days contained in Acts i. 13–26. The idea that the apostolate should be kept at twelve, and that consequently it was necessary to fill the place made vacant by the treachery and death of Judas, is thoroughly characteristic of the early Jewish disciples.[1] In his original appointment of the Twelve Jesus undoubtedly had a symbolic reference to the twelve tribes of Israel, and it is not surprising, therefore, that his disciples should have thought it necessary to preserve the symbolism by keeping the number intact. They certainly anticipated at this time neither an apostolate to the Gentiles which should deprive the symbolism of its

[1] Peter of course did not utter all the words that are contained in vss. 16–22. But if vss. 18 and 19 be regarded as an insertion of the author, as they commonly are, there remains nothing that may not have been said by Peter; and if vs. 17 also be ascribed to Luke, the speech forms a consistent whole. But whether the speech be accurately reported or not, it is certain that vs. 22, which describes the mission of the apostles, cannot have originated with Luke, for he had an entirely different conception of an apostle's work.

significance, nor such a postponement of the return of Jesus as should make it impossible to preserve the number unbroken until the consummation.

It is not easy to discover just what significance attached to the apostles in these early days. They apparently held no official position in the church of Jerusalem, and were not regarded as in any way entrusted with its government or empowered to exercise authority within it. It was not as an office-bearer that Matthias was appointed, but as a witness to the resurrection.[1] And it was not the Twelve that were actually at the head of the church of Jerusalem and the leaders in its affairs, but certain individuals, Peter alone, or Peter and John in the earlier years, and at a later date James, the brother of the Lord.

It is significant that the name "apostles," by which the Twelve are known in the Book of Acts, was early given to many others, who devoted themselves to the work of travelling missionaries, and who, so far as we are able to learn, held no official position in any church or churches. The work which they did seems to have been carried on after the pattern given by Jesus in his original commission to the Twelve.[2] This fact throws light upon the traditional conception of an apostle's vocation, and thus argues against the absorption of the Twelve in work of a different character. Indeed, the author of the Acts himself, though he holds another idea of their mission, gives hints that they were primarily missionaries, when he records that Jesus, after his resurrection, commanded them to wait in Jerusalem, not permanently, but only until they should be endued with power from on high (that is, according to Luke's own view of the matter, only until the day of Pentecost), in order that they might become witnesses "in Jerusalem, and in all Judea and in Samaria and unto the uttermost parts of the earth."[3]

But not simply did the apostles hold no official position in the church of Jerusalem; there exists no proof that they

[1] Acts i. 22.
[2] See for instance *The Teaching of the Apostles*, chap. xi.
[3] Acts i. 4, 8.

held any official position in the church at large, or that they were supposed in these early days to have been entrusted with any kind of authority over it. They seem, as missionaries, to have done the same work that was done by many of their brethren. Matthias was not the only one that could testify of the resurrection, and his appointment did not imply that the others, who were more than five hundred in number according to Paul, were relieved from the duty or deprived of the privilege of bearing their testimony. The significance of the Twelve lay not in the peculiarity of the work that they did, nor in the authority with which they were entrusted,[1] but in the fact that they had been chosen by Christ to be his constant companions, had enjoyed the privilege of intimate fellowship with him, had received his especial instruction, had been sent out even during his lifetime to do the work of missionaries, and had been individually and collectively commanded to carry on that work after his death. Thus they were felt to have been particularly honored by Jesus, and to have been charged by him with a heavier responsibility than the mass of the disciples. But this is far from involving the claim or the recognition of official position and authority. It was, therefore, not as a member of an official board of government or control that Matthias was chosen, but simply as one of the little band of missionaries, whose significance over and above other missionaries, whatever it may have been while there were among them only those directly called by Jesus himself, after the appointment of Matthias could hardly be more than symbolic or prophetic.

But the author of the Book of Acts had another conception of the significance of the Twelve Apostles. He apparently thought of them as constituting an apostolic college, which had in its hands from the beginning the government of the church, and the members of which remained in Jerusalem, and at the head not simply of the congregation there, but also of the church at large,

[1] It cannot be shown even that they were in control of the missionary work of others.

for a number of years.[1] But such a conception is out of accord with the facts as they appear even in the Book of Acts itself,[2] and cannot be made to square with what we know of the church of Jerusalem from the epistles of Paul. The notion is evidently purely dogmatic, resting upon the author's assumption of what the apostles must have been to the church in its early days.[3] Already at the beginning of the second century, the idea was prevalent of an apostolic college to which was committed the control of the church by Christ. It was natural therefore for the author of the Book of Acts, in the absence of specific information upon the subject, to conceive of the position and work of the Twelve Apostles during the early years in Jerusalem in the way that he did.

Historically, the most important fact connected with the appointment of Matthias was the position of leadership assumed by Simon Peter. That a man who but a few weeks before had repeatedly and flagrantly denied his Master, should so soon recover the confidence of his associates, and even appear as their leader and spokesman, is, to say the least, surprising, and might well be doubted, were it not confirmed by the undisputed pre-eminence accorded him on many other occasions throughout these early days. Nothing, in fact, is more certain than that he was for some years the leading figure in the church of Jerusalem. But his pre-eminence, following so close upon his cowardly denial, demands an explanation. It is not enough to point to the fact that even during Jesus' lifetime he was the leading spirit among the disciples, and was recognized as such by Christ himself, for whatever repute he enjoyed then must have been forfeited by his recent conduct. We can explain the restored confidence

[1] Cf. Acts vi. 1, viii. 1, 14, xi. 1.

[2] Though referring so frequently in a vague and general way to "The Apostles," the author makes it evident in many passages that it was some individual or individuals that were held in highest honor, and not the apostles as a body.

[3] This idea was due in part to Paul himself, who in his controversy with the Judaizers enhanced, by his emphasis upon his equality with the Twelve, not only his own dignity and authority, but theirs as well. See below, p. 647.

of his brethren only on the supposition that he had had, since his denial, an opportunity to redeem his character and to vindicate conclusively his loyalty to the Master and his cause. What that opportunity was, we cannot certainly say, but we may find a suggestion of it in the fact that in speaking of the appearances of the risen Jesus, Paul mentions his appearance to Peter first of all. It would seem from Paul's words that that manifestation was of especial significance, and it is possible that it was primarily to Peter that the church owed its belief in the resurrection of its crucified Master. It may have been he who was first convinced of the great fact, and when doubt as to the reality of the resurrection threatened to triumph, or when the disciples' despair had not yet been broken by any ray of hope, he may have come to the rescue with a sturdy declaration of faith such as was characteristic of him, and such as had won for him at an earlier time the blessing of Christ.[1] If this supposition be correct, Peter became in a sense the second founder of the Christian church, and the prophecy of Christ, that upon him he would build his church,[2] found literal fulfilment; for without his faith, and his bold avowal of it at this critical time, the disciples would have gone back to their old life in despair, and the church would have had no existence. Under his leadership, it would seem, with the confidence inspired, in the first instance, by his sturdy faith, and confirmed by their own visions of the risen Lord, the disciples returned to Jerusalem. Under his leadership they met together there, and it was he that proposed the appointment of Judas' successor.

2. Pentecost and the Earliest Evangelism

The day of Pentecost, immediately succeeding the death and resurrection of Jesus, has always been regarded as of epochal significance for the history of the Christian church. Luke himself evidently so considered it; for even in his Gospel the event casts its shadow before, and

[1] Matt. xvi. 16. [2] Matt. xvi. 18.

the first chapter of the Book of Acts is clearly intended to lead up to it. That it was an important day in the history of the church there can be no doubt, but its importance is not that which is ordinarily ascribed to it. It was not the birthday of the Christian church, as it is so commonly called, for the Christian church was in existence before Pentecost; nor was it the day upon which began the dispensation of the Holy Spirit, for his promised coming preceded, or at least was closely connected with, Jesus' own return to his disciples after his resurrection, so that it was through the Spirit's enlightening influence that they became convinced that he still lived and was still with them. Certainly, if the revealing agency of the Spirit was ever needed by the disciples of Jesus, it was needed in the days succeeding his death; and if the Spirit ever did act as the revealer of truth to those disciples, and as the interpreter of the Master's promises to them, it was at the time when they became assured of his resurrection from the dead. As Jesus declared on an earlier occasion that it was not flesh and blood, but his Father in heaven that had revealed his Messiahship to Peter, it could not have been mere flesh and blood that had convinced Peter of the resurrection of the Lord. That conviction must have been the work of God. But in the thought of Jesus there was no distinction in such a case between God's work and the Spirit's. It must be assumed, in the light of this and other facts, that the Holy Spirit promised by Jesus before his death, had already been received by his disciples; that they were under the influence of that Spirit when they recognized the risen Lord, when they returned to Jerusalem to take up his work, when they met together there for prayer and conference, and when they filled Judas' vacant place, just as truly as they ever were.

What, then, is the historic significance of Pentecost, if it was neither the birthday of the Christian church nor the beginning of the dispensation of the Spirit? Its significance is indicated at the close of Luke's Gospel, and in the eighth verse of the first chapter of Acts, where a bap-

tism of power is foretold. Pentecost was a day of power, a day on which the Spirit of God manifested himself through the disciples as a power for the conversion of others. It was the inauguration of the evangelistic activity of the Christian church, when the disciples began the work to which they believed themselves called by the risen Lord, the work of witness-bearing. Under the influence of the Holy Spirit they bore testimony on the day of Pentecost to their Master, and they bore it with power; and it was not the coming of the Spirit, but the testimony of the disciples, that constituted the great central fact of the day, the fact that makes the day historic.

But in accordance with his general conception, the author of the Book of Acts finds the chief significance of Pentecost in the descent of the Holy Spirit, whom he regards as not given until then; and that descent he represents as accompanied by certain marvellous phenomena, — a sound as of the rushing of a mighty wind, tongues parting asunder like as of fire, and sitting upon each one of the disciples, and the speaking by all of them with other tongues as the Spirit gave them utterance. These phenomena are conceived by the author, not as separate and disconnected events, but as manifestations of the one Spirit. Their significance lies in the fact that they reveal that Spirit's presence. With the sound as of wind, and with the tongues as of fire, we need not particularly concern ourselves, but the "speaking with other tongues" demands brief attention. From various passages in the New Testament we learn that a peculiar gift, known as the "gift of tongues," was very widely exercised in the apostolic church, and the fourteenth chapter of Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians makes the general nature of the gift sufficiently plain. It was evidently the frenzied or ecstatic utterance of sounds ordinarily unintelligible both to speakers and to hearers, except such as might be endowed by the Holy Spirit with a special gift of interpretation.[1] The speaker was supposed to be completely under the control of the Spirit, to

[1] 1 Cor. xii. 10.

be a mere passive instrument in his hands, and to be moved and played upon by him. His utterances were not his own, but the utterances of the Spirit, and he was commonly entirely unconscious of what he was saying. He was not endowed with the power to speak in foreign tongues; his words were divine, not human, words, and had no relation whatever to any intelligible human language. It was not unnatural, therefore, that the speaker should appear demented to an unbelieving auditor, as Paul implies was not infrequently the case.[1] But his ecstatic utterances, inspired as it was believed by the Holy Ghost, were regarded by his fellow-Christians as spiritual utterances in an eminent sense. The "speaking with tongues" constituted, in the opinion of a large part of the church, the supreme act of worship, the act which gave the clearest evidence of the presence of the Spirit and of the speaker's peculiar nearness to his God.[2] No other gift enjoyed by the early church so vividly reveals the inspired and enthusiastic character of primitive Christianity. It was apparently this "gift of tongues" with which the disciples were endowed at Pentecost, and they spoke, therefore, not in foreign languages, but in the ecstatic, frenzied, unintelligible, spiritual speech of which Paul tells us in his First Epistle to the Corinthians.

That the Pentecostal phenomenon is thus to be regarded not as something unique, but as the earliest known exercise of the common gift of tongues, is rendered very probable by the lack of all reference to it in other early sources; by the absence of any hint that the disciples ever made use in their missionary labors, or indeed on any other occasion than Pentecost itself, of the miraculous power to speak in foreign languages; by the effect produced by the phenomenon upon some of those present, who accused the speakers of intoxication, and by the fact that it is treated as a fulfilment of the prophecy of Joel, who says nothing of "other tongues," but characterizes the Messianic Age as an age of revelation and of prophecy. But the most decisive argu-

[1] 1 Cor. xiv. 23.

[2] Paul himself had the gift pre-eminently, as he says in 1 Cor. xiv. 18.

ment is to be found in Peter's discourse, which constitutes our most trustworthy source for a knowledge of what actually occurred. Nowhere in that discourse does he refer to the use of foreign languages by his fellow-disciples, not even when he undertakes to defend them against the charge of drunkenness, though it would certainly have constituted a most convincing refutation of such a charge.[1]

The disciples then, it would seem, were endowed on the day of Pentecost with the gift of tongues, just as on many

[1] It is clear that the author of the Book of Acts had another conception of the phenomenon in question than that presented in the text. He evidently supposed that the disciples used foreign tongues, for he took pains to emphasize the fact that those present heard them speaking in the languages severally native to the auditors. It has been claimed that the author's representation is due to a misunderstanding on his part of the common phenomenon of the glossolalia, arising from the fact that he had himself never witnessed it, and an argument is drawn therefrom for the late date of the Book of Acts. But it is to be noticed that in two other passages (Acts x. 46, xix. 6) the author mentions the glossolalia in the correct Pauline way, without any hint of a misunderstanding of it, and some other reason must therefore be given for his misinterpretation of the Pentecostal phenomenon. That reason is perhaps to be found in the glamour which surrounded the infant church in the eyes of its historian, who was himself far removed from the events which he records. Under the circumstances he could hardly avoid investing even familiar occurrences with marvel and mystery. It may well be that the attendant wonders which he doubtless found recorded in the sources upon which he based his account, — the sound as of wind and the tongues like as of fire, — led him to think of the speaking with tongues, which was associated with them in his sources, as only another and similar supernatural manifestation of the inauguration of the dispensation of the Spirit; and hence to picture it also as entirely unique in its nature, and to separate it from the common everyday phenomenon with which the church of his time was familiar. At any rate whatever the cause of his misunderstanding, it is certain that his conception of the phenomenon is borne out neither by Peter's speech nor by his own account of the farther events of the day. It was the opinion of Dr. Schaff (*History of the Christian Church*, Vol. I. p. 231) that while the Pentecostal "speaking with tongues" was in reality the ordinary glossolalia, and therefore did not involve the use of foreign languages, the Holy Spirit interpreted the ecstatic utterances to some of those present, so that each supposed that he heard the disciples speaking in his own tongue. Compare also Overbeck in De Wette's *Kurzgefasstes Handbuch zum Neuer Testament*, 4te Auflage, S. 23 sq.; and Wendt in Meyer's *Apostelgeschichte*, 7te Auflage, S. 59 sq. This makes the whole scene clearer than the ordinary view, and better explains the accusation of drunkenness brought against the speaker by some of the onlookers; but it fails entirely to account for the silence of Peter in his discourse, and is no more nearly in accord with the conception of the author himself than is the view presented in the text, for the author evidently understood that the disciples actually spoke in foreign languages and were not merely supposed to have done so by certain of the hearers. For an elaborate discussion of the whole subject and a statement of the various views upon it, see Wendt, *l.c.*

other occasions when the Holy Spirit made his presence felt, and under the influence of that Spirit they gave utterance in ecstatic phrase to the profoundest spiritual joy and gratitude to God. Their speaking with tongues thus constituted the earliest testimony borne by Christ's disciples after his resurrection in the presence of unbelievers. It did not consist in the explicit and intelligible announcement of Jesus' Messiahship, but it was testimony nevertheless. For the impressive thing about the phenomenon was that men whose leader had been crucified but a few weeks before, and who had fled and scattered in fear and despair, were now gathered together again in the very city where he had been condemned, and under the very eyes of the authorities that had condemned him, and were giving evident and most demonstrative expression to the liveliest joy and gratitude. The amazing fact demanded an explanation, and that explanation Peter gave in his discourse. He interpreted the unintelligible utterances of those who had spoken with tongues, and in the light of his words the strange phenomenon took on new meaning and became the most powerful kind of testimony to the resurrection and exaltation of Jesus, for it was the testimony of the common conviction of a multitude of men. It was not Peter alone, then, that bore witness on the day of Pentecost; witness was borne also by all the assembled disciples, and Peter acted simply as the interpreter of that testimony to those who did not understand it.[1]

The Pentecostal address of Peter is peculiarly interesting because it constitutes the earliest extant Christian apology. It is, moreover, a thoroughly representative discourse. It reproduces not the thought of Peter alone, but the thought of his fellow-Christians as well. The spirit of primitive Jewish Christianity in general speaks in it. The first and most imperative duty of these early disciples must be to prove to their countrymen that Jesus was the promised Messiah. His crucifixion had seemingly

[1] On the views of the early disciples of Jerusalem see, in addition to the general works on New Testament theology and on the history of the apostolic age, Briggs: *Messiah of the Apostles*, p. 21 sq.

given the lie to his claim and proved him an impostor. To go on preaching his Gospel was therefore absurd, unless the impression left by his death could be effaced. Unless he could be shown to be what he had claimed to be, unless it could be shown that his death did not mean what it seemed to mean, the attempt to carry on the work that he had begun might as well be given up at once. Apologetics was the imperative need of the hour; not simply the proclamation of the Gospel, but the defence of it, and the defence of Jesus himself, the preacher of it. Thus the emphasis was changed from the Gospel itself to the evidence for its truth; from the message to the messenger. Not the fatherhood of God, but the Messiahship of Jesus formed the burden of the preaching of the apostles, and so the Master's estimate of values was reversed.

But it is significant that the disciples contented themselves with the demonstration of the proposition that Jesus is the Messiah, and that it apparently did not occur to them to ask what his Messiahship involved for Jesus himself. It was enough to know that he was the Christ. So long as that fact was true his character and nature were a matter of comparative indifference. There is no reason to suppose that the disciples in the beginning had any other idea of the Messiah than that which prevailed among their countrymen in general,[1] and there is no sign that they thought of asking whether that idea was correct or incorrect. Only after some time had passed did Christian thinkers begin to fill in the conception of Messiahship with this and that content; only when the original Messianic interest had somewhat waned, and it was believed that Jesus must have had something else to do besides founding the Messianic kingdom. It was, in other words, the conception that his work was more than merely Messianic that first opened the question as to the constitution of his person.[2]

[1] The Messiah was commonly thought of among the Jews as a man called and chosen by God. See above, p. 8.

[2] The common designation given to Jesus both by Peter and by his fellow-Christians is ὁ παῖς τοῦ θεοῦ, "the servant of God" (Acts iii. 13, 26, iv. 27, 30). ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ does not occur in these early documents (another sign of their

The supreme argument urged by the disciples in support of the Messiahship of Jesus was his resurrection. No event was better calculated to convince unbelievers that he was what he claimed to be; to efface the impression made by his death and to show that it had not meant, as it seemed to mean, that he was a blasphemous impostor, suffering the just vengeance of God. But it was hardly to be expected that those who had not themselves seen the risen Jesus should believe the testimony of his followers to such a startling and unheard-of event, for which even those followers themselves, in spite of their intimate fellowship with him and their belief in his Messiahship, were entirely unprepared. It was natural, therefore, that the effort should be made first of all to render the event credible by showing that, though it formed no part of the common Messianic expectation, it had yet been distinctly foretold in the Scriptures. To a Jew no other explanation was necessary. His teleological conceptions were such that the fact that anything had been prophesied constituted a sufficient reason for it. And so Peter in his Pentecostal address appealed to a passage from the sixteenth Psalm, which he claimed foretold the resurrection of the Messiah, and thus at once rendered Jesus' resurrection credible, and made it a convincing proof that he was actually the Christ. But Peter did not content himself with finding the resurrection in the Scriptures; he employed prophecy also to prove that it was necessary for the Messiah to ascend into the heavens and to sit down at the right hand of God, and this he claimed that Jesus had done, as was evidenced by the outpouring of the Holy Spirit, which was due to him. Thus his exaltation became a farther proof of his Messiahship. In the

primitive character). The loftier titles that are ascribed to Jesus, — Lord, Saviour, Prince, Cornerstone, — attach to him in his exalted post-resurrection existence only, and characterize simply his calling and mission as Messiah. They say nothing as to his natural constitution. He is not represented as a pre-existent, heavenly being, but simply as a man approved of God and chosen by him to be the Messiah and then raised by him to the position of Lord. Of the Pauline conception that he had returned to the glory which was originally his, we have no hint in these early records.

same way a prediction of Joel was used to establish the disciples' contention, involved in their proclamation of Jesus as the Messiah, and in turn supporting his Messiahship, that the last days, the days immediately preceding the consummation, were already come. It was thus claimed by Peter, and in making the claim he simply represented the common sentiment of the church, that the occurrences to which the disciples and the Pentecostal phenomena bore testimony were not unheralded and mysterious events, but a distinct fulfilment of Messianic prophecy, and as such demanded from all true Jews devout recognition and belief.[1] In the light of all he had to urge, Peter might well think himself justified in exclaiming triumphantly at the close of his speech: "Let all the house of Israel, therefore, know assuredly that God hath made this Jesus, whom ye crucified, both Lord and Christ."[2]

But in spite of all the evidence that could be adduced for the Messiahship of Jesus from his resurrection and exaltation and from the Scriptures which foretold those events, his death must remain a stumbling-block, and must seem to many a fatal objection to the identification of the man Jesus with God's chosen Messiah. Not that the conception of a suffering Messiah was absolutely unknown, but such a conception was certainly not common and nowhere included his official rejection and disgraceful

[1] It is entirely gratuitous to find in the use of Old Testament prophecy in Peter's pentecostal discourse evidence of a later hand. It is inconceivable that he could have made any address at all upon the occasion in question without appealing to Scripture; and the fact that he attempts to prove no more than he does is an argument for the genuineness of the discourse or for the primitive character of the document from which Luke got it. Paul's words in 1 Cor. xv. 3-4 are very significant in this connection: "For I delivered unto you," he says, "first of all that which I also received, how that Christ *died for our sins* according to the Scriptures, and that he was buried; and that he hath been raised *on the third day* according to the Scriptures." The Scriptures are here made to prove much more than they are by Peter. Indeed, as time passed, the practice of appealing to them grew increasingly common, and the area of observed coincidence between the life and work of Jesus and Scripture prophecy grew constantly larger. Our gospels, especially the Gospel of Matthew, written as they were more than a generation after the events which they describe, are witnesses to the extent to which the practice had been carried by that time.

[2] Acts ii. 36.

execution by a mode of death pronounced accursed in the law.[1] It was in view of this difficulty that the disciples were led again to look for light in the Scriptures. If it could be shown that it was there foretold that the Christ should suffer and be rejected by God's chosen people, and undergo a disgraceful death, the difficulty would be at once removed, and at the same time added proof would be secured for the Messiahship of Jesus, who had in this particular also fulfilled Messianic prophecy. In Peter's Pentecostal discourse nothing is said upon this subject, though the quotation from the sixteenth Psalm, which is used as a prophecy of Jesus' resurrection, of course involves also his death. But in the address recorded in Acts iii. 12 sq., we read: "But the things which God foreshewed by the mouth of all the prophets, that his Christ should suffer, he thus fulfilled;" and the same idea appears in other passages in the early chapters of Acts.[2] With this explanation of the death of Jesus, the disciples seem for some time to have contented themselves. At least we find no other reason for it referred to in any of the recorded speeches or prayers of Peter or of his associates. There is no sign that they thought of it as Christ did, as possessing an independent value of its own, or as contributing in any way to the well-being of his followers, or to the advancement of the kingdom.[3]

[1] Cf. Justin Martyr's *Dialogue with Trypho*, c. 89 and 90; and see Schürer, *l.c.*, II. p. 464 sq. (Eng. Trans., Div. II. Vol. II. p. 104).

[2] Acts viii. 32 sq. Compare also iv. 11, 28.

[3] The words of Paul in 1 Cor. xv. 3: "I delivered unto you first of all that which also I received" (παρέλαβον) seem to imply that the idea that Christ's death had some relation to men's release from sin, was not original with himself, but was gained from those who were Christians before him. It is certain that the idea was widespread long before the end of the first century even in non-Pauline circles (cf. *e.g.* Matt. xxvi. 28, where the words εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν are added), and there is no reason to doubt that it arose very early. Indeed, it cannot have been long before the disciples were led to make a connection at once so obvious and so clearly suggested by such a passage as Isa. liii. But that the connection was thought of in the early days with which we are dealing, there is no sign in our sources, and it may be regarded as certain, at any rate, that it was not emphasized. It is worthy of remark that even when it was generally recognized that some connection existed, it was long before the nature of it was determined. There was, in fact, for centuries much vagueness of conception and wide lack of agreement at this point.

According to the author of the Acts, Peter's Pentecostal discourse produced a profound impression upon his auditors, and drew from them the anxious query: "Brethren, what shall we do?" Peter's reply, taken in connection with other utterances recorded in the following chapters, reveals with sufficient clearness the conception of the Gospel prevalent among the disciples in these early days. That conception was of the most simple and primitive character. Christianity, as they understood it, was Judaism, and nothing more. It was not a substitute for Judaism, nor even an addition or supplement to Judaism; it was not, indeed, in any way distinct from the national faith. It was simply the belief on the part of good and faithful Jews that Jesus was the Messiah, and it involved no disloyalty to Judaism, and no abandonment of existing principles. For a Jew to believe in the Messiah whom they preached, was not necessarily to revise his conceptions of the nature of the Messianic kingdom, and of the blessings to be enjoyed within it, nor indeed of the conditions of sharing in those blessings. Peter says only, "Repent and be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ."[1] Both here and in iii. 19, where he again exhorts his hearers to repent, the sin that is uppermost in his mind is their crucifixion of Jesus. But in v. 31 the word "repentance" is employed in a more general sense, and even in the two passages just mentioned, it is clear from Peter's reference to the forgiveness or remission of sins, that he did not intend to confine the needed repentance to the single crime which they had committed against the Messiah. It is clear, in other words, that though he was stating primarily not the conditions of salvation in general, for which, indeed, his hearers did not ask, but simply the particular duty devolving upon them under existing circumstances, he was voicing at the same time the general truth, that if one is conscious of sin committed, he must repent before he can expect to enjoy God's promised blessings. In laying down such a condition, Peter was simply reiterating a principle universally prevalent among

[1] Acts ii. 38.

the Jews of his time, that righteousness is an indispensable condition of enjoying God's favor, whether now or hereafter. It would be a mistake to suppose that he intended, during those early days, to enunciate a new way of securing God's favor, or a new method of salvation. He did not put repentance in the place of righteousness, nor did he suggest any revision of the prevailing theory of righteousness, making it consist in something else than the observance of the Jewish law. Moreover, we are not justified in assuming that his words involved in any sense a rebuke of the self-righteousness of his countrymen; that he intended to assert that every man is a sinner, and that repentance is a universal precondition of enjoying God's favor. Whatever his own opinion on the subject, the words which he is reported to have uttered during these early days leave room for the theory, which was widespread, at least in Pharisaic circles, that it is possible for a man to keep the law of God and thereby to secure through his own efforts the favor and blessing of the Almighty. Peter therefore preached no new and unfamiliar Gospel, when he summoned his hearers to repentance. He was simply enforcing the application, in the case of men whom he believed to have committed a grave crime, of a long-established, widely recognized, and genuinely Jewish principle, which they accepted as truly as he.

The baptism which Peter connects with repentance, in ii. 38, was not essentially novel. Baptism in the name of Jesus Christ was, of course, a new thing to the Jews whom he addressed; but baptism as such was entirely in line with the common Jewish rites of purificatiou, and as a symbolical representation of cleansing from the sins or crimes of which they repented, it must seem the most natural thing in the world to them, just as John's baptism seemed quite natural, and was never thought of as involving any disloyalty to Judaism, or any departure from its traditional principles. The connection of the rite with the name of Jesus Christ did not alter its essential character, nor make it an un-Jewish thing. It meant only that the repentance to which it gave expression was

based upon and due to the recognition of Jesus as the Messiah; and it may well be that baptism in his name was demanded by Peter of the Jews whom he addressed at Pentecost, just because the great crime which they had committed was the crucifixion of that Messiah, and because they could thus best give voice to their repentance for that crime. Administered on this occasion in the name of Jesus Christ, the rite would naturally take that form on other occasions, even when administered to those that had had no part in the crucifixion. It might thus in time come to be everywhere regarded not merely as an expression of repentance, but also as an assertion of the Messiahship of the crucified Jesus.

We have no record in our Synoptic Gospels that Jesus himself ever baptized any one, or that baptism was practised by his disciples during his lifetime. But it is distinctly stated in John iv. 2, that though Jesus himself did not baptize, his disciples did, and the entire naturalness of the rite, in the light of John's baptism, and its general prevalence in the apostolic church, confirm the report, and make it practically certain that the rite was not introduced as an innovation after Jesus' death. But if practised during his lifetime, by his disciples, it is altogether probable, in view of his uniform policy touching the announcement of his Messiahship, that baptism had the simple Johannine form, and that it was not a baptism into or in his own name. The name of Jesus is mentioned by Peter in connection with the rite only in ii. 38, in his reply to the questioners at Pentecost.[1] This might suggest a doubt as to whether the formula was really used even on that occasion. And the doubt might seem to be confirmed by the fact that only in two other passages in the Book of Acts, and then only in the narrative portions, is baptism connected with the name of Jesus.[2] It is not impossible that, even after Pentecost, the rite was sometimes administered in the Johannine form, but the common use of

[1] Peter refers to baptism only in one other passage (x. 47), and then does not connect it with the name of Jesus; though Luke tells us in the following verses that he "commanded them to be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ."

[2] Acts viii. 16, x. 48. But compare also the address of Paul, Acts xxii. 16.

the Christian formula in the time of Paul makes it altogether probable that that formula was introduced at a very early day; and the conditions at Pentecost were such as to make its introduction at that time most natural.

Of the trinitarian formula, into the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, which later became universal in the church, we have no trace in the New Testament, except in the single passage, Matt. xxviii. 19.[1] It is difficult to suppose that it was employed in the early days with which we are here concerned; for it involves a conception of the nature of the rite which was entirely foreign to the thought of these primitive Christians, and indeed no less foreign to the thought of Paul. When and how the formula arose, we do not know. We find it expressly enjoined in the *Teaching of the Apostles*,[2] and that it was in common use in the middle of the second century is clear from the old Roman symbol which was based upon it, and also from Justin Martyr's *Apology*.[3] It may have had its origin in the prophecy of the Baptist recorded in all the Gospels, that the Messiah would baptize with the Holy Ghost, and in Jesus' own promise, that he would send the Holy Spirit as another advocate in his place, and that he and the

[1] It is difficult in the light of all we know of Jesus' principles and practice, and in the light also of the fact that the early disciples, and Paul as well, baptized into the name of Christ alone, to suppose that Jesus himself uttered the words: "Baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost," which are quoted in Matt. xxviii. 19. But it may be that he directed his apostles not simply to make disciples of all the nations but also to baptize them, as they had, perhaps, been in the habit already of baptizing those that joined their company. If, then, he simply gave the general direction to baptize (cf. the appendix of Mark xvi. 16), it would be very natural for a scribe to add the formula, "Into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost," which was in common use in his day. On the other hand, the fact must be recognized that Paul's indifference about performing the rite of baptism (see 1 Cor. i. 14 sq.) is hardly what we should expect if the eleven apostles received from Christ a direct command to baptize; and it is not impossible that the entire passage (Matt. xxviii. 19 b) is a later addition, as maintained by some scholars (cf. Teichmann's article, *Die Taufe bei Paulus*, in the *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*, 1896, Heft 4, pp. 357 sq.). On Paul's conception of baptism, see below, p. 541.

[2] *Didache*, vii. But baptism into the name of the Lord is also spoken of in a later chapter as if it were synonymous. Hermas (*Vis.* iii. 7, 3) speaks only of baptism into the name of the Lord. Other apostolic fathers give us no light.

[3] Justin Martyr, *Apol.* i. 6.

Father and the Spirit would abide with his disciples. The formula of benediction employed by Paul in 2 Cor. xiii. 14 may also have contributed to its use.

In stating to his hearers at Pentecost, and on other occasions as well, the means by which they might make amends for the crime they had committed, and prepare themselves for the approaching kingdom, Peter laid down no strange and un-Jewish conditions. In the same way, when describing the blessings that they might expect to enjoy if they repented and were baptized, he preached no new and unfamiliar Gospel. "Repent and be baptized," he says, "in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of your sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost."[1] It was a common belief among the Jews that the presence of the Holy Spirit would be a characteristic feature of the Messianic kingdom; that the spiritual gifts, which in earlier days were enjoyed only by favored individuals here and there, would in that kingdom be bestowed upon all. Peter was therefore on familiar ground, when he connected the outpouring of the Spirit at Pentecost with the advent of the Messianic age. If his hearers agreed with him that the Pentecostal phenomena indicated the Spirit's presence, they could not help agreeing with him in the conclusion drawn therefrom. But in the prophecy of Joel, which he quotes, the outpouring of the Spirit is made to precede and not to follow the "Day of the Lord," and it is clear, in the light of iii. 19 sq., that Peter thus understood the prophecy, and that he regarded the Spirit's advent as a sign not that the promised kingdom was already established upon earth, but that its establishment was at hand. The days that were introduced by Pentecost were only preparatory; the consummation was still in the future. The Messianic realm belonged, in Peter's thought, just as in the thought of his contemporaries, not to this æon, but to another, and before its inauguration must come the day of judgment and the "end of the world," that is, the end of the present age. That Jesus was already Lord and Prince and

[1] Acts ii. 38.

Saviour did not mean that his kingdom was already a reality, and that he was exercising dominion therein, but only that he was preparing the way for its realization. By the outpouring of the Spirit he was fitting his followers for it, and making its speedy establishment possible. That outpouring was a sign of its approach, but not of its actual presence. The disciples therefore lived in the future as truly as their unconverted brethren. The Christ was yet to come to accomplish his true work.[1]

That work there is no reason to suppose that Peter and his fellows conceived in any other way than their Jewish brethren. They evidently thought of the expected kingdom as a national kingdom, for Peter distinctly makes the advent of the Messiah dependent upon the repentance and conversion of those whom he addresses.[2] Only when the Jewish nation has listened to the preaching of the apostles and has recognized Jesus as the Christ, can the times of refreshing come, and the Messiah return to set up the kingdom. Into the details of that kingdom Peter does not enter, but he implies that the expected Messianic judgment will take place,[3] and he conceives the punishment of the wicked in genuine Jewish form as a "destruction from among the people."[4] He speaks also of the restoration of all things, a common phrase in Jewish apocalyptic literature, and of the fulfilment of the entire range of Messianic prediction.[5] All the blessings promised by the prophets, and longingly anticipated by the fathers, he assures his hearers they will yet enjoy, if they repent and thus secure forgiveness and the gift of the Holy Ghost. In the present is offered the opportunity not of realizing a present salvation, but of making certain the enjoyment of a future salvation. It is to make the most

[1] Looking to the future as the disciples were for the consummation of the Kingdom, and for the complete fulfilment of Messianic prophecy, they must inevitably feel less interest in the life of Jesus on earth than in his future advent. The life which they had witnessed was only preparatory, not final, and had value chiefly in its relation to days to come. Thus is explained the remarkable fact that for a long time the significance of Jesus' earthly life was almost entirely overlooked.

[2] Acts iii. 19.

[3] Acts ii. 20, 21, iii. 23.

[4] Acts iii. 23.

[5] Acts iii. 21.

of that opportunity that Peter exhorts his hearers on all possible occasions.[1]

3. The Life of the Primitive Disciples

The life of the early Christians of Jerusalem was in strictest accord with the conceptions that have been described. Their recognition of Jesus as the Messiah did not result in their neglect of the rites and ceremonies of Judaism, nor make them any less zealous than before for the religion of their fathers. They continued to discharge the various religious duties that devolved upon them as Jews, including participation in the temple worship and in the offering of the regular daily sacrifices.[2] We know also from Paul's experience with the Judaizers, that for many years after the death of Christ, there were multitudes of Christians zealously devoted to the laws and traditions of the fathers. Indeed, it may fairly be sup-

[1] A very noticeable feature of the discourses of Peter, which he is reported to have given during these early years, is the uniform absence of a reference to faith as a condition of enjoying God's favors, and sharing in the blessings of the Messianic age. Only once during the period with which we are concerned does he refer to faith, and then he makes faith in the name of Jesus the ground of the healing of the lame man. Of course, baptism in the name of Jesus involves a certain kind of faith, or more accurately the conviction that he is the Messiah, but faith in him is nowhere expressly made a condition of baptism or of discipleship. In this respect the utterances of Peter very closely resemble the Synoptic Gospels, and clearly represent an early type of Christian teaching. Doubtless the later emphasis upon the necessity of faith, which was universal even in circles where most was made of the observance of law, was largely due to Paul. That emphasis did not involve a new conception of the Gospel, but only a clearer apprehension of that which had been from the beginning implicitly wrapped up in it. Peter in his address at the council of Jerusalem (Acts xv. 9) refers to faith as a means by which the heart is cleansed, and Gal. ii. 16 implies that he was one with Paul in his recognition of its necessity. Indeed, he could not do otherwise than agree that the observance of the law was insufficient unless it were supplemented by the belief in Jesus' Messiahship. The fact, therefore, that in the early discourses recorded in Acts, faith is not made a condition of salvation, argues strongly for the primitive character of the documents containing them, of which the author of the Acts made use. To him and his contemporaries Christianity was the proclamation to all the world of eternal salvation through faith in Jesus Christ and obedience to his commands, and it is inconceivable that he, or any one else in his day, can have invented and put into the mouth of Peter a number of discourses in which no trace of such a Christianity occurs, and in which there is no reference whatever to the importance and saving character of faith.

[2] They went up to the temple regularly at the hour of prayer as their neighbors did (Acts iii. 1). Cf. also Acts x. 14, xv. 5, xxi. 21 sq.

posed that the effect of their Christian faith was to make all of the early disciples more devout and earnest Jews than they had ever been; for, as the consummation was at hand, it behooved them to prepare for it by the strictest and most scrupulous discharge of all their religious duties. It was fitting that they, who were the representatives of the Messiah, should reveal in their lives the mighty influence of the principles which they preached, and that their righteousness and piety should commend themselves to all beholders. The idea that they constituted the elect portion of the people, called by God to be heirs of the coming kingdom, would naturally lead them to feel the necessity of observing God's law with especial scrupulousness; would make them sensible of a peculiar obligation, such as they cannot have felt while they were simple Galileans, on the same footing with all their fellows. Such utterances of Christ as that recorded in Matt. v. 19, "Except your righteousness exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in nowise enter into the kingdom of heaven," doubtless influenced them greatly at this time, and it must have been their conviction that, simple Galileans though they were, they ought to exceed all other Jews, even the proudest Pharisees of Jerusalem, in their devotion to the national faith. That Jesus had intended to abrogate the Jewish law, or release his followers from its control, occurred to none of them.[1]

These early Christians, then, were thoroughgoing Jews and never thought of departing from the customs of their fathers. But their Judaism had a new element in it, which modified their lives and marked them off from their unconverted countrymen. They were bound to each other, and distinguished from all without their circle, as disciples of one whom they, and they alone, believed to be the Messiah, and as heirs of the Messianic kingdom which they expected him soon to establish. Their expectation of Christ's speedy return dominated all their lives. They felt themselves to be citizens not of this æon, but of another, and all their interests centred in the future.

[1] On Christ's own view of the law, see above, p. 25 sq.

Doubtless this expectation had much to do with the comparative indifference toward the things of this world which many of them exhibited. It could not fail to foster an unworldly or other-worldly disposition, and it may have had something to do with the poverty which so long prevailed in the mother church. Interested, as they all were, more in the future than in the present, and expecting shortly to receive blessings greater than any that could be acquired by human effort, it is not unlikely that many of them neglected their common occupations, and spent their time largely in prayer and praise, and converse respecting the future. This at least is the impression made by the early chapters of Acts, and it is exactly what we might expect. Poverty under such circumstances was neither a disgrace nor a hardship. To be indifferent to the comforts and luxuries of life was not a duty merely, but a privilege as well.[1]

But the absorption of the minds and hearts of the disciples in the kingdom which was so soon to be established, and the subordination of all other interests thereto, had the effect of binding them most closely to each other. They were not simply fellow-disciples of a common Master, fellow-believers in a common faith, they were brethren in the fullest sense, and the tie that united them was far stronger than their ordinary family and social ties. Doubtless the fact that many of them were comparative strangers in Jerusalem contributed to their sense of isolation from the outside world, and tended to enhance their feeling of brotherhood, but the impulse had a deeper basis than any such accidental circumstance. Whether at home or away from home, they constituted one household, and into this household they received all the converts to their faith. They did not conceive their mission to be simply the promulgation of a truth, or the impartation, to those outside,

[1] Very likely Jesus' words to the rich young man in Matt. xix. 21, and his declaration concerning the rich man's difficulty in entering the kingdom (vs. 23 sq.) tended to promote their contempt for worldly possessions. And doubtless their evident disregard for the things of the present, and their expectation of enjoying the richest blessings in the near future, proved very attractive to the poor, and helps to explain the fact that they won converts especially from that class.

of benefits that they had themselves received. Their mission was to bring others within the family circle, that they might there enjoy the blessings promised to the elect children of God.

It is in the light of this sense of brotherhood that we are to explain the kind of communism which the author of the Acts represents as practised in the church of Jerusalem.[1] It was not, to be sure, an absolute communism. Various indications show that Luke's general statements are to be taken with some qualification.[2] But even though not complete, the principle on which it was based was communistic. It was not mere charity that was practised; it was the recognition of the claims of the Christian family as superior to the claims of the individual, and it was the relief of the necessities of the brethren, not simply because they were needy and suffering, but because they were brethren.[3] The expectation of the speedy return of Christ, and the consequent undervaluation of earthly possessions, of course made such communism easier, but does not account for it. It was the fruit of the conception of the church as a family, which prevailed universally at this time.

It is clear, in the light of all that has been said, that the early Christians of Jerusalem must have found their life very largely in their association with one another, and that they must have been much together. We should expect also that the religious impulse would make itself felt in all parts of their life. They could not confine their

[1] Acts ii. 44, 45, iv. 32, 34 sq.

[2] Acts vi. 1 sq. shows that it was not an equal division of all the property belonging to all the disciples that was thought of, but only a distribution to such as were in need. So Ananias and Sapphira were not condemned for failing to turn over all that they had to the church, but for pretending to be more generous than they were (Acts v. 4); and their case clearly shows that the whole thing was voluntary and not required, while in communism in the strict sense, no room is left for individual generosity. The fact that Barnabas is especially commended for selling his field also suggests that such generosity was uncommon, and there is no implication in the account that he turned over to the apostles everything he had.

[3] The love for one's neighbor upon which Christ laid such stress and which he expressly made to embrace all men, was commonly interpreted by the early Christians, both Jewish and Gentile, to mean simply love for the brethren, fellow-members of the one household of faith. See below, p. 508 sq.

spiritual exercises and employments to certain fixed hours and days; their entire life must be a life of expectation and of preparation, and thus religious in the fullest sense. It would be a mistake to picture them as holding regular and formal religious services such as are held to-day. They did not constitute a separate synagogue, and they never thought of substituting their own meetings for the regular services of the synagogue. The latter they doubtless attended faithfully, in company with their neighbors, just as they had before their conversion. They may have been in the habit of gathering together in a body from time to time for common worship and for mutual edification and inspiration, as we find them doing in the days immediately preceding Pentecost; but as their numbers grew larger, such general gatherings must have become increasingly difficult, and it was at any rate not in them, but in their daily intercourse with one another and in the little family gatherings from house to house, that their Christian life found fullest expression and the sense of Christian brotherhood, which was all-controlling, had freest play.

The feeling of brotherhood voiced itself perhaps most clearly in the breaking of bread, which the author of the Acts refers to in ii. 42 and 46. He undoubtedly employs the expression to denote the Lord's Supper,[1] for the phrase was a technical one in his day. The accuracy of his report, that the Lord's Supper was eaten by the primitive disciples of Jerusalem, can hardly be questioned. The general prevalence of the rite from Paul's time on, and not in Pauline churches alone, but in all parts of Christendom, makes it almost necessary to assume that the custom was already observed in the very earliest period.[2]

[1] The κυριακὸν δεῖπνον, as Paul calls it.

[2] Professor Percy Gardner, in a very suggestive pamphlet entitled *The Origin of the Lord's Supper* (1893), maintains that the Supper was introduced by Paul. But it is inconceivable that the Jewish wing of the church would have taken it up had it originated with him. Its general prevalence at an early day in all parts of the church can be accounted for only on the assumption that it was pre-Pauline. At the same time, the fact must be recognized that it is not absolutely certain that Jesus himself actually instituted such a supper and directed his disciples to eat and drink in remembrance of him

That the disciples held a special service and partook of a special communion meal there is no sign. It is far

(εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν, as Paul says in 1 Cor. xi. 24, 25). Expecting as he did to return at an early day (cf. Mark xiv. 25), he can hardly have been solicitous to provide for the preservation of his memory; and it is a notable fact that neither Matthew nor Mark records such a command, while the passage in which it occurs in Luke is omitted in many of the oldest MSS., and is regarded as an interpolation by Westcott and Hort. Even if the words belong in the Gospel of Luke (as some maintain), they are evidently dependent upon Paul, and supply no independent testimony as to the original utterance of Christ. It is difficult to understand how Matthew and Mark can have abridged the more elaborate formula of Paul and Luke, and especially how they can have omitted the words in question. On the other hand, the enlargement of the briefer and simpler formula is easier to explain. There can be little doubt that Mark and Matthew, so far as they agree, represent the primitive tradition as to Christ's words. But Matthew has also enlarged the original formula by adding the words εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν (xxvi. 28), which occur in none of the parallel accounts. We must go back to Mark, therefore, for the primitive form. Compare Jülicher: *Zur Geschichte der Abendmahlsfeier in der ältesten Kirche*, in the *Theologische Abhandlungen C. von Weizsäcker gewidmet*, 1892, S. 235 sq.; and the note in Briggs' *Messiah of the Gospels*, p. 123.

There can be no doubt that Jesus ate the last supper with his disciples, as recorded in all three of the Synoptic Gospels, and that he said of the bread which he broke and gave to his companions, "This is my body," and of the wine which he gave them to drink, "This is my blood of the covenant which is shed for many," and that he did it with a reference to his approaching death. (Weizsäcker maintains, *l.c.* S. 568, that in speaking of his body Jesus was thinking of his continued presence with his disciples, and that only his reference to his shed blood is to be connected with his death; but see Jülicher, *l.c.* S. 241 sq.) But more than this our sources hardly warrant us in asserting positively. It was apparently not the institution of a memorial feast that he had in mind so much as the announcement of his impending death and the assurance that it would result not in evil but in good to his disciples. He had already told them that he must die, and that his death would be in reality a means of blessing to them. He now repeated that prophecy and promise in vivid and impressive symbol. As the bread was broken and the wine poured out, so must his body be broken and his blood shed, but not in vain; it was for their sake, and not for theirs alone, but for the sake of many. To read into this simple and touching act — unpremeditated and yet summing up in itself the whole story of his life of service and of sacrifice — subtle and abstruse doctrines is to do Jesus a great injustice; for it takes from the scene all its beautiful naturalness, which is so characteristic of him and so perfectly in keeping with his direct and unaffected thought and speech. He was not teaching theology, nor was he giving veiled utterance to any mysterious truth concerning his person and work. He was simply foretelling his death and endeavoring to impart to his disciples something of that divine trust and calmness with which he approached it. But after his death, when his followers ate bread and drank wine together, they could not fail to recall the solemn moment in which Jesus had broken bread in their presence, and with a reference to his impending death had pronounced the bread his body and the wine his blood; and remembering that scene, their eating and drinking together must inevitably, whether with or without a command from him, take on the character of a memorial feast, in which they looked back to his death, as he had looked forward to it. They knew that they were

more likely that whenever they ate together they ate the Lord's Supper. Not that it preceded or followed the ordinary meal, but that the whole meal was the Lord's Supper; that they partook of no ordinary, secular, unholy meals, of none that was not a *κυριακὸν δεῖπνον*.

The *κοινωνία*, to which reference is made in Acts ii. 42, thus found its chief expression in their common meals, but it voiced itself also in all the gatherings of the disciples. It is said in the same passage that they continued steadfastly in the apostles' teaching and in the prayers. It goes without saying that their gratitude to God for the peculiar blessings which they enjoyed as his elect people must have found utterance whenever possible in prayer and hymn, and the example which Luke has given us in Acts iv. 23 sq. may be taken as fairly representative of all the occasions on which any number of them met together. At all such times they doubtless felt the Spirit of God working mightily among them, and prophecy and speaking with tongues were very likely of daily occurrence. But they must also have dwelt much upon the utterances of their Master, as Luke indicates when he says that they continued steadfastly in the apostles' teach-

fulfilling his wish in thus gathering in brotherly fellowship, and they must have felt from the beginning, whether they had his explicit command for it or not, that they were doing only what he would have them do, when they repeated his reassuring words for their own comfort and in fond remembrance of their Master.

Even if one were to question, as Jülicher does, whether Christ actually did institute a memorial feast, which his disciples were to continue celebrating until his return, it can hardly be doubted that Paul was reproducing what he had received from the earlier disciples when he represented Jesus as saying, "This do in remembrance of me." It can hardly be doubted, in other words, that it was believed, at any rate at an early day, if not from the beginning, in the church of Jerusalem, that Jesus had commanded them to do as they actually were doing when they ate and drank together.

On the Lord's Supper in the primitive church see, in addition to the notable essay of Jülicher already referred to, Spitta: *Die urchristlichen Traditionen über Ursprung und Sinn des Abendmahls* in his *Zur Geschichte und Litteratur des Urchristenthums*, I. 205 sq.; Harnack: *Brot und Wasser: die eucharistischen Elemente bei Justin*, in *Texte und Untersuchungen*, VII. 143 sq. The important works by Lobstein (*La doctrine de la saint cène*) and Schultzen (*Das Abendmahl im Neuen Testament*), I know only through the reviews by Schürer and Lobstein in the *Theol. Literaturzeitung*, 1891, Sp. 21 sq., 1896, Sp. 234 sq.

There is no indication in our sources that in these early days the Lord's Supper was thought of as a continuation of or substitute for the Jewish Passover, or that any paschal significance whatever attached to it.

ing. To the personal disciples of Jesus, and above all to the Twelve, they of course looked for their knowledge of his sayings and for such explanation and interpretation of them as might be needed. His prophecies of the future must have interested them especially and invited careful thought, and his words dealing with their duties as children of the kingdom could seem scarcely less important. It cannot have been long, then, before a comparatively fixed body of teaching took shape, embracing the most striking and characteristic, and therefore the most easily remembered, of his utterances, and the tradition thus gradually formed ultimately recorded itself in the Logia, and perhaps in other similar documents.[1]

The Scriptures the early Christians would of course hear read in the synagogue, but they must have made large use of them also when they came together by themselves, pointing out the new sense in which this and that passage was to be read in the light of the Gospel, and thus gaining increased instruction and inspiration. The tradition early tended to become fixed along this line as well, and it is not surprising that we find in the literature of the first and second centuries many Old Testament passages occurring and recurring, and nearly always with the same application and interpretation.

A remarkable feature in the life of the early Christians of Jerusalem was their vivid realization of the presence of the Holy Spirit. Though they mingled so freely with their unconverted countrymen, and had so much in common with them, they really lived in another world, under the direct influence and guidance, as they believed, of the Spirit of God. It is true that Paul's idea that the Spirit is the active, moving power in the ordinary Christian life, and that the life of every believer is spiritual in the fullest sense, seems not to have been prevalent among them; but they had, nevertheless, a most vivid sense of the Spirit's presence and activity.[2] Instead of finding

[1] On the Logia see below, p. 569 sq.

[2] This conception of the Spirit's presence comes out very clearly in connection with the case of Ananias and Sapphira, whose effort to deceive the church is represented by Peter as deception practised upon the Holy Spirit.

him, however, in the every-day faith and piety of the common disciple, they found him commonly only where there was something striking, or remarkable, or unusual, whether in character, in word, or in work.[1] To see visions, to prophesy, to speak with tongues, to proclaim the word of God with more than merely human power and boldness, all this was proof of a divine influence and control of which the ordinary Christian life was supposed to show no evidence. Such spiritual elevation was possible to most disciples only on occasion. They might be filled with the Spirit at the time of their conversion; and, lifted far above the common limitations of life, they might speak with tongues, or prophesy, or give some other striking manifestation of spiritual possession fitted to amaze and impress all beholders. Or, again, when they were gathered together for prayer and mutual converse, the Spirit might descend upon all of them and make his presence known in similar strange and mysterious ways. Such phenomena seem to have been frequently witnessed; and yet they were isolated occurrences, which were distinguished sharply from the every-day experience of the disciples. The way in which they are referred to in our sources shows that plainly enough.

But to some Christians the spiritual elevation possible to most of them only now and then seems to have been habitual; and they were known among their brethren as men "filled with the Spirit." It was disciples of this stamp that the apostles suggested should be chosen to manage the distribution of the alms of the church of Jeru-

The significance of the case is not affected by the doubts that may be cast upon the accuracy of the account in its present form. Even if we were to suppose, with Wendt, that the report which we have in Acts was simply due to the sudden death of the guilty pair, which was looked upon as a direct visitation of the Spirit, or that Ananias' death was interpreted in that way, and Sapphira's name was afterward linked with his by tradition; in any case there can be little doubt that Luke took the account from his sources, and that it represents consequently the conceptions of the primitive Christians of Jerusalem.

[1] In this they were entirely in accord with the common Jewish idea of the activity of the Spirit. Neither in the Old Testament nor in the later Jewish literature is the piety and morality of the ordinary individual traced back to the Spirit. See Gunkel: *Die Wirkungen des heiligen Geistes*, S. 9.

salem; and so Stephen is expressly said to have been full of faith and of the Holy Ghost.[1] The same is said also of Barnabas in another connection.[2] It is not to be supposed that there was any sharp or official line of demarcation drawn between such men and their brethren, but it is evident that they were pre-eminent for their faith and boldness and spiritual power, — so pre-eminent that only the permanent indwelling of the Spirit of God seemed sufficient to account for them.

The purpose and effect of the Spirit's presence are not always specified in our sources, but in so many cases the enlightenment of the disciples, and the quickened power of utterance that resulted, are traced directly to the Spirit, that it is evident that his influence upon their thoughts and words was looked upon as his most characteristic activity. The prophecy of Joel, which Peter quoted at Pentecost, foretells an era of visions and of prophecy, and the same conception of the Spirit's influence runs through all the early records. Christ himself gave commandment to his apostles through the Holy Spirit;[3] filled with the Spirit, the disciples at Pentecost spoke with tongues, as they did on many subsequent occasions; filled with the Spirit, they bore testimony with power, they spoke the word of God with boldness, they were endowed with wisdom, they received revelations and foretold the future.[4] And so, on various occasions, they received directions from the Spirit as to the particular course of action which they were to pursue. Philip was instructed by the Spirit to accost the Ethiopian eunuch, and after his interview with him was ended, he was led away by the Spirit to another place.[5] Peter was directed by the Spirit to accept the invitation of Cornelius, and to go back to Cæsarea with the messengers he had sent.[6] Paul also frequently received instructions from the Spirit,[7] and the apostles and elders in Jerusalem followed the Spirit's guidance in composing their decree for the Gentile church.[8] It

[1] Acts vi. 15.
[2] Acts xi. 24.
[3] Acts i. 2.
[4] Cf. Acts iv. 8, 31, v. 32, vi. 10, vii. 55, x. 46, xi. 28.
[5] Acts viii. 29, 39.
[6] Acts x. 19, xi. 12.
[7] Acts xvi. 6, 7, xx. 23.
[8] Acts xv. 28.

is in such enlightenment and inspiration that the activity of the Spirit seems commonly to have exhausted itself according to the understanding of the earliest disciples.

And yet there were other supernatural manifestations in the life of the primitive Christians of Jerusalem of a very striking character. The early chapters of the Book of Acts contain many references to signs and wonders wrought by the disciples. In addition to the apostles in general[1] and Peter in particular,[2] Stephen[3] and Philip[4] are also reported to have performed many miracles, and even Ananias, an otherwise unknown disciple, is represented as the agent in restoring Paul's sight.[5] On two occasions a miracle is accomplished by an angel of the Lord, who in one case releases the apostles in general from prison,[6] in the other case Peter alone.[7] It is true that most of Luke's statements are of a very general character, and sound like additions of his own,[8] but some specific cases are reported where it can hardly be doubted that he made use of earlier sources, either written or oral,[9] and though signs and wonders may not have been as common as his account would seem to indicate, the fact that the early Christians believed that the miraculous powers which Jesus had exercised were still exhibited among them, is confirmed by Mark xvi. 17, 18, where a prophecy of Christ's is recorded,[10] by the Epistle to the Hebrews,[11] and above all by Paul, who not merely claims to have wrought "signs and wonders and mighty works" himself,[12] but also implies that the other apostles or mis-

[1] Acts ii. 43, v. 12. Cf. also iv. 30, where the disciples pray that signs and wonders may be done through the name of Jesus, without specifying by whom.

[2] Acts iii. 6, v. 15 sq., ix. 34, 40. Cf. also v. 5, 10, where Peter is represented as the mouthpiece of the Spirit in passing condemnation upon Ananias and Sapphira.

[3] Acts vi. 8. [5] Acts ix. 17. [7] Acts xii. 7.

[4] Acts viii. 7, 13. [6] Acts v. 19. [8] Acts ii. 43, v. 12, 15 sq., vi. 8, viii. 7, 13.

[9] Acts iii. 6 sq., v. 5, 10, ix. 18, 34, 40, xii. 7; possibly also v. 19.

[10] Whether the words were actually spoken by Christ or not they are significant, for they show that the belief was held at the time the passage was written that miraculous powers existed among the followers of Jesus.

[11] Heb. ii. 4; cf. also Jas. v. 15.

[12] Rom. xv. 18; 2 Cor. xii. 12; cf. also Acts xxviii. 8 sq.

sionaries, of whom there were so many in the early church, possessed a like power.[1] There is no reason to suppose that in this respect the primitive Christians of Jerusalem differed from other Christians in the world outside. Doubtless there was as vivid a sense of the presence and miraculous activity of the divine among them as among their brethren anywhere.

And yet it is a remarkable fact that, so far as our sources enable us to judge, the early disciples did not commonly connect such wonderful works with the Spirit of God. In the Gospels the agency or power by which Christ did his great works is not ordinarily specified, and only once is such a work brought into any connection with the Spirit, and then the reference to the Spirit is probably an addition to the original source.[2] In the Book of Acts Christ's wonders are ascribed to the Spirit on one occasion by Peter,[3] but nowhere else in the book is the Spirit brought into connection with any such works, and the signs wrought by the disciples are commonly represented as wrought in Jesus' name or by his power.[4] Paul distinctly recognizes the Spirit as the giver of the power to perform miracles,[5] and the failure of the author of Acts to ascribe such wonders to him, when he mentions the wonders themselves so frequently, seems inexplicable, except on the assumption that he was following his sources, and that in them the marvellous works were not connected with the Spirit. But such reticence on the part of the sources of which Luke made use, can hardly have been accidental. We may fairly see in it, in fact, the influence of the traditional conception of the Jews, who always thought of the Spirit primarily as the power which worked through the prophets, revealing to them the will and truth of God, and impelling them to declare that will and truth

[1] 2 Cor. xii. 12.

[2] In Matt. xii. 28, Christ says: "If I by the Spirit of God cast out devils"; but in the parallel passage in Luke (xi. 20), the phrase "finger of God" occurs in the place of "Spirit of God," and is probably the original reading.

[3] Acts x. 38.

[4] Acts iii. 6, iv. 30, ix. 17, 34, xvi. 18; cf. also Mark xvi. 17, 18.

[5] 1 Cor. xii. 9 sq.; cf. Gal. iii. 5.

to others.[1] But we may perhaps go further and conclude that the wonderful works which are recorded in the early chapters of Acts were so exceptional and infrequent, that they were entirely overshadowed by the common but no less striking manifestations of the Spirit's activity in other lines, and that they were consequently not thought of, like the latter, as characteristic signs of the Spirit's presence in the disciples, but only as special deeds wrought through them under special circumstances by Jesus himself. Paul's advance upon the earlier conception at this point is of a piece with his general advance, in ascribing the entire Christian life in all its activities, the most common as well as the most uncommon, to the indwelling Spirit, whose abiding presence alone makes the Christian life possible.

In the beginning the disciples were very likely largely Galileans, but they soon won over to their faith many of the residents of Jerusalem, and as their circle widened, there entered not only Palestinian, but also Hellenistic Jews, who were largely represented in Jerusalem at this time, and even proselytes, who were also numerous in the city. We first hear of such Hellenists and proselytes within the church in the sixth chapter of Acts. It is reported there that the Hellenists, or Grecian Jews, complained that in the daily distribution of alms their widows were neglected.[2] That this should have been the case is not surprising. Even when they were loyal or orthodox in their Judaism, the Hellenists were not always treated by their Palestinian brethren with the same measure of respect that was shown the Jew who had never made his home among the Gentiles. It may well be that their tra-

[1] It is true that physical wonders are occasionally ascribed to the Spirit's influence in the Old Testament. But such a connection is exceptional. See Wendt: *Die Begriffe Fleisch und Geist im Biblischen Sprachgebrauch*, S. 32 sq.

[2] Wendt is doubtless correct in maintaining that up to this time the distribution of alms had been not in the hands of the apostles, or at any rate not exclusively, but of private individuals, and that the change instituted by the appointment of the Seven consisted not in transferring to the latter duties hitherto performed by the apostles, but in bringing under official oversight and control a function which had been hitherto the business of no one in particular. See Meyer's *Handbuch über die Apostelgeschichte*, 7te Auflage, S. 151.

ditional prejudice made itself felt even within the Christian circle, and had something to do with the cavalier treatment accorded the Hellenistic widows. It cannot be supposed that the difficulty was due to the fact that these Hellenists were less orthodox and less careful in their observance of the law than their brethren; for had that been the case, the division between the two classes in the church would have been more far-reaching and lasting than it was. There is no reason, indeed, to suppose that the foreign Jews resident in Jerusalem were any less zealous for the traditions of the fathers and elders than the natives of the Holy Land. Their situation in Jerusalem was very different from the situation of those Hellenists who lived in Greek and Roman communities, and the influences which led the latter to allegorize and spiritualize the law were largely wanting in their case. It may safely be assumed that many of them would be particularly eager to atone for the blot upon their ancestry, or upon their own past, by uncommon zeal for the traditions of the fathers. It is worthy of notice in this connection that the attack upon Stephen, which came a little later, and which was due to his supposed hostility to the Jewish law and temple, was instigated not by Palestinian but by foreign Jews. It is probable, then, that the reason for the neglect of the Hellenistic poor lay not in any differences of opinion or of practice, but solely in the traditional attitude of native Hebrews toward their foreign brethren.

It is to the credit of the apostles and the church in general that the neglect was no sooner discovered than steps were taken to correct it. The remedy proposed was simple but effective. It was the appointment of a board or committee, which should be responsible for the fair distribution of all the alms of the church. The seven men thus appointed have been commonly called deacons since the second century, and it has been the custom to regard them as the first incumbents of that historic office. But they are not called deacons by Luke, or by any other New Testament writer, and there is no sign that there were ever deacons in the church of Jerusalem. Accord-

ing to Epiphanius, the Ebionitic churches of Palestine in his time had only presbyters and archisynagogi.[1] These Ebionites were the Jewish Christian reactionaries, who refused to advance with the Catholic church in its normal development. It is therefore significant that there were no deacons among them in the fourth century. But it is to be noticed, also, that the duties assigned to the Seven were not identical with the functions discharged by the regular deacons of whom we hear in the latter part of the first century. The former were put in charge of the almsgiving of the Jerusalem church, while the latter acted simply as bishops' assistants.

If we cannot, then, regard these seven men as deacons, are we to suppose that they constituted only a temporary committee,[2] or are we to identify them with permanent officials in the church of Jerusalem bearing some other name? In the Book of Acts, apostles and elders are frequently mentioned as the leading personages in the mother church,[3] and it is said in chap. xi. 30 that the Antiochian Christians sent their gifts, intended for the brethren of Jerusalem, to the "elders." The latter evidently had in charge at that time the work originally entrusted to the Seven. The appointment of these elders is nowhere recorded by Luke, and it is natural therefore to identify them with the Seven and to suppose that the latter were in reality the first presbyters of the church of Jerusalem.[4] But in the absence of any specific information upon the subject, and in view of the fact that Luke does not call the Seven "elders," and nowhere hints that they were the same, it is probably safer to conclude that the men whose appointment he records in Acts vi. served only a temporary purpose, and that the duties

[1] Epiphanius, *Hær.* III. 18.

[2] This opinion was held by Chrysostom, and among modern scholars by Vitringa, Dean Stanley, and others.

[3] Elders are mentioned alone in xi. 30, xxi. 18; "Apostles and Elders" in xv. 2, 4, 6, 22, xvi. 4; "Apostles and elder brethren" (πρεσβύτεροι ἀδελφοί), in xv. 23.

[4] It is clear that there cannot have been official elders in the Church of Jerusalem at the time the Seven were appointed, for otherwise the appointment of the latter would have been unnecessary.

originally entrusted to them were ultimately assumed by the elders or elder brethren, who seem gradually to have become the leaders of the church in its various activities. But the identity of the Seven with the so-called elders is to be questioned, not simply because of Luke's silence in the matter, but also because it is exceedingly unlikely that the elders mentioned in the Book of Acts were officers of the church in any sense; or in other words, it is exceedingly unlikely that they had been appointed to take charge of the alms of the church, or to perform any other duties, religious or ecclesiastical. That the older and more experienced disciples should gradually assume the leadership of the church was entirely natural, especially after the subsidence of the storm that broke at the time of Stephen's execution; for the occupation of the Seven was very likely interrupted by that persecution, and after it ceased there were probably few either of the apostles or of the Seven left on the ground. And so it is not surprising that in later chapters of the Book of Acts the elders commonly appear, either alone or in company with the apostles or with James, as the leading figures in the church, even though they were not the incumbents of any ecclesiastical office.[1]

From which party in the church the seven men were chosen we are not told, but it is altogether probable that both parties were represented. At least one of the Seven, Nicolas of Antioch, was a proselyte;[2] and it is very likely that Stephen was a Hellenist, for the attack upon him

[1] In my edition of Eusebius' Ecclesiastical History (Bk. II. chap. i. note), I took the position that the "Seven" were the first elders of the Church of Jerusalem, but I am now convinced that the elders mentioned in various passages in the Book of Acts were not officers in any sense, and consequently are not to be connected with the Seven in any way. Luke himself possibly thought of the men whom he calls elders, as he did of the apostles, as regular officials of the church of Jerusalem, but the facts hardly bear out the opinion, for in Acts xv. 23, although he speaks in the previous verse of the "apostles and elders" in such a way as to leave the impression that he regards them as officers, the decree itself which he quotes, and the early date of which cannot be denied (see p. 212, below), has only "apostles and elder brethren," showing clearly their unofficial character, and throwing light back upon all those passages in which the word "elder" occurs. See also p. 554, below.

[2] Acts vi. 5.

was made by foreign Jews, who had apparently become acquainted with his views through association with him in one of their synagogues. That all were of the same party, as assumed by some scholars on the ground of their Greek names,[1] is very unlikely, for they were entrusted with the dispensation of charity for the entire church, not for one section of it only, and the effort would naturally be made to avoid all cause of complaint in the future by giving both classes a fair representation on the committee.[2]

The spread of Christianity during these early days which we have been considering, must have been very rapid. The interval between Christ's death and the death of Stephen can hardly have been more than a couple of years,[3] and yet the persecution which followed upon the latter event shows that there were already many Christians in Jerusalem. The statement concerning the number of the disciples in the early chapters of Acts are for the most part very indefinite, but a few specific figures are given. Thus, in Acts i. 15, it is said that there were "about a hundred and twenty" gathered together; and that they did not comprise all the disciples is shown by 1 Cor. xv. 6, where Paul says that Jesus appeared to "above five hundred brethren at once." In Acts ii. 41 it is said that about three thousand persons were added to them, and in iv. 4, their numbers are reported to have reached five thousand. Though, as a rule, comparatively little reliance can be placed upon such general figures, the contrast between them and the vague statements in other passages seems to indicate that they were taken by Luke from his sources, and that they are not merely the result of his own idealization of the early history.[4] These are the only definite statements

[1] Palestinian Jews frequently bore Greek names, and two of the Twelve Apostles, Philip and Andrew, are known to us only thus.

[2] Gieseler (*Church History*, Eng. Trans., Vol. I. p. 74) suggests that three Hebrews, three Hellenists, and one proselyte were appointed. That such care was taken is possible, but hardly probable. A committee made up in such a way would have a decidedly modern look.

[3] See below, p. 172.

[4] Though the figures were probably taken from the sources, it is not at all impossible that they are something of an exaggeration, as held by many

upon the subject which we have; and whether the larger number was intended to represent the strength of the Christian brotherhood in the early or in the later part of the period with which we are dealing, we have no means of knowing; for there is for the most part no indication as to the chronological order of the various detached events which Luke records. In Acts ii. 47, it is said that "the Lord added to them day by day those that were being saved"; in v. 14, that "believers were the more added to the Lord, multitudes both of men and women"; in vi. 1, that the "number of the disciples was multiplying"; and in ix. 31, that "the church throughout all Judea and Galilee and Samaria was multiplied." Such general statements of course add little to our knowledge; but though they probably originated with Luke himself, and not with his sources, they are certainly true to the facts; for there can be no doubt that the growth of the little circle of disciples was steady and rapid, until the storm broke which resulted in driving so many of them from the city.

4. The Conflict with Judaism

There is much in the account of these days contained in the early chapters of the Book of Acts that is calculated to convey the impression that the disciples passed a large part of their life in the blaze of publicity, that they were constantly before the eyes of all the people, and that their fame was upon everybody's lips. But such an idea is hardly in accord with the actual facts. That they spoke boldly in the name of Jesus there is no reason to doubt, and that they produced a profound impression upon those that heard them, and won many converts to their faith in the Messiah, cannot be questioned. They doubtless improved the frequent opportunities afforded by the presence of Jewish worshippers in the temple to speak to

scholars (cf. Wendt in Meyer's Commentary, seventh edition, S. 92 sq.). Indeed, though the growth of the church in Jerusalem must have been rapid, there is a difficulty, in the light of the account which we have of their numerous meetings together, in supposing that the number of those who resided in Jerusalem reached into the thousands, at any rate during the earliest days.

them of the Messiah Jesus, and it is altogether likely that they proclaimed him openly in the public streets and squares, or wherever they could get a crowd together. Conscious that their great duty was witness-bearing, they must have seized every available occasion to bear testimony to him, whether in public or in private.[1] But Jerusalem was a large and busy city, and the presence of the disciples can hardly have made any wide impression, at any rate for some time. That they should be preaching a faith which had been completely discredited by the death of their leader, and should still be proclaiming that leader as the Messiah, must have seemed so foolish to most of those that happened to know of it, that they could hardly regard them as anything else than witless and harmless fanatics. The fact that they never thought of attacking or questioning the validity of the Jewish law, that they were not revolutionists in any sense, but, on the contrary, the most devout observers of ancestral law and custom, removed them from the category of dangerous characters who needed to be kept under strict and constant surveillance. Of course it was not a crime for them to declare their continued devotion to Jesus, and that there could be any danger in allowing them to do so can hardly have suggested itself to any one, at least for some time. Only when their number had grown large, and their influence had come to be somewhat widely felt among the common people, did the authorities think it worth while to take cognizance of them. And then it is significant that it was not the Pharisees who brought accusations against them, as in the case of Jesus, but the captain of the temple and the priests and the Sadducees,[2] or, in other words, the political rather than the religious leaders of the Jews.

[1] The utterances of Peter and others recorded in Acts iii. sq. are not to be regarded as formal discourses delivered on particular occasions, but rather as mere examples of the kind of testimony borne by him and by his fellows on all occasions. That they represent so accurately the views of the early disciples is due, not to the fact that they are stenographic reports of particular speeches, but that they are taken from primitive Jewish Christian documents, dating, doubtless, from a very early period.

[2] Acts iv. 1, v. 17.

It has been asserted by many scholars that it is inconceivable that the Christians should have been attacked by the Sadducees, and that the Pharisees, the enemies of Christ, should not have been the ringleaders. But the assertion is based upon a misconception of the principles of the early disciples. There was no reason why the Pharisees should proceed against such strict and consistent Jews as they were. They might well think that the death of Jesus had taken from the movement all Messianic significance, and might well be content to leave such pious Israelites alone, as entirely harmless from a religious point of view. When they were arrested, it was apparently not as teachers of another religion, or as enemies of the law, but simply as disturbers of the public peace, who were gathering crowds about them without license and were threatening a tumult of serious proportions. But though Luke is thus undoubtedly correct in stating that the Sadducees and not the Pharisees were responsible for the attack upon the Christians that took place at this time, the reason which he gives for their hostility betrays a misapprehension of their true character. The Sadducees were not bigoted theologians, who desired to persecute and stop the mouths of all that differed with them. It was not because the disciples preached the resurrection from the dead that they proceeded against them, but because they were creating too much of an excitement in the city, and needed to have their freedom of speech somewhat curtailed.[1] The nature of the punishment inflicted by the authorities upon Peter and John[2] goes to confirm the general conclusion that has been drawn. Surprise has been expressed that when they had been arrested, they should have been released again so soon. But if the object was simply to put some restraint upon their free-

[1] There can be little doubt that the agency of the Sadducees in the arrest of the early Christians was recorded in the sources which the author of the Acts used, and that he added the motive which seemed to him alone to explain their course. There is no discoverable reason otherwise why he should have departed from the tradition as to the hostility of the Pharisees against Jesus, which he follows in his Gospel, and should have made the Sadducees rather than the Pharisees the instigators of the attack.

[2] Acts iv. 3 sq., v. 18 sq.

dom of speech and action, and thus avoid the tumults and disturbances which their public preaching was causing, the course which the authorities are represented to have taken was entirely natural.[1]

The time at which the first arrests were made we do not know, but they must not be brought into any connection with the outbreak that occurred in connection with Stephen, for that had grounds of an entirely different character. We shall probably not go far astray, if we assume that the interference of the authorities, referred to in Acts iv. and v., began in the earlier rather than in the latter part of the period that elapsed between Pentecost and the execution of Stephen, and that that interference actually accomplished the end sought, and that the disciples thenceforth refrained from creating public disturbances, and

[1] The part played by Gamaliel in this connection, as reported in Acts v. 34 sq., has given rise to much discussion. The whole account has been declared by many scholars, for instance by Baur, Zeller, and Overbeck, entirely unhistorical, both because of the attitude which Gamaliel is represented as taking and of the anachronism in his reported speech. But there is no reason, in the nature of things, why the great Rabbi Gamaliel may not have counselled moderation in dealing with the disciples. His attitude, as it appears in the passage in question, does not necessarily imply any secret leaning toward Christianity or any friendliness for the Christians. It is simply the attitude of a wise and cool-headed man who believes that control will accomplish the desired purpose better than repression. That there is nothing incredible in the report that Gamaliel, or any other member of the Sanhedrim, held such an attitude, is shown by the fact that the disciples were actually treated with just such moderation for a long time.

But the fact must be recognized that though the general statement as to Gamaliel's position may be quite correct, the report of his speech cannot be regarded as entirely accurate. Josephus (*Ant.* xx. 5, 1) gives an account of an insurgent leader named Theudas, who, in the reign of Claudius, a dozen years or more after the time to which Luke is referring, announced himself as a prophet and secured a great many followers, and was finally conquered and slain by the procurator Cuspius Fadus. The identity of this man with the Theudas mentioned in Acts has been denied by many scholars in the interest of Luke's account (for instance by Wieseler: *Chronologie des Apost. Zeitalters*, S. 138; Schaff: *History of the Christian Church*, Vol. I. p. 732; and many commentators on Acts), but the descriptions in the two cases agree so closely that it is very difficult to believe that they refer to different men, especially in view of the fact that the name Theudas was far from common. The accuracy of Josephus' chronology at this point cannot be doubted, and it would seem therefore that the author of the Acts, unconscious of the anachronism involved, must have put into Gamaliel's mouth words which he did not actually utter. See Neander: *Pflanzung und Leitung der christlichen Kirche durch die Apostel*, 5te Auflage, S. 57; Wendt: *l.c.* S. 146; and Schürer: *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes*, I. S. 473, where the literature is given with considerable fulness.

carried on their evangelistic work more quietly than they had been inclined to do at first.[1]

The arrest of Stephen at the instigation of certain foreign Jews, who were exceedingly zealous for ancestral law and custom,[2] is a fact of great significance and demands careful examination, all the more careful because it has been widely misinterpreted. The accusations brought against Stephen doubtless had some basis in fact, but he is certainly misrepresented by the "false witnesses" whom Luke quotes in vs. 13, for had he "ceased not to speak blasphemous words against this holy place and the law," he would have incurred the disapprobation not of the unconverted Jews alone, but of his Christian brethren as well. The rigor with which they observed the law not only in the beginning, but for years afterward, and the bitterness and persistency with which many of them later opposed the tendency to regard it as abrogated, or to neglect its observance, make it certain that, had Stephen done as he was said to have done by his accusers, even though he had not preached, as Paul later did, a Gentile Christianity, a serious and bitter conflict must have been precipitated in the church of Jerusalem. But so far as our sources enable us to judge, Stephen continued to stand in unquestioned repute and to enjoy the universal esteem of his brethren. It is not impossible that a freer tendency than that originally represented by Peter and his associates existed within the church of Jerusalem at this time, and that it made itself felt especially among the converts from the Hellenists. But the tendency can have been neither very marked nor very extreme, or it would certainly have split the infant church. It is more probable, under the circumstances, that opposition to Christianity on the part of the stricter spirits among the Hellenists of Jerusalem was aroused not by attacks made by the Christians upon the Jewish law, or by a manifest tendency among them

[1] In confirmation of this supposition it may be observed that the arrest of Stephen was not caused by the Sadducees, but by the religious zealots, and hence it would seem that the action of the disciples had ceased to incur the hostility of the civic authorities.

[2] Acts vi. 9 sq.

to neglect its observance, but by such an emphasis upon the spiritual character of the future Messianic kingdom as led to a seeming neglect of its physical and political aspects, and appeared to many to threaten the permanent stability of Jewish law and custom. It may well be that in his proclamation of the impending judgment and of the return of Jesus to establish the Messianic kingdom, Stephen, as well as others, repeated the prophecies of Christ in which the destruction of the temple and of the city was foretold, prophecies which might easily be interpreted as implying that the Jewish law had only relative and temporary validity. But there is no sign that Stephen thus interpreted them, and there is no sign that he drew from them conclusions affecting in any way the binding character of the law, or thought of suggesting, or even countenancing, its neglect. To say that Jesus the Messiah, as a judgment upon an unbelieving people, will destroy their temple and city, does not necessarily mean that he will change the customs that God has delivered unto them through Moses, and we may be sure that Stephen cannot have taught thus and retained the confidence of the church.

The address which Stephen is reported to have made goes to confirm the conclusion that has been drawn. It is a mistake to interpret that address as implying a belief on the part of the speaker in either the immediate or ultimate abrogation of law and temple worship; or a tendency on his part to regard them as of only relative and temporary worth. The address was not directed, as is frequently said, against the Jews' valuation of the Holy Land, of the temple, and of the law. It was not the speaker's purpose to assert over against such valuation that God may be worshipped everywhere and in all ways, for the sacredness of the promised land is repeatedly emphasized, and the sojourn of Israel in Egypt and in Babylon is regarded as a calamity because it means separation from it. Nor is there any sign of an inclination to treat the law slightingly. On the contrary, the law is called "living oracles" in vs. 38, and its divine character is empha-

sized by its connection with angels in vss. 38 and 53,[1] and Moses himself is accorded the greatest possible honor. In fact, one of the marked characteristics of the address is the emphasis which is put upon the sacredness both of the promised land and of the Mosaic law. The speech might more easily be interpreted as an evidence of Stephen's profound respect for and rigid adherence to those things which his countrymen regarded as holy, than as evidence of his undervaluation of them.

The theme of the address is to be found not in vss. 48–50, but in vss. 51–53. Stephen's design is to show that not he and his fellow-Christians, but his accusers and the unconverted Jews in general are the real criminals and violators of God's law. To bring the matter out in the clearest light, he begins with the call of Abraham and the divine promise that Abraham's descendants should serve God in the land to which God had called him. In the light of that promise the residence of the children of Israel in Egypt, which he recounts at considerable length, appears simply as a temporary sojourn. They are only strangers in Egypt, and their true fatherland is Canaan. Stephen is careful to refer in passing to the burial of Jacob and of the patriarchs in Shechem, thus emphasizing the fact that Canaan and not Egypt is their home and the home of their descendants. But in spite of the fact that, according to God's announced purpose, the Israelites were only strangers and sojourners in Egypt, when Moses, who had enjoyed the most eminent favors from the Egyptian court, and who had consequently the best of reasons to remain in the land of his adoption, voluntarily relinquished all his honors in order to deliver his brethren from their bondage, they refused to go, preferring to remain where they were rather than to seek the land which God had appointed them as the place in which

[1] It is true that in the Epistle to the Hebrews (ii. 2), the agency of the angels in the giving of the law is regarded as a mark of its inferiority as compared with the Gospel which was given through Christ. But in Stephen's address no such idea appears. It was a common belief among the Jews that the law had been promulgated by the mediation of angels, and Stephen refers to the fact for the purpose of magnifying not minimizing the dignity of the law.

to serve him. This is the first instance of the Israelites' unbelief and opposition to the will of God to which Stephen refers, but the instances multiply as the address proceeds. He mentions them evidently with a double purpose: on the one hand, to show that at all stages of their history the Israelites had withstood and opposed the purposes of God, even refusing to receive and obey the "living oracles" which he gave them through the agency of Moses; and, on the other hand, because their conduct furnishes a parallel to the treatment accorded Jesus by those whom he is addressing. He calls particular attention to the fact that the very Moses who had been rejected by his brethren, was afterward commissioned and sent by God to be their ruler and deliverer, and that this same Moses predicted that God would raise up another prophet like unto himself, a prediction which was fulfilled in the person of Jesus the righteous one, whose coming the prophets announced beforehand and were slain for announcing.

Moreover, the Israelites' idolatry and disregard of God's will continued, in spite of the fact that they had the tabernacle of the testimony, which was erected at God's express command. The presence of that tabernacle in their midst did not prevent them from worshipping false gods. Indeed, that worship was carried so far that God could declare that they had in reality offered him no sacrifices during the forty years in the wilderness. And so the building of the temple, which followed the tabernacle, did not insure the true worship of God on the part of his people. For God's dwelling-place is not mere hand-made houses. Tabernacle and temple may be built, but the hearts of the people may be far from God, and if they are, he whose throne is heaven and whose footstool is the earth must withdraw his presence and his favor from them. Taken by themselves, vss. 48–50 might be regarded as a general statement that God is to be worshipped only in spirit and not in hand-made temples, and that consequently the Jewish temple worship is unnecessary, or even harmful, and may or should be done away. But

read in the light of the context in which the words occur, they cannot mean that such worship is unnecessary, but only that mere external temple worship is not enough; that the temple may stand and worshippers gather therein, and yet God himself be absent, because the hearts of the worshippers are turned toward other gods, and the sacrifices which they offer him are no sacrifices. In giving utterance to such a truth, Stephen was simply reiterating a principle repeatedly emphasized by the prophets, and not entirely forgotten among the Jews in his own day; a principle, moreover, with which all of his Christian brethren must have been in heartiest accord. To read more than this into vss. 48–50 is to overlook the fact, which cannot have escaped Stephen himself and his hearers, that Solomon at the very time of the erection of the temple gave distinct expression to the same thought,[1] and is to introduce an idea entirely foreign both to the body of the address and to its conclusion.

Stephen's speech was thus not a direct defence of himself against the accusations brought by his opponents, but a warning, addressed to his accusers and judges, that the possession of the temple and the law, as it had not in the past, so would not now insure the presence of God and the acceptance of the people by him. Only they who cease resisting his Spirit, and receive the righteous one whom he has sent, are truly worshipping and serving God. It is clear, in the light of all that has been said, that to call Stephen a forerunner of Paul, and to think of him as anticipating in any way Paul's treatment of the Jewish law and his assertion of a free Gentile Christianity, is to misunderstand him. He neither questioned the continued validity of the Jewish law nor suggested in any way the call of the Gentiles.[2]

[1] 1 Kings viii. 27; 2 Chron. ii. 6, and vi. 18.

[2] It has been maintained by many that the author of the Book of Acts himself composed the speech with which we have been dealing, and put it into the mouth of Stephen. But if our interpretation of the address be correct, such an assumption is impossible. The author of the Acts cannot have invented and ascribed to Stephen, who was accused of blaspheming the law and the

The closing sentences of Stephen's speech were not calculated to conciliate his hearers. His bold characterization of his accusers and judges as stiff-necked and uncircumcised in heart and ears, his bitter denunciation of them for resisting the Spirit of God, and for breaking his laws, and his stinging arraignment of them as betrayers and murderers of the righteous one whom God had sent, and whom the prophets had foretold, must have enraged them beyond measure, and we are not surprised to learn that they "gnashed on him with their teeth." But there was nothing in his address to substantiate the charge of blasphemy brought against him, and to justify his condemnation. That justification, however, he supplied in the words which he is reported to have uttered in vs. 56 ("Behold I see the heavens opened, and the Son of Man standing on the right hand of God"), and the result was, as might have been expected, his conviction and execution. Blasphemy, according to Jewish law, whether against Jehovah or against his law, was punishable by death,[1] and as Stephen was formally accused and brought to trial before the Sanhedrim, it is probable that he was formally condemned by that body, and that his death was not the result of a mere tumult, as the account of Luke might seem to imply. This probability is strengthened by the fact that his death was by the legal mode prescribed for the crime of blasphemy, and that the stoning was done not by the crowd in general, but by Stephen's accusers in the orderly Jewish way.[2] The Jews, it is true, did not possess, under the Roman procurators, the right to inflict capital punishment,[3] but whether in the present instance the condemnation was confirmed by the Roman authorities, or whether the execution took place illegally without

temple, a speech in which there is no hint of the abrogation of the ceremonial law or of the calling of the Gentiles. Luke undoubtedly got the substance of the discourse from an early source, and reproduced it with approximate accuracy.

[1] Lev. xxiv. 6; Deut. xiii. 6–10.

[2] Acts vii. 58; cf. Deut. xvii. 7.

[3] Upon the powers of the Sanhedrim during the period when Judea was governed by Roman procurators, see Schürer, II. S. 160 sq. (Eng. Trans., Div. II. Vol. I. p. 187).

Roman sanction, as happened later in the case of James,[1] we are not informed. Either supposition is credible; for during the closing years of his official career in Judea, Pilate was in such bad odor with the Jews, and had so much to do to retain his position, that he may well have refrained from calling them to account for their illegal action in this particular case. But it is more probable that the Sanhedrim secured at least some kind of sanction from the authorities before proceeding to the execution, for it is difficult otherwise to explain the persecution which they immediately instituted against the Christians, and the failure of the latter to defend themselves against their persecutors by complaining of their violation of Roman law.

The execution of Stephen, according to the author of the Acts, was the signal for the outbreak of a general attack upon the disciples. Such an attack was entirely natural under the circumstances. There is no reason to suppose that the teachings and practices of Stephen differed in any way from those of his fellow-Christians and that his arrest was due to the fact that he was more radical than they. It is probable that the hostility of the stricter Hellenistic Jews fell first upon him simply because he had first drawn their attention to the new faith. The Hellenists in general very likely knew little about Christianity, — an obscure movement which had arisen in Galilee, and had excited little public attention in Jerusalem, — until it began to spread widely among their own number, and to secure the adherence of men of influence and repute, such as Stephen undoubtedly was. In the discussions which naturally ensued, and which were perhaps carried on in the synagogues, they may have learned for the first time of the startling and ominous prophecies of Jesus. That many of them should take alarm at the consequences which seemed to be involved in such teachings was inevitable. Their hostility, once aroused, would fall not upon Stephen alone, but upon all that professed the new faith. The attack upon him would be but the beginning of a

[1] See below, p. 559 sq.

general attack upon the whole sect. He was arrested at the instance of his fellow-Hellenists and brought before the Sanhedrim, not as a disturber of the public peace, as Peter and John had been, but as an enemy of God and of his law, and though his address did not substantiate the charge, it was not calculated to quiet the suspicions aroused against him and his fellows; and when he gave public utterance finally to a distinctly blasphemous statement, it must have become clear to all that heard him, that belief in the Messiahship of the revolutionary teacher Jesus, who had himself been condemned for blasphemy, even though it might not yet have led his followers in general into any overt breaches of the law, was unsettling and anarchical in its effects. That the religious leaders, who were concerned, above all, in the strict maintenance of ancestral law and custom, should take alarm and determine to crush out this growing heresy, which had at first appeared so harmless and insignificant, was inevitable.

The trouble begun by the attack upon Stephen brought Christianity for the first time into distinct and open conflict with Judaism. Hitherto the disciples had been Jews, and nothing more; now they were denounced by their brethren as heretics, and thus their independent existence was clearly recognized. Though they were still as strict and conscientious as ever in their observance of the law, they now began to be looked upon in Jerusalem as an heretical sect, and the first step was thus taken toward their ultimate separation from the national body corporate. For some time they seem to have been the objects of bitter and unrelenting hostility on the part of the religious leaders of the people, and their position in Jerusalem was exceedingly uncomfortable and dangerous, so that they found it necessary either to go into retirement or to leave the city altogether.[1]

How long the persecution continued we do not know. Three years after the death of Stephen, Peter and James,

[1] The notion that the apostles stood by Jerusalem after the flight of all their brethren, rests upon a misapprehension as to their position and functions, which is characteristic of the author of the Acts as well as of the age in which he lived. See p. 46, above.

the brother of the Lord, were in the city, as we learn from Gal. i. 18 sq., and their presence implies the presence of other Christians as well; though whether they were obliged still to conceal themselves from the eyes of the authorities, we cannot say.[1] But whatever the position of the disciples of Jerusalem at that time, they were sufficiently numerous and well known a few years later to afford Herod Agrippa I. an opportunity, which he thought it worth his while to improve, of vindicating his devotion to the Jewish law, and of currying favor with the Pharisaic party, by executing one of the leaders of the Christians and by imprisoning another.[2] The fact that this attack was made the subject of special record in Luke's sources goes to show that it was exceptional, and that it formed a contrast to the general situation during this period. In fact, it is altogether probable that in the years immediately preceding Herod's accession, and during the greater part of his reign, the Christians were left unmolested by the authorities, and that after his death they enjoyed peace under the government of the Roman procurators, and were permitted to grow without serious interference until the troublous days that ushered in the Jewish war.

5. The Widening Field

The persecution which began with the execution of Stephen became the occasion of a vigorous missionary campaign, and thus resulted in the rapid and wide spread of Christianity. They that were scattered abroad, Luke tells us, went about preaching the Word in Judea and Samaria, and even as far away as Phœnicia, Cyprus, and Antioch. It was perhaps at this time, also, that the Gospel reached Lydia and Joppa, where Peter found disciples some time later.[3] This was not the beginning of missionary work outside of Jerusalem. The Gospel had been already carried at least to Damascus, and there can be little doubt that the fugitive disciples found believers to

[1] Upon the account in Acts ix. 26 sq., see p. 165, below.
[2] James the son of Zebedee was executed, and Peter imprisoned (Acts xii.).
[3] Acts ix. 32, 36 sq.

welcome them in many quarters. But Luke is nevertheless undoubtedly correct in representing the persecution as constituting an epoch in the history of missionary effort. For these Christians of Jerusalem, who had for so long enjoyed such intimate fellowship and communion with one another, who had together witnessed so many manifestations of the presence and power of the Holy Spirit, and who had so fully realized in their common life the ideal of the life within the kingdom to which they were constantly looking forward, could not fail to make their influence felt wherever they went, and to give a mighty impulse to the spread of the Gospel. We are not to think of them as becoming travelling evangelists, and spending all their time in going from place to place preaching the Gospel. They had their daily bread to earn, and they doubtless settled down quietly among their own countrymen in this and that place, and lived the life of faithful, scrupulous Jews, just as they had done in Jerusalem, and just as their neighbors were doing. But at the same time they must have retained the ideal of the Christian life which they had seen realized in Jerusalem, and the little circles in which they gathered with others of like mind, and with those whom they succeeded in winning to their faith, could not fail to take on the character of the circle to which they had there belonged; and thus at an early day among the Jewish population of many cities, towns, and villages within and without Palestine, the same kind of Christian brotherhood was realized that had existed from the beginning in Jerusalem. The flight of the disciples therefore did not mean merely the spread of a knowledge of the Gospel, it meant also the formation of little companies of Christian brethren, ἐκκλήσιαι, wherever they made their homes.

Of the missionary work of the disciples of Jerusalem, Luke gives us some examples in the eighth and following chapters, arranging them in such a way as to lead up gradually to the work of Paul, to which he devotes more than half his book, and in which his interest evidently chiefly centres. With the seventh chapter he concludes

the record of what he regards as the first of the three stages of the programme mapped out in i. 8: "Ye shall be my witnesses, both in Jerusalem and in all Judea and Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth." The history of evangelistic work in Jerusalem, of the spread of Christianity and the growth of the church there, he does not refer to again. The significance of Jerusalem in his narrative, from this point on, lies in its relation to other churches. It is henceforth not the whole Christian church, but only the mother church. The field of operation becomes an ever-widening territory, which acknowledges Jerusalem, to be sure, as its capital and centre, but which increasingly absorbs the interest and attention of the narrator, until Jerusalem itself and the fortunes of the church there are finally forgotten. Thus the execution of Stephen, with the persecution and the scattering of the disciples that ensued, marks a distinct division in the narrative of Luke and brings the first section of his history to a close.

The second section, which contains the record of the second stage of witness-bearing, opens with an account of the preaching of Philip, one of the Seven, in Samaria.[1] The Samaritans were a heterogeneous people of mixed Jewish and heathen blood, but their religion was genuinely Israelitish, though representing a more primitive stage of development than the religion of the Jews proper. They worshipped Jehovah, practised circumcision, observed the Sabbath and all the Jewish feast days, but their holy city was Gerizim instead of Jerusalem, and they rejected all the Scripture canon except the Pentateuch. They were commonly hated and despised by their Jewish neighbors, but they were not put on a level with the heathen. Their membership in the family of Israel, though not certain in each individual case, was distinctly recognized as possible, and the rabbinic regulations respecting the treatment to be accorded them by orthodox

[1] On the Samaritans see Schürer: *Geschichte d. jüdischen Volkes*, II. S. 5 sq. (Eng. Trans., Div. II. Vol. I. p. 5 sq.); also Kautzsch's article in Herzog's *Real-Encyclopaedie*, XIII. S. 340 sq.

Jews were framed accordingly. Their observance of the Jewish law was regarded as very defective by the Pharisees, but they were not treated as complete aliens, and social intercourse, even to the extent of eating with them, was pronounced entirely legitimate by the rabbinic authorities. Philip's work among them, therefore, did not involve any breach of Jewish law, or even an approach thereto; but at the same time it revealed an interest in the people of Samaria which the ordinary Jew could hardly be expected to possess, and to that degree marked a distinct advance upon the spirit of Judaism in general, an advance toward the broader sympathy of Jesus. It is for this reason, no doubt, that Luke records the incident. It may not be altogether without significance that the step was taken by one who was very likely a Hellenist, and who, though he might be as strict an observer of the Jewish law as any one else, would naturally feel more of an interest in the outside world than most of his Palestinian brethren, and would be more inclined than they to carry the Gospel to the Samaritans.

The Samaritans, like the rest of the Jews, seem to have been expecting a Messiah,[1] and Philip's proclamation of Jesus as the Christ was therefore understood by them, though he cannot have made use of Old Testament prophecy in the same way that Peter did in his preaching at Jerusalem. Whether he found the way prepared for him by the brief sojourn of Jesus himself in Sychar some years before, we cannot tell. There is no hint of it in Luke's account, but it may well be that there were still some with whom Jesus came in contact that remembered him, possibly some that had recognized him as the Messiah, and if so we can easily believe that they were glad to hear more about him, and to give expression to their faith in him by receiving baptism. However that may be, Philip's work in Samaria was very successful, according to Luke, and many converts were baptized.

[1] Cf. *e.g.* John iv. 25; and the note of Weiss in Meyer's Commentary, 8th edition. Cf. also Kautzsch's article in Herzog, S. 348.

It is in accordance with his general custom that the author of the Acts brings the missionary work among the Samaritans under the official oversight and control of the church of Jerusalem, or rather of the apostolic college, by recording that the assembled apostles, when they heard of what had been done, sent Peter and John to Samaria; and that the latter prayed and laid their hands upon the new converts in order that they might receive the Holy Spirit, who had not as yet come upon any of them. That Peter and John actually visited Samaria, there is no occasion to doubt; but the idea that they were sent from Jerusalem by the apostles as an official delegation to organize the Samaritans into a church, or to give their Christianity the sanction of their approval, and thus complete the work of Philip, betrays the conceptions of a later age. The apostles did not constitute an official board whose function was to exercise oversight over the church at large, and whose sanction was necessary for the inauguration of any new missionary enterprise, and for the establishment of any new church. The conception of such an official apostolate is certainly post-apostolic.[1] So that even if Peter and John did come from Jerusalem to Samaria at this time, they came not in an official capacity, but as Christian brethren to Christian brethren.

In the same way, the idea that the Holy Spirit was conveyed to the new converts by the mediation of the apostles betrays the thinking of a later age. The author evidently means to indicate that the apostles possessed a peculiar function which was not shared by Philip; that they, and they alone, could mediate the impartation of the Holy Spirit. But such a connection of the gift of the Spirit with a particular office or with a particular class of men, is foreign to the conceptions of the apostolic age, as is shown, even by Luke himself, in many other passages. For instance, in ix. 17, it is recorded that Ananias, an

[1] See above, p. 45 sq. It is widely said that the bishops were the successors of the apostles. It would perhaps be as near the truth to say that the apostles were successors of the bishops! For the official character that has been ascribed to the apostles since the second century was the result of carrying back to them the official character of the bishops.

ordinary disciple of Damascus, laid his hands upon Paul and said, "Brother Saul, the Lord, even Jesus, who appeared unto thee in the way which thou camest, hath sent me that thou mayest receive thy sight and be filled with the Holy Ghost;" in ii. 4, it is stated that all the assembled disciples were filled with the Holy Spirit, where certainly no human agent can be supposed; and in vs. 33 of the same chapter, Peter tells his hearers that the exalted Jesus had poured forth the Spirit whose presence had been manifested to them. That he or any other apostle was in a position to mediate the impartation of that Spirit, and that the Spirit could not be imparted without his mediation, was certainly far from his thought.[1]

The connection of the gift of the Holy Spirit with a particular rite, such as the laying on of hands,[2] is equally alien to the conceptions of the apostolic age, as is shown by Luke himself, not only in the passages already referred to, but also in x. 44 and xi. 15, where it is distinctly stated that the Spirit fell upon Cornelius and those that were with him, while Peter was still speaking, and before they had even been baptized. The coming upon them of the Holy Ghost, which constituted an indisputable evidence that Jesus had himself accepted them, was urged by Peter as a reason why they should receive baptism. That hands were laid upon various persons on different occasions, even in the days of the apostles, as recorded by Luke,[3] there is no reason to question. But it may fairly be doubted whether the impartation of the Holy Spirit was conditioned by, or even ordinarily connected with, any such rite.

It is clear, from vss. 18 and 19, that the descent of the Holy Spirit upon the Samaritan disciples was attended with certain visible and audible phenomena, as was common in the apostolic age.[4] The gift of the Spirit meant

[1] Cf. Acts iv. 31, v. 32, xi. 17, xiii. 52.

[2] The connection appears again in Acts xix. 6.

[3] Acts vi. 6, ix. 17, xiii. 3.

[4] See above, p. 71. Simon's desire to purchase the power to confer the Spirit upon others shows clearly enough that the effect produced by his descent upon the new converts was not their mere growth in grace and piety, but something

to the early Christians in general not the inspiring and controlling power of the entire Christian life, as it did to Paul, but the ability to speak with tongues, or to prophesy, or to do some other startling and uncommon and miraculous thing. And so the evidence of the Spirit's presence was commonly found in these early days in such marvellous manifestations, which seem to have been very frequently witnessed. It was because of the striking effects produced by the descent of the Holy Spirit upon the new converts, that a certain magician named Simon, who is represented as one of them, is reported to have tried to induce the apostles to confer upon him the power which they possessed, in order that he might be able to effect like results by the laying on of his hands. His offer of money was, of course, rejected with scorn, and a severe condemnation was drawn from Peter by his blasphemous suggestion.

This Simon Magus, as he is called, played quite an important rôle in primitive church history. He was widely regarded as the father of all heresy, and the existence of an heretical sect which claimed him for its founder, and called itself after his name, is attested by a number of second century writers. There can be little doubt, in the light of the references to him in the Acts and in the writings of Justin Martyr and Irenæus,[1] that Simon claimed to be the Messiah, and that he instituted a Messianic movement in Samaria, which was intended to rival and supplant Christianity, or to take the place among the Samaritans of Jesus' Messianic movement among the Jews. His effort to rival and surpass Jesus very likely began after his contact with the Christians which Luke records. His religious system was apparently a syncretism of Jewish and Oriental elements, and resembled very closely some forms of second century Gnosticism, if

much more tangible and striking. It shows, too, that the disciples who received the Spirit made the impression even upon unbelievers of being in the possession of a power outside and above themselves. Simon would never have offered money for a power that produced effects which might as easily be produced in other ways, and which gave no clear indication of supernatural influence.

[1] Justin, *Apol.* I. 26, 56, II. 15; *Dial.* 120; Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.* I. 23.

it did not indeed give rise to them. Such syncretism was common in Western Asia in the first as well as in the second century. Simon's movement, judging from the widespread hostility which he aroused within the church, must have had considerable success, and was certainly not confined to Samaria. With the many and conflicting legends that bring him into contact with the apostle Peter, both in East and West, and with those that gather about his career in Rome, it is not necessary to concern ourselves here.[1]

The account of the work of Philip and the apostles in Samaria is followed in the same chapter of the Acts by the story of the conversion of an Ethiopian eunuch through the agency of Philip. Eusebius[2] refers to the eunuch as the first of the Gentiles to embrace Christianity, and he has been followed by many scholars, who regard the Ethiopian as an uncircumcised heathen, and therefore see in his baptism the first instance of a departure from the primitive principle that Christianity is only for Jews, native or proselyte. But there is nothing in Luke's account to suggest that Philip took a step of such far-reaching consequence on this occasion. The fact that the Ethiopian had come up to Jerusalem to worship, and was reading the Prophet Isaiah when overtaken by Philip, suggests that if not a native Jew, he was at least a proselyte, and thus a recognized member of the family of

[1] In the pseudo-Clementine literature of the third century, where Simon Magus is represented as the arch-heretic with whom Peter contends in defence of the true faith, Ebionitic hostility to the apostle Paul finds expression in a covert attack upon him under the cloak of Simon. This fact led many scholars to deny that such a person as Simon ever existed and to resolve him into a mere fiction, invented with an anti-Pauline purpose. The account in Acts was of course regarded by such scholars as entirely unhistorical. But it is now generally recognized that such a procedure is unwarranted, and the theory has been almost universally abandoned. See my edition of Eusebius, p. 113 sq. Luke's account of Simon's dealings with the apostles can hardly be accurate in all the details, for it rests upon the assumption that the Holy Spirit was given by the laying on of the apostles' hands. But there can be little doubt as to the truth of the main fact, that Simon did come into contact with the Christians at this time, and, impressed with the wonderful effects of the Spirit's presence, tried in some way to secure the power of imparting it to others.

[2] *Hist. Eccles.* II. 1.

Israel.[1] At any rate it is inconceivable, in the light of Luke's account of the conversion of Cornelius, that he intended to relate in this passage the conversion of an uncircumcised Gentile. The great emphasis which he laid upon the case of Cornelius, the elaborateness of detail with which he reproduced it, the scruples which he represented as so difficult for Peter to overcome, the controversy which he recorded as precipitated in Jerusalem, and the defence of Peter which he quoted at such length, — all serve to show that he was describing in that case what he regarded as the first occurrence of the kind, and that he cannot have thought of it as a mere repetition of an earlier event already recounted by him. The conversion of the Ethiopian he found worthy of record not because it was a departure from the principles of the primitive disciples, but probably because it meant the spread of the Gospel at so early a day to a land so far distant from the place of its birth.

The first recorded departure from primitive principles took place in connection with the Cæsarean centurion, Cornelius, of whose conversion Luke gives a detailed account in chapters x. and xi. Though a pious and God-fearing man,[2] Cornelius was neither a Jew nor a Jewish proselyte, and therefore his admission to the Christian church was a distinct violation of the principles that had hitherto controlled the action of the disciples. It is in this light that Luke pictures the event. He evidently regarded it as an occurrence of the very greatest significance, as nothing less, in fact, than the official

[1] According to Deut. xxiii. 1, a eunuch could not be a member of the congregation of Israel, and therefore could not be received as a proselyte; but the term may have been employed in the present case simply as an official title, as it was very commonly in the East. At any rate, it is not certain that the prohibition was strictly observed at this time. Cf. Isa. lvi. 3, which anticipates its abrogation.

[2] εὐσεβὴς καὶ φοβούμενος τὸν θεόν (Acts x. 2). The words have a technical sense, and indicate that Cornelius was one of the large class of Gentiles who worshipped the God of the Jews and endeavored to conform their lives in a general way to his will, while they did not accept circumcision and thus become proselytes. (See below, p. 160.) The term "proselytes of the gate," by which such men were formerly called, is a misnomer. See Schürer: *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes*, II. S. 567 sq. (Eng. Trans., Div. II. Vol. II. p. 316 sq.).

recognition by the apostles and other Christians of Jerusalem of the Christianity of the Gentiles, and of their right to enter the church without passing through the door of Judaism. The question is, can such action on the part of the disciples of Jerusalem be reconciled with the subsequent course of events as revealed to us in Paul's Epistle to the Galatians? It is claimed by many scholars that it cannot; that the apostolic council, to which Paul refers in Gal. ii., and Luke in Acts xv., implies that the question of the legitimacy of Gentile Christianity had not before presented itself to the Christians of the mother church, and that it was only by the arguments and influence of Paul that they were induced to give it the sanction they did on that occasion.

But the council took place not less than fourteen years after Paul's conversion, and for at least a part of that time he had been diligently preaching the Gospel to the Gentiles, and had met with very large success in his work. It is upon the face of it incredible that during all that period the Christians of Jerusalem were ignorant of what he was doing, and it is equally incredible that the question as to the legitimacy of the new form of Gospel which he was preaching did not suggest itself to them. Indeed, in the first chapter of his Epistle to the Galatians, Paul distinctly states that his work had long been known to them, and that they regarded that work with approval.[1] It is to be noticed, also, that Gal. ii. 4 sq. implies that the "false brethren," as Paul calls those who opposed the legitimacy of his Gentile Christianity and endeavored to make circumcision an indispensable condition of salvation, had recently come into the church and did not represent, with their extreme views, the sentiment that had hitherto prevailed in the church of Jerusalem. The fact, then, that the legitimacy of Gentile Christianity was challenged in Jerusalem some fourteen years after Paul's conversion, cannot be made to militate against the recognition of its legitimacy at an earlier day. And it may well be that such recognition

[1] "They glorified God in me" Paul says in Gal. i. 24.

was a result of the conversion of Cornelius, as Luke records. For the tremendous change of principle involved in it requires some exceptional event for its explanation. We cannot suppose that the Jewish Christians, loyal as they were to the law of their fathers, admitted that its observance was not a necessary condition of the enjoyment of the blessings of the Messianic kingdom, except under the pressure of the most convincing arguments. Possibly the persecution which began with the execution of Stephen had led some of them to doubt whether there was any hope of the conversion of the Jewish people as a whole, and to turn their thoughts to the Gentile world as a possible field for evangelistic work; but the persecution, though it may have prepared the way for broader views, cannot have effected the change of principle which the recognition of Paul's work presupposes. The visit of Paul to Jerusalem three years after his conversion, which he refers to in Gal. i. 18, might be thought of as the possible cause of the transformation; but there is no hint in his account that the visit had any such significance, and there is no sign of a controversy or conflict such as could hardly have been avoided if the legitimacy of Gentile Christianity had then been discussed. In fact, no other event of which we have any knowledge is so well calculated as the conversion of Cornelius through the agency of Peter to account for the development that took place sometime before the apostolic council.

That Peter should respond at once to the invitation of Cornelius, and should enter his house and preach the Gospel to him, was entirely in accord with his character as revealed on many other occasions. It was the same impulsive and uncalculating spirit that led him at a later time to throw aside all traditional scruples, and to live in intimate fellowship with the Gentile Christians of Antioch. He was just the man to whom such a request as that of Cornelius would appeal most strongly, and he was just the man who would accept most unquestioningly the divine evidence of his conversion, and be quickest to act upon that evidence and receive the new convert as a

Christian brother. But Peter had been from the beginning the foremost of the disciples, and the influence of his example, and of the experience which he had to recount to his Jerusalem brethren, could not but be very great. Had the experience befallen some other disciple of less personal weight and authority than he, its effect upon the mother church would very likely have been far less.

But it has been objected by many that the conversion of Cornelius under the preaching of Peter destroys the independence and originality of Paul's work as an apostle to the Gentiles; and it is maintained also that Paul's reference to Peter in Gal. ii., as the apostle of the circumcision, proves that the latter cannot have preached the Gospel to Gentiles as he is represented as doing in the case in question. But though Paul claims that he has labored more abundantly than all the other apostles,[1] and though he speaks of himself frequently as the apostle to the Gentiles, and of the large work that he has done among them, and though he more than once expresses the intention not to build upon another man's foundation, he nowhere says or implies that he was the first to preach the Gospel to the Gentiles, and there is nothing in the circumstances to lead to such a conclusion. His consciousness of independence and originality in his apostolic labors rested not upon the knowledge that he had begun the work among the Gentiles, and that no one had thought of doing it before him, but upon the conviction that he had been called not by man, but by God, to be their great apostle, and to do for them what others had done and were doing for the Jews. So far as his reference to Peter is concerned, his designation of him as the apostle of the circumcision no more proves that Peter cannot have preached, even on a single occasion, to the Gentiles, than does the fact that Paul calls himself, in the same passage, the apostle of the uncircumcision prove that he never preached to the Jews, when we know from his own words, in 1 Cor. ix. 20, that he must have done so frequently.

[1] 1 Cor. xv. 10.

But it is objected finally, that the trouble at Antioch to which Paul refers in Gal. ii. 11 sq., is inconceivable if the case of Cornelius be historical; for if James, and the Christians of Jerusalem in general, had signified their approval of Peter's conduct in eating with an uncircumcised Gentile in Cæsarea, they could not have found fault with him for doing the same thing later in Antioch; and Peter, though he might have been weak and vacillating, could not have been so characterless as to violate on that occasion, out of mere cowardly deference to the opinion of James, an express divine command which had led him to take such a decisive step as to preach the Gospel to Cornelius and break bread with him. The objection, however, implies a misunderstanding of the incident, for which Luke himself is in part responsible. In Acts xi. 3, the disciples of Jerusalem are represented as contending with Peter because he had gone in to men uncircumcised and had eaten with them; but it is a striking fact that, in the address which follows, Peter does not defend himself against that charge, but against the charge of recognizing a Gentile as a Christian disciple and admitting him to baptism, which is an entirely different matter. It is no less striking that the members of the church of Jerusalem glorify God not because he has broken down the wall between the Jew and the Gentile, and has made it lawful for the Jewish Christian to eat bread with his Gentile brother, but only because he has granted to the Gentiles repentance unto life. In other words, they recognized just what was recognized at a later time at the apostolic council, the legitimacy of Gentile Christianity; but they did not admit the right of any Jew to cease observing the Jewish law, and to disregard the prohibition against eating with the uncircumcised. The latter step was not taken even at the council some years later, and we certainly cannot suppose that it was taken at this time. Luke evidently did not realize the difference between the two steps. He supposed that the settlement of the one question was the settlement of the other, and he therefore did not distinguish them in

his account.[1] But his failure to do so should not lead us to the conclusion that the whole account is unhistorical, and that the incident recorded never took place.

It may fairly be doubted whether the idea of eating with Cornelius and the other Gentile converts presented itself to Peter, for they would certainly not expect him to. It may well be that he only preached the Gospel to them, and in view of the bestowal of the Holy Spirit recognized them as Christians and directed them to be baptized. At any rate, if he did more than this, if he actually ate with the Gentile converts, he did it not because his conscientious scruples had been removed by the vision on the housetop, but because of Christ's acceptance of the Gentiles as his disciples, which was made evident by the outpouring of the Spirit. It was the presence of the Spirit, not the vision on the housetop, that he regarded as the decisive fact, both in Cæsarea and later when he defended his course in Jerusalem. But the outpouring of the Spirit, while it meant divine recognition of Gentile Christianity, did not necessarily mean that a Jew, because he was a Christian, had a right to violate the divine law, and if Peter at this time took it to mean that, and acted accordingly, he certainly did not secure the approval of his brethren, and did not repeat his act for many years.

We conclude, then, that whatever may be thought of the accuracy of Luke's account in all its details, there is no adequate ground for doubting that Peter preached the Gospel to the Gentile Cornelius, and that the legitimacy of his action was acknowledged by the Christians of Jerusalem, or at any rate by the most influential among them. But that they admitted that it was lawful for a Jewish Christian to break bread with his Gentile brethren, or, in other words, to disregard the Jewish law in any particular, must be unequivocally denied.

[1] It is perhaps for this reason that Luke says nothing — if indeed he knew anything about it — of the Antiochian trouble which succeeded the conference at Jerusalem. Not realizing that any other question was involved at Antioch than had been discussed and settled just before at Jerusalem, he may have been totally unable to understand the situation, and therefore simply omitted all reference to it.

It will not do, indeed, to draw too large deductions from the case of Cornelius; it will not do to see in the admission of the legitimacy of Gentile Christianity, which was extorted from the disciples of Jerusalem at this time, the conscious recognition of the principle of universal fraternity and equality in the Gospel. That they foresaw the momentous consequences that were wrapped up in their action, is out of the question. They were forced by the demonstration of the Holy Spirit to admit, in spite of their native prejudices, the possibility of a Gentile's conversion, but they did not see in it the ultimate abrogation of the Jewish law, or the rise of a Christian church in which that law should have no recognition. It was certainly not their belief that the law was any less divine, any less binding, any less permanent, than they had hitherto thought it. When the Christians of Jerusalem approved Peter's action, neither he nor they thought for a moment of turning from the Jews to the Gentiles, or of carrying on active missionary work among the latter; nor had they any idea that Gentile Christianity would one day become so strong that it could take an independent position alongside of Jewish Christianity and demand for itself equal honor and equal rights. At best it was regarded as an exceptional form of Christianity, of a distinctly lower and less perfect type, and it was doubtless their expectation that the great majority of Christians would come from the ranks of the Jews, native or proselyte, and that Gentile worshippers of Jehovah, who might be admitted to the church because they recognized Jesus as the Messiah, would continue to acknowledge the religious superiority of the chosen people, just as those Gentiles had always done who reverenced Jehovah as the supreme God and attached themselves more or less closely to the Jewish people without accepting circumcision and becoming genuine proselytes. From such pious heathen the number of the proselytes was constantly augmented, and it may have been the belief of these early Christians that the family of Israel would receive accessions in the same way from the ranks of the

Gentiles that recognized Jesus as the Messiah, and thus Gentile Christianity constitute for many only a bridge to the full and complete Christianity of the believing children of Abraham.[1] They did not become any the less truly Jews, nor did they consciously waive any of their ancestral prerogatives. To think otherwise is to underestimate the power of their traditional faith and to make inexplicable the subsequent attitude toward the heathen assumed in Jerusalem, both by those who admitted and by those who denied their conversion.

In Acts xi. 19 sq., Luke records that certain men of Cyprus and Cyrene, who must have been either Hellenists or proselytes, being scattered abroad by the persecution which followed Stephen's death, came to Antioch, and there preached the Gospel to Gentiles,[2] and that a great number of the latter were converted. There is nothing surprising in this, and there is no reason to doubt the truth of the report. The fact that Luke makes this Gentile evangelism the work not of apostles, but of unknown men, and that he does not represent it as prompted by the church of Jerusalem, speaks for the trustworthiness of his account. It is no more than we might expect, that Christian Hellenists and proselytes, with their intimate acquaintance and association with the Greek world, should have been moved, when obliged to leave Jerusalem, to tell their Gentile friends of Christianity. And nowhere was such conduct more natural than in Antioch, for we learn from Josephus,[3] not only that there were multitudes of Jews there, but that they were especially active in the work of proselyting, and had a large following among the Greeks of the city. At any rate, whether

[1] It is significant that the Galatians later used their Gentile Christianity in just this way, finding no inconsistency in going on from the belief in Christ to the assumption of the entire law. Cf. Gal. iii. 3.

[2] The best manuscripts read Ἑλληνιστάς or Hellenists, instead of Ἕλληνας or Greeks, and Westcott and Hort adopt this reading. Other editors (Lachmann, Tregelles, Tischendorf) read Ἕλληνας on the ground that the word "Hellenists" does not offer the necessary contrast to the word "Jews" in the previous verse, the Hellenists being themselves Jews. Wendt adopts the reading Ἑλληνιστάς, but regards the word as referring to Greeks, and he is very likely correct. At any rate, Gentiles, not Jews, must certainly be understood.

[3] *B. J.*, vii. 33.

surprising or not, it is certain that the Gospel went to Antioch at an early day, and that there was a strong Gentile Christian community there some time before the council of Jerusalem.[1]

Luke, as is his custom, brings the work in Antioch directly under the control of the church at Jerusalem. He records, in vss. 22 sq., that when the report of what had been done reached the ears of the Christians of that church, they sent Barnabas to Antioch, and that when he had seen the grace of God, he gave his approval to the work there. It is, of course, possible that the disciples at Jerusalem had no serious fault to find with the spread of Christianity among the heathen in Antioch, if they learned of it after Peter's experience with Cornelius had led them to admit the possibility of a Gentile Christianity; but it is not likely that they would themselves undertake to carry on the work thus begun; and Luke, as has been seen, so habitually brings all missionary activity under the direct oversight of the mother church or of the apostles, that little weight can be laid upon this particular account, which may so easily be due to the same interest. But there is at any rate no reason to doubt that Barnabas and Paul labored together among the Gentiles at Antioch, as Luke records, and the fact is confirmed, at least for a subsequent period, by Paul himself in Gal. ii. 11 sq.

It is in this same connection that Luke reports the interesting and significant fact that the disciples were called Christians first in Antioch. Tacitus[2] says that the Romans called them by this name in the time of Nero, and some scholars have consequently thought that the name had its origin in Rome; but Lipsius[3] has shown that the word is probably Greek, not Latin, being formed after

[1] It is of course conceivable that Gentile Christianity in Antioch owed its origin to the preaching of Paul; but it is extremely unlikely, for the city is mentioned only once in his Epistles (Gal. ii. 11), and he addressed no letter, so far as we know, to the Antiochian church. It is in itself inherently probable therefore, quite independently of Luke's account, that Paul found Gentile Christians already in Antioch when he began Christian work there, as recorded in Acts xi. 26.

[2] *Ann.* XV. 44.

[3] *Ueber den Ursprung und ältesten Gebrauch des Christennamens*, 1873.

the analogy of proper adjectives in *-ανός*, *-ιανός*, which were very commonly employed by the Greeks of Asia as party designations. The term might therefore easily have originated in Antioch. It is not likely, however, that it was first used by the disciples, for they called themselves commonly *ἀδελφοί* or *ἅγιοι*; nor is it likely that it was used by the Jews, for they could not have acknowledged the disciples of Jesus as followers of the Messiah. The Jews commonly called them Nazarenes, or the "Sect of the Nazarenes."[1] The name "Christian" was doubtless first employed by the heathen, the word "Christ" being understood by them not as a title, but as a proper name.[2] The invention of the word, if it was due to them, implies that the Christians had already become more or less sharply distinguished from the Jews, and that they were recognized as a separate, if not independent, religious sect. That this should have been the case at an early day in Antioch is what we should expect, if Luke's report of Gentile conversions there be accepted. Such Gentile Christians could not become a part of the Jewish church. It was therefore inevitable, as their numbers increased, that they should constitute, either alone or in company with Jewish Christians that had thrown off the restraints of the law, a community of their own, which had its religious life not within but without the Jewish synagogue. So soon as this state of affairs existed, the conditions were present which made the rise of the special name "Christian" possible, and it can hardly have been very long before the name was coined.

In Antioch, then, under the circumstances described, we may suppose that there came into existence at an early day a Christian community, composed, if not wholly, at least in large part, of uncircumcised Gentiles, with whom a Jew could not lawfully fraternize. This community,

[1] *ἡ τῶν Ναζωραίων αἵρεσις*, Acts xxiv. 5; cf. also Acts xxiv. 14 and xxviii. 22.

[2] Ultimately it was adopted by the disciples themselves and in the second century was commonly used by them. In the New Testament the word occurs in only two other passages (Acts xxvi. 28, 1 Peter iv. 16) and both times as applied by an outsider. In the *Teaching of the Apostles* it occurs once as a self-designation, and in Ignatius and the Apologists very frequently.

whatever the attitude of its individual members toward Judaism, did not bear the character of a Jewish sect. There cannot have been within it any Jewish Christians who still continued to observe the Mosaic law strictly and literally in all its parts, though there may have been many such in the city. It is possible that there belonged to the circle some Jewish disciples who laid aside their ancestral scruples and mingled freely and intimately with their Gentile brethren, as there certainly were some years later.[1] But there can hardly have been many such at this early day, for had the practice become general, the question as to its legitimacy would have been raised at the council of Jerusalem, and found some settlement which would have made the Antiochian episode referred to in Gal. ii. 11 sq. impossible. But whether there were or were not many Jewish Christians in Antioch that treated the Gentile disciples as brethren, and as members of a common household of faith, there was at any rate a growing number of Christians there who were not circumcised, and who did not pretend to be Jews in any sense. In Antioch there was for some years the most important Gentile Christian community of which we have any knowledge. It constituted for a time the centre of Gentile Christianity, as Jerusalem was the centre of Jewish Christianity, and it was one of Paul's headquarters during a considerable part of his career as an apostle. With the rise of such a Gentile Christian community in Antioch, a community which was not bound to the synagogue and did not pay allegiance to it, there began a separate and independent development, the results of which were of permanent and world-wide significance. Not the conversion of Cornelius, or of any individual Gentile, marks the cardinal epoch in that development, but the origin of such a Christian community as has been described, wherever and whenever it took place.

The latter step was a natural result of the former, but it can hardly have been foreseen by those who recognized the conversion of Cornelius. Had it been, it may well be doubted whether that conversion would have found any

[1] Gal. ii. 11 sq.

general sanction in Jerusalem. It is significant that the process by which Gentile Christianity attained the footing which it finally enjoyed was gradual, and that the successive steps were taken only one at a time. The early disciples of Jerusalem would never have taken any of those steps of their own impulse. They simply followed the inevitable logic of events; they did not lead. Christianity had an expansive power which was too strong for the bonds that they had put upon it, and it burst those bonds, we may say, of itself. It was not deliberately sent or carried to the heathen; it went to them and made a home for itself on Gentile soil, even while the original disciples were still steeped in Jewish prejudices and entirely unable to recognize that the faith they preached was anything but a Jewish faith. The steps in the process of emancipation followed one another in natural sequence. Only as we trace them one by one can we understand the final step, and realize that it was inevitable. That final step, with the momentous transformations that resulted, we shall have to consider in a later chapter, after we have studied the Christianity of Paul, the great apostle to the Gentiles, who was chiefly instrumental in bringing it about.

CHAPTER III

THE CHRISTIANITY OF PAUL[1]

PAUL was born in Tarsus, the capital of the province of Cilicia, in Asia Minor, and one of the great literary centres of the world.[2] It is not without significance that his native place was a large and important city, renowned for its educational advantages, and proud of its Greek culture and uncommon devotion to intellectual pursuits. It would be a most surprising thing if a man of Paul's mental calibre had not been more or less affected by the atmosphere which prevailed in such a place, and if he had not revealed throughout his life the influence of his early surroundings. That he got the greater part of his education in Jerusalem seems to be implied in Acts xxii. 3, and is confirmed by all that we know of him from his epistles. But in spite of that fact, his pride in his native place, and his affection for it, remained with him,[3] and his subsequent career shows that his student life in Jerusalem did not efface the impression of the years spent at home in Tarsus, and did not stifle the instincts and im-

[1] See especially, in addition to the general works on the apostolic age and on New Testament Theology, Lüdemann: *Die Anthropologie des Apostels Paulus und ihre Stellung innerhalb seiner Heilslehre* (1872); Pfleiderer: *Der Paulinismus* (1873, 2te Auflage, 1890; Eng. Trans. from the first edition, 1877, in two volumes), also *Das Urchristenthum* (1887), S. 123 sq.; Ménégoz: *Le Péché et la Redemption d'après Saint Paul* (1882); and Du Bose: *The Soteriology of the New Testament* (1892). Sabatier's *L'Apôtre Paul* (2d ed. 1881; Eng. Trans. 1891), Matheson's *Spiritual Development of St. Paul* (1892), Everett's *Gospel of Paul* (1893), Stevens' *Pauline Theology* (1892), and Bruce's *St. Paul's Conception of Christianity* (1894), may also be referred to.

[2] Tarsus was already an important city in the time of Xenophon; and Strabo celebrates the literary character of the place, ranking its citizens even above those of Athens and Alexandria in their love of learning and their devotion to all things intellectual. For references to the city in ancient literature, see Winer's *Biblisches Realwörterbuch, s.v.*

[3] Acts xxi. 39.

pulses acquired there. That he had a regular Greek education may well be doubted. It was not the custom for strict Jews to give their children such a training, and Paul's epistles betray neither a wide knowledge of Greek literature nor a command of good Greek style.[1] And yet, even without such an education, there must have been much in the general culture of the community whose influence a youth of his intellectual alertness could not help feeling, even unconsciously to himself. It is certain that his manners were those of a citizen of the world familiar with the habits of good society, that he had the facile adaptability of a cosmopolite, and that he felt himself at home amid all surroundings and in association with all classes of people. Wherever he might be, he was master of the situation, and he displayed the same assurance and address whether in the presence of the superstitious rabble of Lystra, of the supercilious scholars of Athens, or of magistrates, proconsuls, and princes.[2] There was nothing provincial either in his tastes or tendencies. Strict Jew though he was, he had the instincts and the interests of a Roman citizen, and of a resident of a busy and cultured city of the world. Doubtless his social position also had something to do with the characteristics which he displayed along these lines. He was the son of a Roman citizen,[3] and he came, therefore, from an honorable, and very likely wealthy, family, whose dignity and influence must have been considerable;[4] for citizenship meant a great deal in his day. But it was not simply in his manners, and in his tastes and interests, that Paul revealed the influence of Tarsus; his philosophical and theological conceptions were also moulded to no small degree by certain

[1] The three quotations from Greek authors, which have been pointed out in his epistles and speeches (1 Cor. xv. 32; Titus i. 12; Acts xvii. 28), count for nothing, even though it be granted that all of them are really Paul's, for they are such as might have been picked up by anybody in his intercourse with educated heathen. Paul's style is Hebraistic, and is far from being the style of a man educated in the Greek schools.

[2] Acts xiii., xvi., xxiv. sq.

[3] Acts xxii. 28.

[4] That he was in comparative poverty during at least a part of his missionary career (1 Thess. ii. 9; Phil. iv. 16) proves nothing to the contrary. (See Ramsay: *St. Paul, the Traveller and Roman Citizen*, p. 34 sq.)

intellectual tendencies which were abroad in the Greek world of the period. That he was consciously the pupil of Hellenic or Hellenistic thinkers, or that he was familiar with their writings, is altogether unlikely;[1] but that he imbibed something of the spirit which voiced itself in them cannot be denied.

But though Paul was a Hellenist, and though he felt the influence of the world at large, and absorbed something of its spirit, he was, above all, a "Hebrew of Hebrews,"[2] sprung evidently from strict Jews and himself thoroughly steeped in the traditions and prejudices of his fathers. He was educated in Jerusalem, as was natural for the son of parents of wealth and orthodox principles, and under the tutelage of the greatest rabbinic authorities of the age. His thorough Jewish training appears plainly in all his writings. He thought like a Hebrew and wrote like a Hebrew. His familiarity with the Scriptures, which constituted the basis of Jewish education, was very great, as was also his acquaintance with the interpretations of the schools. He used the Scriptures throughout his life just as they were used by all the Jewish theologians of his day. There is in his epistles the same emphasis upon the divine character of the sacred writings, resulting in their elevation almost to an equality with God himself; and the same idea of their inspiration which prevailed in the Jewish schools, and which led to the treatment of the Scriptures as a mere collection of oracles, that might be torn from their context and applied to any subject and in any way that seemed desirable, and which led also inevitably to the use of the allegorical and typical method of interpretation. Paul, to be sure, was very much freer than most of his contemporaries from exegetical vagaries, and his Scripture interpretation was comparatively sober. But there are not a few notable instances in which he follows the common custom, and shows in a

[1] Pfleiderer (*Paulinismus*, 2te Auflage, S. 27 sq.) maintains that Paul knew and used the Hellenistic Book of Wisdom, but the parallelisms which he points out hardly do more than show that Paul felt to some extent the same influences that were felt by the author of that book.

[2] Phil. iii. 5.

striking way the influence of his training. Thus, in 1 Cor. ix. 9, he interprets the command, "Thou shalt not muzzle the ox when he treadeth the corn," as referring not to oxen, but only to Christian apostles, on the ground that God cannot care for mere brutes; and in Gal. iv. 22 sq., he makes Hagar represent the covenant of law and Sarah the covenant of grace.[1] In the famous passage, Gal. iii. 16, we have a striking example of the common rabbinic method of building an elaborate argument upon the form of a single word. The Old Testament statement that the promises were made to Abraham and to his seed, is interpreted to refer to Christ, because the passage says "seed" and not "seeds." The subtle dialectic method of argument, which Paul employs so freely, especially in Galatians and Romans, is also characteristically rabbinic, and he repeats without question in his epistles not a few traditions which were current in the Jewish schools of the day.[2] He shows himself, in fact, a man well versed in rabbinic modes of thought and thoroughly familiar with rabbinic lore.

But Paul was not simply a Jewish scholar; he was a profound, original, and independent thinker. In spite of his rabbinic training, which was certainly not calculated to encourage intellectual boldness and self-reliance, he was always alive to the teachings of his own intuition and experience, fearless in following their leading, quick to adjust traditional notions to the truth thus learned. There was nothing loose or slipshod, nothing vague and unformed in his thinking. His mental processes were close, compact, and vigorous, his vision clear and keen, his grasp firm. He could not be content with half-truths, or with truths half understood. He must view them in their completeness, determine their bearing, yield them their due weight and influence. He never confounded essentials and non-essentials, or lost sight of the main point in his interest in side issues. The great principles

[1] Compare also his use of the Scriptures for types of Christianity and Christian truth, as for instance in 1 Cor. x. 1 sq.; 2 Cor. iii. 13 sq.

[2] Cf. especially 1 Cor. x. 4, where Paul speaks of the rock that followed the children of Israel.

upon which his life was based stood out always clear before his mind, and gave form and direction to all he thought and said and did.

But Paul was not only a scholar and a thinker; he was a religious devotee, concerned not simply to know, but to do, the will of God, and not simply to observe the divine law himself, but to secure its observance by others as well. Even before his conversion, he desired to be not merely a rabbi, but a missionary; to devote his life to the propagation of true righteousness and to the overthrow of everything which in any way interfered with its advance, and which in any way hindered the people from giving themselves undividedly to the practice of the law. There can be little doubt that he was one of those who were looking forward to the coming of the promised Messianic kingdom, and that he believed with the best spirits of his age that its establishment depended upon the piety of God's chosen people. He took religion very seriously, and he wished others to do the same. It was no light matter to him. It outweighed everything else and controlled all his thinking, feeling, and acting. The ordinary conformity to the law with which most of his contemporaries contented themselves, and upon which they complacently rested their hope of salvation, did not satisfy him. The contempt with which he regarded their easy-going ways appears in the strong words he uses in Gal. v. 3 and vi. 13. Though he had studied under the elder Gamaliel, whose spirit seems to have been more liberal and tolerant than most of his compeers,[1] Paul himself grew up a Pharisee of the most bigoted and zealous type. His natural character reveals itself in the zeal with which he put his principles into practice. The most marked features in that character were singleness of purpose and intensity of temper. What he believed, he believed with all his heart; what he did, he did with all his might. There was nothing passive, lukewarm, or indifferent about him

[1] Acts xxii. 3, v. 34 sq. On Rabbi Gamaliel the elder, so-called to distinguish him from his grandson, Rabbi Gamaliel the younger, see Schürer, *l.c.* ii. S. 300 sq. (Eng. Trans., Div. II. Vol. I. p. 363 sq.).

in any of his relations. The whole man was in every conviction and in every act. There was no dissipation of energy, no scattering of forces. Whether as a Pharisee or as a Christian, he was dominated by a single aim, and he threw himself into its accomplishment with an earnestness which could brook no opposition, and with an *abandon* which admitted no thought of self-interest. With all his originality, freshness, and depth of thought, he was essentially a man of one idea, willing to sacrifice everything to it, willing to die in its behalf. He was of the stuff that martyrs are made of, and he would have died as readily at the hand of Antiochus Epiphanes as he did at the hand of Nero.

When Paul first came into contact with the Christians we do not know, but it may well be that he had been for some time absent from Jerusalem, and that he returned thither only shortly before the execution of Stephen. It is thus easiest to explain the outbreak against Stephen and his fellows, in which he seems to have been a prime mover. He may have heard the Christians repeating utterances which seemed to him subversive of the law of God and the traditions of the fathers, and he was perhaps not aware that for a year or more the followers of the man who had spoken such dangerous words had lived the lives of faithful and consistent Jews, and that they had shown no sign of understanding the words of their Master as Paul understood them. It was therefore natural for him to judge of the movement solely from the consequences which seemed to be involved in the teachings of its founder. And yet it is by no means certain that Paul would have been content to leave Christianity alone even had he known that its adherents remained true to Judaism; for, clear-sighted as he was, he must have seen that the time would come, if it had not yet come, when the teachings of Jesus would have their natural effect, and he must have been anxious to stamp them out at once. But however that may be, he was at any rate one of the chief if not the chief instigator of the attack upon Stephen; for the executioners of the latter laid their clothes at his feet,

implying that he was the principal witness against the accused.[1] As a native of a foreign city, he would naturally be at home in one of the Hellenistic synagogues in Jerusalem, and it is possible that he became acquainted with Stephen there and was the first to perceive the revolutionary tendency of the teachings of Jesus as rehearsed by him and his fellows. Anxious as he was to serve the Lord, we may think of him as eagerly welcoming this offered opportunity to show his devotion to God and to exercise his zeal for the religion of his fathers. But he did not rest with the execution of Stephen. He felt himself called to carry the war even beyond Jerusalem, and to put an end to the growth of the pernicious sect in foreign parts. He was very likely particularly interested in the progress of Judaism in the heathen world. The Pharisees were naturally proselytizers, and as a native of a foreign city, who was in touch to some extent with the life of the world at large, Paul must have been even more interested than his brethren of Jerusalem in the conversion of the Roman Empire to the Jewish faith. If that was the case, he could not but be apprehensive of the consequences of the spread of Christianity among the Hellenists. It may well be, therefore, that his mission to Damascus was intended only as the beginning of a vigorous campaign against the Christians wherever they had secured a foothold; and that he had deliberately determined to devote not a few days merely, but his life, to a work which was not to be abandoned until it was complete, and which he realized could not be accomplished without long effort.

Such an unconditional devotion of himself to the work of exterminating Christianity seems alone to explain his immediate dedication of his entire life to its advancement, when his conversion took place. That conversion was one of the most remarkable transformations in history. Paul gives us no detailed account of the circumstances under which it occurred, but in Gal. i. 12 sq. he refers to it in such a way as to indicate with sufficient clearness

[1] Acts vii. 58.

its cause and its nature.[1] In the passage in question he was emphasizing the fact over against those who were attacking the validity of his apostolate and the truth of his Gospel, that he had received his Gospel not from man, but from God. "Neither did I receive it from man," he says, "nor was I taught it, but it came to me through revelation of Jesus Christ." And then a little farther on he adds: "But when it was the good pleasure of God, who separated me from my mother's womb, and called me through his grace to *reveal his Son in me* . . . immediately I conferred not with flesh and blood." Evidently it was an immediate revelation of Jesus Christ, the Son of God, that made a Christian of him. With the words of the Epistle to the Galatians agrees the statement of 1 Cor. xv. 8, "And last of all, as unto one born out of due time, he [that is Christ] appeared to me also." Paul,

[1] The Book of Acts contains three accounts of a vision of Christ vouchsafed to Paul upon his way to Damascus, whither he was going to carry on the war against the Christians, which he had begun in Jerusalem. The first (ix. 3 sq.) is in the words of the author of the book; the other two (xxii. 6 sq., xxvi. 12 sq.) occur in speeches of Paul which he records. There are some differences between the accounts, but the verbal agreements are so close that the interdependence of the three is assumed by most scholars. The account in chap. xxvi. is the simplest of the three, and bears marks of originality over against the others (see below, p. 350); and as it occurs in a setting whose vividness and verisimilitude are unsurpassed, it is altogether likely that the author found it in his sources and that it constituted the original upon which, with the help of oral tradition, he built the other accounts in chaps. ix. and xxii. At the same time it is clear that he made some additions even in chap. xxvi. (See below, p. 355.) The most important fact which the author added in chaps. ix. and xxii. was the agency of Ananias. Doubtless such a man played a prominent part in connection with Paul's early days as a Christian disciple, though just what that part was is not altogether clear. On the relation of the three accounts to each other see especially Zimmer in the *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie*, 1882, S. 465 sq.; Wendt in Meyer's Commentary, 7th edition, S. 217 sq.; Sorof: *Die Entstehung der Apostelgeschichte*, S. 66 sq.; Spitta: *Die Apostelgeschichte*, S. 270 sq., and Jüngst: *Quellen der Apostelgeschichte*, S. 83 sq.

Various difficulties in the three accounts have been pointed out by critics. It has been maintained for instance that the statement in ix. 17 that Paul received the Holy Spirit through the laying on of Ananias' hands is inconsistent with his own account of his conversion. The descriptions of Paul's visit to Jerusalem after his conversion, in ix. 26 and xxii. 17 sq., have also been pronounced incompatible with his own statement in Gal. i. 18 sq. (cf. also xxvi. 20, where the same idea of the visit appears). In view of such difficulties as these, it is safer to confine ourselves to Paul's own account, and this may the more readily be done because he gives all that is essential to an understanding of the event.

therefore, believed that at a particular period in his life the risen Christ appeared to him, and to that appearance he owed his Christian faith.[1] In order to understand what such an appearance must mean to him, and what effect it must have upon him, it is necessary to acquaint ourselves as fully as possible with his state of mind at the time the great event took place, and to inquire whether he had been in any way prepared for it by his previous experience.

The Galatian passage shows that Paul conceived of his conversion to Christianity as a sudden and abrupt event, as a transformation effected not by the influence or instruction of men, but by the direct interposition and sole agency of God. The passage also apparently excludes the idea that his conversion was the result of a gradual change in his own mind, or the consummation of a process beginning with doubts and fears as to the truth of the Christians' claims, and as to the wisdom and justice of his own course of action, and terminating in his final decision to accept Christianity. Such a gradual process seems to be ruled out by his own statements. He was at any rate not conscious before the critical moment came of any leaning toward the new faith, or of any lack of decision and determination in his attitude of hostility. The event seemed to him absolutely sudden and unheralded; at one moment he was the determined enemy of Jesus, at the next he was his disciple. Nevertheless, though it is clear that Paul thus pictured his conversion, there can be no doubt that his experience had been such not as to effect, but certainly to prepare him for, the change. Such a transformation necessitates some preparation; without it the event is psychologically inconceivable. The preparation need not be direct, but some preparation there must be. What it actually was, we may learn from Rom. vii. 7 sq., a passage which is evidently a leaf out of Paul's own experience before his conversion. It is clear from that passage that, zealous as Paul was in his observance of the Jewish

[1] The reference to Damascus in Gal. i. 17 indicates that the appearance took place in or near that city, as stated in the Acts.

law, and blameless as his conduct was when measured by an external standard, he had become conscious that all his efforts to attain true righteousness were a complete failure. When this consciousness forced itself upon him we do not know, but it was evidently the result of his perception of the fact, which was entirely overlooked by the majority of his contemporaries, and may have been long overlooked by Paul himself, that inner as well as outer sins, sins of heart as well as of deed, were forbidden by the law; that the tenth commandment made covetousness and lust a crime, even though the lust or the covetousness never manifested itself in acts of sensuality or of dishonesty.[1] That Paul, trained as he was in the superficial, legal conceptions of the Pharisees of his day, should have recognized this fact, is a mark of the profoundness of his ethical nature, and distinguishes him from most of his fellows. Only a great religious genius could thus have penetrated beneath the husk of formality to the vital kernel within. It is clear that he was no ordinary Pharisee. The condemnation which Jesus passed upon the Pharisees as a class could not have been pronounced upon him. Even though a Pharisee, he was a man after Christ's own heart. Though he apparently knew nothing as yet about Jesus' teaching, he had reached the principle of which Jesus had made so much, that all external observance of the law is worthless unless it be based upon the obedience of the heart.

But the fact once recognized, that the law demands more than mere external conformity, that it demands in fact the complete purification of all the thoughts and desires, a struggle was begun whose intensity, if the matter were taken seriously, as Paul took it, must grow constantly more awful, as the futility of all efforts thus to bring one's whole nature into harmony with God's holy will became increasingly apparent. But this struggle had the effect of leading Paul to recognize, not as a matter of theory merely, but of the most vivid and bitter experience, a dualism within his own nature, a dualism between

[1] See Bruce, *St. Paul's Conception of Christianity*, p. 28 sq.

the will on the one hand and the passions and desires on the other. To will was present with him, but not to do that which he willed; to keep his affections centred always and only on that which he knew to be holy and right, this he found impossible. "The good which I would I do not," he cries, "but the evil which I would not that I practise."[1]

But this conscious schism between will and deed drove Paul to the assumption that the unruly passions and desires which his will could not control were due not to himself, but to sin, which was dwelling in him. "So then it is no more I that do it," he says, "but sin which dwelleth in me."[2] But whence came this sin? How were its existence and its power to be explained? Paul's answer to this question is of the very greatest significance. He found the explanation of the sin within him in the fleshly nature which he possessed in common with all the race. "For I know that in me, that is in my flesh, dwelleth no good thing."[3] The word "flesh," or σάρξ, seems to have meant to Paul primarily the material substance of which the human body is composed,[4] and it is accordingly frequently used by him for the body itself.[5] He also employs it in an entirely natural, though secondary and derived sense, well known among the Jews, to denote not the material body alone, but the whole man as a living person.[6] But he even goes further than this and makes use of the term very commonly not for the individual man

[1] Rom. vii. 19. [2] Rom. vii. 17, 21. [3] Rom. vii. 18.

[4] Cf. 1 Cor. xv. 50; Col. i. 22; also 1 Cor. xv. 39, where the flesh of beasts, birds, and fishes, as well as of men, is spoken of. Upon the various meanings of the word σάρξ in Paul, see Thayer's *Lexicon*, *s.v.* For fuller discussions of Paul's use of the word, see especially, in addition to the books referred to on p. 113, Holsten: *Die Bedeutung des Wortes σάρξ im Lehrbegriffe des Paulus*, 1855 (republished in his volume, *Zum Evangelium des Paulus und des Petrus*, 1868); Wendt: *Die Begriffe Fleisch und Geist im biblischen Sprachgebrauch* (1878); Dickson: *St. Paul's Use of the Terms Flesh and Spirit* (1883), a work which is especially valuable for its elaborate presentation and criticism of the views of others; and Gloël: *Der heilige Geist in der Heilsverkündigung des Paulus* (1888).

[5] Rom. ii. 28; 1 Cor. vi. 16, vii. 28; 2 Cor. iv. 11, x. 3, xii. 7; Gal. ii. 20, iv. 13, 14, vi. 13.

[6] Cf. Rom. iii. 20; 1 Cor. i. 29; Gal. ii. 16, where the word σάρξ is equivalent to ἄνθρωπος. The Hebrew בָּשָׂר is very frequently used in the same way in the Old Testament. Cf. also 2 Cor. vii. 5, where "our flesh" is hardly more than a circumlocution for "we."

simply, but also for human nature as such. Whatever man's faculties or endowments, Paul pictures him in his natural state as a fleshly being, a being to whose nature may properly be given the name "flesh." And so it is the word σάρξ which he commonly employs when he contrasts, as he does so continually in his epistles, the nature of man with the nature of God, man's nature being fleshly and God's nature being spiritual; and it is this use of the word that is most characteristic of him.[1]

But according to Paul flesh, or human nature, in contrast with spirit, or the divine nature, is evil in its present state, whatever may have been true of it originally. God alone is holy; man is sinful always and everywhere.[2] But the evil flesh or nature expresses itself necessarily in desires or lusts,[3] and those desires, being the expression of an evil nature, are evil or sinful, and that too even though a person may not yet have come to self-consciousness and may not yet have taken cognizance of them.[4] Paul thus conceives of a sinfulness or corruption of nature which may lie entirely without consciousness, and in which the personality may have no part.[5] But this natural sinfulness becomes active sin or wilful transgression as soon as a person comes to a knowledge of law, and is thus in a position to distinguish between right and wrong.[6] By law in these cases Paul does not mean merely the Mosaic law, although as the great objective embodiment of the law of God it is chiefly in his mind, but law in general.

[1] It is a mistake, nevertheless, to see in this use of the word, as many do, an entire departure from its original significance, and to suppose that in employing it in an ethical or religious sense Paul lost sight altogether of the conception of flesh as the material substance which goes to compose the human body. It is true that as the word is commonly employed by him, it takes on a derived and distinctly ethical meaning which makes it more than mere material substance, but it is evident from many passages that the original and literal significance always attached to it more or less distinctly, and that Paul never rid himself completely of the impression of that significance. Cf. *e.g.* Rom. vii. 18, viii. 3, 13; 2 Cor. x. 3 sq.; Gal. iii. 3, v. 13 sq., vi. 8.

[2] Cf. Rom. v. 12 sq.

[3] ἐπιθυμίαι, Rom. vii. 7; Gal. v. 16, 24.

[4] Cf. Rom. vii. 7 sq.

[5] This conception of sinfulness of nature, made possible by Paul's thoroughgoing realism, underlies all his thinking, and he cannot be understood at all unless it is distinctly recognized.

[6] Cf. Rom. iii. 20, iv. 15, v. 13, vii. 7, etc.

For it is clear from more than one passage that he thinks of the Gentiles as under law as well as the Jews, even though they have never known anything of the Mosaic legislation.[1] Heathen, then, are actual transgressors as well as Jews, and they first became such when they acquired a consciousness of the law of God written in their hearts.[2] Moreover, according to Paul, subjective sin is universal, just as the objective sinfulness of the flesh is universal. All men that have reached years of discretion not simply possess an evil nature, but are actual and conscious transgressors;[3] all men are slaves of their flesh. Their understanding perceives what is right, and perceiving it, they may wish to do it, but they cannot. Their evil nature is too strong for them, and they do evil in spite of their knowledge of the good and their desire to do the good. Hence arises the terrible struggle which Paul depicts in the light of his own experience in Rom. vii., a struggle between himself as a conscious person, knowing and approving the good, and his human nature or flesh with its inherent corruption; a struggle which results in his continual defeat, until at last realizing its hopelessness, he cries in despair, "O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me out of this body of death?"[4]

It is a fact of the utmost significance that Paul does not ask for forgiveness, but for deliverance; and for deliverance, moreover, not from the penalty of sin, but from the source of sin. Paul was always thoroughgoing in his conception of sin and its effects. He never thought of death as a penalty arbitrarily inflicted upon the sinner by God, and which God therefore could remove; but he thought of it as the necessary and inevitable fruit of sin or corruption. That which is evil must perish. Evil nature therefore must die.[5] There was no way then to escape from death, except by escaping from the flesh whose condition doomed

[1] Rom. i. 19 sq., 32, ii. 8 sq., 15.
[2] Rom. ii. 15.
[3] Rom. iii. 9 sq., v. 12.
[4] Rom. vii. 24.
[5] Paul, indeed, dealt almost wholly in terms of nature rather than of personality and in real rather than legal conceptions. One cannot speak of inflicting punishment upon an evil nature except by an accommodation of terms. Only a conscious person can, strictly speaking, be punished. But an evil or corrupt nature must of necessity die.

it to death. But how could a man escape from the flesh and live? The common Jewish belief in the resurrection which was prevalent in Paul's day, afforded no answer to the question, for it was a belief in the resurrection of the flesh. Indeed, to the ordinary Hebrew mind no life seemed possible except life in the flesh. But to rise again in the flesh, as Paul clearly saw, would be no blessing, but a curse. To rise again in the flesh must seem to him, indeed, impossible, for the flesh is evil, and evil always means death. There was no way known to Paul, therefore, to escape from the flesh and live. The struggle through which he had been passing, a struggle to which his profoundly ethical nature had given a peculiar and awful intensity, had culminated in utter despair.[1] It was while he was in the depths of that despair that the vision of the risen Jesus was seen by him. The cardinal fact about it was that it was the vision of a spiritual being. It was not a man of flesh and blood that appeared to Paul, but a spirit; it was not an earthly but a heavenly apparition that he saw.[2] And yet Paul at once recognized that spirit as the risen Jesus. What must have been the effect of such recognition? On the one hand, of course, the immediate conviction that Jesus was what he had claimed to be, the Messiah of God; on the other hand, the realization of the pregnant fact that this Messiah Jesus, though possessed, as a man, of the same flesh as other men,[3] had yet escaped death, and that he had escaped it in the very way that Paul had been driven to feel was the only way, by escaping the flesh itself. He had died a man in the flesh; he was now living the life of a glorified spirit. But with his rigorous conception of sin and its consequences, it was clear to Paul that such continued spiritual existence presupposed a life of absolute holiness on the part of Jesus;[4]

[1] That Romans vii. 24 represents the condition of his mind in the days immediately preceding his conversion there can be no doubt; and it is possible that the unusual zeal with which he had recently been giving himself to the practice of religion, and the tremendous and restless energy with which he was devoting himself to the persecution of the Christians, may have been due in part to this inner struggle.

[2] Cf. 2 Cor. iv. 6; Gal. i 16. [3] Cf. Gal. iv. 4; Phil. ii. 7; Rom. viii. 3.

[4] Cf. Rom. v. 18 sq., xv. 3; 2 Cor. v. 21; Phil. ii. 5 sq.

for had he been unholy, he could not have escaped the grasp of death.[1] There must have been something in him then stronger than the flesh which could conquer and rise above it. But in that case he must have been more than an ordinary man;[2] for all men are sinners.[3] It seemed to Paul, indeed, that he must have been nothing less than a heavenly being, endowed with the Spirit of God.[4] As such a being it was possible for him, as it was not possible for a mere man, to overcome the flesh, and to pass through death into a spiritual life released from the flesh, the life he had enjoyed with God before his incarnation.[5]

Thus had Jesus, who appeared to Paul on the way to Damascus, been delivered from the supreme evil, death, and attained that life for which Paul longed so earnestly, and to secure which he had struggled all in vain. But why had Jesus the Messiah done all this? Why had he come down from heaven, assumed human flesh, suffered and died, and returned to the place from whence he came? But one answer was possible to Paul in the light of his own experience, and under the pressure of his own need. Christ had done what he did not in order to free himself, but to free others from the burden of sin and death, and to give them that life with God which he himself enjoyed. There can be no doubt that in the vision which broke upon Paul's startled gaze on the road to Damascus, the risen Jesus appeared to him, not merely as one who should usher in the promised kingdom, but also, and especially, as one

[1] Rom. v. 12 sq., 21, vi. 16, 21, vii. 13 sq.

[2] For the belief that Jesus was more than human was furnished a suggestion in the idea, which was not altogether unknown among the Jews of Paul's day, that the Messiah belonged to a higher order of being than man, that he had an existence in heaven before his appearance on earth, and that he was to be sent down thence by God to fulfil his Messianic calling (cf. Schürer: *l.c.* II. p. 444 sq.; Eng. Trans., Div. II. Vol. II. S. 159 sq.). Whether Paul shared that belief before his conversion, we do not know; but he certainly held it afterwards (cf. Rom. viii. 3; 1 Cor. x. 4; 2 Cor. viii. 9; Phil. ii. 6 sq.).

[3] Rom. iii. 9 sq., v. 12 sq.

[4] 1 Cor. xv. 47; Rom. viii. 9 sq.; 2 Cor. iii. 17, 18, v. 19; Gal. iv. 6. Cf. Col. i. 19.

[5] Rom. i. 4, vi. 9 sq., vii. 4, viii. 9 sq.; 1 Cor. xv. 15, 44, 49 sq.; Gal. i. 1; Phil. ii. 8 sq., iii. 21.

who should break the bondage of death and give his people life. Struggling, defeated, despairing, he saw in it the promise of his own deliverance, for which he had so earnestly longed, but which had seemed utterly unattainable. Had the vision not meant this to Paul, it would have left him in only greater despair than before. To receive a revelation of the Messiah whom he and his countrymen had been expecting, would not have helped him, for into the Messianic kingdom only the righteous could enter, and he was painfully conscious of his own unrighteousness. Indeed, to have revealed to him as the Christ the one whom he had himself been blaspheming and attacking, could mean only a sense of deeper condemnation. Such a revelation must mean judgment not mercy, a curse and not a blessing. That it meant mercy and blessing to Paul, and that it resulted not in terror and despair, but in his immediate and joyful conversion to Christian discipleship, was due to the fact that in the very vision itself was given him an entirely new conception of the office of the Messiah. Like the majority of his countrymen, he had doubtless thought of him as coming not to save his people from their sins, but to bring a righteous people their reward. But in the Messiah who appeared to him on the way to Damascus, Paul beheld his Saviour and Deliverer, and there was born a new hope in his heart, the hope of eternal life which he had completely lost under the stress of the spiritual conflict through which he had been passing. No wonder that his cry of despair was followed by the exultant exclamation, "I thank God, through Jesus Christ our Lord";[1] and no wonder that he could write to the Corinthians, with his mind upon the great event that had taken place more than twenty years before, "It is God who shined in our hearts to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ."[2]

But how was the action of the Messiah to effect that deliverance of which Paul thus felt assured? How was Paul himself, and how were others, to benefit by all that

[1] Rom. vii. 25. [2] 2 Cor. iv. 6.

he had done in their behalf? It was in answering this question that Paul departed most widely from the thought of all his predecessors and contemporaries; that he showed himself most independent of outside influence and revealed most clearly his religious individuality and originality. Christ saves a man, he says, by entering and taking up his abode within him, by binding him indissolubly to himself, so that it is no longer he that lives, but Christ that lives in him, so that whatever Christ does he does, and whatever he does Christ does.[1]

This profound and remarkable answer was entirely in line with the experience through which Paul had passed. It was in fact the only answer that could have satisfied him in the light of that experience. To have believed that the work of Christ was only substitutionary in its significance; that he died merely as a sacrifice by virtue of which other men, though sinful, might be relieved of death, the penalty of their sin; to have believed that there was only an arbitrary and forensic connection between the work of Christ and the salvation of men, would have been to do violence to his most sacred convictions, and to run counter to all his religious experience.

[1] Paul's conception of the significance of Christ's death and of the union between the risen Christ and the believer, though the fruit, as we have seen, of his own religious experience, was yet not without confirmation in the teaching of Christ himself, and there can be little doubt that that teaching contributed to the clearness and certainty of the conception. Christ had more than once referred to his death not as an unavoidable evil, but as a positive and lasting benefit to his followers, and his identification of the bread and wine, in the Last Supper of which his disciples partook, with his own body and blood, might possibly seem to furnish a warrant for the belief in the real and actual oneness between the believer and his Lord. With Christ's utterances concerning his death and with the occurrences connected with the Last Supper, Paul may not have been acquainted at the time of his conversion, but he must have learned of them very soon thereafter, and they may well have exercised an appreciable influence upon the formation of his views; cf. 1 Cor. xv. 3, x. 16 sq., xi. 23 sq. It is true that he interpreted them very differently from Christ's immediate disciples; but the fact that he found in them a confirmation of the fruits of his religious experience, can hardly be questioned.

It can hardly be questioned, moreover, that the universal belief of the early Christians in the presence and influence of the Holy Spirit, with which of course Paul must have been familiar even before his conversion, had its influence in the formation of his views. He could not fail to see in the testimony of others to the presence of the Holy Spirit, a confirmation of his own experience of Christ's indwelling, and the identification of Christ and the Holy Spirit must thus have been all the more easy and natural to him.

Another man of less rigorous character, and less profoundly conscious than he, of the inalienable and essential connection of sin with death, — one of his Jewish contemporaries, for example, — might have adopted some such view; might have believed that God could sever that essential connection, and in virtue of a merely substitutionary sacrifice of Christ could pronounce a sinful man righteous and grant him life, but Paul could not. No other answer, indeed, was possible to him than the answer given above, and yet its boldness is startling. It is not in any sense a scholastic answer, an inference from observed facts, or a logical deduction from premises supplied by Scripture or tradition, but it is an answer based upon direct personal knowledge, upon immediate consciousness. Paul would never have dared to give it, nor could he ever have discovered it, except under the influence and upon the basis of a profound and vivid Christian experience, which was the most real thing in all his life to him. We can understand neither Paul the Christian nor Paul the theologian, unless we appreciate that experience and give it its full value. It marks him as one of the great religious geniuses of history, and it has done more than all else to make his name immortal and his influence world-wide, and that, too, in spite of the fact that he has been all too commonly misinterpreted and degraded into a mere rabbinic legalist or scholastic dialectician. To his Christian experience he gives clear and vivid expression in such striking utterances as the following: "When it pleased God to reveal his Son [not "to me" but] in me";[1] "I have been crucified with Christ; yet I live; and yet no longer I, but Christ liveth in me";[2] "God sent forth the Spirit of his Son into our hearts";[3] and in other passages where he simply transfers his own experience to others, as, for example, in the words: "For as many of you as were baptized into Christ did put on Christ";[4] "My little children of whom I am again in travail until Christ be formed in you";[5] "If Christ is in you, the body is dead because of

[1] Gal. i. 16.
[2] Gal. ii. 20.
[3] Gal. iv. 6.
[4] Gal. iii. 27.
[5] Gal. iv. 19.

sin; but the spirit is life because of righteousness."[1] Paul's epistles are full of utterances like these, and it is plain that in them is revealed the very centre and heart of his Christian experience. Out of that experience, out of the revelation of the Son of God within him, was born the conviction to which he gave such constant expression, that Christ had redeemed him by making him completely one with himself.

But this union between himself and Christ, of which Paul became conscious at the time of his conversion, had a double significance to him. His experience had convinced him, as we have seen, that he could never attain life unless he could be freed from the flesh, which was constantly dragging him downward and dooming him to death. But in the revelation of the living Christ within him, he became conscious that he had already come under the control of a life-giving spirit, and had already passed from death unto life. He must have died, then, with Christ unto the flesh, which had formerly had dominion over him, and he must have risen again with him unto the new life in the Spirit which he was now living. His union with Christ, therefore, meant to Paul both death and life; death unto the flesh, life in the Spirit.[2] Thus the work of Jesus had been made of benefit to Paul. Because he was one with Christ, Christ had effected his salvation by his death and resurrection.

This oneness between himself and the Messiah, which alone made his salvation possible and actual, was conceived by Paul in a very real way. The words in which he describes it are no mere figure of speech. It was not simply a oneness of mind or heart or will, not simply that he possessed the disposition or character of Christ, but that he was actually one with Christ in nature. He conceived the oneness between the spiritual man and Christ, the second Adam, to be as true and complete as between the fleshly man and the first

[1] Rom. viii. 10; cf. also 2 Cor. iv. 6 sq.

[2] Rom. vi. 2 sq., vii. 4, viii. 10; 2 Cor. iv. 10, v. 1 sq.; Gal. ii. 20, iii. 27; Phil. iii. 10 sq., etc.

Adam.[1] Christ and the spiritual man are as really one as Adam and the natural man. The oneness between Adam and the natural man lies in the σάρξ, or flesh; the oneness between Christ and the spiritual man lies in the πνεῦμα or spirit. It is because Adam and all his descendants partake of human flesh, that they are really one in nature; and it is because Christ and the believer alike partake of the Divine Spirit that they are equally one in nature.[2] Paul does not think of the spiritual nature of Christ as of another and lower order than the spiritual nature of God; he does not make Christ's Spirit of one kind and God's Spirit of another; in fact, as already remarked, he does not in any way distinguish the Spirit of God from the Spirit of Christ, but speaks of the same Spirit at one time as the Spirit of God, and again even in the same passage, as the Spirit of Christ.[3] Moreover, in some passages Paul identifies Christ himself and the Spirit of Christ or the Spirit of God,[4] using indifferently the personal name Christ and the term πνεῦμα, which denotes Christ's nature, just as he uses interchangeably the words ἀνθρωπός and σάρξ. It is thus abundantly evident that the πνεῦμα, or spiritual nature of Christ, is the divine πνεῦμα. This Divine Spirit, holy by nature, and possessed of life and endowed with the power to impart life,[5] is placed by Paul in constant contrast with the flesh, which is evil and therefore doomed to death and death-dealing in its effects. The one is holy, the other sinful; the one incorruptible, the other corruptible; the one immortal, the other mortal; the one heavenly, the other earthly. At every point the contrast between them is complete, and is frequently emphasized by Paul.[6] In becoming really united to Christ, then, a man becomes a partaker with him in the divine nature, or πνεῦμα. When Christ takes up his abode in the man, it is the Divine Spirit that dwells in him; he has within him a new nature the opposite in every respect of his old fleshly nature. If he is truly

[1] 1 Cor. xv. 47-49; cf. Rom. v. 15 sq.
[2] 1 Cor. vi. 17.
[3] Cf. *e.g.* Rom. viii. 9 sq.
[4] Cf. *e.g.* Rom. viii. 10; 2 Cor. iii. 17.
[5] 1 Cor. xv. 45.
[6] Cf. Rom. vii., viii.; 1 Cor. xv.; Gal. v.

united to Christ, he is dead unto the latter and alive in the former. His personality has not been destroyed or displaced by the personality of Christ. But his personality has received a new content; Spirit in place of flesh. The old discord between the Ego and the flesh has now given place to the new harmony between the Ego and the Spirit; he is no longer a fleshly but a spiritual man. He has thus passed from death unto life, and his eternal existence is already begun.[1]

It is instructive to notice in this connection that Paul found no difficulty in believing that, being thus released from the flesh, he would himself enjoy eternal life. It is plain that this was not because he had not himself sinned, for the seventh chapter of Romans makes it very clear, not simply that his flesh was sinful, but that he had himself been overpowered by his flesh, and had broken the law of God. If death, then, was conceived by him under the aspect of a penalty, inflicted upon all the guilty, it would seem that he ought to suffer the penalty, unless in some way he were to make expiation for his guilt, or be forgiven for it. But of such expiation there is no trace in Paul, and, as already remarked, he was ethically too rigorous to entertain the idea of the removal of penalty by mere forgiveness. That he could believe, therefore, that he would enjoy eternal life, though he had been a sinner, was evidently due to the fact that he regarded death not primarily as a penalty, inflicted by way of punishment upon a guilty person, but as the inevitable consequence of corruption; that he conceived of it, in other words, chiefly under the aspect of physical death, or the extinction of an evil nature.[2] Being freed from that nature, and becoming partaker of a spiritual, holy, and divine nature, the Christian escapes the death of his old σάρξ and enters upon the life of his new πνεῦμα, and that without regard to his past. It is not so much forgiveness, as a new life; not so much pardon for the old, as release from it that is needed, and

[1] Cf. Rom. v. 5; 1 Cor. ii. 12, iii. 16, 22, vi. 11, 19, xii. 13, xiv. 25; 2 Cor. i. 22, iv. 16, v. 16, 17; Gal. iv. 6, v. 16 sq., etc.

[2] Cf. Gal. vi. 8; and see Kabisch: *Die Eschatologie des Paulus*, S. 93 sq.

that is secured, according to Paul, when a man dies with Christ unto the flesh, and rises with him in the Spirit.

But having already died with Christ unto the flesh, and risen with him in the Spirit, by virtue of his real union with Christ, a man who is united to Christ does not die again. The new life in the Spirit, upon which he has already entered, is not temporary merely, but eternal.[1] The death of the body, then, which is universal, and which ultimately ensues in the case of the believer as well as of the unbeliever, is the death not of the man himself, but simply of his flesh. He has already been freed from the control of the flesh and has become a partaker of the divine nature, and so he lives on in spite of the death of his flesh. That death is not a misfortune or a curse to him, as it would be if he were still living in the flesh, when he would be dragged to destruction with it; but, on the contrary, it is a blessing to him, for by it he is released from contact with the flesh, and from the constant temptation to yield to its evil solicitations, and by it he is liberated from the present evil world, to which he is bound so long as he is in his earthly body, and is enabled to ascend into the heavenly sphere where he truly belongs because he partakes of the Divine Spirit. When this final release from all contact with the flesh has taken place, and not until then, is a man's salvation complete.[2] And so Paul longs for the redemption of his body, for the replacement of this body of sinful flesh by a new spiritual body in which resides no evil.[3]

The resurrection of the body, of which Paul speaks at some length in the fifteenth chapter of First Corinthians, does not mean the resurrection of our present fleshly body —its resurrection would be not a blessing, but a curse; it means, on the contrary, the resurrection of a spiritual body which is not simply the present fleshly body purified, but a body of an entirely different nature. It is this contrast between the present fleshly body and the future spiritual body which Paul emphasizes in the chapter referred to.

[1] Cf. *e.g.* Rom. vi. 8–11, 23. [2] Cf. Rom. xiii. 11.
[3] Rom. viii. 23; 1 Cor. xv. 54 sq.

The new spiritual body is distinguished from the old fleshly body just as sharply as the new spiritual life is distinguished from the old fleshly life. The resurrection of one's body, therefore, is simply the natural sequence of one's resurrection with Christ to the new life in the Spirit here on earth. Those who have already risen here in the Spirit shall rise again after the death of their present bodies in a new spiritual body, by its very nature holy and immortal, and thus fitted for the new spiritual and eternal life.

The death unto the flesh, which has already taken place in the case of the believer, means his release from the control of the flesh, but not his separation from it. Contact with the flesh still continues. He still has flesh, but the flesh no longer rules him. He is now its master, not its slave. He lives no longer in it, but in the Spirit, and he is therefore a truly spiritual and not a fleshly man.[1] But so long as the flesh remains alive, it maintains a constant struggle against the Spirit, striving continually to regain the mastery of the man.[2] For that reason the Christian is in constant danger. Though he has died with Christ unto the flesh and risen with him in the Spirit, and has thus been freed from the control of sin and become a servant of God,[3] he may lose his hold upon Christ[4] and fall back into his old bondage;[5] having begun in the Spirit, he may end in the flesh;[6] for even a spiritual man may be tempted,[7] and coming again under the dominion of the flesh, may be lost.[8] That a man can be at the same time under the control of both the flesh and the Spirit, and can live at the same time in accordance with both, Paul denies unequivocally.[9] But he that is not under the control of the Spirit, he that is living in the flesh and not in the Spirit, is none of Christ's.[10] The Christian's flesh, which still clings to him, is sinful, and continues to serve the "law of sin," as it did before his conversion,[11] but he himself is no longer under its control, he is a "new

[1] Cf. Rom. viii. 4, 5, 12 sq.; 1 Cor. vi. 15 sq.; 2 Cor. iv. 7 sq.; Gal. v. 16, 18, 24.
[2] Gal. v. 17 sq.
[3] Rom. vi. 22.
[4] Col. ii. 19.
[5] Gal. v. 1, 4, 13.
[6] Gal. iii. 3.
[7] Gal. vi. 1.
[8] 1 Cor. ix. 27.
[9] Rom. viii. 6–9; cf. 1 Cor. x. 21.
[10] Rom. viii. 9.
[11] Rom. vii. 25.

creature."[1] Nor can he come under its control and follow its behests without ceasing to be a spiritual man and a disciple of Christ. It is the realization of this danger of subjection to the flesh, which besets a man even after he has been released from its dominion, that draws from Paul the earnest warnings, admonitions, and exhortations with which his epistles are filled. Those exhortations are addressed to Christians, and are none the less urgent because he is continually reminding them that they have already died unto sin and been released from its control. On the contrary, they gain added force and point from that very fact; for having been thus liberated, there is the more reason for Christians to guard their liberty jealously, that they may not fall again into the old and deadly bondage.[2]

In his effort to guard the Christian disciples whom he addresses in his epistles, from renewed subjection to the dominion of sin, Paul urges upon them a twofold treatment of the flesh; exhorting them on the one hand to break its power by bruising it, or by destroying and putting it to death;[3] on the other hand, to take from under its control the bodily members which it has employed as instruments of sin and use them as instruments of righteousness.[4] The former method, which is ascetic in its tendency, is entirely in line with Paul's view of the flesh, and we might therefore naturally expect him to make much of it and to find in asceticism the surest way to life. But the truth is that there is very little asceticism, in the ordinary sense, in Paul's epistles,[5] while there is much that makes in the opposite direction.[6] Paul was perhaps saved from the natural result of his view of the flesh by his belief in the speedy consummation. "The time is shortened," he says, and "the fashion of this world

[1] 2 Cor. v. 17.

[2] Cf. Rom. vi. 12, 13, viii. 12, 13, xiii. 12–14; 1 Cor. vi. 20; Gal. v. 1 sq., 16–25; Phil. ii. 12; Col. iii. 1–10.

[3] Rom. viii. 13; 1 Cor. v. 5, ix. 27; 2 Cor. iv. 10, 11; Col. iii. 5.

[4] Rom. vi. 13, 19; 1 Cor. vi. 15–20.

[5] Traces of it are to be found in 1 Cor. vii. 1, 8; cf. also the passages referred to in note 3.

[6] Cf. Rom. xiv.; 1 Cor. vi. 12 sq., x. 23 sq.

passeth away."[1] The danger to be apprehended, therefore, from the continued existence and presence of the flesh, did not seem as serious as it might otherwise, and a feeling of indifference and contempt for the flesh itself and for the earthly relations and environment which excited its lust, could take the place, at least at times, of the bitter hostility which it naturally aroused. To this consideration is to be added the fact that Paul's dualism was at bottom religious and not cosmical, and that he could, therefore, in true Hebrew fashion, look upon "the earth and the fulness thereof" as the Lord's,[2] could regard all things as belonging to him who is Christ's,[3] and could esteem everything clean in itself,[4] and lawful to the spiritual man.[5]

But more than all, Paul was saved from asceticism by his conception of the Christian life as divine, and by his confidence in the power of the Spirit of God, whose indwelling alone makes that life possible. Though at times, observing as he did in others, and feeling in himself the continued strength and vitality of the old flesh, he urged the trampling of the body under foot, as a rule, and when he was truest to himself, he was so vividly conscious of the power of the Spirit within him, that he felt himself complete master of his flesh, and could use it as his servant, employing all his members as instruments of righteousness. In fact, to admit that his body could not be so used, and that his only safety lay in its destruction, was really to impugn the power of Christ, as Paul himself evidently felt when he wrote such passages as Rom. viii. 16, 17, 38; 1 Cor. x. 13; Gal. iv. 6, 7; Phil. i. 6. But, in accordance with his conception of the controlling power in the Christian life, Paul's exhortations to his Christian readers have reference commonly not to the Christian's attitude toward his fleshly nature, but to his relation to Christ or to the Divine Spirit within him. He is continually expressing the hope that those whom he addresses may keep their minds set on spiritual things, that they may put on Christ,

[1] 1 Cor. vii. 29, 31. [2] 1 Cor. x. 26. [3] 1 Cor. iii. 23.
[4] Rom. xiv. 14, 20. [5] 1 Cor. x. 23.

that Christ may dwell in them richly, that they may be not their own, but Christ's, that they may live in the Spirit and walk in the Spirit, that they may not lose their hold on Christ, but that his Spirit may fill them and abound;[1] and he is confident that if they do thus keep their hold on Christ, and if he does thus dwell in them, as he must if they are his, the flesh will have no power over them, even though they are not yet released from contact with it. But even such exhortations as these fail to express the essence of the Christian life as Paul experienced it; and even such confidence is not the supreme confidence that sustains him and that gives him his wonderful religious power. It is Christ's hold upon the Christian that he trusts, not the Christian's hold upon Christ. The Christian's life is not his own life, but Christ's life; and it is not in exhortations to Christians, therefore, whatever those exhortations may be, but in hymns of praise to God, that Paul's Gospel finds its truest expression.[2]

Our study of Paul's conception of redemption throws light upon his view of law, and of the Christian's relation to it, a subject about which he has so much to say in his Epistles to the Romans and Galatians. By law Paul means ordinarily not merely the divine character, or the natural constitution of the universe, or the ideal of human perfection, but positive divine enactment; a definite expression of the will of God given for a particular purpose. Law in this sense was laid by God upon Adam and all his descendants, Gentiles as well as Jews. But law, whatever its terms, and whatever the time and the circumstances of its enactment, was given only in consequence of sin.[3] Had there been no sin, there would have been no law; it was the existence of sin that required its promulgation. But sin attaches to human nature or flesh. Flesh, therefore, is subject to law, and every man who is in the flesh, whether he be Jew or Gentile, is under its dominion. But the law, whose author is God, is holy while the flesh is unholy. The flesh, therefore, never has obeyed, and

[1] Rom. xiii. 14, xv. 13; 1 Cor. vi. 19, vii. 22; Gal. v. 16, 25; Eph. v. 18.
[2] Rom. viii. 38 sq.
[3] Rom. v. 20; Gal. iii. 19.

never can obey, the law.[1] The law consequently serves only to reveal man's sin.[2] Becoming conscious as he does when he sees the contrast between his own life and the law's righteous requirements that he is a sinner, he knows that not life, but death, the necessary consequence of sin, awaits him. He does not die because he breaks the law; he dies because he is sinful, and that he is whether there be any law or not.[3] But a man is subject to law only so long as he lives. When he dies, he passes out from under its control, for the law has dominion over the living only, not over the dead.[4] When Christ died, therefore, he was discharged from the law, to which he had been subject while in the flesh,[5] just as every man is discharged from it when he dies, not because the law has exacted its full penalty, — the law exacts no penalty, — but simply because it can sustain no relation to one who has ceased to exist. But Christ did not remain dead; on the contrary, he rose again. But in the new life upon which he entered at his resurrection, he was no longer subject to the law, for he was no longer in the flesh, but in the Spirit, and over the Spirit, that is over the Divine Spirit, which alone is in Paul's thought, the law exercises no dominion. Christ's new life, therefore, in the Spirit, was a life of complete freedom from law. But that which took place in the case of Christ takes place also in the case of his disciples, who die with him unto the flesh, and rise with him in the Spirit. Dying, they are discharged from the law, and rising again, they rise unto a new life over which the law has no dominion, a life lying without its sphere. Thus the man who has died with Christ and has risen again with him, is not under the condemnation of the law, for the law sustains no relation to him. It is in this sense that Paul's characterization of the believer as a justified man is to be understood. He has been justified not by the law, but from the law, for he has been discharged from its control, and it no longer has jurisdiction over him.[6]

[1] Rom. vii. 12 sq., viii. 7. [3] Rom. v. 13, vii. 13. [5] Gal. iv. 4.
[2] Rom. iii. 20. [4] Rom. vii. 1.
[6] Cf. Rom. vi. 7: *ὁ γὰρ ἀποθανὼν δεδικαίωται ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας.*

Paul is very emphatic and unequivocal in his assertion that the Christian disciple is a free man; that the Christian life upon which he has already entered, is a life of complete liberty.[1] But such teaching smacks of antinomianism. Indeed, even in his own day, it brought upon Paul the condemnation of many who believed that his Gospel meant the subversion of all good morals, and must inevitably open the floodgates of anarchy and crime. It is instructive to notice the way in which Paul answers his assailants. He makes no compromise, nor does he in the least alter the terms of his Gospel. He simply asserts that if we died with Christ unto the flesh, we died also unto sin, and "how, then," he cries, "shall we who died to sin, any longer live therein?"[2] To say that freedom from the law means license to sin is from Paul's standpoint illogical and absurd, for only he is free from the law who is dead unto the flesh, and therefore unto sin. If he comes again at any time under the control of the flesh, if he ceases to be controlled by the Spirit, and is led by the flesh into sin, he comes thereby immediately under the control of law. He cannot be controlled by the flesh without being controlled by law. Freedom from law, therefore, cannot mean license to sin, for there is no freedom from law where there is sin. If a Christian man were to abuse his freedom, he would in the very act cease to be free, and would be subject

[1] Cf. *e.g.* Rom. vi. 14, vii. 6, x. 4; Gal. ii. 19, iii. 24 sq., v. 13, 18; Col. ii. 14. But there are other passages which seem at first sight inconsistent with the assertion that the Christian is subject to no law. Such, for instance, are Rom. viii. 4, xiii. 8–10, and Gal. v. 14, where the fulfilling of the law is referred to. But it is evident, when these passages are read in the light of the others just mentioned, that Paul was thinking when he wrote them not of a law laid upon the Christian from without, but of the inner law of the divine character. The law which was given by God, and is therefore spiritual (Rom. vii. 14), is an expression of the character of God, and for that very reason it is impossible for the flesh to keep it. But if it expresses the divine character, it must express also the life of the spiritual man, for that life is divine; and thus the spiritual man, though not under the bondage of a law any more than God is under the bondage of a law, may properly be said to fulfil the law, just as God fulfils the law of his own character which finds expression in the revealed law. The Christian is not under law, but the Christian life is a holy life, and thus there are revealed in it the same features that are expressed in the holy law of God. And so the law finds itself fulfilled in the Christian.

[2] Rom. vi. 2.

again to law just as all unredeemed men are subject to it, but he would not then be Christ's.

It will be seen that Paul does not teach the abrogation or destruction of law; law still exists as truly as it ever did, and will exist so long as there is any sin, and will continue to be binding upon sinners so long as there are any sinners. It is only the release from law of those that have died with Christ unto the flesh and risen with him in the Spirit that Paul teaches: the release, that is, of those that have faith in Christ. And such teaching is relieved from all possible flavor of antinomianism by Paul's view of the Christian life as a divine life, and by his profound conception of faith as the human condition of the inception and continuance of that life. Faith, according to Paul, is the act whereby a man identifies himself with Christ, becomes actually one with him in nature, and is thus enabled to die and rise again with him. Faith is thus the indispensable, and at the same time the all-sufficient, condition of salvation. Viewed in this way, it is an act of the profoundest spiritual meaning. It is not mere assent, intellectual or moral, it is not mere confidence in Christ's words or in his promises, it is not a mere belief that he is what he claims to be, but it is the reception of Christ himself into the soul. By it a man becomes completely one with Christ, for Christ enters into and abides with every believing, that is, every receptive, man. Faith is thus not an act of a part only of man's nature, but of his whole nature, or rather, strictly speaking, it is not an act at all, but simply the attitude of receptivity toward Christ. Paul's view of the character and quality of faith appears perhaps as clearly as anywhere in the words: "By their unbelief they were broken off, and thou standest by thy faith. Be not high-minded, but fear; for if God spared not the natural branches, neither will he spare thee."[1] Faith is here made the opposite of high-mindedness, or pride, or self-confidence. It is clear, therefore, that the essence of faith, according to Paul, is the renunciation of

[1] Rom. xi. 20, 21.

confidence in self, and the absolute dependence upon and trust in another; a spirit of humility and self-renunciation which alone fits one for the indwelling of Christ. So long as this attitude of receptivity, this self-emptiness and openness to the Divine Spirit, is maintained, Christ dwells in the man, living in him and through him the Christian life, the free, spiritual life over which no law has dominion. But if the faith be lost, if a man fall into unbelief, or become high-minded and fail to maintain the true attitude of receptivity, Christ will depart, and he will come again under the control of the flesh and under the dominion of the law.[1] Faith, or the attitude of receptivity toward the Spirit of God, thus conditions not merely the beginning, but the continuance of the Christian life. Only to a receptive man will the Divine Spirit be given, and only in such a man will it abide.[2]

What has been said of Paul's conception of the Christian life and the nature of faith, makes his meaning quite clear when he speaks, as he often does, of the righteousness of faith and contrasts it with the righteousness of works. The righteousness of faith is the divine righteousness which a man receives when he receives Christ. It is not a mere declaration by God that the sinner is justified or

[1] This possibility Paul distinctly contemplates in Rom. xi. 20 sq.

[2] The harmonization of this idea with the conception of the absoluteness of God's election, which is asserted so unequivocally in Romans ix., Paul nowhere attempts. But it is to be noticed that his sweeping statement of God's unconditional sovereignty in the matter of election is made in reply to the Jews, who supposed that their efforts after legal righteousness gave them a claim on God, and that God was bound to give them life as a reward. In opposition to such a claim Paul asserts that God is bound by nothing in man; but that he is absolutely free and sovereign, and may elect whom he pleases without any regard to the character or accomplishments of the person or class thus elected. The claim which they make is not that they have faith, — Paul would not have answered such a claim thus, — but that they have merit. On the other hand, over against those who excuse themselves on the ground that they are not to blame, if God thus elects and condemns according to his own good pleasure, Paul is no less decisive in his assertion of human responsibility and in his insistence that the Jews' rejection is due to their own want of faith (Rom. ix. 32). Paul leaves these two divergent lines of thought unreconciled, as they are left in the Old Testament; but the fact that with a particular polemic interest he asserts so strongly God's absolute and unconditioned sovereignty should not lead us to suppose that he intends to imply that the exercise of faith upon which he expressly conditions salvation is not in man's own power. Cf. Bruce, *l.c.* p. 310 sq.

forgiven for his past sins and accounted righteous without regard to his actual character; it is not a mere status into which he is introduced by such declaration, but it is at bottom the real righteousness or the righteous nature which is bestowed upon the believer by God. But this righteousness is placed by Paul in sharpest contrast with the righteousness of man, for the latter in God's sight is no righteousness. Man, being flesh, cannot be righteous. He may think himself righteous, he may observe the law, as he fancies, perfectly, but the law is spiritual, and he is carnal, and his observance of it consequently is but a delusion.[1] For a man to be justified by his own works, or make himself righteous, is an absolute impossibility. Only by escaping from the flesh and becoming, by the reception of the Divine Spirit, a spiritual man, does he become righteous; and only as a righteous man does he escape death and enjoy eternal life. He is saved therefore by grace, and not by works. God saves him; he cannot save himself. But God saves him, not merely by accounting him righteous and declaring him released from the penalty of death, but by giving him the Divine Spirit, and thus replacing his old fleshly nature with a new spiritual nature. Thus the righteousness of God, or the righteousness of faith, of which Paul has so much to say, is not primarily, as he uses it, a forensic or legal term, but stands for a real thing, the actual divine righteousness or righteous nature which man receives from God when he receives God's Spirit.[2] It is righteousness not imputed, but imparted to man; and imparted just because the divine nature or Spirit, which is itself righteous, is imparted to him.[3]

In thus emphasizing the real as distinguished from the forensic element in Paul's thinking, I do not mean to deny that he frequently makes use of forensic terms, and clothes his thoughts in legal forms. The distinct and explicit phrases "reckoning righteousness" unto a man, and "reck-

[1] Rom. vii. 14; Gal. ii. 16, iii. 11, 21.

[2] Cf. Rom. i. 17, iii. 21 sq., iv. 11, 13, v. 17, ix. 30, x. 3, 6; 2 Cor. v. 21; Phil. iii. 9; Eph. iv. 24.

[3] See the references given in the previous note; also Rom. v. 5 sq., vi. 4 sq., viii. 5, 9, 11, 14 sq.

oning faith for righteousness," occur in his epistles,[1] and the word δικαιοῦν, which he uses so frequently, has the forensic meaning of accounting or treating as righteous, at least a part of the time.[2] And yet, in spite of this fact, to regard such expressions as formative in Paul's thinking, and to read his conception of salvation in their light, is to misinterpret him. The truth is that his tendency was predominantly ethical, and the forensic terms were secondary,

[1] Notably in Rom. iv. and Gal. iii. 6. The word used is λογίζομαι; as in Rom. iv. 5, λογίζεται ἡ πίστις αὐτοῦ εἰς δικαιοσύνην. Cf. also 2 Cor. v. 19; Rom. ii. 26, and ix. 8.

[2] It is the common opinion that the word δικαιοῦν is used by Paul solely in the forensic sense, but the opinion is not justified by the facts. Leaving out of view the ordinary meaning of the word in the classics and the LXX., which ought not to be allowed to control our interpretation of it, as used by Paul, to the exclusion of all other considerations, we find the forensic element distinctly and unequivocally involved only in Rom. ii. 13, and iii. 4 (in the latter case in a quotation from the Old Testament), and in both instances real righteousness is assumed as the basis, God himself being the one "justified" in the second passage. In Rom. iii. 20, viii. 34; 1 Cor. iv. 4; Gal. iii. 8, 11, the word might be understood, so far as the context throws light upon the subject, in either a forensic or real sense, but in all other cases (Rom. iii. 24, 26, 28, 30, iv. 2, 5, v. 1, 9, vi. 7, viii. 30; 1 Cor. vi. 11; Gal. ii. 16 sq., iii. 11, 24, v. 4) to exclude the conception of real righteousness, and to interpret the word in an exclusively forensic sense is, in my opinion, to miss the force of the passage. This can be clearly shown at least in Rom. iv. 2–5 and 1 Cor. vi. 11. Thus in Rom. iv. 2 sq., if δικαιοῦν be taken in the forensic sense, we have the unmeaning statement that if God accounted Abraham righteous on the ground of his works, Abraham had no right to boast before God, for God accounted him righteous on the ground of his faith. On the other hand, if we understand ἐδικαιώθη to mean was made or became actually righteous, the connection of the two parts of the passage is very clear. If Abraham was righteous as a result of his works, he had reason for boasting, but even then he could not boast before God, for according to the Scriptures it was his faith, not his works, that God reckoned as righteousness (ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην), and therefore even though he possessed actual legal righteousness, such righteousness counted for nothing in God's sight, for the righteousness that has value in his eyes is only that which he himself imparts to him who has faith. So also in 1 Cor. vi. 11, the fact that ἐδικαιώθητε follows ἀπελούσασθε and ἡγιάσθητε, and that it is connected with ἐν τῷ πνεύματι makes it very clear that it is to be taken in the real and not in the forensic sense.

For a defence of the interpretation of δικαιοῦν in a real sense see Vincent's *Word Studies*, Vol. III. p. 37 sq.; and compare his discussion of the meaning of δικαιοσύνη on pp. 9 sq. and 215. See also Sabatier's *L'apôtre Paul*, p. 273 sq. (Eng. Trans., p. 297 sq.), and Abbott's *Commentary on Romans*, p. 54 sq.

Since this note was written there has appeared in the *American Journal of Theology* (January, 1897, p. 149 sq.) an article by Professor Gould on *St. Paul's Use of* δικαιοῦν, to which I am happy to be able to refer in support of the contention that δικαιοῦν is used by Paul in a real as well as in a forensic sense.

not primary, with him. This appears very clearly in the matter of forgiveness. The Epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians bear witness to his belief that God forgives sins, but the divine forgiveness is not once explicitly referred to in his other epistles, except in a quotation from the Old Testament in Rom. iv. 7.[1] Laying such emphasis as he does upon the idea of God's grace, and contrasting it so constantly and so strongly as he does with man's merit, it is a remarkable fact that the conception which is so common in the Synoptic Gospels should find such infrequent utterance in his writings. It simply shows that his thought ran chiefly along other lines, and though his gracious acceptance with God of course meant much to him, it was less with forgiveness, in the ordinary sense, that he was concerned, than with the possession of the Divine Spirit which transformed him from a sinner to a saint. It is in the light, not simply of his general conception of the Gospel already outlined, but also of the fact just referred to, that his use of such terms as δικαιοῦν, δικαιοσύνη, and δικαίωσις should be interpreted. When interpreted thus, the forensic element, which so many have emphasized to the exclusion of every other, is seen to be subordinate, not supreme.[2]

[1] The verb ἀφίημι, which in the Synoptic Gospels is the common word meaning "to forgive," is found in Paul's epistles in the sense of forgive or remit only in Rom. iv. 7, in a quotation from the Old Testament. The noun ἄφεσις, which also occurs frequently in other parts of the New Testament, is found in his epistles only in Eph. i. 7, and Col. i. 14; while the verb χαρίζομαι is used by him with reference to the divine forgiveness only in Eph. iv. 32, and Col. ii. 13, iii. 13.

[2] What has been said of Paul's conception of forgiveness and of his use of forensic terms is true also of his utterances regarding Christ's redemptive work. That work, though he commonly represents it as a dying unto the flesh and a rising again in the Spirit in order to redeem men from the power of the flesh and give them the new life in the Spirit, he also represents as the offering of a sacrifice, and the result which is accomplished by it, as the reconciliation of man and God. Thus in Eph. v. 2, he calls Christ a sacrifice (θυσία), and in 1 Cor. v. 7 he says that "Our passover, Christ, hath been sacrificed" (ἐτύθη). The noun "reconciliation" (καταλλαγή) occurs in Rom. xi. 15 and in 2 Cor. v. 18, 19, and in the latter passage it is connected directly with the work of Christ, though not explicitly with his death. The verb "to reconcile" (καταλλάσσω or ἀποκαταλλάσσω) is found in Rom. v. 10, 2 Cor. v. 18, 19; Eph. ii. 16, and Col. i. 20, 21, and in each case is connected directly with Christ's death except in 2 Cor. v. 18, 19. But all such references are to be understood in the light of that general conception of salvation

Before bringing this discussion of Paul's Gospel to a close, attention should be called to the patent fact that the belief in the release of the Christian from bondage to law in general involved, of course, his release from bondage to the Jewish law in particular. But for such release an additional warrant was given in the appearance of the risen Christ. Doubtless the chief ground of Paul's hostility to Jesus had been, not that he turned the thoughts of the people upon himself, and thus hindered their preparation for the coming of the true Messiah, though that was bad enough, but that he inculcated principles which seemed calculated to lead them away from the law and to discourage its observance. Such conduct was alone enough to prove him an impostor in Paul's eyes. That he should have been executed by a mode of death pronounced accursed in the law was a fitting sign of the divine judgment upon him. But the revelation of Jesus' Messiahship could mean nothing less than that his teaching was true; and a revision of Paul's conception of the law was consequently inevitable.[1] Thus even had his religious experience not been what it was, and even had it not led him to believe in the Christian's freedom from all law, understanding Christ as he did Paul could hardly have done otherwise after his conversion than assume a freer attitude toward the Jewish law than the original disciples.

But the release of the Christian from the obligation to observe the Jewish law, whether based solely upon his liberty from all law or in part also upon the teaching of Jesus, meant logically the abolition of the wall of partition that separated the Gentile from the Jew. If Paul, therefore, was to be true to his principles, he could recognize no essential religious difference between circumcision and uncircumcision. Both Jewish and Gentile Christians must stand religiously upon

and of the work of Christ which has been briefly outlined, and though they ought to be given their due place, they should not be allowed to control our interpretation of all Paul's thought.

[1] That the Messiah had died by a mode of death pronounced accursed in the law must also have affected to some extent Paul's estimate of the law and must have tended to weaken its hold upon him. Cf. Gal. iii. 13 and see Everett's *Gospel of Paul*, p. 144 sq.

the same plane. This fact Paul saw clearly at an early day, and he did not shrink from the consequences involved in it. On the contrary, he asserted distinctly and unequivocally the equal rights of Gentiles in the Gospel. That assertion constituted the Magna Charta of Gentile Christianity, and Paul stood by it unflinchingly in spite of the bitterest criticism and the most relentless opposition. That he did his life work among the Gentiles, was due, it is true, not solely to his adoption of this principle, — for he might have believed as he did and still have labored chiefly among his own countrymen, as he seems to have done for some time, — but the principle was ultimately responsible for his career as the great apostle to the heathen, and alone made that career possible.

We have been concerned in this chapter, not with Paul's missionary labors, nor with the circumstances which led him to take the course he did as an apostle, but only with the principles that underlay his work. Those principles he reached in the early days of his Christian life, as a direct result of the revelation of the Son of God within him, and they must have been already understood and clearly formulated before he began his work as a Christian evangelist. Upon them his labors were based from the very commencement of his career. It has been maintained by many, it is true, that his Gospel was worked out slowly and gradually, and that it took shape only under the stress of conflict and after years of active service; and an effort has been made by some scholars to trace a development in his conception of Christianity, even during the period within which his extant epistles were written; attention being called to the fact that the Christianity of the First Epistle to the Thessalonians is of a much simpler character than the Christianity, for instance, of the Epistle to the Romans.[1] But even the First Epistle to the Thessalonians was written nearly twenty years after Paul's conversion, and only a brief interval separated it from his greatest writings. Moreover, it was written some years after the

[1] Cf. *e.g.* Sabatier, Matheson, and Clemen (*Chronologie der Paulinischen Briefe*, 1893; S. 255 sq.). On the other side see Bruce, *l.c.* p. 6 sq.

events at Jerusalem and at Antioch, of which he tells us in Gal. ii., and consequently the fact that in it the fundamental principles which are emphasized to such an extent in Romans, Corinthians, and Galatians, have almost no place, cannot be urged as an indication of their later development, for his conduct both at Jerusalem and at Antioch presupposes those principles. It is therefore vain to attempt to discover any essential development in Paul's general conception of Christianity after the time of the writing of the earliest of his extant epistles.[1] That development lay back of the great controversy, back indeed of the beginning of his missionary work among the Gentiles. It was not due to the experience gained in that work, for the work presupposes the development. Indeed, there is little in it that may not have belonged to the earliest days of his Christian life, to a time before he preached the Gospel to either Jew or Gentile. His pre-Christian experience and the circumstances of his conversion were such as inevitably to lead to that very Gospel which we find presented years later in his great epistles. It is impossible to imagine what the Gospel of his earlier Christian years could have been, if it was not that Gospel. It is impossible to conceive of his stopping short of the controlling conception which we find him holding until the end. It was doubtless in the period immediately succeeding his conversion, during the time that preceded his entrance upon his career as an apostle, that he worked out the great problems wrapped up in his conversion, and reached convictions which he held substantially unaltered throughout the remainder of his life.[2]

Those convictions were the fruit not of instruction received from Christ's apostles, nor of a knowledge of the

[1] This is still more evident if Galatians is the earliest of Paul's epistles, as I believe it to be. See below, p. 229.

[2] It is not meant, of course, that no development took place in connection with any of Paul's conceptions during the period represented by his epistles. In some matters, as, for instance, God's ultimate purpose for the Jews, which he discusses in his Epistle to the Romans, Paul's views may have developed considerably after the writing of his Epistle to the Galatians. And so the Christology which appears in the epistles of the imprisonment is marked by some features that very likely formed no part of his thought when he wrote his

teaching of Jesus gained by Paul before or after he became a Christian, but of the revelation of the Son of God within him, and of his own spiritual experience resulting therefrom. His conceptions, consequently, bore a very different form from the conceptions to which Jesus himself gave utterance, and yet they were in the main in harmony with the Master's spirit and tendency. Paul's pre-Christian experience had been just such as to prepare him for that complete renunciation of personal merit and personal pride, and that complete dependence upon God, which were fundamental with Christ. And so in his emphasis upon the Christian life as the divine life in man, and upon the Christian's release from bondage to an external law because of the divine life within him which is its own law, Paul was in essential sympathy though not in formal agreement with the Master. In his occasional references to the divine bestowal of knowledge and power,[1] and in his promise to be with his disciples in spirit,[2] Christ certainly gave some warrant to the developed view to which Paul's experience led him, and in his assertion of God's fatherhood, and in his emphasis upon love as the substance of the law, he really justified Paul in his denial of all legalism.[3]

Thus, though with his more abstract conception of God and man, and with his sharp contrast between flesh and Spirit, Paul held views in many respects different from Christ's, and much less simple and popular than his, he was in sympathy with the spirit of the Master, and he must be recognized as the disciple who most fully understood him, and most truly carried on his work. And yet, not to the teaching of Christ, but to the teaching of Paul, does the church owe its controlling emphasis upon the

earlier letters. And yet the development both here and in other lines involved only details, and did not affect his fundamental positions. The contents of the several epistles will be considered in the next chapter, and such development as actually did take place in Paul's views will then appear.

[1] See Matt. xi. 27, xiii. 11, xvi. 17, xix. 26; Mark xiii. 11, etc.

[2] See above, p. 32 sq.

[3] There can be no doubt that it was directly due to the influence of Jesus' teaching that Paul recognized the law of love as constituting the principle of the Christian life.

Saviour's death; and not to the former, but to the latter, is chiefly due its recognition of him as a Redeemer from sin. It was by Paul, indeed, that the way was opened for a deeper conception of the significance of Christ's work, and for a loftier conception of his personality than had prevailed among his immediate disciples. Even though Paul was understood by very few, and even though his Gospel of the complete liberty of the Christian man found almost no acceptance, his emphasis upon the significance of Christ's death, and upon the divineness of his nature, had wide and permanent influence, and in the end essentially modified the thinking of the church at large. Not Jesus the Messiah, but Jesus Christ the divine Saviour, was thenceforth increasingly, as time passed, the object of Christian faith and worship.

CHAPTER IV

THE WORK OF PAUL

1. The Roman World[1]

Paul's field was the Roman Empire. If we would understand his career and rightly estimate the results accomplished by him, we must acquaint ourselves, at least to some extent, with the political, social, and religious conditions which prevailed within that empire in his day. In the middle of the first century the dominion of Rome extended from Britain to the African desert, and from the Atlantic to the Euphrates, embracing all the countries which bordered upon the Mediterranean Sea. This vast territory was divided into two parts, Italy and the provinces. In Italy lived the ruling nation; in the provinces, which were some thirty-five in number at the time in question,[2] the subject peoples. One of the most striking facts about the empire is the heterogeneity of the elements of which it was composed. It was nothing less than a vast conglomerate. Within its borders were gathered peoples of the most diverse origin and history. This diversity was of course most marked in the provinces. In Italy the Romanizing process had been going on for

[1] See especially Marquardt: *Römische Staatsverwaltung;* Mommsen: *Römische Geschichte,* Bd. V.: *Die Provinzen von Caesar bis Diocletian* (Eng. Trans. *The Roman Provinces,* in two volumes); Schiller: *Geschichte der Römischen Kaiserzeit,* Bd. I.; Arnold: *Roman System of Provincial Administration;* and Friedländer: *Darstellungen aus der Sittengeschichte Roms.*

[2] At the time of Claudius' death (54 A.D.) there were thirty-five provinces: seven in Asia, five in Africa (Cyrene and the Island of Crete constituting a single province), and twenty in Europe, besides the insular provinces, Cyprus, Sicily, and Sardinia. Under Nero the number was increased to thirty-six, and under later emperors the number became still larger, being increased sometimes by addition, but chiefly by the division of those already existing. See the lists in Marquardt's *Römische Staatsverwaltung,* I. S. 489 sq.

centuries and was practically complete before the establishment of the empire. But in the provinces there existed the greatest and most manifold variety. In her conquests it had been Rome's policy from an early day to recognize and so far as possible to leave undisturbed the national customs of the people whom she conquered. She was concerned not so much to Romanize as to control them, and she was content, so long as they recognized her authority, paid their taxes, and remained loyal and peaceable subjects, to allow them to retain much that they held dear in manners, in laws, and in religion. The consequence was that in those parts of the world where there existed an old and highly developed civilization, as in Asia, Egypt, and Greece, the immediate changes wrought by Roman conquest were in the main only external and superficial. The traditional habits of thought and life continued much the same, and though there was political unity, there were many marked and striking diversities in other lines. It would be a mistake consequently to think of the work of Paul and other Christian missionaries as of the same character in all parts of the empire. The mental and moral characteristics of the people, their habits of life, their prejudices and passions, their religious beliefs and superstitions, varied greatly, and methods adapted to one city might prove far from successful in another. To evangelize the Roman world was a very different thing from evangelizing a single province or a closely related group of provinces, and Paul showed on many occasions his appreciation of the fact.

And yet, in spite of all the diversity, so far-reaching and deep-seated in many cases, there existed at the same time a strong bond of union between the different parts of the empire, and a degree of homogeneity which is very remarkable under the circumstances. In republican days the provinces were little more than dependencies of Rome. The line of cleavage between Italy and the rest of the world was very marked. In Italy lived the rulers; outside of Italy, the ruled; and though there might be Roman citizens here and there in the provinces, they were

few and far between, and the provincials in general were regarded by the inhabitants of Italy with undisguised contempt, and were commonly looked upon as inferior even to the freedmen of Rome. The provinces had value only for what could be got out of them, and if they were governed with leniency, and their traditions treated with respect, it was only in order that their material resources might not be in any way lessened and the income from them curtailed. But with the establishment of the empire a new era in provincial administration opened. From mere dependencies the provinces rose gradually to the dignity of integral parts of the empire. The emperors instinctively looked for support not so much to the old aristocracy of Rome as to the people of the empire at large, and the breaking down of the wall between Italy and the rest of the world, and the extension of the privileges of Roman citizenship to an ever-increasing number of provincials, were a natural result. Not until the time of Caracalla, in the early part of the third century, did Roman citizenship become the possession of all free inhabitants of the empire; but the process which culminated then was already under way in the period with which we are dealing. The old line of demarcation still existed, to be sure, and the contempt of Romans for provincials still manifested itself; but the times, nevertheless, were changed, and the provinces were passing rapidly out of their original condition of subjection. The change was evident in many ways. The number of Roman citizens in the provinces was multiplying rapidly; provincials of character and ability were acquiring an influence at Rome which would have been impossible in republican days; honors and emoluments were falling to them; and the ranks of the nobility were increasingly recruited from them. Instead of being subjected to the rapacity of irresponsible governors, who regarded them as their legitimate prey, and whose sole object was to plunder them and line their own pockets, they now enjoyed the benefit of a carefully adjusted system of provincial administration, which was provided with checks and safeguards calculated to mini-

mize the danger of misgovernment. Though maladministration was still frequent enough, the provinces were in the main remarkably well governed under the emperors, and their condition was exceptionally good. Frequently, when the people of Rome itself were suffering from the excesses of a Caligula or a Nero, the inhabitants of the provinces were enjoying the largest measure of prosperity and happiness.

The natural result of the imperial policy was the rapid growth among the provincials of a spirit of loyalty to Rome. The privilege of belonging to the empire was becoming ever more widely recognized and more highly valued, and to be a Roman citizen meant more in the eyes of most than to be a descendant of the proudest and most ancient race. The old racial pride and prejudice were rapidly breaking down, and in their place was growing up a new patriotism which had the Roman state as its object and which found expression in devotion to its interests. The effect of all this was a cosmopolitanism of spirit which is one of the most marked characteristics of the age. Everywhere men felt themselves to be not mere natives of this or that land, but citizens of the world. The immense local differences only contributed to this cosmopolitan spirit, for in their contact with other peoples of such various types men became increasingly conscious of their own limitations and increasingly alive to that which they might gain from others. It was Rome's constant effort to foster this new sense of unity and this new spirit of cosmopolitanism. By her magnificent system of roads she bound all parts of the empire together, and made it possible not only to reach quickly every quarter of her vast dominions with her troops, but also to keep in constant touch with the provinces and to carry on a most active commerce with them. By removing burdensome restrictions, she made trade easy, and opened up new markets for the products of the world. By sending out colonies, she established centres of Roman influence in various quarters. And finally, by organizing the new imperial worship, and providing for its regular practice, especially

in the provinces, she supplied a bond of union of peculiar strength. The provincials were left free and even encouraged to worship their own gods, and in some cases the emperors provided for the public support of the local religions. But the new imperial cult was everywhere insisted upon. The worship of Rome and the emperor was made an official function, and upon the civil authorities was laid the responsibility for its proper observance. The provincials themselves were foremost in their recognition of the deified emperors, and they vied with each other in exhibiting their loyalty by devotion to the new state religion.

The prevailing culture of the world was Hellenic. From the time of Alexander's conquests, Greek influence had been transforming the civilization of Egypt and of Western Asia, and when the already Hellenized East became a part of Rome's dominions, the same influences speedily made themselves felt in the West. The Greeks lacked the genius for government which was so marked a characteristic of the Romans, but they possessed a power of impressing themselves — their culture, their ideas, their beliefs — upon other peoples to a degree shared by no other race. They were a restless, active, enterprising people, and it was not long after the opening of intercourse between East and West before they found their way into all parts of the Roman world. In intellectual and artistic lines they had no peers, and they soon made their services indispensable to the higher classes; while their commercial instinct and ability made them successful rivals of the Jews in all branches of trade. Through them the Greek language and Hellenic culture were acclimated in the Occident as well as in the Orient, and though Roman civilization was always dominant west of the Adriatic, it was permeated in no small degree by the spirit of Greece. Thus, in spite of local differences, diverse interests, and racial peculiarities, a man brought up in circles where the influence of Greek culture was felt could not fail to find himself at home in every great city of the empire, and to meet everywhere men of like sympathies and interests with himself.

Ethically the Roman Empire was not in a wholesome condition. The decaying civilization of the Orient was corrupt to the last degree, and the opening of the East to the influence of Greece through the conquests of Alexander had meant the opening of Greece to the debasing effects of Oriental sensuality. When republican Rome extended her dominions eastward, there flowed into Italy not simply the wealth and the culture of the conquered peoples, but also their vices, and the ethical tone of the entire republic rapidly deteriorated. In those parts of the world, especially the Western world, lying away from the great centres and off the great lines of travel, frugality, simplicity, and austerity were still dominant even well on into imperial times, but everywhere else luxury, debauchery, and sensuality ran riot. The wide prevalence of slavery, the wealth, luxury, and pride of the nobility, and the lack of a strong, respectable, and self-respecting middle class did much to lower the general ethical tone of the world at large; and the growing tendency toward urban life and the increasing depopulation of the rural districts contributed to the same result.

And yet, in spite of the vice which had penetrated society and was fast sapping its energy and vitality, the fact must be recognized that in the period with which we are dealing a widespread ethical reformation was in progress. Thinking men had become sensible of the degeneracy of the age and had begun to labor for the betterment of the world. Philosophy and religion were taking on a predominantly ethical character, and noble men were preaching virtue, and were making their influence felt in all grades of society. There can be no doubt that in the first century of the Christian era there were abroad in the world a deeper consciousness of moral evil, and a more earnest desire to escape from its control, than there had ever been. And so men were beginning to seek in religion not a mere means of warding off calamities and securing success in this or that occupation, but a way of escaping from moral evil, and of attaining to a higher and purer and holier state. Though in the changes that had been going on for so many genera-

tions, the ancient faiths had lost much of their vitality, and the upper classes especially were affected by a widespread scepticism and indifference in religious matters, the age was nevertheless a religious age, and many were striving to discover in their ancestral cults that which could satisfy their newly awakened needs, while many more were seeking in the cults of other peoples that which they could not find in their own. It was in fact an age of religious individualism and eclecticism. And while the new imperial worship was serving the purposes of a state religion, the most various faiths were finding adherents in all parts of the empire.

Among the faiths which profited by the awakening religious interest of the age was Judaism.[1] Long before the opening of the Christian Era the Jews were scattered over the greater part of the known world. In Syria, in Asia Minor, in Egypt, and in the far East they were especially numerous, and before the rise of the empire they had already found their way to the West and were numbered by the thousands in Rome itself. Wherever they went, they worshipped and served the God of their fathers, and gathered regularly for religious services on the Sabbath. When their numbers were sufficient, they built a synagogue, and there were few large cities in the empire which did not contain several such structures. However widely they might be scattered, they retained always the warmest affection for Jerusalem and the Holy Land, and were loyal and devout members of the household of Israel, which had its centre there. To the temple they sent regularly the appointed tribute money, and thither they went in large numbers to attend the great annual feasts. And yet, devoted as they were to the religion of their fathers, and conscious as they were that they belonged to an elect people and possessed a faith infinitely superior to all other faiths, they still felt in no small degree the influence of the world in which they lived, and their beliefs and their

[1] On the Judaism of the Dispersion, see especially Hausrath: *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte*, 2te Auflage, Bd. II. S. 91 sq.; Schürer: *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes*, Bd. II. S. 493 sq. (Eng. Trans., Div. II. Vol. II. p. 219 sq.), and Morrison: *The Jews under Roman Rule*, p. 375 sq.

practices differed more and more as time passed from the beliefs and practices of their Palestinian brethren. There were undoubtedly multitudes of them who endeavored to observe in all their strictness all the ritual ordinances of the law, and to hold themselves rigidly aloof from their Gentile neighbors; but there was a widespread tendency to soften somewhat the rigor of ceremonial requirements in order to permit a larger measure of intercourse with those among whom they lived. The desire also made its appearance at an early day to influence the heathen world, and to propagate the true faith among the Gentiles. But as is very apt to be the case when one's purpose is propagandism, emphasis was laid increasingly upon the more universal and essential elements of Judaism, and the ceremonial and ritual features were proportionately minimized. The Jews in question did not commonly cease observing the ceremonial law themselves, but many of them taught that the essence of Judaism was belief in the one true God, and a life of purity, honesty, and uprightness in the confidence that God will reward the good and punish the wicked in a future life. Emphasizing such truths as these, it was possible for them to appeal strongly to earnest and conscientious souls, and in spite of the dislike with which they were so commonly regarded and the contempt which their peculiar rites and ceremonies often inspired, they seemed to many to offer just that which was most needed by the world.

Their propagandism was carried on with the utmost energy and enthusiasm, and no means were left untried. Not simply did they endeavor to influence their neighbors and acquaintances one by one; the scholars and writers among them made use of all varieties of literary composition for the advancement of the work.[1] The great philosophers, poets, and tragedians of earlier days were made to declare their faith in the God of the Jews and their approval of the principles of Judaism; and books were written bearing the names of noted Greek and Latin

[1] Upon the Hellenistic Jewish literature, see Schürer, *l.c.* II. S. 694 sq. (Eng. Trans., Div. II. Vol. III. p. 156 sq.).

authors long dead. Among these pseudonymous productions the most remarkable and influential was a collection of so-called Sibylline Oracles. The oracles of the Sibyl, popularly supposed to have been an inspired priestess of Apollo, were highly esteemed in the ancient world, and her alleged prophetic powers were turned to good service by various Jewish writers, who made her a preacher of the true faith, and a prophet of the blessedness that was one day to be enjoyed by all that honored and served the God of the Jews, and of the misery that was to overtake the worshippers of idols. These Oracles, which were not the work of one man nor of one period, must have exerted a tremendous influence upon all that accepted them as genuine, as multitudes doubtless did.

But Judaism appealed not simply to the people at large, it addressed itself also to the philosophers of the age and endeavored to show its own superiority to all the systems of antiquity. It was the claim of many Jewish scholars, among whom Philo of Alexandria was the most noted of all, that Judaism was the supreme philosophy and the Jewish Scriptures the original storehouse of all the truth known to the sages of the world. By the application to the Old Testament of the allegorical method of interpretation which was familiar to the writers of the day, there were drawn from it the great truths taught by Socrates and Plato and others like them, and the claim was set up that from Moses and the prophets they had learned all the truth they knew. But it was not so much by such efforts to vindicate the philosophic character of Judaism, that the Jewish propagandists influenced the world. Their pure and lofty monotheism, their ethical ideals, and their emphasis upon the doctrine of rewards and punishments beyond the grave, reinforced by their assertion of a divine revelation guaranteeing all their teaching, appealed most widely and most powerfully to the better spirits among those with whom they came in contact, and it may well be believed that the writings of the great Hebrew prophets exerted a far larger influence than the philosophical productions of Philo and his school.

It may be doubted whether the Jews ever secured a very large number of proselytes in the full sense, that is, of those who accepted circumcision and assumed the obligation to observe the law in all its parts, for the rite of circumcision was exceedingly repugnant to the world in general. But it is certain that they attached to themselves a large multitude of devout worshippers, who attended the services of the synagogue and served and honored their God as the only true God.[1] Many such adherents seem to have observed the Sabbath and some of the Jewish laws respecting food;[2] while others contented themselves with conforming to the moral precepts of the Decalogue, or with the general practice of justice, holiness, and mercy.

It was among these Gentile adherents of Judaism that Christianity had its most rapid spread. They were prepared for it by their belief in the God who was worshipped both by Jews and Christians, and by their acquaintance with the Old Testament, which they heard read in the synagogue week after week. Moreover, they had no native attachment to Judaism and no ancestral traditions which made it difficult for them to break loose from the synagogue; and when Christianity came with its assertion that the prophecies contained in the Divine Scriptures were already fulfilled, and that the promised consummation was already at hand, it is not to be wondered at that they welcomed it warmly, and found in it, especially when preached by those who recognized the full and equal rights of a Gentile Christianity, that which satisfied them even better than Judaism, whose blessings they could enjoy only in part so long as they hesitated to receive circumcision and to become fully incorporated into the family of Israel. How much the existence of such circles of God-fearing men and women in all the great cities of the empire must have meant to Paul, we can easily imagine, and we shall see that he was fully alive to the opportunity offered by them.

[1] These Gentile worshippers of the God of the Jews were commonly spoken of as "Devout and God-fearing men." Cf., *e.g.*, Acts x. 2, and Josephus: *Ant.* xiv. 7, 2; *B. J.* II. 18, 2.

[2] Cf., *e.g.*, Josephus: *Contra Apionem*, II. 39.

2. The First Three Years of Paul's Christian Life

The career of Paul during the years immediately succeeding his conversion is involved in obscurity. We learn from his Epistle to the Galatians,[1] that he went first of all to Arabia and returned again after a time to Damascus. For what purpose he visited Arabia, by which is meant, probably, the desert country lying to the southeast of Damascus, and how long he remained there, we are not informed. The account in Acts, which betrays no knowledge of such a visit, seems to imply that it was of brief duration and of little or no public significance, and Paul's own reference to it is not out of harmony with such a supposition. It can hardly be supposed that he went to Arabia to do missionary work, for it was the last place which he would have chosen for such a purpose. It is much more probable that he went thither in order to reflect in solitude upon the great change that had come upon him, and to determine its bearing upon his subsequent career. The issues involved were too momentous to be treated lightly, and Paul was the last man to reverse his entire course of conduct without considering carefully all that such a reversal meant, and without making very clear to himself the new principles by which he was thenceforth to live and labor. He could not be satisfied with anything less than a thoroughgoing understanding of the Gospel which had been revealed to him, and of its bearing upon his own life. But such an understanding could hardly have been attained without careful meditation, and it is quite unlikely therefore that he plunged into active evangelistic work immediately after his conversion. It may fairly be assumed, then, that it was in Arabia that Paul thought out his Gospel, and that in his Epistle to the Galatians he mentions his visit thither, just because it was there, in communion with himself and with his God, and not at the feet of the apostles in Jerusalem, that he learned his message and received his equipment as a preacher of the Gospel of Christ.

[1] Gal. i. 17, 18.

Returning from Arabia to Damascus, he doubtless began at once to preach Christ in the synagogues, as recorded in the Book of Acts.[1] That he should have begun his work among his own countrymen was entirely natural, and there is no reason whatever to doubt the accuracy of Luke's account. That he labored for the conversion of Jews as well as of Gentiles is proved by his own words in 1 Cor. ix. 20, and Rom. xi. 14, and the second passage indicates that he was even more deeply concerned in the conversion of the former than of the latter. The principles of his Gospel, to be sure, were such that it was impossible for him to think of the Jewish law as having any binding authority over a Christian disciple whether Jew or Gentile; it was inevitable that he should regard the "middle wall of partition" which separated the Jews and the Gentiles as broken down, and should recognize the right of the latter to become Christian disciples without first becoming Jews. Indeed, all this must have become clear to him even before he returned to Damascus; for it was necessarily involved in the Gospel as he understood it, and he could not have remained even temporarily blind to it. But such an unqualified recognition of the rights of a Gentile Christianity might exist, and yet Paul not feel himself bound to turn from the Jews to the Gentiles, and to labor exclusively for the evangelization of the latter. With his ardent patriotism and with his profound love for his own countrymen, to which he bears eloquent testimony in his Epistle to the Romans, it would have been unnatural for him to do so. We should expect rather to find him laboring first and foremost for the conversion of Jews, and only secondarily for the conversion of foreign peoples. The fact that he became finally the apostle to the Gentiles in a peculiar sense, and that his great life work was done among them, and not among his own countrymen, while made possible by his belief that the disciples of Christ were free from all obligation to observe the Jewish law, was not directly due to that belief, but was the result of a combination of circumstances which will be

[1] Acts ix. 19 sq.

referred to later. We may safely assume, then, that upon his return from Arabia to Damascus Paul began preaching the Gospel of Christ among those whom he knew and loved best, among his fellow-members of the household of Israel. That he should feel himself called to preach was inevitable. A man of his character and talents could not remain silent after the great change which he had experienced. His first impulse must be to tell others of the Messiah who had been revealed to him, and as he had believed himself divinely commissioned to exterminate the followers of Jesus, he must now believe himself divinely commissioned to propagate the faith which he had been destroying. Ceasing to be a persecutor, he could not be satisfied to be a mere adherent; he must become a champion of the new sect.

His earliest Christian preaching, according to the Book of Acts, agreed substantially with the preaching of the primitive disciples of Jerusalem, in so far as he proclaimed and endeavored to prove, as they had done, the Messiahship of Jesus. It was with this truth that we should expect him to begin. "Is Jesus indeed the Messiah?" was the burning question, and none of the disciples, least of all Paul, could refrain from stating and restating his reasons for answering that fundamental question in the affirmative. But we may well believe that as he had found in the crucifixion of Jesus his chief ground of offence against those who proclaimed him as the Messiah, he would lay especial stress upon that crucifixion when he began himself to preach the faith that he had once so bitterly denounced; and that he would not simply content himself with showing that Jesus was the Messiah in spite of his death, but would emphasize the fact that the death of Jesus constituted an essential part of his Messianic work. We shall be safe in assuming, therefore, in the absence of direct information upon the subject, that he preached to the Jews of Damascus, at the very beginning of his Christian career, the Gospel which he preached later at Corinth, and which he sums up concisely in the early verses of the fifteenth chapter of his First Epistle to the Corinthians: "Now I make known

unto you, brethren, the gospel which I preached unto you, which also ye received, wherein also ye stand; for I delivered unto you first of all that which also I received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures; and that he was buried, and that he hath been raised on the third day according to the scriptures."

We are not informed whether Paul's evangelistic work in Damascus was crowned with marked success, but the fact that he was obliged to flee from the city in order to escape arrest, as related in Acts ix. 23 sq., and 2 Cor. xi. 32 sq.,[1] indicates that he had become sufficiently prominent as a Christian preacher to attract public notice and to draw upon himself the hostility of the city authorities,[2] who

[1] There can be no doubt that Acts ix. 23, and 2 Cor. xi. 32, refer to the same event, and that the incident took place at the time indicated in Gal. i. 18. It has been claimed that the account of the incident in Acts is based solely upon the passage in 2 Cor., and that consequently there is no sufficient ground for assuming that the event occurred at the time indicated in Acts rather than at some other time. But in view of the fact that so many of the occurrences recorded in 2 Cor. xi. find no mention in the Acts, there is little reason to suppose that this particular incident was taken from that chapter. The account in Acts, therefore, may fairly be regarded as supplementing the reference in 2 Corinthians, by supplying the time at which the occurrence mentioned took place. It is worthy of remark that no other time so well fits the circumstances.

[2] In 2 Cor. xi. 32, Paul says that the ethnarch under Aretas the king guarded Damascus to prevent his escape. This statement, taken in connection with the fact that while many coins of Damascus with the imperial superscription are in existence, no such coins have been found dating from the years 33–62, has led some scholars to the conclusion that Damascus belonged during the reigns of Caligula and Claudius to the kingdom of Arabia, over which Aretas IV. ruled until 40 A.D., the assumption being that Caligula, who came to the throne in 37, gave the city to Aretas. See Schürer: *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes*, I. 617 sq.; II. 86; (Eng. Trans., Div. I. Vol. II. p. 356 sq., and Div. II. Vol. I. p. 98). But such a conclusion is hardly warranted by the evidence; and if my chronology of Paul's life is correct, the flight from Damascus falls within the reign of Tiberius (about 35 A.D.), when it cannot be supposed that any change had taken place in the status of Damascus. Mommsen (*Römische Geschichte*, 3te Auflage, Bd. V. S. 476) remarks that the coins bearing the head of the emperor, while they show that Damascus was dependent upon the Roman Empire, do not show that it was independent of the Arabian king. Aretas therefore may have been in control of Damascus, as Herod was in control of Jerusalem, while at the same time the city was subject to Rome. There is, consequently, no ground in Paul's statement, that the ethnarch under Aretas guarded the city, for the assumption that Damascus was at the time not under Roman dominion, as it certainly was in earlier and later years. No argument therefore can be drawn from the incident as to the date of Paul's conversion. The incident may have occurred as well in the year 35 as in 38.

On the other hand, Paul's statement in Gal. i. 17, that he went from Damascus to Arabia, cannot be employed to prove, as it is by O. Holtzmann

perhaps saw that his preaching was creating a disturbance among the Jewish population of the city which might result in riot and bloodshed. In his Epistle to the Galatians[1] Paul puts his departure from Damascus three years after his conversion,[2] but he says nothing of the circumstances under which he left the city. He informs the Galatians, however, that upon leaving Damascus he went up to Jerusalem to visit Cephas and tarried with him fifteen days, but that he saw no other apostle except James the Lord's brother. It is evident from the passage in Galatians that the purpose of his visit to Jerusalem was not to preach the Gospel there, but to make the acquaintance of Peter.[3] That he should desire to know personally the leading man among the disciples was certainly most natural, and it need cause no surprise that when a convenient opportunity offered itself, he took advantage of it.

(*Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte*, S. 97 sq.), that Damascus was at that time not subject to the Arabian king; for the city might be subject to him or under his protection and yet not be an integral part of Arabia (see Mommsen, *ibid.*). The ethnarch to whom Paul refers would seem, then, to have been the representative of Aretas' authority in the city and as such at the head of the municipal government or at any rate in possession of police jurisdiction. Had he not held such a position, he would have had neither cause nor right to guard the city as he did. Holtzmann's assertion that the term "ethnarch" cannot be understood in so broad a sense, but must denote simply the head of the Arabian colony in the city (*l.c.* S. 97), is hardly justified. Archelaus, for instance, was given the title Ethnarch by Augustus (see Josephus: *B. J.* II. 63; and compare the note of Heinrici: *Das Zweite Sendschreiben an die Korinthier*, S. 481).

[1] Gal. i. 18.

[2] It is possible, as Weizsäcker maintains (*l.c.* S. 81), that Paul reckoned the "three years" not from his conversion, but from the time when he returned to Damascus from Arabia. But if that be the case, it may fairly be assumed that the sojourn in Arabia was of no great duration; for otherwise, in the interest of his argument, which was to show that he waited a long time before seeing the older apostles, he would have specified the length of his stay there. From whichever point therefore the "three years" be reckoned, the result is practically the same.

[3] *ἱστορήσαι Κηφᾶν.* It is hardly possible in the light of Gal. i. 19, 22, to suppose that Paul did such public evangelistic work in Jerusalem as he is represented as doing in Acts ix. 28 sq. He was demonstrating in the Galatian passage his independence of man and his sole dependence upon God for the Gospel which he preached; and it would have been decidedly disingenuous for him to speak as he did concerning his visit to Jerusalem if he had mingled freely with the disciples of the Mother Church. Moreover, his statement in verse 22, that he was still unknown to the churches of Judea, must include the church of Jerusalem, for otherwise it would have no bearing upon the matter in hand, and could only mislead his readers.

The fact that he waited as long as he did before visiting Jerusalem shows that he did not regard himself as in any way dependent upon Peter or the other apostles for authority to preach the Gospel, and there is no reason to suppose that he sought Peter for the purpose of securing his sanction of the work that he was doing; for there is no hint that the need of such sanction was felt by any one at this early stage. On the other hand, the fact that Paul waited three years before going up to Jerusalem does not prove that he purposely avoided the Christians of Jerusalem, with the design of asserting his independence of them; for had he had such a design, he would have remained away still longer. The controversy, which subsequently led him to emphasize his independence, as he does in the Epistle to the Galatians, belonged to a much later period, and he could hardly have foreseen it at so early a date. It is probable that he was too much absorbed in his evangelistic work in Damascus to think of interrupting it for the purpose of visiting Peter or anybody else, and that he conceived the very natural idea of making Peter's acquaintance only when he was compelled to leave the city and was thus at least temporarily prevented from continuing the work to which he had been devoting himself with such enthusiasm. That he saw none of the apostles except Peter and James the brother of the Lord, and apparently very few of the disciples, and that his visit was of such short duration may have been due to the fact that the church of Jerusalem was still undergoing persecution and that most of the Christians were absent or in hiding; or it may have been due to the desire of concealing from the authorities the presence in the city of a man who had fled as a fugitive from Damascus.

The bearing of this visit upon Paul's subsequent career and upon his relations to the Mother Church it is difficult to determine. It is inconceivable that he can have been simply a listener during those fifteen days of converse with Peter. He must have learned much from Peter, it is true, about the Christ whom he had never seen in the flesh, and about the views of Christianity that prevailed

among the original disciples; but he must also have imparted much to him out of his own experience, an experience which could not fail to be of surpassing interest to all that knew of his former hostility and of his sudden conversion. But he could hardly have related that experience to Peter without presenting at least the main outlines of his Christian belief, to which that experience had given rise. And yet in the light of Paul's explicit statement,[1] that at a subsequent visit he laid before the leaders of the church of Jerusalem the Gospel which he preached among the Gentiles, and secured their recognition of his divine commission, and in view of his silence touching the subject of his conference on this earlier occasion, it can hardly be supposed that at this time Peter either approved or disapproved that Gospel. Had he approved it, Paul would certainly not have failed to inform his Galatian readers of the fact; while had he declared his disapproval, the churches of Judea could hardly have glorified God for the work that Paul was doing, and he could not have been left so long unmolested in the labors which he was carrying on among the Gentiles. It is, in fact, altogether unlikely that Paul appeared in Jerusalem, on the occasion of his first visit, in the rôle of an apostle to the Gentiles, or of a champion of Gentile Christianity. It is much more probable that the "Gospel of the uncircumcision" did not come up for discussion, or if it did, that it was not treated either by Peter or by Paul as a matter of immediate and pressing importance. And yet it is not altogether impossible that Peter's interview with Paul, which must in any case have suggested broader and more spiritual views of the nature of Christianity than had prevailed in the Mother Church, prepared the mind of the former at least in some measure for the Cornelius incident. It may be that he found it easier to pursue the course he did on that occasion because of the suggestions he had received from Paul, and that later, when Paul had begun his great missionary career among the Gentiles, the knowledge which Peter had already gained of the fundamental prin-

[1] Gal. ii. 1 sq.

ciples of Paul's Christianity prepared him to sympathize heartily with the apostle to the Gentiles and to approve his work unreservedly. It is certainly not without significance that it was Peter of whom Paul saw most during that fortnight in Jerusalem, and that it was Peter who of all the disciples of Jerusalem known to us showed himself most in sympathy with Christian work among the Gentiles.

3. Paul in Syria and Cilicia

After a stay of fifteen days in Jerusalem, Paul left the city and went into the regions of Syria and Cilicia,[1] two contiguous Roman provinces whose capitals were respectively Antioch and Tarsus, Paul's native place. The interval of eleven years[2] which elapsed between this time and his second visit to Jerusalem, recorded in Gal. ii. 1 sq., Paul passes over without a word. He was concerned not to give his readers a record of his life and works, but only to show them that he had received his Gospel from God and not from man, and for that purpose it was enough for him to enumerate his visits to Jerusalem, during which he might be supposed to have learned something from the older apostles, or from the Mother Church. Our knowledge of this interval is very meagre. That the time was spent in active Christian work there can be little doubt, but of much of the work we know absolutely nothing. In Acts xi. 22 sq., it is recorded that when Barnabas came down from Jerusalem to Antioch and found Gentile Christianity already existing there, he went to Tarsus and brought Paul thence to Antioch, and that the two men labored together in the latter city for a whole year. There is nothing intrinsically improbable in this narrative. As was remarked in a previous chapter, the indications are that Gentile Christianity

[1] Gal. i. 21.

[2] It is possible to date the "fourteen years" of Gal. ii. 1, either from Paul's conversion or from his first visit to Jerusalem, three years later. The latter alternative is adopted by the great majority of scholars, and they therefore put Paul's second visit to Jerusalem seventeen years after his conversion. But the date which I assume for Paul's death (see p. 419, below) leads me to reckon the fourteen years from the earlier date and thus to separate his Jerusalem visits by only eleven years. Ramsay does the same, but on other grounds (see his *St. Paul, the Traveller and the Roman Citizen*, pp. 55, 382).

in Antioch did not owe its origin to Paul, and as we know from Gal. ii. that he and Barnabas were at home there some years later, at the time of the council of Jerusalem, there is no reason to doubt that he may have been brought thither by Barnabas under the circumstances related in Acts, and may have labored there some time before starting upon the missionary tour recorded in Acts xiii. and xiv. Previous to that time he had doubtless been doing Christian work in his own city Tarsus, and possibly in the country round about, for it was there that Barnabas is said to have found him, and he tells us himself that he had spent at least a part of the time between his first and second visits to Jerusalem in Cilicia.[1] That Barnabas was anxious to secure Paul's assistance for the work in Antioch would seem to indicate that the latter had already shown himself a zealous and efficient laborer, and knowing his character and his subsequent career as we do, we cannot doubt that such was the case.

These early years, about which we know so little, must have been of great importance to Paul himself; for though in the existing records they have been entirely overshadowed by the years that followed, and though we have no information of the work accomplished, it was during this time that the great apostle was preparing himself for the marvellous achievements of later days. It was not as a novice that he set out upon his missionary tours which resulted in the evangelization of so large a part of the Gentile world, but as a preacher and worker of long and varied experience, who had familiarized himself thoroughly with the most effective evangelistic methods, and who knew not only the Gospel which he had to preach, but the men to whom he had to preach it. The Paul of the great missionary journeys in Asia Minor, Macedonia, and Greece presupposes the Paul of the quieter, but hardly less busy years spent in Syria and Cilicia. The apostle whose field was the Roman Empire presupposes the humbler evangelist whose field was only a province. Had he not been doing effective service during those years of which we know so little, the record of his

[1] Gal. i. 21.

later years would not be so illustrious as it is. We may assume, then, that from the time of his departure from Jerusalem, some three years after his conversion, until the beginning of his missionary tour recorded in Acts xiii. and xiv., Paul was actively and more or less constantly engaged in evangelistic work in the "regions of Syria and Cilicia."

Between the beginning of Paul's work in Antioch and his departure upon the missionary tour described in Acts xiii. sq., the author of the Acts inserts a visit to Jerusalem, recording that in consequence of the impending famine, which the prophet Agabus had foretold, the Antiochian Christians sent Barnabas and Saul to Jerusalem, to carry contributions for the relief of the brethren that dwelt in Judea.[1] This journey has caused scholars a great deal of trouble. It has been generally recognized that the visit to Jerusalem, to which Paul refers in Gal. i. 18, is recorded by the author of the Acts in ix. 26 sq., and that the visit referred to in Gal. ii. 1 sq. is described in Acts xv. In the present chapter, then, we have apparently the account of a journey to Jerusalem falling in the interval between the two which Paul mentions. But it is clear that Paul intended the Galatians to understand that during the fourteen years that succeeded his conversion, he had been in Jerusalem only twice. He was concerned to show that he had received his Gospel from God, and not from man; and for that purpose he enumerated the occasions on which he had visited Jerusalem, and on which, consequently, it could be supposed by any one that he had received instruction from the older apostles, and he was careful to describe what took place on those occasions, in order to prove that he had been given nothing by them. It is difficult, therefore, unless we are ready to charge Paul with intentionally deceiving the Galatians, to suppose that he actually made another journey to Jerusalem

[1] Acts xi. 29 sq., xii. 25. That there was a famine in Judea during the reign of Claudius is recorded both by Josephus (*Ant.* xx. 2, 5; 5, 2) and Orosius (vii. 6), and their accounts point to the year 45 as the probable date (cf. Ramsay: *St. Paul, the Traveller and Roman Citizen*, p. 68). The collocation, in Luke's account, of the famine and the death of Herod which took place in 44, is no proof that the two events occurred at the same time.

in the interval between the two which he mentions. And yet it can hardly be doubted that a contribution was actually sent by the Christians of Antioch to their brethren at Jerusalem, and it is difficult to account for the report that Paul was one of the messengers that carried it, if he really had nothing to do with it. It has been supposed by some[1] that Paul was commissioned to go to Jerusalem with Barnabas on the occasion in question, and that he may have started thither, but, for some unexplained reason, failed to reach the city; while Luke, finding in his sources the record of the appointment, drew the natural but unwarranted conclusion that both Paul and Barnabas fulfilled the mission entrusted to them.[2] This, however, is at best a lame explanation. A much simpler solution of the difficulty seems to be that Acts xi. and xv. both refer to the same event, and that we are consequently dealing here with the second of the two visits mentioned by Paul in his Epistle to the Galatians. It is entirely conceivable that Luke found two independent accounts of the same journey in his sources; and as the occasion was given differently in the two cases, he supposed them to refer to separate events, and inserted them at what seemed to him the proper points in his narrative. It is true that it appears at first sight difficult to assume that the two accounts refer to the same visit, for the setting is entirely different in the two cases; but Gal. ii. 10 seems to imply that a double purpose was fulfilled by the journey described in that chapter, and that Paul was the bearer of alms as well as the defender of Gentile Christianity.[3] If this be the case, the difficulty disappears. One writer might well be interested to record only the generous act of the Antiochian church,[4] while another might see in the settlement

[1] For instance, by Neander, Meyer, and Lightfoot. [2] Acts xii. 25.

[3] Gal. ii. 10 reads: "Only they would that we should remember the poor; which very thing I was also zealous to do" (ὃ καὶ ἐσπούδασα αὐτὸ τοῦτο ποιῆσαι). These words can hardly refer to the great collection which Paul spent some years in gathering and which he took up to Jerusalem the last time he visited the city, for he had not begun to make that collection at the time he wrote to the Galatians (see below, p. 226).

[4] It is to be noticed that only the occasion of the journey is mentioned in Acts xi., while nothing is said of the events that took place in Jerusalem.

of the legitimacy of Gentile Christianity the only matter worthy of mention. That Luke should then suppose the two accounts to refer to different events was but natural; and it was also natural, if he was aware, as he probably was, that the council of Jerusalem occurred after Paul's missionary tour in Galatia, that he should put the other journey to Jerusalem back into an earlier period, and connect it with the time of the apostle's previous sojourn in Antioch; for it could hardly be thought that Paul and Barnabas visited the Mother Church twice within a few months.[1]

4. The Evangelization of Galatia

With the thirteenth chapter of Acts begins, as has been generally recognized, the second part of the book. It is devoted almost exclusively to the missionary labors and personal fortunes of Paul, and constitutes practically a complete whole in itself. And yet this section of the work, like the first twelve chapters, is based largely upon older sources of varying worth. There are a number of passages which purport to be and doubtless are from the pen of an eyewitness, while other portions of the narrative make no such claim. There can be no doubt, however, that throughout a large part of this half of his work, the author was in possession of much fuller and more trustworthy documents

[1] A confirmation of the conclusion that Acts xi. and xv. refer to the same event, is found in the chronology of Paul's life. The date which I assume for his death (see below, p. 419) makes it impossible to assign the conference, referred to in Gal. ii. and Acts xv., to a time much later than 46; but the famine recorded in Acts xi. occurred probably in that or the previous year, so that the coincidence in time is striking.

Ramsay also identifies the visits to Jerusalem mentioned in Acts xi. and Gal. ii. (*St. Paul, the Traveller and the Roman Citizen*, p. 48 sq.), but he separates Acts xi. and xv., and regards the latter chapter as referring to still another and later visit. This, however, will not do; for the discussion recorded in Acts xv. can have taken place only on the occasion which Paul describes in Gal. ii. 1 sq. At any later time it is inconceivable; and least of all can it have occurred, as Ramsay supposes, after the Antiochian trouble described in Gal. ii. 11 sq. (see below, p. 202 sq.). Moreover, it is impossible to see, as Ramsay does, in Paul's brief reference to the collection for the poor in Gal. ii. 10, a statement of his chief object in visiting Jerusalem. His chief object, as his entire account shows, was to secure the recognition of Gentile Christianity. The carrying of the alms with which he was entrusted was to him at least a minor matter.

than for the period covered by the first twelve chapters. There is also a homogeneity about the last sixteen chapters which is largely wanting in the first twelve. Evidently the sources from which the author drew his knowledge of Paul's great missionary tours, and of the later years of his life, were less scattered and fragmentary than those from which he derived his information touching the fortunes of the early church of Jerusalem, and required far less expansion and adjustment. It may be noticed, for instance, that the early chapters of the book are almost wholly wanting in chronological data of any kind, while in many of the later chapters the chronology is fairly clear and definite.

In the thirteenth and fourteenth chapters is given an account of what is commonly called Paul's First Missionary Journey. The title is convenient, though it is a little unfortunate, for it conveys the impression that Paul's missionary labors began at this time, when in point of fact he had without doubt already been engaged for some years in work of a genuinely missionary character. But of those years we know almost nothing, while from this point on we have a definite and ostensibly consecutive account of Paul's career until his arrival at Rome as a prisoner in the year 56. The journey was undertaken, according to Acts xiii. 1 sq., in conformity with a command of the Holy Spirit, who directed certain prophets and teachers of the Antiochian church to set apart two of their own number, Barnabas and Saul, and send them forth upon a missionary tour.[1] Leaving Antioch, the two men, in company with

[1] Barnabas and Saul are referred to in Acts xiii. 1, as if they had not been previously mentioned by the author. It would seem, therefore, that a new document begins at this point. There can be little doubt, in fact, in view of the accuracy of many of the details recorded in chaps. xiii. and xiv., that the author had at his command a written source covering the journey there described. Most recent writers upon the sources of the Acts suppose that Luke drew in those chapters upon a larger source which he used extensively in other parts of his work, and some identify it with the document containing the "we" passages (see p. 238, below). But I am unable to find any signs of resemblance between these chapters and the sections in which the pronoun "we" occurs, and it may fairly be doubted whether the source from which the author drew his account of Paul's First Missionary Journey was used by him anywhere else. However that may be, it is evident that Luke treated the document underlying these two chapters with a free hand (see below, p. 186 sq.).

John Mark, the cousin or nephew of Barnabas, went down to the seaport Seleucia and took ship thence for Cyprus, Barnabas' ancestral home. Their work in Cyprus is interesting chiefly because it was here that Paul for the first time, so far as we know, came into direct contact on the one hand with a striking and characteristic form of the superstition of the age in the person of the sorcerer Bar-Jesus, and on the other hand with the Roman government in the person of Sergius Paulus, the proconsul of Cyprus.

Bar-Jesus was a representative of a class of men, very numerous in that day, who possessed a familiarity with the forces of nature which was not shared by their fellows, and which was commonly regarded as supernatural in its origin. They were widely looked upon as endowed with superhuman power and wisdom, and were able to wield a tremendous influence over the minds of their fellows, an influence which they turned often to their own private advantage. They were to be found in all parts of the world, and they knew not only how to impress and astonish the common people, but also how to ingratiate themselves with the rich and the great. That there should have been one of them in the retinue of the proconsul is not at all surprising, and it is still less surprising that he should have been hostile to Paul and Barnabas, who represented another system and whose preaching might well seem to threaten his influence and credit with his patron. Paul and other early Christian missionaries must have come into frequent contact with such men, and the incident related here may be regarded as a typical one. It was natural that Luke, finding in his sources, as he probably did, a reference to Paul's meeting with such a man, should picture the scene as an exhibition of the superior power of Christianity in the very field in which Bar-Jesus and his kind were most skilful. He could hardly conceive of Paul as coming into contact with such a man and not giving convincing evidence of his mightier control over the forces of nature, and it may have been a denunciation by Paul of the spiritual blindness of the Magian that led him to suppose that the apostle inflicted physical blindness upon him, as recorded in vs. 11.

But the journey of Paul and Barnabas through Cyprus is significant not simply because of their meeting with Bar-Jesus, but also and chiefly because of their interview with the proconsul Sergius Paulus.[1] He seems to have been interested by the reports that reached him of the two travellers, whose preaching was very likely creating some stir in Paphos, and he consequently sent for them that he might hear them for himself. Luke gives us no account of their preaching before him, his entire attention being taken up with the case of the sorcerer, but he closes the incident with the remark that the proconsul believed;[2] and whether it is to be supposed that he was really converted to the Christian faith and became a disciple, as Luke's words imply, or only that he was strongly and favorably impressed by what he had seen and heard, in any case the interview must have meant a great deal to Paul. It is not impossible that the impression which he made upon the governor led him to turn his thoughts more earnestly than heretofore upon the Roman Empire as the field of his labors, and to cherish a more confident belief in the possibility of bringing the Roman world to Christ. At any rate, even if the event was not actually the occasion of an enlargement of his horizon and expansion of his plans, it was at least typical, for throughout his subsequent career it was the Roman Empire that he was thinking of and aiming to win for Christ. He was proud of his Roman citizenship and made a great deal of it; he always used his Roman name Paul; his churches he designated by the names of the Roman provinces in which they were situated, the churches of Galatia, of Asia, of Macedonia, of Achaia; his thoughts turned continually toward Rome, and in all his journeys his gaze was fixed upon the capital which he longed to see and

[1] A Sergius Paulus is known to us from the writings of Pliny, who is very likely to be identified with the proconsul mentioned by Luke, and the name of a proconsul Paulus is found in Cypriote inscriptions, who is also possibly the same man. See Lightfoot in the *Contemporary Review*, May, 1878, p. 290 sq. For an interesting and suggestive account of Paul's visit to Cyprus see Ramsay: *St. Paul, the Traveller and Roman Citizen*, p. 70 sq.

[2] Acts xiii. 12. It is interesting to notice that Luke ascribes the conversion of the proconsul rather to the miracle performed by Paul in smiting the Magian with blindness than to the preaching of the Gospel by him.

where he longed to preach.[1] The interview with Sergius Paulus therefore is interesting and suggestive even though it may not have marked an epoch in Paul's own career. The author of the Acts, with the instinct of a true historian, evidently felt its significance; for it is in connection with it that he first employs Saul's Roman name Paul,[2] the name by which the apostle is thenceforth uniformly called in the Acts,[3] and which he always uses in his epistles. Luke does not mean to imply, nor is it necessary to suppose, that Paul himself began to use the new name just at this time; but as the great apostle who had entered upon his career as a preacher of the Gospel to the Roman world, Luke proposed to treat him thenceforth not as a Jew, but as a Roman. The name itself, Paul probably bore from the beginning in addition to his Hebrew name Saul; for such double names were not at all uncommon in the provinces, and the son of a Roman citizen could hardly have failed to possess a Roman name. It may well be that he began to use the latter to the exclusion of his Hebrew name when he definitely conceived the purpose of evangelizing the Roman world.

Leaving Cyprus after a stay of unknown duration, Paul and his companions sailed for Perga, an important commercial town of Pamphylia, situated upon the River Cestrus not far from its mouth. It was at this point that John Mark left them and returned to Jerusalem.[4] His withdrawal from the work, which seems to have displeased Paul greatly,[5] suggests that a change had been made in the original plans of the party, and that Paul and Barnabas had decided to undertake a journey which Mark had not anticipated, and which involved a longer absence from home or greater hardships than he was willing to undergo. It may be that the determination was now formed to press north and westward across Asia Minor, in order to carry the Gospel to the provinces of Asia and Bithynia or even over into Europe, as Paul did at a later time. At

[1] Rom. i. 15, xv. 22 sq. [2] Acts xiii. 9.
[3] Except in the discourses of Paul recorded in Acts xxii. and xxvi.
[4] Acts xiii. 13. [5] Cf. Acts xv. 38.

any rate, the travellers left Perga apparently after only a short stay there, and crossing the Taurus Mountains went on to Antioch, a prominent city of Phrygia and the political centre of the southern half of the Roman province of Galatia.[1] If the plan had been formed of going on from Antioch westward or northward into Asia or Bithynia, it was for some reason abandoned at this point, and the apostles turned instead southeastward to Iconium, Lystra, and Derbe, all of them cities lying within the borders of the province of Galatia.[2] On the supposition that the churches of the Galatian cities visited at this time are the ones addressed by Paul in his Epistle to the Galatians, Ramsay[3] suggests that the trip from Perga over the mountains to Antioch was undertaken because Paul was smitten with malarial fever while in the former city, and was obliged to seek the highlands of the interior in order to throw off the attack, and that thus he was led by "an infirmity of the flesh" to preach for the first time to the Galatians.[4] The suggestion is a plausible one, but it seems much more likely that the illness of which Paul speaks in his Epistle to the Galatians overtook him at Antioch rather than at Perga.[5] For if he was taken ill at Perga, it would be more natural for him to return to his home

[1] Upon the name Pisidian Antioch, by which the city was commonly known, see Ramsay: *Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 25 sq.

[2] See Ramsay: *Historical Geography of Asia Minor*, pp. 26, 30, 450, and *The Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 13 sq.; also Weizsäcker, *l.c.* S. 228 sq. (Eng. Trans., I. p. 270 sq.), and Rendall in the *Expositor*, Vol. IX., 1894, p. 254 sq. Schürer in the *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 1892, Sp. 468 (cf. also 1893, Sp. 410), and in the *Jahrbücher für Protestantische Theologie*, 1892, S. 471, denies that the province which included Galatia, Pisidia, and Lycaonia, bore the official name Galatia, and that the inhabitants of Pisidia and Lycaonia could ever have been called Galatians; but Ramsay has shown him to be in error.

There can be no doubt that the Roman province Galatia did embrace at the time with which we are dealing, not only the old kingdom of Galatia, but also Pisidia, Lycaonia, and a part of Phrygia, and that the inhabitants of the latter countries might properly have been called Galatians by Paul.

[3] *Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 61 sq.

[4] Gal. iv. 13.

[5] So also Weizsäcker, S. 240. If his "infirmity of the flesh" was an attack of malarial fever, as is very likely, Paul may have contracted the disease in the lowlands of Pamphylia, but it may not have made its appearance until he reached Antioch. It is frequently only after a person leaves a malarial region that he feels the consequences of residence in it.

or to Cyprus, where both he and Barnabas were already acquainted, than to go into an entirely unfamiliar country, which could be reached only by eight days of hard travel.[1] And it could hardly be said in Acts xv. 38, in speaking of Mark's withdrawal, that he refused to go "on to the work" with Paul and Barnabas if the trip to Antioch was undertaken merely for the sake of Paul's recovery. On the other hand, if while the travellers were pressing north or westward, not intending to stop to preach in Antioch, Paul was stricken down and obliged to remain there for some time, it would be natural for him to tell his message, when he found himself able to do so, to those among whom he was thus providentially thrown. When he was obliged to leave Antioch, as recorded in Acts xiii. 50, it may be that he turned southeastward instead of westward or northward, because he had not yet fully recovered his strength, and thought it best to return home rather than to undertake at this time the longer journey he had planned. If this were so, it would be literally true that he had preached not to the Antiochians alone, but to all the Galatians, "because of an infirmity of the flesh," and the words in which he refers to his malady and to the kind reception they had given him[2] would apply to all of them and not simply to the Christians of a single city.

It has been assumed in what has just been said that the Galatian Christians, whom Paul addressed in his epistle, are to be found in the cities of Antioch, Iconium, Lystra, and Derbe, which he visited at this time, according to the account of the Book of Acts. This opinion has been maintained by some eminent scholars,[3] but it is by no means the prevailing view. The great majority of writers upon the New Testament hold that the Epistle to the Galatians was addressed to Christians living in the Galatian country, a district lying to the north and east of Lycaonia and Phrygia, and constituting only a part of the great Roman province of

[1] See Ramsay, *l.c.* p. 65. [2] Gal. iv. 13–15.

[3] Among others by Renan, Hausrath, Weizsäcker, Pfleiderer, and most recently by Ramsay.

Galatia.[1] This district, whose chief cities were Ancyra, Tavium, and Pessinus, had been inhabited for some centuries by a Keltic people, and had constituted before its incorporation in the Roman Empire the Kingdom of Galatia. It is contended by the writers who maintain the so-called "North-Galatian" theory, that only the inhabitants of this country could have been called Galatians by Paul. But it was his uniform custom, in speaking of his churches, to use the names of the Roman provinces and not of the geographical districts in which they were situated. Thus he speaks of the churches of Asia, of Macedonia, and of Achaia, and it is fair to assume that he uses the term "Galatia" in the same official sense. The fact that the author of the Acts frequently uses geographical terms, such as Mysia, Phrygia, Pisidia, Lycaonia, has no bearing upon the matter, for it is Paul's usage and not the usage of the Book of Acts that we are seeking; and it should be observed that in such a narrative of travel as is given in Acts, we might expect to find the various districts of a province through which the apostles passed, referred to by their common geographical or national designations. As Ramsay has clearly shown, if Paul wished to address the Christians of Antioch, Iconium, Lystra, and Derbe in a single circular letter, the only general term which he could employ to designate them all, and at the same time the most honorable term, was "Galatians" or "Men of the province of Galatia."

There are, moreover, a number of excellent reasons for assuming that the Epistle to the Galatians was actually intended for the Christians of Antioch and the other cities just referred to. It is very difficult, for instance, to understand how Paul can have preached the Gospel in North Galatia "because of an infirmity of the flesh."[2] So far as we know, he never visited any country so situated that his

[1] Among the many that hold this view may be mentioned Lightfoot (Commentary on Galatians), Wendt (Meyer's Commentary on the Acts, 7th edition), Lipsius (Commentary on Galatians, in the *Hand-Kommentar zum Neuen Testament*), Schürer (in the articles already referred to), and Weiss and Jülicher in their Introductions to the New Testament. For an especially thorough presentation and defence of the view, see Holsten's *Evangelium des Paulus*, I. S. 35 sq.

[2] Gal. iv. 13.

journey thither took him through North Galatia, and it is inconceivable that illness can have led him to go so far out of his way, as he must have gone, if he preached in Ancyra or Tavium or other prominent North Galatian cities. If he preached there at all, it would seem that he must have gone thither for that express purpose; but his own words in Gal. iv. 13 preclude such a supposition. It is very difficult also to discover a time when Paul can have done evangelistic work in North Galatia. It is clear from Gal. iv. 13 sq., that he had visited the Galatians twice before he wrote them. The former of these visits the advocates of the North Galatian theory commonly find referred to in Acts xvi. 6, the latter in Acts xviii. 23, on the assumption that the word "Galatia" in these two cases can be understood only in a geographical sense. But the assumption is entirely erroneous;[1] and even if it were granted, it would certainly be an extremely hazardous proceeding to insert in Acts xvi. 6, the extended and fruitful evangelistic labors which Paul's epistle shows that he did among the Galatians. It should be remarked still farther that the use of ὑμᾶς in Gal. ii. 5, though it may not conclusively prove, does at least imply that the Galatians had been evangelized before the conference of Jerusalem which Paul describes in his epistle to them. But there is nowhere in our sources a hint that he had visited North Galatia before that time. Again the reference to Barnabas in Gal. ii. 13, is such as to suggest that the Galatians must have had reason to be particularly interested in him. But on the second and third missionary journeys, when it is assumed by the defenders of the theory in question that Paul visited the country, Barnabas was not one of the company, and the North Galatians, therefore, were not personally acquainted with him, as the Christians of Antioch, Iconium, and the other South Galatian cities were. It is also a very significant fact that whereas, according to 1 Cor. xvi. 1 sq., Galatia had a part in the great collection which Paul made for the saints of the Mother Church, no disciple from North Galatia is mentioned as accompanying him when he carried

[1] Cf. Ramsay, *l.c.* p. 77 sq.

it to Jerusalem, while Macedonia, Asia, and South Galatia were all well represented.[1] Finally, it is upon the face of it extremely improbable that the conversion of those disciples to whom Paul was so profoundly attached, and to whom he wrote one of his most important epistles, should have been entirely ignored by the author of the Book of Acts, and that he would have omitted all mention of Paul's labors among them, and of the churches which he founded, when he related with such fulness the work in other countries and especially in the South Galatian cities, to which, on the theory that we are combating, Paul makes no reference in any of his letters.[2] In view of all these considerations, there can be little doubt that, in his Epistle to the Galatians, Paul was addressing Christians who dwelt in the southern part of the great province of Galatia, in the cities, for instance, of Antioch, Iconium, Lystra, and Derbe.

Weizsäcker, who holds the same opinion, contends that Paul cannot have preached in Galatia before the Council of Jerusalem, and he therefore assumes that the account of the apostle's labors contained in Acts. xiii. and xiv. has been inserted in the wrong place. The only ground for this assumption is the omission of a reference to Galatia in Gal. i. 21, where Paul says that after his first visit to Jerusalem he went into the regions of Syria and Cilicia. It is true that if he preached in Cyprus, and in Antioch, Iconium, Lystra, and Derbe, before the council, his silence is somewhat surprising, but it is not absolutely conclusive; for he does not say that he remained in Syria and Cilicia during the entire period that elapsed between his first and second visits to Jerusalem, and his argument did not require that he should give an account of himself during all that time, but only that he should omit no occasion on which he came into contact with the Mother Church, or with the older apostles, and on which, therefore, he might be supposed to have received his Gospel. On the assump-

[1] Acts xx. 4.

[2] Antioch, Iconium, and Lystra are mentioned in 2 Tim. iii. 11, but the passage is of doubtful authenticity.

tion that he was addressing in his epistle the very churches which he had founded during that period, there was still less reason for him to mention a fact so well known to his readers. On the other hand, it is difficult to suppose that Paul can have visited Galatia after the important conference at Jerusalem, and not have told his Gentile converts of the significant results accomplished at that time. But his description of the conference in the second chapter of his epistle implies that he is there giving them his first account of it. It should be observed also that Barnabas was Paul's companion during the missionary tour recorded in Acts xiii. and xiv. But it is exceedingly difficult to suppose that the two men can have made such a journey together after the occurrence related in Gal. ii. 13, an occurrence which apparently took place almost immediately after the council.[1] If any reliance, therefore, is to be placed upon the account contained in Acts xiii. and xiv., it seems necessary to conclude that the author is correct in putting the journey in question before and not after the Council of Jerusalem, described in the fifteenth chapter.

According to Acts xiii. 14, Paul and Barnabas began their evangelistic work in Antioch in the synagogue, directing their efforts primarily to the conversion of the Jews, and turning from them to the Gentiles only when the former had rejected their message and refused to believe.[2] The accuracy of this report has been strenuously denied by many scholars, on the ground that such conduct on Paul's part is inconsistent with his mission as the apostle to the Gentiles. But the objection is not well taken; for, as has already been seen, Paul's conception of the Gospel, while it involved the legitimacy of Gentile Christianity, did not compel him to preach to the Gentiles rather than

[1] The Book of Acts is doubtless correct in recording that Paul and Barnabas separated soon after the council and went each his own way (xv. 35 sq.). But the reason which it gives is hardly adequate to account for their separation. It may safely be assumed that the real ground lay in the unfortunate incident to which Paul refers in Gal. ii. 13.

[2] Acts xiii. 46. Paul and Barnabas are also reported to have preached in the synagogues of Cyprus (Acts xiii. 5).

to the Jews, nor is there any sign that during the early years of his Christian life he discriminated against his own countrymen and confined his attention exclusively or even chiefly to the heathen. The Epistle to the Galatians itself indicates that though the Gentiles were largely in the majority in the churches addressed,[1] there were at least some Jewish disciples among them,[2] while in Antioch in Syria, where Paul labored for so long a time, there was evidently a large and influential Jewish Christian element.[3] That Paul regarded himself, as he certainly did in a peculiar sense, the apostle to the Gentiles, by no means indicates that he did not believe it his duty to labor also for the evangelization of the Jews. In fact, his own words, in his epistles to the Romans and Corinthians,[4] prove beyond all shadow of a doubt, not only that he was profoundly concerned in the conversion of his countrymen, but also that he had done what he could to bring it about. Had we no record in the Book of Acts of the method followed by Paul, a comparison of all his own utterances upon the subject would compel us to conclude, in the first place, that he desired the salvation of every man, whatever his race or country, but as a true patriot, longed most profoundly for the conversion of his own nation; in the second place, that he believed himself, if not in the beginning, at least at the time he wrote his epistles, called by God to devote himself especially to the evangelization of the Gentile world, with the conviction that the salvation of the heathen would redound to the benefit of the children of Abraham; in the third place, that he understood this call to mean not that he was to forget or neglect his own countrymen, but that he was to improve every opportunity that might offer itself to win such of them as he came in contact with while carrying on his world-wide mission; that he was, in fact, to win every man he could, whether Gentile or Jew.

The belief that he had been called to labor especially among the heathen may have come to him at the time of his conversion, as his own words in Gal. i. 16 might seem

[1] Gal. iv. 8, v. 2, vi. 12, 13.
[2] Gal. iii. 28.
[3] Gal. ii. 13.
[4] Rom. ix., x. 1, xi. 11 sq.; 1 Cor. ix. 20.

to indicate, or it may have grown upon him gradually. His birth and residence in a foreign city, his consequent interest in Jewish propagandism among the heathen, which must have been vivid from an early day, his Roman citizenship, his profound belief in the absolute liberty of the Gospel, his knowledge of the fact that the great majority of the disciples were laboring exclusively for the conversion of the Jews, his recognition of the hostility which his own revolutionary principles could not fail to excite among his countrymen, and finally his own experience of their obdurateness and inaccessibility, must all have contributed if not to the formation, at least to the confirmation of his belief. He must have recognized in all of them providential indications of the peculiar work to which he was called and for which he was fitted, and his statement in Gal. i. 16 is abundantly satisfied if we suppose that it was as a result of such providential indications that he first realized just what his call meant. In view of all that has been said, the method pursued by Paul according to Acts xiii., in beginning his evangelistic work in Galatia, must be pronounced entirely natural. If it be granted that his object in preaching at all in Pisidian Antioch was to bring a knowledge of the Gospel to as many as he could, and to win as many converts as possible, and it would be difficult to show that this was not his object, the most natural thing for him to do was to enter the synagogue, and there improve the opportunity which he knew would be readily afforded him, as an educated Jew, to proclaim Jesus as the Messiah. By such a course he might reach not only Jews, but also proselytes and God-fearing Gentiles, who commonly attended the services of the synagogue in large numbers; and with the converts thus secured as a nucleus, he might push the work still further, both among Jews and heathen. On the other hand, had he ignored his fellow-countrymen and begun his work among the heathen, he would have cut himself off from any possibility of influencing the Jews, whether native or proselyte, and at the same time would have failed to utilize the obvious advantage afforded by the already awakened religious interest of many Gentiles.

In other words, he would have begun, as no wise man would have thought of beginning, with the least accessible and least promising portion of the community, and would have circumscribed permanently and quite unnecessarily his sphere of labor.

The account with which we are dealing records that Paul's preaching in the Antiochian synagogue aroused much interest, but that the Jews in general finally rejected his message and refused to believe, and that he and Barnabas then turned to the Gentiles.[1] This does not mean that it was in Pisidian Antioch that Paul first preached the Gospel to the Gentiles,[2] — the Book of Acts itself refutes such an assumption, — nor does it indicate that at this time occurred a permanent change in Paul's missionary policy; for he is recorded to have preached in the synagogue again upon reaching Iconium.[3] Acts xiii. 46, therefore, does not mark and was not intended by the author to mark the close of Paul's work among the Jews, and the beginning of his work among the Gentiles. It records a fact of merely local significance, and that not the beginning of Paul's effort to win the Gentile converts in Antioch, for he undoubtedly had Gentiles as well as Jews in mind when he preached in the synagogue, but the definite abandonment of the attempt to convert the Jewish colony there. And yet, though the event must be recognized to have had merely a local significance, every such event — and doubtless it was not the first of the kind that Paul had experienced — must strengthen his conviction that his work lay chiefly among the Gentiles, and that his greatest successes were to be won among them. But it must have done more than that; it must have led him to see that Gentile Christianity was to overshadow Jewish

[1] Acts xiii. 46.

[2] It is possible that this idea was in the mind of the writer of the document which was used by the author of the Acts in chaps. xiii. and xiv.; for in xiv. 27 the strange remark is made that Paul and Barnabas, upon their return from their missionary tour, told the church of Syrian Antioch "how God had opened a door of faith unto the Gentiles." In the light of xi. 1, 18, 19 sq., it is difficult to suppose that this statement is to be attributed to the author of the Acts.

[3] Acts xiv. 1.

Christianity and surpass it in influence and extent, that in the Gentile world the Gospel was to make far more rapid strides than it had in Judea, and thus there must have presented itself to him at an early day the perplexing problem of God's purpose for his chosen people with which he wrestled years later in his Epistle to the Romans. It was doubtless such experiences as this at Antioch that led him to see in the conversion of the heathen not simply their own salvation, but God's providential means for saving finally the whole family of Israel.[1]

Though we cannot doubt, as has been said, that Paul and Barnabas preached to the Jews in Antioch, it may fairly be questioned whether the address contained in Acts xiii. actually reproduces with accuracy what Paul said. There is a resemblance in the early portion to the speech of Stephen, and in other parts to the discourses of Peter, while the style is in the main undeniably Luke's. Moreover, it is difficult to believe that Paul can have uttered vss. 38 and 39, at least in the form in which we have them. Both of them are sufficiently un-Pauline to excite surprise, occurring as they do at the climax of his address, when we should expect him, if ever, to give utterance to the very essence of the Gospel as he understood it. Verse 38 contains an idea of which there is little trace in his teaching, while the phrase itself, ἄφεσις ἁμαρτιῶν, which is employed by Peter with the same significance and practically in the same connection in both his Pentecostal and Cæsarean discourses,[2] is found in none of Paul's epistles, except once in Ephesians, and again in the parallel passage in Colossians.[3] On the other hand, in vs. 39, where it is said that "every one that believeth is justified from all things from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses," a conception of justification is expressed, which, if not distinctly un-Pauline, nevertheless falls far below Paul's characteristic and controlling idea of justification as the state of the saved man who is completely reconciled to God and enjoys peace with him. But though we cannot depend

[1] Rom. xi. 11-26. [2] Acts ii. 38, x. 43. [3] Eph. i. 7; Col. i. 14.

implicitly upon the address in chap. xiii. for a knowledge of what Paul actually preached in Galatia, we learn from Gal. iii. 1 sq. that that preaching embraced at any rate the crucifixion of Christ, salvation by faith and not by works, and the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, — all of which constituted fundamental elements in his Gospel. Though he does not refer to the resurrection of Christ as a part of his original proclamation, he must, of course, have emphasized it from the very beginning in Galatia, as everywhere else. It may be assumed, in fact, that whatever he may have said on any particular occasion, or however he may have addressed the Jews in their synagogues, it was his Gospel of death with Christ unto the flesh and resurrection with him unto a new life in the Spirit which he inculcated in Galatia; that Gospel which he had worked out in his own experience and which constituted the sum and substance of his Christianity. He was true to his great underlying principles even in his evangelistic work. He did not reserve those principles for mature and developed Christians, but began with them, and built everything else upon them. This is what we should have expected a man of Paul's character to do, and this is what his Epistle to the Galatians shows that he actually did.[1]

After giving up their attempt to convert the Jews of Antioch, Paul and Barnabas, according to Acts xiii. 48 sq., remained some time in the city preaching the Gospel to the Gentiles and meeting with considerable success in their work. But the Jews, who were not content with merely contradicting the things spoken by Paul and rejecting the message which he brought them, succeeded finally in arousing the hostility of the "devout women of honorable estate[2] and of the chief men of the city," and the result was that the two missionaries were expelled from the place; very likely as disturbers of the public peace, and after a formal trial before the town magistrates. It is not necessary to suppose that Paul and Barnabas

[1] Cf. also 1 Cor. xv. 3 sq.

[2] Probably female proselytes, who were perhaps induced by the Jews to incite their heathen husbands against the apostles.

were condemned for preaching false gods or for attacking the religion of the Antiochians. A large measure of religious liberty was enjoyed in all parts of the empire at this time, and the existence of a Jewish synagogue in Antioch shows that it was enjoyed there as well as elsewhere. But any uproar or disturbance of the public peace the imperial and municipal authorities were always quick to put down with a strong hand, that it might not grow into something worse and result in widespread disaffection. It is probable, therefore, that the Jews started an outcry against Paul and Barnabas, and that the magistrates, without investigating very carefully the merits of the case, thought it safer to get the strangers out of the city before their presence led to any serious outbreak. Driven out of Antioch, they went on to Iconium, a large and important Galatian city, situated to the southeast on the way to Tarsus and Syria. Here they remained for some time,[1] preaching, at least in the beginning, in the synagogue, and winning many converts among both Jews and Greeks; but they were finally compelled to flee from Iconium as they had fled from Antioch, and they then found their way to Lystra, a city of Lycaonia, but belonging, like Antioch and Iconium, to the province of Galatia. At the time Paul and Barnabas visited Lystra, it was not a rude and uncivilized village, as has been frequently asserted, but an important garrison town which was a centre of Roman culture and influence.[2] Nothing is said of their preaching to the Jews in Lystra, or later in Derbe, and whether they did or not, we have no means of knowing. But the peculiar experience which they had with some of the heathen of the city, who supposed them gods and proposed to offer sacrifices to them,[3] would seem to indicate that they had more to do while there with Gentiles than with Jews, and that they did not reach the former merely through the instrumentality of the latter. The incident referred to, which was caused by a miracle of healing

[1] *ἱκανὸν χρόνον*, Acts xiv. 3.
[2] See Ramsay: *Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 47 sq.
[3] Acts xiv. 11 sq.

wrought by Paul upon a cripple,[1] was entirely natural under the circumstances, and the identification of Barnabas, the more silent and passive of the two travellers, with the supreme god Jupiter, and of the more active Paul with Mercury, is strikingly characteristic of the Oriental estimate of greatness. It is true that the account of Paul's miracle bears a close resemblance to the account of the healing of the lame man by Peter, in Acts iii. 2 sq., and that the apostles' expostulation with their would-be worshippers is analogous to Peter's expostulation with Cornelius in Acts x. 26, and that the words that follow are much like Paul's words in his address to the Athenians recorded in the seventeenth chapter of Acts. But though it may well be that the author felt the influence of other accounts given elsewhere in his work, the main incident related in this passage is too striking and unique to have been invented, and serves to attest the general trustworthiness of the events that precede and follow it.

In spite of the enthusiasm with which Paul and Barnabas were hailed by the heathen populace, hostility was aroused against them by Jews who came from Antioch and Iconium,[2] and doubtless worked upon the prejudices of their fellow-countrymen residing in Lystra. It may have been easy for them to incite the populace against the apostles because of the latter's rejection of the divine honors which had been offered them. At any rate, the result was that Paul was stoned by a mob and left for dead. Recovering, he departed with Barnabas for Derbe, which lay somewhat more than a day's journey to the southeast, and was the frontier city of the province in that direction. Like Lystra, Derbe was at this time a town of some importance, and a centre of Roman life and influence.[3] After making many disciples in the city, the apostles retraced the route by which they had been travelling, passing through Lystra, Iconium, and Antioch, and

[1] That Paul worked miracles, is confirmed by his own statement in 2 Cor. xii. 12. No general argument, therefore, can be drawn from this and other miracles related of him in the Book of Acts against the primitive character of the documents upon which the accounts are based.

[2] Acts xiv. 19.

[3] See Ramsay, *l.c.* p. 54 sq.

thence turning southward to Perga, whence they set sail for Antioch in Syria, the place from which they had started upon their eventful tour. Why they went westward again from Derbe, instead of crossing the mountains and going on to Cilicia and Syria at once, as they seem to have intended to do when they turned eastward from Pisidian Antioch, we do not know. It may be that they reached Derbe in the winter and found the passes over the Tarsus too difficult to attempt; or it may be that finding himself in good health once more, Paul decided before returning home to visit again his converts in the other cities of the province, whom he had been obliged to leave so abruptly, and who, he might well fear, were in danger of forgetting him and the Gospel which he had preached.[1] However that may be, he would certainly improve the opportunity afforded by the return trip to confirm the work that he had already done, and to encourage and strengthen his recent converts.[2] It need not cause surprise that Paul and Barnabas should revisit the cities from which they had been so recently expelled. It is probable that they had spent some time in Derbe, and the excitement which their presence had aroused in Antioch, Iconium, and Lystra had very likely been forgotten before they made their reappearance, and there is no reason to suppose that any legal bar against their return existed. They owed their expulsion from Iconium and Lystra apparently not to the magistrates, but to the fury of the populace, and even in Antioch it is improbable that a permanent decree of exile had been

[1] It might be thought that news had reached Paul that Jewish Christians were attempting to induce his Gentile converts to receive circumcision and observe the Jewish law. If this were so, we could easily explain his return at this time to Syrian Antioch and his subsequent journey to Jerusalem; and in support of this opinion might be urged Gal. i. 6 and v. 3, which seem at first sight to imply that Paul had been compelled to warn the Galatians against Judaizers on some previous occasion (so Lightfoot, Lipsius, and many others). But it is to be noticed, on the other hand, that Paul does not say, in Gal. i. 6, "I marvel that ye are so soon *again* removing unto a different gospel." The defection of the Galatians which called forth his epistle to them seems indeed to have come upon him as a complete surprise; and in view of that fact it is hardly probable that he had had to meet the difficulty before. It seems better, therefore, to interpret Gal. i. 6 and v. 3, as referring to the preceding context, and not to an earlier period when he was with the Galatians.

[2] Acts xiv. 22.

passed against them. There was, therefore, nothing for them to fear from the authorities, provided their presence did not give rise to another popular tumult. It is hardly likely, under the circumstances, that they entered into the synagogues and preached the Gospel openly as they had before. It is more probable that they avoided publicity and devoted themselves solely to those who had already embraced the Christian faith, as is implied in Acts xiv. 22.

According to vs. 23, Paul and Barnabas upon their return trip through Lystra, Iconium, and Antioch appointed presbyters in the various churches. In the light of Paul's epistles in general and especially of his Epistle to the Galatians, which contains no hint of the existence of officers in the churches addressed, it is difficult to suppose that he gave those churches a fixed and definite organization, and appointed regular officers. It is not improbable, however, that he recognized the peculiar respect and honor in which some of the disciples were held by their companions, or the gifts with which they were endowed, or the marked zeal and devotion with which they gave themselves to the spread of the Gospel and to the service of their brethren, or the diligence and faithfulness with which they looked after the interests of the church, and that he exhorted the disciples in general to follow the guidance of such Christians and to be subject unto them in the Lord,[1] in order that confusion and division might be avoided and the growth of the church be wholesome and vigorous. More than this it can hardly be supposed that he did at this time.[2]

That Paul's missionary work in Galatia was productive of large results, especially among the Gentiles, and that the churches which he founded were very near his heart, is made abundantly manifest by his Galatian Epistle. Whether his stay in the province lasted only a few months, or covered a period of some years, he could look back upon it after he had returned to Syrian Antioch with joy; for he had been received by the Galatians as an angel of God, and had won

[1] Cf. 1 Cor. xvi. 16.

[2] Upon the development of ecclesiastical organization, see below, p. 645 sq.

their love and been treated by them with the utmost devotion.[1] His missionary journey had been a great success so far as the Gentiles were concerned, and though prevented by sickness from fulfilling his cherished plan, he had yet made large conquests and had shown himself eminently fitted to carry the Gospel into distant lands and among foreign peoples. He must have returned to Antioch with a firmer conviction than ever that his life work was to be the evangelization of the heathen world and with the fixed determination to continue at the earliest opportunity the campaign so auspiciously begun.

5. The Conflict with Judaizers

But in the meantime an event occurred which threatened to undo all that Paul had accomplished, and to put an end once and for all to Gentile Christianity; an event which caused him the greatest anxiety, and the consequences of which he felt for many years. According to Acts xv. 1, certain men came down from Judea to Antioch and taught the brethren that they could not be saved unless they received circumcision and thus became members of the family of Israel. The demand which was thus made of the Gentile Christians of Antioch involved a distinct repudiation of the position taken by the church of Jerusalem on an earlier occasion when the legitimacy of Gentile Christianity was acknowledged,[2] and yet it was a most natural thing under the circumstances that the demand should be made. It is by no means certain that all the Christians of Jerusalem acquiesced heartily in the approval given to Peter by the church as a whole. It was inevitable that there should be then and that there should continue to be two opinions as to the wisdom and propriety of such a course. But those who disapproved may have been too few in number, and of too little personal weight, to be able to make their opposition seriously felt, and they may have thought it best to accept quietly what they could not prevent. But as time passed and as the church of Jerusalem increased in

[1] Gal. iv. 14, 15.

[2] See above, p. 101 sq.

size, it is conceivable that the number multiplied of those who believed that circumcision was in each and every case absolutely necessary to salvation. And even among those who had formerly given their approval to the conduct of Peter in the case of Cornelius, and had joined with their brethren in recognizing the possibility of a non-Jewish Christianity, there can hardly have failed to be some who were increasingly troubled by the rapid growth of an independent Gentile church and by the evident tendency on the part not only of the converts from the heathen, but also of the missionaries that worked among them, to regard the form of Christianity which they possessed as of equal dignity and worth with the original Jewish Christianity of Christ himself and of his apostles, and thus to rob God's chosen people of all their prerogatives and the divine law of all its sanctity. It is not surprising, therefore, that in course of time there should be a large number within the church of Jerusalem who shared the conviction that a halt should be called and that a firm stand should be made for the religion of Moses and of Christ. How long it was after the return of Paul and Barnabas to Antioch before matters came to a head and the conflict was precipitated, we do not know, but it may well be that the news of the great success which they had had in Galatia and the large number of Gentiles that had been converted there led the stricter party to feel that it would be fatal to delay longer; that the time had come when a public and decisive stand must be made against the dangerous movement which was spreading so rapidly. And hence it may have been very soon after their return that the emissaries from Jerusalem appeared in the city, insisting that the Gospel which Paul and Barnabas were preaching was all a mistake, and that no Gentile could be saved unless he were "circumcised after the custom of Moses." [1]

[1] The "false brethren" of Gal. ii. 5 were probably those that came down to Antioch and disturbed Paul there, and not brethren that came forward at the time of the council in Jerusalem and insisted on Titus' circumcision. The reference in Gal. ii. 5 is apparently to the larger subject. Because of the men that had made all the trouble, Paul took a firm stand at Jerusalem on the great question and yielded not a single iota at any point.

The excitement that must have been caused in the Antiochian church by such an announcement may be easily imagined. The emissaries came from Judea and doubtless claimed to represent the Mother Church of Christendom, and thus a peculiar authority seemed to attach to their declaration. The crisis was a serious one. Paul might be confident of his own apostolic calling and might be convinced that he had received his Gospel from God and not from man; and yet it was clear that if the apostles, who had been Christ's chosen companions during his earthly ministry, and were in consequence generally believed to know the Master's will most fully, — if they were to declare that form of Christianity which Paul and his fellows had been preaching all a mistake, the work which they had already accomplished would be practically destroyed and there would remain little or no hope of winning the heathen world for Christ. It was under these circumstances that Paul, whose heart was bound up in the preaching of the Gospel to the Roman world, felt it to be the will of God that he should go himself to Jerusalem and settle the matter once and for all with the older apostles.[1] They must be induced to repudiate distinctly the demands made by their alleged representatives.

Paul was accompanied upon his journey not only by his fellow-worker Barnabas, who had himself been at one time a prominent member of the church of Jerusalem and whose influence and support must be very desirable at such a time, but also by Titus, one of his own Gentile converts,[2] by whose presence he hoped perhaps to give an ocular demonstration of the success of his work among the heathen and of the blessing of God which had attended it. Paul's account[3] of the events that took place during his stay in Jerusalem is very brief and the details are somewhat obscure, but the general outcome is entirely clear. His

[1] Paul says in Gal. ii. 2: "I went up *by revelation*." These words do not exclude the commission laid upon him by his Antiochian brethren which is recorded in Acts xv. 2 (and xi. 30); but they show that it was not their appointment but his own conviction of the Divine Will that led him to undertake the journey.

[2] Gal. ii. 3; Titus i. 4.

[3] Gal. ii. 1-10.

words in Gal. ii. 2 imply that he laid the Gospel which he preached among the Gentiles not only before the disciples in general, but also privately before those of repute,[1] meaning apparently the "pillars," James, Peter, and John.[2] The recognition of the legitimacy of Gentile Christianity, which was the fundamental thing with him, was bitterly opposed by those whom he calls "false brethren," but in spite of their opposition he succeeded in carrying his point and convincing not only the apostles, but also the church as a whole, that God had already set the seal of his approval upon the Gospel which he preached among the Gentiles, and had thus distinctly declared that men may be saved without receiving circumcision. But his opponents, when they found themselves defeated, proposed apparently that at least Titus should be circumcised.[3] They might with some show of reason insist that even though the legitimacy of Gentile Christianity were acknowleged, it was unseemly that the Jew, Paul, should have with him as his companion and fellow-worker an uncircumcised Greek, and that it was an unnecessary offence to the sentiment of the Christians of Jerusalem to bring such a man into their midst. They may have contended, moreover, that the circumcision of Titus at this time would have the effect of allaying somewhat the hostility of the unconverted Jews, as they saw Christianity thus becoming a bridge from heathenism to Judaism; and they perhaps expressed themselves as willing to submit to the majority in the larger matter if an exception were made to the general principle in this particular case. The proposition was thus apparently of the nature of a compromise, and it may be that it was supported by many of those who had taken Paul's side upon the main question, possibly even by the apostles.[4] But Paul and Barnabas refused absolutely to give their consent to the proposal.[5] The reason for their refusal is

[1] καὶ ἀνεθέμην αὐτοῖς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον . . . κατ' ἰδίαν δὲ τοῖς δοκοῦσιν.

[2] Gal. ii. 9.

[3] Gal. ii. 3.

[4] The words οἷς οὐδὲ πρὸς ὥραν εἴξαμεν τῇ ὑποταγῇ (vs. 5) seem to imply that Paul and Barnabas stood almost, if not quite, alone in their opposition to this compromise.

[5] Gal. ii. 3.

stated by Paul in vss. 4 and 5. "On account of the false brethren who came in to spy out our liberty, we stood out firmly in this matter also," he seems to say, "and did not yield even for a moment." He evidently saw clearly that the proposition was not as harmless as it seemed; that it meant practically a recognition in Jerusalem itself of a principle that had just been repudiated for the church at large, and that it was bound to be used by his opponents against him and his work among the Gentiles. By his refusal, in which the church at Jerusalem finally sustained him, he asserted unequivocally the full rights of Gentile Christianity and thus the truth of the Gospel was preserved not for the Galatians alone, but for all converts from the heathen world.[1]

But this recognition of the legitimacy of Gentile Christianity was not all that Paul secured at Jerusalem. Both he and Barnabas received from those who were esteemed "pillars," that is, from James and Peter and John, the right hand of fellowship, in which was involved the acknowledgment of their divine call to preach the Gospel among the Gentiles; in which was involved, moreover, the recognition of their right to preach just as they had been preaching, for Paul expressly asserts that the apostles imparted nothing to him, that they did not in any way enlarge or curtail or modify the Gospel which had been given him by God and not by man.[2] It is significant that Paul does not say that he and Barnabas received this endorsement from the Jerusalem church as a whole, as he could hardly have failed to had it been a fact. It may well be that though the majority of the disciples were willing to admit that Gentiles might become Christians without becoming Jews, they were not ready to set the seal of their approval upon the evangelistic methods of Paul, who unequivocally asserted the absolute liberty and independence of his Gentile converts, and flatly refused to adopt any measures to win them over to the religion of Moses, and thus make their Christianity a bridge to the Christian Judaism of the Mother Church. It was perhaps under

[1] Gal. ii. 5. [2] Gal. ii. 6 sq.

these circumstances that Paul had the private interview with the apostles of which he speaks in vs. 2. He must have seen clearly that if he left Jerusalem without securing any kind of an endorsement, the Judaizers would be certain to use the circumstance against him, and even though they might be compelled to recognize the legitimacy of Gentile Christianity in general, would undermine his influence and hinder him in his work, and would appeal to the authority of the Mother Church for so doing. To obtain from the apostles, therefore, the approval which the church at large was not prepared to give him was a matter of vital importance.

But though Paul received from James and Peter and John the right hand of fellowship, and though they frankly recognized his divine call to preach the Gospel among the Gentiles, and though they refrained from adding anything to or taking anything from the message with which he believed himself entrusted, it is to be noticed that there is no sign that he was acknowledged by them as a fellow apostle.[1] It is significant, indeed, that in vs. 8, where he speaks of the apostleship of Peter, he says nothing of his own, a very surprising fact in view of the emphasis which he lays upon his apostolic commission in the opening of his Epistle to the Galatians, and in view of the special importance of maintaining his influence and authority under existing circumstances. In his Epistles to the Corinthians also, where he has occasion to defend himself against those who deny him to be an apostle,[2] he says nothing of having been recognized as such by the Twelve or by any of their number, though the mention of such a fact would certainly have stopped the mouths of his antagonists.[3] It may well be that

[1] Cf. Holsten: *Evangelium des Paulus*, S. 21.

[2] 1 Cor. ix.; 2 Cor. xii., etc.

[3] It cannot be urged that Paul's silence both in Galatians and Corinthians was due to his wish not to seem dependent upon the earlier apostles for the Gospel which he preached; for the statement that his apostleship had been recognized by them would no more impair or throw suspicion upon his independence, than the statement that his call to labor among the Gentiles had been so recognized. It may be that his insistence in his Epistle to the Galatians upon the fact that he was an apostle not by man's appointment and

though James and Peter and John were ready, when they saw the grace that was given him, to acknowledge Paul's divine call to do missionary work among the Gentiles, they were not willing to grant that he had the right to share in the peculiar privileges and prerogatives which they doubtless thought would attach to Jesus' personal companions and disciples in the approaching kingdom of the Messiah. And they may well have believed still, even though they recognized a Gentile Christianity, that in the Messianic kingdom the chosen people were to be supreme and that consequently no missionary to the Gentiles, however abundant his labors, could share the pre-eminence enjoyed by the apostles to the Jews, by those to whom had been entrusted the evangelization and to whom would one day be committed the judgment of the twelve tribes of Israel.[1] In the light of all that has been said, it is clear that though Paul considered himself an apostle and did not hesitate to call himself such in his epistles, and though he later declared himself to be not a whit behind the very chiefest apostles,[2] yet he was not recognized as such upon the occasion of his visit to Jerusalem, either by the older apostles or by the church.

What has been said upon this subject suggests the possibility that James, the brother of the Lord, who was certainly not one of the original Twelve,[3] had before this time been made an apostle by the choice of the brethren, as Matthias had been many years before. That appointment showed that it was the belief of the church of Jerusalem, at any rate in its early days, that the number of the apostles should be kept at twelve, and we know of nothing that had happened in the meantime to lead to a change of view. In fact, it is altogether likely that the belief continued among the immediate disciples of Jesus

commission, but by God's, was itself due in part to his failure to secure such recognition either from the church of Jerusalem or from its leaders. It was not that the mere name "apostle" was denied him, for the name was a very general one, and attached in those days to many besides the Twelve (see below, p. 646); but that they failed to recognize him as possessing equal dignity with themselves, and as an apostle in any such sense as they were.

[1] Matt. xix. 28. [2] 2 Cor. xi. 5, xii. 11.

[3] Cf. John vii. 25, and see p. 549, below.

as long as they retained the idea that Christianity was solely or even chiefly for the Jews, or that the Jews were to enjoy a pre-eminence over Gentiles within the Messianic kingdom. It may well be, therefore, that when James the son of Zebedee was slain, James the brother of the Lord was chosen to fill his place, and that he was thenceforth numbered among the Twelve, with whom Paul himself seems to class him in Gal. i. 19.[1]

Though Paul received from James and Peter and John, as has been seen, the right hand of fellowship, and though his divine call to preach among the Gentiles was frankly recognized, and though nothing was added to or taken from his message, it was not agreed that his Gospel was in any way to supplant or take the place of the Gospel of the original apostles, or that it was to be preached among the Jews. In fact, the compact entered into by Paul and Barnabas with the "pillars" at Jerusalem involved not so much a union as a division. James, Peter, and John were to continue to preach as they had been in the habit of doing to the Jews, while Paul and Barnabas were to go on preaching to the Gentiles. But that was not all. It was not simply two distinct fields that were provided for, but two distinct messages. Paul and Barnabas were to preach to the Gentiles the Gospel of the uncircumcision, while the others were to preach to the Jews the Gospel of the circumcision. The assumption was that the law should continue to be binding upon all Jews, and that to the heathen alone should be proclaimed liberty from its bondage. If the apostles of Jerusalem were not to go to the Gentiles and preach to them subjection to the Jewish law as the Judaizers had done at Antioch, neither was Paul to go to the Jews with his message of freedom from the law and teach them to neglect and disregard it. In securing recognition for his own Gospel, therefore, Paul gave his approval to the Gospel of the Jewish Chris-

[1] That the choice should fall upon James was altogether natural, for his relationship to Jesus must have made him a conspicuous figure in the church of Jerusalem from the time of his conversion; and his character was such as to excite the respect and admiration of all his countrymen. See below, p. 551 sq.

tians. The compact was a mutual one, and it meant the division of the church by common consent into two denominations, a Jewish and a Gentile, or rather it meant the express sanction and perpetuation of a division already existing. It may have been the sense of the danger to the spirit of Christian brotherhood that lurked in such denominationalism that led the apostles to suggest that Paul and Barnabas should secure contributions from their Gentile converts for the poor of Jerusalem. They may have believed, and Paul doubtless agreed with them and hence gladly fulfilled their desire, that such an exercise of charity would warm the hearts both of those that gave and those that received, and would thus prevent the loss of fraternal sympathy and affection.[1] But there was more than this in their request. It is to be noticed that they did not propose to minister to the necessities of the Gentiles, but only to receive their ministrations. And there can be little doubt that they made the suggestion they did with the idea that expression might thus be given to the superior dignity and prerogatives of the Jews, the sense of which the Gentile Christians would be in danger of losing when freed from all obligation to observe the Jewish law. Even Paul had something of the sort in mind when he wrote the words: "It hath been the good pleasure of Macedonia and Achaia to make a certain contribution for the poor among the saints that are at Jerusalem. Yea, it hath been their good pleasure; and their debtors they are. For if the Gentiles have been made partakers of their spiritual things, they owe it to them also to minister unto them in carnal things."[2] And that in spite of his strenuous assertion of the Christian's freedom from all law, including the law of Moses, he yet shared in a measure the national pride and sense of superiority, is made abundantly manifest by many other passages.[3] It is clear, therefore, that Paul could have no serious objection to the proposition of the apostles, but of course he did not intend to sanction by the collection, as possibly they did, the notion

[1] On the closing words of Gal. ii. 10, see above, p. 171.
[2] Rom. xv. 26, 27. [3] Rom. iii. 1 sq., xi. 24, 28, etc.

that Jewish Christianity was in any way superior to Gentile Christianity, or that the Christian who was circumcised and kept the law of Moses stood upon a higher plane religiously than other Christians. Such a notion he repudiated over and over again in his epistles.

Paul accomplished much by his visit to Jerusalem, and he might well look back with satisfaction at the way in which "the truth of the Gospel" had there been vindicated and maintained; but he did not secure all that he had hoped to. It was doubtless a disappointment to him that the church of Jerusalem as a whole did not give him the right hand of fellowship and commend him to the confidence and affection of all the brethren; and perhaps he was disappointed that the apostles did not recognize him as one of themselves, and declare him to be an apostle of Christ as truly as they. Moreover, the evident determination, not of the church of Jerusalem alone, but of the apostles as well, to draw a sharp line of demarcation between the two wings of the church, and to insist that Christians of Jewish birth should continue to observe the law of their fathers in all its strictness, must have been anything but pleasing to him. Believing as he did in the complete freedom of every Christian, whether Jew or Gentile, he must have regarded with great dissatisfaction the action of the disciples of Jerusalem in this matter, action which fell far below his large and broad conception of the Gospel, and which was calculated to keep alive the idea that there was saving efficacy in the observance of the law of Moses. Knowing also far better than they the conditions that existed in foreign cities, where Jews and Gentiles were unavoidably thrown into more or less intimate relations with each other, and where there must inevitably be many Christians of both classes, he must have seen, as they did not, that the separation which they contemplated, if vigorously enforced in all places, would give rise to endless trouble and dispute. But as he had gained his main point, he was willing for the present to leave the matter of association between Gentile and Jewish Christians unsettled. He doubtless felt that he could not demand

any more at this time without imperilling all that he had secured, for he saw clearly that neither the church of Jerusalem nor the apostles were prepared to admit the right of a Jewish Christian to disregard the law and to mingle unrestrainedly with his Gentile brethren. To insist that a disciple of Hebrew birth had such a right would have been doubtless to turn them all against him and to give the victory to the Judaizers.[1] He therefore contented himself with the guarantee of Gentile liberty, which was his chief concern, and left to the future the settlement of the farther question, which he knew, as the apostles did not, was bound to arise sooner or later.

It was not very long after the conference at Jerusalem that the question arose at Antioch, upon the occasion of a visit with which Peter favored the Christians of that city. Whether the action of the church and of the apostles in Jerusalem had affected in any way the relations between the Jewish and Gentile disciples in Antioch, we do not know; but at the time when Peter visited the city, it is clear that there were at least some Jews, perhaps many, who had thrown aside their religious scruples and were associating intimately with their Gentile brethren. They may not of course have ceased to observe the law in other respects, but they were entirely disregarding it so far as it prohibited fellowship with the uncircumcised. Such conduct on the part of Jewish Christians had not been expressly forbidden at the Council of Jerusalem, — probably because it was not supposed that there would arise any need of such a prohibition; but its unlawfulness had been assumed in the agreement which the apostles had concluded with Paul; for it

[1] What was thought of Paul's own conduct and of the conduct of Barnabas in associating intimately with their heathen converts, we do not know. It may be that it was just because an approval of their missionary work and their evangelistic methods meant the acknowledgment of their right, though Jews, to disregard the law of their fathers, that the church of Jerusalem refrained from expressing their approval. It may be that it was only with difficulty that the apostles were induced to do what the church as a whole did not do, feeling driven by the witness of the Spirit, which had been accorded in such large measure to Paul and Barnabas, to admit an exception in their case to the general rule of Jewish Christian conduct. Possibly one reason for their refusal to recognize Paul as an apostle, like themselves, lay in the fact that he did not observe the law in all its strictness.

was stipulated by them that though Paul and Barnabas might preach to the Gentiles their Gospel of absolute freedom from the Jewish law, they were not to preach it to the Jews. But in spite of that fact, at a time not long after the conference, Jewish Christians in Antioch were disregarding at least a part of their ancestral law, and Peter upon his arrival among them was so impressed with the faith of the Gentile converts and with the fraternal spirit which bound the two classes of disciples together, that he also threw his scruples to the wind and, following the example of Paul and Barnabas and many others, associated freely and openly with the uncircumcised.[1] Peter can hardly have expected to do this when he left Jerusalem. Certainly it was not in his thought at the time of the conference and it was a distinct step in advance of the position agreed upon there. And yet for Peter, warm-hearted and impulsive Christian as he was, the step was a most natural one. It may fairly be doubted whether he believed even at the time of the council that the observance of the Jewish law was absolutely essential to the salvation of any one. It is altogether likely that Acts xv. 11 is correct in representing him as taking the position even then that Jewish Christians were to be saved not by the observance of the law, but by the grace of the Lord Jesus in the same manner as the Gentiles.[2] He doubtless believed with James and John that under ordinary circumstances the obligation rested upon the Jew to observe the law of the Fathers, even though he was a disciple of Christ, just as Jesus himself had done during his life, and that the Jewish people as a whole were to continue to observe it at least until they should be released from the obligation by the Messiah. But such a belief was not inconsistent with the idea that there might be exceptions to the rule and that what was true under ordinary circumstances and of the people as a whole was

[1] Pfleiderer (*Urchristenthum*, S. 572) suggests that the vision on the housetop recorded in Acts x. 9 sq. belongs to this time, and that it was that vision, or something similar to it, that led Peter to throw aside his scruples, and eat and drink with the uncircumcised.

[2] Cf. Gal. ii. 16, where Paul seems to be stating a belief common both to Peter and himself.

not necessarily true under all circumstances and of every individual. If it was this conception of the Jewish Christian's relation to the law that Peter had at the time of the conference in Jerusalem, it is easy to understand how, for the sake of Paul and Barnabas and the Gentile brethren whom he found in Antioch, he could cut himself loose from the trammels of the law and could go in and out among them with perfect freedom.

All went well in Antioch until messengers from James arrived and took Peter to task for his conduct. The result of their remonstrance was that he drew back and separated himself from the Gentiles, and the influence of his example was so great that the rest of the Jewish Christians, including even Barnabas, did the same thing. The occurrence was a most unfortunate one and elicited from Paul a severe arraignment of Peter. He seems to have called a meeting of the church and to have administered a public rebuke to the great apostle. "When I saw," he says, "that they walked not uprightly according to the truth of the gospel, I said unto Cephas before them all, If thou, being a Jew, livest as do the Gentiles, and not as do the Jews, how compellest thou the Gentiles to live as do the Jews?"[1] It is to be observed that Paul arraigns Peter for a double offence: on the one hand for his inconsistency, for the apparent lack of accord between his principles and his practice; and on the other hand for his violation of the compact entered into at Jerusalem. Paul did not rebuke Peter for holding a conception of the Gospel which differed from his own, but for doing violence to that conception which his previous conduct seemed to indicate that they both shared. Peter's inconsistency did not lie in the fact that having lived like a Gentile, he afterwards lived like a Jew. That he might have done without incurring any such charge; for though by his neglect of the law he had apparently placed himself squarely upon the ground held by Paul, that the law is binding upon no one either Jew or Gentile, he might still regard the observance of the law as advisable, and might practise it without stultifying himself in any way, as Paul

[1] Gal. ii. 14.

himself practised it on occasion.[1] Peter's inconsistency lay rather in the fact that having declared that he believed that the Jewish law was not binding on any one, even a Jew, he acted in such a way as to make it binding on every one, even on Gentiles. But it was not Peter's inconsistency alone that angered Paul, though his inconsistency gave point to his rebuke and made it possible for Paul to arraign him as he did, — it was above all the fact that Peter had violated the agreement reached at Jerusalem, in entering Paul's missionary field and there preaching the Gospel of circumcision to his Gentile converts. It is to be noticed that Paul did not find fault with Peter because he lived as a Jew, but because he compelled the Gentiles to live as Jews; because he laid upon Paul's heathen converts the obligation to observe the law, when their complete freedom from the law had been expressly guaranteed at Jerusalem by Peter himself as well as by the church in general.

But the question arises, In what sense did Peter lay this obligation upon Paul's Gentile converts; how did he compel them to live as the Jews lived? Are we to understand that he actually followed the example of the Judaizers and told the Gentile Christians of Antioch that they could not be saved without circumcision?[2] There is no sign that he went so far as this, nor can it be supposed that he so explicitly and wilfully violated the compact sealed at Jerusalem. But in his withdrawal from association with the Gentile Christians there was involved in reality as genuine a compulsion as if he had distinctly told them that circumcision was necessary to salvation; for such withdrawal must seem to mean nothing else under the circumstances than the declaration that they were not clean because they were not observing the law, and hence that there rested upon them the obligation to cleanse themselves by obeying its injunction. In observing the Jewish law in all its strictness, including its prohibition of association

[1] Cf. 1 Cor. ix. 20.

[2] Ritschl (*Entstehung der altkatholischen Kirche*, Zweite Auflage, S. 146) maintains that Peter did this. In the first edition of the same work he held that it was the decree of Acts xv. 23 sq., which Peter laid upon the Gentile Christians of Antioch.

with the Gentiles, Peter acted, it is true, in harmony with one part of the Jewish compact, but at the same time he violated the other part and made it very clear that the compact could not be kept in both its terms under such conditions as existed in Antioch. The truth is that the compact provided only for the distinct and separate existence of Jewish and Gentile Christianity and did not contemplate their relation one to the other. It was only when they came in contact in Antioch that it was seen to be self-contradictory and to involve either the emancipation of Jewish Christians from the law or the bondage of Gentile Christians to it. And so Paul might justly regard Peter's conduct at Antioch not only as an act of self-stultification, but also as a violation of the agreement reached at Jerusalem, and as such he was entitled to resent it bitterly. Even had Peter not eaten with the Gentiles upon his arrival in Antioch, but held himself aloof from the beginning, he would justly have incurred Paul's resentment; for his action would have been a practical announcement to the Gentile Christians that they must keep the law if they wished to stand on the same plane with him and enjoy the benefits of association with him, and would thus have been in reality a violation of the spirit of the Jerusalem compact. But when he took such action after he had been for some time associating with the Gentiles and had won their personal friendship and affection, it was much worse in its consequences. It is no wonder that Paul took him sharply to task before all the brethren.

And yet it should be said, in justification of Peter's conduct, that his action was not necessarily due to fear of the Jewish Christians, as Paul declares.[1] It is more likely that he acted from a sense of duty in separating himself from the Gentiles. Conscious as he was that his work lay among the Jews, as Paul's among the heathen, it may well be that the messengers from James led him to see that his influence among his countrymen would be undermined, and his power to reach them destroyed, if he showed himself in any way careless in his observance of

[1] Gal. ii. 12.

the law of the Fathers. He may have realized as he had not at first that he could not live like an apostle to the Gentiles and still be a successful and effective apostle to the Jews. And so, believing that he had been called to evangelize the latter and not the former, it may have seemed to him a sacred duty to do as the brethren from Jerusalem advised, even though his action might appear inconsistent, and might work harm to the Antiochian church.

The Antiochian episode was momentous in more ways than one. It opened a question which had not been discussed at Jerusalem: the relation to each other of Jewish and Gentile Christians within a community containing both classes. The emissaries of James insisted that even in such communities Jewish Christians must observe the law in all its strictness, but Paul called attention to the fact that such observance meant a violation of the guarantee of Gentile liberty which he had secured at Jerusalem. But as the emissaries preferred to sacrifice the liberty of the Gentiles rather than consent to the neglect of the law by the Jewish Christians of Antioch, Paul went further and declared, as he had not done at Jerusalem, that their insistence upon the observance of the law by Jewish Christians meant in reality a denial of the Gospel of Christ, and that their Christianity, instead of being a higher and better form than the Christianity of the Gentiles, was in reality quite the opposite, involving as it did dependence upon the law rather than upon Christ for justification, and thus making the death of Christ a vain thing.[1] Thus the war was carried into the camp of the Jews. The Antiochian episode, therefore, did more than merely open the question of the relation of Jewish and Gentile disciples to each other; it revealed a fundamental difference of principle between Paul and the Christians of Jerusalem. The breach between them was thus widened and the number of Paul's enemies doubtless greatly increased. It may well be indeed that the episode furnished the occasion for the Judaizers to open their campaign

[1] Gal. ii. 21.

against Gentile Christianity and against Paul himself. Aroused and bitterly enraged by what had occurred at this time, with their numbers increased and with their hands strengthened by the widespread hostility to Paul to which his conduct had given rise, they probably began at once that propaganda in the churches of Galatia which called forth his epistle.

We are not told what effect Paul's severe rebuke, and his clear exposition of the meaning of the Gospel, had upon Peter and Barnabas and the Jewish Christians of Antioch. It is clear at least that Peter did not yield and associate again with the Gentiles as he had been doing, for Paul would certainly have mentioned the fact if he had; and it would have been natural for him to tell the Galatians of it, if his remonstrance had proved effective in the case of Barnabas. We shall probably be safe in assuming that whatever was true at a later date, at the time when Paul wrote his Epistle to the Galatians, not only Peter, but also Barnabas and many of the Jewish Christians of Antioch, still felt the influence of James,[1] and that the former cordial relations between Jews and Gentiles within the Antiochian church were not entirely restored.

In our consideration of the events that took place upon the occasion of Paul's visit to Jerusalem, and of the occurrences that followed at Antioch, we have confined ourselves to Paul's statements in his Epistle to the Galatians. But the fifteenth chapter of Acts contains a somewhat elaborate account of the conference in Jerusalem which differs in some respects from that of Paul and demands examination at this point.[2] It has been widely

[1] There is no reason to doubt that the messengers that came from James represented his own position in the matter. Paul's words imply as much as that, and the position taken by them in Antioch is entirely in harmony with all that we know of James himself.

[2] Ramsay (*St. Paul, the Traveller and Roman Citizen*, p. 55 sq.), recognizing the difficulty of reconciling Luke's account with that of Paul, denies that they refer to the same event. But the conference between Paul and the church of Jerusalem recorded in Acts xv. is impossible at any later time than that referred to in Gal. ii. 1 sq., for after the matter had been settled as Paul indicates in that passage, it could not have been canvassed again in any such

claimed that the differences between the two accounts are so numerous and radical, that Acts xv. must be pronounced entirely unhistorical. But it is to be noticed that in at least two important respects the accounts are in complete agreement; in the first place, according to both of them the legitimacy of Gentile Christianity was recognized by the church of Jerusalem, and circumcision was not required of converts from the heathen world; and in the second place, they both imply that it was taken for granted by the church that Jewish Christians would continue to observe their ancestral law. It should be remarked also, that there is nothing improbable in the supposition that Peter and James made such addresses as are ascribed to them in Acts xv. It may be doubted whether all the words that are put into Peter's mouth were actually spoken by him;[1] but that vss. 8 and 11 fairly represent the position which he held at this time is rendered exceedingly probable by his subsequent conduct at Antioch and by the words of Paul in Gal. ii. 15 sq. Upon his arrival in Antioch he acted exactly as a man naturally would who held the belief expressed in Acts xv. 8 and 11, and as we have already seen, his conduct there was due not to a change in that belief, but to the fear that his association with the Gentiles would make it impossible for him to fulfil his mission among the Jews. And so when Paul rebuked him for his action, he based his argument upon a principle that was apparently recognized by Peter as well as himself; but it is just that principle that finds expression in Acts xv. 11. Moreover, not only the address of Peter but also that of James is genuinely characteristic. We know from Gal. ii. 9 sq., that James recognized the legitimacy of Gentile Christianity as he is represented as doing in Acts xv. 19, and the passage from Amos which he quotes in vss. 16 to 18 may well have been employed by him at this time

way as described in Acts xv. To find in the ministry for the poor, referred to in Gal. ii. 10, the chief object of Paul's visit to Jerusalem, as Ramsay does, and to make all that goes before it entirely subordinate and unimportant, is to do violence to the entire passage. It must be insisted upon as certain, that Gal. ii. 1 sq. and Acts xv. 1 sq. refer to the same time.

[1] For instance, vs. 9, and especially the latter part of vs. 10.

as a justification of such recognition on his part. For such Old Testament prophecies must have had much to do with the approval which the Jewish Christians in general finally consented to give to the evangelization of the Gentiles. On the other hand, we know from Gal. ii. 12 that James was more conservative than Peter and that he was not ready even some time later to go as far as Peter did at Antioch and to associate intimately with the uncircumcised. The recommendation which he is represented as making in vs. 20 is therefore entirely in keeping with his general tendency. Finally it is to be noticed that though Paul says nothing of the addresses of Peter and of James, he does hint, as already remarked, at a public as well as a private meeting in Jerusalem,[1] and his silence respecting the details of that meeting is no argument against the account in Acts. It is clear from his own words that the apostles, or at least James, Peter, and John, were more ready than the church as a whole to approve his work among the Gentiles, and it is therefore natural to suppose that their influence was exerted to induce the church to take the action it did. That Paul and Barnabas should rehearse the great things which God had done among the Gentiles through them,[2] and that they should then leave it to the apostles, who had much greater influence in the church of Jerusalem than they, to urge the recognition of that form of Christianity which God had so signally approved, is just what we might have expected them to do. Paul appeared in Jerusalem to defend the Christianity of the Gentiles, and however conscious he was of his own independence and of his divine call, it would have been the height of unwisdom, and would have defeated the very purpose which he had in view, for him to treat the apostles with anything else than the utmost respect and deference, or to insist, upon the basis of his own apostleship, that the church should do as he wished it to without regard to the desires of its own guides and leaders. In fact, it is not too much to say that the account of the proceedings in Acts xv. 6–21 is in its general features

[1] Gal. ii. 2.

[2] Acts xv. 4, 12 sq.; cf. Gal. ii. 2, 7, 9.

entirely in accord with the probabilities of the situation as revealed in Gal. ii. 1–10.

But the same cannot be said of vss. 22 sq. It is very difficult to suppose that such a decree as is contained in vss. 28 and 29 was adopted at this time and carried back to Antioch by Paul and Barnabas with representatives of the church of Jerusalem, as Luke records. For it is to be noticed that there is no sign in Paul's epistles that he ever put the decree into force in any of his churches, or recommended any of his converts to observe it; nor is there any sign that anything was known about the decree in the churches to which he wrote.[1] It is also a fact of the utmost significance that Paul distinctly asserts[2] that those who were of repute in the church of Jerusalem imparted nothing to him, that is, laid no additional requirements upon him;[3] in other words, he was left entirely free by them to preach to the Gentiles exactly as he had been preaching. But according to Acts xv. 28, the Gentiles were not simply requested, but required by the action of the apostles and elders in Jerusalem, to abstain from the four things enumerated in the decree. The latter refrain from laying upon the converts from the heathen the burden of the whole law, but abstinence from these four things they regard as "necessary." For Paul, therefore, to acquiesce in this action and to carry the decree to the Antiochian church would have been to lay a burden upon the Gentiles not as great, to be sure, as the Judaizers would have liked, but none the less a burden, and none the less opposed to his principle of complete liberty. It does not help the matter to urge that Paul himself recommended a voluntary curtailment of one's liberty for the sake of the weaker brethren, as in 1 Cor. viii. and Gal. v. 13, and that therefore he might have been willing to acquiesce in this decree in order that the Jewish Christians might not be too much offended by the lives of their Gentile brethren; for it is not that a voluntary curtailment of their liberty

[1] It is significant that the Corinthians betray no knowledge of it when they ask Paul's advice in the matter of meats offered to idols (1 Cor. viii. 1).

[2] Gal. ii. 6. [3] ἐμοὶ γὰρ οἱ δοκοῦντες οὐδὲν προσανέθεντο.

is suggested, but that an enforced submission to certain requirements is demanded by the church of Jerusalem. But it is to be remarked finally, that the decree contains the same prohibitions that were laid upon strangers living within the land of the Jews, according to Lev. xvii. and xviii., and that its formal enactment by the council implies that the disciples of Jerusalem proposed to relegate the Gentile converts to the position occupied in ancient times by such strangers, and in more recent days by the σεβόμενοι, or God-fearing heathen. In other words, the decree in the form in which we have it means that the Gentile Christians were to be treated as less honorable and less pleasing to God than their Jewish brethren, and were to be required to treat the latter as religiously on a higher plane than themselves. This feeling was entirely natural, and was doubtless shared by James as well as by the majority of the disciples of Jerusalem, but Paul certainly could not require, nor could he consent that others should require, his converts to acknowledge the religious superiority of the Jews by the observance even of the simplest requirements of the Mosaic code. Still less could he consent that they should do anything which would lead them to think that those who observed the Jewish law were more righteous or pleasing to God than themselves. In view of all that has been said, we are forced to conclude either that the decree was never adopted and promulgated by the church of Jerusalem, or if it was, that it was done without Paul's knowledge and consent, and hence not under the circumstances recorded in Acts xv.[1]

The question then arises, how is the presence of the decree in our account to be explained? It is impossible to suppose so peculiar a document an invention of the author of the Acts. Some historic basis for it must be assumed.

[1] As it cannot be supposed that Paul had anything to do with the adoption of the decree, so it cannot be supposed that he had anything to do with its promulgation, and the accuracy of the statement in Acts xvi. 4 must therefore be questioned. The statement was a very natural one for the author to make, with the understanding he had of Paul's relation to the decree, and it is not necessary to suppose that he derived it from his sources any more than xvi. 5, which goes with it.

Such a basis may be found either in the address of James, recorded in Acts xv. 13–21, or in the actual adoption and promulgation of the decree at some other time than that designated by our author. So far as the former alternative is concerned, it is to be observed that it is not at all impossible that during the conference James may have suggested that the Gentile converts be requested to abstain from practices which were calculated particularly to offend the prejudices of the Jews, who had their synagogues in every city, and heard the law of Moses read every Sabbath.[1] Nor is it necessary to suppose that Paul must have taken exception to such a request. So long as it involved nothing more than the expression of a desire that the Gentile Christians might do nothing in the exercise of their liberty to offend their Jewish brethren unnecessarily, Paul could have no fault to find with it; for he himself exhorts his converts to give no occasion for stumbling either to Jews or to Greeks.[2] If then it be assumed that James expressed the hope that the Gentiles would voluntarily show some consideration for the feelings of their Jewish brethren, it is not inconceivable that the expression of that hope which was contained in the original record of his speech, may have led the author of the Acts to compose and append the epistle with its formal decree as we find it in vss. 23 sq., or to give the form of an official enactment to a mere request made by the church in accordance with the suggestion of James.[3]

But the second alternative referred to above, that the decree was actually adopted and promulgated by the church of Jerusalem at some other time than that designated by the author of the Book of Acts, seems much more probable than the one just considered.[4] That the author of the Acts, coming into possession of a document

[1] Acts xv. 21. [2] 1 Cor. x. 32.

[3] Attention has been frequently called to the stylistic resemblance between the opening of the epistle in vss. 23 and 24, and the prologue of Luke's Gospel.

[4] This suggestion was originally made by Ritschl in the first edition of his *Entstehung der altkatholischen Kirche*, and has been adopted by Weizsäcker and others, though abandoned by Ritschl himself in the second edition of his work.

containing such a decree, and being ignorant of its exact date and of the circumstances under which it had its rise, should have inserted it in his work in what seemed to him the most appropriate place, is what we should expect in view of his treatment of his sources in the composition of the third Gospel. Moreover, there are several indications that he made use of more than one authority, or that he considerably altered and expanded the authority which he followed in writing the very chapter with which we are dealing. The record as we have it contains difficulties which can be satisfactorily explained on no other assumption.[1] There is, therefore, upon the face of it nothing improbable in the supposition that the decree existed in a separate document and was appended by the author to his account of the conference.[2]

So far as the time is concerned at which the decree of vss. 28 and 29 was adopted, it cannot have been before the meeting described in Acts xv. and Gal. ii.; for the legitimacy of Gentile Christianity which it presupposes was still an open question when that meeting began. On the other hand, there is nothing in Paul's account of his controversy with Peter[3] to suggest that the decree was en-

[1] Compare vs. 1 with vs. 5, and vs. 4 with vs. 12. Compare also vss. 4, 12, and 22, where the whole church is referred to, with vss. 6 and 23, where only the apostles and elders are mentioned. It is to be noticed also that *αὐτοὺς* in vs. 5, which evidently refers to the Gentiles, has no grammatical antecedent. It is not impossible that Acts xi. 27–30 formed originally the beginning of the account with which we are now concerned, and that it was separated from its context, not only because it referred to a famine which the author identified with the famine that took place in the early part of Claudius' reign, some years before the time at which he understood the council of Jerusalem to have been held, but also because it assigned a purpose to the visit described in chap. xv. which did not seem to accord well with the matter actually considered at that meeting. (But see p. 171, above.) If such a displacement were made, the author would naturally supply some such introduction to Acts xv. as we actually find in vss. 1 and 2. For various analyses of the sources of Acts xv. see especially J. Weiss (in the *Theologische Studien und Kritiken*, 1893, S. 519 sq.); Voelter (*Komposition der Paulinischen Hauptbriefe*, S. 133 sq.); Spitta (*Apostelgesch.*, S. 179 sq.); Jüngst (*Quellen der Apostelgeschichte*, S. 134 sq.).

[2] It is quite possible that the church of Jerusalem actually sent some such letter as is given in vss. 22–27, and that only vss. 28 and 29 are added. Some letter (and perhaps messengers) we might expect them to send, and it may well have been of this sort. The addition, then, of vss. 28 and 29 would be all the easier to explain.

[3] Gal. ii. 11 sq.

acted by the church of Jerusalem before the latter visited Antioch. Weizsäcker is of the opinion that the adoption of the decree took place after the Antiochian occurrence and as a result of it. But it seems hardly calculated to meet the exigencies of the situation which existed after that time, when the relations between Gentile Christianity and the Mother Church must have been greatly strained. It is less thoroughgoing than we should expect it to be, if promulgated after the open break had occurred. It says nothing whatever about the conduct of Jewish Christians, nor does it warn the Gentiles that they must not expect or desire their Jewish brethren to associate intimately with them, as they had been doing at Antioch. It is to be noticed that the abstinence of the Gentiles from the four things prohibited in the decree did not make it lawful for a Jew to meet them on terms of equality, and we cannot suppose that either James or the church of Jerusalem was ready to sanction even the slightest neglect of the law on the part of their countrymen.[1] The decree in fact betrays no apprehension of the true difficulties of such a situation as existed in Antioch, and hence bears every appearance of having been drawn up before the trouble occurred there. If any action was taken by the Mother Church after that time, it would naturally look either toward the widening and deepening of the chasm between the Jewish and Gentile wings of the church, or toward the construction of some bridge across the chasm, according as it was prompted by the more bitter or by the more conciliatory spirits. But the decree of Jerusalem answers neither of these purposes. It seems best then to suppose that it was adopted shortly after Paul left Jerusalem, and after Peter, too, had taken his departure, and that it was the result of farther deliberation in the church of Jerusalem upon the subject which had been discussed at the council. It may have seemed to James and to the majority of the church after they had considered the matter more fully, that the guarantee of complete Gentile liberty, which had been given at that time, threatened the prerog-

[1] Cf. Acts xxi. 31 sq.

atives of the chosen people, and they may have thought that the danger might be avoided, without intrenching upon the Gentiles' freedom from the Jewish law, if the latter were required to show some respect for that law, such respect in fact as had been of old demanded of strangers dwelling within the land of Israel. It is possible, then, that the emissaries from James came to Antioch,[1] not because they had heard that Peter was eating with the Gentiles, and wished to call him to account for his conduct, but as the bearers of the decree to the Antiochian church.

It is worthy of notice that this view as to the time of the adoption of the decree affords a satisfactory and much needed explanation of the conduct of Barnabas to which Paul refers in Gal. ii. 13. It is not difficult to understand why Peter should have been influenced by the arguments of the messengers from Jerusalem, for he was the apostle of the circumcision, whose work was to lie chiefly among the Jews. But that Barnabas, Paul's fellow-apostle to the heathen, whose right to work among the Gentiles had been recognized in Jerusalem, just as Paul's had been, after living for some years in intimate fellowship with his Gentile converts, should have drawn back and separated himself from them is very strange. The only plausible explanation of his conduct is that a new idea as to their true position within the church had presented itself to him. He may not have been in full sympathy with Paul's doctrine of the Christian's complete liberty from all law of whatever kind, and he may originally have recognized Gentile converts as brethren only under the compulsion of the same kind of divine evidence as convinced the Christians of Jerusalem. But having become satisfied of their emancipation from the Jewish law, it perhaps did not occur to him that it was possible still to conserve the dignity of that law, however much he may have desired to do so, without denying their Christianity, which he could not do, and did not wish to do. The decree may have suggested to him for the first time the true way to

[1] Gal. ii. 12.

meet the difficulty, and consequently the true way to preserve the honor of Judaism while recognizing the Christianity of the Gentiles.

Of the events that occurred during the weeks and months immediately succeeding the controversy between Paul and Peter at Antioch, we have no explicit information. Paul's remonstrance apparently effected no change in the conduct of Peter and Barnabas,[1] and it must have been some time at any rate before cordial relations were restored between the Jewish and Gentile wings of the Antiochian church. Meanwhile the Judaizers, whose demands Paul had successfully resisted at Jerusalem, determined to carry the war against him, and against the Gentile Christianity for which he stood, into his own territory. Some of them may have begun their Jewish propaganda immediately after the conference, but it is probable that they received their chief impulse from the occurrence at Antioch. Perceiving, in the light of that event, that the Gospel which Paul preached meant inevitably not simply the rise of a free Gentile church in which the law should be entirely disregarded, but also the wide and increasing neglect of that law on the part of the Jews themselves, they felt that the only way to stem the rising tide of apostasy was to insist upon the circumcision of the Gentiles. They looked upon it as a life and death matter. If the Gentiles did not become Jews, the Jews would become Gentiles, and regard for the law of Moses would entirely disappear within the Christian church outside of Palestine, and Christ would thus become a minister of sin to an ever-increasing multitude of the dispersion.[2] It is hardly likely that the Judaizers would have exhibited such zeal, and would have proved themselves so bitterly and relentlessly hostile to Paul as they did, out of mere opposition to Gentile Christianity as such, and with the sole desire to make proselytes of Paul's converts. It was doubtless the fear that the Christians of Jewish birth would apostatize under the influence of their Gentile brethren that did more than anything else to add fuel to the flame of their zeal, and that

[1] See p. 208, above. [2] Gal. ii. 17.

gave its peculiar intensity and bitterness to their enmity for Paul. Not that he preached the Gospel to the Gentiles, but that he taught the Jews to disregard their law, was the accusation brought against him later at Jerusalem,[1] and though the zealots that found fault with him there may not have been in full sympathy with the Judaizers who caused him so much trouble in his missionary work, they doubtless voiced in their complaint that which was his most heinous offence, not in their eyes alone, but in the eyes of all his opponents. In Gal. vi. 12 sq., Paul declares that the Judaizers were endeavoring to force circumcision upon the Gentile converts, not in order that the law might be observed by the latter, but in order that they might themselves escape persecution from unbelieving Israel. Paul's words, both here and in Gal v. 11, imply that the persecution which the Judaizers wished to escape was due, not chiefly to the fact that they preached Christ, but to the fact that they preached a religion which the Jews believed was calculated to undermine and destroy the influence of the law, and which was actually having that very effect among the Israelites of the dispersion. It was not enough to exhibit their zeal in the work of proselytism,[2] they must, above all, counteract this fatal tendency if they would relieve Christ from the accusation of inciting to sin,[3] and themselves from persecution as promoters of apostasy.

And so Judaizers appeared at an early day in Galatia, where Paul and Barnabas had preached some time before, and with an entire disregard for the compact concluded at Jerusalem and for the official recognition which Gentile Christianity had received there, they announced to the Galatian converts that unless they became members of the household of Israel by receiving circumcision and observing the law of Moses, their faith in Christ would avail them nothing, and they would be shut out as aliens from the enjoyment of the blessings which had been promised by God only to the children of Abraham.[4] The arguments which the Judaizers were able to employ in support of their position

[1] Acts xxi. 25.
[2] Gal. vi. 13.
[3] Gal. ii. 17.
[4] Gal. iii. 7, 14, 16, 29, etc.

were very plausible. They doubtless emphasized the fact that Jesus was a Jew, and that he was the Jewish Messiah promised in the Scriptures, as Paul himself had taught them, and that consequently the blessings which he brought were for his own people, and for them alone.[1] In support of this conclusion, which constituted their main point, they evidently appealed to God's covenant with Abraham,[2] and to the divine law given through Moses,[3] asserting that that law was still binding, and without doubt confirming the assertion by calling attention to the fact that not only Christ himself, but also all his apostles, observed the law in all its parts.[4]

But they not only urged positive arguments in support of their position, they also attacked Paul, to whom the Galatians owed their belief that salvation is through faith in Christ and not by works of the law, insisting that he was not a true apostle, that he had never seen Christ and received a commission from him as the Twelve had, and that consequently his Gospel was not from God but from man, and had no independent authority.[5] Moreover, they declared that it was not simply a human Gospel but a false Gospel,[6] because it did not agree with the Gospel of the Twelve Apostles, who had been called and commissioned by Christ, and who not only observed the law themselves, but also taught that its observance was an indispensable condition of salvation.[7] Paul was in reality, therefore, not a friend to the Galatians as he had seemed to be, but an enemy, because he had led them away from the true path of life.[8] But the Judaizers went even further than this, and attacked Paul's honesty of purpose, accusing him of double dealing, in that he preached circumcision when he was among those that preferred that kind of doctrine,[9] and uncircumcision when among those to whom a Gospel of liberty was most acceptable. In other words, they asserted that his sole aim was to please men, to win their approval and applause, and to gain a following; and that conse-

[1] Cf. Gal. iii. 7 sq.
[2] Gal. iii. 6 sq., 15 sq.
[3] Gal. iii. 17.
[4] Cf. Gal. iii. 6.
[5] Cf. Gal. i.
[6] Cf. Gal. i. 6 sq.
[7] Cf. Paul's argument in Gal. ii. 6 sq.
[8] Gal. iv. 16.
[9] Cf. Gal. v. 11.

quently he suited his preaching to the tastes of those whom he addressed without any regard to the real truth.[1] It is not surprising that with such arguments and calumnies as these the Judaizers should have succeeded in unsettling the minds of the newly converted Galatians and winning many of them over to their side. Christianity had come to the Galatians through the synagogue; they had first heard it from the lips of native Jews; and they had learned from Paul himself to find in the Scriptures those prophecies which pointed forward to the Messiah Jesus whom he preached. There seemed good ground, therefore, for the assertion that Christianity was only for the Jews and for those of the Gentiles who should attach themselves as proselytes to the family of Israel. Paul's explanation of the method by which the Christian believer is released from all obligation to observe the law was at best difficult to understand, and the full appreciation of it presupposed a depth and maturity of spiritual experience which comparatively few of the Galatians could as yet have attained. And so when the Judaizers asked them if Paul had based his Gospel of liberty upon distinct and unequivocal utterances of Christ, or if he had appealed to Christ's chosen apostles in support of the radical innovation which he had introduced among them, and they were unable to say that he had, it is not to be wondered at that they should begin to question whether Paul really was all that they had supposed him to be, and whether he had not actually deceived them in preaching as he had. But whatever the exact course pursued by the Judaizers, they had evidently had considerable success in the Galatian churches before Paul wrote his epistle.[2] Some, and apparently the majority, of those whom he addressed were already beginning to observe the Jewish ceremonial law at least in part;[3] they were falling away from the grace of Christ and were attempting to secure justification by works of the law;[4] though they had begun in the Spirit, they were now striving to perfect themselves in the flesh;[5] and though they had originally received

[1] Cf. Gal. i. 10. [2] Cf. Gal. iii. 1, v. 7. [3] Gal. iv. 10.
[4] Gal. i. 6, iv. 19, v. 4, 7. [5] Gal. iii. 3.

Paul himself as an angel of God, they were now regarding him as an enemy.[1] But the case was not hopeless. The success of the Judaizers was not yet complete. The Galatian Christians, or at any rate many of them, had not yet received circumcision,[2] and Paul had reason to believe that he might yet stem the tide; might yet win back the allegiance of those who had been alienated from him and convince them of the truth of the Gospel which he had preached among them.[3]

With this end in view, he wrote them a letter, fiery, impassioned, polemic; at one moment rebuking them sharply for their fickleness, at another expressing confidence in their continued loyalty and faithfulness; severe and at times even bitter in denouncing his opponents,[4] and not without heat in repudiating their calumnies and in vindicating his own character and prerogatives.[5] From beginning to end the letter bears the stamp of Paul's own personality; and whether he attacks his enemies or defends himself, whether he discusses doctrine or urges holy living, he has constantly in mind the exigencies of the situation with which he is confronted, and everything he says has direct and sole reference to that situation. The epistle is both doctrinally and historically of the very greatest value, and yet it must be constantly borne in mind that it was intended neither as a history nor as a treatise on theology, but solely as a defence of its author and of his Gospel against a specific attack conducted along specific lines.

In the very first sentence of the epistle Paul meets the assault upon his own apostleship by asserting that he is an "apostle not from men, neither through man, but through Jesus Christ and God the Father"; and a little farther on he declares that the Gospel which he preached was received by him not from man, but through a direct revelation of Christ.[6] He then undertakes to demonstrate the truth of his assertion by a rapid sketch of his career, calling attention to the great zeal with which he had practised the

[1] Gal. iv. 16.
[2] Gal. iv. 21, v. 2, vi. 13.
[3] Cf. Gal. iv. 11, v. 10, 13, vi. 10, 18.
[4] Cf. Gal. i. 8, v. 12, vi. 12 sq.
[5] Cf. Gal. ii. 6.
[6] Gal. i. 11, 12.

Jewish religion and the bitterness with which he had persecuted the church, in order to show that his conversion was no ordinary event, but that it could be accounted for only by the direct interposition of God, who had called him by his grace and had revealed his Son in him, and that it indicated that God had some special purpose to accomplish through him. That purpose Paul asserts to have been the evangelization of the Gentiles,[1] and his Gospel of the uncircumcision he thus bases immediately upon a commission received from God himself. To substantiate still further the truth of his assertion, that he had received his Gospel from God and not from man, he calls attention to the fact that he did not confer with any one after his conversion, nor go up to Jerusalem to see the apostles, until three years later, when he had already been engaged for some time in the evangelistic work to which he had been called. Even then he spent only two weeks in Jerusalem and saw only Peter and James, and during the next eleven years he carried on his missionary work without once coming into contact with the Christians of Judea. Thus he demonstrates conclusively his independence of the original apostles and of the church of Jerusalem. But it was not enough for him to establish his independence; he must show that his independence had not led him astray. For this purpose he gives an account of the conference at which his Gospel received official approval and he and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship, that they should continue to carry on their work among the Gentiles just as they had been doing in the past. This might have sufficed to refute the charges of his enemies, but Paul relates also the occurrence that took place afterward at Antioch, in order to show that Peter, the great apostle to the Jews, had not simply recognized the legitimacy of Gentile Christianity at Jerusalem, and acknowledged Paul's call to evangelize the heathen, but that he had even gone so far as to disregard the Jewish law himself, and live like a Gentile with the Gentile Christians of Antioch. To be sure, he had drawn

[1] Gal. i. 16.

back again after a time, and separated himself from the uncircumcised, but that was due to fear, not principle, and his true belief as to the Christian's relation to the law was revealed by the course he pursued before he was called to account by the emissaries from Jerusalem. Thus Paul triumphantly refutes all the accusations of his adversaries, not only demonstrating his independence as an apostle called and commissioned directly by God, but also proving that the Christianity which he preached among the Gentiles had received ample recognition from the older apostles, whom the Judaizers had claimed as their authority for declaring his Gospel false and pernicious.

But Paul does not rest with this vindication of himself. He proceeds to restate, for the benefit of his Galatian readers, the Gospel which he had preached among them and the grounds upon which it was based. They evidently needed instruction upon the subject, and Paul devotes a large part of his epistle to it. He first summarizes briefly his argument with Peter, in which he had clearly stated his fundamental principles, and had clinched the matter by calling attention to the fact that Christ's death was all for naught, if righteousness were to be attained through the law.[1] He then turns directly to the Galatians, and after reminding them that it was Christ crucified who had been plainly and openly preached to them, he appeals to their own experience as a testimony to the truth of the Gospel of liberty which they had heard from him. He reminds them that they had received the Spirit, and that the works of the Spirit had been wrought among them, even though they were Gentiles, and though they had had no thought of receiving circumcision and observing the Jewish law. Why, then, did they turn to the law now, when it had been proved unnecessary by their own Christian experience? The argument was similar to that which had been employed at Jerusalem with such good effect. God himself had borne witness in the lives of the Gentiles to the truth of the Gospel which Paul preached. But Paul appeals to the experience not

[1] Gal. ii. 21.

of his Gentile readers alone, but also of the great Abraham, the father of the Hebrew race, upon God's covenant with whom the Jews based their claim to be the chosen people of Jehovah. Long before the law was given, Abraham was justified because he believed God, and the covenant which God made with him and with his children was conditioned not upon works, but upon faith, so that all that have Abraham's faith are truly his sons. The fact that a law was given four hundred and thirty years later could not disannul God's covenant. The promised inheritance, which had been expressly conditioned upon faith alone, could not now be conditioned upon the observance of a law. The law, in fact, was not given with any such purpose; it was intended solely as a tutor to reveal sin and thus lead men to Christ. It has, therefore, only a temporary purpose to serve, and as soon as it has accomplished that, it passes away. Christ thus becomes the end of the law to those who believe in him, and redeems them from the law whose curse they have incurred by their inability to keep it. Redeemed from it, they are henceforth entirely free from its control; they are no longer bond-servants, but sons, sons and heirs of God, because bound to Christ by faith and possessed of his Spirit.[1] After elaborating his argument at considerable length, Paul appeals finally to the Scripture story of Sarah and Hagar, which he calls an allegory, and in which he finds a prophecy of the bondage of unbelieving Israel, and of the liberty of believers in Christ, and a promise that not the former, who are bound to the law, but the latter, who are freed from it, shall enjoy the inheritance.

Before closing his epistle, he warns his readers[2] against regarding their freedom as a license to sin; reminding them that the true Christian has crucified the flesh with its passions and lusts, that the Christian life is a life not in the flesh but in the Spirit, and that only he who has the Spirit is freed from the law; so that liberty means only liberty to bring forth the fruits of the Spirit. It is clear that the same objection was brought against Paul's Gos-

[1] Gal. iii. 26, 29, iv. 6, 7. [2] Gal. v. 13 sq.

pel of liberty in Galatia as elsewhere. He was accused of making Christ a minister of sin and of breaking down all the safeguards of holiness.[1] He met the accusation by an appeal to that principle which was fundamental in his Christian system, and which he had evidently impressed upon the Galatians in the very beginning,[2] that the Christian life is not a human but a divine life, that it is the life of Christ in the believer. That he did not elaborate this doctrine as fully in the Epistle to the Galatians as in the Epistle to the Romans, was due doubtless to the fact that he had sufficiently dwelt upon it when he was with the Galatians. A large part of his epistle to them presupposes it, and can be fully understood only in the light of it.

The letter closes with a passage written by Paul's own hand.[3] He seems to have finished dictating what he had to say, and then suddenly to have had a rush of personal feeling which led him to pick up his pen for a parting word of attack and defence. After denouncing the Judaizers once more, and accusing them of selfish and dishonest motives, he reasserts the Gospel of liberty and closes with a solemn adjuration to his enemies to trouble him no more, for he bears upon his body the marks of Jesus: the stripes and the blows which he has suffered as a missionary of the cross. They are a sufficient testimony to his apostleship and a sufficient refutation of all the calumnies of his adversaries.

Paul's Epistle to the Galatians was addressed primarily to his Gentile converts, who were evidently considerably in the majority in the churches of Galatia. At the same time the Gospel which he presents so clearly was a Gospel for Jewish as well as Gentile Christians, and that there were at least some of the former in the churches to which he wrote is evident from more than one passage.[4] That he had taught his Jewish converts in Galatia to cease observing the law, and to live like Gentiles, we cannot be sure, though he must at least have insisted that they should recognize the Gentile disciples as brethren in the full sense

[1] Gal. ii. 17.
[2] Cf. Gal. iii. 2, v. 18 sq.
[3] Gal. vi. 11 sq.
[4] Gal. iii. 28, v. i.

and should fellowship with them. He must also have insisted that if they continued to observe the law in any particular, they should not do it as a means of justification. His principles were really such as to lead Jewish as well as Gentile disciples to neglect the law entirely, and in his epistle he clearly applies those principles to the former as well as to the latter.[1] So far as he himself was concerned, he had evidently lived among them like a Gentile, putting his principles into practice before them all,[2] and the difficulties which had arisen would not incline him thenceforth to look with favor upon any other course on the part of his Jewish converts, whatever he might think as to the conduct of Jews when by themselves.[3]

It was probably while Paul was still in Antioch, before he departed upon his second missionary journey, that he wrote the letter to the Galatians which we have been considering. It is true that it is the almost universal opinion of scholars that the epistle was written upon Paul's third missionary journey,[4] either on his way to Ephesus or during his three years' stay there,[5] the Galatian visit, mentioned in Acts xviii. 23, being commonly reckoned as the second of the two to which Paul refers in his epistle.[6] But when the churches addressed by Paul are identified with the churches of Antioch, Iconium, and Lystra, where he preached upon his first missionary journey, the visit mentioned in Acts xviii. 23 becomes the third

[1] Cf. especially Gal. v. 1.

[2] Cf. Gal. iv. 12.

[3] The agreement into which Paul entered at Jerusalem provided for the continued observance of the law by Jewish Christians. He could take no exception to such observance, provided it was not practised where there were Gentile Christians and where it would result in the withdrawal of the Jewish disciples from their Gentile brethren and the consequent implication that the latter were religiously on a lower plane than the former.

[4] Described in Acts xviii. 23 sq.

[5] Acts xix. 1 sq. Lightfoot puts the composition of the epistle still later, maintaining that it was written in Macedonia, between the First and Second Epistles to the Corinthians. In support of this opinion he urges the similarity of subject and style between Galatians, 2 Corinthians, and Romans; but the truth is that the resemblances are far less striking than the differences. Galatians, in fact, deals with an entirely different set of problems and reveals an historic situation of which there is not the slightest trace in either of the other epistles.

[6] Gal. iv. 13.

instead of the second Galatian visit, and it is therefore necessary, if we follow the account in Acts, to put the epistle before instead of after that visit; for Gal. iv. 13 implies that Paul had been in Galatia only twice before he wrote.[1] The epistle, then, might have been written during his second missionary journey, between the time when he left Galatia[2] and returned to Antioch.[3] But if Paul saw the Galatian Christians during the interval that elapsed between the conference at Jerusalem and the writing of his epistle, it is exceedingly difficult to understand why he should be obliged to give them in his letter so full an account of that conference and of the events that followed. It seems clear that in Gal. ii. Paul is telling his readers of events about which they had before heard nothing, at any rate from him. But it is incredible that after his experience with Judaizers in Jerusalem, and later in Antioch, he could have been so short-sighted as to fail to foresee that they would yet cause him trouble, and hence take no pains at all to fortify his own converts against their machinations. It is incredible, in fact, that he can have visited Galatia after the occurrences referred to and have said absolutely nothing about them. He lays great stress upon those events when he writes to the Galatians. Why should he have maintained absolute silence respecting them when he was with them? This consideration seems sufficient to prove that the epistle must have been written during the interval between the conference at Jerusalem and Paul's next visit to Galatia, which the author of the Acts mentions in xvi. 1 sq.

Against this conclusion there is no serious objection to be urged, while there are, on the contrary, many indications that the conclusion is correct. In the first place, the epistle seems to have been written very soon after the Judaizers had begun their work in Galatia; for while they had already met with considerable success, the defection of the Galatians was evidently in its early stages when

[1] τὸ πρότερον is the phrase used. [2] Acts xvi. 6.

[3] Acts xviii. 22. This is the opinion of Rendall, who supposes that the epistle was written in Corinth soon after Paul's arrival there (*Expositor*, 1894, Vol. IX. p. 254 sq.).

Paul wrote. In the second place, the apostle expresses his surprise, not simply that his converts were falling away and accepting a different Gospel, but that they were doing it so quickly.[1] It is evident that no very long interval had elapsed since the time when he first preached the Gospel to them. Again, it is to be noticed that the two visits to which Paul refers in Gal. iv. 13 seem to have been separated by only a short interval. It is so difficult, indeed, to keep them apart that it has even been denied that he refers to more than one.[2] But if our assumption be correct, we are to identify the first occasion on which Paul preached the Gospel to the Galatians with his trip eastward from Antioch to Derbe, and the second with the return trip to Antioch, when he revisited the churches he had newly founded. Thus his words seem better satisfied than if an interval of some years be inserted between the two occasions. Those who assume another and later visit to Galatia, before the writing of Paul's epistle, are obliged to reckon these two as one; but it was in reality only on his eastward journey and not on his return westward, that Paul preached to the Galatians, "because of an infirmity of the flesh." Still farther it should be remarked that the epistle contains no personal greetings from any one in Paul's company and there is no hint that he had among his companions any one with whom the Galatians were acquainted. But throughout the greater part of his second missionary journey, both Silas and Timothy were with him, the latter himself a Galatian, and the names of both of them appear in the salutations of the two epistles to the Thessalonians, which were written during that journey. Finally it is to be observed that there is no sign in any other of Paul's epistles that the Judaizers were causing him serious trouble. That fact would seem to indicate that he had fought his battle with them and won his victory over them at an early day, at a time before he had begun his missionary work in Western Asia and in Europe, so that when he went thither, he went forewarned

[1] Gal. i. 6. The words οὕτως ταχέως are emphatic.
[2] Cf. Volkmar: *Paulus von Damascus bis zum Galaterbrief*, S. 100 sq.

and forearmed and took pains to fortify his churches against the adversaries that had done so much mischief in Galatia. But if the Epistle to the Galatians was written between the conference at Jerusalem and the Galatian visit referred to in Acts xvi. 1 sq., it is natural to think of Antioch as the place of composition; for Paul returned thither after the conference and went thence, apparently with no long delay upon the way, to Galatia.[1] There is, indeed, a possible hint in Gal. ii. 11, that Paul was actually writing at Antioch, and not long after the event there recorded. In the light of all that has been said, we shall probably be safe in concluding that the epistle was written soon after the controversy with Peter, while Paul was still in Antioch and before he had started on his second missionary journey.[2]

The epistle to the Galatians is thus the earliest of Paul's epistles known to us, antedating by some two years the First Epistle to the Thessalonians, which is commonly regarded as the oldest that we have.[3] That it should have

[1] Acts xv. 41, xvi. 1.

[2] Volkmar (*l.c.* S. 31 sq.) also holds that the Epistle to the Galatians was written at Antioch, but he assigns it to a later time, when Paul was in Antioch at the close of his second missionary journey (Acts xviii. 22). He maintains, however, that Paul was only once (Acts xvi. 6) in Galatia (which he regards as North Galatia) before he wrote, and not after but before the conference at Jerusalem, which he thinks displaced by the author of the Acts.

[3] It is an interesting fact that Marcion put the Epistle to the Galatians first in his New Testament Canon. Whether he was actuated by chronological considerations, we do not know. The difficulty of putting so doctrinal an epistle as Galatians earlier than the much simpler epistles to the Thessalonians, which suggests itself at once, is less real than it may seem at first sight. There can be no doubt that the great underlying principles of Paul's Gospel, which appear in the Epistle to the Galatians, were clear to him long before he wrote any of his epistles; and the lack of emphasis upon them in the Thessalonian letters cannot be due to the early date of those letters, but only to the purpose for which they were written. There is nothing in Galatians, as there is possibly in Romans and in the epistles of the captivity, which points to a development in Paul's thought beyond the positions held by him at the time of the conference at Jerusalem. The epistles to the Thessalonians can be assigned an earlier date than Galatians, on the ground of their omission of the doctrinal element which characterizes the latter, only if they be put before the Council at Jerusalem and the Antiochian trouble which followed. This Clemen actually does (*Chronologie der Paulinischen Briefe*, S. 205 sq.), but without sufficient warrant. On the ordinary, and without doubt correct view, that the council preceded Paul's second missionary journey, during which the Thessalonian letters were written, no argument against the early date of Galatians has any validity. See also p. 147, above.

been written at this early date, before Paul left Antioch, is very natural. Doubtless the council at Jerusalem and especially the controversy at Antioch were the signal for the Judaizers to begin their campaign against Paul, and it was inevitable that they should speedily find their way to Galatia, which was near at hand and recently evangelized, and the churches of which were so largely composed of Gentile converts. It was natural also that tidings of their work should quickly reach the apostle at Antioch, and if he did not happen to be able to leave for Galatia at once, he would of course write to them immediately.

At the time Paul wrote, the division in the Antiochian church which had been caused by Peter's visit may still have been giving him trouble, and may have contributed to the distress and anxiety which are evident on every page of his letter. But however that may be, it was apparently not long afterward that the difficulties had so far settled themselves that he was able to start again upon a missionary tour, and as we should expect, he hastened at once to Galatia. Upon this journey he took with him as his companion, not Barnabas, who had accompanied him before, but Silas, who, according to Acts xv. 22, was one of the messengers appointed by the church of Jerusalem to carry their decree to Antioch,[1] and who is doubtless to be identified with the Silvanus whom Paul mentions in his epistles.[2] The separation of Paul and

[1] There is apparently some confusion in the account, for in vs. 33 Silas is said to have gone back to Jerusalem, and there is no notice of his return to Antioch. This fact led some copyist to insert the statement: "But it seemed good to Silas to abide there," which appears in some late manuscripts and is found in our Authorized Version. It may well be that Silas and Judas Barsabbas actually returned to Antioch with Paul and Barnabas, to carry the greetings of the Mother Church and to assure the Gentile disciples that they were recognized as brethren by the Christians of Jerusalem, but their connection with the decree is problematical. Had Silas been one of the emissaries from Jerusalem who brought the decree to Antioch and took Peter to task for his conduct, Paul could hardly have cared to take him on a missionary tour, and he would probably not have cared to go. Silas was with Paul apparently during the greater part of the second missionary journey, after which we hear no more of him, except in 1 Peter v. 12, where, under the name of Silvanus, he appears as the author's amanuensis.

[2] 1 Thess. i. 1; 2 Thess. i. 1; 2 Cor. i. 19. The names are the same, Silas being the Greek and Silvanus the Latin form. Weizsäcker questions the

Barnabas is stated by the author of the Acts to have been the result of a disagreement concerning John Mark, who had deserted the missionaries when they were in Pamphylia some years before.[1] It is possible, however, that the real reason lay deeper than this; that their difference of principle touching the relations of Jews and Gentiles within the church, which the recent occurrences at Antioch had revealed, made farther association in the work among the heathen seem undesirable to both of them. That the disagreement was not such as to alienate them permanently, is clear from Paul's reference to Barnabas in 1 Cor. ix. 6, which, if it does not show that the two men were again together, at least indicates that they were not enemies. Barnabas, therefore, was probably led finally to see the untenable nature of the position he took at Antioch and to range himself again upon Paul's side.[2]

After passing through Syria and Cilicia, Paul hastened westward into the province of Galatia to revisit in company with Silas the churches which had been founded some years before by himself and Barnabas, and to which he had recently written his epistle. The letter had apparently had the desired effect; for Paul was received in a friendly spirit, and one of his Galatian converts, Timothy, became his companion at this time and continued until the close of his life his dearest and most trusted friend.[3]

identity of the two men, suggesting that Luke displaced the Silvanus of Paul's epistles with the Silas of Jerusalem in order to emphasize Paul's connection with the Mother Church (*l.c.* S. 247; Eng. Trans., Vol. I. p. 292).

[1] Acts xiii. 13, xv. 38.

[2] It was impossible for either Barnabas or Peter to occupy permanently the ground they took at Antioch. Either they must go back to the position of James, or go on to the position of Paul, so far as it related to the observance of the law. If my theory in regard to the authorship of 1 Peter be correct, Barnabas must have reached ultimately the view of Paul upon the subject in dispute, and must have accepted also the fundamental principles of the Pauline Gospel upon which that view was based. See below, p. 485 sq. After separating from Paul, Barnabas went with John Mark to Cyprus, his native home. He is not again mentioned in the writings of the period except in 1 Cor. ix. 6. Mark appears again as Paul's companion in Col. iv. 10, 2 Tim. iv. 11, and Philemon 24, and as the companion of the author of the first epistle of Peter in 1 Peter v. 13. On his connection with the second Gospel, see below, p. 485 sq. That he was subsequently on such friendly terms with Paul shows that the separation at this time left no permanent unpleasantness.

[3] Cf. especially Phil. ii. 20.

There is no hint that Paul ever had any more difficulty with these churches, which were so dear to him, but which had caused him such anxiety and distress. His victory over the Judaizers seems to have been complete, and they appear to have given him no farther trouble, at any rate in Galatia, and no serious trouble anywhere.[1]

The most striking incident connected with this Galatian visit is recorded in Acts xvi. 3, where it is stated that Paul circumcised Timothy "because of the Jews that were in those parts; for they all knew that his father was a Greek." The truth of this report has been doubted by many scholars, on the ground that the action is inconsistent with Paul's attitude at Jerusalem touching the proposition to circumcise Titus, and also with his principles so clearly and repeatedly avowed in his Epistle to the Galatians.[2] It should be remarked, however, that the cases of Timothy and Titus were by no means parallel. Titus was a Greek. Timothy, though his father was a Greek, was the son of a Jewish mother. In the case of Titus also there was a principle at stake, and to have circumcised him under the circumstances would have been to sacrifice that liberty of the Gentiles which Paul had gone to Jerusalem on purpose to maintain. It should be noticed, moreover, that there are other passages in Paul's epistles of a different tenor from those referred to, which make it clear that such action as he is reported to have taken in Timothy's case would not have been regarded by him under ordinary circumstances as inconsistent and out of place, provided it could be made to contribute to the spread of the Gospel.[3] We are not warranted, therefore, in asserting on general grounds that Paul cannot have circumcised the son of a Jewess under any circumstances. If he wished to have him accompany him upon his missionary journeys, where it might prove at times a real advantage for him to be able to mingle freely

[1] Paul visited the Galatians again some years later (Acts xviii. 23) and they contributed with his other churches to the great fund which he collected for the poor saints of Jerusalem (1 Cor. xvi. 1).

[2] See especially Gal. v. 1 sq. and compare 1 Cor. vii. 18.

[3] Cf. Rom. i. 16, iii. 1, xi. 14, and especially 1 Cor. ix. 20.

with Jews, it is conceivable that he might have taken the unusual step.

But it is not to be denied that there are certain peculiar difficulties in this particular case which cannot be met by the mere general considerations that have been urged. The visit to Derbe and Lystra, recorded in Acts xvi. 1 sq., took place not long after the conference at Jerusalem and the controversy at Antioch, when Paul must have been peculiarly sensitive upon the subject of circumcision and the observance of the Jewish law, and when he must have been unusually careful to avoid everything that might be interpreted by his enemies as a stultification of the principles for which he had so recently done battle. There is no time in his life when we should suppose him less likely to circumcise one of his converts. Moreover, Timothy was a Galatian, a member of one of the churches addressed in that very epistle in which Paul deprecates circumcision in the strongest terms. If he had circumcised Timothy before he wrote his epistle, why is there no hint of the fact in such a passage as Gal. v. 1 sq.? Why is there no reference there to the exceptional character of Timothy's case which must have been in the thoughts of many of his readers? Could he have spoken in such positive and sweeping terms with the memory of that case fresh in his mind? Could he have done it even if Timothy had not been a Galatian?

On the other hand, if the epistle was written, as maintained above, before the journey recorded in Acts xv. 40 sq., it is scarcely less difficult to understand the occurrence in question. It might be said indeed that having conquered his adversaries and won the renewed confidence and allegiance of the Galatians, he could venture now without fear of misinterpretation to perform an act which at any other time would have been misunderstood. And yet what elaborate explanations and apologies he would have been obliged to make in order that his act might not plunge the weak brethren again into difficulties and open the door for a new influx of Judaizing zeal! And what was the great end that should justify such a risk? That he did not

consider it necessary for all his companions and helpers to be circumcised, is clear from the case of Titus, who was one of his most efficient and valued assistants, and did excellent service in connection with the Corinthian church.[1] Evidently Timothy might have accomplished much, even though uncircumcised, and his companionship would have brought no more reproach upon Paul than the companionship of Titus. While if Paul felt the need of a Jewish helper, he already had one in the person of Silas. In the light of all that has been said it must be recognized that grave difficulties beset the account in Acts xvi. 3, and its immediate juxtaposition to the statement that Paul and Silas delivered the decree, which had been adopted at Jerusalem, to the churches which they visited[2] does not enhance its trustworthiness. And yet the report cannot be regarded as an invention. It is altogether probable that Timothy, though the son of a Greek father, was actually circumcised, and that too under circumstances which excited remark and caused the fact to be remembered. May it be that he was one of Paul's Galatian converts who had received circumcision at the instance of the Judaizers? And may it be that when Paul arrived in Galatia, he found him so regretful for what had taken place, and so earnest and zealous in his support of the true Gospel, that he chose him as a companion, with the declaration "circumcision is nothing and uncircumcision is nothing; but a new creature"? It would have been easy in that case for the tradition to grow up that the Gentile Timothy, Paul's convert and dearest fellow-worker, had received circumcision at Paul's own hands, and the fact that his mother was a Jewess might naturally seem to supply the explanation.

6. The Evangelization of Macedonia

After leaving Lystra, the home of Timothy, Paul and his companions travelled westward through the province of Galatia, visiting doubtless both Iconium and Antioch and possibly other places not known to us. It is to this

[1] Cf. 2 Cor. ii. 13, vii. 6, 13 sq., viii. 6, 16, etc. [2] Acts xvi. 4.

journey through the southern part of the Galatian province, or Phrygia-Galatica, that Luke refers in vs. 6, and not to a trip through North Galatia. Ramsay has shown that the phrase which Luke employs[1] correctly describes that part of the Galatian province in which Antioch and Iconium were situated, and there is no ground whatever for inserting at this point a visit to North Galatia, which would have taken the travellers entirely out of their way, and a satisfactory motive for which it is impossible to discover. Paul had apparently intended to hasten on westward in the direction of Ephesus, after a brief stay in Galatia, but for some reason he was "forbidden of the Holy Ghost to speak the word in Asia,"[2] and consequently turned northward toward Bithynia until he came opposite Mysia, when, finding himself again stopped, he made his way westward through Mysia, without preaching anywhere until he arrived at Troas on the Ægean Sea.[3] He had thus come all the way from Pisidian Antioch to Troas, apparently without stopping to do any evangelistic work. He seems to have been looking all the time for an open field. He felt the whole heathen world calling him, but he did not know where to begin. Twice his designs had been frustrated, and he had finally found himself, when at the frontier of Bithynia, forced either to turn back or to go on westward. He had chosen the latter course, and was now on the shore of the Mediterranean, still without a field. All Europe lay before him, but Asia lay behind still unevangelized. Should he go forward, or should he turn

[1] *τὴν φρυγίαν καὶ Γαλατικὴν χώραν.* See Ramsay: *Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 74 sq.

[2] Ramsay (*St. Paul, the Traveller and Roman Citizen*, p. 194 sq.) is very likely right in following the inferior manuscripts in Acts xvi. 6, and reading with the *textus receptus* *διελθόντες* instead of *διῆλθον*. But he has shown (p. 211) that even if *διῆλθον* be read, as in the great manuscripts and the Revised Version, the sentence can be interpreted in practically the same way, making the prohibition against preaching in Asia follow and not precede the work in Galatia. See also Gifford in the *Expositor*, Vol. X., 1894, § 16 sq.

[3] *παρελθόντες* in Acts xvi. 8 must be understood, not in the sense of passing alongside of Mysia, but of passing through it without preaching, that is, "neglecting" it, for Troas could be reached by Paul only through Mysia (cf. Ramsay: *St. Paul*, p. 196 sq.). Blass (in his *Acta Apostolorum*) reads *διελθόντες*, on the authority of the Bezan text, but the other reading is to be preferred.

back and make another experiment? Whatever his hope may have been of ultimately preaching the Gospel in Europe, he evidently had not intended to go thither until he had established Christianity in Western Asia. It might well seem to him a step of doubtful expediency, to leave the better-known lands and peoples and plunge into new and unfamiliar scenes. It was while he was debating the question, uncertain what course to pursue, that he had the dream which Luke reports in Acts xvi. 9. "There was a man of Macedonia standing, beseeching him, and saying, Come over into Macedonia, and help us." He regarded the dream as an indication of God's will that he should take the decisive step; that he should leave Asia behind and press on to a new continent. The way in which the author represents Paul as led and guided by the Spirit throughout this entire journey from Galatia to Troas, and over into Macedonia, is very significant; and it is undoubtedly true to Paul's own experience. As he looked back upon these days of uncertainty and indecision, when obstacles hemmed him in on this side and on that in unaccountable ways, and prevented him from carrying out one plan after another, it is not surprising that he saw God's providence directing his every step and leading him on to the larger work across the seas.

It is just at this juncture, when Paul, in obedience to the summons he had received, set sail from Troas for Macedonia, that there begins, without warning or introduction, the first of those passages containing the pronoun "we," which are scattered through the second half of the Book of Acts. There are four of the passages, all of them containing accounts of journeys: the first, Acts xvi. 10–17, describing the journey from Troas to Philippi, with some events that occurred in the latter city; the second, Acts xx. 5–16, the journey from Philippi to Miletus, which took place some years later; the third, if it be separated from the second,[1] Acts xxi. 1–18, the continuation of the same journey from Miletus to Jerusalem; the fourth, Acts xxvii. 1–xxviii. 16, the sea voyage from Cæsarea to Rome. These

[1] But see below, p. 338.

passages begin and end abruptly in every case, and are distinguished from other parts of the book by conciseness of style, vividness of description, and wealth of detail. They are evidently notes of travel written by one of Paul's own companions, who was a participant in the events which he records. Coming directly as they do from the pen of an eyewitness, they possess a unique value and are universally recognized as exceptionally trustworthy. But they present to the student of the Book of Acts a problem of great difficulty. That the author of the book made extensive use of written sources in composing his work, as he did in composing the third Gospel, there can be no doubt; but the question is, are the "we" passages to be regarded as a part of his sources or are we to suppose that in them the author of the book is himself the narrator? In the latter case the Book of Acts and the third Gospel are from the pen of one of Paul's companions. This is the traditional opinion, and is still maintained by many scholars.[1] But the supposition is beset with serious difficulties; for the knowledge of events displayed by the author is less accurate and complete than might be expected in one who had been personally associated for any length of time with Paul himself. It is true that such a man might easily be ill informed concerning the history of the church of Jerusalem and might be ignorant of much of Paul's early life, if he did not conceive the plan of writing his work until after the apostle's death, when adequate sources of information were largely closed to him. But his work betrays a similar lack of knowledge even concerning the latter part of Paul's career, during which the author of the "we" passages must have been intimately associated with him, at least a part of the time; and certain critical periods in Paul's life are treated as we should hardly expect them to be by one of his own companions.[2]

[1] Cf. especially Weiss: *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, S. 583 sq. (Eng. Trans., Vol. II. p. 347). Among the most recent writers, Blass (*Acta Apostolorum*) and Ramsay (*St. Paul, the Traveller and Roman Citizen*) maintain the identity of the writer of the "we" passages and the author of the Acts.

[2] Compare, for instance, the idea, which finds frequent expression, that Paul went to Jerusalem immediately after his conversion and did missionary

It seems necessary, therefore, to conclude that the author of the Acts was not identical with the eyewitness who appears in certain parts of his book. If the "we" passages then are to be ascribed to another hand, the question naturally suggests itself, did they constitute originally parts of a larger work? and if so, did the author of the Book of Acts make use of other portions of that work? This double question has been answered in the affirmative by many scholars in recent years. In fact, there seems to be a growing unanimity upon the subject, and not a few have thought they could trace the document which contained the "we" passages through the greater part of Acts.[1] That an extended and generally trustworthy source, beginning with the thirteenth chapter and containing an account of Paul's missionary labors, underlies the second half of the book,[2] can hardly be doubted in the light of recent investigations; and it is of course natural to regard the "we" paragraphs as a part of that source, and the whole consequently as the work of a companion of Paul. In favor of this assumption may be urged not only the use of the first personal pronoun,

work there (ix. 26 sq., xxii. 17 sq., xxvi. 20); the account of the council at Jerusalem including the decree (xv.); the report concerning Timothy's circumcision (xvi. 3); the lack of all reference to the great collection, which engaged so much of Paul's attention during the latter part of his missionary career; the silence touching Paul's dealings with the Corinthian church during his stay in Ephesus, and the omission of the name of Titus, who was so prominent a figure at that time in Corinth as well as earlier in Jerusalem; the emphasis upon that part of Paul's work which was of least importance in so many of the cities which he visited; as, *e.g.*, in the cities of Galatia, in Philippi, Thessalonica, Corinth, etc. Upon his failure to understand Paul's theology, little stress, perhaps, can be laid, for so few of Paul's followers comprehended him fully; and yet we should hardly expect one so intimately acquainted with him as the writer of the "we" passages, to be so unfamiliar with his Gospel as the author of the Acts seems to have been.

[1] So, for instance, Spitta (*Die Apostelgeschichte*, 1891) and Jüngst (*Quellen der Apostelgeschichte*, 1895). Wendt (in Meyer's Commentary on Acts, 7th edition) traces the source through the latter half of Acts, beginning with xi. 19. He also emphasizes the fact (*Theol. Studien und Kritiken*, 1892) that the pronoun "we" occurs in xi. 28, according to Codex D. According to Clemen (*Chronologie der Paulinischen Briefe*, S. 110 sq.) and Hilgenfeld (*Zeitschrift für wiss. Theologie*, 1895 sq.), the source begins with chap. xiii. Weizsäcker (*l.c.* S. 204 sq.; Eng. Trans., Vol. I. p. 242 sq.) and more recently Sorof (*Entstehung der Apostelgeschichte*, S. 14) deny that the "we" passages constitute a part of the larger source or sources used by the author — a source which Sorof traces through the entire book.

[2] And possibly also a part of chap. xi.

but also and especially the general uniformity of style between the "we" sections and other portions of the book.[1] At the same time, the fact must be recognized that the passages in question may have been originally entirely independent of the context in which they now occur, and that the author of the Acts combined them with the general source from which he drew his outline of Paul's career. That that source was one only, and that they constituted originally a part of it, cannot be asserted with the same assurance with which we assume the fact of its existence.[2]

From Troas Paul and his companions, among whom were Silas, Timothy,[3] and the unknown author of the "we" passages, took ship for Neapolis and thence made their way, apparently without delay, to the important city of Philippi, which lay some eight miles inland. It was in the neighborhood of Philippi, in the year 42 B.C., that Octavius and Antony won their great and decisive victory over Brutus and Cassius, and in honor of that event the city had been made a Roman colony. Its citizens were Roman citizens, and its laws were Roman laws. The city was in fact, so far as language, government, and customs went, a miniature Rome. In this thoroughly Romanized town Paul's missionary labors in Europe began. There seem to have been few Jews in the place, for they had apparently no synagogue, and were accustomed to meet for

[1] See especially Spitta, *l.c.* S. 235 sq., 257 sq.

[2] Nowhere else is the source which the author of the Acts used marked by anything like the vividness, preciseness, and fulness of detail that characterize the "we" sections. If they formed part of a larger whole, the remainder of the document from which they were taken must have been very meagre, as is clear when the evident additions of the author of the Acts are eliminated. That a companion of Paul writing an account of his missionary career should relate with such minuteness three episodes in his life, simply because he happened to be an eyewitness of them, and should content himself with such brief references to the rest of his career, is not altogether what we should expect. Were it not for the identity of diction between the "we" passages and other parts of the book, and the lack of any sign of a break between the former and their immediate context, it would be easiest to suppose that the author of the Acts, coming into possession of fragments of a journal dealing with periods covered in the general source, which he was using, substitnted their fuller and more explicit account for the briefer record contained in the latter. Upon the composition of the Book of Acts, see also p. 433, below.

[3] Phil. i. 1, ii. 19 sq.

prayer by the river bank without the walls.[1] In the cities of Galatia Paul had begun his work in the synagogues, and following the same principle, he sought the Jews' place of worship on the Sabbath, and told his message to those that came thither. The author speaks only of women, as if no men were present, and among them he singles out as worthy of special mention a proselyte Lydia, who was apparently a woman of some wealth and consequence[2] and who after her conversion entertained Paul and his companions in her own house. No other converts are mentioned in Acts except the jailor and his household. But "the brethren" are referred to in xvi. 40 as if there were already many of them, and in his Epistle to the Philippians Paul alludes to two women, Euodia and Syntyche,[3] and three men, Epaphroditus,[4] Synzygos, and Clement,[5] while in the opening of the epistle he addresses not only the Philippian disciples in general, but also the bishops and deacons, showing that the church must have had a considerable membership at the time he wrote.[6]

Of Paul's work in Philippi the author of the Acts tells us very little. The greater part of his account is devoted to Paul's arrest and imprisonment, which took place as the result of a miracle performed by him upon a maid "possessed with a spirit of divination."[7] The maid thus described was probably a ventriloquist, and as ventriloquism was commonly believed among the ancients to be due to supernatural influence, and to imply the possession of superhuman insight, it was natural that she should acquire the reputation common enough in those days of being a prophetess, a reputation which her masters were not slow

[1] Acts xvi. 13. The text underlying the Authorized Version is doubtless to be preferred at this point to the text reproduced in the Revised Version; "where they were wont to meet for prayer," instead of "where we supposed there was a place of prayer." See Blass, *in loc.*

[2] Acts xvi. 15. [3] Phil. iv. 2. [4] Phil. ii. 25, iv. 18. [5] Phil. iv. 3.

[6] It is interesting to notice that not only in Philippi but also in Thessalonica and Berœa, Paul's success among the women is especially referred to by Luke. That their influence was felt at least in the church of Philippi is clear from Paul's statement in Phil. iv. 3, that Euodia and Syntyche had labored with him in the Gospel. On the position of women in Macedonia, see Lightfoot's Commentary on Philippians, p. 55 sq.

[7] Acts xvi. 16.

to turn to their own account. The maid, we are told, followed Paul and his companions for some days, and testified publicly to their divine mission. What led her to do so, and why her testimony so annoyed Paul, we do not know; but as Christ frequently did under similar circumstances, he finally turned upon her and commanded the spirit to come out of her. Paul testifies to his own belief in the reality of demons in 1 Cor. x. 20, and to his exercise of miraculous powers in 2 Cor. xii. 12, so that there is nothing in the account to betray the hand of a later writer. The occurrence was doubtless related by the eyewitness who wrote the document which Luke quotes in vs. 10 sq.[1]

The first personal pronoun is not used after vs. 17, and how much of that which follows comes from the "we" source, is uncertain. But there is no reason, at any rate, to question the fact of the arrest and imprisonment; for Paul himself refers not only in Philippians,[2] but also in 1 Thessalonians,[3] to the persecution and ill treatment which he had endured while in Philippi,[4] and the latter passage implies that he had been obliged to leave the city in consequence of his troubles there. Nor is there any reason to doubt the connection of the arrest of Paul and Silas[5] with the occurrence related in vs. 18; for though Paul's act hardly constituted a basis for the institution of legal proceedings against him, it could not but arouse the enmity of the girl's masters, and it was easy for them, by accusing these travelling Jews of teaching strange and unlawful customs, to play upon the preju-

[1] For a plausible explanation of the event, see Ramsay: *St. Paul, the Traveller and Roman Citizen*, p. 216.

[2] Phil. i. 30. [3] 1 Thess. ii. 2.

[4] He says nothing, however, of the remarkable deliverance recorded in Acts.

[5] The Book of Acts mentions the arrest of only Paul and Silas, and says nothing of Timothy and the other companion of Paul. It may be that only Paul and Silas were arrested because they were the leaders or because they alone were Jews. At any rate, we cannot argue from the omission of Timothy's name in the account of Paul's work both in Philippi and in Thessalonica that he was not with Paul in either city; for Phil. i. 1, ii. 19, 1 Thess. i. 1, iii. 1 sq., and 2 Thess. i. 1 clearly imply that he assisted in the establishment of Christianity in both places. On the other hand, the unnamed author of the "we" source evidently did not accompany Paul to Thessalonica, and it is to be doubted whether he was with him during his whole stay in Philippi.

dices, not only of the populace who instinctively hated Jews and were ready to believe any evil of them, but also of the magistrates who were jealous of the honor of their city as a Roman colony. The charge brought against Paul lacked definiteness, to be sure, and would hardly have borne investigation, but the magistrates seem to have taken the guilt of the accused men for granted, and to have beaten and imprisoned them without a trial.[1] It was doubtless the realization of the illegality and unbecoming haste of their action, that led them to release the prisoners on the following day without further examining their case. Why Paul and Silas[2] did not announce the fact that they were Roman citizens as soon as they were brought before the magistrates instead of waiting until the next day, we are not told. The law of the state guaranteed to Roman citizens immunity from scourging, and on another occasion Paul is reported to have saved himself from the indignity by claiming his legal rights.[3] It seems strange that he did not do the same thing in Philippi. But that for some reason he did not always choose to assert the prerogative of a Roman citizen, or that the assertion did not always avail, is proved by 2 Cor. xi. 25, where he informs his readers that he had been thrice beaten with rods.

How long Paul remained in Philippi, we do not know. The account in Acts would lead us to suppose that he was there but a short time; but it is certain that he remained long enough to gather quite a number of converts, and to lay the foundation of a strong church which he always regarded with peculiar affection, and whose faithfulness and unwavering loyalty to him was a source of perpetual joy and gratitude.[4] From the Philippians Paul consented, contrary to his usual custom, to receive financial aid on more than one occasion.[5] They contributed to his needs while he was in Thessalonica,[6] and again in Corinth,[7] and when he was a prisoner in Rome some years later, they did the same thing.[8] Indeed Paul's epistle to them seems to

[1] Acts xvi. 37. [2] They were both Romans according to Acts xvi. 37.
[3] Acts xxii. 25. [5] Phil. iv. 15. [7] 2 Cor. xi. 9.
[4] Phil. i. 3 sq., ii. 12, iv. 1. [6] Phil. iv. 16. [8] Phil. iv. 10, 18.

have been written chiefly for the purpose of thanking them for their kindness in this respect.[1] There is none of his epistles so filled with expressions of joy, and none that betrays such confidence and satisfaction, as his letter to his best-beloved church written from Rome some ten years after its foundation.[2]

There is no hint that Paul felt the hostility of Jews or Jewish Christians while he was in Philippi. The trouble which he had there was brought upon him by heathen, and the Jews seem to have had nothing whatever to do with it. It is true that the persecutions which the Christians of Philippi were called upon to endure after his departure[3] were apparently due to Jewish as well as heathen prejudice, but there is no sign that the church ever suffered from the machinations of Judaizers. The disagreements and divisions which Paul deprecates in his epistle to them were seemingly the result of personal and not doctrinal differences. A spirit of jealousy and rivalry had made its way into the church,[4] and was causing trouble, especially between two women who had labored with Paul "in the gospel," and whom he held in high esteem.[5] The difficulty was evidently not of a very serious character, for it did not prevent him from expressing his great joy and confidence in the church to which he was writing; but at the same time it was serious enough to draw from him earnest words of warning and of exhortation. The immunity from Judaistic attacks which the Philippian church enjoyed may have been due to the fact that there were comparatively few Jews in Philippi, and that their credit and influence were small.[6] But inasmuch as in Thessalonica, where the Jews were certainly more numerous, there seems to have been a like immunity, this reason can hardly be regarded as sufficient. It is more probable that after his experience in Galatia, Paul was on his guard, and that he

[1] Phil. ii. 25, iv. 19. [2] Upon the epistle itself see below, p. 385 sq.
[3] Phil. i. 28–30. [4] Phil. ii. 2 sq. [5] Phil. iv. 2 sq.
[6] There is no passage in Paul's epistle which proves that the Christians whom he addressed were exclusively Gentiles; but it is altogether probable that the great majority of them were, and that the Jewish contingency within the church was of insignificant size and influence.

forewarned both the Philippians and Thessalonians against Judaizers. The effect produced by his Epistle to the Galatians shows that all that was needed in order to forestall such Judaizers was to show that he had himself been called by God to evangelize the Gentiles, and that even the apostles at Jerusalem had recognized his right to preach the Gospel which he had received from God, and not from man.[1] It was not by Judaistic, but by antinomian tendencies, that Paul was chiefly troubled in the Philippian church.[2] Such antinomianism was very natural in converts from heathendom, and he had to combat it in more than one epistle.

From Philippi, Paul and his companions travelled southward through Amphipolis and Apollonia to Thessalonica, the capital, and at the same time the largest and most important city of Macedonia. It was characteristic of Paul that when compelled to leave Philippi, he did not go into retirement or seek some less prominent and important field of labor, but immediately betook himself to the chief city of the province. In Thessalonica, a great commercial metropolis, the Jews were naturally more numerous than in Philippi, and they had a synagogue, which Paul, according to the Acts, visited on three successive Sabbaths, and where he proclaimed Jesus as the Messiah.[3] The summary of his preaching, given in Acts xvii. 2, 3, is based evidently not upon direct knowledge of what Paul actually said in Thessalonica, but upon the author's inference as to what he must have said in addressing Jews. The discourse recorded in Acts xiii. made it unnecessary to do more here than to state the subject of his preaching, which the author assumed, of course, to have been the same as on all similar occasions. In addressing a Jewish audience, a Christian preacher must always prove that Jesus was the Messiah,[4] and this could best be done by showing that, according to Scripture prophecy, the Messiah must suffer and die and rise again, just as Jesus had suffered and died and risen.

[1] There is no reference to Judaizers in either of the epistles to the Thessalonians, and the doctrine of liberty from the Jewish law is not mentioned.

[2] Cf. Phil. iii. 19.

[3] Acts xvii. 3.

[4] Cf. Acts ii., iii. 12 sq., ix. 22, xiii. 16 sq., etc.

According to the Acts,[1] Paul secured some converts from the Jews, but more from the ranks of the pious Greeks, or proselytes, and in addition many prominent women. The implication is that the conversion of all of them was due to Paul's preaching in the synagogue, and nothing is said of his labors among the heathen, or of his preaching to them. And yet we learn from his own epistles that the Thessalonian church was composed very largely, if not wholly, of Gentiles,[2] and the substance of his preaching to them is indicated in 1 Thess. i. 9, 10, where nothing is said about the Messiahship of Jesus, but where the emphasis is laid upon monotheism, upon the resurrection and second coming of Jesus the Son of God, and upon the approaching judgment from which he delivers his disciples. Evidently the author of the Acts has recorded the least important part of Paul's labors in Thessalonica. If he began in the synagogue, he certainly did not do his chief work there, but among the heathen outside; and it was therefore not the Messiahship of Jesus that he chiefly preached, a subject which could have little interest to the Gentiles, but salvation from the wrath of God through his Son.[3]

The success with which Paul met in Thessalonica aroused the hostility of the Jews, just as it had some years before in Antioch, Iconium, and Lystra, and they succeeded in setting the city in an uproar, which resulted in the arrest, not of Paul and his companions, whom they could not find, but of their host, Jason, and some of the new converts. The accusation brought against Jason and the other brethren was not religious, but political. As in Philippi the missionaries had been accused of teaching customs which it was not lawful for Romans to observe, so here they were accused of turning the empire[4] upside down. But a worse offence was charged upon them in this case; nothing less, in fact, than treason, in that they preached another king instead of Cæsar.[5] The accusation had reference primarily, of course, to Paul and his companions, who were the

[1] Acts xvii. 4. [2] 1 Thess. i. 9, ii. 14. [3] 1 Thess. i. 10.

[4] ἡ οἰκουμένη has reference here evidently not to the world in general, but specifically to the Roman world.

[5] Cf. the accusation brought against Jesus, Luke xxiii. 2, John xix. 12, 15.

originators of the trouble; but Jason and the other brethren were charged with participation in their guilt, in that they had attached themselves to them, and were engaged with them in plotting a revolution.

The magistrates, after examining the prisoners, evidently found that they were not as dangerous characters as they had been represented, and that there was little fear that they would bring about a revolution; for after they had laid bonds upon them to keep the peace, they released them without inflicting any punishment. It is interesting to notice that whereas in Philippi the attack upon Paul and his companions had been made at the instance of heathen, in Thessalonica, as in so many other cities, the Jews were the instigators. The accuracy of Luke's account at this point has been widely questioned, especially in view of the fact that Paul in his epistle refers to the afflictions which his readers had suffered at the hands of their own countrymen,[1] and says nothing about an attack of the Jews of Thessalonica either upon them or upon himself. At the same time, there seems to be a hint in 1 Thess. ii. 16 that not only in many other places, but in Thessalonica also, the Jews had given evidence of their hostility to the work of Paul, and it is quite possible that he had in mind, when he wrote the words, the particular circumstance recorded by Luke. Moreover, it should be observed that the particular form which the accusation took, according to Acts xvii. 7, a passage whose trustworthiness can hardly be doubted, suggests that it emanated from the Jews; for it was not Jesus as a king that Paul preached, but Jesus as a Saviour, and it could have occurred to no one but a Jew, who thought of the Messiah always as a king, to accuse Paul of proclaiming another sovereign instead of Cæsar.

Luke's account of Paul's work in Thessalonica is very meagre. Had we no other source, we might suppose that he remained there only three weeks and that he preached the Gospel only in the synagogue. We should hardly gather from the record in Acts that his labors in Thessalonica were uncommonly effective, especially among the

[1] 1 Thess. ii. 14.

Gentile population of the city, and that he founded a church there which was peculiarly important and influential.[1] But that this was the fact, we learn from Paul's two epistles to the Thessalonians, which were written from Corinth only a few months after he left them, and which make it evident that he must have spent some time in the city. In 1 Thess. i. 7 sq., and 2. Thess. i. 4, Paul declares that the Christians of Thessalonica had become an ensample to all the believers in Macedonia and Achaia, and that their reputation had spread even beyond the confines of those two provinces. They had distinguished themselves especially by their liberality and generosity toward all the brethren of Macedonia.[2] In fact, Paul speaks of them in both his epistles in terms of the highest commendation and warmest affection.[3] His relations with them were perhaps not quite so close and intimate as with the Philippians; for his epistles to them lack something of the peculiar tenderness which makes his Philippian letter so beautiful, and yet they were evidently very dear to him, and their love and faithfulness and patience gave him great joy. That he did not consent to receive aid from them, as from the Philippians, was not due to any lack of regard for them, but only to the fear that he might set them a bad example;[4] for it seems that in their absorption in the approaching return of Christ, many of them were losing their interest in the world about them and were neglecting their daily work and becoming indolent and disorderly.[5] Why circumstances should have been so peculiar in Thessalonica, and why a tendency should have appeared there of which we discover no trace in Philippi, we do not know. It is possible that the unusual prevalence of vice and impurity, which may well have marked a great

[1] Ramsay's emendation of the text (*St. Paul, the Traveller and Roman Citizen*, p. 226 sq.) by which Luke is made to refer not only to Jews and proselytes, but also to Greeks (πολλοὶ τῶν σεβομένων καὶ Ἑλλήνων πλῆθος πολύ), brings Luke into better accord with Paul, but can hardly be justified on sound principles of criticism.

[2] 1 Thess. iv. 10.

[3] 1 Thess. i. 2 sq., ii. 13, 19, iii. 6 sq., v. 11; 2 Thess. i. 3, ii. 13, iii. 4.

[4] 2 Thess. iii. 9.

[5] 1 Thess. iv. 11, 12; 2 Thess. iii. 6 sq.

commercial metropolis like Thessalonica,[1] caused Paul to lay special stress upon the impending judgment and to make it so prominent as to overshadow every other truth, with the consequence of leading his converts to live in daily and hourly expectation of it. It is certain at any rate, whatever the cause, that Paul did say a great deal upon the subject when he was with them, and that their minds dwelt constantly upon it after he was gone.[2]

From Paul's first epistle to them we learn that the Thessalonians had asked him a question, after he had left them, touching the fate of the brethren that died before the return of Christ.[3] Evidently they had originally believed that Christ would come so soon that they would all be alive to greet him, and to enter the kingdom which he was to establish. But as time went on, some of their number passed away and yet Christ tarried. Were they then to be deprived of the privilege of receiving the Lord when he should come and sharing with him in his joy and glory? This question Paul answers in 1 Thess. iv. 13 sq., telling his readers that those who have fallen asleep in Jesus will rise again at his coming and be forever with him, so that those who remain alive until that time will have no advantage over their brethren that have fallen asleep. That Paul found it necessary to instruct the Thessalonians upon the subject of the resurrection, and even to bring proof in support of it,[4] is a very significant fact. It is evident in the light of this passage, read in connection with 1 Cor. xv. 12 sq., that the resurrection of believers at the return of Christ was not regarded by him as one of the primary truths of his Gospel, but that it occupied a subordinate place both in his thought and in his teaching. That the death of the individual soul with Christ unto the flesh and his resurrection with him to the new life in the Spirit, was fundamental in his thinking, and that he always emphasized it as the very heart of his

[1] Cf. 1 Thess. iv. 3 sq.
[2] Cf. 1 Thess. i. 10, iii. 13, iv. 6, 13 sq., v. 2 sq.; 2 Thess. ii. 1 sq.
[3] 1 Thess. iv. 13.
[4] 1 Thess. iv. 14.

Gospel, there can be no doubt;[1] but the final resurrection of the believer in a new spiritual body was of minor importance and was apparently discussed by him as a rule only in response to the questions of his converts.[2]

Though Paul evidently remained quite a while in Thessalonica, it is clear from 1 Thess. ii. 17 that he was compelled to leave the city before he wished to, and under circumstances which made him fear for the permanence of his work and for the steadfastness of his new converts. A persecution[3] had apparently broken out which made it necessary for him to depart in haste, and which after his departure fell heavily upon the Christians whom he left behind. It may be that his flight was misinterpreted by some of the brethren as an act of cowardice on his part, and that it was made a ground of complaint against him. At any rate, he felt it necessary later to defend himself against the accusation of being a covetous, ambitious, and selfish man, who preached the Gospel not in sincerity, but in guile and hypocrisy, and with an eye not to the advantage of the Thessalonians, but to his own glory and gain.[4] If the persecution was begun at the instance of the Jews, it was at any rate carried on by the Gentiles,[5] and its severity was so great that Paul feared that the Thessalonian disciples might lose their courage and renounce their faith. It was this fear that led him to desire so earnestly, and more than once, to return to Thessalonica and see his converts face to face.[6] Finding it for some reason impossible to do so, perhaps because his friends had given bonds for his continued absence, he sent Timothy from Athens to establish and comfort them and to bring

[1] That Paul had taught this great central truth in Thessalonica as well as elsewhere is suggested by 1 Thess. v. 10 (cf. also i. 10).

[2] So both in 1 Thessalonians and 1 Corinthians. The passage upon the resurrection in 1 Thessalonians can therefore hardly be urged as a proof that Paul was compelled to leave Thessalonica before he had completed the instruction which he was in the habit of imparting to his new converts. There is no reason to suppose that the subject of the final resurrection of believers would have been discussed more fully by him had he remained longer.

[3] It is uncertain whether this persecution is to be identified with the one mentioned in Acts xvii. 5 sq.

[4] 1 Thess. ii. 1–12. [5] 1 Thess. ii. 14. [6] 1 Thess. ii. 17.

him news concerning their state.[1] Timothy upon his return gave Paul a most cheering report of their patience and faithfulness, and of their love for him.[2] At the same time he informed him of the existence of certain evils within the church. The prevalent heathen vices of impurity and lust,[3] against which Paul had preached while he was in Thessalonica, were all too rife among them, and the unhealthful tendency to neglect their accustomed avocations under the influence of their belief in the speedy return of Christ was abroad and was causing unfavorable comment among those without the church.[4] It would seem also that the Thessalonian Christians were not entirely free from quarrels and divisions, and that there was a tendency on the part of some to treat the leaders of the church with disrespect and to disregard their counsels,[5] a tendency which was entirely natural where enthusiasm and fanaticism had such play. On the other hand, in opposition to the uncontrolled enthusiasm and fanaticism of some of the disciples, there were others who were inclined to look with disfavor upon all manifestations of the Spirit, and to "despise prophesyings."[6] Timothy also informed Paul without doubt of the accusations against him, which were upon the lips of some of the disciples, and repeated the question asked by the Thessalonians touching the resurrection of the dead.

In view of all these circumstances Paul felt impelled to write them his first epistle.[7] In it he gives expression to his continued joy and confidence in them, exhorts them to increased fidelity, admonishes them to eschew the vices and to avoid the evil tendencies which were abroad among them, defends himself and his own conduct at considerable length, and answers their inquiry concerning the resurrection in the way already described. The epistle seems to have accomplished its purpose at least in part; for we hear nothing more of attacks upon him or of criticisms of his motives, nor do the Thessalonians seem to have needed any farther instruction concerning the resurrection of the

[1] 1 Thess. iii. 1 sq. [3] 1 Thess. iv. 4, 5. [5] 1 Thess. v. 12–14. [7] 1 Thess. iii. 6.
[2] 1 Thess. iii. 6 sq. [4] 1 Thess. iv. 11, 12. [6] 1 Thess. v. 20.

dead. But in one respect the epistle failed to produce the effect intended. Some of the disciples still neglected their ordinary avocations in their expectation of the immediate return of the Lord. Paul therefore wrote them a second epistle, designed to put a stop to such unhealthy fanaticism. After commending them for their patience and faithfulness, and encouraging and exhorting them as he had in his first epistle, he plunged in chapter two into the main subject. He had thought when he wrote before that an exhortation to live soberly and to perform their daily duties with faithfulness and diligence was all that was necessary in the premises, and he took for granted that the Thessalonians did not need instruction respecting the time and season of the consummation.[1] But he saw now that it was their belief, that the times were ripe and that Christ's return might be expected at any moment, that was unsettling the minds of so many of them, and he therefore called attention in his second epistle to the fact that some time must yet elapse before the consummation could take place, and consequently it would not do to act as if it were already here. He had told them so, it seems, while he was with them,[2] and he therefore assumed that they were aware of it when he wrote his first epistle; but it had evidently not made sufficient impression upon them and he found it necessary to repeat, doubtless in greater detail and with the addition of some new particulars, the substance of what he had already said. Antichrist, he reminds them, must appear before the Messiah himself can return, but Antichrist cannot appear until he that restraineth has been taken out of the way.

Much ingenuity has been expended in the attempt to interpret this apocalypse and to discover the persons or events to which Paul refers in such mysterious terms, but the attempt is vain. The apocalypse is cast largely in Old Testament form, and it is probable that he had no concrete or definite person or appearance in mind when he referred to the "man of sin," but that he shared with the Jews in general the belief in the final outbreak of the powers opposed

[1] 1 Thess. v. 1. [2] 2 Thess. ii. 5.

to the Messiah under the lead of Antichrist.[1] And as that outbreak, though apparently already begun,[2] had evidently not yet reached its climax and no one corresponding to the traditional conception of Antichrist had yet appeared, he still looked forward to his advent. That Paul had in mind some definite historical person or power in speaking of that "which now restraineth,"[3] is very probable, but we have no means of determining to whom or what he referred. That he may have meant the authority of the Roman state, the protection of whose laws was enjoyed by the Christians as well as by other men,[4] is possible but far from certain. But however the details of Paul's apocalypse may be interpreted, it is clear that though he believed that the consummation was not far distant and apparently expected to live to witness it himself,[5] he was nevertheless convinced that an interval of greater or less duration must elapse before the end came, and it was this fact that he was especially concerned to emphasize in his second letter to the Thessalonians, for he saw that they especially needed to be reminded of it. Under ordinary circumstances there would have been more reason for him to emphasize the nearness of the parousia, and the duty of constant watchfulness in view of its approach, as he had done in his previous epistle. But the conditions in the Thessalonian church were peculiar, and those conditions account for the difference between his two letters, and for the fact that in the second of them he gives expression to views that appear nowhere else in his writings.

The authenticity of 2 Thessalonians is widely doubted, in part because of this very fact, in part because of the striking similarity in other respects between it and the earlier epistle. But though it is beset with serious difficulties, its style is genuinely Pauline, and when read in the light of the conditions that existed among those to whom it was addressed, the grounds for asserting its Pauline authorship appear weightier than any that can be urged

[1] See Schürer, *l.c.* II. p. 448 (Eng. Trans., Div. II. Vol. II. p. 164).
[2] "The mystery of lawlessness doth already work" (2 Thess. ii. 7).
[3] 2 Thess. ii. 6, τὸ κατέχον; vs. 7, ὁ κατέχων.
[4] Cf. Rom. xiii. 1 sq. [5] 1 Thess. iv. 17.

against it. The differences have been already accounted for; the resemblances are sufficiently explained if it be assumed that the second epistle was written but a short time after the first, while the affairs both in Thessalonica and Corinth remained practically unchanged and while Paul, as well as the Thessalonians, were still enduring afflictions and trials.[1]

It seems from 2 Thess. ii. 2, that those disciples of Thessalonica who were insisting that the parousia was at hand were appealing in defence of their view to a letter bearing Paul's name; but as Paul was not conscious of having written anything to support their opinion, he leaped to the conclusion that they were making use of a forged epistle, and he was therefore careful to call attention at the close of 2 Thessalonians to his autograph signature, which guaranteed the genuineness of all his letters. It is hardly probable that Paul's surmise was correct, for it is difficult to suppose that any one would have ventured to impose a forged epistle upon the Thessalonian church so soon after his departure; and the fact is that the passage in 1 Thessalonians, where Paul emphasizes the duty of watchfulness,[2] might easily be interpreted in such a way as to furnish a confirmation of the belief in question, and it is very likely that good use was made of it.

From Thessalonica, Paul and his companions travelled westward to Berœa, a smaller and less important city than Thessalonica, situated in the third of the four districts into which Macedonia was divided. Although in Acts xvii. 10, Paul and Silas alone are mentioned, we learn from vs. 14 that Timothy was also with them, and though nothing is said of his presence in Philippi and Thessalonica, various references in Paul's epistles indicate that

[1] In defence of the genuineness of 2 Thessalonians, see the New Testament Introductions of Weiss and Jülicher, and especially Bornemann in Meyer's Commentary, 5th and 6th eds. The authenticity of 1 Thessalonians has also been doubted by many scholars, but is now generally recognized. 1 Thess. iv. 17, with its implication that Paul expected to live until the return of Christ, is alone enough to prove that the epistle cannot have been written after his death. But the truth is that the Pauline character of the epistle as a whole is abundantly evident.

[2] 1 Thess. v. 1–11.

he was one of the party in both those cities as well.[1] Of Paul's work in Berœa we know only what is told us in Acts xvii. 10–14. According to that passage, he met with better success among the Jews than he had in Thessalonica, and secured many converts from the ranks both of Jews and Gentiles. The contrast drawn between the receptivity of the Berœan and Thessalonian Jews implies the use of an older source and argues for the general trustworthiness of the account. Some years later, when Paul went up to Jerusalem with the collection for the Mother Church, one of his Berœan converts accompanied him upon his journey.[2] His presence in the party testifies to the continued existence of the church of Berœa, and shows that it shared with Paul's other churches in contributing to the necessities of the saints of Jerusalem.

Though Luke mentions Paul's work in only three Macedonian cities, it is evident from 1 Thess. i. 7 sq. that Christianity was already widespread in the province at the time he wrote, and it may well be that he did considerable missionary work outside of Philippi, Thessalonica, and Berœa of which our sources tell us nothing. We learn from Rom. xv. 19 that he had preached the Gospel as far west as Illyricum before the year 53, and it is probable that he did so at this time; for when he passed through Macedonia again on his way to Corinth,[3] he was in so anxious a state of mind respecting the Corinthian church[4] that he could hardly have turned aside to undertake an extended evangelistic tour in a new country, and there is no other occasion so far as we know when he can have gone thither. At any rate, Paul evidently spent a long time in Macedonia and accomplished a large and important work there. His Macedonian labors were particularly successful, and the churches which he founded were not only peculiarly dear to him, but enjoyed remarkable exemption from the internal troubles which beset some of his other churches. They were subjected to persecutions, it is true, for many years, but their development was not impeded

[1] See above, p. 241.
[2] Acts xx. 4.
[3] Acts xx. 1.
[4] Cf. 2 Cor. vii. 5 sq.

by the influence of Judaizing tendencies and their consecration to Christ, their spirituality, their zeal for the advancement of the Gospel, their love and their unselfish devotion to the brethren, were all very marked and caused Paul the profoundest joy and gratitude. Nowhere, in fact, does his preaching seem to have borne richer fruit than in Macedonia, and of none of his churches does he speak in terms of deeper satisfaction.[1]

In no other part of Paul's missionary field do we get a clearer glimpse of the way in which he was accustomed to bring Christianity to the knowledge of the Gentiles, and to gather disciples from among them. He evidently did not go about through the cities of the province with a flourish of trumpets, summoning all the inhabitants to repentance and proclaiming from the housetops the kingdom of God; but he sought to win converts by direct personal contact, forming acquaintances as opportunity offered, very likely first of all among those of his own trade,[2] laboring with them for his daily bread,[3] and telling them his message one by one until he had succeeded in gathering about himself a little circle which became the nucleus of a church. It was through this quiet hand-to-hand work that he doubtless accomplished most, and not through public preaching, whether in the synagogues or elsewhere. The fact that the author of the Acts always lays chief stress upon his public activity, has resulted in a wide misconception of the ordinary method of the Gospel's spread, and has led many to picture the beginnings of Christianity in the various cities of the empire in an altogether too official and artificial way. Christianity did not appear in the cities where Paul labored as a great public movement, involving religious and political consequences of civic or national proportions, but as a leaven working quietly for the conversion of one household after another, and binding them all together in the bonds of a common faith and a common hope. In these Gentile churches of which we

[1] Cf. not only Philippians and 1 and 2 Thessalonians, but also 2 Cor. viii. 1 sq.

[2] Cf. Acts xviii. 2.

[3] Cf. 1 Thess. ii. 9; 2 Thess. iii. 8.

catch glimpses in Paul's epistles, we have a beautiful parallel to the early Jewish church of Jerusalem: the same sense of belonging to a heavenly kingdom, the same separateness from the world, the same closeness of fellowship with each other, the same intimate family life, and the same unsparing generosity to those in need.

Paul visited Macedonia on two subsequent occasions, in 52 A.D. on his way from Ephesus to Corinth,[1] and again a few months later on his way back from Corinth to Jerusalem.[2] No particulars of the latter visit have been preserved, but the condition of the Macedonian Christians at the time of the former visit is referred to in the Second Epistle to the Corinthians. It appears that they were still suffering persecution[3] and that Paul himself was suffering with them.[4] It appears, moreover, that they were very poor in this world's goods,[5] but that their generosity was great, and that they contributed voluntarily and even beyond their means to the collection which Paul was gathering for the church of Jerusalem.[6] They appointed a representative to travel with Paul and assist him in the matter of the collection,[7] and when he went up to Jerusalem to carry the contributions of the churches, there were at least three, or if the author of the "we" source was a Philippian, four Macedonians in his company.[8] Acts xix. 29 acquaints us with another Macedonian Christian, named Gaius, who was with Paul in Ephesus, and the Epistle to the Philippians, with a number of others.[9]

7. The Evangelization of Achaia

Being compelled to leave Berœa because of the trouble caused by hostile Jews from Thessalonica, Paul went

[1] Acts xx. 1. [3] 2 Cor. viii. 1. [5] 2 Cor. viii. 2. [7] 2 Cor. viii. 18 sq.
[2] Acts xx. 3. [4] 2 Cor. vii. 5. [6] 2 Cor. viii. 3 sq., ix. 2.

[8] Acts xx. 4. The three were Sopater, Aristarchus, and Secundus. Aristarchus was with Paul also in Ephesus (Acts xix. 29) and both he and the author of the "we" source accompanied him to Rome (Acts xxvii. 2; cf. also Col. iv. 10, and Philemon 24).

[9] Epaphroditus, Clement, Synzygos, Euodia, and Syntyche. The Demas, who is mentioned in Col. iv. 14, 2 Tim. iv. 10, and Philemon 24, may also have been a Macedonian of Thessalonica (cf. 2 Tim. iv. 10).

down to the coast, apparently undecided where to go next.[1] He must have had Achaia in mind when he crossed over into Europe, as well as Macedonia, but he apparently did not regard his work in Macedonia as finished, and he did not wish to leave it. But the important centres seemed closed to him at the moment, and he therefore made up his mind to pass on to Achaia, the next province to the south, and begin work there. Making his way by sea to Athens, the first large city of the province, he sent back word to Silas and Timothy to join him at once. The account in Acts seems to imply that Paul left Athens before they reached the city, and went on to Corinth, where they finally overtook him.[2] But from 1 Thess. iii. 1 sq. we learn that Timothy was actually with Paul in Athens, and that Paul sent him thence to Thessalonica, whence he returned to the apostle after the latter had reached Corinth. The two accounts are not absolutely contradictory, for Luke, though he fails to mention Timothy's visit to Athens, does not expressly exclude it; but it must at any rate be recognized that he could hardly have written as he did, had he known of Timothy's arrival in Athens, and of his journey to Thessalonica to which Paul refers. Nevertheless, though his account betrays a lack of familiarity with some of the events that transpired during this period, there are certain striking features in his report of Paul's stay in Athens which can be explained only on the supposition that he had in his hands an older document which he followed in the main quite closely. Though he states[3] that Paul preached in the synagogue to the Jews and pious Gentiles, he departs from his usual custom in laying the emphasis not upon his work among them, but upon his work among the heathen. And yet his account of that work is not drawn in such colors as we might suppose he would employ, if he invented the situation in order to provide an appropriate setting for a presentation of Paul's preaching to the heathen as he understood it. It is clear that he was keenly alive to the dramatic possibilities of the position in which the apostle

[1] Acts xvii. 14. [2] Acts xviii. 5. [3] Acts xvii. 17.

found himself placed,[1] and yet he refrained from making such use of them as he might have been expected to had he been without any information as to the actual events of the stay in Athens, or had he chosen to disregard the information which he had. The implication that in Athens, the ancestral home of Greek philosophy and the intellectual centre of the Hellenic world, Paul had no intention of preaching the Gospel, that he proposed to pass through the place without making any effort to bring Christianity to the knowledge of its inhabitants, and that his stay in the city and his proclamation of the Gospel there were due solely to the delay in the arrival of Silas and Timothy, can be explained only on the assumption that the author was following an earlier authority. That Paul should recognize the inaccessibility of the Athenians to such a message as he had to bring them, and should think it not worth while to undertake regular missionary work among them, was entirely natural, but it is inconceivable that such a view of the matter should suggest itself to a later writer. Athens must seem to him just the place where Paul would be most eager to proclaim the truth of Christianity and to expose the sophistries of Greek thought. It may be remarked still farther, that the statement that he was finally led to break silence not by the false philosophy that he heard taught in the city, but by the idolatry that was practised all about him, must have emanated not from an idealizing historian of a later day, but from a writer who was well acquainted with the local conditions that prevailed at the time Paul visited Athens. Moreover, the curious piece of information that the heathen supposed that Paul was preaching two gods, Jesus and Resurrection,[2] can hardly have been invented by Luke; while his

[1] Compare his references to the Epicurean and Stoic philosophers in vs. 18; to the Areopagus in vss. 19 and 22; and to the character of the Athenians in vs. 21.

[2] Acts xvii. 18. A different interpretation has been put upon this passage by some commentators, but in view of the collocation of the two words (*τὸν Ἰησοῦν καὶ τὴν ἀνάστασιν*) and the use of the article with both, and in view of the fact that Paul was supposed to be a preacher of more than one strange god, most scholars adopt the view indicated above. Peculiar as it may seem, it is in fact not at all strange that the Athenians, with their

report of the meagreness of the results accomplished is hardly what we should expect if he was merely romancing. Here, if anywhere, in the stronghold of Pagan thought and worship, the Gospel must vindicate its divine power. But only a few are said to have been converted, and only two of them are named, one a man, Dionysius the Areopagite, and the other a woman, Damaris.[1]

An examination of the speech which Paul is reported to have made in Athens leads to the same conclusion touching the general trustworthiness of the account. His skilful use of one of the many altars "to an unknown god," which we know existed in the city, as the text of his discourse, is too characteristic to have been invented, and the general tenor of the speech is entirely in line with his preaching to the Gentiles in Thessalonica, as exhibited in his epistles to the Thessalonians written only a few months later. Both in Athens and in Thessalonica he preached one living and true God, who would yet judge the world by him whom he had raised from the dead.[2] It is true that the Athenian speech entirely lacks the great characteristic features of the Pauline theology which are revealed in his chief epistles, and traces of which appear even in the letters to the Thessalonians; and it is also true that there is no reference in it, as in many passages in the latter, to Jesus Christ as a Saviour, and to the comfort involved for the disciples in his second coming. And yet the omission of such truths in a discourse delivered under the peculiar circumstances in which Paul found himself placed in Athens ought not to occasion surprise. The author of the Acts does not exaggerate when he says that Paul found the city "full of idols." Pausanias tells us that there were more gods in Athens than in all the rest of the country, and the Satirist Petronius declares that

tendency to multiply divinities and to deify all the forces and movements of nature, should have understood Paul to refer to two gods, the one male, the other female.

[1] Very likely the document which Luke was using reported no conversions, and he inserted the names of Dionysius and Damaris on the basis of tradition; for Paul calls the household of Stephanas the firstfruits of Achaia (1 Cor. xvi. 15).

[2] Cf. 1 Thess. i. 9, 10, iii. 13, iv. 6, v. 2 sq.; 2 Thess. i. 7 sq., ii. 12.

it was easier to find a god in Athens than a man. It is not strange, therefore, that Paul's spirit was provoked within him as he looked about him. To him the beauty which was scattered everywhere in such profusion meant nothing. With his native Jewish prejudice against the plastic art in all its forms, he could see in the marvellous works of art that adorned not the Acropolis alone, but all the streets and squares of the city, nothing of loveliness or of charm. To him the fairest statues were only idols, and the most beautiful temples only the dwelling-places of false gods. It was to be expected that in the midst of such surroundings the peculiar and distinctive truths of Christianity upon which his mind was most accustomed to dwell should seem to him for the moment of minor importance in comparison with the great fundamental truth which Christianity shared with Judaism, the truth that there is only one living and true God, who is not "like unto gold or silver or stone graven by art and device of man." In fact, such a discourse as that ascribed to Paul in Acts xvii. is exactly what we should expect from him under the circumstances. It would be difficult, indeed, if not impossible, to suggest any other line of thought better adapted to the situation in which he was placed, and more likely to have been followed by him.[1]

[1] Though in view of these considerations it can hardly be doubted that Paul delivered an address in Athens upon the subject indicated, and that the general outline of that address is accurately reproduced in Luke's account, there are words in vss. 28 and 29 which it is possible are Luke's and not Paul's. Paul seems not to have thought of the unredeemed man as possessed of a constitution like God's, but rather to have emphasized his unlikeness to God, drawing a sharp contrast between his fleshly nature and the spiritual nature of the Divine Being. It is not altogether easy to reconcile the statement that we are God's offspring, and the inference that is drawn from it in vs. 29, with such a passage as 1 Cor. xv. 47 sq. It is not impossible that as Luke frequently introduced into the speeches which he recorded appropriate quotations from the Old Testament, so he may here have introduced the familiar passage from the Greek poet Aratus, which Paul's previous words might naturally suggest to him, without perceiving that he thus gave to Paul's thought a turn which Paul himself had not intended. With the exception of this passage there is nothing in the address that need cause any difficulty; and there is no reason, therefore, for questioning the trustworthiness of the discourse as a whole.

Verse 30, which has been objected to on the ground that it contradicts Paul's judgment of the heathen expressed in Rom. i., finds a parallel in Rom. iii. 25. The "overlooking" of the times of ignorance which is here referred to does

That Paul's preaching in Athens was attended with small results is just what we should expect. Luke has correctly characterized the Athenians in vs. 21. Since the time they had lost their political independence, their interest had centred increasingly in philosophical and religious questions, and they devoted the greater part of their time and energy to the discussion of such themes. Commercially and industrially Athens was at this time a place of no importance, but it was the home of a great university and the resort of philosophers of all schools. It was, in fact, the intellectual Mecca of the world. At the same time it was probably the most religious city in the empire. The Athenians were widely famed for the multitude of deities whom they worshipped, and for their hospitality toward new gods and new faiths; and they were exceedingly proud of their reputation in this respect. Paul therefore spoke the truth, and at the same time revealed his wisdom and tact, when he began his address with the complimentary words: "Ye men of Athens, I perceive that ye are in every respect uncommonly religious."[1] But in spite of this conciliatory language, there was nothing in Paul's address, in fact there was nothing he could have said, that was calculated to persuade an Athenian audience and convert them to the Christian faith. His auditors were ready enough to listen, but their interest in him and in his preaching was due solely to curiosity and had no practical purpose, and his appeal to them to repent in view of the impending judgment could seem nothing less than absurd. But though the Athenians did not accept Christianity, they had no inclination to persecute Paul or give him trouble of any kind. There is no hint that he

not imply that in pre-Christian days God regarded the idolatry of the heathen with indifference or saved them from the consequences of their sins, denounced so vigorously in Rom. i., but simply that the time for the final judgment had not come until now, and that they were, therefore, summoned now to prepare for it as they had not been before.

It is a fact of no little significance that there is nothing in the address to betray the effort of a later writer to put into Paul's mouth a genuinely Pauline discourse.

[1] Acts xvii. 22. The translation both in the Authorized and Revised Versions does Paul an injustice.

incurred the suspicion of the authorities or that his freedom of speech and conduct was curbed in any way.[1] How long he stayed in Athens, we do not know. He can hardly have remained a great while, for he must have realized that little could be accomplished in such a city and he was not the man to waste his time. He probably only waited for Timothy's arrival from Berœa, and then, after despatching him upon the important mission to Thessalonica,[2] made his way without delay to Corinth, the capital and commercial metropolis of the Roman province of Achaia.[3]

Corinth was a place of an entirely different type from Athens. Upon the ruins of the old Greek city Julius Cæsar had founded a colony which had been peopled in the beginning largely by freedmen from Rome, and which still bore a marked Roman character. The Greek element, however, was naturally strong and the Greek language was commonly used, except in official circles. Moreover, there was the same love of wisdom and the same pride of intellect that had characterized the Greeks for centuries. Corinth indeed, in spite of the contempt felt for her by Athens and other genuinely Greek cities, plumed herself greatly upon her position as the capital city of Achaia, and claimed to be the true heir of the glories of ancient Greece. But Corinth was not merely a Roman and a Greek city; the Orient also was represented, and the luxury and licentiousness of the East ran riot in her streets. Corinthian immorality was proverbial the world over. The unique geographical situation of the city made it the gateway between Orient and Occident, and through it passed a large part of the trade of the East with the West. In it were gathered people of all nationalities and faiths, and like every great commercial

[1] He was certainly not brought to trial as an offender before the court of the Areopagus or any other court.

[2] 1 Thess. iii. 1.

[3] Upon Paul's stay in Athens see especially Ramsay: *St. Paul, the Traveller and Roman Citizen*, p. 237 sq. Ramsay maintains that Paul made his famous speech, not on the Areopagus or Hill of Mars, as is commonly supposed, but in the Agora before the council of the Areopagus, which was sitting, not as a civil or criminal court, but as a university council to pass judgment upon Paul's qualifications as a lecturer.

centre it had a large floating population. It was cosmopolitan in the fullest sense, — Greek, Roman, Oriental, — and it was characterized by all the features that commonly mark such a city. Never before had the Gospel been brought face to face with such extreme worldliness; never had it been assigned a more difficult task than to make its way in such a city and among such a people. And it is probable that Paul himself had never had so keen a sense of his own impotence as just at this juncture. He knew well enough that he possessed none of the graces of style and none of the oratorical gifts which were so highly prized among the Greeks, and his recent experience in Athens must have made him painfully conscious that he was not the kind of a man to impress and attract the Corinthians.[1] The contempt, moreover, with which the Gospel had been received by the Athenians showed him that the truths which he had preached there, sublime though they seemed to him, were not such as to appeal to those whom he would have to meet in Corinth. It is no wonder that he approached the city with fear and trembling.[2] The Gospel was to be put to a supreme test. If it could make headway in this busy, profligate metropolis, if it could show itself adapted to the needs and equal to the demands of this world in miniature, its power to conquer the world at large would receive such a demonstration as it had never had.

There can be little doubt that Paul's thoughts had long been upon Corinth; that from the time he crossed the Ægean he had looked forward to the day when he should preach the Gospel at the meeting-place of East and West, in the very vortex of worldliness and in the very hotbed of vice. And yet it is clear that he felt it to be a crisis not in his own career alone, but also in the progress of the Gospel, and that the thought of it cost him much anxiety and not a little foreboding. He evidently debated long and earnestly regarding the best method of approach. Should he meet the corrupting and debasing polytheism which had full sway in the city with the doctrine of the one true

[1] Cf. 2 Cor. x. 10, xi. 6. [2] 1 Cor. ii. 3; cf. also Acts xviii. 9.

spiritual God, whom he had preached in Athens? Should he meet the prevailing licentiousness and debauchery with Christianity's lofty code of ethics, and startle the careless votaries of pleasure and the worldly-minded devotees of wealth with the proclamation of an impending judgment? Or should he appeal to the Greeks' instinctive love of philosophy and present the Gospel "in persuasive words of wisdom," as a great system of truth fitted to satisfy the intellectual cravings of the wisest and to answer the deepest questions of the most thoughtful minds? Any one of these courses might have recommended itself to him. By any one of these methods he might have hoped to secure a hearing for the Christianity which he preached and to bring the power of the Gospel to bear upon the life of the city. But he rejected them all. Possibly his experience in Athens had taught him something. At any rate, after careful deliberation as it would seem, he determined to know nothing among the Corinthians save "Jesus Christ and him crucified."[1] He would strike at the very root of the matter; not improvement, not amendment, not reformation, but the replacement of the life of the flesh by the life of the Spirit. He would begin with that which was the very heart of his Gospel. He would throw down the gauntlet to the fleshliness and corruptness of the heathen world in its very stronghold, and he would conquer not by the help of adventitious aids of any kind, but by the power of the Gospel alone. As he had little to offer which could attract and interest such a city as Corinth, he would eschew all ordinary methods of attracting and interesting those with whom he came in contact, and would emphasize only that in Christianity which must at first sight seem to them the height of human folly and the extremity of human weakness. Such a course was characteristic of Paul. The more he was opposed, the more insistent he became. The greater the crisis, the more determined he was not to lower his standards, not to compromise his principles, not to abate his demands in the slightest degree. The contrast be-

[1] 1 Cor. ii. 2; cf. 1 Cor. iii. 10.

tween his preaching in Thessalonica and his preaching in Corinth illustrates this characteristic in a very marked way. There he began apparently with the proclamation of the living and true God and with the announcement of the coming of his Son from heaven to save his people from the impending day of wrath.[1] But in Corinth, where the conditions were such that the Gospel was likely to meet with greater indifference and opposition and with less sympathy than anywhere else, he presented it in its most uncompromising form: Jesus Christ and him crucified; which meant of course not the crucifixion of Christ for his own sake, but his crucifixion for man's sake; man's death with Christ unto the flesh in order to a resurrection with him unto the new life in the Spirit.[2] Believing profoundly, as he did, that the life of the flesh can be overcome only by the life of the Spirit, that man can be freed from corruption and death only by the entrance into him of the power of the divine Christ, he made up his mind that the true way to deal with the life of the flesh in its grossest and most degrading manifestations, as it appeared in Corinth, was to place the spiritual life over against it in sharpest contrast and to deny unequivocally the power of anything else to amend matters in the least.

It was not a new Gospel that Paul preached in Corinth, a Gospel elaborated under the influence of the peculiar conditions that existed there, and preached by him nowhere else. On the contrary, it was the Gospel which he had held from the very beginning of his Christian life and which he had without doubt proclaimed in many another city, but probably nowhere else had the immediate need of just such radical doctrine been more apparent than in Corinth, and nowhere else, unless in Galatia after the intrusion of the Judaizers, did it receive more exclusive emphasis. It is interesting to notice how the same fundamental conception is turned at one time against legalists and at another time against antinomians; at one time against those who would

[1] 1 Thess. i. 9, 10.

[2] 1 Cor. i. 9, 30, ii. 12 sq., iii. 16 sq., vi. 11, 14 sq., x. 16 sq., xii. 3 sq., xv. 1 sq., 20 sq.

make law everything, and at another time against those who would repudiate all law. That under such different circumstances, and in the face of such opposite tendencies, Paul reached the same Gospel is an evidence of the degree to which it had taken possession of him, and become the controlling principle in his thinking and his living.

The accuracy of Paul's declaration that he had determined not to know anything among the Corinthians save Jesus Christ and him crucified, is confirmed by both of his epistles to them. All that he has to say in those epistles about the duties of the Christian life is brought into relation with that fundamental truth. When he warns them against licentiousness and intemperance, he reminds them that they have been joined unto the Lord, and that their bodies are members of Christ and temples of the Holy Spirit.[1] When he discusses the subjects of marriage, of meats offered to idols, of the Eucharist, of spiritual gifts, and of the resurrection, he makes the oneness between the believer and Christ the controlling principle in every case.[2] When he condemns idolatry, he does it not on the ground that it detracts from the glory of the one supreme God, but that it makes union with Christ impossible.[3] The Gospel which he preached was thus applied by him to all the circumstances and relations of life, and its practical power was abundantly demonstrated. At the beginning of his first epistle he thanked God for the grace that was given unto the Corinthians in Christ Jesus, that "in everything they were enriched in him in all utterance and all knowledge," so that they "came behind in no gift." And though there was much in the lives of those to whom he wrote that he had to complain of, he could yet call them to witness that Christ had been proved in their own experience the power of God, and that he had been made unto them "wisdom and righteousness and sanctification and redemption."[4]

Paul's labors in Corinth were very successful. He won

[1] 1 Cor. vi. 15 sq.
[2] 1 Cor. vii., viii., x., xi., xii., xv.; 2 Cor. i. 21, iv. 11 sq., v. 17 sq.
[3] 1 Cor. x. 14 sq.
[4] 1 Cor. i. 30.

a great many disciples, and when he took his departure he left behind him a strong and flourishing church. His converts were drawn largely, but not wholly, from the lower classes of society.[1] Not many wise, not many mighty, not many noble, were among them; but his words imply that there were at least some such, and Crispus and Gaius and Stephanas and Erastus must have been men of some wealth and social position.[2] Indeed, the zeal and ability displayed by the Corinthians in contributing to Paul's fund for the poor saints of Jerusalem[3] shows that there were among them many who were blessed with a sufficiency, if not with an abundance, of this world's goods. It is not at all improbable that while his converts in Corinth, as well as in other parts of the world, came in general from the lower or lower-middle stratum of society, in a city where there was so much wealth the church itself was in this respect at least peculiarly favored.

Paul's epistles make it clear that his work in Corinth was largely among the Gentiles, and that there were comparatively few Jewish believers.[4] Indeed, the great majority of his Corinthian converts seem to have come directly from heathendom and not, as was so commonly the case, from the ranks of the proselytes or from the number of those that had already felt the influence of the ethics and religion of the Jews.[5] This perhaps explains the remarkable fact that there is nowhere in either of his epistles to the Corinthians a reference to the connection between Judaism and Christianity, or to the Christian's relation to the Jewish law, of which he makes so much in

[1] 1 Cor. i. 26 sq.; cf. vii. 21 sq.

[2] Cf. Acts xviii. 8; 1 Cor. xvi. 15; Rom. xvi. 23.

[3] 2 Cor. viii. and ix.

[4] Cf. 1 Cor. xii. 2. That there were some Jewish disciples may be gathered from such passages as 1 Cor. i. 22 sq. and xii. 13, and from the nature of the Cephas party, to which Paul refers in 1 Cor. i. 12 sq. But their number must have been very small.

[5] The ethical questions which Paul has to answer, the temptations against which he is obliged to warn his readers, and the sins which he is compelled to combat are a clear enough evidence of this; cf. 1 Cor. v. 1, vi. 9, viii. 1 sq., x. 14 sq. Such instruction and such exhortations would hardly be needed by those who had been proselytes or "God-fearing" heathen before they became Christians.

his epistles to the Romans and Galatians. He makes free use of the Old Testament, as he does in those epistles, but he employs it only for the sake of illustrating or confirming what he has to say, and not as an authoritative code or a final court of appeal, and he nowhere makes it a basis for belief in the truth of the Gospel.[1]

But while it is clear that Paul's work in Corinth was done almost wholly among the Gentiles, the author of the Book of Acts follows his usual custom in recording that he began his labors in the Jewish synagogue, and turned his attention to the Gentiles only after the Jews had refused to believe.[2] He represents him, moreover, as going from the synagogue not directly to the heathen, but to the house of a certain proselyte, Titus Justus, which was immediately adjoining. But in Paul's own epistles there is no hint of any such procedure, and the statement that he determined not to know anything among the Corinthians save Jesus Christ and him crucified, and that he was with them "in weakness and in fear and in much trembling," when taken in connection with the fact just referred to, that the great majority of his converts came apparently directly from heathendom, is hardly calculated to confirm Luke's account at this point. It is possible, of course, that Paul sought in Corinth, as in other cities, to gain a foothold first among his own countrymen and through them to reach the most accessible of the Gentiles. It was certainly a natural thing to do there as well as elsewhere. But if he did so, his effort was so abortive, and his work among the Gentiles was so independent both in its inception and its continuance, that he could speak at a later date as if he had had nothing whatever to do with the synagogue; as if he had made his appearance in Corinth not as a preacher of the Messiah, but as the herald of a new life in the Spirit for men still wedded to their fleshly idols and their fleshly lusts. Whatever vantage ground he may have found elsewhere in the synagogue and in its Gentile adherents, in Corinth he found little.

[1] Cf., *e.g.*, 1 Cor. i. 19, 31, iii. 20, ix. 9, x. 1–13; 2 Cor. vi. 2, ix. 7 sq.
[2] Acts xviii. 4–6.

He met the heathen there as heathen, and brought them a Gospel for which few of them had been prepared by their contact with Judaism. Even though Luke's account of what occurred may be substantially accurate, so far as it goes, he has evidently recorded again that which was least significant and important in Paul's experience and activity.

It is to be noticed also that we are introduced by the Book of Acts and by Paul's epistles to two different circles of disciples. Luke mentions only Jewish disciples: Crispus, the ruler of the synagogue, Aquila and Priscilla, Paul's hosts, and Titus Justus, a proselyte;[1] while of Stephanas, who was Paul's first convert and, as it would seem, the leading man in the Corinthian church,[2] he says nothing. The names of other apparently Gentile disciples, Gaius, Fortunatus, Achaicus, and Chloe, all of whom are mentioned in Paul's first epistle,[3] are likewise omitted by Luke. This makes it still more evident that the record in Acts was not based upon Paul's own account of his stay in Corinth.

On the other hand, it must be recognized that there are some striking points of contact between the Book of Acts and the epistles to the Corinthians. A Crispus is mentioned by Paul as one of the few converts whom he had himself baptized, and though he says nothing to indicate that he had been a ruler of the synagogue, or even a Jew, there is no reason to doubt that he is the man whose conversion Luke reports.[4] Aquila and Priscilla Paul refers to more than once as persons of influence and importance,[5] while Acts xviii. 19 and 1 Cor. xvi. 19 agree in giving them a residence at a later time in Ephesus. Silas and Timothy are said in Acts xviii. 5 to have been with Paul in Corinth, which agrees with Paul's own statement in 2 Cor. i. 19 and with the fact that their names appear in the salutations of the First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians, both of which were written from Corinth. And it is perhaps not without significance that in the salutation of the First

[1] Titus Justus is mentioned in none of Paul's epistles.
[2] 1 Cor. i. 16, xvi. 15, 16.
[3] 1 Cor. i. 11, 14, xvi. 17.
[4] 1 Cor. i. 14; Acts xviii. 8.
[5] Rom. xvi. 3, 1 Cor. xvi. 19; cf. also 2 Tim. iv. 19.

Epistle to the Corinthians occurs the name Sosthenes, which was borne by the ruler of the synagogue referred to in Acts xviii. 17. Luke, to be sure, says nothing of his conversion to Christianity, and whether the two are identical, we do not know.

Finally, it is to be noticed that the hostility of the Jews upon which the author of the Acts lays such stress in his account, and about which he has something quite definite to report,[1] is apparently confirmed by Paul's First Epistle to the Thessalonians, in which he speaks as if he were enduring their opposition at the time he wrote.[2] The account, in fact, of the effort of the Jews to excite the enmity of the Proconsul Gallio against Paul, and to secure his condemnation by the civil authorities, bears every mark of truth. Gallio himself, who became proconsul of Achaia toward the end of Claudius' reign, is known to us as the brother of the famous Stoic Seneca, and as a man of high character and philosophical disposition. That he should have refused to entertain such a complaint as the Jews brought against Paul was but natural. The Jews, to be sure, accused Paul not of an offence against their own law, but of persuading men to worship God contrary to the law of the empire; but Gallio was acquainted with the people with whom he was dealing, and knew that their hostility to Paul was due solely to their concern for their own religion and not for the religion and laws of Rome, which they cared nothing about. He therefore summarily dismissed the complaint. The only surprising thing about the matter is that the Jews should have imagined that he would do anything else. Possibly they thought as he was new to his position — they seem to have made their complaint soon after his accession to office — they might be able to influence him to do what, under ordinary circumstances, no just and capable governor would think of doing. This striking narrative, taken in connection with the numerous agreements pointed out just above between the Book of Acts and Paul's epistles, makes it evident that while Luke's account of Paul's first visit to Corinth was not

[1] Acts xviii. 12 sq. [2] 1 Thess. ii. 15 sq.; cf. also iii. 7.

written by any one who was intimately associated with him, it was yet based upon an older source, and was not the product of the writer's imagination.

It is clear from many passages in Paul's epistles to the Corinthians that they owed their Christianity to him. He did not enter into the heritage of some other man's labors.[1] On the contrary, he himself laid the foundations; he himself first planted the Gospel seed among them.[2] He reminds them that he is their father;[3] and he tells them that he is jealous over them, for it was he that had espoused them to Christ.[4] He glories in them, for they are his own work in the Lord and the seal of his apostleship;[5] they are his epistle, known and read of all men.[6] From him they had received the traditions which they were still holding fast, and the Gospel in which they were standing and by which they were saved.[7]

But though Christianity in Corinth was due in the first instance to Paul's evangelistic labors, it is significant that he did not esteem it his chief work to organize a church and to gather his converts into it, but simply to preach the Gospel. Christ sent him not to baptize, but to preach;[8] and the baptism of those who believed concerned him so little that he left it almost entirely to others, and was unable even to remember whether he had himself baptized any one except Crispus and Gaius and the household of Stephanas.[9] It cannot be concluded from this that his Corinthian converts were commonly left unbaptized. It is clear, from 1 Cor. i. 13 and xii. 13, that baptism was practised in Corinth just as it was elsewhere, and that every believer was expected to signify his entrance upon the Christian life by receiving the rite. But Paul's indifference respecting the matter shows that his interest while he was in Corinth lay rather in Christianity than in the church; rather in the progress of the Gospel than in the establishment of an institution. And

[1] 2 Cor. x. 14.
[2] 1 Cor. iii. 6, 10; cf. also iii. 1 and ix. 11.
[3] 1 Cor. iv. 14 sq.; 2 Cor. xii. 14.
[4] 2 Cor. xi. 2.
[5] 1 Cor. ix. 2; 2 Cor. i. 14.
[6] 2 Cor. iii. 2.
[7] 1 Cor. xi. 2, xv. 1 sq.
[8] 1 Cor. i. 17.
[9] 1 Cor. i. 14 sq.

what was true of him in Corinth was true of him elsewhere as well. He was a preacher, not an organizer; and it was apparently his general custom to leave to his converts the adoption of such methods as seemed to them necessary for the conduct of the affairs of the church. He thought of them always as guided and controlled in all their relations with one another by the Spirit of God, and under such circumstances organization, rites and ceremonies, and regulations for the conduct of worship and discipline, seemed matters of small moment to him. The peculiar practice of baptizing the living for the dead, to which he refers in 1 Cor. xv. 29, would seem to imply that already, before that epistle was written, the custom had grown up in Corinth of postponing baptism until the convert had received a certain amount of Christian instruction and the sincerity of his conversion had been tested; so that entrance upon the Christian life and baptism did not necessarily coincide. This was the almost universal custom in the second century, and it was not unnatural that where the Pauline idea of baptism as a symbol of burial and resurrection with Christ prevailed, the desire should arise, when a believer happened to die without baptism, to testify that he had died with Christ, and would therefore rise again with him, by having another baptized as his representative. Paul can hardly have understood the practice to mean more than a mere testimony of the believer's real oneness with Christ; for if it was based upon a superstitious idea that the rite possessed a magical efficacy in and of itself, we may be sure that he would have condemned it, or that he would at any rate have refrained from giving it such tacit sanction as is implied in his employment of it as an argument for the resurrection of the dead. Possibly the practice actually did foster such an exaggerated and unhealthful estimate of the rite, and was in consequence finally opposed by Paul, and given up by his converts. At any rate, it never became common in the Christian church.[1]

[1] The practice is reported to have existed in the Marcionitic and Cerinthian sects (see Tertullian: *De res. carnis*, 48, and *Adv. Marc.* V. 10, for the Marcion-

According to the Book of Acts, Paul spent something more than a year and a half in Corinth, and the work that he accomplished there makes it evident that the length of his stay is not exaggerated. Whether he remained in the city itself during all that time, or preached the Gospel in other parts of the province as well, we do not know. There were, at any rate, Christian disciples in Achaia, outside of Corinth, when he wrote his last epistle, for he addressed it not simply to the church in Corinth, but also to "all the saints in the whole of Achaia";[1] and the household of Stephanas he calls the firstfruits not of the city simply, but of the province.[2]

8. The Evangelization of Asia

Leaving Corinth probably in the spring or summer of 49, in company with his friends and fellow-workers, Aquila and Priscilla,[3] Paul made his way to the seaport Cenchreæ and thence took ship for Syria by way of Ephesus. There is no sign that he left under the pressure of persecution. He seems to have felt that he had succeeded in establishing Christianity upon a firm foundation in Achaia and that it was time for him to seek a new field. It is significant that he did not go on westward toward Rome, but that he turned back again toward the East. He doubtless had the still unevangelized province of Asia in mind, and though he probably did not give up his design of proclaiming the Gospel ultimately in Rome itself, he was apparently anxious first to accomplish the work which he had been prevented from doing before he visited Macedonia and Achaia. Whatever it was that had hindered him from preaching in Asia two years or more earlier,[4] the situation had evidently changed in the meantime, so that he could now attempt what he had then been obliged to postpone. Ephesus was one of the most important and influential cities of the East, and if once established there, Christianity might well hope

ites; and Epiphanius: *Hær.* XXVIII. 7, for the Cerinthians), but we hear of it nowhere else. Cf. Heinrici's Commentary on First Corinthians, *in loc.*

[1] Cf. also 1 Cor. i. 1; 2 Cor. xi. 10; Rom. xvi. 1.

[2] 1 Cor. xvi. 15. [3] Acts xviii. 18. [4] Acts xvi. 6.

to penetrate speedily into all parts of Asia Minor. It is not to be wondered at, therefore, that Paul should wish to preach the Gospel there before going further westward.

Before entering upon a new campaign, he desired to visit the scene of his earlier labors, and he consequently tarried only a short time in Ephesus and then hastened on to Antioch, promising to return in the near future.[1] The author of the Acts reports that he set sail from Ephesus for Cæsarea, and that when he had landed there he "went up and saluted the church," meaning apparently the church of Jerusalem.[2] But there are difficulties in the way of supposing that Paul visited Jerusalem at this time. After the agreement made with James and Peter and John, he would certainly not wish to go thither empty-handed, but would prefer to wait until he had gathered the collection for the poor saints of the Mother Church upon which he lays such stress in his epistles to the Corinthians and Romans. Moreover, the account of his later visit to Jerusalem, in Acts xxi., is such as to imply that he had not been in the city since the time of the conference concerning Gentile Christianity.[3] It looks as if the statement that he "went up and saluted the church" were due to the author's assumption that Paul could not have gone back to Syria without paying his respects to the older apostles; an assumption which was entirely natural in one who held the general view that he did touching the relation between Paul and them. Our conclusion in this matter is confirmed by Luke's apparent lack of knowledge touching the particulars of the visit to which he refers in such general and even ambiguous terms.[4]

[1] Acts xviii. 21. [2] Acts xviii. 22. [3] Cf. especially Acts xxi. 25.

[4] The vow which is spoken of in Acts xviii. 18 had no connection, as is sometimes supposed, with Paul's alleged visit to Jerusalem. Even if it was Paul himself and not Aquila who took the vow, which is by no means certain, there is not the slightest reason to suppose that it involved a journey to Jerusalem. A vow seems to have been made by either Paul or Aquila that some particular thing should be done, and as a sign his hair was to be allowed to grow until it was accomplished. To what the vow had reference and when it was fulfilled we have no means of knowing; but such vows were very common in those days and there is nothing out of the ordinary in the one recorded by Luke.

After a stay of some time at Antioch, Paul visited again his churches in Galatia,[1] and from thence made his way back to Ephesus, where he had left Aquila and Priscilla a few weeks or months before.[2] Here he took up his residence and carried on an active evangelistic campaign for some three or more years.[3] It is to be regretted that we possess no such elaborate epistle as those to the Galatians, Thessalonians, and Corinthians, from which we may learn of the origin of the church of Ephesus and of Paul's long and important work there. The so-called Epistle to the Ephesians was not addressed to that church,[4] and it throws very little light upon the condition of things even in the other churches of the province to which it seems actually to have been sent. And yet we are not without sources. We have a brief note intended to introduce and commend Phœbe to the Ephesian Christians; and two short letters or fragments of letters incorporated in 2 Timothy.[5] We have also scattered notices in Paul's two epistles to the Corinthians, one of which was written in Ephesus and the other soon after he left there; an address to the Ephesian elders recorded in Acts xx. 18 sq.; and finally the somewhat extended but not altogether satisfactory account in the Book of Acts.[6]

The brief note of introduction referred to throws more light than any of the other sources upon the life of the Ephesian church. It is found in Rom. xvi. 1–23. That that passage did not constitute originally a part of the Epistle to the Romans seems plain enough. It is inconceivable that Paul, who had never been in Rome when

[1] Acts xviii. 23.

[2] Paul apparently did not take the main road to Ephesus, which passed through Colossæ and Laodicea, for Col. ii. 1 seems to indicate that he had visited neither of those cities. He must have taken the less frequented but somewhat more direct route running through the Cayster valley, a little to the north of the main road. (See Ramsay: *Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 93 sq.) He probably made his way directly to Ephesus without stopping to do evangelistic work in other parts of the province. It was always his custom to seek the great centres, and we have a possible confirmation for the assumption that he followed his usual plan in this case in Rom. xvi. 5, where Epænetus, apparently a resident of Ephesus (see just below), is called the "firstfruits of Asia."

[3] Acts xx. 31; cf. xix. 8, 10, 22.

[4] See below, p. 379.

[5] See below, p. 407.

[6] Acts xix.

he wrote his epistle, should not only know personally so many members of the Roman church, but should also be intimately acquainted with their situation and surroundings.[1] There is far less of the personal element in the remainder of the epistle than in most of Paul's letters, and yet in this single sixteenth chapter more persons are greeted by name than in all his other epistles combined, and the way in which he refers to them shows a remarkable familiarity with local conditions in the church to which he is writing. The Epistle to the Romans comes to a fitting close at the end of chapter fifteen, and the disordered state of the text in the latter part of the epistle, and the repetitions and displacements of the doxologies in some of the most ancient manuscripts, suggest that one or more additions have been made to the original letter. On the other hand, while the chapter in question seems entirely out of place in a letter addressed to the church of Rome, it contains just such greetings, and just such a wealth of personal allusions as might be expected in an epistle sent to Ephesus, where Paul labored so long and zealously. There are to be found in it, moreover, certain specific references that point to Ephesus as the place of its destination. Among those to whom Paul sends salutations are Epænetus, the "firstfruits of Asia,"[2] and Aquila and Priscilla, whom he calls his fellow-workers, and who, as we know, labored with him in Ephesus during at least the greater part of his stay in the city. He refers to the church in their house both in this chapter and in his First Epistle to the Corinthians,[3] which was written at Ephesus. Among those who join Paul in sending greetings are Timothy and Erastus, both of whom were with him in Ephesus.[4] It is clear also, from 1 Cor. i. 11 and xvi. 15 sq., that the intercourse between the Christians of Ephesus and of Corinth was close and constant, and it is therefore not surprising that there should be others in the latter city at the time Paul wrote, who were personally known to the Ephesian disciples.[5] Finally, it

[1] As Jülicher (*Einleitung*, S. 73) remarks, a regular migration of Paul's converts to Rome must have taken place, including whole families.

[2] Rom. xvi. 5.

[3] 1 Cor. xvi. 19.

[4] Acts xix. 22; cf. 1 Cor. iv. 17.

[5] Rom. xvi. 21 sq.

should be observed that Paul's references to the fact that Aquila and Priscilla had laid down their necks in his behalf, and that Andronicus and Junias had been his fellow-prisoners, — references which seem to recall events well known to the Christians to whom he was writing, — point to dangers and sufferings similar to those which we know he was called upon to face in Ephesus. In the light of such facts as these, it is altogether probable that we have in the sixteenth chapter of Romans, a letter addressed to the Ephesian church.[1] It is possible that it is only part of a larger epistle now lost, but it is more likely that we have it practically complete and in its original form. Just as it stands, it constitutes an appropriate note of introduction and commendation, and there is no sign that it is merely a fragment. That it should have been attached to the Epistle to the Romans is not particularly surprising. It was evidently written from Corinth, as the Epistle to the Romans was, and at about the same time with that epistle. It may have been transcribed also by the same hand, and in that case nothing would be more natural than that the smaller should become attached to the larger in copies of the two taken in Corinth at the time they were written.

The amount of information contained in this brief note touching the work of Paul in Ephesus, and the conditions existing there at the time it was written, is not great, but there are a few welcome hints which we shall do well to observe.[2] It is clear that there were Jewish as well as Gentile Christians in the church and among Paul's fellow-workers. He calls Andronicus, Junias, and Herodion his kinsmen; and Aquila and Priscilla were also Jews, as we learn from Acts xviii. 2. To these is to be added, if we may judge from her name, the Mary mentioned in vs. 6, making altogether at least six of Jewish birth, or nearly

[1] The theory that Rom. xvi. was addressed to Ephesus instead of Rome was first broached by Schultz in 1829, and has been accepted by Renan, Weiss, Weizsäcker, Jülicher, and many others. The arguments against the theory are given with the greatest possible fulness in Sanday's recent Commentary on Romans, pp. xciii sq. and 418 sq.

[2] Cf. especially Weizsäcker *l.c.* S. 331 sq. (Eng. Trans., Vol. I. p. 392 sq.).

one-fourth of the list. Aquila and Priscilla were probably converted under Paul's influence in Corinth, and learned the Gospel first from his own lips, but Andronicus and Junias were Christians before him. That he speaks of them as his fellow-prisoners and as men of note among the apostles simply shows that it was not an uncommon thing for other Jewish Christians, besides those converted by Paul himself, to be in hearty sympathy with his work, and to labor side by side with him for the advancement of the Gospel. We are doubtless too prone to regard the cases of Barnabas and Silas as exceptional in this respect. It is altogether likely that Andronicus and Junias were but two among many of their class whom Paul could count as his supporters and fellow-apostles.

It is interesting to note also that there were at least three congregations or local bodies of Christians in Ephesus at the time Paul wrote. He speaks in vs. 5 of the church in the house of Aquila and Priscilla,[1] and the two groups of disciples to which he refers in vss. 14 and 15 evidently constituted similar churches or companies of disciples. And yet they were all a part of the church of Ephesus and there was no schism among them. Paul introduces Phœbe to the church as a whole and addresses them all as members of one body. We have in these local or house churches an example of what must have been very common from the beginning in all the larger cities.[2] The Christians of a particular neighborhood or those who were bound together by any special ties, whether domestic, social, or industrial, would naturally constitute a special church of their own, would meet by themselves for worship, would partake together of the common meal or Lord's Supper, and would perhaps even receive and dispense their own alms and administer their own discipline, at least to a certain extent, while all the time regarding themselves as fellow-disciples with other Christians in all parts of the city and as members of one common church. It may be that the servants and slaves belonging to the households of Aristobulus and Narcissus, to whom Paul refers in vss.

[1] Cf. also 1 Cor. xvi. 19. [2] Cf. Col. iv. 15, and Philemon 2.

10 and 11, likewise constituted family churches of their own. It is at any rate significant that Paul speaks of them in a body without mentioning any of their names, as if they formed a community by themselves and had their significance rather as members of it than as individuals. It was doubtless, indeed, in the families of wealthy householders, who had large numbers of slaves, that the local or house churches were most common.[1]

Paul speaks with peculiar tenderness in vs. 13 of a woman whose name he does not give: "Salute Rufus the chosen in the Lord and his mother and mine." Such words mean much from a man of Paul's temperament. It must be that she had had peculiar opportunities of rendering him such services as only a woman can. It is possible, as Weizsäcker suggests, that Paul had made his home with her and her son, and if that were so, he may have had good cause to remember with gratitude many occasions during his troublous stay in Ephesus when her motherly care had blessed both his body and his mind. From vss. 17–20 we learn that the church of Ephesus was not wholly free from internal difficulties. Certain disciples of antinomian tendencies were creating divisions and leading the hearts of the innocent astray; but they seem not to have been causing any very serious trouble, for Paul was convinced that their efforts would soon be defeated, and he could rejoice over the Ephesian Christians in general because their obedience was known of all men. Thus, though the note is a brief one, and though it was written only for the purpose of commending Phœbe to the disciples of Ephesus, we can gather from it some interesting and instructive hints touching the life of the Ephesian church and the personality of its membership.

From the two letters to Timothy, incorporated in Second Timothy, we learn one or two additional facts. An Onesiphorus is mentioned in 2 Tim. i. 16 sq. and iv. 19, whose home was in Ephesus and who ministered to Paul in many ways both there and in Rome. He was apparently dead at the time Paul wrote his final letter to Timothy, for

[1] Cf. also 1 Cor. i. 11, where "those of Chloe's household" are spoken of.

greetings are sent only to his family; but the apostle had very tender memories of him and commends both his courage and his love. A certain coppersmith named Alexander is also mentioned in the earlier of the two notes [1] and Timothy is warned to beware of him, because he had done Paul much evil and had opposed his preaching bitterly. The later of the two notes refers also to two Ephesian Christians, Phygelus and Hermogenes, who with many others had turned away from the apostle, not, however, until long after his departure from the city.[2]

For an insight into Paul's own life during his residence in the capital city of the province of Asia, we find his two epistles to the Corinthians most helpful. That he was subjected to the severest trials, and that he had many hardships and much suffering to endure, is clear enough from such passages as 1 Cor. iv. 10 sq., xv. 30, 31, and from many utterances in his second epistle which were without doubt due in part at least to experiences he had passed through but a short time before in Ephesus.[3]

One incident to which he refers in 1 Cor. xv. 32 is of especial significance. "If after the manner of men I fought with beasts[4] at Ephesus," he cries, "what doth it profit me?" These words are commonly interpreted as referring to his conflict with his human adversaries,[5] but why he should appeal in such a striking way and at the very climax of his argument to that which was so common an experience with him in other cities, as well as in Ephesus, it is difficult to understand. His words seem to imply that he had in mind a certain definite and unique event; that he was, in fact, actually condemned while in Ephesus to a combat with wild beasts in the arena.[6] It is

[1] 2 Tim. iv. 14 sq.

[2] 2 Tim. i. 15. Whether Hymenæus and Philetus, mentioned in 2 Tim. ii. 17, belonged to Ephesus, we do not know. The passage in which their names occur is probably from another hand than Paul's. The same may be said of the Hymenæus (very likely the same one just referred to), and of the Alexander (not to be identified with the coppersmith of 2 Tim. iv. 14), mentioned in 1 Tim. i. 20.

[3] Cf., *e.g.*, 2 Cor. i. 4 sq., vii. 5, xi. 23 sq.; cf. also his address to the elders of Ephesus in which his trials and his tears are emphasized (Acts xx. 19, 31).

[4] ἐθηριομάχησα. [5] Cf., *e.g.*, Heinrici, *in loc.*

[6] So also Weizsäcker, *l.c.* S. 325 (Eng. Trans., Vol. I. p. 385).

surprising, to be sure, that he escaped with his life, but we know that such a thing sometimes occurred. It is surprising, too, that he does not mention so remarkable an experience in 2 Cor. xi. 23 sq., where he recounts many of his trials and adventures. But the two epistles were written to the same church, and as he had mentioned it in the first, it may have seemed unnecessary to do so in the second. The incident was well known to his readers, and would of course at once occur to them as one of the many occasions on which he had been brought face to face with death.[1] But if Paul was compelled to face the wild beasts in the arena, he must have been regularly condemned by the civil authorities. Probably his preaching, which was done largely in public,[2] finally aroused such widespread hostility against him, that an uproar resulted, and he was arrested and condemned to death as the cause of it. In the exercise of his extraordinary police jurisdiction, the provincial governor might pass sentence upon Paul, if he believed that the public peace was endangered by him, even though he had committed no actual crime.[3] And it was within his province, when the contest in the arena did not result fatally, to set him free, if he chose, instead of sending him to the executioner as was commonly done. Doubtless he was convinced that Paul would avoid creating any more disturbances. It may have been in connection with the same event that Paul underwent the imprisonment which is implied in his reference to his fellow-prisoners Andronicus and Junias.[4] They were perhaps arrested as his accomplices and thrown into prison with him, but escaped the condemnation which fell upon him as the ringleader.

That the disturbance which led to this almost fatal result is the same as the one described in Acts xix. 23 sq., as due to the hostility of Demetrius, the silversmith, is possible, but by no means certain. It is significant that the town clerk suggests that if Demetrius and his

[1] 2 Cor. xi. 23, 26.

[2] See Mommsen: *Der Religionsfrevel nach römischem Recht* (*Historische Zeitschrift*, Bd. 64, 1890, S. 389 sq.).

[3] Acts xix. 9, xx. 20.

[4] Rom. xvi. 7; cf. 2 Cor. xi. 23.

companions have a grievance against any one, they are at liberty to bring the matter before the proconsul; and it may be that this was exactly the course followed. But we learn from 2 Cor. i. 8 sq., that before leaving Ephesus Paul was again brought face to face with death, and barely escaped with his life. The reference in this case must be to a new danger and a new escape; for he speaks of it as a recent experience of which the Corinthians have not yet heard, while of his earlier trial he told them in his first epistle written more than a year before. Possibly the trouble with Demetrius is identical with the later rather than with the earlier experience. If Paul had already been condemned some time before as a disturber of the peace, and if he had taken up his evangelistic work again after his release, such an uproar as that started by Demetrius would of course be exceedingly dangerous, and would make it necessary for him to flee for his life; and he might easily speak of it a few weeks later in the strong terms of 2 Cor. i. 8 sq., even though, because he was fortunate enough to get away, it actually resulted in no serious consequences. In favor of the supposition that it is to this affair that Paul refers in 2 Cor. i. 9 sq., might be urged the fact that it is put by the author of the Acts at the very end of Paul's stay in Ephesus, and that his departure from the city is closely connected with it. But in a fragmentary account such as we have in the nineteenth chapter, little stress can be laid upon the order in which the events are narrated. At any rate, whether the incident is to be connected with either of the experiences to which Paul refers in his Corinthian epistles, the general trustworthiness of Luke's account cannot be questioned. The occurrence is too true to life and is related in too vivid a way to permit a doubt as to its historic reality.[1] The only point in it that is not quite clear is the part played by the Jew Alexander.[2]

[1] Upon Demetrius, the silversmith, and the riot incited by him see especially Ramsay: *Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 112 sq., with the literature referred to by him; and compare also his *St. Paul, the Traveller and Roman Citizen*, p. 277 sq.

[2] It is of course natural to identify the Jew Alexander, of Acts xix. 33, with Alexander, the coppersmith, mentioned in 2 Tim. iv. 14. But the identification

Possibly the Jews of the city feared that the disturbance might result, as such disturbances were very apt to do, in an attack upon them because of their known hostility to idolatry; and they may have endeavored to prevent such an attack by drawing the attention of the crowd back to Paul, who was the original cause of the uproar, and by disclaiming all connection with him and his followers.

But though Luke thus records an incident that bears all the marks of truth, it is noticeable that he says nothing about the dangers and trials of which Paul himself speaks with such feeling. Even the riot instigated by Demetrius is related in such a way as to leave the impression that Paul himself was brought into no serious danger by it. In fact, there is no sign in the account of Acts that his residence in Ephesus was a time of peculiar tribulation. Nothing is said of the peril which was daily besetting him at the time he wrote his First Epistle to the Corinthians; nothing of his conflict in the arena; nothing of the narrow escape to which he refers in 2 Cor. i. 9 sq.; nothing of his imprisonment; nothing of the "trials which befell him by the plots of the Jews";[1] nothing of the anxiety caused him by the Corinthian Christians, and of his active intercourse with them. It is impossible to discover a satisfactory reason for the intentional omission of such occurrences as these, and we are again forced to the conclusion that the sources upon which the author relied were fragmentary, and, as in so many other cases, failed to relate the events which were of most interest and concern to Paul himself.

At the time Paul wrote his First Epistle to the Corinthians, it would seem that an enlarged opportunity for usefulness had recently opened before him in Ephesus, and that he was anticipating a period of uncommon success.[2]

is doubtful, for the trade of the latter, and the evil done by him to Paul, suggest rather that he belonged to the heathen craftsmen whose hostility against Paul was incited by Demetrius. The name Alexander was a very common one, and not much weight can be laid upon the identity. At any rate, it would seem from a comparison of 2 Tim. iv. 14, and 2 Cor. i. 8, that the Alexander mentioned in the former passage was one of those whose hostility brought Paul into such imminent danger, and led to his flight from the city. See below, p. 409.

[1] Acts xx. 19. [2] 1 Cor. xvi. 9.

He was not even now free from adversaries, but they seem only to have made him the more eager to push the work forward and to take advantage of the open door. It may well be that his arrest and imprisonment, while it had put a stop for a time to his evangelistic work, had resulted in the end to the advantage of his cause. It must at any rate have made him better known throughout the city, while his release by the governor would naturally deter his enemies from making another attempt at once to secure his condemnation. There is a hint, in Acts xix. 22, that Paul's public labors in the school of Tyrannus did not continue until the close of his stay in the city. It is altogether likely that after his release he pursued a quieter but none the less effective method, and thus accomplished as much as or even more than he had before, without forcing himself needlessly upon the attention of the authorities. At the same time he knew that he was in constant danger and that his adversaries might at any time succeed in compassing his death.[1] He apparently continued his labors, however, for a year or so longer, when suddenly the crisis came, and he was obliged to leave the city and make his way to Troas.[2] Paul's arrest and condemnation by the civil authorities thus divided his labors in Ephesus into two periods; the first marked until almost its close by steady growth and by comparative immunity from serious danger; the second exceedingly troubled, but affording nevertheless a splendid opportunity for successful evangelistic work.

There is no reason to doubt that when he first arrived in the city, he entered the synagogue, as reported by the author of Acts, and preached Christ to the Jews and through them to their Gentile adherents. If there was warrant anywhere for such a course, there certainly was in Ephesus, where the Jews were very numerous and where they had large numbers of proselytes. And the statement finds some confirmation in the present instance in the sixteenth chapter of Romans, where so many Jewish names are mentioned, and also in Paul's address to the elder

[1] 1 Cor. xv. 30. [2] 2 Cor. ii. 12.

brethren of Ephesus, in which he reminds them that he preached while among them both to Jews and Greeks. But his labors in the synagogue did not continue long. Luke is certainly following a trustworthy source, when he reports the very interesting fact that Paul taught during the greater part of his stay in Ephesus in the school of Tyrannus, which was probably a public hall such as was used as a lecture room by the philosophers and rhetoricians of the day. Paul must thus have appeared to the people of Ephesus as a travelling sophist, a representative of a class which was very large at that time in all parts of the empire; and jealous though they were of the honor of their patron goddess, it would naturally be some time before they thought of him as a dangerous character. Only after his influence had spread widely in the city and province,[1] and the effect of his teaching had shown itself in a marked and constantly increasing disrespect on the part of the common people for the religion of their fathers, would the attention of those who were interested either pecuniarily or otherwise in the practice of that religion be turned upon him, and his position become unsafe. This is the only recorded instance of the adoption of such a method by Paul, but it was very commonly followed by the Christian preachers of the second century, and had not a little to do with the spread of the idea that Christianity was a philosophy and not merely a religion and a life.

This first and apparently more public period of Paul's activity may have continued for a couple of years, but hardly more than that; for his First Epistle to the Corinthians was written nearly a year before his departure from the city, and he was there altogether only about three years.[2]

An interesting incident connected with Paul's stay in Ephesus is related in Acts xix. 1 sq. According to that passage, he found upon his arrival in the city certain disciples who had been baptized only with the baptism of John, and had not received the Holy Spirit when they be-

[1] Acts xix. 10, 26. [2] Acts xx. 31.

lieved. They had, in fact, not even heard that the Spirit was already come, as they expected him to come at the advent of the Messiah. The account is considerably confused and the author himself seems not to have had a very clear conception of the position of those whom he describes. He calls them disciples, that is, Christian disciples, and yet he implies that they knew nothing about Jesus.[1] But in spite of the confusion in the account, it is clear enough that we have to deal here with disciples of John the Baptist pure and simple, and with their conversion under the influence of Paul. That there should have been such disciples in Ephesus is not in the least surprising. We know from the Gospels that John's followers maintained their own separate existence even after their master's death, and that by no means all of them became disciples of Jesus. But as they were expecting the coming of the Messiah, it was not difficult for Paul to convince them that Jesus was he.[2] There is no reason to doubt the accuracy of the account as a whole, but it is clear that the author's conception, that it was a special function of the apostles to mediate the impartation of the Holy Ghost by the laying on of hands, moulded his representation, just as it did in connection with the work of Peter and John in Samaria.

A little farther on in the same chapter a curious tale is told of certain strolling Jews who plied the trade of exorcising demons[3] — a common trade in that day, as we know from various sources.[4] Impressed by Paul's power over evil spirits, they used the name of Jesus as a formula of adjuration with disastrous results to themselves; and as a consequence of their discomfiture many were converted to Christian discipleship, and those who had pursued

[1] Acts xix. 4.

[2] The existence of these disciples of John throws light back upon the relation between John and Jesus. See p. 11, above.

[3] Acts xix. 13 sq.

[4] It was natural in an age when lunacy and all the more aggravated forms of nervous disease were ascribed to the direct agency of evil spirits that exorcists should be very common. There were many of them among the Jews as well as among the Pagans, and the former claimed to have gained their knowledge of their art from Solomon. See the remarkable tale in Josephus, *Ant.* viii. 2, 5, and compare Matt. xii. 27.

magical arts publicly renounced their practices and burned their books. The account lacks clearness,[1] but there can be little doubt that it had a basis in fact,[2] and it is interesting as another instance of the contact of Christianity with the common superstition of the day,[3] and as another evidence of the belief of the early Christians that the Gospel was not simply an ethical and spiritual force, but also a power adequate for the production of marvellous effects in the realm of nature.[4]

Paul's influence while he was in Ephesus was not confined to the city, but extended throughout a large part of the province of Asia.[5] Epænetus is spoken of as the "firstfruits" not of Ephesus, but of "Asia,"[6] and greetings are sent to the Corinthians by the "churches of Asia."[7] Whether Paul himself preached in other cities of the province, we do not know. He certainly did not in Colossæ and Laodicea,[8] though we should naturally expect him to have done so, if he had made any general tour of the province. Troas he visited at least three times,[9] but only on his way to some other place, and he apparently passed through on each occasion without stopping to do any extended missionary work.[10] He probably remained the greater part of the time in Ephesus,

[1] In vs. 14 seven men are mentioned; in vs. 16 they are only two in number.

[2] The mention of the name of Sceva implies some actual occurrence as the basis of the report.

[3] Cf. also Acts viii. 9 sq., xiii. 6 sq., xvi. 16 sq. The effect produced by the discomfiture of the exorcists resembles that produced by the infliction of blindness upon the sorcerer Elymas according to Acts xiii. 12. In both cases the conversion of onlookers results.

[4] It is, perhaps, not without significance that in the same passage the purely marvellous element in Paul's own activity is emphasized. Instead of merely healing those with whom he comes in contact he works cures at a distance by means of handkerchiefs or towels to which special virtue has been imparted by contact with his body.

[5] Cf. Acts xix. 10, 26, xx. 18.

[6] Rom. xvi. 5.

[7] 1 Cor. xvi. 19.

[8] Cf. Col. ii. 1.

[9] Acts xvi. 8 sq., 2 Cor. ii. 12, and 2 Tim. iv. 13 (see below, p. 409); Acts xx. 5 sq.

[10] On the second occasion he seems to have intended to do missionary work in the city (see 2 Cor. ii. 12, where he says that he "came to Troas for the Gospel of Christ"), but though the opportunity was great, as might be expected in such an important seaport town and commercial centre, he was impatient to see Titus, and get news from him touching the church of Corinth, and so he hastened on to Macedonia after apparently only a brief stay.

the metropolis, and reached the surrounding country through his disciples. At any rate, he doubtless began in Ephesus.[1] Whether Christianity in Asia or in Ephesus owed its origin to his efforts, or whether he found Christians already there when he arrived, it is impossible to say. Paul himself makes no such statement as he does touching the church of Corinth. Possibly Andronicus and Junias were working there before he came upon the scene. But it is safe to assume that whatever Christianity there may have been in the province was largely sporadic, and that a systematic and effective campaign was begun first by Paul. There is no reason to suppose that Paul had any more to do with matters of organization in Ephesus than he had had in Corinth. Acts xx. 17 and 28 are quite widely cited as an evidence that there were regular church officers in Ephesus at this time, and the conclusion is drawn that Paul must have had something to do with their appointment or with the institution of the office which they filled. But there is no sign that the term "elders" in vs. 17 means anything more than elder brethren, and vs. 28, which speaks of them as appointed overseers or bishops by the Holy Spirit, makes rather against than for their official character. Read in the light of Paul's words in 1 Cor. xvi. 15, 16, it seems clear that this passage refers only to the spiritual control exercised naturally by the older and more mature brethren, without other appointment than that of God's Spirit, who calls every Christian to serve the church in such a way as he is best fitted to do.

The work of Paul in Ephesus seems to have been attended with a large measure of success, but it is a remarkable fact that his personal influence in the city and the province was apparently very short-lived. That he did not visit Ephesus again after he left for Macedonia, at the close of his three years' residence, may not be of any significance, for external circumstances sufficiently account for his failure to do so.[2] But that he wrote no epistle to

[1] Cf. Acts xx. 18.

[2] His haste while on his way to Jerusalem (Acts xx. 16) and his subsequent arrest and imprisonment.

the church, so far as we know, except the brief note of introduction already referred to, seems a little strange; and that in the latter part of the first century the church of Asia, which was in a very flourishing condition, should be practically without Pauline traditions, and that its entire history should group itself about another name than his, is still stranger.[1] What happened in Asia after his departure, we do not know; but there are indications that a serious defection of some kind took place, and that a break in the historic continuity of the Asiatic church occurred which made necessary a practically new beginning. While he was still in Corinth, Paul was compelled to caution the Christians of Ephesus against those who were causing divisions and occasions of stumbling;[2] and in his address to the Ephesian elders, he warns them that grievous wolves will enter after his departure, and that even of their own number men will arise, speaking perverse things.[3] If the words are Paul's, they show that he already saw grave reason to fear for the stability of the church. If, on the other hand, they were put into his mouth by the author, they testify to the existence of a very critical state of affairs either before or at the time the account was written. Moreover, the two epistles to Timothy, whether they are Paul's or not, bear witness to a similar condition of things; and 2 Tim. i. 15 is especially significant: "This thou knowest, that all that are in Asia turned away from me." It is with this sad statement that our knowledge of the personal connection between Paul and the churches of Asia comes to an end. We shall return to Asia again a little later, but we shall find other forces in control at that time. And yet, whatever Paul's relations to the Christians there during his later years, and whatever eclipse his credit and his authority may have suffered, it is clear that the impress of his thinking and teaching continued to be felt long after he had passed away, and that the peculiar form which the Christianity

[1] Cf. the Apocalypse and the Gospel and Epistles of John; also Papias (quoted by Eusebius: *H. E.* III. 39), Polycarp (Eusebius: *H. E.* V. 20), and Polycrates (Eusebius: *H. E.* III. 31). See p. 606 sq., below.

[2] Rom. xvi. 17 sq.

[3] Acts xx. 29 sq.

of Asia Minor took on in the late first and early second centuries was due in no small part to him.[1]

9. Trouble in the Church of Corinth

It was while Paul was still residing in Ephesus, that difficulties arose in the church of Corinth which demanded his serious attention. His work there had been very successful, and he had left the city with the hope that Christianity was so firmly established, and the Spirit of Christ so completely in control, that all would be well with his converts, and that the development of the church would be steady and normal. But after he had been in Ephesus about two years, some members of the household of a certain Chloe arrived from Corinth and brought him news of a very disquieting character. The proverbial party spirit of the Greeks had made itself felt even within the Christian brotherhood, and rival factions were appearing which threatened to put an end to the peace and unity of the church. "Now this I mean," Paul writes in 1 Cor. i. 12, "that each of you saith, I am of Paul; and I of Apollos; and I of Cephas; and I of Christ." The immediate occasion of this factional development is not far to seek. It was evidently due to the presence of Apollos, who had come to Corinth not long after Paul's departure from the city, and had labored there for some time.[2] Of Apollos himself we know very little. According to Acts xviii. 24, he was a Jew of Alexandria, well versed in the Scriptures and an eloquent and powerful speaker. The author of the Acts represents him as already a Christian before he reached Ephesus; but he says that though he had been instructed in the way of the Lord, and spake and taught carefully the things concerning Jesus, he knew only the baptism of John.[3]

This description of Apollos is not altogether clear. When it is said that he knew only the baptism of John, it is evidently the author's intention to class him with the Johannine disciples spoken of at the beginning of

[1] See below, p. 487 sq. [2] Acts xviii. 27. [3] vs. 25.

the next chapter. But as has been already seen, they did not know the "things concerning Jesus"; in other words, they did not know that he was the Messiah. When they learned that he was, they must have ceased to be disciples of John, and must have become disciples of Jesus; for, like their master, they were looking for the coming of the Christ. But as soon as a disciple of John became a disciple of Jesus the Christ, he knew more than the baptism of John, as Luke understands the phrase, whether he had been baptized into the name of Jesus or not; for it was an essential part of his belief that the Messiah at his coming would baptize with the Holy Spirit. And so if Apollos knew that Jesus was the Messiah, as reported in vs. 25[a], then vs. 25[b] can hardly be accurate in recording that he knew only the baptism of John, which means, as Luke uses the words, that he did not know the Spirit had been given.[1] On the other hand, if the latter statement is correct, he apparently did not know that Jesus was the Messiah, and the report that he "had been instructed in the way of the Lord," and "spake and taught carefully the things concerning Jesus," would seem to be erroneous. It is altogether probable that this was the case, and that Apollos was really only a disciple of John; for otherwise it is difficult to see what Priscilla and Aquila can have had to do in the matter. It seems clear that they did for him what Paul did for the disciples of John mentioned in the next chapter; that they told him of Jesus, and were thus the agents in his conversion to the Christian faith. There can be little doubt at any rate that the original source which Luke used, intended thus to represent them. The first part of vs. 25 must, then, have been added to the original account by the author of the Acts. He may have been led to do this because he could not imagine Apollos coming from Alexandria to preach in the synagogue at Ephesus, unless he was a Christian evangelist. That a Jew could proclaim the Messiah and yet not preach Jesus,

[1] Luke's conception of Apollos as a Christian who knew Jesus to be the Messiah, but did not know that the Holy Spirit had been given, is entirely in line with his external conception of the Spirit exhibited in so many passages, and with his idea, revealed in the first two chapters of the Acts, that the disciples received the Holy Ghost for the first time at Pentecost.

was doubtless inconceivable to him. We are therefore to think of Apollos as a disciple of John who was carrying on the work of his master and preaching to his countrymen repentance in view of the approaching kingdom of God.[1] Convinced by Priscilla and Aquila that Jesus was the Messiah whom he had been expecting, he would naturally carry on the same kind of work he had been doing and would become a Christian evangelist. His large knowledge of the Scriptures and his experience in expounding them in a Messianic sense would, of course, give him great power as a Christian preacher among the Gentiles as well as among the Jews. For, as we know from many sources the argument from prophecy was used with good effect in early generations for the conviction of the former as well as of the latter, and the Jewish Scriptures were studied as diligently by the converts from the ranks of the heathen as by their Hebrew brethren. The author of the Acts, it is true, seems to imply that Apollos labored while in Achaia as he had in Ephesus, chiefly, if not solely, among the Jews.[2] But 1 Cor. iii. 5 sq. makes it evident that he followed in Paul's footsteps, and though the size of the church may have been increased by his labors, its character was not changed; it was still as largely Gentile after Apollos left as it had been before he arrived. Apollos was in fact as truly an apostle to the Gentiles as Paul himself or any of Paul's fellow-workers.

The appearance of such a preacher as Apollos must have been hailed with delight by the Christians of Corinth. He was just the kind of a man to attract and interest a Greek audience. He had all the qualifications which the situation demanded. His eloquence, his learning, and his experience in the allegorical interpretation of the Scriptures, which he can hardly have failed to acquire in Alexandria, would all combine to impress those that heard him, and he must have been popular from the very start. It is

[1] For other interpretations of the passage relating to Apollos, see the commentaries *in loc.*, especially Wendt in the seventh edition of Meyer's Commentary on Acts. Wendt throws out the whole of vs. 25, regarding Apollos as a Jew who had no connection either with John or with Jesus.

[2] Acts xviii. 28.

certainly not to be wondered at that where party spirit was naturally so strong and where the contrast between the preaching of Apollos and of Paul was so marked, there should be many in the Corinthian church who proclaimed loudly their preference for the former and declared him to be a greater man than Paul. This incipient Apollos-party may have had its strength largely among his own converts, who had never known Paul; but there was much in his teaching which would seem even to those who had learned the Gospel from Paul's lips more profound and philosophical than anything the latter had to offer, and many of them must have been inclined to mingle their plaudits with those of the others, and to forget their own spiritual father. But the effort to magnify Apollos at the expense of Paul must of course arouse the animosity of others who were more loyal to the memory of the great apostle, and they in turn would loudly proclaim their devotion, and thus the harmony and peace of the church would speedily be disturbed by rival factions. Apollos himself was evidently entirely innocent in the matter. He had no intention of stirring up party feeling when he went to Corinth, and of undermining Paul's influence and reputation. It may be indeed that the trouble began only after he had left Corinth, or it is possible that he took his departure in consequence of it, not wishing to encourage his partisans in any way. At any rate, Paul bore him no grudge and held him in no way responsible. He speaks of him in his First Epistle to the Corinthians in terms of the fullest confidence, and he even urged him to return to Corinth in response to the wishes of the Christians there.[1] The two men were clearly on the best of terms and in complete sympathy in their work. But this fact makes it plain that the difference between the preaching of Paul and Apollos was rather a difference of form than of substance. They did not proclaim two Gospels, but one and the same Gospel. Their method and their style of preaching might differ, but they were one in their aims, one in their devotion to Christ, one in their conception of Christianity and the Christian life.

[1] 1 Cor. xvi. 12.

Had he not known this, Paul could not have said that he had planted and Apollos had watered, and that "both he that planteth and he that watereth are one."[1]

The rise of the two parties that have been described might easily lead to the formation of a third. The emphasis laid upon the merits of their respective heroes by the partisans of Apollos and of Paul would naturally suggest to others an appeal from both of them to the original apostles of the Lord, who possessed a dignity enjoyed by no other missionaries however able and successful. Thus the Cephas-party arose, taking its name from the one who had been from the beginning the leader and spokesman of the Twelve. It is not necessary to suppose, as some have done, that Peter had himself visited Corinth. In view of the fact that Paul nowhere refers to such a visit and while he speaks of himself as planting and Apollos as watering says nothing of the labors of Peter, it seems extremely improbable that he had.[2] Dionysius of Corinth, writing toward the end of the second century, says that the church of Corinth was founded by Peter and Paul;[3] but he was interested to secure for his own church a dignity equal to that of Rome, and the reference to the Cephas-party in First Corinthians might easily have seemed to him a sufficient basis for the assumption that Peter had honored Corinth with his presence. In any case, even if Dionysius' statement were to be regarded as proving that Peter actually visited the city, it could hardly be supposed that he arrived there before the composition of First Corinthians.

It is very likely that many of those who ranged themselves under the banner of Peter were of Jewish birth,[4] but it is not necessary to suppose that they all were, and there is no reason to think that any of them were Judaizing in their tendency. They evidently met on friendly terms and communed freely with the other Christians of Corinth, who were certainly largely Gentiles, and they thus lived

[1] 1 Cor. iii. 6 sq. [2] Cf. also 1 Cor. iv. 6.

[3] Quoted by Eusebius: *H. E.* II. 25, 8. So far as I am aware, there is no other reference to Peter's Corinthian visit in early Christian literature.

[4] The use of the Hebrew name Cephas instead of the Greek Peter is perhaps an indication of this.

in a way entirely inconsistent with the principles of the Judaizers. The rise of a party, calling itself by the name of Peter, suggests, of course, that those who composed it regarded him and the rest of the Twelve as apostles in a special sense, and that Paul and Apollos were ranked together in their minds over against the others, and placed on a distinctly lower plane than they. And it may be due in part to this that Paul emphasized his own apostleship,[1] and declared that it was a matter of small moment to him that he was judged by the Corinthians, for he was accountable as an apostle to the Lord, and not to men.[2] But such overvaluation of the dignity and authority of the Twelve as compared with Paul, by no means involves a Judaizing purpose and practice, nor does it imply the desire to undermine and destroy Paul's influence and credit. If there was any such desire in the Corinthian church, or if there was an inclination to Judaize in any way, Paul was certainly not aware of it at the time he wrote his first epistle, for that epistle contains no hint of anything of the kind.

It is commonly supposed that in addition to the parties which have been described, there was also a fourth, or Christ-party, in the Corinthian church. Its character is widely disputed, but the prevailing view is that it was composed of Judaizers.[3] The chief ground for this opinion is found in the tenth and eleventh chapters of Second Corinthians. The persons attacked by Paul in those chapters are commonly regarded as Judaizers, and as they apparently claimed to belong to Christ, and to be his apostles and ministers in a peculiar sense,[4] it has been assumed that they were members of the Christ-party supposed to be referred to in First Corinthians. But even granting that they were Judaizers, as they probably were not, they can hardly be identified with the Christ-party of that epistle, for they were strangers who had recently come to Corinth with letters of introduction, while the Christ-party was evidently composed of members of the Corinthian church.

[1] 1 Cor. ix. [2] 1 Cor. iv. 3 sq.

[3] So, for instance, Weizsäcker, *l.c.* S. 275 sq., 299 sq. (Eng. Trans., Vol. I. pp. 329, 354).

[4] 2 Cor. x. 7, xi. 13, 23.

Moreover, if there was in Corinth at the time Paul wrote his first epistle a party composed of such men as he denounces in 2 Cor. x. and xi., it is inconceivable that he should nowhere in that epistle attack them or defend himself against them. But not simply is it a mistake to identify the persons attacked in 2 Corinthians with the Christ-party of 1 Cor. i., it is equally a mistake to suppose that there was any party in the Corinthian church arrogating to itself the name of Christ in an especial and exclusive sense. Had there been, Paul could hardly have spoken in the unguarded way he does in his epistle about those who were Christ's. We might have expected, for instance, that he would take occasion to say in such a passage as 1 Cor. xv. 23, "Not those who merely claim to be Christ's, like the members of the Christ-party, but those who really are Christ's."

But the decisive argument against the existence of any Christ-party in the Corinthian church is to be found in 1 Cor. iii. 22 sq. In that passage, at the close of his discussion of the divisions, and at the very climax of his denunciation of the party spirit, Paul speaks of three parties, but says nothing whatever of the fourth, or Christ-party, which, according to the common theory, was the worst and most dangerous of all. And more than that, he plays directly into the hands of that party, if it existed, by exhorting all the Corinthians to range themselves under the banner of Christ. "All things are yours," he cries, "whether Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas; . . . all are yours: and ye are Christ's." In view of these considerations, it is difficult to suppose that there was a fourth faction in Corinth, calling itself by the name of Christ. And indeed, when carefully examined, the passage in which the parties are referred to is seen itself to imply the existence of only three. The words in vs. 13, "Is Christ divided?" indicate that the fault of the Corinthians was not that they were rejecting Christ, and substituting another leader for him, but that they were dividing him. The implication is, that they all regarded themselves as alike under the banner of Christ, but that some were Pauline Christians, some Apollos-Chris-

tians, some Cephas-Christians. It seems clear, therefore, that the fourth term of vs. 12 was not, like the first three terms, a party watchword, but that it constituted the cry of other Corinthian disciples who belonged to none of the three factions, and who, disgusted at the display of party spirit, declared against all such divisions and announced their allegiance to Christ alone. With such a course Paul himself must have been in hearty sympathy. It was, in fact, just what he exhorted all the others to do. "Do not divide Christ," he says in effect. "We, Paul and Apollos and Cephas, whom ye are making the leaders of your parties, are only builders; Christ is the one foundation upon whom we all build; we are all Christ's, and ye are all Christ's."[1]

Paul therefore learned through the members of the household of Chloe of the existence not of four, but of three factional parties within the church of Corinth. But it is clear that though the church was thus torn and divided, open rupture had not yet occurred. All of the disciples still met together as one household of faith, and carried on their worship in common.[2] They were all addressed by Paul as one church,[3] and the epistle which they wrote him was sent, apparently, in the name of all.[4] Nevertheless, though the parties were yet in their incipiency, and though the church was still intact, there was decided danger in allowing such a divisive tendency to go on unchecked; and so, being unable to go at once to Corinth himself, as he wished to do, Paul despatched Timothy thither as his representative, hoping that he might succeed in harmonizing the various factions and in restoring peace to the church.[5]

[1] On the Corinthian parties, see especially Pfleiderer: *Urchristenthum*, S. 89 sq. See also Heinrici in Meyer's Commentary on First Corinthians, 7th ed. p. 7, 27 sq., where the various views and the literature upon the subject are given with considerable fulness.

[2] 1 Cor. xi. 18, xiv. 26. [3] 1 Cor. i. 2, v. 9. [4] Cf. 1 Cor. vii. 1.

[5] 1 Cor. iv. 17. This journey is without doubt the one referred to in Acts xix. 22. According to that passage, Timothy upon leaving Ephesus went to Macedonia, and it is implied in 1 Corinthians that he took that road to Corinth, for Paul, though writing after Timothy's departure, expected his letter, which he doubtless sent by the direct sea-route, to reach there before him (1 Cor. xvi. 10).

Meanwhile, soon after Timothy's departure, other Corinthian Christians made their appearance in Ephesus, bringing with them still farther news of a disturbing character.[1] As has been already remarked, Corinth was one of the most immoral cities in the world, and it was inevitable that the debased ethical tone of the community at large should make itself felt even within the church. There might be a sincere desire on the part of the disciples to live worthily of the Gospel of Christ, but their standards were necessarily low, and many things must seem to them comparatively harmless which in other less corrupt communities would be universally condemned. Thus they were inclined to regard fornication as the gratification of a natural appetite, involving no greater sin than eating and drinking. This was the common estimate of it in Corinth, and it is therefore hardly to be wondered at that there were Christians who held the same view. So long as Paul himself was present, such an opinion could hardly prevail within the church; but after his departure, as the number of disciples multiplied, it would be easy for it to find lodgment and it would be difficult for those who did not like it to prove it wrong. Already some time before the events which we have been describing, Paul seems to have learned that the tendency was abroad in the church to look with altogether too much leniency upon those who practised fornication, and as a consequence he had written an epistle in which he had exhorted the Corinthians to have nothing to do with such persons, and to hold themselves entirely aloof from them.[2] His remonstrances, however, had not had the desired effect. Instead of doing what he commanded, they were actually tolerating within their circle a man who was living with his stepmother in defiance of the common sentiments of decency that prevailed even in the world outside. And they were not simply tolerating him, they were even defending his course and were showing no signs of sorrow or

[1] That this additional news was brought not by the household of Chloe, but by later arrivals, seems to appear from the fact that Paul gives as his reason for sending Timothy to Corinth not the other disorders to which he refers in his epistle, but only the divisions which have been described.

[2] 1 Cor. v. 9. This epistle is no longer extant.

of shame.[1] Moreover, they were justifying their utter disregard of Paul's direction not to associate with fornicators, by claiming that such a command was impracticable, for they could not avoid associating with them unless they left the world altogether.[2] Their action in the matter was not due to a contempt for Paul's authority, and did not indicate that they cared nothing about him or his wishes; for they wrote him quite an extended epistle in which they asked his instruction concerning a variety of subjects. But it is evident that they had no such conception as he had of the sinfulness of fornication, and that they regarded his scruples as due to mere prudery. They were concerned, therefore, rather to defend their course of action than to change it.

But the tendency of the Corinthians to look with indifference upon sins of the flesh was not the only additional source of anxiety to Paul. Quarrelsomeness and a love of litigation, common fruits of the natural self-assertiveness of the Greeks, and of their almost morbid sense of individual rights, had begun to play havoc with the peace of the Christian brotherhood.[3] There were also very serious disorders connected with their religious exercises; and it seems that doubts were beginning to prevail touching the reality of the resurrection of the dead, and that even the resurrection of Christ was denied by some. Such doubts affected not a mere subordinate doctrine, but the very heart of Paul's Gospel, and it is no wonder that he felt deeply concerned.

But in addition to the disquieting reports which have been referred to, there was received by Paul, soon after Timothy's departure, an epistle from the Corinthians written in reply to the one he had sent them some time before.[4] The contents of this letter, which is no

[1] 1 Cor. v. 2. [2] Cf. 1 Cor. v. 10 sq. [3] 1 Cor. vi. 1 sq.

[4] The epistle was probably brought by Stephanas, Fortunatus and Achaicus, to whom Paul refers in 1 Cor. xvi. 17. It may have been they, also, that brought him the news of the sad state of affairs that existed in the Corinthian church; but his statement that they had supplied that which was lacking on the part of the Corinthians and had refreshed his spirit makes it doubtful. Still, it is possible that they brought him good news in addition to the bad, and Paul may have chosen at the close of his epistle to refer only to that which was a cause of rejoicing to him. He may not have wished, moreover, to have the Corinthians know that these men had reported bad things of them.

longer extant, can be gathered at least in part from First Corinthians. The Christians of Corinth had apparently given utterance in it to their misunderstanding of Paul's epistle touching association with fornicators[1] and had then asked his advice concerning various practical questions about which their own opinions were divided: for instance, whether it was right for a disciple to marry;[2] whether a believing husband or wife ought to separate from an unbelieving companion;[3] whether it was lawful for a Christian to eat meat sacrificed to idols;[4] and finally what was to be thought of spiritual gifts, and of their relative value.[5] They seem also to have asked for directions in regard to the collection for the saints of Jerusalem,[6] and to have requested that Apollos might return to them.[7]

It was in reply to this lost letter that Paul wrote the epistle which is commonly known as First Corinthians. After commending his readers in general terms, he plunged at once into the subject which had very likely been uppermost in his mind ever since the arrival of Chloe's household. Though he had already sent Timothy to heal the dissensions of which he had been told, he was still troubled about them, and he could not write to the Corinthians without referring to them. He doubtless saw in the immediate return to Corinth of the messengers from that church, a welcome opportunity to prepare the Corinthians for the coming of Timothy and to reinforce his efforts. What he says upon the subject is directed not primarily against the parties as such, but against the party spirit which underlay them. And yet he takes pains to emphasize the groundlessness of the dissatisfaction with himself and with his preaching which was felt by many after they had heard Apollos. He had not preached, as Apollos had, in such a way as to impress the multitude with his wisdom, but to those who had the ability to perceive it, the true wisdom of the Gospel which he had proclaimed was clearly mani-

[1] Cf. 1 Cor. v. 9 sq. [2] 1 Cor. vii. 1. [3] 1 Cor. vii. 10. [4] 1 Cor. viii. 1. [5] 1 Cor. xii. 1. [6] 1 Cor. xvi. 1.

[7] 1 Cor. xvi. 12. All of these subjects Paul introduces with the phrase *περὶ δέ*, as if referring in each case to matters mentioned by the Corinthians.

fest.[1] Had they been more truly spiritual, he might have imparted to them many of the deep things of God, but they had not been ready to receive them, as was shown very plainly by the effect which the preaching of Apollos had had upon them.[2] Their hold upon the great central truth of the Gospel was so slight, that they lost it as they listened to Apollos, and failed to distinguish between the essential and non-essential in his teaching, and thus supposed that they were hearing from his lips another and more profound Gospel than they had learned from Paul. It was not the fault of Apollos that they had thus misunderstood him; he had preached the true Gospel; but it was the fault of their own lack of spiritual discernment. There is an implication, to be sure, in what Paul says,[3] that Apollos may have built upon the one foundation which they both recognized something else than gold, silver, and precious stones; but the important thing was that he had not built upon another foundation, and his teaching was therefore at bottom one with Paul's, and the Corinthians should never have overlooked the fact. Every attempt to set the two over against each other and to use their names as party watchwords was entirely unjustifiable. So far as the Cephas-party was concerned, Paul thought it necessary to say little about it. His general attack upon the party spirit was, of course, directed against those who appealed to the name of Cephas as well as against the others; but he seems to have felt that the third party would disappear if the others did, and that, if the supremacy of Christ and the subordination of all his ministers were recognized as it should be, there would be no more difficulty. It was not so much an undervaluation of himself that was causing the trouble as an undervaluation of Christ; and he was concerned consequently not chiefly to exhibit his own superiority to others, but to magnify Christ, and to emphasize the nothingness of all men, himself included, in comparison with Christ, to whom all belong.[4] Only at the close does he remind the Corinthians of all that he has

[1] 1 Cor. i. 24, ii. 14.
[2] 1 Cor. iii. 1 sq.
[3] 1 Cor. iii. 8, 10 sq.
[4] 1 Cor. iii. 22 sq., iv. 6 sq.

suffered and endured, that he may touch their hearts and quicken their waning loyalty and affection for him;[1] and even then he does not rank himself above others, but classes himself with them,[2] not wishing to do anything to promote comparisons, and thus turn his readers' thoughts from Christ to his ministers.

Having finished what he had to say about the divisions in the church, Paul turned to other matters that were troubling him. His reference to himself and to all that he had endured and suffered was not primarily for the purpose of shaming the Corinthians, but that they might be reminded of his right to deal with them as a father with his children, and might thus accept the admonitions which he felt called upon to utter on account of the sad disorders which existed among them. As he begat them in Christ, they should not judge him, as some of them were doing in the pride of their new-found wisdom, but they should imitate him. It was to put them in remembrance of his life and teaching, which they seemed in danger of forgetting, or of disregarding altogether, that he had sent Timothy to them. He would have gone himself if he could; for he had heard that the report was abroad among the Corinthians that he was not going to visit them again, either because of indifference for their welfare, or through fear of those who had set themselves up as his judges, and as a consequence some of them were puffed up and were confirmed in their preaching and practice of principles which they knew were entirely opposed to his. Because of such persons he feared that when he came, he should be obliged to come with a rod instead of in love and a spirit of meekness.

Meanwhile, as he could not go to Corinth at once, he applied the rod in his epistle. He first condemns in unsparing terms the flagrant case of fornication, recently reported to him, and then exhorts the church to use its rightful power and excommunicate the offender, both for the offender's sake and for its own, that he may be saved and that the church may be made pure.[3] His exhortation to the

[1] 1 Cor. iv. 8 sq. [2] 1 Cor. iv. 9. [3] 1 Cor. v. 5, 7.

church to do its duty in this matter, and to pass judgment upon the guilty man, reminds Paul that the Corinthians are sadly delinquent also in another respect, in that they allow their personal disagreements and quarrels to come into the civil courts instead of settling them among themselves. It is bad enough for brethren to have any differences, but if they must, they ought to see to it that judges be appointed from among their own number, and that all such matters be adjusted by them.[1] After a general condemnation of intemperance and lust, not on the ground that they are a violation of law,[2] but on the ground that the Christian is a member of Christ, and that his body is a temple of the Holy Spirit,[3] Paul takes up the question of marriage,[4] about which the Corinthians had asked his advice in their epistle. He handles this difficult and delicate question with great circumspectness. Celibacy, he thinks, is better than marriage, because a celibate can give himself more unreservedly to the service of the Lord; but he is careful to insist that marriage is not in itself inconsistent with the Christian faith, and that it is better for those who have not the gift of continency to marry. Those already married should remain as they are, and should faithfully perform all the duties of the married life, even though yoked with unbelievers. It is not the external state or condition that makes the Christian, but his relation to Christ, and that can be sustained even in the midst of the most unfavorable circumstances. The general law governs all such cases that every man should abide in that vocation wherein he was called, for union with Christ frees a man from all human bondage, and makes him entirely independent of circumstance and condition. It is along the same broad lines, and yet with a like regard for practical difficulties and exigencies, that Paul handles the subject of meats offered to idols,[5] concerning which the Corinthians had also asked his opinion. Idols are in reality nothing, and therefore things are not defiled by being sacrificed to

[1] 1 Cor. vi. 1 sq. [2] 1 Cor. vi. 12. [3] 1 Cor. vi. 15 sq.
[4] 1 Cor. vii. [5] 1 Cor. viii., x. 23 sq.

them, and a Christian is neither the better nor the worse for eating or abstaining. But not all have this knowledge, and it seems to some a sin to eat of meat thus offered. For the sake of such weak brethren it is the Christian's duty to abstain if there is any danger that his example will lead them to do violence to their conscience. All things are lawful to the Christian, but not all things are expedient, for not all things edify; and it is the Christian's duty not to seek his own but his neighbor's good, and to sacrifice if necessary his own liberty and his own rights for his sake. Paul would have the Corinthians imitate him in this respect, for it was this principle that had controlled his life. As an apostle he had the right to do many things which he had not chosen to do. He had the right, for instance, to look to the Corinthians for support while he was preaching the Gospel among them. That he had not availed himself of that right did not prove, as some were contending, that he was not truly an apostle, and that he did not dare to claim such a privilege. On the contrary, he had abstained from exercising that which was clearly his right for the sake of the Gospel, that he might be free from any suspicion of avarice or self-seeking, and thus might win the more to Christ. The ninth chapter is thus at once an illustration of the great principle which Paul was enforcing and a defence of himself against his enemies, who, curiously enough, were using that which was an act of self-sacrifice on his part as an argument against his apostolic character and calling.

After this digression concerning the principles that had governed his own life, to which he was led by his assertion of the Christian's duty to have regard always to the welfare of his brother, Paul returned to the subject with which he was dealing, and called attention in the tenth chapter to another consideration which should govern the conduct of disciples in the matter under discussion. Though an idol is in reality nothing, yet in their sacrificial feasts, of which the heathen worshippers were in the habit of partaking, they communed with devils and not with God. And whoever voluntarily took part with them in such religious meals

entered into the same kind of communion with devils that the believer entered into with Christ when he partook of the Lord's Supper. A Christian must therefore strenuously avoid all such feasts, and not tempt God as the children of Israel did in the wilderness. The eating of meats offered to idols is thus permitted by Paul so long as it does not cause a weaker brother to stumble, but the participation in idolatrous feasts is, under all circumstances, prohibited. The Christian need not be deterred from eating and drinking what he pleases by any idea that it has been defiled by its contact with an idol; but he must hold himself aloof from every act of heathen worship.[1]

In the next three chapters[2] Paul discusses various matters connected with the religious services of the Corinthians, some of them suggested by their epistle, others by reports he had heard of the condition of affairs among them. He begins by commending them for remembering him in all things, and holding fast the traditions which he had delivered unto them, a commendation that sounds a little strange, in view of the fact that he has so many things to find fault with. But the fact that the Corinthians had asked Paul's advice, indicated their desire to conform to his wishes so far as they could, and they had doubtless given expression in their epistle to that desire, and to the conviction that they were already following his directions so far as he had given any. Paul takes them at their word and praises them for their obedience, and then goes on to point out their faults. He declares, first of all, that it is improper for women to pray or prophesy with their heads unveiled, as some of them at least were in the habit of doing in Corinth. The practice, which was so out of accord with the custom of the age, was evidently a result of the desire to put into practice Paul's principle that in Christ all differences of rank, station, sex, and age are done away. But Paul, in spite of his principle, opposed the practice.[3] His opposition in the present case was doubt-

[1] 1 Cor. x. 14 sq. Cf. Pfleiderer: *Urchristenthum*, S. 95; and Heinrici: *Das erste Sendschreiben an die Corinthier, in loc.*

[2] 1 Cor. xi.–xiv.

[3] 1 Cor. xi. 5.

less due in part to traditional prejudice, in part to fear that so radical a departure from the common custom might bring disrepute upon the church, and even promote disorder and licentiousness. But he found a basis for his opposition in the fact that by creation the woman was made subject to the man. Paul's use of such an argument from the natural order of things, when it was a fundamental principle with him that in the spiritual realm the natural is displaced and destroyed, must have sounded strange to the Corinthians; and Paul himself evidently felt the weakness of the argument and its inconsistency with his general principles, for he closed with an appeal to the custom of the churches: "We have no such custom, neither have the churches of God," therefore you have no right to adopt it.[1] This was the most he could say. Evidently he was on uncertain ground.

The next matter upon which he touches is much more serious, and elicits a very severe rebuke. In dealing with it he shows no such embarrassment as in the previous case. The gatherings of the Christians, which should make always for the edification of all, were doing more harm than good. There were divisions among them, so Paul had heard, and those divisions were affecting even the Lord's Supper, so that it was no longer in any true sense a communion meal of brother with brother, but each was looking out for himself alone. Each was concerned only to satisfy his own appetite. The early comers left nothing for those that came later, and while some ate and drank to excess, others were obliged to go hungry. The Supper was thus a scene not merely of discord, but of debauchery, and its character, both as a communion-feast and as a holy meal, was entirely destroyed. In condemning their conduct, Paul reminds them in solemn words of the meaning of the Lord's Supper. The bread is the Lord's body, and the cup is the new covenant in his blood. As often as they eat of the bread, and drink of the cup, they show the Lord's death till he come. Whoever, therefore, in partaking of the Lord's Supper fails to recognize its holy character, and to distinguish the body and

[1] 1 Cor. xi. 16.

blood of the Lord from the ordinary bread and wine, eaten and drunk at any common, secular meal, commits a sin worthy of severe punishment, for he dishonors the Lord; and it is because the Corinthians have been committing this sin that there is so much sickness and death among them. Their sin is already visited with judgment, according to Paul.[1]

Turning next to the subject of spiritual gifts, concerning which the Corinthians had made inquiry in their epistle, Paul calls their attention to the fact that the indwelling of the Holy Spirit is the one great thing which distinguishes Christians from all other men. All believers possess the Spirit, for it is the Spirit alone that enables them to recognize and confess Jesus as Lord. But though it is one Spirit that dwells in all disciples, he manifests himself in different measure and in different ways. Not all possess the same spiritual gifts. Some are gifted for one kind of service, others for another; but as it is the one Spirit that has endowed every Christian, none should look with contempt upon another's gift, or boast of the superiority of his own. As a body has many members, and all the members have their uses and contribute each in its way to the well-being of the whole, so the body of Christ has many members, each of which is necessary. Paul's remonstrance against the tendency on the part of some of the Corinthians to pride themselves upon their own gifts, and to despise their brethren who are gifted in lesser measure or in other ways, leads him to emphasize the importance of love.[2] Far superior to the gift of tongues, of prophecy, of knowledge, of miracle working, is the spirit of love which leads the believer not to vaunt himself above others, and not to envy or be angry with them because of their endowments, but to think always and only of their good and to give himself unreservedly to their service. If this spirit of love prevails, all the questions touching the relative value of the charisma of

[1] Upon Paul's conception of the Lord's Supper and the effect upon the Supper of the directions laid down by him in this chapter, see below, p. 537 sq.

[2] 1 Cor. xiii.

this or that disciple, and all the rivalries and contentions to which the possession of spiritual gifts has given rise, will disappear, and the gifts will prove a blessing to the whole church instead of proving, as in too many cases, a curse. After emphasizing this fundamental principle, Paul goes on to lay down a general rule by which their value is to be tested; not that one brother may compare himself with another and vaunt himself above him, but that all may seek the best gifts and may not estimate too highly those which are in reality of least worth. All of them, Paul says, are given not for the benefit of the recipient, but for the good of others; and the value of a gift, therefore, is to be measured by the degree to which it contributes to the edification of the brethren. Thus the gift of tongues, though one of the showiest of all, is of far less worth than the gift of prophecy, because it commonly does no one any good except the person exercising it. This rule Paul applies to the religious services of the Corinthians. They are to be occasions not for displaying gifts, but for using them to benefit others, and only such are to be exercised as contribute to that end. If there is no interpreter present, there is to be no speaking with tongues. The prophets are to utter their revelations not all at once, but in turn, so that they may be heard and understood, and each one is to give way willingly to another who may be prompted to speak, that the church may have the benefit of all the instruction the Spirit has to impart.

It was the same consideration for the good of the church as a whole that led Paul in vs. 34 sq. to direct that the women keep silence in the churches. Not that they had not the right to speak, to pray, and to prophesy, as they were in the habit of doing according to xi. 2 sq.; but that such public participation in the services would do more harm than good, because it was commonly regarded as a scandal for a woman thus to put herself forward in public, and the benefit her words might convey would be more than counterbalanced by the evil effect of such violation of the common rule of decency. The passage does not contradict xi. 2 sq., for there Paul was concerned with another

matter. A woman must be always veiled, even when praying and prophesying, even when exercising her religious right as a child of God. The exercise even of such a right must not lead her to do violence to the traditional law of propriety. But in the present case Paul is dealing with the matter of edification, and as he believes that it will do more harm than good for a Christian woman to speak in public, he can insist with perfect consistency that she ought not to do it at all.

From the religious services of the Corinthians, Paul turns to the subject of the resurrection.[1] He has learned that some of the Corinthians are denying the resurrection not only of believers, but even of Christ, and he therefore devotes a long passage to the matter. He first points out the firm historic basis upon which the belief in Christ's resurrection is founded, as he had declared it to them while still among them. He then reminds them that their redemption rests upon the resurrection of Christ. If he has not been raised, they have not been redeemed, they are still in their sins, and their faith is vain. The fact of Christ's resurrection is therefore absolutely fundamental. There is no Christianity, no salvation, without it. A discussion of the method of the resurrection follows. Evidently, doubt as to its reality was due to difficulties as to its method; and Paul therefore points out that he does not mean, as some evidently supposed, that the body of flesh will rise again. It is not flesh that is to rise, but a new spiritual body fitted for the indwelling Spirit. Resurrection means not the rehabilitation of the flesh, but permanent release from it. The Christian is to look forward not to a new life in the old body, but to a new life in a new body. Thus Paul clears away all the difficulties that were felt to beset the idea of a revivification of the flesh, whose destruction he had himself so earnestly emphasized.

After answering the question of the Corinthians touching the collection for the saints,[2] and promising when he came to make arrangements for sending it to Jerusalem, and after

[1] 1 Cor. xv. [2] 1 Cor. xvi. 1 sq.

explaining Apollos' failure to visit Corinth in response to their request, Paul exhorted them to treat the house of Stephanas with becoming honor and to be subject to them in the Lord,[1] and then closed in the usual way, with greetings and a prayer for their welfare.

In this epistle, which Paul sent by the hand of certain unnamed brethren,[2] he announced his intention of visiting Corinth at an early day.[3] He was too much engaged with the work in Ephesus to go at once, but after Pentecost he intended to leave for Macedonia, and to go on thence to Corinth, and perhaps spend the winter with the Corinthians. Whither he would go afterwards, he did not know; possibly to Jerusalem with the deputation appointed to carry the collection thither, possibly in some other direction.[4] The divisions and disorders in the Corinthian church were such that he was not sure that his promised visit would be an altogether pleasant one. Timothy's mission and the epistle that followed might not accomplish all that he hoped, and it might be necessary for him to come with a rod and put down the troubles with a strong hand.[5] Paul's fear of this seems actually to have been realized. From various passages in Second Corinthians we learn that he had been in Corinth twice before he wrote that letter;[6] and as there is no hint in First Corinthians that he had been there more than once, there can be little doubt that his second visit took place during the interval that elapsed between the writing of the two epistles. The visit was evidently made before his work in Ephesus was finished; and after leaving Corinth he returned to Ephesus, for when he wrote our Second Corinthians he had just come from Ephesus into

[1] Possibly the party spirit had given rise to criticism of Stephanas and others like him, who represented Paul's interests in the congregation. Exhorting them to be subject to such as he, Paul was, perhaps, really exhorting them again to give up their divisions and to exhibit their friendliness towards himself, whose convert and trusted friend Stephanas was. He and those with him had shown their devotion to Paul at this trying time, and this made up in part for the waning loyalty of some of the Corinthians.

[2] 1 Cor. xvi. 11, 12. Titus was very likely one of these brethren, and perhaps the brother mentioned in 2 Cor. viii. 22, xii. 18 was another. See below, p. 324.

[3] 1 Cor. iv. 19, xi. 34, xvi. 3.

[4] 1 Cor. xvi. 3 sq.

[5] 1 Cor. iv. 21.

[6] 2 Cor. ii. 1, xii. 14, xiii. 1.

Macedonia.[1] He had therefore not carried out the plan sketched in First Corinthians. At the time that epistle was written, he had intended to remain in Ephesus until he had completed his labors there; and then after a trip through Macedonia he had expected to make a long stay in Corinth, and go on thence to some other place. But circumstances had apparently arisen which made an earlier trip to Corinth necessary. He had learned, probably from Timothy himself, that the troubles in Corinth had increased rather than diminished, and that Timothy was unable to cope with them. He consequently made up his mind to go thither without delay, feeling that the difficulties were too serious to be allowed to go on unchecked. This visit proved a sorrowful one.[2] Paul was unable to accomplish his purpose, and returned to Ephesus in the greatest distress and anxiety. His authority had apparently been defied, and his credit and influence decidedly lowered; and he had even had to endure personal insult.[3] It was under these circumstances that he wrote another letter to the Corinthians immediately upon his return to Ephesus, defending himself against the attacks of his enemies, and calling the Corinthians sharply to account for their disloyalty to him, and for allowing themselves to be influenced by his opponents and detractors. This letter is referred to in 2 Cor. ii. 4 sq. and vii. 8 sq. Its general nature is clear enough. It was sorrowful, like the visit. It was written out of much affliction and anguish of heart, and with many tears;[4] and Paul even regretted afterwards that he had sent it,[5] for he was afraid that it might have the effect of alienating the Corinthians from him.

It is common to speak of this third epistle of Paul's as no longer extant. But it is not impossible that we still have it in whole or in part in 2 Cor. x.–xiii.[6] It is, to say

[1] Cor. ii. 12. [3] Cf. 2 Cor. ii. 5 sq., vii. 12, x. 1, 10. [5] 2 Cor. vii. 8.
Cor. ii. 1. [4] 2 Cor. ii. 4.
support of this opinion see especially Hausrath: *Der Vierkapitelbrief;* rer: *Urchristenthum*, S. 105 sq.; Von Schmiedel in the *Hand-Kommentar euen Testament* (II. 1, S. 56 sq.); Clemen: *Chronologie der Paulinischen* , S. 226. On the other side see Heinrici: *Das zweite Sendschreiben des l Paulus an die Korinthier*, S. 3 sq.; and Jülicher: *Einleitung*, S. 63 sq.

the least, exceedingly difficult to suppose that those chapters constituted originally a part of the epistle with which they are now connected. Their tone is entirely different from that of the first nine chapters, and what is more, they seem to point to another situation altogether. The writer is not moved in chapters x.–xiii. merely by the remembrance of experiences that belong to the past and have been happily lived down, but by the pressure of existing difficulties the outcome of which he does not yet know. He is not defending himself against calumnies which the Corinthians have already declared their disbelief in, and against enemies whom they have already repudiated. He is in the very midst of the conflict, and he is filled with anxiety lest his words will not avail, and the Corinthians will cast him off and give their entire allegiance to his foes.[1] And yet in vii. 9 sq., he had expressed his joy that his epistle had made them sorry unto repentance, and that it had wrought such earnest care in them, such clearing of themselves, such indignation, such fear, such longing, such zeal, such avenging. He had told them that *in everything* they had approved themselves pure in the matter which had caused the trouble between them, that they had vindicated their loyalty and affection for him, that the spirit of Titus had been refreshed by the conduct of *all of them*, and that he himself had been comforted and was *in everything* of good courage concerning them. And a little farther on,[2] in exhorting them to contribute largely to the fund for the saints of Jerusalem, he had said, "But as ye abound in everything, in faith, in utterance and knowledge, and in all earnestness, and in your love for us, see that ye abound in this grace also." It is evident that Paul and the Corinthians were again on the best of terms when he wrote those passages. Of lack of confidence or affection between them, there is not a sign. But in chapters x.–xiii. all is still uncertain. Paul hopes while writing these chapters that the Corinthians will listen to him and be convinced by him, but he is far from sure, and even fears the very worst. It seems exceedingly difficult, in the light of these facts, to suppose that the earlier

[1] Cf. 2 Cor. x. 2, 6 sq., xi. 3, 20, xii. 11, 13, 19, xiii. 3, 6. [2] 2 Cor. viii. 7.

and the later chapters were originally parts of the same epistle.[1]

But if it be assumed that we have in our 2 Corinthians two separate epistles of Paul, there can be no doubt that the one contained in chapters x.–xiii. was written earlier than the other; for otherwise we are compelled to assume a still later attack upon Paul and a second estrangement between him and the Corinthians of which we know nothing.[2] But if chapters x.–xiii. constitute a separate epistle written earlier than chapters i.–ix., it is of course the most natural thing to identify them with the epistle to which Paul refers in 2 Cor. ii. 4 and vii. 8 sq. The general tone of chapters x.–xiii. is exactly what Paul's references to that epistle would lead us to expect. Those chapters were evidently written out of much sorrow and anguish of heart, and there was good reason to doubt whether the Corinthians would receive them kindly.[3] They were calculated,

[1] Against this separation of the two parts of 2 Corinthians no valid objection can be urged. 2 Cor. x. 1, 10 sq., which speak of Paul's strong letters and weak presence, are fully justified by 1 Corinthians, while the apparent identity of the mission of Titus in 2 Cor. viii. 17 sq. and xii. 18 is apparent only. The reference in chap. viii. is to a mission which Titus is to perform, and Paul bespeaks a kind reception for him in viii. 24; while the mission referred to in xii. 18 is already past. "Did Titus take any advantage of you?" Paul asks. The fact that the four chapters are now a part of our second canonical epistle constitutes no great difficulty. Nothing would be easier than for two comparatively brief epistles to be joined together and to be counted as one over against the larger epistle which we know as 1 Corinthians; and this would be particularly easy if one of the brief epistles lacked the formal introduction which most of Paul's epistles bore. The emphatic *αὐτὸς δὲ ἐγὼ* Παῦλος with which chap. x. begins, suggests, as Pfleiderer and others have seen, that chaps. x.–xiii. may be simply Paul's part of a larger epistle written jointly by himself and some companion, very likely Timothy. It may be that Timothy expressed his mind touching the difficulties which he had not succeeded in allaying, and that then Paul added what he had to say, beginning with the words, "But as for me, Paul, I entreat you." If this supposition were correct, it would be very easy to account for the disappearance of the part of the letter written by Timothy, and for the attachment to another epistle of the part written by Paul.

[2] It is perhaps not without significance that in 2 Cor. iii. 1, Paul speaks of "beginning *again* to commend" himself (cf. also v. 12), as if he had in mind some extended commendation of himself, such as we find only in 2 Cor. xi. sq.; and the reference to epistles of commendation suggests that it is actually to that passage, where he defends himself against the attacks of foreign apostles, that he is referring. It is noticeable that when he does enter upon the detailed account of his labors and experiences in chap. x. sq., he speaks as if it were something new, and as if he had not before done any glorying. He does not use the word "again" in chaps. x. and xi., as in chaps. iii. and v.

[3] Cf. especially 2 Cor. xii. 19, xiii. 3, 6.

if they did not move them to repentance, to make them angry, and to widen the breach already existing.[1]

On the assumption, then, that Paul's Third Epistle to the Corinthians has been preserved in 2 Cor. x.–xiii., we may turn to it for information touching the occasion of Paul's second visit to Corinth, and the state of affairs that existed there at that time. It is clear that Paul's apostolic dignity and authority had been questioned, and that he had been compared with the Twelve to his decided disadvantage.[2] It had even been denied that he was in any sense a minister of Christ,[3] and in support of that denial had been urged on the one hand the weakness of his bodily presence and the ineffectiveness of his speech;[4] on the other hand the fact that he did not receive support from the Corinthians as all the genuine ministers of Christ were entitled to do.[5] It was insinuated that he intended to turn to his own uses the money which the Corinthians had collected for the saints at Jerusalem, and that he had hitherto refused to receive anything from the Corinthians, in order that they might be impressed with his exceptional freedom from avarice, and thus trust him with the large sum which they were gathering.[6]

Who the enemies were that attacked Paul in this way, it is not altogether easy to determine. It is clear that they were Jews, or at least their leaders were,[7] and that some if not all of those leaders came from abroad,[8] and claimed to be ministers or apostles of Christ.[9] It is natural, of course, under such circumstances to think of

[1] Cf. 2 Cor. x. 7, xi. 20, xii. 20, xiii. 2, 5, 10. There is perhaps a reference to xiii. 2 and 10 in i. 23 and ii. 1.

[2] Cf. 2 Cor. xi. 5, xii. 11. It is a mistake to identify the ὑπερλίαν ἀπόστολοι of xi. 5 and xii. 11, with the ψευδαπόστολοι of xi. 13. Paul would hardly have cared to claim in two different passages that he was "not inferior" to men whom he calls "false apostles" and "ministers of Satan." The point at issue was whether he was equal in dignity and authority to the Twelve, and he asserts with emphasis, in xi. 5 and xii. 11, that he is. The "false apostles" are simply the enemies of Paul who are attacking him in Corinth and denying his equality with the Twelve.

[3] Cf. 2 Cor. x. 7, xiii. 3.

[4] Cf. 2 Cor. x. 1, 10, xi. 6.

[5] 2 Cor. xi. 7 sq., xii. 13; cf. 1 Cor. ix. 3 sq.

[6] Cf. 2 Cor. xii. 16 sq.

[7] 2 Cor. xi. 22.

[8] Paul always speaks of them in the third person, in distinction from the Corinthians whom he is addressing (cf. 2 Cor. x. 10 sq., xi. 4, 13, 22, iii. 1).

[9] 2 Cor. xi. 13, 23.

them as Judaizers. But it is to be noticed that Paul has not a single word to say in his epistle in opposition to Judaizing principles, or in defence of the freedom of the Gospel. It is a mistake to suppose, as most do, that every Jewish Christian who was hostile to Paul must have been a Judaizer. Because Paul's enemies in Galatia were Judaizers, there is no reason to think that all his enemies were. In fact, there can be no doubt that among the Jewish Christians that recognized the right of the Gentiles to become disciples of Christ, without receiving circumcision and assuming the obligation to observe the law of Moses, there were many who disliked and even hated Paul, not because he preached the Gospel to the Gentiles, but because he was himself an apostate from Judaism who neglected entirely the law and the customs of the fathers, and taught other Jews to do the same.[1] The distinction between such Jewish Christians and Judaizers, properly so called, should always be kept in mind. That there were Jewish Christians of the former type in Corinth at this time, and that they were attacking the character and apostolic mission of Paul, there can be no doubt. But that they were doing it with the purpose which had actuated the Judaizers in Antioch and in Galatia, that they were doing it with the hope of bringing the Gentile Christians of Corinth finally under the yoke of the law, there is not the slightest evidence. It is inconceivable, if that was their ultimate aim, that Paul should not have understood it even though they had not yet avowed it, and that he should not have exposed their purpose and endeavored to show its inconsistency with the Gospel of Christ as he had in his Epistle to the Galatians. Instead of doing anything of the sort, he merely defends his own personal and apostolic character. It is noticeable that there is no hint in these chapters of the existence of any legalistic tendency among the Corinthians themselves, or of an effort on Paul's part to guard against the development of such a tendency in the future. It is not legalism, but its opposite, that gives him concern. He fears not that the Corin-

[1] Cf. Acts xxi. 21-24; and see below, p. 340 sq.

thians will lose sight of the Gospel of liberty in their desire to win righteousness through the works of the law, but that they will fall again into their besetting sins of quarrelsomeness and licentiousness.[1] It would seem, then, that Paul was contending in his third epistle, not with Judaizers, but with Jewish Christians, who, because of their personal enmity for him, were endeavoring to destroy his credit and undermine his influence. They may have had an ulterior purpose in doing so, but that purpose was certainly not, as in Galatia, to subject the Gentiles to the law of Moses, but rather to prevent Jewish Christians from becoming apostates and to maintain within the Christian church the peculiar dignity and prerogatives of the Jews. This was a matter of comparatively little moment to Paul, but it was of great concern to him that his influence and credit were threatened with destruction. For if once overthrown, there would remain no sufficient barrier against the sins whose onslaught his Gospel of the divine life in man seemed to him alone adequate to meet and repel. It was not so much the substitution of others' influence for his own that Paul feared, as the loss of all influence which could avail for his converts' establishment in the Christian faith and life, and thus the general demoralization of the Corinthian church.

These Jewish Christians had already met with some success. They had acquired so much influence in Corinth, that Paul was afraid the church would be completely alienated from him. Even the Corinthians themselves were asking him for a sign that Christ was really working through him,[2] and were beginning to question his apostolic authority[3] and to be a little doubtful about his honesty.[4] Matters had reached a serious pass. There was already a hostile party within the church, and it was apparently growing steadily. The party seems to have owed its origin to the missionaries from abroad whom Paul calls false apostles.[5] Their presence in Corinth was doubtless reported to Paul by Timothy, and it was because of them that he

[1] 2 Cor. xii. 20 sq. [2] 2 Cor. xiii. 3. [3] 2 Cor. xi. 5, 23.
[4] 2 Cor. xii. 17. [5] Cf. 2 Cor. xi. 4, 13.

made the hasty trip thither referred to in 2 Cor. ii. 1, xiii. 2. But that visit proved unsuccessful and was attended with circumstances of a very trying and disagreeable nature, as already remarked. Not only had he been unable to check the growing hostility, but he had even been treated with contumely apparently by some particular person,[1] and instead of resenting the insult and taking his part, the church had actually shown sympathy with his detractor or at least utter indifference in the matter. Who this person was, we do not know. It is at any rate clear that whether originally a Corinthian or one of the travelling missionaries who had been causing the trouble, he was a member of the Corinthian church at the time Paul wrote; for the church was in a position to exercise control over him, and to subject him to discipline. He must have been a man of prominence, and his personal standing and influence must have been considerable or it would not have been possible for him to treat Paul in the way he did without suffering the church's immediate vengeance. It is a mistake to identify him, as many do, with the shameless fornicator mentioned in 1 Cor. v. 1. The cases were entirely different, and there is no reason for connecting them in any way. In 1 Cor. v. Paul was dealing with a gross offender who had sinned not against himself, but against Christ; in 2 Cor. ii. and vii. with a personal enemy against whose private character he had nothing to say.

Upon his return to Ephesus, Paul wrote his Third Epistle to the Corinthians, comprised in 2 Cor. x.–xiii., hoping to accomplish by means of it what he had failed to effect when present.[2] In this epistle he does not single out his chief enemy for attack, but simply refers to all his detractors in a body. And yet there is a hint even here that he had one man especially in mind when he says: "If any man trusteth in himself that he is Christ's, let him consider this again with himself, that, even as he is Christ's, so also are we."[3] He does not demand that the Corinthians shall deal either with him or with any of the others in any particular way. He simply defends himself against them

[1] 2 Cor. ii. 5, vii. 12. [2] Cf. 2 Cor. x. 10. [3] 2 Cor. x. 7.

and endeavors to exhibit them in their true colors, leaving the Corinthians to take what course they please.[1] The letter begins with a warning to its readers not to act so that when Paul comes again he will be obliged to deal sharply with them. For he can deal sharply, in spite of what his opponents say about his weakness and cowardice. His strength is not in himself, but in Christ. He does not war with fleshly but with spiritual weapons, and with them he is mighty even for the casting down of strongholds. He does not care to compare himself with others, and to boast himself as they do; for not he that commendeth himself is approved, but he whom Christ commendeth. But if they claim to be Christ's, let them know that he is Christ's too, and that he has the right to glory in the authority which Christ has given him. He does not enter as they do into another's labors and reap another's fruits, but he glories only in his own labors and only in those who have been won by his own efforts. It is foolish to speak of his own successes and grounds for glorying, and yet, as his detractors have had so much to say about themselves and have so influenced the Corinthians against him, it is necessary for him to show that he is not a whit behind the very greatest apostles. It is true that he did not allow the Corinthians to support him; but was that a sin? He took the course he did in order that no occasion might be given his enemies to accuse him of avarice, or of making merchandise of the Gospel of Christ. They are false apostles; ministers of Satan, not of Christ. And yet the Corinthians allow themselves to be overawed and carried away by them. But what merits have they which

[1] The way in which the epistle opens seems to indicate that Paul adds what he has to say to the words of another (see p. 313, above). It is possible that the insult which Paul had been compelled to endure in Corinth had touched not himself alone, but also his friend and companion Timothy, whom he had perhaps taken with him to Corinth with the desire of re-establishing his credit and influence along with his own. At any rate, the use of the third person in 2 Cor. vii. 12 ("for his cause that suffered the wrong") suggests that it may have been not merely Paul himself that had been attacked. It was possibly because of this that Titus, and not Timothy, was employed by Paul in his subsequent negotiations with the Corinthians, and that Timothy's name was coupled with his own in his final epistle to the Corinthians (2 Cor. i. 1), which was written after the trouble was finally settled and peace restored.

he has not? He is as much of a Hebrew as they, and if they are ministers of Christ, he is even more so; for how much he has endured and suffered for the Master! "In labors more abundantly, in prisons more abundantly, in stripes above measure, in deaths oft. Of the Jews five times received I forty stripes save one. Thrice was I beaten with rods, once was I stoned, thrice I suffered shipwreck, a night and a day have I been in the deep; in journeyings often, in perils of rivers, in perils of robbers, in perils from my countrymen, in perils from the Gentiles, in perils in the city, in perils in the wilderness, in perils in the sea, in perils among false brethren; in labor and travail, in watchings often, in hunger and thirst, in fastings often, in cold and nakedness."[1] In all these things Paul would glory. And he would glory also in his revelations, especially in a revelation received fourteen years before, so wonderful that lest he should be exalted overmuch, there was given him a thorn in the flesh to keep him humble.[2] When he besought the Lord to remove it, he had replied that his grace was sufficient for him and that his power was made perfect in weakness; and so even the weakness itself became cause for glorying.

After expressing his regret that the failure of the Corinthians to take his part, and to defend him against the attacks of his enemies, has made it necessary for him to commend

[1] 2 Cor. xi. 23–27.

[2] 2 Cor. xii. 1 sq. The "thorn in the flesh" to which Paul refers here is probably to be connected with the "infirmity of the flesh" which led him to preach the Gospel the first time to the Galatians (Gal. iv. 13). Ramsay is very likely correct in thinking that that "infirmity" was malarial fever, and that Paul was subject to frequent attacks throughout his life (*St. Paul, the Traveller and the Roman Citizen*, p. 94 sq.). The common opinion that the thorn in the flesh was a malady of the eyes, Ramsay has clearly shown the improbability of (*l.c.* p. 38 sq.). For other interpretations see Meyer's Commentary, *in loc.*

The "fourteen years" referred to in the passage in 2 Corinthians would carry the date of the revelation back to about the year 38 or 39 (see below, p. 359), which was probably three or four years before he visited Galatia for the first time. But Paul's words do not necessarily imply that the "thorn in the flesh" was given him immediately after he had received his revelation. Where and under what circumstances that revelation was received, we have no means of determining; we only know that it was a most remarkable one, and that Paul heard unspeakable words which it was not lawful for him to utter.

himself, Paul asserts that he seeks not their property, but themselves, and that he will gladly spend and be spent for their sakes, as a father for his children. In reply to the accusation that he was intending to devote to his own uses the fund collected for the saints of Jerusalem, he calls the Corinthians to witness that neither his own conduct nor the conduct of Titus and his other messengers has justified any such base suspicion. After warning them against quarrelsomeness and sins of the flesh to which they were so prone, he declares that if he comes again, as he gives them reason to expect he will soon, he will not spare them, but treat them with the utmost severity on the basis of the authority given him by Christ. He then closes in the customary way with a salutation and a benediction.

This sharp and passionate epistle, which was carried to Corinth by Titus,[1] produced the effect for which it was intended. Paul had feared for the result, and had even regretted that he had written such a letter, but his fears proved groundless. The Corinthians realized their error and took their stand unequivocally on his side. He learned of their renewed loyalty from Titus, who returned from Corinth after accomplishing his errand, and met Paul in Macedonia. Paul had expected to await Titus in Ephesus, and to go thence at once to Corinth by the direct sea-route;[2] but in the meantime trouble broke out in Ephesus, and he was compelled to leave the city before the latter's arrival. Not wishing to go to Corinth while matters were still in an unsettled condition, not wishing to go thither with a rod as he would have been compelled to do, had he gone again while the situation was unchanged,[3] he went instead to Troas, and when he did not find Titus there, became impatient and hastened on to Macedonia, hoping the sooner to get the desired news from the Corinthian church.[4] It was in Macedonia that he met Titus, and was cheered with the most comforting report.[5] The Corinthians had vindicated their loyalty, and had even gone further than he had

[1] 2 Cor. ii. 13, vii. 13 sq. [2] 2 Cor. i. 15. [3] 2 Cor. i. 23.
[4] 2 Cor. ii. 12. [5] 2 Cor. ii. 13, vii. 13 sq.

asked them to in their zeal for him. They had inflicted severe punishment upon his chief enemy, the one who had openly insulted him, — apparently excluding him from the church and refusing to associate with him.[1]

It was under these circumstances that Paul wrote his fourth and last epistle to the Corinthians, which is found in chapters i.–ix. of our Second Corinthians. The letter was written in his own name and in that of Timothy.[2] It opens with an expression of gratitude to God for the comfort with which he had comforted Paul in all his afflictions, and especially in the troubles, both physical and mental, through which he had so recently passed. Then after giving his reasons for not coming to Corinth directly from Ephesus, as he told the Corinthians he would when he sent Titus with his previous epistle, and after defending himself against the charge of fickleness, to which his change of plan might naturally give rise,[3] Paul turns to the case of the person who had caused sorrow not to him alone, but to the whole church. He exhorts the Corinthians, who had already visited their vengeance upon him, to forgive him. He had written them before not for the sake of the offender, or of the offended party, but in order that their love and loyalty to himself might be put to the test, and as they had shown clearly by their action where they stood, it was not necessary now to carry the matter further and overwhelm the offender with despair.[4] His reference to the person who had caused him so much trouble recalled to Paul the distress and anxiety in which he had been while he was waiting for the return of Titus from Corinth, and the joy brought him by the report of the latter, and after giving expression again to that joy in its contrast with his previous sorrow, he points out that his claim to be a minister of Christ upon which he had laid such stress in his previous epistle has been fully vindicated by God. But this leads him to expound at considerable length his conception of the apostolic mission with which he had been entrusted by Christ, not in order to defend himself against the at-

[1] 2 Cor. ii. 6 sq.
[2] See p. 318, note.
[3] i. 15, ii. 4.
[4] 2 Cor. ii. 5 sq.

tacks of his enemies, but to confirm the restored confidence of his beloved Corinthians, to show them that their loyalty to him was fully justified, and to explain his own deep concern in the matter. He is not one who uses the Gospel for his own profit, as so many do. On the contrary, he is always sincere, and he does everything in Christ.[1] His reference to his conduct in this regard does not mean that he is about to commend himself again.[2] He does not need commendation either to the Corinthians or from them, as some do; for the Corinthians are themselves his epistles known and read of all men. The work he has done among them speaks for itself, and proves that he has labored not in his own power, but in the power of God, and that he has been made by God a minister not of the old Covenant of the letter, but of the new Covenant of the Spirit, which gives life and is far more glorious than the old.[3] It is this confidence in his divine call to be a minister of the new Covenant that gives Paul his great boldness and endurance.[4] It is true that he is weak enough in himself, but that is only that the power of God may be the more clearly manifested in him. Endowed with that power, he is strong to meet everything.[5] His afflictions work out for him an eternal weight of glory, and even death itself means only the putting off of an earthly tabernacle, in order to be clothed upon with an heavenly, and is thus in reality better than life.[6] And so Paul is of good courage whatever happens. His supreme aim at all times and in all places is to please the Lord, and he therefore devotes himself in all sincerity and earnestness to the work of preaching Christ.[7] With this work not even the worst afflictions have interfered. He has endured them all as a minister of God and as an ambassador of Christ.[8] The reference to the trials which he has been called upon to suffer brings him back again to the relations that exist between himself and his beloved Corinthians, and after urging them to open their

[1] 2 Cor. ii. 17.

[2] 2 Cor. iii. 1. There is an apparent reference here to his former self-commendation in 2 Cor. xi.

[3] 2 Cor. iii. 1-11.

[4] 2 Cor. iii. 12-iv. 6.

[5] 2 Cor. iv. 7 sq.

[6] 2 Cor. iv. 16-v. 5.

[7] 2 Cor. v. 6 sq.

[8] 2 Cor. v. 20-vi. 10.

hearts still more widely to him, as he has opened his to them, he gives even fuller expression than before to his joy in their renewed loyalty and affection.[1]

Before closing his epistle, Paul refers to the collection for the saints of Jerusalem and urges the Corinthians to give liberally and cheerfully.[2] He assures them of his satisfaction with the readiness they have already displayed, and expresses his confidence that they will more than fulfil his expectation and justify his boasting on their behalf. He also commends Titus and the other brethren whom he sends on before to look after the matter. He informs his readers that the latter have been appointed by the churches for this very purpose, that there may remain no ground for the suspicion that he intends to turn the funds to his own use. The letter ends abruptly without the usual salutations and benediction. The original ending was probably displaced when the third epistle was added, and perhaps is still to be found at the close of the latter.

This fourth and final epistle to the Corinthians was sent, like the previous one, by the hand of Titus, with whom went two unnamed brethren, the one appointed by the churches to assist Paul in the matter of the collection, the other a personal companion of the apostle who had been with him for a long time.[3] Titus had already had to do with the collection in Corinth.[4] But he can hardly have concerned himself with it at the time he carried Paul's third epistle, for he was occupied then with other business of a very different character. The Corinthians had begun to gather for the fund a year before,[5] at the time doubtless when they received Paul's second letter[6] (our First Corinthians), and it was probably then that Titus made a beginning of the work.[7] He was very likely one of the

[1] 2 Cor. vi. 11–vii. 16. The passage upon fellowship with unbelievers (vi. 14–vii. 1) is entirely out of connection with what precedes and follows, and is in all probability an interpolation. Chap. vii. 2 continues the subject of vi. 13, and seems originally to have followed it immediately. It has been suggested that vi. 14–vii. 1, is a part of Paul's lost epistle to the Corinthians, in which he had told them not to associate with fornicators (cf. Franke's article in the *Studien und Kritiken*, 1884, S. 544). The suggestion is a plausible one.

[2] Chaps. viii. and ix.

[3] Cf. 2 Cor. viii. 6, 18, 23, ix. 3 sq.

[4] Cf. 2 Cor. viii. 6.

[5] 2 Cor. viii. 10, ix. 2.

[6] 1 Cor. xvi. 1 sq.

[7] 2 Cor. viii. 6 sq.

bearers of that letter, especially entrusted with the preliminary arrangements for the great collection.[1] When he returned to Corinth therefore with Paul's fourth and last epistle, he went thither for the third time, and as on the first occasion a part of his business related to the fund for the Mother Church.

10. Paul's Final Visit to Corinth and his Epistle to the Romans

After despatching his fourth and last epistle to Corinth, Paul tarried some time in Macedonia, apparently visiting his churches throughout the province, and devoting his attention to the collection which he wished to carry to Jerusalem at an early day.[2] He intended after leaving Corinth to go immediately to Jerusalem, and this seemed his only opportunity to see his Macedonian friends. It is therefore not surprising that he tarried, as he seems to have done, a number of months in the province.[3] He apparently reached Corinth only late in the fall or early in the winter, for according to Acts xx. 3, he spent three months in Greece, and according to Acts xx. 6 and 16, he made the journey thence to Jerusalem in the spring. Of the events of this Corinthian visit we have no account in

[1] It is easier to understand why Paul should have chosen Titus as his representative in the serious difficulty between himself and the Corinthians, if the latter had already been in Corinth and had gained their confidence, than if he was a complete stranger to them. If Titus carried First Corinthians, he must have been one of the brethren referred to in 1 Cor. xvi. 11 and 12, and it must be his mission to Corinth at that time that Paul refers to in 2 Cor. xii. 17 sq. Probably also the brother mentioned in 2 Cor. viii. 22 was one of the messengers that carried First Corinthians, and it is to him, therefore, that Paul refers along with Titus in 2 Cor. xii. 18. At any rate, Paul says in viii. 22, that he had many times proved the brother there mentioned earnest in many things, and implies that the latter was already acquainted with the Corinthians. Who this brother was we have no means of determining; nor the brother mentioned in viii. 18.

[2] 2 Cor. viii. 1 sq., ix. 2 sq. For fuller particulars as to the possible movements of Paul, of Timothy, and of Titus at this time, see below, p. 409 sq., where the information supplied by the pastoral epistles is discussed.

[3] He wrote his second epistle (our First Corinthians) apparently not many months before Pentecost (cf. 1 Cor. xvi. 9 with iv. 9), and his fourth epistle (2 Cor. i.-ix.) something over a year later (cf. 2 Cor. viii. 10 and ix. 2 with 1 Cor. xvi. 1). The latter was therefore probably written in the spring or early summer, six or eight months before his arrival in Corinth.

our sources.[1] The Book of Acts dismisses it with a single sentence, recording only that a plot was laid against him by the Jews, and that he consequently gave up his intention of sailing direct to Syria and returned to Asia by way of Macedonia. That the friendly relations which existed when he wrote his fourth letter remained undisturbed is made evident by the Epistle to the Romans, which was written at Corinth during his final stay there and contains no hint that he was in the midst of trials or difficulties at the time. The victory he had won over his enemies was apparently complete and his credit and his influence were not again imperilled. When Clement of Rome wrote to the Corinthians a generation later, the name of Paul was held in high esteem by both writer and readers, and he was permanently honored as the apostolic founder of the church.[2]

It was during Paul's final stay in Corinth, as already remarked, that he wrote his Epistle to the Romans. That epistle is peculiar in that it was addressed to a church which he had not himself founded nor even seen. He had for a long time wished to visit Rome.[3] From an early day in his missionary career, he seems to have had distinctly in mind the evangelization of the Roman Empire, and his plan included the preaching of the Gospel in Rome, its capital. But in the meantime, while he was engaged in missionary work in the East, Christianity was carried to Rome and a church was founded there. But this made a difficulty for him, for it was one of his principles not to build on another man's foundation.[4] Rome was therefore closed to him as a field of missionary labor; and yet the Roman church was a Gentile church,[5] and in the fulfilment of his calling as an apostle to the Gentiles, he felt it to be his right and his duty to impart to it such spiritual gifts as he could.[6] He consequently

[1] It is possible that Paul visited Crete at this time. See below, p. 411.

[2] Cf. Clement: *Ad Cor.* c. 47. Dionysius of Corinth, writing in the latter part of the second century, makes Paul and Peter the joint founders of the Corinthian church. See Eusebius: *H. E.* II. 25, 8.

[3] Rom. i. 10, 13, xv. 22.

[4] Rom. xv. 20; cf. 2 Cor. x. 15, 16.

[5] Rom. i. 6, 13, xi. 1, 13, xv. 16.

[6] Rom. i. 5, 11, 13, 14, xv. 16.

found himself in a somewhat perplexing position. The result was that he finally determined not to give up his long-cherished plan of visiting Rome, but to look beyond for a field of farther labor and to make the capital of the empire simply a temporary halting-place on his westward journey. His work in the East being completed, and no place remaining for him there, he would make his way to Spain, whither Christianity had not yet penetrated, with the intention doubtless of carrying the Gospel thence throughout the Western world.[1] It was with this plan fully formulated that he wrote his Epistle to the Romans. His purpose in writing was apparently a double one. He wished to excuse himself to the Christians of Rome for not having visited them before, and at the same time to announce his intended coming and to prepare them for it.[2] Evidently they had for some time had reason to expect that they would see him, and his delay was causing surprise and even unfavorable comment. But in speaking of his projected visit he was careful to inform them that he was not coming as a missionary to the unevangelized, but as a brother with the expectation of receiving from them as well as imparting to them spiritual gifts.[3] He was careful also to preserve his genuine apostolic character and to guard himself against the accusation of building upon another's foundation by assuring them that his objective point was far beyond and that he desired not to labor in Rome, but only to be set forward on his journey. But even then he felt it necessary to justify his proposed visit, doubtless in view of what he knew his enemies would say about it, by appealing to the fact that his readers were Gentiles, and were therefore his especial province because he had been called of God to be an apostle to the heathen and to minister unto their needs.[4] He was evidently desirous of doing everything he could to conciliate his readers and to promote good feeling between himself and them.

It was natural that an epistle intended to explain his past failure to visit Rome and to announce his expecta-

[1] Rom. xv. 23 sq.
[2] Rom. i. 10 sq., xv. 23 sq.
[3] Rom. i. 12.
[4] Rom. i. 5, 13, xv. 16.

tion of going thither in the near future should have been written just at this juncture, when Paul was on the point of turning eastward again, and when it might well be supposed by the Roman Christians that he had abandoned altogether his intention of seeing them. The reason for the epistle is thus clear enough; but the epistle itself is not so easy to understand. The subject of his visit fills altogether only a few verses at its beginning and its close, while the remainder is almost wholly doctrinal and ethical, and bears no obvious relation to the occasion which led him to write. And yet there was a reason in the situation in which Paul found himself placed for the composition of just such a letter. If his intended visit was to have the effect which he hoped, if it was to prove helpful both to himself and to the Christians of Rome, and contribute to the success of his projected missionary work in Spain, it was necessary that all hindrances to a friendly and fraternal intercourse between himself and them should be removed, and that any misunderstanding they might have as to the nature of his Gospel, and any suspicions they might entertain as to its soundness, should be cleared away. It was therefore important not that he should give them a complete statement of his beliefs and of his conception of his apostolic mission, but that he should address himself to such suspicions and misunderstandings as were actually abroad in the Roman church. A careful examination of his epistle shows that this is exactly what he did. It is customary in many quarters to call it a presentation of Paul's system of theology, or a didactic statement of his Gospel, but it is a great mistake to think of it thus. It is a letter written to remove or to guard against certain definite misapprehensions and to oppose certain definite evils, and it contains only so much of the theology and ethics of Paul as was adapted to that purpose. And yet it constitutes the most elaborate exposition that we have of his Gospel, and that fact shows that the misapprehensions which had to be corrected affected the very essence of his Christianity. The epistle contains an extended discussion of the relation of law and Gospel,

and of God's dealings with the people of Israel, and it is thus evident that a part at least of the objections and difficulties which Paul had to meet had their origin in or were connected with Judaism. At the same time the practical exhortations in chapters xii.–xv. are not such as would be addressed to Christians who were inclined to observe the Jewish law, and to regard such observance as a means of salvation. The unhealthful tendencies which the epistle combats in those chapters are for the most part genuinely heathen and show no trace of the influence of Judaistic principles. It is noticeable also that there is less of storm and passion and less of the personal element than in almost any other of Paul's letters, and this shows that he had not been attacked in Rome by any such hostile Judaizers as undermined his work in Galatia, or by any such bitter enemies as beset him in Corinth.

What, then, are we to conclude as to the condition of things in Rome which made it necessary for Paul to write as he did? The only reasonable assumption in the light of the first eleven and of the last four chapters of the epistle seems to be that the church of Rome, while its Gentile members were largely in the majority, yet contained a not inconsiderable minority of Jewish Christians, and that Paul found it necessary to address himself to both classes: on the one hand to convince the Jewish Christians, if possible, of the truth of his Gospel and thus remove the natural opposition which they felt to him as the apostle to the heathen, and on the other hand to combat the antinomian tendencies which were appearing among the Gentile Christians, many of whom were turning their liberty into license and were appealing to his Gospel in support of their conduct. But in expounding his principle of freedom from the law for the sake of those who believed in its continued authority, Paul had in mind the Gentile majority as well as the Jewish minority, and was concerned not simply to convince the latter, but also to give to the former the means of defending successfully their free Christianity against the criticisms of their Jewish brethren.

It is clear from the entire tone of his epistle that the Jewish Christians whom Paul addressed were not personally hostile to him and were not bitter in their opposition to his teachings. It was not censure and attack they needed, but instruction and enlightenment; and there was reason to hope that they might be influenced by what he had to say. The Gentile majority were already favorably disposed toward him. They recognized his apostolic calling and were quite ready to listen to his admonitions. In order, therefore, to convince the Jewish minority of the truth of his Gospel, to fortify and confirm the Gentile majority in their free Christianity, and to combat the evil tendencies to which a misunderstanding of the profound ethical significance of that Christianity was giving rise, Paul expounds his Gospel on the one hand over against legalism, and on the other hand over against libertinism. But it is worthy of notice that it is not two Gospels nor even two different sides of one Gospel which he presents, but the very heart and essence of that Gospel, which equally precludes both legalism and libertinism.

The epistle, which was thus written with a definite practical aim, opens with words of salutation and of commendation, followed by the expression of Paul's earnest and long-cherished desire to visit those addressed.[1] This desire has hitherto proved impossible of realization, but he hopes soon to carry it out, that he may have fruit in them even as in the rest of the Gentiles.[2] The Gospel which he has preached elsewhere, and is ready to preach in Rome also, is not a Gospel of which he is ashamed; "for it is a power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth"; "for in it is revealed a righteousness of God from faith unto faith."[3] These words contain the theme of the entire epistle, which is all of a piece, though it falls naturally into three general divisions. The first of those divisions contains a thoroughgoing exposition of the Gospel thus briefly characterized, the Gospel of the divine life in man;[4] the second, a discussion of God's dealings with

[1] Rom. i. 1–12. [2] Rom. i. 13–15. [3] Rom. i. 16, 17. [4] Rom. i.–viii.

and his purposes for the children of Israel, whose prerogatives as a covenant people seem entirely destroyed by that Gospel as preached by Paul;[1] the third, the practical application of the Gospel of the divine life in man to the every-day life of the Roman Christians.[2]

Paul begins the exposition of his Gospel with a demonstration of the fact that every one needs salvation; that no one is righteous or can be righteous of himself, and that therefore no one can escape the just judgment of God.[3] Upon this truth he dwells at considerable length, showing its application not only to the Gentiles,[4] but also to the Jews,[5] and thus addressing both classes within the Roman church. Gentiles and Jews are alike responsible in the sight of God; the former, because God has manifested himself from the beginning in his created works, and because they have a law written in their own hearts; the latter, because they have been entrusted with the oracles of God and instructed in his ordinances. But though responsible, they cannot meet their responsibility. No one can become righteous in God's sight by keeping a law. Law serves only to bring man to a knowledge of his sin.[6] After showing the universality of human sinfulness and the absolute non-existence of human righteousness, and thus demonstrating man's need, Paul declares that that need has been met by God, who has revealed in Jesus Christ a righteousness of his own, which is imparted to those, and to those alone, that have faith in Jesus.[7] This righteousness can be secured, whether by Jew or Gentile, only by faith, and not by the observance of a law. But the Jew at once objects: If faith and not the observance of the law is made the condition of the attainment of righteousness, is not the law of God made of none effect? To this Paul replies with a decided negative;[8] and then, in order to convince the Jew that the principle of righteousness by faith instead of by works, which he is emphasizing, is not, as it might seem, utterly

[1] Rom. ix.–xi.
[2] Rom. xii.–xv. 13.
[3] Rom. i. 18–iii. 20.
[4] Rom. i. 18–ii. 16.
[5] Rom. ii. 17–iii. 20.
[6] Rom. iii. 20.
[7] Rom. iii. 21–30.
[8] Rom. iii. 31.

subversive of the divine law and opposed to all God's dealings with his chosen people, he calls attention to the experience of Abraham and to the words of David.[1] Abraham, the father of God's covenant people, whether it be assumed that he lived righteously or not, was at any rate, as is proved by the express statement of Scripture, treated as righteous by God, not because of his works or of his righteous living, but because of his faith;[2] and he was treated as righteous by God while he was still uncircumcised, so that it cannot be claimed that circumcision constituted in any sense a basis of God's action in his case.[3] Thus the experience of Abraham is typical of the experience of every other man, whether circumcised or uncircumcised, whether living under law or without law. And the experience of Abraham in this respect is confirmed by the words of David, who pronounces a blessing upon the man to whom God reckons righteousness apart from works.[4]

After thus answering the objection of the Jews by demonstrating from their own Scriptures the truth of his assertion that faith, not works, is the real condition of justification, Paul returns to his Gospel of the righteousness of God, and indicates the blessings that flow to the believer from the possession of that righteousness: peace with God, joy in the assurance of his love, release from condemnation, and eternal life.[5] Over against this life, which is the chief fruit of the divine righteousness and the believer's supreme blessing, Paul then places in sharpest contrast that death which is the fruit of sin.[6] He shows that as the reign of death began with the sin of Adam, the reign of life began with the righteousness of Christ, and he asserts that where sin with its re-

[1] Rom. iv. 1-22.

[2] Rom. iv. 2-4 may be paraphrased as follows: If Abraham was made just from works, or was just in his works, he hath a ground of boasting, but even then he hath it not toward God, for the Scripture says that God reckoned his faith for righteousness, and therefore whether he kept the law or not he was treated by God as righteous, not because he kept the law, nor because of his works, however good those works may have been, but because of his faith. God justifies no man because he keeps the law. The only ground of justification in God's sight is faith.

[3] Rom. iv. 9 sq. [4] Rom. iv. 6 sq. [5] Rom. v. 1 sq. [6] Rom. v. 12 sq.

sultant death abounded, the gift of the divine righteousness with its resultant life abounded more exceedingly.[1]

But this at once raises the question, If the prevalence of human sin was the occasion of the bestowal of the divine gift of righteousness, will not the gift be greater, the greater the sin, and ought we not therefore to continue in sin that grace may abound? This question is similar to that to which Paul had referred in passing in iii. 8, and it doubtless represents both an objection to his Gospel made by Jewish Christians and a practical conclusion drawn from it by Gentiles. Paul answers the question with a decided negative, and in order to show what a complete misapprehension lies back of it, he enters upon a thoroughgoing exposition of the nature of the Christian life which he preaches. That life is simply the divine life in man. The Gospel which was stated briefly in i. 17 and in iii. 20 sq. contains two terms: the righteousness of God and the faith of man; the former the gift, the latter the condition of its bestowal. In the fourth chapter Paul answered the Jews' objection to the principle of faith as the condition of righteousness; in the following chapters he deals with the righteousness itself, and in doing so reveals the very heart of his Gospel and makes evident its profound religious and ethical significance. The believer who is buried with Christ in baptism dies with him unto sin and rises with him unto a new life of righteousness, a life which can be nothing else than righteous because it is divine.[2] But in this new life there is freedom not only from sin, but also from law.[3] This does not mean license to sin, for the believer is already dead to sin and alive unto righteousness.[4] His death to the law Paul then illustrates for the sake of his Jewish readers by the Jewish law touching marriage.[5] But the fact that the believer, when joined to Christ, dies unto the law, does not mean that the law is sinful and unholy, as one might think. It means simply that the law has fulfilled its purpose, which was not to make righteous, but to convince

[1] Rom. v. 20, 21. [2] Rom. vi. 1-14. [3] Rom. vi. 14.
[4] Rom. vi. 15-23. [5] Rom. vii. 1-6.

of sin.[1] This Paul illustrates from his own experience, showing how he was led by the law to a conviction of his sin and from that conviction to the realization of his fleshly nature, which was necessarily evil and which made righteousness absolutely impossible to him. He shows also how he was finally released from the control of the flesh, the body of death, by the Lord Jesus Christ.[2] Thus Christ frees from the body of flesh, and hence from sin and condemnation and death, all those that are in him, and introduces them into the new life in the Spirit, a life which is divine, not human, and which is consequently holy and eternal.[3] And so he that is Christ's, being no longer a debtor to the flesh but being under the control of the Spirit, cannot do otherwise than mortify the deeds of the body.[4] He is no longer a bond-servant over whom the flesh holds sway. He is a child of God. But if a child, then an heir, a joint heir with Christ in whose sufferings and death he has shared—a joint heir of the glory which shall far surpass all the sufferings of the present.[5] There is a hope that into this divine sonship all men, having been subjected for so long a time to the bondage of the flesh, may yet be brought, and thus share with those who are already believers in the glory that is one day to be revealed.[6] Waiting in patience for that final revelation, they that are children of God know that all things work together for their good; for to be called by God to be his sons means to be conformed to the image of his first-born Son, and to be one with him in righteousness and in glory, for nothing can separate those that are his from the love of God in Christ Jesus.[7]

Thus Paul makes it clear that the righteousness of God, of which he spoke in i. 17, and which he declared in iii. 21 sq. to have been manifested in Jesus Christ, is not a mere declaration that a man is righteous, as might be supposed if we had only the third and fourth chapters, but that it is the actual righteousness of the Divine Spirit in man. Thus his fuller exposition of his Gospel has shown that that Gospel

[1] Rom. vii. 7 sq. [2] Rom. vii. 7-25. [3] Rom. viii. 1-11. [4] Rom. viii. 12 sq. [5] Rom. viii. 14-18. [6] Rom. viii. 19 sq. [7] Rom. viii. 25-39.

leaves no more room for libertinism than for legalism; that if the divine life in man can be subjected to no law, neither can it be anything else than divine and therefore holy. It is evident that Paul is taking account throughout these chapters of both classes of his readers, of Gentiles as well as of Jews, and that his exposition relates itself to the needs of both.

From this presentation of his Gospel of the righteousness of God in Christ, which closes with an exultant hymn of assured confidence, Paul turns to a consideration of the relation of the Jewish people to Christianity, and of God's dealings with them.[1] Though himself a Jew, Paul was devoting his life to missionary work among the Gentiles instead of among his own countrymen, and he was accused consequently not only of a lack of patriotism and of a want of affection for his brethren after the flesh, but also of running counter to the revealed will of God, who would have the children of Abraham first brought into the kingdom, and only afterwards through their agency the nations of the world. But the Jewish Christians were not merely dissatisfied with Paul's conduct in the matter, they were also troubled and perplexed by the practical results of his preaching and of the preaching of other missionaries to the heathen. The proportion of Gentiles within the church was growing constantly larger and the Jews were falling into an ever more hopeless minority. How could this fact be reconciled with the purpose of God as declared in his promise to Abraham? In chapters ix., x., and xi., Paul is evidently meeting not captious objections, but honest difficulties; and is concerned not so much to repel attacks upon himself and upon his Gospel, as to explain a problem which troubled and weighed upon him as well as upon his readers. He begins his discussion with a solemn asseveration of his affection for his people, and of his longing to see them saved. But why are they not saved? Has God really cast them off and has he broken his promise to Abraham? By no means; for not all that are called Israel are truly Israel and not all of Abraham's descendants are his children in the true sense. God in the exer-

[1] Rom. ix.-xi.

cise of that absolute sovereignty which is abundantly testified to in the Scriptures, and which therefore no Jew ought to question, has chosen some and rejected others out of his own good pleasure; for has not the potter the right to use the clay as he pleases, and to make vessels unto honor and vessels unto dishonor out of the same lump? God has chosen not all the descendants of Abraham, but only such of them as he wished, and with them such of the Gentiles as he wished. They together constitute the children of the promise, and in their election God's covenant with Abraham has been fulfilled.[1]

But this assertion of God's sovereignty in the matter does not satisfy Paul. It may silence objectors, but it does not solve the problem. He is convinced that if the majority of the Jews are not saved, it is their own fault; it is because they have depended upon their own works instead of depending upon God in faith.[2] Thus they were not cast off by God, but they made it impossible for God to save them. And yet this was not true of all of them. There were some, including Paul himself, who believed and who therefore shared in the election by grace.[3] And even those Israelites who were hardened did not stumble in order that they might be finally rejected, but by their fall they became a means of the preaching of the Gospel to the Gentiles. And the salvation of the Gentiles thus made possible by their fall will in turn redound to their good, provoking them to jealousy, and thus leading them to Christ.[4] It is for this reason, Paul tells his Gentile readers, that he is so earnest in preaching the Gospel to them, that through them he may save his own countrymen.[5] And so they are not to be puffed up with pride, nor to glory over the branches that were broken off that they might be grafted in; for it is not they that bear the root but the root them, and if God spared not the natural branches but broke them off because of their unbelief, neither will he spare the branches that were ingrafted if they become high-minded and continue not in

[1] Rom. ix. 6–29. [2] Rom. ix. 30–x. 21. [3] Rom. xi. 1 sq.
[4] Rom. xi. 11 sq. [5] Rom. xi. 13 sq.

faith.[1] Moreover, as he has grafted in strange branches, he is able to graft in again those branches that were cut off, if they renounce their unbelief; and this Paul believes will in the end actually take place. His optimism carries him so far that he makes the sweeping assertion that all Israel shall be saved.[2] A hardening in part has befallen them until the fulness of the Gentiles has come in, and then they, too, shall be brought in, for "the gifts and the calling of God are without repentance."[3] No wonder that Paul breaks out in a hymn of praise to God whose "judgments are unsearchable and his ways past finding out."[4] Paul thus meets the national difficulties of the Jewish disciples as he met in the earlier chapters their religious difficulties; and at the same time he removes all ground for jealousy and strife between the two classes of Christians within the Roman church.

He then returns in the twelfth chapter to his Gospel of the righteousness of God in man, and applies that Gospel to the practical life of the individual believer, showing how it should manifest itself in the varied circumstances in which the Christian is placed and in the varied relations which he sustains toward others.[5] In xiv. 1–xv. 13, he addresses himself particularly to a condition of things somewhat similar to that which had existed in Corinth, where the liberty of some was offending the weak consciences of others.[6] The principles which Paul lays down are the same in both cases. Though he recognizes the liberty of the Christian in eating and drinking and in the observance of special days and times, and though he distinctly says that "nothing is unclean of itself," he nevertheless urges his readers to govern their action in all such cases by the law of love; to have regard at all times to the good of others and to do nothing that will cause offence to a weaker brother or lead him astray. And at the same time he exhorts them to treat such a brother not with contempt, but with all kindness and consideration. It is evident that the weaker brethren referred to in this chapter were

[1] Rom. xi. 17 sq.
[2] Rom. xi. 26.
[3] Rom. xi. 29.
[4] Rom. xi. 33 sq.
[5] Rom. xii.-xv.
[6] Cf. 1 Cor. viii.

not Judaizers nor under the influence of Judaizers. Had they been, Paul could not have proposed any such compromise with them or any such consideration for their scruples. They were not observing the Jewish law and making its observance necessary to salvation, as the Judaizers did, for the Jewish law does not forbid the use of flesh and wine. If they were Jews at all, as their observance of special days might seem to suggest, they owed their scrupulosity not to Pharisaic legalism, but rather to the dualistic tendency which voiced itself in Alexandrian Judaism and in Essenism. But it is more probable in the light of xv. 7, where both parties seem to be distinguished from the Jews, that they as well as the "stronger" brethren were largely Gentile Christians, who felt the common ascetic impulse which was widespread in the heathen world of the period. Abstinence from flesh and wine and the observance of special fast days became very common in the church of the second and subsequent centuries, quite independently of Jewish influence. It will hardly do, therefore, to find in the stronger and weaker brethren of chapters xiv. and xv. the Jewish and Gentile wings of the Roman church, of whose existence we learn from the earlier chapters of the epistle.[1] Doubtless the "stronger" and the "weaker" made up only a small part of the entire membership, and neither the scruples of the latter nor the independence of the former, who were apparently Paulinists of an extreme type, were shared by the majority of the disciples. After completing what he has to say upon this subject, Paul appeals once more to the fact that he is an apostle to the Gentiles, in justification of his writing to the Roman Christians, and informs them of his plans, which include a visit to Rome in the near future. He then closes his epistle with a request for their prayers and with a benediction.[2]

[1] As Pfleiderer, for instance, does in his *Urchristenthum*, S. 119 sq. I am in hearty sympathy with Pfleiderer's general view of the conditions in the Roman church and have learned much from his discussion; but at this point I am unable to agree with him.

[2] Rom. xv. 14-33. Upon chap. xvi., which was apparently intended originally not for Rome but for Ephesus, see above, p. 275 sq.

11. Paul's Final Visit to Jerusalem and his Arrest and Imprisonment

When Paul wrote the epistle known as First Corinthians, he was not sure whether he would himself go to Jerusalem with the collection for the saints or would send it by the hand of others;[1] but at the time he wrote to the Roman church, his plans were definitely formed to make the journey himself. Possibly the size of the collection had something to do with this determination. After a stay of three months in Corinth, he set out for Jerusalem in company with a number of his disciples from Macedonia, Asia, and Galatia.[2] He took the land-route through Macedonia instead of the more direct sea-route, in order, according to the author of the Acts, to avoid hostile Jews who were apparently lying in wait for him on the road to Cenchreæ, or had laid plans to murder him on ship-board. It is just at this point that the "we" source again appears, and from it is taken the entire account of the journey from Macedonia to Jerusalem.[3] It is true that it has been denied by many critics that the "we" document contained the record of Paul's meeting with the elder brethren of Ephesus in Miletus found in Acts xx. 17–38. But there seems to be sufficient reason for such denial neither in the general fact of the meeting nor in the words which Paul is reported to have spoken. That a meeting with some one at Miletus was recorded in the older source, is implied in xxi. 1,[4] and there is no adequate ground for the assumption that the meeting referred to was of a different kind from that described by the author of the Acts. The known quotations from the "we" document are too few and brief to warrant the assertion that it cannot have contained an extended address, and while there are sentences in the speech recorded in the twentieth chapter that might with some show of reason be ascribed to the author of the Book of Acts, rather than to the writer of the original account,[5]

[1] 1 Cor. xvi. 4. [2] Acts xx. 4. [3] Acts xx. 5, xxi. 18.

[4] "And when it came to pass that we set sail, *having torn ourselves away from them*" (*ἀποσπασθέντας ἀπ' αὐτῶν*).

[5] As, for instance, vss. 21 and 28–30.

such passages can be employed to prove at most only that the author used a somewhat free hand in reproducing the report contained in his sources, as we have reason to think that he did in other cases. It is to be noticed that Paul refers in the address in question to experiences in Ephesus not recorded in Acts xix.,[1] and that he draws a picture of his residence among the Ephesians differing quite markedly from the picture given in that chapter, but agreeing closely in at least some of its features with the indications in his own epistles to the Corinthians.[2] This fact of course speaks for the trustworthiness of the address, and the absence of the doctrinal and the prominence of the personal element which characterize it are not favorable to its free composition by the author of the book. We shall be safe, then, in assuming that the account of Paul's meeting with the elder brethren of Ephesus and the report of the words which he uttered are substantially accurate.

The reason given by the author for Paul's desire not to visit Ephesus, and for his consequent request that certain of the Ephesian Christians should meet him in Miletus,[3] is entirely satisfactory. That he should wish to reach Jerusalem in time for Pentecost was natural enough, for there was a peculiar fitness in offering his collection to the church of Jerusalem on that occasion. It was the harvest feast and it brought to Jerusalem a larger number of foreign Jews than any other festival, so that the relation between Palestine and the rest of the world received then especial emphasis. Paul might well fear that a visit to Ephesus, where he had so many friends, and very likely enemies as well, would demand more time than he could afford under the circumstances, possibly compelling him to wait for another ship. The stay of a week in Troas and again in Tyre was probably caused not by his desire to visit the Christians of those places (in Tyre there seem to have been very few of them),[4] but by the fact that his ship did not sail sooner; and hence those delays cannot

[1] Acts xx. 19, 31, 34 sq.
[2] Cf., *e.g.*, 1 Cor. iv. 12, xv. 30 sq., xvi. 9; 2 Cor. i. 8 sq.
[3] Acts xx. 16.
[4] Acts xxi. 4, 5.

be urged as inconsistent with his haste at Miletus. At Ptolemais Paul and his companions left the ship and made their way by land to Cæsarea. After spending a few days there in the house of Philip the Evangelist, one of the "Seven,"[1] they went up to Jerusalem. It is not said whether they reached there in season for Pentecost, but they had abundance of time to do so, and there is no reason to doubt that they carried out their original plan.[2] Arrived in Jerusalem, they were received gladly by the Christians there, and on the following day, according to Acts xxi. 18, they went in unto James, with whom were gathered all the elder brethren.

The account of the proceedings which ensued is beset with difficulties. The pronoun "we" is not used after vs. 18, and how much of that which follows is taken from the "we" source, it is impossible to say. According to the account as we have it, Paul was induced to give an ocular demonstration of his devotion to the Jewish law, in order to prove to the multitude of believers in Jerusalem, who were zealous for the law, that there was no truth in the report which they had heard, that he was himself living in disregard of the law of Moses, and that he was teaching Jews everywhere to do the same.[3] The question is, Can Paul have taken the course attributed to him? It is clear, first of all, that the report of his conduct which was current in Jerusalem, though considerably exaggerated, was nevertheless true at least in part. Paul had certainly been living for years in entire disregard of the law of the fathers. He had been living on intimate terms with his Gentile converts and had been to all intents and purposes a Gentile. It is true that on many occasions, in the company of Jews

[1] Acts xxi. 8. Upon Philip, see above, p. 95. He was probably called the Evangelist to distinguish him from the apostle of the same name. Upon the confusion of Philip the Evangelist and Philip the Apostle in the writings of the fathers, see my edition of Eusebius, Bk. III. Chap. xxxi. note 6.

[2] See Ramsay's *St. Paul, the Traveller and the Roman Citizen*, p. 289 sq., where the duration of the journey is carefully estimated. For a different estimate see Overbeck in De Wette's *Exegetisches Handbuch zum Neuen Testament*, I. 4, S. 336 sq. Ramsay's entire account of the journey to Jerusalem is interesting and instructive.

[3] Acts xxi. 19–26.

only, he may have lived like a Jew,[1] but such occasions constituted exceptions to the general rule of his life. His habit, apostle to the Gentiles as he was, and laboring among them almost entirely as he did, must have been to treat the law of Moses as if it no longer existed, as in fact it did not exist either for him or for any other Christian, according to his view. It is hardly possible therefore to suppose that Paul undertook in Jerusalem to prove to the Jewish Christians there, that he was accustomed to "walk orderly, keeping the law."[2] Moreover, although he recognized the legitimacy of Jewish Christianity, and the right of Peter and other apostles to preach to the Jews the Gospel of circumcision,[3] and though there is no evidence that he ever undertook to lead the Jews as a people to cease observing their ancestral law, he had certainly been in the habit of insisting that his Jewish converts should associate on equal terms with their Gentile brethren, and that they should not allow their law to act in any way as a barrier to the freest and most intimate association with them.[4] But this, of course, meant, in so far, their violation of the law's commands. It is certain also that Paul had preached for years the doctrine that not the Gentile Christian alone but the Jewish Christian as well is absolutely free from all obligation to keep the law of Moses, and though such teaching might not always result in a disregard of that law by his Jewish converts, it must have a tendency to produce that effect and doubtless did in many cases. It is clear therefore that both accusations had much truth in them, and it is difficult to suppose that Paul can have deliberately attempted in Jerusalem to prove them wholly false.

And yet, though as an honorable man and a man of principle he can hardly have undertaken to demonstrate that there was no truth in the reports which were circulated concerning him, it may well be that he tried to show that they were not wholly true. It was evidently assumed by those who accused him of "teaching all the Jews which are among the Gentiles to forsake

[1] Cf. 1 Cor. ix. 20.
[2] Acts xxi. 24.
[3] Gal. ii. 7.
[4] Cf., *e.g.*, Gal. ii. 11 sq.

Moses, telling them not to circumcise their children neither to walk after the customs,"[1] that he hated the Jewish law and that he was doing all that lay in his power to destroy it; that he believed and that he taught everywhere that its observance was under any and all circumstances a positive sin. But this assumption was not true. Paul was certainly not hostile to the law in any such sense. He believed that it had no binding authority over a Christian, and he opposed with all his might the idea that its observance had any value as a means of salvation, or that it contributed in any way to the believer's righteousness or growth in grace; but he held no such view of the law as made its observance necessarily sinful, and rendered it impossible for him ever to observe it himself in any respect. And it was not at all unnatural that he should desire to convince the Christians of Jerusalem of the fact; especially when he had come thither with the express purpose of conciliating them and winning their favor for himself and for his Gentile converts. He would have been very foolish under these circumstances to allow such a false impression touching his attitude toward the law to go uncontradicted. Had he been in the midst of his conflict with Judaizers, it might have been safer to let such an impression prevail than to run the risk of playing into their hands in the endeavor to remove it. Such a step as he is reported to have taken in Acts xxi. 26 would doubtless have been used against him by them, and would have constituted an effective weapon in their campaign among the Gentiles. But Paul's bitter war with Judaizers was a thing of the past. At least six or seven years had elapsed since it was fought through in Galatia, and the final victory won. There was consequently no such danger now as there might have been at an earlier day. It is worthy of notice that the accusations brought against him in Jerusalem did not emanate from Judaizers. There is no hint that fault was found with him because he preached a Gentile Christianity. His course was criticised by Jewish Christians, who held the position taken by the majority of

[1] Acts xxi. 21.

the church of Jerusalem some years before, at the time of the apostolic conference. They maintained, as had been maintained then, not that the Jewish law is binding upon the Gentiles, but that it is binding upon Jews, whether disciples of Christ or not. And so there was little reason for Paul to fear that his public observance of the law at this time would do harm among the Gentiles; while he might well hope that such observance would serve to prove the falsehood of the report that he hated the law and thought it sinful to keep it under any circumstances and in any part. The action which Paul is recorded to have taken was calculated to demonstrate the falsity of just such a report. But it was entirely inadequate as a proof that he always kept the law, or that it was his regular habit to keep it; and it was equally inadequate as a proof that he never advised Jewish Christians to neglect its observance. It seems evident in the light of all that has been said, that Paul may well have done just what he is reported to have done in Acts xxi. 26. But if he did, it must have been not to prove that the two accusations brought against him were wholly false, but that he was not as hostile to the law as those who made the accusations represented, and as was commonly supposed in Jerusalem. There is therefore no sufficient ground for denying the truth of the fact recorded in xxi. 26, a fact for whose invention no plausible explanation can be given;[1] but there is every reason for thinking that vs. 24 does not represent with entire accuracy the motive which prompted Paul to take the step he did.

The step, though recommended by James and the other leaders of the church of Jerusalem, had quite another effect from that intended. It led, in fact, to the accusation that Paul was profaning the temple, and the result was an up-

[1] It is to be noticed that the action recommended by the leaders of the church of Jerusalem and adopted by Paul failed entirely to accomplish its end; and the reputation for wisdom enjoyed both by himself and by James must thus suffer in the eyes of the reader. When a simpler explanation of Paul's arrest would have answered every purpose, the explanation given can be accounted for only on the assumption that it is the true one and that the author of the Acts found it in his sources.

roar and his arrest by the Roman authorities, as a disturber of the peace.[1] The instigators of the attack are said to have been Jews from Asia,[2] who had seen among Paul's companions the Gentile Trophimus of Ephesus, evidently personally known to them, and supposed that he was one of the men whom Paul had taken with him into the temple. Paul's arrest was not wholly unexpected to him. Of course, he had not foreseen that his effort to conciliate the Christians of Jerusalem, and to disprove the accusation brought against him, would have such an effect, but that he had serious fears that his journey would end disastrously, and would result even in his death, is shown by his request in Rom. xv. 31, that his readers would join him in the prayer that he might be "delivered from them that are disobedient in Judea." His words to the elder brethren of Ephesus, recorded in Acts xx. 22 sq., also reveal the same apprehension. He had hoped, when he wrote to the Romans, that his mission to Jerusalem would prove successful, and that he would escape imprisonment and death; but by the time he reached Miletus he was convinced that his hope was vain, and that he must be prepared for the worst. The same feeling was shared by others whom he met upon his journey,[3] and the effort was made by his friends to dissuade him from carrying out his purpose.[4] But Paul refused to listen to their pleadings, declaring that he was ready not only to be bound, as Agabus had foretold that he would be, but also to die for the name of the Lord Jesus in Jerusalem.[5] It is not surprising that fears should have been entertained as to the outcome of Paul's journey. He had not been in Jerusalem since the conference, more than half a dozen years before, and in the meantime his work among the Gentiles had

[1] Acts xxi. 27 sq.

[2] It is perhaps significant that the Jews were from Asia, where Paul had already had considerable trouble with his countrymen.

[3] Acts xxi. 4, 11. The former passage is especially strong because it represents the Spirit as directing him not to go up to Jerusalem. In the latter passage Agabus, who on an earlier occasion had foretold the famine (Acts xi. 28), prophesies that Paul is to be bound by the Jews at Jerusalem, and delivered into the hands of the Gentiles.

[4] Acts xxi. 12.

[5] Acts xxi. 13.

proved very successful both in Asia and in Europe, and his reputation as an apostate Jew, who was doing all he could to destroy the influence of Judaism in the world at large, had become widespread. The hostility of the Jews toward him was well known, and it must have seemed extremely hazardous for him to make his appearance in Jerusalem. He could hardly fail, if his presence there were known, to precipitate a conflict from which it was decidedly doubtful whether he would escape with his life, in view of the known tendency of the Romans to placate the Jews in every possible way, and to guard their national and religious customs from violation. The only surprising thing about the whole transaction is, that under such circumstances Paul should still have insisted upon going to Jerusalem. It may be that he decided to make the trip before he fully realized the danger that was involved in it, and that he did not wish to turn back out of seeming cowardice. But it is more probable that he felt it his duty to visit Jerusalem in order that now, after these years of separate development, the bond between the Jewish and Gentile wings of the church might be finally cemented, and thus the foundation laid for the realization of his dream of the salvation of all Israel, following upon the conversion of the Gentiles.[1] If he had such a conception as this of the possible significance of his visit to Jerusalem, he was not the man to be deterred from going thither by any dangers, however great. For the accomplishment of such an end, he would gladly lay down his life at any time.

The arrest of Paul in Jerusalem, the various scenes in his trial, the circumstances under which he finally appealed to Cæsar, and his journey to Rome as a prisoner are related by the author of the Acts at great length. A quarter of his entire book is devoted to these events. The great emphasis thus put upon this part of Paul's life is all the more striking when we realize that the Book of Acts falls into four nearly equal parts; the first of which contains the history of the early church of Jerusalem;[2] the second,

[1] Cf. with Rom. ix., xi., Rom. xv. 26 sq., and especially vs. 27.
[2] Acts i.-vii.

the account of the spread of Christianity through the agency especially of Philip, Peter, Barnabas, and Paul, with the beginnings of the work among the Gentiles;[1] the third, the record of the great missionary career of Paul after the official settlement of the question as to the conditions upon which the Gentiles were to be admitted to the church;[2] and the fourth, his arrest and imprisonment.[3] That the arrest and imprisonment should fill so disproportionate a space in an historical work like the Book of Acts is very surprising; and particularly so in view of the fact that though the chapters devoted to the subject cover a period of nearly five years, they contain almost no reference to Paul's occupations and labors during that time, but describe at great length, and with many repetitions, his successive appearances before one and another tribunal. If it appeared that the remarkable fulness of the author's account of this part of Paul's life was due to the fact that he made use, in all parts of his book, of all the sources he possessed, and that for this particular period he had more extended sources than for any other, the phenomenon would be of less significance. But such a supposition is unwarranted. If anything is clear, it is that the Book of Acts is not a mere collection of documents, but a well-ordered and artistically arranged composition. The author made considerable use of older sources, but he treated them with freedom, and arranged them in such a way as to exhibit the general course of development as he understood it. It is true that he gives a disproportionate space to the "we" passages, with their wealth of minor detail, and if it could be shown that he drew the whole of the fourth part of his book from the same report of an eyewitness, the amount of space devoted to Paul's arrest and imprisonment might possibly thus be accounted for. But there are many things in chapters xxii.–xxvi. which it is impossible to ascribe to such a source. It would seem therefore that Luke must have had a distinct and definite purpose in devoting so much space to a matter of comparatively minor historical importance. What that purpose was can hardly be doubted.

[1] Acts viii.-xiv. [2] Acts xv.-xxi. 26. [3] Acts xxi. 27-xxviii.

It is noticeable that throughout the Book of Acts, whenever Christianity is brought in any form to the cognizance of the Roman authorities, its harmless character is vindicated to their complete satisfaction. So in Cyprus the proconsul Sergius Paulus himself becomes a believer;[1] in Philippi the Roman magistrates, after scourging Paul and Silas, and committing them to prison without a trial, formally release them with an apology for the illegal punishment inflicted upon them;[2] in Corinth the proconsul Gallio refuses to entertain the charges brought against Paul by the Jews;[3] in Ephesus certain of the Asiarchs are spoken of as the apostle's friends,[4] and the effort of Demetrius and his fellow-workmen to secure the condemnation of Paul and his companions comes to naught, while the city clerk, who stood nearest to the governor of the province, distinctly vindicates the missionaries and denounces the attack upon them as unjustifiable and illegal.[5] On the other hand, it is a remarkable fact that there is no record in the book of a condemnation passed, or a punishment inflicted upon Paul or his companions by the Roman authorities, except at Philippi, and then the officials themselves apologize afterwards for their action.[6] And yet it can hardly be doubted that at least some of the sufferings which Paul was called upon to endure, according to 2 Cor. xi. 23 sq., were inflicted by Roman officials, and the death sentence passed upon him in Ephesus, to which he refers in 1 Cor. xv. 32, but of which no mention is made in the Acts, must have proceeded from the Roman governor or his representative.

[1] Acts xiii. 12. [2] Acts xvi. 35 sq. [3] Acts xviii. 12 sq. [4] Acts xix. 31.

[5] Acts xix. 35 sq. It is worthy of notice, that though the town clerk invites Demetrius and his fellows to bring their grievances before the proconsular court, Luke does not record that they did anything of the kind.

[6] The trouble in Pisidian Antioch, Iconium, and Lystra (Acts xiii. and xiv.) is distinctly said to have been instigated by the Jews, and the impression is conveyed that Paul and Barnabas were not regularly condemned before any judicial tribunal, but were the victims of popular prejudice, and in Lystra, at least, of mob violence. In Thessalonica, in spite of the very serious charge brought against the missionaries and their converts, the rulers of the city before whom Jason and others were arraigned did nothing more than take security from them to keep the peace, and then released them without punishing them in any way.

The tendency which thus appears in other parts of the book to exhibit Christianity in its relation to the state in as harmless a light as possible, and to emphasize the fact that the Roman authorities had uniformly regarded it in that light, is still more clearly seen in the chapters with which we are now dealing. In those chapters Paul comes into contact with three different Roman officials, and two of them bear express testimony to his innocence,[1] while the third shows him considerable favor, and refrains from setting him free only because he wishes to conciliate the Jews, and because he hopes, at the same time, to receive a bribe from Paul's friends.[2] The Jewish king Agrippa, who stood in high favor at Rome, also adds his testimony to that of Lysias and Festus.[3] And so, though Paul remains a prisoner in Cæsarea for more than two years, no condemnation is passed upon him by any Roman tribunal. On the contrary, his judges uniformly pronounce him innocent, and his final release is prevented only by the fact that he has appealed to Cæsar; and when he is sent to Rome as a prisoner, it is as an appellant not from an adverse decision of the governor, but in spite of a favorable decision.

There can be little doubt in the light of these facts that the author of the Book of Acts devoted so much space to the arrest and imprisonment of Paul, and related his successive appearances before various tribunals with such a wealth of detail, in order to show that Christianity in the person of its chief missionary and at the very climax of his career, after he had preached it throughout a large part of the empire, was acquitted by the Roman authorities in the most pronounced way and after the most careful investigation.[4] There must have been an especial reason for the emphasis of this fact in the position in which the Christians found themselves placed at the time

[1] The chief captain, Claudius Lysias, in xxiii. 29 sq., and the governor, Festus, in xxv. 25 and xxvi. 31.

[2] Acts xxiv. 22 sq.

[3] Acts xxvi. 32.

[4] In the third Gospel, the same interest appears in connection with the trial of Jesus, Pilate's repeated declaration of Jesus' innocence being recorded only in that Gospel (Luke xxiii. 4, 14, 22).

the book was written. They were probably looked upon with disfavor, and were treated with more or less hostility by the imperial officials at that time; and the author was concerned not simply to write an account of the early days of Christianity for the instruction of a friend, but also to present an apology for it to the authorities of the state.[1] Only on this assumption can we explain the disproportionate amount of space given to a subject which from a purely historical standpoint is of comparatively minor importance. It was doubtless this same desire that led the author to close his book without mentioning the condemnation and execution of Paul, to whose arrest and imprisonment he had devoted so much space; to close it rather with a reference to the large degree of liberty which he enjoyed in Rome, — a liberty which included the permission to preach the Gospel without let or hindrance to all that would listen to him, and thus showed that Christianity was not regarded as harmful and dangerous by the state. The author could not, of course, deny that Paul was finally condemned and executed, and his silence does not imply that he wished his readers to think that he had not been; but to mention the fact would have been entirely out of line with his purpose, and he therefore recorded only that part of the process which was distinctly favorable to Paul, and thus endeavored to leave the impression that his execution was entirely unjustifiable, as of course he believed that it was.[2]

Turning to the account of Paul's arrest and imprisonment contained in the chapters of which we have been

[1] Various indications point to the reign of Domitian as the date of the composition of the Book of Acts. During his reign the Christians suffered considerably from the hostility of the state (see below, p. 630). Moreover, the conception of Christianity which prevails throughout the book is similar in many respects to that which is found in other documents of that period. See below, pp. 437, 462.

[2] Ramsay also agrees in his interpretation of the purpose which governed Luke in the composition of the last part of Acts, and he emphasizes the evidences of that purpose, which appear in earlier chapters (*St. Paul, the Traveller and the Roman Citizen*, p. 303 sq.). But the conclusion which he draws therefrom, that Luke must have planned to write a third work, describing the acquittal and release of Paul and his subsequent labors, I am quite unable to accept. See below, p. 418.

speaking, we learn that immediately upon his arrest he was permitted to address the excited Jewish multitude in his own defence.[1] A reference, however, to his mission to the Gentiles gave rise to a second outbreak, and he was hurried into the castle and commanded by the tribune Lysias to be examined by scourging, in order that the nature of his offence might be determined.[2] But Paul appealed to his Roman citizenship, which guaranteed immunity from such indignity, and the result was that he not only escaped a scourging, but also received much more consideration from the authorities than would otherwise have been shown him.[3] Still uncertain as to the cause of all the trouble, Lysias brought him on the following day before the Sanhedrim, in order that he might learn what it was that the Jews accused him of.[4] He got little satisfaction,

[1] The address is given in xxii. 3–21. There is nothing in the early part of it that might not have been spoken by Paul upon such an occasion, but vs. 17 sq., in which he is represented as returning to Jerusalem after his conversion, with the intention of beginning his missionary work there, can hardly be regarded as his own utterance. Indeed, the relation of the speech to the parallel accounts in chaps. ix. and xxvi. is such as to make it probable that, like the former, it was composed by the author of the Acts upon the basis of the latter (see above, p. 120). Luke may have found in his sources the statement that Paul made an address on this particular occasion, and that he should reproduce what he supposed to be its general tenor and contents was but natural. He knew that Paul was guiltless of the charge of insurrection preferred against him (Acts xxi. 38, xxiv. 5) and he understood that the hostility of the Jews was due primarily to his preaching of the Gospel to the Gentiles. There was no better way, therefore, to demonstrate his innocence and to exhibit the intolerance of the Jews and the groundlessness of their enmity toward him, than to let him recount in his own words his conversion and divine commission.

[2] Acts xxii. 22 sq.

[3] Acts xxii. 25, xxiii. 27.

[4] There is nothing improbable in the report that Lysias brought Paul before the Sanhedrim; but the scene depicted in xxiii. 1–10 is not without difficulties. The Pharisees in the council must have been bitterly hostile to Paul as a man who taught everywhere against the people and the law and the temple. That they should have been led to support him by his declaration that he preached the resurrection of the dead, and that the Sadducees alone should have remained hostile to him, because of their opposition to that doctrine, can hardly be believed. The resurrection, while it was accepted by the one party and denied by the other, was a minor matter with both sects, and was not at all the ground of their mutual hostility. Paul's assertion of it could not have led the Pharisees to condone his offence against the law; nor would it have sufficed to make the Sadducees his persecutors. Luke's idea is similar to that which appears in Acts iv. 2, where he represents their opposition to the doctrine of the resurrection as the ground of the Sadducees' attack upon the early disciples. The basis of the account which he gives of Paul's arraignment before the Sanhedrim may possibly have lain in Lysias' reference to it in xxiii. 28, 29.

however, from them; and learning of a plot which had been formed against Paul by more than forty Jews,[1] he thought it wisest to send his troublesome prisoner to Cæsarea, the residence of the procurator. He therefore hurried him away under cover of the night and in charge of a strong guard.[2]

Arrived in Cæsarea, Paul was brought to trial after five days[3] before the procurator Felix, and was then formally accused by the Jews not only of attempting to profane the temple, but also and especially of being an habitual insurrectionist.[4] The latter was one of the worst charges that could be brought against a man in the eyes of the Roman state, which was quick to put down with a strong hand disturbances and uprisings among the provincials, whatever their character or occasion. The Jews did not succeed, however, in making their charge good. Felix, who doubtless knew them well after his long residence among them, was aware that they cared far less about the peace of the empire than about their own law and customs; and he no doubt saw at once that their hostility to Paul, of whose case he had already been informed by the tribune Lysias, was due solely to religious differences. At the same time, he did not wish to incur the enmity of the Jews by releasing immediately a prisoner in whose condemnation they were so deeply interested; and so, after listening to Paul's defence,[5] he reserved his decision upon the pretext that he

[1] Acts xxiii. 12 sq. Of Paul's sister, mentioned in vs. 16, and of her son, who discovered the plot and disclosed it to the tribune, we have no other information.

[2] Acts xxiii. 23 sq. The letter which Lysias is represented to have written to Felix concerning Paul (xxiii. 26–30) bears marks of genuineness, and may possibly have constituted one of the sources used by Luke in the composition of this part of his book.

[3] Acts xxiv. 1 sq. [4] Acts xxiv. 5 and 6.

[5] Recorded in Acts xxiv. 10 sq. The address which Paul is reported to have made on this occasion, if not a free composition by the author of the Acts, is at any rate only partially Paul's, for it contains some utterances that are quite out of line with his character and teaching. Cf., *e.g.*, vs. 11, and especially vs. 15 with its emphasis upon the resurrection not only of the just, but also of the unjust. Verse 17 with its reference to the great collection for the saints at Jerusalem, which the author of the Acts entirely omits to mention in his account of Paul's life and work, looks like a reminiscence of words actually spoken by Paul before Felix. But in its existing form it betrays a later hand. It is possible, to be sure, that Paul may have represented the collection

wished to have a personal consultation with the tribune who had made the arrest.[1] In the meantime he committed Paul to the care of a centurion, with the command that he should be treated with indulgence, and that his friends should be allowed to visit him freely.[2] Such military custody, as it was called, was a regular form of imprisonment under Roman law, and was intended to provide for the safe-keeping of an accused person, pending his trial, without subjecting him to the discomfort and misery of confinement in the public jail.[3] Felix thus held Paul a prisoner without deciding his case until the close of his term of office two years later. That Paul should have been kept in custody so long is not surprising. A Roman magistrate had the right to fix the time for the hearing of a case, and such a protracted confinement as Paul was subjected to was not at all uncommon. The author of the Acts, moreover, gives a special and entirely credible reason for the long delay in the present case, when he reports that Felix hoped to receive money for releasing Paul.[4] Such conduct was quite in accord with his character as we know it from Josephus and Tacitus;[5] and the close bond which existed among Christians, and the evident affection in which Paul was held by his friends and followers, might well encourage him to expect a large bribe.

which he brought to his Christian brethren as alms and offerings for his nation, but he could hardly have said that he presented them in the temple without laying himself open to the charge of disingenuousness. It looks as if Luke, knowing nothing about the collection, interpreted a reference to it as applying to the offerings made in connection with the vow which Paul had assumed in Jerusalem (Acts xxi. 23).

[1] Acts xxiv. 22. [2] Acts xxiv. 23.

[3] Persons held for trial might be confined in the public jail, which was usually a wretched hole, or they might be placed in military custody, or if they were persons of distinction, be given into the care of some official of high rank, who could grant them as much liberty as he chose, so long as he produced them at the time of their trial. A man held in military custody might reside in the barracks or sometimes in a private house, but he was commonly chained to his guard, who was made responsible for his safe-keeping with his life (cf. Wieseler: *Chronologie d. ap. Zeitalters*, S. 380 sq.). Whether Paul, while in Cæsarea, lived in the barracks or in some private house as he did later in Rome, we are not told, but the former is more probable in view of the author's silence here and of his explicit statement in xxviii. 30, in connection with the Roman imprisonment.

[4] Acts xxiv. 26. [5] Josephus: *Ant.* XX. 8; Tacitus: *Ann.* XII. 54.

Paul's innocence was by no means so apparent as it perhaps seems to us; and though he was a Roman citizen, Felix could hold him a long time for trial without subjecting himself to the charge of flagrant injustice.

In spite of the large amount of space which the Book of Acts devotes to Paul's Cæsarean imprisonment, we know in reality very little about it. Luke's account is confined wholly to Paul's dealings with the authorities, and except for the single statement that he was treated with indulgence and was permitted to see his friends at will, we have no information about his life and work during this period. It is true that there are three epistles, Colossians, Philemon, and Ephesians, which some scholars suppose to have been written at this time.[1] But it is probable that the traditional and commonly accepted opinion is correct and that they were written in Rome rather than in Cæsarea, so that we cannot use them as sources for a knowledge of the apostle's activities and experiences during his stay in Cæsarea.

Some two years after Paul's arrest Felix was succeeded by Porcius Festus.[2] Immediately upon his arrival in Cæsarea the new procurator went up to Jerusalem, and while there was told about the prisoner whom Felix had left in bonds, and was requested by the leading Jews to send him thither for trial before the Sanhedrim.[3] Festus, however, with a proper regard for Paul's rights, refused to accede to their request, but promised to take up the matter as soon as he returned to Cæsarea, and advised them to be on hand with their accusations. When the case came on for trial, Festus saw that it had to do largely with Jewish law and custom, about which he had very little knowledge, and he therefore suggested that Paul should consent to be tried in Jerusalem. But Paul knew the temper of the Jews, and was well aware that he could not expect justice at their hands, and so he refused to go, as he had a

[1] So, *e.g.*, Weiss: *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, S. 249 sq. (Eng. Trans., I. p. 326). Clemen (*Chronologie der Paulinischen Briefe*, S. 249 sq.) puts the composition of Colossians and Philemon into the Cæsarean imprisonment, but assigns Ephesians to a later author.

[2] Acts xxiv. 27. [3] Acts xxv. 1 sq.

perfect right to do.[1] Why he should have appealed to Cæsar in this connection, as he is reported to have done, is not altogether clear. His Roman citizenship gave him the right to be tried in Cæsarea at the bar of the imperial procurator, and it was therefore not necessary for him to appeal to the emperor in order to escape a trial in Jerusalem. It is evident that he had good reason to fear that the case would go against him in Festus' court, and it may be that he saw that his unwillingness to be judged by his own countrymen had led the latter to think him guilty. The character of Festus, as portrayed by Josephus,[2] forbids the assumption that he would have condemned Paul merely for the sake of pleasing the Jews and without regard to the evidence. Paul's appeal to Cæsar, therefore, is a proof that his enemies had a strong case against him and that his innocence was by no means so apparent as the words of Agrippa, recorded in Acts xxvi. 32, would seem to indicate.[3]

The appeal, which Festus was bound to entertain,[4] re-

[1] Acts xxv. 10. [2] Josephus: *Ant.* XX. 8; *B. J.* II. 14.

[3] It has been frequently claimed that the favorable treatment which Paul received from the authorities in Cæsarea, and the declaration of his innocence to which Lysias, Agrippa, and possibly Festus also gave utterance, show that there was nothing in the case against him, and point to his final acquittal and release. But Paul would hardly have appealed to Cæsar, with all the expense, and trouble, and delay which such an appeal involved, so long as he had a reasonable prospect of securing an acquittal at the bar of Festus. It is absurd to suppose that he appealed because he wanted to visit Rome, as has been suggested by some scholars (cf. Wieseler, *l.c.* S. 383), for had he been released he could have gone thither as a free man whenever he wished to. That he did not appeal under Felix shows that he was in less danger while he was procurator. But as Festus was a much better man and a more honest official than Felix, it looks as if it were Felix's hope of receiving a bribe from Paul which led him to treat Paul with leniency. It is not impossible that the alternative of Paul's protracted imprisonment under Felix was not his release, but his conviction, and that if Felix had not hoped to receive a bribe he would have passed sentence upon him long before he was succeeded by Festus. It would seem then that Paul appealed under Festus, because the latter's reputation for honesty, and his prompt attention to his case, led him to see that he could hope for no favors from him, and as the witnesses against him in Cæsarea were many and zealous, his chances of an acquittal would be better at a distant court whither they might not take the trouble to pursue him. Whatever Festus' attitude toward Paul after his consultation with Agrippa, there can at any rate be no doubt that when Paul appealed to Cæsar he had reason to think that the evidence against him was so strong that his trial before Festus would result in his condemnation.

[4] Notorious robbers, pirates, and plotters against the government might be refused the right of appeal if their guilt was perfectly clear, but in ordinary

moved Paul's case from the jurisdiction of the procurator and made it necessary for the latter to send him to Rome at the earliest opportunity. But before the time of his departure arrived, Herod Agrippa II.[1] came to Cæsarea with his sister Bernice to pay his respects to the new procurator, and Festus improved the occasion to get Agrippa's opinion of Paul and his advice as to how the latter's alleged offence should be described to the emperor.[2] Agrippa expressed a desire to hear Paul for himself, and the result was that the apostle was afforded a welcome opportunity to give an account of himself and of his work, not in the presence of Agrippa and Bernice merely, but also of the procurator and many other officials of high rank.[3] He seems to have im-

cases the right could be denied to no Roman citizen. There was nothing in Paul's case to justify Festus in refusing him the common privilege which his citizenship guaranteed him, as he and his council clearly saw (Acts xxv. 12).

[1] Son of Herod Agrippa I., whose death is recorded in Acts xii. 23. Herod Agrippa II. came to the throne in 48, and lived until 100 A.D.

[2] Acts xxv. 13 sq.

[3] Acts xxv. 23–xxvi. 29. The account of Paul's arraignment before Festus and of his appearance before Agrippa, given in Acts xxv. and xxvi. is more vivid and less open to criticism than the preceding context. The story of his conversion recorded in chap. xxvi. is much more compact and simple than in chaps. ix. and xxii., and at the same time reproduces his own ultimate impression of the event with greater accuracy than the other accounts, when it represents him as receiving his apostolic call at the time of his vision instead of later through the agency of another (cf. Gal. i. 16, and see Wendt, in Meyer's Commentary on Acts, 7th edition, S. 217 sq.). It is therefore probable that the address was found by the author in his sources, and that it constituted the original upon which the other accounts were built. But it is clear that he made additions to it as to so many of the speeches recorded by him. Thus vs. 20 is in line with the idea, which appears so frequently in Acts, that after his conversion Paul did missionary work in Jerusalem and Judea. Verse 8 also looks like an addition; and in the light of Acts xiii. 38, it is not impossible that the reference to the remission of sins in vs. 18 is Luke's and not Paul's. See also p. 120, above.

It is held by some scholars, by Wendt among others, that chaps. xxv. and xxvi. were taken from the work of the eyewitness, from which chaps. xxvii. and xxviii. also came. But I am unable to discover any grounds for such an assumption. The man who wrote xxvii. 1–xxviii. 16, and the other "we" passages was interested even in the little things which concerned Paul, and it cannot be supposed that if he was with Paul during his Cæsarean imprisonment, he would have written so impersonal and official an account as appears in chaps. xxv. and xxvi. It is to be noticed, moreover, that xxvii. 1 has no direct connection with what immediately precedes. There is a marked gap between xxvi. 32 and xxvii. 1, and yet it can hardly be supposed that the author who reproduced the "we" passage in such detail in chaps. xxvii. and xxviii., would have omitted that which must have connected chaps. xxvi. and xxvii. if they constituted originally a part of one whole. There seems to be another indication here that the "we" source was of a fragmentary character.

pressed his listeners as a man of culture who had become unbalanced upon the subject of religion and was pursuing a foolish and fanatical course, but was neither a criminal nor a vicious character. Whether Festus shared the opinion as to Paul's innocence, to which Agrippa is represented as giving explicit utterance, we do not know,[1] but at any rate Paul had appealed to Cæsar and to Cæsar he must go.

Paul's Cæsarean imprisonment, which has been engaging our attention, has been commonly employed as a starting-point from which to reckon the chronology of a large part of the apostle's life. It is clear that he was sent from Cæsarea to Rome soon after the accession of Festus.[2] If the date of the latter event therefore can be determined, the time of his imprisonment can be fixed with a good deal of exactness, and calculations can be based upon it respecting preceding as well as subsequent events. Unfortunately, the desired date is not directly given in any of our sources, and can be ascertained only by a combination of various more or less uncertain references. The prevailing opinion is that Festus became procurator in the year 60.[3] But there is good ground, it seems to me, for revising that opinion and for pushing the date of his accession back to the year 55. Such a revision involves so considerable a change in the generally accepted chronology of Paul's life, that the mat-

[1] Luke says indefinitely in xxvi. 31, that "they spake one to another, saying, This man doeth nothing worthy of death or of bonds"; and more explicitly in vs. 32, that "Agrippa said unto Festus, This man might have been set at liberty, if he had not appealed unto Cæsar." But though Paul's address may have convinced Agrippa and others, including even Festus, that he had committed no crime, it did not serve to prove that he was not a dangerous character, and that he would not stir up trouble in the future as he had in the past. It was not enough for Paul to prove that his intentions were good and that there was no valid reason why his teaching should create an excitement and lead to riots wherever he went. The fact that he was the innocent cause of such riots was enough to condemn him in the eyes of the Roman state, and Festus, as a faithful Roman official, could hardly have set him at liberty on the strength of his address and of Agrippa's opinion.

[2] Cf. Acts xxv. 1, 6 sq., 13 sq., 23, xxvi. 32, xxvii. 1.

[3] Many say 59, some 61. For a very clear and concise presentation and defence of the prevailing view, see Schürer: *l.c.* I. S. 483 sq. (Eng. Trans., Div. I. Vol. II. p. 182 sq.). For a fuller treatment of the subject see especially Wieseler: *Chronologie d. ap. Zeitalters*, S. 66 sq. Schürer, who decides for the year 60, closes his careful discussion of the subject with the words: "It is most correct to say, with Wurm, 'At the earliest 58, at the latest 61, probably 60.'"

ter merits careful consideration.[1] Josephus records that Festus' predecessor Felix was accused before Nero by prominent Jews of Cæsarea, and that he escaped punishment only because of the influence of his brother Pallas, who at that time enjoyed the especial friendship of the emperor.[2] But Tacitus reports that Pallas fell into disfavor with Nero and was relieved of his offices before the end of the year 55;[3] and the historian's account of Nero's attitude toward Pallas and his silence touching any reconciliation between them, to say nothing of the emperor's treatment of Agrippina, with whose fortunes those of Pallas were so intimately bound up, make it very difficult to believe that the latter again acquired influence at court. That Pallas was acquitted of the crime of conspiracy a few months after his dismissal from office[4] cannot be urged as a proof that he subsequently regained Nero's favor, for he had expressly stipulated at the time of his dismissal that he should not be questioned for any part of his past conduct,[5] and Tacitus remarks that his "acquittal was not so gratifying [evidently meaning to the emperor] as his arrogance was offensive."[6] But the accusation from which Felix was relieved by the good offices of his brother was made after his departure from Palestine and after the accession of his successor Festus.[7] It seems therefore that the latter must have become procurator in 55; for before the end of that year Pallas was in disgrace, while Nero ascended the throne too late in the previous year (Oct. 13) to send Festus to Palestine before the early fall, when Paul was despatched to Rome.[8]

Against this opinion it has been urged that the words addressed by Paul to Felix, two years before the close of the latter's term of office ("Forasmuch as I know that thou hast been for many years a judge unto this nation"[9]) make so early a date impossible. But that is a decided

[1] The substance of the following discussion of the date of Paul's Cæsarean imprisonment has been already printed in the *American Journal of Theology* for January, 1897, p. 145 sq.

[2] *Ant.* XX. 8, 9.

[3] *Ann.* XIII. 14.

[4] *Ann.* XIII. 23.

[5] *Ann.* XIII. 14.

[6] *Ann.* XIII. 23.

[7] Josephus: *Ant.* XX. 8, 9.

[8] Cf. Acts xxvii. 9.

[9] Acts xxiv. 10.

mistake, for even though Cumanus may not have been succeeded by Felix until 52, as Tacitus and Josephus seem to imply,[1] Tacitus expressly says that Felix had already been for a long time governor of Judea, including Samaria, while Cumanus was governor of Galilee.[2] Josephus, to be sure, says nothing of such a division of the province, but his account at this point is so improbable in many of its features and contains so many palpable inaccuracies, that we can hardly hesitate to follow Mommsen in preferring the authority of Tacitus to that of Josephus.[3] Paul's words therefore might have been uttered in 53, when, if our view be correct, he was taken a prisoner to Cæsarea, as well as in 58 or any other year. Josephus' apparent ignorance touching Felix's presence and authority in Palestine before the year 52 probably explains the fact that he relates most of the deeds which he ascribes to Felix, including his victory over the Egyptian referred to in Acts xxi. 38, in connection with the reign of Nero.[4] At any rate, in view of that ignorance, it is clear that no valid argument against the earlier date for Paul's arrest can be drawn from the fact that such events are connected by Josephus with Nero's reign.

In confirmation of the early date I have been maintaining for the accession of Festus and the arrest and imprisonment of Paul may be urged, on the one hand, the traditional residence of the apostle Peter in Rome, which seems to require an earlier date for Paul's death than that commonly adopted,[5] and on the other hand the chronology of the latter's missionary career. Reasons have already been given for thinking that the apostolic council probably took place in the year 45 instead of 50 or 51, as is commonly assumed.[6] It is true that our data for obtaining the length of Paul's missionary journeys are few and uncertain, but the generally accepted calculations are probably approximately correct.

[1] *Ann.* XII. 54; *Ant.* XX. 7, 1. [2] *Ann.* XII. 54.

[3] Mommsen: *Römische Geschichte*, 3te Auflage, V. S. 525 sq. Cf. also Blass: *Acta apostolorum*, p. 21, and Ramsay: *St. Paul, the Traveller and the Roman Citizen*, p. 313.

[4] Cf. Josephus: *Ant.* XX. 8; *B. J.* II. 13.

[5] See below, p. 592 sq. [6] See above, p. 172.

They make the interval between the apostolic council and the arrest of Paul in Jerusalem about seven or eight years, and if the former event therefore be fixed at about 45, the latter can hardly be put much later than 53.[1] It may fairly be assumed then on the grounds given above, which find confirmation in the considerations just mentioned, that Paul's imprisonment in Cæsarea, which followed immediately upon his arrest in Jerusalem, began in the early summer of 53 (he was arrested soon after Pentecost) and continued until the late summer or early fall of 55, when he sailed for Rome.[2]

The account of Paul's journey from Cæsarea to Rome is taken from the "we" source, and is exceedingly accurate and without doubt entirely trustworthy from beginning to end.[3] Late in the summer or early in the fall[4] he left

[1] Assuming, as is very likely, that Paul left Antioch upon his second missionary journey (Acts xv. 40) in the spring of 46, he must have reached Philippi before the end of the fall, for his journey through Asia Minor was evidently a rapid one, and he stopped nowhere for any length of time (see above, p. 235). The length of his stay in Macedonia is uncertain, but a year would probably cover it, so that he may have reached Corinth in the autumn of 47. Here he remained a year and a half according to Acts xviii. 11, and at the opening of navigation in the spring of 49 he very likely sailed at once for Syria (Acts xviii. 18). He seems to have tarried only a short time in the East, and to have hastened back to Ephesus without stopping to do evangelistic work on the way (xviii. 21 sq., xix. 1). It is therefore probable that he reached Ephesus by the middle of the year 49. From Acts xix. 8, 10, and 22, it appears that his residence in Ephesus lasted something over two and a quarter years, and in Acts xx. 31, the whole duration of it is given in round numbers as three years. We conclude from 1 Cor. xvi. 8, combined with xvi. 1 and 2 Cor. ix. 2, that he left Ephesus for the last time in the spring, so that he was probably there from the summer of 49 to the spring of 52. He reached Corinth apparently toward the close of the same year (see above, p. 324), and after a stay of three months there, left in the spring for Jerusalem (Acts xx. 4, 6), where he arrived in time for Pentecost in the year 53. These calculations are of course for the most part only approximate; but they can hardly be more than a year out of the way, and they thus go to confirm, in a general way, the earlier date for Paul's imprisonment.

[2] The earlier date for Festus' accession and Paul's imprisonment has been maintained also by Kellner in the *Zeitschrift für Kath. Theologie*, 1888, S. 630 sq., and in other articles; by Weber in his *Kritische Geschichte der Exegese des 9ten Kapitels des Römerbriefes*, 1889, S. 177 sq.; and more recently by O. Holtzmann in his *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte*, S. 128 sq., and by Blass, *l.c.* S. 21 sq. Blass puts the arrest of Paul at Jerusalem in the year 54.

[3] On Paul's voyage to Rome see especially James Smith's *Voyage and Shipwreck of St. Paul*, and compare Ramsay: *St. Paul, the Traveller and the Roman Citizen*, p. 314 sq.

[4] They were at Crete in October according to Acts xxvii. 9, and they must have been already some weeks on the voyage. The fast referred to in that passage is the great fast of the day of atonement, which fell on the tenth

Cæsarea, in charge of a centurion named Julian, who was conducting a body of prisoners to Rome. He was accompanied by Aristarchus of Thessalonica[1] and the unnamed author of the account of the voyage. They very likely went in the capacity of Paul's personal attendants or slaves, for otherwise such intimate association as they seem to have had with him throughout the journey would hardly have been possible.[2] Paul seems to have appeared in Cæsarea and in Rome as a man of high social rank, and he was treated as such by the authorities.[3] It was therefore entirely natural that he should have a couple of attendants and that they should be allowed to accompany him to Rome.[4] The voyage from Cæsarea was made by ship, and the winds proved exceedingly unpropitious, so that instead of reaching Rome before the close of navigation in the fall, they were shipwrecked on the island of Malta, and forced to remain there three months. Paul's courage, wisdom, and presence of mind were very conspicuous in all the difficulties and dangers of the voyage and made a great impression upon the centurion and all the ship's company. He showed himself equal to the emergency in this case as in every other, and we could ill spare the picture of his calm and confident demeanor in the midst of the panic-

of the month Tisri, the seventh month of the Jewish year, corresponding approximately to our October.

[1] Aristarchus was with Paul in Ephesus, according to Acts xix. 29, and accompanied him upon his final journey to Jerusalem, Acts xx. 4. He also remained with him for some time in Rome (Col. iv. 10; Philemon 24).

[2] See Ramsay: *l.c.* p. 315 sq.

[3] Notice the consideration shown him by the centurion at Sidon, where he was allowed to visit his friends, according to Acts xxvii. 3.

[4] Ramsay (*l.c.* p. 310 sq.) has an interesting note upon the finances of the trial, in which he suggests that Paul had recently fallen heir to considerable property, and that he was thus in a position to defray easily the large expenses involved in his trial and protracted imprisonment. It is possible that this was the case, but not only at an earlier day in Macedonia and Achaia, but also later in Rome, he received gifts from the church of Philippi and found them very welcome (Phil. iv. 10 sq.). It hardly looks, therefore, as if he were a man of independent wealth at any time. That he had enough property to raise him above the level of the ordinary criminal, and to insure him a measure of respect from the authorities, is very likely, but it is probable that Felix was counting upon the devotion of Paul's disciples and not upon the apostle's purse alone when he tried to secure a bribe for his release (Acts xxiv. 26), and that frequently during his imprisonment Paul had the assistance as well as the sympathy of his Christian brethren.

stricken prisoners and crew. Though only a prisoner, he was the commanding figure in the vessel, and he made his influence felt. The secret of his marvellous power and success as a missionary of Christ lay in no small measure in his superiority to circumstances so clearly manifested in such scenes as these, and in the dominating forcefulness of his personality, which was felt by high as well as low, by governors and kings as well as by soldiers and sailors.

In Malta Paul is reported to have performed many miracles[1] and to have gained the confidence and affection of the inhabitants, but nothing is said about his preaching the Gospel and securing converts to the Christian faith. At the opening of navigation in the spring the voyage was resumed in another ship, and Puteoli was reached in good time and without farther mishap. After a week's stay there, during which Paul enjoyed the association of Christian disciples residing in the place, the soldiers with their prisoners made their way to Rome by land. The Roman Christians had received news of Paul's coming, probably from the brethren at Puteoli, and a number of them met him at the Forum of Appius, more than forty-five miles from the city on the Via Appia, and others at the Three Taverns, some twelve or thirteen miles nearer.[2] They gave him a warm welcome and Paul was greatly cheered and encouraged by it. It must have meant much to him, arriving a prisoner in bonds, to be greeted in such a way. The Roman church was not of his own planting and he himself was a stranger to most of its members, and he might well have entertained doubts as to whether they would care to show him any particular attention, or would dare to do it, under existing circumstances, even if they wished to. Their friendliness and sympathy thus promptly expressed, and their evident disregard of the possible con-

[1] The attempt to cut out vss. 3-6 and 7-10 of chap. xxviii. as interpolations is quite unwarranted. Paul himself testifies in 2 Cor. xii. 12 to his own performance of signs and wonders, and the record of such events in accounts of his life and work is in itself no sufficient indication of late date. The age with which we are dealing was in an eminent sense a supernatural age, and the belief in miracles was universal among the disciples.

[2] Acts xxviii. 15.

sequences of compromising themselves in the eyes of the authorities, must have affected him deeply. He felt himself among friends, even though a prisoner in a strange city, and he "thanked God and took courage."[1]

The "we" source apparently closes just at this point, though it may be that a part of that which follows was taken from it. At any rate, it is not at all impossible that Paul had a conference with some of the leading Jews of the city as recorded in vss. 17–20, in the hope that he might succeed in disposing them favorably toward him, or might at least disarm their hostility, which of course would work to his decided disadvantage in his approaching trial. The words uttered by the Jews, according to vs. 22, convey the impression that they had not themselves come in contact with Christianity, but knew it only by hearsay. Such an impression, however, is hardly in accord with the actual facts. There were certainly Jewish Christians in the church of Rome at the time Paul wrote his epistle, and it is altogether likely that the disturbances which led to the expulsion of some of the Jews from the city during the reign of Claudius were due to the preaching of Christ in the synagogue.[2] It cannot be denied, moreover, that the words attributed to Paul in vss. 25–28 seem on their face a little out of harmony with the situation and with the immediate context; for while vss. 17–20 represent him as summoning the leaders of the Jews in order to disarm their prejudice against him, vss. 23–28 picture him as preaching the Gospel to them, and then pronouncing condemnation upon them for their refusal to believe, in

[1] Acts xxviii. 15.

[2] Cf. Acts xviii. 2, and Suetonius: *Claudius*, 25. Suetonius says that Claudius expelled the Jews from Rome because they were making disturbances at the instigation of a certain Chrestos (*Judæos impulsore Chresto assidue tumultuantes Roma expulit*). The identification of Chrestos with Christ is not certain, but is very probable, and has been adopted by most scholars.

Dion Cassius (LX. 6), referring probably to the same event, says that Claudius did not expel the Jews from the city, as there were too many of them, but forbade them to hold meetings. Very likely an edict of expulsion was passed and some of the Jews, including Aquila and Priscilla (Acts xviii. 2), left the city; but the Jewish colony was so large that it was found impracticable to carry out the edict, and so a prohibition of their religious services was substituted. The date of the edict is unknown to us, and no chronological conclusions can be drawn from it.

words calculated only to enrage and embitter them. So too the utterance recorded in vs. 28 ("Be it therefore known unto you that this salvation of God hath been sent unto the Gentiles; they also will hear") sounds like an anachronism at this time and place. When Paul arrived in Rome, there was already a Christian church there composed largely of Gentiles, and it was undoubtedly among them that he had most of his friends, and by them that he was welcomed most warmly. It is a little strange under such circumstances that he should say to the Jews of the city that their refusal to believe would result in the salvation of the heathen. That he actually did come in contact with unconverted Jews in Rome, and that he even endeavored to win them over to the Christian faith, need not be doubted, but the particular form which his intercourse with them takes in the account of Acts was possibly due to the author, who perhaps represented Paul as having such an interview as is described in order to emphasize at the very close of his book the fact upon which he had laid frequent stress, that Paul was not to blame for the non-conversion of the Jews, and for the predominantly Gentile character of the church, but that the Jews themselves were to blame for it; that he had offered the Gospel to the Jews of Rome before turning to the Gentiles, just as he had in nearly all the cities which he visited; that everything possible had been done to induce them to accept Christianity, but that they had persistently refused, and that, too, in spite of the fact that Christianity was the true form of Judaism which all their prophets had been foretelling, and to which all their past had been leading up. This fact, which thus received renewed and final emphasis, had also an apologetic significance. It was calculated to explain and, at the same time, to show the injustice of the Jews' enmity for the Christians, which was undoubtedly very marked at the time our author wrote, and which contributed not a little to the hostile treatment accorded the church by the Roman authorities.

12. Paul in Rome

The Book of Acts closes with the statement that Paul "abode two whole years in his own hired dwelling, and received all that went in unto him, preaching the kingdom of God, and teaching the things concerning the Lord Jesus Christ with all boldness, none forbidding him."[1] That Paul during the two years thus described actually did enjoy a large measure of freedom in communicating with his friends and with any others who were interested enough to visit him, and that he continued his activity as a preacher of the Gospel to those about him and retained his interest in his own churches and in the progress of Christianity in the world at large, is evidenced by four epistles from his pen, all of which were apparently written at this time: the epistles to Philemon, to the Colossians, to the Ephesians, and to the Philippians. That the last-named was written in Rome, while Paul was a prisoner there, is commonly taken for granted.[2] The expectation of death which haunted the imprisoned apostle while he wrote;[3] the large and active circle of Christian disciples with which he was surrounded, and the various tendencies exhibited among them;[4] the reference to the prætorian guard,[5] and the greetings from the members of Cæsar's household,[6] — all point to Rome.

But there are some scholars that maintain that the first three of the epistles mentioned were written not in Rome, but in Cæsarea during Paul's imprisonment there.[7] It is certain that the three cannot be separated from each other. If they are genuine epistles of Paul, they must have been written at the same time and place. But for the opinion that that place was Rome and not Cæsarea speaks the fact

[1] Acts xxviii. 30, 31.

[2] The Epistle to the Philippians is put into the Cæsarean imprisonment by O. Holtzmann: *Theologische Litteraturzeitung*, 1890, Sp. 177, and by Spitta: *Die Apostelgeschichte*, S. 281, but so far as I know by no other recent scholars. Clemen, who divides the epistle into two, puts the earlier into the Cæsarean imprisonment, the later into the Roman (*Die Chronologie der Paulinischen Briefe*, S. 197).

[3] Phil. i. 20 sq., ii. 17.

[4] Phil. i. 12 sq.

[5] Phil. i. 13.

[6] Phil. iv. 22.

[7] See above, p. 353.

that while Paul was in Cæsarea, all his thoughts were turned toward Rome, and it is exceedingly unlikely that he would plan to visit Asia Minor again in case of his release, as he announces his intention of doing in Philemon 22, instead of carrying out his long-cherished purpose to go at once to Rome. But that he actually had the intention, while a prisoner in the latter city, to return East if he were released, is proved by Phil. i. 27 and ii. 24. Moreover, it should be observed that the marked resemblances that exist between Colossians and Philippians make it exceedingly difficult to separate them by any long interval.[1] In view of these considerations there can be little doubt of the correctness of the traditional and commonly accepted opinion that Colossians, Ephesians, and Philemon were written during Paul's imprisonment in Rome.

Their date it is impossible to determine more exactly. On the ground, on the one hand, of resemblances between Philippians and Romans and, on the other hand, of the less Pauline style and of the more highly developed Christology and ecclesiology of Colossians and Ephesians, Lightfoot has maintained, in disagreement with the great majority of scholars, that the Epistle to the Philippians was written before the other three.[2] But the resemblance to Romans has no weight; for the epistles were separated at any rate by an interval of at least three years, and the literary style of Colossians and Ephesians and the alleged doctrinal difficulties which beset them cannot be accounted for by the lapse of twelve or fifteen months, which at the very most intervened between them and the Epistle to the Philippians. On the other hand, the fact that Timothy was with Paul when he wrote Philemon, Colossians, and Philippians, but that the last-named epistle announces his impending departure for the East, suggests that it was written later than the others; for Timothy was certainly in the East toward the close of Paul's imprisonment, as appears

[1] Upon these resemblances, see especially Von Soden in the *Hand-Kommentar zum Neuen Testament*, III. 1, S. 14.

[2] See his Commentary on Philippians, edition of 1894, p. 30 sq.

from 2 Tim. iv. 19. The tone of the Epistle to the Philippians is very different from that of the others. Though Paul hopes to be released, he is occupied much with the thought of death, and evidently realizes that it may be imminent; while in Colossians, Ephesians, and Philemon there is no reference to his death, and he seems to be looking forward to a protracted period of activity in Rome.[1] It may fairly be assumed, then, that the common opinion is correct, and that the Epistle to the Philippians was written later than the other three. But how long an interval separated it from them, we have no means of determining.

The first of the epistles of the captivity was addressed to a church which Paul had neither founded nor visited,[2] — the church of Colossæ in southwestern Phrygia. But the Colossians apparently owed their Christianity to one of Paul's own disciples, a man named Epaphras;[3] and he therefore felt no hesitation in treating them as his own converts and writing them an epistle. The contrast between Paul's attitude toward the Colossians and the Romans is noticeable. He does not think it necessary to apologize for addressing the former as he did in the case of the latter. Though not his own converts, they are the converts of one of his disciples and thus they owe their Christianity indirectly if not directly to him, and consider themselves a part of his missionary field. He is therefore not building upon another man's foundation or entering another man's territory in writing to them, but only fulfilling the duty which he owes to all his churches, among which Colossæ reckons itself and is reckoned by Paul as truly as any other. Paul's epistle is thus significant for the light it throws upon the respect in which he was held even among those who had not seen his face and the authority which he exercised over them. He was the apostle of a much wider field than he had himself personally traversed.

The Colossian Christians were Gentiles,[4] and they had

[1] Cf. Eph. vi. 19; Col. iv. 3.
[2] Col. ii. 1.
[3] Col. i. 7, iv. 12.
[4] Cf. Col. i. 21, ii. 13.

learned from Epaphras Paul's own Gospel;[1] but at the time he wrote an ascetic and legalistic tendency was appearing among them, not dissimilar to that referred to in Rom. xiv.[2] This tendency was evidently not due to the influence of Judaizers, such as Paul had to contend with in Jerusalem and Galatia; for there is no sign that the attempt was made to impose circumcision upon the Colossians or to insist upon the observance of the Jewish law as a condition of salvation. Nor is there any sign of hostility to Paul himself, or of an inclination to question his authority or the truth of the Gospel which he preached. There is no indication, moreover, that the men who advocated the practices which Paul attacks in his epistle denied the salvation of those who failed to observe them. They seem only to have recommended them as the means of reaching a higher stage of Christian perfection, and of making one's salvation more secure.[3] They did not preach another Gospel, as did the Judaizers in Galatia whom Paul was compelled to anathematize. They accepted the Gospel of Paul, but they believed that only by abstinence from certain kinds of food and drink, and by the observance of certain days, was it possible to reach that stage of perfection to which all Christians should aspire; and they were therefore condemning those who did not adopt their practices as less perfect than themselves. The differences between their principles and Paul's lay not in the sphere of theology or philosophy, but in the sphere of ethics. Their aims were wholly practical; and Paul opposed them not because they taught a false philosophy of the universe or even a false doctrine of Christ, but because they advocated pernicious observances, the practical effect of which was to obscure the full significance of Christ's work and to loosen the Christian's grasp upon him. The rites and ceremonies and the ascetic practices which they inculcated they apparently based upon the need of conciliating and warding off the hostility of those spiritual beings or angels who

[1] Col. ii. 6 sq.

[2] On the Colossian errorists, see especially Von Soden: *Hand-Kommentar*, III. 1, S. 5 sq.

[3] Cf. Col. i. 6, 9 sq., 22, 27, 28, ii. 3, 10, iii. 14.

were widely supposed among the Jews to be active in the affairs of the world, and to exercise a large measure of control over the destinies of men. A belief in the existence of such intermediate spiritual agents and a tendency to ritual observance and ascetic practice were also widespread in heathen circles, especially in the East; but there are indications in Paul's Epistle to the Colossians that the errorists whom he opposes there were Jews rather than Gentiles, or at least owed their principles to Jewish influence. At any rate, their insistence upon the observance of new moons and Sabbath days,[1] and their apparent high estimate of circumcision,[2] both point in that direction.[3] At the same time it is evident that they were not Pharisaic legalists; and it is almost equally clear that they were not Essenes as some scholars have supposed.[4] Ascetic tendencies and such a belief in angels as they held were certainly not confined to that sect; and there is no reference in our epistle to any of the most characteristic features of Essenism: celibacy, communism, and scrupulosity in connection with rites of purification. It is likely, in view of their special emphasis upon such practices as were most common among Gentile adherents of Judaism in the world at large outside of Palestine — abstinence from certain kinds of food and the observance of sacred days, — and in view of their angelology and their appeal to philosophy and visions[5] in support of their demands, that the errorists were under the influence of Alexandrian rather than Palestinian Judaism. There is nothing surprising in this, for the Judaism of Alexandria made itself widely felt in the world at large, and we have other traces of its influence in Asia Minor.[6]

But though the Colossian errorists were either Jews themselves or under Jewish influence, the principles which

[1] Col. ii. 16. [2] Col. ii. 11, iii. 11.

[3] Cf. also the words παράδοσις (ii. 8), δόγματα (ii. 14 and 20), and στοιχεῖα (ii. 8, 20), the last of which is used in Gal. iv. 3 and 9 to designate the requirements of the Jewish law.

[4] So, *e.g.*, Weiss: *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, S. 253 (Eng. Trans., I. p. 330).

[5] Col. ii. 8, 18.

[6] Compare, for instance, Paul himself, who was trained in Tarsus; also Apollos and the author of the prologue of the Fourth Gospel.

they preached were such as to appeal naturally to the Gentile Christians of Colossæ; for the same kind of a belief in spiritual beings, bridging the chasm between man and the invisible God, and the same tendency to conciliate them and win their assistance in the effort to acquire perfection and rise to an immediate contemplation of Deity, were widespread throughout the East, and later played a large part in the development of Christian theology and practice. We have in Colossæ the first appearance of that syncretism of Oriental theosophy and Christian faith which in one form or another characterized all the Gnostic systems of the second century, and which was not without its influence upon the ultimate conception of the end and means of redemption that prevailed in the orthodox church. We have also the first appearance of that syncretism of heathen and Christian ritual which in a developed form was so marked a feature of the religious life of the church of the fourth and following centuries. It was not a mere form of Jewish Christianity which Paul attacked in his epistle, but a superimposition of Jewish and heathen elements, primarily practical, secondarily speculative, upon the Christian faith and life. The effect of such elements, Paul saw at once, was to belittle the significance of Christ and of his work, and to lead Christians ultimately to depend for salvation upon their own efforts instead of the divine Christ within them, and thus to substitute the old life in the flesh for the new life in the Spirit, to their inevitable destruction.[1]

And so, after commending in high terms the faith of his Colossian readers and offering a prayer for their growth in the knowledge of God's will and in true Christian virtue, Paul emphasizes in the strongest terms the exalted nature of Christ, in whom dwelleth the fulness of God, and his superiority to and sovereignty over all the visible and invisible forces of the universe,[2] in order to show the Colossians that the man whom Christ has redeemed and in whom Christ dwells need have no fear of principalities and powers, either earthly or heavenly. It is with this aim in view that he asserts that redemption in Christ means the

[1] Col. ii. 6, 8, 10, 18, 20, 23, iii. 2. [2] Col. i. 15 sq.

forgiveness of sins,[1] so that the Colossian Christians need not suppose that they have any debt to pay to those beings whose hostility they fear. And it is with the same aim that he emphasizes the fact that Christ has not only created all things visible and invisible, but has also reconciled them all to himself through his death,[2] meaning thereby not that he has saved them, for Paul does not speak of reconciling them to God, but that he has put an end to their hostility to himself and to those in whom he dwells, possibly by demonstrating the uselessness of that hostility; so that they are no longer to be feared by the Christian. With the same motive Paul then goes on to emphasize the completeness of the Christian's redemption in Christ, which not only insures him against the machinations of all hostile spirits, but also makes him holy and without blemish and unreprovable before God,[3] and thus renders unnecessary such efforts to acquire perfection as are urged by the false teachers. After this preliminary statement of what Christ has done for the Christian, Paul indicates that his purpose in writing thus is to show the groundlessness and harmfulness of the practices and observances which the errorists are endeavoring to impose upon the Colossians;[4] and in order to clinch the matter he emphasizes again Christ's authority over all principalities and powers, and repeats in even clearer and more explicit terms his account of Christ's work, which has resulted in the complete redemption of the Christian and in his release from the bondage of the law.[5] Freed as he has been from that bondage, let the Christian not subject himself again to the ordinances of men and endeavor unnecessarily to propitiate the angels, with whom he has really nothing more to do since he died with Christ; for the ritual observances and ascetic practices which he undertakes with that end

[1] Col. i. 14. [2] Col. i. 20. [3] Col. i. 22. [4] Col. ii. 4 sq.

[5] Col. ii. 8–15. In ii. 14, 15 we have another indication that the Colossian errorists were Jews or under Jewish influence; for the angels, or the principalities and powers (ἀρχαὶ καὶ ἐξουσίαι), are here represented, as they were commonly thought of among the Jews, as the agents and guardians of the law. It is from their control, according to Paul, that a man is released when freed from the bondage of the law.

in view, instead of profiting him and enabling him to rise above the flesh, only contribute to its power and cut him off from Christ.[1] After thus warning his readers against the false teachers and showing how inconsistent the principles of the latter were with the true conception of Christ's work and of the Christian life which the Colossians had been taught, and how, if they were to follow the advice of their would-be instructors, they would be separated from Christ and thus be led away from God instead of toward him, Paul exhorts them to live the true Christian life, and to set their minds, as those who have died and risen again with Christ, on things above rather than on things upon the earth.[2] The conduct which that true Christian life involves is then exhibited both in its individual and in its social aspects, and in strong contrast to the observances and practices inculcated by the false teachers.[3] The epistle closes with various personal notices and salutations, and with an exhortation to Archippus, who evidently held official position in the Colossian church, to fulfil his duties faithfully.

The Colossians at the time Paul wrote had apparently not been led far astray; for he does not exhort them to return to their first faith, but to hold it fast and remain steadfast in it, and he speaks of them in terms of the highest commendation.[4] They may have begun to adopt the practices recommended by the false teachers,[5] but they still believed the Gospel of salvation in Christ as taught by Paul, and all that he needed to do was to show them how much that salvation implied and how inconsistent with it were the principles which they were asked to accept. He did not find it necessary to defend his Gospel or to prove its truth, but simply to point out what was involved in it; and he was confident that that would be enough to convince the Colossians of the error of the course which had been urged upon them.[6] Evidently the

[1] Col. ii. 16–23. [3] Col. iii. 5–iv. 6. [5] Cf. Col. ii. 20.
[2] Col. iii. 1–4. [4] Col. i. 4 sq., 9, ii. 5, 6.
[6] It is worthy of notice that it is an increased acquaintance with God's will which Paul desires for the Colossians in i. 9. It is thus practical, not speculative, knowledge that he feels they need. Cf. also i. 6, 26.

false teachers were not attacking or trying to undermine Paul's doctrine of salvation and of the person and work of Christ. Indeed it looks very much as if they accepted his Gospel, as the Colossians in general did, without realizing the practical consequences that were involved in it. Paul's sharp antithesis of flesh and spirit, naturally suggesting as it did the value of asceticism, was quite in line with their own tendencies, and they very likely regarded him with respect and believed themselves to be in essential agreement with him. This would explain the fact that Paul treats them with comparative mildness and nowhere denounces them bitterly; and the still farther fact that he represents them not as denying Christ, as the Galatian Judaizers denied him, but simply as losing their hold upon him.[1] Such treatment would have been impossible had they consciously degraded Christ and made him simply one of a number of spiritual beings or æons, as the Gnostics subsequently did; but there is no sign that they did anything of the sort. Their error was practical only, and concerned the effects of Christ's work, not his nature or his character. All that Paul says about the latter is said in the interest of the former, with the purpose of showing that Christ's redemptive work is absolutely complete and leaves no place for propitiatory observances and practices.

But this consideration disposes of the chief objection which has been brought against the authenticity of the Epistle to the Colossians. The argument against its genuineness drawn from its language and style has no weight. While there are undoubtedly linguistic and stylistic peculiarities in the epistle, the most noticeable of them can be explained from the subject-matter and from the polemic use by Paul of the terminology of those whose teachings he is refuting; and the marks of identity with his acknowledged works, especially with the Epistle to the Philippians, which was written at about the same time, are far more numerous and striking. But the Christology of the epistle has long been a stumbling-block and has led many scholars to deny that Paul can have been its author. But when the purpose

[1] Col. ii. 19.

of the epistle is kept clearly in mind; when it is realized that the author's object was not to teach Christology, but to emphasize the completeness of Christ's redemptive work, in order to show the groundlessness of the observances and practices recommended in Colossæ, the difficulties vanish. Thus the striking assertion that in Christ "dwells all the fulness of the Godhead bodily,"[1] which goes beyond numerous utterances in Paul's other writings only in form and emphasis, finds its explanation, as the context shows, in his desire to bring out the fact that the man who is in Christ has full redemption and does not need to seek fulness and perfectness in ritual observance and ascetic practice. And so again the passage upon the creative work of Christ,[2] in which he is represented not simply as the agent of creation as in 1 Cor. viii. 6, but also as its author, ground and end, may be fully accounted for by Paul's wish to emphasize in the strongest terms Christ's superiority to and authority over all those spiritual powers, of whom the false teachers were making so much; and though it is an advance upon anything found in his other epistles, it is not inconsistent with them and is entirely natural under the circumstances. And so finally the statement that Christ has reconciled unto himself heavenly as well as earthly things[3] is made for the sole purpose of showing the needlessness of the observances and practices in question; and though it cannot be duplicated in his other epistles, it is not in the least un-Pauline, for it does not mean that Christ has saved heavenly beings or angels, as he has saved men, but that he has put an end to their machinations against himself and those in whom he dwells, so that they need no longer be feared by the Christian. Thus all the advances upon the statements of Paul's other epistles touching the person and work of Christ, may be satisfactorily explained in the light of the situation which called forth the letter to the Colossians without recourse to the hypothesis that it is the work of another hand. And indeed that hypothesis cannot be successfully maintained in the face of the genuine Paulinism which underlies

[1] Col. ii. 9; cf. i. 19. [2] Col. i. 16, 17. [3] Col. i. 20.

the entire epistle: the conception of redemption as accomplished by the death and resurrection of Christ; of salvation as dying with Christ unto the flesh and rising again with him a new creature; of the Christian life as the divine life in man, a life freed from the bondage not of the flesh alone, but also of the law; of baptism as burial with Christ; of faith as union with him in the new life, and thus not merely one grace or virtue among many, but the root of all the Christian virtues and graces. When it is realized how little Paul was understood even in the period immediately succeeding his death, and at how many points his disciples misinterpreted him, it is difficult to suppose that any one else can have written an epistle which presents so accurately and in such true proportions the most characteristic features of his Gospel, and which has that Gospel as its very heart and essence.

The occasion for writing the Epistle to the Colossians was supplied apparently by the arrival of Epaphras in Rome. He brought Paul news of the love and faith and steadfastness of the Christians of Colossæ,[1] and at the same time, it would seem, informed him of the efforts that were making to impose upon them the observances and practices already referred to. What brought Epaphras to Rome, we do not know. It is hardly probable that he came thither as a messenger of the Colossian church to consult Paul in regard to the new principles that were preached among them; for Paul makes no reference to any request for advice or instruction on their part, and he sent his epistle to Colossæ not by Epaphras, but by Tychicus of Asia.[2] He takes pains also to emphasize Epaphras' love and devotion to the Colossians and the good account he has given of them, apparently fearing that his report of the existing troubles may arouse their resentment.

With Tychicus, the bearer of the epistle, went also Onesimus, a runaway slave belonging to Philemon, a wealthy Christian of Colossæ. Onesimus, it seems, had come to Rome, and had there been converted under the influence of Paul,[3] and the apostle now sends him back to his mas-

[1] Col. i. 7 sq., ii. 5. [2] Col. iv. 7; cf. Acts xx. 4. [3] Philemon 10.

ter, a new man, with a note of commendation in which he begs Philemon to receive his returning slave as he would receive the writer himself. The brief note is one of the most charming things of the kind ever written. It shows the most exquisite tact and delicacy, and breathes throughout a spirit of true Christian courtesy. It reveals a side of Paul's character which is entirely in keeping with what we know of him from his other epistles, but which nowhere else appears so clearly and distinctly. The personal affection and devotion with which he was regarded by his companions and disciples need no explanation in the light of such a note as this. It is noticeable that Paul does not once refer to his own apostleship. He lays no commands upon Philemon in virtue of his spiritual authority. He writes simply as one Christian to another. But he writes with the assured confidence that Philemon's gratitude and affection will lead him to do gladly whatever he can for the one to whom he owes his Christian faith, and so though he requests him to charge to his account whatever loss he may have incurred through Onesimus' flight, and promises to make it good,[1] he indicates in the same passage that he does not expect him to make any such charge, for Philemon is his debtor to an amount not to be measured in money. Paul's confidence that Philemon's gratitude and affection would prompt him to do whatever he could for him illustrates the influence enjoyed and the authority wielded in the early church, not by Paul alone, but by all the apostles and evangelists. The one to whom a man or a community owed their Christian faith must always have been held in peculiar honor, and his requests must have had almost the force of a command with them. It was not in the relation of rulers to their subjects, but of fathers to their children, that the apostles stood toward the churches which they had founded, and their influence and authority were measured by their converts' love and devotion for them. It is altogether probable that Paul, though he had not been in Colossæ, was personally acquainted with Philemon, and that it was under his per-

[1] Philemon 18, 19.

sonal influence that the latter had been brought to Christ, possibly during a temporary stay in Ephesus. But Paul was apparently regarded with the same respect and affection even by those Colossians who had not seen his face; and was thus looked upon as the author of their Christian faith even though he had not himself preached the Gospel to them.

Paul's brief note to Philemon is also significant because it shows the attitude which he took toward existing social institutions. Though he taught with the utmost insistence that every man is a freeman in Christ, he yet refused to draw from that fundamental principle the natural conclusion that slaves ought to renounce the service of their masters and realize their Christian liberty in freedom from all earthly bondage. In his epistles to the Corinthians, he admonishes converted slaves to remain in the service of their masters and not even to seek to be free, for they can serve God as well in that condition of life as in any other; and he nowhere so much as hints that he desires or expects to see slavery done away with. It may be doubted, indeed, whether such a thought ever occurred to him. Christianity, as he understood it, did not directly affect social or political conditions. There were still to be rulers and governors, and they were to be treated with all respect, and loyal obedience was to be rendered them. There were still to be rich and poor, masters and slaves, as there had always been. The Christian life was to be lived in the midst of existing conditions. It was to manifest itself in faithfulness to duty, in love and unselfishness, in cheerful contentment with one's lot in life, and in the grateful acceptance of all things as the gifts of God. A political and social revolution was the last thing Paul was seeking, and the last thing he would have countenanced. And so when the runaway slave became a Christian under his influence, the first thing Paul urged upon him was the duty of returning to his master and making good in so far as he could for the inconvenience and loss which he had caused him. There is no hint in Paul's letter that he

condoned Onesimus' conduct in leaving his master. The fact is recognized that Onesimus had seriously wronged Philemon, and that the latter had the right to be angry with him and to exact a heavy penalty from him. Nor is there any hint that Philemon ought to grant Onesimus his liberty and no longer hold him as a slave. Paul expresses the hope, to be sure, that he will now regard him as a Christian brother, but that does not mean that he wants him to set him free. It means only that the old relation shall be sweetened and beautified by the recognition of the new tie of Christian fellowship.

Paul's letter was addressed primarily to Philemon, but his wife Apphia, Archippus, and the church in Philemon's house are also mentioned in the salutation, and are all of them included in the benediction at the close. As Onesimus was a member of Philemon's household, of course all of his family would be interested in his return, and especially those who belonged to the church in his house, among whom the converted Onesimus would henceforth be numbered. It was therefore a delicate act of courtesy that they should also be addressed. The reason for the inclusion of Archippus is not altogether clear. It is possible that he was one of Philemon's own family, whose name was mentioned, along with that of Apphia, simply because of his special prominence and influence. But we learn from Col. iv. 17 that he held some position of authority among the Christians of Colossæ, and it is very likely that he was at the head of the Colossian church. He may have been addressed by Paul, therefore, as a representative of the church in the city, which of course included the little circle in Philemon's house, and in recognition of his interest in Onesimus as a member of his flock.

Closely related to the Epistle to the Colossians, both in content and in style, is the so-called Epistle to the Ephesians. If it is Paul's own work, it was evidently written at about the same time as Colossians and sent by the hand of the same man, Tychicus.[1] The object of the epistle is

[1] Cf. Eph. vi. 21 with Col. iv. 7.

purely practical, the author's fundamental purpose being to incite his readers to live in a manner worthy of their Christian calling. With this end in view, he emphasizes first of all the good purpose of God, who chose them to be his own children, and redeemed them through Christ from a life of sin to a life of holiness.[1] He then prays that they may appreciate the glory of their inheritance and the greatness of their redemption,[2] and in order to quicken their appreciation he magnifies the power and the love of God, who, though they were dead in sin, raised them with Christ to a new and heavenly life.[3] And he reminds them of the fact that though, as Gentiles, they were once strangers and aliens, the wall of separation between them and the covenant people, Israel, was broken down by Christ and they were made members of the one household of God and became temples for God's habitation.[4] In view of the purpose of God thus manifested in their redemption, Paul gives utterance, after enlarging upon the fact that he had been called to preach the Gospel to the Gentiles, to the prayer that Christ may dwell in their hearts through faith in order that they may apprehend the greatness of the divine purpose for them, and may know the love of Christ and thus be "filled unto all the fulness of God."[5] The remainder of the epistle is devoted to the conduct which ought to be exhibited by those whom God has honored with so great and glorious a calling; emphasis being laid especially upon peace and unity, upon holiness, upon kindness and brotherly love, and upon the mutual duties of wives and husbands, children and parents, servants and masters.[6] After a stirring exhortation to manful warfare in the conflict with the hosts of wickedness[7] and after a request for the prayers of his readers that he may preach the Gospel with boldness, the author closes with a reference to the bearer of the epistle and with a benediction.

It is a mistake to suppose that the Epistle to the Ephesians was written with any speculative or dogmatic

[1] Eph. i. 3–14. [2] Eph. i. 15 sq. [3] Eph. ii. 1–10. [4] Eph. ii. 11–22. [5] Eph. iii. 1–19. [6] Eph. iv. 1–vi. 9. [7] Eph. vi. 10.

purpose. Its aim, as has been seen, was exclusively practical, and its profound utterances concerning the eternal will of God and concerning Christ and his church were called forth solely by that aim. It is also a mistake to suppose that it was written with the purpose of putting an end to existing divisions between Jewish and Gentile factions within the church or churches addressed. The epistle contains in reality no sign of such divisions. The former state of alienation in which the Gentiles lived is referred to by the author only for the purpose of emphasizing the greatness of their redemption; and the Christian unity which is inculcated with such earnestness is a unity not between Jews and Gentiles particularly, but between all Christians within the one household of faith.

The occasion which gave rise to the epistle, we do not know. There is no sign that false teachers were at work among the readers, as they were in Colossæ. The sins attacked are such as all Gentile Christians were liable to; and the virtues might with equal propriety have been urged upon every Gentile Christian community. Indeed, they are such as we find Paul emphasizing in all his epistles; and everything that is said might apply equally well to any of his churches. When this fact is taken in connection with the further fact, that the epistle contains absolutely no reference to the origin and history of the church or churches addressed, or to the condition and character of its readers, beyond the fact that they are Gentile Christians; no greetings and no mention of names; no hint of any previous connection or personal acquaintance between writer and readers; no trace of any local coloring, — it is difficult to believe that it was addressed to any particular church, above all to the church of Ephesus, with which Paul had been so intimately associated for so many years, and where he had so large a circle of friends. Indeed, the supposition that the epistle was addressed to the Christians of Ephesus is apparently inconsistent with the author's words in i. 15, which imply that he knew of his readers' Christian faith only by hearsay, and is completely ruled out by his words in iii. 2 sq.,

which indicate still more clearly that he was not personally acquainted with them. Fortunately, internal evidence is supported in this case by external; for some of the most ancient manuscripts omit the words ἐν Ἐφέσῳ in the salutation, and the words were likewise wanting in the copies of Tertullian, Origen, and some other Fathers, though the tradition that the epistle was addressed to the church of Ephesus was already current and was accepted by them. Marcion, who was the first Christian so far as we know to make a collection of Paul's epistles, read ἐν Λαοδικείᾳ instead of ἐν Ἐφέσῳ in his copy of the letter. But though the Laodiceans would fulfil the requirements of the case better than the Ephesians, since Paul had never visited Laodicea, it is difficult to understand how the name of the latter city can have been displaced by the name Ephesus. Moreover, the general characteristics of the letter, already referred to, make it extremely improbable that it was addressed to any particular church. It would seem, in fact, as is now generally admitted, that it must have been a circular letter addressed to a number of churches, with most of which, at any rate, the author was not personally acquainted.

That it was intended for a definite circle of churches and not for the church at large, or for Gentile Christians in general, is clear from various passages where the readers are represented as constituting only a part of the whole body of saints[1] and also from vi. 21 sq., where the commission of Tychicus is mentioned. As the salutation contained the words ἐν Ἐφέσῳ in some manuscripts and ἐν Λαοδικείᾳ in others, and as it was carried by Tychicus, a resident of Asia, along with the Epistle to the Colossians, it is safe to assume that the churches addressed in it belonged to Asia Minor, and at least some if not all of them to the province of Asia. It is possible, then, though by no means certain, that Ephesus was one of the churches addressed; for Paul's words in iii. 2 do not necessarily imply that none of the readers of the epistle knew him personally. And though if the author had Ephesus chiefly in mind, we might expect such a form of greeting as is found in 2 Cor. i. 1, and at least some local

[1] Eph. i. 15, iii. 18, vi. 18.

coloring; if he were thinking, on the other hand, primarily of the needs of those churches which he had not seen, he might write as he did even though the letter was to be read also in Ephesus. It is probable that the original copy contained in the salutation the names of all the churches for which it was intended; for the mention of some place or places after τοῖς οὖσιν is required to complete the sense, and it is hardly likely that Paul adopted the essentially modern device of leaving a blank space to be filled in successively by the several churches addressed. If we suppose that they were all named in the original letter, each church in taking a copy of it to be preserved for its own use, as it could hardly fail to do, would naturally omit as unnecessary all the names except its own. The absence, then, of any name in the most ancient manuscripts known to us may be due to the fact that an early scribe, having a number of copies before him bearing the names of different places, did not venture to decide between them, and consequently left the space blank, possibly noting in the margin his conjecture that the epistle really belonged to Ephesus, the chief and only well-known city of the province.[1]

In Col. iv. 16 Paul mentions an epistle from Laodicea which he directs the Colossians to read. It is thought by many scholars that the epistle thus referred to is our Ephesians, and there is much to be said in favor of the opinion. As Marcion's copy of the letter was addressed to the Laodiceans, it is altogether likely that Laodicea was one of the cities for which the epistle was intended by Paul. Moreover, the close connection between the epistles to the Colossians and Ephesians makes the mention of the one in the other very natural; and the form of expression, the "epistle from Laodicea" instead of the "epistle to the Laodiceans," suggests just such a circular letter as our Ephesians. Laodicea was on the direct road from Ephesus to Colossæ, and the circular letter, if intended for both cities, would naturally reach Laodicea first and be passed on thence to Colossæ. On the other hand, it should

[1] Upon the purpose and destination of Ephesians, see especially Hort: *Prolegomena to St. Paul's Epistles to the Romans and the Ephesians*, p. 75 sq.

be observed that Tychicus was apparently charged with the duty of delivering the circular letter to all the churches addressed and therefore Paul's direction to the Colossians to read the epistle from Laodicea seems superfluous if that epistle was the one which Tychicus was himself carrying. In the light of this fact it must be recognized that the identification of the two, probable though it may seem, cannot be positively asserted.

There is no indication, as has been already remarked, that Paul's circular letter was called forth by any special troubles and difficulties in the churches addressed. The sole occasion for it seems to have been found in Tychicus' proposed journey to the East, and in Paul's desire to seize the opportunity for uttering general words of counsel and exhortation to the Christians of a large and important district to which his especial attention had been recently directed by the visit of Epaphras, who was immediately interested at least in the churches of Laodicea and Hierapolis, as well as in the church of his own city, Colossæ. The epistle thus differs notably from the other epistles of Paul, all of which were called forth by some particular occasion or by some peculiar need on the part of those addressed. Ephesians alone was prompted only by his general desire to do good as opportunity offered.

The authenticity of the epistle, which resembles so closely in many respects the Epistle to the Colossians, is denied by all that deny the genuineness of the latter; and even some who ascribe Colossians to Paul are unable to admit that he wrote Ephesians. There can be no doubt that the difficulties which beset the latter are greater than those which attach to the former, and that the marks of Paul's own hand are fewer and less distinct. But when the authenticity of the one has been admitted, the principal arguments against the genuineness of the other are deprived of their force. The style and diction of the two are similar; and though the peculiarities which differentiate Colossians from the other writings of Paul are still more marked in Ephesians, the contrast is not sufficiently great to prove difference of authorship. If we had only

Ephesians, we might find it difficult to believe it was written by the author of the epistles to the Galatians, Thessalonians, Corinthians, Romans, and Philippians. But Colossians constitutes a bridge between it and the others, and shows that identity of authorship is not impossible. Moreover, the resemblances between Colossians and Ephesians, both in style and in matter, are much easier to explain on the assumption that they were written by the same man at about the same time than on the assumption that the author of the latter copied from the former. Many of the ideas as well as many of the words and phrases are the same in both, but there is nowhere a trace of slavish or mechanical reproduction. Ephesians, like Colossians, was written with a free hand, and the coincidences were to all appearances entirely undesigned. Either the two were written by the same man, or the author of the one was so saturated with the thought and language of the other, that he reproduced them unconsciously and without premeditation even when writing upon a totally different subject. The latter alternative is possible but certainly less likely than the former.

The chief argument against the genuineness of the Epistle to the Ephesians is drawn from its doctrinal statements. But here again, as in Colossians, the advance upon Paul's other writings is almost wholly in the matter of emphasis, and when the practical purpose of the epistle is taken into account, the difference makes no insuperable difficulty. The Christology of the epistle does not go beyond that of Colossians, and even in its statements concerning the church, which is a subject of especial interest to the author, there is nothing inconsistent with Paul's utterances in other epistles. Thus the conception of the church as the body of Christ, which is contained implicitly in Romans,[1] appears still more clearly in 1 Corinthians,[2] and finds explicit utterance in Colossians.[3] That the author of Ephesians should concern himself exclusively with the church universal instead of with its local manifestation, the particular congregation, which is

[1] Rom. xii. 4 sq. [2] 1 Cor. xii. 12 sq. [3] Col. i. 18, 24.

dealt with in most of Paul's epistles, is not at all surprising, in view of the fact that he was writing a circular letter addressed to no single community, and that peace and Christian unity were virtues upon which it was necessary to lay special emphasis. Even in 1 Corinthians[1] and in Philippians,[2] the church in its larger sense is referred to, and the two passages in Colossians[3] go as far as anything in Ephesians. There are some passages in the epistle, it is true, which look suspicious, and suggest another writer than Paul. Such, for instance, are ii. 20, where the "apostles and prophets" are represented as the foundation of the church, and iii. 5, where the "holy apostles and prophets" are spoken of as the recipients of the Gospel revelation. But the word "holy" was applied by Paul to all Christians, and it is not necessary to give it any distinctive and exclusive sense in this passage; while if we understand by the apostles in both cases, in accordance with a frequent usage, not the Twelve and himself merely, but all the travelling missionaries and heralds of the Gospel, and by the prophets the Christian prophets to whom he so frequently refers, neither passage need make us any serious difficulty. The author's emphasis upon the charismatic apostles and prophets in these passages, and also in iv. 11, is, in fact, entirely in keeping with his emphasis in other epistles upon the presence of the Spirit in the church revealing the truth and will of God. It is true that evangelists and pastors, who are mentioned along with apostles, prophets, and teachers in iv. 11, are referred to nowhere else in Paul's epistles. But the list in 1 Cor. xii. 28 contains some terms found only there, and the bishops of Phil. i. 1 are not duplicated in his genuine writings. Moreover, the list in Eph. iv. 11 does not point to a time when regular officers were beginning to take the place of the charismatic men of Paul's day, any more than the reference to bishops and deacons in Phil i. 1. Indeed, the mention of apostles and prophets first of all in the passage in Ephesians shows that that time had not yet come.

[1] 1 Cor. x. 32, xii. 28, xv. 9. [2] Phil. iii. 6. [3] Col. i. 18, 24.

So far as the author's general conception of Christianity is concerned, there is no trace in it of un-Pauline ideas. There are, to be sure, fewer positive indications of Paul's thought than in the Epistle to the Colossians, but the difference in this respect is fully accounted for by the difference of purpose, and there is enough genuine Paulinism in it to make out a strong case for its authenticity. Thus the author declares that salvation is solely of God, and is by grace alone, not by works.[1] Redemption he pictures in genuine Pauline fashion as an adoption into the relation of sonship,[2] and again as a resurrection with Christ.[3] The Christian life he represents as the life of a new man in Christ.[4] His Christian readers he speaks of as temples for God's habitation,[5] and prays that Christ may dwell in their hearts through faith.[6] The law, he says distinctly, was done away by Christ's death in the flesh;[7] and the fact that he makes use of this truth to emphasize the oneness of Jew and Gentile within the church rather than their freedom from the law, is due to the special purpose which he has in hand, and does not detract in the least from the genuinely Pauline character of the passage. All these utterances are fully in line with Paul's thinking, and though they are less clear and decisive than some passages in the Epistle to the Colossians, they may fairly be regarded as sufficient, in the absence of ideas and conceptions of an opposite character, to confirm the explicit claim of the letter to be Paul's own production.[8]

In addition to the epistles just considered, Paul wrote, during his Roman captivity, a letter to his beloved Philippian church, thanking them for gifts which they had sent him by the hands of one of their own number, Epaphro-

[1] Col. ii. 5, 8, 10. [3] Eph. ii. 5. [5] Eph. ii. 22. [7] Eph. ii. 14 sq.
[2] Eph. i. 5. [4] Eph. iv. 24. [6] Eph. iii. 17.

[8] In defence of the genuineness of Ephesians, see especially Hort, *l.c.* p. 111 sq. On the other side see Holtzmann: *Kritik der Epheser und Kolosserbrief*, 1872; and Von Soden in the *Hand-Kommentar*, III. 1, S. 86 sq. For a very impartial and well-balanced statement of the case, see Jülicher: *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, S. 94 sq. The great majority of the critical school deny the authenticity of Ephesians, even when they accept all the other epistles except the pastorals. See the list of names in Holtzmann's *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, 3te Auflage, S. 257 sq.

ditus, and explaining the latter's return to Philippi. The epistle is largely of a personal character and entirely informal. It lacks, consequently, that careful arrangement and logical sequence of thought which mark most of Paul's epistles. After a salutation and a warm expression of love for his readers and of gratitude for their Christian character,[1] the apostle tells them something of his condition and experiences in Rome and of his outlook for the future.[2] He then passes naturally from the statement of his belief that his life will be spared for their sake, to the expression of his hope that whether he visits them again or not, they will continue to live in a manner worthy of the Gospel of Christ, presenting a bold and united front to their adversaries, avoiding all dissensions, cherishing each other in love, laboring each for his brother's good with the spirit of devotion and self-sacrifice which animated Christ, and living in all respects in such a way as to commend Christianity to those about them.[3] He then tells them of the proposed visit of Timothy, and of his hope that he may himself be able to come to them in the near future; explains Epaphroditus' return to Philippi and commends him for his faithfulness and devotion;[4] and seems about to close,[5] when he suddenly branches off into a severe attack upon certain men whom he characterizes as dogs and evil-workers, and whom he brands as the concision in contrast to the followers of Christ, who constitute the true circumcision.[6] After denouncing them and comparing his own faith and life with theirs, he exhorts the Philippians to govern their lives by the principles which have controlled his, setting their minds on heavenly things and conforming their conduct to the

[1] Phil. i. 1–11. [2] Phil. i. 12 sq. [3] Phil. i. 27–ii. 18. [4] Phil. ii. 19 sq. [5] Phil. iii. 1.

[6] The words τὰ αὐτὰ γράφειν in iii. 1 apparently refer not to what precedes, but to what follows; and as there is nothing like the latter in the earlier chapters, it looks as if Paul were referring to another epistle in which he had written of the same subject. It is certainly quite unlikely that during all the years which had elapsed since he first preached in Philippi he had not once written to his converts there. It is true that no other epistle to them is known to us, but that does not prove that none was written. Undoubtedly, Paul wrote many letters of which we have no knowledge. It is perhaps significant that Polycarp speaks in his Epistle to the Philippians (c. 3) of "letters" which Paul had written to them (ὅς καὶ ἀπὼν ὑμῖν ἔγραψεν ἐπιστολάς).

character of Christ.[1] After this digression he returns to a matter which was very likely in his mind while he was exhorting his readers to peace and unity in the early part of his letter, and addressing certain individuals by name, he beseeches them to be reconciled to each other.[2] After a final exhortation to joy and peace and purity in thought and life,[3] he thanks them heartily for their gifts and closes with salutations and a benediction.[4]

The immediate occasion of the epistle was evidently Epaphroditus' intended return to Philippi, and the letter is primarily a commendation of Epaphroditus himself and an expression of thanks for the gifts which the Philippians had sent by him. Epaphroditus can hardly have remained very long in Rome, for otherwise Paul would doubtless have found some earlier opportunity of expressing his gratitude to his benefactors. He seems to have left for home much sooner than he had expected to; for Paul takes pains to give the reasons for his return, and to explain that it is not because of any lack of courage or devotion on his part. It seems that he had been taken ill,[5] probably very soon after his arrival in Rome, and had almost lost his life. Upon his recovery he naturally longed to see his home and his friends again, and so, though it was apparently his original intention to remain much longer in Rome, assisting the apostle in his work and ministering to his needs in such ways as he could, Paul sent him back to Philippi, assuring the friends whose representative he was, that he had done his duty faithfully and well, and exhorting them to receive him with all honor. Paul's treatment of Epaphroditus reveals most beautifully his tenderness and thoughtfulness toward his companions and disciples, and the unselfishness of his love for them. The whole epistle in fact, with its warm expression of affection, with its hearty recognition of the devotion of the Philippians, and with its unaffected gratitude for their liberality, combined with its kindly and yet frank and earnest admonitions, furnishes one of the most charming revelations

[1] Phil. iii. 2–21. [2] Phil. iv. 1 sq. [3] Phil. iv. 4–9.
[4] Phil. iv. 10–20, 21–23. [5] Phil. ii. 25 sq.

we have of the apostle's personal character, and of the closeness of the ties which bound him and his converts together. If he seems in some of his epistles sharp and censorious in his dealings with his churches, we see him in this one overflowing with tenderness and appreciation, and we realize how much they all were to him and how deeply his heart was enlisted in their welfare, and we understand better than we otherwise might the keenness with which he must feel defection or faithlessness on the part of any of them.

The Epistle to the Philippians, as we have seen, was primarily a note of thanks and of commendation, but Paul had evidently learned from Epaphroditus, or from some other source, of the existence of a spirit of faction or jealousy within the church, and he consequently improved the opportunity to urge his readers to peace and unity. The difficulty, whatever it was, seems not to have been very serious, but it prompted the apostle to emphasize the importance of harmony and to call attention to the example of Christ's humility and self-sacrifice, in a striking passage [1] which closely resembles some of his utterances in the Epistle to the Colossians. This Christological passage has commonly been given an undue amount of weight, and some have seen in it a reason for denying the authenticity of the epistle. But such a use of it is entirely unjustifiable, for it goes beyond Paul's statement in 2 Cor. viii. 9 only in form of expression, and there is nothing un-Pauline in it. It should be observed also that the passage was inserted not with a dogmatic but with a practical purpose. It was not the author's aim to teach Christology, but to remind his readers of the example of Christ, and thus to inspire them to similar love and sacrifice. The passage thus constitutes an integral part of the epistle and finds its explanation in the practical aim that dictated the entire chapter in which it stands.

The polemical passage in the third chapter is not altogether easy to explain. It is the common opinion that those against whom Paul warns his readers were Jewish Chris-

[1] Phil. ii. 5 sq.

tians, who were endeavoring to force circumcision and the observance of the Jewish law upon the Gentile Christians either of Philippi or of Rome, as they had tried to do years before in Galatia. But it is certainly strange that such Judaizers should suddenly make their appearance, whether in Philippi or in Rome, so many years after Paul had won his decisive victory over them in Galatia, when during the entire interval we have no trace of their activity in any part of his missionary field. Our knowledge of Philippi during the years that had elapsed since Paul first preached Christianity there is, to be sure, very meagre, and we do not know all the forces that had been at work in the interval. But it is certain that Paul could not have commended the Philippians in such glowing terms if they had been already led astray by Judaizers, and that he could not have brought his epistle to a close, as he seems to have intended to do at the beginning of the third chapter, without warning them against such Judaizers, if he had known that they were threatened by them. It is possible that he learned for the first time after his letter was partly written, that Judaizers had recently made their appearance in Philippi; but their sudden and unheralded activity there is, to say the least, very improbable. On the other hand, it seems even more difficult to account for their presence in Rome, for there is no sign that they were there when Paul wrote his Epistle to the Romans, and the utter absence of any reference to them in Colossians, Ephesians, and Philemon makes their presence there when those letters were written extremely unlikely. Moreover, in the first chapter of the Philippian epistle itself, Paul speaks of his fellow-Christians in such a way as to preclude utterly the supposition that there were any active Judaizers among them at the time he began to write.[1] All the probabilities therefore are against the supposition that they were at work in Rome when the third chapter was written.

It is to be noticed also that the course which Paul pursues in the chapter in question is not that which we should ex-

[1] Phil. i. 14 sq.

pect him to follow, if his purpose was to fortify his readers against Judaizing influences and prevent them from accepting circumcision and observing the Jewish law. Absolutely nothing is said about the effect of such conduct upon his readers; about their separation from Christ and the loss of the benefits of his redemptive work which would result from their adoption of Judaistic principles.[1] It is equally difficult to suppose, if the passionate words in iii. 2 sq. were prompted by a fear of Judaistic machinations, that Paul could drop the subject again so soon, and devote the latter part of his epistle to matters of an entirely different character. It would seem that the sudden reappearance of an enemy which had caused him such distress and anxiety a dozen years before, and over which he had gained a decisive and apparently lasting victory, must have stirred him so deeply and filled him with such terrible forebodings as to make it impossible for him to revert so easily to matters of comparatively little importance, and to write of them in a bright and cheerful vein, and finally to close his epistle with evident joy and gratitude.

In view of these facts, it seems better to assume, with Lipsius[2] and others, that Paul had in mind in writing Phil. iii. 2 sq. not Judaizers or Jewish Christians, but unbelieving Jews. It is true that the language of the passage, read in the light of his earlier experiences, naturally suggests Judaizers. But in 2 Cor. xi. he employs similar language in defending himself against Jewish Christian opponents who were not Judaizers; and there is no reason in the present case, where there is a notable absence of any reference to their Christian profession, and to the fact that they claimed to be apostles or ministers of Christ, why the language may not refer to unconverted Jews. There is a possible suggestion that the latter were actually in Paul's mind in the sixth verse of the third chapter, where he cites, as the only instance of his zeal, his persecution of the Christian church, which could hardly tend to strengthen

[1] Compare with this passage the Epistle to the Galatians.
[2] In the *Hand-Kommentar*, II. 2, S. 217.

his case, if those with whom he was comparing himself were Christians.[1]

If the passage be taken to apply to Jews, instead of being entirely out of line with all that precedes and follows, as it certainly is if it refers to Judaizers, it can be shown to be in close connection with other parts of the epistle, and to be in harmony with the general course of the apostle's thought. We know from i. 28 sq.[2] that the Philippians at the time Paul wrote were exposed to persecution,[3] and it was his evident desire throughout his epistle to encourage them in the face of the trials which they were called upon to endure, and to strengthen their Christian faith, which was subjected to the strain not of their own sufferings alone but also of Paul's, in whose imprisonment and threatened death it might well seem that the cause of Christianity was doomed to perish. Thus, almost at the beginning of his epistle,[4] Paul assures them that his own imprisonment was contributing to the progress of the Gospel, and that the brethren in Rome were becoming bolder and more zealous than ever under the influence of his bonds. And he expresses his belief that he will yet be released and be enabled to carry on his work for the benefit of his converts; but he gives utterance at the same time to his confidence that Christ will in any case be magnified, whether by his life or by his death. It was doubtless with the opposition of the enemies of Christ in mind, that he laid so much stress upon the importance of healing all divisions and of preserving peace and unity within the church, and that he repeated so frequently and

[1] Paul's reference to his persecution of the Christian church is introduced here in a connection very different from that in which it occurs in Gal. i. 13. In the latter passage Paul was concerned to show that he received his Gospel not from man, but from God, and he therefore cited his attitude toward the church up to the time of his conversion, to show how far he was from getting his Christianity from the disciples.

[2] Cf. also Phil. ii. 15 and 19.

[3] Though the enemies of the Philippians may have been for the most part heathen, as they seem to have been in Thessalonica when Paul wrote his epistles to that church ten years before, there is no reason for denying that the hostility of the Jews was also making itself felt; and for aught we know to the contrary, it may have been largely from their machinations that the Philippians were now suffering.

[4] Phil. i. 12 sq.

with such emphasis his exhortations to rejoice at all times and under all circumstances.[1] The same consideration very likely had something to do with his reference to Christ's endurance even unto death, and to the glory which he received as his reward.[2] Read in the light of this idea, the bearing of the passage with which we are dealing becomes very plain. It is possible that the sudden outbreak of passion in iii. 2 was caused by some new manifestation of hostility to himself on the part of the unbelieving Jews, or by some new evidence of the effect of that hostility upon his situation and prospects; for it was to their enmity that he owed his imprisonment and that he was yet to owe his execution. But however that may be, it was but natural, with his own sufferings and the sufferings of the Philippians in mind, due very likely in both instances to the same Jewish hatred of Christianity, that he should give vent to his feelings, and should not only emphasize the superiority of Christianity to Judaism and contrast the true spiritual circumcision of the Christian with the fleshly concision of the Jew, but also compare his own devotion with the devotion of those who were persecuting him as a renegade and apostate, and dwell upon the fact that he possessed all and more than they were boasting of, but had risen above it and counted it as naught, in order that he might attain to the excellency of the knowledge of Jesus Christ his Lord. The passage has the appearance almost of a soliloquy, for it is only of his own experience that Paul speaks; and yet it was entirely natural under the circumstances for him to express himself thus, and his words were certainly calculated to strengthen the Philippians and to inspire them to press on toward the same goal.

The exhortation to be of like mind and to imitate him in his Christian struggle follows easily upon Paul's description of his own life, as does also the warning to avoid the conduct of those corrupt and carnal-minded disciples whose hearts were more engrossed in earthly than in heavenly

[1] Phil. ii. 17 sq., iii. 1, iv. 4.
[2] Phil. ii. 3 sq.; cf. also ii. 16, iii. 11, 20 sq.

things and who possibly made use of Paul's own doctrine of freedom to justify their libertinism and antinomianism.[1] Paul's agitation in speaking of them and his sorrow even unto tears are best explained by the supposition that they claimed thus to be carrying out his principles, and to be consequently his true disciples,[2] as we know that many did in his own and subsequent days.

The authenticity of the Epistle to the Philippians is now so generally recognized that it is not necessary to consider it at any length. There is, in fact, nothing in the epistle which need cause doubt as to its genuineness. Its style is thoroughly Pauline, and the only doctrinal passages in it[3] are in entire accord with the apostle's positions as known from his other writings. It is simply inconceivable that any one else would or could have produced in his name a letter in which no doctrinal or ecclesiastical motive can be discovered, and in which the personal element so largely predominates and the character of the man and of the apostle is revealed with so great vividness and fidelity. The epistle deserves to rank alongside of Galatians, Corinthians, and Romans as an undoubted product of Paul's pen, and as a co-ordinate standard by which to test the genuineness of other and less certain writings.

The epistles which we have been considering, especially that to the Philippians, throw considerable light upon Paul's condition in Rome. Though a prisoner, bound night and day by a chain, according to Roman custom, to the soldier who guarded him,[4] he had made good use of the opportunities which were afforded him for intercourse with those about him[5] and had thus succeeded by converse

[1] Cf. Rom. vi. 1 sq.; 1 Cor. vi. 12 sq.; Gal. v. 13 sq.; Eph. v. 1. sq.; Col. iii. 1 sq.

[2] Cf. Lightfoot's Commentary, *in loc.*

It will hardly do to identify, as is commonly done, the enemies of the cross of Christ in iii. 18 with those who are attacked in iii. 2 sq., for Paul's vehement words in vs. 18 seem to imply a fear that the Philippians may be influenced by those whom he there denounces and may imitate their conduct; but there could certainly be no danger that they would renounce their Christianity and become Jews.

[3] Phil. ii. 5 sq., iii. 8 sq.

[4] Acts xxviii. 16, 20; Eph. vi. 20; Phil. i. 7, 13, 14, 17, etc.

[5] Cf. Eph. vi. 19; Col. i. 29, iv. 3, 11.

with his guards, who relieved each other in succession, in making the name of Christ known throughout the whole prætorium,[1] that is, throughout the whole body of imperial troops under the command of the prætorian prefect, to whose custody Paul had been committed. His bonds were thus redounding to the advantage of Christianity by the spread of a knowledge of the Gospel which was resulting from his association with those about him, and which went so far that even some members of the imperial household, probably court officials or servants, had been won to Christ.[2] His imprisonment, moreover, was enhancing the zeal and activity of other disciples in Rome, and was thus indirectly as well as directly contributing to the advance of the cause. Not all of those who were preaching the Gospel there were in sympathy with Paul and friendly to him. Some were moved rather by party spirit than by a sincere desire to promote the cause of Christ, and were striving to outdo Paul and show themselves greater missionaries than he. But in spite of that he rejoiced in the labors of all of them, whether his friends or his enemies, for by all of them Christ was proclaimed.[3] There can be little doubt that those who preached in a spirit of unfriendliness toward Paul belonged to the Jewish wing of the church, whose existence we find testified to in the Epistle to the Romans. But the fact that Paul rejoiced in their labors shows clearly enough that they were not Judaizers. They were apparently unfriendly to Paul not on account of any radical difference of principle or of doctrine, but because the great work which he had been doing among the Gentiles in other parts of the world, and was now doing in Rome, was overshadowing the work which they and others were accomplishing among the Jews, and was pushing the Jewish wing of the church more and more into the background. It was not that they wished to impose Judaism upon all Gentile Christians, or that they wished to exclude the latter from the church, but that they

[1] Phil. i. 13. On the meaning of the word "prætorium," see Lightfoot's Commentary, p. 99 sq.

[2] Phil. iv. 22.

[3] Phil. i. 18.

were impatient and jealous of their growing numbers and supremacy. They were redoubling their efforts among their own countrymen simply in order to outdo Paul, and to check the increasing disparity between the two wings of the Roman church.

Paul's situation under such circumstances must have been peculiarly trying. He was not the founder of the Roman church, and he was not at home in Rome. He had come in as a stranger long after Christianity had made a place for itself there, and highly as he was esteemed and honored by perhaps a large majority of the Christians of the city, he realized that whatever success he might have in winning converts would inevitably be compared with the success of those who were on the ground before him, either to his own or to their disparagement, and that the greater the work accomplished by him, the greater would be the jealousy and hostility engendered in many quarters. He was in some sense an outsider, and there could not be that same oneness of interest and sympathy between himself and those about him that there was in his own churches and among his own converts. There is evidently a touch of resignation in the declaration of Phil. i. 18. Paul asserts that he rejoices in the proclamation of the Gospel even by his rivals, but his joy is tinged with a natural and pardonable sadness as he realizes not only that the work which he sees going on about him is not his work, but also that the greater its success, the more will his own influence be curtailed and the supremacy of other men and of other interests be established. It is true that there were many in Rome who were preaching Christ in a spirit of loyalty to Paul,[1] but even they, so far as they did not owe their Christian faith to him, must have been less concerned for his honor and for the supremacy of his peculiar principles than his own disciples. And so it is not strange that he felt lonely in Rome; and it is hardly to be wondered at that in spite of his many friends in the city, he should complain, in writing to the Philippians, that they all sought their own and not the things of Jesus Christ.[2] He did not

[1] Phil. i. 14 sq. [2] Phil. ii. 21.

mean to accuse them of self-seeking and of faithlessness to Christ, but their lack of interest in his especial work which lay so largely outside of Rome, and their absorption in their own labors, made him feel his isolation keenly, and made him long for that undivided sympathy and devotion which he had enjoyed in his own churches, and which had served to bind all his converts closely together, even though they dwelt widely apart. The memory of the oneness of interest that had existed between himself and his beloved Philippians must have had much to do under these circumstances with the tone of affection and of confidence which so strongly marks his letter to them.

The situation in which Paul found himself in Rome was prophetic of the subsequent development of the Roman church. Though his name was always held in honor, and though he even came to be looked upon as the joint founder with Peter of the church of Rome, the development of Christianity there went largely its own independent way, and the influence of his principles was little felt. He may have realized this. He may have seen that though he was the great apostle to the Gentiles, there was arising upon Gentile soil, in the very capital of the world, a form of Christianity which owed little to him, and which bore a character widely different from his. And it may have been this that led him to think of the possible continuance of his life as profitable not so much for the world or the church at large as for his beloved Philippians.[1]

And yet though Paul's epistle reveals a consciousness of isolation and of separateness from those about him, he was not without intimate friends and companions. Timothy was with him when he wrote to the Colossians, to Philemon, and to the Philippians; Tychicus of Asia and the Colossian slave Onesimus, when he wrote the earlier letters.[2] But the last two went East immediately thereafter, and were doubtless absent when the Epistle to the Philippians was written. Aristarchus of Thessalonica, who had made

[1] Phil. i. 24 sq.

[2] Tychicus is mentioned in Eph. vi. 21 and Col. iv. 7; Onesimus in Col. iv. 9 and Philemon 10.

the journey from Cæsarea to Rome in Paul's company, was still with him when he wrote to the Colossians and Philemon,[1] as were Mark, Luke, Demas, Epaphras of Colossæ, and Jesus Justus, a Jewish Christian otherwise unknown to us.[2] But in the Epistle to the Philippians only Timothy and the Philippian Epaphroditus are mentioned by name. Onesiphorus of Ephesus evidently did not come to Rome until after Timothy's departure for the East;[3] and the same is possibly true of Crescens and Titus, who left him again before the letter to Timothy was written.[4] Eubulus, Pudens, Linus, and Claudia, with whom Timothy was personally acquainted,[5] were very likely already Paul's friends, but their names seem to indicate that they belonged to Rome, and they were therefore probably not of the number of his old companions and disciples. It is true that Luke, the beloved physician, who was with him when he wrote to the Colossians and Philemon, was still at his side when he wrote to Timothy;[6] and that Demas, who was also in his company at that earlier time, did not leave Rome until after the Philippian epistle was written.[7] It is true also that the "brethren" from whom Paul sends greetings in Phil. iv. 21, and whom he distinguishes from "all the saints," might be supposed to include them, as well as others of his old-time companions. But the terms in which he speaks of those about him in Phil. ii. 21 make it improbable that any such companions were on the ground. At any rate, it could hardly be true of them, as it might be of the Romans, that they were not interested in Paul's work in that part of the world whence they themselves had come. It seems best therefore to interpret the "brethren" of Phil. iv. 21 as referring to Roman Christians who were assisting Paul in his work, and to conclude that Luke was temporarily absent, and that Demas was either absent or was already beginning to display that lack of devotion which led him finally to desert Paul entirely;[8] while the other old friends who were with

[1] Col. iv. 10; Philemon 24.
[2] Col. iv. 11 sq.
[3] 2 Tim. i. 16.
[4] 2 Tim. iv. 10.
[5] 2 Tim. iv. 21.
[6] 2 Tim. iv. 11.
[7] For otherwise Timothy would have known of his departure.
[8] 2 Tim. iv. 10.

him when he wrote Colossians and Philemon, but whose names are mentioned neither in Philippians nor in 2 Timothy, had left the city permanently.

That Paul should feel much alone under these circumstances is not to be wondered at. Friendly as many of the Roman Christians might be, and actively as they might co-operate with him in his Christian work, they were not like the companions whom he had with him during his great missionary campaigns. They knew him only as a prisoner, and they could hardly regard him with that enthusiastic devotion and homage which were shown him by his friends and disciples in his days of battle and of triumph. Paul was large-hearted and broad-minded enough to rejoice in the extension of the Gospel in Rome, even though his own share in the work was small, and even though some of it was done by those who regarded him with jealousy and hostility; but he was at the same time human enough to feel keenly the contrast between his present and his former position. So long as he remained where he was, he would do his part in spreading the name of Christ as he had always done; he would be faithful and bold and zealous even in his bonds, and he would rejoice in the thought that his own confinement, which prevented him from carrying on his great work in the world at large, was yet bearing fruit in the narrower and more limited circle of the camp and the court, and was indirectly promoting the cause of Christ throughout the city. But he could not do otherwise than regret the loss of the tremendous personal influence which he had been accustomed to wield wherever he went and sigh for the days when he was himself in the van of the battle, the leader to whom all looked and whom alone all followed.

Of the remainder of Paul's life we know very little. It is true that there exist three more epistles bearing his name, — two addressed to Timothy, and one to Titus, which, if they be genuine, involve his release from his Roman imprisonment and his return to the East, and from which, therefore, much added information may be gathered concerning the closing years of his life. But the authen-

ticity of these epistles has been widely questioned, and there is grave reason to doubt whether they are actually Paul's.[1] It is to be noticed, first of all, that the external testimony to their genuineness is far weaker than in the case of any of his other letters. There are traces of an acquaintance with them in Ignatius and possibly in Polycarp, but in no other writings until after the middle of the second century; and not until the time of Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria, and the Muratorian Fragment are they expressly included in the number of Paul's epistles.[2] They are the only letters bearing his name which are not found in the New Testament of Marcion, the earliest canon known to us, formed in the second quarter of the second century. As Marcion had no hesitation in expurgating the Pauline epistles when he found anything that did not suit him, the fact that there are anti-heretical passages in these epistles does not account for his omission of them, if he knew them to be Paul's.

In the second place, the tone employed by the author in addressing Timothy and Titus is not what we should expect from Paul. They had been for many years beloved and trusted disciples and intimate friends and companions, and yet Paul finds it necessary to emphasize his apostleship, to defend his character and authority, to assert that he is not lying, just as if he were addressing strangers or even enemies such as he had to deal with in Galatia and Corinth.[3] On the other hand, the instructions which he gives, and the warnings and exhortations which he addresses to Timothy and Titus, are of a kind entirely suited to immature and untried disciples, or to the common multitude of Christians, but certainly not at all suited to men such as they had proved themselves to be. The author instructs them, especially Timothy, in regard to the most elementary duties of the Christian life and the most elementary truths of Christianity; he warns

[1] In defence of the authenticity of the pastoral epistles, see especially Weiss: *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, S. 286 sq. (Eng. Trans., Vol. I. p. 374 sq.).

[2] Tatian, writing possibly a decade or two earlier, accepts Titus as genuine.

[3] 1 Tim. i. 12 sq., ii. 7; 2 Tim. i. 3, 11. Compare the greetings of all three of the epistles with the opening of the Epistle to Philemon.

them against vice and lust, and urges them repeatedly to be honest, faithful, sober, and pure, as if he were greatly in doubt not only as to their official but also as to their private character.[1] It looks very much as if they were simply lay figures, and the letters were intended not for them, but for the church at large. Such a course was entirely natural in a later writer to whom Timothy and Titus were only names, but not in Paul, whose loved friends and disciples they were.

In the third place, the style of the epistles is un-Pauline. That Pauline words and phrases occur not infrequently is quite true. There are, in fact, certain superficial resemblances to the language of Paul. But the resemblances are not such as to indicate identity of authorship. They might naturally occur in the writings of any one familiarly acquainted with his epistles. The differences over against the superficial likenesses are so extensive, so radical, and so thoroughgoing, that it seems impossible to account for them, except on the supposition that the letters are, at least in their present form, the work of another than Paul. The divergence in style appears not so much in the vocabulary, though there are striking differences there, as in the use of peculiar phrases and combinations of words, in the displacement of favorite Pauline forms of expression by others of a totally different kind, in the employment of particles, in the construction of sentences and periods, and finally in the total lack of that compression of thought and of that vigor of expression which are so characteristic of Paul as he appears in all the other epistles that bear his name. The attempt is frequently made to break the force of this argument by calling attention to the fact that the pastorals were written at a later period in Paul's life than any of the other epistles, and when he was already an old man. But how little there is in such a consideration appears when we realize that at latest they cannot have been written more than three or four years after the letter to the Philippians, and that the

[1] Cf. 1 Tim. i. 19, iv. 12, vi. 11; 2 Tim. i. 6 sq., ii. 1 sq., 22, iii. 14 sq.; Titus ii. 7.

differences between them and the latter are immeasurably greater than between the latter and Paul's earliest epistles, which were written a decade before. We know Paul's literary style very well, for we have it exhibited in ten epistles covering a period of a dozen years, and its essential features, in spite of modifications due to differing subject-matter and circumstances, appear in all of those epistles, but are entirely lacking in the pastorals.[1] Closely related to the matter of language and style is the striking lack of order and arrangement which characterizes the letters with which we are dealing. Whatever else Paul may have been, he was not a loose and illogical thinker and writer. Even in his most hastily written and most informal epistles, his ideas bear a most intimate relation to each other. But in the pastorals, especially in 1 Timothy, we have for the most part a mere collection of detached passages, betraying a writer largely lacking in the directness, incisiveness, and grasp which were so characteristic of Paul.

In the fourth place, the attitude of the author toward false teachers and their teachings should be noticed. The difficulty is not so much with the heresies attacked, as with the way in which the author attacks them. It is true that many of the things said point to the existence of Gnosticism, at least in an incipient form,[2] but though this suggests a later date for the epistles, it does not prove it; for it is possible that such Gnostic ideas had made their appearance in some parts of the church even before the death of Paul. The Epistle to the Colossians, for instance, shows that heretical tendencies may have existed at that early date of which we have no hint in any other sources. But though we cannot, with many critics, draw a conclusion adverse to Pauline authorship from the existence of such heresies as we find alluded to, we are compelled to see in the way they are handled by the author

[1] The best and most exhaustive treatment of the style of the pastoral epistles is to be found in Holtzmann's *Pastoralbriefe* (1880), S. 84 sq.

[2] It is possible that the reference in 1 Tim. vi. 20 (*ἀντιθέσεις τῆς ψευδωνύμου γνώσεως*) is to the "Antitheses" of Marcion. But if so, the passage is a later addition.

a convincing proof that he was not Paul. He evidently had a very confused idea of the nature of the heresies which he denounces. His references to them are extremely vague, and he apparently fails to perceive that there is any real distinction between tendencies of an exactly opposite character. Whether the false teachers are antinomian or ascetic,[1] whether they are spiritualistic or legalistic,[2] the author does not treat them as if there were any vital difference between them. They are all alike given to foolish and ignorant questionings, disputes about words, strifes about the law, fables, genealogies, and profane babblings. Such indiscriminate denunciations are certainly not what we should expect from a man like Paul, who was an uncommonly clear-headed dialectician, accustomed to draw fine distinctions, and whose penetration and ability to discover and display the vital point of difference between himself and an antagonist have never been surpassed. Those who ascribe to Paul the references to false teaching which occur in the pastoral epistles do him a serious injustice.

But it is not simply the author's imperfect apprehension of the significance of the heresies which he attacks, that makes it difficult to identify him with Paul; his polemical method is equally un-Pauline. Instead of demonstrating the falseness of the positions taken by the heretical teachers, he simply denounces them; and instead of exhibiting his own Gospel and showing its bearing upon the questions in dispute, he simply appeals to the fact that a deposit of faith has been handed down as a safeguard against all heresies of whatever sort. The contrast between this kind of procedure and that which Paul follows in Galatians, Corinthians, Romans, and Colossians, in all the epistles, in fact, in which he has to deal with heresy, is most striking. The spirit that actuates the pastorals is not the spirit of Paul, but the spirit of 2 John and of Polycarp.

In the fifth place, and most decisive of all, the Christianity of the pastoral epistles is not the Christianity

[1] 1 Tim. i. 4 sq., iv. 3 sq. [2] 2 Tim. ii. 18; Titus i. 10-14, etc.

of Paul. It is true that there are some Pauline ideas and passages,[1] but they are altogether exceptional. For the most part there is no trace whatever of the great fundamental truth of Paul's Gospel, — death unto the flesh and life in the Spirit, — although in many cases we might fairly look for a reference to it, especially over against the false teachers. We should expect also in 2 Tim. ii. 18, where those are mentioned who declare that the resurrection is past already, a statement of Paul's conception of the resurrection; for it is clear that the declaration referred to was due to a misunderstanding of his own teaching upon the subject. One who laid the emphasis as he did upon the resurrection at baptism to the new life in the Spirit, and thus suggested the view of Hymenæus and Philetus, could hardly dismiss that view without a word of explanation. Only one who understood by the resurrection nothing else than the resurrection of the fleshly body could express himself as our author does in this passage.

But it is not simply the absence of the great fundamental conceptions of the Pauline Gospel, it is the presence of another Gospel of a different aspect, that is most significant. Instead of faith by which a man becomes identified with Christ, so that Christ lives in him and his life is divine not human, we find piety and good works chiefly emphasized. A man's salvation is conditioned upon his piety or godliness, which manifests itself in his good works.[2] The word translated piety or godliness,[3] which occurs in none of Paul's epistles, is found eleven times in the pastorals, nine times in 1 Timothy alone, and plays the prominent part which the word "faith" plays in Paul; while the latter word is not employed in its profound Pauline sense, but is used to signify one of the cardinal virtues, along with love, peace, purity, righteousness, sanctification, patience, and meekness.[4] Occasionally it denotes the intellectual acceptance of certain truths, or the truth itself; Christianity being conceived as an objective system which

[1] For instance, 2 Tim. i. 9–11, ii. 11 sq.; Titus iii. 4–7.
[2] 1 Tim. v. 8.
[3] εὐσέβεια; once θεοσέβεια.
[4] Cf. 1 Tim. ii. 15, iv. 12, vi. 11; 2 Tim. ii. 22, iii. 10; Titus ii. 2.

one may accept or deny.[1] All this reminds us of the common conception of faith and of the Christian life, which prevailed widely in the second century and finally became universal in the church, but which is widely removed from the conception of Paul. If we admit the authenticity of the pastoral epistles in their present form, we must suppose that Paul in the two or three years which succeeded the composition of the letters to the Colossians and Ephesians, in which his fundamental conceptions as we know them from Galatians, Corinthians, and Romans find clear and unequivocal expression, gave up that form of the Gospel which he had held and taught throughout his life, and descended from the lofty religious plane upon which he had always moved, since Christ had been revealed in him, to the level of mere piety and morality.[2]

But if Paul was not the author of the pastoral epistles, how are we to explain their ascription to him? It has been widely supposed that they are wholly pseudonymous; that they were composed from beginning to end by some disciple of Paul or by some Christian of a later generation, under the apostle's name, in order to give wider currency and greater authority to his own views, especially in relation to church government and heresy. But it is clear that it would be much easier to account for the existence of the epistles in their present form, if we could suppose them based upon genuine letters or notes of Paul to Timothy and Titus. And upon examining them carefully, we find many indications that such documents actually do underlie them. In some cases the connections between paragraphs and sentences are such as to suggest interpolation, and one or two striking inconsistencies point in the same direction.[3] Moreover, there are some passages, es-

[1] Cf. 1 Tim. i. 19, iii. 9, iv. 1, 6, v. 8.

[2] The contrast between the Christianity of Paul and that of the pastoral epistles appears with especial clearness in such passages as the following: 1 Tim. iv. 16, ii. 15, iv. 8, vi. 18, 19; Titus iii. 8. Cf. also 1 Tim. i. 5, 19, iv. 12; 2 Tim. iii. 14–17, ii. 22, iii. 10. Upon the Christianity of the pastoral epistles, see especially Von Soden in the *Hand-Kommentar*, III. 1, S. 167 sq.

[3] Compare, for instance, 2 Tim. i. 15–18, which is entirely out of relation to the context; so also Titus i. 7–9. Compare also the reference to the bishop in 1 Tim. iii. 1 sq. with the reference to the elders in v. 17 sq.

pecially in 2 Timothy and Titus, which have a genuinely Pauline look and in which a conception of Christianity finds expression that is in sharp contrast to the epistles as a whole.[1] Some of the personal notices also which occur in 2 Timothy and Titus bear every mark of genuineness. It is very difficult to suppose such passages as 2 Tim. i. 15–18, iv. 9–21, and Titus iii. 12, 13, the work of another than Paul; for they have no relation whatever to the evident tendency of the epistles as a whole, and no adequate reason can be discovered for their composition by a later writer.

We may fairly conclude, then, in agreement with many modern scholars,[2] that we have in the pastoral epistles authentic letters of Paul to Timothy and Titus, worked over and enlarged by another hand. But when we attempt to distinguish the genuine portions from the later additions, we find ourselves faced with a problem of peculiar difficulty. It is easier to draw the lines in 2 Timothy than in either of the others, but even in 2 Timothy it is impossible to divide with any degree of accuracy. The greater part of the first chapter might have been written by Paul. Verses 9–11 at least are genuinely Pauline; but vs. 6b is doubtful, and vss. 12–14 are so unlike Paul, and are so closely related both in thought and language to 1 Timothy, that we cannot hesitate to ascribe them to a later hand. The first part of the second chapter contains Pauline conceptions in vss. 1 and 8–13; and there is nothing in the section which might not have been written by Paul, though the words "Faithful is the saying"[3] are very likely an interpolation, for they occur in both of the other pastorals, but nowhere else in Paul's epistles. The section extending from ii. 14–iii. 17 is both in style and in content the most un-Pauline part of the epistle, and though there may

[1] See p. 403, above.

[2] See, among others, Lemme: *Das echte Ermahnungschreiben des Apostels Paulus an Timotheus* (1882), and Hesse: *Die Entstehung der Neutestamentlichen Hirtenbriefe* (1889). For a statement of the various views of scholars upon the subject, see Holtzmann: *Einleitung*, 3te Auflage, S. 275. Those who recognize genuine letters of Paul, underlying the epistles in their present form, differ very widely in their reconstruction of them.

[3] 2 Tim. ii. 11.

be genuine passages in it, the greater part of it at any rate is from another hand. The fourth chapter contains only two verses (3 and 4) which it is necessary to ascribe to the interpolator, and there can be no doubt that at least vss. 9–21 are Paul's. We have in 2 Timothy, then, a genuine letter of Paul, including very likely a large part of the first chapter, the first twelve verses of the second chapter, and the greater part of the fourth chapter.

In Titus vss. 7–9 and the greater part of vss. 10–16 of the first chapter, most of the second chapter and vss. 8–11 and 14 of the third chapter are probably by another writer than Paul. On the other hand, in iii. 1–7 there is much that has a genuinely Pauline ring and may well be his; while there can be no doubt about the authenticity of iii. 12, 13. We thus have in Titus one of Paul's own letters whose limits are not so well defined as in 2 Timothy, but which doubtless included chapter iii. vss. 1–7, 12 and 13, and possibly parts of the first chapter. Both in 2 Timothy and Titus, the original greeting has probably been added to.

In 1 Timothy it is even more difficult to distinguish authentic passages. Both in style and in contents, it is less Pauline than either of the other pastorals. It might fairly be doubted whether there is any genuine element in it; whether it is not simply a free composition by the interpolator of 2 Timothy and Titus, designed to enforce and to supplement the instruction contained in those epistles. If it be assumed, as is probable, that it was composed some time later than the others, it is easy to explain its composition on the ground that the need of such additional instruction had made itself felt since the others were written. But if it be assumed that 1 Timothy was throughout the free composition of the interpolator of 2 Timothy and Titus, we find it difficult to explain the historic reference in chapter i. vs. 3 and the anacoluthon in the same passage. It looks very much as if the first half of vs. 3 constituted a part of the opening sentence of a genuine letter addressed by Paul to Timothy, while the latter was in Ephesus, and as if the conclusion of the sen-

tence had been displaced by the insertion of the passage on the false teachers. But I am inclined to look for the remainder of the original letter not in 1 Timothy, where I can find no convincing evidence of it, but in 2 Timothy, where there are indications that two letters have been combined. It may be that when the two were put together, the opening of one of them, including the greeting and the introductory sentences, had to be dropped out, and that it was this beginning upon which the author built up another epistle to Timothy, when he felt the need of saying what he had not said in the earlier one.[1]

But if the existence of genuine Pauline epistles to Timothy and Titus underlying those that we have be assumed, the question arises when and under what circumstances were they written? Second Timothy apparently contains two letters of Paul, or fragments of them. For, in the first place, it is impossible, unless we assume a second Roman imprisonment, to reconcile the various historical notices which the epistle contains. According to 2 Tim. i. 8 and 17, the apostle was writing while a prisoner in Rome;[2] but if during the imprisonment known to us, 2 Tim. iv. 13 is very difficult to explain, for it was at least three or four years since he had been in Troas; and iv. 12 is also difficult, since it necessitates the assumption that during the same imprisonment, he sent Tychicus all the way to Asia Minor at least twice;[3] while iv. 20 is impossible, for Paul had not been at Miletus since he stopped there on his way from Troas to Jerusalem, some years before, and at that time Trophimus had not been left behind, but had gone on with him to Jerusalem.[4] In

[1] It is very likely that there are scattered fragments of the original epistle in 1 Timothy, as, for instance, in v. 23. But it is difficult to find anything which we can be confident was written by Paul.

[2] Cf. also 2 Tim. iv. 6 sq. and 21.

[3] Cf. Col. iv. 7; Eph. vi. 21.

[4] Acts xxi. 29. The epistle as it stands can hardly be put earlier than Ephesians, Colossians, and Philippians, for the apostle's isolation and loneliness, and the cowardice of Demas (compared with his presence at the time Colossians was written), point to a later date in his imprisonment, when death was at hand. But if it be put later than the others, all the facts referred to must have been known to Timothy, who was with Paul when those letters were written.

the second place, whether the epistle was written during the imprisonment known to us or another and later one, it is, as it stands, inconsistent with itself; for it is assumed down to iv. 5 that Timothy is to remain in Ephesus and continue his work there, while in iv. 9 he is directed to leave Ephesus and join Paul at once. In the third place, it is easier to explain the evident displacement of i. 15–18, if we suppose another epistle combined with the first in iv. 9 sq. Knowing that 2 Timothy, as we have it, is at any rate largely interpolated, there is no more difficulty in assuming that the author used two letters of Paul, which happened to come into his hands, than in assuming that he used only one.

One of the two epistles of Paul, thus employed by the redactor, included probably the greater part of 2 Tim. i. 1–12, ii. 1–13, iv. 1, 2, 5–8, 16–19, 21 [b], 10, and i. 15–18. It was thus an epistle of some length, intended to encourage Timothy and to exhort him to carry on his work with vigor and fidelity, in spite of the fact that Paul himself was soon to be put to death. It was written from Rome while Paul was a prisoner there,[1] and apparently toward the close of his imprisonment; for, of those who were with him when he wrote Colossians and Philemon, Luke was the only one left,[2] and the apostle was expecting to die shortly.[3] All hope of release, such as he had when he wrote the other epistles, had disappeared.[4] The letter constituted, in a sense, his dying testament addressed to his dearest disciple, who was carrying on and was to continue to carry on the apostle's work in Ephesus. It would seem that we still have the complete epistle, and that it formed the basis upon which was built our 2 Timothy, by the addition of the section ii. 14–iii. 17, and of other brief passages, phrases, and sentences in other parts of the epistle.

[1] Cf. 2 Tim. i. 17, and the salutations in iv. 21; also i. 8 and iv. 6 sq.
[2] 2 Tim. iv. 11. [3] 2 Tim. iv. 6 sq.
[4] That it was not written before the other epistles is clear, not only from the reasons given in a previous note, but also from the fact that Timothy, who was with him when he wrote those epistles, was now absent and apparently expecting to remain in Ephesus.

But with it was combined, as has been seen, another letter from Paul to Timothy, apparently much briefer than the former, probably nothing more in fact than a note urging Timothy to join him as soon as possible. This note, the address of which is possibly preserved in a modified form in the early verses of 1 Timothy, very likely included 2 Tim. iv. 9, 11–18, 20, 21 [a], and ran somewhat as follows: "Do thy diligence to come shortly unto me. Take Mark, and bring him with thee: for he is useful to me for ministering. I have sent Tychicus to Ephesus. The cloke that I left at Troas with Carpus, bring when thou comest, and the books, especially the parchments. Alexander the coppersmith did me much evil: the Lord will render to him according to his works: of him be thou ware also; for he greatly withstood our words. Erastus abode at Corinth: but Trophimus I left at Miletus sick. Do thy diligence to come before winter." The situation is very uncertain, but it seems most probable that the note was written from Macedonia, after Paul had left Ephesus for the last time. This final departure from Ephesus is referred to in Acts xx. 1 and in 2 Cor. ii. 12, vii. 5 sq., and though the route taken by Paul to Troas is not stated, he may have had reasons for making the trip by boat from Miletus, and therefore have left Trophimus there sick, as he says in 2 Tim. iv. 20. Timothy was apparently not in Ephesus at the time of Paul's departure from the city, otherwise the information contained in vs. 14 sq. would have been unnecessary. But he was evidently expecting to arrive there shortly,[1] very likely from the East, whither he may have gone on a visit, or on a mission for Paul. It had been Paul's intention, it would seem, to have him remain in Ephesus when he arrived there, and he had apparently written him to that effect when he left Ephesus himself.[2] Meanwhile, however, he found that he needed him, and he therefore wrote him from Macedonia to come at once, and he took occasion to utter a warning against Alexander the coppersmith, who had done him much evil, and who had, perhaps, brought him into the danger to

[1] Cf. 1 Tim. i. 3, 2 Tim. iv. 13 and 15. [2] 1 Tim. i. 3.

which he refers in Second Corinthians, written shortly afterward.[1] He also asks Timothy to bring certain things from Troas, tells him of the illness of Trophimus, and the whereabouts of Erastus, who had apparently been expected to join Timothy in Ephesus, or Paul himself in Macedonia. He also requests him to bring Mark, and informs him that he has sent Tychicus to Ephesus, apparently to take either Mark or Timothy's place. If this sketch of the course of events at this time be correct, Timothy must have obeyed Paul's summons speedily; for he was already with him in Macedonia when Second Corinthians was written,[2] which cannot have been long afterward. It is true, of course, that this reconstruction is merely hypothetical. But the Pauline authorship, whether of the pastoral epistles in their present form or of briefer letters underlying them, can be maintained only on the basis of a hypothetical reconstruction, either of an entire period subsequent to the Roman imprisonment or of the events within some period known to us. And it is claimed only that the one here attempted has more points of contact with known facts than others that have been suggested, and that it accounts better for all the phenomena of the case.

Turning to the Epistle to Titus, we find that Titus was in Crete at the time Paul wrote to him, according to i. 5. We can account for this reference only on the ground of its genuineness, and there is no reason for questioning it. But Titus' stay in Crete, and Paul's letter to him, can hardly be put at any other time than during the apostle's final visit to Achaia, recorded in Acts xx. 1 sq. The mention of Apollos excludes a date earlier than Paul's long residence in Ephesus; and his proposal to winter in Nicopolis, and his direction to Titus to join him there, make against the assumption that the epistle was written in the earlier part of that period. But during the greater part of the last year spent in Ephesus, and until the composition of 2 Corinthians, Titus was fully occupied with the difficulties in the church of Corinth, and could not have gone to Crete to do work there. It would seem,

[1] 2 Cor. i. 8 sq. [2] 2 Cor. i. 1.

therefore, that he must have made his way thither after he had carried Paul's final epistle to the Corinthian church, and while Paul himself was still on his way to Corinth.[1] The original letter to Titus, then, which underlies the epistle in its present form, must have been written before Paul's three months' stay in Corinth; for, at the time he wrote, he was planning to spend the winter in Nicopolis, a plan which he did not carry out, though he may have spent a little while there.[2] Whether Paul himself had been in Crete before he wrote to Titus, as implied in Titus i. 5, we cannot be absolutely sure. It is possible that he went thither soon after writing 2 Corinthians, during the interval of six or eight months which elapsed before his final arrival in Corinth.[3] But the fact must be recognized that it would have been easy for a later writer, in composing alleged instructions of Paul to Titus, to add the reference to Paul's presence in Crete, which might naturally suggest itself as furnishing a justification for such instructions and a proper setting for the epistle.

Paul's letter to Titus, which underlies our present epistle, was apparently written primarily for the purpose of asking Titus to join him for the winter. But that he should take occasion to add words of instruction, exhortation, and encouragement, such as we find in the third chapter, is not at all surprising. The letter seems to have been carried by Zenas and Apollos, who were intending to pass through Crete, and whom Paul commends to Titus' hospitality.[4] Whether Titus actually rejoined Paul before the latter's departure for Jerusalem, we do not know. He was apparently not among the number of those that

[1] Titus may have been already acquainted in Crete, and may have gone there simply to resume work begun some time before.

[2] Paul actually spent, at any rate, the latter part of the winter in Corinth, for he was three months there according to Acts xx. 3, and he left there some time before Passover (xx. 6).

[3] It is possible that the three months of Acts xx. 3 are to be reckoned, not from the time of Paul's arrival in Corinth from Macedonia, but from the time of his return thither after a trip to Crete. The indefiniteness of xx. 2 suggests that the author of Acts knew very little about the details of Paul's life at this time.

[4] Titus iii. 13. Zenas is mentioned only here; Apollos in Acts and 1 Corinthians.

accompanied him thither;[1] but at a later time we find him making his way from Rome to Dalmatia, some distance to the north of Nicopolis, as if he were already acquainted there, and his acquaintance throughout the whole region lying along the eastern coast of the Adriatic may have begun at this time. He may now have taken up and carried on the work which Paul had possibly already done in Illyricum.[2]

The purpose of the redactor of the pastoral epistles it is not at all difficult to discover. He desired to provide for the healthy development of the church by the institution of permanent safeguards and by the formulation of permanent rules. Paul's brief letters to Timothy and Titus coming into his hands, he added to them in good faith what he believed Paul would himself say in the light of the peculiar needs of the day. He regarded himself as a loyal follower of Paul, who understood his teaching thoroughly, and was thus justified in acting as his mouthpiece. As the evils which seemed to him especially to require combating lay in the spheres of life and doctrine, he emphasized particularly the importance of living righteously and piously, and of renouncing and eschewing all novelties and vagaries of faith. In 2 Timothy he denounces at considerable length and with great vehemence the doctrine of certain false teachers and the practices of certain libertines. In the Epistle to Titus he is also concerned to do away with false doctrine and corrupt practice, but he takes a somewhat different course, emphasizing the need of proper officers who shall guard the churches against such evils. There is less denunciation of heresy in Titus than in 2 Timothy, but much more emphasis is laid upon church organization and upon the practical duties of the Christian life.

[1] Cf. Acts xx. 4 sq.

[2] Cf. Rom. xv. 19; and see above, p. 254. The term Illyricum was probably used by Paul in the passage referred to in its general sense to designate the country lying along the eastern coast of the Adriatic from Epirus northward to the Danube, and including with other territory the provinces of Pannonia and Dalmatia, and the western part of Moesia and Macedonia. In its narrower sense Illyricum was the name of the Roman province which, from the time of Augustus on, was more commonly called Dalmatia. See Marquardt: *Römische Staatsverwaltung*, I. S. 295.

Having produced these two epistles, the redactor was led some time afterward to feel that there was a need of renewed exhortations and of fuller and more explicit instruction, not only in the matters already dealt with, but also in connection with worship and organization, in which certain evil tendencies were making their appearance. He therefore composed a third epistle, using the greeting and the opening sentence which he had been obliged to omit, when he combined Paul's briefer letter with the longer one to form our 2 Timothy.[1] The arrangement of the material is much less orderly in 1 Timothy than in either 2 Timothy or Titus. Various subjects are thrown together without any apparent relation to each other. But in spite of the lack of order, the general purpose which controls all three of the epistles, to provide for the healthy development of the church by the institution of safeguards and by the formulation of rules, is kept constantly in mind; and all that is said has a more or less direct reference to it, though it may have no immediate relation to the context. That purpose, in fact, is carried out more fully in 1 Timothy than in either of the other epistles. More space is given to false teachers, and greater emphasis is laid upon church organization. The epistle constitutes an excellent supplement to the others, stating with greater elaborateness and completeness principles which find expression in them.

Who the redactor of the pastoral epistles was, and where he lived, we have no means of determining. He can hardly have been a personal disciple of Paul, certainly not an intimate disciple; but he evidently regarded Paul as his master, and believed himself to be a genuine Paulinist. The time when he did his work can be fixed only approximately. The three epistles were almost certainly known to Ignatius and Polycarp, and therefore cannot well be put later than the first or second decade of the second century. On the other hand, the emphasis upon heresy in all three epistles, the lack of the primitive idea of the

[1] That the latter, though written first, is traditionally known as 2 Timothy, is due, of course, to the fact that it represents a later period in Paul's life than 1 Timothy.

endowment of all believers with spiritual gifts, fitting them for special forms of service, and the substitution for such inspired believers of appointed officers, charged with the performance of teaching as well as of financial and disciplinary functions, point to a time as late as the close of the first century, or the early years of the second.

But though the pastoral epistles in their present form are the work of a later hand than Paul's, we may yet gather from the longer of the two letters which underlie 2 Timothy some information touching Paul's life during the period subsequent to the composition of the Epistle to the Philippians. It was arranged that after Epaphroditus had departed with that epistle, Timothy should remain in Rome for a time until Paul had some assurance as to the outcome of the preliminary trial which seems to have been expected in the near future.[1] Apparently, however, Timothy left for the East before the hearing took place, for Paul tells him something about it in 2 Tim. iv. 16. Very likely it was postponed longer than had been looked for, and it was therefore thought best that Timothy should not wait for it. He must have visited Philippi and despatched his business there before Paul wrote to him, for he was already in Ephesus and was apparently intending to remain there.[2] An interval of at least some months therefore separated the Epistle to Timothy from the Epistle to the Philippians. The letter to his beloved disciple, the last product of Paul's pen known to us, was evidently written shortly before his execution. His death was immediately impending and he no longer entertained any such hopes as he had when he wrote to the Philippians. The preliminary trial had not had the favorable issue which he had thought possible at that time, and his forebodings had proved to be fully justified. The companions that were with him had failed to stand by him in his hour of need,[3] and now upon the eve of his execution only Luke remained at his side. He still had friends, to be sure, for he sends greetings to Timothy from Eubulus, Pudens, Linus, Claudia, and "all the brethren";[4] but apparently

[1] Phil. ii. 23 sq. [2] 2 Tim. iv. 19 and iv. 1 sq. [3] 2 Tim. iv. 16. [4] 2 Tim. iv. 21.

Luke alone now shared his quarters with him, as his other old-time companions had done during the earlier part of his imprisonment,[1] and Luke alone therefore was left to perform their ministrations and to fill their place.[2]

From Acts xxviii. 30, it may fairly be inferred that Paul's execution took place about two years after his arrival in Rome. It is plain enough, at any rate, that some decisive and permanent change in his situation occurred at that time. That change may have been simply his removal from his lodging and his committal to prison after his condemnation, to await the execution of the sentence passed upon him; but the end could not be long delayed in any case, and the two years may therefore be taken as representing at least approximately the time that elapsed between his arrival in Rome and his death.

It is true that it is believed by many that Paul's Roman imprisonment was brought to an end not by his condemnation and execution, but by his acquittal and release.[3] In support of this opinion are urged, on the one hand, a journey to Spain which Paul is reported to have made, and which he cannot have made before his Roman imprisonment, and on the other hand, a final trip to the East, subsequent to the period covered by the Book of Acts, which must be assumed if the pastoral epistles are genuine in their present form. So far as the alleged journey to Spain is concerned, it may be dismissed on the ground of insufficient evidence. Clement of Rome, who wrote before the end of the first century, is cited by many as a witness to

[1] Paul's reference to Aristarchus in Col. iv. 10 and Epaphras in Philemon 23, as his "fellow-prisoners," seems to imply that they were living with him in his own dwelling. It may be that his friends took turns in sharing his confinement in order that they might minister to him in such personal ways as they could not otherwise.

[2] The reference in 2 Tim. i. 17 to Onesiphorus' diligent search for Paul seems to imply that he was no longer living where he had been, and enjoying the same degree of freedom. Condemnation had perhaps already been passed upon him, and he was confined in prison pending his execution.

[3] In support of Paul's alleged release and second Roman imprisonment, see especially the most recent work upon the subject by Spitta: *Die zweimalige römische Gefangenschaft des Paulus* (*Zur Geschichte und Litteratur des Urchristenthums*, Bd. I. S. 2–108). In it may be found all that can be said in favor of the theory.

it; but his words are as easily referable to Rome as to Spain, and to use them in support of Paul's release from his Roman imprisonment, and a missionary tour in the West, is to attribute to Clement an elliptical mode of expression and a compression of thought and style utterly foreign to the remainder of his epistle.[1] The earliest distinct references to a Spanish journey are found in the Muratorian Fragment, a document dating from the close of the second century,[2] and in certain apocryphal Acts of Peter and Paul which probably contain material dating from the latter half of the same century.[3] But such late testimonies, utterly unsupported as they are by the Fathers of the second and third centuries, and running counter as they do to the tacit assumption of most of the writers of the period, that Paul met his death in Rome at the close of his two years' imprisonment there, can have little weight over against the significant fact that there is absolutely no trace of Paul's visit to Spain in the tradition of any Spanish church. That it should have been supposed by

[1] Clement's words are as follows: "On account of jealousy and strife Paul pointed out the prize of patient endurance. After that he had been seven times in bonds, had been exiled, had been stoned, had become a herald in the East and in the West, he received the noble renown of his faith; having taught righteousness to the whole world, and having come to the end of the West, and having borne testimony before the rulers, he departed thus from the world, and went to the holy place, having become a supreme example of patient endurance" (*Ad Cor.* 5). A journey to Spain is supposed by many to be involved in the words: "having come to the end of the West" (ἐπὶ τὸ τέρμα τῆς δύσεως ἐλθών). It is true that τὸ τέρμα τῆς δύσεως taken alone might naturally be interpreted as referring to the Columns of Hercules or Spain (though it is a mistake to say that the phrase was a technical one for that or any other place), but the connection in which the words occur make such a reference extremely unlikely. The next two clauses certainly refer to Paul's trial and death in Rome, and it is difficult to suppose that in the clause in question Clement can be recording a journey beyond Rome from which Paul had to return in order to bear his testimony before the rulers. It is worthy of notice that the early Fathers who read Clement's epistle never thought of interpreting the words as referring to Spain (cf. Harnack: *Patrum Apostolicorum Opera, in loc.*). The truth is that if Rome was the westernmost point that Paul reached, the phrase τέρμα τῆς δύσεως might be used of Rome with perfect propriety in speaking of his career.

[2] The Muratorian Fragment reads: "Acta autem omnium apostolorum sub uno libro scripta sunt. Lucas optime Theophile comprendit, quia sub præsentia ejus singula gerebantur, sicuti et semote passionem Petri evidenter declarat, sed et profectionem Pauli ab urbe ad Spanlam profiscentis."

[3] See Spitta, *l.c.* S. 64 sq.

the authors of the Muratorian Fragment and of the apocryphal Acts referred to, that Paul actually visited Spain, is easy to understand in the light of his intention to go thither expressed in Rom. xv. 24, 28.[1]

On the other hand, so far as another visit to the East is concerned, the only evidence we have for such a visit is found in the pastoral epistles, whose authenticity in their present form has already been shown to be untenable, and the genuine fragments of which have been fully explained on the assumption of a single Roman imprisonment. Under such circumstances not much of an argument can be drawn from them in favor of another trip to Ephesus and other eastern points. Moreover, it is exceedingly difficult to understand how Luke can have repeated on his own account and without any comment, in Acts xx. 38, Paul's categorical declaration to the Ephesian elders, that they should see his face no more,[2] if he knew that five years later Paul visited Ephesus again, as he can hardly have failed to know if he actually did so. Thus the arguments that are urged in support of Paul's release from his Roman imprisonment must be pronounced inconclusive, whether they are drawn from an alleged visit to Spain or from an assumed journey to the Orient.

But there are positive reasons for asserting that Paul cannot have been released, and we may therefore go beyond the mere conclusion that such release has not been proven. It is, to say the least, surprising that in his second imprisonment, as in his first, Demas and Luke and Tychicus should be his companions, all the more surprising in view of Demas' ultimate cowardice and faithlessness referred to in 2 Tim. iv. 10. But the decisive fact is the silence not of the Book of Acts alone but of all our sources. That silence constitutes the strongest kind of an

[1] It is very significant that the author of the Muratorian Fragment says nothing about Luke's failure to record Paul's release from imprisonment, a more surprising omission than the journey to Spain, if he really was released. But this seems to show clearly enough that the writer had no knowledge of the Spanish journey, but that he simply drew a conclusion from the passage in Romans; assuming, very likely, that Paul went to Spain before the Roman captivity recorded in Acts.

[2] Acts xx. 25.

argument against Paul's release, and consequently against a journey either eastward or westward after his two years' imprisonment in Rome. Paul had appealed to Cæsar. If Luke could have recorded that he was acquitted and released by the emperor, it seems inconceivable that he would have failed to do so. Such an acquittal would have constituted a magnificent climax in the long series of instances which he gives of the favorable treatment accorded Christianity by the Roman authorities.[1] If a Roman em-

[1] See above, p. 346 sq.

Ramsay apparently feels the force of this consideration and recognizes the difficulty of believing that Luke, after dwelling at such length upon the various stages of Paul's trial, can have intended to let his acquittal and release go unmentioned. But instead of drawing the conclusion that Paul was not released, he maintains that Luke contemplated the composition of a third work, "in which should be related the final stages of the trial, the acquittal of Paul, the active use which he made of his permission to preach, the organization of the church in the new provinces, and the second trial occurring at the worst and most detested period of Nero's rule" (*St. Paul*, p. 309). But of such a third work there is absolutely no sign; for the use, by such a writer as Luke, of πρῶτον instead of πρότερον in referring to the Gospel (Acts i. 1) can hardly be intended by Ramsay to be taken as a serious argument. The book, as we have it, comes to a well-defined conclusion and there is no hint that any farther account is intended. Indeed the plan of the book is so comprehensive that it is difficult to suppose that the author had in mind the composition of a third work, for which there was left only a comparatively brief and unimportant period. Had he had any such work in mind, he would certainly have divided his material differently and would have covered much less ground than he does in his second book. Moreover, it is inconceivable, if he intended to relate the close of Paul's trial and his release from imprisonment, that he should have postponed it to a third work. If he had any historic sense, — and Ramsay is right in emphasizing the fact that he had a great deal, — he could not do otherwise than put the whole of the trial into one work, either including it all in the Book of Acts, or saving the entire subject, from the arrest at Jerusalem on, for the third book. To break off in the midst of the trial was most irrational, especially since if Paul was set free, his release must constitute the climax of the entire account of his imprisonment. Not only, then, is there nothing to support the theory that Luke contemplated a third work in which the release of Paul was to be recorded; the theory runs exactly counter to all the probabilities of the case.

Spitta also maintains that Luke planned to write a third work in continuation of the Book of Acts (*Die Apostelgeschichte*, S. 318 sq.). He is led to his opinion by the observation that the two sources which he claims were used by the author of the Acts do not reach a definite and final conclusion with the close of that work. But even if the existence of his two sources were admitted, and even if it were recognized that they are not followed to their end by the author of the Acts, the proof that he intended to continue the use of them in a third work would still be lacking; for his plan might well lead him to close his history where he did, without regard to his sources, as it certainly led him to omit much that must have been recorded in his sources if they were the kind of documents that Spitta supposes. Spitta's argument consequently can-

peror had officially declared the great apostle of the Gentiles innocent, and had sent him away a free man after his five years of imprisonment, it is difficult to suppose that the fact can have been entirely unknown to Luke, and it is impossible to suppose that it can have been unknown to the whole early church. And yet it is mentioned by no early writer. When apologetics was made so much of in the first and early second centuries, and every means was employed to prove that Christianity was innocent and harmless, it is inconceivable, if such a striking vindication of it was known to have occurred, that it could be passed by in absolute silence, and be appealed to by not a single Christian.[1] In the light of this consideration alone, even were there no other, it would be necessary to pronounce Paul's release a fiction, and to conclude that his two years' imprisonment in Rome closed with his conviction and execution.

As Paul left Cæsarea in the fall of 55, and reached Rome the following spring, he must have died in 58, some six years before the great persecution of Nero. It will not do, therefore, to connect his death in any way with that persecution. He was not convicted of preaching

not make the assumed continuation of the Book of Acts probable. And indeed, even if the possibility were granted that Luke intended to write a third work, the remarkable fact would remain unexplained, that Paul's acquittal and release is mentioned by no early writer, and that no one even hints that Christianity had received official vindication, in the person of its greatest apostle, at the bar of a Roman emperor. To assume, in the presence of such eloquent silence, that Paul was actually acquitted, and that Luke intended to record the important fact in a work which he after all failed to write, is to say the least venturesome.

[1] The fact that Paul was arrested not as a Christian, but as a disturber of the peace, does not affect the matter; for in whatever light he may have appeared to the authorities, he regarded himself and was regarded by all his brethren as a sufferer for his Christian faith, and his acquittal consequently must seem a verdict in Christianity's favor.

That Nero subsequently persecuted the Christians would be a reason not for keeping silence in regard to his earlier acquittal of Paul, but rather for appealing to that acquittal and contrasting it with the Emperor's later action. Every one recognized that in the butchery of the Christians he had been actuated by anything but motives of justice and a care for the welfare of the state, and if it could be shown that at an earlier time, when his worst passions had not yet broken loose, he had acquitted the leader of the Christians after a full and fair trial, it would be a magnificent argument in favor of the harmlessness of Christianity.

new gods, or of promulgating a novel and illegal religion. Had he been condemned on that ground, the matter could not have stopped with his execution. Other leading Christians as well must have fallen under condemnation, and have suffered a like fate. In other words, Paul's death must have been but the beginning of a persecution of the sect to which he belonged. But there is absolutely no evidence that such a persecution took place. Nero's attack upon the Christians half a dozen years later was due to causes of an entirely different character.[1] The crime for which Paul was ultimately executed was that which had been charged against him in Cæsarea, — the crime of inciting riots. It was not simply that he had created a disturbance in Jerusalem, but that he was a "pestilent fellow, and a mover of insurrection among all the Jews throughout the world."[2] Doubtless, when he came up for trial before Nero, his Jewish accusers were on hand to testify against him; and very likely they had taken pains to gather evidence in other cities than Jerusalem, which went to substantiate their charge. Jews from Asia had precipitated the attack upon him in Jerusalem, and they, of course, knew of his conduct in Ephesus and of the disturbances which he had caused there. It may be that they collected testimony also in the cities of Galatia, and in Philippi, Thessalonica, Corinth, and many other places where his presence and his teaching had led to more or less serious outbreaks. Certainly it was possible to make out a very damaging case against him quite independently of his connection with the Christian sect. Even though it could not be proved that he had himself incited any riots, or that he had uttered disloyal and revolutionary sentiments, or committed any overt breaches of the peace, still the fact that wherever he went disturbances resulted was in itself enough to condemn him in the eyes of the state. Such a man was dangerous to the peace of society, and the Roman government never hesitated to dispose of dangerous characters however innocent their intentions, and however pure their purposes might be. Ruling as

[1] See below, p. 628.

[2] Acts xxiv. 5.

it did so many diverse races and nationalities, Rome was quick to repress anything like sedition or rebellion even of the most insignificant character. Peace must be preserved at all hazards, and the arm of the law fell heavily upon every one that endangered it in any way. Paul's offence in the eyes of the state could not seem as light and trifling as it seems to us. It must have had a very serious aspect, and the result cannot be wondered at. An acquittal could hardly be expected, unless his enemies saw fit not to press the charge against him and took no pains to gather evidence. Paul may have hoped for a time after his arrival in Rome that they would take that course, and his interview with leading Jews of the city was very likely directed to that end. But his hope was vain. When his trial finally came on, long delayed as trials very commonly were in those days, his enemies were evidently ready with their evidence; and though the first hearing resulted in a suspension of judgment,[1] he knew that the case against him was too strong to be met and he looked forward to a speedy sentence.[2]

The earliest extant reference to Paul's death is found in Clement's Epistle to the Corinthians,[3] written toward the close of the first century. Clement records that Paul suffered martyrdom, but he gives no particulars as to the place, time, or manner of his execution. Origen of Alexandria, writing early in the third century, reports that he suffered martyrdom under Nero in Rome,[4] and a somewhat older contemporary, Tertullian of North Africa, says that he was beheaded there.[5] There is no reason to doubt Tertullian's statement. Paul was a Roman citizen, and he was entitled to die by the sword.[6] Though he was executed as

[1] 2 Tim. iv. 16. [2] 2 Tim. iv. 6 sq.

[3] Clement: *Ad Cor.* 5, quoted above, p. 416.

[4] Quoted by Eusebius: *H. E.* III. 1.

[5] *Scorpiace*, 15; cf. *De præscriptione hær.* 36.

[6] Caius of Rome, writing early in the third century, reports that Paul was buried on the Ostian way outside the walls of Rome (Eusebius: *H. E.* II. 25), and the tradition is very old and probably trustworthy that he was beheaded there. The supposed site has been occupied for centuries by the Abbey of the Three Fountains. The fountains which give the abbey its name are said to have sprung up at the spots where Paul's head struck the ground three times after his decapitation, and the pillar to which he is said to have been

an insurrectionist and not as a Christian, he died a martyr to his Christian faith, and the memory of his martyrdom was cherished by the church.

Thus ended the life of the greatest of the apostles, the man who had done more than any other to spread the knowledge of Christ's name and to bring the world to him. From the beginning to the end of his Christian career he was controlled by a fixed and definite purpose, and he carried it out with remarkable tenacity and success. After a few years spent first in Damascus and then in Tarsus and Antioch, laboring in places where Christianity was already known, and apparently largely among his own countrymen, he started upon the great missionary campaigns which continued almost without interruption for ten or a dozen years, and resulted in the evangelization of the four great provinces of Galatia, Macedonia, Achaia, and Asia, in the first three of which at least little or nothing had been done before his arrival. That he should have been able to accomplish as much as he did in so short a time is an eloquent testimony to his zeal and power. Brief as his stay in each province was, he succeeded in establishing Christianity permanently in all of them. He confined himself almost wholly to the great centres of population, but the influence of the word which he preached spread rapidly until large districts of the country round about were reached and won. He had an eye always for the strategic points, and he did his work not in any haphazard and aimless way, but with system and farsightedness. He succeeded, wherever he went, in enlisting the enthusiastic friendship and support of his converts, and they carried on his work during his lifetime and after his decease, and became the means of spreading the Gospel into districts which he had not himself visited. He thus became a power over a much larger territory than he had traversed, and his name was honored and revered throughout the Gentile church. His experiences and his

bound is still shown! In the fourth century, at the same time that Peter's remains were transferred to the Vatican, Paul's body is reported to have been buried in the Basilica of St. Paul, which stood upon the site now occupied by the church of San Paolo fuori le mura.

fortunes during his missionary career are known to us only imperfectly. Something of what he did in the various parts of his great field we can gather from his epistles and from the Book of Acts. We have enough in those writings to show what an able, active, courageous, self-sacrificing missionary he was, and to reveal the principles upon which he labored and the wisdom with which he put them into practice; but the work which he did speaks more eloquently than any words and shows how fragmentary our records are. How little we know is sufficiently illustrated by a single passage in one of his epistles, where he enumerates a long series of trials and hardships, hardly any of which are referred to elsewhere.[1] The shipwrecks alone which he there mentions prove that he must have travelled much more widely than our records indicate.

We have traced the work of Paul in such detail because of the light thrown by it upon the spread of Christianity and upon the fortunes of the church during the period with which we are concerned. The study of Paul's career is a study of Christian history. He was the greatest missionary of the age, and in him the Gospel fought its mightiest battles and won its most splendid victories. He more than any one else was instrumental in giving it world-wide influence and power, and in his successes and defeats, in the obstacles which he had to meet, and in the encouragements which he found, we see foreshadowed the experiences of the church at large during its early days of world-wide evangelism.

13. The Companions and Disciples of Paul

About fourscore companions and disciples of Paul are mentioned by name in his epistles,[2] and about a score

[1] 2 Cor. xi. 23 sq.

[2] In addition to Aquila and Prisca, Apollos, Aristarchus, Barnabas, Crispus, Erastus, Jason, Mark, Silvanus (Silas), Timothy, Trophimus, and Tychicus, who are mentioned both in Paul's epistles and in the Acts, we have in the Epistle to the Galatians the name of Titus (referred to also in 2 Corinthians, 2 Timothy, and Titus); in 1 Corinthians the names of Sosthenes (possibly the ruler of the synagogue referred to in Acts xviii. 17), Gaius, Stephanas, Fortunatus, and Achaicus. Whether Chloe, members of whose household are referred

more in the Book of Acts.[1] A large proportion of them were doubtless his own converts; but some of them owed their Christianity to others.[2] Only a few of them have any particular claim to be remembered; of only a few, in fact, do we know anything beyond their names.

The man who stood closest to Paul and was most intimately associated with him during the early years of his Christian career was the Cypriote Jew, Barnabas,[3] who was a member of the church of Jerusalem in its primitive days, and who seems to have been one of the first to recognize the Christian zeal and devotion of the young convert Saul.[4] His friendship meant much to the latter, and

to in 1 Cor. i. 11, was herself one of Paul's friends or disciples, we do not know. In one or more of the epistles of the imprisonment occur, in addition to some of those already mentioned, the names of the Galatian women Lois and Eunice, grandmother and mother of Timothy (if 2 Tim. i. 5 constitutes a part of Paul's farewell note to Timothy); also the names of Philemon, Apphia, Archippus, Epaphras, and Onesimus of Colossæ, and Nymphas of Colossæ or Laodicea; Epaphroditus, Clement, Euodia, Syntyche, and Synzygus (if it be a proper name) of Philippi; Eubulus, Pudens, Linus, and Claudia, who apparently resided in Rome; Carpus of Troas; Onesiphorus of Ephesus; Crescens and Demas, the former of whom possibly belonged to Galatia, the latter to Thessalonica (2 Tim. iv. 10); and Jesus Justus, Luke, and Titus, whose residence is unknown. In the note addressed to the church of Ephesus and preserved in Rom. xvi. occur, in addition to some of those already mentioned, the names of Phœbe of Cenchreæ; Epenætus, Mary, Andronicus, Junias, Ampliatus, Urbanus, Stachys, Apelles, Herodion, Tryphæna, Tryphosa, Persis, Rufus, Asyncritus, Phlegon, Hermes, Patrobas, Hermas, Philologus, Julia, Nereus, Olympas, all of them apparently of Ephesus; and Lucius, Sosipater, Tertius, Erastus, and Quartus, the last two at least of Corinth. Whether Aristobulus and Narcissus, members of whose households are greeted in vss. 10 and 11, were also friends or disciples of Paul, we do not know. Finally, we have in Paul's note to Titus the names of Artemas and Zenas, and in his earlier note to Timothy (2 Tim. i. 15) the names of Phygelus and Hermogenes, none of whom is mentioned elsewhere. In the enlarged epistles to Timothy, Hymenæus, Alexander, and Philetus are also referred to with censure (1 Tim. i. 20; 2 Tim. ii. 17). Whether they were personal disciples of Paul or belonged to a later day, we do not know.

[1] In addition to Philip the evangelist (xxi. 8), Agabus the prophet (xi. 28), and Paul's fellow-laborers in the church of Antioch, Lucius of Cyrene (by some identified with the Lucius of Rom. xvi. 21), Symeon, Niger, and Manaen, we have in the Acts the following names not mentioned in Paul's epistles: Gaius of Macedonia (xix. 29) and Gaius of Derbe (xx. 4), Dionysius and Damaris of Athens (xvii. 34), Eutychus of Troas (xx. 9), Lydia of Philippi (xvi. 14), Secundus of Thessalonica, and Sopater of Berœa (xx. 4), Titus Justus of Corinth (xviii. 7), and the proconsul of Cyprus, Sergius Paulus (xiii. 7 sq.; see above, p. 175).

[2] For instance, Barnabas, Silvanus, Apollos, Mark, Andronicus, Junias, and very likely others.

[3] Cf. Acts iv. 36.

[4] Acts ix. 27, xi. 25.

doubtless contributed in no small degree to his credit and influence with Christians of Jewish birth. And yet, though Barnabas was a disciple before Paul, and though he seems to have stood sponsor for him in the earlier days when the memory of his persecuting career was fresh in the mind of the church, it was not long before Paul took the lead; and during the years of their joint missionary activity, so far as those years are known to us, he was the more prominent figure of the two, and Barnabas appears in our sources as little more than his assistant.[1] Paul's was evidently the stronger and more forceful character, and he influenced Barnabas far more than the latter influenced him. When the two men separated after the unfortunate occurrence at Antioch,[2] Paul turned his steps to Galatia, while Barnabas made his way to Cyprus in company with his nephew Mark.[3] At this point we lose sight of him. All that we know certainly about his subsequent career is contained in the casual reference to him in 1 Cor. ix. 6, which indicates that he was still actively engaged in missionary work, and implies that he and Paul were once more on good terms. He seems to have continued his apostolic labors for a number of years longer, at least a part of the time in Asia Minor,[4] and if my hypothesis in regard to the authorship of First Peter is correct, he was in Rome toward the close of his life, a couple of decades or more after the death of Paul.[5] With the later legends that cluster about his name, we need not concern ourselves.[6] Clement of Alexandria calls him one of the seventy disciples,[7] and the tradition is not in itself incredible; but the same statement is made by early writers touching so many persons belonging to the apostolic age that no weight can be attached to it. An epistle

[1] Cf. Acts xiii. and xiv.; Gal. ii. 1, 9. [2] Gal. ii. 11. [3] Acts xv. 39.

[4] Paul's reference to him in Col. iv. 10 implies that he was well known to the readers of that epistle.

[5] See below, p. 598 sq.

[6] The Clementine *Recognitions* and *Homilies* frequently mention Barnabas, and speak of his activity in Alexandria and Rome. One tradition sends him to Milan and makes him the first bishop of the church there, but the silence of Ambrose is a sufficient proof of its falsity.

[7] In *Strom.* II. 20. See my edition of Eusebius, Bk. I. chap. 12.

belonging to the late first or early second century is still extant, which has been ascribed to Barnabas since the time of Clement of Alexandria. The epistle, however, abounds in misconceptions touching the ceremonial law of the Jews and is marked by bitter hostility to historic Judaism, and it is clear that it cannot have been written by a Jew, much less by a Levite, as Barnabas is said to have been in Acts iv. 36.[1] The Epistle to the Hebrews was also ascribed to him by an ancient tradition, but that, too, contains some statements in regard to the Jewish ritual which a Levite would not be likely to make, and is much more probably the work of another man.[2] The only extant writing to which the name of Barnabas can be attached with any show of reason, is the First Epistle of Peter. If that epistle is his work, interesting conclusions may be drawn from it as to the degree to which Paul's thinking influenced him, and as to the fidelity with which he carried on the work of his greater companion after the latter's death.[3]

Of Paul's companion, Silvanus, or Silas, as he is called in the Book of Acts,[4] we know very little. He seems to have been a member of the church of Jerusalem,[5] and therefore did not owe his conversion to Paul. He accompanied the apostle upon his second missionary journey, according to the Book of Acts,[6] and his presence with him in Macedonia and Achaia is testified to in Paul's own epistles.[7] After that time he disappears from view until the latter part of the century, when he was apparently in Rome with the author of the First Epistle of Peter.[8] Our complete ignorance concerning his whereabouts during the thirty years or more separating that epistle from the time of Paul's first stay in Corinth is simply one of the many indications of the limits of our knowledge of the apostolic age.

[1] See my edition of Eusebius, Bk. III. chap. 25, note 20.

[2] See below, p. 480. The only father to connect the Epistle to the Hebrews with Barnabas is Tertullian in his *De Pudicitia*, 20.

[3] See below, p. 485 sq.

[4] Weizsäcker questions the identity of the two. See above, p. 230.

[5] Acts xv. 22, 27. [6] Acts xv. 40 sq., xvi. 19 sq., xvii. 4 sq., xviii. 5 sq.

[7] 2 Cor. i. 19; 1 Thess. i. 1; 2 Thess. i. 1. [8] 1 Pet. v. 12.

Another member of the church of Jerusalem who was a companion of Paul for some time was John Mark, a nephew or cousin of Barnabas,[1] who started with the apostles upon their first missionary journey, but turned back at Perga, to Paul's great displeasure,[2] and some years later went to Cyprus with Barnabas, when the latter separated from Paul at the beginning of the second missionary journey.[3] We know nothing more about him until the time of the third missionary journey, when he was apparently in Ephesus and again enjoyed the affection and confidence of the apostle.[4] Whether he actually joined Paul in Macedonia in accordance with the latter's wish, and whether he remained with him during the months that followed, we do not know; but he was with him in his Roman imprisonment,[5] and was a companion of Peter during the latter's stay in Rome,[6] and was also there some years later when the First Epistle of Peter was written.[7] An ancient tradition connects him with the foundation of the church of Alexandria, but little reliance can be placed upon it.[8]

Other Jewish Christians whom we know to have been among Paul's companions and fellow-workers were Apollos of Alexandria, who labored both in Corinth and in Ephesus;[9] Andronicus, Junias, Herodion, and Mary, who were in Ephesus at the time Paul wrote the note contained in Rom. xvi.;[10] Lucius, Jason, and Sosipater, who were in Corinth at the time that note was written;[11] Jesus Justus, who was with the apostle in his Roman imprisonment;[12] Aristarchus of Thessalonica, who was one of his companions not only then but on many earlier occasions;[13] and finally Aquila and his wife Prisca (or Priscilla, as she is called in the Acts), Jews of Rome, with whom he

[1] Cf. Col. iv. 10.
[2] Acts xiii. 13, xv. 38.
[3] Acts xv. 39.
[4] Cf. 2 Tim. iv. 11, and see above, p. 409.
[5] Col. iv. 10; Philemon 24.
[6] See below, p. 603.
[7] 1 Pet. v. 13.
[8] See Eusebius: *H. E.* II. 16 and 24, and compare my note upon the former passage.
[9] Acts xviii. 24 sq.; 1 Cor. i. 12 sq., xvi. 12.
[10] See above, p. 277 sq.
[11] Rom. xvi. 21.
[12] Col. iv. 11.
[13] Acts xix. 29, xx. 4, xxvii. 2; Col. iv. 10; Philemon 24.

made his home in Corinth, and who later resided in Ephesus.[1] Their house in the latter city was the meeting-place of one of the Christian circles of the town, and they were evidently very active and zealous and possessed a large measure of influence among the brethren.[2] Their devotion to Paul was signalized in some remarkable way, apparently at a time when he was in great danger; for he says that they laid down their own necks for his life.[3] Evidently the tie that bound them to the apostle was a very strong one, and he returned their devotion with deep affection. They are always mentioned together, both in the Acts and in the epistles, and they furnish the most beautiful example known to us in the apostolic age of the power for good that could be exerted by a husband and wife working in unison for the advancement of the Gospel.[4]

More important to Paul himself than any of those already mentioned was the Galatian Timothy, whose mother was a Jewess, but whose father was a Greek.[5] He was one of Paul's converts, and joined him when he passed through Galatia on his second missionary journey.[6] During the remainder of the apostle's life he was his most beloved and trusted disciple and companion. After the farewell note which was sent him from Rome shortly before Paul's execution, Timothy disappears from view except for a passing reference at the close of the Epistle to the Hebrews,[7] which was written probably twenty-five years or more after the apostle's death. From that reference we learn that he had recently been released from some imprisonment, and that he was expecting shortly to see the readers of the epistle, who were very likely resident in Rome.[8] Of the place and circumstances of his imprisonment we know nothing, nor have

[1] Acts xviii. 2, 18 sq.; Rom. xvi. 3; 1 Cor. xvi. 19; 2 Tim. iv. 19.

[2] Cf. Rom. xvi. 3 sq.; 1 Cor. xvi. 19. [3] Rom. xvi. 4.

[4] The fact that Prisca is mentioned before Aquila in a number of passages seems to indicate that she possessed peculiar pre-eminence, which was due possibly to her greater ability and forcefulness of character, possibly to the fact that she was of higher rank than Aquila. See Ramsay: *St. Paul, the Traveller and the Roman Citizen*, p. 268.

[5] Acts xvi. 1. [7] Heb. xiii. 23.

[6] See above, p. 231 sq. [8] See below, p. 468.

we any information as to his whereabouts during the years preceding and following. An ancient tradition makes him bishop of Ephesus,[1] and that he actually did labor there for some time is clear from Paul's farewell note to him; but no particular reliance can be placed upon the report that he was the official head of the church, in view of the tendency in the second century to assign to all the followers of the apostles episcopal sees. There remain no writings from his pen, and so far as we know he wrote nothing, except possibly a lost letter to the Corinthians;[2] but his name is joined with Paul's in the salutations of six epistles, — in itself a clear enough indication of the apostle's affection for him and confidence in him.

One of the most mysterious figures in the apostolic age is the figure of the Gentile Titus, whom Paul took with him to the council of Jerusalem in the year 45 or 46, as an example of the work that God was doing among the heathen through him.[3] His birthplace and his nationality it is impossible to determine. It is not unlikely that he was a Galatian, as Paul's largest work among the Gentiles, before the time of the council, was done in that country, but he may have been from Syria or Cilicia. The delicate and responsible mission with which he was entrusted in connection with the church of Corinth, and which he discharged with such success,[4] shows that he enjoyed the confidence of the apostle, and it may fairly be concluded that he had been an intimate and trusted companion for some years, and had had other opportunities of proving his fidelity and ability. And yet he is referred to by Paul only in the Epistle to the Galatians,[5] in the Second Epistle to the Corinthians,[6] and in the later of the two notes to Timothy preserved in Second Timothy.[7] He must have been with the apostle at least a part of the time that elapsed between the council at Jerusalem and the outbreak of the troubles at Corinth,

[1] See Eusebius: *H. E.* III. 4.
[2] See above, p. 313.
[3] See above, p. 194.
[4] See above, p. 320 sq.
[5] Gal. ii. 1, 3.
[6] 2 Cor. ii. 13, vii. 6, 13, 14, viii. 6, 16, 23, xii. 18.
[7] 2 Tim. iv. 10. Paul also addressed a letter to him, which is found in our canonical Epistle to Titus. See above, p. 410.

and between the settlement of those troubles and the closing days of Paul's imprisonment in Rome; but there is no trace of him during those intervals in any of our sources. His name is not joined with Paul's in the salutations of any of the latter's epistles, and there is no reference to him in connection with the evangelization of any city or province. Moreover, he is not once mentioned in the Book of Acts, which has so much to say about Barnabas, Silas, and Timothy, and which contains the names of more than a score of Paul's disciples and companions. It might almost seem as if his name must have been omitted by the author of the Acts with a purpose, as has been maintained by many scholars; but what that purpose can have been, it is impossible to discover. The old idea that the work was written with an irenic aim, in the hope of contributing to a better understanding between the Jewish and Gentile wings of the Christian church, is not borne out by the book itself, and has been generally abandoned.[1] And so the suggestion that the name of Titus was omitted as offensive to Jewish Christians because of the occurrence at the council of Jerusalem must be rejected as quite without foundation. It is altogether probable, in fact, that the omission was due not to any design on the part of the author, but simply to the silence of his sources. It may well be that the account of the council which came into his hands said nothing about Titus, and as he was probably not acquainted with the Epistle to the Galatians, he had no information as to his presence in Jerusalem. It is to be noticed that nothing is said in the Book of Acts about the troubles in the church of Corinth and about the dealings which Paul had with that church during his stay in Ephesus, and so we could not expect to find in it any record of Titus' connection with that affair. That he was a less prominent and important figure than Timothy can be gathered from Paul's own epistles, and there was perhaps no more reason why he should be mentioned than

[1] This was the contention of the Tübingen school, and is still maintained in a modified form; among others by Weizsäcker.

many others of Paul's disciples. We should not be misled by the existence in our canon of an epistle addressed to him, and conclude that both he and Timothy were preeminent above all their companions in the affections of Paul, and that they were singled out from all the rest and commissioned by the apostle to carry on his work during his lifetime and after his death in a way that no one else was. We have seen that the Epistle to Titus in its present form is not Paul's, and there is no reason why he may not have written notes resembling the one which lies at the basis of it to many of his companions. That this particular one was used by a later writer, together with the notes to Timothy, was not necessarily due to the fact that, next to Timothy, Titus was the most prominent and best known of Paul's disciples. It may be that only the notes to Timothy and Titus came into the writer's hands.

Of the later career of Titus after his journey to Dalmatia, to which reference is made in 2 Tim. iv. 10, we have no information. The tradition that he was the first bishop of Crete[1] has no more weight than most such traditions. His presence in Crete at the time Paul wrote to him, that is, about the year 52, was alone sufficient to give rise to the tradition. It is to be noticed that when he left Rome five or six years later, it was not to Crete that he went, but to Dalmatia.[2] He left no writings so far as we know, and it is a remarkable fact that neither to him nor to Timothy has tradition ascribed any literary productions.

The names of Linus[3] and Clement[4] have acquired some importance from the fact that our most ancient catalogues of the earliest bishops of Rome have both a Linus and a Clement among the first four names, and that many writings are extant which are ascribed by tradition to the latter. That the Linus from whom greetings are sent in 2 Tim. iv. 21 is the same man who appears in all our lists as the first bishop of Rome after Peter, is quite possible, and it is also possible that he was a leading figure in the

[1] See Eusebius: *H. E.* III. 4.
[2] 2 Tim. iv. 10.
[3] 2 Tim. iv. 21.
[4] Phil. iv. 3.

Roman church during its early days, and that he bore with others the title of bishop, which was widely in use in the closing decades of the first century; but in so far as the lists represent him as the official head of the church, they carry back into primitive days the conditions of a later time.[1]

That the Clement who appears in the various catalogues as the second or third bishop of the Roman church was also a prominent figure in that church during the latter part of the first century cannot be doubted, but the same may be said of his official position that has just been said of the position of Linus. His name is much better known and is much more prominent in the early history of the church than the name of the latter. A number of writings of different periods have been assigned to him by tradition, and in the case of the epistle sent by the church of Rome to the church of Corinth almost at the close of the first century, the tradition is probably correct. Eusebius, doubtless following the suggestion of earlier fathers, identifies this well-known Clement of Rome with the man mentioned in Phil. iv. 3;[2] but the latter was living in Philippi, not in Rome, and there is no ground whatever for making the identification. The tendency to connect the prominent figures of the post-apostolic age with the apostles themselves is a very natural one, but some stronger basis than mere identity of name must be found before any such connection can be regarded as probable. There were doubtless many Christians in the post-apostolic age whose names were the same as those borne by disciples of the time of Paul, and only the smallest fraction of them are known to us. It is quite possible that the Roman Clement had known Paul, and Peter too, in his earlier days,[3] but no reference to him occurs in the New Testament.

The same may be said of Hermas, the author of the remarkable allegorical work entitled *The Shepherd*, which was written by a Roman Christian some time before the

[1] See below, p. 659 sq. [2] Eusebius: *H. E.* III. 4, 10. See my note *in loc.*
[3] Cf. Irenæus: *Adv. Hær.* III. 3, 3.

middle of the second century. Origen suggested that its author was identical with the Hermas mentioned in Rom. xvi. 14,[1] but the date of the work makes the identification impossible, and it is to be noticed, moreover, that the Hermas mentioned by Paul was a resident of Ephesus, not of Rome.[2]

Among all the companions of Paul none has been so highly honored by tradition as Luke, "the beloved physician,"[3] to whom has been ascribed the authorship of the third Gospel and of the Book of Acts. Of Luke himself we know very little. He is mentioned only in Col. iv. 14, Philemon 24, and 2 Tim. iv. 11, and nothing is told us as to his nationality or the time and circumstances of his conversion, and we do not know whether he had long been a friend and companion of Paul or was one of his more recent converts. It is evident, however, that he was very intimate with the apostle and peculiarly dear to him during his imprisonment in Rome, and he must have been in a position to learn much about his life and work. At the same time, the tradition which makes him the author of the third Gospel and of the Book of Acts, both of which are by the same hand, can hardly be maintained. The reasons for thinking that the latter work, at any rate, was not written by one of Paul's own disciples have already been given and need not be repeated.[4] But the question arises, how came these two important works to be ascribed to a man who fills so small a place in Paul's epistles and who has left no other trace of himself in history? It would seem that there must be some foundation for the tradition, or otherwise it might fairly be expected that the writings in question would have been attributed to some better known man. Two possible alternatives suggest themselves. Either the Gospel and the Acts were actually written by a man named Luke, who was not a companion of Paul, but whom tradition identified with "the beloved physician" referred to in Col. iv. 14,

[1] Origen: *In Epist. ad Rom.*, Lib. X. c. 31. See also Eusebius: *H. E.* III. 3, 6.

[2] See above, p. 275 sq. [3] Col. iv. 14. [4] See above, p. 237.

or the latter was the writer of the document containing the "we" passages, of which the author of the Acts made use in composing his book, and his name thus became attached to the completed work. The latter is a common opinion, and there is much to be said in favor of it. The man who wrote the "we" passages was evidently an intimate companion of Paul, and he made the journey from Cæsarea to Rome in his company.[1] We naturally look for him, therefore, among those whom we know to have been with the apostle in his Roman imprisonment. The only ones whose names are known to us are Jesus Justus, mentioned in the Epistle to the Colossians, Timothy, Tychicus, Onesimus, Aristarchus, Mark, Epaphras, Luke, and Demas, mentioned both in that epistle and in the Epistle to Philemon;[2] Epaphroditus, mentioned in Philippians; and Onesiphorus, Crescens, Titus, Eubulus, Pudens, Linus, and Claudia, in Second Timothy. Claudia, a woman, cannot be thought of. Onesimus was converted to Christianity while Paul was in Rome;[3] and Onesiphorus, Epaphroditus, and apparently Epaphras also, came thither only after the apostle was already there.[4] Timothy, Tychicus, and Aristarchus are ruled out by the way in which they are referred to in the "we" passages themselves.[5] Mark was not with the apostle on his second missionary journey, when the author of the first of the passages in question was in his company.[6] Titus, who must have been very offensive to many of the Christians of Jerusalem after the experience at the council, would hardly have accompanied Paul, as the author of the "we" document did,[7] upon his last journey thither, when the apostle was particularly anxious to conciliate the Mother Church. Of his other companions in Rome, Jesus Justus, Luke, Demas, Crescens, Eubulus, Pudens, and Linus, none is more likely to have written the personal notes of travel than Luke, who seems, indeed, to

[1] Acts xxvii. and xxviii.

[2] Timothy is mentioned also in Philippians, Tychicus in Ephesians, and Luke and Demas in Paul's farewell note to Timothy.

[3] Philemon 10. [4] 2 Tim. i. 17; Phil. iv. 18; Col. i. 8.

[5] Acts xx. 4, xxvii. 2. [6] Acts xv. 39, xvi. 10 sq. [7] Acts xxi. 17, 18.

have been the nearest and dearest to Paul of them all.[1] It is true that we have no reference to Luke except in the epistles of the imprisonment; but it is quite possible that he was with Paul during the periods covered by the "we" passages, when none of the extant epistles was written, and those passages themselves seem to show that their author was not with the apostle very constantly, if at all, in the intervals between.[2] If "the beloved physician" was the author of the passages with which we are dealing, it is easy to explain the ascription to him of the entire work in which his own personal notes were used. His name might well be remembered when the name of the later writer who incorporated those notes into his larger work was entirely forgotten.

At the same time the fact must be recognized that there is no positive evidence connecting Luke with the "we" passages, and that some other companion of Paul entirely unknown to us, or known only by name, may have been their author. For the former of the two alternatives referred to above is not impossible, and explains the ascription of the Acts to Paul's companion, Luke, fully as well as the alternative which has been discussed. Luke was not an uncommon name, and not only one but many Christians may have borne it in the latter part of the first century. The tendency to identify the disciples of that period with companions of the apostles that happened to bear the same names has been already referred to, and certainly nothing would be more natural than to find in the Luke, to whom tradition ascribed the third Gospel and the Book of Acts, the beloved physician referred to in terms of such affection by Paul himself, as Origen found in the author of Clement's Epistle to the Corinthians the Clement of Phil. iv. 3, and in the author of *The Shepherd of Hermas* the Hermas of Rom. xvi. 14.[3]

[1] Cf. 2 Tim. iv. 10.

[2] For a statement of the various companions of Paul to whom the "we" document has been ascribed by scholars, see Holtzmann: *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, 3te Auflage, S. 394.

[3] The third Gospel and the Acts are first ascribed to Luke, the companion of Paul, in the Muratorian Fragment, which dates from the latter part of the second century.

Whether the "we" passages were the work of Luke or of some other companion of Paul, it was entirely natural that a writer living in the latter part of the first century, a generation after the apostle's death, in undertaking to write an account of the early days of the Christian church, and particularly of the work of Paul, should make use of such accounts of an eyewitness, as we know that he made use of many other documents both in the Gospel and in the Acts. The only surprising thing is that he did not make larger use of them than he seems to have done. It looks as if there had come into his hands not a complete work containing an account of Paul's missionary career, but only fragments of such a work, or detached leaves of a journal, or mere letters describing certain episodes, and it may well be that he inserted them all in his history, and that their extent is approximately indicated by the actual occurrence of the first personal pronoun.[1]

Our study of the events recorded in the Book of Acts has shown us that the author of that book drew much of his material from excellent and entirely trustworthy sources; but it is a remarkable fact that he seems to have made no use of Paul's epistles, all of which were written long before he composed his work, and many of which throw light upon occurrences that he relates and supply much additional information. It is true that many scholars hold that he did make a large use of Paul's epistles,[2] but I am unable to discover any trace of such use. The two sources — epistles and Acts — go their independent way, apparently quite oblivious of each other. Where the epistles are fullest and most explicit in their historical references, the author of the Book of Acts seems frequently to have had least knowledge, and in some cases his account is out of accord with Paul's statements. He certainly did not undertake to conform his narrative to Paul's epistles and to control it by them, and it can hardly be supposed in the light of his evident respect for

[1] See also p. 239, above.

[2] Cf., *e.g.*, Weizsäcker, *l.c.* S. 176 (Eng. Trans., Vol. I. p. 209), Ramsay: *St. Paul, the Traveller and the Roman Citizen*, p. 385, and especially Jacobsen: *Die Quellen der Apostelgeschichte.*

his memory that he would have ventured consciously to correct the apostle. To ascribe to him the deliberate purpose of making Paul seem something other than he really was, and of modifying the facts in order to bring him into closer accord with the principles and practice of the older apostles, is to do him an injustice. Nothing in the Gospel or in the Acts warrants us in accusing him of intentional perversion of the facts. The defects in his narrative, and his divergences from the epistles of Paul, can be fully and most satisfactorily accounted for by his lack of information; and the assumption of a conscious deviation from the facts in the interest of a cause cannot be made to square with all the phenomena. It must be concluded, then, that if the author of the Acts had read any of Paul's epistles, he did not at any rate have them in his hands at the time he wrote his work, and was not so familiar with them that they materially affected his narrative. The epistles and the Acts do confirm and supplement each other in many cases, but such confirmation is largely of an indirect and evidently undesigned character. It is worthy of notice that the author of the Acts does not once speak of Paul's correspondence with his churches, and it is a mistake to suppose that within twenty-five or thirty years after the apostle's death his epistles were so widely circulated that every intelligent Christian of the Gentile world must have been familiar with them. The literature of the early church shows that the acquaintance with many of his writings was very limited even as late as the beginning of the second century.

The date and place of the composition of the "we" passages, and the residence and personality of their author, it is impossible to determine; and much the same may be said of the Book of Acts. The indications, however, point to the reign of Domitian as the time when the latter was composed. The date of the third Gospel prevents us from putting it much earlier than that reign,[1] and the apparent need felt by the author of defending

[1] See below, p. 577.

Christianity before the Roman authorities points to a time when the Christians were beginning to experience the disfavor of the state,[1] as we know that they were in the time of Domitian; while, on the other hand, the author's lack of acquaintance with many of Paul's epistles, and the indications of a knowledge of his book on the part of Christian writers of the early second century, make it inadvisable to put it into a later period.

That Paul had many other companions and disciples besides those mentioned in his epistles and in the Book of Acts cannot be doubted, and it may be that some of them were of greater importance and exerted a far larger influence than many whose names we know. Except in the case of a very few, the preservation of those names was largely due to accidental circumstances. The brief note to the church of Ephesus introducing Phœbe of Cenchreæ furnishes us, for instance, with some thirty otherwise entirely unknown. But Paul's influence was not measured by the men who counted themselves his disciples or who were immediately associated with him in his work. His influence was felt by multitudes who never saw his face and whose names he never knew. His historic significance is to be estimated not by the number of his converts nor by their names, but by the amazing success with which he carried out his great plan of world-wide evangelism and still more by the impulse which he gave to the preaching of the Gospel in all parts of the empire. By his tireless activity he brought a knowledge of the Gospel to many of the most important cities of the world; and not simply that, he started Christianity upon its world-conquering career, and, above all, he made it completely and forever independent of Judaism. His principles might not be fully appreciated and the arguments upon which he based his assertion of the independence of the Gospel might be generally misapprehended, but the fact for which he stood could not be mistaken; and though he was not the only one that stood for it, it was due to him more than to any one else that Jewish exclusiveness

[1] See above, p. 348.

was broken down and the evangelization of the Gentile world made possible. He not only won a victory over the Judaizers, but he clinched his victory and made it permanent by the active, eager, successful work which he carried on for years afterward, and by which he demonstrated, so clearly that it could never be questioned, the universality of the Gospel and its permanent independence of all racial and national limitations. Whatever else he did, he at least gave to his disciples and companions, and through them to multitudes of others, the impulse and the courage to preach such a Gospel to all the world.

CHAPTER V

THE CHRISTIANITY OF THE CHURCH AT LARGE

1. The Common Conception of the Gospel

Paul was not the founder of Christianity; he was only its greatest missionary. The Gentile church, the church of the world at large, owed its existence and its rapid spread very largely to him, but it was by no means a Pauline church; it was a Christian church, and there was room in it, as the event proved, for many other conceptions of the Gospel than that which Paul himself preached. His name outside of Ebionitic circles was always held in high honor, but the Christianity of the world-church of the second and subsequent centuries had little likeness to the Christianity of the epistles to the Galatians, Corinthians, and Romans. This does not mean that the teachings of Paul were entirely neglected or misunderstood. Some of those teachings are reproduced in many post-Pauline writings. But even where they are thus found, they appear in nearly every case in proportions and in relations different from those in which they were originally uttered, and combined with other ideas entirely foreign to Paul's thought. Now one element, now another of his teaching is seized upon by this or that Christian, and given a prominent or even a controlling place in his system, but Paul's total conception of Christianity is lost. Almost no one looks upon the Gospel as he does, and reproduces his interpretation of it in its original proportions.

This remarkable lack of a true and genuine Paulinism in the writings of the early Christians was due in part to the fact that Paul's teachings, which were so largely the fruit of his own experience, were too profound to be understood or appreciated by the mass of his converts,

who possessed no such religious nature as he was gifted with, and who had passed through no such spiritual crisis as had preceded his conversion to the Christian faith.[1] But it was due still more largely to the fact that Paul was not the only missionary of Christ, and that multitudes of Gentile Christians received the Gospel from other lips than his. This was true of the Christians of Alexandria, a city which he never visited, and of Rome, where he spent the closing years of his life. It was true also of many provinces lying both east and west of his missionary field, and of many communities even within the territory which he covered. Thus Pontus and Bithynia on the east, Gaul, Spain, and North Africa on the west, were never visited by him, and even in the province of Asia, where he labored for so long, Colossæ, Laodicea, and Hierapolis had not seen his face. If even those who owed their conversion directly to him were commonly unable to apprehend the full nature and significance of his Gospel, much less was it to be expected that those who knew him only by reputation, or those who heard him only after their own conceptions of Christianity were already formed and crystallized, should understand and make his Gospel their own. And still less was it to be expected, when the Gospel which they received from others was commonly far more in line with their own previous thought and experience, and thus far easier of comprehension and acceptance.

This Gospel, which was brought to the Gentile world by other missionaries than Paul, it is impossible to recon-

[1] Most of them knew nothing of that discipline of the conscience which Paul had undergone in his effort to conform his life in all respects to the requirements of an exacting and minute code of religion and ethics; for nearly all of them were Gentiles or Hellenists, who either knew nothing about the Jewish law, or regarded it simply as a general expression of the proper attitude of devotion towards the supreme God, and observed it at most only in its larger lines. It is not to be wondered at that such men failed to make Paul's conception of Christianity their own. It is a great mistake to identify Paulinism with primitive Gentile Christianity, and to place him and the early Gentile Christians over against Jewish Christians, as representatives of a distinct and independent development. Paul was a Jew, and his conception of the Gospel rests upon Jewish presuppositions which distinguish it sharply from various other conceptions that made their appearance in the Gentile world.

struct in all its details; for the sources upon which we have to depend for our knowledge of it are very limited. But the main features of it, which must have been much the same even when it was preached by Christians who held widely different views on many points, can be reproduced with some degree of confidence.

Upon one point all of them were in agreement, both with each other and with Paul. All believed that the Gentile Christian is free from the obligation to observe the Jewish law. Moreover, the men that carried the Gospel to the heathen world were commonly agreed that the Jewish Christian, as well as his Gentile brother, is free from such obligation. This principle, to be sure, was longer than the other in finding general recognition. In Jerusalem, long after the freedom of Gentile Christians had been admitted, the disciples of Jewish birth continued to observe their ancestral law in all its strictness, and to insist upon the duty of all their Christian compatriots to do the same.[1] And there can be no doubt that there were at that time many outside of Palestine who followed the same course. But there were many, too, and probably far more, in the church at large, who believed in the abrogation of the national code for Jewish as well as Gentile disciples. As was seen in an earlier chapter, there were those, even before Paul entered upon his great missionary career, who held this opinion and acted upon it in Antioch and elsewhere quite independently of him. And as time passed, and Christianity spread ever more widely in the Roman world, and the Gentile contingent grew ever larger and more influential, the number of such Jewish liberals must have increased with great rapidity. It was inevitable, indeed, that those who still clung to the old forms, and refused to meet their Gentile brethren on equal terms, should find themselves in an ever more hopeless minority, and that the church at large should go its way without seriously concerning itself about them. It is a mistake to think that the question remained a burning one for any length of time. All

[1] Acts xxi. 20.

the writings of the first century bear witness to the contrary. It will not do to explain the lack of references to the controversy touching the law in the non-Pauline literature of that century by assuming a desire on the part of the writers to rise above the differences that had agitated the church, and to construct a platform upon which both parties could stand. Such an assumption is entirely groundless. The truth is that there was no dispute at the time that literature was written, and the controversy had never been so widespread as to impress its memory upon the church at large. That Christians, both Jewish and Gentile, were entirely free from the obligation to observe the law of Moses, simply went without saying in most parts of Christendom, even before the time of Paul's death, and there was no reason whatever for a Christian writer to spend either time or thought upon a question that concerned neither himself nor his brethren.

But though complete freedom from Jewish ceremonial was thus widely taken for granted, Paul's principle that the Christian is released from all external law was not generally accepted. The Gospel was understood by the original disciples in Jerusalem as a Gospel of righteousness, and righteousness meant to them, as to the Jews in general, the strict observance of the revealed law of God. When it came to be believed that the national code of the Jews was no longer binding, the result was the belief not that the Christian is subject to no objective law, but that he is subject to a new and higher one.

It is significant that the Christians in general, who agreed with Paul as to the abrogation of the Jewish law, reached their position, whether under Paul's influence or independently of him, by an entirely different route from that which he pursued. His conviction rested upon a principle which was fundamental in his thinking, — the principle that the Christian life is a life of freedom from the flesh; and his conviction involved, therefore, the Christian's release from subjection to law in general and not simply to the Jewish law. But among other mis-

sionaries to the Gentiles there were many who were led to the same conclusion touching the Jewish law by mere force of circumstance or example, and probably still more who had already before their conversion ceased to lay any great stress upon the observance of ceremonial rites, and contented themselves with conforming their lives to the general principles of good morals. Among the Hellenistic Jews of the period there were many such. In their hands Judaism had become transformed in many quarters into a universal religion, whose sum was the belief in one supreme, spiritual God, and in a final judgment, when men were to be rewarded or punished for their observance or non-observance of the general moral law. They differed from many of the better and more thoughtful spirits in the heathen world about them only in their belief in revelation. In the Jewish Scriptures, interpreted largely in an allegorical manner, they were convinced that they had an authentic revelation of the character and will of the true God and of his future purposes for men. It was in large part due to the efforts of such Hellenists as these that Jewish propagandism was so amazingly successful in the first and second centuries of our era, and among them doubtless Christianity won multitudes of adherents. But of course to such men as these Christianity could not mean the observance of the Jewish ceremonial law. Their Christian faith and life must be conditioned by their previous convictions; and that meant not simply that the Christianity which they professed, and which they preached to their Gentile neighbors, must be superior to Jewish exclusiveness, whether national or religious, but also that it must be marked by the features which they regarded as essential in the older faith. It must be the supreme and final revelation of the true God, who had already revealed himself through Moses and the prophets, and it must contain a still clearer and more emphatic expression of his will and of the consequences to follow its observance or non-observance. It was thus inevitable that the Christianity of the world at large, so far as it felt the influence of these men, should bear a legal character,

and should be in this respect widely removed from that of Paul. But there was no perversion in all this of the principles of the original disciples. To them, too, Christianity bore a strictly legal character, just as Judaism had done. The only difference lay in their conception of the content of the law which it was the duty of Christ's followers to observe. This being the case, the Christianity accepted and preached by these liberal Hellenistic Jews must agree in principle with the Christianity of other missionaries to the Gentiles, who were in more immediate connection with the Mother Church. Whether or not the latter continued to think that the observance of the Jewish ceremonial law was necessary to any one's salvation, they were at any rate at one in their belief that to be a Christian meant to keep the commandments of God, whatever they might be.

And so, besides that form of Christianity which Paul preached, sometimes preceding, sometimes following it, went to the Gentile world another form, preached by multitudes of missionaries, both Palestinian and Hellenistic, — missionaries who were doubtless for the most part entirely friendly to Paul, so far as they knew anything about him, and who believed themselves to be carrying on the same work that he was doing. They were in general agreement with each other and with him, at an early day if not from the beginning, in the belief that the ceremonial law is no longer binding upon the Christian, and they inculcated the same kind of living that he did: faith in God and devotion to him, honesty, sobriety, purity, temperance, patience under afflictions, joy, peace, long-suffering, hospitality, love for the brethren. It is not to be wondered at that they, and those to whom they preached, should be generally unconscious that there was any disagreement between them and him. They were proclaiming the same Christ, and they seemed to be preaching the same Gospel. And indeed Paul himself recognized them as fellow-disciples, and never denied that their message, different as it was from his in its interpretation of the work of Christ and of the nature and

basis of the Christian life, was a Christian message fitted to lead men to the Master.[1] It is only as we recognize this oneness of purpose which actuated Paul and the many other missionaries of the day, and their consciousness of being engaged in the promotion of a common cause which bound them all together, that we can understand the subsequent development, in which the peculiar views of Paul were so largely crowded out, while his name continued to be held in the highest honor and all believed themselves true to his memory.

The common legal conception of Christianity which has been referred to is found in nearly all the non-Pauline writings of the first and second centuries, whether of Jewish or of Gentile origin. In the Epistle of James, in the Apocalypse, in the Epistle to the Hebrews, in the pastoral epistles, in Jude and Second Peter, in Clement's Epistle to the Corinthians, in Barnabas, in the *Didache*, in II. Clement, in Polycarp, in Justin Martyr, the same general idea appears, in spite of the large variety in the subject-matter and the wide diversity of view at many points.

The Epistle of James, which bears in reality more the character of a homily than of an epistle, is very significant in this connection. It was addressed by a Christian of Jewish birth, possibly primarily to Christians of the same race,[2] more probably to Christian brethren in general without regard to race.[3] In either case the author's attitude toward the ceremonial law of the Jews was that of a member of the world-church. There is no trace of the idea that that law was still binding upon any Christian, and no hint that it was still observed by either writer or readers. And yet Christianity is conceived distinctly under the aspect of a law.[4] It is called a law of liberty,[5] to be sure, but that does not destroy its legal character. It simply means that the observance of it, which involves

[1] Cf. Phil. i. 15 sq.

[2] Cf. Jas. i. 1, ii. 2.

[3] Upon the date and authorship of the epistle and the character of its readers, see below, p. 580 sq.

[4] Cf. Jas. i. 25, ii. 8, 12.

[5] Jas. i. 25, ii. 8.

love and mercy for one's neighbor, will secure a merciful judgment from God,[1] and that a man, therefore, whose heart is right toward those about him, need not fear God's vengeance, as he must if he were to be judged only by the letter of an external code. There is evidently a great advance here upon the common pharisaic notion of the law. In fact, the principle enunciated by James resembles closely the principle of Christ, who came not to destroy the law, but to fulfil it by revealing and emphasizing its inner meaning. And yet it is not the principle of Paul; for to him the Christian life is not obedience to any objective law, even the law of love, but the working out in the man of the life of Christ within him. The resultant character and conduct may be the same in both cases, but the process and the principle are different. Moreover, the contrast between Paul and James is greater than between Paul and Jesus; for though Jesus pictures the Christian life as the observance of the law of love, he views that law always as the expression of a Father's will, and he accordingly emphasizes love for God as well as love for men. At this point there is a close resemblance between Paul's teaching and the Master's; for Paul sees in love an expression of the divine character, whether in God himself or in man, and can thus say that love is the fulfilling of the law.[2] But in James there is no such conception of the fatherhood of God, and of the Christian's love for him.[3] "Pure religion and undefiled" is defined by him as "visiting the fatherless and widows in their affliction," and keeping oneself "unspotted from the world."[4] And so it is not the Christian's filial relation to God, as in Jesus' teaching, nor the presence of Christ himself in the believer, making him a son of God, as

[1] Jas. ii. 13. [2] Rom. xiii. 10.

[3] There is no reference to love for God (except in a traditional phrase in i. 12 and ii. 5), and the word "Father" is used of God only three times; once in the phrase "Father of lights" (i. 17); again in the phrase "the God and Father" (τῷ θεῷ καὶ πατρὶ, i. 27), where the Revised Version wrongly inserts the word "our"; and finally in the phrase "the Lord and Father" (τὸν κύριον καὶ πατέρα, iii. 9). In each case it is evident that the word is used in a merely traditional sense, with no deeper meaning than it had to Jews.

[4] Jas. i. 27.

in Paul's teaching, that insures his salvation, but the observance of God's law.[1]

The conception of Christianity as a law, which is so clearly voiced by James, is very prominent also in the Apocalypse, though there it is obedience to the commands of God in general which is emphasized, and the summary of the law which James gives, and his characterization of it as a law of liberty, do not appear.[2] The same may be said also of the pastoral epistles,[3] and even more emphatically of 2 Peter.[4] So even in the Epistle to the Hebrews, which reveals the influence of Paul in many ways, the Christian life is represented as a life of obedience, or of endurance in the service of God unto the end.[5]

That this conception of Christianity as a law, which finds clear expression in so many of the writings of the period, and which was doubtless shared by the great majority of the early missionaries, should meet with a cordial response, and should secure a much wider acceptance in the Gentile world than the peculiar doctrines of Paul, was but natural. For Paul's views there was little preparation in the world at large. Few, in fact, were in a position either to understand or appreciate them. But the views of James and others like him were calculated to appeal strongly to the better and more earnest spirits everywhere. The period with which we are dealing was

[1] Jas. i. 21 sq., 25, ii. 8 sq., 14 sq., iv. 11. Though James sums up the content of this law as love for one's neighbor, he also speaks of the Christian's duty to have faith when he prays (i. 6 sq.), to subject himself to God (iv. 7), to draw near unto him (iv. 8), to humble himself before him (iv. 10), to submit to his will (iv. 15), and on the other hand to keep himself unspotted from the world (i. 27). He thus implies that the law involves more than one's duties to one's neighbor.

[2] Compare the letters to the seven churches in Rev. ii. and iii.; also xii. 17, xiv. 12, xix. 8, xx. 12 sq., xxi. 7, xxii. 12.

[3] Cf. 1 Tim. ii. 15, iv. 8, vi. 18 sq.

[4] Cf. 2 Peter i. 10, ii. 9 sq., 20, iii. 11, 14, 17.

[5] Heb. iii. 18, iv. 11, v. 9, vi. 10, ix. 14, x. 36, xii. 28; and iii. 6, 14, vi. 6, 12, x. 23 sq., xii. 1. The conception of Christianity as a law is found also in nearly all the patristic writings of the period. Cf., *e.g.*, 1. Clem. 1, 2, 7, 9, 10; Barnabas 2, 21; Polycarp 2; II. Clem. 8, 11; Hermas: *Sim.* VI. 1, VIII. 3, 7; *Mand.* IV. 2, etc. And it is in accordance with this conception that Christ's Gospel of the Fatherhood of God is almost entirely lacking in the extant literature of the early church.

marked by a widespread impulse toward moral reformation. However low the average moral condition of the Roman world in the closing years of the Republic, it is certain that during the first and second centuries of our era, a mighty ethical movement was in progress quite independently of the Christian church, and that its effects were widely felt among all classes of people. There was "a growing reaction in the popular mind against the vices of the great centres of population,"[1] and an ever-increasing emphasis upon the importance of pure and upright living.

But of most significance to us is the fact that this movement meant the growing recognition of moral law and the growing sense of the necessity of conforming one's life to its dictates. The movement found its philosophical expression and justification chiefly in Stoicism, which underwent a remarkable revival during the first and second centuries. It is perhaps worth while to quote a few characteristic sentences from the greatest representative of the tendency of which I am speaking, — the moral philosopher and teacher Epictetus. "In all cases," he says, "progress is the approaching to that to which perfection finally brings us." "Where is progress then?" he continues. "If any of you, withdrawing himself from externals, turns to his own will, to train and perfect and render it conformable to nature: noble, free, unrestrained, unhindered, faithful, humble; if rising in the morning he observes and keeps to these rules: bathes regularly, eats frugally, and to every subject faithfully applies the same fixed principles,— if a racer to racing, if an orator to oratory,— this is he who truly makes progress." It is the law of nature which Epictetus here insists upon as the law of human conduct. The duty of every man is to strive to bring his will into harmony with nature. But Epictetus goes further than this. He finds the law for the government of human life not in nature alone, but in God. It is not simply that man must conform his con-

[1] Hatch: *Influence of Greek Ideas and Usages upon the Christian Church*, p. 141. Upon this whole subject see that notable work.

duct to the law of nature; he must conform it to the law of God. "We must learn what the gods are, for such as they are found to be, such must he seek to be to the utmost of his power who would please and obey them. If the deity is faithful, he too must be faithful; if free, beneficent, and noble, he must be free, beneficent, and noble likewise, in all his words and actions behaving as an imitator of God." "Our duty is to follow God;" "to be of one mind with him;" "to acquiesce in his administration;" "to devote ourselves to the performance of his commands. If we will not do it, we suffer loss. There are penalties imposed, not by a vindictive tyrant, but by a self-acting law." "Lastly, for all other pleasures substitute the consciousness that you are obeying God and performing not in word but in deed the duty of a wise and good man."[1]

Thus does Epictetus give expression to his conception of man's duty, and thus it is upon duty that he lays chief emphasis. And in this he was at one with the best sentiment of his day. Conformity to law, whether the law of nature or the law of God, was the ethical watchword of the age.[2] And so the Gentile world was in a position to appreciate the conception of Christianity as a divine law, which was taught, not by Paul, but by his fellow-missionaries. Thus, indeed, must most of them regard Christianity if they accepted it at all. It is certainly not surprising that they did not make their own Paul's view of the Christian life as a release from law; it is not surprising that they saw in such a view only an encouragement to libertinism and immorality, and that they refused to believe that Paul, whom they so highly esteemed, taught any such thing. He was read by the early Christians in the light of their own ideas, and though they all recognized his refusal to admit the binding authority of the ceremonial law of the Jews, they considered him as truly a teacher of Christian law as any of his fellows.

[1] The passages are taken from various parts of the *Discourses of Epictetus* (Higginson's Trans.). Cf. also Hatch, *l.c.* pp. 144, 155.

[2] Compare the words of Seneca: "We should not only submit to God, but assent to him, and obey him out of duty, even if there be no necessity."

Had he not been thus interpreted, he must have been repudiated by the church at large, as he was by the Judaizers and by their successors, the Ebionites. That Christianity, then, secured converts in the Roman world of the first and second centuries, was largely due not to the fact that it was what Paul conceived it to be, but to the fact that it was regarded as the promulgation of a law for the government of human life, — a law resting, as it was claimed, upon the clearest divine sanctions.

But Christianity, as understood by its early missionaries, was something more than a law; it was a promise as well. They were conscious of proclaiming to the world above all else a Gospel, — the Gospel of eternal life. The law was not an end unto itself. It was simply a means to the attainment of salvation, and it was as a message of salvation that Christianity was preached to the world at large. But it was in accordance with their conception of Christianity as a law, that the disciples of whom we have been speaking conceived of salvation solely as a future thing, as the condition of blessedness into which, after the coming of Christ, those shall enter who have kept the law unto the end.[1] The eschatological element was all-controlling in the church at large of the first and second centuries, just as in the church of Jerusalem in the days immediately preceding Christ's departure. The disciples in all parts of the world lived in the future as truly as their brethren of Jerusalem, and it was their hope of a salvation soon to be revealed that sustained them in all their troubles, nerved them in all their conflicts, and inspired them to endure in faith and virtue even to the end. They looked for the blessings of salvation not to the present, with its emptiness and vanity and evil, but to the future. In that future they lived, and its glory and splendor were vivid to their gaze. The enthusiasm thus kindled permeated all their thought and life, and the evidences of it that still remain

[1] Cf. Jas. i. 12, ii. 5, v. 7 sq.; Heb. i. 14, vi. 19, ix. 28, x. 34 sq., xii. 28, xiii. 14; 1 Tim. vi. 19; 2 Pet. i. 11, iii. 4, 8 sq.; Rev. ii. 7, 10, 26 *et passim;* I. Clem. 28, 34, 35, 50; Polycarp 5; Barnabas 4; *Didache* 16; II. Clem. 5, 16 sq.; Hermas: *Vis.* III. 8 *et passim.*

constitute one of the most marked and striking features of the literature of the period.

So far as concerns the nature of that future salvation to which all were looking forward, it was assumed, as a matter of course, that it meant eternal life and everlasting felicity in the presence of God and in company with Christ and with his saints. But there were many who believed that it was to include also the enjoyment of the blessings of a visible and material kingdom to be established upon earth at Christ's second coming. This sensuous conception of the future was widespread in the early church. We find it in the Apocalypses of John and of Peter, in Barnabas, II. Clement, Hermas, and Papias, and possibly also in the *Didache*,[1] and the importance that was widely attached to it is clearly shown by Justin Martyr, who, though he admits that some Christians do not accept it, regards it himself as a foundation-stone of the Christian faith.[2] The belief was Jewish in its origin, and though of course the national hopes of the Hebrews played no part in the anticipations of the church at large, the belief retained for a long time many of the details of the older Jewish conception, which are found in such writings as the Book of Enoch and the Apocalypses of Ezra and Baruch.

Connected with the idea of an earthly kingdom of Christ is the belief in a resurrection of the body, which, at least in the case of believers, is a necessary corollary of that idea. The expectation of a resurrection, at least of pious

[1] Upon this conception of salvation, see Harnack: *Dogmengeschichte*, 3te Auflage, I. S. 158 sq. (Eng. Trans., Vol. I. p. 167 sq.). While sensuous views of the future were very widespread in the early church, chiliasm, specifically so called, — that is, the belief that Christ upon his return will set up a kingdom on earth, to be shared in by his saints, and to endure only for a definite period, until the general resurrection and the Day of Judgment, — was not quite so general as Harnack's note upon the subject would seem to indicate. By some of the writers to whom he refers only a future kingdom is mentioned, and nothing is said about its limited duration and the general resurrection and judgment to follow. The genuine chiliastic view does appear, however, in many of the documents of the period, as, for instance, in the Apocalypses of John and Peter, in Papias (Eusebius: *H. E.* III. 39, 12), in Justin Martyr (*Dial.* c. 80 sq.), in Irenæus (*Adv. Hær.* V. 33 sq.), and apparently also in *Barnabas* 15, and possibly in the *Didache* 16.

[2] Cf., *e.g.*, *Dialogue with Trypho*, 80.

Israelites, who were expected to rise in order to share in the blessings of the Messianic kingdom, was widespread among the Jews at the opening of the Christian era. The idea was foreign to the Greek mind, though the belief in immortality had secured acceptance in the Greek and Roman world of the period. In the beginning, when Christians expected the speedy return of Christ to set up his kingdom, the thought of a resurrection of Christian believers can hardly have suggested itself. But in time, as the consummation was postponed, and death carried away an ever-growing number of disciples, a difficulty arose. Were the brethren that died before the return of Christ to be excluded from the enjoyment of the blessings of his kingdom? A Jewish Christian would find the answer ready to hand in the common belief of his countrymen touching a resurrection. But the traditions of the world in which he lived offered no such relief to a Gentile Christian, and it is very likely that the question caused wide perplexity. It is evident, at any rate, that the Thessalonians were troubled by it; for Paul, in his first epistle to them, found it necessary to exhort them not to sorrow concerning those that had fallen asleep, for the dead in Christ were to rise at his coming and share with the living in the blessings which he was to bring.[1]

At a very early day, perhaps under the impulse of the same difficulty which presented itself to the Thessalonians, the expectation of a resurrection of the body had become almost universal among Christians, and it is explicitly avowed or tacitly assumed by nearly all the writers of our period. Paul's belief in the resurrection, as was seen in a previous chapter, was not due to his desire to give all Christian believers a part in the blessedness inaugurated by the return of Christ. As he conceived it, it was a purely spiritual thing, and a part of the process of redemption from the flesh. But Paul's idea did not find wide acceptance. When the belief in the resurrection had become general, it was a bodily resurrection in the material sense, a resurrection of the

[1] 1 Thess. iv. 13 sq.; cf. also 1 Cor. xv.

flesh, that was commonly assumed.[1] Of course the belief found support in the resurrection of Christ, which had been pictured from an early day by most Christians as a mere revivification of the fleshly body which had lain in the tomb; but it would be a mistake to suppose that Christ's resurrection was the primary ground of the belief. In strict consistency, the idea of a resurrection of the flesh should have existed only where the expectation of an earthly and visible kingdom of Christ prevailed; but in reality it was shared by many who do not seem to have looked for such a kingdom. Clement, for example, who is entirely free from sensuous views of the future, makes much of the resurrection of the flesh, and takes great pains to show its credibility.[2] Clearly it was regarded by him and by others, in the period with which we are dealing, as an essential article of the Christian faith, and as such it entered into the creed of the church, and maintained itself even after chiliasm and everything like it had entirely disappeared.

But it was natural that where the resurrection of the fleshly body of believers was conceived to be necessary to the enjoyment of the blessings of salvation, the idea should also find acceptance that a resurrection was necessary in the case of unbelievers, in order that they should suffer the punishment for their sins from which the disciples of Christ were to escape. A similar consideration had led to the growth of the same belief among the Jews, and it was natural that it should in the end find general acceptance among Christians. Paul teaches only the resurrection of believers, the sole ground of a resurrection being the oneness of a man with Christ. But where this idea did not exist, and the resurrection was based, as it commonly was, solely upon the action of God, there was as much ground for the resurrection of unbelievers as for that of believers, and the need of the former was of course enhanced, as the wickedness of the Jewish and

[1] Compare, for instance, the old Roman symbol which has the words ἀνάστασιν σαρκός; cf. also II. Clem. 9.

[2] I. Clem. 24 sq. Compare also the old Roman symbol which says nothing about an earthly kingdom in any form.

heathen world increasingly manifested itself in active hostility against the Christian church. Comparatively little is said about the matter in the literature of our period, the resurrection being commonly referred to in general terms as one of the blessings to be enjoyed by the followers of Christ; but the resurrection of the wicked is explicitly mentioned in the Acts,[1] and in the Gospel and Apocalypse of John,[2] and Justin Martyr in the second century emphasizes it as an essential factor of the Christian faith.[3]

It was said above that all early Christians, whether chiliasts or not, assumed as a matter of course that salvation meant eternal life and the enjoyment of everlasting felicity in the presence of God and in company with Christ and his saints. But the forms in which this eternal life was conceived differed considerably. Some, especially the chiliasts and those who emphasized the resurrection of the body, pictured it in more sensuous, others in more spiritual forms, but the most characteristic conception was that which connected it in genuine Greek fashion with knowledge. The writings of John and of the Gnostics are especially significant in this connection, but the conception is not confined to them. It appears also in 2 Peter,[4] in Clement,[5] and in the *Didache*.[6] That such a conception was due in large part to Hellenic influence, either directly or through the medium of Hellenistic Judaism, there can be no doubt.[7] It is along this line, in fact, that the Hellenization of Christianity took place,[8] and it is interesting to observe that it was this idea of

[1] Acts xxiv. 15. See above, p. 351.

[2] John v. 29; Rev. xx. 12 sq. In the latter passage the first and second resurrections are carefully distinguished.

[3] *Apol.* I. 6.

[4] 2 Pet. i. 3 sq.

[5] I. Clem. 36. The words of Clement are especially striking: "Through him the Lord willed that we should taste of immortal knowledge." Compare also the doxology at the close of II. Clement.

[6] *Didache* 9, 10.

[7] It is significant that the idea is not confined to philosophers and students, but that it appears even in writings of men of little culture who were entirely unfamiliar and out of sympathy with the philosophical tendencies of the age.

[8] See Harnack: *Dogmengeschichte*, 3te Auflage, I. S. 158 sq. (Eng. Trans. I. p. 167 sq.)

future salvation as consisting in knowledge of and communion with the divine, that finally drove out the sensuous notions of the chiliasts, the Greek spirit displacing the Jewish in this case as in so many others. But all that lies far beyond our horizon. The conception itself appears only in the latter part of the period with which we are dealing, and can hardly have had a place in the thought of the earliest Christians, whether Jewish or Gentile. But whatever may have been the views of this or that individual or party within the church touching the nature of the future life, it was agreed by all that it would mean supreme and lasting blessedness to all the saved; and thus it was possible to appeal to the peculiar needs and desires of every man. Whether health, or wealth, or pleasure, or power, or knowledge, or purity, or holiness was the supreme aspiration of any one, that aspiration, it was promised, he should find completely satisfied in the future life with God, and in its proclamation of that life therefore is to be found the chief persuasive power of the Gospel, whether it addressed itself to the lower or the higher, to the worst or the best classes of society.

Thus Christianity came to the world at large both as a law and as a promise; or, rather, it would be more correct to say that it came as a promise which had a law wrapped up within itself, — a promise whose fulfilment was conditioned upon the observance of that law. The law was looked upon not as a burden or an infliction, but as a blessing. It constituted an integral part of the Gospel. The revelation of it through Christ meant that the possibility was opened to men of securing eternal felicity. Law and Gospel were thus correlative, not exclusive terms. The Christian law itself was Gospel; the law was a saving law.[1] It was under this aspect that it was commonly contrasted with the law of the Jews, which had no saving power, and with the mere human laws of the heathen. Only the law revealed through Christ opened to men the way of life. Thus even though salva-

[1] Cf., *e.g.*, Jas. i. 18, 21 sq.; Heb. viii. 10, x. 16; Hermas: *Simil.* VI. 1.

tion had been regarded as the mere natural result of the observance of the law, as growing out of it by an inevitable necessity and quite independently of God's appointment, it would still have been in a sense God's gift; for the revelation of the law by him alone made salvation accessible to men. But the fact is that salvation was universally regarded as God's gift in a higher and more direct sense than this. Eternal life was not conceived as the mere natural and necessary result of righteous living, but as a blessing prepared and promised by God himself. Throughout the literature of the period, indeed, this aspect of salvation is emphasized. Everywhere it is recognized as a divine blessing, never as the mere product of human effort and attainment.[1] This, of course, was entirely in line with the original proclamation of the Gospel by Jesus, and with the conception of it which prevailed from the very beginning among his disciples. As Jews, they saw in it only the announcement of the fulfilment of the divine promise made long ago to their fathers; as Gentiles, the revelation of God's love and the gracious offer of his salvation to all men. That the attainment of such salvation was made dependent upon the fulfilment of a certain condition, was not thought to make it any the less God's free gift. For that condition was a necessary, not an arbitrary, one. And it was, moreover, not in any sense a barrier between man and his salvation, but a positive means, and the only possible means, to the attainment of that salvation which, whatever else it was, must be oneness in will and character with God.

But that condition, which is in substance simply the faithful and earnest observance of God's law revealed through Christ, involves certain other conditions, which are often joined with it in the writings of our period, and which are sometimes mentioned alone, and thus seem to acquire an independent value which they do not in fact possess. It involves, for example, repentance, without

[1] Cf., *e.g.*, Heb. i. 14, *et passim*; Jas. i. 18; 2 Pet. i. 3 sq.; I. Clem. 59; Barnabas 3, 16; Hermas: *Vis.* I. 3; *Simil.* VIII. 6, etc.

which no man will or can observe the law of God. If he does not regret his non-observance and his violation of God's commands in the past, he will not strive to observe them in the present; and if he is honest in his endeavor to keep them, he will repent day by day of his repeated failures. And so the importance of repentance is dwelt upon by most of the writers with whom we are dealing, and it may fairly be assumed that it was inculcated wherever emphasis was laid upon the observance of God's law. But back both of the effort to keep the divine law revealed by Christ, and of the repentance which precedes such effort, lies faith, the primary condition of Christian living. Paul was not alone among early Christians in emphasizing faith. Its indispensable character was everywhere recognized. And yet it is a noteworthy fact, that almost nowhere did it mean what it meant to Paul. Indeed, to one who believed that Christianity is a law, and that the Christian life consists in keeping that law, as most of Paul's contemporaries did, faith could not mean what it meant to him. Instead of being the profound spiritual act by which we identify ourselves with Christ in his death and resurrection, faith, as conceived by most of the men with whom we have been dealing, is simply the assured conviction that what God has promised or threatened, he will perform. It is thus in its essence intellectual, and as such the opposite of doubt, or of the double-mindedness of which James speaks.[1] Thus conceived, faith simply furnishes the motive which leads a man to obey the law of God, and thus secure salvation. If he does not believe that the law really is God's law, and if he does not believe that God will reward those who obey and punish those who disobey it, he will neither regret his past disregard of it, nor endeavor to observe it in the future. And so faith is an indispensable condition of salvation, preceding both repentance and righteousness. But the faith which only supplies a motive can conceivably exist without leading to obedience, and James at least actually contemplates such a contingency, when he

[1] Jas. i. 8; cf. also i. 6, ii. 22; Hermas: *Mand.* IX., and II. Clem. 11.

speaks of faith as dead if unaccompanied with works.[1] Thus faith, though necessary, is not the all-sufficient condition of salvation. Without it a man cannot be saved; with it, even though he retains it as long as he lives, he may fall short of salvation. The contrast between this view and Paul's on the one hand, and between it and Jesus' view on the other hand, is very marked. And yet it was this view, and not Christ's or Paul's, which entered into the thought of the church at large.[2] A Christian who had this conception of faith might still emphasize its fundamental saving quality, and might even reproduce Paul's language concerning it, without realizing that there was any disagreement between himself and the great apostle to the Gentiles;[3] for it is possible to think of the righteous life as the mere outgrowth of the motive which lies back of it. Viewed thus, it is not faith and works which constitute the condition of salvation, but faith eventuating or bearing fruit in works, —a formula which is not so far removed from Paul's own. And yet the agreement between this idea, even when thus expressed, and the idea of Paul is only apparent. In reality they are as wide asunder as the poles.

The conception of faith as a motive, leading a man to enter upon and continue in the Christian life, resulted not unnaturally in a farther idea of it that ultimately secured wide acceptance, and obscure hints of which are found even in the period we are dealing with. According to that idea, faith is the acceptance of certain theological propositions, and finally of a regular creed, those propositions, which later went to constitute the creed, being regarded simply as the formulation of the grounds upon which the Christian law and its sanctions were supposed to rest, and without which therefore that law could not

[1] Jas. ii. 14 sq.; cf. also i. 22 sq.; and Hermas: *Simil.* VIII. 9.

[2] Compare, for instance, Heb. iv. 2, vi. 12, 18, the whole of chap. xi., and especially xi. 6. Compare also I. Clem. 12. There can be no doubt that this view was held by all those who shared in the conception of Christianity which has been described.

[3] Cf., *e.g.*, I. Clem. 32.

appeal to men with convincing power.[1] Conceived thus as a formulation of those truths which supply the motive for Christian living, the earliest creeds had a distinctly practical purpose. But faith in such statements of truth having once come to be recognized as a primary condition of salvation, it was inevitable that when the interest underlying them had become chiefly intellectual, and the statements themselves largely speculative, faith in them should still be regarded as of fundamental importance and orthodoxy become the chief criterion of Christian discipleship. But all this lies far beyond our period; only the beginnings of the process are to be detected in some of the writings with which we are dealing.[2]

It has been already said that salvation was universally regarded in the early church as the gift of God; that it was always recognized as a divine blessing, and never as the mere product of human effort and attainment. But the grace of God was manifested not alone in his offer of salvation to men, and in the revelation of his righteous will by whose observance that salvation might be attained, but also in his readiness to assist men in their efforts to keep his law and to forgive them for their breaches of it. Everywhere this twofold action of God is recognized. It is not that the forgiveness and the help render a man's own action unnecessary. Only those that strive earnestly to keep God's law, and truly regret their failures, are assisted in their efforts and granted the divine forgiveness; but all such can surely count on receiving gracious aid and merciful treatment. Thus God not simply makes salvation possible by revealing his will to men; he also does something toward making it actual by forgiving and assisting them.

But the idea was a common one that God does even more than this; that he elects for himself, in fact, a people to be heirs of his promised salvation. This idea

[1] Cf., *e.g.*, 1 Tim. vi. 21, and Jude 3, 20, where "faith" is used in an objective sense for the statement of truth which has been handed down, *fides quæ creditur*.

[2] Cf., *e.g.*, in addition to the passages referred to in the previous note, 1 John iv. and v.

doubtless had its root in the Jews' historic consciousness that they were God's chosen people. Into their heritage it was commonly believed by the early Christians that the disciples of Christ had entered, and it was inevitable, consequently, that they should regard themselves as God's elect, in as true a sense as the Jews had ever done. But the ground of their election could not be found in ancestry or nationality. It must lie somewhere else; and it was natural that, with their all-controlling conception of Christianity as a law, they should find it in their observance of that law. The election of God is spoken of sometimes, to be sure, in such an unqualified way as seemingly to imply that it is thought of as absolutely unconditioned by anything in man. But many passages in the same writings, as indeed the entire conception of the Gospel which underlies them, show clearly enough that the election is not independent of man's conduct, but that it is either a general determination that they shall be saved who live truly Christian lives, or the particular choice of those who it is foreseen will thus live.[1]

God is thus thought of not simply as offering salvation and revealing the way thereto, but also as choosing those who shall enjoy it, or, in other words, as choosing his church.[2] It is for this church, for his elect children, that God does everything that can be done. He forgives their sins, is long-suffering toward them, bestows his grace upon them, sends them his Spirit, guards and guides them, educates, sanctifies, perfects, and establishes them. But all these things he does only for those who prove themselves worthy of such mercies. Thus salvation is indeed of God; man does not and cannot save himself alone; it is God that saves him.[3] And yet with this genuinely Jewish idea of a covenant people, chosen and

[1] Cf. Jas. ii. 5; iv. 8; 2 Pet. i. 10; Barnabas 3; I. Clem. 58; II. Clem. 14; and especially Hermas: *Simil.* VIII. 6.

[2] According to Hermas: (*Vis.* II. 4) the church was created before all things, and even the world was formed for its sake. Cf. also II. Clem. 11, where it is said that the church was created before the sun and moon.

[3] It was in its universal recognition of the divine activity in salvation that the church at large approached nearest to the thought of Paul.

prepared and perfected by God, is combined the idea, at once Jewish and Greek, that a man must work out his own salvation, that the gifts of God are given only to those that deserve them, and that only as a man fulfils the divine will can he enjoy the benefits which God has offered.

A striking evidence of the wide prevalence, both in Pauline and non-Pauline circles, of the type of Christianity which has been described is furnished by the Synoptic Gospels. The authors of all three of them believed in the universality of the Gospel, but none of them, not even Luke, based his belief upon the Pauline principle of the Christian's freedom from all law. That the Gospel was preached to the Gentiles was due simply to the fact that the Jews to whom it was first offered rejected it.[1] They did not regard the observance of the ceremonial law of the Jews as binding upon any one, but, like the church at large, they looked upon the Christian life as the faithful observance of God's commands, or of the commands of Christ, as Matthew phrases it.[2] And so they all emphasize repentance as the fundamental condition of salvation, and in the Book of Acts, which was written by the same author as the third Gospel, repentance is represented as occupying the foremost place even in Paul's preaching.[3]

It is true that the Gospel of Luke and the Book of Acts reveal more of the spirit of Paul than the Gospels of Matthew and Mark and the other works of which mention has been made; that more emphasis is laid in them upon the abounding love and free grace of God, of which Paul makes so much. And it is true that their author was especially interested in the great apostle to the Gentiles, and believed himself to be in complete agreement with him. But for all that he was not in any true sense a Paulinist. He did not understand that there was any difference between the principles of Paul and those of

[1] Compare especially the Book of Acts, which was written by the author of the third Gospel, and in which this is repeatedly emphasized.

[2] Matt. xxviii. 20.

[3] Cf., *e.g.*, Acts xx. 21, xxvi. 20.

the other apostles, and he did not take his part over against them. He emphasizes the prerogatives of the Twelve Apostles even more strongly than the other evangelists, and he gives no hint of a desire to provide a place for Paul, or to rank him alongside of the Twelve. In fact, he always treats him as subordinate to them and as deriving his authority from them. It is possible that he felt the influence of Paul to some extent, as multitudes of Christians felt it who had not themselves known the great apostle; but there is no trace in his writings of Paul's fundamental conception of the work of Christ and of the Christian life, and his emphasis upon the free grace and the forgiving love of God does not in the least interfere with his adoption of those common ideas of Christianity which prevailed so widely in his day, and which have already been described.

2. The Christianity of the Epistle to the Hebrews

One of the most striking examples of the way in which a man could feel the influence of Paul, and make good use of some of his ideas, while remaining in fundamental agreement with the common conception of Christianity which has been sketched, is to be found in the so-called Epistle to the Hebrews, which was written probably in the reign of the Emperor Domitian, a generation after the apostle's death.[1] It has been commonly taken for granted that the epistle was addressed, as its title implies,

[1] Domitian reigned from 81 to 96. The epistle cannot have been written later than his time, for it was known to Clement, who wrote before the close of the century. On the other hand, it was evidently the work of a Christian of the second generation (cf. ii. 3), and the conditions which it presupposes — discouragement, faintheartedness, loss of faith and zeal, due to hope long deferred, and to the pressure of persecution — suggest a late rather than an early period in the history of the church or churches addressed. So the references to earlier days in which the readers had shown their steadfastness under persecution (x. 32 sq.), and the mention of former leaders of the church, who had witnessed a good confession, and had been succeeded by other rulers (xiii. 7, 17, 24), point in the same direction. We have, it is true, comparatively little information about the condition of the Christians during the last three decades of the first century, but we know that the Christians of Rome, to whom the epistle was probably addressed (see p. 468, below), suffered at any rate under Nero and Domitian, and it is natural to think of the persecution under Nero as the earlier time of distress referred to in x. 32 sq., and the persecuting

to Jewish Christians, and many scholars have accordingly thought of the church of Jerusalem or the churches of Palestine as its recipients. But only a Christian who was intimately connected with the Mother Church, and whose authority was very high there, could have addressed the members of that church in the tone employed in this epistle, and certainly we should not expect such a man to write to his Aramaic-speaking brethren in Greek, and elegant Greek at that, and to use uniformly the Septuagint instead of the Hebrew text of the Old Testament, even where the two texts differ widely. Moreover, the reference to the great generosity of those addressed, and to their continued ministrations to the necessities of the saints,[1] does not accord well with what we know of the long-continued poverty of the church of Jerusalem; and that Timothy should be expected to return thither upon his release from imprisonment,[2] is the last thing we should expect.

measures of Domitian as the trials which the Christians were enduring at the time the epistle was written (x. 36 sq., xii. 3 sq.).

Many scholars contend that the author's language in regard to the Jewish ceremonial implies that the temple of Jerusalem was still standing at the time he wrote, and that if it had been already destroyed he would certainly have referred to the fact, and would have used it as an argument against apostasy to Judaism. Had he been writing to Christians who were in danger of falling back into Judaism, it is true that he might have been expected to make use of the great catastrophe as an ocular demonstration of God's final condemnation of the Jewish people, and of his definitive abrogation of the old covenant. But he was not addressing such persons (see below, p. 467), and the destruction of the temple had no bearing whatever upon his argument. He was dealing throughout with Judaism, not in its existing but in its original form, and whether the Jewish rites and ceremonies were still practised, and the Jewish religion still had its adherents, was a matter of no consequence to him. It is noticeable indeed that he never mentions the temple. It is always the tabernacle of which he speaks, thus making it clear enough that the changes which took place in the course of the centuries in the condition of the Jewish people, and in the external features and accessories of their worship, were of no significance to him. He uses in his comparison of the old and the new covenant, not the Judaism of his own time, — a religious system which he and his readers knew from their own observation or experience, — but the Judaism of the Scriptures, and he might have written in just the way he does had he never seen a Jew, and had the rites and ceremonies of Judaism ceased to be practised centuries before his day. It is worthy of notice in this connection, that in Clement's Epistle to the Corinthians (written certainly twenty-five years or more after the destruction of the temple) there is the same disregard of the fact that the temple is already destroyed and the sacrifices no longer offered (cf. chap. 4).

[1] Heb. vi. 10. [2] Heb. xiii. 23.

But not simply is it altogether improbable that the epistle was addressed to the church of Jerusalem or to the churches of Palestine, it is extremely unlikely that it was addressed to Jewish Christians at all. It is true that the title πρὸς Ἑβραίους is found in all our manuscripts. But it does not constitute a part of the text of the epistle, and no weight whatever can be attached to it, any more than to the name of Paul, which is connected with it. The internal indications which are commonly assumed to confirm the correctness of the title signally fail to do so. The apparent identification of the readers with the children of Abraham and with the chosen people of the Old Testament[1] proves nothing; for Abraham is made by Paul the father of all Christians, Gentiles as well as Jews,[2] and what is more to the point in this particular case, Clement of Rome, in his letter to the Corinthians, which was addressed to a Gentile church, and was written shortly after the Epistle to the Hebrews, speaks of "our Father Jacob"[3] and "our Father Abraham,"[4] and when referring to the Old Testament worthies in general, he calls them "our fathers."[5] Nor is anything proved by the extended use which the author makes of the Old Testament, for Clement makes even larger use of it than the Epistle to the Hebrews. The Jewish Scriptures constituted the chief source for a knowledge of God's will and truth, not to Clement alone, but to his readers as well; and he assumes throughout a thorough acquaintance with those Scriptures on the part of those to whom he writes.[6] The truth is that from the very beginning the Gentiles accepted the Old Testament as a Christian book, and it was for a long time the only authoritative Scriptures that they had. They used it in their services, they

[1] Heb. i. 1, ii. 16.
[2] Rom. iv. 1–12.
[3] Clement: *Ad Cor.*, chap. 4.
[4] Chap. 31.
[5] Chap. 62.
[6] Compare chap. 45: "Ye have searched the Scriptures which are true, which were given through the Holy Ghost; and ye know that nothing unrighteous or counterfeit is written in them"; and chap. 53: "Ye know, and know well, the sacred Scriptures, dearly beloved, and ye have searched into the oracles of God." Compare also chap. 62, which contains words to the same effect.

read and studied it diligently, they accepted its statements as the word of God, and they never thought of questioning its authority in any respect. It belonged to the Gentile as truly as to the Jewish wing of the church, and an argument drawn from it had just as much weight with the former as with the latter. It is clear therefore that the extended use of the Old Testament in the Epistle to the Hebrews indicates nothing as to the Jewish or Gentile character of its readers.

The detailed comparison which the author institutes between the old covenant and the new, and the emphasis which he lays upon the superiority of the latter, likewise prove nothing; for the superiority is emphasized not in order to derogate from the dignity of the old, but simply in order to magnify the glory of the new, and there is every evidence that it is done not to convince sceptical minds, but only to quicken and arouse the courage and zeal of believing but weak and fainting souls. A "word of exhortation," the author calls his epistle,[1] not a "word of instruction." And certainly nothing could be better calculated to strengthen the confidence and inspire the enthusiasm of Christians who believed in the divine authority of the Old Testament Scriptures, even though they were not Jews and had no inclination to become Jews, than such considerations as he presents. The Epistle to the Hebrews was at the time it was written, and is still, just as effective a weapon against weakness and discouragement, and loss of Christian faith and zeal in general, as against apostasy to Judaism, which it is commonly assumed it must have been the author's chief aim to prevent. It is to be noticed, indeed, that in the practical exhortations and warnings with which the epistle is filled, and which reveal most clearly the real aim it was written for, nothing whatever is said about apostasy to Judaism. The readers are never warned against falling back into the religion of Moses, although if that is what the writer feared, it would seem that he could hardly have failed, when he contrasted the new

[1] Heb. xiii. 22.

covenant with the old, to call direct attention to the folly of deserting the one for the other. But instead of doing that, he draws lessons of an entirely different kind: "How shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation?"[1] "Take heed lest there shall be in any one of you an evil heart of unbelief."[2] "Let us draw near with boldness that we may receive mercy."[3] "Be not sluggish, but imitators of them who through faith and patience inherit the promises."[4] "Let us hold fast the confession of our hope that it waver not."[5] These are fair samples of the exhortations scattered through the epistle.[6] And when the author warns his readers against the worst of all sins, —the wilful denial and repudiation of Christ, after once accepting him,[7]—there is no sign that he thinks of such apostasy as due to the influence of Judaism, or as connected with it in any way.[8]

But not simply is there no sign that the author was addressing Jewish Christians, who he feared would apostatize to their old faith: there are some passages, on the other hand, which make it evident that he was addressing Gentiles, and Gentiles who had apparently come to Christianity not through Judaism, but directly from heathenism. Thus he says significantly: "How much more shall the blood of Christ cleanse your conscience from dead works to serve the living God?"[9] and again: "Wherefore let us cease to speak of the first principles of Christ and press on unto perfection; not laying again a foundation of repentance from dead works, and of faith toward God, of the teaching of baptisms and of laying on of hands, and of resurrection of the dead, and of eternal judg-

[1] Heb. ii. 3. [2] Heb. iii. 12. [3] Heb. iv. 16. [4] Heb. vi. 12. [5] Heb. x. 23.

[6] It is to be noticed also that Clement, who was certainly addressing Gentile Christians, draws the same lesson of the greater responsibility of Christians, as compared with Jews, due to their greater knowledge (chap. 41).

[7] Heb. x. 26 sq.

[8] Heb. xii. 16 is instructive in this connection. Esau sold his birthright not because he did not believe it had value, but because of the weakness of the flesh. He gave away a future blessing for a present good. This is a fault not of sceptics and unbelievers, but of weak people who need inspiration and encouragement.

[9] Heb. ix. 14.

ment."[1] These passages do not necessarily show that the epistle was addressed exclusively to Gentile Christians, but they do prove that there were Gentile Christians among those addressed, and that they were chiefly in the mind of the writer.[2] In fact, all the indications point to a church or group of churches whose membership was largely Gentile, where the Jews, so far as there were any, had become amalgamated with their Gentile brethren, so that all race distinctions were lost sight of, and the disciples were thought of not as Jews or Gentiles, but as Christians.[3] Such were most of the churches of Paul's missionary field, most of the churches, indeed, of the world at large at an early day. The congregation or group of congregations addressed by the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews might be looked for, therefore, almost anywhere in the Roman Empire outside of Palestine. But there are some hints that point in the direction of Rome, and at least suggest that the letter may have been sent to the Christians of that church. It was first used by Clement in his Epistle to the Corinthians, which was written from Rome certainly not very long afterward. There is little doubt that it was well known also to Hermas, who wrote in Rome a generation later. Elsewhere we find traces of it only in the latter part of the second century. The somewhat peculiar phrase, "Those from Italy," by which the author apparently designates certain disciples in his own company,[4] seems

[1] Heb. vi. 1, 2. Nearly all the "principles" enumerated in this passage were common to Jews and Christians, and a Christian, therefore, in writing to Jewish disciples could not refer to them in such a way. Only a heathen would need to lay such a foundation in accepting Christ.

[2] Notice also the prohibition of fornication and adultery in xiii. 4.

[3] That the Epistle to the Hebrews was addressed to Jewish Christians, has been the universal opinion of scholars until comparatively recent years. For a defence of this opinion see, especially, Westcott: *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, p. 35 sq.; and Ménégoz: *La Théologie de l'Épitre aux Hébreux*, p. 18 sq. On the other hand, that it was addressed to Gentile Christians, or to Christians in general without regard to race, is maintained by Pfleiderer: *Das Urchristenthum*, S. 624 sq.; Von Soden: *Hand-Kommentar*, III. 2, S. 10 sq.; and Jülicher: *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, S. 108 sq. Cf. also Weizsäcker: *Das apostolische Zeitalter*, S. 473 sq. (Eng. Trans., Vol. II. p. 157 sq.).

[4] Heb. xiii. 24.

also to point to Rome or to Italy as the home of the Christians addressed, and the reference to the generosity of the latter agrees exactly with what we know of the church of Rome from many other sources.[1]

At the time the Epistle to the Hebrews was written, the Christians addressed were suffering persecution,[2] and the pressure was so great that some of them were growing discouraged, and the danger was imminent that they might even forsake Christ and deny their faith altogether. The epistle was written therefore with an eminently practical aim. It was the writer's chief concern to arouse his readers to their old-time faith and zeal, to impart renewed courage, and to warn them against the danger of backsliding and apostasy. With this end in view, he undertook to exhibit the superlative glory of Christ's person and work, in order, on the one hand, to kindle their pride in and enthusiasm for their Christian faith, and to convince them that the greatest sacrifices and the worst sufferings ought to be looked upon as a small price to pay for the supreme blessings which Christ had secured for his followers; and, on the other hand, to impress them with the awful consequences of denying such a Christ and repudiating such a salvation. All that he has to say about Christ and his work is said not with a doctrinal but with a practical purpose, and that purpose leads him to use every opportunity offered by the course of his argument to exhort his readers to greater fidelity, or to warn them against faithlessness and disobedience. The epistle thus bears a practical character throughout and is as far as possible from a systematic theological treatise. As a consequence, it will not do to declare the author's conception of Christianity different from Paul's, simply because he follows another line of thought from that found in the epistles of the latter, and emphasizes matters which are left subordinate in them. The line of thought which he pursues, and the emphasis which he puts upon certain

[1] Compare, for instance, the words of Dionysius of Corinth quoted by Eusebius: *H. E.* IV. 23. The responsibility felt by that church for the welfare of other parts of Christendom is revealed already in Clement's Epistle.

[2] Heb. x. 36 sq., xii. 3 sq.

subjects, might be fully explained by his practical purpose. But it is true, nevertheless, that the difference between his conceptions and those of Paul is clearly revealed in many ways, and the practical character of the epistle does not serve in the least to obscure the wide chasm that separates them; for it is just in their treatment of the practical questions of the Christian life that their ideas concerning the origin, basis, and nature of that life, and the redeeming work of Christ, voice themselves most unequivocally.

With the practical purpose already referred to, of arousing his readers to their old-time faith and zeal and of imparting renewed courage and inspiration, the author gives concise expression in the opening words of his epistle to the supreme greatness of Christ, as the Son of God, and as God's agent in creation, revelation, and redemption; and then goes on to compare him with the angels and with Moses, God's chief agents in the earlier revelations of his will and truth, pointing out how far superior Christ is to them in all respects; for they are but servants, while he is a son.[1] His elevation above the angels is not nullified by the fact that for a little while he was made lower than they, and partook of human flesh and blood and underwent suffering and death; for this was only temporary, and it was all done with a purpose, — the purpose of saving men by becoming one with them and passing through all their experiences with them.[2] But Christ's superiority to the angels involves a like superiority of the revelation mediated by him, and the writer is thus led to warn his readers in passing against the peculiar enormity of neglecting the salvation offered by Christ;[3] and in the same way his demonstration of Christ's superiority to Moses[4] is followed immediately by a practical exhortation to faith and obedience, based upon the unbelieving and disobedient conduct of those whom Moses led through the wilderness.[5] Thus a large part of the first section of the epistle is filled with direct practical appeals to the readers.

[1] Heb. i. 4–ii. 5. [2] Heb. ii. 6–18. [3] Heb. ii. 1–4.
[4] Heb. iii. 1 sq. [5] Heb. iii. 7–iv. 13.

After exhibiting Christ's superiority to other agents of divine revelation, and drawing some of the practical lessons therefrom, the writer turns to a subject which is evidently a favorite one with him, and to which he devotes more than a third of his work,— the priestly office of Christ.[1] But though he dwells upon this subject at so great length, it is a mistake to call it the theme of his epistle. As already remarked, the epistle is not doctrinal but practical, and its theme is to be found not in any of its theological passages, but in its repeated exhortations and warnings, to which everything else is subservient, and which look to the one end of confirming the faith and zeal of its readers. And so the long passage upon the priesthood of Christ is intended primarily not to convey instruction, but to quicken faith and inspire courage. In the very beginning of it, the fact that Christ is our high priest is made a reason for fidelity and a ground of assured confidence.[2] Though our high priest is from heaven, yet he is one of us, and has that human sympathy which is essential to the true discharge of the priestly office.[3]

After showing that Christ possesses also another fundamental quality of the true priest, in that he was appointed by God and did not take the office upon himself,[4] the writer proceeds to compare him with Aaron and his successors, the God-appointed priestly line of the old dispensation, and to exhibit in the most elaborate way his infinite superiority to them. He introduces the subject with a passage of mingled reproof and exhortation;[5] then, taking his departure from the words of Psalm cx.: "Thou art a priest forever after the order of Melchizedek,"[6] he shows how Christ, as the antitype of Melchizedek, a greater than Abraham and Levi,[7] is a priest of a new and higher order than the line of Aaron. They were made priests after the law of a carnal commandment, he after the power of an endless life; they were mortal and succeeded one another in rapid succession, he is immortal

[1] Heb. iv. 14–x. 18. [3] Heb. v. 1 sq. [5] Heb. v. 11–vi. 20. [7] Heb. vii. 1–10.
[2] Heb. iv. 14–16. [4] Heb. v. 4 sq. [6] Heb. vi. 20.

and abideth a priest forever; they were earthly, he is higher than the heavens; they were sinners, he is holy; they were men of infirmity, he is a son perfected forever more. But not simply in his person, in his work as well, Christ is exalted infinitely above the high priests of Aaron's line. He has obtained a more excellent ministry than they, for they are the ministers of an old covenant which passes away, he of a new covenant which endures forever; they minister in an earthly tabernacle, he in a heavenly; they with carnal ordinances, he with spiritual; they offer the blood of bulls and goats, which can at most cleanse only the flesh, he offers his own blood, which is efficacious for the cleansing of the conscience from dead works unto the service of the living God; their imperfect sacrifices they must repeat continually, and yet they can never take away sins, while he by the offering of himself once for all has "obtained eternal redemption," has "put away sin," and "perfected forever them that are sanctified."[1] Having thus exhibited the superiority and the infinite perfection of the priestly character and work of Christ, the author proceeds at once[2] to draw practical lessons from what has been said, exhorting his readers to renewed boldness and faith and steadfastness, and warning them against the awful consequences of sinning wilfully after they have once come to the knowledge of the truth, for there remains no second sacrifice for sins;[3] the sacrifice of Christ is the final one, as he has shown.

Appealing then to the boldness and steadfastness which had been manifested by his readers in the face of a persecution they had been called upon to endure at an earlier time, he reminds them that they have need under the present circumstances of the same patience, and he encourages them with the prospect of the speedy return of Christ, when they shall receive their reward if they continue in their faith;[4] for the faith without which they cannot be saved is a faith that takes hold upon the future and upon the unseen, the assurance that God will yet reward those that serve him. This is the faith which has

[1] Heb. vii. 11-x. 18. [2] Heb. x. 19 sq. [3] Heb. x. 26-31. [4] Heb. x. 32-39.

actuated all the holy and heroic men of God in days that are past, as the author shows by a long list of Hebrew worthies, whose experiences he recounts in eloquent language, and the inspiration of whose example, reinforced by the example of Christ, he employs to nerve the fainting hearts of his readers.[1] He finds still another reason for continued faithfulness on their part in the fact that their suffering is for their own good; that it is the chastening of God, who deals with them as a loving father deals with his children, that there may be worked out in them the peaceable fruit of righteousness.[2] After reminding them once more of the contrast between the old and the new covenant, and of the fact that their responsibility is larger than that of the fathers, and the penalty for unbelief and disobedience proportionately greater,[3] he exhorts them to the practice of various virtues, and warns them against sundry vices, and finally concludes in the customary way with salutations and a benediction.[4]

The brief outline which has been given shows how far the epistle is from being a systematic theological treatise. Theology there is in it, indeed, much of it of a very profound character; but all of it is made subservient to a practical end, and more than that, the form and disposition of the letter, as well as the matter of it, are largely controlled by that end. It is, as the writer himself calls it, both in form and in content a λόγος παρακλήσεως.[5]

But the outline which has been given shows also clearly enough the marked contrast between the author's conceptions and those of Paul. The fundamental difference is in their conception of the Christian life. By the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, as by James and most of the other writers whom we have been considering, the Christian life is regarded as the faithful and continued observance of God's will, by which a man finally secures salvation. Salvation is thus wholly a future blessing, and faith, upon which the author lays great emphasis, is nothing more than a motive which leads a man to become a

[1] Heb. xi. 1–xii. 3. [2] Heb. xii. 5–13. [3] Heb. xii. 18–29.
[4] Heb. xiii. [5] Heb. xiii. 22.

disciple of Christ and to endure unto the end.[1] Of Paul's controlling idea of the Christian life as the divine life in man, — a life of complete freedom from the flesh and the law, brought about by his mystical oneness with Christ in the latter's death and resurrection, — no use is made, although that idea was peculiarly adapted to add force to the author's practical appeal.[2]

But though the Christian life is thus a life of obedience by which a man gains salvation, the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews lays great stress upon the covenant relation that exists between the Christian and his God. The idea of the Gospel as a new covenant is, in fact, very prominent and largely determines the direction of his thinking. That the Christians were heirs of God's covenant with the children of Israel was generally believed by the early disciples, as has been already seen. But the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews was the first one, so far as we know, distinctly to formulate and elaborate the conception of a new covenant, and he did it possibly under the influence of Paul.[3] And yet his interpretation is not Paul's. It is, in fact, identical with the common view of those writers whom we have been considering. The new covenant, according to the Epistle to the Hebrews, is a covenant at once of law and of grace. It includes the promise of the clear revelation of the divine law, by whose observance a man may gain life, and also the

[1] It is in accordance with this idea that conversion to Christianity is represented as "enlightenment" in x. 32, and as a reception of the "knowledge of the truth" in x. 26.

[2] It is true that the author speaks of his readers as "partakers of Christ" in iii. 14, as "partakers of the Holy Spirit" in vi. 4, and as "partakers of God's holiness" in xii. 10; but both in iii. 14 and in xii. 10 he is thinking not of the present, but of the ultimate end to which the Christian that endures may look forward. And in view of his general conception of the Christian life, which is too clear to be mistaken, it is evident that the participation in the Spirit, which Christians already enjoy, is understood not in the Pauline sense, but in the sense of the church at large, which believed that the gift of the Spirit was bestowed upon every disciple for his strengthening and enlightenment (cf. x. 29). And so the statement in ii. 11 is to be understood to mean only that salvation is a gift of God, and not the mere natural product of man's labors. With this the entire church was in agreement.

[3] Cf. 1 Cor. xi. 25; 2 Cor. iii. 6, 14. Christ's reference to the covenant at the time of the Last Supper undoubtedly influenced both Paul and the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

promise of forgiveness and assistance.[1] It does not differ in principle, therefore, from the old covenant. That involved the observance of the divine law, and sacrificial institutions were provided with a view to the forgiveness of transgressions. Thus though the author agrees with Paul that the old covenant has been abrogated in favor of the new, he represents its abrogation as due not to the fact that it is radically different from the latter, but that it is imperfect and only a shadow of that which is perfectly realized in the new covenant. Under the old dispensation men were saved, just as under the new, by faithful and continued obedience and by patient endurance unto the end.[2]

The controlling place which the conception of a new covenant had in the author's mind explains his emphasis upon the work of Christ, in which he goes beyond all his predecessors and contemporaries except Paul. As the old covenant had been sealed with a sacrifice, the new covenant must be also,[3] and so a real significance is given to the death of Christ, — a significance to which Jesus himself had referred, but which seems not to have been generally recognized by his early followers. But the death of Christ, in order to seal the new covenant, was not the whole of his work; it was, in fact, but a minor part of it. It was in the carrying out of the covenant that he was chiefly concerned. It was through him that it was revealed to men, and thus the conditions of enjoying its blessings made known.[4] It was by him, moreover, that an example of obedience was set, which served both to instruct them and to inspire them to the fulfilment of those conditions,[5] and that a victory was gained over Satan which was calculated to free them from that fear of death which had always kept them in bondage to the

[1] Cf., *e.g.*, Heb. viii. 8 sq., x. 16 sq.; also i. 14, iv. 16, xiii. 21, etc.

[2] The author had evidently reflected deeply upon the relation of Judaism and Christianity, and it is interesting to notice how his conception of Christianity as a law led him to a conclusion so widely different from that of Paul.

[3] Heb. x. 29, xiii. 20.

[4] Heb. i. 2, ii. 3, viii. 6, etc.

[5] Especial stress is laid throughout the epistle upon the example of Christ. Such emphasis was quite natural in view of the practical end which the author had in mind.

devil.[1] But it was through him above all that the forgiveness and assistance needed by men and promised by God were actually secured, and thus the covenant completely fulfilled. It was by the continued exercise of his high-priestly office in heaven that Christ accomplished this part of his work, and it is accordingly upon that office that the author lays chief emphasis. Everything else that Christ has done is subordinated to this his supreme and permanent function.[2] In the exercise of his high-priestly office, he offered himself upon the heavenly altar as a sacrifice for sin, perfect and of lasting efficacy;[3] and he now devotes himself to the sanctification of those that are truly his, standing surety for their ultimate perfection, and at the same time, conscious of their need, interceding in their behalf, and securing from God continued forgiveness and the bestowal of grace to assist them in their efforts.[4] It is noteworthy that our author does not represent the priestly work of Christ as consisting merely in the offering of the sacrifice, but as including also the sanctification of his followers, and continued intercession with God for forgiveness and grace. It is all the more noteworthy because the priestly office as exercised among the Jews offered no parallel to this service, and the idea therefore was not simply a result of the comparison between Christ and the Jewish high priest. It should be observed, moreover, that it is upon this continued action of Christ that the author lays chief stress. What the Saviour is now doing for his followers in heaven is his supreme work. To him they owe not simply the forgiveness of their sins, but purification from them, which alone makes salvation possible.[5] To

[1] Heb. ii. 14 sq.

[2] Cf. Heb. viii. 1 sq.

[3] Heb. vii. 27, ix. 12 sq., 26, x. 10 sq., 18. Christ offered his sacrifice, not upon the cross, but at the heavenly altar. He did not begin the exercise of his priestly work upon the cross, — there he was only the victim, — but when he entered heaven and presented his sacrifice to God. See Briggs: *Messiah of the Apostles*, p. 263 sq.

[4] Heb. ii. 11, 14 sq., 18, iv. 16, vi. 17 sq., vii. 25, ix. 14, x. 12 sq., 21, xii. 2, 10, 15, xiii. 20 sq.

[5] Heb. xii. 14. The blood of Christ is thus represented as fulfilling a double purpose. It acts not simply as sacrificial but also as cleansing blood (cf. ix. 13 sq., x. 22, 29).

him they owe also the assistance which is rendered them by the Spirit of grace;[1] and to him they owe final perfection.[2]

It was this controlling interest in the work which the Lord is doing for his followers in heaven, that led the author to emphasize his life on earth and his genuinely human experiences, which were such as to enable him to understand man's needs and the difficulties that lie in the way of the perfect fulfilment of God's law. Jesus was thus fitted, as he could not otherwise have been, to be our high priest, to offer a sacrifice for us, and to intercede with God on our behalf.

It was thus the humanity, and not the divinity or pre-existence of Christ, which chiefly concerned our author. His references to the pre-existence and to the divine character of the Son, in the beginning of his epistle, were due solely to his desire to emphasize the superlative worth and dignity of the new covenant of which Christ was the mediator. The Messiah's pre-existence had nothing to do with his work as Redeemer, as our author conceived that work, and his belief in it therefore had a very different root from Paul's. The idea resembles that which finds expression in Philippians and Colossians, and it is possible that he learned it from Paul. But the truth is that the same idea was widely current in the Hellenistic Judaism of the day, especially in Philonic circles, and it would be surprising if a writer who owed so much to Philo had failed to make use of his conception of the Logos, especially when it was so admirably adapted to explain the relation of the old and the new covenant, and to show the superiority of the latter

[1] Heb. vi. 4, x. 29.

[2] Heb. x. 14, xii. 2. The exercise of his high-priestly office by Christ does not mean, as our author conceives it, that God was not inclined to fulfil the promises which he had himself made under the new covenant, and needed to be induced by Christ to do so. For Christ did not take the priestly office upon himself, but was appointed thereto by God (v. 4 sq.); and all the work that he did constituted a part of God's own arrangement for the fulfilment of his covenant. It was due to God's grace that Christ died (ii. 9), and it was by God that he was perfected (ii. 10), and thus enabled to accomplish the work entrusted to him. God himself is thought of throughout as the ultimate author of salvation, just as he is by all the writers of the period.

to the former. And indeed the fact should not be overlooked that the "Son of God" in the Epistle to the Hebrews occupies the same position as the Logos in Philo,[1] and almost identical language is frequently used in speaking of him. Thus he is the "first-born";[2] he is above the angels; he is the "image of God,"[3] and his representative; he is the agent in creation, and he sustains the world; he is the great high priest who is without sin and intercedes for sinners; he is the mediator between God and man. Philo, moreover, sees in Melchizedek a type of the Logos, just as the author of our epistle makes him a type of the "Son of God," and the two interpret the name "Melchizedek" in the same way and almost in the same words.[4] In the light of such resemblances as these, and of the unmistakable Philonism of the epistle in many other respects,[5] there can be little doubt that it was not solely to the influence of Paul but

[1] Philo calls the Logos also the "Son of God" and the omission of the former designation by the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews is no argument against his dependence on Philo; for he may well have preferred to use the phrase "Son of God," which had been applied to Christ from the beginning, and which expressed the idea with equal clearness, rather than the philosophical term "Logos."

[2] *ὁ πρωτότοκος*. Philo calls the Logos the *πρωτόγονος υἱός*.

[3] The same terms, *ἀπαύγασμα* and *χαρακτήρ*, are found in both Philo and Hebrews.

[4] *Βασιλεὺς εἰρήνης*; *Σαλήμ*.

[5] In addition to the resemblances referred to in the text, we find in Philo the statement that appears in Hebrews, that the sacrifices are of value not because they take away sins, which they do not, but because they furnish a reminder of them (Heb. x. 3). We find also in Hebrews and in Philo the same cosmological conceptions and the same idea of the visible material world as the shadow and symbol of the invisible spiritual world; so, also, the same notion that created things are perishable, and that only divine things are eternal. Biblical characters are described in a similar way, and some of them in almost identical words. The author of Hebrews employs also the genuine Philonic mode of Scripture exegesis. It is not merely that he uses the allegorical method, for that method was current in the Rabbinic schools of Palestine, but that he uses it as Philo does. It is not that he treats words and letters and numbers as mysterious symbols, which may be juggled with in every conceivable way, but that he employs an historic character or institution or event as the symbol of profound spiritual realities from which may be drawn lessons of the deepest spiritual significance. So the author's allegorical treatment of Melchizedek is genuinely Philonic in all respects. Upon the Philonism of the Epistle to the Hebrews, see, especially, Siegfried: *Philo von Alexandrien*, S. 321 sq., where the references to Philo's works are given with great fulness; also, Pfleiderer: *Das Urchristenthum*, S. 629 sq.; and Ménégoz: *La Theologie de l'Épitre aux Hebreux*, p. 197 sq.

also in part at least to the influence of Philo that our author owed, directly or indirectly, the conception of Christ's pre-existence which he turned to such practical account. At any rate, the conception was not due to the same interest as Paul's, and hence, though it is similar in Hebrews and in Paul's later epistles, it is a mark rather of the difference than of the oneness between them.

And yet though the contrast between Paul and the author of Hebrews is very marked, as appears clearly enough from what has been already said, there can be no doubt that the latter felt the influence of the great apostle's teaching, at least at some points. The most decisive indication of Pauline influence is to be found in his connection of the remission of sins and purification from them with the death of Christ. It is true that his idea of the way in which Christ's death accomplishes such remission and purification is different from Paul's, but there can be little doubt that the idea itself was due to Paul's suggestion. Of the connection referred to, we have almost no trace in the thinking of those who preceded Paul. There is no indication, indeed, that they reflected at all seriously upon the significance of Christ's death. It was Paul who first gave his death a prominent place and used it as a constructive principle in the formulation of Christian truth. It is a fact of no little historic significance that the author of such an epistle as we have been dealing with followed Paul in this respect, while at the same time he interpreted the event in a very different way.

The Epistle to the Hebrews is also noteworthy, because it represents an attempt to give to all Christ's activities a real value. In this respect, too, the author resembled Paul more nearly than any one else. But again he departed from him in laying the emphasis upon other points, and in interpreting Christ's entire career in another way. Thus he found a value in the earthly life and experiences of Christ which Paul did not, and he pictured his present activity in a form quite unfamiliar to the latter, while of his resurrection, which to Paul was

the cardinal fact in the whole process of redemption, he has nothing particular to say.[1]

It may be said in general, then, that the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews represents a development of the common conception of Christianity which prevailed among the primitive Christians of the world at large, — a development determined in part by the influence of Paul, which he felt more than most of his predecessors and contemporaries; in part by the influence of Philo, with whose teaching he had been familiar before his conversion. It is possible that the author was one of Paul's own converts, but his controlling conception of Christianity is so different from Paul's, that it is much more probable that he felt the latter's influence only after that conception was already formed, and that he was never intimately associated with him. Who he was, we do not know; but his Philonism suggests that he may have been an Alexandrian Jew, possibly even a disciple of Philo.[2] At

[1] The resurrection of Christ is mentioned only once (xiii. 20), and then is not connected with the work of redemption. Of course it is constantly presupposed by the author, for it is involved in Christ's continued activity in heaven, of which he makes so much. But the lack of explicit reference to it reveals the contrast between his view and Paul's.

[2] The old tradition that the Epistle to the Hebrews was written by Paul was long ago abandoned by scholars. The epistle does not claim to have been written by him, and only a widespread and utter lack of appreciation of the characteristic features of Paul's thought and style could have made possible its ascription to him. The idea that it was his work appears first in Alexandria, in the latter part of the second century, and seems to have no tradition back of it. Even then Clement, who defends its Pauline origin, recognizing the disparity in style between it and other epistles of Paul, is forced to assume a Hebrew original, translated into Greek by Luke. In the Western Church the epistle was not connected with the name of Paul until the fourth century, but from the fifth century on it was accepted universally both in East and West as a genuine work of Paul's, and its authorship was not again questioned until the Reformation. See my edition of Eusebius, Bk. III. chap. 3, note 17.

The only really ancient tradition that we have links the epistle with the name of Barnabas (Tertullian: *De Pudicitia*, 20). It is possible that Barnabas was its author, but not at all probable. He was a member of the church of Jerusalem in its earliest days, and he could hardly have reckoned himself as belonging to the second generation of Christians, as our author does in ii. 3. He was, moreover, a Levite, according to Acts iv. 36, and he would not be likely to represent the high priest as offering sacrifices daily for his own sins and the sins of the people, as our author does, in agreement with Philo. It is also improbable, though of course not impossible, that Barnabas had had the Alexandrian education which the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews had evidently

any rate, in reading his epistle we are in a genuinely Philonic atmosphere. Only a man who had been thoroughly trained in Philonic modes of thought, who had studied the Old Testament in the light of Philo's treatment of it, and who was so thoroughly under the influence of his thinking that he instinctively interpreted even the Gospel itself in the light of it, could have written the epistle. The author's relation to Philo is significant from a literary as well as from a theological point of view. He is the first Christian known to us to make distinct and extended use of that master's peculiar theological conceptions and exegetical methods, but he was by no means the last. In fact, he was the progenitor of a long line of Christian theologians, through whom the thinking of the great Jewish philosopher influenced the thinking of the church at large for many centuries.

Though religiously and in vigor and force of personality the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews was inferior to the great apostle to the Gentiles, he was without doubt the finest and most cultured literary genius of the primitive church. His thought moves throughout on an elevated plane, and his language is uniformly worthy of his thought, in certain passages becoming genuinely eloquent and even sublime. The fact that a writer of such rare power and grace should have left us only a single monument of his genius, and that a mere letter, written for a definite practical purpose, and that his name should have been entirely forgotten within less than a century after his death, serves to remind us in a very forcible way of the limitations of our knowledge respecting the early days of Christianity. It would seem as if

enjoyed. In my edition of Eusebius I defended the view that Barnabas wrote the epistle, but I have been led to modify the opinion there expressed.

The name of Apollos was suggested by Luther and has been adopted by many modern scholars. What we know of the character and training of Apollos agrees with what we can gather from the Epistle to the Hebrews concerning the character and training of its author. But there may have been many other Christians who had enjoyed the same kind of training and who were as eloquent and as mighty in the Scriptures as Apollos, and since no tradition connects the epistle with his name, and there are no personal references which can furnish a clue to the identity of the author, we shall do well to content ourselves with a *non liquet*.

in a society so small in numbers, and for the most part so uncultured as the early church, such a man must have made a reputation for himself that could never be forgotten, and that his writings (for the Epistle to the Hebrews can hardly have been the only thing he ever wrote) must have been diligently collected and carefully preserved. But in point of fact absolutely nothing was known about him two generations after his death. It is evident that there may have been other geniuses in the primitive church of whom we know nothing, and that there may have been many things written which have left no trace. The apostles were not the only thinkers and writers in those early days, and with the exception of Paul probably not the greatest, but they have crowded all their fellow-Christians into obscurity. In that age names meant nothing; literature meant still less. The Spirit of God speaking in and through believers was everything. Had it not been for the crisis through which the church passed in the second century, subsequent generations would have retained no knowledge either of the men or the writings of its primitive days. As it was, they retained for the most part only what was supposed to be apostolic, and only because it was. And all those who could not lay claim to the dignity of apostles passed into oblivion, and the few brief and scattered products of their pens which have survived the ravages of time owe their preservation to the fact that they were fortunate enough to lose their identity and to get themselves attached in one way or another to some apostolic name.

3. The Christianity of the First Epistle of Peter

Much more closely akin to Paul than the writer whom we have been considering was the author of the work known as the First Epistle of Peter.[1] That work was called forth by the trials which were befalling the Christians of the five provinces named in the salutation, — Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia, —

[1] Upon the authorship of the epistle, see below, p. 593 sq.

comprising the whole of Asia Minor north of Mount Taurus. It seems that they were suffering persecution,[1] and it was because of it that the author wrote them a letter of exhortation.[2] His purpose was a double one: on the one hand, to encourage and inspire them in the face of the severe trials they were called upon to undergo; and on the other hand, to urge them to conduct themselves in such a way as to give their enemies no ground for their hostility.

After the customary salutation, the author begins, much after the style of Paul, with an expression of his gratitude to God that his readers have been born again unto a living hope, and unto a salvation which is surely to be enjoyed by them, even though for a little while their faith is tried by suffering.[3] This introductory passage, in which the occasion that called forth the epistle is clearly indicated,[4] is followed by an exhortation to those addressed to live worthily of the promised salvation, in holiness, in brotherly love, in sincerity, and in vital union with Christ; for they are God's elect people, chosen to show forth in their own lives the virtues of him who called them out of darkness into the light.[5] After this general exhortation, the writer turns his attention to the particular circumstances in which his readers are placed and points out the especial importance of the conduct which he has been urging upon them, in order that their heathen enemies may have no just ground for attacking them, but may, on the contrary, be led by their good works to glorify God.[6] With this end in view he takes up the matter of conduct in detail, urging his readers to be loyal citizens,[7] and those that are servants to be in subjection to their masters, even though they are treated cruelly and unjustly by them; for Christ left them an example that they should bear patiently even undeserved evils.[8] He then exhorts wives to be obedient to their husbands, husbands to

[1] 1 Pet., i. 6, iii. 14 sq., iv. 1, 12 sq., 16, v. 8 sq.
[2] 1 Pet. v. 12.
[3] 1 Pet. i. 3-12.
[4] 1 Pet. i. 6.
[5] 1 Pet. i. 13-ii. 10.
[6] 1 Pet. ii. 11 sq.
[7] 1 Pet. ii. 13-17.
[8] 1 Pet. ii. 18-25.

honor their wives, and all to be kind, tender-hearted, and humble-minded.[1] If they live thus, no one will harm them, and those who revile them will be put to shame. But even if they still have to bear the attacks of their enemies, let them realize that it is better to be attacked for well-doing than for evil-doing, for even Christ suffered, though he was righteous, and his passion redounded both to his own good and to the good of others; for, having been put to death in the flesh, he was raised and glorified in the spirit. By his death, moreover, he saved not simply his own followers, but also men of earlier generations who had been disobedient to God; for he preached the Gospel to the dead as well as to the living.[2] Inasmuch, then, as Christ thus suffered in the flesh, it behooves those to whom the epistle is addressed to arm themselves with the same conviction that he had, — the conviction that he that has suffered in the flesh has been freed from sin, — in order that they may devote the remainder of their lives not to the desires of the flesh, but to the will of God.[3] The need of such living is especially urgent now, for the end of all things is at hand. They ought therefore to be sober and prayerful, and above all to love one another, overlooking each other's faults, freely dispensing hospitality, ministering according to the gift of God imparted to each, that in all things God may be glorified.[4] The author then turns once more to the persecution, and begs his readers to rejoice in it; for if they are partakers of Christ's sufferings, they will have reason to rejoice when the time comes for the revelation of his glory; if they suffer, that is, not for evil deeds, but for the name of Christ.[5] In a closing passage he urges the older men to discharge their duties faithfully, the younger to be subject to the older, and all to be humble, sober, watchful, and steadfast in the face of persecution, knowing that the same trials beset their brethren everywhere, and that after they have suffered a little while they will be perfected by God, who called them

[1] 1 Pet. iii. 1–12. [2] 1 Pet. iii. 13–22. [3] 1 Pet. iv. 1–6.
[4] 1 Pet. iv. 7–11. [5] 1 Pet. iv. 12–18.

unto his eternal glory in Christ.[1] After a reference to Silvanus, the writer's amanuensis, and a final exhortation to steadfastness, the letter closes in the customary way with greetings and a benediction.

It is clear enough, in the light of this outline, that the author's purpose in writing was exclusively practical. There is no sign that he had any theological aim, or that he was concerned to impart instruction of any kind to his readers except in so far as it was needed for their encouragement and inspiration in the face of persecution. What he says about election, about Christ's sufferings, about his preaching to the dead, about man's redemption, about the impending judgment and the approaching revelation of Christ's glory, all has direct and immediate application to the conduct of those to whom he writes, and is referred to with no other aim. It is therefore a great mistake to see in 1 Peter, as some have done, a presentation of the theology of Peter, either in opposition to or in confirmation of the theology of Paul, or an effort on the part of a post-apostolic writer to reconcile the Petrine and Pauline types of thought, or to give expression to that form of theology which had developed after their death upon the basis of the teaching of either or of both.

And yet in spite of the distinctly practical character of the epistle there can be no mistaking the fact that the author was a Paulinist, that his Gospel was the Gospel of Paul, and that his mind was saturated with Paul's ideas. There is no other early Christian document, by another hand than Paul's, whose Paulinism can begin to compare with that of 1 Peter. The author, whoever he was, understood the great apostle to the Gentiles far better than any one else known to us. In support of this assertion, attention may be called to such passages as the following: "Having been begotten again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible."[2] "He that hath suffered in the flesh hath ceased from sin."[3] "As free, and not using your freedom for a cloak of wickedness,

[1] 1 Pet. v. 1–11. [2] 1 Pet. i. 23. [3] 1 Pet. iv. 1.

but as bondservants of God."[1] "Because Christ also suffered for sins once, the righteous for the unrighteous, that he might bring us to God; being put to death in the flesh, but quickened in the spirit."[2] "For unto this end was the Gospel preached even to the dead, that they might be judged according to men in the flesh, but live according to God in the spirit."[3] And most striking of all: "Who his own self carried our sins in his body up to the tree, that we, having died unto sins, might live unto righteousness."[4] It is true that there is no discussion in the epistle of the Christian's relation to the law,[5] that there is nothing said about justification by faith instead of works, and that the polemic utterances of Galatians, Corinthians, Romans, and Philippians are wanting. But the essence of the Pauline Gospel is there, and the omissions referred to do not indicate a failure on the author's part to comprehend Paul, or a lack of sympathy with his teachings, but simply show that he was writing under different conditions and with a different purpose.

And yet it is evident that though at bottom a genuine Paulinist in his conception of Christianity, he had felt to some extent the influence of the common views, which have been already described and which prevailed so widely in his day. Thus there is an apparent tendency to give to the ethical side of the Christian life an independent value which it lacks in Paul, who always lays chief stress upon its religious basis. There is a tendency also to emphasize the future, and to treat faith as almost synonymous with the hope which looks forward to the glory of Christ and his saints, and thus furnishes an incentive to Christian living, instead of making it as clearly and distinctly as it is in Paul the mystical oneness of the believer with Christ. And so baptism in the same way takes on the aspect rather of a pledge of right conduct than of a bond between the Christian and his

[1] 1 Pet. ii. 16. [2] 1 Pet. iii. 18. [3] 1 Pet. iv. 6.

[4] 1 Pet. ii. 24. With these passages compare, also, iii. 15, 16, 21, iv. 10, 13, 14, v. 10, 14.

[5] But the Christian's freedom is assumed in genuine Pauline fashion in ii. 16.

Lord. Similarly, the sufferings of Christ are looked upon not simply in their redemptive value, as effecting the death of the flesh, and thus the believer's release from its bondage, but also in their moral value as an example for the Christian. These differences are not marked enough to warrant us in asserting that the author was in fundamental disagreement with Paul, but they illustrate the natural tendency, in dealing with the duties and temptations of the Christian life, to view that life chiefly in its ethical aspect, and thus to approach the common conception of the church at large; and they indicate the direction which even Paul's truest followers might take in addressing themselves in a practical way to the conditions which faced the author of 1 Peter. There are slight traces of the same tendency even in one of Paul's own epistles,[1] and it is therefore not to be wondered at that it should be apparent in the work of another, who naturally felt more than he did the influence of alien conceptions.

In the Epistle to the Hebrews we see the common conception of Christianity which prevailed in the church at large developing under the influence of Pauline ideas; in the First Epistle of Peter Paulinism developing under the influence of that common conception. Elements from two independent views appear in both, but in the one case the conception of the church at large, and in the other that of Paul, is the controlling factor, and the results accordingly are widely different. The First Epistle of Peter bears testimony to the survival after Paul's death of his conception of Christianity in a somewhat modified, but still comparatively pure form. But in this respect it stands alone among extant documents. In no other sources do we find his characteristic views reproduced with equal fidelity.

4. The Christianity of the Johannine Writings

And yet some of Paul's views made their influence felt long after his death in the churches of Asia Minor, as is evidenced especially by the Johannine writings and by

[1] Cf. Eph. v. 1 sq., vi. 16.

the epistles of Ignatius of Antioch; and in combination with other independent and even inconsistent elements, they had a long and fruitful history in the Christian church. The Johannine writings present a problem of peculiar difficulty to one who attempts to trace the development of thought during the early days of Christianity.[1] Both in the Gospel and in the First Epistle of John we find two striking points of resemblance with the teaching of Paul. On the one hand the pre-existence of Christ is strongly emphasized,[2] and on the other hand the Christian life is pictured as the divine life in man, divine both in its inception and in its continuance. The Christian man is born from above, and the Spirit of God or of Christ, or God or Christ himself, dwells in him and makes him what he is. If these views of Christ and of the Christian life were found only in the epistle, or only in the narrative portions of the Gospel, the matter would be comparatively simple; for it might easily be assumed that the author learned them from Paul, even though in

[1] On the connection of these writings with the apostle John, see below, p. 613 sq.

[2] It is to be observed that the belief in Christ's pre-existence, which appears in the fourth Gospel, cannot be explained as the same belief in the Epistle to the Hebrews was explained, as a result of Philo's influence. Aside from the term "Logos," which is confined to the prologue, there is no trace of Philo's ideas. In fact, there is more than one passage which runs exactly counter to all Philo's thinking (cf., *e.g.*, vi. 37, 44, 66, x. 29). In the light of this fact, the use of the term "Logos" proves little. It was doubtless already widely current in Hellenistic circles, and the author adopted it and put it in the forefront of his Gospel, simply because he was convinced that all that his contemporaries found in the Logos he and his fellow-disciples actually had in Christ in visible form; and he believed that he could thus best interest them in the Saviour of whom he wrote. That the author did not owe his belief in Christ's pre-existence to Philo is made still more evident by the fact that he connects that pre-existence directly with Christ's work of redemption as Paul does. It is because he came down from heaven that he can reveal the Father, and give the bread of life to men, and thus save them. Of this connection there is no trace in the Epistle to the Hebrews, and hence, though that epistle agrees both with Paul and with John in its emphasis upon the fact of Christ's pre-existence, the three do not represent a single line of development. Paul and John stand together at this point, as the representatives of the religious interest, while the Epistle to the Hebrews stands apart as the exponent of the philosophic interest which voiced itself in the school of Philo. The fact that two independent interests thus led up to the same belief is of the greatest historic significance. It was possible, as it proved, for the Logos Christology ultimately to satisfy both the religious and the philosophic needs of Christendom, and to take complete possession of the field.

other respects he did not reproduce the teachings of the great apostle to the Gentiles. But the difficulty is that both the pre-existence of Christ and the divine origin and basis of the Christian life are found clearly and unequivocally expressed in the discourses of Jesus himself, one or the other of them being in fact the subject of the majority of those discourses. And yet in the Synoptic Gospels there is hardly a trace of either of them. Is it, then, to be supposed that the discourses are wholly John's, and that he has simply put into the mouth of Jesus ideas learned from Paul? This was formerly a common opinion among critical scholars, and is still held by many.[1] And yet there are reasons for thinking that the conclusion is unfounded. Such a method on the part of the author of the fourth Gospel implies an indifference to historic truth which is by no means borne out by the Gospel as a whole. In spite of some evidences of lack of information, or of intentional disregard of chronological sequence, there are recorded in many cases words and actions of Jesus entirely out of line with the author's own conception of his character and person, and their insertion in the Gospel can be explained only by his desire to write a true account of the Master's life. Thus, although Christ is represented as a divine being, come down from heaven and living upon earth, words and deeds are recorded which show that he was conscious of human weakness and insufficiency, and was in a true sense a child of the earth, like the other men about him with whom he associated day by day.[2] Such words and deeds seem to destroy the unity and consistency of the author's portraiture of the divine Christ, and could have found no place in his work except under the pressure of his wish to record the actual facts as he knew them. But if he had such a desire, it can hardly be supposed that he put into Jesus' mouth extended discourses which had no basis whatever in his actual words.

[1] For the best presentation of this view, see O. Holtzmann's *Johannesevangelium* (1887).

[2] Cf., *e.g.*, John iv. 6, v. 19, 30, vii. 1, xi. 33 sq., 41, xii. 27, 49, xix. 11, 28.

Again, it is to be noticed that although the picture of Jesus drawn by the author of the fourth Gospel is in striking contrast to that portrayed by the Synoptists, and though the discourses of the one are very different from the pregnant and sententious sayings of the others, there are some utterances recorded in the earlier Gospels which suggest on the one hand the exalted personal consciousness, and on the other hand the conception of the Christian life which find such extended expression in the fourth Gospel. Thus in Matthew and Luke we have the words: "All things have been delivered unto me of my Father, and no one knoweth the Son, save the Father; neither doth any know the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal him."[1] And in the eschatological passages of the Synoptic Gospels Jesus' Messianic consciousness appears highly developed, and involves his exaltation above the level of the mere earthly and human. Though, to be sure, the consciousness of pre-existence, to which the fourth Gospel bears witness, does not appear in the other Gospels, there is nothing in it absolutely irreconcilable with Synoptic teaching, and hence, in view of the utterances just referred to, it cannot fairly be said that there is sufficient ground for denying the authenticity of the discourses of the fourth Gospel, simply because they give expression to a consciousness on Christ's part of the possession of a superhuman, supramundane character.

The same may be said in regard to the discourses in which the divine origin and basis of the Christian life are emphasized. There are in the Synoptic Gospels a few isolated utterances which go to show that the Christ there depicted might have represented the Christian life under such an aspect. Thus we read: "Unto you it is given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven, but unto them it is not given."[2] "Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-Jonah; for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven."[3] "With

[1] Matt. xi. 27; Luke x. 22. [2] Matt. xiii. 11; cf. Mark iv. 11.
[3] Matt. xvi. 17.

men this is impossible, but with God all things are possible."[1] "For it is not ye that speak, but the Holy Ghost."[2] In the light of these passages it cannot be said that there is sufficient ground for denying the authenticity of the discourses of the fourth Gospel, simply because they represent the Christian life as divine in its inception and continuance.[3]

It must be maintained, then, that the author of the fourth Gospel may have been true to historic fact in representing Christ as giving utterance to a belief in his own pre-existence and to the conception of the divine origin and basis of the Christian life, and that he cannot fairly be accused of ascribing to Jesus a truth which originated only with Paul. How, then, are we to explain Paul's relation on the one hand to that truth itself, and on the other hand to the expression of it in the fourth Gospel? It can hardly be supposed that Paul adopted, even under the guidance of his own religious experience, a view of Christ and of the Christian life out of line with all that he knew of the teaching of the Master; or that he was led by the revelation vouchsafed him on the road to Damascus to the same view to which Jesus had given utterance, and yet remained in ignorance of his agreement with him. It is more natural to assume that in reaching his position, Paul felt to some extent the guiding influence of Christ's instruction as well as the leading of his own experience. And yet in view of the almost total silence of the Synoptic Gospels, and of Paul's lack of reference to words of Christ upon the subject; in view, moreover, of his account of his conversion, and his emphatic declaration that he did not learn his Gospel through converse with the apostles, it certainly will not do to assume that the discourses of the

[1] Matt. xix. 26; cf. Mark x. 27.

[2] Mark xiii. 11; cf. Matt. x. 19 sq.; Luke xii. 12. Compare also Matt. xxviii. 20; Luke xi. 13, xxii. 32, and the passages already quoted from Matt. xi. 27 and Luke x. 22.

[3] It is to be noticed also that in the Epistle of James, which contains much that is closely related to the teaching of Jesus, especially to the Sermon on the Mount, there is a hint of an acquaintance with the conception of the divine origin of the Christian life which appears in the fourth Gospel. Thus we read in i. 18: "Of his own will he brought us forth by the word of truth."

fourth Gospel, which were first given to the world at large more than half a century after the Saviour's death, or even the substance of those discourses, was already known to Paul at the time of his conversion or during the early years of his Christian life, when his conception of the Gospel took permanent shape. But it is not impossible that scattered words of Christ, which were generally known among his followers but had made little impression upon them, and of which only the vaguest hints are found in the Synoptic Gospels, came to Paul's ears, and took on new meaning to him in the light of his own experience, and confirmed and clarified his conception of the Gospel, and that, thus set in their true light by him, their significance was finally understood by a disciple who had known Christ personally, and led him to recall still other words to the same effect which had been commonly forgotten or neglected. It was, at any rate, under the indirect influence of Paul that the discourses of the fourth Gospel were composed. That many of the ideas which find expression in them go back to Jesus himself there is no sufficient ground for denying, but it is difficult to account for their preservation, and it is impossible to explain the form and the emphasis given to them, except in the light of Paul's teaching.

And yet though the author of the fourth Gospel had undoubtedly learned much from Paul, he was by no means a slavish imitator of the great apostle to the Gentiles. He was a disciple of Christ before he was a disciple of Paul, and though the latter influenced mightily his conception of the Master, he was still under the sway of the historic Jesus, and it was of him he wrote. The prologue of the Gospel should not lead us into the mistake of supposing that the author was concerned primarily with the pre-existent Son of God, and that his Gospel was intended simply to recount his manifestation in the flesh. The truth is that he was interested first of all in the man Jesus and took his departure from him. His belief that Christ had come from heaven, and that he had returned thither to be again with Him from whom he came forth,

rested ultimately upon the impression of his oneness with God which had been gained from a study of his earthly life. That impression alone might not perhaps have led the author to the conclusion which finds its most explicit utterance in the first verse of the prologue, but the conclusion once suggested, that impression constituted its immediate and only adequate confirmation. He wrote his Gospel not in order to prove that the Logos had come down to earth, but in order to prove that "Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God."[1] It was only because of his primary interest in the man Jesus that he wrote his Gospel at all. Paul would hardly have thought of writing a Gospel, even had he known all about Christ's life. His interest centred altogether in the dying and risen Christ. The contrast between John and Paul at this point appears very clearly in the fact that the former represents Christ as dwelling in his followers even during his earthly life among them, and not simply after his departure from them.[2] Only one who had himself known Jesus, or had learned of him first from one of his own disciples, could thus have given to him during his life on earth, before his death and resurrection, the saving significance which Paul ascribed to him only in his exalted spiritual existence, after he had laid aside the trammels of the flesh.

It was this same impression of the historic life of Jesus that led the author of the fourth Gospel to picture his work chiefly under the aspect of the impartation to men of the life of God by the manifestation of God in his own person and teaching. Although reference is made occasionally to the saving significance of his death,[3] there is no trace of the Pauline idea that he accomplished the redemption of men by dying unto the flesh and by rising again in the Spirit. His death is viewed commonly simply as a manifestation of the love of God drawing men unto him.[4] Thus the death of Christ had not the funda-

[1] John xx. 31. [2] John xv. 1 sq.
[3] John iii. 14, x. 11 sq., xi. 51, xii. 32, xv. 13; 1 John i. 7, iii. 16.
[4] Cf. John iii. 14 sq., xii. 32.

mental and controlling significance to John that it had to Paul.[1] The same may be said also of his resurrection. Instead of meaning, as it did to Paul, release from the flesh and a new life in the Spirit, it meant to John, just as it did to the Synoptists, Christ's resurrection in the flesh;[2] and the only saving efficacy that attached to it beyond the confirmation of his disciples' faith in him,[3] was that it made it possible for him to return to the Father and to send down the Spirit for their aid and guidance.[4] This is all the more significant, because John had Paul's idea that the Christian man has already passed from death unto life, and has thus already enjoyed a spiritual resurrection.[5] That with this conception of the Christian life he should fail to ascribe to Christ's resurrection the effect which Paul ascribed to it, confirms the impression made by his omission of Paul's interpre-

[1] In only one passage in the Johannine writings is the death of Christ explicitly connected with sin, namely, in 1 John i. 7, where it is said, "The blood of Jesus his Son cleanseth us from all sin." A connection is also implied in the Baptist's words in John i. 29: "Behold, the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world"; and in 1 John ii. 2, and iv. 10, where Christ is called a propitiation for sins. The contrast at this point not only between John and Paul, but also between John and the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, is very marked. That John felt to a less degree than the latter did the influence of Paul in this matter, was doubtless due in part to the fact that his interest was not so predominantly ethical (see below, p. 496), in part to the controlling impression upon him of the earthly life of Christ.

[2] How little John appreciated or sympathized with Paul's conception of redemption as a release from the flesh is made clear enough by his emphasis upon the fact that Christ rose in the flesh, and in the same flesh which he had before his death (cf. xx. 20, 27). It is instructive in this connection to compare Ignatius (*Smyr.* 3), who is still more pronounced in his departure from the conception of Paul.

[3] John xx. 8, 28.

[4] John xiv., xvi. 7 sq., xx. 17. John's idea of Christ as an advocate with the Father (1 John ii. 1) resembles the idea that he intercedes with the Father, which appears in Rom. viii. 34, and in Heb. vii. 25. Doubtless we have a sign of Paul's influence at this point, but the conception is not carried out as it is by the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

[5] 1 John ii. 29, iii. 14, v. 12 sq. (cf. John v. 21, 24). The idea, in fact, is so prominent in John's thought that it almost completely overshadows the common expectation of the final bodily resurrection. Christ speaks of the final resurrection in John v. 29, vi. 39 sq., 44, 54, but there is no reference to it in John's epistle, and it is evident that it is subordinated in the author's mind to the spiritual resurrection of believers which takes place in this life. According to v. 29, unbelievers as well as believers share in the final resurrection. Paul's idea, therefore, that that resurrection is simply a fruit of the present spiritual resurrection, is wanting.

tation of Christ's death, and by his general view of the significance of Christ's life on earth. His system was evidently not merely a development of Paul's. It had, in fact, another basis, and Paul's influence was but secondary.

Another striking mark of difference between John and Paul lies in their conception of the believer's relation to law. John agrees with Paul, to be sure, that the Gospel is for all men, not merely for the Jews, and he never thinks of requiring of Gentile converts circumcision and the observance of the Jewish law. He even goes beyond Paul in his hostility to his unbelieving countrymen, and he holds out no hope of the ultimate salvation of Israel, such as Paul gives expression to in his Epistle to the Romans. But although he thus occupies in this respect the standpoint of a Christian of the world, to whom Jewish law and prerogative mean nothing, he has no conception of the believer's liberty from all law in his new spiritual life with Christ. When he speaks of the freedom which Christ brings his disciples, it is freedom from sin of which he thinks,[1] and he regards the Christian as just as truly subject to law as any one else. "We receive what we ask of God," he says, "because we keep his commandments and do the things that are pleasing in his sight."[2] There can be no doubt that this idea of the Christian life as the keeping of God's commandments, which is somewhat out of line with the author's view that Christ dwells in the Christian, making his life truly divine, was due, in part at least, to the influence of the legal conception of Christianity, which was so widely prevalent in the church at large. Though he was so saturated with the Pauline view of the Christian life, John felt the influence of that common conception even more than the author of 1 Peter did.

Another marked difference between John and Paul appears in the views which they take of the redemption accomplished by Christ. To Paul it is release from the

[1] Cf. the words of Christ which John quotes in viii. 31 sq.
[2] 1 John iii. 22; cf. vs. 24.

sinful flesh, and thus escape from death, and an entrance upon a new life of complete holiness in the Spirit. The idea of salvation as an escape from death and the attainment of eternal life is common in John's writings,[1] and the complete holiness of the believer is asserted in his epistle.[2] Moreover, in the conversation with Nicodemus we have the flesh and the Spirit contrasted in a way that reminds us of Paul.[3] But the contrast is not carried out, and redemption is not represented as accomplishing a man's release from the flesh. In place of this idea, which is so prominent in Paul, we find redemption repeatedly pictured as a transfer from the realm of darkness into the realm of light.[4] In spite of all he has to say about sin, and in spite of the fact that he more than once represents Christ as coming to take away sin,[5] John had apparently no such controlling ethical interest as characterized Paul and the Synoptists, and indeed the church at large of his day. Not to escape from sin, but to know God, he regarded as the chief thing, the *summum bonum*.[6] And so Christ's great work was to manifest the Father; and where that manifestation is recognized and accepted is eternal life, where it is rejected is eternal death.[7] John's supreme interest in this aspect of redemption and in this side of Christ's work is revealed very clearly in the idea, to which he gives occasional expression, that the Gospel is not for the sinful but for the righteous; that Christ came to save only those that were already his own; and that only the prepared can receive him and come into the light and enjoy eternal life.[8] This idea, which tends to take away from Jesus' work much of its ethical sig-

[1] 1 John iii. 14 sq., iv. 9, v. 11 sq.; cf. John v. 24, vi. 48 sq., viii. 51, etc.

[2] 1 John iii. 6, 9, v. 18, where the author denies that the Christian can sin, just as Paul does in Rom viii. and elsewhere. Cf. also John xiii. 10, xv. 3.

[3] John iii. 6 sq.; cf. also i. 13, vi. 63.

[4] 1 John i. 7 sq., ii. 9 sq., etc.; cf. John i. 4 sq., iii. 19 sq., viii. 12, ix. 5, xii. 35 sq., 46.

[5] John i. 29; 1 John iii. 5; cf. also John viii. 24, 36; 1 John ii. 2, iv. 10.

[6] 1 John ii. 3, 13, 22, iii. 1, iv. 6 sq., v. 20; cf. also John xiv. 20 sq., xvii. 3.

[7] 1 John ii. 23 sq., v. 20; cf. John i. 18, iii. 32, v. 24, viii. 31 sq., 51 sq., xii. 36, xiv. 6 sq., xvii. 6, 26, xviii. 37.

[8] John ix. 31, xi. 52, xiii. 1; 1 John v. 20; cf. John iii. 20 sq., viii. 44, xv. 13, xviii. 37.

nificance and efficacy, is so different from his general teaching contained in all four of the Gospels, that it would seem that it must be John's and not Christ's, at least in the form in which we have it.

Our author's view of redemption as the transfer of man from the realm of darkness to the realm of light, and of Christ's work as primarily a work of illumination, has been supposed by many to be due to Hellenic influence, or more particularly to the influence of Gnosticism. And there can be little doubt that at any rate the same tendency that voiced itself in Gnosticism had something to do with the marked emphasis which the idea receives, and the peculiar form which it takes in John's writings. But it is a mistake to derive the idea itself either wholly or chiefly from that source. It is, in fact, simply a result of the common impression of the life of Jesus upon those with whom he came in contact, — a result entirely natural to one who believed in the pre-existent oneness of Christ with God, and in the divine origin of the Christian life. The impression made by Jesus upon those that heard him was primarily that of a teacher who told them of heavenly things; and it was almost inevitable that one who was under the control of that impression, and at the same time believed that Christ had come from God to bring down the gift of life to men, should conceive of that life as mediated by his manifestation of the Father, and should consequently picture his work chiefly under the aspect of revelation or illumination. The idea, therefore, though it may perhaps testify to the influence of a tendency which was widespread in the contemporary Greek world, constitutes at the same time another evidence of the degree to which the author felt the impression of the earthly life of Jesus. The contrast between John and Paul in their attitude toward the life of Christ on earth, which appears in so many ways, is especially noticeable just at this point. To both of them the Christian life is the divine life in man; but while Paul, though he has much to say about the virtues of the believer's life, never calls attention to their connection with the corresponding virtues in

God, John, true to his impression of Christ as primarily the revealer of the Father, traces back the various features of the Christian character to the character of God himself, and emphasizes the fact that they have their root in him.[1] Thus men are to cleave to the truth because God is truth;[2] they are to be pure because God is pure, and righteous because he is righteous;[3] they are to walk in the light because God is light;[4] they are to love God and their brethren because God is love;[5] and it is because God is life that they who are Christ's have life.[6]

The difference of conception between Paul and John touching the work of Christ and the redemption accomplished by him resulted in a difference in their ideas of faith. To both of them the word has profound spiritual significance, but as used by Paul it denotes the oneness of the believer with Christ in his death and resurrection, — a oneness so complete that the acts of Christ become in a real sense the acts of the believer, and the latter actually dies and rises again with his Master. The object of faith is thus not merely Christ, but Christ dying and rising again. To John, on the other hand, faith is the attitude of receptivity toward Christ in the totality of his person, as the complete manifestation of God. Receiving Christ in the Johannine sense, the believer receives his revelation of the Father, and passes from darkness to light, and thus from death to life. The fact upon which faith lays hold, therefore, is not Christ's work for the sinner, but Christ's relation to God, which makes him a manifestation of the Father. Thus John was driven, not by a speculative, but by a practical interest, to consider more fully than Paul the nature of Christ, and to exhibit his pre-existent connection with God. And thus at the same time faith tended to become more of an intellectual act and to lose something of its religious significance. Instead of binding the soul immediately to Christ, and

[1] Cf. Stevens: *The Johannine Theology*, p. 4 sq.
[2] 1 John v. 20; cf. John iii. 21, viii. 26, 31 sq.
[3] 1 John ii. 6, 29, iii. 3, 7. [4] 1 John i. 5. [5] 1 John iv. 7, 16 sq.
[6] 1 John i. 2 sq.; cf. John vi. 57. And so, according to Jesus, as quoted in John iv. 24, men are to worship God in spirit, because God is a Spirit.

bringing about the mystical identity of the believer and his divine Master, it was thought of as preparing the soul for the reception of that knowledge of God which leads to eternal life; and however spiritually and vitally that knowledge might be conceived, the stress laid upon it promoted the tendency to emphasize the intellectual at the expense of the religious element,— a tendency which already makes its appearance in John's first epistle, where the recognition of the divine sonship of Jesus and of the reality of his incarnation is made a test of Christian character.[1]

The brief comparison we have made of the conceptions of Paul and John shows how widely and in how many respects two of the most influential thinkers of the primitive church could differ, while at the same time fundamentally agreed touching the person of Christ and the nature of the Christian life. It shows also how some of Paul's controlling conceptions lived after him and had a history in the Christian church, while others which constituted a no less essential part of his system were entirely neglected. With his conception of the pre-existence of the Son of God, those who came after him had no trouble. But his idea of the believer's oneness with Christ in his death and resurrection was too profoundly spiritual, and too much out of line with the common experience of the ordinary Christian man, to make its way in the church at large. In the form, however, which the conception of the unity between Christ and the believer took in the writings of John, it was much easier of comprehension and of verification. The divine origin of the Christian life, and the abiding presence of the spiritual Christ, were facts to which the ordinary experience of the primitive Christian

[1] Cf. 1 John iv. 15, v. 1, 5. John's conception of faith was evidently much more profound than that which prevailed in the church at large. But the common idea of the Christian life as the observance of a law had something of an influence even upon his view of faith, though the result was not the same as appears in the writings which we have already considered. Thus in 1 John iii. 23, he makes the commandments of God include belief in the "name of his Son Jesus Christ." This is very instructive, because it shows how the way was opened for regarding faith as a meritorious act, and for ranging it alongside of other virtues as a part of man's obedience to the divine will, and thus one of the means by which he gains salvation.

bore constant testimony; and this belief, thanks above all to the fourth Gospel, lived on in spite of the oblivion which overtook so much that Paul taught.

Closely related both to Paul and to John was another Christian belonging to the same part of the world as the latter, Ignatius of Antioch, who suffered martyrdom in the first quarter of the second century. Into his views we cannot enter here, but it is worthy of notice that he was one with both Paul and John in his recognition of the pre-existence of Christ, and especially in his emphasis upon the real and actual oneness of the believer with Christ. Salvation meant to him the deification of man by his union with the divine; and though under influences similar to those which made themselves felt in the Greek mysteries and kindred religious developments, Ignatius' conception of Christianity took on many features foreign to that of John, and even more alien to the thought of Paul,[1] the agreement of all three in the two fundamental positions referred to just above is of the very greatest historic significance. That Paul permanently influenced the thought of the church at large, was due in no small degree to the fact that at least a part of his fundamental conception of the Gospel made itself felt after his death in Asia Minor, and that its harmony with the life and teachings of Jesus himself was there exhibited in a masterful way by one of the greatest spirits of the early church, and that it was combined by a fervent and profound religious genius with other ideas easier of comprehension by the popular mind and more in line with the prevailing religious tendencies of the age.[2]

[1] The most striking differences between Paul and Ignatius arose from their difference of conception touching the constitution of man, and the consequent impossibility of an agreement concerning the nature and need of redemption. To Ignatius salvation did not mean, as it meant to Paul, release from the flesh, and entrance upon a new life in the spirit; for he regarded both flesh and spirit as essential elements of humanity, and man therefore could not exist without his flesh. Redemption consequently meant to Ignatius the endowment of the whole man, both flesh and spirit, with immortality through the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ, the incarnation of Deity.

[2] Upon Ignatius and his relation to Paul and John, see especially von der Goltz: *Ignatius von Antiochien als Christ und Theologe*, in von Gebhardt and Harnack's *Texte und Untersuchungen*, XII. 3.

At two points Christians of subsequent centuries felt the influence of Paul, where it was not felt, at any rate to any marked degree, by the author of the fourth Gospel. In the first place, the emphasis which Paul put upon Christ's death gave to that event a value in the eyes of the church which it would not otherwise have had. Upon this subject John has more to say than the Synoptists, but his overmastering impression of the earthly life of Jesus prevented him from giving his death the prominence which it had in Paul's thought. In this respect the church at large followed the lead of Paul. But they followed him only in emphasizing the importance of Christ's death; Paul's interpretation of it they utterly failed to understand. Even Ignatius, though he laid great stress upon it, gave it no real significance of its own. The truth is, that it was centuries before the event, in spite of all that was said and thought about it, was given any vital and controlling place in Christian theology.

In the second place, Paul's conception of the church as the body of Christ, and of the consequent oneness of all believers, to which he gave fullest and most distinct expression in his Epistle to the Ephesians, was taken up by those who came after him and had overmastering and permanent influence in the development of ecclesiastical theory and practice. The idea was too foreign to the conceptions of Christ and to all the traditions of his teaching, to find much of a place in John's writings;[1] but it was made a great deal of by Ignatius, and he was in reality the first to emphasize and develop it, and to turn it to practical use in the interest both of unity and of discipline. Thus, though Ignatius departed from Paul at some points even further than John did, more of Paul's thought lived on in him than in John, and we really find reproduced in his writings the substance of practically all the Paulinism that the church at large permanently made its own.[2]

[1] But compare John xvii. and 1 John ii. 19 sq.

[2] The pre-existence and deity of Christ; the union of the believer with Christ, without which the Christian life is impossible; the importance of Christ's death; the church the body of Christ.

5. The Radical Paulinism of the Gnostics and Other Sectaries

And yet, though the church in general accepted only a part of Paul's Gospel, other views of his lived on, for a time at least, and enjoyed a considerable development in the thought of Christians of other schools than the school of John and Ignatius. Some of his ideas, in fact, found emphatic though one-sided expression in the teachings of many who were looked upon as heretical by the church at large of their own and subsequent generations. There can be no doubt, for instance, that the Hymenæus and Philetus who were condemned by the redactor of the pastoral epistles because they taught that the resurrection was already past[1] were led to take the position they did by Paul's teaching concerning the believer's death with Christ unto the flesh at baptism, and his resurrection with him unto a new life in the Spirit. Only such a view as we know Paul held of a spiritual resurrection in this life can account for their belief that the resurrection had already taken place. Similarly, the asceticism in Colossæ, Hierapolis, and Laodicea, which Paul opposed in his Epistle to the Colossians, very likely found something of a basis in his dualism of flesh and Spirit, and in his constant emphasis upon the spiritual character of the Christian life. The same may be said of the asceticism which is denounced in the First Epistle to Timothy.[2] Such libertinists, moreover, as are combated in 1 John, in Jude, and in the letters of John to the churches of Pergamum and Thyatira,[3] can hardly have gained their principles from any other source than from Paul's doctrine of the freedom of the Christian man, or at any rate they can hardly have failed to find confirmation for their principles in that doctrine.

But in the great Christian reformer, Marcion, who flourished in the second quarter of the second century, and in the various Gnostic schools of the same period, the characteristic views of Paul found their fullest acceptance

[1] 2 Tim. ii. 17 sq. [2] 1 Tim. iv. 3 sq. [3] Rev. ii. 14 sq., 20 sq.

and their most remarkable development. The teachings of these men we cannot reproduce here. It may simply be said that the dualism which was common to all their systems, whether the result of metaphysical considerations, as it was with most of them, or due merely to a practical interest, as was the case with Marcion, found its warrant in the dualism of Paul, and that its existence within the church, and the belief of its representatives that it was genuinely Christian, can be explained only in the light of Paul's doctrine of flesh and spirit. And so the antinomy between Judaism and Christianity, and between the creating and redeeming God, upon which most of them laid so much stress; the asceticism upon which many of them insisted, and the libertinism inculcated by others; their assertion of the impossibility of salvation for any man not endowed from above with a spiritual nature; their Docetic views of Christ, and their identification of him with one of the pre-existing beings or æons, which were supposed to bridge the chasm between God and matter; their denial of the fleshly resurrection, and their insistence upon the purely spiritual character of eternal life,—all have their points of contact in the system of Paul, and may be recognized as more or less perverted and distorted reproductions of his views touching the relation of law and Gospel, the origin and nature of the Christian life, and the person and work of Christ. The Gnostics simply carried out consistently the Hellenistic tendency which voiced itself to a limited degree in Paul. The dualism, which in his thinking was religious merely, because he was concerned only to interpret his own experience, in their thinking was cosmical as well. The contrast and the irreconcilability between matter, or flesh, and spirit was to them not simply a means of understanding the religious experience of the redeemed man, but a fundamental postulate in the light of which Christianity and the history of the universe as a whole must be read.

And so, in spite of the fact that their teaching was so closely related to Paul's in many respects, and their fundamental postulate but the consistent carrying out of a

principle upon which he too laid great stress, he could not have seen in them his legitimate followers. Their thoroughgoing dualism, which left no room for a belief in providence, their attitude toward historic Judaism, their asceticism (or libertinism), and above all their Docetism, which made the death of Christ impossible, must have been as distasteful to him as they actually were to the church at large. And yet the controlling influence of his principles upon their thought is not to be mistaken. They were nearest him in their doctrine of flesh and spirit, and in their recognition of the Christian life as the divine life in man, eventuating in his complete and permanent release from the trammels of the flesh; they were farthest from him in their Docetism, and in their conception of the work of Christ as a mere illumination instead of a real redemption by participation in human flesh.

The close kinship that existed between these men and John, in spite of the pronounced hostility of the latter to every form of Docetism, is at once interesting and instructive. They and he represent in part an identical, in part a divergent, development of the principles of Paul. All of them felt Paul's influence and were one with each other and with him in their belief in the pre-existence of Christ and in the divine origin of the Christian life; but the form which those beliefs took, both in John and in the Gnostics, reveals the common operation of influences which Paul did not feel. It was due in part, moreover, to a common influence, that while following Paul in his emphasis upon the work of Christ as the sole ground of redemption, they nevertheless departed from him in conceiving that work under the aspect primarily of revelation or illumination, by which is opened to the children of God, that is, to those possessed of a truly spiritual nature, the way of entrance into the realm of light, and thus into the enjoyment of eternal life with God. But at other points, under the control of widely different interests, they went their separate ways: John, under the impression of the earthly life of Jesus, refraining from carrying the Pauline antithesis of flesh and spirit as far as Paul himself had carried it;

the Gnostics, on the other hand, under the influence of their thoroughgoing dualism, carrying it much further, and reaching positions entirely out of line with the traditional belief of the church at large.

Our study of the leading ideas which found expression in the Christian church during the first century has sufficed to show that the development of theology which had its beginning then could not be other than complex and complicated. That development we cannot trace any further here. It may simply be said that the common primitive conception of Christianity, which was described in the earlier part of this chapter, continued in control. Christianity remained a law and the Christian life its observance. But the influence of Paul made itself permanently felt in the combination with it of the idea of Christianity as a redemption, and in the development and elaboration of that idea Christian theology has had its largest exercise. Out of it grew the church's historic insistence upon the deity of Christ, and upon the completeness and reality of his manhood; out of it grew the doctrine of regeneration, with all that flowed from it; out of it grew the belief in the real presence, and at least some of the essential features of the catholic theory of grace. But most striking of all is the fact that though Paul was so little understood and appreciated by those that came after him, and though his fundamental principles never came and never could come to their full rights in the Catholic church, the ecclesiastical theory upon which that church was built was due ultimately to him. The belief that the church is the body of Christ, which finds its classic expression in the Epistle to the Ephesians, and which is itself the natural outgrowth of his controlling conception of salvation, constitutes the basis upon which rests the entire ecclesiastical system of the Catholic church. Rome is not wholly deluded when she traces her establishment to Paul as well as to Peter, and believes herself the heir of both.

6. The Christian Life

Our study has revealed the existence in the apostolic age of two radically different conceptions of the nature and basis of the Christian life, but in spite of the difference there was general agreement as to the ideal of that life. Whether it was believed with Paul that the Christian life is the divine life in man, or that it is man's own life governed by a divine law, in either case the ideal was conformity to the will and character of God. To be perfect even as God is perfect, to exhibit in one's life the traits of the divine character, was the supreme ideal of all. The disciples believed themselves to be God's peculiar and elect people. They were not simply μάθηται or disciples, they were ἅγιοι or saints, men set apart by God to his own service, and hence they must be governed by divine principles, and must conform their conduct to the divine will. Whether they regarded salvation as a present possession, or thought of it as future only, and pictured it under the aspect of a reward bestowed upon those who lived righteously and endured faithfully unto the end, in either case they were at one in their conviction that the Christian life is distinguished from the life of the unbeliever by its heavenly character; by the fact that the law which governs it and the standard which measures it are from God and not from man. But when it came to the specific traits of character, or the specific duties which conformity to the divine will required, it is a notable fact that there was comparatively little difference between the ethical principles of the Christians and the principles of the best men of the Pagan world. The general ideal of the Christian life was practically little else than complete conformity to the highest ethical standards of the world at large. As in Jerusalem the primitive disciples believed that they ought to distinguish themselves above their unconverted brethren by a stricter and more faithful observance of the law of their fathers, so in the Gentile world the Christians believed that they ought to distinguish themselves above their neighbors by their more per-

fect exhibition of those traits of character which were everywhere recognized as truly virtuous. Honesty, justice, truthfulness, purity, sobriety, peaceableness, were all emphasized by Christian and Pagan writers alike. Paul, indeed, on more than one occasion appealed directly to the existing ethical standards of the day as standards for his own converts: "Whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honourable, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report; if there be any virtue, and if there be any praise, think on these things," are his words in Phil. iv. 8; and in Rom. ii. 15, he declares that even the heathen have the law of God written on their hearts.

And yet, though to live in conformity with the divine will meant to the early Christians to live in conformity with the dictates of the universal human conscience, especial emphasis was laid by them upon certain points, and thus their life bore a character differing in some respects from that of the best Pagans of the age. The most distinctive elements in the Christian life were love and holiness. Upon love emphasis was laid by all the writers of the period, and it constituted a prominent and permanent element in the ethical ideal. It could not be otherwise, indeed, in the light of the teaching of Jesus. But it is significant that the Master's profound conception of love for God and man lost much of its depth and reach in the teaching of his disciples. Of love for God we hear in some of the writings of the period,[1] but not in all; and in none of them has it any such fundamental and controlling place as in the teaching of Christ, and in none of them is it filled so full of meaning. The conception of God as lawgiver and judge largely displaced Christ's conception of him as a father, and fear and honor were increasingly regarded as the proper attitude toward him.[2] In Paul and in John, to be sure, the conception of divine

[1] Cf. Rom. viii. 28; 1 Cor. viii. 3; Heb. vi. 10; Jas. i. 12, ii. 5; 1 John iv. 21, v. 2.

[2] Cf. 1 Pet. ii. 17.

fatherhood is preserved, but even in their writings it is less controlling than in the teaching of Jesus, and elsewhere in the literature of the period there is practically nothing of it. It is not that the belief in God's goodness and grace disappears — that is everywhere maintained; but the closeness and intimacy which are involved in the word "father," as used by Christ, are largely lost sight of by his disciples, and when the term "father" is used of God, it is commonly employed in the sense of creator, or characterizes him only in his relation to Christ. But not simply love for God, love for man as well, lost among the early Christians something of the meaning which it had to Jesus. The notable fact about it is the growing tendency to narrow the circle, so that Christian love becomes love for the brotherhood, that is, for one's fellow-disciples. It is true that love as a constant attitude of the heart is inculcated by many of the writers of the period, and that in some cases love for those without the church is explicitly referred to,[1] but as a rule the emphasis is laid solely upon love for the brethren. Especially significant in this connection is the injunction of the First Epistle of Peter: "Honour all men. Love the brotherhood. Fear God. Honour the king."[2]

That Christians should treat all with whom they came in contact with becoming respect, and that they should show them kindness as opportunity offered, and should avoid hatred, resentment, and anger toward them, was of course believed by all; but it was the active exercise of love, not toward one's neighbors in general, but toward one's fellow-disciples, fellow-members of the one household of faith, that was chiefly emphasized. In this the feeling of brotherhood in Christ found expression, and the stress laid upon such love is an evidence of the vivid realization of that brotherhood on the part of the early Christians. Within the circle of disciples the love which Jesus inculcated burned warm and vivid, and one of the most

[1] Cf. Rom. xiii. 8; 1 Thess. iii. 12.

[2] 1 Pet. ii. 17; cf. also i. 22, iii. 8, iv. 8, and Rom. xii. 10; 1 Thess. iv. 9, etc. The writings of John, both Gospel and Epistle, are especially notable in this respect.

characteristic marks of the life of his followers in the apostolic age was their devotion to one another and their unselfish regard for each other's good. It was this more than anything else that gave its peculiar character to their Christian life, and it did much to attract others to them. That the circle within which love found its chief exercise should thus have been narrowed to coincide with the limits of the Christian brotherhood, instead of retaining that breadth and universality which it had in the thought of Christ, to whom all men were brethren, common sons of a common Father, was due largely to the fact that the Christians regarded themselves as an elect people called by God out of the world and separated from it as his own peculiar possession. This feeling gave them a profound attachment to each other, and marked them off from all without their pale to such a degree that the narrowing of the sphere of love was inevitable.

It was this same sense of being a peculiar people of God, that had much to do with the emphasis which they laid upon holiness. That which separated the world from God, and fundamentally characterized it over against him, was its impurity and corruptness; and the distinguishing feature of the Christian life, as contrasted with the life of the world at large, must consequently be its purity and incorruptness. In this all the writers of our period were agreed. Not only Paul, to whom the contrast between flesh and spirit was fundamental, but also those who least felt his influence, were at one in their emphasis upon the virtue of holiness.[1] Whatever else a Christian was, he must at any rate be holy; the very name, ἅγιος,[2] indeed, by which he was commonly called by his brethren, meant not simply set apart to the service of God, but also free from moral blemish or sin.

That holiness or sinlessness which their character as children of God required was commonly conceived by

[1] In addition to Paul's epistles, in which so much is made of holiness, see also 1 Tim. ii. 15; 2 Tim. i. 9; Heb. xii. 14; Jas. i. 27; 1 Pet. i. 15; 2 Pet. iii. 11; 1 John iii. 4; Rev. xxii. 14, etc.

[2] Cf. not only Paul's epistles, but also Acts ix. 13, 32, 41; 1 Tim. v. 10; Heb. vi. 10, xiii. 24; Jude 3; Rev. v. 8 *et passim*.

the early disciples as primarily the avoidance of fleshly impurity and lust. The crying sins of the age were fleshly sins, and it was natural that Paul and the other early missionaries to the Gentiles should see in such fleshliness the chief obstacle to the presence of the Holy Spirit, whose very nature made association with corruptness and impurity impossible. But without the Holy Spirit there could be no church and no elect people of God; only in the Spirit was Christ himself present with his disciples to bless and assist them; and so it is not surprising that the emphasis was increasingly laid upon the cleanness of the Christian life, and that everything else was more and more subordinated to it. The result was that holiness, interpreted in a purely negative sense, finally acquired the controlling place in the Christian ideal which active love and devotion to the good of others occupied in the teaching of Jesus, and the entire bent of the Christian life was thus changed. It was not that love was lost, but that it was subordinated, and that its vitalizing and energizing power was thus largely sacrificed.

But such holiness as was preached by the early disciples involved not only abstinence from lust, intemperance, and other fleshly sins which were so common in that age, but also the alienation of the affections from the world. Love for the world was regarded as essentially the love of that which is impure and unholy and consequently as incompatible with the service of God.[1] But the natural tendency of such a belief was of course to lead to the growth of asceticism, and of a spirit of world-renunciation which meant the repudiation of all the natural relations of life. That tendency was very widespread in the early church, and it caused much trouble and perplexity. It was felt by most of the sober-minded disciples that the tendency was unhealthful and ought to be checked, but where to check it, and on what principle, was by no means clear. Paul asserts that all the creatures of God are good and to be received with thanksgiving, that there is nothing evil

[1] Cf., *e.g.*, 2 Cor. vi. 16 sq.; 2 Tim. iii. 4; Jas. iv. 4; 2 Pet. i. 4; 1 John ii. 15 sq.

in itself, and that all things are lawful to the Christian; and yet Paul himself gave utterance on various occasions to principles of a genuinely ascetic character. Thus he says, in 1 Cor. ix. 27: "I bruise my body and bring it into bondage"; and in 1 Cor. vii. 1 sq. he implies that celibacy is a higher state than marriage, and that marriage is only a concession to fleshly lust for the benefit of those who are weak and cannot restrain their passions.[1]

The line between friendship for the world, or love of it and of the things that are in it,[2] and such use of it as is not sinful, the disciples found it very difficult to draw, and there was much doubt and uncertainty as to where it should be drawn. The church at large finally settled down upon the principle that not the world itself is evil, but only the wrong use of it, and that it is not necessary to repudiate or flee from the world, but only to overcome its temptations and to preserve oneself pure in the midst of its corruptions. But there were many who believed themselves too weak thus to withstand the temptations of the world, and many more who were too thoroughgoing in their interpretation of the holiness demanded by the Gospel, to be willing to content themselves with such half-hearted measures, and so asceticism finally blossomed into monasticism, and Christians in general applauded, as the highest ideal of the Christian life, a world-renunciation which they did not themselves practise. The rise of monasticism lies far beyond the close of the apostolic age, but in the tendencies which were already at work in that age we can see the roots of all that followed.

But the significance of Christianity as an ethics lay not so much in the difference, even where there was a difference, between its ideal and that of the world at large, as in the motive power within it. As an ethical system it was noble, lofty, and pure, but as an ethical system it could never have accomplished what it did. The teachings of many others besides Christ were noble, lofty, and pure.

[1] Cf. also 2 Cor. vi. 17 sq.; and Rev. xiv. 4. On the other hand, Paul takes a higher view of marriage in 1 Cor. vii. 13 sq., xi. 11, and 1 Thess. iv. 4 sq.

[2] Cf. Jas. iv. 4; 1 John ii. 15.

the message was brought that he possessed ethical and spiritual possibilities hitherto undreamed of, and he was invited to become, as he might become if he would, a child of God, to enroll himself among God's chosen people, and to enter into the heritage prepared for those that love and serve him. The power of this appeal under existing conditions cannot be overestimated. In it is to be found, doubtless, one of the chief causes of the rapid spread of the Gospel, and of the tremendous hold which it took upon the world. New ideals, new hopes, new visions, were opened to the common people, who had never shared in the delights of philosophy, and whose existence had been circumscribed hitherto by the bounds of their daily round of toil. How much it must have meant to such as they, to be told that there was a larger life open to them, that they were not mere slaves of circumstance, but children of God, entitled to share, if they would, on equal terms with the highest and the noblest of men, in blessings and glories of infinite richness and worth! The divine sonship and the universal brotherhood of man might be believed in by this or that philosopher as an abstract theory, and their realization might be looked forward to as a beautiful dream, but here were divine sonship and human brotherhood made real and actual; here was the explicit announcement to every man, on the basis of an immediate divine revelation, of his rights and privileges as a child of God, and here was the explicit offer to every man of the greatest conceivable blessings. It is not to be wondered at that the Gospel proved itself a power for the conversion of multitudes, especially from the lower classes of society.[1]

But the appeal which Christianity made to their moral and spiritual natures not simply moved and attracted men, it also proved a real and permanent power for righteousness in their lives. It would be a mistake to suppose, even where the Christian life was thought of as the observ-

[1] Those who were conscious of possessing already sufficient moral impulse and power, as a rule cared little about Christianity, except as they were attracted to it because of its observed ability to create virtue in the most unpromising quarters. And so its spread for some generations was more rapid among the lower than the higher classes.

ance of the law of God and salvation as the reward given for faithful endurance in such observance to the end, that it was only the hope of reward or the fear of punishment that deterred the disciples from sin and kept them up to their duty. The truth is, that the sense of their privilege and responsibility as the elect people of God had much to do with their earnestness and faithfulness. The appeal is made in the writings of the period with which we are dealing oftener to higher than to lower motives and impulses. The hope of reward and the fear of punishment are urged not infrequently, but stronger and more constant emphasis is laid, not by Paul alone but by others as well, upon the duty of Christians to walk worthily of their calling as children of God and as his elect people, to be true to their opportunities and responsibilities, to be all that God would have them be, and thus honor both him and themselves.[1] To the man who had never believed in his own ethical and spiritual worth came the message that God desired to make a holy man of him and fit him for communion with himself. Such a message appealed to the best in every man, and laid hold mightily upon whatever of divinity he possessed. Responding to it, a man became conscious of a power above his own, of impulses and capabilities hitherto unsuspected, and in them he recognized the action of the Spirit of God and believed himself to be a spiritual man, however imperfectly his newly felt power might work itself out in action.

It could not be expected, of course, that the Christians of the apostolic age, any more than of any other age, should realize completely their own ideals. Many passages in our sources show that the ethical conditions of the church at large were not all that they should have been in the days of the apostles. Not simply the sins which beset men of all ages and climes, but sins to which that age was particularly prone, made their way into the infant church and called forth earnest and re-

[1] Cf. on the one hand 1 Cor. vi. 9 sq.; Gal. v. 21, vi. 9; Heb. ii. 1 sq., iv. 1, vi. 10 *et passim*; 2 Pet. iii. 8; Rev. ii. and iii.; on the other hand Rom. xii. 1 sq.; 1 Cor. vi. 20; Eph. iv. 13 sq., v. 8 sq.; Phil. ii. 13 sq.; Col. i. 28, iii. 1 sq.; 1 Thess. iv. 1 sq.; 1 Pet. iv. 1 sq., and Clement: *Ad Cor.* 30.

peated admonitions from all the writers of the period. The prevailing vices of the heathen world were licentiousness and intemperance, vices fostered rather than restrained by many of the religious cults of the age, and it proved exceedingly difficult for converts from heathenism to break loose from their past and to repudiate completely the habits of the society in which they had been trained, and in the midst of which they still lived. Many of them brought their vices with them into the church, and conditions of the most shocking character existed in some congregations. Moreover, the looseness of life which characterized some Christians was not due simply to the prevailing immorality of the age and the difficulty in overcoming its constantly recurring temptations; the truth is that the principles of many of the disciples were such as to make various questionable practices seem indifferent and harmless. An antinomianism in principle as well as in practice grew up early in the church, on the basis chiefly of Paul's teaching of the Christian's freedom from law, which cost the apostle much anxiety and played havoc in many quarters. The better and more healthful sentiment of the church, however, was against such antinomianism, and it was ultimately excluded, though it had a considerable lease of life in some of the Gnostic sects of the second century.[1] But though antinomianism was excluded, the tendency to look with indifference upon many practices which others regarded as sinful continued and gave rise to difficulties in many places and on many occasions. In Corinth the question of eating meat offered to idols was a burning one for a time at any rate, and Paul was obliged to deal with it in one of his epistles at considerable length.[2] So in Rome, differences concerning meats and drinks and days and times caused much trouble and claimed the apostle's attention in his epistle to the Christians of that city.[3] All such questions were settled by him along the same broad lines, the principle being laid down that a consideration for the good of others should

[1] See above, p. 502 sq.

[2] 1 Cor. viii. See above, p. 303 sq.

[3] Rom. xiv. See above, p. 336 sq.

govern one's conduct in all matters of the kind. But the principle was too broad and general for the church at large of subsequent days, and there was a growing tendency to insist upon a rigid conformity to rule on the part of all alike, and to deny so great liberty of conscience as Paul had insisted on.

In addition to such sins as have been indicated,—sins due to the general instincts and impulses of men, or to the peculiar conditions that prevailed in the world of the period,—there were certain specific temptations to which the disciples were liable that were immediately due to Christianity itself, and to the new hopes and aspirations which it implanted in their souls. The awakening of the ethical and spiritual natures of the new converts led them often into spiritual pride and self-assertion which threatened ruin to themselves and destruction to the well-being of the church. Against such spiritual pride Paul and other writers of the age uttered frequent warnings, and the quarrels and rivalries to which it inevitably led were a constant source of distress and anxiety.[1] The spirit of other-worldliness, moreover, which permeated the life of the primitive believers, was a spirit which could easily be carried to excess, and our sources show that it actually was. In Thessalonica, at an early day, Christians were becoming fanatical and were neglecting their regular occupations, to the great scandal of their neighbors and to the ill repute of the church.[2] It was such manifestations as these that called forth the exhortations to diligence, sobriety, and quietness, which are so frequent in the epistles of the New Testament.[3]

But the consciousness of belonging to a higher kingdom, controlled by principles very different from those of this

[1] Compare the condition of things in Corinth as depicted in 1 Cor. i., xii.-xiv.; see above, pp. 290, 307 sq.

[2] See above, p. 247.

[3] Cf., *e.g.*, Eph. iv. 28; 1 Thess. iv. 11; 2 Thess. iii. 10 sq.; 1 Tim. ii. 15; Titus ii. 2 sq.; 1 Pet. iv. 15. The principle laid down by Paul in 2 Thess. iii. 10: "If any will not work, neither let him eat," is emphasized also in the *Didache*, XII. The importance attached to diligence and labor among the early Christians was undoubtedly one of the secrets of their healthful growth and their permanent power.

That which chiefly differentiated Christianity from other ethical systems was the power with which it appealed not to the wise and virtuous and noble-minded, but to the common people, and the moral energy which it supplied to those who had hitherto been entirely without such energy. That it should lead the ignorant and the low and the worthless to live like philosophers, that is, to live soberly, temperately, and purely, was the remarkable thing about it in the eyes of thinking men, when they once became aware of the fact. That it could appeal with such power to the masses, was due on the one hand to its belief in a future life, with its blessedness for the saved and with its misery for the lost, and on the other hand to its emphasis upon the eternal worth and the infinite possibilities of every human soul.

The power of the eschatological beliefs of the early Christians has been already referred to.[1] They had a far more vivid sense of the reality and nearness of the future world than any of their contemporaries, and they could preach it with a vigor and certainty possible to no one else. The persuasive power of their appeal to it is evidenced over and over again in the literature of the period. The consummation is at hand, the judgment is approaching, the Lord himself is about to return, and into eternal bliss and felicity are soon to enter all that are truly his, while those whom he condemns are to suffer the fitting penalty for their unrighteous and unholy lives.

But it was not simply this emphasis upon the future which gave the Gospel its persuasiveness and its impelling power; its appeal to the moral possibilities of every man meant even more. The ethical systems of the Pagan world were essentially aristocratic. They appealed to the naturally high-minded and virtuous, and they beautified and ennobled the lives of multitudes of the better classes; but for the ignorant and the degraded, for the vicious and the abandoned, they had no message. For such there was no hope. But the Gospel appealed with peculiar power to just such classes. To every man, however degraded,

[1] See p. 455.

world, led many Christians to desire to reform the present world in accordance with those higher principles, to repudiate the authority of the existing government, to do away with the existing social inequalities, to assert the equal worth of all classes and individuals, to free the slaves, to elevate the position of women, and in general to revolutionize society and transform it into the image of the kingdom of heaven. Against all such desires and tendencies not only Paul but also others protested with earnestness, and Paul at least not alone on the ground of expediency, but also on the ground of right.[1] It is God's will, he says, that the world shall be governed as it is, and he himself has appointed its rulers and given them their power.[2] It is his will also that the inequalities in social rank and condition shall continue to exist, and that Christians shall be content with their position, whatever it may be. Whether poor or rich, whether bond or free, every man is to remain in the place where God has put him. He is a free man in Christ, but that freedom does not mean any change in his social status or environment.[3] Paul is very emphatic upon this point. He denies unequivocally that the Gospel was intended to work any political or social revolution in the world. And Christianity was perhaps saved by his insistence and by the insistence of other leaders of the church from becoming a mere social agitation, and from bringing upon itself, as it must inevitably have done, speedy destruction.

But it is not enough to speak of the ethical principles and practice of the early Christians; their life was above all else religious, and it was its dominant religiousness that gave it its peculiar and distinctive character. The controlling fact in their life was the consciousness of being citizens of a heavenly kingdom and heirs of a heavenly inheritance.[4] They might go about their ordinary occupations as they had always done and might mingle with their

[1] Cf., *e.g.*, Rom. xiii. 1 sq.; 1 Thess. iv. 11; 2 Thess. iii. 6 sq.; 2 Tim. ii. 1; Titus iii. 1 sq.; Heb. xiii. 5; 1 Pet. ii. 13.

[2] Rom. xiii. 1.

[3] Cf., *e.g.*, 1 Cor. vii. 18 sq.

[4] Cf., *e.g.*, Phil. iii. 20; Heb. x. 34; Jas. iv. 4; 1 Pet. ii. 11; 1 John ii. 17; Rev. xxii. 1 sq.

neighbors as before, but they were conscious all the time that they were living in another world, and that the forces and influences which controlled them were from above. This consciousness found concrete expression in the belief that the Holy Spirit was in the church, guiding and inspiring the followers of Christ, and endowing them with power far beyond their own. From the very beginning it was believed that the Spirit was the common possession of all believers. At Pentecost he descended upon the assembled disciples and they all spoke with tongues, and Peter held out the promise to the onlookers whom he addressed on that occasion that they too should receive the gift of the Holy Ghost if they repented and were baptized in the name of Jesus Christ.[1] And so when the disciples were gathered together for prayer after the release of Peter and John, they were all filled with the Holy Ghost and spoke the word of God with boldness.[2] In the manifest presence of the Spirit was found the chief evidence that the promised Messianic age had already dawned, for it was generally believed among the Jews that that age would be the age of the Spirit in an eminent sense.[3] But what was true of the early disciples of Jerusalem was true also of the church at large throughout the greater part of the apostolic age. Everywhere the presence of the Spirit was taken for granted, and his operations constituted the most characteristic feature in the life of the church.[4] Those operations were of a very vivid and striking character. Speaking with tongues and prophecy were common, and even miracle-working was not unknown, and such mysterious phenomena were uniformly attributed to the Spirit, and in them was found the guarantee of his activity.[5] The influence of the Spirit, to be sure, was not exhausted in such striking operations. It was believed,

[1] Acts ii. 38.

[2] Acts iv. 31; cf. also v. 32, x. 47, xv. 8, xix. 6, and see above, p. 71 sq.

[3] See p. 62, above.

[4] Cf., *e.g.*, in addition to Paul's epistles which are filled with references to the Spirit's presence, 2 Tim. i. 14; Titus iii. 5; Heb. vi. 4; 1 Pet. i. 2, iv. 14; 1 John iii. 24, iv. 13; Jude 19 sq.

[5] But compare the remarks made on p. 75 relative to the connection of the Spirit with the working of miracles in the Book of Acts.

at any rate where the influence of Paul was felt, that Christians enjoyed the constant aid and enlightenment of the Spirit,[1] but it was nevertheless in the marvellous phenomena indicated that his activity was thought chiefly to manifest itself, and hence such phenomena were valued very highly as the clearest evidences of his presence.[2]

The consequence of all this was that the life of the primitive Christians, both Jewish and Gentile, bore a very peculiar character. Soberness and self-restraint were at a discount, and uncontrolled enthusiasm, ecstasy, and spiritual abandonment seemed the natural expression of the Christian life. To what extent the disciples indulged in such manifestations of their possession by the Spirit in their every-day intercourse with their friends and neighbors we cannot tell. There are evidences that the manifestations were frequent enough to produce a considerable impression upon those with whom they came in contact. There can be little doubt, in fact, that the reputation which they thus acquired of being under the sway of supernatural powers did much to enhance the influence of the Gospel and to contribute to its spread, especially among the less intelligent and more superstitious classes. This would be eminently the case in connection with the travelling missionaries, who were endowed with the Spirit in larger measure than most of their fellows, and who exercised everywhere the gifts of tongues, of prophecy, of miracle-working.[3] On the other hand, these manifestations of the activity of the Spirit doubtless had much to do with the reputation for folly and fanaticism which very commonly attached to the Christians in the communities in which they lived, and contributed to the belief, which we know was widespread at an early day, that they were in league with demons, and were devoted to the practice of the dark arts.[4]

[1] Cf., *e.g.*, Heb. vi. 4; 1 Pet. i. 2; 1 John iii. 24, iv. 13; Jude 20.

[2] Cf., *e.g.*, Acts viii. 18, x. 45, xix. 6; and 1 Cor. xii. and xiv.

[3] Cf. Mark xvi. 17; Acts viii. 13, xiv. 8 sq., xxviii. 3 sq.; 2 Cor. xii. 12; Heb. ii. 4.

[4] The accusation of demoniacal possession was brought even against Jesus, as we learn from Mark iii. 22; and so Paul was pronounced mad by Festus

But the gifts of the Spirit were exercised especially in the religious meetings of the Christians. Nowhere else, in fact, was there such opportunity and encouragement for their use. In possession of the Spirit, as they all believed themselves to be, it was when they came together to worship God and to commune with each other that their spiritual enthusiasm naturally manifested itself most freely and unrestrainedly. The clearest picture we have of those early meetings is found in Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians; and the picture is especially significant and valuable because it shows not only the characteristic features of the services themselves, but also the principle underlying them and the results to which the unrestrained operation of that principle was already leading. The picture, moreover, is evidently true not for Corinth alone, but for the church at large. The natural temper of the Corinthians, and the surroundings in which they lived, may have promoted to some extent the excesses into which they were running, but such exceptional circumstances do not account for those excesses; they were, in fact, exactly what must be expected wherever Christians were conscious of the Spirit's presence, and believed that he must make his presence known in marvellous and mysterious ways. Corinth certainly was not alone in that consciousness and in that belief; both were widespread in the apostolic age.

The most notable and characteristic feature of the Corinthian services, as described by Paul, is the immediate activity and the controlling influence of the Holy Spirit. It was supposed that those who took part in the meetings did it not on their own impulse, but under the impulse of the Spirit, and that all their utterances consequently were divinely inspired. The Spirit was supposed to be the ac-

(Acts xxvi. 24), very likely under the impression of the same kind of enwrapt and enthusiastic utterance which marked the addresses of the prophets, and aroused in believers the conviction that they spoke under the influence of the Holy Spirit. Cf. also 1 Cor. xiv. 23, where the same accusation of madness follows the speaking with tongues.

The reputation of being adepts in the arts of magic, which was naturally prompted not only by their exhibition of miraculous power, but also by their prophesying, had not a little to do with the persecutions which the Christians had to suffer. See below, p. 628 sq.

tive power; the Christians that spoke were simply his instruments or organs. Whoever had a psalm, or a teaching, or a revelation, or a tongue, or an interpretation,[1] received it from the Spirit, and when he communicated it to his brethren, it was accepted as a divine and not a mere human utterance. It is in the light of this fact that the freedom which characterized the Corinthian services must be interpreted. That freedom seems at first sight to have been complete. The confinement of the right to participate in the meetings to a certain class or to certain regularly appointed individuals was evidently quite unknown. Every Christian had the right to take such part as he wished, and the woman's right was equal to the man's. But the recognition of that right was not due to the Corinthians' recognition of the equality of all believers; it was due to their reverence for the Spirit of God. A disciple had the right to take part in the services not because he was a Christian possessed of equal privileges with all his brethren, but simply because he was an organ of the Spirit, and it was the Spirit's will that he should speak. Unless the Spirit prompted him, he had no right whatever. And hence the freedom which is so characteristic a mark of the services as they appear in Paul's epistle was, after all, decidedly limited. There was freedom only for the Spirit, not for men as men.

But it was their belief in the Spirit's presence and activity that led the Corinthians to value most highly, as they evidently did, those gifts which were most striking and mysterious and seemed therefore to involve a larger measure of the Spirit's action. Thus the gift of tongues, in the exercise of which a man was least master of himself and most completely under the influence of another power, was especially esteemed.[2] And in this the Corinthians were not alone. So pre-eminently did this gift seem to reveal the action of the Spirit, that the speaker with tongues was called "The Spiritual" in an especial sense.[3]

[1] 1 Cor. xiv. 26.

[2] Cf. 1 Cor. xiv. 2. On the gift of tongues, see above, p. 50 sq.

[3] Thus Paul apparently uses the word πνευματικός in 1 Cor. xii. 1, and xiv. 37; and as his own conception of the spiritual man was very different, it

This of course does not mean that the gift of tongues was regarded as the only truly spiritual gift, but it does indicate that it was looked upon as peculiarly such.

But the Corinthians' belief in the presence of the Spirit, and in his controlling activity in the religious services of the church, led naturally and almost universally to just such disorder and confusion as Paul condemns in his epistle. A *man* might be controlled by his brethren. If he spoke too long or too often, if he interrupted others that were speaking or disregarded the ordinary rules of decorum, he might easily be checked and quiet and orderliness be preserved. But when it was the Holy Spirit who was prompting his utterances, who could venture to interfere? Would it not be blasphemy to put restraints upon the divine activity? It is clear that the question was a serious one. It cannot be supposed that the Corinthian Christians were entirely indifferent to the condition of things which existed among them, that they were quite satisfied with the confusion and disorder that reigned in their services and cared nothing about it. The very fact that they asked for light from Paul touching those endowed with the Spirit,[1] indicates that many of them, at least, were troubled about the matter. The confusion, therefore, is not to be ascribed to bad motives on the part of the Corinthians, as if they were governed solely by personal pride or ambition or jealousy and each one desired to take a prominent place in the meetings, to display his own gift, and to show himself superior to his brethren. Doubtless the speakers themselves were for the most part entirely honest and sincere, and deprecated the confusion and disorder; but when the Spirit prompted them to speak, what could they do? Must they not obey at once? Were they not mere instruments of the Spirit, subject completely to his control? Evidently it was not merely a question between true and pretended inspiration, or between the

would seem that he must have followed in these passages the usage common among his readers or in the church at large. Cf. also 1 Thess. v. 19; and see Gunkel: *Die Wirkungen des heiligen Geistes*, S. 20 sq.; and Heinrici: *Das erste Sendschreiben an die Korinthier*, S. 347 sq.

[1] Cf. 1 Cor. xii. 1.

worthy and unworthy exercise of spiritual functions; it was a question of conscience, and it demanded careful consideration.

In his treatment of the subject Paul lays down two principles of far-reaching importance. The first is, that all that is done in the services of the church must be done primarily for the edification of those present. The purpose of the service, according to Paul, is not that the individual may exercise his spiritual gifts, or commune with God and offer prayer and praise to him, but that all may be edified. If any one takes part, he is to do it for the sake of his brethren; that he may contribute something which will bless them. And so only such gifts are to be exercised, and only under such conditions, as will best promote the edification of all. Thus the value of any gift depends not upon its mysterious and marvellous character, but upon its usefulness. But the application of such a test involved of course a great change in the Corinthians' estimate of the various charismata. Speaking with tongues, instead of being the most important of all, was relegated by Paul to an inferior place and the exercise of it was brought within narrow limits, and even forbidden altogether unless an interpreter were present.[1] This does not mean that Paul intended to deny the spiritual character of the gift of tongues; on the contrary, he saw in it a clear evidence of the Spirit's presence and activity, and he consequently wished that all his readers might exercise the gift,[2] and thanked God that he had it in larger measure than any of them.[3] But in spite of that, he would rather in the church speak five words with his understanding that he might instruct others also, than ten thousand words in a tongue.[4] In the church, that is, in the meetings of the Christians, all must be done for edification; each one must there have in view not his own but his brother's profit. Whatever gifts, therefore, a man may exercise at home or in private, when he meets with his brethren, let him eschew everything that will not benefit and bless them.

[1] 1 Cor. xiv. 27 sq. [2] 1 Cor. xiv. 5. [3] 1 Cor. xiv. 18. [4] 1 Cor. xiv. 19.

But the statement of this principle at once raises a difficulty. How can a man refuse to utter what the Spirit gives him? How can he refrain from speaking with tongues when prompted thereto, even though there be no interpreter present, and how can he refrain from prophesying when the revelation is imparted to him, even though another is prophesying at the same time? In answer to this question Paul lays down a second principle, no less important and far-reaching than the first. "The spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets," he says in vs. 32. In other words, an inspired man not only can, but has the right to utter or refrain from uttering that which is given him, to use it in such a way as his judgment dictates, and to hold it in subservience to the well-being of the church. The utterance is a startling one, but it does not indicate any tendency on Paul's part to detract from the dignity of the Spirit or to disparage his gifts. It is to be noticed that he does not say that the spirits of the prophets are subject to other uninspired men, but only that they are subject to the prophets themselves, and the assumption evidently is that with the gift, if it be a true gift, goes always wisdom to guide the prophet in its use; "for God is not a God of confusion, but of peace,"[1] and he cannot intend that his gifts should be employed in such a way as to impede instead of promote the good of the church. But the principle nevertheless is of far-reaching consequence, and its utterance marks an epoch in the history of Christian worship. For the effect of it, in association with the other principle that all things are for edification, must evidently be in the end to subject the action of the Spirit to the will not only of the prophet himself, but also of the church. If he does not exercise discretion in the use of his spiritual gifts, the church has the right and the duty to exercise it for him, and the complete freedom of the inspired individual must thus yield to the control of the assembled congregation. The way is thus prepared for a regular and stereotyped order of services, and the way is prepared also for the appoint-

[1] Cor. xiv. 33.

ment of certain persons to take charge of the services and to see that the established routine is followed and all things done decently and in order. Such a stereotyping process and such a development of officialism Paul seems not to have contemplated in writing to the Corinthians, but the principles enunciated by him could hardly have any other effect in the long run. And our sources indicate that the effect ensued in due time. In Rome, before the end of the first century, the process was already well under way, and regularly appointed officials were in control of the services.[1] And long before the middle of the second century, the original freedom seems to have given place almost everywhere to the bondage of liturgical rules, and instead of the simple informal gatherings of the earliest days, regular services were held, in which a fixed order was followed, and the privilege of participation was granted only to certain persons and only under well-defined restrictions.[2] In 1 Cor. xiv. 33 Paul implies that the principles laid down in the preceding context were applicable to other churches as well, and he doubtless inculcated them elsewhere as need arose. And so, though the development was due in part to natural conditions and needs which were everywhere similar,[3] there can be no doubt that Paul's influence had much to do with that development, and that the two principles first enunciated, so far as we know, by him were ultimately responsible for it.

It is impossible, of course, when the meetings were of such an informal and spontaneous character as they were in the earliest days, to give a detailed description of them. But the First Epistle to the Corinthians indicates clearly enough the exercises which ordinarily took place. The gift of tongues, as we have seen, was very common and especially prized. But Paul's direction that it should be employed only when an interpreter was present, must

[1] Cf. Clement: *Ad Cor.* 40–42, 44, 59 sq.

[2] Cf., *e.g.*, *Didache*, IX. sq., Justin Martyr's *Apology*, I. 67; and Ignatius: *Magn.* 4, 7; *Trall.* 7; *Smyr.* 8.

[3] In Thessalonica the excesses to which the free exercise of spiritual gifts was leading were producing a reaction against their exercise (1 Thess. v. 19, 20), and what was true there may well have been true elsewhere.

ultimately, though not immediately, have put a stop to it. Interpretation involved some peculiar rapport between speaker and interpreter; the latter must be spiritually endowed as well as the former, and such reciprocal endowment cannot have been general at any time and must have grown increasingly uncommon. And so it is not surprising that tongues ceased, as they seem to have done, at a comparatively early day.

Prophesying, too, usually constituted a part of the service.[1] It was as truly a spiritual act as the speaking with tongues, being nothing else than the utterance of revelations received directly from God. Whether those revelations had to do with the past, the present, or the future, with belief or with conduct, with the individual or with the church, the act was the same. Whatever was immediately imparted to a man by the Spirit, and uttered by him under the Spirit's influence, was prophecy.[2] The gift of prophecy was distinguished from the gift of tongues by the fact that the person exercising it, though he might be under great excitement, was entirely aware of what he was saying and of what was going on about him. He was not beside himself, or deprived of consciousness in any such way as the speaker with tongues. Moreover, his utterances were intelligible both to himself and to others.[3]

[1] It is to prophecy that Paul refers in 1 Cor. xiv. 26, when he uses the word "revelation" (ἀποκάλυψις). Cf. also the whole of the fourteenth chapter.

[2] Examples of various kinds of prophecy are found in the New Testament. Agabus foretells a famine which leads the brethren of Antioch to send help to the Mother Church (Acts xi. 28). He also announces to Paul the fate that is to befall him in Jerusalem (xxi. 11). The same kind of a prophetic warning is given also by the disciples of Tyre (xxi. 4). So Paul frequently received divine direction at critical junctures (cf. Gal. ii. 2; Acts xvi. 6, 9), and the same was true of Peter and Philip (Acts x. and viii.). Paul had, moreover, many visions and revelations (see, for instance, 2 Cor. xii. 1 sq. and compare the vision of Stephen, Acts vii. 56); and indeed his whole Gospel rested upon a revelation, and was thus an inspired Gospel. He received announcements of God's will, also, for the guidance of the church (compare, for instance, 1 Cor. vii. 10, xiv. 37) and was granted knowledge of the future for the instruction and encouragement of his brethren (compare 1 Cor. xv. 23, 50; 2 Thess. ii. 3). The most notable example of prophecy in the New Testament is the Apocalypse, which purports to be from beginning to end the record of a revelation vouchsafed by Christ to the author, while he was in the Spirit (Rev. i. 1, 10).

[3] Tongues required interpretation, prophecy did not (cf. 1 Cor. xiv. 2 sq., 28 sq.).

The prophet was thus at the same time a teacher, for the revelations which he received and uttered were for the instruction of those to whom he spoke; but he differed from the ordinary teacher in that he imparted not what he had acquired by study or thought or reflection, but only what was directly given him, only what he saw or heard. He was simply the mouthpiece of the Spirit, and his own wisdom and attainments played no part in the matter.

It was because the utterances of the prophet were fitted to instruct and edify others, that Paul ranked the gift of prophecy so much higher than the gift of tongues. "He that speaketh in a tongue, edifieth himself, but he that prophesieth, edifieth the church," he says in 1 Cor. xiv. 4, and while he expresses the wish that all might speak with tongues, he is much more anxious that all should prophesy.[1] In prophecy he sees the greatest power, not only for the upbuilding of the saints, but also for the conviction and conversion of unbelievers.[2] The gift upon which Paul lays such emphasis was a very common one in the apostolic age. There were prophets not only in Paul's churches, but also in Jerusalem, Antioch, and Cæsarea.[3] Moreover, the gift was confined to no particular class of Christians. Women as well as men prophesied in Corinth,[4] and Paul's wish that all might prophesy, shows that the gift was not the prerogative of a special order or office.[5]

But when the gifts of the Spirit were valued so highly as they were in those early days, it was natural that there should be some who pretended to gifts which they did not

[1] 1 Cor. xiv. 5.
[2] 1 Cor. xiv. 24.
[3] Acts xi. 27, xiii. 1, xv. 32, xxi. 9.
[4] 1 Cor. xi. 5; cf. also Acts xxi. 9.
[5] 1 Cor. xiv. 5, 24, 31; cf. also Acts xix. 6. It is one of the most notable signs of the enthusiastic spiritual character of the early church and of its vivid consciousness of being under direct divine control and in intimate communion with God, that the belief in prophecy was universal and the exercise of the gift so widespread. Even in the second century when the primitive enthusiasm and spontaneity had already largely passed away, Christians still believed in the continuation of prophecy and there were still prophets in the church (cf., *e.g.*, *Didache*, XI.; Epistle of Barnabas, XVI.; Ignatius: *Phil.* 7; Hermas: *Mand.* XI.; Justin: *Dial.* 81, 88; and see Harnack's edition of the *Didache* in the *Texte und Untersuchungen*, II. 1, S. 123.

Only under the pressure of its controversy with the Montanists in the latter part of the second century did the church at large finally come to the conclusion that prophecy had ceased.

possess, and when all were under excitement and in constant expectation of receiving inspiration from on high, it was inevitable that some should imagine themselves prompted by the Spirit when they were not. It was therefore important that there should be a means of determining whether a speaker was really under the influence of the Spirit, and this was especially needful in connection with the prophets, whose utterances purported to be the word of God for the guidance and instruction of their brethren. And so Paul, in 1 Cor. xiv. 29, directs that while the prophets are speaking the others shall discern, that is, shall determine whether their utterances are really the Spirit's or only their own; and in xii. 3 he gives a test by which the true and the false prophet may be determined: "No man speaking in the Spirit of God saith, Jesus is anathema; and no man can say, Jesus is Lord, but in the Holy Spirit." This can mean nothing else than that if a man is truly inspired, all that he says will be for the glory of Christ and not the reverse.[1] And so the character of that which is uttered in any meeting by a prophet is to be weighed by his brethren before its divine origin is admitted. If there is in it anything unchristian or anything that detracts from the honor of Christ, it cannot be accepted as God's word.[2] But evidently no test could be given which would enable Christians to determine absolutely in every case whether the Spirit of God was speaking or only a man, and hence some were supposed to be endowed with a special charisma which made it possible for them to distinguish the false from the true: the charisma of "discerning of Spirits," as Paul calls it.[3]

In addition to prophecy and speaking with tongues, Paul mentions teaching as another part of the religious services.[4] Prophecy was itself a form of teaching, but in 1 Cor. xiv. 6 and 26, teaching is distinguished from prophecy

[1] A similar though somewhat more specific test is given in 1 John iv. 2 (cf. also Gal. i. 8). In the *Didache* (XI.) the prophet's conduct is made a test of his divine calling, but it is implied in the beginning of the same chapter that the agreement of his teaching with that which the readers have already received must also be taken into account.

[2] Cf. also 1 Thess. v. 21. [3] 1 Cor. xii. 10. [4] 1 Cor. xiv. 26.

as a special function, and the gift of teaching is likewise distinguished from the gift of prophecy in 1 Cor. xii. 8 sq. and Rom. xii. 6 sq.[1] The difference between the two lay in the fact that while prophecy was the utterance of a revelation received directly from God, teaching, specifically so called, was the utterance of that which one had gained by thought and reflection. The teacher might be led and guided by the Spirit,— indeed, he must be, if he were to be a true teacher and his teaching truly spiritual,— but what he said was in a real sense his own. He was thus an inspired man, but not a mere mouthpiece of the Spirit. It was the especial function of the man endowed with the gift of teaching to expound and apply and draw lessons from the revelations of God imparted either to the ancient prophets or to the prophets of the present, and he might deal with the simplest matters or delve deep into the mysteries of divine truth. His gift might not display the immediate activity of the Spirit to the same extent as the gift of tongues or of prophecy, but its usefulness was very great, as Paul himself indicates in more than one passage.[2] It was largely by its exercise that the church was enabled to preserve its balance and was kept from running into all sorts of spiritual excesses and eccentricities. The quietness and soberness which naturally attached to it constituted an excellent counterpoise to the excitement and frenzy which attended prophecy and speaking with tongues. The exercise of the gift in the service invited those present to thought and reflection, and enabled them to understand better both themselves and the Gospel, and to make a wiser use of the spiritual riches offered them by the prophets. It was, indeed, only as they were carefully instructed in the meaning of the Gospel that they were competent to test the truth of the utterances of the prophets, and to estimate their worth. Paul's epistles are very largely devoted to the impartation of instruction which his teaching charisma fitted him to give, and in all of them

[1] Cf. also 1 Cor. xii. 28, and Eph. iv. 11, where teachers are distinguished from prophets.

[2] Cf. 1 Cor. xiv. 6; also xii. 8, and xiv. 26, in both of which passages teaching is mentioned before prophecy.

he assumes that his readers have received such instruction from the beginning. The common conceptions of Christianity which prevailed in the church, and some of which finally crystallized into the creeds and confessions of the second and subsequent centuries, were much more largely the fruit of thought and reflection than of immediate revelation. Teaching, specifically so called, had more to do with them than prophecy. And yet though the gift of teaching was so useful, and though its permanent influence upon the life and thought of Christendom was so great, in a church like that of Corinth, where so much was made of those gifts which were most mysterious and marvellous (and Corinth was not unique in this respect), the gift of teaching must have seemed of comparatively little value, and its exercise was very likely completely overshadowed by tongues and prophecy. There can have been little opportunity for quiet instruction and little inclination to listen to it where there was such activity and where so many were clamoring for utterance as in the meetings described by Paul. But when the principles laid down by Paul for the conduct of the services were put into practice, the teaching function found a much larger exercise, and as the early enthusiasm abated somewhat and spiritual ecstasy grew less general and constant, the influence of the man endowed with the teaching charisma rapidly increased.

Other exercises which commonly constituted a part of the services of the early Christians were praise and prayer. In 1 Cor. xiv. 26 Paul mentions praise first of all, and from the word he uses,[1] and the way in which he speaks of it, it is evident that it took the form ordinarily of a psalm, which was sung or spoken by this or that individual believer under the impulse of the Spirit. The psalm of praise might be unintelligible, constituting simply a form of the speaking with tongues, or it might promote the edification of those present, just as prophecy and teaching did.[2] In either case it was the utterance of a man spiritually endowed, and it formed his contribution to the service.

[1] ψαλμός. [2] Cf. 1 Cor. xiv. 15.

Paul does not indicate whether the psalm was ordinarily sung or simply spoken. It was as much a psalm in the one case as in the other, and doubtless the practice varied according to individual tastes and talents. That singing was common is clear from Eph. v. 19 and Col. iii. 16, as well as from Pliny's epistle to Trajan, in which he says that the Christians were accustomed "to sing responsively a song unto Christ as God."[1] The psalms thus sung or spoken were doubtless in some cases new and original with those that uttered them, in other cases old and familiar to all. Their spiritual character and their fitness to voice one's praise did not depend upon their originality. A few examples of early Christian hymns are found in the New Testament, some of them without doubt composed by the writers themselves with an immediate reference to the subject in hand, others possibly already current in the church.[2]

Paul does not mention prayer as distinguished from praise in 1 Cor. xiv. 26, but that it must have constituted a part of every religious service of the early Christians goes without saying,[3] and in xi. 4 it is explicitly referred to, and in xiv. 15 is expressly distinguished from praise. Like the latter, it might be intelligible, and thus edifying to all present, or it might be simply a form of the speaking with tongues, and as such of benefit to no one except the man himself;[4] but in either case it was thought of, like all the other exercises, as prompted by the Spirit, and of course the same freedom attached to it as to them. Any one might offer prayer at any time and in any form, just as he might speak with tongues or prophesy. The earliest set form of Christian prayer known to us is the Lord's prayer, which is reported only by two of the evangelists, Matthew and Luke, but of whose authenticity

[1] *Carmenque christo quasi deo dicere secum invicem;* in epistle No. 96 (97) of Pliny's collected epistles, written in 110 or 111 A.D. See my translation of Eusebius, p. 165.

[2] Cf., *e.g.*, Rev. xix. 1–3, 6 sq., xi. 17 sq., iv. 11, v. 9–13, xv. 3 sq. For other songs see Luke i. 46 sq., 68 sq., ii. 14, 29 sq. Upon the whole subject see Weizsäcker, *l.c.* S. 557 sq. (Eng. Trans., Vol. II. p. 259 sq.).

[3] Cf. Acts ii. 42; also 2 Cor. i. 11, where common prayer is spoken of.

[4] 1 Cor. xiv. 14.

there can be no doubt. It is possible that the Aramaic word "Abba," in Rom. viii. 15 and Gal. iv. 6, points to its common use in Paul's day.[1] At any rate, it was generally employed in the second century, if not already in the first. The earliest distinct reference to it outside of the Gospels is in the *Teaching of the Apostles*, where it is repeated in full, and Christians are directed to pray thus three times a day.[2] In the same work other set forms of prayer are given, to be used in connection with the eucharistic service,[3] but it is expressly stipulated that the prophets shall not be bound by such forms, but shall be permitted to give thanks at as great length as they please. This stipulation is very significant, for it shows how prescribed forms of prayer gradually took the place of the free prayers of the earliest days. Prayer being regarded as a spiritual exercise indulged in only under the prompting of the Spirit, it became necessary in the services, as the consciousness of inspiration grew less general, to depend for it, as well as for prophecy and teaching, upon certain peculiarly favored individuals, and in their absence to repeat the prayers offered by them when present. The forms prescribed in the *Didache* for use in the absence of prophets were without doubt regarded as inspired utterances, and the repetition of them was thought to be the best that could be done when genuine inspiration for new and spontaneous prayer was lacking.[4]

In addition to prayer, praise, teaching, prophecy, and tongues, there is reason to suppose that the reading of the Scriptures also constituted commonly a part of the services of the early Christians. Such reading is not mentioned in 1 Cor. xiv. 26, but the omission of a specific reference

[1] See Weizsäcker, *l.c.* S. 556 sq. (Eng. Trans., Vol. II. p. 258 sq.).

[2] *Didache*, VIII. See the notes *in loc.* in Harnack's edition of the *Didache* (*Texte und Untersuchungen*, II. 1).

[3] *Didache*, IX. sq.

[4] In Clement's Epistle to the Corinthians, chaps. 59–61, an extended prayer is given which was doubtless in common use in the church of Rome, for it bears no relation to the object of the epistle, and can hardly have been composed by Clement for the occasion. According to Justin (*Apol.* I. 67), the president, that is, evidently, the bishop, who was in charge of the service prayed in such form as he pleased. But before the end of the second century an established liturgy was almost everywhere in use.

to prayer in the same passage shows that the enumeration was not intended to be exhaustive, and Paul's silence therefore cannot be urged as a proof that the Scriptures were not read in the services of the Corinthian church.[1] There is the same lack of reference to the matter in all our first century sources,[2] but the familiar acquaintance with the Old Testament which Paul and other early writers assume on the part of those whom they address, and the emphasis upon its divine character and upon its value both as law and prophecy, which was so widespread from the beginning, among Gentile as well as Jewish Christians, make it practically certain that the Scriptures were diligently read and expounded in their meetings.[3] Justin Martyr tells us that they were thus read in his day,[4] and there is every reason to think that the custom existed from the beginning.

Least of all the exercises which have been described could the reading of the Scriptures be regarded as a spiritual function. And yet even here the influence of the Spirit must have been recognized, prompting a Christian to impart something from the word of God for the instruction and edification of those present, and quickening his appreciation and apprehension of its meaning. A prescribed exercise in the service the reading can hardly have been in the early days of informality and freedom. It must have been, like all the other functions, the voluntary contribution of this or that brother; and it was doubtless by those endowed with the gift of teaching that the Scriptures were most commonly employed in the meetings. Upon selected passages, either read or repeated from memory, they very likely based much of the instruction which

[1] The fact that reading was not naturally subject to abuse, may have led to the omission of it in 1 Cor. xiv. 26.

[2] But see Acts i. 20, iv. 25, xv. 16 sq.

[3] Cf., *e.g.*, in the epistles of Paul such passages as Rom. vii. 1; 1 Cor. ix. 18, xiv. 21, 34, xv. 1 sq.; 2 Cor. vi. 16 sq.; Gal. iv. 26. The large use of the Old Testament in the Epistle to the Hebrews, in 1 Peter, and in Clement's Epistle to the Corinthians is also to be noticed. Especially significant are the words of Clement in chap. 53: "For ye know and know well the sacred Scriptures, dearly beloved, and ye have searched into the oracles of God" (cf. also chap. 62).

[4] Justin's *Apology*, I. 67.

they had to impart to their fellows. Thus is best explained the fact that the familiarity of the church at large with the Old Testament seems to have been confined in the main to certain portions of it, particularly to such portions as could be understood in a Messianic sense. A body of Messianic predictions was thus brought together at an early day, and nearly all the apologetic writers of the second and subsequent centuries drew largely upon it, the same passages recurring again and again in early Christian literature, and nearly always with the same interpretations.

In addition to the Old Testament Scriptures, there is reason to think that records of Christ's life, and especially of his words, were widely read in the meetings of the primitive Christians. We know that such records were composed at an early day, and that some of them were made use of by the authors of our Gospels;[1] and as the words of Christ were everywhere recognized as possessing authority in the church,[2] it is altogether probable that Christians were increasingly careful to acquaint themselves and their brethren with those words as transmitted either orally or in writing. At the same time it would be a grave mistake to suppose that our Gospels or any other Gospel records were looked upon as "Scripture" during the period with which we are dealing. The only "Scripture," that is, the only sacred and authoritative text which the church had, was the Jewish Bible. The ascription to the records which contained them of the sacredness and authority which attached to Christ's words was not thought of until well on in the second century. Not because they were written, but because they had fallen from Christ's lips, were his words authoritative, and their authority was not in the least diminished because they were transmitted orally rather than in writing. Indeed, Papias valued the oral traditions more highly than the written records, and in this he doubtless voiced the sentiment of many of his contemporaries.[3] So far, therefore,

[1] See below, p. 569 sq. [2] Cf., *e.g.*, 1 Cor. vii. 10, ix. 14, xi. 23.

[3] Cf. Eusebius: *H.E.* III. 39, 4. I embrace this opportunity to correct the interpretation of Papias' words given in my edition of Eusebius, Bk. III. chap. 39, note 11. I am now convinced that the words ἐκ τῶν Βιβλίων refer not,

as such Gospel records were read or quoted in the services of the early Christians, they were regarded not as the revealed and inspired word of God, but simply as sources from which a knowledge of Christ's utterances or of his deeds might be drawn. That the epistles of Paul were also read to the assembled Christians in the various churches addressed is clear from such passages as 1 Thess. v. 27 and Col. iv. 16. That they must have been thus read goes, indeed, without saying. And the same is equally true of other epistles, whether written by one church to another,[1] or by apostles, prophets, and other men of like repute.[2] The public reading of such epistles and other writings did not, of course, mean that they were regarded as Scripture and put upon the same plane with the Jewish Bible. Many of them might in time acquire such canonical dignity and authority, but during the period with which we are dealing there was no thought of such a thing. As already remarked, the only "Scripture" was the traditional Jewish canon, and neither gospels nor epistles nor apocalypses found in those early days a place alongside of the old law and prophets.[3]

We have been dealing thus far only with those parts of the religious service in which there was a mutual interchange of the gifts of the Spirit, or in which the impartation of inspiration, instruction, and edification was the

as maintained by Lightfoot, to written expositions or interpretations of the utterances of Christ, but to the Gospel records themselves which contained such utterances.

[1] As, for instance, the epistle of the church of Rome to the church of Corinth, commonly known as Clement's First Epistle to the Corinthians, which was read in the church of Corinth on the Lord's day as late as 170 A.D., as was also the later epistle of the same church, written by the hand of Bishop Soter. See Eusebius: *H.E.* IV. 23, 11.

[2] Not only the epistles which are contained in our New Testament canon, including the Apocalypse (compare Rev. i. 3, and xxii. 16, 18), were thus read, but also many other epistles and works of various kinds. Thus, for instance, the *Shepherd* of Hermas was widely read in the public services in the second century (compare *Vis.* II. 4), not to mention the epistles of Barnabas, Ignatius, Polycarp, and many others.

[3] The implied inclusion of Paul's epistles in the "Scriptures" by the author of 2 Peter (iii. 16) is one of the many signs of the late date of that epistle (see below, p. 602). Neither Paul's letters nor any of the other writings which are contained in our New Testament canon were regarded as Scripture until well on in the second century.

chief end subserved. But there was another function of an entirely different kind which constituted from the very beginning an important feature of the gatherings of Christian disciples, and that was the Lord's Supper. It is not necessary to suppose that such exercises as have been described did not occur in connection with that feast. It is altogether probable that when Christians came together to break bread, they spoke and prayed and prophesied as they had opportunity or as the Spirit gave them utterance.[1] But at the same time a distinction may fairly be drawn between the services which have been considered and the meetings for partaking of the Lord's Supper. Such services might be held on many occasions and in many circumstances when there was no opportunity for eating a common meal. According to Pliny, the Christians of Bithynia in his time met twice on a stated day: in the morning to sing a hymn and to join in a pledge, and again later to partake of a common meal,[2] and there are indications that in Corinth a similar custom was observed. At any rate, the exercises which Paul mentions in the fourteenth chapter of First Corinthians cannot well have taken place in the meeting which he describes in the eleventh chapter under the circumstances that existed in that meeting; and in xiv. 24 unbelievers are represented as being in attendance, while they can hardly have been present at the common meal.[3] Though the custom which thus seems to have been followed in Corinth, and later in Bithynia, may not have been universal, and though hard and fast lines between the two kinds of services must not be drawn, it is safe to assume that Christians everywhere met together, sometimes with the particular purpose of partaking of the Lord's Supper, at other times with an altogether different aim.

It was seen in an earlier chapter that the Lord's Supper was eaten by the primitive disciples of Jerusalem, and there can be no doubt that it was everywhere celebrated in the churches of the apostolic age. The only descrip-

[1] Cf., *e.g.*, Acts xx. 7. [2] See Pliny's epistle referred to on p. 531, above.
[3] Cf. also Weizsäcker, *l.c.* S. 548 sq. (Eng. Trans., Vol. II. p. 249 sq.).

tion of it which we have in the literature of the period is found in Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians.[1] In that epistle he is led by certain abuses which attached to the Supper in Corinth to reprove his readers very sharply, and to indicate his own conception of the service and the principles which ought to govern its observance. It seems that the Corinthians were in the habit of meeting together for the purpose of partaking of a common meal, just as the early disciples of Jerusalem had been in the habit of doing, and that at that meal they ate bread and drank wine with an especial reference to Jesus, thus making a commemorative and religious feast of it.[2] But at the time Paul wrote his epistle, the meal, which should have been a holy meal from beginning to end, had degenerated into a scene of discord and debauchery. Each was concerned to satisfy his own appetite without any regard to his brethren, and the spirit of Christian brotherhood, and even the common rules of decency, were violated in a shocking way. It was under these circumstances that Paul reminded them that the commemoration of Christ's death was the chief purpose of the meal and not the eating and drinking for their own sakes, and he therefore commanded them to satisfy their hunger at home, so that when they came together they might give themselves wholly to the religious part of the service, and might be in a condition to commemorate Christ in the right spirit.[3] The principle thus voiced by Paul is of far-reaching significance. It means logically the doing away of the simple and informal character of the Lord's Supper, of the identification of that Supper with every meal eaten by Christians, and the substitution of a specific and formal religious service in which

[1] 1 Cor. xi. 18 sq.

[2] The common meals which were very much in vogue in the heathen world of the period may have had some influence upon the common meals of the Christians, contributing to their frequency and moulding to some extent the practices connected with them (cf. especially Hatch's *Hibbert Lectures* on the *Influence of Greek Ideas and Usages on the Christian Church*, p. 300), but it is not necessary to look to those feasts for an explanation of the common meals of the Christians. The impulse thus to meet together was given by the conception of the church as a family, and Paul without doubt instituted the Lord's Supper in all his churches at the very beginning.

[3] 1 Cor. xi. 22, 34.

eating and drinking are purely symbolic acts. Thus a ceremonial rite takes the place of a real meal, and a line is drawn between the sacred and the secular. Instead of the permeation of every ordinary meal with a sacred character, there is the distinct setting apart of a particular feast, or rather the institution of a special symbolic feast, to which attaches a purely religious meaning, so that the secular character of all other meals is tacitly recognized. Though the Lord's Supper was everywhere eaten by Christian disciples before Paul, it may be said in a certain sense that it was established by him; for it was he, so far as our sources enable us to judge, who first made it a special meal, and separated it from all others. It is significant that his action was due to the abuses which had arisen in connection with the Supper as eaten in the ordinary way. It was in order to meet a practical emergency that he laid down a principle which was destined ultimately to find acceptance everywhere, not only because of his authority, but also and chiefly because the same difficulties which made their appearance at an early day in Corinth must at some time or other make their appearance in other places as well, even though in less offensive form. While the original sense of Christ's immediate presence was real and vivid, every meal, as every meeting, of the disciples would naturally bear a sacred character and be permeated with a holy meaning; but as that sense grew gradually fainter, as it did with the passage of time, with the multiplication of converts, and with the delay of the parousia, the difficulty of preserving the sacred character of all meals and all times must increase, and the need of setting apart certain special times and instituting certain special meals of a more sacred character must be increasingly felt. It is one of the strange paradoxes of history that the great apostle of liberty, who did more than any one else to oppose and destroy the reign of rites and ceremonies, should yet have laid down principles in relation both to the services of the church in general, and to the Lord's Supper in particular, which were essentially formal and stereotyping in their effect.

It was some time before the principle enunciated by Paul in connection with the Lord's Supper was carried out to its logical result. It was not his intention in his Epistle to the Corinthians to lay down a general law which should govern all churches. He was concerned simply to provide against a particular difficulty which had arisen in Corinth, and to prevent the recurrence of disgraceful scenes which may not have been common elsewhere at that time. And so it is not strange that so long as similar difficulties did not arise in other churches, they should continue to unite the observance of the Lord's Supper with a regular meal. In Syria and Asia Minor at the time the *Teaching of the Apostles* and the epistles of Ignatius were written, and in Bithynia in the time of Pliny, the Lord's Supper and the common meal, or agape, seem to have been combined.[1] But in Rome, when Justin Martyr wrote his *Apology*, the Lord's Supper was attached to the regular Sunday service of worship, and the agape had disappeared altogether or was held at some other time.[2] And though the common meal lingered on in some quarters for many generations, it was gradually prohibited because of the excesses to which it frequently gave rise, as it had done at an early day in Corinth.

Paul's conception of the significance of the Lord's Supper appears in 1 Cor. xi. 24 sq. and x. 16 sq. In the former passage he repeats the words of institution as he had learned them, and then adds, in vs. 26, a comment of his own, which shows that he conceived of the Supper primarily as a memorial feast in which the death of the Lord, the great central fact in the Pauline theology, was commemorated. In x. 16 sq., on the other hand, he speaks of the Lord's Supper as a communion feast, in partaking of which believers become united not simply with each other, but also with Christ, whose body and blood are symbolized in the bread and wine of which all partake. Thus Paul finds in the Eucharist a symbolic representa-

[1] Cf. *Didaché*, X.; Ignatius: *Rom.* 7; *Smyr.* 7, 8, and the Epistle of Pliny referred to above.

[2] See Justin's *Apology*, I. 66.

tion of that real and vital union of the believer with the risen Saviour which was fundamental in his conception of the Christian life. In the Lord's Supper are symbolized at once the believer's death with Christ, when he partakes of the cup which represents Christ's blood, and his living union with him, when he partakes of the bread which represents his abiding presence with his disciples.[1] That Paul does not think of the communion with Christ as a realistic or material participation in his body and blood is made plain enough by vs. 18, where he speaks of the Jews as having communion with the altar at their sacrificial feasts; but he does think, nevertheless, of the real union of the believer with Christ and of the consequent union of believers with each other as symbolized in the common meal, in which one bread and one cup are partaken of by all. The unity of the church, the body of Christ, to which Paul refers in 1 Cor. xii. 27, and which he emphasizes so strongly in his Epistle to the Ephesians, is thus clearly shown forth in the Lord's Supper as he interprets it.

Our sources throw little light upon the common conception of the Lord's Supper which prevailed in the church at large during our period.[2] It must have been commonly regarded as a commemoration of Christ's death, and yet that this idea of it was not everywhere prominent appears from more than one second-century writing.[3] It was not long before there were read into it many ideas entirely foreign to the thought of Christ himself and equally foreign to the thought of Paul,— ideas developed on the one hand out of the notion of sacrifice, which attached to the Supper at an early day, and on the other hand out of the

[1] Weizsäcker's reference of the bread to the living Christ and of the wine to his death (*l.c.* S. 576; Eng. Trans., Vol. II. p. 282) is justified by Paul's words in 1 Cor. x. 16 sq., but not by his words in xi. 24 sq. Verse 26 of the latter chapter makes it clear that in writing that passage Paul was thinking of Christ's death as symbolized by both elements. The fact must be recognized that he was looking at the service from different points of view in the two chapters, and that in chap. x. he brings out with a special purpose a special and secondary idea which does not appear in the other passage.

[2] The supper is mentioned in the New Testament only in the Synoptic Gospels, in Acts ii. 42, 46, and xx. 7, in 1 Cor. x. and xi., and in Jude 12.

[3] Cf., *e.g.*, *Didache*, IX. and X.; Ignatius: *Eph.* 20; *Trall.* 8; *Smyr.* 6.

conception of it as a means of grace or of the bestowal of divine gifts upon the participants.[1]

In the *Teaching of the Apostles*,[2] it is expressly commanded that the Eucharist shall be given only to the baptized. The emphasis upon the matter suggests that the principle was not always observed, and that even unbaptized persons were sometimes permitted to partake of the Supper. But the command doubtless represents the common sentiment and custom of the church at large, and the disregard of it must have been exceptional. As was seen in an earlier chapter, baptism was probably practised in the Christian church from the beginning,[3] and was everywhere regarded as the rite by which a believer was received into the Christian circle. It seems to have been originally a baptism of repentance, like the baptism of John, and to have symbolized the purification of the penitent from the sins of which he repented. With his deeper and more spiritual conception of the Christian life, Paul attached a new and profound meaning to the rite, making it symbolize the death of the believer with Christ unto the flesh and his resurrection with him unto the new life in the Spirit.[4] But as Paul's conception of the process of redemption did not find general acceptance, so his interpretation of baptism seems not to have prevailed widely.[5] Since it was commonly regarded as the rite which symbolized or marked a believer's entrance upon the Christian life, it was possible for it to be interpreted in many ways, according as one or another element in that life was emphasized. The writings of our period throw no light upon the subject, but in the literature of the second century[6]

[1] These later ideas cannot be traced here, but the reader may be referred to Harnack's *Dogmengeschichte*, 3te Auflage, I. S. 200 sq. (Eng. Trans., Vol. I. p. 209 sq.). The idea that the Eucharist (a name for the Supper which appears first in the *Didache*, IX. and in many other second-century writings) is a sacrifice is found early in the second century, the name *θυσία* being first applied to it in the *Didache*, XIV.

[2] Chap. X. [3] See above, p. 59 sq.

[4] See Rom. vi. 3 sq.; Gal. iii. 27; Col. ii. 12; and cf. 1 Cor. xii. 13.

[5] But compare 1 Pet. iii. 21.

[6] See Harnack: *Dogmengeschichte*, 3te Auflage, I. S. 198 sq. (Eng. Trans., Vol. I. p. 206 sq.). Upon the original and later baptismal formula, see above, p. 60 sq.

we find the ceremony pictured under the most diverse aspects.

Paul apparently did not perform the rite himself very often; for he regarded it as his business not to baptize, but to preach the Gospel.[1] At the same time, his words in 1 Cor. xii. 13 make it clear that all his converts were baptized, as we should expect them to be in view of the profound symbolical meaning which he attached to the rite.[2] It is evident from 1 Cor. i. 14 sq. that he did not regard its administration as the peculiar function or prerogative of an apostle or of any ecclesiastical official, and the separation of the descent of the Holy Spirit from the act of baptism, and the ascription to him and to other apostles of the power to impart the Spirit by the laying on of hands, which we find in the Book of Acts, is certainly not in accord with his conception.[3]

The ordinary mode of baptism in the apostolic age was immersion, as is proved not only by Paul's figure in Rom. vi. 3 and 1 Cor. x. 2, but also by the *Teaching of the Apostles*.[4] The latter prescribes immersion in ordinary cases, but allows pouring under exceptional circumstances, when water is not at hand in sufficient quantity to permit baptism by the former mode. It may safely be inferred from this that while from the beginning baptism was commonly by immersion, the essential feature of the rite was the use of water and not the mode of its use, and that such an exception as is made in the *Teaching of the Apostles* would have been generally recognized as valid. To assert that in the time of the apostles particular stress was laid upon the external form in connection with such a rite is to run counter to all that we know of the temper of the age. The insistence upon form began early, to be sure, but it did not mark the earliest stage in Christian history.[5]

[1] 1 Cor. i. 14 sq.

[2] Cf. also Eph. iv. 5. On the practice of baptizing for the dead, referred to in 1 Cor. xv. 29, see above, p. 272.

[3] See above, p. 97 sq. [4] Chap. VII.

[5] Upon the mode of baptism in earlier and later days, see especially Schaff's *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, p. 29 sq.

Whether infants were baptized in the apostolic age, we have no means of determining. Where the original idea of baptism as a baptism of repentance, or where Paul's profound conception of it as a symbol of the death and resurrection of the believer with Christ prevailed, the practice would not be likely to arise. But where the rite was regarded as a mere sign of one's reception into the Christian circle, it would be possible for the custom to grow up under the influence of the ancient idea of the family as a unit in religion as well as in all other matters. Before the end of the second century, at any rate, the custom was common, but it did not become universal until a much later time.[1]

There can be little doubt that throughout the period with which we are dealing the disciples came together in larger or smaller companies, whether for the breaking of bread or for mutual edification, as often as they could, and that they did not confine their religious meetings to stated days and times. Where the idea of the church as a family and the sense of brotherhood and of separation from all the rest of the world prevailed, as they did in the early days in Jerusalem,[2] and as they seem to have done in all parts of Christendom for a long time, the closest possible association would be natural, and all such association would inevitably bear more or less of a religious character. But in Jerusalem and in other Jewish communities the Sabbath or seventh day of the week, when all orthodox Jews refrained from labor, would afford unusual opportunities for religious meetings, and it is very likely that on that day special services were held by the disciples almost from the beginning. It was natural, also, that the first day of the week, on which Jesus arose from the dead, should be an occasion for peculiar rejoicing, and that an effort should be made to mark the day by gathering together in as large numbers as possible; and

[1] Tertullian (*De Bapt.* 18) refers to the practice but condemns it, while Origen defends it and declares that it had existed since the days of the apostles (*Ep. ad Rom.* Lib. V. c. 9). See Schaff: *l.c.* p. 31, and *Church History*, Vol. II. p. 258 sq.

[2] See above, p. 66 sq.

thus the special observance of the Lord's day, which had become established in the second century, may have begun in the very earliest period.[1] We have no command upon the subject in the writings of apostles or in the literature of the apostolic age. Paul esteemed all days alike sacred, and his principles were not such as to lead to the setting apart of any particular times as exclusively or especially holy; but on the other hand he doubtless observed the Sabbath, at any rate when he was in Jerusalem, and he doubtless united with his converts everywhere in commemorating the resurrection of Christ on the Lord's day, as he commemorated his death in the Lord's Supper.[2]

Our study of the Christian life of the apostolic age has revealed the moving and controlling power of that life in the disciples' vivid sense of the presence and activity of the Holy Spirit. It is its spiritual character which distinguishes the age from all subsequent periods in the history of the church. But before the apostles themselves

[1] In Pliny's epistle to Trajan it is said that the Christians of Bithynia met twice on a stated day (*die stato*), which can hardly have been any other day than Sunday. In the Epistle of Barnabas, xv., we read: "Therefore also we keep the eighth day with joyfulness, the day also on which Jesus rose from the dead and was manifested and ascended into heaven." In the *Didache*, XIV., occurs the command: "On the Lord's day of the Lord (κατὰ κυριακὴν κυρίου) come together and break bread"; and in Justin Martyr's *Apology*, I. 67, is given an elaborate description of the regular Sunday service. That the practice of holding special services on the first day of the week, which were more important and more generally attended than other services, existed already in the apostolic age may be fairly inferred from 1 Cor. xvi. 2, where the Corinthian disciples are directed to lay aside on that day their contributions to the great collection for the saints of Jerusalem; and from Rev. i. 10, where the author seems to have had in mind the gathering of Christian brethren on the Lord's day. Cf. also John xx. 26, and Acts xx. 7. In addition to the Lord's day weekly fast-days were also widely observed in the second century. The *Didache* (VIII.) prescribes Wednesday and Friday, and they were for a long time regular fast-days in the church, the former commemorating the betrayal, the latter the crucifixion of Christ. Of such special fast-days we have no trace in the apostolic age.

[2] We learn from Rom. xiv. 5 sq. that there was already at the time that epistle was written a decided difference of sentiment in Rome touching the observance of special days, and what was true there was doubtless true in many other places. Cf. Col. ii. 16 sq., and see above, pp. 337 and 367 sq.

We learn from Heb. x. 25 that there were some Christians who were in the habit of absenting themselves from the services of the church, and the author of the epistle found it necessary to exhort his readers not to follow their example. A similar exhortation to faithful attendance is found more than once in the epistles of Ignatius (cf. *Magn.* IV.; *Phil.* VI.; *Smyr.* VI.).

passed off the scene conditions arose which were calculated to do away ultimately with the primitive spirit and the primitive practice, and which must inevitably lead to the development of formalism and to the partial, if not complete, subjection of the spirit to the letter, of the individual to the organism. The beginnings of that process in the sphere of worship have already been pointed out. We shall have occasion in the next chapter to trace its beginnings along other lines as well.

CHAPTER VI

THE DEVELOPING CHURCH

THE age of the apostles was primarily a missionary age, the age of Christian origins. But it was not simply that, for long before they passed off the scene, the days of seed-sowing were succeeded in many quarters by the days of tendance and husbanding, and the churches planted by the earliest missionaries had entered upon that period of development which culminated in the orthodox catholic church of the third and following centuries. It is impossible to draw any hard and fast lines in this connection. The attempt to separate distinctly the earlier from the later period must necessarily end in failure. It has been frequently said that the apostolic age really came to an end with the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 A.D., but there is no reason to suppose that that event had any such vital and far-reaching significance as to justify its use as the point of division between the apostolic and post-apostolic ages. The destruction of Jerusalem of course affected Jewish Christians. But the church at large was not Jewish, and Jerusalem had long ceased to be the centre of Christendom. The fall of the city was commonly interpreted by the disciples as God's judgment upon the Jews for their rejection of Christ; but it did not bring about any break between Judaism and the Christianity of the world at large, for that break had occurred long before, and the judgment of Judaism current in the Gentile church was not in any way affected by it. Not enough attention has been paid to the significant silence of the literature of the late first and early second centuries touching the destruction of Jerusalem. It was formerly thought that many documents must have been written before 70, because they

do not refer to it. It is now known that they were written after 70, though they do not refer to it, and the fact certainly suggests that the event had far less importance in the eyes of most Christians than has been commonly supposed. To make the event an epoch in the history of the church, is to give to later Jewish Christianity a far more important place in the development of the church than it deserves, and is to obscure the fact that Christianity had become independent long before, and that its independence was due to causes of a far more vital character than the destruction of a city. The arrest of Paul in Jerusalem at the instance of the Jews, when he was endeavoring to cement the bond between the Jewish and Gentile wings of the church, may fairly be regarded as of greater historic significance for the development of Christianity than the destruction of Jerusalem; but it would involve an equal exaggeration of the significance of Judaism, to make even that the dividing line between the apostolic and post-apostolic ages.

It has been claimed that the apostolic age really closed with the death of Paul. But while its history is very largely a history of his life and work, it is not wholly that. There were apostles before he came upon the scene, and there were still apostles after he had passed away. It is true that we know much less about Christianity in the last forty years of the first century than during the lifetime of Paul, and that the current was setting very rapidly during those years in the direction of the distinctly sub-apostolic Christianity of the second century. But neither of these considerations justifies us in excluding the years in question from the apostolic age. Paul's death was undoubtedly a fact of momentous importance. But the tendencies which we find dominant in the latter part of the first century were already at work long before his death. Even in his own churches the conditions that existed at the close of the century had begun to exist during his lifetime, and in the churches where his personal influence was not felt his death meant little.

If the term "apostle" were to be taken in the broader

sense in which it was widely employed in the primitive church, we should have to bring the apostolic age down well into the second century, when there were still travelling missionaries who bore the name of apostles; but the term early acquired a narrower significance, and has been employed ever since to denote the Twelve and Paul exclusively. The phrase "apostolic age" accordingly means in ordinary usage the period in which the Twelve Apostles and Paul, all or any of them, were still upon the scene. And as there is no particular event which can be regarded as a vital epoch dividing the age of origins from the age of development, we shall do well to employ the phrase in its traditional sense, and to bring our study to a close at the time, if that time can be determined, when John, the last of the Twelve, passed away. Not that his death had any great historic significance. It meant even less to the church in general than the death of Paul, but so long as he was alive, it cannot fairly be said that the days of the apostles were gone.

The most marked characteristic of the closing decades of the apostolic age is the rapid progress made in the direction of the institutionalism of the second and following centuries. The chapter dealing with that period, therefore, may fairly be denominated The Developing Church, and the chief subject of interest in it must be the beginning of the historic process of consolidation and conservation. But the entire history of the period concerns us so far as it can be known, and we may not confine ourselves to the single subject. Indeed, that subject itself can be understood only in the light of the general history of which it forms a part.

The history of the church of Jerusalem after the rise and spread of Gentile Christianity lies largely aside from the general history of the church; but it cannot be neglected in a work like this, and it may fitly be considered in the present chapter, because the same process which went on outside of Palestine began in the church of Jerusalem at an early day. It entered, indeed, upon its period of consolidation and conservation even earlier than other com-

munities. And so before turning to the developing church in the world at large, we may consider the independent development of the Mother Church of Christendom, and we can study it best in connection with the life and character of James, the brother of the Lord, who was for many years the dominant personality in it, and who was the great representative of Jewish Christianity, as Paul was of Gentile Christianity.

1. James and the Church of Jerusalem

From Mark vi. 3 and Matt. xiii. 55 we learn that Jesus had four brothers: James, Joseph, Simon, and Judas.[1] The first named of these brothers, and the oldest of them, if we may judge from his position in the list, was one of the most important figures in the church of the apostolic age, and exerted an influence within the Jewish wing of the church second to that of no other man. And yet he was not one of the Twelve, and apparently not even a disciple until after Christ's resurrection. At least John, in speaking of the brethren of Jesus, records that they did not believe on him,[2] which can mean nothing else than that they did not believe him to be the Messiah; and though the statement is made in connection with a particular event, whose chronological place in the life of Christ is not certain, it may fairly be concluded from it that they continued in the same state of unbelief throughout the period of his ministry.[3] It is hardly to be wondered at that such should have been the case. That Jesus made a great impression upon his younger brothers during their boyhood life in Galilee cannot be doubted. They must have grown up with an unbounded affection and admiration for him. And yet the very intimacy

[1] These "brethren of Jesus" were probably his own brothers, younger sons of Joseph and Mary. Upon the various theories touching their relationship to Jesus, see note in my edition of Eusebius, Bk. I. chap. 12; and especially the elaborate discussion by Mayor in his *Epistle of St. James*, p. vi. sq.

[2] John vii. 5. Mark iii. 31, when compared with iii. 21, suggests that Jesus' brethren, like others of his friends, feared that he was demented, as was not unnatural if they did not believe in his divine call and mission.

[3] The fact that Jesus, on the cross, committed his mother to the apostle John, when her own children were still living, goes to show that they were not disciples at the time of his death.

of their association with him, and the simplicity and naturalness of his life in the home circle, would make it difficult for them to see in him the Messiah; and much as they loved him, and confident as they must have been of his honesty and purity of purpose, they could hardly think of one of their own number, who was of humble extraction like themselves, and had passed with them through all the simple and homely experiences of boyhood and youth, as the great Messiah of God, as the chosen one who was to deliver Israel from the yoke of the oppressor and establish the kingdom foretold by the prophets. All those difficulties which hindered his townspeople and fellow-countrymen from recognizing him as the Messiah must act upon them with double force. The words "A prophet is not without honour, save in his own country and among his own kin and in his own house,"[1] were spoken by Jesus out of his own experience, and no other experience was possible under the circumstances.

But within a few weeks after his resurrection, the brethren of Jesus were gathered with his followers in Jerusalem, and evidently belonged to the company of his disciples.[2] In the interval, therefore, they must have become convinced of their brother's Messiahship. When and under what circumstances their conversion took place, we are not told; but we have a hint of the occasion that led to it, at least in the case of James. In his First Epistle to the Corinthians Paul mentions an appearance of the risen Jesus to James, and separates it from his appearances to Peter, to the Twelve, and to the five hundred brethren, in such a way as to imply that it took place later than the others.[3] This fact at once suggests the conclusion that James was not a disciple at the time of those earlier manifestations, but became such as a result of his own vision of the risen Lord.[4] The cir-

[1] Mark vi. 4. [2] Acts i. 14. [3] 1 Cor. xv. 7.

[4] Compare the account of Christ's appearance to James, in the apocryphal Gospel according to the Hebrews, quoted by Jerome in his *De vir. ill.* c. 2. Jerome's words are as follows: "The Gospel also which is called the Gospel according to the Hebrews, and which I have recently translated into Greek and Latin and which Origen also often makes use of, after the account of the resurrection of the Saviour, says, 'But the Lord, after he had given his grave-clothes to the servant of the priest, appeared to James, for James had sworn

cumstances under which the other brethren of Christ became believers, we have no means of determining. They, too, may have enjoyed, as James did, a special manifestation of the risen Lord, or James may have succeeded in convincing them of the reality of the resurrection, and they may have become believers under his influence. They were at any rate of less importance than James, and we know nothing about their Christian career, except that they were gathered with the disciples in Jerusalem in the days preceding Pentecost,[1] and some twenty or more years later were travelling about apparently doing missionary work.[2]

It is necessary to assume, in the light of subsequent events, that James' conversion was complete and thoroughgoing, and led him to throw himself heart and soul into the service of the Master. He cannot have been a half-hearted disciple. He must have been one of the most zealous, active, and devoted of them all to secure the position which he ultimately held. His relationship to Jesus, and his intimate acquaintance with him from boyhood, of course made him a marked man among the disciples, and doubtless contributed greatly to his reputation and authority; but such natural advantages do not alone account for the tremendous influence which he wielded for so many years, — an influence which he did not share with his brothers. Only because he possessed at the same time the qualities of a leader, and an uncommon zeal and devotion, could he acquire the universal credit he enjoyed.

But it was not simply his character as a Christian that contributed to James' influence and authority. His character as a Jew counted for a great deal with the strict Jews of the Mother Church. Though he was converted by a vision of the risen Jesus, as Paul was, his conversion pro-

that he would not eat bread from that hour in which he drank the cup of the Lord until he should see him rising from the dead.' And again a little later it says, 'Bring a table and bread, said the Lord.' And immediately it is added, 'He took bread and blessed and brake and gave to James the Just, and said to him, My brother, eat thy bread, for the Son of man is risen from among those that sleep.'"

[1] Acts i. 14.

[2] 1 Cor. ix. 5. In this passage Paul mentions the "brethren of the Lord," without indicating how many of them he has in mind.

duced an entirely different effect upon him. He had apparently passed through no such experience of the futility of endeavoring to keep the law, and it was not a sense of the need of justification, or of deliverance from sin and death, that led him to Christ. He was evidently before his conversion an uncommonly devout and faithful Jew, and in accepting Christ he never thought of ceasing to be such, or of regarding the observance of the law as of less importance than before. Rather, like his other Christian brethren, he must have regarded it as of even greater importance; and nothing in the teaching or conduct of Jesus suggested anything else to him. All that we know of him points to an excessive reverence for the Jewish law in all its parts, and a most scrupulous observance of it throughout his life,[1] and in a church constituted as the church of Jerusalem was such a tendency naturally promoted greatly his reputation for piety. He was thoroughly in sympathy with the religious ideal which prevailed from the beginning in the Mother Church, and he was himself apparently one of the most earnest and faithful of the disciples in its realization. In this respect he was much more nearly in accord with the spirit and tendency of the Christianity of Jerusalem than Peter was, at any rate, after the latter's experience with Cornelius; and it is not to be wondered at that even while Peter and perhaps other apostles were still on the ground, his influence should have been very great, and that after they left the city to carry on missionary work elsewhere, he should have been universally recognized as the leading figure in the church.

Already, at the time of Paul's first visit to Jerusalem, three years after his conversion, James occupied, apparently, a prominent position among the disciples,[2] and eleven years later he was one of the three "pillars" of the church, from whom Paul received the right hand of fellowship and with whom he entered into the compact by which

[1] Cf. Acts xv. 20 sq., xxi. 20 sq., Gal. ii. 12 sq.; also Hegesippus, in Eusebius: *H.E.* II. 22; and Clement of Alexandria, in Eusebius: *H. E.* II. 1.

[2] Gal. i. 19. Cf. also Acts xii. 17, where it is recorded that Peter, after his release from prison, directed the disciples in Mary's house to tell "James and the brethren" what had happened to him.

Christendom was divided into a Jewish and a Gentile wing.[1] It is significant that James is here associated with Peter and John in the same way that James the son of Zebedee was during the lifetime of Jesus, and it may well be, as suggested in a previous chapter,[2] that after the martyrdom of his apostolic namesake he was chosen as his successor, as Matthias at an earlier time had been chosen to succeed Judas Iscariot. But however that may be, he was at any rate the chief personage in the church of Jerusalem shortly afterwards, when messengers sent by him to Antioch took Peter to task for his conduct and persuaded him to withdraw from association with his Gentile brethren.[3] He was also the leading figure among the disciples some seven or eight years later when Paul visited the city for the last time.[4]

The exact position which James held in the church of Jerusalem, it is impossible to define with absolute assurance. Tradition, beginning with Clement of Alexandria, who lived and wrote in the latter part of the second century, makes him the first bishop of the Mother Church, and reports that he was appointed to the office by the apostles.[5] But similar traditions were abroad at that time concerning all the great churches of the world, and little reliance can

[1] Gal. ii. 9. It is to be noticed that Paul in this passage mentions James before Peter and John, as if he were of more importance in the church of Jerusalem than even those two apostles.

[2] See p. 198, above. [3] Gal. ii. 11 sq. [4] Acts xxi. 18.

[5] Cf. Eusebius: *H. E.* II. 1, where Clement is quoted as follows: "For they say that Peter and James and John after the ascension of our Saviour, strove not after honour, because preferred by our Lord, but chose James the Just bishop of Jerusalem." There is some doubt as to whether ἑλέσθαι "(chose")" or γένεσθαι ("became") is the true reading, but the former is probably to be preferred. See my translation of Eusebius, note *in loc.* Clement got much of his information about James from Hegesippus, but whether he took this particular statement from him we do not know. Hegesippus has a great deal to say about James, and clearly recognizes him as the chief man in the church of Jerusalem, but he does not call him bishop in the extant fragments of his writings. (Whether the word δεύτερον, in Eusebius, IV. 22, 4, is to be taken with ἐπίσκοπον, implying that there had been a bishop of the church before Symeon, or with ἀνέψιον, implying only that Symeon as well as James was a relative of Jesus, is uncertain. The latter alternative is maintained by Loening in his *Gemeindeverfassung des Urchristenthums*, S. 108, and is the more probable of the two.) James is also called bishop of Jerusalem by Eusebius, in II. 23, III. 7, and IV. 5; and in II. 23 it is said that he was appointed by the apostles.

be placed upon any of them. At the same time, the fact must be recognized that there is more apparent ground for the tradition in the case of James and the church of Jerusalem than in any other case; for he certainly exerted a commanding influence in that church for many years. If the term "bishop" may be legitimately applied to any individual in the apostolic age, it would seem as if that individual must be James the brother of the Lord. But, as a matter of fact, our sources do not warrant us in using the term even of him. Though he is mentioned so frequently in the Book of Acts and in the epistles of Paul, he is not once called bishop, nor are episcopal functions ascribed to him. To call him bishop of the church of Jerusalem, therefore, would be even less justifiable than to call the Seven deacons. The episcopate, like the diaconate, had its origin not in Jerusalem, but in the churches of the Gentile world, and the causes that gave rise to it were entirely different from those that led to the elevation of James.[1] It is, consequently, unhistorical and misleading to use the term in speaking of him, as is often done.

But not simply is it to be denied that James can properly be called bishop of the church of Jerusalem; we may go further and say that there is no sign that he held any official position in that church. That he possessed a controlling influence in it is evident; but the possession of such an influence is far from involving official position and authority, and of the latter there is nowhere a trace in our sources. The decree quoted in Acts xv. 23 sq., though proposed by James, was issued by "the apostles and elder brethren," and does not contain his name, as it would seem that it must have done if he held a specific office distinguishable from that of the apostles, and superior to that of the elders. The truth is, that there is no reason to suppose that during the lifetime of James there was any official ruler, or even any regular governing body in the church of Jerusalem. The apostles certainly did not constitute such a body,[2] and there is

[1] See p. 659, below.

[2] See p. 45, above; and see also Réville's *Les Origines de l'Épiscopat* (p. 50 sq.), which came into my hands after my discussion of the apostolate was in type.

no proof that the elders did. Indeed, the use of the term "elder brethren" in the decree just referred to makes directly against the existence of an official eldership at the time that decree was prepared, and throws light back upon those passages in which the noun "elder" or "presbyter" occurs. Thus in the immediately preceding context the author of the Acts speaks of the apostles and elders as the authors of the decree in such a way as to leave the impression that they constituted two official classes in the church,[1] but the decree itself presents them under an entirely different aspect.

It was natural that the elder brethren should exert a large measure of influence from the very beginning, and that the conduct of affairs, and the settlement of difficult questions, should fall more and more into their hands as time passed, and as the number of disciples multiplied. And it was natural that out of this personal precedence, there should finally develop an official precedence and authority, and that the Christian churches in Palestine should ultimately take on an organization similar to that of the Jewish communities in whose midst they made their home.[2] But that development could hardly take place until the conditions under which the Christians of Jerusalem originally lived had entirely changed. So long as they constituted an integral part of the Jewish people and worshipped in the temple and the synagogue with their unconverted countrymen, there was no reason for them to form a separate community of their own with an independent organization. Such a step must seem like cutting themselves off from the family of Israel, to which in reality they felt most closely bound. Even the persecution that followed the execution of Stephen did not sever the bond that united them to their Jewish brethren. Many of them, especially the Hellenists, were

[1] Acts xv. 22.

[2] The influence of Judaism may, and very likely does, explain the official eldership of the later Jewish Christian churches. But it is possible, on the other hand, that that eldership was due to a merely natural growth. In support of the former alternative see Loening: *Gemeindeverfassung des Urchristenthums*, S. 69 sq., and Réville: *Les Origines de l'Épiscopat*, p. 60 sq. On the other side see Sohm: *Kirchenrecht*, Bd. I. S. 103 sq.

scattered abroad and probably made their homes permanently elsewhere; but after the storm had passed, the church of Jerusalem seems to have been in much the same position it had occupied from the beginning. Indeed, it is probable that the disciples made a greater effort than ever to exhibit their loyalty to the religion of their fathers, in order to vindicate themselves from the charge which had been brought against them. At any rate, it is certain that they were exceedingly zealous for the Jewish law at the time of the apostolic council, and also seven or eight years later when Paul visited the city for the last time.[1] And so they seem to have lived on good terms with their neighbors, and without suffering any molestation from them until almost the beginning of the Jewish war. Had it been otherwise, it would not have been possible for their leader, whose position among them must have been well known, to enjoy the reputation he did among his unbelieving countrymen and to be called by them, as well as by his Christian brethren, "James the Just."[2] It was doubtless the supreme desire of the Christians of Jerusalem after the death of Stephen, as it had been before, to lead not simply individual Jews but the Jewish nation to Christ, and to permeate it in its organized form, — with its temple, its synagogue, its priesthood, and its Sanhedrim, — with the Christian faith. But this aim, while it would not of course in the least interfere with the practice of Christian worship and with the exercise of charity and of discipline within the Christian brotherhood, would naturally hinder the development of an independent organization. Only after the outbreak of the Jewish war, when the Christians of Jerusalem, finding themselves obliged to leave the city and to make their home among the Gentiles, broke definitely and permanently with the Jewish nation, did the conditions exist that might be expected to lead to a separate body corporate. In the light of these considerations, coupled with Paul's complete

[1] Acts xxi. 20.

[2] Cf. Hegesippus in Eusebius: *H. E.* II. 23; Clement of Alexandria in Eusebius: *H. E.* II. 1; and the words ascribed to Josephus by Origen and Eusebius and quoted by the latter in II. 23, 20.

silence upon the subject and with the indications in the Book of Acts which have been already referred to, it may fairly be assumed that there were no regular officials in charge of the church of Jerusalem during the period covered by the Book of Acts, and that the precedence both of James and of the elder brethren was natural only, not official.

The influence of James was not confined to the church of Jerusalem. It was but a short time after the apostolic council that he made his authority felt in Antioch, and succeeded in inducing Peter and other Jewish disciples, who had thrown aside their scruples and were communing with Gentile Christians, to withdraw from association with the latter and return to that strict observance of the Jewish law which was practised in Jerusalem.[1] This is the only explicit testimony we have to the extension of his influence beyond the bounds of Palestine during his lifetime; but prominent as he was in the Mother Church, his pre-eminence must have been recognized everywhere by those (and there were many of them) who were one with that church in their aims and in their practices.

And yet it would be a mistake to suppose, as has been supposed by many, that James lent his support to the anti-Pauline campaign which was carried on by Jewish Christians in one form or another for many years. They may have appealed to him as their authority, but there is no proof that they did, and at any rate they were not justified in doing so. James was not a Judaizer. At the time of the council he distinctly recognized the legitimacy of Gentile Christianity, and gave his approval to the work of Paul; and there is no reason to suppose that he later receded from the position taken then. Indeed, Paul could not have visited Jerusalem in the year 53 had either the church of Jerusalem as a whole or James himself, the leading figure in it, been in sympathy with the principles of the Judaizers. That the latter had support in Jerusalem, there can be no doubt. There was an influential party in the church there at the time of the council that

[1] Gal. ii. 11 sq.

was unwilling to recognize Gentile Christianity, and did all it could to secure its condemnation. But the Judaizers were defeated by Paul both at Jerusalem and, later, in Galatia, and they seem finally to have given up the contest as futile. But though thus defeated they did not cease to hate Paul, who was an apostate from Judaism and who was influencing Jewish Christians everywhere to become what he was. Hostility to him still continued bitter, both within and without the church of Jerusalem, and that hostility led to attacks upon his apostolic calling and character in Corinth and elsewhere. How James felt about the effects of Paul's work upon the Jews of the dispersion we are not told, but we can imagine that he must have shared the dissatisfaction of his brethren in Jerusalem as he saw so many of the children of the Promise renouncing the religion of their fathers; as he saw Christianity becoming, instead of a bridge from Gentilism to Judaism, as the Christians of Jerusalem had hoped that it would, a bridge from Judaism to Gentilism. And yet he evidently did not break openly with Paul; and we can hardly suppose, in the light of Paul's final visit to Jerusalem, that he approved of the attacks made upon Paul's character and calling. But, on the other hand, it may fairly be doubted whether there was any very strong bond of confidence between the two men, and whether it was not for his own sake as well as for that of the church at large that James joined with others in proposing that Paul should do something while in Jerusalem to demonstrate his loyalty to Judaism.[1]

At any rate, whatever the exact feeling of James, it is clear that the church of Jerusalem as a whole was far from friendly to Paul. He avoided visiting the city for a long time after the apostolic council, and when he finally went thither, he went armed with a contribution which he hoped would be accepted as a proof of his own devotion to the Mother Church and thus dissipate the prejudice and hostility of the disciples there, and at the same time serve to bind the two wings of the church together as they had

[1] Acts xxi. 23.

not hitherto been bound. But he had serious misgivings as to the way in which his offering would be received,[1] and though the brethren are said to have welcomed him and his companions gladly,[2] their suspicions were not allayed, and instead of cordial approval and hearty recognition of the great work which he had been doing, he met with adverse criticism and but thinly veiled hostility. The great collection failed utterly to produce the effect which he had hoped that it would, — it is not even mentioned by the author of the Acts, — and when he was accused of profaning the temple there is no hint that his Christian brethren of Jerusalem came to his assistance in any way or took any steps to secure his vindication. They were doubtless dissatisfied with the effect of his work upon the Jews of the dispersion and they must have been aware, in spite of his effort to show that he was not an enemy of the law, that he did not commonly observe it, and it may well be that they were unwilling to compromise themselves by taking his part. So when he was arrested they left him to his fate, refraining apparently even from bearing testimony to his innocence. The long-standing hostility to Paul, which thus found expression on the occasion of his last visit to Jerusalem, became finally even more general within the Jewish wing of the church, and in subsequent generations constituted one of the most distinctive and characteristic features of Ebionism.

Our knowledge of the fortunes of the church of Jerusalem after the first few years of its existence is very meagre. The persecution instituted by Herod Agrippa I.[3] seems to have been only of brief duration, and from that time until almost the beginning of the Jewish war the disciples apparently lived at peace with their neighbors and with the authorities. But in the year 62 the high priest Ananus, a son of Ananus the elder,[4] seized the opportunity offered by the death of the procurator Festus, and the delay in the arrival of his successor Albinus, to compass the death of James and of some others, who were also probably Chris-

[1] Cf. Rom. xi. 31. [2] Acts xxi. 17. [3] Acts xii.
[4] Called Annas in the New Testament, but Ananus by Josephus.

tians.[1] He accused them before the Sanhedrim of violating the Jewish law, and though the Sanhedrim had no right to pass sentence of death upon any one, except with the consent of the procurator, they were condemned to be stoned, and the sentence was executed at any rate in the case of James, and apparently in the case of all of them. The ground of the hostility exhibited by Ananus, we do not know. It is not likely that he was moved by religious considerations; for he was not the kind of a man to care much about the religious principles and practices of James or any one else, and the accusation that they were violating the Jewish law was probably a mere pretext. All that we know of James forbids the supposition that he had made himself liable to such a charge, and had his real crime been of that character, not Ananus, a Sadducee, but the Pharisees would have been his accusers.[2] It is possible that in the unsettled and turbulent condition of the city, when the feeling against the Romans was running high and the people were in a very inflammable state, the Messianic preaching of the Christians seemed dangerous to the Sadducees, who were friendly to Rome and strenuously opposed to war, and that their representative Ananus took the high-handed action he did with a desire to conserve public peace and safety. His conduct, however, incensed many leading men in the city, who resented the illegality of his course,[3]

[1] See Josephus: *Ant.* XX. 9, 1, and Eusebius: *H. E.* II. 23, 21 sq., where the passage is quoted.

[2] Hegesippus (in Eusebius, II. 23) represents the Scribes and the Pharisees as the moving spirits in the execution of James, and says nothing about the agency of Ananus. But his reference to the Scribes and Pharisees is so general (in one case he says "the Jews and Scribes and Pharisees") that little weight can be placed upon it. In his day the Scribes and Pharisees were the leaders among the Jews, and he probably simply took it for granted on the basis of that fact and of their known hostility to Jesus that they were instrumental in compassing James' death. He was well acquainted with Jewish Christianity in the second century, but he knew very little about the actual condition of things in Palestine before the destruction of Jerusalem. Where it contradicts the clear, concise, and consistent account of Josephus, the story related by Hegesippus cannot be relied upon.

[3] Josephus refers to those persons who disapproved of the action of Ananus as men skilled in the law, and the probability is that they were Pharisees. The Pharisees were hereditary enemies of the Sadducees, and were very likely friendly to James because of his exceeding piety and his scrupulousness in the observance of the law.

and the result was that complaints were lodged against him with the new procurator, Albinus, and Agrippa, who had appointed Ananus, was obliged to depose him after he had held office only three months.

Though the Christians were relieved from farther attacks of the kind by the arrival of Albinus, the years that followed were troublous ones for all the Jews. Since the death of Herod Agrippa I., conditions had been growing steadily worse until they had become almost unbearable. The corruptness of the procurators left crime and violence a free field, and their unjust and tyrannical rule drove the people to madness. The land was almost in a state of anarchy, and between the rapacity of the procurators and the violence of the mob neither life nor property was safe. The Jews were naturally impatient and restless under Roman rule. Their belief in their divine election made it peculiarly difficult for them to submit quietly to the authority of a foreign power, and certainly no people were ever given greater cause for rebellion than the Jews during the period of the later procurators. The wiser and cooler-headed men counselled patience and submission, for they saw the utter folly of an attempt to throw off the Roman yoke; but the more restless and adventurous spirits were burning to avenge themselves upon their oppressors, and were eager for war. Saner counsels could prevail little with those who believed as profoundly as the Jews did in their divine election; and when under Gessius Florus, who became procurator in 64, injustice, oppression, and tyranny reached a climax, the people at large threw caution to the winds, and with the confidence that God would in some way come to their rescue and vindicate their cause, they came out in the year 66 in open rebellion against Rome, and the war was fairly begun.[1] After the entire land had been subdued by Vespasian, the siege of Jerusalem itself was finally undertaken in the spring of 70 by his son Titus. In September of the same year, after a stubborn

[1] Our chief source for a knowledge of the Jewish war is Josephus' *Bellum Judaicum*. Compare Schürer, *l.c.* I. S. 502 sq. (Eng. Trans., Div. I. Vol. II. p. 207 sq.), and O. Holtzmann: *Das Ende des jüdischen Staatswesens und die Entstehung des Christenthums*, S. 636 sq.

and desperate resistance, the city fell and the national existence of the Jews came to an end. Jerusalem, the historic centre of their religious and national life, about which all the glories of Israel had clustered for centuries, and where it had long been believed that the Messiah would one day establish the throne of his power, was levelled to the ground, the temple was utterly destroyed, the inhabitants of the city were slain or sold into captivity, and only a Roman garrison was left upon the scene. No other issue was to have been expected; but their doom was hastened by the stupendous folly and fatuousness of the Jews themselves, who, instead of uniting all their forces and presenting a solid front to their common enemy, carried on a constant and devastating warfare with each other which sapped their strength and wasted their resources, so that when the Romans finally began the siege of Jerusalem, they were opposed only by the worn-out survivors of an internecine conflict which had lasted for two years, and whose horrors almost pass belief.

Our information touching the Christians of Jerusalem during this terrible period is very slight, but from brief references in our sources and from our general knowledge of their character and principles we can gain a fairly accurate idea of their course. They were doubtless among those who had deprecated the war from the beginning and had desired peace. Such a struggle as their countrymen, under the lead of the restless and turbulent zealots, were bent upon plunging into was utterly opposed to the teaching of their Master, and they could hardly engage in it without violating their principles. They seem to have clung to Jerusalem as long as they could, in the hope that peace might be concluded before the war reached its walls, and that the sacred city itself might be saved. But when finally they saw that matters had gone so far that its destruction was inevitable, and that to remain in it meant either to take an active part in the approaching struggle or to be sacrificed to the rage of their fellow-citizens, they followed the example of many others and fled from the doomed city. Crossing the Jordan, they made their way

in a body to Pella, a city of Perea, which was largely Gentile and lay outside the theatre of war.[1] Eusebius records that they left Jerusalem in response to a divine revelation,[2] and the report doubtless represents their own belief. The step was a decisive one, and they can hardly have taken it unless they were convinced that it was in accordance with the divine will. It meant not necessarily a permanent, but certainly a temporary abandonment of their effort to convert the Jewish nation to faith in Christ; and, more than that, it meant a serious break with their own people, and a seeming violation of their most sacred duty as loyal and faithful Jews. They possibly hoped that their departure would be but temporary, and that after the war was ended and peace concluded they might return and labor as before for the conversion of their brethren. But their desertion of the city in its hour of need so incensed their countrymen, that from that time on they were regarded by them with the bitterest and most relentless hatred. They had proved themselves apostates, and all their faithfulness and scrupulosity in the observance of the Jewish law now counted for nothing, and their opportunity to win their brethren to faith in Jesus was forever gone.

The flight of the disciples to Pella and the destruction of Jerusalem which followed mark an epoch in the history of Jewish Christianity. Hitherto they had constituted an integral part of the Jewish people; now the bond that united

[1] See Eusebius: *H. E.* III. 5, 3, and Epiphanius: *De mensuris et ponderibus*, c. 15. Harnack conjectures that the report of Eusebius was taken from Aristo of Pella, a Jewish Christian writer of the early second century. (*Texte und Untersuchungen*, I. 1, S. 124 sq.) Whether the conjecture be sound or not, there is at any rate no reason to doubt the accuracy of the report. On Pella see Schürer, *l.c.* II. S. 99 sq. (Eng. Trans., Div. II. Vol. I. p. 113). The date of the departure of the Christians from Jerusalem, we do not know, but it may be assumed that they remained in the city as long as there was any hope that peace might be concluded and the impending struggle be averted, that is, probably until the latter part of the year 69.

[2] It has been suggested that certain passages in the apocalyptic discourses of Jesus, recorded in the Gospels (as, for instance, Mark xiii. 7 sq., 14 sq.; Luke xxi. 20 sq.), date from this time. Cf. Weiffenbach: *Der Wiederkunftsgedanke Jesu*, S. 175 sq.; Wendt, *Lehre Jesu*, I. S. 20; Weizsäcker, *l.c.* S. 371 sq.; and O. Holtzmann, *l.c.* S. 669. And so various passages of supposed Jewish origin in the Apocalypse of John have been dated from this period by several scholars. See Weizsäcker, *ibid.*; and O. Holtzmann, *l.c.* S. 657 sq.

them to their countrymen was severed, and their independent existence was begun. Thus the impulse was given to organize themselves into a separate church, or ecclesiastical body corporate, and it cannot have been long before it was acted upon.[1] The first step in this direction of which we have any record was the election of Symeon to be the official head of the Christian community.[2] This Symeon was a nephew of Joseph, and consequently a cousin of Jesus,[3] and that fact doubtless had much to do with his selection.[4] Hegesippus and later writers call him a bishop, but it is hardly likely that he was so called by his Christian brethren.[5] It is more probable that he had some

[1] Cf. Loening: *Gemeindeverfassung des Urchristenthums*, S. 106 sq.

[2] See Hegesippus in Eusebius: *H. E.* IV. 22; and Eusebius himself in *H. E.* II. 11. Neither of them indicates the exact place or time of the appointment of Symeon. Hegesippus says "after the death of James"; Eusebius, "after the destruction of Jerusalem"; and neither of them specifies where the choice was made. Symeon was doubtless prominent among the Christians long before they left Jerusalem, and after the death of James he was very likely the leading man among them, but he can hardly have been chosen official head of the church until after the break with Judaism had taken place. Even if chosen in Pella, he might of course be regarded as the head of the church of Jerusalem; for Pella was only a temporary asylum, not a permanent home, and doubtless the Christians there still thought of themselves as constituting the Mother Church, the church of Jerusalem. It is perhaps worthy of notice that, in speaking of the flight of the Christians from Jerusalem, Eusebius mentions no bishop or ruler, but says that they left in obedience to a command given by revelation to "approved men" (δόκιμοι) among them. Hegesippus reports that there was a rival candidate for the position to which Symeon was chosen, in the person of a certain Thebuthis, and that he started a schism in the church because he was defeated (Eusebius, IV. 22, 5). Little reliance, however, can be placed upon the report. The fathers were fond of making disappointed ambition the ground of heresy and schism, — an interesting indication of the eagerness with which ecclesiastical office must have been sought by the Christians of the early centuries. See my translation of Eusebius, note *in loc.*

[3] According to Eusebius (*H. E.* III. 11), who appeals to Hegesippus as his authority, Symeon was the son of Clopas, a brother of Joseph. Hegesippus himself, in the passage quoted by Eusebius (*H. E.* IV. 22), says only that Symeon was a son of Clopas, the Lord's uncle. Eusebius' opinion, therefore, that Clopas was a brother, and not merely a brother-in-law, of Joseph, may have been only an inference from Hegesippus' more general statement, or in some other passage not preserved Hegesippus may have said what Eusebius says. Clopas is mentioned in John xix. 25 as the husband of a certain Mary, who is not to be regarded as a sister of the Virgin Mary, as she often is. See my translation of Eusebius, Bk. III. chap. 11, notes 4 and 6.

[4] Hegesippus says explicitly (Eusebius: *H. E.* IV. 22, 4) that Symeon was chosen "because he was a cousin of the Lord."

[5] Loening, *l.c.* S. 108, calls attention to the fact that the term ἐπίσκοπος was a common title of municipal officials in the region east of the Jordan, and so thinks that Symeon may have been called a bishop by his Christian brethren.

such title as archisynagogus, which was the name borne by the head of the Ebionitic congregations of the fourth century.[1] Whether the council of elders which constituted the governing body in those congregations at that later date came into existence at this time, we have no means of determining.

How long the Christians of Jerusalem remained in Pella, we do not know. Epiphanius[2] reports that they returned to Jerusalem some time after the destruction of the city, and Eusebius implies the same thing when he gives a list of the bishops who presided over the church there until the city was again destroyed by Hadrian.[3] But we have no information that Jerusalem was anything more than a Roman garrison during the interval,[4] and the report is probably a mistake. At the same time, we learn from Hegesippus[5] that Symeon suffered martyrdom under Atticus, who was governor of the province of Judea in the time of Trajan, and hence it may be assumed that the Christian community of which he was the head had returned to Judea before that time.[6]

Of their fortunes during the latter part of the first century we know almost nothing. Hegesippus[7] reports that two grandchildren of Judas, the brother of Jesus, were arrested and taken before Domitian, because they were de-

But it is unlikely, conservative Jews as they were, that they would have adopted such a title. Their organization took the place of the organization under which they had been living as Jews in Jerusalem, and whatever officers they chose would naturally bear familiar titles.

[1] See Epiphanius: *Hær.* XXX. 18.

[2] Epiphanius: *De mensuris et ponderibus*, chap. 15.

[3] Eusebius: *H. E.* IV. 5. Cf. also his *Demonstratio Evangelica*, III. 5. No reliance can be placed upon Eusebius' list of fifteen bishops. They may have been simply prominent men among the Jewish Christians of Judea, or elders in one or another Christian community, and the assignment of them to the position of bishops in Jerusalem itself may have been mere inference.

[4] See Schürer, *l.c.* I. S. 569 sq. (Eng. Trans., Div. I. Vol. II. p. 297).

[5] In Eusebius: *H. E.* III. 32. According to Hegesippus Symeon was condemned both as a descendant of David and as a Christian, and was crucified at the great age of 120 years; which probably means no more than that he was very old when he was put to death.

[6] In the time of Hadrian, also, there were apparently many Jewish Christians in Judea, as appears from the hostility shown them by Barcocheba. See Justin Martyr: *Apol.* I. 31.

[7] In Eusebius: *H. E.* III. 20.

scendants of David and relatives of Christ, and it was feared that they might start a Messianic movement and incite the Jews to another rebellion. Domitian, however, convinced himself of their innocence and harmlessness, and set them free. It is implied in the same passage that the Christians of Judea had before this been persecuted by Domitian, and it is quite possible that they had suffered with their fellow-countrymen, who are said to have been treated with great severity by Vespasian, Domitian, and Trajan.[1] But it is not likely that any of these emperors instituted a special persecution against the Christians of the country, for they can hardly have taken the pains to distinguish between them and their Jewish brethren. Whatever may have been true in other parts of the world at this time, in Judea, undoubtedly, all Jews were Jews in the eyes of the Roman state, whether Christian believers or not.

After the uprising of the Jews under the leadership of Barcocheba,[2] Hadrian built a heathen city, Ælia Capitolina, upon the site of Jerusalem, and forbade Jews to enter it. Jewish Christianity therefore could no longer exist there; and in the province, as a whole, many of the Christians gave up their exclusiveness and went over into the world-church. It was natural that this should be so. The destruction of Jerusalem was interpreted by most Christians as God's vengeance upon the Jewish people for their rejection of Christ, and it was accepted by many as an indication that all the prerogatives of Israel had passed over to the church of the world at large, and that the old wall of partition between Jews and Gentiles had been forever broken down. Thus the tragic event finally led many that had hitherto clung tenaciously to their earlier principles, to draw the conclusion that had been drawn long before by Paul and by multitudes of their brethren outside of Palestine; and the distinction between the Jewish

[1] See Hegesippus in Eusebius: *H. E.* III. 12, 20, 32; also the notes in my edition of Eusebius, and Schürer, *l.c.* I. S. 555 sq. (Eng. Trans., Div. I. Vol. II. p. 279).

[2] The rebellion began in 132, and was quelled in 135, and Barcocheba ("son of a star"), who had pretended to be the Messiah, was slain.

and Gentile wings of the Christian church was finally obliterated.

But there were other Jewish Christians who could not thus give up their ancestral faith, and to whom the destruction of Jerusalem did not mean the abrogation of the Jewish law and the abolition of the wall of partition that separated Jews and Gentiles. Though repudiated by their own race as apostates to another faith, they believed themselves to be the elect remnant of God's people, and they continued to observe the Jewish law in all its strictness, and to hold themselves rigidly aloof from the Christians of the Gentile world. They clung closely together and went their separate and independent way, hated by their Jewish brethren, and regarded with pity and finally contempt by their Christian brethren of the world at large. As time passed, they withdrew constantly more and more into themselves and became ever harder and narrower in their estimate of the world outside. As the Judaism of the period succeeding the destruction of Jerusalem was more bigoted and exclusive than it had ever been, so the Jewish Christianity of the same period exhibited the same tendency. In the second century these Jewish Christians acquired the name of Ebionites, or "poor men," and were regarded as heretics by the church at large.[1] In their continued observance of the Jewish law, in their bitter hostility to the apostle Paul, in their rejection of his writings and of the entire canon of the New Testament, with the exception of a Gospel of Matthew, which was not identical with the Gospel current in the church at large, and finally in their refusal to follow that church in its Christological development, and in their insistence upon the belief that Jesus was a mere man, they were strikingly at variance with the Christians of the Roman world and their condemnation by the latter was inevitable. Thus the Jewish Christianity of the Mother Church finally eventuated in the heretical Ebionism of the second and following centuries, and the Gentile church revenged itself upon the Judaizers of the

[1] Upon the Ebionites see the notes in my edition of Eusebius, Bk. III. chap. 27.

apostolic age. The future was not with these Ebionitic Jewish Christians. They were out of the current of progress, and it was inevitable that they should ultimately pass away. In the fourth century they were numerous in the country lying east of the Jordan,[1] but they finally disappeared altogether.

And yet, though the history of Jewish Christianity, after the time when Paul began his work among the Gentiles, thus lies apart from the history of the developing church, the Christians of Jerusalem left a rich legacy to that church in the knowledge they transmitted of the work and the teaching of Jesus. It was there that his own disciples were gathered, and it was there that the impression of his personality was most vividly felt and the memory of his words and deeds most carefully cherished. The church of Jerusalem was essentially a conservative church, and it was concerned, above all else, to be true to the teaching and example of Christ.[2] But it was natural that, in their desire to govern their lives in accordance with the principles and precepts of the Master, the disciples should bring together his most striking and important utterances, from which light could be gained as to the right course to be followed in the various relations in which they found themselves placed, and it was natural also that his words touching the future kingdom in which their interest so largely centred, should be gathered up and appealed to constantly for inspiration and encouragement. It was not to be expected that the tradition should fix itself at first in any stereotyped way, or that any hard and fast lines should be drawn. There was a rich store of teaching in the memory of Jesus' own disciples; and as new questions were constantly arising, different parts of that teaching would be drawn upon, and it would be employed in many different

[1] See Eusebius: *De locis Hebraicis*, 15; Epiphanius: *Hær.* XXIX. 7, XXX. 2; Jerome: *De vir. ill.* 3. Compare also the statement of Julius Africanus, of the early third century, in Eusebius: *H. E.* I. 7, 14.

[2] It was in part this design not to go beyond Christ at any point that made them so tenacious of their Judaism, which had been his Judaism, and which he had not directed them to abandon.

ways. Thus there doubtless existed in Jerusalem, at a comparatively early day, collections of Christ's sayings of greater or less extent, and grouped in one way or another to meet this or that particular need. The object leading to their formation was not historical but practical, and the form and extent of the collections naturally varied with the need.[1]

The first written collection of Christ's words of which we have any definite knowledge is the so-called Logia; but there can be little doubt, from the way in which the utterances of Christ are grouped in that work, that the process which has been referred to had been going on for some time before the Logia were compiled. The first one to mention them is Papias of Hierapolis, a writer of the early second century, who records that "Matthew composed the Logia in the Hebrew language, and every one interpreted them as best he could."[2] The work thus referred to is no longer extant, but it is possible to gain some idea of its form and contents from a comparison of the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, in which large use was made of it.[3] Probably neither Matthew nor Luke incorporated the whole of the work in his Gospel, and it may have contained not only some passages that are found only in one or the other of them, but also much that is found only in uncanonical writers, and still more that has perished altogether. According to Papias, the original Logia were composed in Hebrew (or Aramaic), and the report is doubtless true.[4] It is clear, therefore, that they were intended primarily for disciples of Jewish birth, and more particularly for residents of Palestine; and there can be little doubt that they proceeded from the circle of Christians with which we have been dealing.

[1] Upon the influences that led to the composition of the Gospels, see especially Weizsäcker, *l.c.* S. 369 sq. (Eng. Trans., II. p. 32 sq.).

[2] In Eusebius: *H. E.* III. 39.

[3] For attempted reconstructions of the Logia, see Weiss: *Das Matthaeus-Evangelium und seine Lukasparallelen* (1876), and Wendt: *Lehre Jesu*, I. S. 44 sq.

[4] Cf. also Irenæus: *Adv. Hær.* III. 1, 1; Pantænus (as reported by Eusebius: *H. E.* V. 10); Origen (quoted by Eusebius: *H. E.* VI. 25); Jerome: *De vir. ill.* 3; Epiphanius: *Hær.* XXIX. 9.

In line with this fact that the Logia were of Jewish origin, and were intended for Jewish readers, is the farther fact that their compiler apparently thought of Christianity as intended only for Jews. His horizon was no broader than the Jewish people, and he quotes words of Christ which have a decidedly particularistic tendency.[1] At the same time he does not enter into any discussion, nor does he represent Christ as entering into any discussion, with those who maintained that the Gospel was for Gentiles as well as for Jews. The only controversy which is hinted at in his work is that between the unbelieving Jews and the followers of Jesus. It cannot be supposed that the work was compiled before the question of the admission of Gentiles had been raised, and we must therefore conclude that, while the author was a man of conservative views, he was without controversial temper and interest. Though the Logia were primarily intended for Christians who understood Hebrew, they were known and used at an early day by those also whose every-day speech was Greek. Papias tells us that every one interpreted them as best he could. But it could not be long after they had made their way into the Greek-speaking world before Greek translations of them were put into writing for the use of those who knew no Hebrew, and who were unable to interpret them for themselves.

The date of the Logia we do not know,[2] but it is evident that they were compiled before the destruction of Jerusalem; for in the eschatological passages that event and the end of the world are not in any way distinguished. But they cannot be pushed back much beyond the great catastrophe, for the development that preceded their production must have required at least some decades. That their compiler was Matthew is asserted by Papias, and there is no reason to doubt the truth of his statement.[3]

[1] Cf., *e.g.*, Matt. x. 5, 6, xv. 22.

[2] Irenæus: *Adv. Hær.* III. 1, 1 (quoted also by Eusebius: *H. E.* V. 8), says that "Matthew published his Gospel among the Hebrews in their own language, while Peter and Paul were preaching and founding the church in Rome."

[3] We know nothing about the character or career of Matthew, and consequently have no data to go upon, except the statements of Papias and other

It is hardly to be supposed that no other collections of Christ's words were made than the Logia of Matthew. It is probable that Luke used another source than the Logia in chapters ix.–xvii. of his Gospel, and that he drew from it, for instance, the parables of the good Samaritan, the foolish rich man, the prodigal son, the unrighteous steward, Dives and Lazarus, the unjust judge, and the Pharisee and Publican. Most of these parables bear a common character which distinguishes them from those recorded in the Logia, and which points to a compiler of a somewhat broader spirit and more humanistic temper than Matthew; to one who belonged, in fact, to another circle and was in touch with mission work in the world at large.

The impulse which led the disciples to gather up Christ's words and commit them to writing, led them to treat his deeds in a similar way. The historical motive seems not to have operated in the latter case any more than in the former. It was the desire to secure guidance for the conduct of the Christian life that led the early disciples to appeal to Jesus' example as well as to his precepts; and in their efforts to win their neighbors to belief in his Messiahship, it was natural that the correspondences between the events of his life and the predictions of the prophets should be pointed out and emphasized. And so the tendency arose to fix the tradition of Christ's deeds, and to group together those that illustrated and confirmed this or that principle of living, or that brought out most clearly his goodness, his wisdom, and his power, and thus made the strongest impression upon unbelievers, or that furnished by their fulfilment of prophecy the best evidence of his Messiahship.

The first account of the deeds of Jesus of which we have any explicit information is the Gospel of Mark. In the passage already quoted from Papias, occur these words: "Mark, having become the interpreter of Peter, wrote down accurately whatever he remembered of the things

later fathers. Eusebius (*H. E.* III. 24) says that Matthew, "when he was about to go to other peoples, committed his Gospel to writing in his native tongue," but his authority for the first clause of the sentence we do not know.

said or done by Christ, not however in order, for he had not heard the Lord, nor had he followed him; but afterwards, as I said, he followed Peter, who adapted his instructions to the needs of those who heard him, but without attempting to give a connected account of the Lord's utterances. So that Mark did not err when he thus wrote some things down as he remembered them; for he was careful of one thing, — not to omit any of the things which he had heard, nor to falsify anything in them."[1] There is no reason to doubt the general accuracy of this report, and there is no sufficient ground for referring Papias' words to any other work than our second Gospel.

That Gospel was probably not written in Judea, and yet its author was originally a member of the Mother Church, and he got much of his information from the apostle Peter;[2] so that the account which he gives may be traced back not so directly as the Logia, but, nevertheless, ultimately to the Christians of Jerusalem. There is evidence, moreover, that Mark's Gospel had behind it not simply the oral teaching of Peter, but also written accounts more or less brief and fragmentary of some of Christ's deeds,[3] which may well have arisen in the Mother Church in the way already indicated.

Though the Gospel of Mark differs from the Logia in being an account of Christ's ministry rather than a collection of his utterances, it cannot be said that its author was not interested in the words of Jesus, for they fill more than a quarter of his work. They constitute, in fact, along with his deeds, an essential part of the picture of Jesus, the Messiah and Saviour, which it was the writer's aim to draw as clearly and faithfully as he could. It was not his purpose to record the inner life and experiences of Jesus, or his mental and spiritual development, but simply to give an account of his ministry, or, in other words, to present him as he appeared to those that followed him

[1] Eusebius: *H. E.* III. 39, 15. [2] See also p. 603, below.

[3] This is made evident by the visible welding together at various points of independent narratives. See Wendt: *Lehre Jesu*, I. S. 9 sq., 22 sq.

during the period between his baptism and his resurrection; to show him to others who had never seen him as he had shown himself to them. In carrying out this purpose, Mark followed the simple and straightforward plan of recounting, without comment, such events in Christ's life and such utterances as were known to him, or seemed most characteristic, as nearly as possible in chronological order. He wrote, moreover, in a picturesque and graphic, though decidedly colloquial style, and the result is a portrait of Christ which, though it is drawn only in barest outline, is more vivid than that presented in any of the other Gospels, and carries upon its very face the marks of truth.

The Hebraistic style of the Gospel indicates that it was written by a Jew. But it is certain at the same time that it was written in Greek, and that it was consequently not intended for Palestinian Jews, — a fact which is confirmed by the translation of such Aramaic expressions as are occasionally employed.[1] Nor was the work intended primarily for Jews outside of Palestine, as is clear from xiv. 12, where the author explains "on the first day of unleavened bread," by the words "when they sacrificed the passover." In fact, he had chiefly in mind in writing not Jewish, but Gentile, Christians. This does not mean that he was hostile to his Jewish brethren, or that he had any polemic purpose in writing his work. It simply means that he was a member of the world-church, and that distinctions of race and lineage meant nothing to him. His horizon was thus much broader than that of the author of the Logia, and his situation and surroundings were very different from his. The Gospel was written evidently after the destruction of Jerusalem, for the coming of Christ is distinctly separated from that event as it is not in the Logia,[2] but apparently not long after, for it would seem that the consummation was thought of as following closely upon the great catastrophe.[3] The place of composition cannot be determined, but it may well have been Rome; for Mark was there at least in the late fifties,

[1] Cf. Mark v. 41, xv. 22. [2] Cf. Mark xiii. 10. [3] Mark xiii. 24.

and Peter came thither soon afterward.[1] The language of the Gospel, moreover, contains many Latinisms, and there are some apparent indications that the author was writing with a Roman public particularly in view.[2]

The Logia of Matthew and the Gospel of Mark, the one containing Christ's words, the other an account of his ministry, and the one originating in Judea, the other probably in Rome, were subsequently employed in the composition of our first and third Gospels. They constituted, in fact, the principal sources of those Gospels, more than three-fourths of Luke and more than seven-eighths of Matthew being taken from one or the other of them. The primary purpose of the author of our first Gospel, the Gospel of Matthew, was to establish the Messiahship of Jesus. While therefore he followed Mark more or less closely in his general outline of Jesus' public ministry, he was concerned to do more than merely give a vivid and trustworthy account of that ministry, as Mark attempted to do. He was concerned to prove that from his birth to his ascension Jesus fulfilled all the requirements of Messiahship. His lineage, his birthplace, the circumstances attending both his birth and his death, and the events of his life are shown by Matthew to be in complete accord with the Messianic predictions of the Old Testament prophets, and thus to guarantee his Messiahship. The Gospel consequently bears a very different character from the Gospel of Mark; it is an argument, not merely a picture. The author is not content simply to depict Jesus as he was and to let him influence the reader by the power of his personality, as during his life he had influenced those who saw and heard him; but he tells his readers that Jesus bore a certain character and occupied a certain position, and then he writes his Gospel to prove it.[3] The difference in purpose between the Gospels of Matthew and Mark makes itself clearly seen in their difference of structure. While Mark follows the chronological method, relating the events

[1] See below, p. 591. Mark was also there twenty years or more later, when First Peter was written. See 1 Pet. v. 13.

[2] Cf. Mark xii. 13 sq., xv. 16.

[3] Compare his words in the very first chapter of his Gospel, vss. 1, 16, 17, 22.

of Christ's ministry one after another in a simple and natural way, Matthew adopts the topical arrangement and groups much of his material under distinct heads, not wholly, to be sure, but largely, without regard to chronological sequence. The result is an artistic, well-sustained, and impressive argument for the Messiahship of Jesus; but if one would see Jesus himself as he actually was in his daily life, and in his relations with his fellows, one must forget the framework, and detach the materials, which Matthew reproduces with great richness and fulness, from the setting in which he has placed them.[1] The work was written by a Christian Jew, and apparently a Jew of Palestine; for the author employs the Hebrew text of the Old Testament in his citations, whenever he is not following another source. He seems also to have had his Jewish brethren especially in mind in writing, though he evidently did not write for them alone; for, like Mark (though not so frequently as he), he translates Aramaic phrases into Greek. But though thus a Jew, and writing apparently primarily for Jews, he was not a particularist in any sense. He believed that the Gospel was for all the world, for Gentiles as well as for Jews, and he was entirely free from all bondage either to the Jewish law or to the prejudices of his countrymen. His Gospel contains utterances as distinctly universal in their character as anything in Mark or Luke.[2] He was not a member of a Jewish-Christian party, or of any other party. He was a member of the church at large, and the Pauline and Judaistic controversy was a dead issue to him. Though himself more Jewish than Mark and Luke, he stood equally with them upon the platform of the developing world-church.

The author of our Gospel and the place of composition, we have no means of determining. The tradition which connects it with the name of Matthew is of no weight, for

[1] The Sermon on the Mount is an example of this. We form an erroneous impression of Jesus if we picture him as delivering such a set discourse as is recorded in Matt. v.–vii., instead of thinking of him as dropping his golden words here and there in familiar conversation with those with whom he mingled day by day.

[2] Cf. Matt. xxviii. 19.

it rests ultimately upon the testimony of Papias alone; but the words of Papias refer not to the Gospel of Matthew, but to the Logia which lie back of it. There is no hint in the work itself that it was produced by a personal disciple of Jesus, who was an eyewitness of the events recorded. It can hardly be supposed that such a man, in writing a Gospel, would draw seven-eighths of it from written sources, one of which was the work of a man who had not himself seen Christ. Our first Gospel, in fact, is evidently from the pen of a Christian of the second or third generation, and the apostolic name which has attached to it in tradition is due simply to the fact that it was supposed at an early day to be a translation of the Logia of Matthew, doubtless because it incorporated the greater part of that work and superseded it in the use of the church.

The Gospel of Luke, like the Gospel of Matthew, was based primarily upon the Gospel of Mark and the Logia, but other sources were apparently employed to a larger extent than by Matthew. The collection of Christ's words from which the author drew many of his parables has already been referred to, and he evidently used also a written source containing an account of Jesus' birth and childhood. His purpose in writing his Gospel was more historical than Matthew's. Having traced the course of all things accurately from the beginning, he aimed to write an account not merely of Jesus' public ministry, but of his life; an account, moreover, in which the chronological order should be preserved throughout, so that Theophilus might have an accurate knowledge of the matters in which he had been instructed. He refers to the fact that many others, not themselves personal disciples of Jesus, had undertaken to write of the Master's work; but he claims for his own Gospel superiority to theirs on the ground of its comprehensiveness and completeness and of its improved chronology.[1] It is in accordance with this historical purpose that he endeavors to reproduce the contents of the Logia in as nearly as may be their original historical setting, instead of grouping the words of Christ together,

[1] See the prologue of the Gospel.

as Matthew does, without regard to the time or the circumstances in which they were uttered.

The author was apparently a Gentile Christian. He knew little about Jewish manners and customs, and wrote as a foreigner unacquainted with the scenes in which the history was enacted. More than that, he had very little concern with the relations between Christianity and Judaism, and the strictures of Jesus upon the laws and customs of the Jews did not interest him as they did Matthew. Christianity was to him primarily a religion for the world, and he was interested only in its relation to the world. He recognizes Jesus' Messiahship and his Davidic lineage, and he calls attention occasionally to the fulfilment of Old Testament prophecy, but all this receives surprisingly little attention from him; evidently his sympathies lay chiefly along other lines.

The Gospel of Luke was written after the destruction of Jerusalem; for the author made use of the Gospel of Mark, and in the eschatological passages the Jewish war and the fall of the city are more clearly referred to than in either Matthew or Mark.[1] On the other hand, the Gospel was known to the writer of the fourth Gospel; and though in its introductory section, and in its account of the resurrection, it represents a considerably later stage of development than Mark, it represents, at least in the account of the resurrection, an earlier stage than Matthew, and belongs in all probability to an earlier date. It is therefore safe to conclude that it was written before the close of the first century, very likely a decade or two before.

Who the author was, and where he wrote, we have no means of determining. That he was not himself an eyewitness of the events he records is distinctly stated in his prologue, and it is worthy of note that he does not lay claim to have gained his information from the apostles, or from any one of them; that he does not claim, indeed, to have stood in such a relation to any of the leading Christians of the first generation as to be possessed of independent and first-hand knowledge of Christ's life, and thus

[1] Cf. Luke xxi. 20, 24.

peculiarly fitted to write of him. He implies that he had gained his information only by such study and investigation as any one of his day might have undertaken. He believed that he could produce a fuller and more accurate account of Christ's life and work than had yet been written, simply because he had devoted careful attention to the subject and had used faithfully all the sources he could find, including, apparently, some not known or used by his predecessors. Tradition, beginning with Irenæus and the Muratorian Fragment, ascribes the Gospel to Luke, the companion and friend of Paul; but there is no hint in the Gospel, not even in the prologue, that the author knew Paul. And though, to be sure, the argument from silence cannot be pressed in this case, there are very strong reasons for denying that a companion of Paul wrote the Book of Acts, which is certainly the work of the author of the third Gospel.[1]

Though the Synoptic Gospels represent other principles than those that controlled the early disciples of Jerusalem, they can all be traced back ultimately, as has been seen, to the Mother Church, and to that church is therefore due an everlasting debt of gratitude. Had the Gentile world depended upon Paul for its knowledge of Christ, there would have been handed down to subsequent generations hardly more than the fact of the Saviour's death and resurrection. It is to the Gospels whose composition was due to the impulse given by the Christians of Jerusalem, that Christendom owes its knowledge of the personality and character of the Master. Though the Synoptic Gospels have had very little influence upon theology, and though the beliefs of the church have been drawn very largely from other sources, they have served to keep the memory of Christ alive, and have thus acted, not simply as a permanently vitalizing and uplifting power, but also as a salutary check, recalling the church over and over again to the historic basis of its faith, and preventing it from losing itself altogether in empty speculation, and from deluding the world with hollow ceremonial and with

[1] See above, p. 433.

artificial faith. Paul's writings, great as they are, might be dispensed with, but the picture of Jesus, as he was in his divine sonship and in his human brotherhood, — a picture preserved in our Gospels alone, — the world could not do without. Our thinking may be controlled largely by the thinking of Paul, but it is Jesus of Nazareth that controls our lives.

Before closing this section upon James and the church of Jerusalem, it is necessary to examine two works, one of which bears the name of James, and has been ascribed since the third century to the brother of the Lord; the other of which bears the name of "Judas, the brother of James," and has been ascribed since the latter part of the second century to Jude, another of the four brethren of Jesus mentioned in the Gospels.

The Epistle of James is addressed to the "twelve tribes of the dispersion"; and yet, though it opens with a greeting in genuine epistolary form, it is to all intents and purposes not a letter at all, but a practical tract or homily. There is neither greeting nor benediction at the close, and there is no hint in the work itself that the author was writing to those at a distance. It bears, in fact, less of an epistolary character than any other New Testament epistle. It looks as if a work written originally as a homily, and with reference to the needs of a particular community, was later sent out into the world with the general superscription which it now carries. But in either case, whether the author thought primarily of the church at large, or of the narrower circle in which he himself lived, his purpose in writing was eminently practical. He had actual conditions in mind, and he was concerned not to present a theory of ethics and religion or a statement of the general principles which should govern a man's living and thinking,[1] but to meet definite and particular needs: to warn against certain prevalent faults, to admonish to certain neglected duties, to encourage those who had

[1] Jas. i. 27 is significant in this connection. In that passage "pure religion and undefiled" is defined, not in a general way as personal holiness and love for one's neighbor, but in concrete form as visiting the fatherless and widows in their affliction and keeping oneself unspotted from the world.

special reasons for being disheartened and despondent. The author makes no attempt to follow a preconceived plan or to develop his ideas logically. He takes up one subject after another in such order as they happen to suggest themselves, without any effort to bring them into connection or to keep them rigidly apart. The work, therefore, does not constitute an orderly and well-arranged treatise; it is rather a collection of detached observations, warnings, and admonitions on a variety of practical topics. Some of the observations were doubtless original with the author, but many, and perhaps most of them, came from other sources. Not that the epistle is a mere compilation. On the contrary, it was written with a free hand. But the writer's mind was well stocked with the teaching of others, and he incorporated whatever seemed suited to the matter in hand without regard to the source from which it came and without attempting to reproduce it in its original form or to employ it in its original sense. Reminiscences of the Old Testament and of later Jewish literature are very numerous, but there are almost no direct quotations. The literary style corresponds to the structure of the epistle. Though the author writes good Greek, and has an excellent command of the language, there are few long periods and few connective particles. As in the Book of Proverbs and the Sermon on the Mount, concise observations, aphorisms, and gnomic utterances abound. The epistle, in fact, is a fair sample of the so-called wisdom literature of the Jews.

The work bears the name of "James, a servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ," and it has been ascribed by tradition, since the time of Origen who first mentions it, to James, the brother of the Lord. That James should have addressed an epistle to "the twelve tribes of the dispersion," that is, if the words be taken literally, to his Jewish Christian brethren of the world at large, is not at all surprising. We know that he occupied a position of great prominence in the apostolic age, and that he was regarded with respect and deference far beyond the confines of Palestine. And yet it is by no means certain that

he was the author of our epistle. James was a zealous devotee of the Jewish ceremonial law; but the work contains no reference whatever to that law, and no hint that either the author himself or his readers observed it in any of its parts. If it be assumed that he simply took its observance for granted as a matter of course, and thought it unnecessary to say anything about it, it is evident that the epistle must have been written before the outbreak of the Pauline controversy, when the question of the Christian's relation to the Jewish law became a burning one. But against so early a date may be urged, in the first place, the extreme worldliness of those addressed,[1] which points to a loss of their primitive devotion and enthusiasm, and seems to necessitate the lapse of a considerable time since their conversion; and in the second place, the passage on faith and works,[2] which apparently presupposes the teaching of Paul and the widespread abuse of that teaching. But against the assumption that James, the brother of Jesus, wrote the epistle either at an earlier or at a later time, may be urged its remarkable and striking silence touching Jesus himself. Except in the salutation and in ii. 1, where "Jesus Christ, the Lord of glory," is referred to in passing, there is absolutely no mention of Christ in the epistle; no allusion to his birth, his death, his resurrection, or to salvation through him; no hint of his Messiahship; no hint, indeed, that the Messiah is already come. The character of the work is entirely different in these respects not only from the Pauline and post-Pauline writings in the New Testament, but also from the speeches in the early chapters of the Book of Acts, in which the resurrection and Messiahship of Jesus are made so much of.

The ethical tone and standard of the work are noble and inspiring and, in many respects, closely allied to the teaching of Jesus, but it is not easy to understand, and it is not altogether agreeable to contemplate the fact that a man who knew Jesus intimately should show no trace of the influence of the Master's wonderful personality;

[1] Cf. Jas. iv. [2] Jas. ii. 14 sq.

should, in fact, ignore him entirely and address to fellow-Christians an extended homily or epistle in which their life and duties are discussed at considerable length and from various points of view, without bringing Jesus into any connection with that life or those duties. It is true that there is much in the epistle that resembles utterances of Christ in the Sermon on the Mount, and it is frequently said in consequence that it represents the true primitive type of Christianity. But it is one thing for Jesus to say little about himself; it is quite another thing for a disciple to say little or nothing about him. And so far as the primitive character of the Christianity of the epistle is concerned, it is to be noticed that the idea of God's fatherhood hardly appears in the work,[1] and that the "kingdom" upon which Jesus laid so constant stress is only once referred to,[2] though there are a number of cases in which we should expect the term to be employed by one who had felt his influence.[3] It is clear that with its total lack of all reference to Jesus as the Messiah, and with its almost total lack of the two controlling conceptions of his teaching, "the fatherhood of God" and the "kingdom of God," the epistle can hardly be regarded as fairly representative of Christianity in its earliest days, whether the Christianity of Jesus himself or of his immediate followers. In the light of all that has been said, it seems most improbable that the epistle with which we are dealing was written by James, the brother of the Lord, who knew Jesus so well, and who was so intimately associated with his disciples in Jerusalem during the early years of the church there. Only on the assumption that the work was written by some one who had not known Jesus personally, and who lived in circles where the memory of him was not vivid, can its remarkable lack of the specifically and explicitly Christian element be explained.[4]

[1] See above, p. 447.

[2] Jas. ii. 5, where it is to be noticed that the kingdom promised by God to those that love him is brought into no connection with Jesus.

[3] Cf., *e.g.*, Jas. i. 12, ii. 14 sq., v. 7 sq.

[4] The only other primitive Christian work which can be compared with the Epistle of James in this respect is the *Shepherd* of Hermas, which was written

Where and by whom the work was written, we do not know. The author was evidently of Jewish birth and training,[1] but it is clear that he was not a Jewish particularist, and it is therefore altogether likely that he was a member not of the Mother Church or of any of the Ebionitic communities of Palestine, but of the church at large; and this conclusion is confirmed by the excellent Greek in which the epistle is written, and by the fact that the text of the Septuagint is used throughout. But if the epistle was written by a Hellenistic Jew who was a member of the world-church, it can hardly have been addressed exclusively to Jewish Christians; for in that church the wall between Jewish and Gentile Christians was completely broken down long before he wrote, and the Gentile disciples were recognized as sharing with their Jewish brethren in the heritage of the elect people of God. There were outside of Ebionitic circles no exclusively Jewish or Gentile churches; there were only Christian churches

by a Roman Christian of the second century. It is worthy of notice also that the general conception of Christianity which appears in the two works is very similar, and the conditions to which their authors address themselves much the same.

[1] The recent investigations of Professor Spitta (*Der Brief des Jakobus* in his *Zur Geschichte und Litteratur des Urchristenthums*, Bd. II.) have made it abundantly clear that the author was a Jew by birth. It is not simply that he was acquainted with the Jewish Bible; for it was a sacred book to Gentile as well as Jewish Christians, and was studied as diligently by the former as by the latter. But his intimate familiarity with contemporary Jewish literature, and his genuinely Jewish spirit and mode of thought, can be explained only on the assumption that he was a Jew born and bred. But Spitta's theory that the author was an unconverted Jew, though the surprising lack of the specifically Christian element and of all reference to the life and work of Christ is a strong argument in its favor, is beset with two fatal objections. In the first place, the resemblances to Christ's words recorded in the Synoptic Gospels are too numerous to be explained, except on the assumption that the author was acquainted with many of his utterances. In the second place, it is difficult to comprehend how a Christian, in transforming a Jewish into a Christian work, could content himself with the addition of only two phrases (*καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ* in i. 1, and *ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ* in ii. 1). He must have felt the need of giving a work borrowed from an unchristian source a more specifically Christian character by the insertion of at least some references to the life of Christ, an appeal to whose example would have added so much to the force of the epistle; or, if not to his life, at least to his death and resurrection. It is conceivable that a Christian, writing to fellow-disciples with a purely practical purpose, might omit such references as unnecessary; but something of the sort must have seemed essential to one who was concerned to give a Christian character to a Jewish work.

in which Jews and Gentiles stood on one plane. It would seem, then, that the greeting to the "twelve tribes of the dispersion," whether constituting originally a part of the epistle or attached to it by a later hand, must be taken figuratively, as in First Peter, to apply to Christians in general without regard to race.

The exact date of the epistle, assuming it to have been written under the circumstances described, cannot be determined. The general conception of Christianity which appears in it is practically identical, as has been already indicated, with the conception of First and Second Clement and Hermas, and points to conditions much the same as when those works were written. But the frank way in which the author asserts that a man cannot be justified by faith alone, and his entire lack of concern with the fact that his words might be construed as out of accord with the teaching of Paul upon the subject, seem to point to the earlier rather than the later post-Pauline period, to a time, that is, when Paul's epistles were not widely read, and when his authority, as one of the apostles of Christ, was not everywhere recognized in the church at large as it was after the beginning of the second century. I should be inclined, in fact, to suppose the epistle written before the end of the first century by a Jewish Christian, who was not in any way connected with Paul, and who was neither hostile to him, nor his follower; a man to whom Paul meant no more than any other travelling apostle or evangelist, and who, finding misconceptions in regard to faith prevalent, attacked them without any particular thought of him, and without any intention of undermining his credit and influence.

But if it be concluded that the epistle was written not by James, the brother of the Lord, but by some Hellenistic Jew in the latter part of the first century, what is to be said of the tradition which ascribes it to James? That tradition is very late, and no weight whatever need be attached to it.[1]

[1] It begins with Origen in the third century, and it was long in finding universal acceptance. The epistle is put by Eusebius among the antilegomena or disputed books (*H. E.* III. 25).

It is worthy of notice that no trace of the epistle is found in Jewish Christian or Ebionitic circles where the name of James was held in the highest honor, and that even Hegesippus, a Jewish Christian of the second century, who was very diligent in collecting information about James himself and about the early church of Jerusalem, knows nothing of such a work.[1] And yet there is no warrant for regarding the work as pseudonymous. It makes no claim to have been written by James, the brother of the Lord, and it is conceivable either that it was actually written by some James otherwise unknown to us, or that the superscription was added by a later scholar or scribe. The only objection to the former alternative is the address of the epistle, which must be original if the preceding words are; for those words cannot have stood alone. That address implies some well-known James, and at least suggests the brother of the Lord. On the other hand, against the latter alternative, may be urged the exceedingly modest phrase by which the author is designated. It is difficult to suppose that a later writer, in attributing the epistle to the great James, would speak of him in such a way. It is possible that the address "To the twelve tribes of the dispersion" is alone original, and that the phrase "James, a servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ," was added to the anonymous epistle under the influence of the parallel words in the Epistle of Jude, which seems to have been ascribed to Judas, the brother of James, before our epistle was ascribed to James himself.[2]

The epistle which bears the name of Judas, "brother of James," is of a very different character from the Epistle of James. Though it is addressed to no specific church, it is yet a genuine letter, as appears not only from the salutation at the beginning and the benediction at the close, but also from vs. 3, where the author speaks of writing to

[1] Nothing is said of James' epistle in the extant fragments of Hegesippus' writings, and Eusebius, who was so careful to record all the early testimonies to the antilegomena which he could find, would not have failed to mention the fact if he had discovered any reference to the epistle in Hegesippus' memoirs.

[2] The Epistle of Jude is ascribed to Judas, the brother of Jesus, by the author of the Muratorian Fragment, by Tertullian and Clement of Alexandria.

those whom he addresses. But the contrast between the two works is not merely one of form. The aim of the Epistle of Jude is entirely different from that of James' epistle, and its contents equally so. The purpose which the author of the former had in view in writing was to denounce certain false teachers and their teachings, and to warn Christian believers against them. The entire work is devoted to the one subject. It is clear that the persons attacked were Gnostic in their tendency,[1] if they did not constitute, as they very likely did, a regular Gnostic sect. They apparently denied the supreme God to be the ruler of the world,[2] as all the Gnostics did, and they seem to have been Docetic in their conception of the person of Christ.[3] It is possible also that in genuine Gnostic fashion they separated themselves, as alone truly spiritual, from the mass of Christians in general.[4] Finally, they were thoroughgoing libertines, and apparently libertines on principle.[5] It is especially their libertinism which draws upon them the condemnation of our author. Nearly the whole of his epistle is devoted to a denunciation of their lascivious practices, and he is not sparing in his use of language. He does not undertake to enter into a discussion with those whom he attacks and to prove their principles fallacious. He is satisfied to denounce their practices and to remind his readers that the judgment of God will surely overtake such despisers of his will as it always has in the past. It is interesting to notice, however, that the writer does not charge his readers simply to avoid such persons, but urges them to do what they can to reclaim them.[6] In this respect he differs very strikingly from Polycarp and the author of Second John.

[1] Cf. Jude 10, 13, 16; and see Pfleiderer: *Urchristenthum*, S. 835 sq.

[2] Compare the words *τὸν μόνον Δεσπότην . . . ἀρνούμενοι* in vs. 4.

[3] As is suggested by the words *κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἀρνούμενοι* in the same verse.

[4] Cf. vs. 19.

[5] Cf. vss. 4, 8, 13, 16. They were thus closely related in some respects to the false teachers attacked in the Epistle of John, but they bore a still more distinctly Gnostic character, and represented apparently a somewhat later stage of development.

[6] Cf. vss. 22 and 23.

The author and the time and place of composition are uncertain. He seems to have been familiar with at least some of Paul's epistles, and he makes use of two late apocryphal works, the *Assumptio Mosis* and the Book of Enoch, taking the incident which he relates in vs. 9, concerning the archangel Michael's contention with the devil, from the former work, and vss. 6 and 14 sq. from the latter. It is worthy of notice that the words in vs. 14 sq. are expressly ascribed by him to the patriarch Enoch. He speaks of the apostles as if they had lived long before,[1] and he uses the word "faith" in the same objective way in which it is used in the pastorals, to denote the deposit handed down from earlier days and which it is necessary for all true Christians to accept and preserve; and he even goes so far as to speak of such faith as delivered once for all, implying apparently that no farther revelation is possible.[2] These facts, taken in connection with the distinct anti-Gnostic purpose of the author, point to the second century or to the closing years of the first as the time when he wrote. On the other hand, it will hardly do to assign a date later than the first quarter of the second century; for those whom the writer denounces are still within the church and meet with their fellow-Christians in their love feasts.[3] External testimony does not help us in the matter; for the first reference to the epistle is in the Muratorian Fragment, which belongs to the closing decades of the second century.

So far as the personality of the author is concerned, he designates himself as "Judas, a servant of Jesus Christ and brother of James." The epistle accordingly passes in tradition as the work of the Judas who is mentioned in the Gospels as one of the brethren of Jesus, the James referred to being naturally regarded as the well-known brother of the Lord. It may safely be assumed, however, for the reasons already given, that the letter was not written by a Christian of the first generation. The age of Christ and his apostles had long passed, and the author nowhere hints that he himself was a survivor of that earlier

[1] Jude 17. Cf. also vs. 4. [2] Cf. vss. 3 and 20. [3] Cf. vs. 12.

age.[1] But it is not necessary to assume that the epistle is a pseudonymous work. It may have been written by a Christian named Jude, who is otherwise entirely unknown to us. It is, at any rate, difficult to understand why an author who wished to give his epistle apostolic authority should have selected the name of Jude, and why, having chosen that name, he should have called himself simply the brother of James, instead of the brother of the Lord, which would have enhanced greatly the dignity and authority of his letter. The same considerations may be urged against the assumption that the name "Jude" was attached to the epistle by some copyist or scribe. But if the author actually bore the name, and designated himself in the salutation of his epistle, "Judas, a servant of Jesus Christ," it would be the most natural thing in the world for some one in the second century, supposing him to be the brother of the great James referred to in the Gospels, to add the words ἀδελφὸς δὲ Ἰακώβου, thus innocently ascribing the work to the wrong man.

2. Peter and the Church of Rome

Of Peter's career during the period when Paul was carrying on his great missionary campaigns, we are almost entirely ignorant. In the earliest days he was the leading figure among the disciples in Jerusalem; and he seems still to have been regarded as such three years after Paul's conversion, for the latter went up to Jerusalem at that time for the express purpose of seeing him.[2] Whether his visits to Lydda, Joppa, and Cæsarea, described in the ninth and tenth chapters of Acts, took place before or after this, we do not know. But he was in Jerusalem, at any rate, some eight or ten years later, and was still so prominent a figure among the Christians there that when

[1] The brothers of Jesus were doubtless all of them dead long before the Epistle of Jude was written. It is worthy of notice that Hegesippus says in Eusebius (*H. E.* III. 20): "Of the family of the Lord there were still living [that is, in the time of Domitian] the grandchildren of Jude, who is said to have been the Lord's brother according to the flesh." The statement of course implies the prior death of all Jesus' immediate family.

[2] Gal. i. 18.

Herod wished to persecute them, he singled him out, along with James, the son of Zebedee, as a special object of attack, beheading James, and throwing Peter into prison.[1] Immediately after his miraculous escape, Peter left the city,[2] and we hear nothing more of him until the time of the council, in the year 45 or 46. It would hardly have been safe for him to return to Jerusalem until after Herod's death, and it is therefore probable that he spent at least a part of the interval away from the city, — very likely in missionary work. At the council his influence seems to have been less controlling than in earlier days, and the position of leadership, which he had originally held by common consent, was apparently occupied by James, the brother of the Lord.[3] From that time on, if not already before that time, James, and not Peter, was the prominent figure in the Mother Church. The pre-eminence which he enjoyed may have been largely due to Peter's repeated and extended absences from the city; but he was naturally more in sympathy with the spirit of the strict Jewish Christians of Jerusalem than Peter, and the knowledge of that fact doubtless tended to undermine somewhat the credit and authority of the latter. James seems to have remained closely at home, and his horizon was not broadened by any such experiences as came to Peter in his missionary journeys in the world outside. The liberal tendency of the latter, evinced by his action in connection with Cornelius, by his speech at the council, and by his subsequent conduct at Antioch, was not in harmony with the prevailing tendency in Jerusalem; and it may fairly be doubted whether he could have retained the complete confidence of all his brethren, and could have kept his original hold upon the Mother Church, even had he made his permanent residence there. But however that

[1] Acts xii. Herod Agrippa died in 44 A.D. How long before his death the arrest of James and Peter took place, we do not know; for there is no necessary chronological connection between Acts xii. 20 and the preceding context.

[2] Acts xii. 17. The author of the Acts seems to have known no more than we know about Peter's whereabouts between this time and the Council of Jerusalem.

[3] Not simply is James given a more prominent position in the account of the conference contained in Acts xv.; he is mentioned before Peter in Gal. ii. 9.

may be, he at any rate left the leadership of the church to others, and spent the greater part of his life in missionary labors elsewhere. Already, at the time of the council, he was known as the great apostle of the circumcision;[1] that is, it would seem, as the one who was doing the largest missionary work among the Jews in foreign parts. His presence in Jerusalem is not again referred to, and it is clear, at least, that he was not there when Paul visited the city for the last time seven or eight years later.[2]

Where he went after his unfortunate experience in Antioch, to which Paul refers in Gal. ii. 11 sq., we do not know. A few years later he was travelling about as an apostle, in company with his wife, as we learn from 1 Cor. ix. 5; but no hint is given as to the scene of his labors. It may well be that he confined himself during this period very largely, if not exclusively, to the province of Syria. It is significant that, although Paul labored in that province for a number of years after his conversion, he did nothing there in the latter part of his career, and that he wrote no epistle, so far as we know, to any Syrian church. His complete withdrawal from his earlier field of labor, and his apparent lack of responsibility for its welfare, may have been due to the fact that Peter was working there, and thus making Paul's presence and interest unnecessary.[3] Syria was very thickly populated with Jews, and Peter, who was regarded by Paul and regarded himself as the apostle of the circumcision, would find there a natural and an ample field. But whether there or elsewhere, he was evidently doing a large work and vindicating his reputation as the greatest of the original apostles. James' credit might be greater in the church of Jerusalem, but in the church at large Peter's missionary activity and his broader spirit, which brought him into closer sympathy with Christians outside of Palestine, could not fail to give him more prominence and influence than James possessed.[4]

[1] Gal. ii. 8. [2] Acts xxi. 18 sq.

[3] See Weizsäcker, *l.c.* S. 466 (Eng. Trans., Vol. II. p. 149).

[4] Cf., for instance, the credit and authority which he enjoyed in Corinth, where one of the three parties was named after him (1 Cor. i. 12), and the special emphasis which Paul lays upon his name in 1 Cor. ix. 5.

But though Peter very likely confined himself to Syria during much of the time when Paul was carrying on his missionary campaigns, there can be little doubt that he made his way to Rome before the end of his life and labored there for some time. Clement of Rome, writing before the end of the first century, though he does not explicitly state, certainly does imply that Peter had been in Rome and that he had suffered martyrdom there.[1] Ignatius of Antioch, also, in writing to the Romans a few years later, says, "I do not enjoin you as Peter and Paul did,"[2] which has no meaning unless Peter had preached to them as well as Paul. Dionysius of Corinth, Clement of Alexandria, Irenæus of Gaul, and Tertullian of North Africa, all writing before the end of the second century, refer to Peter's presence in Rome as a well-known fact,[3] and it is mentioned over and over again in the literature of the third and following centuries. But though in the light of such early and unanimous testimony it may be regarded as an established fact that Peter visited Rome, it is equally certain that he cannot have gone thither during Paul's lifetime. His presence there, either before or at the time Paul's Epistle to the Romans was written, is inconceivable in view of the absolute silence of that epistle and of the situation which it presupposes. It is equally inconceivable that he can have been there during Paul's imprisonment when Philippians, Ephesians, Colossians, Philemon, and a part of 2 Timothy were written. And yet a somewhat prolonged residence and activity in Rome seem to be imperatively demanded by the traditions of the Roman church, and by the universal recognition which was later given to the claim of that church to be the See of Peter. It is true that there is no single witness to whom we can appeal with any degree of confidence, and it is true, moreover, that the tradition of a twenty-five years' episcopate is worthless.[4] But the honor in which Peter's

[1] *Ad Cor.* 5 and 6. [2] *Ad Rom.* 4.

[3] Dionysius of Corinth in Eusebius: *H. E.* II. 25; Clement in Eusebius, VI. 14; Irenæus: *Adv. Hær.* III. 1, 1; Tertullian: *De Bapt.* 4, *De Præscr. Hær.* 32, 36 (cf. also *Scorpiace*, 15).

[4] That tradition is found first in Jerome: *De vir. ill.* 1.

memory was universally held by the Christians of Rome, and the way in which his figure overshadowed that of Paul, can hardly be explained on merely dogmatic grounds. Nothing less than his leadership and personal domination in the Roman church can account for the result.

But such leadership and domination could hardly be secured, where there was so much rivalry and division as in Rome at the time Paul wrote to the Philippians, until Peter had labored some time there and gained the confidence of all parties. His liberal spirit and his practical sense made it possible for him to unify and consolidate opposing factions as another might not have been able to do, but even he could not do it in an instant. Under these circumstances it is difficult to believe, as is widely taken for granted, that he spent only a few weeks or months in Rome, coming thither just before the Neronian persecution and perishing in that deluge of blood. It must be assumed either that his death did not occur until some years after that time, or that he came to Rome some years before it. The former alternative, though possible, is far from probable. That Peter suffered martyrdom is too well attested to admit of doubt,[1] and that his death occurred under Nero was the common belief of the church, at least from the second century on.[2] Moreover, that he suffered in the great Neronian persecution, or at any rate not later than that time, though not explicitly stated by Clement of Rome, is certainly implied in the sixth chapter of his Epistle to the Corinthians, where the victims of that persecution are said to have been "gathered unto" Peter and Paul; and the tradition that he was crucified,[3] and the statement of Caius of Rome[4] that he was buried in the Vatican, which was the scene of the butchery, both go to confirm the assumption that he was one of those vic-

[1] Cf., for instance, John xix. 20; Clement: *Ad Cor.* 5.

[2] Cf. Dionysius of Corinth in Eusebius: *H. E.* II. 25, and Tertullian: *Scorp.* 15. Compare also the Chronicles of Eusebius and Jerome, which put Peter's death in 67 and 68 respectively.

[3] See Tertullian: *De Præscr. Hær.* 36; also Origen (quoted by Eusebius: *H. E.* III. 1). Some scholars find a reference to Peter's crucifixion in John xxi. 18. See, for instance, Lightfoot: *St. Clement of Rome*, II. p. 492.

[4] Quoted by Eusebius: *H. E.* II. 25.

tims. It is not easy, therefore, to believe that he lived until a later time.[1] But if the death of Paul be put back into the year 58, there is no difficulty in supposing that Peter came to Rome some five or six years before Nero's attack upon the Christians, and remained there the rest of his life. His presence and his labors there during that time would then help to account for the fact that the Christians were well enough known in the city before the great conflagration to make it possible for Nero to single them out as scapegoats in order to divert from himself the suspicion of having been the author of the fire; and a residence of half a dozen years is amply sufficient to account for the overmastering influence which he acquired, and for the permanent impression which he left upon the Roman church.

Three New Testament books are connected by tradition more or less directly with Peter's name, — the First and Second Epistles of Peter and the Gospel of Mark. The occasion, the purpose, and the contents of the First Epistle of Peter have been already indicated; and it has been shown that its author was a genuine Paulinist, truer to the teaching of the great apostle to the Gentiles than any other writer known to us.[2] But this fact suggests the question whether the epistle can have been written by the apostle Peter, whose name it bears. And the question is rendered still more pressing by the fact that the Christians addressed in it were Gentiles,[3] and that they lived in that part of the world which had been evangelized by Paul, at least a part of them residing within

[1] Ramsay (*Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 262 sq.) assumes that Peter was still alive as late as the year 80, but though it is not impossible it is certainly extremely improbable that he lived until so late a date.

[2] See above, p. 485 sq.

[3] Cf. 1 Pet. i. 14, ii. 9 sq., iii. 6, iv. 3. The fact that they are called "the elect who are sojourners of the dispersion" in i. 1 cannot be urged as proof that they were Jewish Christians; for Paul, the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, Clement, and Barnabas all looked upon the Christians as children of Abraham and heirs of God's covenant with the fathers; and there is, therefore, no difficulty in supposing these words to have been used in a figurative sense of the people of God, the true children of Abraham (whose fatherland is heaven) scattered throughout the world, and surrounded not with their own brethren but with unbelievers and heathen (compare also i. 17 and ii. 11).

his own missionary territory, — the provinces of Galatia and Asia. It is surprising, to say the least, that the man who was recognized at the time of the conference at Jerusalem as "the apostle of the circumcision," and who believed his life-work to be the evangelization of the Jews (as is clear from his conduct at Antioch), should have written an epistle to Gentile Christians, to those, moreover, who owed their conversion to Paul; and it is still more surprising that a man who had learned his Christianity from Jesus himself, who had been most intimately associated with him throughout his entire ministry, and who, both before and after Christ's death, was the leader among the apostles, should have gone to school to Paul, and should have studied him so faithfully and sympathetically that the only epistle which we have from his pen is essentially Pauline from beginning to end.

But it is not simply the Paulinism of the epistle that is surprising. No less striking is the entire lack of that element of personal reminiscence which we might justly expect to be very prominent in the letters of a man who stood as near to Christ as Peter did. So far as this letter goes, there is not a hint in it that the author had ever known Jesus personally, except the bare reference in v. 1 to the fact that he was a witness of Christ's sufferings, which probably means that he had seen him crucified. All that he says about him might have been said equally well by Paul, or even by one of Paul's converts.[1] If our epistle was written by Peter, it is necessary to assume that he who was Jesus' leading disciple, and one of his closest companions during his entire ministry, felt Paul's influence to such a degree that his own personal impression

[1] The only passage in which there is any reference to Christ's earthly life over and above his death and resurrection, which of course are spoken of frequently, as in the epistles of Paul and in all the literature of the period, is 1 Pet. ii. 22–23, where we read: "Who did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth: who, when he was reviled, reviled not again; when he suffered, threatened not; but committed himself to him that judgeth righteously." But there is nothing in this to betray personal acquaintance with Jesus and quite as much is found in many early Christian documents written by men who were not Christ's immediate disciples (compare, for instance, Rom. xv. 3; 2 Cor. x. 1; Clement: *Ad Cor.* 16; Barnabas, 5; Ignatius: *Smyr.* 3; Polycarp, 10; and especially Heb. ii. 18, iv. 15, v. 7 sq.).

of the Master was replaced by Paul's conception of him, and that he who had known Jesus so intimately saw him in his later years only through the eyes of a man who had never looked upon him. The improbability of such an assumption goes without saying.[1]

But if we question the Petrine authorship, how are we to explain the words, "Peter, an apostle of Jesus Christ," which occur at the beginning of the epistle, and which constitute the sole ground for its ascription to him? That the letter was originally pseudonymous, — that it was given Peter's name by its author, — it is very difficult to believe. For if the writer wished his epistle to pass for the work of Peter, it is hardly likely that he would have contented himself with the mere mention of his name in the salutation. We should certainly expect him to assume the character of Peter in other parts of the epistle, or to indicate its alleged origin in other ways, as we find the author of Second Peter doing in more than one passage.[2] Moreover, it might fairly be expected that if the author wished to write in the name of an apostle, he would choose Paul's name rather than Peter's; for those whom he addressed owed their Christianity to Paul, and with him the writer himself was in closest sympathy. It is difficult, also, to discover any adequate motive for pseudonymity. There were still, at the time the epistle was written, apostles and prophets in the church who were speaking and writing under the influence of the Spirit of God, and it was not necessary for the author to invoke the name of one of the Twelve, in order to secure a hearing and give his words effect. Finally, it is to be remembered that the epistle was called forth by a particular emergency; that it was written to Christians who had recently begun to suffer persecution, and that its aim was to exhort and encourage

[1] The difficulty of ascribing the epistle to Peter is enhanced by the fact that the condition of the Christians addressed makes it necessary to bring its composition down to the time of Domitian. Ramsay lays stress upon the late date of the epistle, and is able to ascribe it to Peter only on the assumption that he lived until the year 80 or thereabouts (see above, p. 593). But, as already seen, it is altogether probable that Peter perished in the persecution of Nero in the year 64.

[2] 2 Pet. i. 14, 18, iii. 1.

them in the face of the trials they were undergoing. Under these circumstances, to give the letter the name of an apostle who must have been already dead — or the writer would not have ventured to use his name — would be to defeat its purpose by destroying its special applicability to the case in hand. In view of all these considerations, it can hardly be supposed that the epistle was originally pseudonymous. It is much more probable that it was anonymous, like Hebrews, Barnabas, and the epistles of John, and that it became attached to the name of Peter only in the second century, his name, perhaps, being written upon the margin of a manuscript by some scribe, and adopted thence into the text. This supposition is not without confirmation in the literature of the second century. Though the epistle was known and used certainly by Polycarp and Papias, and possibly by other early writers, it is nowhere quoted or referred to as Peter's until almost the close of the second century, by Clement of Alexandria, Irenæus, and Tertullian. Even the Muratorian Fragment fails altogether to mention it, which is very surprising if the author of that fragment knew it to be Peter's.[1]

The date of the epistle it is possible to determine with considerable exactness. There can be no doubt that its writer was acquainted at least with the epistles to the Romans and Ephesians, if not with others of Paul's letters. Its composition therefore must be put later than the time of Paul's Roman imprisonment. Still farther, the work shows that a regular and systematic persecution was taking place in Asia Minor as well as elsewhere;[2] a per-

[1] The suggestion that the epistle was originally anonymous was first made by Harnack in his *Texte und Untersuchungen*, II. 1, S. 106 sq. (cf. also *Das Neue Testament um das Jahr 200*, S. 81). But Harnack holds that the name of Peter was added in the second century at the time of the canonization of the epistle in order to give it the requisite apostolic authority. The latter opinion, however, can hardly be maintained in view of the fact that the Epistle to the Hebrews and the three epistles of John found their way into the canon without the addition of an apostolic name. It seems better indeed to regard the addition of Peter's name as the mere chance act of an individual scribe, who had no idea of giving the epistle canonical authority, but thought he saw good reason for regarding it as the work of Peter.

[2] 1 Pet. v. 9.

secution which was carried on under the direction of the Roman authorities, and was resulting even in the death of Christians.[1] It had already gone so far, indeed, that the profession of Christianity was itself regarded as worthy of punishment, even though other offences could not be proved.[2] This can hardly have been the case during the reign of Nero; for the disciples were executed by him not as Christians, but as men who were guilty of particular crimes, and there is, besides, no evidence that his persecution extended beyond Rome. Such a state of affairs, therefore, as is depicted in First Peter can hardly have existed until a later day. On the other hand, there is no indication in the epistle that the Christians addressed were called upon to worship the image of the emperor, and that their refusal to do so was visited with punishment, as was the case during the later years of Domitian's reign when the Apocalypse was written with its letters to the seven churches of Asia.[3] The author of the latter work, moreover, looks back apparently upon a period of long-continued persecution,[4] while the author of First Peter speaks of the trial which his readers are undergoing as a new thing.[5] And indeed the whole tone of the Apocalypse, with its uncompromising hostility to the empire, and with its conviction that between it and the church only enmity is possible, contrasts strikingly with Peter's friendly attitude toward the state, and his hope that the persecution will soon cease.[6] In view of all these considerations, it seems probable that our epistle was written later than the reign of Nero, but before the composition of the Apocalypse; that is, probably in the early part of Domitian's reign, some time before the year 90.[7]

First Peter was apparently written in Rome. The author sends greetings, in v. 13, from the church "that is in Baby-

[1] Cf. 1 Pet. i. 6, iii. 15, iv. 15, 16.
[2] 1 Pet. iv. 15.
[3] Cf. Rev. xiii. 15, xx. 4; and see p. 634, below.
[4] Rev. ii. 13, vi. 10, xviii. 24.
[5] 1 Pet. iv. 12.
[6] Cf. 1 Pet. iii. 13 sq., iv. 7, v. 10.
[7] If Professor Ramsay be correct in contending that the Christians were persecuted also under Vespasian and Titus (*Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 253 sq.), it is possible to date the epistle before Domitian's accession, that is, between 70 and 81. But of such persecution there is little evidence.

lon." The name "Babylon" is employed in the Apocalypse to designate Rome, and though its use in an epistle is somewhat surprising, other equally figurative expressions occur in i. 1 and v. 13,[1] and it is certainly upon the face of it much more likely that a letter to the Christians of Asia Minor should be written from Rome than from distant Babylon, which played, so far as we know, no part in early church history. The author's acquaintance with Romans and Ephesians also suggests Rome as the place of composition, and the general character of the epistle, with its emphasis upon loyalty to the state and subjection to the civil authorities, points in the same direction. Finally, it is to be noticed that Mark, from whom the author sends greetings,[2] was in Rome, certainly during the latter years of Paul's life,[3] and probably still later with Peter.

The writer of the epistle, if it be assumed that it was not Peter himself, we have no means of determining with certainty; but it is at any rate not beyond the bounds of possibility that he may have been Paul's old friend and companion, Barnabas. Barnabas was a Jew, and that the author of our letter was the same is rendered exceedingly probable by more than one passage.[4] Barnabas, moreover, was a Hellenist, and the excellent Greek of the epistle and the writer's familiarity with the Septuagint, and his use of it to the complete exclusion of the Hebrew original, point in the same direction.[5] Barnabas was also a Levite, and the conception of all Christians as priests, which appears in 1 Peter ii. 5 and 9, would be a natural one to him. Still farther, Barnabas was for many years an intimate friend and companion of Paul, and recognizing Paul as he did as the leader in the missionary work they were carrying on together, he must have been greatly influenced by his thinking; and though he did not at once understand him fully and make his profound conceptions his own,[6] no one had a better opportunity than he

[1] 1 Pet. i. 1: "The elect who are sojourners of the Dispersion"; v. 13: "She that is elect together with you."
[2] 1 Pet. v. 13. [3] Col. iv. 10. [4] 1 Pet. i. 11, 14, ii. 9.
[5] These considerations, of course, make against the Petrine authorship.
[6] See above, p. 216.

to become acquainted with them, and he may have been convinced ultimately of their truth. Possibly his experience at Antioch, when he followed Peter in separating himself from his Gentile brethren, was the means of opening his eyes to the real significance of Paul's teaching as they had not before been opened. Certainly, the course he took at Antioch could not permanently satisfy him, and a reaction must ultimately set in. That such a reaction actually did take place, and that he resumed his missionary work among the Gentiles, is rendered probable by Paul's reference to him in 1 Cor. ix. 6. But if he again put himself squarely upon the platform of a universal Christianity, the Gospel of Paul must have appealed to him more powerfully than ever; for in it alone could he find a complete and satisfactory solution of the difficulties which he had so keenly felt in his own experience, and which he had found it vain to endeavor to solve by any halfway and compromising measures.

On the other hand, while Barnabas was a companion of Paul and undoubtedly felt his influence most profoundly, he was a member of the church of Jerusalem in its early days and may have been in the city at the time of Christ's death. If so, he was one of the very few companions of Paul who could fulfil the conditions apparently involved in 1 Peter v. 1. Again, it would be very natural for Barnabas to write to the Christians of Asia Minor. Some of them certainly owed their Christianity to him as well as to Paul; and it is not at all unreasonable to suppose that he carried on the work in that part of the world after the latter's departure for the West. He was, at any rate, still a travelling missionary while Paul was residing at Ephesus,[1] and was well known to the Colossians when Paul wrote to them from Rome.[2] Moreover, Silvanus, who is referred to in v. 12, was one of his old acquaintances,[3] and what is still more significant, Mark, whom the writer calls his "son" in v. 13, was his nephew or cousin,[4] and a favorite protégé and companion.[5] That Barnabas should speak of

[1] 1 Cor. ix. 6. [2] Col. iv. 10. [3] Acts xv. 25 sq.
[4] Col. iv. 10. [5] Acts xv. 37 sq.

him as his son was very natural, but it is not likely that any one else would do it save Paul himself. Finally, if it be assumed that Barnabas was the author of First Peter, the striking fact is explained that both in East and in West an epistle was ascribed to him which was in reality written by some one else. In Alexandria his name was attached at an early day to the work which is still erroneously called the Epistle of Barnabas, while in Carthage he was reputed to be the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews.[1] It may have been widely known that he had written an important work; but as he had not chosen to inscribe it with his name, its identity was uncertain, and in the East one anonymous letter was ascribed to him, in the West another. So far as I am aware, the name of Barnabas has not before been suggested in connection with First Peter, and it is of course suggested now as little more than a possibility. There is, at any rate, no one else known to us save Barnabas to whom it can be ascribed with any show of reason, if the Petrine authorship be questioned.

The second of the two epistles ascribed by tradition to the apostle Peter is still more evidently the work of another hand than his. The letter is very closely related to the Epistle of Jude. Indeed, nearly the whole of the latter is incorporated substantially in 2 Peter ii. 1–iii. 3. At the same time the author of Second Peter did not write with the purpose of combating false teachers, as Jude did, but simply with the aim of confirming his readers in their faith in the second coming of Christ for salvation and for judgment, — a faith which was beginning to grow faint in many quarters because of the long and unexpected delay.[2] That the author attacks and denounces false teachers in the second and third chapters is only because such teachers were denying the second coming, and were thus leading many astray and contributing to the widespread uncertainty and doubt. The work is very practical and contains some striking utterances,[3] but in the parallel passage it is by no means as pregnant and incisive as Jude, and it lacks the

[1] See above, p. 480. [2] Cf. 2 Pet. ii. 12 sq., iii. 1 sq. [3] Cf. especially 2 Pet. i. 5–7.

profoundness and richness of thought that mark First Peter. The diction is Greek rather than Hellenistic, but the style is awkward and betrays an author without literary training and of comparatively little education. The repeated emphasis, however, upon knowledge is very marked and shows that the writer, though not a man of culture and though a decided opponent of the heretical Gnostics, was a genuine Greek in his conception of the function of knowledge in the accomplishment of salvation.[1]

The epistle bears the name of "Simon Peter, a servant and apostle of Jesus Christ"; and it is not possible in this case, as in the case of First Peter, to suppose that the name was added to a letter originally anonymous, for Petrine authorship is assumed in i. 14, 16 sq., iii. 1, 15. The author, in fact, if he was not Peter himself, took particular pains to have his epistle pass as Peter's. We are dealing therefore either with a genuine Petrine production, or with a pseudonymous work in the strict sense. But that we are dealing with the latter and not with a writing from the pen of the apostle Peter, there can be, it seems to me, no doubt. It is true that the denial of the Petrine authorship of First Peter makes it easier to accept the Petrine authorship of Second Peter; for nothing could well be clearer than that the two epistles are not the work of the same hand. The differences, both in style and in theological conception, are too thoroughgoing and fundamental to permit the assumption of identity of authorship.[2] But such denial does not help us in the present case, for the epistle contains many indications of a post-apostolic date. In the first place, the author certainly knew and made extensive use of the Epistle of Jude, which, as has

[1] Cf. 2 Pet. i. 2, 3, 6, 8, iii. 18, and especially i. 4, where the author gives utterance to the Greek idea (of which the Gnostics made so much) of participation in the divine nature and liberation from the corruption of the world.

[2] The style of 1 Peter is more Hellenistic than that of 2 Peter, but it is much smoother and richer. The author of the former was a man of considerable culture; the author of the latter was entirely without it. So far as the difference of theological conception is concerned, it is enough to remark that the Paulinism of 1 Peter is entirely wanting in 2 Peter, and that the sufferings and resurrection of Christ, which are so strongly emphasized in the former, are not mentioned in the latter.

been already seen, cannot have been written before the closing years of the first century.[1] It is significant also that the false teachers are condemned still more unmercifully than in Jude, and that all idea of saving them from their errors, an idea which appears in Jude, seems to have been definitely abandoned.[2] It is a still farther indication of the post-apostolic date of Second Peter that the days of the original Christians are referred to in iii. 4 as already long past, and that the prophets, the Lord, and the apostles are mentioned in iii. 2, as the three authorities for a knowledge of Christian truth, just as they are by the old Catholic fathers of the late second and following centuries. Finally, the author is not only acquainted with Paul's epistles, but he even ascribes to them, it would seem, canonical authority, placing them on a level with, or at any rate ranging them alongside of, "the other Scriptures."[3] All these indications point to a time at least as late as the beginning and very probably as late as the middle of the second century. So far as external testimony goes, the epistle might have been written even as late as the very end of the second century; for the earliest traces of its existence are found in the writings of the fathers of the third century, and it was later than any other work in acquiring general recognition as a part of the canon.[4] Its authenticity is widely questioned even in conservative circles, more widely questioned than the authenticity of any

[1] Spitta has recently endeavored to show that Jude is dependent upon 2 Peter (*Der zweite Brief Petri und der Brief Judae*); but his attempt is a failure. The dependence of 2 Peter on Jude is, in fact, abundantly manifest, and is almost universally recognized by scholars. It is to be noticed that the Epistle of Jude is controlled throughout by a single definite purpose, while the parallel passage in Peter clearly shows the effort to make use of Jude's words, and at the same time to turn them to another purpose than that for which Jude employed them, and so we find in 2 Peter numerous additions which are in entire accord with the purpose of the epistle as a whole, but are out of accord with the original purpose of the words quoted from Jude.

In a number of cases, moreover, the words of 2 Peter can be understood only in the light of Jude, the original and natural significance of the words being lost in the form in which they are used in 2 Peter. Compare, for instance, 2 Pet. ii. 11, which can be understood only in the light of Jude 9; 2 Pet. ii. 12, in the light of Jude 10; and 2 Pet. ii. 17, in the light of Jude 12.

[2] Compare 2 Pet. ii. 20 sq. with Jude 22 sq.

[3] 2 Pet. iii. 16.

[4] See Holtzmann: *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, 3te Auflage, S. 325.

other canonical book, and there can be little doubt that it is the latest of the writings of the New Testament.

But though First Peter is probably and Second Peter certainly not the work of Peter, the tradition which connects the Gospel of Mark with his name has more to commend it. That tradition has been already referred to, and Papias' account of the composition of the Gospel has been quoted.[1] There is no reason for referring his words to any other work than our second Gospel, nor is there any reason for doubting the general accuracy of his account. All that we know of Mark goes to confirm the ascription of the Gospel to him. As has been already seen, its style and contents show that it was written primarily for Gentile Christians by a Christian Jew, who had broken entirely loose from the trammels of Judaism, and was a member of the world-church to whom distinctions of race and lineage meant nothing. But Mark was exactly such a man. A resident of Jerusalem in his earlier days, he became later a disciple and companion of Paul, and labored with him both in East and West for the spread of Christianity among the Gentiles. All the indications also, which point to Rome as the place of the composition of the Gospel, are favorable to the tradition that Mark was its author; for he was in Rome at any rate in the late fifties, and twenty years or more later when the First Epistle of Peter was written.[2] It should be noticed, finally, that our second Gospel nowhere claims to be the work of an eyewitness of the events recorded, nor even hints at such a thing, and in this respect, too, Mark apparently satisfies the conditions; for nothing that we know of him suggests that he was a personal disciple of Jesus, and Papias distinctly asserts that he was not.

Papias' report that Mark got the material for his Gospel from Peter also finds confirmation in the Gospel itself. There are many indications in it that the author was particularly interested in Peter, and many of Peter's own characteristics appear in it. It is just such a work as we should expect a man to write who had been intimately

[1] See above, p. 571 sq. [2] Cf. Col. iv. 10; Philemon 24 and 1 Pet. v. 13.

associated with the apostle, and had gained his knowledge of Christ largely from him. In view of these various considerations, the accuracy of Papias' account may safely be relied upon, and it may be assumed that though our second Gospel was not Peter's own work, and though use was made in it of other sources besides his teaching, it yet contains in large measure his reminiscences of Jesus, and represents, at least in a general way, his conception of the Master's character and work.

But if the Gospel of Mark be connected with Peter in the way that has been indicated, it is perhaps possible to gain from it not simply his picture of Jesus, but also some knowledge of the views of Christianity which he held in the later years of his life. All that we learn from it is entirely in keeping with what we know of him from other sources. The work reveals the same impression of Jesus' power which Peter felt so strongly. It is in Christ's mighty works that the writer is chiefly interested; his words concern him far less. The simplicity and directness which were so characteristic of Peter also appear in the Gospel, and it is marked by the same practical interest that controlled him so largely. It is no accident that repentance, upon which he laid special emphasis in his discourses recorded in the early chapters of Acts, stands in the very forefront of Mark's Gospel. It can hardly be doubted that with his decidedly practical interest Peter was heartily in accord with the common conception of Christianity which prevailed in his day, and that in his later years, as well as in his earlier, he conceived of the Christian life as the faithful observance of God's law. If Peter was thus a representative of the ordinary un-Pauline conception of the Gospel, and if he taught it to the Christians of Rome, it is much easier to explain the fact that that type of thought was permanently accepted by them, and that while honoring the name of Paul they failed to adopt the latter's views. If Peter followed the lead of Paul and preached the Gospel which he preached, it is certainly surprising that the Roman Christians so completely misunderstood or disregarded Paul's teaching.

Taught by both of the men whom the church most highly venerated, it would seem that his distinctive views must have made more impression than they did. If First Peter contains the conceptions of the apostle Peter, the subsequent history of thought in the Roman church is much more difficult to explain than if the Gospel of Mark represents him. That both of them can be traced back to him is impossible. If he wrote First Peter, the influence of his thought was not felt to any appreciable degree by the author of Mark; if the author of Mark wrote in the spirit of Peter, then the epistle is by some other hand.

But the Gospel may also be supposed to represent accurately Peter's final views touching the Christian's relation to the Jewish law. His earlier progress in the direction of liberalism has been already sketched, and it cannot be doubted that before the end of his life he reached that position which was evidently held by the author of the second Gospel, — a position of complete superiority and indifference to all national and race distinctions within the Christian church, — and that he rose not alone above bigotry and narrowness, but also above controversy upon the subject.[1] Had he not reached this position he could not have secured the confidence of the Christians of Rome and exerted the influence there that he did.

Thus, though the first and second epistles of Peter cannot be employed as sources for a knowledge of the apostle's views, we may gather some instructive hints from the Gospel of Mark, — hints that make the history of the Roman church much easier to understand than it would otherwise be. The epistle of Clement, sent by the Christians of Rome to their Corinthian brethren almost at the close of the century, shows the development well under way. The common conceptions of the church at large were already in control, and though words and formulæ of Paul were still current, the underlying prin-

[1] It is not without significance that Peter remembered, and emphasized so that Mark too remembered them, the striking words of Christ recorded in Mark vii. 15 sq. These words must have been vividly recalled to him by his experience on the housetop in Joppa.

ciples were largely Peter's, and not Paul's. It was not simply because Peter was the leader of the Twelve Apostles, nor merely because he spent some time in Rome after Paul's death, that his figure overshadowed the figure of the great apostle to the Gentiles in the memory of the Roman church; but also because the Christianity which he preached was entirely in accord with the principles that naturally prevailed most widely among the Christians of Rome, both Jews and Gentiles, and was fitted to unite them in practical, aggressive work whatever their theoretical and speculative differences. The Roman church is not wholly in error in claiming Peter as its founder. It was he and not Paul whose impress was chiefly felt in the formative period of its career, and through it he ultimately became the great apostle of the entire Western church, which always felt the dominating influence of Rome.[1]

3. John and the Church of Asia

Our sources bear witness not only to the presence of the apostle Peter in Rome, but also to the residence of the apostle John in Ephesus. Like Peter's presence in Rome, John's Ephesian residence has been disputed by many scholars, but the tradition seems too strong to be shaken. The chief witness for it is Irenæus, a pupil of Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna, who reports that Polycarp was a personal disciple of John, and that the latter lived in Ephesus until the reign of Trajan, who became emperor in the year 98.[2]

[1] The ancient theory that Peter was the first bishop of Rome, or that he appointed its first bishop, was due to the assumption of the fathers of the late second and third centuries that the ecclesiastical organization and institutions of their own day were all apostolic. But the rejection of that theory should not carry with it the rejection of the historic fact that Peter spent some years in Rome, and that he profoundly influenced the development of Roman Christianity.

[2] In his epistle to Florinus (quoted by Eusebius: *H. E.* V. 20) Irenæus mentions his own acquaintance with Polycarp in Asia, and records that the latter was a personal disciple of John. In his *Adv. Hær.* II. 22, 5 and III. 3, 4, he reports that John resided in Asia (in the latter passage he says more specifically Ephesus) until the time of Trajan. In another passage in the same work (III. 1, 1) he says that "John, the disciple of the Lord who leaned upon his breast, published a Gospel during his residence at Ephesus in Asia." Weizsäcker justly remarks that this is not tradition, but documentary evidence (*l.c.* S. 482; Eng. Trans., II. p. 168).

In addition to the direct and explicit statements of Irenæus, whose acquaintance with Polycarp gives his statements peculiar force, we have the independent testimony of Polycrates, bishop of Hierapolis in the latter part of the second century,[1] and of his contemporary, Clement of Alexandria,[2] both of whom refer to John's residence in Ephesus, though without mentioning the fact that he lived until the time of Trajan. The force of all this testimony cannot be broken by the suggestion that the apostle John may have been confounded with the presbyter John, who lived in Asia about the same time.[3] For though the tradition of the latter part of the second century, to which Polycrates and Clement are witnesses, might be mistaken in the matter, it cannot be supposed that Irenæus, who knew Polycarp personally, could commit such a blunder. He had not merely met Polycarp casually; he was his pupil, and he must have known of whom he spoke when he referred to John. But the evidence for John's Ephesian residence is not external alone. The Johannine writings themselves testify to the fact; for whatever may be thought as to their authorship, they at any rate belong to Asia, and they prove beyond all peradventure that there lived in that quarter of the world, in the latter part of the first century, a controlling personality, who had himself felt the personal influence of Jesus and who stamped his conceptions upon a large circle of disciples. In the light of this consideration, taken in connection with the direct testimonies already referred to, the argument against John's presence in Asia, based upon the silence of Ignatius[4] and of other contemporary writers can be allowed no great weight; and it may safely be concluded that the apostle John spent the latter

[1] In his epistle to Victor, quoted by Eusebius: *H. E.* III. 23 and V. 24.

[2] In his *Quis dives salvetur?* Chap. 42; also quoted by Eusebius: *H. E.* III. 23.

[3] The presbyter John is mentioned by Papias in a passage quoted by Eusebius: *H. E.* III. 39. See below, p. 623.

[4] Ignatius of Antioch felt the influence of the same conceptions that find expression in the Johannine writings, as was seen in the previous chapter, and his silence respecting John and his residence in Asia is certainly surprising, but not conclusive. There is no passage in his epistles in which he must have referred to John, if he knew that he had resided there.

part of his life in Ephesus and that he died there at a great age, in the reign of Trajan, as reported by Irenæus.

Of his career before he took up his residence there, we know even less than of Peter's. He appears with Peter as a leading figure in the church of Jerusalem during its early years, but the latter is always represented as the spokesman and chief actor in the various scenes recorded. Together with James and Peter, he is referred to by Paul as a "pillar" in Gal. i. 9, but here, too, he is less conspicuous than either of the others; and although the passage shows that he was in Jerusalem at the time of the council, he is not mentioned in Acts xv. Paul speaks of him only in the Galatian passage just referred to, and from this time on we know absolutely nothing about him until we hear of him in Ephesus in the latter part of the century. Where he went and what he did during the long interval, we have no means of determining. He was evidently not in Jerusalem when Paul visited the city for the last time,[1] and it is probable that, like Peter, he had already sought other fields of labor. We may gather from the fourth Gospel, whether it be his own work or the work of one of his followers, that before the end of his life he had cut entirely loose from the particularism of the primitive Jewish disciples and had ceased to draw a line between Jewish and Gentile Christianity. It is by no means likely that he reached this broader view at an early day, for in that case Paul would probably have found some occasion to refer to the fact; but it may well be that he was more in sympathy with Peter than with James, and that he, too, finally found the extreme conservatism of the church of Jerusalem uncongenial. He cannot have taken up his residence in Asia during Paul's lifetime, as is clear from the epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians, and especially from Paul's final note to Timothy, written just before his death. It is possible that he had been laboring in Palestine, and when the Jewish war broke out, and made successful work among the Jews there no longer possible, he found his way to Ephesus, which

[1] Acts xxi. 18 sq.

was a natural place for him to choose as the centre of his future labors; for it was the most important city of the East after Antioch, and had a large and influential Jewish population. It is, at any rate, necessary to assume that he came to Ephesus not many years after the death of Paul; for only a long residence there is sufficient to account on the one hand for the marked impression which Paul's conceptions made upon him,[1] and on the other hand for his own predominating influence over the church of Asia Minor.

Five writings in our New Testament — a Gospel, three epistles, and an apocalypse — are ascribed by tradition to the apostle John. The Gospel, though historical in form, is not an historical work in the strict sense. It is an attempt to present in the form of a record of the words and works of Jesus the author's idea of his character and personality. The work has a double purpose; on the one hand to prove that "Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God," and on the other hand to lead its readers into such belief in him that they may be truly united to him and have life in his name.[2] In its effort to prove that "Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God," the Gospel of John resembles the Gospel of Matthew; but its apologetic purpose is avowed even more distinctly and is carried out with even more consistency and thoroughness than in the latter work. Moreover, the author undertakes to show not simply that Jesus is the Messiah, as Matthew does, but that he is a spiritual being of a higher order than man. This, in fact, is what the term "Messiah" or "Son of God" means to him when he applies it to Jesus. Jesus is not simply a man called and anointed by God to do a particular work in the world; he is the incarnation of a pre-existent heavenly being, who came from God and at the end of his earthly career returns to God. Thus the author represents Jesus as living constantly under the sense of his higher nature, and all his words and deeds are interpreted in the light of it. His omniscience and his omnipotence are frequently emphasized and viewed as manifestations of his higher nature; and the miracles which he performs are not pri-

[1] See above, p. 487 sq.

[2] John xx. 31.

marily for the good of others, as in the Synoptic Gospels, but many of them at least are done simply as signs to show his superhuman power.[1] And so the author's apologetic purpose leads him to represent John the Baptist solely in the character of a witness to Jesus;[2] leads him to emphasize the testimony of Christ's enemies to the wonderful nature of his signs and miracles;[3] leads him to call attention to the fact that the betrayal of Jesus and his death at the hands of his enemies were only a fulfilment of his own purposes, that they took place only in his own good time and in accordance with his will, and were thus a sign of his power and not of his weakness.[4] Many other objections urged against the Messiahship of Jesus are met and answered by Jesus himself in the Gospel: for instance, that he has appeared without proper legitimation;[5] that he has not the Spirit of God, which the true Messiah should have, but on the contrary a devil;[6] and finally that he suffers death instead of abiding and setting up a permanent kingdom as the true Messiah is to do.[7]

But the Gospel of John, though so largely apologetic both in form and in content, is not simply an apology. As already said, it is also an effort to lead its readers into such belief in Christ as shall truly unite them to him and thus give them life. And so the significance of Christ to the believer, and the true relation between them, are emphasized at great length, that relation being represented in genuine Pauline fashion as a complete mystical unity. It is thus not only Christ in himself in whom the author is interested, but also Christ in his relation to man, and particularly to believers. Indeed, the saving fellowship of the believer with him is the ultimate aim of the work. The author would prove Jesus to be the Christ in order to arouse faith in him, and thus bring about that fellowship which means salvation.[8]

I have spoken of the Gospel of John as a presentation of the author's ideal of Jesus' character and personality.

[1] Cf. John xx. 30, 31.
[2] John i. 29 sq.
[3] John vii. 45, xi. 46, xii. 19, 42, etc.
[4] John x. 18, xviii. 4 sq., xix. 11.
[5] John ix. 29.
[6] John viii. 48 sq.
[7] John x. 15 sq., xi. 51 sq., xii. 32.
[8] Cf. John xx. 31.

The Gospel of Matthew is also to some degree an ideal picture, portraying Christ primarily as Messiah, and grouping together the words and works which serve to bring out most clearly this or that feature of his Messianic character. But the process of idealization is carried much further by the author of the fourth Gospel. While Matthew, though largely disregarding the historic order and setting, reproduces the contents of the Logia apparently for the most part with fidelity, John composes with a free hand, and though he does not invent the contents of the discourses which he puts into Jesus' mouth, he at least gives them their peculiar form. A comparison of the utterances of Christ recorded in the fourth Gospel with those recorded in the Synoptics is sufficient to prove this beyond all shadow of a doubt; and a comparison of them with the narrative portions of the Gospel and with the First Epistle of John only confirms what needs no confirmation. But it is to be noticed that the impression of Christ's personality which is gained from the fourth Gospel is due not simply to the matter, but also to the form of the discourses which it contains. The ideas in many of those discourses, if uttered in the brief, incisive, gnomic style, or in the parabolic form which is so common in the Synoptic Gospels, and only at the impulse of a particular occasion or suggestion, would leave a very different impression. As it is, they are repeated and elaborated and emphasized to such an extent, that they leave the impression that Jesus was thinking and talking constantly of his own divine personality, and of his own unique significance, not alone for those who were following him, but also for all the world. But if reliance is to be placed upon the united testimony of the Synoptic Gospels, such an impression as this can hardly be accurate.

Another indication of the author's idealization of Jesus appears in the fact that he takes no account of any historic development in his public ministry. Instead of the gradual unfolding of his Messianic character and mission, such as is portrayed with the utmost naturalness in the Gospel of Mark, we find Jesus in the Gospel of John assuming pub-

licly the position of Messiah at the beginning of his career. John the Baptist proclaims his identity clearly and unmistakably, and he himself goes almost immediately to Jerusalem and exhibits himself in his Messianic character before the multitudes gathered there for the feast of the Passover; and though his ministry continues three full years, according to John's chronology, no appreciable development appears in his own announcement of himself or in the attitude of the people toward him. The account of John is in this respect very different from that of the Synoptists, especially of Mark; and it is clear that it was the author's desire to present Jesus throughout his work in his character of Messiah and Son of God that led him to regard the historic sequence of events with indifference and to paint the early days of Christ's ministry in the same colors as the later.

But though it is evident, in the light of what has been said, that the fourth Gospel contains an ideal picture of Christ, this is a very different thing from saying that it is simply the elaboration of an idea which has no basis in fact. The truth is, that there are many evidences in the Gospel that the picture, ideal as it is in the form in which it is presented, is the picture of a real person. Such a combination of exaltation and humility as was referred to in a previous chapter[1] it is impossible to suppose the invention of any author. Moreover there are many evidences that the writer had an accurate acquaintance, over and above that gained from the Synoptic Gospels, not simply with the manners and customs of the people of Palestine, but also with the events in the life of Jesus himself.[2] In the light of these facts it may fairly be said that the time is past when the fourth Gospel can be explained as a mere piece of religious fiction from the pen of a second-century writer; but on the other hand the time is not yet come, and possibly may never come, when it can be claimed to be either an absolutely exact picture of Jesus' character, or a really historical account of his ministry.

[1] See above, p. 489.

[2] Upon this whole question, see P. Ewald: *Das Hauptproblem der Evangelienfrage*, S. 51 sq.

Under such circumstances it would seem most natural to assume that the Gospel, like the Gospel of Matthew, was written by one who was not himself a personal disciple of Christ and an eyewitness of the events which he records, but was possessed of sources of the first rank; so that his account is accurate so far as it is based on his sources, but unreliable in other parts. Wendt, following the suggestion of earlier scholars, has attempted to prove that the author used an authentic and trustworthy Johannine source containing nearly all the discourses, but covering only the closing period of Jesus' life, which he spent in Jerusalem.[1] The striking dissimilarity between the Synoptic and Johannine narratives, and their respective portraits of Christ, would then be due to the fact that the author of the fourth Gospel distributed the material contained in his source over the entire ministry of Christ, and thus represented him as teaching and acting at the beginning of his career and during his Galilean days, as he actually taught and acted only during the closing days of his life in Jerusalem, when he felt that the time had come to emphasize and impress upon his followers his Messianic character. This theory is a very suggestive one, and has much to recommend it; but the difficulty is, that the sharp distinction in tendency and purpose which Wendt draws between the completed Gospel and its original source, and which alone justifies such a division as he makes, is largely imaginary. Indeed, the work as we have it is too homogeneous, and is controlled too completely by a single spirit and purpose, to give to any such attempt as Wendt's much hope of success. If the author used sources, he handled them in so sovereign a way that it is simply impossible to separate them from the work as a whole. What he really had was the vivid picture of an actual, living personality; and with an accurate knowledge of the people, the customs, and the scenes among which Jesus lived, and with more or less extensive information as to the events of his life, he composed a Gospel which was not in any sense a compilation, but which was an attempt to portray

[1] See Wendt: *Lehre Jesu*, I. S. 215 sq.

that personality in living form as he saw him in his own mind, and to give the portrait such an historical framework as his knowledge enabled him to supply.

The question is, can such a Gospel have been written by a personal disciple of Jesus, — by the apostle John, to whom it is ascribed by tradition, — or must we attribute it to a Christian of the second or third generation? Most of the considerations commonly urged in support of the former alternative fail to help us in the matter. It is true that there are traces in the literature of the second century both of the Gospel itself and of the first epistle, which compel us to push them back at least as far as the early years of that century. But to assign them to the beginning of the second century, or even to the latter part of the first, is not necessarily to ascribe them to the apostle John or to any other personal disciple of Jesus. It is true, still farther, that the author was a Jew. He shows himself thoroughly familiar not with the letter of the Old Testament merely, but with its spirit as well, which means of course much more. His style is that of a man whose native tongue was Hebrew, not Greek; and his acquaintance with Palestinian localities, manners, and customs is so intimate and accurate that there can be no doubt that he was a native of the Holy Land or had, at any rate, resided there for a long period. We get more material for a knowledge of contemporary Palestinian Judaism from the Gospel of John than from all the other Gospels combined. But there is no guarantee of apostolic authorship in all this. Nor can the fact that the author was undeniably possessed of a large amount of trustworthy information, over and above that derived from the Synoptic Gospels, be made to prove that he was a personal disciple of Jesus. Even the many vivid and minute details scattered through his work may be fully accounted for if he gained his information from an eyewitness of the events, as Mark, for example, gained his. Moreover, the author's evident interest in John, which is manifested in many ways, notably by his uniform designation of him as "the disciple whom Jesus loved," and the testimony of the

appendix of the Gospel,[1] which emanated from the same circle, prove no more than that John was held in peculiar honor where the work was written, and that he was the author's chief authority. The same is true also of the tradition for Johannine authorship upon which so much stress is commonly laid. The tradition, though not absolutely unanimous,[2] is certainly very strong. The Johannine authorship is testified to, toward the close of the second century, by Theophilus of Antioch, by the Muratorian Fragment, which belongs probably to Rome, and by Irenæus of Lyons. The last named was a pupil of Polycarp, who was himself in turn a pupil of John, so that his opportunities for knowing the truth were excellent. At the same time, the fact that both the Apocalypse and the Gospel, which were certainly not written by the same hand, are ascribed by Irenæus to the apostle John, throws some suspicion upon the accuracy of his statement in regard to the Gospel. And the fact must in any case be recognized that the tradition might have arisen even if John was only indirectly connected with the production of the Gospel; if, in other words, it was composed by one of his disciples or companions who had gained much of his material from John himself, and whose work was written in the spirit of John and represented his type of teaching. The Logia of Matthew gave his name to the Greek Gospel in which they were so largely incorporated, and in the same way the name of John may have become attached at an early date to a Gospel for which he was indirectly responsible. More than this, the tradition, strong though it is, does not permit us to assert with confidence. Only one fact, indeed, carries us beyond the general conclusion that the author was in some way connected with the apostle John, and seems to make direct Johannine authorship

[1] Cf. John xxi. 24. Verse 23 of the same chapter seems to point to a time when John was already dead, and when the necessity was consequently felt of explaining the apparent assurance of Christ that he would live until the second advent.

[2] The sect of the Alogi in the middle of the second century denied that the Gospel was written by John, but they had a theological bias against it, and their denial must therefore be discounted to some extent.

necessary. In John i. 14, and also in the opening words of the First Epistle of John, which was certainly written by the same hand as the Gospel, the author himself apparently claims to have been a personal disciple of Jesus and a witness of the events which he records.[1] These passages can be reconciled with the assumption that he was any one else than John only by interpreting them in a spiritual sense, which is difficult, to say the least, especially in the latter case.[2] Were it not for these two passages, we could hardly hesitate to regard the Gospel as the work of a disciple and companion of John rather than of the apostle himself. But as the matter stands, certainty either way is hardly attainable. One thing, however, may fairly be insisted upon as a result of the painstaking criticism to which the Gospel has been subjected in recent years. It contains a large body of genuine apostolic matter; and though the picture of Christ is one-sided, its several features are in the main trustworthy, and though the discourses, in the form in which we have them, are the composition of the author, they embody Christ's genuine teaching, at least to some extent. So much we can be sure of even though we ascribe the Gospel to a disciple of John instead of to John himself, and more than this it is impossible to claim even if we ascribe the Gospel to John. So that the question of authorship is, after all, of no great practical importance. We must use the work in any case in connection with the Synoptic Gospels, and must interpret it in the light of the picture of Christ portrayed by them; and its authorship can neither increase nor diminish our confidence in it. But the Gospel of John alone reveals fully the secret of Christ's marvellous power in his profound God-consciousness, and it is this that gives it its permanent historic as well as religious value. It constitutes an indispensable supplement of the Synoptic Gospels for the historian who would know not simply the actual words and deeds of Jesus and the course of his daily life,

[1] John xix. 35 and xxi. 24, which are often said to involve the same thing, prove no more than that John was the ultimate authority for the facts recorded in the Gospel.

[2] But compare 1 John iii. 6 and 3 John 11.

but the ultimate basis of his religious ideas and ideals, and thus the explanation of his controlling and abiding influence.

Of the three epistles ascribed by tradition to the apostle John, the first and longest is certainly by the same author as the Gospel. Both literary style and religious conceptions are too closely related to permit any doubt upon this point. The epistle, like the Gospel, bears no name, and it is therefore not a pseudonymous work even if it be the production of some one else than John. It was addressed to a church or group of churches whose locality is not indicated, but its connection with John suggests that its readers lived in the province of Asia.[1] The epistle was evidently called forth by the existence of false teachers, who were at once Docetists and libertines. Their error consisted, on the one hand, in the denial that Jesus was the Christ, the Son of God,[2] and on the other hand, in the assertion that a Christian man is bound by no law and that he is under no obligation to obey God's commands; that he is, in fact, above law, and that no sin is possible to him, even though he live in utter disregard of all moral precepts, whether human or divine.[3] In this denial and in this assertion, these false teachers were in entire accord with at least some of the Gnostic sects known to us. The Docetic distinction between the man Jesus and the higher heavenly being or Christ was genuinely Gnostic, being based upon the dualism which lay at the root of all the Gnostic system; while the antinomianism that marked some of the Gnostic sects was the direct result of the teaching of Paul, who made so much of the believer's freedom from external law, and whose contrast between the old and new dispensations, and between the flesh and the spirit, made him the great apostle of the Gnostics.[4] It is this Gnostic combination of Docetism and antinomianism against which our author feels it necessary to warn his readers. But though

[1] It is maintained by some scholars that the work is a discourse rather than an epistle, but i. 4, ii. 1, 12 sq., and v. 13, make against the assumption.

[2] 1 John ii. 22, iv. 2, 15, etc.

[3] 1 John i. 8 sq.; ii. 3 sq. 29; iii. 3 sq., etc.

[4] See above, p. 502 sq.

he insists as strenuously as some other writers of his day — for instance, Jude and the interpolator of the pastoral epistles — upon the importance of cleaving to the old faith which was received in the beginning,[1] he does not content himself as they do with simply denouncing and condemning the false teachers; on the contrary, he undertakes to exhibit over against them the true Gospel, or, in other words, to place in opposition to their false gnosis the true gnosis which alone is eternal life.[2] The purpose of his epistle, therefore, is primarily not negative, but positive; not to attack error merely, but to impart the truth, and thus to fortify his readers against all the assaults of false teachers and of false teaching. The Gospel, or the true gnosis, which the author presents in his epistle, has two elements: the one ethical, and the other Christological. He emphasizes not only right living, but also right thinking; not only the necessity of obeying God's commands, but also the necessity of believing Jesus Christ to be the Son of God. And these, moreover, are not two separate and independent elements, placed over against two separate and independent errors; they are so closely bound together in the author's thought that one cannot be detached from the other. A man cannot obey God's commands, the sum of which is love, unless he abides in God; and he cannot abide in God unless he recognizes Jesus Christ as his Son, and becomes one with him.[3] Thus righteous living is conditioned upon belief in Jesus Christ as the Son of God, and upon oneness with him, in true Pauline fashion. It is this theme which controls the writer's thought throughout his epistle. All that he says bears upon it. But the epistle follows no definite and logical plan. The author takes up first one side of the matter, and then the other; then, apparently with the feeling that he has not said enough, he takes them up again, and finally a third time.

The similarity between the epistle and the Gospel is so great that it is safe to assume that not many years separated them; and yet the polemic tone of the epistle con-

[1] 1 John ii. 7, 24, iii. 11. [2] Cf. 1 John i. 1 sq., v. 20.
[3] Cf. 1 John iii. 6 sq., iv. 15 sq.

trasts strongly with the calm and even tone of the Gospel, and makes it altogether probable that the two were written under very different circumstances. The false teachers whom the author attacks in his epistle seem not to have been in his mind when he wrote the Gospel, and it may well be that they had come into prominence since its composition, being aroused to open hostility by its publication, — especially by its assertion of the incarnation of the Son of God, — and at the same time turning to their own use such conceptions in it as were in line with their own tendencies. It is clear, for instance, that they claimed that, in an eminent degree and in contrast with other Christians, they were free from sin,[1] were walking in the light,[2] were acquainted with God[3] and loved him,[4] were in close fellowship with him,[5] were abiding in him,[6] and possessed his Spirit.[7] The importance of all these things is emphasized over and over again in the fourth Gospel. And so our author finds it necessary to deny the claims of the men in question, pointing out that their refusal to believe that Jesus is the Son of God, and their corruptness and lack of brotherly love, prove the emptiness of their claims. The false teachers did not get their views from the fourth Gospel. They doubtless had them already; for they gained them, as the author of our epistle gained his, largely from Paul.[8] But they found in the Gospel much that fell in with their own ideas, and they appropriated it to themselves. The tremendous impression which Paul left on the Christianity of Asia Minor is made very manifest by the fact that two so widely different schools as those represented on the one hand by the author of our epistle and of the fourth Gospel, and on the other hand by the false teachers

[1] 1 John i. 8. [3] 1 John ii. 4. [5] 1 John i. 6. [7] 1 John iv. 1 sq.
[2] 1 John ii. 10. [4] 1 John iv. 20. [6] 1 John ii. 6.

[8] It is interesting to notice in this connection that our author exhibits the same sort of rigorous superiority to observed facts that is exhibited by Paul himself. In one part of his epistle, to be sure, he asserts that no man is without sin (i. 8 sq.); but in other passages he declares unequivocally, and in genuine Pauline fashion, that the man who is begotten of God *cannot* sin (iii. 6, 9, v. 18); and the same kind of reliance upon theory over against the testimony of appearances is seen in v. 15, where the author says, "If we know that he heareth us, whatsoever we ask, we know that we have the petitions which we have asked of him."

whom he combats, should both have adopted certain of his fundamental conceptions, and based their divergent systems thereupon.[1]

The two brief epistles, known as Second and Third John, were written by one hand and at about the same time. Whether they, too, are by the author of the Gospel and of the First Epistle of John is not certain. The use of the term "elder" in the opening salutation is against the identification, as are also certain differences in style. But on the other hand there are striking resemblances both in thought and in language, which naturally suggest, and indeed make it quite probable, that the author was the same in both cases. Tradition does not help us in the matter, for it begins very late, and even then is not unanimous. Some of the fathers ascribe the letters to the apostle John, others to John the presbyter, others are in doubt as to their authorship. But, at any rate, even if not identical with the author of the first epistle, the writer of the two short epistles must have belonged to the same school and breathed the same atmosphere, and must have been familiar with the Johannine literature.

One of the epistles is addressed to some church, probably in the province of Asia, which the author designates by the figurative expression "elect lady";[2] the other to a member of the same church, Gaius by name.[3] The author's purpose in writing to the church was to warn his readers to have nothing to do with certain false teachers who were travelling about, and who, he feared, might be received by his readers and lead them astray. They seem, in fact, already to have found a welcome from some in the church, and to have gained adherents among them.[4] There

[1] In the light of this fact it will hardly do to assume with Weizsäcker (*l.c.* S. 476 sq., Eng. Trans., II. p. 16 sq.) that the church of Ephesus which Paul planted was practically destroyed after his departure from the city, and that the church of the latter part of the century was to all intents and purposes a new foundation. In spite of the opposition which Paul had to encounter, and of the hostility that continued to manifest itself after he had left, his influence was more deep and lasting there than in any other part of Christendom. See above, p. 487 sq., where the Paulinism of John, of Ignatius, and of the Gnostics and other sectaries is exhibited.

[2] 2 John 1. [3] 3 John 1. [4] Cf. 3 John 9 sq.

was therefore special reason for the author to denounce them and to warn his readers against them. The heresy of which they were guilty seems to have been the same as that attacked in 1 John, involving both Docetism and antinomianism.

The author's purpose in writing to Gaius, a member of the church addressed in 2 John, was to introduce and commend to him the brethren who carried the latter epistle. His hospitality is highly commended, and he is exhorted to welcome them, in accordance with his well-known custom, and to set them forward on their journey. The brethren, thus referred to, were evidently travelling evangelists who went from place to place preaching the word. The author improved the opportunity at the same time to beg Gaius not to imitate the example of Diotrephes, a prominent if not the chief official in the church,[1] who was hostile to the writer and received kindly neither himself nor his messengers. Apparently Diotrephes was inclined to favor the false teachers who are denounced in the other epistle. Thus, though the letters are so brief, they give us an interesting glimpse of the life of an early church, and reveal one of the means by which the unity of Christendom was preserved, and a uniform development secured, even in the midst of the widest diversity of local conditions and tendencies. But of this it will be necessary to say more later.

The Apocalypse, the last of the five works ascribed by tradition to the apostle John, is the only one of the five that bears the name of John. Justin Martyr expressly identifies the author with the apostle,[2] and no one seems to have questioned the identification except the sect of the Alogi, until toward the close of the third century, when Dionysius of Alexandria, to whom the chiliasm of the book was offensive, expressed doubts as to its apostolic origin. His doubts were echoed by Eusebius, who reports that many in his day ascribed the work to the presbyter John, of whose existence we learn from Papias.[3] Eusebius consequently put the work among the antilegom-

[1] 3 John 9. [2] Justin: *Dial.* 81. [3] See below, p. 623.

ena,[1] and it was long before it acquired an unquestioned place within the canon. One thing, at any rate, is entirely certain, and that is that the author of the Apocalypse was not the author of the fourth Gospel. The few superficial parallels that can be pointed out between the two works[2] count for nothing over against the total difference in their style, and especially in their conception of Christianity. There is absolutely nothing in the Apocalypse of that profound mysticism which is fundamental both in the Gospel and in the First Epistle of John, and in spite of the author's emphasis upon the death and the pre-existence of Christ, his standpoint is essentially the standpoint of the primitive church at large.

Whether the writer of the Apocalypse was the apostle John is another question. If the apostle John was the author of the fourth Gospel, he cannot have written the Apocalypse. But even if he was not the author of the fourth Gospel there are strong grounds for assuming, as has been already seen, that that work proceeded from a circle in which he was the leading figure, and that it bears the stamp of his teaching, and represents with more or less accuracy his controlling conception of Christianity. But if that be so, it is almost as difficult as in the other case to regard the Apocalypse as his work, for it represents in the main an entirely different type of thought. It is to be noticed that the author does not himself claim to be an apostle, and his work contains no hint that the one whom he saw in his vision was the beloved Master upon whose bosom he had leaned and with whom he had been so intimately associated during the whole period of his earthly ministry.[3]

[1] Eusebius: *H. E.* III. 25.

[2] For instance, the frequent characterization of Christ as the Lamb of God, a phrase which is used of him in John i. 29, 36; and the occurrence of the term "Logos" in Rev. xix. 13. So far as the latter is concerned, there is no trace in the entire work of the Logos conception of the fourth Gospel, and in the passage referred to there is no ground for identifying the phrase λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ, which is due to a mere personification of the revelation given through Christ (Rev. i. 2), with the technical term λόγος employed in John i. 1 sq.

[3] This fact makes not only against the ascription of the work to the apostle John, but also against its pseudonymity. There is no sign, indeed, that the author wished his work to pass as the work of the apostle John, or of any one else than himself.

It is a mistake, moreover, to assume that the author claims or must have possessed any special authority over the seven churches to which he writes. He speaks simply as a Christian prophet, and what he says demands belief and attention not because it is his own word, but because it is the word of God revealed to him, just as that word was supposed in his day to be revealed to Christian prophets everywhere. Any Christian who was recognized as a prophet in the churches addressed, and who commanded the respect and confidence of his brethren, might have written the Apocalypse. All that we can certainly say, then, about the author is that he was a Christian prophet of Jewish birth,[1] but of universalistic principles,[2] whose name was John and who resided in Asia; and that he was thoroughly familiar with the conditions of all the churches addressed, and thoroughly at home among them. An early tradition knows of a certain presbyter John who lived in Asia during the latter part of the first century,[3] and to him the Apocalypse is ascribed by Dionysius of Alexandria,[4]

[1] The Hebraistic style of the work is alone sufficient to prove him a Jew; and his conceptions bear throughout a genuinely Jewish character.

[2] The author evidently made use of Jewish or Jewish Christian sources in which the national particularism had considerable play (cf., *e.g.*, vii. 4 sq., xxi. 12); but he himself was thoroughly in sympathy with the church at large in its recognition of the salvation of uncircumcised Gentiles, and he evidently never thought of the Jewish ceremonial law as binding upon any Christian (cf. v. 9, vii. 9 sq.).

[3] The presbyter John is mentioned by Papias in a passage quoted by Eusebius: *H. E.* III. 39, 4. Irenæus failed to distinguish him from the apostle John, and supposed consequently that Papias was a hearer of the latter, and many modern scholars agree with Irenæus. See, for instance, Salmon's article *Joannes the Presbyter* in the *Dictionary of Christian Biography*. But Eusebius saw that Papias was referring in the passage in question to another John, and he therefore concluded quite rightly that Papias was a hearer of the latter and not of the apostle. We have no other information about this presbyter John. He was confounded at an early day with the apostle, and his memory seems to have perished entirely. But there is no reason for doubting his existence, as some scholars do. That two Johns were buried at Ephesus is said by Dionysius of Alexandria (in Eusebius: *H. E.* VII. 25), by Eusebius himself (*H. E.* III. 39), and by Jerome (*De vir. ill.* 9). Not much weight can be attached to the report, but so far as it goes it tends to confirm the separate existence of the presbyter John.

[4] Dionysius, quoted by Eusebius: *H. E.* VII. 25, does not say that the Apocalypse was written by the "presbyter John," but only by another John than the apostle; and he calls attention to the fact that there were two tombs in Ephesus bearing the name of John.

by Eusebius,[1] and by many modern scholars. We know so little about this presbyter John that it is impossible either to prove or to disprove his identity with the author of the Apocalypse; but if John the apostle was not its author, it is altogether probable that John the presbyter was, for otherwise we should have to assume that still a third influential man of the same name lived and labored in Asia at the same time with the apostle and presbyter. This of course is not impossible, for the name was a very common one among the Jews; but it is hardly likely. Of the date and general character of the Apocalypse, and of the circumstances which called it forth, I shall speak a little later in connection with the subject of persecution.

The writings which we have been considering throw considerable light upon the conditions that existed in the churches of Asia Minor during the closing years of the first century. The picture of an unknown church which is contained in the second and third epistles of John, has already been referred to. The first epistle, as has been seen, reveals the prevalence of a heresy which was at once antinomian and Docetic, and we know from the letters of Ignatius, and from other later sources, that the Gnostics, to whom the false teachers attacked in 1 John were closely related, had large influence throughout Asia Minor in the second century. From the seven epistles contained in the second and third chapters of the Apocalypse, we get a peculiarly interesting and vivid glimpse of the diverse conditions that existed in seven specified churches, and our knowledge of the general course of development in Christendom at large is greatly enhanced thereby. That the author of the Apocalypse addressed only seven churches, when there were doubtless many others in the province, was due simply to his love of symbolism. The sacred number seven was a favorite one with him and controlled to a large degree the composition of his book. Undoubtedly he chose the seven churches he did, either because they were the most prominent in the province or

[1] Eusebius: *H. E.* III. 39, 6. See my edition of Eusebius, note *in loc.*, and also III. 24, note 20.

because their needs were greatest. The truth is that in all but two of them he found much to criticise. Only the churches of Smyrna and of Philadelphia receive undivided commendation, and even they appear to have been far from strong.[1] In both cities, moreover, the Jews were evidently exceedingly hostile, and were making the Christians considerable trouble; for the author denounces them sharply, and characterizes them as a synagogue of Satan.[2]

The church of Laodicea receives the most unsparing condemnation. It was apparently prosperous from a worldly point of view, but its prosperity had resulted in a lack of spiritual earnestness and consecration which the author severely rebukes. In Sardis the state of affairs seems to have been almost as bad as in Laodicea. The writer even speaks of the church as dead, but at the same time he declares that there are some of its members who have not defiled their garments, and are worthy of commendation. In Ephesus, Pergamum, and Thyatira the condition of things was more complicated. The most prominent factor in the situation was the presence of certain antinomian teachers who were leading some of the disciples astray, and whom the author found it necessary to condemn in strong terms and to warn his readers against. These Nicolaitans and Balaamites were evidently akin to the libertines who are denounced in other New Testament epistles, but it is worthy of note that there is no hint that they were also Docetic in their views, as were the false teachers attacked in the epistles of John and Ignatius. Their error seems to have been only practical. They very likely found a warrant for their libertinism in the principles of Paul, though there is no reason to suppose that our author had Paul or his teachings in mind

[1] Rev. ii. 9, iii. 8. It is interesting to notice in this connection that Ignatius in writing to the church of Philadelphia a few years later found it necessary to warn his readers against those who preached Judaism (chap. 6). Apparently the Jews were still prominent there, and were attempting to secure converts among the Christians. In Smyrna they seem to have been doing no harm when Ignatius wrote, for he says nothing about them in his Epistle to the Smyrnæans.

[2] Rev. ii. 9, iii. 9.

in writing to them.[1] In fact, though Paul's principle touching the freedom of believers from all objective law was not generally accepted, there was no disposition on the part of the church at large to denounce him, or to declare its disagreement with him, for the simple reason that his principle was not generally understood, and it was commonly believed that he was as true a supporter of the Christian law as anybody else. And in this the church was right so far as the practical question was concerned; for Paul was as bitterly opposed to libertinism and licentiousness as any of his brethren, and was heartily at one with the author of the Apocalypse in condemning everything that savored of looseness or laxity in morals.[2]

In Ephesus the disciples had already repudiated the false apostles and the teachings of the Nicolaitans, and the only thing which the author had against them was that their original love had grown cold. Possibly the writer himself was at home in Ephesus, and his presence may have had something to do with their rejection of false teachers; but their zeal against heresy may also have had something to do with their growing coldness in Christian love and their neglect of the practical duties of the Christian life. In Pergamum the false teachings of the Nicolaitans seem to have found some acceptance within the church, and in Thyatira there were apparently many who had been led astray. Conditions in the latter place were, in fact, the reverse of those in Ephesus. Love and devotion to the practical duties of the Christian life were on the increase among the disciples of Thyatira, while their attitude toward the false teachers was not all that could be desired. There seems to have been in the city a heathen prophetess, to whom the author, with evident reference to the notorious wife of the Israelitish king Ahab, gives the name

[1] It is entirely unwarranted to find in the false apostles of Rev. ii. 2, a reference to Paul, for the author was evidently referring to recent events; but Paul had not been in Ephesus for more than thirty years.

[2] Irenæus, followed by other fathers, connects the Nicolaitans mentioned in Rev. ii. 6, 15, with Nicolas, one of the seven who were appointed to take charge of the charities of the church of Jerusalem. But there is no ground for such a connection. Cf. Eusebius: *H. E.* III. 29, and my notes *in loc.*

Jezebel. She was apparently wielding considerable influence, and was leading even some Christians astray.[1]

The picture of the conditions that prevailed in the seven churches is thus a variegated one, but it is exceedingly interesting on that very account. It shows clearly the many difficulties, both external and internal, with which Christianity had to contend in its early days. From without not only hostility and persecution, but also the seductive and insidious influence of Jewish and heathen principles and practices; from within coldness and indifference, unsound thinking and corrupt living. It is not to be wondered at that as time passed the need of organization should be increasingly felt, and that tried and true men should be more and more looked to to control the destinies of the churches and to guard them from the growing dangers. But of this it will be necessary to speak more particularly in another connection.

4. The Church and the Empire

The apostle Paul came into frequent contact with the authorities of the Roman Empire during his great missionary campaigns, but in every instance he found in them, according to the Book of Acts, a protecting and not an attacking power. And there can be no doubt that the representation of that book is in this respect quite true, at least for the period preceding his Roman captivity. That he was finally executed as a criminal was due not to the fact that he was a Christian, but to the fact that he was a disturber of the public peace, and his condemnation had no effect upon the status of his Christian brethren. They were not participants in his crime, and no obloquy or suspicion attached to them because of it. For some years after his death the church seems to have gone quietly on its way without attracting the attention of the authorities and without suffering any molestation from them. Matters might have gone on thus for years longer, had it not been

[1] See Schürer's essay: *Die Prophetin Isabel in Thyatira*, in the *Theologische Abhandlungen C. von Weizsäcker gewidmet*, S. 37 sq.

for the great conflagration which swept away a considerable part of Rome in the summer of 64, and which brought upon the Christians of that city the terrible baptism of blood known as the persecution of Nero.[1] The term is a somewhat misleading one, for it seems to imply that Nero was an enemy of the Christian religion, and that he undertook to exterminate it or to check its growth, as some of his successors did. But the truth is that he did nothing of the sort. There is no reason to doubt the statement of Tacitus,[2] that he inflicted tortures and death upon the Christians of Rome simply in order to relieve himself from the suspicion of being the author of the conflagration and to turn the rage of the people upon another object. That the Christians should have been thus selected as the scapegoats was not in the least strange. The emperor was entirely under the influence of his wife, Poppæa, who was a Jewish proselyte, and it is quite possible that his attention was called to the Christians by her. Once brought to his notice, their notorious lack of patriotism, their reputed atheism, their unsociability, their alleged devotion to the black arts, and their general unpopularity might well lead him to see in them the best possible persons to accuse of the crime which he had himself committed. It may be that the trial and conviction of Paul had already acquainted him with the existence of the Christians, and that he was all the more ready when the emergency arose to make such use of them. It would seem from the account of Tacitus and the somewhat ambiguous words of Suetonius,[3] that the majority of the Christians were not punished for the actual crime of incendiarism, — which Tacitus says could not be proved against them, — but were put to death as enemies of society and as dangerous characters, whose principles and practices were such as to imperil the welfare of the people and of the state. In the exercise of his extraordinary police jurisdiction, the emperor had the right to proceed against such persons, as against brigands and pirates,

[1] Upon the Neronian persecution, see Arnold: *Die Neronische Christenverfolgung*, and especially Ramsay: *Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 226 sq.
[2] *Annals*, XV. 44. [3] Suetonius: *Nero*, 16.

without recourse to the courts or to the regular legal forms of criminal procedure.[1] What began, therefore, simply as an attempt on the part of the emperor to throw the blame of the great conflagration upon the disciples, eventuated, when the charge against them could not be proved, in a wholesale attack upon them as dangerous characters, whose destruction was demanded by the good of the community at large; and the attack doubtless came to an end only when the emperor tired of the executions, and according to Tacitus not until the people's hatred for the Christians had been turned into pity by the awful sufferings to which they were subjected.

The inhumanity and brutality which attended their execution almost pass belief. According to Tacitus, "They were also made the subjects of sport in their death, for they were covered with the hides of wild beasts and worried to death by dogs, or nailed to crosses, or set fire to, and when day declined they were burned to serve as nocturnal lights." It is doubtless to the same occasion that Clement refers in his Epistle to the Corinthians in the words, "To these men . . . there is to be added a great multitude of the elect, who, having through envy endured many indignities and tortures, furnished us with a most excellent example. Through envy those women, the Danaides and Dircæ, being persecuted, after they had suffered terrible and unspeakable torments, finished the course of their faith with steadfastness, and though weak in body received a glorious reward."[2] It is not to be wondered at that the people of Rome, little as they might care for the victims (who were evidently from the lowest classes of society, or the emperor would not have dared to treat them thus), and heartily as they might despise them for their foolish delusion, should feel that they were punished less to satisfy justice than to satiate the bloodthirstiness of Nero, and that their hatred and contempt should ultimately give way to compassion.

[1] See Mommsen in the *Historische Zeitschrift*, 1890, S. 490 sq.; and Hardy: *Christianity and the Roman Government*, p. 101.

[2] Clement: *Ad Cor.* 6.

There is no reason to suppose that the massacre extended beyond the confines of Rome, or that any law was passed or edict issued making the profession of Christianity a crime, or placing the Christian society under the ban of the empire. But it was to be expected that the emperor's action should be widely known, and that provincial governors should feel at liberty, in the exercise of their extraordinary police jurisdiction, to follow his example in treating the Christians as outlaws and criminals whenever their own inclination or the hatred of the populace suggested such a course. The Christians, therefore, were thenceforth in a precarious condition, liable at any time to be held responsible for local or national disaster, and to be sacrificed to popular prejudice and passion, or to be made the victims either of religious and patriotic zeal, or of petty jealousy and spite.

Of their actual condition in Rome and elsewhere, during the years succeeding Nero's attack upon them, we have no explicit information, though there are possible hints of outbreaks against them under Vespasian and Titus.[1] But the emperor Domitian was avowedly hostile to them as well as to the Jews, and they suffered considerably during his reign both in Rome and in the East. Domitian's enmity, both to Christians and to Jews, seems to have been due in part to the widespread attempt to evade the payment of the tax to the Capitoline Jupiter which was levied upon all the Jews, after the destruction of Jerusalem, as a substitute for the ancient temple tax which they had been accustomed to send to the latter city. The tax, of course, was collected from Jewish Christians as well as from other Jews, and there were so many of the former that the Christian church, as well as the Jewish synagogue, must have had the attention of the Roman officials particularly drawn to it; and thus Christianity in general must have shared with Judaism, to some extent, at least, the hostility of the authorities, even though the two faiths were not confounded by them. But Domitian's enmity, both to Jews and to Christians, was due especially

[1] See Ramsay: *Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 256 sq.

to their known disinclination to pay the emperor such divine honors as he desired to receive from all his subjects. Upon the respect and homage due to himself, his jealous and suspicious disposition made him peculiarly sensitive, and many besides Jews and Christians suffered his vengeance for real or fancied slights which were interpreted to mean disloyalty and rebellion. Dion Cassius records that during his reign a large number of persons were put to death, or had their property confiscated on the charge of sacrilege.[1] Among them were Flavius Clement, a cousin of the emperor and consul in the year 95, and his wife Domitilla. The former was executed; the latter banished. There can be no doubt that Domitilla at least was a Christian,[2] and in all probability it was primarily their attachment to the Christian faith which brought the emperor's vengeance upon her and her husband, as well as upon the many others referred to by Dion Cassius. We also know that outside of Rome the disciples had to endure severe persecution during the reign of Domitian,[3] and that the mere profession of Christianity was regarded as a crime and punished with death in some sections;[4] while the refusal to worship the image of the emperor was treated in the same way.[5] The emphasis laid by Domitian upon the worship of the emperor, as a mark of loyalty to the empire, must necessarily lead the authorities ultimately to regard the profession of Christianity as tantamount to a declaration of disloyalty; and though no law seems to have been passed upon the subject, we find that already before Pliny became governor of Bithynia, it was generally recognized as a capital crime to be connected with the church, and it had become the custom to put an accused Christian to the test by requiring him to sacrifice to the image of the emperor.[6] Just when this

[1] *ἀθεότης*, Dion Cassius, LXVII. 14 (see Neumann: *Der römische Staat und die allgemeine Kirche*, S. 14 sq.; and Ramsay, *l.c.* p. 260).

[2] Compare Eusebius: *H. E.* III. 18; and see Ramsay, *l.c.* p. 261.

[3] Cf. 1 Pet. i. 6, iii. 15, iv. 15, v. 9, and the Apocalypse, *passim*.

[4] 1 Pet. iv, 14, 16; Rev. ii. 13, vi. 9, etc.

[5] Rev. xiii. 15, xiv. 9, xix. 20, xx. 4.

[6] See Pliny's Epistle to Trajan referred to on p. 531, above.

custom arose we do not know, but there can be little doubt that it had its origin during the reign of Domitian. The Christians, then, during the latter part of the first century in Rome, as well as elsewhere, were regarded as dangerous and disloyal characters, and though no law was passed against them, and no systematic policy of extermination was entered upon by the authorities either imperial or provincial, they were subjected not infrequently both in Rome and in the provinces to suffering and even to death.

But the hostility of state thus manifested, and the persecutions which the Christians were called upon to endure, had a marked effect upon the development of the church. Especially striking is the hatred which was engendered among the disciples for the power which oppressed them, and their sense of the irreconcilable and permanent opposition between the church and the empire. In the epistles of Paul no such feeling is exhibited. On the contrary, believers are exhorted to honor and obey the constituted authorities, and it is said expressly that the powers that be are ordained of God, and that rulers are a terror not to the good but to the evil.[1] The same attitude toward the state is inculcated in First Peter,[2] and it is implied in that epistle that the authorities may put a stop to their persecution, if the Christians show by their conduct the purity and harmlessness of their lives.[3] But in the Apocalypse we find an entirely different spirit. The state there appears as the irreconcilable foe of the church, and the war between the two is to be fought out to the bitter end. Instead of preaching submission to the state and recognizing it as a power ordained of God, the author represents it as a satanic might and thinks only of vengeance upon it. Enmity for it knows no bounds, and he calls upon all the people of God to rejoice over its approaching destruction.[4] The Apocalypse constitutes the classic example of that bitter enmity for the empire with which

[1] Rom. xiii. 1, 3. Compare also 2 Thess. ii. 6, where the Roman Empire seems to be represented as a restraining power.
[2] 1 Pet. ii. 13 sq. [3] 1 Pet. ii. 12, 15, iii. 16. [4] Rev. xviii. 20.

many disciples returned the latter's hostility, and it constitutes at the same time the classic example of the way in which persecution led the church to lay emphasis upon the approaching consummation and upon the blessedness and glory to be enjoyed by Christ's followers in his kingdom. This, in fact, was the second marked effect of persecution. The original expectation that Christ would speedily return to establish his kingdom could not fail to be enhanced by the terrible experiences of the latter part of the first century, and Christians must be more than ever convinced that the time was at hand.

It was under the impulse of this feeling that the author of the Apocalypse, like so many Jewish writers from the time of Daniel on, took up his pen to depict, for the comfort and inspiration of his suffering brethren, the good time coming, when their enemies should be trampled under foot and they should enjoy blessedness and glory unspeakable. The aim of the work, which was addressed primarily to the seven churches of Asia mentioned in the first three chapters, was the same as that of First Peter and the Epistle to the Hebrews. It was to quicken and arouse Christian courage and zeal and to nerve the followers of Christ to continued faithfulness and endurance. But the method employed for the purpose was very different from that followed in those epistles; and yet it was a most natural method, especially for one familiar, as the writer evidently was, with the apocalyptic literature of the Jews and imbued with its spirit.[1] In carrying out his task, the author made large use of earlier apocalyptic writings, probably both Christian and Jewish.[2] That much of

[1] It is significant of the degree to which he felt the influence of Jewish conceptions that he represents Christ as setting up an earthly kingdom at the time of his return, in which the saints are to rule with him for a thousand years before the final onslaught of Satan and the Last Judgment (xx. 4 sq.). This is the earliest distinct statement known to us of the chiliastic view which was so common in the church of the second century.

[2] The investigations of scholars during recent years have made it abundantly clear that the author of the Apocalypse made large use of earlier sources, though the number and extent of those sources are still a matter of debate, and will probably remain so. It is not my purpose here either to reproduce the results of others, or to attempt an independent analysis of my own. Dr. Briggs' recent work on the *Messiah of the Apostles* contains a very

the material besides the epistles to the seven churches was original with himself, there can be little doubt; but it is impossible to fix its limits with exactness, and the line separating the various sources from each other can be drawn only approximately.

The work in its present form evidently dates from the reign of Domitian. The persecution of Nero is distinguished in vi. 9 sq. from the persecution which the readers were enduring at the time the author was writing. Domitian, moreover, is referred to in xvii. 11 under the figure of the eighth beast, and is pictured as a Nero redivivus, under the influence of a widespread popular belief that that emperor still lived and would yet appear upon the scene, and in accordance with the common Christian estimate of Domitian as a second Nero, which grew up only after his character as a bitter persecutor had become well established. But various indications point not simply to the reign of Domitian, but to the latter part of his reign, as the date of the Apocalypse. The policy of persecution had been established for some time when the work was written, and many had suffered for their faith. It was not a new condition which the author faced, as was the case when First Peter was written. The battle had been raging so long and so bitterly that all hope of compromise and reconciliation was past, and nothing but the final advent of Christ for the destruction of his enemies could put an end to the conflict. Moreover, the practice of testing Christian discipleship by requiring those accused of being Christians to worship the image of the emperor was already in vogue, as it was later in the time of Pliny, but as it

careful and elaborate analysis which may be studied with great profit (p. 284 sq.). Other works of especial importance are those of Völter (*Die Entstehung der Apokalypse*, 1882; 2te Auflage, 1885; and *Das Problem der Apokalypse*, 1893), Vischer (*Die Offenbarung des Johannes; eine jüdische Apokalypse*, in Gebhardt and Harnack's *Texte und Untersuchungen*, II. 2, 1886), Weizsäcker (*Das Apostolische Zeitalter*, 1886, S. 504 sq.), Sabatier (*Les Origines littéraires et la Composition de l'Apocalypse de St. Jean*, 1887), and Spitta (*Die Offenbarung des Johannes untersucht*, 1889).

For farther literature upon the subject, see the chapter in Dr. Briggs' work referred to just above, and also a valuable article by Baldensperger (in the *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*, 1894, S. 232 sq.), in which is given an excellent review of the progress of recent investigation.

seems not to have been when First Peter was written. All these conditions point to the latter part of Domitian's reign, the period to which the Apocalypse is expressly ascribed by Irenæus, the earliest father to tell us anything about its composition.[1] The work, as has been already remarked, constitutes the classic example of that strong hatred for the Roman Empire which its persecuting measures aroused in the hearts of many Christians. But it is to be noticed that the seven epistles in the second and third chapters lead to something of a modification of the impression made by the work as a whole, that at the time it was written the church of Asia was in the midst of an awful and bloody persecution which was resulting in the torture and death of multitudes of Christians. Though it is implied in i. 9 and iii. 10 that persecution was the common lot of the churches addressed, and though throughout the seven epistles emphasis is laid upon the need of patience and endurance, persecution is explicitly referred to in only two of them: in the epistles to the churches of Smyrna and Pergamum. Moreover, in Smyrna the death penalty had apparently not yet been inflicted,[2] while in Pergamum it would seem that only one martyr, Antipas, had lost his life.[3] Evidently it was not so much specific cases of suffering that led the author to give vent to his hatred for the empire, as the general policy to which the authorities had committed themselves, — a policy which might not lead to many deaths in any one place or at any one time, but which meant permanent and irreconcilable conflict between state and church. The same conditions prevailed during a large part of the century that followed. The number of deaths seems never to have been large, but

[1] Irenæus: *Adv. Hær.* V. 30, 3. The indications of an earlier date, which occur in some parts of the Apocalypse, are due to the sources of which the author made use, and cannot be urged against the later date, which is too well established to admit of doubt. Among those indications of an earlier origin, one of the most notable is found in xi. 1 sq. That passage, whether part of a larger work or not, was apparently written by a Jew during the latter part of the Jewish war, while the Romans were in possession of Jerusalem, but when the temple was not yet destroyed. To about the same period, or possibly to the reign of Vespasian, parts of chaps. xiii. and xvii. are also probably to be referred.

[2] Rev. ii. 10. [3] Rev. ii. 13.

the enmity of the empire was as clearly manifested in one death, as in a hundred. The principle was the same in either case; and whenever any special circumstances led the authorities to take particular cognizance of Christianity, increased severity was always the result.

But the hostility of the state thus manifested had the effect not simply of arousing the hatred of Christians, but also of compacting the church and broadening the line which separated it from the world at large, and thus making more real and vivid the sense of unity and of brotherhood which had always existed among the disciples of Christ. One of the notable facts to which the literature of the late first and early second centuries bears testimony is the increasing realization of the ideal of Christian unity and the growing effort to give that ideal practical expression and visible embodiment.

5. The Unity of the Church

The conception of the unity of the church of Christ was a possession of Christian believers from the beginning. It is true that the word "church," in the universal sense, cannot be proved to have been employed before Paul,[1] but the conception, to which that word in the usage of Paul and of those that followed him gives expression, existed from the first. The original disciples of Jesus in Jerusalem thought of themselves as a family, and conversion meant their incorporation into the one household of faith. As the Gospel made its way beyond Palestine the same feeling continued. Christians everywhere were conscious of belonging to one family, and Christ's disciples were brethren wherever they might be. It was one of Paul's chief concerns throughout his missionary career to foster this sense of unity among his churches, and to make it practical. He was interested not simply in individual conversions, but in the growth of the church of God, the body of Christ.[2] It was that church which he had persecuted,[3]

[1] The word ἐκκλησία in Matt. xvi. 18 is of doubtful authenticity. Cf. Briggs: *Messiah of the Gospels*, p. 190, note.

[2] Cf. Eph. i. 23 *et passim*.

[3] 1 Cor. xv. 9; Gal. i. 13; Phil. iii. 6.

and it was that church to whose service he afterwards gave himself body and soul.[1] But Paul was concerned not simply to promote the unity of the Christian communities founded by him, but also to bind them all to the Mother Church at Jerusalem. It was no mere Gentile church that he had in mind, but the one church of God embracing all Christ's followers everywhere; the one family of faith with its centre in Jerusalem and with its members in all parts of the world.[2] It was the threatened breach of this unity — the threatened separation between his churches and the Mother Church — that caused him such concern at the time of the Council of Jerusalem,[3] and it was with the aim of preventing such a break, and of cementing more closely the bond that bound the two diverging wings together, that he made so much of the great collection for the poor saints of Jerusalem and that he laid it upon his churches everywhere as a sacred duty.[4] It is true that he was not wholly successful in this latter aim; that the Mother Church always looked with more or less suspicion upon his converts, and that no real unity between them was established. It is true, indeed, that the separation finally became complete and the church of Jerusalem and the church of the world at large went their separate and independent ways. But in spite of this fact the principle of unity upon which Paul laid such stress lived on in the world-church — the church of history. It was this principle of unity, in fact, that largely controlled the development during the centuries that followed. Christians were conscious of belonging not simply to the churches of Ephesus, of Corinth, or of Rome, but to the one universal church of God. Not only in Paul's epistles, but also in the literature of the post-Pauline period, this conception of the universal church is very prominent.[5] The word "church," to be sure, was commonly employed not by others only, but by Paul as well, in a local sense, to

[1] Col. i. 24. [2] Rom. xi. 13 sq.; Eph. ii. 11 sq. [3] Gal. ii. 3.
[4] Compare especially Rom. xv. 27 and 2 Cor. ix. 12 sq.
[5] Compare, for instance, Heb. xii. 23; 1 Pet. ii. 9; I. Clement, 29, 30, 64; *Didaché*, IX., X.; Ignatius: *Phil.* 9; II. Clement 14; Hermas: *Vis.* II. 4.

designate the Christians of a particular city,[1] or even of a particular house.[2] But this usage does not in the least conflict with the broader conception. The church in the city or in the house is simply a local manifestation of the church of God; there is in reality only one church as there is only one body of Christ. Of that true Christians everywhere are members, and the fact that they dwell in Ephesus and Corinth and Rome, the fact that they are scattered over all the world, does not in the least interfere with their unity. The words of the *Didache* are especially significant in this connection: "As this broken bread was scattered upon the mountains, and being gathered together became one, so may thy church be gathered together from the ends of the earth into thy kingdom."[3]

It was a long time before this conception of the one church of God, lying back of all local bodies of Christians, found expression in organization. It was long before the church at large came under the control of a common authority and was ruled by a common government. During the period with which we are dealing, and for some generations thereafter, the unity of the church universal was a unity of spirit rather than of body. Christians everywhere were bound together by a common faith, a common hope, and a common purpose. They were conscious of belonging to the elect people of God. But there was no central government, and no compact which obliged one part to submit to the will of another part, or of the whole. Their unity was purely ideal. They were all members of the one body of Christ bound by their discipleship to observe his will and to love their brethren everywhere; but they were entirely free to interpret that will for themselves, and to go their own independent way.

[1] So Paul speaks of the "church which is in Corinth" (1 Cor. i. 2); of the "church of the Thessalonians" (1 Thess. i. 1); of the "church in Cenchreæ" (Rom. xvi. 1); and in the plural of the "churches of Galatia" (Gal. i. 2); of the "churches of Judea" (Gal. i. 22); of the "churches of Asia" (1 Cor. xvi. 19); of the "churches of the Gentiles" (Rom. xvi. 4); see also 1 Cor. xi. 16; 2 Cor. viii. 18, etc.

[2] Paul speaks of house-churches in Rom. xvi. 5; 1 Cor. xvi. 19; Col. iv. 15; Philemon 2.

[3] *Didache*, IX.

That this freedom did not lead ultimately to the complete sacrifice of unity, as it might have been expected to do, — that all the local churches did not develop along separate and divergent lines, and the Christianity of every section remain entirely independent and distinct from the Christianity of all other parts of the world, — was due not simply to the abstract belief in the unity of the one church of God, but also to the fact that from the earliest days that unity found practical expression in many ways, and was promoted by various causes.

Prominent among the practical expressions of church unity, and the causes that promoted that unity, was the active intercourse which was kept up among the various Christian communities.[1] Communication not only between different parts of the same province, but also between different provinces, was very active under the empire, and travel was very brisk along the great Roman roads. And as Paul had confined himself largely in his missionary work to the principal cities of the provinces which he visited, and to the important towns upon the main highways of travel and commerce, it was but natural that the disciples of different places should see much of each other. The sense of brotherhood which was so strong among them would inevitably lead a travelling Christian to seek out his fellow-believers in every city in which he tarried for any length of time. Paul's epistles, as well as our other sources, bear frequent testimony to the closeness of intercourse thus enjoyed.[2] Indeed, the intercommunication between even the most widely separated communities was so general and so constant as to constitute one of the most marked features in the life of the early church. And so it is not surprising that the virtue of hospitality was very highly esteemed, and that it is inculcated over and over again in the writings of the apostolic age.[3]

But such intercommunication was not simply accidental and confined to the chance visits of Christians who were

[1] Compare Ramsay: *Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 361 sq.

[2] Compare, for instance, 1 Cor. i. 11, xvi. 17; Heb. xiii. 23; 3 John 6.

[3] Cf. Rom. xii. 13; 1 Tim. iii. 2; Heb. xiii. 2; 1 Pet. iv. 9; I. Clement 1, 10, etc.

travelling upon other business. It was common also for church to communicate with church, as occasion arose, through regular delegates sent for the purpose. Paul, as we know, often despatched messengers from one part of the world to another, and his converts frequently communicated with him in the same way.[1] And so the church of Rome, in the latter part of the first century, sent a deputation to Corinth, and despatched a letter thither with the aim of putting an end to the schism which was distracting the Corinthian church;[2] and Ignatius, in his epistles to Polycarp and to the churches of Philadelphia and Smyrna, requested that delegates might be sent to Syria to congratulate the disciples there upon the restored peace which they were enjoying.[3] Such constant intercommunication, and such manifestations of interest in the welfare of sister churches, of course tended to keep alive the sense of unity of which they were the practical expression, and at the same time to promote uniformity in the beliefs and customs of Christendom.

But unity and uniformity were also promoted by the itinerant apostles and prophets who were very numerous in the early church. Besides the Twelve and Paul himself, there were many other apostles engaged in the work of evangelizing the Roman world during the first and early second centuries.[4] And in addition to them there were prophets and other teachers who travelled from place to place imparting divine revelations and preaching the word of God.[5] They were received with great honor, and were heard with respect wherever they went. Their utterances were listened to commonly as messages from God, and their influence in moulding the conceptions and the customs of the church at large was tremendous. It was very largely through them that unity was preserved

[1] Cf. 2 Cor. viii. 18 sq.; Eph. vi. 21; Col. iv. 7; Phil. ii. 19, 25; 1 Thess. iii. 2; 2 Tim. iv. 12; 1 Cor. vii. 1; Phil. iv. 16.

[2] Cf. Clement: *Ad Cor.* 65.

[3] Ignatius: *Phil.* 10, *Smyr.* 11, *Polycarp*, 7.

[4] Compare, for instance, Acts xiv. 4, 14; 1 Cor. xii. 28, xv. 7; Rom. xvi. 7; 1 Thess. ii. 6; 2 Cor. xi. 13; Rev. ii. 2, and especially *Didache*, XI.

[5] Compare especially 1 Cor. xii. 28, and *Didache*, XI.

between different parts of Christendom, and that it was made possible for communities, even of the most widely sundered provinces, to develop with so striking uniformity. It would be impossible to exaggerate the significance of these travelling apostles, prophets, and teachers. It is true that we have few records of their activity, and that their names have nearly all perished; but the general results of their work are very apparent, and the few references we have to them show how numerous and how diligent they must have been.

That it was possible, when the disciples came chiefly from the lower classes of society, for such apostles, prophets, and teachers to devote themselves to religious work, and even to leave their homes and travel from place to place, was due largely to the fact that they were welcomed everywhere by their brethren and supplied by them with the necessaries which they might require upon their farther journey. Doubtless there were many of them who, like Paul, maintained themselves by the work of their hands. But it was recognized that they had the right to expect entertainment and support from those to whom they ministered.[1] It was widely regarded, indeed, as their duty to depend wholly upon the hospitality of others, and to take nothing with them upon their journeys except the bare means of subsistence while going from place to place.[2]

Still another means by which the unity of the church at large was promoted, was the custom of sending apostolic and other important epistles around from church to church, that others besides those to whom they were addressed might enjoy the benefit of their perusal. Thus Paul directed that his Epistle to the Colossians should be read in the neighboring church of Laodicea, and the epistle from Laodicea in Colossæ.[3] And so Clement's reference, in his Epistle to the Corinthians,[4] to Paul's letter to them shows that that letter was read in his day at Rome as well as at Corinth. The same custom was fol-

[1] Compare, for instance, Matt. x. 10; 1 Thess. ii. 6; 1 Cor. ix. 12 sq.; 2 Cor. xi. 7 sq.; *Didache*, XI.

[2] Compare Matt. x. 9 sq.; *Didache*, XI.

[3] Col. iv. 16.

[4] Clement: *Ad Cor.* 47.

lowed also with other writings than those of Paul. The Philippians in the second century requested Polycarp to forward them copies of the epistles of Ignatius, that they might be edified by their perusal;[1] and Hermas was directed in his vision not only to read his book to the church of Rome, but also to have copies of it sent by Clement to other cities, that "all the elect" might read it.[2] Indeed, many works during the period with which we are dealing were expressly addressed to a wider public than a single church. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians was designed for the churches of Galatia, and must have been sent consequently from one city to another throughout the province. The so-called Epistle to the Ephesians was also a genuine circular letter, intended for a wide circle of readers resident apparently in different parts of the province of Asia.[3] The same is true, too, of First and Second Corinthians, in which not only the church of Corinth itself is mentioned in the salutation, but also, in the one case, "all the saints which are in the whole of Achaia"; and, in the other case, "all that call upon the name of our Lord Jesus Christ in every place." Similarly the Apocalypse was intended for a large public. Seven churches of Asia are addressed in it, and they doubtless simply as representatives of the entire church of the province. What is true of some of Paul's epistles and of the Apocalypse is still more true of most of the so-called catholic epistles. First Peter is expressly addressed to the Christians of all the five provinces of Asia Minor, James still more generally to the "twelve tribes of the dispersion,"[4] and in 2 Peter, Jude, and 1 John the circle of readers is not limited in any way. Such general or catholic epistles of course imply, so far as the addresses are original, that their authors were recognized as apostles or prophets not simply

[1] Polycarp: *Ad Phil.* 13.

[2] Hermas: *Vis.* II. 4. Compare also Dionysius of Corinth in Eusebius: *H. E.* IV. 23.

[3] See above, p. 380.

[4] On the address see above, p. 583. As remarked there, James was probably not written as an epistle but as a homily; but it may have been sent out later into the world at large as a catholic epistle or tract, by its own author or by some one else.

by particular communities, but by the church at large, or at least by large sections of it. They presuppose, in fact, the travelling missionaries and preachers to whom reference was made just above. Only because there were such men who were going from place to place, and were received everywhere with honor as Christ's divinely commissioned messengers, could 1 Peter, 1 John, Jude, and James (if it be an epistle at all) have been written.[1] But it is clear that all such general epistles, and all other epistles which had more than a local circulation, must have contributed to the sense of unity between the churches, and must have promoted a uniformity of development in the different parts of Christendom. Not to the same extent as the apostles and prophets themselves did such writings influence the life of the church at large. The spoken word always preceded the written; and they were addressed not to the unconverted, but to those who were already within the fold, and hence their influence was only secondary, not primary. And yet it was real, nevertheless, and account must be taken of it in every attempt to trace the history of the church during the generations that followed.

The same is true to some extent of the Gospels, which were intended not for a single church or community, but for the world at large. The conceptions of the earliest generations of Christians were not formed, to be sure, nor were they influenced to any great extent by the Gospels. It was long before those works secured any wide circulation, and they commonly found the Christianity of the communities to which they came more or less stereotyped. But after they had made their way into general circulation, they had some effect in controlling the development of Christian thought, and in keeping alive the sense of unity throughout the church at large, by holding always before the minds of believers everywhere the idea of their common Master and of their common discipleship.

[1] Second Peter of course falls, as a pseudonymous work, into a different class. It appealed for a hearing not to its real author's apostolic or prophetic character, but to the authority of Peter, under whose name it passed.

Thus various agencies aided, in one way or another, and to a greater or less degree, in preserving and promoting the sense of unity which existed from the beginning, and made it possible, in spite of the disintegrating influence of local conditions and interests, for the most widely separated churches to keep in touch with each other and to develop along the same general lines.

But the actual unity of the church at large was promoted, also, by the pressure of persecution from without and of heresy from within. That unity would have found expression, and would have been conserved in the ways that have been indicated, even had no such pressure been felt. But the immediate effect of the hostility of the state, as has been already indicated, was to lead Christians everywhere to realize more and more their heavenly citizenship and destiny, and the broad line which separated them from the world about them, and which marked them off from their neighbors as a peculiar people, as fellow-disciples of a common Lord. Thus their oneness was emphasized and increased under the pressure of persecution. But still more marked was the effect of heresy; of the growth of principles and practices which Christians in general looked upon as utterly subversive of the religion of Christ. The forms which those principles and practices commonly took, during the period with which we are dealing, have been already indicated and do not concern us here; but the effect which they had upon the development of the world-church is of the very greatest historic significance. That effect, in a word, was to narrow and define the circle of Christian brotherhood, and thus to make the church in reality something less than the sum of all Christ's followers. The process of exclusion, by which all that did not accept certain well-defined doctrines, and govern their lives in accordance with certain specified laws, were finally put without the pale of the church and regarded as no better than the unbelieving heathen about them, was only in its incipiency in the apostolic age. The line was not yet sharply drawn, and the false teachers and their followers were still commonly within the churches

addressed in the letters attacking and denouncing them.[1] But the principle which must result in their ultimate exclusion is enunciated in all those letters. They are not true Christians and members of the body of Christ, and so they cannot be allowed permanently to commune and to associate as brethren with those who are. Into the steps which the church at large took in its effort to exclude such men, we cannot enter here. They fall within the second century.[2] And yet, even in some of the writings which form a part of our New Testament canon, we find one of those steps foreshadowed. There are hints, for instance, in Jude 17 and in 2 Peter iii. 2 of that tendency which resulted ultimately in the universal recognition of the teaching of the apostles as an exclusive standard and norm of Christian truth.

Thus, as a result of the growth of false principles and practices among the disciples themselves, the church of Christ, which originally comprised all that professed themselves his followers, was finally narrowed to include only a part of them, and without its pale were large numbers who claimed to be truly his disciples. The sense of unity among those within was increased by the exclusion, but it was no longer an all-embracing unity. The world-church, like the Jewish Christian church before it, had become an exclusive institution, and the age of Catholicism, which meant at the same time the age of sectarianism, had already dawned.

6. The Developing Organization[3]

The result referred to at the close of the previous section implies that the original unity of the church of Christ

[1] Compare not only Paul's epistles, but also Second and Third John; Jude 12; Rev. ii. 14 sq., etc. From 1 John ii. 19, it seems that those whom the author attacks had already separated themselves from those addressed.

[2] In my Inaugural Address, entitled *Primitive and Catholic Christianity* (p. 29), I describe those steps in the following words: "These steps were three: first, the recognition of the teaching of the Apostles as the exclusive standard and norm of Christian truth; second, the confinement to a specific office (viz., the Catholic office of bishop) of the power to determine what is the teaching of the Apostles; and third, the designation of a specific institution (viz., the Catholic Church) as the sole channel of divine grace."

[3] Upon this subject see especially Hatch: *The Organization of the Early*

had been succeeded by a legal unity; that the church had already begun to organize itself, and to take on the form of a visible institution with a regular government, with definite laws, and with the right to inflict penalties for rebellion against that government, and for the violation of those laws. That process of organization began before the close of the period with which this volume deals, and to it, so far as it lies within the first century, we must now devote our attention. If we would understand it, we must remember that the universal church did not grow out of the local congregations, but that they grew out of it; that they believed themselves to be simply manifestations of the kingdom of God established on earth by Christ.[1] It is clear, therefore, that our study must begin not with the local communities, but with the church of Christ that lay back of them.[2] That church owed its origin to Jesus himself, but its spread primarily to his apostles. They had been chosen by him to be his witnesses in an especial sense, and to proclaim the Gospel to the unevangelized. Their work was evangelistic work, and they carried it on after his death, first of all in Jerusalem, and afterwards in other parts of the world. If they were true to their calling, they were as truly apostles or missionaries in the beginning at Jerusalem, as when they were later journeying about in distant lands, preaching to those who had never heard of Jesus. They were serving the church at large in the one case as truly as in the other. But the Twelve were not the only apostles in the early church. Indeed, the name "apostle" was not originally a distinctive title of the Twelve. There were many apostles or missionaries, but among them the Twelve were especially distinguished,

Christian Churches; translated into German with notes and excursuses by Harnack under the title *Die Gesellschaftsverfassung der christlichen Kirchen im Alterthum;* Harnack in his edition of the *Didache* (*Texte und Untersuchungen*, II. 1, S. 88 sq.); Weizsäcker, *l.c.* S. 606 sq. (Eng. Trans., II. p. 291 sq.); Loening: *Die Gemeindeverfassung des Urchristenthums;* Loofs in the *Theologische Studien und Kritiken*, 1890, S. 619 sq.; Sohm: *Kirchenrecht*, Bd. I.; Réville: *Les Origines de L'Épiscopat;* and of the older literature, Lightfoot's *Essay on the Christian Ministry*, in his Commentary on Philippians.

[1] See above, p. 638.

[2] Compare Sohm, *l.c.* S. 16 sq.

because they had been singled out by Christ for special service and privilege. An examination of the literature of the first century is very instructive in this connection.[1] In the Gospel of Matthew the twelve appointed by Christ are commonly spoken of as the twelve disciples.[2] They are called apostles only once, and then not "The Apostles" as if they were the only ones, but "The twelve Apostles."[3] In the Gospel of Mark they are called "The Apostles" only once,[4] in all other passages "The Twelve."[5] In the Gospel of John they are not referred to at all as "The Apostles"; indeed the word "apostle" occurs only once in the Gospel, and then only in the most general sense.[6]

On the other hand, in the Gospel of Luke, the Twelve are called "The Apostles" in ix. 10, xvii. 5, xxii. 14;[7] and in the Book of Acts they are thus designated some twenty-eight times, being called "The Twelve" only once,[8] and then evidently under the influence of an older source. As a matter of fact, in the first century the word "apostle" is used in an eminent sense of the Twelve (and of Paul) only in the writings of Paul himself, and of those authors who had felt his influence. That peculiar use of the word seems to have been a result of the controversy between Paul and the Judaizers. It was not enough for him to claim that he was an apostle in the sense in which every missionary was. The Judaizers urged over against him the teaching and practice of the original Twelve, and it was necessary, consequently, for Paul to show that he had been called by Christ in as true and direct a way as

[1] Compare also Harnack's edition of the *Didache*, S. 115 sq.

[2] Matt. x. i, xi. 1, xx. 17, xxvi. 20.

[3] Matt. x. 2. In two cases they are spoken of as "the Twelve" (xxvi. 14, 47); once as "these Twelve" (x. 5).

[4] Mark vi. 30. Very likely through a conformation of the text to the text of Luke, as in Mark iii. 14, where in some manuscripts the words "whom also he named apostles" are added from Luke vi. 13.

[5] Mark iv. 10, vi. 7, ix. 35, x. 32, xi. 11, xiv. 10, 17, 20, 43. In iii. 14 they are called simply "Twelve."

[6] John xiii. 16: "An apostle [that is, "one sent"] is not greater than he that sent him." In John vi. 67, 70, 71 they are called "the Twelve."

[7] Cf. also Luke vi. 13: "He chose twelve of them and called them apostles." They are called "the Twelve" in Luke viii. 1, ix. 1, 12, xviii. 31, xxii. 3, 47, apparently in each case under the influence of an older source.

[8] Acts vi. 2.

they, and that his credit and authority were equal to theirs. He could not call himself one of the Twelve, of course; but he could emphasize the fact that his apostleship was as high as theirs, and that it involved all that theirs did; that he represented to the Gentiles what they did to the Jews; that he was the apostle of the uncircumcision in the same eminent sense in which they were the apostles of the circumcision. The controversy thus tended to set both the Twelve and Paul apart from all other apostles in the minds of his followers, and it was inevitable that the title, upon which he laid such emphasis and which was common both to him and them, should be used in Pauline circles, if not exclusively, at any rate in a peculiar sense, of himself and the Twelve. In his own epistles the word is employed frequently in the broader sense,[1] but it is implied in many passages that he regards his own apostleship, and with it the apostleship of the Twelve, as of a higher grade and greater dignity than that of others.[2]

In the Gospels of Matthew, Mark, and John, as already indicated, and in the Epistle of Barnabas,[3] the common use of the word in a broader sense is implied, and in the Apocalypse[4] and the *Didache*[5] the word is explicitly employed

[1] Cf. Rom. xvi. 7; 1 Cor. iv. 9, ix. 5, xv. 7; 1 Thess. ii. 6. It is significant that Paul uses the word in a still broader sense to designate messengers appointed by a particular church for a particular mission, as in 2 Cor. viii. 23 and Phil. ii. 25. This makes still more evident the originally unofficial character of the word.

[2] Cf. Rom. i. 1; 1 Cor. ix. 1, xv. 5 sq.; Gal. i. 1, 17, 19; Eph. i. 1; and especially 1 Cor. i. 1, 2 Cor. i. 1, Col. i. 1, where he distinguishes himself in the one case from Sosthenes and in the other cases from Timothy by the use of the title "apostle," although Timothy at least was an apostle, as we learn from 1 Thess. ii. 6. It is worthy of notice also that in Eph. iv. 11 Paul apparently uses the word in its narrower sense to designate only the Twelve and himself, for only thus, it would seem, can the enumeration of evangelists after apostles and prophets be explained. The word "evangelist" occurs in only two other passages in the New Testament, in Acts xxi. 8 of Philip and in 2 Tim. iv. 5 of Timothy, who is included among the apostles by Paul himself in 1 Thess. ii. 6. The word is not found, so far as I am aware, in the literature of the second century, but it is used by Eusebius (*H. E.* III. 37 and V. 10) to designate the missionaries who are called apostles in the *Didache*. Evidently the evangelists were simply apostles, and the only reason for the use of the word "evangelist" was the desire to confine the title "apostle" to the Twelve and Paul.

[3] Barnabas, V. 9, VIII. 3.

[4] In Rev. ii. 2 the reference to false apostles implies the existence of true apostles besides the Twelve, for they were known to be false only after trial.

[5] *Didache*, XI.

in that sense. In the Book of Acts, on the other hand, the broader meaning appears only twice,[1] and then apparently under the influence of an older source; while in Clement and Ignatius the word is used as the exclusive title of Paul and the Twelve.[2] In other writings of the same period the usage is ambiguous.

It is clear that as Paul used the title, and as it was used in the Apocalypse and in the *Didache*, it did not imply that the person designated by it had necessarily seen Jesus; for Paul uses it of Timothy in 1 Thess. ii. 6 and of Apollos in 1 Cor. iv. 9, and even though it is possible that Silvanus, Andronicus, and Junias, to whom he also applies it,[3] may have seen Christ, Timothy and Apollos certainly had not.[4] Moreover, in view of the late date of the *Didache*, it is of course impossible that the travelling apostles whom it mentions can have been personal disciples of Jesus, and the same is true of the false apostles referred to and of the true apostles implied in Rev. ii. 2. Thus even in circles where the influence of Jewish Christianity was felt to a marked degree, personal association with Jesus during his earthly life was not regarded as an essential precondition of apostleship. But a divine call and endowment were universally regarded as necessary. The mere fact that a man proclaimed the Gospel did not make him an apostle. Only as he was doing the work under the direct impulse and guidance of the Spirit could he lay claim to the title of apostle, and only in so far as it was recognized that he was working thus would the title be accorded him by those

[1] Acts xiv. 4, 14.

[2] Cf. Clement: *Ad Cor.* 42, 44, 47; and especially Ignatius: *Magn.* 6, *Trall.* 3, 7, *Rom.* 4, *Phil.* 9. See also Harnack, *l.c.* S. 117, note.

[3] 1 Thess. ii. 6; Rom. xvi. 7.

[4] It is true that 1 Cor. ix. 1 seems at first glance to indicate that no one could be an apostle who had not actually seen Jesus, but that interpretation will not hold. Paul in that passage is not mentioning qualifications of apostles in general, but qualifications which he himself possesses, and which put him on the same plane with the Twelve, and make him the equal of any apostle however high his standing. Strange to say, even Sohm (*l.c.* S. 42) follows Lightfoot in accepting the common opinion as to the necessity of the qualification in question, but the passage which he cites (1 Cor. xv. 7) does not prove that according to Paul there could never be any apostles except such as had seen Christ, but only that Christ appeared to all that were then apostles.

to whom he ministered. The basis of his apostleship was divine, not human, and his credentials were God-given.[1] It is very likely true that apostles were sometimes appointed and sent out by this or that church, and that they were given letters of introduction and commendation which vouched for their apostolic character and mission.[2] But even in such cases it was not the appointment of the church which made them apostles; only the divine call could do that. All that the church could do was to bear testimony to its conviction that such a call had been received, and that the person in question was consequently fitted to do apostolic work and worthy to receive recognition and honor. And even then a man's apostleship must be continually tested by his character and accomplishment. The right of churches and of individuals to test the claims of those who came to them as apostles was everywhere recognized, and it is a decisive proof of the latters' unofficial character.[3]

It was seen in an earlier chapter that the Twelve did not occupy any official position in the church of Jerusalem or in the church at large.[4] Their personal significance was due not to the fact that they were the incumbents of the highest office in the church, but simply to the fact that they were Christ's chosen missionaries, and as such had a peculiar responsibility for the spread of the Gospel. They were preachers and teachers, and their true mission was not to hold office, but to proclaim the message of Christ. They owed whatever dignity and authority they possessed solely to their spiritual character and endowment. What was true of them was true also of all the other apostles. They were officials neither of a local congregation nor of the church at large. They served the church universal, devoting themselves to the conversion of the world and

[1] Among those credentials were the performance of signs and wonders (2 Cor. xii. 12), the patient endurance of hardships and trials (2 Cor. xii. 12 and xi. 23), the spiritual power of his preaching (1 Cor. ii. 4 sq.), and the success of his missionary work (1 Cor. ix. 2).

[2] Cf. 2 Cor. iii. 1.

[3] Cf., for instance, 1 Cor. ix. 1 sq.; also 2 Cor. xi. 13, 22 sq., xii. 12 sq., xiii. 3, and in general the whole of chaps. x.–xiii., in which Paul defends his own apostleship. Cf. also Gal. i. 8 sq.; Rev. ii. 2; *Didache*, XI.

[4] See above, p. 45 sq.

thus to the extension of the kingdom; but they did it not because they were elected or appointed to the office of missionary or apostle, but because they were impelled thereto by the Spirit. Accordingly, whatever authority they exercised in the church was a purely spiritual authority, and depended always upon the recognition of their divine commission and endowment by their brethren. That their influence was great wherever their apostolic character was recognized, and especially in the churches which they had themselves founded, of course goes without saying,[1] and that they were in a position not simply to advise and recommend, but even to utter commands, is equally clear.[2] But there existed no legal relation between them and their converts which bound the latter to listen to them and obey them. Only because they were conscious that they were speaking God's word could they demand obedience, and only as those to whom they spoke recognized the same fact could they expect them to render such obedience.[3] The test of the truth of their preaching and teaching of course could not always be found in the content of that which they preached and taught. Much must be accepted by those who heard on the personal authority of men already tried and approved, and hence the authority of one who was recognized as an apostle must be greater than that of an ordinary disciple, and the authority of the apostle who had first preached the Gospel in a city, and to whom the disciples owed their Christian faith, must be peculiarly great and lasting. But it was not they themselves, it was the Master whom they represented, that uttered commands and required compliance.

What was true of the apostles was true also of the prophets. In 1 Cor. xii. 28, Paul says, "And God hath set some in the church, first apostles, secondly prophets, thirdly teachers"; and the prophets who are thus ranked next to the apostles are mentioned frequently in the lit-

[1] Cf. 1 Cor. iv. 14 sq.; Gal. iv. 13 sq.

[2] Cf. 1 Cor. v. 13, vii. 6, xi. 34, xvi. 1; 2 Cor. ii. 9, etc.; also Ignatius; *Trall.* 3, *Rom.* 4. Compare also 1 Cor. ix. 14, and Rom. xiii. 2, where the same word διατάσσεσθαι is used of Christ and of God.

[3] Cf. 1 Cor. vii. 10, xiv. 37; 2 Cor. i. 24.

erature of our period.[1] It is evident that they were very numerous, and that they were not confined to the churches founded by Paul.[2] The gift of prophecy, as we have already seen,[3] was exercised not exclusively by any particular class in the church, but by disciples of all classes. At the same time there were those who possessed the gift in an eminent degree, and who exercised it so frequently that they acquired the name of prophets and were distinguished thereby from the brethren in general. They were not simply the occasional recipients of a revelation; they were in possession of a permanent prophetic gift, which enabled them to know and to utter the will and truth of God. And so, like the apostles, they received special honor from their fellow-Christians and were looked to for guidance and for instruction. They possessed, moreover, as the apostles did, a large measure of authority; not because of any official position or rank, but simply because they were the mouthpiece of Christ, whose will was law to his church. So far as they were believed to speak for him, their utterances were authoritative, and were gladly heeded by the faithful. But there were false prophets as well as true, and so it was necessary to test all that claimed to be prophets before accepting their declarations as the word of God;[4] and even after they had approved themselves it was not their authority that was recognized, but only the authority of the Spirit that spoke through them. Even true prophets might speak when not under the influence of the Spirit. They might on their own impulse instruct or advise or exhort their fellows,[5] but speaking thus they could claim nothing more than the respect and attention due to any other approved disciple.

That the prophets are uniformly mentioned after the apostles by Paul and by other writers, when the two classes are spoken of together, does not mean that they

[1] Cf. Acts xi. 27, xiii. 1, xv. 32; Rom. xii. 6; 1 Cor. xiv.; Eph. ii. 20, iii. 5, iv. 11; Rev. xxii. 9; also Matt. x. 41, xxiii. 34.

[2] See above, p. 527. [3] *Ibid.*

[4] Cf. 1 Cor. xii. 10, xiv. 29; 1 John iv. 1 sq.; *Didache*, XI.; Hermas: *Mand.* XI.

[5] Cf. 1 Cor. vii. 12, 25, xiv. 37.

held an official rank below that of the apostles, for neither they nor the apostles were officers in the church; but it indicates that their mission was regarded as less exalted and responsible than that of the apostles. All the apostles were prophets, endowed by the Spirit with the power to proclaim the will and the truth of God. But not all prophets were apostles; for the latter were called to the special and much more laborious and self-sacrificing work of preaching the Gospel and planting the church in new territory. Their work was therefore primary and fundamental, and their dignity as founders was naturally greater than the dignity of those who came after them. But it would be a mistake to draw hard and fast lines in this connection; to suppose that the functions of the apostles in these early days were carefully distinguished from the functions of the prophets. An apostle might tarry for a longer or a shorter time, or might even take up his residence in this or that place and perform what was practically a prophet's work there, while a prophet might at any time be called to do the work of an apostle and to carry the Gospel to the unevangelized portions of the world.[1] It would be a mistake, moreover, to speak of the relative authority of apostles and prophets, regarding the former as possessed of higher authority in virtue of their higher

[1] Paul and Barnabas, who were prophets in the church at Antioch, were sent out to do the work of apostles (Acts xiii. 1), and in the time of the *Didache* prophets travelled about from church to church as well as apostles (*Didache*, XI., XIII.). On the other hand, Paul not simply founded churches, but watched over their fortunes with care and solicitude, visiting them repeatedly, and residing in some places for a considerable length of time. And the same is true of others to whom he gives the name "apostles," as, for instance, Barnabas, Apollos, Timothy, Andronicus, and Junias. So Peter came to Rome and labored for some time there, though Christianity had long been established in the city; and so John resided for many years in Ephesus. Paul's boast that he had never built on another man's foundation does not imply that an apostle had no right to preach in already existing churches, but simply indicates his individual principle of action. So the apostles mentioned in the *Didache* did not preach solely in unevangelized places, but went about from church to church. On the other hand, the *Didache* represents a later stage of development, due clearly to the prevalence of abuses, when it insists that apostles must not remain more than two days in any one place and must receive only their bare subsistence, while the prophets are permitted to settle down permanently wherever they please, and Christians are instructed to give them tithes of all their property.

rank. The only authority in the church was the will of Christ, the sole head of the church, and that will was absolute, whether uttered by apostle or by prophet. A conflict of authority was therefore impossible. The apostle and the prophet must agree, or else one of them was speaking of himself and not of the Spirit, and in that case he had no authority whatever. Thus a prophet might judge an apostle or an apostle a prophet. Thus, indeed, any Christian possessed of the Spirit of God might judge them both. Neither the one nor the other could claim any authority of his own.[1] If the influence of an apostle was greater than that of a prophet in any particular church, or in the church at large, it was not because one was an apostle and the other only a prophet, but simply because the one had secured, as it was easy under ordinary circumstances for an apostle to secure, a more assured place than the other in the respect and confidence of his converts and of his brethren.

In the passage already quoted from Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians, teachers are mentioned in the third place after the apostles and prophets.[2] They, too, were common in the early church, and shared in the honor enjoyed by the apostles and prophets. Their function was similar to the function of the prophet, for it consisted in the impartation of spiritual instruction;[3] but at the same time there was a marked difference, for the instruction given by them was the fruit of thought and reflection, and not of immediate revelation.[4] As prophecy was a gift

[1] The reproof administered by Paul to Peter at Antioch (Gal. ii. 11 sq.) is an illustration of the principle. Compare also 1 Cor. xiv. 37; *Didache*, XI., etc.

[2] Cf. also Acts xiii. 1; Rom. xii. 7; Eph. iv. 11; Jas. iii. 1; *Didache*, XIII.; Hermas: *Sim.* IX., *Vis.* III., etc.; and see Harnack, *l.c.* S. 110, note.

[3] It will not do to draw hard and fast lines here any more than in connection with the apostles and prophets. All prophets were in a sense teachers, for they imparted divine truth. But not all teachers were prophets, for not all of them received immediate revelations from God. But the same persons might, and doubtless frequently did, impart revelations, and also give their fellows the benefit of their own thought and reflection; or, in other words, exercised both the gift of prophecy and the gift of teaching in its narrower sense. Compare Acts xiii. 1; 1 Cor. iv. 17; 1 Tim. ii. 7; 2 Tim. i. 11, etc.; and the epistles of Paul in general, which contain both immediate revelations and the fruits of reflection.

[4] Upon the gift of teaching, see above, p. 528 sq.

which was not confined to a favored few, or to any one class within the church, so the gift of teaching might also be possessed in a measure by all. Thus Paul exhorts the Colossians to teach and admonish one another,[1] and the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews tells his readers that they ought to be teachers instead of mere learners.[2] And yet, as wisdom and experience were pre-eminently required in an instructor, the number of those endowed with the charisma in so great degree as to entitle them to be called teachers, must have been limited; and hence those who did possess the gift in so large measure were held in high honor, and were regarded with the greatest respect and deference.[3] They had no official position in the church; they were no more officers than were the apostles and prophets. But they possessed influence and exercised a measure of authority on the same ground as the latter. They, too, spoke the word of God, and it was that which gave their utterances weight. At the same time they did not claim to utter immediate revelations, and therefore what they said was not the word of God in the same sense as the prophet's message. There was a large human element in it which the prophet's utterances did not have, and for that reason their words carried less weight than the latter's, and their dignity and authority were not as great as his. It is thus easy to understand why in the literature of the period they should be commonly mentioned after the apostles and prophets. And yet their practical influence in the conduct of the church and in the development of Christian thought and life was very great. They were endowed from on high with wisdom and knowledge,[4]—a permanent gift,—which fitted them always to instruct and edify the church, while the prophet might receive his revelations only occasionally, and at other times have nothing to impart to his brethren. And

[1] Col. iii. 16. [2] Heb. v. 12.

[3] Compare the words of the author of the Epistle of Barnabas, who disclaims the right to speak as a teacher (chaps. i. and iv.). Cf. also *Didache*, XIII., where it is said that the teacher, like the prophet, deserves to be supported by the church.

[4] λόγος σοφίας and λόγος γνώσεως, 1 Cor. xii. 8.

so even after the enthusiastic age of the church had passed, and when the consciousness of the immediate presence of the Spirit was no longer vivid and widespread, and when there were no more prophets to impart new revelations from God, the gift of teaching continued to find exercise, and Christians looked to those who possessed it for the instruction and guidance which they had formerly received from apostles and prophets as well.

The apostles, prophets, and teachers, whom we have been considering, all belonged to the church at large, and not merely to some local congregation.[1] The apostles might be the only ones who spent their lives in travelling about from place to place; but the prophets and teachers also, even though they may have remained commonly in a single city, had their significance for the general church, and not for the local congregation alone. If they were endowed with the gift of prophecy or of teaching, that gift was good everywhere, and they were at liberty to exercise it in any church. Not that they had an absolute right to do so, and could insist that a congregation should listen to them whether it would or no;[2] but every congregation would gladly listen if they had the Spirit and could utter God's word, and their utterances, whenever their inspired character was recognized, must have the same weight in one part of Christendom as in another.

The apostles, prophets, and teachers were, of all the Christian brethren, the ones who were held in highest honor by the early church, and their honor was due to the fact that they proclaimed the word of God. Thus, the author of the *Didache* says, "My child, him that speaketh unto thee the word of God[3] thou shalt remember night and day, and thou shalt honor him as the Lord"; and from the eleventh, thirteenth, and fourteenth chapters it is clear that

[1] Cf., for instance, *Didache*, XI., XIII.; Hermas: *Vis.* II. 4; and see Harnack, *l.c.* S. 100 sq.

[2] Only those whom the congregation permitted could take part in the services. Cf. 1 Thess. v. 19; 1 Cor. xiv.; *Didache*, X. Not only was the church to judge those who claimed to be inspired, but also to regulate their speaking, as occasion demanded. See above, p. 524.

[3] τοῦ λαλοῦντος σοι τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ. *Didache*, IV.

the apostles, prophets, and teachers were the ones who thus spoke the word of the Lord and were to receive chief honor.[1] But not only were they the honored ones among the disciples,[2] they were also naturally, and necessarily, the leaders of the church.[3] But their leadership involved many things. As men especially inspired of God, they must be the natural guides of the church in all its spiritual activities. But the church had no activities which were not spiritual, and hence their controlling influence must be felt in every department of the church's life.[4] Upon them, for instance, must devolve commonly the direction of the religious services. Free and informal though those services were in the earliest days, no one was supposed to take part in them unless he was prompted by the Holy Spirit, and had something to communicate for the spiritual good of those about him. But the apostles, prophets, and teachers must ordinarily have more to impart than the believers in general, and they must be better able to judge whether the utterances of others were truly spiritual and calculated truly to edify the church. Thus there must devolve upon them, especially, not only the duty of contributing spiritual food, but also the duty of exercising control wherever control was needed, as it was in Corinth, and as it must have been everywhere at an early day.

But an important part of the religious services of the primitive church was the giving of alms for the support of

[1] Paul says in 1 Cor. xii. 28: "*First* apostles, secondly prophets, thirdly teachers," thus ranking them above all other Christians.

[2] The τετιμημένοι, as the *Didache* calls them (Chap. XV.).

[3] The ἡγούμενοι, as they are called in Heb. xiii. 7, where it is said, "Remember your leaders who spake unto you the word of God." Cf. also Acts xv. 22, 32, where Judas and Silas are called ἡγούμενοι in the one case, and προφῆται in the other; and Clement: *Ad Cor.* 1, 21. The ἡγούμενοι mentioned in Heb. xiii. 7 are not to be identified with the ἡγούμενοι of vss. 17 and 24. The reference in vs. 7 is apparently to the apostles and prophets who first preached the Gospel to those addressed, while in vss. 17 and 24 there can be little doubt, in view of the late date of the epistle and the implication that those spoken of belong to the church addressed, that the reference is to such rulers as are elsewhere called bishops.

[4] Cf., for instance, Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians, where instruction is given for the ordering not simply of the life of the individual, but also of the services of the church. See also Clement's Epistle to the Corinthians with its directions concerning the government of the church, and the *Shepherd* of Hermas with its directions concerning penance.

the brethren that were in need. Such gifts were thought of from the very beginning as offerings to God, and not merely to men; the act of charity was a religious, not simply a humane act.[1] The brethren were helped primarily, not because they were needy, but because they were brethren, — members of the one body of Christ, — and in serving them a Christian served his Lord and Master. The distribution of the offerings, therefore, would most naturally devolve upon the inspired persons in the church, — upon those who were God's representatives in an especial sense, and were acquainted with his will. And so, in the church of Jerusalem, the matter was originally in the hands of the apostles, and when they needed to be released, men "full of the Spirit and of wisdom," that is, other inspired men, were selected to take their place.[2]

So, also, in the matter of discipline, the apostles, prophets, and teachers naturally exercised a controlling influence. The word, which it was their function to proclaim, concerned not simply belief, but conduct as well, and it was to them, consequently, that Christians looked for a knowledge of the will of God which they were to observe, and it was upon them, for the same reason, that the duty devolved of warning and reproving those who did not live aright, and in extreme cases, of taking steps to have them excluded from Christian fellowship.[3] They knew better than others the will of God for any particular offender; they knew better than others whether admonition, or rebuke, or some severer punishment should be administered.

Thus inspiration to declare the word of God meant inspiration to lead the church in many lines; in fact, in all its varied activities. So far therefore as the church in its earliest days had any rulers except Christ, it had them in the apostles, prophets, and teachers who have been de-

[1] Cf. Acts v. 3, where Peter tells Ananias that he has sinned not against man, but against God. Cf. also Phil. iv. 18, where the Philippians' gifts to Paul are spoken of as a sacrifice to God.

[2] Acts vi. 1 sq. Cf. also *Didache*, XIV., where the firstfruits are given to the prophets, certainly not solely for their own use, but also for distribution to the needy.

[3] Cf. 1 Cor. iv. 21, v. 3 sq.; 2 Cor. xiii. 2; Gal. vi. 1; 1 Thess. ii. 11; 1 Tim. v. 1, 20; 2 Tim. iv. 2; Tit. iii. 10, etc.

scribed.[1] But their rule was purely spiritual, as has been seen, and depended not on human appointment or election, nor upon the existence of any official or legal relation between them and other Christians, but simply upon their own belief and the belief of their brethren that they were commissioned by God to speak for him.[2]

But what if there were no apostles, prophets, and teachers? What if at any time the Christians of a particular city should have in their midst no one especially endowed with the teaching charisma; no one immediately called of God to do the work of an apostle, prophet, or teacher? That such a contingency might arise occasionally, and with increasing frequency as time passed and the number of churches multiplied, goes, of course, without saying. There could not be apostles everywhere and all the time, even though their number was great; and although in Corinth there might be a large number of prophets, as there were when Paul wrote, there may well have been many churches, especially after the original enthusiasm had somewhat cooled, in which they were not always present. The *Didache*, indeed, in the early part of the second century distinctly contemplates such a condition of affairs.[3] And, of course, what was true of prophets might also be true of teachers; and what was true in the churches addressed by the author of the *Didache* might be true in other churches, and at an earlier time as well. But as soon as such a contingency arose anywhere, the need

[1] The common distinction between the functions of teaching and ruling will not hold for these earliest days. The teachers ruled just because they were teachers, and they ruled by teaching; that is, by declaring the will of God.

[2] Rebuke and denunciation could have no effect, unless it was recognized as uttered in accordance with the divine will. And so the power to exclude from Christian fellowship lay not with the apostles, or the prophets, or the teachers, but with the church. (Compare, for instance, 1 Cor. v. 5 sq., 13; 2 Cor. ii. 6.) Not that the church ruled itself, but that Christ alone was sovereign, and that his disciples, so far as they were true to him, would act only under his direction and would withdraw their fellowship from any one only when they believed that Christ wished them to do so. The church in these days was not a democracy, it was an absolute monarchy, but Christ, and Christ alone, was King.

[3] *Didache*, XIII.: "The firstfruits ye shall give to the prophets. . . . But if ye have no prophets, give to the poor."

must be felt of providing in some other way for the performance of those duties which ordinarily devolved upon the apostles, prophets, and teachers.

Those duties were manifold, but among them none demanded more regular attention than the collection and distribution of the alms, which constituted an essential part of Christian worship. Only as the varying wants of all the needy brethren were known could the charity of the church be wisely and helpfully dispensed. Even where apostles, prophets, or teachers were on the ground, it might be difficult for them always to give to the matter the attention which it required; and so we find the apostles in Jerusalem recommending, at an early day, the selection of seven men to whom the matter might be entrusted, and they thus be left free to devote themselves more exclusively to the preaching of the word.[1] What happened in Jerusalem may well have happened in other places also, and especially where the apostles, prophets, and teachers were coming and going, and there was no certainty that the permanent presence of any of them could be counted upon. The need, in fact, must have been very widely felt at an early day of making some provision for the regular and official discharge of at least this important function of the church's life.

It was very likely this need more than any other which gave rise to the earliest bishops. They are mentioned for the first time in the salutation of Paul's Epistle to the Philippians, and it is a significant fact that that letter was primarily a note of thanks for gifts sent to Paul by the Philippian church. So Clement in his Epistle to the Corinthians says, "It will be no light sin for us if we thrust out those *who have offered the gifts of the bishop's office* unblamably and holily";[2] and Justin Martyr, a generation later, expressly declares that the president (by whom he evidently means the bishop) receives and dispenses the alms offered at the Eucharistic service.[3] But it was not this need alone that gave rise to bishops, and

[1] Acts vi. 1 sq. See above, p. 77 sq. [2] Clement: *Ad Cor.* 44.
[3] Justin: *Apol.* I. 67.

it is a mistake to confine the attention too exclusively to this point, as has frequently been done. The need must also have been widely felt at an early day of putting into the hands of competent men the responsibility for the proper conduct of the religious services of the church, and especially of the Eucharistic service, which was most important of all. When the services began to take on a formal character, we do not know; but the influences which must ultimately lead to the repression of the original freedom were at work at an early day, and already before the end of the first century the stereotyping process was well under way.[1] But, of course, where order and form were emphasized, the need of leaders to conduct the services, and to see that such form and order were properly observed, would naturally be felt. So long as apostles, prophets, and teachers were on the ground, all was well; but in their absence there must be others found to take their place. And so bishops arose to meet this need also, and it fell to their lot not simply to receive and dispense alms, but to preside at the religious services as well.[2]

But the requirements of ecclesiastical discipline also contributed to the rise of bishops, making necessary the appointment of men charged with a special responsibility, which had originally devolved chiefly upon the apostles, prophets, and teachers. The inspiration of the latter, as has been already seen, fitted them above all others to exercise control in the matter of discipline. But as time passed, and such inspired men grew relatively fewer, the need of the careful and faithful administration of discipline only increased, and with it the need of men especially charged with its oversight. It is an interesting fact that in the *Didache*, where the churches addressed are especially directed to appoint bishops and deacons, the reason given for such appointment is that the Eucharist may be kept pure, or, in other words, that unworthy men may be excluded from participation in the sacred

[1] Cf. *Didache*, VII., IX. sq.; and see above, p. 525.

[2] Compare *Didache*, XV. 1, where the needs of the Eucharistic service lead to the appointment of the bishops and deacons. Compare also Justin: *Apol.* I. 67.

service.[1] And so in 1 Tim. iii. 4 sq., the fact is emphasized that it is a bishop's duty to rule in the church and to exercise discipline when discipline is needed.[2]

The bishops thus constituted the successors, or, better, the substitutes of the apostles, prophets, and teachers in the performance of the varied and responsible functions which have been described. They owed their existence to the fact that men especially inspired to declare the will of God were not always on hand, and therefore could not always be depended upon by the Christians of any particular city for the needed direction and leadership. In the absence of such inspired men the church did the best thing it could. It looked to the most thoroughly tried and trusted disciples it had to take their place. But it goes without saying that such men were to be found commonly among the more mature and experienced brethren; among those who were oldest, not necessarily in years, but in length of Christian service. From the beginning, the disciples fell naturally into two classes, — the older and the younger, — and so far as the latter were not distinguished by special inspiration, which made them apostles, prophets, or teachers, they were inferior in dignity and influence to the former, and instinctively looked to them, in the absence of inspired men, as their guides and leaders. The Christian life itself was universally regarded as a gift of God, and the man who had proved himself a true disciple of Christ by a long life of faithful and devoted service must be in possession of a large measure of the Spirit, and must be especially qualified to instruct and lead the younger and less experienced believers, who had not yet been so long and so thoroughly tried as he.[3] And so, when the church needed leaders in place of the inspired apostles, prophets, and teachers, it found them naturally among the older and more mature disciples.

[1] Compare Chap. XIV. with XV. 1. The qualification of gentleness, or meekness which is mentioned first among those required of the bishops in XV. 1, doubtless has special significance in this connection.

[2] Compare also Titus i. 6, 7; Acts xx. 28, 31; Clement: *Ad Cor.* 42–44.

[3] An illustration of this belief is found in the large measure of control which the confessors, that is, those who had endured persecution for their Christian faith, exercised in the church of the second and third centuries.

But not all, even of the tried and experienced Christians, were equally fitted to perform all the functions that have been described, and it was inevitable, especially where there were many such Christians, that some of their number should seem to be more especially set apart by the Spirit for the work that needed to be done; and that the church should therefore ratify the divine will by appointing them to do a particular service, and by laying upon them the responsibility for its regular and efficient performance. Thus it came about that some of the elder brethren, whether more or fewer, were made bishops. As soon as that happened, a distinction existed between bishops and elders. But it is a mistake to suppose that the distinction was the same as that which existed in the second century, when bishops and presbyters were both ecclesiastical officers, charged each with their own separate functions; for the elders or presbyters, in the period with which we are dealing, were not officers in any sense. They were not men appointed for any service. They were simply the older and more mature disciples; naturally honored by their younger and less experienced brethren, but holding no official position of any kind. But that being the case, it is equally a mistake to deny all distinction between bishops and elders, and to regard them as identical in the primitive church. The truth is, that though all bishops were elders, because chosen from the more mature and experienced brethren, not all elders were bishops by any means.[1]

[1] The unofficial character of the elders, during the period with which we are dealing, appears from the contrast which is drawn between them and the younger brethren (the νεοί) in 1 Pet. v. 5; 1 Tim. v. 1; Titus ii. 2 sq.; Clement: *Ad Cor.* 1, 3, 21; and from the fact that where the several officers of the church are enumerated bishops and deacons are mentioned, but never presbyters (so in Phil. i. 1; 1 Tim. iii.; Clement: *Ad Cor.* 42, 44; *Didache*, XV.). On the other hand, Acts xiv. 23, Titus i. 5, and Clement: *Ad Cor.* 54 ("Only let the flock of Christ be at peace with its appointed elders"), seem to imply that the elders were regularly appointed officers of the church. But in the light of the passages in Clement's epistle, already referred to, it is evident that in chap. 54 the "appointed elders" must be the bishops whom the author speaks of elsewhere, and cannot be the same as the elders in general, of whom he also speaks frequently.

There were thus in Corinth, when Clement wrote, both elders and "appointed elders," the latter being the bishops, who were taken from among the

But the fact that the bishops were taken from the elder brethren explains, as it could not otherwise be explained, the historic relation which they sustained to teaching in the narrow and specific sense of that word. The chief function of the apostles, prophets, and teachers was to declare the will and truth of God for the instruction of their brethren. It was because they were endowed with the power to do it, that the leadership of the church, in all its varied functions, devolved upon them. But after them, the more mature and experienced disciples must be best fitted to impart the information as to God's will and truth which the church needed; for they had passed through a longer tutelage than their brethren; they had heard the word preached by inspired apostles, prophets, and teachers year after year, and their memory reached back to earlier days, and brought down into the present a knowledge of the utterances of messengers of God long since departed. In the absence, therefore, of special and immediate revelations or of any one commissioned to impart new truth, their wide and long familiarity with the truth of God revealed by inspired men of the past, as well as of the present, must lead their brethren to look to them for the instruction which was always needed. And so the teaching function,

elders, and might therefore be called simply "elders," or, to distinguish them from the others who had no official position, "appointed elders." In the light of Clement's use of the two words, there can be little doubt that the presbyters of Acts xiv. 23 and of Titus i. 5 are to be understood in the same way. Titus was not directed to appoint men to the office of elder, but to appoint elders to office, that is, as i. 7 indicates, to the office of bishop. And so the author of the Acts did not mean that Paul and Barnabas made men elders, — they were elders already, — but that they made officers out of elders, *i.e.* appointed certain of the elder brethren to official position in the churches which they planted. That the author did not give them the name "bishops" is of a piece with his course in connection with the Seven. He was careful not to give the latter any specific name, and he was equally careful to avoid a definite title in the present case. He assumed that rulers were appointed by Paul and Barnabas, but he did not venture to identify them with any particular ecclesiastical officers of his own day. The "elders that rule well" of 1 Tim. v. 17 are doubtless also to be regarded as "appointed elders," or bishops. The author, in speaking of the elder brethren in general, and of the treatment to be accorded them, directs that double honor be paid to such elders as rule well, *i.e.* to such as exercise faithfully the bishop's office, of which he had already spoken earlier in his epistle. On the unofficial character of the primitive elders, see especially Weizsäcker, *l.c.* S. 617 sq. (Eng. Trans., II. p. 330), and Sohm, *l.c.* S. 92 sq.

as well as the functions of dispensing the charity of the church, of leading the religious services, and of administering discipline, belonged to the bishops from the beginning. When the inspired apostles, prophets, and teachers were absent, they were their substitutes, so far as substitutes were needed, for the performance of all the duties which had commonly devolved upon the former. But the instruction which the bishops gave was distinguished by its traditional character. They could impart only what they had received from others, and the value of their instruction must depend wholly upon the faithfulness with which they reproduced what they had heard. Thus it came about that it was regarded as their function not to impart fresh truth, but to conserve the truth imparted by others, by inspired apostles, prophets, and teachers of their own and earlier days. And thus it came about that when the line was finally drawn, as it was before the end of the second century, between the apostolic and all subsequent ages, and the apostles, in the narrower sense, were regarded, along with the Old Testament prophets, as the sole recipients of God's revelations, the bishops could be thought of quite naturally, and without any apparent violation of historic fact, as the depositaries of the teaching of the apostles, and the authoritative exponents and expounders of apostolic truth.[1]

The date of the appointment of the earliest bishops we do not know. There is no reference to them in the epistles to the Galatians and Romans; and what is still more significant there is none in the epistles to the Corinthians. Had there been any in the church of Corinth, Paul would certainly have referred to them in emphasizing the need of conducting the religious services in a decent and orderly manner. The Corinthians, to be sure, are directed to be in subjection to all those who, like the household of

[1] It is interesting to notice that according to the *Didache*, X. 7, only the prophets are to be allowed to indulge in free prayer, — a spiritual exercise in an eminent sense, — while others, including in this case the bishops also, are to use certain prescribed forms. This is simply an indication of the common belief that a man not endowed with special inspiration must confine himself in the services of the church to the utterances of others who are thus endowed.

Stephanas, serve and labor for the good of the saints;[1] but there is no hint that such persons had been appointed to any office, or been entrusted with any special work. The passage, however, is significant, because it shows that before the churches began to appoint officers there were those who took it upon themselves to serve in various capacities, and whose services were such as to entitle them to peculiar deference and to a large measure of control in the affairs of the congregation.[2] The same conditions existed apparently in Thessalonica, when Paul wrote his first epistle to that church. It is possible that the προιστάμενοι, to whom he refers in v. 12, had been regularly appointed by the congregation; but his exhortation implies rather that their service was purely voluntary, and that it was on that very account that they were not receiving the honor which was their due.[3] Light is thus thrown upon the way in which the earliest bishops were selected. There can be little doubt that when the need of regularly appointed officers was felt, the church instinctively chose those who had proved themselves, by their long and faithful services, best fitted to discharge the required functions. Their appointment, in fact, was very likely nothing more in the beginning than a tacit recognition by the brethren of their call to serve the church as they were already doing, and only gradually did such recognition develop into regular choice and induction into an office. The reference in Phil. i. 1 to the two classes, bishops and deacons, seems to imply that there were already ecclesiastical officials in Philippi; and Clement's Epistle to the Corinthians shows that there had long been regularly appointed bishops and deacons both in Rome

[1] 1 Cor. xvi. 15.

[2] It is significant also that Stephanas and his household were the first converts of Achaia, and thus enjoyed a natural pre-eminence in virtue of their Christian maturity and experience.

[3] Rom. xii. 8, where the same word (προιστάμενος) is used, and 1 Cor. xii. 28 imply that the function of ruling or governing was a common one in the church; but in Corinth certainly, and in Rome probably, there were no regularly appointed officers at that time. Such officers, however, are very likely to be found in the ἡγούμενοι of Heb. xiii. 17 and 24. See above, p. 657.

and in Corinth.[1] It would seem from the *Didache*, on the other hand, that the custom of appointing such officers, though common, was not universal even at the beginning of the second century.[2] Where apostles and prophets were as numerous as they were in the churches with which the author of the *Didache* was acquainted, it was, of course, natural that the official development should be slower than in some other parts of Christendom. But even in places where the need of officers was later in making itself felt, the influence of other parts of the one church of Christ, whose unity was so strongly emphasized, soon led to their appointment, and before the middle of the second century there were bishops (and deacons) almost everywhere.[3]

But it would be a mistake to think of these bishops as possessing in the beginning an official status in the church, in such a sense that they had an absolute right to bear rule, and could insist upon the obedience and submission of their brethren. The ability to rule in the church was as much a charisma or divine gift as the ability to teach or prophesy,[4] and if any one was appointed to the

[1] Cf. Clement: *Ad Cor.* 42, 44. [2] *Didache*, XV. 1.

[3] The deacons, who are commonly mentioned with the bishops in our sources (Phil. i. 1; 1 Tim. iii. 8 sq.; *Didache*, XV.; Clement: *Ad Cor.* 42), were evidently nothing more than the assistants of the latter. That is what the literature of the second and following centuries, in which their relation to the bishops is explicitly stated, shows them to have been then, and the meaning of the title itself, and the fact that they are always mentioned after bishops, and that no additional qualifications are demanded of them, confirms the assumption that they were the same from the beginning. Our second-century sources show that they assisted the bishop in the conduct of the Eucharist, in the dispensing of alms by informing him of the needs of the brethren and ministering to them in accordance with his directions, and in the administration of discipline, by bringing to his knowledge such offences as needed attention. As they were servants, or assistants simply, not rulers, they might be taken from the younger brethren, and very likely commonly were; but they must be men of thoroughly approved character (compare, for instance, 1 Tim. iii. 8 sq. and *Didache*, XV.). In the *Didache* the qualifications demanded are the same for both bishops and deacons: they must be worthy of the Lord, meek, free from avarice, true, and approved. In First Timothy, where the qualifications are given with greater fulness, it is required of the bishop, but not of the deacon, that he shall be no novice or neophyte (*νεόφυτος*).

The word *διάκονος* is used some thirty times in the New Testament, but in an official sense apparently only in the passages already referred to (Phil. i. 1; 1 Tim. iii. 8 and 12).

[4] Compare 1 Cor. xii. 28 and Rom. xii. 8.

office of bishop, it was simply because it was believed that he had been called by God to such office.[1] The appointment was originally only the recognition by the church of his possession of a charisma fitting him for special service. And so his right to hold office and to discharge its duties was dependent upon his brethren's recognition of his divine call. If at any time they doubted his possession of the requisite gifts; if at any time they doubted whether the Holy Spirit was with him authorizing him to lead the services, to dispense alms, to administer discipline, to proclaim the divine truths learned from God's inspired witnesses, — they could refuse to permit him to exercise his functions, and could refuse to follow him and to listen to his words. His right was thus no more a legal right than that of the apostles, prophets, and teachers. He was simply a substitute for the latter, and his privileges and prerogatives were no greater than theirs had been. Indeed, the presence of an apostle, prophet, or teacher might at any time make his offices entirely unnecessary. But as time passed, and the duties devolving upon the bishops became more complicated and pressing, and the need of regularity and order more apparent, it was inevitable that a feeling should grow up that the control of the affairs of a particular church should remain permanently in the hands of its bishops, and should not be committed to such apostles, prophets, and teachers as might chance to appear, especially since they were growing fewer year by year. It was inevitable, as a result of this, that the bishops should increasingly regard themselves, and be regarded by their brethren, as possessed of certain exclusive rights of which they ought not to be deprived. This feeling we first find voiced in Clement's Epistle to the Corinthians, where he says, "Those [bishops], therefore, who were appointed by them [that is, by the apostles], or afterwards by other men

[1] Compare Acts xx. 28: "Take heed unto yourselves and to all the flock in the which *the Holy Ghost hath made you bishops*." It may be doubted, however, whether ἐπίσκοποι is to be taken in this passage in an official sense; whether it is not rather to be understood in the sense of natural overseers upon whom a special responsibility devolved because of their age and maturity. And the doubt is confirmed by the lack of a reference to bishops in Eph. iv. 11.

of repute with the consent of the whole church, and have ministered unblamably to the flock of Christ in lowliness of mind, peacefully and with all modesty, and for a long time have borne a good report with all, these men we consider to be unjustly thrust out from their ministration. For it will be no light sin to us if we thrust out those who have offered the gifts of the bishop's office unblamably and holily."[1] The epistle in which these words occur was called forth by the existence of trouble in the Corinthian church, apparently due to a conflict between those who believed that, when men possessed of special inspiration were on hand, they should take precedence even of the regular officers of the church, and should have the conduct of the religious services, together with the management of the charity of the church; and those, on the other hand, who maintained that the duly appointed officers should remain constantly in full control. The majority of the church evidently sympathized with the former, and the result was that some of the bishops, who made a stand against them, were deposed from office. It was under these circumstances that Clement's epistle was written in the name of the church of Rome. It is instructive to notice the way in which the trouble is dealt with. The author does not enter at all into the merits of the particular case in hand. He institutes no inquiry as to the character of the prophets and teachers who were the cause of the difficulty. Evidently, for aught he knew to the contrary, they were true prophets, and their teaching was entirely sound; but he insists that in any case the conduct of the services must be in the hands of the duly appointed officers, and no one has a right to take any part except under their direction or with their consent. He asserts distinctly that the church is subject to its officers in all respects, and that it has no right to disobey or to rebel against them, or to remove them from office so long as they do not disgrace their position by immorality and irreligion; and he bases his principle not upon custom or expediency, or anything of the kind, but upon the will

[1] Clement: *Ad Cor.* 44.

of God. God sent forth Christ, Christ sent forth the apostles, and they in turn appointed bishops and deacons, so that the bishops and deacons hold their office by divine right.[1] The significance of this principle for the subsequent history of the constitution and government of the church can hardly be overestimated.[2] But into that subsequent history we cannot enter here. It is enough to see the principle clearly and explicitly avowed in a letter sent by the church of Rome to the church of Corinth before the end of the first century. The future greatness of the church of Rome was already foreshadowed, not simply in the interest it felt in the fortunes of a sister church, and in the responsibility it assumed for the settlement of that church's difficulties, but also in the clearness of vision and in the resoluteness of purpose with which it entered upon that development in which it has always led the world.

The bishops and deacons, whom we have been considering, did not belong to the church at large in the sense in which the apostles, prophets, and teachers did. They served the local congregation primarily, not the universal church, and their official position gave them no rights in other congregations than their own. And yet the local congregation was not an independent and separate church;

[1] It was in accordance with this principle that the laying on of hands, or ordination, came finally to be regarded as the bestowal of special divine grace through which a man was made an officer by God, and had imparted to him an indelible character. In the beginning the laying on of hands signified nothing of the sort. In the apostolic age it was nothing more than the public recognition of a person's call to a particular service. The person was supposed to have the grace or charisma already. It was the possession of it which constituted his call, and therefore there could be no virtue or efficacy in the laying on of hands which followed (compare Acts vi. 3, 6, xiii. 1, 3, and 1 Tim. iv. 14).

The laying on of hands is mentioned also in 2 Tim. i. 6, where hands are laid upon Timothy by Paul; in Acts ix. 17, where hands are laid upon Paul immediately after his conversion by Ananias, an ordinary disciple; and in Acts viii. 17 and xix. 6, where hands are laid upon new converts by apostles in order that they may receive the Holy Spirit. In the last two passages the later conception of the act is foreshadowed, but as the rite of confirmation, not of ordination.

[2] Cf. Sohm, *l.c.* S. 157 sq. Sohm is certainly right in emphasizing the importance of the principle voiced in Clement's epistle, but he goes too far when he makes that epistle responsible for the principle itself and for the results to which it led. Clement doubtless simply gave utterance to a principle already recognized generally in Rome and by many even in Corinth.

it was only a manifestation of the one church of Christ, and, as such, constituted one body with all sister congregations everywhere. And hence the conception of a universal episcopate ruling the universal church was a natural outgrowth of the conception of a local episcopate ruling the local congregation. But the conception, though implicitly wrapped up in the original idea of the bishops as substitutes or successors of the apostles, prophets, and teachers, did not make its appearance until a later time.

During the period with which we are dealing the churches, so far as we are acquainted with them, were ruled each by a number of bishops. The substitution of a single bishop for the original plurality was the result of a process which followed inevitably upon the principle avowed in the epistle of the church of Rome to the church of Corinth; but that process lies beyond our horizon and cannot be discussed here. Nor can we enter here upon the steps by which the elder brethren of the apostolic age developed into the official presbyters of the second and following centuries.[1]

At the close of the apostolic age, — that is, at the close of the first century, — we find at least some churches in possession of regularly appointed bishops and deacons, and we find the principle already accepted in some quarters that they are officers in the strict sense, and as such have a right to exercise the functions attaching to their position, which no inspired man, nor even the church itself, can deny them, except on the ground of malfeasance of office. When this principle, so distinctly voiced by Clement of Rome, was adopted by the church at large, as it was during the second century, that church was organized in a true sense, and its institutional character was an established fact. The change from the original condition of things was stupendous, but the process by which the change was wrought was gradual and entirely natural, as has been seen. It did not mean the loss of the primitive belief in

[1] Upon the rise of monarchical episcopacy and upon the evolution of an official eldership out of the unofficial elder brethren of the earliest days, see especially Sohm, *l.c.* S. 145 sq.

the presence of the Spirit, and in the special inspiration of certain individuals and their enjoyment of immediate revelations from on high; but it did mean the subjection of spirit to law and of the individual to the institution, and thus foreshadowed the rise of Catholicism.

INDEX

CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE

	A.D.
Death of Jesus	*c.* 30.
Death of Stephen	31 or 32.
Conversion of Paul	31 or 32.
Paul's first visit to Jerusalem	34 or 35.
Paul in Syria and Cilicia	after 35.
Evangelization of Galatia (Paul's first missionary journey)	before 45.
Death of Herod Agrippa I.	44.
Death of James the son of Zebedee and imprisonment of Peter	44 (or earlier?)
Paul's second visit to Jerusalem (apostolic council)	45 or 46.
Paul's Epistle to the Galatians	*c.* 46.
Evangelization of Macedonia and Achaia (Paul's second missionary journey)	*c.* 46–49.
Paul's Epistles to the Thessalonians	*c.* 48.
Evangelization of Asia (Paul's third missionary journey)	*c.* 49–52.
Trouble in the church of Corinth, and Paul's Epistles to the Corinthians, and notes to Timothy and Titus	*c.* 51–52.
Paul's last visit in Corinth	52–53.
Paul's Epistle to the Romans, and note to the Ephesians	52–53.
Paul's last visit to Jerusalem and arrest there	53.
Paul's imprisonment in Cæsarea	53–55.
Paul's journey to Rome	55–56.
Paul's imprisonment in Rome	56–58.
Paul's Epistles to the Colossians, Philemon, Ephesians, and Philippians, and note to Timothy	56–58.
Paul's death	58.
Peter in Rome	after 58.
Death of James, the brother of the Lord	61 or 62.
Burning of Rome and persecution of Nero	summer of 64.
Death of Peter	summer of 64.
Jewish war	66–73.
Destruction of Jerusalem	September, 70.
Death of John	98 +.