The University of Chicago
FOUNDED BY JOHN D. ROCKEFELLER

THE CHRISTOLOGY IN THE APOSTOLIC FATHERS

A DISSERTATION

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

(DEPARTMENT OF NEW TESTAMENT LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE)

BY

ALONZO ROSECRANS STARK II

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

Published November 1912

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

OUTLINE

CONTENTS

PREFACE

From the christological point of view, the writings known as the Apostolic Fathers have been found to fall into three stages of development. In the first group, God the Father is supreme and is the center of interest. In consequence of this supremacy of the Father, the subordination of Christ is most pronounced. Christ is assigned a high rank, but he is always and pre-eminently the agent of the Father.

In this division belong the writings of Clement of Rome, the Didache, and the Fragments of Papias.

In the second group of writings, Christ is the center of interest. Less emphasis is put upon the idea of his subordination. His authority is vastly extended. He is conjoined with God in certain important functions on a basis of virtual equality. Prayer is offered to Christ. He is frequently called God in a limited sense, and finally he is called God in the absolute sense.

Here belong the writings of Ignatius, Polycarp, and Second Clement.

In the third group of writings the cosmological function of Christ appears. He is the Creator and Maintainer of the universe. His authority is so extended that now universal dominion is ascribed to him. The idea of subordination has almost disappeared, and the equality of Christ with God is fully recognized.

The writings of Barnabas and Hermas and the Epistle to Diognetus belong here.

This dissertation examines in detail the christological teachings of each writer in the group. In the summary at the end of each group, the relation of each writer to the dominant ideas of the group is set forth, and an attempt is made to show just what each writer contributes to these ideas. After examining the writers of each period, an effort is made to show also the precise elements in one group which are in advance, from a christological point of view, over the preceding division.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Lightfoot, J. B. *Apostolic Fathers, Ignatius and Polycarp*, Vols. I, II, III. 1885.

Ribagnac, Adolphe. *La christologie du Pasteur d'Hermas.* 1887.

J. Rendel Harris. *The Teaching of the Apostles.* 1887.

Lightfoot, J. B. *Apostolic Fathers, Clement of Rome*, Vols. I, II. 1890.

Schaff, Philip. *The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles.* 1890.

Dorner, J. A. *History of the Development of the Doctrine of the Person of Christ*, Div. I, Vol. I. 1891.

Cruttwell, C. T. *A Literary History of Early Christianity.* 1893.

Hort, J. F. A. *The ante-Nicene Fathers.* 1895.

Goltz, Eduard Freihernn von der. *Ignatius von Antiochien als Christ und Theologe. (Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Litteratur bis Eusebius*, B. 12.) 1895.

Harnack, A. *The History of Dogma*, Vol. I. 1896.

Fisher, J. P. *History of Christian Doctrine.* 1896.

Krüger, G. *History of Early Christian Literature.* 1897.

Harnack, A. *Geschichte der altchristlichen Litteratur bis Eusebius*, Vol. I. 1897, Vol. II. 1904.

Scherer, W. *Der erste Clemensbrief an die Corinther.* 1902.

Pfleiderer, Otto. *Das Urchristentum*, Vol. II. 1902. Eng. Trans., *Primitive Christianity*, Vol. 888. 1910.

Swete, H. B. *Patristic Study.* 1902.

Wernle, Paul. *Die Anfänge unserer Religion.* Eng. Trans., Vol. II. 1903.

Gebhardt, Harnack, and Zahn. *Patrum Apostolicorum Opera.* 1906.

Goodspeed, E. J. *Index Patristicus.* 1907.

Farrar, F. W. *Lives of the Fathers*, Vol. I. 1907.

Newman, A. H. *A Manual of Church History*, Vol. I. 1907.

Harnack, A. *The Mission and Expansion of Christianity*, Vol. I. 1908.

Burton, E. D., Smith, J. M. P., Smith, G. B. *Biblical Ideas of Atonement.* 1909.

Granberry, J. C., *Outline of New Testament Christology.* 1909.

Deissmann, G. A. *Light from the Ancient East.* 1910.

CHAPTER I

GOD THE FATHER IS SUPREME AND IS THE CENTER OF INTEREST

INTRODUCTORY

A. THE LETTER OF CLEMENT TO THE CORINTHIANS

The author.—The letter bears the name of the church at Rome, and not that of an individual. The opening words are: "The church of God which sojourneth at Rome to the church of God which sojourneth at Corinth." The name of the writer of the letter is nowhere mentioned in the letter. From this it is evident that whoever wrote it, he wrote as the representative of the church at Rome. It is a letter from one church to another church. There are sufficient grounds, however, for assigning the letter to Clement, who is reckoned the third bishop of Rome. Lightfoot and Harnack agree in putting his term of office from about 90 to 100 A.D. Eusebius (IV. 23) quotes parts of a letter from Dionysius, bishop at Corinth about 170 A.D., in which Dionysius says: "Today we have passed the Lord's holy day, in which we have read your epistle. From it, whenever we read it, we shall always be able to draw advice, as also through the former epistle, which was written to us through Clement." Eusebius says that Hegesippus, who visited at Corinth and Rome about 170 A.D., made some remarks about the letter of Clement to the Corinthians. But he does not state what the remarks were. Harnack quotes Irenaeus, who lived from 130 to 202 A.D., as saying that he had read of a sedition which had arisen in Corinth, and that Clement had written a letter about it. There is much to favor the position of Lightfoot, that Clement, who wrote the letter and was the bishop of Rome, was a freedman and namesake of Flavius Clemens, the consul and cousin of the emperor Domitian. Some have sought to identify the consul and the bishop. The weight of scholarship, however, is on the side of Lightfoot's conclusions. There is more difference of opinion about whether Clement was a Jew or a Gentile. Lightfoot and Lemme claim that he was a Jew, while Harnack and Wrede claim that he was a Gentile. Both opinions rest upon the internal proofs furnished by the letter itself. His knowledge of the Septuagint furnishes a strong argument for his Jewish nationality. He not merely quotes the Septuagint freely, but he is permeated with its style and ideas. On the other hand, he shows no familiarity with Greek and Roman literature, such as would be expected of a man holding his position if he had been a Gentile.

The date.—It is the generally received opinion that the document belongs at about the close of Domitian's reign, or soon after (95 or 96 A.D).[1] A few scholars assign the letter to the close of Nero's reign, and others take the extreme position of assigning it to the reign of Hadrian. In addition to the external testimonies quoted above, the internal evidence points to the reign of Domitian rather than the reign of Nero. The view of the Corinthian church as ancient moves the letter away from the earlier date, and the reference to Paul and Peter as belonging to our generation forbids giving the letter the extreme date suggested by Volkmar and others.

The object.—A sedition has arisen in the church at Corinth. Elders who were appointed by the apostles have been thrust out. This letter aims to secure the restoration of these elders to their office, and to lead the rebellious to repentance and to submission to the properly constituted officers of the church. All christological teaching is aside from the main purpose of the letter, and such Christology as the letter contains is presented by way of illustration of his theme, and for the purpose of enforcing the duty of subjection upon the elders.

B. THE DIDACHE

The date.—The Didache abounds in primitive material. The picture of church life given here is that of a very early period. Prophets are the chief teachers and are not yet superseded by bishops. The Agape and Eucharist are observed as one feast. The Christology is very closely allied to First Clement. In keeping with these positive marks of its early origin is the absence of any trace in it of the movement which agitated the church in the second century. There is no sign of Ebionism, nor of Gnosticism, which were felt early in the second century. There is the recognition of false teachers, but no such opposition to Judaism as Barnabas shows. The ancient testimonies to the work are not numerous. Eusebius knows the work, and calls it the "so-called teachings of apostles."[2] Clement of Alexandria quotes from it as Scripture. It is possible that Irenaeus makes a reference to it. Some have tried to see some connection with First Clement through the use of Christemporos.[3] Schlecht's Latin probably represents a Greek original which is shorter than the Greek document which we have.

These facts admit of two interpretations. First, the primitive material may have come from some out-of-the-way district where it

[1] Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers, Clement*, I, 346.

[2] *H.E.* III. [3] I Clement 1:10; Dis. 13:5.

has been unaffected by the movements of the age. In this way Harnack thinks that it is possible to make the date as late as 160 A.D., though he says that the material fits better in the period 80–120 than 120–60. Still, because of the fixed form of fasts and prayers, the established order of the prophets, and the corruption that has grown up among them, the improbability that it would have been composed until some time after the death of the apostles, and the priority of Barnabas to the Didache, he thinks that this originated shortly after 131 A.D. Secondly, more weight may be given to the primitive nature of the material and consequently an earlier date assigned to it, say from 80–120. So Schaff, Lightfoot, and others.

The use of Matthew furnishes a means for determining the earliest limits of its origin, as the Didache in chap. VIII quotes Matthew's version of the Lord's Prayer. Still this is not a certain guaranty of its earliest date, as the sources of Matthew's Gospel might have been used in the Didache. If it be granted that the quotation is from the Gospel of Matthew, this makes it necessary to put the Didache some time in the second century as the time of its earliest origin, as the present tendency is to give a late date to the Gospel of Matthew, Burkitt placing it from 90–100.

Place of origin.—The Didache came into the stream of history at Alexandria. But for one statement there would probably be no one to question that some out-of-the-way district in Egypt was the place of its origin. In the eucharistic thanksgiving IX. 4, are the words: "As this broken bread was scattered upon the mountains, and being gathered together became one." Schaff regards these words as an insuperable objection to its Egyptian origin. They may, however, be understood as an Old Testament allusion. The first appearance of the Didache in Egypt, its use there as witnessed by Athanasius, and the origin of Barnabas' letter in Alexandria give the weight of the argument in favor of its origin in Egypt.

C. THE FRAGMENTS OF PAPIAS

The fragments furnish no material for a Christology and merely need to be mentioned. Papias was bishop of Hierapolis, and flourished about 140 A.D. Harnack puts the date of his birth at about 80 A.D.; Lightfoot puts it ten years earlier. Irenaeus says that he was a companion of Polycarp and a hearer of John. Ancient testimony agrees that he wrote five books on the teachings of Christ. Jerome gives as the title of his work, *Expositions of the Discourses of the Lord.*

I. The Christology in the First Epistle of Clement

1. The Relation of Christ to God

(1) *The author maintains a careful distinction between Christ and God by his use of titles*

Three titles are applied to God exclusively: θεός, δεσπότης, and δημιουργός. Κύριος is applied to both God and Christ. It is used of Christ often, of God only sparingly. In the quotations of Scripture the author follows the Septuagint, and so retains both κύριος and ὁ κύριος as designations of God. And even this small number must be reduced in importance by the consideration that in four instances in which he uses κύριος of God, he may have been influenced by the Septuagint. Chap. 53:3 furnishes a clear example of such an influence where the short statement εἶπεν κύριος πρὸς αὐτόν is set in the midst of a quotation from the Septuagint. This leaves only five times that he independently applies κύριος to God. This manifest preference for the word δεσπότης to designate God is significant. The old distinction between δεσπότης and κύριος does not continue in the time of our author. Of this distinction Archbishop Trench, *New Testament Synonyms*, p. 53, says: "There lies in κύριος the sense of authority owning limitations—moral limitations it may be; while the δεσπότης exercises a more unrestricted power and absolute domination, confessing no such limitations or restraints. The Greeks refused the title of δεσπότης to any but their gods." While this early distinction has been lost, Philo seeks to make something out of it, and says as quoted by Trench in the reference above: "δεσπότης is not κύριος but φοβερὸς κύριος, and implies on the part of him who uses it a more entire prostration of self before the might and majesty of God than κύριος would have done." The fact cannot be questioned that Clement shows a decided preference for δεσπότης over κύριος as a name for God, and applies the latter to him sparingly. The significance of this use permits of more than one interpretation. In his desire to avoid confusion and keep the distinction clear between Christ and God, he may have chosen for God the term δεσπότης with the feeling that something of the old dignity still clung to the word, and he wished to express by it his sense of the higher exaltation of God. Or the use may signify nothing more than the desire to avoid confusion. But the whole attitude of Clement toward the unique majesty of God lends support to the view that he sought to indicate this majesty in some measure by the use of the word δεσπότης.

(2) *The author assigns to Christ a unique relation to God by the titles which he gives to him, and the ascriptions which he makes to him.*

a) The power of Christ.—His conception of the power of Christ is indicated by the titles "Lord," "Son," "High Priest," "Savior," "Helper," and "Patron." The dignity conveyed by these titles cannot be determined from the words themselves, but must be learned from the force which the author gives them. Christ has power and authority over the spiritual life of believers. He calls them, protects them, sanctifies them; he is their high priest, savior, helper; they are his elect, his flock; and they must obey him. This spiritual work exhausts the work that is denoted by any of his titles. He is Lord, but only over the spiritual life of believers. He is the Son seated at the right hand of God. The author uses "son" not to denote moral likeness on the ground of which he may be called son. Rather by this term he means akin to God in nature; he is using "son" in the metaphysical sense. The ascription to him of a place at the right hand of God denotes his participation in the administration with God, his Father. But when we seek the nature and extent of his administration, the answer is clear: he deals with the spiritual life of believers. In 36:2, he declares Christ is "the reflection of the majesty of God." Here Clement is following Heb. 1:3. But he has confused the meaning somewhat by substituting μεγαλωσύνης for δόξης. The passage in Hebrews declares that Christ is the reflection of the absolute perfection of the Deity. Clement, by the word which he uses, calls attention to the governing power of the Deity. But Clement has made a mistake in his use of the word, for the idea which he wishes to express, as the context shows, is the moral perfection of God as reflected in Christ. In 16:2, by the use of the phrase "the scepter of his majesty," he calls attention to the governing power of God. The scepter is the symbol of power. The application of the figure to Christ signifies that royal majesty has been transferred to him. The majesty of God is represented in him.[1] But in what field, and to what extent, does he represent the imperial majesty? His work is limited to the spiritual life of believers. This limitation of the power of Christ is made still more sharp by the consideration of two negative aspects of his work. He is not said to have dominion over all men, or over the whole life of believers. Universality of dominion is assigned to God alone, and he alone creates and preserves men. This leads to the

[1] Dorner, *Doctrine of the Person of Christ*, Div. I, Vol. I, p. 101.

second negative aspect of Christ's work. No cosmological function is assigned to him. And the failure to assign such a function to Christ is not because Clement omits this subject. He has much to say of preservation and creation, but God is alone in this work. See 19:2: "the Father and maker of the whole world"; 26:1: "the Creator of the universe"; 27:4: "by the word of his majesty He compacted the universe." Many other passages might be cited.

From three passages attempts have been made to identify Christ as the agent of God in creation. The passage quoted above (27:4) is thus interpreted by Dorner.[1] He says that the "word of his majesty" is the pre-existent Christ. He gives as the reason of this identification that Clement frequently applies μεγαλωσύη to Christ; that he was familiar with Paul's cosmological teaching and also with the teaching of the author to the Hebrews. As a matter of fact, Clement uses the word only eight times, and in five of these instances it refers without the possibility of a doubt to God. This leaves only two instances in which the word is used in reference to Christ, outside of the passage under discussion. Clement's usage, therefore, affords no presumption in favor of the application of the term to Christ, but rather the contrary. It can be so applied, but only on the basis of an argument from the context. The connection, however, in which the phrase occurs, "by the word of his majesty," gives no hint that it means Christ, and such an interpretation is in conflict with the whole letter of Clement, which assigns creation to God. W. Scherer also attempts to make Christ the creator.[2] In 59:3, Scherer identifies "Lord" with Christ in the prayer: "Grant unto us Lord." Lightfoot brackets these words in this place, and Gebhardt, Harnack, and Zahn omit them altogether. But even if they are retained, they would clearly refer to God as the primal source of all creation, and add but one more to the small number of passages in which he calls God κύριος. In the immediately preceding context God the creator is expressly distinguished from "his beloved son Jesus Christ." And immediately following, the primal source of creation is called God—"who alone art the benefactor of spirits and the God of all flesh." Our author, moreover, in no other place calls Christ θέος. In 2:1, Clement says: "And ye were all lowly in mind and free from arrogance, yielding rather than claiming submission, more glad to give than to receive, and content with the provisions which Christ supplieth. And giving heed unto his words, ye laid them up diligently in your

[1] *Doctrine of the Person of Christ*, pp. 356, 357.

[2] Scherer, *Der erste Clemensbrief an die Corinther*, S. 159–61.

hearts, and his sufferings were before your eyes." Here Scherer identifies Christ with God, and then reasons that Christ is the creator of all things, "and consequently uncreated and therefore God." While the reading here is in dispute, Gebhardt, Harnack, and Zahn read τοῦ Χριστοῦ, the reading for which Scherer contends. But in vs. 3 the subject changes to "Almighty God" as the object of the Christians' prayer, and there is little justification for thinking that Clement intends to apply θεός to Christ. The two persons are constantly kept clearly distinct.

b) *The pre-existence of Christ.*—The author shows his belief in Christ's pre-existence in three different ways. In 16:2 his declaration involves pre-existence. He says: "The scepter of the majesty of God, even the Lord Jesus Christ, came not in the pomp or arrogance of pride, though he might have done so." He declares that Christ spoke parts of the Old Testament through the Holy Spirit. In 22:1, he says: "Now all these things the faith which is in Christ confirmeth; for he himself through the Holy Spirit inviteth us." Then he follows this statement with a quotation from the Septuagint of Ps. 53:1–12. In the passage from Isaiah concerning the suffering servant (53:1–12), he represents Christ himself as speaking a part of this chapter. In 15:16, he says: "And again he himself says." He identifies Christ with this speaker.

c) *The holiness of Christ.*—In 23:5, he identifies Christ with the "Holy One." In two instances the work of Christ suggests the inference that he is holy, if it does not positively involve such an inference, as Scherer maintains.[1] In chap. 36, men look up to heaven and taste immortal knowledge through fixing the eyes upon Jesus. By calling Christ (36:2) "the reflection of the majesty of God," and from the connection of this passage with Heb. 1:3, he presents Christ as the one who reveals the perfection of the Deity. In 7:4, Christ wins for the whole world the grace of repentance. Whatever interpretation may be put upon this passage, he who takes away sin, either by bearing the penalty of sin or by his marvelous exhibition of love in death winning men away from sin, must himself be a holy being.

d) *The knowledge of Christ.*—The author gives no reliable hint of his thought about Christ's knowledge. Whatever opinion he may have held regarding the omniscience of Christ, he has not made it known to us. Violence is done to the simple statement of the writer if one attempts to construe 4:41 into a declaration of the omniscience of Christ. Here he says: "And our apostles knew through our Lord Jesus Christ that there would be strife over the name of the bishop's office." From this

[1] *Der erste Clemensbrief an die Corinther*, S. 181.

statement Scherer concludes that in Christ lay concealed all the treasures of science and of wisdom, and that before his eyes the veil of the future was lifted.[1] But such a statement implies no more knowledge than in the case of the apostle Paul when he tells the Ephesian elders that they may expect trouble in the church. In Acts 20:29, he says: "I know that after my departing grievous wolves shall enter in among you, not sparing the flock." Such a statement rests upon an understanding of the situation, and implies only human foresight. Nothing more than this can be gained from Clement's statement regarding the knowledge of Christ. In 23:5, he barely refers to a day of judgment. Here Christ is the "Holy One," who will suddenly come to his temple.

(3) *The conjoining of Christ with God*

The author conjoins Christ with God in such a way that he shows the exaltation of Christ. Most important are two trinitarian passages. We read in 46:6: "Have we not one God, and one Christ, and one spirit of grace that was shed upon us?" Still more significant is 58:2: "For as God liveth, and the Lord Jesus Christ liveth, and the Holy Spirit, who are the faith and hope of the elect." Dorner and Scherer have called attention to the fact that this statement is the form of the oath employed in the Old Testament (Deut. 6:13), "as God liveth." Lightfoot also points out the similarity of this statement to the baptismal formula in Matt. 28:3. It has been contended that great significance belongs to the fact that these three names are joined together in the form of the oath. However, the names of men were joined with God in the form of an oath, as in I Sam. 25:36: "Now therefore, my lord, as Jehovah liveth, and as thy soul liveth"; also the same form is seen in II Sam. 15:21: "As Jehovah liveth, and as my lord the king liveth." Still further it is maintained that it is significant that three persons are made conjointly the foundation of the faith and hope of the elect. From this Scherer concludes (p. 146): "It is the essential Deity which the author assigns to the persons." Dorner also maintains that the work of salvation involves Deity even more clearly than the work of creation.[2] In fact, however, what Clement ascribes to Christ in union with the Father and Spirit is not deity, but only the work which he has already ascribed to Christ alone in other places, that is, the work of salvation. The new element here is that the three are put together on an equality so far as this work is concerned. By virtue of this implied equality in the work

[1] *Der erste Clemensbrief an die Corinther*, S. 168.

[2] Dorner, *op. cit.*, I, 100.

of salvation, the language certainly conveys an exalted conception of Christ.

In two instances the same doxology is used in respect to Christ which in other places is used of God. In 20:12, he says: "Our Lord Jesus Christ, to whom be the glory and the majesty forever and ever." And in 59:7 glory is ascribed to Christ. Outside of these doxologies, Clement has declared that majesty and glory belong to Christ without implying his deity. To throw this declaration into the form of a doxology does not essentially change the meaning. Clement undoubtedly holds a very exalted conception of Jesus.

(4) *The subordination of Christ to God*

This subordination appears when Christ takes the position of God's agent. The whole of Christ's work is done as the agent of God. God gives grace and peace through Christ; he shows mercy through Christ. He calls and instructs men through Christ. In the agent, Clement does not lose sight of God back of the agent. Christ works not only in harmony with the will of God, but in obedience to it. God sent Christ as Christ sent the apostles. Christ is governed in his work by the will of God. However, there is no suggestion of force in the rule of God over Christ. By love and compassion, Christ was moved to his work of salvation.[1]

In his resurrection is seen Christ's subordination to God. In 24:1, it is said: "whereof he made the Lord Jesus Christ the first fruit, when he raised him from the dead."

The author shows a distinctly different attitude toward God from that which he takes toward Christ in many particulars. He emphasizes repeatedly the supremacy of God. He is almighty, omniscient, all-holy; he created and preserves all things; men offer prayer to him; men worship God; and they must fear him. The resurrection offers an opportunity for Clement to enlarge upon the power of God as seen in nature. He says in 24:5: "The sower goeth forth and casteth into the earth each of the seeds; and these falling into the earth dry and bare decay; then out of their decay the mightiness of the Master's [τοῦ δεσπότου] providence raiseth them up, and from being one they increase manifold and bear fruit." And again in 26:1, he says: "Do we think it to be a great and marvellous thing, if the creator of the universe shall bring about the resurrection of them that have served him?" Omnipotence is ascribed so repeatedly to God alone that the writer makes a wide separa-

[1] Int. 32:4; 42:12; 49:6.

tion between God and all other beings. All the universe is under subjection to God. Nature renews itself in obedience to his laws; and the breath of men is from Almighty God. Christ forms no exception to the universal supremacy of God. God works through Christ. But back of the agent, the supreme author of the work stands transcendent in power and authority. The authority of God is consequently unique and absolute. The love of Christ, which is the foundation of mercy, is plainly declared. But God alone has authority to exercise mercy. It is not a question in regard to the spirit of either Christ or God. It is entirely a matter of authority. And here the supremacy of God is made emphatic. To him prayer is offered; to him thanksgiving is rendered for all benefits. The whole attitude of dependence upon the power and mercy of God and of prayer to him differs widely from the attitude taken toward Christ. Omnipotence, omniscience, creation, preservation, universal dominion are ascribed to God, but never to Christ.

2. THE HUMAN NATURE OF CHRIST

Clement constantly assumes and clearly recognizes the human nature of Christ, though he gives but little attention to this aspect of his nature. In 32:2, his descent is traced to Abraham according to the flesh. The phrase "according to the flesh" shows clearly that this account of Christ does not exhaust Clement's conception of him. Christ was more than human. In 49:6, he speaks of his body and soul. In other places he represents Christ as sharing the nature common to men when he speaks of Christ as enduring hardships and suffering, physical death.

3. THE FUNCTION OF CHRIST'S DEATH

Clement speaks of the function of Christ's death in the following five passages: 7:4; 12:7; 16:3–16; 21:6; 49:6. There is one other reference which has some value for this subject in 20:11, where he says: 'have taken refuge in his compassionate mercy through our Lord Jesus Christ."

It forms no part of the author's purpose to set forth any doctrine concerning the atonement. His use of the death of Christ has for its object the practical purpose of leading the faction in the church to repentance, to reinstatement of the elders, and to submission to the rule of the divinely appointed officers.

In 7:4 Clement makes three statements concerning the blood of Christ: (1) The blood of Christ is precious unto the Father; (2) it was shed for the salvation of men; (3) and it has brought the grace of

repentance to the whole world. Clement in this passage, and in all the others relating to this subject, is treating of the death of Christ, and not of his life. The value of the death of Christ is related in some way to God. It may mean that the kind of conduct which is displayed in the death of Christ is that upon which God places a high estimate. Or it may mean that the death of Christ has great value in its influence upon God. The ὅτι clause assigns the reason for the preceding statement of the value of the blood of Christ. The act itself and the work which it accomplished are the grounds for its high estimation. It was shed for the benefit of men. But in what way did his blood benefit men? The answer to this question depends upon the interpretation of the statement "won the grace of repentance." The word χάρις has great significance in the interpretation of the passage. Its usual meaning, in the New Testament at least, is favor, a gracious, favorable attitude of one toward another. There is no reason to depart from that usage here. In vss. 5–7 of this chapter, he says: "The Master has given a place for repentance to those that desire to return to him. Noah preached repentance, and they that obeyed were saved. Jonah preached destruction to them of Nineveh; but they, repenting of their sins, obtained pardon of God by their supplications and received salvation, albeit they were aliens from God." So the readers are exhorted to fix their eyes upon the blood of Christ as that which "brought to all the world the grace of repentance"; the graciously granted opportunity to repent, implying also the guaranty of pardon. The connection implies clearly enough that it is God who confers this favor of repentance. This shows then that the value of Christ's blood consists in its influence upon God. The author's meaning is as follows: Christ's death has so influenced God that on account of his death God has given the opportunity of repentance to the whole world.

The other passages confirm this representation as the author's way of thinking. In 16:3–16, he quotes Isaiah 53:1–12. His purpose in introducing this quotation is to give an example of lowliness as exhibited in the life of Christ. The lowliness of Christ consists in his enduring suffering for men and bearing the penalty of their sins, since Clement identifies Christ with the suffering servant. The Isaiah passage teaches that the suffering servant bears the penalty of the sins of others. He is, repeatedly spoken of in this chapter as the substitute of the wicked.[1]

[1] So this passage is interpreted by Dr. J. M. P. Smith, *Atonement*, pp. 35–37: "The penalty due their sins has been borne by Israel. He has suffered in their place. No thought appears so frequently in this passage as this of the righteous servant's

In 49:6, he says: "Jesus Christ our Lord has given his blood for us by the will of God, and his flesh for our flesh and his life for our lives." While this passage may receive two different interpretations, it is in harmony with the preceding passage to treat it as meaning that his death takes the place of our death. In 12:7, the passage in regard to Rahab, the author introduces the word λύτρωσις. Her scarlet thread is a prophecy "that through the blood of the Lord there shall be redemption unto all them that believe and hope on God." Clement uses the word λυτρόω with two significations. In 59:4 there is no thought of the price paid. The word is used to express "deliverance." But in 55:2, he speaks of deliverance through the payment of a price. He adduces examples who have made sacrifices for others, and then says: "We know that many among ourselves have delivered themselves to bondage that they might ransom others." In 12:7, since the blood of Christ is mentioned, it is most natural to regard it as the price paid to deliver men from the penalty of sin. Scherer, likewise, in his treatment of this passage, takes the view that if repentance were sufficient the author would say nothing about redemption.[1] Chap. 21:6 should be interpreted in harmony with the other passages. "The blood given for us" is that which is given in the place of us.

4. THE CONSTRUCTIVE ASPECT OF CHRIST'S SOTERIOLOGICAL WORK

The whole work of salvation is assigned to Christ. Election, calling, sanctification, illumination, grace, peace, forgiveness of sins, salvation in its totality, all are the work of Christ.[2]

This work may be viewed as accomplished in part through the example of the earthly Christ. Thus in the calling of men the earthly Christ is an important factor. He is the reflection of the glory of the Father, and as such makes an appeal to men. In his introduction, he greets those who "are called and sanctified through our Lord Jesus Christ." Christ accomplishes this calling, in one way at least, by reflecting the glory of God. So in the illumination of men, the glory of God,

substitution for the wicked (vss. 4, 5, 6, 8, 19, 11, 12). The thought is that of the vicarious satisfaction of demands made by the divine righteousness. . . . . He is bearing the penalty of others' sins." For a different interpretation, see Professor E. D. Burton, *Atonement*, pp. 104, 105. Dorner says of this chapter in Clement, *Doctrine of the Person of Christ*, I, 98: "Every interpretation of this passage is forced which does not recognize in it the idea of substitution."

[1] *Der erste Clemensbrief an die Corinther*, S. 179.

[2] Chaps. 1, 20, 36, 42, 50, 59, and in many instances this work is presented.

reflected in the life of Christ on earth, transformed men.[1] This passage in chap. 36 reflects very strikingly II Cor. 3:18, except that Clement says nothing of the activity of the Lord in connection with beholding. The vision of Christ illuminates the moral understanding. "Through him the eyes of our heart were opened." The vision of Christ quickens holy desires and gives strength to the will. "Through him our foolish and darkened mind springeth up unto his marvellous light." The vision of Christ gives a taste of immortal knowledge. The part achieved by the earthly Christ in the work of salvation must not be overlooked. But this does not exhaust the content of Christ's work. The heavenly Christ also saves men. The believer is in union with him. Clement uses also Paul's figure of the body to denote the relation of the believer to Christ. Thus the activity of the heavenly Christ accomplishes the work of salvation. Believers must regard the living Christ, together with God and the Holy Spirit, as the foundation of their hope of salvation.[2]

Faith is required of men in order to secure their salvation. In 32:4, he speaks of faith very much as Paul considers it. He says: "And so we having been called through his will in Christ Jesus are not justified through ourselves or through our own wisdom or understanding or piety or works which we wrought in holiness of heart, but through faith, whereby the Almighty God has justified all men that have been from the beginning."

5. THE RESURRECTION AND ESCHATOLOGY

Clement mentions the resurrection of Christ but twice. In 24:1, he says that God raised Christ from the dead and made him the first-fruit. And in 42:3, he says that the resurrection of the Lord gave assurance to the faith of the apostles. He mentions the second coming of Christ in only two passages. In 23:5, to warn them against sinning, he reminds the readers of the second coming of Christ. He speaks in 59:4 of the visitation of the kingdom of Christ, and in connection with it of the reward of the righteous, and their resurrection from the tombs.

6. THE CHRISTOLOGY OF CLEMENT VIEWED IN THE LIGHT OF THE OBJECT OF THE LETTER

The object of the letter is stated above. It is necessary here only to call attention to the method by which Clement seeks to attain his object.

[1] Chap. 36. [2] Chap. 58:2.

The sanction for the order of the church is received from God. God sent Christ; Christ sent the apostles; the apostles appointed bishops and deacons.[1] The order of the church is thus divine, and conformity to it is submission not to men but to God. Obedience to the divine order is essential to the welfare of men. Such conformity to the divine arrangement is the condition of welfare in all relations. In the Temple services each one had his place, and the offering must be presented in the prescribed manner.[2] There is harmony in nature and obedience to the laws of God.[3] The author says here: "The heavens are moved by his direction and obey him in peace. Day and night accomplish the course assigned to them by him, without hindrance one to another. The sun and the moon and the dancing stars according to his appointment circle in harmony within the bounds assigned to them without any swerving aside." This whole chapter is an eloquent description of nature in harmony with the behests of God. There must be obedience to authority in an army, for only thus can the life of the army be maintained. The welfare of the body is dependent upon the same harmony.[4] He also seeks to overcome rebellion by a long list of examples which show the dire consequences of envy, jealousy, and rebellion in the past. The character itself of the seditious is despicable. The author displays no little warmth of feeling as he characterizes the leaders of this sedition. Over against the picture of evil are placed the results of obedience and the nobility of self-denial for the good of others. Thus the author seeks to restore order in the Corinthian church by showing that God has established the order in the church, and that to his supreme will all owe allegiance; by showing from a long list of examples the evil consequences of sedition; and also by a great number of examples, he shows the benefit of obedience. Such an object led the writer to state and illustrate one main thought—supremacy.

To attain this object of supremacy he exalts God. But this purpose need not lead Clement to lower his Christology. Another man writing later would have accomplished the same object by exalting Christ.

II. The Christology in the Didache

1. The subordination of Christ to God

A marked feature of the Christology that shows the affinity of the Didache with First Clement is the emphasis upon the subordination of Christ to God. The Son is the agent of salvation, but God is made

[1] Chap. 42.
[2] *Ibid.*
[3] Chap. 20.
[4] Chaps. 37, 38.

very prominent as the power back of the Son. God made known knowledge, faith, and immortality through the Son. In the prayers and thanksgivings, the supremacy of God is made very prominent. To Him all glory is ascribed; to Him thanksgiving is offered and prayer is made. "We give thee thanks, O our Father; thine is the glory and power through Jesus Christ for ever and ever."[1] The use of παῖς σοῦ, which is equivalent to παῖς τοῦ θεοῦ, to designate Christ is not without significance. In this matter also the Didache shows its kinship to First Clement.[2] The word υἱός is used of Christ only twice, and both times in the baptismal formula. But παῖς is used five times.[3] And these uses are in connection with the agency of Christ in securing salvation. The use of the less exalted word marks more distinctly the subordinate position of Christ and the supremacy of God. It has been maintained that in X. 6, Jesus is called the "God of David," and in XVI. 7, the Jehovah of the Old Testament.[4] In X. 6, it is said: "May grace come and may this world pass away. Hosanna to the God of David. If any man is holy, let him come; if any man is not, let him repent. Maran Atha. Amen." And XVI. 8 is as follows: "The Lord shall come and all his saints with him. Then shall the world see the Lord coming upon the clouds of heaven." The designation of Christ as υἱός and παῖς and ὁ κύριος, and the sharp distinction kept between Christ and ὁ θεός, the Father, in other places, make it highly improbable that the author would, in these two places under discussion, ascribe deity to Christ. Moreover, in X. 6, the context is strongly against referring θεός to Christ. In this chapter, thanksgiving is offered to the Holy Father, vs. 2; to the Father is assigned the work of creation; to him is ascribed glory and all power; the church belongs to him. No ascriptions are made to Christ throughout the chapter; he is assigned a subordinate place as an agent. It is, therefore, entirely unnatural and without any warrant in the context to interpret Ὡσαννὰ τῷ θεῷ Δαβιδ as an ascription of praise to Christ. It must rather refer to the Father. In XVI. 7, the author reflects Matt. 25:31, and there is no reason to think that he connected ὁ κύριος here with the Jehovah of the Old Testament. This expression is constantly used in the New Testament both of the Father and of Christ, and there is nothing here indicating a connection with the Old Testament Jehovah. He is one with Clement in the extent

[1] Chaps. IX, X.

[2] 59:4.

[3] 7:1, 3; 9:2, 3; 10:2, 3.

[4] Schaff, *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, p. 25; Harnack, *Geschichte der altchristlichen Litteratur bis Eusebius*, II, 428.

of the authority which he assigns to Christ. The author recognizes Christ as Lord over their spiritual lives. He is the agent of God. The Christian secures through him salvation—that is, knowledge, faith, spiritual food, eternal life—and in turn they call him Lord. It uses the trinitarian formula in baptism.[1] The Christians baptize in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. In this there is doubtless to be seen the influence of Matthew's Gospel, not an independent development of Christology, and no direct affirmation concerning the nature of the Lord. The Didache calls Christ the son of God. The title is used, not to indicate his official position, or the moral nature of Christ, but rather it indicates the metaphysical relation of Christ to God.

2. ESCHATOLOGY

Chap. xvi contains a brief but clear statement of the last things. False prophets shall appear; iniquity shall increase; the sheep shall be turned into wolves, and love into hate. Then the world-deceiver shall appear as a son of God, work signs and wonders, and the earth shall be delivered into his hands. This temporary reign of the world-deceiver suggests the triumph of Satan, Rev. 20:7. A peculiar feature of the eschatology is the "cure of the curse." All created mankind shall come to the fire of testing, and many shall be offended and perish, but they that endure in their faith shall be saved by the curse himself.[2] The intention is probably to express the well-known truth that those who do not fall under a great temptation will be purified and strengthened by it. It is not permissible to push the meaning of the words "all created mankind" to their literal signification. For in vs. 7 below, it is said that not all will be raised from the dead. Rather, the words signify that all people living will be tested by this great trial. At its close Christ will come. There will be "a rift in the heaven, then a sign of a voice of a trumpet, and thirdly a resurrection of the dead" who are righteous.

III. THE CHRISTOLOGY IN THE FRAGMENTS OF PAPIAS

The only hint of the christological position of the Fragments of Papias is the use of the titles "Lord" and "Christ." In the short fragments which Eusebius professes to quote, he uses the title "Lord" eleven times and "Christ" twice. Eusebius quotes a narrative in which he says that Papias speaks of the ascension of Christ, but he gives

[1] Chap. 7.

[2] For an interpretation of this obscure passage, see J. Rendel Harris, *The Teaching of the Apostles*, p. 62, interesting because of its uniqueness.

no quotation of such a passage. The title "Lord" is used to denote the authority of Christ over the Christians and the Christian community. So far as it contains any indication of the author's position, it shows that he belongs to the First Clement group.

Summary of the Christology in This Group

A. CLEMENT

The highest point of the author's Christology is reached in the function which he assigns to Christ as Lord of the Christian community, and, in conjunction with the Father and Spirit, as the ground of the believer's hope of salvation. In harmony with this conception is the representation that he was pre-existent, and that he is the scepter of the divine majesty.

But the marked characteristic of Clement's Christology is the subordination which he assigns to Christ. This subordination he makes emphatic in several ways: (1) He applies three titles exclusively to God, namely, θεός, δεσπότης, and δημιουργός. Thus he separates God from Christ. (2) He places limitation upon the power of Christ in that Christ's power extends only to the spiritual lives of believers. (3) He sets forth certain negative aspects of Christ's work: his dominion is not affirmed to be over all men; no cosmological function is ascribed to him, though the author has much to say of creation and the maintenance of the universe; he is not associated with God as the source of grace and mercy, in the manner in which Paul so constantly conjoins the Father and son; prayer is never offered to Christ; omnipotence, omniscience, creation, preservation, and universal dominion are ascribed to God but never to Christ. (4) He represents Christ as an agent acting under the direction of God. This is the conception which dominates the whole letter. (5) He says that God raised Christ from the dead. (6) And finally he assumes a distinctly different attitude toward God from that which he takes toward Christ.

B. THE DIDACHE AND THE FRAGMENTS OF PAPIAS

The Didache is one with Clement in recognizing Christ as Lord over the lives of believers; in representing Christ as an agent of God; and in presenting him as the mediator of salvation. Though much less fully and definitely expressed, the Christology of the Didache is of the same type as that of Clement.

The Fragments of Papias indicate only that Christ is Lord over the believer.

CHAPTER II

CHRIST IS THE CENTER OF INTEREST

INTRODUCTORY

A. THE LETTERS OF IGNATIUS

The author.—The chief knowledge which we have of Ignatius is the account of his journey from Antioch to Rome when he had been condemned to suffer death at Rome from the wild beasts. From a few references in the letters which he wrote on this journey, it is concluded that he was converted rather late in life. In Rom. 9:2, he says: "But for myself I am ashamed to be called one of them; for neither am I worthy, being the very last of them, an untimely birth; but I have found mercy that I should be some one." The expression "an untimely birth" indicates in this connection that he was converted after he had reached maturity at least. The expression "being the very last of them" occurs in three other places in his letters, namely, Ephes. 21:2; Trall. 13:1, Smyr. 11:1. In itself it might indicate only his deep sense of humility. But in two places it is used to explain his unworthiness. Thus it is used in Trall. 13:1 and in Smyr. 11:1. He is unworthy because he is the last of the faithful. It thus lends support to the view of his late conversion. He is "one of those broken natures out of which, as Zahn has truly said, God's heroes are truly made."[1] His condemnation to die from the wild beasts shows that he was not a Roman citizen. The circumstances of his trial and condemnation at Antioch are unknown. Nor is it known why he was sent to Rome to die.[2] The one thing which is certain is that the sentence of condemnation had already been passed when he was on his journey. He says to the churches at Ephesus and Tralles, "I am a convict"; and to the church at Rome, "Let me be given to the wild beasts, for through them I can attain unto God."[3] He made the journey from Antioch to Rome under a guard of ten soldiers. He calls them leopards, and says that the more kind he was to them the more cruel they became.[4] But liberty to meet churches and confer with delegates from different places was granted to him, and at Smyrna he met with representatives from a number of churches.

[1] Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers, Ignatius*, I, 28.

[2] For a conjecture concerning his condemnation and death, see F. W. Farrar, *Lives of the Fathers*, I, 31, 73.

[3] Ephes. 12; Trall. 3; Rom. 4.

[4] Rom. 5:1.

He was reckoned the second bishop of the church at Antioch, not counting the apostles. The exact date of either the beginning or the end of his episcopate is unknown. The date assigned to his letters fixes the close of his episcopate at approximately 110 A.D.

The seven genuine letters.—His letters reveal intense devotion and eagerness for martyrdom. By his death he says that he will attain unto God, and become a word of God. This bold and unselfish spirit made a deep impression on his age, and finally, under the desire to imitate his example, undue importance is attached to martyrdom.[1] The seven letters known to Eusebius, and now generally accepted as genuine, were written while he was on the journey from Antioch to Rome. From Smyrna he wrote the letters to the churches at Ephesus, Magnesia, Tralles, and Rome. And from Troas he wrote the letters to the churches at Philadelphia, Smyrna, and the letter to Polycarp.

In six of the letters, all except the letter to the church at Rome, the object is the same. In them all he urges to unity among themselves, to subjection to the bishop, presbyters, and deacons, and warns them against false doctrine, especially docetism. Church unity and subordination to the officers of the church are the safeguard against the entrance of false doctrine. He lays great stress on the reality of the human nature of Christ. This truth which in our day seems so certain was at his time in danger of being obscured, and Ignatius appeared as its defender.[2] But Ignatius maintains also the divine nature of Christ. The letter to the church at Rome has an entirely different object. He is afraid that the love of the Christians at Rome will lead them to seek to avert his death. This intentional kindness he regards as cruelty because it would rob him of the crown of martyrdom for which he is eager. So he writes to them: "I am God's wheat, and I am ground by the teeth of wild beasts that I may be found pure bread of Christ. Rather entice the wild beasts that they may become my sepulchre and may leave no part of my body behind."[3]

The date.—These seven letters may be accepted as genuine, and the

[1] For a general characterization of Ignatius, see H. B. Swete, *Patristic Study*, pp. 14–17.

[2] Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers, Ignatius*, I, 39, says: "To deny the truth of Christ's humanity, to question the reality of his birth and life and death in the flesh, is the shadow of smoke, is the dream of a dream to us. Yet all the notices conspire to show that during a considerable part of the second century, it constituted a real danger to Christianity."

[3] Rom. 5:4.

date of the writing placed at about 110–17. It may have been a little earlier or a little later.[1]

B. THE LETTER OF POLYCARP

The author.—Polycarp was bishop of the church at Smyrna when Ignatius passed through this place on his way to Rome. Ignatius remained here for some time and received the messengers from near-by churches. Such a meeting gave Ignatius a fine opportunity to gain a true knowledge of the character of Polycarp. The disciple eager for martyrdom found a sympathetic spirit in Polycarp. He speaks of Polycarp in the letter to the Ephesians, saying that he wrote to them "with thanksgiving to the Lord, having love for Polycarp as I have for you also."[2] And in his letter to the church at Smyrna he calls Polycarp "your godly bishop." This character for saintliness is given to Polycarp in the account of his martyrdom which the church at Smyrna furnished the church at Philomelium nearly half a century later. Ignatius in his letter to Polycarp speaks of his godly mind, grounded as it were on an immovable rock, and of his great joy that he had been permitted to see his "blameless face."[3] It is in this same letter that he uttered the prophetic words: "Stand thou firm, as an anvil when it is smitten. It is the part of a great athlete to receive blows and be victorious."[4] These words found fulfilment about forty years later. Polycarp held the position of bishop at Smyrna for about fifty years. Irenaeus says that he "not only had been taught by apostles, and lived in familiar intercourse with many who had seen Christ," but that he also received his appointment from apostles. Tertullian adds definiteness to this statement, and says that John was the apostle who appointed him to his office.

But to go back from this time when Polycarp is introduced to us in connection with Ignatius, we find that he was probably from Christian parents. He says at his martyrdom that he had served the Lord eighty-six years. This statement can be understood most easily if we suppose that he counts the years of service from his birth. If his conversion should be dated at an early age, ten, twelve, or fifteen years added to eighty-six would make him very old. On the first supposition, and by counting the martyrdom at 155 A.D., he was born 69 A.D. Lightfoot has shown the important relation in which Polycarp stood to Christian

[1] See Harnack, *Geschichte der altchristlichen Litt. bis Eusebius*, Erster Band, S. 381–406.

[2] Ephes. 21:1. [3] Pol. 1:1. [4] Pol. 2:3.

leaders. He sustained intimate relations to John, Ignatius, and Irenaeus.[1] The well-known circumstances of his martyrdom are learned from the letter of the church at Smyrna to the church at Philomelium. Here we are given the circumstances of his burning at the stake in Smyrna. His words to the magistrate are memorable when that officer pressed him hard and said, "Swear the oath, and I will release thee; revile the Christ." Polycarp answered: "Fourscore and six years have I been his servant, and he hath done me no wrong. How then can I blaspheme my king who saved me?"

The occasion of the letter.—Ignatius had requested the churches of Asia Minor to write a letter to Syrian Antioch and congratulate the church on the cessation of persecution, and he had asked that his letter should be sent by a trustworthy messenger. On leaving Philippi, he had made the same request of the church there. The church at Philippi wrote to Polycarp and asked that their letter should be borne by the messenger from Smyrna. The Philippians asked also for copies of the letters which Ignatius had written, and invited Polycarp to address them any word of exhortation. In reply to this letter, Polycarp wrote the letter to the Philippians. The letter consists chiefly of a series of exhortations to refrain from evil and live righteously, giving as the sanction of conduct the future judgment, and as the inspiring motive for their life the example of Jesus.

The date of the letter.—The letter was written not long after the visit of Ignatius to Smyrna. At the time of writing, Polycarp has no sure knowledge of the fate of Ignatius, though he expects that Ignatius has suffered martyrdom. He says to the Philippians: "Moreover, concerning Ignatius himself and those that were with him, if you have any sure tidings, certify us."[2] Since Polycarp is recognized as a man having authority, Harnack thinks that 110 A.D. is the earliest date that can be assigned for the letter. If Ignatius' visit to Smyrna was near 110, the date of this letter must have fallen in 110 or 111. It is very well established that the date is between 110 and 120.

In literary characteristics the letter is very different from the letters of Ignatius. It is lacking in the glowing enthusiasm and bold originality so characteristic of Ignatius. The death of Christ occupies a place of far less importance in the letter of Polycarp. But from the point of view of Christology, the letter belongs to the same group as those of Ignatius. The high rank which he gives to Christ, the conjoining of

[1] *Apostolic Fathers, Ignatius and Polycarp*, I, 433.

[2] Phil. 13:2.

Christ and God in important functions, and the slight emphasis upon the subordination of the Son to the Father; all these important features show that he is close to Ignatius.

C. II CLEMENT

Its character as homily.—This designation, II Clement, is still retained by Gebhardt, Harnack, and Zahn in their *Patrum Apostolicorum Opera*, though it is generally agreed that it is not a letter, and that it was not written by Clement of Rome who wrote our First Clement. Harnack, however, still maintains that it is a letter. Lightfoot calls it "an ancient homily by an unknown author." The work itself furnishes rather decisive evidence that it is a homily. Chapters nineteen and twenty especially have the hortatory style. Here we find such expressions as the following: "Let us not be displeased and vexed"; "let us therefore practice righteousness"; "let not the godly be grieved"; "let us then have faith, brethren and sisters." This direct appeal is suitable to address. But this is not a decisive element in determining the nature of the work. Paul's letters have such appeals. The letter to the Romans abounds in exhortations more than do the nineteenth and twentieth chapters of this work. The direct address "my brethren" is in Paul's letters as much as "brothers and sisters" cited in this work. There are two expressions, however, which clearly determine that this work is a homily. In XIX. 1, he says: "Therefore, brothers and sisters, after the God of truth has been heard, I read to you an exhortation." Here is a plain statement which shows its nature as a homily. He reads or speaks to them. In XVII. 3, he says: "Let us not think to believe and give heed now only, while we are admonished by the presbyters; but likewise when we have departed home let us remember the commandments of the Lord." This furnishes an instance of the early church meeting such as Justin describes in his *Apology*. As the earliest example of the addresses delivered at these meetings, this homily has great interest.

The author.—Three men have been proposed as the author. Bryennios thinks that Clement of Rome who wrote the first letter to the Corinthians is the author. The external testimony is very strong against such a supposition. The correct translation of the words of Dionysius as quoted by Eusebius, *H.E.* IV. 23. 11, shows that the church at Corinth knew only one letter of Clement. Dionysius writes to Soter: "Today we have passed the Lord's holy day, in which we have read your epistle. From it, whenever we read it, we shall always be able to draw advice,

as also from the former epistle, which was written to us through Clement." Eusebius, who was the first to mention the second letter of Clement, speaks disparagingly of its authenticity, describing it as the so-called letter of Clement. But the internal evidence is decisive against the authorship of Clement. The author's attitude toward Christ in speaking of him twice as God allies him with Ignatius rather than Clement. Hilgenfeld has proposed Clement of Alexandria as the author. But Lightfoot has shown with convincing clearness that this identification cannot be made. The attitude of the two writers toward a quotation from the Egyptian Gospel is very different, as well as the style of the two writers. Harnack identifies our Second Clement with Soter's letter to the Corinthians. The preservation of Soter's letter by the Corinthian church is not sufficient to make the identification, and the evidence that this work originated at Corinth is opposed to the identification.

The place of origin.—Because of the document's resemblances to Hermas, Harnack thinks that it originated in Rome. But these resemblances, as Lightfoot has shown, are artificial, while the differences are great. The reference to the Isthmian games, and the fact that it has borne the name of Clement, make it probable that it originated in Corinth.

The date.—The date is some time between 120 and 140 A.D.[1]

On the basis of its Christology, Second Clement belongs in the group with Ignatius.

I. The Christology in the Letters of Ignatius

1. The conception of the relation of Christ to God

Ignatius uses the name "Jesus Christ" as the usual designation of Christ. Out of about one hundred and thirty-two times that he mentions Christ, he calls him Jesus Christ one hundred and seven times, leaving only twenty-five times that he applies to him other names.

(1) *The titles given to Christ and their significations*

He applies to Christ all the titles used by Clement, ὁ κύριος, ὁ σωτήρ, ὁ ἀρχιερεύς, ὁ χριστός, ὁ υἱὸς θεοῦ, and one most significant additional title ὁ θεός. He gives also to some of these titles which had already been employed a wider meaning. He uses the title ὁ κύριος to denote the authority of Christ over men in every relation in which he

[1] Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers, Clement of Rome*, II, 191–210.

considers men. His authority extends over the spiritual life of the believer. He watches over their safety. Men must obey the ordinances of the Lord in order that they may prosper in all things. They must be obedient to the bishop as to Jesus Christ, and "live not after men but after Jesus Christ."[1] His power extends over the body as well as the spirit. He uses "flesh and spirit" very frequently to designate the whole man.[2] Ecclesiastical affairs are under his authority. Christ is the bishop of all. The bishop of the local church is under the authority of Christ. The deacons of the church "have been appointed according to the mind of Jesus Christ, whom after his own will he confirmed and established by his Holy Spirit."[3] The marital relations must be in harmony with the Lord. The award of honor and the acceptance or rejection of men are under the authority of Christ.[4] The extent of God's authority is not greater than Christ's. He recognizes so fully the sway of Christ in every realm that to the mind of Ignatius there seem to be no limits to the authority of Christ. Here is a marked difference between Ignatius and Clement. Christ is presented almost constantly by Clement as acting under the direction of the Father. Clement saw the supreme authority of God back of Christ. In the view of Ignatius the background with God in it fades away, and Christ stands alone as Lord over men.

The author's use of *σωτήρ*, *ἀρχιερεύς*, and *ὁ χριστός* has not much significance in it. He indicates in no way by his use the content of the word *σωτήρ*. Christ as *ἀρχιερεύς* is the mediator between God and men. He is the door to the Father through whom Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob enter in. The author uses *ὁ χριστός* only once as a title, and there is nothing in the context to show his conception of the Messiah. He uses *υἱός* in the following combinations: *τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ*, *τῷ υἱῷ ἀνθρώπου*, *υἱὸν θεοῦ κατὰ θέλημα καὶ δύναμιν θεοῦ*. The title indicates that he is son in the metaphysical sense. Two of these titles are especially significant. *τοῦ μόνου υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ* is a reflection of John 1:14 and 3:16: *δόξαν ὡς μονογενοῦς παρὰ πατρός*, and *τὸν υἱὸν τὸν μονογενῆ*. Such a title separates him from men. *υἱὸν θεοῦ κατὰ θέλημα καὶ δύναμιν θεοῦ* stands in contrast to his human nature. His human nature is accounted for by his descent from David. But this fails to exhaust the idea which the author has of him. His existence also pro-

[1] Philad. 5; Mag. 13; Trall. 2.

[2] Ephes. 10:3; Mag. 1; Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers, Ignatius and Polycarp*, II, 160.

[3] Philad. Int.; Pol. Int.; Mag. 3:1. [4] Pol. 5; Philad. 11.

ceeds from the divine will and power. But the most significant title which Ignatius gives to Christ is ὁ θεός. Lightfoot maintains that Ignatius never uses θεός of Christ in an absolute sense. Some adjective or modifying phrase is used or the word is used predicatively. The correctness of this statement can scarcely be maintained. There are some passages which can be explained in no other way than in the absolute sense. At least they are so used in the text as it is given to us. Lightfoot recognizes this fact and is compelled to resort to the expedient of a corrupt text. An examination of the instances in which Ignatius uses θεός will confirm the statement that he uses it in an absolute sense. The title is applied to Christ thirteen times in these letters. Seven times it is "our God," as in Ephes. Int. 15:3; 18:2; Rom. Int. 3:3; Pol. 8:3. Once it is "God in men," Ephes. 7:2. Once it is "the God who has bestowed such wisdom upon you," Smyr. 1:1. Three times it is used without any qualification: Ephes. 1:1, "the blood of God" Trall. 7:1, "inseparable from God, Jesus Christ"; Smyr. 10:1, "ministers of Christ, God." Thus it is seen that out of the thirteen times that the title is applied to Christ, three times it is applied absolutely. Lightfoot thinks that the use of "blood of God" and "blood of Christ" as convertible expressions gives no warrant for the conclusion that he would therefore speak of Christ as God absolutely. But it is difficult to see how the equivalence of the two expressions destroys its absolute use in this instance. Moreover, the absolute use cannot be denied to Smyr. 10:1, χριστοῦ θεοῦ, except by maintaining that the text is corrupt here. Lightfoot retains χριστοῦ but brackets it. Gebhardt, Harnack, and Zahn retain χριστοῦ without the brackets. There has been some attempt where χριστοῦ is retained to interpret it as if there were a καί between χριστοῦ and θεοῦ, and even Lightfoot shows sympathy with this interpretation and wishes to read it "inseparable from God, and Jesus Christ, and the bishop," although the text is kept as Gebhard Harnack, and Zahn give it. However, Lightfoot acknowledges that such an absence of the connective is contrary to the genius of the Greek language.[1] Goltz has made a careful study of the way in which Ignatius forms compounds with θεός. The messenger who should carry the letters from Asia Minor to Antioch is called in Pol. 7:2 θεοδρόμος. Again in Smyr. 11:2, he is called θεοπρεσβευτής. Polycarp is addressed, Pol. 7:2, as θεομακάριστος. In Smyr. 1:2, the passion of Christ is spoken of as θεομακαρίτης. The Magnesian Christians, Mag. 1:2, are accounted worthy to bear a name θεοπρεπεστάτου. In Ephes. 2:1,

[1] *Apostolic Fathers, Ignatius and Polycarp*, II, 289.

Crocus is said to be θεοῦ ἄδιος. Goltz concludes from these passages that Ignatius has a tendency to designate the divine character of an act or of a person by θεός. So he interprets Ignatius' application of θεός to Christ in the same way. The divine act of Christ in bringing salvation entitles him to be called θεός. θεός is the collective denotation of the good of salvation.[1] It must be noted, however, that the word θεός is applied to an act or a person, apart from God or Christ, only once. In Ephes. 14:1, he says: ἀρχὴ μὲν πίστις, τέλος δὲ ἀγάπη, τὰ δὲ δύο, ἐν ἑνότητι γενόμενα, θεός ἐστιν. Here he characterizes as θεός the essential qualities of God which he wishes the Ephesians to possess. This is the only significant use, and the bold application by a figure of speech of θεός to a thing is very different from calling a historical person θεός. In all of the other instances, the relation to God is clearly indicated from the adjective with which he combines θεός. It is a long step from this modified use of θεός in compound words to its use without any qualification. In this unmodified sense θεός is applied to Christ, and for such use there is no analogy furnished by its indirect application to men, or its evidently boldly figurative application to things. Moreover, the fact that Ignatius calls Christ "our God" seven times[2] and "my God" once[3] prepares the reader for the application in the absolute sense, and these instances in which it occurs come without any suggestion of inappropriateness.

(2) *Ascriptions to Christ*

Pre-existence, eternal existence, omniscience, and holiness are ascribed to Christ, and prayer is addressed to him. Christ was with the Father before the worlds. Christ shared with the Father in the act of foreordination 'before the ages," and he appeared at the end of time in the likeness of men.[4] Ignatius declares still more absolutely the eternity of Christ. He is "ingenerate."[5] The parallel clauses show that he means that as God he is "ingenerate" and that as man he is "generate." Lightfoot has shown in an excursus on γεννητός and ἀγέννητος that Ignatius does not use these words with the same accuracy with which they were employed by later theologians.[6] Ignatius has no intention to deny the eternal generation of the Son as it was asserted by

[1] Ed. v. d. Goltz, *Ignatius von Antiochien als Christ und Theologe*, in *Texte und Untersuchungen*, B. 12, S. 21–29.

[2] Ephes. Int. 7:2; 15:3; 18:2; Rom. 3:3; Int.; Pol. 8:3.

[3] Rom. 6:3. [4] Mag. 6; Ephes. Int. [5] Ephes. 7.

[6] *Apostolic Fathers, Ignatius and Polycarp*, II, 90–94.

later theologians. The idea of "eternal generation" was not present to his mind, not having yet been developed. The word that was later used to express the fact which Ignatius has in mind was ἀγένητος. Christ as God was not only before the ages, but he was "increate." In Pol. 3:2, he writes: "Await him that is above every season, the eternal"—τὸν ἄχρονον. ἄχρονος denotes here "transcending the limits of time," "eternal." The declaration of his eternity is made also in Mag. 7:2: "who came forth from the Father, and is with One, and has departed unto One." The expression εἰς ἕνα ὄντα described the eternal union of the Son with the Father. A similar expression is found in John 18:1: μονογενὴς θεὸς ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρός.[1] Christianity, in order to evade the charge that it was new, falls back upon the pre-existence of Christ.[2] He was the teacher of Moses and the prophets. He was different from the Father and also pre-existed. This excludes modalism.[3] There is no express declaration of the omniscience of Christ, but it is involved in the functions ascribed to him. God is represented as shepherd.[4] Then in the next line Ignatius says that Jesus alone shall be shepherd. The care of the invisible bishop involves omniscience. When he speaks of the bishop as God, in Mag. 3, he adds that nothing is hid from the eyes of the invisible bishop. Such knowledge on the part of the bishop was used to warn the Christians against sinning. In his letter to the Ephesians, Ignatius informs them that it is his purpose to write a second tract to them if it is the divine will, and if the Lord should reveal aught to him. Here ὁ κύριος denotes Christ. Ignatius never uses this title of the Father. Christ is the treasury of knowledge from which Ignatius drew. Jesus Christ is their only teacher. He has bestowed wisdom upon them.[5] But the most direct ascription of omniscience to Christ is in Ephes. Int. There he says that foreordination is by the will of the Father and Jesus Christ. Foreordination involves omniscience.

Holiness is also involved in the ascriptions made to Christ. He is true life; he is the mind of God; he is the unerring mouth of the Father; he is perfect faithfulness. He can be relied upon with absolute certainty to remember those who have lived righteously. In Ephes. 17, there is a reflection of Mark 14:1–8, the anointing of Christ. He says that the ointment was poured upon the head of the Lord in order that he might breathe incorruption upon the church. The teaching of the

[1] *Ibid.*, 123.

[2] Dorner, Div. I, Vol. I, p. 112.

[3] Goltz, B. 12, S. 15.

[4] Rom., chap. 9.

[5] Mag. 9:2; Smyr. 1:1.

prince of this world robs men of life, but Christ preserves life. He urges the Magnesians to unity and to obedience to the bishop and then holds up Christ as the example of righteous conduct. He did nothing without the Father and is the pattern "than whom there is nothing better." He is presented constantly as the norm of righteous conduct. Men should run in harmony with the mind of God. Christ is the mind of God. And all conduct in obedience to him is righteous. All such statements rest upon the assumption that Christ is holy.

The general attitude of dependence finds fullest expression in the address of prayer to Christ. When he writes to the Romans about his anticipated death by the wild beasts, he asks them to supplicate the Lord for him that through these instruments he may be found a sacrifice to God. Gebhardt, Harnack, and Zahn read τὸν χριστόν instead of κύριον as read by Lightfoot. The kindness of the church at Ephesus in sending delegates to meet him at Smyrna awakens in his heart "thanksgiving to the Lord." Philo and Rhaius Agathopus, who had been treated well by the church at Smyrna, "gave thanks to the Lord for you, because you refreshed them in the way."[1] Ignatius' use of ὁ κύριος to designate Christ, and not God the Father, furnishes the proof that Christ is here the object of prayer. The address of prayer to Christ is a distinct advance over Clement. Men come to God through Christ according to Clement, but Christ is not made the direct object of thanksgiving nor do men supplicate him for the things desired.

(3) *Important acts and functions are ascribed to the Father and Christ conjointly*

Foreordination "before the ages," direction of the action of men at present, and granting mercy are acts which are ascribed to the Father and Son conjointly. The joint action is carried back to eternity, and is brought down to the present. The welfare of men is traced to the joint action of the Father and Son in eternity, and men are at present dependent upon both Father and Son. Christians belong to God and Jesus Christ conjointly. This ownership is predicated both of individuals and of the church. God and Jesus Christ are conjointly bishop. He declares that the two are bishop of the church at Antioch, and also are bishop of Polycarp. Fellowship with God the Father and Jesus Christ is the common basis for sending "greetings" to others. Ignatius is in union with God and Jesus Christ; the Magnesians partake of the same

[1] Ephes. 21:1; Smyr. 10:1.

fellowship; this union forms a bond of connection on the basis of which greetings pass from one to the other.[1]

(4) *Jesus is subordinate to God*

However little the subordination of Christ to God is emphasized, it is not altogether absent. Jesus is an agent. He mediates between God and men. He is the unerring mouth of God. The mind of the Father comes to expression through the words of Jesus. Jesus is the revelation of the character of God. As the high priest, Jesus is the door through whom men enter in to the Father. Even Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob must enter through this door. Jesus was under the authority of the Father. God sent him into the world. On earth Jesus was subject to the authority of the Father. Jesus imitated the Father. God raised up the Eucharist, the flesh of Christ.[2] The attitude of Ignatius toward Christ is shown not by his denial of the subordination of Christ to God, but by the emphasis which he puts upon Christ's authority, independence, and association with the Father. We may, therefore, summarize Ignatius' teaching concerning the relation of Christ to the Father as follows: Christ possesses the divine attributes of eternity, omniscience, and holiness. He has the power to give life. He is associated with God in all the functions which are ascribed to God. He possesses divine qualities. He is called God. And very slight emphasis is put upon his subordination to God.

2. THE TWO NATURES OF CHRIST

The great ideas upon which Ignatius dwells grow out of the practical needs of his situation. This is true in regard to his teaching concerning: (1) the reality of Christ's human nature; (2) the place of Christ's passion in the believer's life; (3) union with Christ.

The reality of Christ's human nature is maintained in opposition to Docetism. Ephes. 7:18–20; Trall. 9–11; and Smyr. 1–4 are devoted to this subject. While the purpose of the author is to assert the reality of Christ's human nature, at the same time he is not content to present the human nature alone. So over against the human nature, he constantly puts the divine. He is "of the seed of David and of the Holy Ghost"; he is "both son of man and son of God"; he is born as man and not born as God; he is born of both "Mary and of God." His divine

[1] Ephes. Int.; Mag. Int.; Rom. Int.; Philad. Int. 3:2; Smyr. Int.; Pol. Int.; Trall. 1:1.

[2] Rom. 8:2; Mag. 7:8; 8:2; 13:2; Smyr. 7:1; 8:1; Trall. 9:2.

nature is presented to show that the human side does not exhaust Ignatius, conception of Christ. He speaks of only two events in the life of the historical Christ, and these are the beginning and end of his life. He was born of the Virgin Mary, and he was crucified under Pontius Pilate. The proofs of the reality of his human nature are his birth, suffering, death, and appearance after his resurrection. He came into the world subject to the laws which govern birth, and in his life he was subject to the condition of suffering under which men universally live. Only a real man could suffer as other men suffer. The reality of his resurrection is dwelt upon, and the proof of it is taken from John 20:24–29, the account of Christ's appearance to his disciples. He says to the disciples, according to the quotation of Ignatius: "Lay hold and handle me, and see that I am not a demon without a body." And then Ignatius says "Straightway they touched him, and they believed, being joined to his flesh and blood."[1] And their conviction of his reality inspired them with great courage and lifted them above the fear of death. The bonds of Ignatius are a proof to him of the reality of Christ's suffering. To Ignatius his willingness to suffer and his desire to fight with wild beasts are inexplicable except as the effect upon his heart of the real sufferings of Christ.[1] That which was most fundamental in its effects upon Christian life was not a semblance. Rather, those who deny the reality of the sufferings are themselves mere semblances.

3. THE DEATH OF CHRIST

Ignatius' own anticipated martyrdom gave the death of Christ deep significance to his mind. He affirms the historical fact of his death, the reality of his passion, and the function of his death. The first two points have been presented above. So the function of his death must now be considered.

He dies to deliver men from death, and his death is the ground upon which God forgives sin, and justifies the believer. In Trall. 2:1, he says: "He died for us, in order that you believing might escape dying." The infinitive ἀποθανεῖν denotes, not a state of death, but the act of dying. Christ's death relieved men from the necessity to suffer death. Faith is the condition upon which men appropriate the benefits of Christ's death. He says "faith in his death" either because he considered the confession of the reality of his death a test of Christian faith, or because he considered that it was by virtue of his death that faith in him was effective. He employs the word λυτρόω in Philad. 11:1. He says:

[1] Smyr. 3.

οἱ δὲ ἀτιμάσαντες αὐτοὺς λυτρωθείησαν ἐν τῇ χάριτι τοῦ Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ. He prays that the Lord may receive those who have honored the messengers who ministered to him. In the case of those who have dishonored the ministers of Ignatius, the inference is that their conduct has made them displeasing to the Lord, and so liable to punishment. He prays that the favor of the Lord may remit the punishment. He is leading them not out of one moral state into another, but out of a state of liability to punishment into a state where there is no such liability. In Philad. 8:2, he says that through their prayers he hopes to be justified by the cross of Christ. He is considering the sins of division and anger. Two ends are held in view: forgiveness of the sin and deliverance from the power of the sin. Two conditions are given upon which these purposes can be attained: repentance and the cross of Christ. These conditions are not joined together formally. He says: "The Lord forgiveth all men when they repent." He also says that he expects to be justified by the cross of Christ, and that men escape death through faith in Christ.[1] Repentance and faith are required of men in order that their sins may be forgiven, and the death of Christ is the ground upon which the favor is exercised. Ignatius is not content to view the effect of Christ's death as beginning at a certain historical moment, the time when he was crucified. The effect of Christ's death began in eternity. They were "united and elect in a true passion by the will of the Father and Jesus Christ our God."[2] The death of Christ is thus viewed as the ground of the election of men.[3]

The moral effects of Christ's death occupy a far more prominent place in the thought of Ignatius. The passion and the resurrection of Christ are the center around which the thought of Ignatius revolves. Lightfoot has suggested that the incarnation has significance for him only because it leads up to the passion. The whole Christian life springs out of the passion and the resurrection.[4] He says to the Smyrnaeans that they are the fruit of Christ's resurrection. Death is the tree upon which the fruit of Christian life has grown. He warns the Magnesians against Judaism and the observance of Sabbaths, but urges them to fashion "their lives after the Lord's day, on which our life arose through him and through his death."[5] Life out of death is fundamental in the thought of Ignatius. "Repent and return to the passion which is our resurrection."[6] Not only does he make the general statement that the whole

[1] Trall. 2:1. [2] Ephes. Int.

[3] Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers, Ignatius and Polycarp*, II, 25.

[4] Smyr. 1:2. [5] Mag. 9:1. [6] Smyr. 5:3.

life of the believer comes from the death and resurrection of Christ, but his mind is so filled with this thought that he constantly connects specific Christian graces with the death of Christ. His present sufferings and his anticipated and greatly desired martyrdom would naturally center his thoughts upon the death of Christ. The Trallian's peace—felicity in the assurance of salvation—comes from the death of Christ.[1] So also the joy of the Philadelphians comes from the death of Christ.[2] He praises the Ephesians for their well-beloved name to which they are entitled by natural right, but he reminds them that the blood of Christ has kindled their generosity into a flame.[3] Christ's passion inflames the hearts of men with a desire for the most generous deeds. His own experience testifies to the power of the death of Christ to produce the highest devotion in the lives of men. The death of Christ was the pattern for his own martyrdom, and the inspiration to it. He was humbled by the cross, and yet at the same time inspired by it.[4] He says that he longs to imitate the passion of his God. He declares that if anyone has Christ in him, he will understand the intensity of Ignatius' desire. Christ's death is that which fills the heart of Ignatius with love for his Lord. He says: "It is good for me to die for Jesus rather than to reign over the bounds of the earth. Him I seek who died on our behalf."[5] Christ's death is the power which made love firm and strong in the hearts of believers.[6] Christ's death as a principle of love is that power in the world which transforms the lives of men.[7] The death of Christ is a great factor in the building-up of the Christian life. He uses Paul's familiar figure of the building. The individual members are stones in the temple of God. They "are hoisted up to the heights through the engine of Jesus Christ, which is the cross, and using for a rope the Holy Spirit; while your faith is your windlass, and love is the way that leadeth up to God."[8] The passion of Christ furnishes the standard which the believer's conduct must attain, if he would have the life of Christ in him.[9] In one peculiar passage, he speaks of the relation of Christ's blood to the baptismal waters. Here he says: "He was born and baptized that by his passion he might cleanse water."[10]

[1] Trall. Int. [2] Philad. Int. [3] Ephes. 1:1.

[4] Farrar, *Lives of the Fathers*, I, 62.

[5] Rom. 6:1. [6] Smyr. 1:1.

[7] Dorner, *Doctrine of the Person of Christ*, I, Vol. I, p. 107.

[8] Ephes. 9:1. [9] Rom. 6:3.

[10] Ephes. 18:2. Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers, Ignatius and Polycarp*, II, 75, 76, says of this passage: "The baptism of Christ might in a certain sense be said, in the language of our liturgy, to sanctify water to the mystical washing away of sins; but it was the death of Christ which gave their purifying effect to the baptismal waters."

Ignatius takes a twofold view of the death of Christ. It had vicarious value, and moral power over the lives of men.

4. THE CONSTRUCTIVE ASPECT OF CHRIST'S SOTERIOLOGICAL WORK

As the prominent doctrines of Ignatius, which have been considered above, grew out of the practical needs of his day, so does this one of union with Christ. Six of these letters are full of exhortations to unity. In the churches of Asia Minor there was a manifest tendency to extreme individualism which was disintegrating the church and giving an opportunity for the entrance of heresy, such as Docetism and Judaism. There were some who were performing the functions of church life apart from the direction of the constituted officers. Ignatius admonishes them to obey the officers as a means of securing unity, and presents unity as a safeguard to their life. This unity which he desired in the church led him to emphasize unity with Christ as the condition of life. Christ as living, leading the church, and molding the life of believers is everywhere present to the thought of Ignatius. Christ is acting upon their lives. Now one of the ways in which Christ's work is accomplished in men is union with him. Two figures set forth the nature of this union with Christ, the body and the building. He says to the Ephesians that they are members of Christ, and urges them to live so that God will acknowledge them as members of his son. His use of the common Pauline figure to express the relation of the believer to Christ shows that the relation is one by means of which life is derived.[1] The figure of the building is employed in two different ways. Believers dwell in Christ, and Christ and God dwell in the believer.[2] The latter figure is the one most fully developed. He describes the manner of building the temple in which God dwells. Then, again, each believer bears his shrine. This figure is derived, no doubt, from the prevalent custom at Ephesus at that time. The pagans in their processions carried images of their gods. Now, he says that the Christians bear their shrines, but God and Christ are in them. Thus by these figures he portrays the nature of the intimate relation to Christ by means of which life was derived. He also expresses union with Christ by the Pauline phrase ἐν χριστῷ. They are found in Christ Jesus, and this relation leads unto true life. In Christ Jesus men live forever."[3] In Christ Jesus "is the relation which forms a bond of unity between men. On the basis of this common union with Christ, Ignatius sends greeting to the different churches. Apart from all figures, he declares that believers must have union with Jesus and the Father,

[1] Ephes. 4:2. [2] Ephes. 10:3; 15:3. [3] Ephes. 20:2.

and says that if they continue in this union they will attain unto God.[1] This statement in reference to union with Jesus grows out of the exhortation to unity among the disciples. The union of believers he regards as something more, perhaps, than mere harmony. At least, their union was a condition of life. The unity of the membership was the only power which would hold the church together and prevent its dissolution.[2] The still higher relation which is essential to life is union with Christ. In Ephes. 3:2, he says that Jesus is their inseparable life. He is not content in stating in general terms the effect of union with Christ. Many specific effects of Christ's work are given. Christ strikes off their fetters; he puts the stamp of God upon them; he breathes incorruption on the church; he is the physician of the flesh and the spirit; he gives strength for duties; he fills the heart with praise to God; he gives men hope; he furnishes the ground upon which they expect salvation.[3]

5. ESCHATOLOGY

The resurrection of the believer and the second coming of Christ receive but small notice in the writings of Ignatius. In Trall. 9:2, he says that the Father who raised up Jesus will raise up the Christians also. And in the inscription to the Trallians he speaks of the Christians' resurrection.

In Rom. 10:3, he speaks of the "patient waiting for the coming of Christ." The expectation of the speedy return of Christ has given place to the patient waiting for him. If Ignatius had "a settled conviction that the present state of things would not last long,"[4] he gives but little expression to such a conviction.

II. The Christology in the Letter of Polycarp to the Philippians

1. THE HIGH RANK WHICH THE AUTHOR GIVES TO CHRIST

(1) *The extent of Christ's authority.*—Christ is Lord over the Christian community and the lives of believers. "Our Lord" and "the Lord" are the usual designations for Christ. These two titles occur in this short letter about twenty-five times, while all other titles occur only

[1] Mag. 1:2.

[2] Starbuck, "The Ignatian Question," *Andover Review*, September, 1892, says: "Without this every church will go to pieces; a heresy dissolving the very historic forms of Christianity will have free entrance; and the regenerate life which is essentially a corporate life will soon be lost in a mist of discordant atoms."

[3] Philad. 8:1; Mag. 5:2; 7:1; Ephes. 17:8; 7:2; 4:2; Smyr. 4:2.

[4] Cruttwell, *A Literary History of Early Christianity*, I, 68.

about seventeen times. We can scarcely admit with Deissmann that the title "Lord" is itself a predication of divinity, unless we take divinity in so attenuated a sense that it will itself call for definition.[1] Such definition can be best made by considering the ascription of authority to Christ. Polycarp says that the will of Christ is the law for their conduct individually and collectively. The number of times that the title "Lord" is used shows how this thought permeates the letter. For examples of this use consider the following passages: II. 2: "If we do his will and walk in his commandments"; IV. 1: "Walk in the commandment of the Lord"; VI. 3: "Serve him with fear and reverence as he gave commandment"; V. 3: "Submitting yourselves to the presbyters and deacons as to God and Christ"; VI. 2: "We are before the eyes of our Lord and God." He recognizes clearly the dependence of men upon Christ for salvation. Here Christ is Lord. In the introduction he gives Christ the title "Savior." By this title he expresses the thought of salvation in its totality. Throughout the letter some more definite details of this salvation are given. Christ conjointly with God the Father chooses men; Christ grants forgiveness; he builds men up in the faith; and his work ceases not until the future destiny of men is settled and he acts as judge of the living and the dead and grants a lot and portion among the saints.[2] His authority passes beyond the limits of the Christian community. Polycarp declares that Christ participates with God in the government of the world. In II. 1, he says that Christ has a position at the right hand of God. Harnack traces the development of this power. He says that from being the author of spiritual life his power extended to all life.

A still wider reach is given to his authority in two noteworthy statements. In II. 1, he says: "Unto whom all were made subject that are in heaven and that are on the earth;" and also: "He is judge of quick and dead." Lightfoot thinks that although he does not use the title "God" as Ignatius does, he assigns to him an even higher function.

(2) The author's habit of conjoining Christ with God in important functions and prerogatives indicates the rank of Christ. This mode of thought allies him closely with Ignatius and as clearly marks him off from Clement. The attitude toward Christ represented by the two groups is entirely different. Clement's greeting is mercy and peace

[1] Deissmann, *Light from the Ancient East*, p. 354, says: "It may be said with certainty that at the time when Christianity originated, 'Lord' was a divine predicate intelligible to the whole Eastern world."

[2] Pol. I. 1; VI. 2; XII. 2; II. 1.

from God the Father through Christ. But Polycarp says: "May mercy and peace be multiplied from Almighty God and Jesus Christ our Savior." This expression is very close to that found in Paul's salutations, "grace and peace from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ."[1] Polycarp conjoins Christ with the Father in the following functions: as the source of mercy and peace; in the election of men to salvation; in the government of the world; in beholding the conduct of men; in building men up in faith; and as the object of love.[2]

(3) The slight emphasis placed upon the subordination of Christ to God indicates the high rank of Christ in the mind of the author. The idea of subordination is expressed in the following statements: God raised Christ from the dead; God saves men through Jesus Christ; God gave Christ glory and a throne; and to Christ all things were subjected.[3] In this last passage, the power was clearly conferred by God. Universal dominion is not exercised by Christ alone. He shares it with the Father, as all those passages in which the Father and Son are conjoined in authority show. The thought of subordination, which occupies so large a place in Clement, has almost entirely disappeared in Polycarp. Only once does he say that God saves men through Christ, while the dominant thought of his letter is that God and Christ are in a position of virtual equality in the work of salvation. The subordination implied in God's raising Christ applies only to his state of humiliation, and it is doubtful if Polycarp has any intention of expressing subordination by it. He gives the simple historical statement in the language of Scripture without any thought of its bearing upon the rank of Christ. And it is certain that in the passage which represents God as giving a throne to Christ that the subordination involved in "giving" is not at all in the author's mind. He has his mind fixed upon the "glory" and the "throne"—the exaltation of Christ.

2. THE FUNCTION OF CHRIST'S DEATH

Polycarp is far removed from Ignatius in the emphasis which he places upon the death of Christ. In Ignatius the death of Christ occupies a central place. Men are exhorted to believe on the death of Christ. The death of Christ is a source of life. The attention of Polycarp is only slightly fixed on the death of Christ. Lightfoot calls attention to the fact that in Ignatius the blood of Christ is presented as a center of

[1] Rom. 1:7; I Cor. 1:3; II Cor. 1:2; Phil. 1:2.

[2] Int. I. 1; II. 1; III. 1; V. 23; VI. 2; XII. 2.

[3] I. 2, 3; II. 1, 2; IX. 2; XII. 2.

unity, while in Polycarp it is presented as a crime demanding vengeance.[1] Christ's death is mentioned three times, in the following places: II. 1; VIII. 1; and IX. 2. These passages have already been noticed. There is the simple statement in IX. 2 that he died in behalf of us and in itself the statement gives no clue to the author's conception of the function of Christ's death. The idea is implied in the context, as Dorner had suggested,[2] that his death begot love in the hearts of the disciples. They loved him who died for them. The function of his death is more clearly stated in VIII. 1. He bore our sins on the tree that we through union with him might live. This passage reflects I Pet. 2:21–25, which in turn is founded upon Isa., chap. 53. On the assumption that I Peter reflects the idea of Isaiah, that the suffering servant bears the penalty of others' sins, and that Polycarp reflects the thought of I Peter, this passage means that Christ bore the penalty of sins for others. He endured death for sins which were not his own in order that men might live, that is, need not endure the death on account of sin which fell upon him.

The purpose that the author has in view is entirely practical, and his main point is that Christ's endurance of death furnishes an example to be imitated. In chapters six and seven he has spoken of false brethren, who deny the testimony of the cross, who pervert the oracles of the Lord, and who say that there is no resurrection nor judgment. Against all this current of evil and error, the Philippian Christians must stand firm. The great example of endurance is Christ on the cross. It may be doubted if the thought of Polycarp goes beyond Christ as an example. At least it is certain that the main use that he makes of this Scripture is that he gains here an example of endurance for the imitation of the Philippians. In connection with the death of Christ, he speaks of his holiness, an idea that is implied, however, in his work of salvation.

3. THE CONSTRUCTIVE ASPECT OF CHRIST'S SOTERIOLOGICAL WORK

Faith in Christ is the condition of salvation. He commends the Philippians for the steadfast root of their faith, famed from primitive times, which abides yet and bears fruit unto the Lord. Again he says that a portion of the future world of bliss is dependent on faith. Christ and God build men up in faith as a comprehensive grace.[3] While faith is thus recognized as the source of the Christian's life, the emphasis of the letter as a whole is upon works worthy of a Christian rather than

[1] Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers, Ignatius and Polycarp*, I, 579, 580.

[2] Dorner, *Doctrine of the Person of Christ*, Div. I, Vol. I.

[3] I. 2; XII. 2.

upon the inner source of good works. They must forsake evil practices, follow righteousness, walk blamelessly, be compassionate, endure, and they shall receive the future world. He has the Pauline idea of union with Christ. His use of the phrase ἐν αὐτῷ shows this. He suffered that men might live "in him." He exhorts the Christians to be perfect "in him." Union with Christ is the source of their life. Such union furnishes the means for them to attain strength and perfection of character, and it forms the bond of Christian fellowship.

4. ESCHATOLOGY

He has no detailed treatment of the last things. He expects Christ to come again, to raise the dead, and to judge men.[1] His statement that the covetous and idolatrous will be judged as the Gentiles who are ignorant of the judgment of the Lord is the only statement that implies a resurrection of the wicked. The other statements about the resurrection apply only to the righteous. His statement in VI, 2, that at the judgment seat of Christ each must give an account of himself, conveys the impression that the judgment will be made on the basis of deeds, though he does not expressly make this affirmation.

III. The Christology in the Homily of Second Clement

1. THE HIGH RANK WHICH THE AUTHOR GIVES TO CHRIST

(1) He calls Christ God. In XIII. 4, he says: "God saith." And then the quotation of Christ's words makes it certain that by "God" he means Christ. For he gives the well-known words of Christ: "It is no thank unto you, if ye love them that love you, but this is thank unto you, if you love your enemies and them that hate you." When he speaks of the future kingdom of God, he says that no one knows the day of God's appearing.[2] And then by the following context he leaves no doubt that he refers to Christ's appearing. For he goes on to say that in a certain conversation the Lord himself, being asked when his kingdom would come, said: "When the two shall be one, and the outside as the inside, and the male with the female, neither male nor female."[3] In the opening words of this homily the author urges the Christians to think of Christ as they think of God, as judge of the living and dead.

(2) Second Clement gives to Christ the same rank as to God. Calling him "God" is not something which may be regarded as a lapse, or due to carelessness, or really out of harmony with the fundamental

[1] V. 2; II. 1; VI. 2; XI. 2.

[2] II Clement XII. 1.

[3] II Clement XII. 2.

thought of the author. On the contrary, this designation of Christ is in accord with the author's fundamental conception of Christ. In common with all this group of writings, he regards Christ as Lord over the Christians. They must obey his commandments. His authority extends to the future judgment day. He will confess or deny men before his Father according as they have been loyal or disloyal to him. He has power to cast men into Gehenna. Christ's boundless power to give life leads the author to call him the "Prince of immortality." It is not the mere assignment of this power to Christ which is so significant, but the author has shown that he has his own interpretation of this work of Christ. His saving work gives to Christ the same rank as to God. When he urges them to think of Christ as God, he intends to put the Creator of the spiritual life on the same level with the Creator of the world. Other writers in this period will carry the thought still further and make Christ the Creator of all things. But Second Clement has not advanced so far as that. His distinct contribution toward such development is the emphasis which he puts on spiritual creation as on a par with universal creation. He thinks of the spiritual life in terms of creation. He says in I. 8: "For he called us, when we were not, and from not being he willed us to be." The reference in this verse can scarcely be to their creation in the absolute sense. For in vs. 7, he is considering their hopeless condition spiritually apart from Christ. When they had no hope Christ called them, and when they had no spiritual life he willed them to be. To the mind of the homilist, salvation was a wonderful work. The Christians must not think mean things of this salvation. He who had the boundless power to dispel the darkness of the cloud wherein they were wrapped, who could give unto them light, and who was the Prince of immortality, who by the power of his will called them from not being to be—of him they must think as God.

(3) Second Clement gives a clear statement of the pre-existence of Christ. It is said in IX. 5: "If Christ the Lord who saved us, being first spirit, then became flesh, and so called us in like manner, we shall in this flesh receive our reward." Dorner has pointed out that this doctrine is stated because of the author's desire to emphasize the dignity of the body. Christ became flesh, and so the body has dignity. But for christological purposes this passage has especial value because of the distinct separation which the author makes between the pre-existent and the incarnate Christ. He was spirit: he became flesh. This expression resembles the declaration in John 1:14: "And the Word became flesh, and dwelt among us (and we beheld his glory, glory as of the only

begotten from the Father) full of grace and truth." His life was not merely the manifestation of a being who had been hidden with God; he became something different. Harnack finds in this passage, which is typical of the teaching of the Apostolic Fathers concerning pre-existence, "the root of the orthodox system of dogmatics," the fundamental theological and philosophical creed on which the whole trinitarian and christological speculations of the church of the succeeding centuries are built."[1]

(4) His slight emphasis upon any idea of subordination also indicates the high rank which he gives to Christ. There are only a few passages from which the idea of subordination can be gained, and they do not all represent the main thought of the author. He says: "Through him we know the Father; God made known to us the heavenly life through Jesus; God sent forth Jesus."[2] It must be remembered, however, that the homilist calls Jesus God, and that though this term is not expressly applied to him in this pre-existent state, yet it is used of the incarnation, which is not a process of exaltation but of humiliation. So that Harnack is, perhaps, very nearly correct when he says: "Even in his pre-existent state, Christ is an independent power, existing side by side with God." And again: "This doctrine threatens the monarchy of God."[3]

This doctrine of the high rank of Christ clearly puts this work in the group with Ignatius, in which group we find the first stage in the development of Christology after Clement.

2. SECOND CLEMENT DIFFERENT FROM IGNATIUS IN CERTAIN RESPECTS

Second Clement speaks of the death of Christ only once. He says in I. 2: "He endureth to suffer for our sake." This statement gives no indication of the author's conception of the function of Christ's death, nor does he make the death a center of unity, nor a source of life and activities. Second Clement is also destitute of any constructive aspect of Christ's work of salvation. He doubtless assumes faith and union with Christ, but he says nothing about them. He lays the stress upon the externalities of the Christian life. The conduct must be in harmony with the will of Christ, and the sanction of conduct is the power of Christ to cast the disobedient into Gehenna.[4]

[1] *History of Dogma*, I. 328.
[2] III. 1, 2; XX. 5.
[3] *History of Dogma*, I, 33.
[4] VI. 7; VIII. 4.

3. ESCHATOLOGY

Second Clement has a clear plan of the last things. In this respect it is more explicit than Ignatius. The following details of the plan are given:

(1) Jesus will come, though there is no certainty about the time of his coming. He attempts to indicate the time by saying that the Lord himself had explained that he would come when his disciples had attained a certain high standard of conduct. "When the two shall be one, and the outside as the inside, and the male with the female, neither male nor female."[1] This condition of the Lord's second coming has the happy effect of not binding Second Clement to any definite time when the Lord would come. The author had probably seen enough disappointment in this matter to make him rather wary in his statement. But, as the Scriptures before him, he turns this uncertainty to good advantage, and he makes the certainty that he will come and the uncertainty when he will come the basis for exhortation to righteous conduct. "Await the kingdom of God betimes in love and righteousness, since we know not the day of God's appearing."[2] And when Christ comes, he appears as God.[3]

(2) Christ will judge all men.[4] The unrighteous as well as the righteous are under his dominion. It is affirmed: "The unbelievers shall see his glory and his might." When he appears the kingdom of the world shall be given to him. He will then proceed to exercise judgment.

(3) The basis of the judgment is "works." For it is said: "He shall come and redeem us, each man according to his works." The things which are enumerated that lead to condemnation are ungodly lives, false dealing with the commands of Christ, doing amiss, and the denial of Jesus. The deeds of the righteous for which they are commended are the following: having done good, a phrase comprehensive enough to include everything; having endured torments; and having hated the pleasures of the soul. The Christians were subject to persecution at that time. The date 120 A.D. puts this homily near the martyrdom of Ignatius, and the later date, 140 A.D., is only fifteen years before the martyrdom of Polycarp. So the endurance of torment was very naturally one of the virtues which called for especial regard. Those rewarded have also hated the pleasures of the soul. The punishment of the wicked will be grievous torments in unquenchable fire. But all that is said of

[1] XII. 2. [2] XII. 1. [3] XII. 3, 4. [4] XVII. 4–7.

the righteous is that there will be hope for him that has served God with his whole heart,

Summary of the Development of Christology in This Group

(1) The writers of this group show a new attitude toward Christ as compared with those of the preceding division. Christ and his work occupy a much larger place than in the first group. Clement treated of Christ only indirectly. Christ is the center of thought here. Ignatius, for example, conceives of the work of Christ in a variety of ways. Christ is an example. Christ has died for men. Christ is the giver of life, the Prince of immortality. Christ is the source of blessings. Christ is an object of prayer. In a great number of ways, a central place is given to Christ in these writings.

(2) In these writings there is a change in emphasis upon the subordination of Christ. In Clement the subordination of Christ is so emphasized that it holds the prominent place. In these writings, on the contrary, subordination though still present notably recedes. Ignatius does not make subordination emphatic. Polycarp gives still less attention to it, saying only that God raised Christ from the dead, God saves men through Christ, and God gave Christ a throne. And Second Clement has only a few passages from which the idea of subordination can be gained.

(3) These writings give a wide extension to the authority of Christ. In Clement the authority of Christ reaches only to the spiritual lives of men. Here Christ is Lord over the whole man, spirit and body. In Clement the authority of Christ is over believers. Here he is Lord over all men. This is the representation of all three of these writers.

(4) A greater significance is attached to Christ's work of salvation. Second Clement especially thinks of Christ's saving work in terms of creation. This conception furnishes an anticipation of creation in the absolute sense which is assigned to Christ by the next group of these writings.

(5) The ascription of eternal pre-existence to Christ is another advance over the first group.

(6) The function of judge at the great judgment day is assigned to Christ by all of these writings.

(7) Christ is conjoined with the Father much more boldly and thoroughly than in the first group of writings. The Father and Son are conjointly the hope of salvation in Clement. But the thought is expressed only once, and it is not the prevailing mode of Clement's

thought. In Clement's salutation, grace and peace come from the Father through the Son. In these writings the Father and Son are together the source of grace and peace. They are conjoined in election and foreordination; together they grant mercy to men; together they direct the actions of men. Men belong to Christ and God. Christ is conjoined with God in authority over Christians, in the government of the world, in beholding the conduct of men, in building men up in faith, and as the object of the believer's love. This is true, however, of Ignatius only.

(8) Christ is called God. Ignatius addresses Christ as our God, or calls him God in a modified sense a number of times. Three times he calls him God in the absolute sense. Second Clement calls Christ God twice without any limitations.

CHAPTER III

THE COSMOLOGICAL FUNCTION OF CHRIST APPEARS

INTRODUCTORY

A. THE LETTER OF BARNABAS

The author.—The earliest witness to this letter, Clement of Alexandria, attributes it to Barnabas the apostle. There is no indication why he ascribed the letter to the apostle. Lightfoot has suggested that the author may have been a namesake of the apostle. In this case the confusion could be understood. The only foundation for the suggestion is the early ascription of the letter. This does not carry us beyond conjecture in regard to the author. The letter itself makes it perfectly clear that it could not have been written by the apostle. In V. 9, he refers to the apostles in such a way that he seems to exclude the possibility that the writer belonged to this group. He says: "And when he chose his own apostles who were to proclaim his gospel, men who were sinners above every sin, in order that he might show that he came not to call the righteous but sinners, at that time he manifested that he was the Son of God." More decisive against the authorship of the apostle is the treatment of the Law. Such an allegorical interpretation is not possible in the case of an apostle who was a Levite. The allegorism and style of the letter point toward an author living in Alexandria.

The place of origin.—The contents and character of the letter help to fix the place of its origin, if not the name of its author. In its negative aspect the letter is a polemic against Judaism, at least in its ceremonial requirements. He seeks to give a spiritual interpretation to all the commands of the Law.[1] But in addition to the anti-Judaistic purpose, the author has the positive aim to build up Christian life. Life, righteousness, and love, he says, are the three ordinances of the Lord. In opposition to Judaism, he shows that the way to attain the goal of the Christian faith is by means of an inner life, rather than by the observance of external forms, though he comes perilously near formalism in his attitude toward baptism. A new creation, the indwelling of Christ, circumcision of the heart, patience, fear, and self-restraint are aids to faith

[1] Cruttwell, *A Literary History of Early Christianity*, I, 52, says: "The general argument of the treatise is to prove that Judaism, at any rate in its ceremonial aspect, is not an expression of the mind of God, but a carnal misinterpretation of commandments that were from the first intended to be wholly spiritual."

instead of sacrifices, fasts, and the keeping of Sabbaths. Allegorism is a marked characteristic of the work and finds expression, for example, in his interpretation of the command not to eat swine. It means, he says, that they shall not cleave to men who are like unto swine.[1] In the same manner he interprets many other commands. Such allegorism creates a strong probability in favor of Alexandria as the place of its origin.

The date.—There are some fairly reliable data for determining the earliest and latest limits of its date. The absence of reference to Gnosticism fixes the latest limit at about 130 A.D. Harnack regards that as a rather late date for it. The earliest limit is fixed by the use of the Gospel of Matthew, unless we may assume that the author used some of the sources of Matthew. "The many called and few chosen" of IV. 14 is a reflection of Matt. 12:14. By giving a late date to Matthew the earliest limit of this book would be in the beginning of the second century. The fact that the book shows no close connection with the apostles tends to put it as far as may be away from the apostolic group. With the late date agrees XVI. 4: "Behold they that pulled down this temple shall build it. So it cometh to pass; for because they went to war it was pulled down by their enemies. Now also the very servants of their enemies shall build it up." It seems best with Harnack to interpret this as a reference to the reign of Hadrian. He was in Syria and Palestine in 130, 131 A.D., and gave orders to build the city; and in 132 A.D. came the insurrection and destruction of the city.[2] The present "it cometh to pass" seems to imply that this work of building up the city was going on when this letter was written, and the final destruction of the city had not yet taken place. We may safely take this letter as a monument of Alexandrian Christianity, originating near 130 A.D.

B. HERMAS

The author.—The author gives us the geographical setting of his work and tells us something about himself. In the first "Vision" he is in Rome by the River Tiber; and in the second "Vision" he is on the way to Cumae. The first sentence gives the information that he was at one time a slave. He says: "The master, who reared me, had sold me to one Rhoda in Rome." The Muratorian Fragment says that he was a brother of Pius, whose episcopate lasted from 140–55 A.D. This relationship is very generally accepted now, though Origen says that he is the Hermas saluted by Paul in Rom. 16:14, and some others have proposed a Hermas who was a contemporary of Clement, 90–100, and who is otherwise unknown.

[1] X. 3.

[2] Harnack, *Geschichte*, II, S. 257–67.

The date.—The date of the book is about 140 A.D. Hermas knows nothing of the questions that agitated the church soon after this date, or at least he gives no clear hint of the activity of Valentinus. Harnack thinks that parts of the book may have been written as early as 110 A.D., but that the final redaction was made about 140 A.D.[1]

The character of the work.—The book consists of visions, mandates, and similitudes. Under these various forms it presents a vivid picture of the church at Rome at this time. Hermas inveighs against wealth as one of the sins of the church. In Vision III. 9:6, he says: "Look ye therefore, ye that exult in your wealth, lest they that want shall moan, and their moaning shall go up unto the Lord, and ye with your (abundance of) good things be shut outside the door of the tower." In Similitude I, he says that for fields they should buy the poor. The possession of enough to eat, and more than enough, by some, while others are suffering from want, is a condition against which he speaks. Such sins as abuse of wealth, extravagance, adultery, lying, anger, betrayal of parents are spoken against. The warnings concerning false prophets are significant, and indicate one of the conditions existing in the church. The false prophet is denounced severely: "Being empty himself, he giveth empty answers to empty enquirers; for whatsoever enquiry may be made of him, he answereth according to the emptiness of the man."[2] He gives the marks by which the false prophet may be distinguished from the true, and speaks of the havoc that the false prophet is working in the church, leading men astray. The virtues insisted upon are faith, continence, simplicity, guilelessness, reverence, knowledge, love, truthfulness, purity, mutual helpfulness, and such things.

The object of the book is the reformation of the church at Rome.

C. THE LETTER TO DIOGNETUS

The author.—The writer is unknown. The letter is addressed to Diognetus, and Lightfoot thinks that it is possible that he is the one who was the teacher of Marcus Aurelius.

The date.—The greatest uncertainty still prevails concerning the date of this letter. Lightfoot thinks that no certainty is possible. On the whole he thinks that it belongs about the middle of the second century. Harnack dates it much later. He quotes Donaldson who puts it in the time of the Renaissance. But he himself thinks that it belongs in the third century, or at the end of the second. The theology of chaps. VII–X he regards as coming after the gnostic fight and built on the

[1] Harnack, *Geschichte*, II, S. 257–67.

[2] Mandate XI.

results of this conflict.[1] But the statements of these chapters concerning the nature of the one who came to earth are a little too precise and careful to indicate that the gnostic conflict is entirely over. The writer defines Christ negatively as not belonging in the class with subalterns, or angels, or rulers, and then gives the positive characterization of Christ that puts him above all creatures. His conception of the function and rank of Christ is very similar to that of Barnabas and Hermas, and for that reason this letter is included in this study and is put in the group with these two. The last two chapters are the work of a later hand, and therefore are not considered here.

The purpose.—The purpose of the letter is to give an account of the God whom the Christians worship, and to make a defense of the Christian's manner of life—a life of kindness and affection toward the brotherhood and of patient endurance of death under persecution. The letter possesses a high literary quality.[2]

I. The Christology in the Letter of Barnabas

1. The rank which he gives to Christ

The marked feature in the Christology in this letter is the cosmological function assigned to Christ. In V. 10, he says: "For if he had not come in the flesh, neither would men have looked upon him and been saved, forasmuch as when they look upon the sun that shall cease to be, which is the work of his own hands, they cannot face its rays." He goes beyond Hermas here in ascribing creation to Christ, since Hermas only makes Christ the sustaining principle of creation. Barnabas gives expression to this exaltation of Christ in opposition to the humiliation of his incarnation. He feels the objection which this humiliation raises against the dignity of Christ, and he explains the necessity of the humiliation. Christ must come in the flesh to save men, to destroy death, to show the way of life, and to show the resurrection. He must have the veil of the flesh thrown over his glory or men could not bear the sight of him, just as they cannot look directly upon the sun. But if men could not thus look upon the sun, much less could they look upon him who created the sun. In close connection with the world-creative power of Jesus must be placed his spiritual creation. In XVI. 8,

[1] Harnack, *Geschichte*, I, S. 513–17.

[2] Cruttwell, *A Literary History of Early Christianity*, I, 305, says: "Even in its mutilated state it conveys the impression of high literary power." Swete, *Patristic Study*, chap. v: "The paradox of Christian conduct is painted in undying words"; chap. vi: "The love of the atonement and the righteousness of faith are handled in a manner unparalleled in early Christian literature."

he says: "Hoping in the Name we became new, created afresh from the beginning." This is his allegorical interpretation of building a temple to the Lord. He gives up the material temple to destruction, but he builds a temple in the hearts of men.

In close connection with the above function must be placed the power of Christ to destroy death and raise the dead.[1] These three statements give a most complete statement of the creative power of Christ: he created the world; he creates men anew; and he raises men from the dead.

Barnabas and Hermas agree in one particular in the pre-existence of Christ. They put Christ with God before the creation of the world. God says to the Son: "Let us make man in our image."[2] Christ was with God when the Father was planning creation. Barnabas is interested especially to show the priority of Christ to the prophets and the Old Covenant. The prophets received grace from Christ and prophesied concerning him. Barnabas takes up the objection urged by men that Christ is the son of David. The idea which he is combating is that Christ is only the son of David. He says: "David himself prophesieth being afraid and understanding the error of sinners. The Lord said unto my Lord sit thou on my right hand until I set thine enemies for a footstool under thy feet."[3] Then he quotes a saying which he says is from Isaiah: "The Lord said unto my Christ, the Lord, of whose right hand I laid hold, that the nations shall give ear before him, and I will break down the strength of kings." Then he says: "See how David calleth him Lord, and calleth him not son." In this way he shows the superiority of Christ to the Judaic system. The passages which declare his incarnation witness to his pre-existence. He is about to become manifest in the flesh; he appears in person.[4] In one reference to the incarnation he calls Christ God, apparently in the fullest sense of the word. He says: "Lest haply they should cease to fear the God who is over both of you; for he came not to call with respect to persons, but to call those whom the Spirit had prepared."[5] He thinks of Christ as manifest in the flesh.

He shows the dignity of Christ by the authority which he ascribes to him. Christ is often given the title ὁ κύριος, which designates his authority over the Christian community. He has authority as judge to determine the final destiny of men. He is Lord and future judge of quick and dead. And then, as Lord of the whole world, he has universal dominion.[6]

[1] Chap. V.
[2] V. 5.
[3] XII. 11.
[4] VI. 7; XIV. 5.
[5] XIX. 7.
[6] VII. 2; V. 15.

The idea of subordination is present, but only in the title "Son," which does not strongly express it, and in a statement made in XIV. 6: "It is written how the Father chargeth him to deliver us from darkness." But almost no place is given to the thought of subordination by this author.

The same work and function are ascribed both to Christ and to God, but the two names are not conjoined in the same expression. In VI. 11, re-creation is ascribed to the Father, and in XVI. 8 and XII. 5, to the Son. In XXI. 5, God is called Lord of the whole world, and in V. 5, Jesus is said to be Lord of the whole world. This attitude toward the Father and the Son suggests the equality of the two, even more perhaps than a conjoined expression. That which is done by the one may be said to be done by the other. According to the representation of Barnabas, Christ created the world; he was associated with the Father in counsel concerning the creation of the world; he has universal dominion, as also God has; he re-creates men, giving to them eternal life; he is judge of the quick and dead; and once he is called God who is over both master and servant. In all of these relations Christ is put on an equality with God, and is called God. With such a high Christology it is difficult to see how such an author as Cruttwell can say: "There is little doubt the author accepted the divinity of Christ, but the idea is not clearly expanded."[1] It is just in this author that we find the fullest expansion of the idea of the divinity of Christ that is given by any one of the apostolic Fathers.

2. THE FUNCTION OF CHRIST'S DEATH

In accordance with his allegorical method, Barnabas makes many things that have preceded in the Old Covenant to be types of the death of Jesus. Isaac about to be offered by his father is a type of the death of Jesus. The accursed goat, the scarlet wool twisted on the tree, the heifer that is burned, the brazen serpent, Moses with his hands stretched out in battle, all these are types of the death of Jesus.[2] But most of these passages are colorless so far as their teaching relates to the function of his death. For example, it is said in V. 5: "if the Lord endured to suffer for our soul" (*περὶ τῆς ψυχῆς ἡμῶν*). This does not indicate in what way his suffering was for our soul. In V. 1, 2, the author's conception of Christ's death is made more clear. Here he says: "For this purpose he endured to deliver his flesh to corruption, that by the remission of sins we might be cleansed which is by the blood of his sprinkling." His death had for its purpose our cleansing by the for-

[1] *A Literary History of Early Christianity*, I, 51.

[2] VII. 5, 7; VIII. 1, 2; XII. 2.

giveness of sins, and it achieved its end. The cleansing and the forgiveness are the same fact regarded in different aspects. His death is related to the cleansing or forgiveness both purposely and effectively. The relation which the author conceives the death to sustain to the pardon is indicated also by his quotation of a part of Isa., chap. 53. There the servant is a penal substitute for the sins of others, and the application of this passage here to Christ favors the view that the author regarded the death of Christ as substitutionary. The statement in VII. 2 looks in the same direction. Here he says: "If then the son of God, being Lord and future judge of quick and dead, suffered that his wound might give us life, let us believe that the son of God could not suffer except for our sakes." The author is seeking to maintain the majesty of Christ. But the humiliation and suffering are a standing objection to his exaltation. So he declares that there is nothing in Christ which calls for suffering. The ground for the suffering is in the sin of men, and comes from Christ's relation to the sin of men. His wound is intended to give life to men. The designation of the death of Christ by "wound" shows that the thought of the Isaiah passage has permeated his mind. The idea of substitution seems manifest in VIII. 1, 2. When the sins of men are full grown, they take a heifer and slaughter it and burn it and then the people are purified by the sprinkling of the ashes upon them. Jesus is the calf, and he is offered by sinners to purify them. In XI. 1, 7, baptism and the cross are joined together to secure the remission of sins. The primary purpose of the author is not to give the function of Christ's death, but rather to show that all the events in the previous Jewish history point to Christ, and have significance only in relation to him.

3. THE CONSTRUCTIVE ASPECT OF THE SOTERIOLOGICAL WORK OF CHRIST

The author emphasizes the graces of the Christian life more than faith as the root of the life. This is true even apart from the "two ways" section. Carefulness, fear, patience, long suffering, self-restraint—this is the aspect of the life which he sees and upon which he lays stress. There is, however, the teaching that men must have faith. They believe on God; they rest their hope and fear on Jesus.[1] The clearest statement of faith in Jesus is found in IV. 8: "That the covenant of the beloved Jesus might be sealed unto our hearts in the hope which springeth from faith in him." Here faith is made the source of life. In his opposition to Jewish formalism he dwells upon the spirit rather than the letter as essential to life.

[1] XI. 11.

Christ carries on his work in the life through dwelling in men. In VI. 14, 15, he says: "He himself was to be manifested in the flesh and dwell in us. For a holy temple unto the Lord, my brethren, is the abode of our heart." The fullest development of dwelling in the hearts of men is given in XVI. 7–10. But, according to this passage, the one who dwells in the heart is God, as in VI. 14, 15 it is Christ.

4. ESCHATOLOGY

Barnabas has a fully developed doctrine of the last things. He has a number of names for the Evil One. He calls him the "Black One," "the Active One," "the lord of the season of iniquity," "the Lawless One."[1] In XVIII. 2, the person designated by these different names is called "the Lawless One" and is identified with Satan. There is no evidence that he identifies him with any earthly ruler. The nature of the Evil One is sufficiently indicated by his names. Barnabas represents that the Evil One has the authority in this age. He says in II. 1: "Seeing then that the days are evil, and that the Active One himself has the authority, we ought to give heed to ourselves and to seek out the ordinances of the Lord." There is an order of things in which the Active One has dominion, but Christians do not belong to this order and are not under his rule. They must be on their guard lest he shall effect an entrance into their ranks. His reign shall last six thousand years, until the end of the present world. Barnabas interprets God's completion of creation in six days, and his resting at the end of the period, to mean that the world will come to an end in six thousand years, and then the Active One shall be destroyed along with the earth, and then the Sabbath rest shall begin. He has a number of expressions which show that he conceives the end of the world to be near at the time when he is writing. He urges them to give no relaxation to their souls that they should be at liberty to consort with sinners and wicked men, for the last offense is at hand. Again, he says: "Wherefore let us take heed in these last days." The Beloved is hastening and coming to his inheritance, and to hasten his coming the Master has cut the days short. For he says: "The day is at hand, in which everything shall be destroyed together with the Evil One. The Lord is at hand and his reward."[2] Christ is the judge. As such he is called "Christ," "Son of God," "his son," and "the Lord."[3] The order of events for the last things is, first, the coming of the Lord; then the resurrection, followed by the judgment, the destruction of everything, together with the Evil One; the reward

[1] II. 1; IV. 13; XVIII. 2; XV. 5.

[2] IV. 3, 9. [3] V. 7; VIII. 2; XV. 5; XXI. 3.

of the righteous; and, last, the making of a new earth, when "he shall change the sun and the moon and the stars, and then shall he truly rest."

The judgment is made on the basis of conduct and character. "If he be good, his righteousness shall go before him in the way; if he be evil, the recompense of his evil doing is before him."[1]

II. The Christology in Hermas

1. The rank of Christ

The two features of Hermas which put him in the rank of the high Christologists of this period are, first, the cosmological function that he assigns to Christ, and, second, the boundless limits of his authority. Christ sustains the whole world and he is Lord of the whole world. But in connection with this rank there is some material that apparently gives to Christ a distinctly lower position, making him not only subordinate to the Father, but under the authority of the Holy Spirit, and subject to the judgment of the heavenly tribunal—the Father, the Holy Spirit, and the glorious angels. Hermas himself sees that his parable, in which he represents the Son as a slave, apparently degrades the Son, and he has the speaker answer the objection which he himself makes. He then vigorously repudiates the intention to lower the Son of God, but maintains on the contrary that he exalts Christ. The confusion of thought, or misinterpretation, is only that which is characteristic of this kind of writing, consisting of visions and parables. In the case of Hermas the misinterpretation has arisen from a failure to maintain a distinction which he has made with a fair degree of clearness. He treats the person of Christ under three different aspects: (1) the incarnate Christ; (2) the pre-existent Christ; and (3) the Christ apart from any idea of humiliation, whether pre-incarnate or post-incarnate. Naturally the affirmations made concerning one of these phases of Christ's life do not apply to another, and a consistent representation of the person of Christ will be obtained only if the different phases are kept distinct. Furthermore, it is scarcely to be hoped that the author in a book of this character will always take pains to make clear which phase of Christ's life he has in mind, or that he will always be entirely consistent. Bearing this in mind, we may examine his conception of Christ as presented under the three forms.

(1) *The incarnate Christ.*—Here it must be noted that he identifies the incarnate Christ with the pre-existent Son of God. This identification is made in Similitude IX. 12:1–3. The "Rock" is the pre-

[1] V. 7; XXI. 3; XV. 5; IV. 12.

existent Son of God, older than all creation. The "Gate" is the incarnate Son, and is made "recent" because the pre-existent Son was "made manifest in the last days of the consummation."

The reality of the human nature is affirmed repeatedly, and there is no evidence of Docetism, such as Ignatius combated.

The incarnate Son is in a condition of humiliation. This state is set forth most strikingly in Similitude V by the parable of the Estate and Vineyard. The parable is as follows: A householder commits a vineyard to a slave; the slave tends the vineyard exceedingly well; the master returns and is greatly pleased with the servant's work. He then calls his son who is heir, and his friends, and tells them that he has promised the slave freedom on the condition of good and faithful service. Now, because of the especially faithful work of the slave, the master wishes to give to him not only his freedom but to make him joint-heir with his son. Then Hermas gives the following interpretation: The estate is the world; the servant is the Son of God; the vines are the people whom God had planted; the fences are the holy angels; the friends and advisers are the angels which were first created. When the first objection to his parable is raised, that the Son of God is degraded by being made a slave, the author answers by an evident contradiction of himself, and says that he has not made the Son a servant. For he says: "The Son of God is not represented in the guise of a servant, but is represented in great power and lordship." We shall return to this passage later.

In Similitude V. 6:5, Hermas says: "The Holy Pre-existent Spirit which created the whole creation God made to dwell in flesh that he desired." This statement must refer to the relation of the Holy Spirit to Jesus, the incarnate Christ, not, as some have thought, to an incarnation of the Holy Spirit in the person of Jesus. *σάρξ* here designates the whole person of Jesus. The same use is seen in John I. 14: *ὁ λόγος σάρξ ἐγένετο*. In a similar manner, Jesus is designated *ἀνήρ* in Similitude IX. 6:8; 12:7, 8; 7:1: *ὁ ἀνὴρ ὕψηλος, ὁ ἀνὴρ . . . . ὁ ἔνδοξος, ἔνδοξον καὶ μέγαν ἄνδρα*. The author has no hesitation in speaking of Christ as a man when Christ is in the condition of humiliation, and he leaves him thus in certain instances without any more precise definition of his nature. In V. 7 below, he designates human nature by *σάρξ* and speaks of the Holy Spirit as dwelling in it: "For all flesh which is found undefiled and unspotted, wherein the Holy Spirit dwelt, shall receive a reward." The relation of the Holy Spirit in vs. 5 to *σάρξ* is just the same as in vs. 7. There is no more reason to interpret it as an incarnation in one case than in the other. The Holy Spirit's holding a relation to the

incarnate Jesus which is the same in kind, but different only in degree from that which he holds to men, is not an idea which is new to Christian thought, but has been given currency by the gospels, especially by the accounts of the temptation. And, again, σάρξ must denote the incarnate Jesus here, for the reason that the reward of the career is pronounced upon the σάρξ by the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit would scarcely be represented as sitting in judgment upon his own incarnation. Moreover, the treatment of the flesh as the incarnate Jesus is consonant with the whole representation which makes so clear a distinction between the pre-existent and the incarnate state of Jesus. In the latter he may be regarded very consistently as under subjection to the Holy Spirit, and may be rewarded for his relation toward the Holy Spirit at this time. The relation represented here as existing between Christ and the Holy Spirit is not the only relation that existed between the two. In his state of humiliation Christ was subject to the Holy Spirit according to Barnabas, but in his pre-existent state an entirely different relation was sustained between them.[1] Some confusion is introduced by Hermas calling the Holy Spirit "Son" in the heavenly tribunal that passes judgment upon the incarnate life of Jesus. But this strange title comes from the exigency of the parable which represents the householder's heir as his son. The author has no intention to confuse the Holy Spirit and Jesus in this manner. It has been thought by some that this reward of Jesus, making him a partner with the Holy Spirit, lends support to the idea of adoption. But the author makes the pre-existence of Christ so essential a part of his conception of Christ that he excludes the possibility of adoption. His career here of unfailing obedience and stainless purity won for his earthly career the judgment of the heavenly tribunal that he deserved partnership with the Holy Spirit.

The subordinate position of the incarnate Christ is seen further by the statement in Similitude V. 6:3 that he gives the people the law which he receives from the Father.

The humiliation of his incarnate state is thus shown by the representation that he is a slave over the vineyard working for his freedom, that he is obedient to the Holy Spirit just as other men ought to be, that he is subordinate to the Father, that he is judged by God, the Holy Spirit, and the glorious angels, and that he is rewarded by being exalted to partnership with the Holy Spirit.

But this is not the whole representation of his incarnate state. He ascribes to Christ great majesty and glory in this state. It is from this point of view that Hermas denies the "servant guise" to the Son.

[1] Dorner, *Doctrine of the Person of Christ*, Div. I, Vol. I, p. 386.

He has delivered the people over to him. The Son himself controls the angels and places them over the people to keep watch. The Son has cleansed the people of their sins by laboring much and enduring many toils. He has shown them the path of life. The exaltation of the Son which this work indicates can be properly appreciated only in the light of Hermas' view that the world itself was created for the church. To have charge of the church, to redeem it and show it the way of life raises the Son to a most exalted position. Hermas goes so far that he says that Christ himself is "Lord of the people, having received all power from his Father." Hermas cannot view the work of salvation from sin without thinking that such work involves all power. In Mandate IV. 1:11, where he is considering the sin of adultery, he says that there is One who is able to give healing; "it is he who has authority over all things." Here the reference is to Christ. And because of this work of healing, he predicates of Christ all authority. The limitless extent of his power is inconsistent with the "servant guise," but the author is breaking away from his parabolic representation and presenting Christ in harmony with what he considered his real nature. It is possible to abate the representation which Hermas gives of Christ's humiliation. His earthly work manifestly has an aspect of power and majesty. Then whatever there may be of humiliation, such as his sufferings, may be regarded as "the work of his free love, as the means of the taking away of our sins, and as the point of passage to higher perfection."[1] But however great the power and majesty, the picture of the incarnate Christ which he gives is that of subordination and subjection.

(2) *The pre-existent Christ.*—He was with the Father before all creation, and to this extent, he had part in the creation of all things.

(3) *His conception of Christ apart from all humiliation.*—He is great and incomprehensible, and sustains the whole world. This cosmological function of Christ is developed here in connection with his power to sustain men who bear his name and walk according to his commandments. From our point of view, Hermas reaches the highest Christology when he ascribes to Christ a part in creation, and the function to sustain the world. But this is not the author's point of view. He reaches the climax when he ascribes to Christ the founding of the church. In Vision II. 4:1, he says that the church was created before all things and that the world was created for her sake. Evidently, then, the greatest glory that could be ascribed to any being would be the founding of the church. And this work he ascribes to Christ. In Vision III. 3:5, he says that the "tower" is the church, and that the "tower has been

[1] *Ibid.*, Div. I, Vol. I, p. 131.

founded by the word of the Almighty and Glorious Name." The usage of Hermas leaves little doubt that by the "Almighty and Glorious Name" he means to designate Christ. In Vision III. 1:9, when Hermas desired to sit on the right of the "lady" on the couch, he was forbidden, and told that the place on the right was for others, even for those who have been well-pleasing to God, and have suffered for the name's sake. The author makes a distinction here by his statement between God and the "name." But if the language itself need not necessarily indicate two persons, the fact is made certain that he distinguishes between the two, for the reason that the Christians were not suffering on account of the name of God, but on account of the name of Christ. In Vision III. 2:1, he makes still more unmistakable his meaning: "What did they suffer, say I. Listen, saith she. Stripes, imprisonments, great tribulations, crosses, wild beasts, for the name's sake." In Similitude IX. 13:2, he speaks of some who bear the name of the Son of God and not its power.

The high rank which Hermas ascribes to Christ is seen also from the slight emphasis he gives to the subordination of Christ to God the Father. All the passages which speak of Christ's subordination are those which treat of his incarnation. This state is of short duration, and does not alter the essential glory which belongs to him. In this state he receives power from the Father and is the agent of the Father. God calls men to be saved through his Son; and God gives commandment through his Son.

But however high the rank which Hermas assigns to Christ, and however clear the distinction which he makes and keeps between the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, he still holds to the unity of God, as is seen from Mandate I: "First of all believe that God is one, even he who created all things and set them in order."[1] He makes no attempt to show how he reconciled his Christological positions with the unity of God.

2. THE CONSTRUCTIVE ASPECT OF CHRIST'S SOTERIOLOGICAL WORK

Hermas is peculiar among the writers of this period in the unusual place which he gives to baptism and works as means for securing salvation. In two passages he assigns a distinctly soteriological power to baptism. In Mandate IV. 3:1, he says: "We went down into the water and obtained remission of former sins." And in Vision III. 3:5, it is said: "Hear then why the tower is builded upon waters; it is because your life is saved, and shall be saved, by water."

In another passage he ascribes salvation to works, and without indicating the relation of baptism to works. In this instance it is

[1] Dorner, *op. cit.*, Div. I, Vol. I, pp. 129, 135.

primarily a question concerning the sins of Hermas. He has been neglectful of his family, and is mixed up with their evil transactions. The writing that the "lady" has given him says: "But herein is thy salvation, in that thou didst not depart from the living God, and in thy simplicity and in thy great continence. These have saved thee if thou abidest therein; and they save all who do such things, and walk in guilelessness and simplicity."[1] But these good works belong to those who are already in the "tower," the church. This is clearly true of Hermas, and the same thing may be fairly supposed to be true of the "all who do such things." So the righteous works do not save them apart from baptism. In fact, baptism is given priority to works in the process of salvation.

The case is not the same, however, in the relation between faith and baptism. Men enter into the "tower" by faith as well as baptism. In Vision III. 8:1–5 is given the development of the place of faith in salvation, and as a means of entrance into the church. Hermas sees the "tower" surrounded and guarded by seven women. Then the names of these women are given. "The first of them, the woman with the strong hands, is called Faith; through her are saved the elect of God." And then follow the names of the others. Then Hermas is told that "whosoever shall serve these women, and shall have strength to master their works, shall have his dwelling in the tower with the saints of God."

A fourth factor also enters into his conception of salvation. The Holy Spirit dwells in the hearts of men who are strong in faith and gives them strength to master evil inclinations.[2] On the basis of the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, he exhorts men to put anger out of their hearts very much after the manner of Paul's appeal to the Corinthians to avoid fornication because their bodies are the temple of the Holy Spirit.

Although baptism has an essential part in his plan of salvation, and although he gives an emphasis to works that relates him closely to James, it is still evident that faith holds the most fundamental place in his mind and is the root of all the virtues. In Vision III. 8:7, he makes the statement that the virtues are all born from faith. He says: "From faith is born continence, from continence simplicity, from simplicity guilelessness, from guilelessness reverence, from reverence knowledge, from knowledge love." And in Similitude IX. 15, when he is naming "the more powerful virgins, those that are stationed at the corners," he says that the first is faith. Faith as the root of the Christian life thus finds strong emphasis in this work.

[1] Vision II. 3:2.

[2] Mandate VI. 1, 2.

3. ESCHATOLOGY[1]

In his eschatology he gives a place to judgment with punishment and reward, and there is a coming age, but no judge is named. The end of the world is conceived of as near. The "tower" is still building, but it will soon be built, and the completion of the "tower" comes at the end of the world. The only purpose of the world is to minister to the church, and when the church is completed, the world is very naturally destroyed. The destruction will be by fire. This fact is affirmed in Vision IV. 3:1, 2 by the color of the beast that Hermas met. He says: "The black is this world in which ye dwell; and the fire and blood color sheweth that this world must perish by fire." There are two classes that shall be burned—the sinners and the "Gentiles." By sinners he seems to designate those who belong in some way to the Christian fold, but have proved to be false. And the Gentiles stand apparently in opposition to the Christians. This whole class shall be burned "because they knew not him that created them."

III. The Christology in Diognetus

1. THE RANK WHICH HE ASSIGNS TO CHRIST

The position assigned to Christ is shown, in the first place, by his cosmological function. Christ created the world and controls all the natural world.[2] The writer calls Christ the Artificer and Creator of the universe, and in VII. 2 says that all the elements are in subjection to him—"the heavens and the things in the heavens, the earth and the things in the earth, the sea and the things that are in the sea, fire, air, abyss, the things that are in the heights, the things that are in the depths, the things that are between the two." The universality of his dominion is thus elaborated. Furthermore, he was with the Father before the creation and had a part in planning the universe.

In all this presentation, however, the author retains in some measure the idea of the subordination of the Son to the Father. The Son is the agent of the Almighty Creator of the universe, the invisible God. God created the universe by means of the Son. The Son was also sent by the Father. And the "sending" must involve some superiority on the part of the Father. Still, subordination is the idea that is least prominent in the mind of the author.

[1] In all the other writings of the Apostolic Fathers where eschatology is treated, it has a direct bearing on Christology. Here, though eschatology is not expressly related to Christology, it is presented to give completeness to the treatment.

[2] Chap. VII.

The exact revelation that Christ gives of God shows the rank of the Son. It has been suggested that the author loses the distinction between the Father and the Son, and that Christ is God manifested in the flesh. But the names of Christ keep the distinction clear. Christ is the "Son of God," "the Only-Begotten Son," "his Beloved Son," and in all he bears a relation to the invisible God. The character of God, however, finds expression in Christ. The writer calls Christ "the one righteous man," "the holy."[1] The highest conception that Christ reveals to men is love, the love of God in giving his Son a ransom, the holy for the lawless. Power is not the supreme attribute in God, but persuasion and gentleness. And in these respects Christ is a true reflection of God. In one passage, he speaks of Christ as God when he says in VII. 4: "He sent him as sending God."

The pre-existence of Christ shows his rank. In common with Barnabas and Hermas, the writer carries back the existence of Christ to a time before the creation of the universe and makes him the Father's counselor.[2]

2. THE FUNCTION OF CHRIST'S DEATH

This subject is developed in chap. IX. God has borne with the sins of men. Now the time has come when punishment and death were manifestly expected as a recompense for sins. Instead of visiting punishment upon men, God parted with his own Son as a ransom for them. The thing from which the Son ransomed men was not the power of sin, but the punishment of sin. He accomplished this work by his death, the holy dying for the lawless. The Son of God justified lawless and ungodly men. The author expresses his wonder and amazement at the love of God thus shown in the Son. He exclaims: "O the sweet exchange, O the inscrutable creation, O the unexpected benefits; that the iniquity of the many should be concealed in the righteous man, and the righteousness of One should justify many that are iniquitous."

3. CHRIST'S REVELATION OF GOD

The chief function of Christ in relation to the life of men, apart from his atoning work, is the revelation of the Father. When men apprehend the nature of God, they put their faith in him. Then their lives are made strong in righteousness. In themselves they were unable to live righteously, but by faith in God they prevail over sin. God becomes to them "teacher, physician, mind, light, honor, glory, strength and life."

[1] IX. 5, 9. [2] IX. 1.

The writer has no program of last things. Only, once he says that gentleness will not continue forever. "For he will send him in judgment, and who shall endure his presence?"[1]

Summary of the Development of Christology in this Group

(1) The cosmological function assigned to Christ is the one marked feature of these writings which places them in advance of the preceding group. In Barnabas and the Epistle to Diognetus, it is affirmed that Christ created the world. All three of these writings declare that Christ sustains the universe. This heightened Christology was prepared for by Ignatius in the important function which he assigned to Christ as the bringer of salvation and the giver of life; and Second Clement gives a hint of this higher development in his reference to salvation as a work of Christ. But here the final step has been taken, and Christ is affirmed to be the Creator and Maintainer of the universe. (2) There is also an advance over the past in the statement of the universality of Christ's dominion, and in the emphasis which is put upon it. The universality of his dominion is most fully developed in the Epistle to Diognetus VII. 2. The doctrine is stated, however, just as clearly by both Barnabas and Hermas. (3) The existence of Christ is carried back to a time before the creation, and he is presented as associated with God the Father when he was planning the creation of the universe. When God thought of the universe and formed his plan, Christ was with him. (4) Christ is called God. (5) The idea of the subordination of Christ to God almost entirely disappears.

Conclusion

The result of this study has been the discovery of a clear line of christological development in the works of the Apostolic Fathers. The development is in the relation which Christ sustains to God. In the first group of writings, in which the letter of Clement of Rome holds the leading place, Christ is represented chiefly as an agent under the authority of the Father. The subordination of Christ is most pronounced.

In the second group of writings, in which Ignatius is the chief writer, Christ attains a position of virtual equality with God in respect to his soteriological work. He is conjoined with God in most important functions on a basis of equality, and is designated God.

In the remaining group, the final step in the progress is taken and the cosmological function is assigned to Christ. He created the universe and sustains it.

[1] VII. 6.