

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_bib-sacra\\_01.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php)

## ARTICLE IV.

## STUDIES IN CHRISTOLOGY;

WITH CRITICISMS UPON THE THEORIES OF PROFESSOR  
ADOLF HARNACK.

BY FRANK HUGH FOSTER.

## I.

THE study of history in the Christian church, like every other study, has distinct practical aims. If to some the cultivation of historical science is the worship of a "himmlische Göttin," who is to be revered for her own sake, to those who are engaged, like the church, in the most momentous of practical problems, it is the pursuit of that instruction which "philosophy teaching by example" is pre-eminently able to give.

In beginning these "studies in christology," the writer does not hesitate to avow a distinct purpose. History is employed in our day, and by no one more vigorously and consciously than by the eminent Professor Harnack of Berlin, as a means of influencing the course of dogmatic thought. If such a use is legitimate for the critical and destructive schools of theology, it is legitimate for the conservative and constructive; and it is as necessary as it is absolutely legitimate. If Harnack's description of the historical development of Christian doctrine, drawn out in his *Dogmengeschichte*, by which it is viewed as the product of Greek thought, corrupting and overloading with a mass of foreign conceptions the simple ideas of primitive Christianity, be accepted as correct, the great Christian system, though the product of many former ages, will be

condemned and rejected by our own age. Whether the historical argument does, or does not, touch the vital, determinative, and positive arguments upon which the formulators and defenders of the dogmatic systems rightly depend for the proof of their propositions, an edifice which has arisen in such a way, will be believed unsound and will be forsaken. And to effect this result is Harnack's unconcealed purpose.

We believe, after many years of study of the theme, that Harnack's general result is unreliable, that his general thesis as just sketched is unsound, and that the irresistible conclusion to which he would bring us, not only is avoidable, but will be replaced, when a truly objective view of the history is obtained, by a conclusion equally impressive, but of exactly contrary character. To exhibit this objective view, in opposition to Harnack, and, in a sense, in reply to him, is the purpose of these studies. The writer will attempt to sketch as thoroughly as possible with the somewhat limited apparatus accessible to him, the history of one line of Christian thought—that pertaining to the nature of Christ—from the close of the first century to the Council of Chalcedon (451). If two things shall appear, if (1) the development shall be found to begin in ideas conformable to those of the New Testament as we have it, and existing substantially from the beginning of our study at about the year 100 A. D., and if (2) the motive forces which have produced the development, shall be found to have their origin and home within the circle of the church, on fire with great thoughts, and appropriating at every point all the intellectual products of the day to assist her in performing a task, which is still peculiarly her own, and wrought out with her own resources,—if these two things shall appear, we shall deem our reply successful. Not every intellectual phenomenon of the times is to be viewed as entering into the great, on-sweeping current of productive thought. Not every antagonistic tendency will

prove on examination to be significant. The main, churchly current is the object of our chief attention; and if that bears the marks of a truly normal historic development, then the system of Christian doctrine is sound, and gives evidence that it is the work of the Spirit of God. We believe that truly objective historical investigation abundantly establishes this result.

## II.

Before entering on the positive historical task we have set before us, it will be necessary to come to an understanding with our antagonists upon certain methods employed by Harnack which we cannot regard as legitimate, and upon certain positions which he takes, where we take their exact opposites. That he does not accept the dogmatic form which was given to the Christian system by the successive definitions of councils and doctors will, of course, be understood from the remarks already made. Neither, in all respects, does the present writer, or the communion to which he belongs. But Harnack's point of view is extreme. Not only objectionable theories of Christian doctrine, but also the great underlying doctrines of historical Christianity—the trinity, the deity of the Redeemer, etc.—he rejects, and often with an emphasis<sup>1</sup> which implies dogmatic prejudice rather than calm historical judgment. We do not deny the right of the historian to have an opinion upon the essential value of speculations or doctrines, and do not maintain that he commits himself to the acceptance of every persistent belief in the church. There may be persistent error as well as permanent truth. But we accept the great common doctrines

<sup>1</sup>For example, Vol. II., p. 213, after bringing out clearly that Athanasius taught the "numerical unity" of Father and Son, so that the distinction (*Zweiheit*) is only relative, Harnack parenthetically exclaims: "Wenn man den *Unsinn* schreiben darf"! And a few pages below (p. 222) after detailing the effort of Athanasius to explain the immanent relations of Father and Son,—certainly somewhat of a perverted and abortive effort,—he adds: "*Quot verba, tot scandala!*"

of Protestant Christianity, believing them reasonable and founded in sound exegesis of the Scriptures, as well as confirmed by the growing consent of the church.

This is our difference of dogmatic standpoint from Harnack. But we differ in method also. The comprehensive criticism upon his methods which we have to pass, is that they are not *objective*, and thus lack that prime characteristic to which historical science as developed in Germany owes not only its reputation but its real value to mankind. The objective historian comes to the study of a period in a teachable spirit. He examines the records of the period, without preconceptions as to what that history will reveal. He is critical, but not suspicious. When evidence arises of mutilated or corrupted text, of forgery, of suppression of the truth, and the like, he investigates and decides according to evidence. What appears insignificant he lets pass as such. But Harnack's attitude is different. He has formed such definite opinions about each given period apart from the documents before him, that he often judges them to be full of blunders, suppression of the truth, and misunderstanding. Whence does he derive these antecedent opinions? I would speak with all respect for his remarkable attainments, but I am constrained to say that I think they are often the product of his own imagination. There is no way of objectively knowing a period apart from its records; and the frame of mind which regards, as Harnack seems constantly to do, what is read between the lines, as infinitely more valuable than what the lines themselves convey, cannot be defended from the charge of unreliable subjectivity.

Many instances of specific error at this point will come up in the following studies. A few must be introduced here from the period antedating our present work. Harnack says:<sup>1</sup> "The origin of a series of the most important Christian ideas is obscure, and will probably never be cleared up, for no one

<sup>1</sup> *Dogmengeschichte* (edit. of 1886), I., p. 92.

ever listened<sup>1</sup> to their development in any of its phases. . . . When and where arose baptism into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost,<sup>2</sup> and how did it get control in the Christian system? . . . When and how did belief in the birth of Jesus from a virgin get currency?" Again:<sup>3</sup> "To the establishment . . . of the knowledge . . . that the Pauline theology is identical neither with the original Gospel nor with any later system of doctrine, there is required *so much historical judgment, and so much good will* [solid determination] *not to suffer one's self to be led astray by the N. T. canon in the investigation*, that we cannot hope, within a conceivable time, to witness a change in the current ideas." Of course, this is quite an embarrassing style of remark, and the objector hesitates. If the historian *has* "*historical judgment*," and can see the true course of things in spite of the records, any one who disputes him does it at the peril of being told that he himself lacks all these high qualifications. But, nevertheless, the writer will venture to say that this style of utterance seems to him historically unwarranted, and dangerously subjective.

An example of method and teaching related more closely to our theme is the following. After informing us that the Jewish apocalypics ascribed pre-existence to the Messiah<sup>4</sup> "according to a fixed method whereby one expressed the especial worth of an empirical object by distinguishing between the essence and the inadequate phenomenal form, by hypostatizing the essence, and exalting it to a position above space and time,"—"the ideal aim was placed before the means by which it was realized in a kind of real

<sup>1</sup> "Belauscht," implying a secret growth which one must observe somewhat by stealth.

<sup>2</sup> Matt. xxviii. 19 is "not an utterance of Jesus," *ibid.*, p. 56. Why? Only because *Harnack's idea* of Jesus is such as forbids such an utterance as incongruous.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 93.

<sup>4</sup> *Dgmgesch.*, p. 69.

existence, as the prototype"—Harnack says:<sup>1</sup> "*After the same method* some of the first confessors of the gospel (though not all of the N. T. writers) advanced beyond the expressions employed by Jesus himself and developed from his Messianic consciousness, and sought to conceive in systematic and speculative form, the worth and absolute significance of the same. The religious convictions that (1) the establishment of the kingdom of God upon earth and the sending of Jesus as the perfect mediator were founded from all eternity in the plan of God as its highest purpose;<sup>2</sup> that (2) the exalted Christ has been conveyed to the position of dominion like that of God, which is his due; that (3) in Jesus God has himself been revealed, and that he consequently surpasses all the prophets of the O. T., and all angelic powers,—these convictions were expressed by some in the form that Jesus pre-existed, that in him a heavenly being, formed like God,<sup>3</sup> who is older than the world, is, indeed, its creative principle, has appeared and assumed flesh."<sup>4</sup> Is it, now, a proof that Paul did not know that Christ was a pre-existent being, because the apocalyptics arrived at concep-

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 71.

<sup>2</sup> "*Zweckgedanke.*"

<sup>3</sup> "*Gott gleich gestaltetes Wesen.*"

<sup>4</sup> Harnack supports this "fixed method" by an example (*Dogmgesch.*, I., p. 70) from the Shepherd of Hermas. "Hermas declares expressly that the world was created for the sake of the church; consequently he affirms that the church is very old, and created before all things." Who would imagine from this, if he did not know, that the Shepherd is an allegory, and that an old lady appears to Hermas, and that she is explained by the interpreter (*Vis.* II, 4) as the church? "Why, then, is she an old woman?" asks Hermas. "Because she was created first of all. On this account is she old. And for her sake was the world made." Is this to be taken as a sober statement of philosophic fact, in the face of the well-known recent origin of the church? Such a pressure of an allegorical writing seems too great.—But, then, Harnack adds later, "The concept of 'existence' might run through all the degrees which lay, according to the then current Mythology and Metaphysics, between what we call to-day 'validity' and the most concrete being." We may accept the interpretation of "validity" as applying to the pre-existence of the church; but this does not help prove Harnack's main point.

tions of pre-existent beings in invalid ways? What reason has Harnack for this statement, but a conception of revelation, derived from Ritschl and shared with Schultz, which renders such an objective truth as the pre-existence of Christ foreign to its nature? We may even recognize a human element in the reasoning of the biblical writers,<sup>1</sup> and yet if we retain the idea of revelation at all, as anything more than the quickening of natural powers, we must accept the apostolic beliefs as the reflections of the absolute truth. The completion of this line of reply, as lying outside of the limits of the inquiry proposed in these "studies," we may leave to special students of the N. T. and its times. Enough to say now that these studies will proceed upon the basis of the fact, recognized by Harnack, that the biblical writers maintain the pre-existence of Christ, and of the understanding, denied by him, that this idea thus gains a place in the number of the legitimate, original ideas of Christianity.

In a word, then, we shall, in distinction from Harnack, accept the N. T. books as the productions of the first century, and shall regard their ideas as the sum and substance of the original teaching of Christ himself. So far as Harnack disputes these positions, we must refer to the conservative N. T. scholars, and particularly to Prof. Bernhard Weiss, also of Berlin, for our justification. The history of our doctrine in the post-New Testament writers we shall endeavor to discuss with complete independence; but the result, we believe, will confirm the results of the conservative critics of the N. T.

### III.

Among the apostolic fathers we select as the first subject of discussion

1. The "Teaching" (*Διδαχὴ*).<sup>2</sup> In the second form

<sup>1</sup>For example in the following passages: Acts ii. 25-31; Gal. iii. 16; Heb. i. 10-12.

<sup>2</sup>We place this here because we regard it as prior to the Epistle of Barnabas.



of the title of this tract we meet at once the term *κύριος* applied to Jesus. The purpose of the work is to hand down, in faithful reproduction, the vital elements of his teach-

Harnack makes it subsequent to Barnabas on the following grounds. The Teaching XVI, 2 quotes from Barnabas 4, 10; X, 6 follows the express directions of Barn. 12, 10. 11; II, 7 is weakened from Barn. 19, 5, and so presupposes it; II, 7 corrects Barn. 19, 11; IV, 1 is a "thorough revision" of Barn. 19, 9. 10, securing "a considerable step (gewaltiger Fortschritt) in the development of church organization;" IV, 14 makes a like considerable addition to Barn. 19, 12; IV, 10 modifies Barn. 19, 7; Barn. 19, 8 is omitted; and, in general, the whole passage as to the two ways was derived from Barnabas. But the difficulties of supposing the logical and connected discourse of the Teaching to have been culled from the confused and diffuse Barnabas are very great. Even Harnack says: "Es ist bewunderungswürdig was der Verfasser der *Διδαχή* aus diesem wilsten Haufen von moralischen Sätzen gemacht hat! . . . Man wird es nach genauem Studium der Composition der *Διδαχή* kaum für glaublich halten, dass diese ausgezeichnet disponirten Abschnitte nicht frei vom Verfasser componirt worden sind, sondern dass er sich hier treu an eine ihm den Stoff darbietende Vorlage gebunden hat" (*D. L. d. Z. Ap.* p. 83). These considerations have still greater force when we consider the style of Barnabas' additions, which are decidedly of the type of expatiating moralizing. E. g., he says: "Thou shalt love him who made thee [from the Teaching, adding then the next himself] thou shalt fear him who fashioned thee, thou shalt glorify him who ransomed thee from death" (19, 2). This is of the very style of the interpolations of the longer recension of Ignatius. Accordingly with Schaff ("Oldest Church Manual," 1885, p. 121) Zahn, Funk, Langen, Farrar, Hitchcock and Brown, J. R. Harris, and many others, we prefer to place the Teaching before Barnabas. As for Harnack's distinct points,—the first and the last two may be reversed without question; the second shows the same idea in both documents, more expanded in Barn., and amplified, which is rather in favor of the priority of the Teaching; the third is another illustration of our whole position as to Barn.; the fourth may read either way; the argument from the fifth and sixth rests upon a too narrow view of the development of organization, for this went forward freely, and two contemporary writers may have held different positions, or an earlier in time held a later position in logical order. Harnack's view is too mechanical in supposing chronological and logical development to go uniformly hand in hand. This is true only under many modifications. What Harnack adds in Herzog (Vol. XVII., p. 661 f.) in support of his position contains nothing essential to the argument. Our view then is that the Teaching is prior to Barnabas, and we explain the dependence from the character of the Teaching. It is a catechism, of Egyptian origin, as was also Barnabas (Harnack in Herzog), and may easily be conceived to have been used by the writer of Barnabas, till it was known very intimately. He may himself have learned it before baptism. He quotes it in

ing.<sup>1</sup> This term, *κύριος*, is repeated frequently<sup>2</sup> throughout the tract, sometimes with no especial force beyond that of mere designation. But generally there is some implication of an instructive nature. In IV, 12 and 13, and in VI, 2 (*ζυγὸν τ. Κυρίου*), the authority of Jesus, recognized in the title, is recognized again; in VIII, 2 (*ὡς ἐκέλευσεν ὁ Κύριος ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ αὐτοῦ*) not only this, but also some accepted embodiment of his authority, probably a definite written Gospel.<sup>3</sup> The frequency with which Matthew is quoted renders it probable that this was the "Gospel" the writer had in mind. Thus the Christian terminology is taken up just where the N. T. drops it. There is also a trace or two of the same tendency which is found in the N. T. (Rom. xiv. 9; 1 Cor. ii. 16; x. 22; Heb. i. 10) to apply to Christ directly the attributes of Jehovah, when once the name of Jehovah (*κύριος*) has been assigned to him. Thus not only is one of the eucharistic prayers (IX, 4) closed with a doxology "through Jesus Christ," being thus virtually a prayer in his name (Jn. xvi. 23), but prayer is offered to him (X, 5);<sup>4</sup> and the familiar and irregular way of one quoting from memory (J. R. Harris' "Teaching," p. 20, makes the same supposition). If this view be correct it must considerably antedate Barnabas (at the latest c. 120) and hence may be put c. 100 A. D. With this date agrees remarkably its relation to the Gospel of John as detailed by Harnack, *D. L. d. Z. Ap.*, p. 79 ff. I cannot see how the Teaching can be said to have known John; but it originated in circles where the Johannean ideas and forms of expression were known (so Harnack, *l. c.*, p. 81). It cannot have originated long after that Gospel, else it would have known it. Hence if John antedates the year 100, as I believe, the Teaching cannot be later than the same year. Harnack finally says (Herzog, p. 668) only that the date between 100 and 120 is "unsicher."

<sup>1</sup> So also Harnack, *Die Lehre der Zwölf Apostel* (1884), p. 32. "Der Verfasser hat alles darauf angelegt, in *übersichtlicher, leicht fasslicher, und leicht behaltlicher* Form die wichtigsten Regeln für das christliche Leben, die *διδάγματα τοῦ κυρίου*, zusammenzustellen."

<sup>2</sup> Besides the passages cited, at IX, 5. XIV, 1. XV, 1. 4. XVI, 1. 7. 8.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. also XV, 4.

<sup>4</sup> Harnack, *D. L. d. Z. Ap.*, p. 33, understands *κύριος* here of God "denn κύριος ist Gott in Bezug auf die Kirche." The passage runs: *Μνησθητι, Κύριε, τῆς ἐκκλησίας σου τοῦ βύσασθαι αὐτὴν ἀπο παντὸς πονηροῦ καὶ τελειῶσαι αὐτὴν ἐν*

it would seem that the giving of the O. T. is also ascribed to him (XIV, 3), or if not, this is the only passage in the tract where *κύριος* is applied to God rather than to Christ. The person of Christ as related to the Christian personally (IV, 12), his life as an example and criterion of conduct (XI, 8),<sup>1</sup> his doctrine as an object of constant study (XI, 2), for the attainment of a knowledge of himself (*γνώσιν κυρίου*), his work as now ruling in his church by sending forth his messengers (XII, 1), misuse of sacred office for selfish purposes as an offence against him (XII, 5), are so common thoughts to this writer as to be let fall in the easiest and freest allusion or suggestion. And when he rises to what Harnack styles the *theologia Christi*<sup>2</sup> and names<sup>3</sup> Jesus *υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ* (XVI, 4)<sup>4</sup> and then *θεὸς Δαβὶδ* (X, 6),<sup>5</sup> it is still as free from all appearance of strained effort as it is in perfect conformity to the N. T. style of speech. The eucharistic prayers, which are derived from older sources,<sup>6</sup> employ the word *παῖς* of Jesus (IX, 2, 3., X, 2); but even thus they connect with the N. T., not only in quotations from the O. T. (Matt. xii. 18), but in original use (Acts. iii. 13, 26; iv. 27, 30). And in the

*τῆ ἀγάπῃ σου, καὶ σῶσον αὐτὴν ἀπὸ τῶν τεσσάρων ἀνέμων, τὴν ἀγιασθεῖσαν, εἰς τὴν σὴν βασιλείαν ἢν ἡτοίμασας αὐτῇ*, etc. Now we think that the references to the church (cf. Acts xx. 28, "τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ κυρίου," Tdf. VIII, American Revisers; Rev. xxi. 2, 9; xxii. 17), to the work of perfection, which in Jn. xvii. 22, 23, is performed by Christ, to the gathering, which in Matt. xxiv. 31, Christ performs by means of his angels, to the sanctification which according to Eph. v. 25 Christ performs, and to the kingdom which is Christ's (Matt. xvi. 28; cf. xxv. 31; also cf. Jn. xiv. 3 *ετοίμασαι τῶνον*), make the interpretation of *κύριος* which we have adopted *preferable*, if not necessary.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. also XV, 1.

<sup>2</sup> *D. L. d. Z. Ab.*, Proleg. p. 60. <sup>3</sup> By inference.

<sup>4</sup> Also the formula of baptism (VII, 1 and 3) gives a basis for the phrase *οὐ βαπτισθέντες εἰς ὄνομα Κυρίου* (IX, 5).

<sup>5</sup> For the emendation of this text *υἱὸς Δαβὶδ* made by Bryennios, there is no MS. authority whatever, as the facsimile text of Prof. J. R. Harris ("The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles," Baltimore, 1887) clearly shows, and Bryennios himself stated (*Διδαχὴ*, etc., Constantinople, 1883, p. 38).

<sup>6</sup> So Harnack, *D. L. d. Z. Ab.*, p. 59.

only passage referring especially to the redeeming work of Christ (XVI, 5), a bold phrase is employed which suggests the very centre of that work, the vicarious sacrifice,—*σωθήσονται ὑπ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ καταθέματος*,—and bears a Pauline thought (Gal. iii. 13, *γενόμενος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν κατάρα*) though not employing the exact Pauline term.<sup>1</sup> The summit of all this style of expression is reached in IV, 1, where in enforcing the honor of the preachers of the word of God, it is incidentally suggested, that the main topic of that preaching was the dominion (*κυριότης*) to which Jesus had been exalted: “For where the dominion is proclaimed [Harnack: *die Herrschaft verkündet wird*], there is the Lord.” Thus, in perfect accord with Phil. ii. 11,—*πᾶσα γλῶσσα ἐξομολογήσεται ὅτι κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός*—, the *Διδαχή* views the exalted Christ not only as *θεός*, but as God upon the throne,<sup>2</sup> from which he shall come at the last day “upon the clouds of heaven” (XVI, 8).

Every doctrine has emerged in the Christian church only after long and tedious discussion, and exists in every instance at first only in the form of dim intimations and implications. Controversy has always elicited and defined truth. Hence at this early stage, upon this threshold of the post-apostolic history of the church, we cannot expect to find precise and complete doctrinal statements; and none will demand them less than the great scholar whose views we here oppose. But as we pass now from the sacred to the common writings of the church, how perfectly easy the transition, how imperceptible the line of demarcation, how

<sup>1</sup> I agree entirely with Prof. Harnack's translation of this verse, “werden gerettet werden von dem Verfluchten selbst,” so far as the construction is concerned. But it seems to me that his reference to the phrase “ἀνάθεμα Ἰησοῦς” of I Cor. xii. 3, and to the idea of Rev. i. 7, though supported by references to Barn. 7, 9; 11 Clem. 17, 5, gives a less natural and easy sense. See *D. L. d. Z. Ap.*, p. 62 f.

<sup>2</sup> So also Harnack, *D. L. d. Z. Ap.*, p. 14: “*κυριότης* ist die Gottheit. näher die Herrschergewalt, sei es Gottes sei es Christi (so an unsrer Stelle).”

entirely one the spirit, and even the form of doctrinal expressions, so far as the "Teaching" contains doctrinal elements at all! It is the N. T. which we see reflected here, and the intellectual forces we see here suggested, flow from N. T. generating centres. This we deem an indisputable result of the simple survey of the materials.

2. Upon the threshold of the Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians,<sup>1</sup> to which we now turn, we are met by a benediction quite in the style of Paul, and embracing God and Jesus Christ in one expression,—“Grace to you and peace from God almighty through Jesus Christ.” This utterance, possibly explainable as a merely traditional form, is rendered more significant by a fresh association of the same names with the addition of the Spirit,—“Have we not one God and one Christ, and one Spirit of grace that is poured out upon us?”<sup>2</sup> to which is added another expression, making it indisputable that Clement meant to ascribe deity to Christ, since absolute life is predicated of him as of God,—“For God lives, and the Lord Jesus Christ lives, and the Holy Spirit, the faith and the hope of the elect,” etc.<sup>3</sup>

These expressions constitute a distinct class. Another is formed of the single designations of Jesus, implying or expressing divinity. In chapter II we have *παθήματα αὐτοῦ* where the latter word represents *θεοῦ*.<sup>4</sup> Then the suffering Christ was God. Therefore the title “Son of God” is applied to him,<sup>5</sup> and also “child” in a passage reminding one

<sup>1</sup> Best edition that of Gebhardt and Harnack, *Patrum Apostolicorum Opera* (Leipzig, 1876), including the portions recovered by Bryennios (1875), from which the quotations of the apostolic fathers in this article are all made.

<sup>2</sup> XLVI, 6.

<sup>3</sup> LVIII, 2: *ζῆ γὰρ ὁ θεὸς καὶ ζῆ ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἡ τε πίστις καὶ ἡ ἐλπίς τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν.* Cf. Jn. v. 26: *ὡς περὶ γὰρ ὁ πατήρ ἔχει ζωὴν ἐν ἑαυτῷ οὕτως καὶ τῷ υἱῷ ἔδωκεν ζωὴν ἔχειν ἐν ἑαυτῷ.*

<sup>4</sup> I state this without qualification or defence because both the text and the explanation are Harnack's own, II, 1, note. So also Jacobson, *Pat. Ap.*, Oxford, 1847, Vol. I., p. 13.

<sup>5</sup> XXXVI, 4: *ἐπὶ δὲ τῷ υἱῷ αὐτοῦ οὕτως εἶπεν ὁ δεσπότης.* The whole passage is modeled after Hebrews, chap. i.

strongly of Col. i. 13, 15:—"In order that the maker of all things may preserve undiminished the number of his elect through his beloved child Jesus Christ, through whom he called us from darkness into light, from ignorance to the knowledge of the glory of his name."<sup>1</sup>

From this central point, Clement both looks back upon the pretemporal glory of Christ, and down upon his humiliation during his earthly career. Thus, following the line of thought pursued by Paul in Phil. ii. 6-11, he writes:<sup>2</sup> "The Lord Jesus Christ, the scepter of the majesty of God, did not come in the pomp of pride and arrogance, though he was able, but humbly, as the Holy Spirit spake concerning him." So we have: "Of whom [Jacob] is our Lord Jesus Christ, according to the flesh" (XXXII, 2), with close verbal likeness to Rom. ix. 5. Then, on the other hand, quite in the N. T. vein, we have the mission and work of Christ set forth. "The apostles preached the gospel to us from (ἀπὸ) the Lord Jesus Christ, Jesus the Christ was sent from (ἀπὸ) God."<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> LIX, 2: διὰ τοῦ ἡγαπημένου παιδὸς αὐτοῦ I. X. The passage in Colossians reads: μετέστησαν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ υἱοῦ τῆς ἀγάπης αὐτοῦ. I have not thought fit to add here references to the possible use of the word λόγος of Christ, as if the use were perfectly clear. They are: XIII, 3: φησὶν γὰρ ὁ ἅγιος λόγος; LVI, 3, substantially the same, and both referring probably to the scripture, thus not differing from γραφή, though possibly of the divine inspirer of the word (cf. XXII, 1); and finally XXVII, 4: ἐν λόγῳ τῆς μεγαλοσύνης αὐτοῦ συνεστήσατο τὰ πάντα, καὶ ἐν λόγῳ δύναται αὐτὰ καταστρέφαι. This I regard with Harnack (*op. cit.*, p. 47), *non satis certa*. Neither did Dorner speak as positively as Harnack implies. But the resemblance to the phrase σκῆπτρον τῆς μεγαλοσύνης τοῦ θεοῦ (XVI, 2), and the permeation of the "Teaching," a parallel work, with Johannean thought, make it more probable than it was when Harnack wrote (1876) that we have a designation of Christ in the last passage. But Harnack is wrong in thinking that pre-existence is implied in XVII, 1.

<sup>2</sup> XVI, 2: τὸ σκῆπτρον τῆς μεγαλοσύνης τοῦ θεοῦ, ὁ κίριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, οὐκ ἤλθεν ἐν κόμπῳ δλαζονείας οὐδὲ ὑπερηφανίας, καὶ περὶ δυνάμενος, ἀλλὰ ταπεινοφρονῶν, etc. The first phrase is a very loose quotation of Heb. ii. 3. In XXXVI, 2: there is a more nearly correct quotation: ἀπαύγασμα τῆς μεγαλ. The latter part of the verse, similar as it is in thought, has scarcely a word in common with Phil. ii. 6, and 7.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Jn. xvii. 18; xx. 21.

Christ therefore is from God, and the apostles from Christ" (XLII, 1. 2). This activity began even before the earthly life, for, says Clement, "he himself invokes us through the Holy Spirit" (XXII, 1); and then quotations from the O. T. follow. The office of the blood of Christ in our redemption is mentioned repeatedly,<sup>1</sup> and the uniqueness of his work in our salvation exhibited by calling him the gate (XLVIII) and the high priest (LXI). And his authoritative position in the church (II, XLIX), his resurrection (XXIV), his headship of the body, the church (XXXVIII), and his second coming (XXIII, XXXIV), add important particulars to the view given of him, as well as make more evident the perfect identity of thought with that of the N. T. writers.

Again we find in an apostolic father identity of thought with the N. T. as we touch at a point geographically different, but chronologically the same,<sup>2</sup> another line of demarcation, distinguishing, but not separating, the sacred and the common writers of the church.

3. As we pass to Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch, martyred at Rome about the year 110, we pause to notice that the attention of the two writers we have now reviewed has been directed to the divinity more than to the humanity of Christ, to his divine kingship over the church, more than to his historical career upon earth. Ignatius, now, takes up the expressions by which Christ's divinity has been set forth, and even intensifies them. In the salutation which opens the Ephesians we read of Jesus Christ "*τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν*" a phrase which is substantially repeated in many places.<sup>3</sup> Ignatius speaks of "the blood of God" (Eph. I, 1), of the "passion [*πάθος*] of my God" (Rom. VI., 3); suggests the trinity in a number of ways (Eph IX, 1. Mag. XIII, 1. *et. al.*); plainly declares the pre-existence of Christ (*ὅς πρὸ αἰώνων παρὰ*

<sup>1</sup> See chaps. VII, XII, XXI, XXXVI, XLIX.

<sup>2</sup> Harnack dates this epistle from 93 to 97 A. D. See *op. cit.*, p. lx.

<sup>3</sup> Eph. XVIII., Trall. VII., Rom. salutation, III., Smyr. I.

πατρὶ ἦν καὶ ἐν τέλει ἐφάνη, Mag. VI, 1, cf. Jn. i, 1, ἐν ἀρχῇ . . . ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεόν; also Mag. VII, 2, cf. Jn. xvi. 28 with the identical thought); and at least once he terms him λόγος (Mag. VIII, 2. θεός . . . ὁ φανερώσας ἑαυτὸν διὰ I. X. τ. υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ, ὃς ἐστὶν αὐτοῦ λόγος ἀπὸ σιγῆς προελθῶν) in probable reference to John.<sup>1</sup> Interwoven with these are other passages in which the subordination of Christ to the Father is expressed. "Be ye subject to the bishop and to one another," we read, "as Christ is to the Father according to the flesh" (Mag. XIII, 2. cf. Eph. V). The suffering of Christ is also variously emphasized.

Now, in all this there is nothing essentially new. These ideas were in the mind of the church in the N. T. period, and passed without jar or perceptible transition into the possession of the post-N. T. writers. Any intensification of expression we note is easily explicable by the intensity of loyal feeling in the breast of a man who was on his way to die in Christ's behalf.

But there is a new element in Ignatius, the emphasis laid upon the reality of the historical Jesus. He says that Christ was *truly* (ἀληθῶς) of the seed of David, *truly* born of a virgin, *truly* nailed to the cross (Smyr. I), *truly* suffered, *truly* raised up himself (*ibid.* II), etc., etc., and he directs his polemics against certain "unbelievers" who say "τὸ δοκεῖν αὐτὸν πέπονθαι" (Smyr. II).<sup>2</sup> We have thus the

<sup>1</sup> Another possible case is Smyr. salutation. It is the more probable that there are here coincidences with the gospel of John because there is one passage, Philad. VII, 1, which is beyond a reasonable doubt from Jn. iii. 8: τὸ πνεῦμα οὐ πλανᾶται, ἀπὸ Θεοῦ ἐν. οἶδεν γὰρ πῶθεν ἔρχεται καὶ ποῦ ὑπάγει καὶ τὰ κρυπτὰ ἐλέγχει. "The application in Ignatius is strained and secondary; nor is his language at all explicable except as an adaptation of a familiar passage." (Lightfoot, Ignatius, com. *in loco*).

<sup>2</sup> For details see Mag. VIII, IX; Trall IX; Philad. VIII, IX; Smyr. XII, and many other passages. Lightfoot, Ignatius, Vol. I., p. 359 ff. has an excellent treatment of this Gnosticism. Dorner, (Pers. Ch., Eng. Trans. I. 110) derives from Smyr. III, 1, the idea that Ignatius taught the present existence of the



reason of this new emphasis of the true humanity of Christ. Ignatius is contending against an incipient Gnosticism which has displayed itself chiefly in doceticism, and Jewish practices. That it had already begun to talk about Aeons, such as *Σιγή*, is evident from Mag. VIII, 2 quoted above, and from Smyr. VI.<sup>1</sup> Thus it is the shock of an actual contest that recalls the mind of the church to an element of christology that it was in danger of forgetting. Out of this new view of the humanity of Christ comes Ignatius' suggestion of real advance in the doctrine, the dim hint<sup>2</sup> of a doctrine of two natures in Christ. This is to be found in two passages of Ephesians; first in VII, 2: "There is one physician, having flesh and also spiritual, generate and ingenerate, God come in flesh, genuine life in death, both of Mary and of God, first passible and then impassible, Jesus Christ our Lord;"<sup>3</sup> second in XX, 2: "Jesus Christ, according to the

flesh in heaven. But the passage is directed to show the reality of the resurrection body, nothing more. It reads: *Ἐγὼ γὰρ καὶ μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν ἐν σαρκὶ αὐτὸν οἶδα καὶ πιστεῖω ὄντα*. The participle is *imperfect*, and the translation should be: "For I know and believe that even after the resurrection he *was* in flesh."

<sup>1</sup> A hint of an effort to evacuate the idea of emanations by referring the generation of the Son to the *will* of the Father (cf. Just. Martyr, Dial. 61 and 128) is given by Smyr. I, 1. if we follow Lightfoot's text: *ἀληθῶς ὄντα ἐκ γένους Δαυεὶδ κατὰ σάρκα, υἱὸν θεοῦ κατὰ θέλημα καὶ δυνάμιν, γεγεννημένον ἀληθῶς ἐκ παρθένου*. But Zahn's text (*Pat. Apost. Ignat.* p. 82) is better, and affords a better antithesis. It reads: *ἀληθῶς ὄντα ἐκ γένους Δαβὶδ κατὰ σάρκα, υἱὸν θεοῦ κατὰ θέλημα καὶ δυνάμιν θεοῦ γεγεννημένον ἀληθῶς ἐκ παρθένου*; and is to be translated: Being truly of the race of David according to the flesh, truly become Son of God [that is, the phenomenal Christ] according to the will and power of God of the Virgin, etc. This reading removes the supposed effort, too subtle for Ignatius in any case.

<sup>2</sup> It is true, as Harnack says (*Dogmengesch.*, I., p. 138, note 4), that we are not to ascribe to Ignatius a *doctrine* of two natures, since his view is far from developed. But we have here a "dim hint," the clear perception of the elements of *fact* which lie at the basis of the doctrine, and make the subsequent development a necessity, and hence legitimate.

<sup>3</sup> *Ἐὶς λατρός ἐστιν σαρκικός τε καὶ πνευματικός, γεννητός καὶ ἀγέννητος, ἐν σαρκὶ γενόμενος θεός* [Lightfoot *ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ θεός*], *ἐν θανάτῳ ζῶν ἀληθινή, καὶ ἐκ Μαρίας καὶ ἐκ θεοῦ, πρῶτον παθὴρ καὶ τότε ἀπαθής, Ἰησοῦς Χρ. ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν*. We

the flesh of the family of David, Son of man and Son of God." In close connection with these is to be read the passage in Poly. III, 2: "He who is above all time, eternal; invisible, become visible on our account; impalpable and impassible, become passible on our account; who in every way suffered for our sake."<sup>1</sup>

We begin here to see already, as I think, those motive forces at work in the church, which finally produced her christology. It is true that the course of thought in the apostolic circle was from the phenomenal Christ to the heavenly Christ, from what they saw to what was necessary to explain this. So far Harnack's idea is correct. The ascension of Christ cast great light upon his essential nature (Acts i. 11). Then the prophecy of the O. T. still more cleared their vision (Acts ii. 16, 25). His relation to creation, and that of his kingdom to the race of man and the world (Col. ii. 13; Phil. ii. 6; 1 Cor. xv. 24, and parallels) gave added help. But the N. T. idea was *pneumatic*, that Christ was infinite God come to earth for our salvation; and the great stress of the apostolic preaching was in the line that "though he was *rich*, yet for our sakes he became poor," that "he humbled himself," etc., etc. To the apostolic circle, and to the apostolic church when preaching Christ's redemptive work, the humanity of Christ was a prominent thought; but in the post-apostolic church, which received

should note here the anticipation of phrases which are subsequently to play a great part in christological discussions, *γεννητός, ἀγέννητος, ἐν σαρκὶ γενόμενος*, etc. Lest the reader should hastily draw an inference from the order of *παθής* and *ἀπαθής* favorable to Harnack's preference of the "adoptive christology," the parallel passage cited above should be compared, where the order is reversed: *τὸν ἀόρατον, τὸν δι' ἡμᾶς ὁρατόν· τὸν ἀψηλάφητον, τὸν ἀπαθῆν, τὸν δι' ἡμᾶς παθόν.* In the first case Ignatius affirms what the docetists denied, that Christ had a passible body, and then affirms the impassible nature of the glorified Christ; in the other he pursues the order from the pre-existent, impassible Christ, to the historical, passible.

<sup>1</sup>It is to be noted, in addition, that in Ignatius the second coming of Christ is put quite in the background.

the idea of his divinity from the apostles, the regnant king on the throne, the God whose almighty saving power was exerted on their behalf, would naturally be, and was, the central object of thought. This we find actually exemplified in all the writers hitherto studied. Yet the humanity was not denied, and when a practical exigency arose, when the old heresy (Col. ii. 8-23; 1 Tim. i. 6, *et al.*) was revived, when men came forward claiming to be brethren, and yet refusing to celebrate the Lord's Supper "because they confessed not the eucharist to be the flesh of our Saviour, Jesus Christ" (Smyr. VII, 1), refusing to engage in prayer, and neglecting the charitable work of the church (*ibid.*, VI, 2), that practical exigency called forth again, by the living reaction of a church engaged in a great work and filled with jealousy for the truth, the doctrine of the true humanity of Christ. Thus the phenomena we see in Ignatius are fully explained as resulting from the native and original forces of the church.

If now, the plain teaching of the original Christianity was that Christ was a mere man, how will Harnack explain this temporary forgetting of the humanity? If there is this repeated effort, under the influence of a "fixed method," derived from Alexandrian apocalypics, or even from the Platonic doctrine of "ideas," to ascend from the phenomenal to the explanatory "real," which in spite of the tendency of the church to reverse the logical order, is always displaying itself by the unwelcome persistence of an idea of the original, simple Christianity, even down to the time of Arius (325), how is it that in Ignatius the divine is first, and the human is called into prominence by a definite doctrinal issue? These questions we deem unanswerable, and they display the first element of the historical proof of the two positions which we think overturn Harnack's theory, (1) that the christology is dynamic, and (2) that the forces developing it are native to the church and to original Christianity.

We may add as an appendix to this treatment of Ignatius the following summary remarks about the Epistle of Polycarp, the Martyr, which is contemporaneous with Ignatius' epistles (XIII, 2). The type of doctrine represented is almost exactly the same. The term *κύριος* is common (prologue; I, 1; X, 1, etc), though generally having no special christological significance; the exaltation of Christ to the throne of glory is emphasized, and his coming to future judgment (II, 1); his coming in the flesh is maintained against the Docetists (VII, 1) in close similarity to 1 Jn. iv. 2, 3, and 2 Jn. 7; and in one passage, according to the preferred Greek<sup>1</sup> reading of both Zahn and Lightfoot, he is styled *θεός* (XII, 2, *αὐτὸς ὁ αἰώνιος ἀρχιερεύς, θεός Ἰησοῦς Χριστός*), to which we may add the expression in Polycarp's prayer in the Martyrdom (XIV, 3), *διὰ τοῦ αἰώνου καὶ ἐπουρανίου ἀρχιερέως, Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἀγαπητοῦ σου παιδός*. Thus Polycarp is a witness confirmatory of the conclusions we may draw from Ignatius, though contributing little that is important, for himself.

4. Upon the Epistle of Barnabas (*c.* 120) there is little occasion to dwell. Though coming subsequent to Ignatius, it occupies a less advanced position, according closely with the Teaching and with Clement. It teaches very clearly the pre-existence of Christ, his eternity, and his lordship over the world (*ὡν παντὸς τοῦ κόσμου κύριος φ' εἶπεν ὁ θεὸς ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου*, V, 5), since in him and unto him are all things (XII, 7), his unique position as "the beloved" [son] (III, 6. IV, 3. 8), the inspiration of the prophets by him (*ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ἔχοντες τὴν χάριν εἰς αὐτὸν ἐπροφήτευσαν*, V, 6), his appearance in the flesh in order that he might manifest himself (V, 6. 9. VI, 7., *et al.*), himself rise from the dead (V, 6. 7), enable men to behold him for their salvation (V, 10),

<sup>1</sup>The Latin text, the only continuous representative of the original we now have, reads *Dei filius*. The preferred Greek depends on the Syriac of Timotheus and Severus.

sum up their iniquities (V, 11), and suffer in their behalf (V, and VI). The flesh is thus the preparation, in Barnabas' mind, for the manifestation and the suffering more than for anything else. And though he does not, and cannot, deny the flesh of Christ, his chief emphasis is laid on the pre-existent divinity.<sup>1</sup> He also keeps the second coming of the Lord in mind (XV, 5). All this doctrine is derived from the O. T. according to the purpose of the Epistle, which is to lift Judaizing Christians, by means of their own accepted Scriptures, upon the higher plane of free Christianity.

5. In passing to the Shepherd of Hermas, we come into an entirely new atmosphere. The book before us is no longer a collection of hasty letters, or a labored and argumentative epistle, but an allegory, written for practical edification, by a man of the people,<sup>2</sup> who not only reflects their style of speech, but their popular, unsystematic style of thought. In time it falls also somewhat later, about 138 A. D.,<sup>3</sup> and the scene reverts again to Rome.<sup>4</sup>

Yet it is not without points of contact with the writers who have been already reviewed. With these, indeed, it will

<sup>1</sup> The passage XII, 9-11 correctly translated, does not give a "direction" which the Teaching follows, as Harnack, *D. L. d. Z. Ap.*, p. 87 suggests. Barnabas' point is that the O. T. is full of types teaching the divinity of the Son. He quotes a passage having some similarity to Ex. xvii. 14: "Take a book into thy hands and write what the Lord declares, that the Son of God will in the last days cut off from the roots, all the house of Amalek." He then comments: *Ἴδε πάλιν Ἰησοῦς, οὐχὶ υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἀλλὰ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, τίς ποτε δὲ ἐν σαρκὶ φανερωθεῖς*; that is, "Behold again Jesus, not [designated as] Son of man but Son of God, manifested moreover by a type in flesh." And he continues; "Since therefore they are going to say that Christ is the Son of David, David himself prophesies, fearing and understanding the deceit of the sinners, "The Lord said to my Lord, etc., . . . Behold how David calls him Lord, and does not say Son." Thus the designation Son of man is not declared *improper*, but its *substitution* for the other *as if Christ were not* Son of God, is the point opposed. The antithesis is against the Judaizing error which regarded Christ as a mere prophet.

<sup>2</sup> See Zahn quoted approvingly by Gebhardt and Harnack in their Hermas (*Patr. Apost. Fasciculus III.*, 1877), p. xi.

<sup>3</sup> Geb. and Harn. *ibid.*, p. xxxii.

<sup>4</sup> Vis. I., 1, 1.

be advisable that we begin our study, and since we are here to meet the first effort of Harnack to maintain the existence of the two distinct christologies which he ascribes to the ancient church, we shall need to establish each position with care, at the risk even of some tediousness.

The christology of Hermas is not made very prominent and occupies but little space. Similitudes V and IX contain most that is said upon the subject. We begin with the latter as affording the easier entrance to Hermas' thought. The most important passage (IX, 12, 1-3) runs as follows:<sup>1</sup>

"First of all, sir," I said, "explain this to me: What are the rock and the gate [of the tower, which forms the subject of the similitude and which represents, according to Zahn,<sup>2</sup> the empirical church]?" "This rock and the gate," he answered, "are the Son of God." "How, sir?" I said, "the rock is old but the gate new." "Listen," he said, "and understand, ignorant man. The Son of God is older than all his creation, so that he became counsellor with the Father of his creation: wherefore he is also old." "But why is the gate new, sir?" said I. "Because," he replied, "he became manifest in the last days of the consummation, therefore the gate was made new, in order that they who are to be saved might enter in through it into the kingdom of God."

We may remark, first, that the framework surrounding the christological idea in this passage, is in entire conformity to the gospels, and even to the fourth gospel. The "gate"

<sup>1</sup> In Greek: Πρῶτον, φημί, πάντων, κύριε, τοῦτό μοι δῆλωσον. ἡ πέτρα καὶ ἡ πύλη τίς ἐστιν; Ἡ πέτρα, φησὶν, αὕτη καὶ ἡ πύλη ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστὶ. Πῶς, φημί, κύριε, ἡ πέτρα παλαιὰ ἐστὶν, ἡ δὲ πύλη καινὴ; Ἄκουε, φησί, καὶ σὺνιε ἀσύνητε. ὁ μὲν υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ πάσης τῆς κτίσεως αὐτοῦ προγένεστερός ἐστιν, ὥστε σὺμβουλον αὐτὸν γενέσθαι τῷ πατρὶ τῆς κτίσεως αὐτοῦ. διὰ τοῦτο καὶ παλαιὸς ἐστὶν. Ἡ δὲ πύλη διὰ τὴν καινὴν, φημί, κύριε; ὅτι, φησὶν, ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν τῆς συντελείας φανερός ἐγένετο, διὰ τοῦτο καινὴ ἐγένετο ἡ πύλη, ἵνα οἱ μέλλοντες σώσασθαι δι' αὐτῆς εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν εἰσελθῶσι τοῦ θεοῦ.

<sup>2</sup> Quoted by Geb. and Harn., *op. cit.*, p. 220.

(*πύλη*, cf. Clement, XLVIII; cf. Ignat. Philad. IX, 1. *αὐτὸς ὡν θύρα τοῦ πατρὸς δι' ἧς εἰσέρχονται Ἀβραάμ*, etc.), not only from the very implication of the term (cf. Jn. x. 7, 9), but from the statement which Hermas makes that it is the entrance for those who are to be saved into the kingdom of God, must be the historical Jesus. Otherwise Hermas has lost all touch with any supposed section of the Christian church, for all who were Christians became such because, in some sense or other, they ascribed their salvation to the historical man, Jesus. The fact that they did thus ascribe it, as we understand him, Harnack maintains as cordially as any one. Now this gate and the rock are the same,—“Hermas scit petram et portam eundem significare,” comments Harnack,—and they are the Son of God, a term which therefore describes Jesus Christ. In this term we have another point of contact with the previous writers.<sup>1</sup> And now, in explaining the twofold form under which Jesus, the Son of God, is represented—ancient rock, and new gate,—the old christology appears, by which the Son of God is a pre-existent spirit, *πάσης τῆς κτίσεως αὐτοῦ προγενέστερος* (cf. Col. i. 15, *πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως*, and Jn. i. 1, *ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος*), counsellor with the Father in the creation (Heb. i. 3, *δι' οὗ καὶ ἐποίησεν τοὺς αἰῶνας*, Jn. i. 3, *πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο*) and *manifest* (*φανερὸς* cf. 1 Pet. i. 20 *φανερωθέντος δὲ ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν χρόνων δι' ὑμᾶς*; also 1 Tim. iii. 16 and Ignat. Mag. VI, 1, in full above) in the last days. If anything more were needed to make this christology evidently entirely harmonious with that of Hermas' predecessors and with that of the N. T., an allied passage, chapter XIV of the same Similitude, would seem to be enough. Here, again in close agreement of thought with Heb. i. 3, we read:

<sup>1</sup> The point here made needs the more carefully to be weighed because Harnack (Hermas, p. 221) interprets here the phrase *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ* of “*Spiritus Sanctus*,” and refers to Sim. IX, 1, 1., V, 5. 6. We shall return to this point later.

"The name of the Son of God is great, and cannot be contained (*ἀχώρητον*) and supports (*βαστάζει*, Hebrews *φέρων*) the whole world." A little below, he is styled a "foundation" (*θεμέλιον* cf. I Cor. iii. 11).

But Professor Harnack does not accede to this interpretation. There is, indeed, a close "approach" of the adoption christology, which he supposes Hermas to hold, to the pneumatic, for the Spirit of God, dwelling in the man Jesus, is conceived as the pre-existent Son of God.<sup>1</sup> "Son" in these passages means nothing else, says Harnack, than the Spirit of God; and this explanation is derived from the Fifth Similitude, which, therefore, next claims our consideration.

The Similitude is not in all respects a satisfactory one.<sup>2</sup> It is designed to justify an idea of works over and above the commands of God (2, 2. and 3, 3.) by referring to the voluntary labors of the Son of God (2, 4. and *ἀμαρτίας ἐκαθάρισε*, 6, 2) and their reward. That the doctrine here taught is the Roman doctrine of supererogatory works, we need not affirm;<sup>3</sup> but at least the seeds of that doctrine are here. The choice of the figure of the "master," God, "going into a far country," and of his "coming" (*παρουσία*, 5, 3.) is unfortunate in the general use of the same figure, in the gospels, of Christ (Matt. xxv. 14 ff., *et al.*) But these things aside, as not pertaining especially to our present purpose, the substance of the Similitude is as follows:

A Master, departing to a foreign country, calls to him a slave (*δοῦλόν τινα πιστόν καὶ εὐάρεστον*) and gives him a specified task in a vineyard of his—viz., staking the vines,—

<sup>1</sup> *Dogmengeschichte*, I., p. 137.

<sup>2</sup> We shall notice several points of confusion as we proceed. Even Harnack, who reproaches Zahn for thinking the Similitude unfortunate, says (Hermas, p. 151), "*scriptorem . . . parabolam turbasse*," and (p. 156) "*neglecta parabola*."

<sup>3</sup> Harnack says (Hermas, p. 147), "*Initia doctrinae de operibus supererogationis*."



and promises him his freedom, if he performs it. The slave not only performs the prescribed task, but much more. The master, returning and seeing what has been done, calls his "beloved son who was his heir" (*τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν ἀγαπητὸν ὃν εἶχε κληρονόμον, καὶ τοὺς φίλους οὓς εἶχε συμβούλους*) and with his consent and that of other counsellors, makes the slave not only free, but his heir, and co-heir with his son (*ταύτη τῇ γνώμῃ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ δεσπότου συνηυδόκησεν αὐτῷ ἵνα συγκληρονόμος γένηται ὁ δούλος τῷ υἱῷ*), "in return for the work which he has done."

The explanation of the Similitude runs as follows:—"The field is the world; and the Lord of the field is he who created all things and perfected them and clothed them with power (*ὁ κτίσας τὰ πάντα καὶ ἀπαρτίσας αὐτὰ καὶ ἐνδυναμώσας*); and the son is the holy spirit (*ὁ δὲ υἱὸς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιόν ἐστιν*); and the slave is the Son of God (*ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ*); and the vines are the people whom he planted. . . . Why, sir, I [Hermas] asked, is the Son of God in the parable in the form of a slave? Hear, he answered, the Son of God is not in the form of a slave, but in great power and might (*εἰς δούλου τρόπον οὐ κεῖται ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ἀλλ' εἰς ἐξουσίαν μεγάλην κεῖται καὶ κυριότητα*). . . . God planted the vineyard, that is to say, he created his people, and delivered them to his Son (*παρέδωκε τῷ υἱῷ αὐτοῦ*); and the Son appointed the angels over them to keep them, and himself purged away their sins. . . . You see, he said, that he is Lord of the people, having received all authority from his father (*ἐξουσίαν πᾶσαν λαβὼν παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ*.) And why the Lord took his Son and the glorious angels as counsellors, regarding the kingship of the slave, listen. The holy, pre-existent spirit that created every creature, God made to dwell in flesh, which he chose. This flesh, accordingly, in which the holy spirit dwelt, was nobly subject to that spirit, walking in gravity and holiness, in no respect defiling the spirit, and accordingly, after it had lived excel-

lently and purely, and labored and co-operated with the spirit in everything, and after it had acted vigorously and courageously, he assumed it as a partner with the holy spirit. For the conduct of this flesh pleased God, because it was not defiled on earth while it had the holy spirit. He took therefore as counsellors his son and the glorious angels, in order that this flesh, which had been subject to the spirit without a fault, might have some place of tabernacle, and that it might not appear to have lost the reward of its servitude; for all flesh which has been found without spot and defilement, in which the Holy Spirit has dwelt, shall receive a reward."<sup>1</sup>

If, now, one or two things be kept in mind, the explanation of this passage, in spite of its infelicities, will be perfectly clear, when it is viewed in the light of the former passage. The reader needs to be constantly on the guard against making Hermas speak the language of centuries long after his own period. Thus it is not necessary, as Zahn seems to have thought,<sup>2</sup> to maintain that he clearly distinguishes between the eternal Logos, or Son, as later writers generally designated the second person of the trinity, and the Holy Spirit, the third person. We are in the period of the undeveloped doctrines of theology and christology, and may expect to find even the correct ideas that are held,

<sup>1</sup> The Greek of the passage from "the holy, preexistent spirit" in full: "τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον τὸ πρῶτον, τὸ κτίσαν πᾶσαν τὴν κτίσιν, κατέκτισεν ὁ θεὸς εἰς σάρκα ἢ ἠβούλετο. αἶτη οὖν ἡ σὰρξ, ἐν ᾗ κατέκτισε τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, ἐδοίλευσε τῷ πνεύματι καλῶς ἐν σεμνότητι καὶ ἀγνείᾳ πορευθεῖσα, μηδὲν ὄλων μάνισα τὸ πνεῦμα. πολιτευσαμένην οὖν αὐτὴν καλῶς καὶ ἀγνῶς, καὶ συγκατοῖσασαν τῷ πνεύματι καὶ συνεργήσασαν ἐν παντὶ πράγματι, ἰσχυρῶς καὶ ἀνδρείως ἀναστραφεῖσα, μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἀγίου εἴλατο κοινωνῶν ἤρεσε γὰρ [τῷ θεῷ] ἡ πορεία τῆς σαρκὸς τα[ύτης]· ὅτι οὐκ ἐμάνθη ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἔχουσα τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον. σύμβουλον οὖν ἔλαβε τὸν υἱὸν καὶ τοὺς ἀγγέλους τοὺς ἐνδόξους, ἵνα ἡ σὰρξ αὐτῆ δουλεύσασα τῷ [πνεύματι] ἀμέμπτως, σχῆ τύπον τινα κατασκευώσεως, καὶ μὴ δόξη τὸν μισθὸν [τῆς δουλείας αὐτῆς ἀπολωλεκέσαι· πᾶσα γὰρ σὰρξ ἀπολήψεται μισθὸν] ἢ εὐρηθεῖσα ἀμάρτος καὶ ἁσπιλος, ἐν ᾗ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον κατέκτισεν.

<sup>2</sup> Gebhart and Harnack, Hermas, pp. 156, 157.

clothed in anomalous forms. But if in this we may agree with Harnack against Zahn, it seems equally plain that we must maintain, against Harnack, that the phrase "holy spirit" does not generally mean the Holy Spirit in the sense of "the Spirit of God" (Schultz) or the indwelling sanctifying influence of God, but is another phrase chosen for homiletical or rhetorical purposes, to express exactly the idea of the Johannean λόγος.<sup>1</sup> It is the "pre-existent spirit," a phrase that accords entirely with this identification; it "created every creature," a phrase never used of the Holy Spirit, but repeatedly of the λόγος; and is designated in the parable also "Son," which accords with its identification with the λόγος, and also with the style adopted in Similitude IX. It is the λόγος considered as a spirit, possessing the attribute of holiness.<sup>2</sup> As, then, the gate of Similitude IX is twofold, and is as a whole the "Son," who is both "old" and "new,"—pre-existent, and revealed,—so here the "Son of God," who keeps and purges the people of God, is twofold, being the creative, pre-existent, holy spirit whom God made to dwell in "flesh," or human nature. His work is an undivided, divine-human work, since it involves control over, and employment of "the angels," and is perfectly controlled by the indwelling holy spirit to which the humanity (σάρξ) "is wholly subject," and with which it "co-operates." Thus

<sup>1</sup> Note not only the points of contact with the fourth Gospel indicated above, but also the phrase (V, 6, 4) ἐξουσίαν πᾶσαν λαβὼν παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ, cf. Jn. x. 18; xvii. 2; v. 27; also cf. Matt. xxviii. 18.

<sup>2</sup> So the virgins of the Similitude are called (IX. 13, 2) ἅγια πνεύματα, and also δυνάμεις τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ, certainly not simply the powers of an inspired man. Cf. also IX. 1, 1. The use of πνεῦμα of the divine nature in Christ is by no means uncommon in the early writers. Dörner (Person of Christ, Eng. transl., I., 389 ff.) has exhibited this use in an elaborate note. He refers to Matt. i. 18; Luke i. 35; Rom. i. 3; ix. 5; 1 Peter iii. 18; Heb. ix. 14, as illustrations of the same use in the N. T., and to Ignatius, Mag. I, 2,—*ἐνωσις σαρκὸς καὶ πνεύματος*; Barnabas VII, *σκεῶς πνεύματος*; Tertullian, *adv. Marcion.* iii. 16, *Spiritus Creatoris qui est Christus, adv. Prax.* 26, *hic* [Lk. i. 35] *Spiritus Dei idem erit Sermo*; Theophilus; Athenagoras, etc. Cf. 1 Tim. iii. 16, *ἐδ κ-αὶ ἀθή ἐν πνεύματι.*

the historical Jesus is God *and* man, for there is a certain separation between the two, which reminds one of the later Antiochian christology. Hence it is that the human nature, for its obedience, is made "co-heir with the Son," that is, is taken up into heaven with the ascending Son, and made to share his glory. That this is the true interpretation of the "adoption," may be seen from the term *μισθόν* (6, 7) which for all other flesh, which is said to have its *μισθόν*, is pre-eminently heaven. And thus we have here a parallel to the "exaltation" of Phil. ii. 9, just as the labors of the slave (*πολλὰ κοπιάσας καὶ πολλοὺς κόπους ἠντληκώς*, 6, 2) corresponded to the "obedience unto death" which Jesus fulfilled (ii. 8).

That this interpretation is not without its difficulties must be granted; but in consequence of the defects of the parable itself, some difficulties attend every interpretation. The evident lapse into the common use of the term Holy Spirit at the end of the explanation ("all flesh in which the Holy Spirit has dwelt, etc., shall receive a reward") is easily explicable from the practical character of the whole book. The writer wishes to say that Jesus is an example and encouragement to the believer in respect to his reward, as well as in respect to every other thing. This is a universal method of thought both in biblical and post-biblical times. It remains, however, somewhat incongruous that the Son should himself be the counsellor as to the exaltation of his own human nature, but the thought is partially explained by the separation between divine and human which is maintained even in describing the work of the Son on earth, as remarked above.

Harnack, however, makes the "holy spirit" of Hermas the Spirit of God, considers the "Son of God" as simply a man in whom the Spirit dwelt, as in all Christians, and who, for his obedience, was viewed by Hermas as exalted to deity. But the following insuperable difficulties attend his explana-

tion, and, in our view, render it impossible, viz., (1) The Holy Spirit will then be styled (V, 6, 5) the creator, in itself improbable. (2) The "fellow-counsellor" in the creation, hence this Holy Spirit, is styled the "Son of God" in his pre-existent state (IX, 12, 2), and identified with Jesus, a view elsewhere unheard of. (3) There is no hint in Similitude IX, 12 connecting the Son and the Holy Spirit. (4) Harnack's view exactly reverses the natural interpretation of Similitude IX, 1, 1. "I wish to explain to you what the holy spirit that spake to you in the form of the Church (*τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον τὸ λαλήσαν μετὰ σοῦ ἐν μορφῇ τῆς Ἐκκλησίας*) showed you, for that spirit is the Son of God." Hermas doubtless thought the old woman, the church, was some spirit speaking to him, and is here informed that it was the Son of God. That is natural and accords perfectly with our view. But Harnack makes the passage an explanation of the "Holy Spirit," by the strange definition that it was the Son of God. Does that agree with the idea of the indwelling Holy Spirit at the close of Similitude V, 6, 7? (5) Harnack's view seems to require a misinterpretation of Similitude V, 6, 1, quoted above, "the Son of God is not in the form of a slave," etc. He interprets in *Dogmengeschichte*, I., 135: "Jesus was adopted as Son and exalted to *μεγάλη ἐξουσία καὶ κυριότης*." And in Hermas, p. 154, in commenting on the passage, he says, "*οὐ κείται, i. e., destinatus est ut magnam potestatem et regnum acquirat*." This is doubtless an interpretation, not a strict translation depending on the very peculiar Greek, *εἰς δούλου τρόπον οὐ κείται*, for such a translation would make no sense in the question asked just above, where the same construction occurs, *εἰς δούλου τρόπον κείται*. That question is: Why is the Son of God in the form of a servant? The answer is: He is not in the form of a servant! And when the astonished Hermas says: I don't understand; the discourse goes on to justify its paradoxical answer by mentioning things which the slave in the parable,

and the Son of God in the explanation, does *in the vineyard*, viz., setting angels over the people, purging their sins, giving them the law, etc., that is, does *before his "adoption."* Hence the *μεγάλη ἐξουσία καὶ κυριότης* is what he *truly possesses in the period of earthly sojourn and labor.* In fact, Hermas views it as *the qualification* for the work he does, for we read: "He is Lord of the people having received all authority (*ἐξουσίαν πᾶσαν*) from his father. But if he has the *κυριότης* (cf. "Teaching," IV, 1. Clement XVI, 2. "*σκηπτρον μεγαλοσύνης*"), what can this christology be but pneumatic? Harnack's interpretation has the further difficulty that the addition of the word *now*, or its equivalent, is required to make the sense; but an ellipsis of this word, just the pivotal word required, is improbable.

While, therefore, acknowledging the peculiarities of Hermas' christology, we must, nevertheless, give him his place with those who saw in Jesus Christ a heavenly, pre-existent spirit come to earth and incarnated for the purification of our sins, and for our salvation. The doctrinal motive which led to the emphasis which he placed upon the reward of Christ, was the likeness of the reward of the disciple to that of his master. Thus it was an entirely Christian and churchly motive (cf. Heb. xii. 1, 2); and thus for Hermas, again, the two points of our proof of the legitimacy of the great current of pneumatic christology, and of our refutation of Harnack are made, viz., (1) the ideas of Hermas as well as those of the early church writers conformed to the N. T., and (2) the explanation of the peculiar form adopted by him (for he can scarcely be said to constitute a step in the development), is a force from within, not from without.

6. The Homily, commonly designated as the Second Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians, is placed by Gebhart and Harnack somewhere in the interval between 130 and 160,<sup>1</sup> and is therefore contemporaneous, or nearly so, with

<sup>1</sup> *Pat. Apost. Opera*, Clementis Romani Epistulae, Leipzig, 1876, p. lxxiii.

the Shepherd; and there are, accordingly, some striking resemblances between the two writings. We shall be still on controverted ground, for at the very opening of the Homily a passage occurs upon which Harnack builds an argument for the existence and legitimacy of the adoption christology. The passage runs as follows: "Brethren, it is fitting that you should think of Jesus Christ as of God, as of the judge of the living and the dead. And it does not become us to think lightly of our salvation; for if we think little of him, we also hope to receive little. And we hearing as if of small things, sin, not knowing whence we were called, and by whom, and to what place, and how much Jesus Christ endured to suffer for our sakes."<sup>1</sup>

The argument of the passage is at once evident when the general scope of the Homily is understood. Its purpose is strictly practical. It addresses hearers who were likely to fall into gross sins, if not already guilty of them, into adultery (IV, 3. VI, 4), evil speaking, envy, avarice (IV, 3), corruption, and deceit (VI, 4), and its purpose is to lift them to a higher plane of Christian living. Hence it brings great motives to bear upon their minds. Men sin because they are not deeply moved by the greatness of the realities with which religion deals. If they were, they would be prompted by gratitude to make the only return they can,—good lives. Hence the "greatness of their salvation" is one from idolatry, blindness, darkness, and death (I, 6). It is emphasized because it is a fact, an acknowledged fact, and one which, when thought of, is calculated deeply to stir the heart. And for the same reason the divinity of the Saviour is emphasized, as a fact, an acknowledged fact, just like the fact that he is the Judge, and a fact fitted to move to serious thought and serious lives. It is the appeal of the

<sup>1</sup> The Greek runs: Ἀδελφοί, οὕτως δεῖ ἡμᾶς φρονεῖν περὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ὡς περὶ θεοῦ, ὡς περὶ κριτοῦ ζώντων καὶ νεκρῶν καὶ οὐ δεῖ ἡμᾶς μικρὰ φρονεῖν περὶ τῆς σωτηρίας ἡμῶν. ἐν τῷ γὰρ φρονεῖν ἡμᾶς μικρὰ περὶ αὐτοῦ, μικρὰ καὶ ἐλπίζομεν λαβεῖν καὶ οἱ ἀκούοντες ὡς περὶ μικρῶν ἀμαρτάνομεν, οὐκ εἰδότες πόθεν ἐκλήθημεν, etc.

preacher, an appeal often paralleled in the earnest preaching of our own day.

Harnack views the matter otherwise. He says:<sup>1</sup> "From the earliest tradition the name 'ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ,' as well as 'κύριος' and 'σωτήρ' clung to Jesus. . . . It was immediately inferred from these that Jesus belonged in the sphere of God, and that one must think of him, as it runs in the oldest homily known to us, 'ὡς περὶ θεοῦ.' In this formulation is classically expressed the indirect *theologia Christi* which we find expressed unanimously in all witnesses of the earliest epoch." The passage shows, he thinks, how the *φρονεῖν περὶ αὐτοῦ ὡς περὶ θεοῦ* was arrived at, and supported (*begründet*), viz., by the thought that such a salvation needed a great Saviour, one really a God, to effect it.

But this interpretation of Harnack's seems to us impossible for the following reasons:

(1) The purpose of the whole homily, as explained above, is against it.

(2) If we have here the justification of thinking of Jesus "as of God," then, since the words *ὡς περὶ κριτοῦ ζώντων καὶ νεκρῶν* follow in a construction exactly parallel, it is necessary to suppose that this function of Jesus is justified in the same way. But it is too general and simple a Christian thought to require any such justification.

(3) The supposed course of thought reverses the actual course given in the words *ἐν τῷ γὰρ φρονεῖν ἡμᾶς μικρὰ περὶ αὐτοῦ, μικρὰ καὶ ἐλπίζομεν λαβεῖν*. The thought is: Think little of Christ, and you will hope little from him; not: You hope great things of Christ, therefore he is great, viz., God.

(4) The thought of Harnack is too modern, too Ritschlian, too Kantian, to fit the times to which we are transposed as we read this homily. The idea that Christ "represents" God, and hence is to be treated and thought of "as God," may do for an age which refuses to discuss ontological ques-

<sup>1</sup> *Dgmsch.*, I., 130 f.



tions, but it could never have had a home in an age in which the boldest efforts at ontological knowledge (Platonism, Gnosticism, etc., were common among Greeks and Orientals.

We take this passage, then, as applying the term *θεός* to Christ in a legitimate manner, and as expressive of the common belief of the Christians round about the preacher. It is probably applied to him again in XII, 1, in the phrase *ἐπιφάνεια τοῦ θεοῦ*, since *ἐπιφάνεια* is not applicable to the invisible Father, and is expressly connected with "the Lord" in XVII, 4.<sup>1</sup>

But this is not all. The pre-existence of Christ is clearly stated, and the Homily thus takes its place in the number of witnesses to the pneumatic christology of the early church. In IX, 5 we read: "If Christ, the Lord, who saved us, though he was first a spirit, became flesh (*ὡν μὲν τὸ πρῶτον πνεῦμά, ἐγένετο σὰρξ*), and thus called us, so shall we also receive the reward in the flesh." The likeness of type to Hermas is here exhibited in the employment of *πνεῦμα*<sup>2</sup> to designate the pre-

<sup>1</sup> Harnack's references (*op. cit.*, p. 128) to 1 Tim. vi. 14; 2 Tim. i. 10; iv. 1. 8; Tit. ii. 13 are apparently designed to show that *ἐπιφάνεια*, though generally employed of Christ, may be employed of God. But the only passage in point is Tit. ii. 13, and in this the phrase is *ἐπιφάνεια τῆς δόξης τ. μεγ. θεοῦ*. Still, it must be admitted that the phrase *τοῦ θεοῦ* of Christ is exceptional, and one is tempted to conjecture that the article has slipped in by error, though the MSS. give no such hint. If it stands, it must be taken as a remarkable intensification of biblical language, though possibly no greater than the expressions of Ignatius *τὸ πάθος τοῦ θεοῦ μου*, Ro. VI, 3, *ὁ θεός ἡμῶν* I. δ X., Eph. XVIII, 2, *et al.*

<sup>2</sup> Harnack says in illustration of this word, in his commentary on the passage (*Clem. Rom. Epistulae*, pp. 124 f.), after referring to Theophilus *ad Autol.* II, 10: *ὁστος οὖν* (scil. *ὁ λόγος*) *ὡν πνεῦμα θεοῦ*, etc., and to Hippolytus *Noët.* 16: *τί δὲ τὸ ἐξ αὐτοῦ γεννηθὲν ἀλλ' ἢ πνεῦμα, τουτέστιν ὁ λόγος*, "It is well known that the Apologists and fathers of the second century who flourished before Irenaeus, although they constantly defended the rule of faith, nevertheless did not make a fixed distinction between the Holy Spirit and Christ. Yet in controversies with those who favored any modalism, they distinguished *λόγος θεοῦ* and *πνεῦμα θεοῦ ἀσυνχύτως*." This remark is a virtual surrender to us of our whole position. What Harnack further remarks, that "the formula of our author clearly shows that the *theologumēnon* concerning Christ as the *λόγος θεοῦ* had not yet been accepted (*valuisse*) by all," is, after the above discussion, of no importance.

existent nature of the Lord. Another passage, with another point of contact with Hermas, chapter XIV, teaches the pre-existence of Christ, though confusing it strangely with the ideal of the pre-existence of the church. It runs: "Wherefore, brethren, if we do the will of God our Father, we shall be of the first, the spiritual, church which was created before the sun and the moon. . . . So then let us choose to be of the church of life that we may be saved. I do not however suppose that you are ignorant that the living church is the body of Christ (for the Scripture saith: God made man male and female; the male is Christ, the female, the church) and that the Books and the Apostles teach that the church is not new, but is from above.<sup>1</sup> For she was spiritual, as our Jesus also was, but was manifested in the last days that he<sup>2</sup> might save us. And the church being spiritual was manifested in the flesh of Christ, signifying to us that if any one of us will guard her in the flesh and not corrupt her, he shall receive her in the holy spirit. For the flesh is the antitype of the spirit; therefore no one that has corrupted the antitype shall partake of the authentic.<sup>3</sup> Therefore he says this:<sup>4</sup> Brethren, guard the flesh that you may partake in the spirit. And if we say that the flesh is the church, and the spirit Christ, then he that hath shamefully used the flesh, hath shamefully used the church. Therefore such a one shall not partake in the spirit, which is Christ. Such life and incorruption this flesh can partake of when the holy spirit is joined to it. No one can utter or speak what the Lord hath prepared for his elect.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *ἄνωθεν*, translated by Riddle (Ante Nicene Library, Am. Ed. Vol. VII., p. 521, "from the beginning." But the N. T. figures in Gal. iv. 26; Heb. xii. 22; Rev. xxi. 2, 9, as well as the context—"manifested"—seem to render "from above" preferable, in spite of the close collocation with *ἔν*.

<sup>2</sup> Or, possibly, "she:" *ἵνα ἡμᾶς σώσῃ*.

<sup>3</sup> τὸ *αὐθεντικόν*, archetype, original.

<sup>4</sup> Riddle, *l. c.*, translates: "This, then, is what he meaneth."

<sup>5</sup> The Greek text is: *ἵνα οὖτε, ἀδελφοί, ποιῶντες τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν θεοῦ ἐσόμεθα ἐκ τῆς ἐκκλησίας τῆς πρωτῆς τῆς πνευματικῆς τῆς πρὸ ἡλίου καὶ σελήνης*

The church is here presented as coming from heaven, as having a spiritual form, and as manifested upon earth, as Christ was spiritual and manifested in the flesh. It is expressly said to have been created before the sun and moon, but this pre-existence is explained by the further figure introduced by which the spiritual, and hence the pre-existent church is identified with Christ (τὸ πνεῦμα Χριστόν). It has its pre-existence in his pre-existence. As Christ is pre-existent spirit (IX, 5) and flesh, so the church has flesh, the temporal church, and spirit, Christ. Sharing in him, and joined to him, this earthly church, the flesh, will receive life and immortality.

Harnack warns<sup>1</sup> us against concluding that the passage ascribes to Christ any other pre-existence than that which is ascribed to the church, viz., one which is purely ideal. But it seems that he has inverted the order of the writer's thought, as in the opening passage of the homily. There is an ideal pre-existence of the church; but the writer wishes to *justify* it, and hence he explains it by a parallel and *well-known*, *acknowledged*, case. Men do not explain the obscure by the equally or more obscure, but by the plain. Hence he says:

ἐκτισμένης· ἐὰν δὲ μὴ ποιήσωμεν τὸ θέλημα κυρίου, ἐσόμεθα ἐκ τῆς γραφῆς τῆς λεγοί-  
σης· Ἐγενήθη ὁ οἶκος μου σπήλαιον ληστῶν. ὥστε οὖν αἰρετισώμεθα ἀπὸ τῆς ἐκκλησί-  
ας τῆς ζωῆς εἶναι, ἵνα σωθῶμεν. οὐκ οἴομαι δὲ ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν ὅτι ἐκκλησία ζῶσα σώμα  
ἐστὶ Χριστοῦ (λέγει γὰρ ἡ γραφή· Ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν ἀνθρώπων ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ· τὸ  
ἄρσεν ἐστὶν ὁ Χριστός, τὸ θῆλυ ἡ ἐκκλησία) καὶ ὅτι τὰ βιβλία καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι τὴν ἐκ-  
κλησίαν οὐ πῦν εἶναι ἀλλὰ ἀνωθεν. ἦν γὰρ πνευματικὴ ὡς καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἡμῶν, ἐφα-  
νώθη δὲ ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν ἵνα ἡμᾶς σώσῃ· ἡ ἐκκλησία δὲ πνευματικὴ ὅσα ἐφα-  
νερῶθῃ ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ Χριστοῦ, δηλοῦσα ἡμῖν ὅτι ἐὰν τις ἡμῶν τηρήσῃ αὐτήν ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ  
καὶ μὴ φθεῖρῃ, ἀπολήσεται αὐτήν ἐν τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ· ἡ γὰρ σὰρξ αὕτη ἀντίτυ-  
πὸς ἐστὶ τοῦ πνεύματος· οὐδεὶς οὖν τὸ ἀντίτυπον φθείρας τὸ αὐθεντικὸν μεταλήσεται.  
Ἄρα οὖν τοῦτο λέγει, ἀδελφοί· τηρήσατε τὴν σάρκα, ἵνα τοῦ πνεύματος μεταλάβητε.  
εἰ δὲ λέγομεν εἶναι τὴν σάρκα τὴν ἐκκλησίαν καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα Χριστόν, ἄρα οὖν ὁ ὕβρις  
τὴν σάρκα, ὕβρισε τὴν ἐκκλησίαν. ὁ τοιοῦτος οὖν οὐ μεταλήσεται τοῦ πνεύματος ὃ ἐ-  
στὶν ὁ Χριστός. Τοσαύτην δύναται ἡ σὰρξ αὕτη μεταλαβεῖν ζωὴν καὶ ἀφθαρσίαν κολλη-  
θέντος αὐτῇ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου, οὐτε ἐξαιρεῖν τις δύναται οὔτε καλεῖσθαι ἄ ἠτοι-  
μησεν ὁ κύριος τοῖς ἐκλεκτοῖς αὐτοῦ.

<sup>1</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 132.

The church was spiritual and then manifested, just as Jesus was. And then the deeper question arises, How shall this pre-existence be *explained*, which is solved by identifying it with that of Christ, again stated as *undoubted*. The strongest expression for a *real* pre-existence of the church, that it was created before the sun and moon, Harnack himself explains by referring us to Hermas (Vis. I, 1, 6.): *ὁ θεὸς . . . κτίσας ἐκ τοῦ μὴ ὄντος τὰ ὄντα . . . ἔνεκεν τῆς ἀγίας ἐκκλησίας* (cf. Vis. II, 4, 1).

- But we need not pause even here. It is not alone in these disputed passages that the pre-existence of Christ is brought out. In II, 7, his pitying love, leading him to lay aside his heavenly state, is referred to: "There also did Christ desire to save the things which were perishing, and has saved many by *coming* and calling us when hastening to destruction." And at the end (XX, 5) the Father is said to have *sent forth* (*ἐξαποστέλλω*) the Saviour.

Thus in every way, this Homily unites with the other witnesses to the fact that the pneumatic christology was the element in which the life of the church moved, from which it drew its practical stimulus and encouragement, and also its more subtle analogies as well.

We have now completed our review of the first group of Christian writers subsequent to the N. T., and we have found an unanimous agreement among them that Christ was a pre-existent being become man for our salvation. This general and indefinite truth they all hold, although with many modifications of expression. They fully apprehend neither it nor its relations to other Christian truths; but they receive it in its broad outlines.

It is not probable that there were no parties or individuals during this period, the first half of the second century, who held a lower view of Christ's person. The Jewish tendency to include Christ in the number of the prophets, and thus to make him a mere man, as well as to protect the

strict unipersonality of monotheism from any association of another spiritual element with the supreme divine; the oriental dualism reacting to degrade the divine in Christ even in the minds of Christians to some point beneath true deity; together with all the ill-regulated and miscellaneous aberrations of incipient speculation, may well have produced even in this epoch the beginnings of later variations, and sowed the seeds of later controversies. But we do not find them in those writers whose works so reflected the general convictions that they were preserved, and have come down to us as the representatives of the first age after the apostles. And hence we are justified historically in saying,—and, conversely, we are *not* historically justified in disputing the affirmation,—that the original Christianity as delivered to the earliest generation had as its central thought the general conception that in Christ God had come to earth for our salvation in such way that Jesus Christ was himself God.

How was this thought developed? How did it come to assume the form of the final christology of Chalcedon and of the church since? What were the elements with which the church operated in reaching her results? Were they homogeneous with her other fundamental ideas and materials? Was the development normal and sound? Was the result legitimate? Such are the questions which the review of the following history is to answer.

*[To be continued.]*