



1931

Some Significant Phases of Justin Martyr in the Development of Early Christianity

Elmer G. Homrighausen

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.butler.edu/grtheses>



Part of the [Religion Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Homrighausen, Elmer G., "Some Significant Phases of Justin Martyr in the Development of Early Christianity" (1931). *Graduate Thesis Collection*. 167.

<https://digitalcommons.butler.edu/grtheses/167>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Scholarship at Digital Commons @ Butler University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Graduate Thesis Collection by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ Butler University. For more information, please contact digitalscholarship@butler.edu.

SOME SIGNIFICANT PHASES OF JUSTIN MARTYR

IN

THE DEVELOPMENT OF
EARLY CHRISTIANITY.

Sample

With some
modern implications

A dissertation presented as partial requirement
for the degree of Master of Arts

Presented

by

Elmer George Homrighausen

Butler University

College of Religion

May

Nineteen Hundred and Thirty One.



TABLE OF CONTENTS

701
B82h
HG57

10 Nov 51

I. INTRODUCTION.....PAGE 1

II. A SKETCH OF JUSTIN'S LIFE, CHRISTIAN EXPERIENCE
AND WRITINGS.....PAGE 16

III. THE GENERAL SIGNIFICANCE OF JUSTIN'S ACCEPTANCE
OF CHRISTIANITY.....PAGE 36

IV. THE SIGNIFICANCE OF JUSTIN'S APOLOGETICAL
WRITINGS.....PAGE 50

V. THE SIGNIFICANCE OF JUSTIN'S MARTYRDOM.....PAGE 58

VI. THE SIGNIFICANCE OF JUSTIN IN THE DEVELOPMENT
OF CHRISTIAN EDUCATION.....PAGE 68

VII. THE SIGNIFICANCE OF JUSTIN IN THE
DEVELOPMENT OF CHRISTOLOGY.....PAGE 76

VIII. THE SIGNIFICANCE OF JUSTIN IN THE
DEVELOPMENT OF THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF GOD
AND THE TRINITY.....PAGE 110

IX. THE SIGNIFICANCE OF JUSTIN AS A WITNESS TO
A NEW DEVELOPMENT IN CHRISTIAN SOTERIOLOGY.....PAGE 133

X. THE SIGNIFICANCE OF JUSTIN AS A WITNESS TO THE
NATURE OF THE CHURCH IN THE SECOND CENTURY.....PAGE 149

XI. THE SIGNIFICANCE OF JUSTIN AS A WITNESS
TO THE SOCIO-ETHICAL NATURE OF THE
CHRISTIAN SOCIETY IN THE SECOND CENTURY.....PAGE 180

XII. BIBLIOGRAPHY.....PAGE 221

40846

The original intention of this study
was to provide a comprehensive survey of the
history of the Church in the United States.
It was inspired by the realization
of great need, since no adequate history of
Christianity had been written in our country
and later graduate work. Some persons, who are
intimately acquainted with the religious history of
this life through the study of the Bible and
other sources, have been called upon to write
a history of the Church in the United States.

INTRODUCTION

It is the purpose of this book to discuss the
real reasons of the Church in the United States
and to show the way to the real understanding
of Church history. There are many who are
today, in short, personalities who combine a
scholarship with a warm devotion to the reality
of their subject, are today and will always be
the best witnesses of truth to the immature
learner.

Side by side with this fact goes the clear
understanding of the subject. Indeed, the
development of Christianity was not confined
to the persecuted and martyred Christians
of the Bible, but to us it is a thrilling story,
the life of which has never been seen.

Henry Page wrote recently, "If it had not
been for the life and rapid development of
Christianity, it would be regarded as utterly
impossible. The religion of an obscure teacher
in a remote province, who himself was crucified
as a common malefactor, should

The original inspiration to undertake this study issues from composite sources. Undoubtedly, in the last analysis, it was implanted by the personalities of great teachers, whose contagious enthusiasm for Christian history I contracted early in my theological and later graduate study. Great teachers, who are intimately acquainted with the ongoing currents of Christian life through the centuries, who have developed a love for the Christian movement, whose mature scholarship gives them the power to discern the real essence of the Christian religion in its historic expressions, these are still the keys to the real understanding of Church history, these are what students need today. In short, personalities who couple a critical scholarship with a warm devotion to the reality of their subject, are today and will always be the best mediators of truth to the immature learner.

Side by side with this fact goes the sheer romance of the subject. Indeed, the development of Christianity was no romance to the persecuted and martyred Christians of the time, but to us it is a thrilling story, the like of which has never been seen.

Kirby Page wrote recently, "If it had not actually happened it would (the rise and rapid development of Christianity) be regarded as utterly impossible. That the religion of an obscure teacher in a conquered province, who himself was crucified as a common malefactor, should

spread within three centuries, in spite of vigorous opposition and bitter persecution, so rapidly that it became the official religion of the mightiest empire of all the earth: this is simply incredible. "1

Indeed "the age that followed the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ witnessed the most wonderful outburst of moral and spiritual energy that human history has ever seen." 2

Mommsen in the closing pages of his monumental history has this to say, "The world was growing old, and not even Caesar could make it young again." But what Caesar could not do, Christ did!

As we study the greatest teachers of the age, who always are the spiritual index of the temper and vitality of the age, we can see better the dark background against which this marvelous light of the Christian religion takes on an awful brilliancy. The Stoics are undoubtedly the best expression of the age. Yet lofty as their teachings are, their whole philosophy of life is directed towards the giving of men a sturdy, impersonal, hard endurance in the face of the evils of the time. There is no sense of joy or spontaneity or missionary power in their noble philosophy. The Stoic could fortify the faithful, but he could not win the world.

But the miracle of it all is that right out of this spiritually sad and tired cynical age there sprang this spring of an amazing outburst of life and gladness of the early Christian faith. What Caesar was unable to do, Christ did! Indeed it was a 'new race' of men. Not only did it

1. Jesus or Christianity, Page 53.

2. D. S. Cairns, The Reasonableness of the Christian Faith, Page 89.

recreate the souls of men with hope, but it made new the brains of men. The whole of the New Testament is a panorama of new ideas. Their faith gave them fertile minds and sensitive consciences. There is about them and the whole Christian movement of which they are the fruit, a thrill of a new discovery. They are full of energy and vitality, which sends them out over land and sea to tell the good news of God to all mankind. The Stoic may express noble endurance, but the Christian expresses a triumphant spirit of world-victory. Whatever may be the opinion of quibbling scholars, here is a phenomenon that baffles all scientific inquiry. As we sit down before this wonder in our day, we must confess that generally there is a stoical attitude prevalent. Since the World War this spirit of futility and defeatism and cynicism has been growing. Our age is much like that of the first century, yes and the second. Religious questing is in the air, as it was then,--but there is no joy or power or vitality or missionary zeal.

Indeed many scholars have sought for reasons for this phenomenal growth, but every one of them makes the fatal error of supposing they have comprehended the WHOLE cause of this growth.

Kirby Page himself gives eight reasons: The conviction that Jesus rose from the dead and the expectation of his early bodily return; the preaching of the gospel of salvation in a decaying world; the practice of love and sharing; personal purity and family loyalty; the rejection of violence and war; the exhibition of unbounded courage and sacrificial devotion; the solidarity and discipline of the Christian fellowship; and eventually, compromise with prevailing (pagan) beliefs and practices. Kirk, in "The Religion of Power," 1 explains the

rapid progress of Christianity on the basis of the political and religious disillusion of the people, the passionate search of a way of life, the keen interest shown by the people of the day in religious discussions. These coupled with the spread of the Jew of the dispersion, made for the rapid spread of the central message of Christianity. Glover, in "The Jesus of History," 1 states simply that the Christians out-thought, out-lived, and out-died their contemporaries. Professor Nagler in "The Church in History," 2 lists a number of causes for the rapid rise of Christianity. He gives a place to Divine Providence which is often forgotten! He states emphatically that the new religion offered the world something intrinsically new which satisfied the deepest needs of men's hearts. The Church captured the strategic city centers; it did not have imperial support which might have enervated it; the Church was desperately intolerant; the Christians' intense loyalty to their cause, their passionate devotion; their trust in God for ultimate triumph; their boundless faith in the finality and absoluteness of their Church; their lives of purity and love, their fortitude, intense earnestness, and unwavering conviction, all these made their cause irresistible.

Many of these are to be found in all the standard Church Histories, copied largely from Uhlhorn or from Harnack. Gibbon's famous chapter XV has been the standard diet for historical students in accounting for the rise of Christianity.

But it has been very pertinently remarked that Gibbon has not thought of accounting for the combination of these causes. At least all these causes are constituent causes, and they must have a common cause. Besides, the causes always given by

1. Pages 185, 203.
2. Pages 63-65.

historians are only the EFFECTS of Christianity in the world! Where did the zeal come from? Where did the doctrine of the future life come from in a world that was decadent? Lying back of all these causes there must be something else out of which they themselves spring. What all these causes for the rapid progress of Christianity leave out is the secret of their power, the source of their inspiration. The real romance of the early Christian movement is that which comes from a recognition of the fact of God in Christ. The task of the historian is not complete when his analytical scalpel has dissected the physical corpse of institutional and effectual Christianity, but rather he must pursue his study to meanings, to Reality itself. We hope that in this study we may keep humble enough in the use of scientific devices of psychology, sociology, comparative religion, etc., that we may not escape the value of God in the rise of the Christian movement.

What romance there is in this phenomenon! Lecky 1 makes an interesting remark when he says that right under the eyes of the world's best philosophers and statesmen of Rome, the Christian movement took its rise. They treated the whole movement with contempt, and yet,-- the Christian movement proved to bring in the greatest religious change in the history of mankind, and proved to be the most powerful lever that has ever been applied to the affairs of men. This IS interesting and romantic. The few short years of Jesus' life really did more to recreate life than all the disquisitions of the philosophers.2

1. Lecky -- History of European Morals.
2. Lecky, Ibid.

Dr. A. Harnack has exhaustively treated the expansion of Christianity, especially in the second volume. 1 The cultured, those in the courts, in the army, and the women took ^{to} the Christian religion, not only those of the lower social classes.

If the remarkable phenomenon of the external expansion of Christianity is romantic enough to be inspirational, it is equally true of the internal expansion of the Christian movement itself.

When we compare the Sermon on the Mount in its simplicity and naivete, with the highly speculative and intricate Creed of Chalcedon we are face to face with a development that almost baffles imagination.

The simple Gospel, which was certainly not a statutory law in its origin, and does not seem to be so regarded in its canonical literature, developed in time to become a system. We find three stages in this development which we are directly concerned with.

The earlier stage was not far removed from the death of Christ. The Christians were still in Jerusalem and they largely regarded the Christian religion as a part of Judaism. It represents the Ebionite development, before the leaven of the universal content of the Gospel had become generally understood. It was not until the persecution following Stephen's martyrdom and the rise of the Gentile group at Antioch and the appearance of Paul, that this group took a relatively unimportant place in the Christian movement. Undoubtedly the Tuebingen

1. Harnack, Mission and Expansion of Christianity Vol. II, Pages 244-246, etc. See also Glover, Conflict of Religions-- Angus, Environment of Early Christianity, etc.

emphasis upon the Petrine and Pauline antagonistic development in the early Church has truth in it. The early stage to which we refer was before the breach became so evident. We do not seem to understand adequately the opposition which Paul encountered because of his avowed universalism. At least, the disciples were called Christians first in Antioch. Whether it was a bit of sarcasm we do not know, but it might seem that there is more truth in it from a Christian point of view than we realize! At least the early stage of Christian development seemed more Jewish than Christian!

The intermediary stage is intimately connected with the apostle Paul "who tore the Gospel from its Jewish (and provincial) soil and rooted it in the soil of humanity. It was he who raised the movement out of its tentative beginnings into a mission that embraced the world." 1 In Paul we do find, in spite of all that may be said to the contrary by the liberal critics, a bit of theology. If we did not, then how can we account for the fact that every Christian theological system has quoted Paul as their patron theological saint! This may be the reason why Paul has caused so much bitter strife in the Church, it may be the reason why "Paul is on trial" 2 in the modern world. His ambiguity and inconsistency is certainly heart-rending. But on the other hand, Paul's very inconsistency 3 is his genius!. Paul is the theologian of Religion, 4 he is all-inclusive. This is his very virtue.

1. Harnack, Mission and Expansion, Vol. I, Pages 54, 64-65.
2. Still --St. Paul on Trial.
3. Phrase used in Peabody -- Paul and the Modern World, and quoted by Glover --Saul of Tarsus.
4. Deissman -- Paul.

When theologians generally, who quarrel with sacred things, realize that Paul wrote no metaphysical and scientific theological system, but that he wrote experimental treatises and letters on Religion, then we might better appreciate him in these days when metaphysics is so in disrepute, and theology so obnoxious. Paul was the real interpreter of Jesus 1 and we cannot doubt that he still is. Paul has couched the significance of Christ in terms that are universal in their import, and although limited by Hebrew thought-forms and Greek language and Roman culture, yet underlying all this there is a theology in germ, which is capable of many and varied theological interpretations. What is most important is that Paul drove a wedge into the early Christian community, and pried the Gospel from its strict and exclusive Jewish dogmatic moorings, and thus made it a religion of the new humanity, which transcended the barriers of men, so that henceforth there was "neither Jew nor Greek--no racial barrier, neither bond nor free--no social barrier, neither male nor female-- no sex barrier."² Paul's chief emphasis is upon the Spirit, that universal element, and not upon justification by faith. ³

The third stage of Christian development took place not long after Paul, when the Gentiles with their background of culture and thought commenced to embrace the Christian religion. With them they brought their ideas of religion, their thought forms, their ecclesiastical and political theories, their sacramentalism, their ethical systems, their Weltanschauung, etc. Christianity had started as a

1. Robertson, A.T. Paul, The Interpreter of Christ.
2. Gal. 3: 28: Col.3: 11.
3. Cf. E. Stanley Jones, " The Christ of Every Road," P. 96.

spontaneous and ecstatic movement, and undoubtedly for that reason it has made such rapid progress among the Gentiles. If it had commenced as a well-defined system of established ritual and doctrines, it might have remained a small sect. Thanks to Paul who made it possible for Christianity to be freed from the shackles of Judaisers. We might maintain that the third degree in Christian development took place not when the Gentiles came into the new movement, but rather when the Christian fellowship met some of the troublesome problems which arose during the various controversies. The process was a long one, and at times it was bitter in its expressions. But all through it was an adventure, for the infant Christian movement had to learn step by step the things that were necessary to the working out of its salvation. At least it came to one of the first stages in this process in the Gnostic struggle about the year 130 A. D. It is from this time on that we can mark a distinct stage reached in the gradual development of the Christian movement of a simple ecstatic society on its way into an institution of law and order and worship and forms and doctrines.

When we say that this third stage came to a definite stage of development about 130 A. D. that does presuppose that the process had not been going on previous to this. Dr. E. F. Scott in his recent book ¹ says that the early Church began to tighten up, so to speak, on the Gentile question about the end of the first century. Paul had enthusiastically welcomed the Gentiles as did the Christians following him. But even before Paul's death, as can be seen from his closing epistles, this attitude has commenced to

1. The Gospel and its Tributaries-- E. F. Scott, Page 188 - 190.

alter, and the early Church became increasingly critical of foreign ideas. Practically all the later writings of the New Testament refer to "false teachings" and are rather controversial. Christianity had become definitely Hellenistic, but was not subdued by it. The Church was beginning to form judgments upon some of the current ideas of Christians. At least, Dr. Scott is quite right when he maintains that there is a little truth in the fact that the Church sometimes compromised to grow, but that the larger and more evident truth is that the Church has had the genius to see when the Gospel was in danger of being submerged in foreign accumen. He calls the process which we have here called the third stage a 'rebound', in which the permanent principles of the Gospel were again re-emphasized. At least this seems to be evident, that the so-called false teachings mentioned in the New Testament were "nothing but the early advances towards what was afterwards known as Gnosticism." 1

It is in the late development of this third stage process that Justin stands as a conspicuous figure. Being a widely-traveled man he was acquainted with the situation in the Church. It is for that reason that he is an interesting person to study.

Some of the intriguing problems which the rise of 'the old catholic Church' offers are as follows: How did the early Church develop a consciousness as to its institutional nature? Of course we find it in germ in the New Testament, but not in the large proportions that we find it at the end of the second century. How shall we account for the rise of the clergy and their later development into an ecclesiastical

1. Ibid, Page 201.

hierarchy with power over the Church? How shall we account for the rise of forms of worship,-- the ritual? How shall we account for the rise of the sacramental idea in the Lord's Supper? How shall we trace the intricate threads that finally make up the doctrinal fabric of the early Church? How shall we account for the rise of the interest in sacred things, festivals, councils, synods and many other phases of early Church life? How shall we account for the rise of the attempt at a metaphysical statement of the Trinity, of the person of Christ, the formal development of the ethical side of life into an elaborate system? How account for the rise of the great Christian schools and the body of materials that composed their curricula? How account for the elaborate system of charity-dispensation which we find very early in the Church throughout the whole Mediterranean basin? How shall we analyze the development of a Canon of Scripture, not only of the New Testament, but a canon which incorporated within it the chief Jewish literature? How did it happen that the Old Testament was finally and rationally Christianized, and the new religion became definitely connected with the historic past,--indeed a difficult and dangerous accomplishment! How did the persecuted, propertyless fellowship ever reach the stage where it possessed great wealth, with Churches, burying grounds, lands? How did the Logos finally undergird a highly speculative Christology, or the simple experimental doctrine of redemption in Paul grow into the intellectual formulae found in the later treatises on the Atonement and the Incarnation? How did the Christian group develop a uniformity of social philosophy so that they became a highly significant group in the eyes of the crafty Constantine, who finally realized that the Christians

were the only nucleus upon which he could rebuild the unity of the Roman Empire?

In the light of these questions, is it any wonder why the study of Justin should be interesting? Or useful? Any study that attempts to rediscover that essential Gospel-- Good News-- which took its origin in Palestine through the mediation of Jesus Christ is a most important study in this age, which has lost its bearing, and with it the unique "good news" of the Christian Gospel. Many scholars today are deploring the fact that today the forces of Christendom were never more active, but that with all the activity, there never was more corresponding spiritual impotence! Many have attempted to tabulate the reasons for the apparent helplessness of the Churches of the day to cope with the baffling problems of life, and of the social order. We lack today the dynamic of the Christian religion for many reasons. This is outside the field of this treatise. But certainly a revival of historical mindedness and sympathetic study of the "early days of Christianity" (Farrar) would do much to give us a glimpse of "the originality of the Christian Gospel", 1 and with a glimpse of that originality would come a new emotional warmth and enthusiasm which would actually give the Christian religion power to launch a new offensive against the rampant individualism, eclecticism, Stoicism, materialism, tired intellectualism and cynicism,-- that would be more far-reaching in its effects than the Christian movement of the first three centuries.

Underneath the social and intellectual expression of early Christianity, dependent as it was upon the cultures into which it came, we are able to get hold of the scarlet thread of the redemptive power of God in Jesus Christ, which is the real

1. Mackintosh, H. R.-- Originality of the Christian Gospel.

dynamic in the whole historic development of Christianity. Beneath all the developments which we have enumerated above, there is a living power rooted in God. To the question of Harnack and Hatch which they state cynically,--"Did the Gospel succeed in holding its own amid this change?" we answer with an emphatic "Yes". For had not the Gospel been at the heart of all these ecclesiastical and theological human amplifications and interpretations, the Christian religion would long have not only ceased to grow, but, we believe, to exist. The genius of Christianity is its germinal universalism, and its power to rectify itself and rise from the tomb into which the speculations of men have often thrust it.

It is our hope that we may equate a part of this whole problem in a small way in this study and relate it to our own day. Today we need to know what the Gospel is, and there is no better way to discover that than by historical study of what it has been. The problem can never be exhaustively treated, since the records are too meagre, and in some cases they portray most widely varied and untrustworthy viewpoints on the same subject. 1

1. Of Harnack, *Mission and Expansion of the Christianity*, Volume I, Preface Pages VIII-XII. "The primitive history of the church's mission lies buried among legends; or rather it has been replaced by a history of what is said to have been enacted in the course of a few decades throughout every country on the face of the earth.--The literary sources available for the history of primitive Christian missions are fragmentary." What is true of Christian missions is true of every phase of Christian history during the first three centuries and especially during the persecutions and the unlitrary period of the early Church. Workman, *Christian Thought*, Page 4--"Unfortunately the century which followed the death of St. Paul is a silent century that has left us but 'fragments of fragments' of its history. Annalists had slight place in a community that lived in expectation of the sudden coming of the Lord.-- Only here and there is the curtain lifted upon those memorable days."

When we treat the various subjects in their order we shall be able to state our reasons for the rise of many of the later developments, and in that way arrive at a better understanding of the essential Christian message, as potent-- yes, more so-- than it was in the days of Justin.

SKETCH OF JUSTIN'S
LIFE, CHRISTIAN EX-
PERIENCE, AND
WRITINGS

CHAPTER II

Our knowledge of the life of Justin is well preserved in his own writings, especially in the Dialogue with Trypho and the First Apology.

"I, Justin, the son of Priscus, and grandson of Basilide, natives of Flavia Neapolis in Palestine",-- the opening words of the First Apology, constitute a personal announcement of his ancestry. Flavia Neapolis was the most important city and colony founded near the eastern borders of Syria, and was named after Flavius Vespasian. His father's name was Priscus, a Latin name; his grandfather Basilide, a Greek. But

THE USE OF A SKETCH OF JUSTIN'S LIFE, CHRISTIAN EXPERIENCE, AND WRITINGS

He calls himself a Samaritan, but there seems to be no trace of any Samaritan training in his writings. His Samaritanism may

CHAPTER II place of birth, not to any blood kinship with the Samaritans. At least he was not a Jew nor was he a Christian by birth. He specifically tells Trypho that he was uncircumcised and that it was not until he was 12 that he became a Christian.

Justin appears to have inherited some wealth. For there is a statement to that effect in his writings. It is likely that he had the needed capital to pursue his search after knowledge, which became the driving impulse of his life.

He turned to philosophy at an early age. He determined to find the Truth. As a result he wandered from one teacher and school to another. It is interesting to note the typical

1. "We who possessed",-- I. Apol. 12.

Our knowledge of the life of Justin is well preserved in his own writings, especially in the Dialogue with Trypho and the First Apology.

"I, Justin, the son of Priscus, and grandson of Bacchius, natives of Flavia Neapolis in Palestine",-- the opening words of the First Apology, constitute a personal announcement of his ancestry. Flavia Neapolis was the name of the city and colony founded near the ancient Sychem in Samaria, and was named after Flavius Vespasian. His father's name was Priscus, a Latin Name; his grandfather Bacchius, a Greek. But the use of Greek and Latin names in this age was so prevalent a practice, that they tell us nothing accurate about Justin's real ancestry.

He calls himself a Samaritan, but there seems to be no traces of any Samaritan training in his writings. His Samaritanism may refer to his place of birth, not to any blood kinship with the Samaritans. At least he was not a Jew nor was he a Christian by birth. He specifically tells Trypho that he was uncircumcized and that it was not until manhood that he became a Christian.

Justin appears to have inherited some wealth, for there is a statement to that effect in his writings. ¹ At least it gave him the needed capital to pursue his search after knowledge, which became the driving impulse of his life.

He turned to philosophy at an early age. He determined to find the Truth. As a result he wandered from one teacher and school to another. It is interesting to note the typical

1. " We who possessed",-- I. Apol 13.

systems to which he turned. They represented the entire gamut of important "ways of intellectual salvation" then bidding for the ears of an eager humanity questing for a satisfying knowledge of Reality.

It is this fact that has lead many of Justin's critics to look upon the account of his experiences in the various philosophical schools an idealization or dramatization of a long period of experiences. Besides this method of writing was then in vogue, it was a contemporary literary habit. This method gave him an opportunity to survey the leading tenets of the philosophic systems of the day and criticize or jibe them as he wrote. It may be that Justin's "spiritual pilgrimage" was not in reality so orderly in its ascent. However, the underlying truths may be accepted. He was a diligent and earnest seeker of Truth and Reality. He does reveal in some cases an intimate knowledge of the systems while in other cases he reveals only a rudimentary knowledge of others.

Justin gives us an intimate glimpse into the great schools of philosophy of his day, as he travels from one to another in his eager quest for the Truth.

His first adventure is with a teacher of the Stoic school. He stayed with him for some time. Undoubtedly the Stoics were the exponents of the noblest thought of his day and so it is to them that he goes first. His soul was "athirst for God." He "surrendered" himself to a certain Stoic. But after a time with him the object of his quest was not to be found, for the Stoic not only had nothing to teach him but he "said such instruction was unnecessary." Of course, the Stoics never thought the knowledge of God so important. There was no

satisfaction for a hungry soul in a cold immanent pantheism, devoid of any belief in a personal God. Their philosophy has become absolutely immanent. The ethical end of life is virtue, which is nothing more than a serenity of life which comes from an adjustment of life to the cosmic forces which are operative in the universe. They adhered to the doctrine of fatalism, because they did not claim to have any knowledge of the rational ground of the world. In fact there was none. Forbearance was to them the chief virtue. This came as a result of the fact that the Stoics looked upon evil as resulting from the ignorance of men. Their sympathies were indeed broad, but it possessed no warmth of dynamic. Man stood alone in the face of the gigantic concourse of forces operative about him. There is something of nobility and sheer grit about the Stoic philosophy, but it was not satisfying to Justin. He was looking for God.

His next experience was with a Peripatetic scholar, who had a very high opinion of his own intelligence, but whose concern for the tuition fees made Justin suspicious of his boasted wisdom, and forthwith Justin abandoned him, concluding he "was no philosopher at all."

Thereupon he went to a Pythagorean, a "very celebrated man", who thought a great deal of his own wisdom. No sooner had Justin presented himself as a possible student than the professor asked him, "Are you acquainted with music, astronomy, and geometry? Do you expect to perceive any of those things which conduce to a happy life, if you have not been first informed on those points which wean the soul from sensible objects, and render it fitted for objects which appertain to the mind, so that it can contemplate that which is honorable in its essence and that which is good in its essence?" To all the

prerequisites, Justin confessed his ignorance, and with hesitant step turned from him. Justin deemed the Pythagorean as being one possessed with the knowledge he wished, but the period of undergraduate work was too long for one advanced in life as he was!

It was then that he turned to Platonism, which he found to be taught by one who had lately settled in his city,-- undoubtedly Ephesus. He was a man of ability and distinction, and Justin ardently availed himself of his instructions. The perception of immaterial things over-powered him, the contemplation of ideas "furnished his mind with wings." After a while he thought he had attained wisdom, and he hoped for the time when Platonism would fulfill for him its promised end of enabling him to look upon God. He had not yet found an answer to his anxious question, "Where is the place of understanding, and where shall wisdom be found?"

It was while delighting in the doctrines of Plato that Justin's attention was drawn to the fearless indifference with which Christians met death. Surely people who lived wicked and pleasure-full lives could not face death with such calm and poise. What sensual or intemperate man would welcome death as did the Christians. Justin marveled not only at the Christians' fearlessness of death, but of their fearlessness of all other things that men generally fear.

As a Platonist he has heard the common charges brought against the Christians, how they were supposed to feed on human flesh, slaying humans, drinking their blood, and living lives of shameless impurity. His belief in these calumnies was shaken. He came to think that the pagans were laying their own misdeeds upon the Christians. At last he wished

that someone would mount a lofty rostrum and exclaim to the world, "Shame on the guilty, who charge upon the innocent the crimes of themselves and of their gods!"

At this time he met the man who proved to be an angel in disguise, who gave him the impulse which resulted in his conversion.

Justin was at some city near the sea, it may be Ephesus, and with his mind full of deep thoughts and perplexing questions, he had retired to a lonely spot not far from the seashore to meditate. But his quiet loneliness was disturbed by an old gentleman, full of meekness and venerable manners, who followed him. "Do you know me?" asked the old man. "No", replied Justin, to which the old man replied, "Then why do you gaze at me so fixedly?" Justin explained that he had not expected to meet anyone in so lonely a spot, whereupon the old man answered that he had come to look after some of his own household. Justin explained that he had come here to give concentrated attention to the exercise of reason.

Sophistically the old man asked Justin if he placed reason above practice. The reply was that the two should not be separated, yet the use of reason and its product philosophy was a means to enable and give significance to the whole course of life. To the question whether philosophy gave happiness Justin replied that it did. "What is philosophy and what is happiness?" asked the old man and Justin replied that "philosophy is the full knowledge of reality and the clear perception of truth, and happiness the reward of such knowledge and such wisdom," -- really a noble answer.

The conversation proceeded in an interesting fashion. "What do you call God?" asked the old man, to which Justin replied that he was the changeless cause of all things. But now the question came, whether there was not an epistemological problem involved in that position. Was there not a difference between the knowledge of divine and human things, and if so how was it possible to know God unless we learn of Him from one who has seen Him. How then could the philosophers know Him if they had neither seen Him or know Him. Justin's Greek epistemology, learned from Plato, was confronted with the dualistic nature of knowledge characteristic of the Hebrew. To this Justin answered that Plato taught that we become aware of God through the mind, which was typically Greek in its emphasis. Now the mind had to be in a proper state of disposition. Then the reply came that the soul of man must be divine to comprehend divine things. If that is true why do not animals souls know God. To which Justin replied that they were not pure and just. But they injure no one, why cannot they see God? They drop this point and take up the problem of the possibility of seeing God in this life or in the life afterwards. Justin thinks one can in this body see God, but more fully hereafter. Yet the old man is still possessed on showing up the faults of Justin's Platonism, and is leading him step by step to his conception of Divine truth and its revelation. He asks Justin how the soul can see God, if Plato's doctrine of preexistent souls is such that the finite soul has no reminiscence of this previous existence. Further there must be a punishment for souls not knowing God, and what is it? The answer of Justin that these souls are imprisoned within the bodies of wild beasts is again answered by the question, "How do these souls know the

reason for their punishment, since they are not conscious of their being punished?" Thus it seems that the whole Platonic defense of Truth is laid low for the whole Platonic theory of the Vision of Abstract Being and of the Transmigration of souls is punctured.

Justin's Greek Weltanschauung receives another jolt when the old man tells him that the philosophers know nothing about the soul, and have no right to call it immortal, since the world was created. This doctrine of creation too is another serious jolt to Justin, for it contradicts his whole mental disposition. He confronts Justin's mind with the forensic doctrine of the will of God, upon which all things are made to depend.

Here it is that Justin is referred to the teachers more ancient than all the philosophers, who spoke by the Divine Spirit, predicting the future. They did not arrive at the Truth, ^{by the dialectic method, they merely testified to it;} and their authority is proven by the fact that they performed miracles and that their predictions were realized. Upon this the old man leaves him with the admonition to pray that the gates of light may be opened upon him, for these things cannot be grasped by all, but only by those to whom God and His Christ have imparted their Wisdom.

At this a "flame was kindled" in his soul,-- a love of the prophets who are friends of Christ possessed him, and while revolving these statements in his mind he came to a definite conclusion that this philosophy was alone safe and profitable. He hoped with a passionate zeal that all men might not keep themselves from Christ, for His words possess a terrible power and are dynamic enough to inspire and grant the sweetest rest when made a diligent practice of.

As noted above, if this is not a historical fact, it at least gives us the story of his soul-struggle, the pilgrimage that finally brought about his conversion. Here is a real narrative of the mental processes which culminated in his decision to abandon the pagan philosophies.

It has been advanced that Justin has copied a fictitious setting of the Platonic dialogues. But then the naive description is too unassuming and lacks that note of pendency which we find in the philosophers. There is something warm about the whole episode, it is couched in a zealously and emotional enthusiasm which is entirely lacking in the purely intellectual treatises.

Justin looked upon his philosophical training as a preparation for the Truth of Christianity. His studies had led him to yearn for the satisfaction of his soul's hunger. The Truth had finally come to him along the path of diligent and intelligent religious search. He found that Christ did not destroy any of the good that had been revealed in pagan philosophy. He rather fulfilled the old philosophies, he completed their imperfections. The "light that lighteth every man" now was revealed in all of its fullness.

Nor did Justin overturn the ladder by which he rose. Truth anywhere was not ^{an} alien but an ally of Christ's cause. "I have cast aside all the vain desires of men, I glory now only in being a Christian in the face of the world." His Christianity had not put him out of the class and cast of philosophers, on the other hand it had made him indeed a philosopher. He continued still to be a philosopher, he still wore the threadbare cloak which distinguished the philosopher. The Truth which he was dispensing was older than Plato, yes, even Plato was mumbling what Moses the prophet had long been

made aware of by the Divine Spirit. Justin's was a religious quest.

Very much injustice has been done Justin by critics who look upon his Christianity as a mere intellectual satisfaction. Some have called him an Ebionite, some a Paulinist, some an ardent representative of the Petrine or Jewish-Christian party. Others like Baur have made him a Jewish-Christian, an anti-Paulinist. Credner has done the same thing, while Semisch, one of the first modern critics of Justin, calls him a thorough-going Hellenist. VonEnglehardt calls him essentially a gentile, his thought pagan, while at heart he is a Christian. Ritschl and his school, true to their critical views, put the stamp of the gentile upon him, who possessed no understanding of the Old Testament foundations of Christianity nor of Paul's teachings, and made him one of the chief perpetrators in the degeneration of Christianity from its simple fellowship into an institution of Law, Dogma and Canon.

These labels are very dangerous. One must discard them all to understand the faith of Justin. That Justin designed to do anything at all to the Christianity of his day is simply out of the question. He is an important witness to the trend of Christianity in his time. No one who approaches the study of Justin's writings, even with the keenest critical insight, can come to the conclusion that he was a perpetrator of any brand of Christianity. He was essentially a Christian. The critics of the left wing have set up their standard of essential Christianity a priori, usually that of the Synoptics, and as a result their whole study of historic Christianity is biased. It is this false premise that makes historical students label Justin. If, as we believe, the essence of the Gospel is the redemptive power of God in Christ, then we must say that

a study of Justin's life reveals the fact that he had caught the meaning of the Gospel. His slant may have taken a peculiar turn, due to a host of circumstances, yet he was a Christian.

After his so-called conversion, we find him become an ardent apolstle, authorized by nothing more than the zeal and fervency of his convictions. His Christian life was real. His long and bitter mental struggles made him at once an effective missionary to his age. Never for a day did he lose his sense of responsibility for the propagation of the Gospel. Whether to Jews, Pagans, or heretics, he would go. Especially with the Jews would he plead, that they might be found accepting the Divine Truth, to the extent that he might himself be found guiltless in the day of judgment.

Had not the Lord said, "The sower went forth to sow?" So he must needs go that some seed may fall into the good ground, for the Lord will call everyone to account as he has received. He must do all in his power to dispel the ignorance of others. It is this urge that caused the Apologies to be written, conferences and disputations to be carried on.

Indeed the Christian religion had fertilized his mind, inspired his heart, and volatalized his will. He had no settled home. He was able to take his place in the established and authorized Christian groups as a champion of what Christians generally agreed Christianity was. In fact, he was later regarded as effective in his opposition to the heresies as he was an apologist. In Rome he had engaged in controversies. He had been there as early as 147, for in his first Apology he singles out the great heretic, Marcion. Rome in those days was a place where folks could try their wits. Into Rome poured scholars of every shade and type. Besides here was

established one of the most popular Christian Churches.

It was during his residence at Rome that he became entangled in controversies with a Cynic philosopher by the name of Crescens. Justin describes him as a "lover of bravado and boasting, not worthy of the name of a philosopher." But his effort at convincing Crescens of the falsity of his slanders was to no avail. "It is impossible for a Cynic who makes indifference his end, to know any good thing but indifference," Justin remarked. At the same time he had^a suspicious feeling that it would be through the influence of Crescens that he would be "plotted against and fixed to the stake."

Whether or not this actually happened we can but conjecture. His second Apology, issued as a result of the spectacle of wrongs inflicted upon Christians under Orbicus the praefect of the city. As a result of an unfortunate marriage relation, in which the wife became a Christian, several Christians were apprehended and executed.

The only account of his death is spurious, yet its validity has been accepted by some because of its strong internal evidence. 1 Rusticus, the praefect of the city, asked him where Christians assembled, what their doctrines were, besides other questions. To the question whether Justin hoped to live after this life Justin said that he not only hoped so, but that he knew so. Justin at first refused to obey the gods and submit to the king. At last upon being asked to sacrifice to the gods, Justin replied that "no right-thinking person falls away from piety to impiety." Upon this reply the word was given for his decapitation.

1. Foalkes- Jackson, Studies in the Life of the Early Church, page 123. "The original document is unknown, but its very baldness is a testimony to its genuine antiquity."

perfect harmony with what was happening continually. And there is no ground to believe that he might not have died in this fashion. It is to such a fate that he had long looked forward to with heroic fancy. And there is a noted absence of anything miraculous and superstitious in the narrative.

The date of his death is uncertain. Harnack holds that he died thirty years after his conversion, while Dr. Hort, dates it as early as 163 A. D. For general purposes the date of 163-167 is accepted. W. Walker quite correctly puts the date at 164 A. D.

There is something nobler than Stoicism in his statement to the pagans, "You can kill us, injure us you cannot, and in the warning that by inflicting martyrdom on Christians they did but injure themselves, while they conferred the highest blessing upon those whom they meant to harm." 1

He went to his death with more than a Stoic's grim tolerance. He went to his death with the Christian conviction. The early Church remembered him with the highest reverence. He was not necessarily a deep thinker, and this is what characterizes him as a good representative of the Christianity of his age. Had he been peculiarly scholarly, he might be otherwise. He was not an eloquent writer nor a powerful reasoner. But he was a man of wide reading, who possessed the spirit of the pagan world's religious quest, a beautiful candor and a childlike simplicity. Some one had said that there is nothing more noticeable in his character than his "transparent truthfulness." He was a Christian

1. Farran, Lives of the Fathers, Page 146.

full of Zeal and glowing enthusiasm. In most respects he was a man who stood on the ordinary level of his time; in his possession of a knowledge of Greek literature and the sacred books of the Hebrews, he stood a bit superior to all but a few of his contemporaries. 1

Justin was a voluminous writer. He was also a widely traveled man who was acquainted with the general culture of the times. We would expect to have many writings attributed to him since he was so highly regarded in the early Church. The Epistle to Diognetus, An Exposition of True Faith, and several other fragments have been attributed to him, but betray by their internal evidence that they have not been written by his hand.

The two Apologies and the Dialogue are undoubtedly his. They may not be the two mentioned by Eusebius, for he declares that one of them was addressed to Marcus Aurelius. It seems to be common opinion that the Second Apology has been lost, and that what now passes as the second Apology, is in reality a preface to what is now called the First Apology or it may be an appendix.

Justin himself mentions a treatise of his against all heresies. Irenaeus remarks that he wrote against the great heretic Marcion, while Eusebius and Photius attribute other works to him that are no more extant. So there were other writings of his which are now lost.

The First Apology dates itself. It is addressed to the Emperor Antonius Pius, 2 together with his son Verissimus the philosopher, and Lucius the philosopher, etc. It

1. History of Rome.

2. Reigned 138-161.

certainly could not have been written before 147. Harnack 1 is inclined to accept Justin's statement that he is writing about 150 years after Jesus' birth, with a possible leeway of ten years in either direction. As it is not our plan to give a critical study of the date of the writings of Justin, we can hold for our general use the opinion that the date of the first Apology is about 150-155. 2

The second Apology as noted above has been often considered as a preface or an appendix to the first. It contains no elaborate proof of Christianity, but it has about it more passion. It was written a little later than the first.

The Dialogue has not received the attention given to the Apologies. Some have doubted Justin's authorship of it, yet none of the arguments have been sufficient to disestablish his authorship.

A more detailed statement of the contents of the Apologies and the Dialogue is in order.

In the first Apology he refutes the anti-Christian slanders. The charges of atheism and immorality are denied by stating that guilty Christians are unworthy of the name. Christians worship the God of Truth and it is rather their accusers who are the atheists. Christians are not political plotters; they are concerned about a Divine Kingdom, and not an earthly one.

As to their doctrines, Christians are monotheists, who worship a graded heirarchy: God, Jesus Christ, then the Prophetic Spirit. He has a great deal to say about the Logos doctrine. Plato was directly dependent upon Moses for his wisdom. The proof of Christianity rests upon its fulfilled

1. History of Dogma.
2. Cf. Ayer, Source Book, Page 16; Workman, Christian Thought, Page 40.

prophecy. The grounds of his demand for toleration rest though upon pure justice. He defends the belief in prophecy against fatalism. The divine Logos was in the world from the beginning, and men who live and have lived rationally are Christians, and those who did not were enemies of Christ. Christians have the knowledge of the true God, and the heathen have been misled by the demons. In short, Christianity is a philosophy that merits respect from all, for it has been truly verified by revelation.

The second Apology contains no elaborate proof of Christianity. But it possesses more passion than the first. Through it we discern a sense of injustice. An incident had occurred in which two Christians had been executed in Rome. It opens sharply. He tells of the incident, shows a fear for his own life, and gives answer to the two questions brought to the face of Christians. First, since they were so willing to die, why did they not kill themselves? Justin answers that God made the world for man, that if they would kill themselves no one would be left to spread the divine doctrines. Christians confessed their faith because they would tell no lies. When asked why God did not protect them, Justin answers that the world has evil in it because of the fallen angels who became demons. These cause the evil which good men endure. The Logos, he says, came to set men free from demons. Those who follow reason, Logos, are always persecuted. But in the judgment this will be rectified. He affirms that Christianity is superior to all philosophies, because it reveals the whole Logos of God. The death of Christians, he says toward the close, is the proof of their religion's truth. Nothing in Christianity is contrary to Plato, but rather Christianity is the fulfillment of Plato.

He hopes for the authorization of his works, since they are not as subversive as some that are authorized.

The Dialogue, due to its dullness, has not received the attention that has been given the Apologies. It has been doubted that the same pen which wrote the Apologies wrote the Dialogue. But the style is the same. In it there are quotations from the first Apology, Eusebius, quoted it as from Justin's hand. Some have maintained that the background of the Dialogue is Platonic, while that of the Apologies is a Hellenistic Judaism. Of course, the Dialogue contains the "Chiliastic" conception. The approach to the Deity is somewhat different, and some inconsistencies of detail are to be found here and there. But none of these arguments are sufficient to disestablish Justin's authorship. Besides, who is looking for a consistent system in Justin? We could not expect it from one who was attempting the transition work he was doing. Like Paul, Justin knew no system. His significance lies not so much in the details of his system-- as in the general trend of his work.

The date of the Dialogue falls between the first Apology and Justin's death.

The burden of the Dialogue is to prove the truth and the power of the Christian belief, while Trypho the Jew argues to the contrary. There are three divisions: the first deals with the nature of the Mosaic Law; the second is burdened with the nature and the significance of Jesus Christ (the arguments are frequently broken by digressions, the proofs offered are strictly Scriptural); the third suggests that those who follow Christ are the true successors to Israel, Sons of Abraham. He closes with an exhortation to Trypho and his kin to accept the Truth of Christianity.

It may be that the Dialogue is a record of an actual discussion. At least Trypho is a kindly Jew who never embarrassed Justin, a sort of a straw man. The arguments are typical, rather than actual, like those commonly employed.

There has been an attempt to identify Trypho with Rabbi Tarphon, a bitter anti-Christian Jew. It is doubtful if the Rabbi ever argued with Justin in person. Justin rather named his straw man after this influential anti-Christian opponent, so say others. Yet Justin made Trypho out to be a layman dependent upon others for his knowledge of Judaism. We may safely conclude that Trypho is a representative of the vast number of Jews of the time. At least, Trypho has read the Gospels, knows a little philosophy, is open to the evidence and possible convictions of Christianity, understands no Hebrew, has the double Alexandrian sense of the Scriptures, and holds to a part of the Law. He even goes so far as to deny the value of Law, welcomes a mystical salvation over against a legal, and has no seeming prejudice against a second Deity. The only place that Trypho parts from Justin is on the question of the Incarnation of the Second Deity in Jesus Christ. of the second century.

So Justin has created an ideal Jew. With this he portrays his own knowledge of Palestinian Judaic teaching. Whence has he all this knowledge? It is highly probable that he received it from a written source, or even that he learned it by his disputations with the Jews. Many of his views are as old as Paul's. He may or may^{not} have been a student of the original Hebrew Old Testament, for he makes slips here and there in quotation and interpretation.

11. His "slips" may be due to his quotations from memory. Cf. Westcott, Text and Canon; Ladd, Doctrine of Scriptures, Vol. II, etc.

Some are inclined to think that he collected from previous collections of Old Testament verses quoted against the Jews, and in this way he has preserved for us a composite of Palestinian and Hellenistic-Judaic elements.

What was the purpose of the Dialogue? Some deny that it was, as is commonly held, written as a piece of propoganda among the Jews. Von Engelhardt thinks Justin wanted to attract Jews at the start by his conversion to Christianity through the prophets. The truth seems to be that he addressed it to those interested in philosophy, and that he did not intend it to be controversial. He is attempting a reconciliation of Jew and Christian, in the eyes of the pagan world, to show to the world that the writings of the Jews and the doctrines of the Christians are a production of a "single spirit of inspiration and revelation." Marcus Pompey is shown the stubbornness of the Jews, in the face of the clearest demonstration that their revelation is culminated in the person and teaching of Jesus Christ.

The narrative of the life, religious experience, and writings of Justin are very valuable as witnesses to the life of Christians in the middle of the second century.

As noted above, Justin was considered by himself and by Christians generally as an accepted authoritative representative of the average Christian and of the Christian group. He was widely traveled and keen in his observations. He took a leading part in the introduction of converts into the Christian faith. His martyrdom gave him an honored standing in the later Christian community. He became an authentic and ardent defender of the new faith.

It is for these reasons that he is an interesting character. We can be comforted that we have his writings,

for "were it not for the Apologies we should know but little of the actual Christian life of the second and third centuries."

In the following chapters, we shall deal with some significant facts which this sketch of his life reveals.

THE GENERAL SIGNIFICANCE OF
JUSTIN'S ACCEPTANCE OF
CHRISTIANITY

CHAPTER III

This sketch of Justin's life-experience and his writings suggests to us a host of facts of great significance in the story of the evolution of early, and later, Christianity.

It is not assumed that we can study Justin out of his environment i.e., which includes a number of influences, social, philosophical, etc. He stands in the process of a moving process. It is impossible to study any one of these "thunder-bolt" phenomenon in any great historical revolution or movement. History, as some one has aptly said, does not happen, it grows. History is an organism, a stream of flowing life. The events of one day are provided by events of yesterday and

THE GENERAL SIGNIFICANCE OF

JUSTIN'S ACCEPTANCE OF

CHRISTIANITY

CHAPTER III

The battle of Gettysburg to us as Stuart Mill writes that the battle of Marathon (490 B. C.) even as an event of Western history has more importance than the battle of Hastings. If the issue of that day had been different the British and the Saxons would still be wandering in the woods!

Of late this type of historical interpretation has been used almost universally. It is called the synthetic (holistic) correlation of history, and seeks to analyze any process in terms of all its constituent factors.

We must therefore remember that the history of Justin in a period of Christian development would mean very little unless we understood him as standing within the process of that development. Justin is not an individual standing alone in the second century, but a part and parcel of a social process. Undoubtedly the social emphasis has often robbed great men of their pivotal reputation and diluted their creative genius; yet on the other hand, I believe

This sketch of Justin's life experiences and his writings suggests to us a host of facts that are significant in the study of the evolution of early, and later Christianity.

It is not assumed that we can study Justin out of his environment i.e., which includes a number of influences, social, philosophical, etc. He stands in the current of a moving process. It is impossible to study any one as a "thunder-bolt" phenomenon in any great historical situation or movement. History, as some one has aptly said, does not happen, it grows. History is an organism, a stream of on-flowing life. The events of one day are preceded by events of yesterday and would be impossible without them.

The battle of Hastings is as important to the Englishman as is Gettysburg to us, yet John Stuart Mill wrote that the battle of Marathon (490 B. C.) even as an event of English history has more importance than the battle of Hastings. If the issue of that day had been different the British and the Saxons would still be wandering in the woods!

Of late this type of historical interpretation has been used almost universally. It is called the synthetic interpretation of history, and seeks to analyze any process by means of all its constituent factors.

We must therefore remember that the history of one man in a period of Christian development would mean very little unless we understood him as standing within the process of that development. Justin is not an individual standing alone in the second century, but a part and parcel of a social process. Undoubtedly the social emphasis has often robbed great men of their pivotal reputation and diluted their creative genius; yet on the other hand, I believe

that it has given us a clearer conception of their contributions to society in general. Besides the social analysis has put us into possession of valuable social intelligence. If the study of history should do any one thing, it should produce a healthy and sane historical mindedness, a perspective, a sane and cautious critique.

Celsus 1, the great antagonist of Origen and of Christians in general could say of the Christian group, "Let no man come to us who is learned or wise or prudent; but who is ignorant or babyish, he may come with confidence. The only converts we care to have (or indeed can get) are the silly, the ignoble, and the senseless, the slaves, the women, and the children." In a word, Celsus' scornful summons to the Christians was a sarcastic way of describing the Christian group. We may make a little reservation for some hyperbole, but as Professor Gwatkin remarks, the statement is "not untruly given." 2

Origen could refute the self-sufficient Celsus in his own inimitable way by answering: "when men, not only the laboring classes of Greece, came to see something honorable in Christianity.....scholars endeavor to penetrate deeper into the truth of Christianity"... he signified that in his own day, there were many who did not despise, nor were devoid of, learning already in the Christian ranks.

The original thanksgiving of the Christ who prayed 3 that "the Father had hidden these things from the wise and prudent and revealed them into babes", and Paul's 4 avowal that "not

1. Origen, Adversus Celsus, III, 44.
2. Early Church History.
3. Luke 10:31
4. I Cor. 1:26

many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble" had yet been chosen, was not intended to put a premium on ignorance and poverty, but to express the Christian truth that the Gospel overlooks all differences of birth and wealth and learning. Celsus is right in a sense, but wrong when he intimates that the Christians chose bad characters for followers and counted rank and learning evil, and required a blind obedience. "Do not examine, only believe", he thinks to be the motto of Christians. Why even in the New Testament we find men of rank in the Churches! And even in the day of Justin, there was no such opposition to reason on the part of the Gospel as Celsus imagined.

There were quite a number of educated and cultured men and women finding their way into the Christian fold. This influx of new life had begun before Justin's time, but the number was now taking on new proportions. Justin tells us that only in his own day had the Gentiles in the Church become more numerous than the Jews. They were becoming a problem, and they were as Christians confronted by a new situation. There was a new breath of life appearing in the Christian movement when men like Justin entered it.

With the influx of these cultured and learned persons there naturally came many things which were new to the Christian faith. Here were men who had, as Augustine did later, come into Christianity through Platonism. They were professional philosophers. These men were usually fashionably dressed, honored by society as private teachers, consulted on personal matters, esteemed as possessors of wisdom, the highest possession of the Greek World. They created an intellectual as well as a social problem.

They brought with them a totally different background

than the background in which the simple Gospel of Palestine has been set. Their Weltanschauung was as different as could be from the typical Hebrew. Their idea of God, their opinion on ethics, the highest good, all were couched in a different temper. The early Gospel had been a religio-ethical movement, and here were men of thought-force finding in the Gospel the culmination of all Truth, the end of the quest of philosophy. Besides, Christianity from the start had been most intimately associated with the Hebrew religion, with its supreme emphasis upon the transcendence of God, while these Greeks had been, from the beginning, putting emphasis upon immanence. The Greek mind was always rational, it wished to know. The Hebrew mind was one of obedience. The Hebrew had an instinct for feeling the moral order of the universe, the Greek had an instinct to find the rational order. That Professor Nagler I can say, "that Christianity conquered the world of intellect was just as marvellous as her victory over the Roman imperial government" is very significant; but that there were some other things that happened to the Christian religion in the way of a reverse conquest is just as evident. Gnosis versus faith!

Justin's conversion was symptomatic of the coming of the Greeks with their store house of capacities and slants who were to give a perculiar conceptual dress to many of the Christian experiences. We must not presume on later chapters, but we can make a few observations in an introductory way.

The Greeks were monists. The universe was one. Men were

1. The Church in History, Page 53.

capable of knowing everything. 1 Besides, there reigned a universal system of law. Greek philosophy and the Greek mind in general possessed this temper to regard everything in its cosmic significance. Whereas the Hebrew later developed a strong predestination doctrine, it never did belong to the Hebrew faith proper. Besides, it did not have the fatalistic aspect of the Greek conception. To the Hebrew anything could happen, God could intervene in His order as He willed. But to the Greek there was noticeable in his whole system of life an "undertone of sadness," for the Fates were in control and even the gods had to submit. Now this doctrine of the cosmic, absolute and monistic universe was carried over into the Christian religion. It was to have a bearing on the Greek interpretation of the Christian God, on the concept of salvation as a release from the flesh, ignorance and the fateful grind of absolute necessity. It was going to have a bearing on the question of miracles, on the question of the reasonableness of the Christian religion and man's ability to explain every phase of it rationally. The Hebrews were not philosophers, their thinking was always intensely practical, imaginative, dramatic. The abstract theorizing of the Greeks was foreign to them. Their idea of God was very close to life. Never did the Hebrew call his God the Absolute, Pure Being, Essence, Substance, or the like. He always employed practical concepts, Father, Mother, Friend, Husband. All the Hebrew's faith was intensely experimental. On the other hand the Greeks, as Hatch says,

1. Scott, The Tributaries of the Gospel, Page 110.

"The Greek Spirit was above all things rational, -- had a sense for a rational order. They set themselves to know believing that through knowledge a man could make himself at home in the universe. The Greeks taught us that the system of things is rational, and that man holds the key to it in his own intelligence."

possessed that tendency to define, to speculate, to orthodoxy. They worked for determinative mental frameworks, they erected abstract theoretical concepts as essentials to truth.

What is more, the Greeks that came into Christianity as did Justin, were acquainted with the Platonic ideals of being and truth. The Greeks made a distinction between form and matter. Likewise they made a distinction between matter and mind. All the realities of life were thrust back into the unseen world, the metaphysical world. The mind in men became divine because it partook of the nature of God. All that the Greeks had to do to possess salvation was to think God's thought after Him, they needed to be illuminated. Man, in salvation, became divine. This "gnosis" is the highest value there is, it is more, it is the supreme good. Mind is the source of all good in the world, and as a result, matter came to be regarded as the source of all evil. The body with its evil passions clogs the activity of the spirit so as to darken and pervert even its vision of good. This conception of matter in later Greek life brought about a profound change in the idea of God, who at first was thought of as independent existence, as ordering mind which worked upon matter which was distinct from Him, and was reduced to order. Aristotle had caused a lot of confusion among the medieval theologians because he has posited the eternality of matter. Later Greek thought made God absolute in His purity, in fact so pure that He could not have been brought into contact with matter through Creation. For this work there must be a lower God, or a Being lower than God. All of these ideas, so metaphysical, had their bearing on the Christian religion as those who were trained in this atmosphere embraced the Christian faith.

Again, this identification of evil with matter affected

the whole concept of salvation. Salvation was a liberation form of the tyranny of the body. It came about in two ways, one through contemplation and the strengthening of the spirit of man, primarily energistic; the other came about through the weakening of the body, a literal starving it off, or asceticism. It is for this reason that the Greek temper must be taken into consideration, since it resulted in the Christian emphasis upon mystic ecstasy and rigid asceticism. All of this salvation must be mediated by a pure divine spirit who redeemed the flesh by his incarnation. Sacramentalism also played a large part in the Greek mind as a real medicine of immortality possessing supernatural powers.

At least this is true, that by far the vast majority of Christians were proselyted from the Graeco-Roman world, and that not a few of them were among the learned and cultured, and that their whole background of thought and temper was to give Christianity a new phase of expression and start it on a course of interpretation which would take it away from its older thought forms. Now these Greek peculiarities were bound to play an important part in molding Christianity. Hyde 1 tells us that Greek philosophy this time had taken on a definitely religious character. If we may take as our authorities Case and Angus as two representatives of differing viewpoints on the phase of early Christianity, representative of the scholars, we note that there was definite religious quest in the air during the time of the Empire. Everywhere there was a growing seriousness, a great spirit of ferment, which revealed itself in the rapid spread of Cults, the revival of belief in older faiths (Jewish too) and forms, in a new study of Platonism, in an increased membership in the

guilds, and a growth of a social conscience. 1 Justin's acceptance of Christianity as the end of his quest for God, is but a typical case of many others of the time. The Gospel was originally a possession of simple Palestinian peasants, now became the possession of men who were the heirs of centuries of acute speculation.

Greek philosophy at this time had possessed a theological character. That is why it is that when these learned men entered the Christian movement, they would not do so until the demand of their minds for an intellectual religion had been satisfied. In the midst of age-old philosophies with traditions, they wished a philosophy with as much traditions, and as much philosophical respectability. Justin was more than pleased to say that his new philosophy antedated Plato, and more, that Moses had really possessed all that Plato thought. The Greek love for sacred literature and inspired lore was an added attraction.

Naive Christianity came into a ground that was prepared to receive it. Besides, it had to run the risk of being manipulated by the Greek temper, or be relegated to a peculiar group. 2. It is the universal genius of Christianity that its message and Gospel can and did survive after adaptation to the Greek climate of life.

The whole concept of God and ethics and salvation as thought out by the Greeks come in, not to engulf, but to strengthen and undergird Christianity by a reasoned intelligent basis. The Greeks had reasoned their way to monotheism and absolutism, to a hazy Personal Being. The new Greek adaptation

1. Dill Roman Society.
2. As proof of this fact, we have but to refer to the Ebionite Christians, who were bent on maintaining the old formulae as expressions of their faith. They died as a result. They failed to grasp the universal import of the

made the Christian God not only spiritual and transcendent, but metaphysical as well.

These hints are given to acquaint us with the type of men that were entering the Christian fold when Justin came in. It is a significant phase in the whole development of early Christianity when Christianity began to be defended by these Hellenistic converts. This new phase of the union between Hellenism and Christianity brought on a new turn in the development of scientific theology. We cannot help but repeatedly reiterate the fact that this process had been going on even in Paul's lifetime. Mains has a chapter in ^{one of} his books on the comparison and wide divergence in Justin's theology as compared with Paul's. Of course, the divergence is great, but the divergence is not ^{altogether} in kind, but in degree. Indeed the whole process had begun before Paul. Our best critics, conservative and liberal alike, tell us that Paul was a product of this process, not its author. It is in this development that Justin stands out as one of the important bridgers of the yawning chasm which we find between the Sermon on the Mount, the Good Samaritan, and the highly speculative definitions of the Trinity and the psychological definition of the person of Christ and other doctrines in the Nicene-Constantinopolitan-Chalcedon Creeds; between the New Testament Synoptics and the monumental monistic system of Augustine.

Philosophy, which the Collossians were told to beware of, because it seemed to represent those powers so antagonistic to the new faith, was to become the groom of this new bride. These two were to become so united that one almost believes that they cannot be parted until the very death of either has taken place! One marvels at the short courtship

and the remarkable efficacy of the union. Justin, and those Greeks with him, stand at the very fountain head of a new development in speculative Christianity. Even if we are not in full accord with Harnack's definition of dogma and Justin's relation to it, we can at least say that in him we find the first real developments which were to result in the theological issues that so disturbed the early Christian Church and still continue to do so.

It was certainly true that Christianity some day had to meet this situation. If it had not met it, it would have had to give up its claim to the right of a universal religion. This principle is a potent one today as we are seeking to make Christianity respectable in the eyes of the world.

What is more, there are many entering the Christian fellowship from cultures that are quite foreign to our culture. These new converts have a Weltanschauung that is certainly at variance with what is generally called Western or Occidental. New situations will seek new ways of expressions. Already this fact is facing us in our dealings with Oriental Christians. We must remember that it was the missionary expansion of the Christian Church, and the introduction of proselytes from other cultures, which really tore the Gospel from its Jewish roots, and forced the readjustment of the Christian religion because of its world import, its essential universalism.

The evident effect of the apologist was to lift Christianity from being a sect founded upon enthusiasm into a world-religion that appealed to the universal conscience and reason. 1

1. Workman, Christian Thought, Page 41.

The rise of indigenous Churches has caused the Christian religion to become indigenous to the mental temper and outlook of its new home. This is what was happening in a new and unique way in Justin's day.

We must not suppose that the introduction of philosophical methodology and formulae and metaphysical ideas submerged the Gospel. It gave it color. The resulting theological interpretations have indeed been legion, but I think that beneath the mental vehicles and rational frameworks we still can see the essence of the Gospel, faintly sometimes, "the power of God unto salvation." The "meanings" are there!

We see how Justin stands in the conservative stream of Christian development. This can best be seen in comparison with the Gnostic principles, which also attempted the solution of this problem of adaptation of the Gospel to the Greek mind, but which broke with historical facts that were too essential to be lost. Justin, on the other hand, made Christianity rational without adding or detracting materially from the traditional and historical material. He retained the Gospel under his mental forms. His mind needed a Gospel that was rooted not only in his history and antiquity, but in cosmology as well, and as a result he carried into Christianity his theistical and moral concepts of the world.

Foalkes-Jackson remarks that "this (viz. doctrinal development and its attendant emphasis upon the rational element in Christianity) has been often considered a drawback to the promotion of pure Christian belief, morality and conduct; but it is undeniable that the greatest of the Christian thinkers have not been as a rule backward in these respects, and piety and morality have never flourished in the days of

intellectual stagnation." 1

H. R. Niebuhr 2 would decidedly disagree with this statement. He would, as many another, say that the increased intellectual aspects of Christian development tended to obscure the life of Jesus, subordinated the ethical to the doctrinal elements, stimulated a soft aesthetic ritualism and tended to make life morbid and ascetic. The beginning of theological interpretation really brought on a decline in the ethical integrity of early Christianity, for doctrinal emphasis tends inevitably to reduce the ethical. If this is true then Justin did start a trend in early Christianity that was most deplorable. However in Justin's day apocalypticism and chiliaism created a radical ethical character in the early Church. Justin stands at the source of the doctrinal development, and although he was a chiliast his influence was to weigh heavily towards the abrogation of the radical ethical theories of the early Church.

Workman has an interesting remark to make in this connection, perhaps a little more homiletical than should appear in a thesis. "Over the Cross of the Saviour the inscription was written in three languages, Hebrew, Greek, Latin, a threefold appeal to the great races, which by their organization and thought influenced and moulded the infant Church. From the Jew, the Greek and the Roman the new faith received elements, differing according to the genius of the different races, yet all of value in the building of the city of God. For the Jew, the Greek and the Roman, on entering the Church did not lose their racial idiosyncrasies or abandon their distinctive tempers and modes of thought. The Jew came to the

1. Studies-- Page 195.

2. Social Sources of Denominationalism, Page 32 f.

New Testament through the Old; the Greek, even if he entered the Church through the synagogue, yet brought with him his philosophy; while the Roman construed all in terms of his polity." 1

The process of meeting the existing conditions and adjusting the old faith to the new culture was inevitable and inescapable. 2 Christianity had to make the adjustment or perish along with the pagan cults that refused to and could not do it.

It is to the credit of Christianity that it possesses such germinal vitality. "The Fathers could not help themselves; the terms were there and they must speak in the language of their people and day and school. But to use the language was to admit the thought; to translate their beliefs into the formulae of the schools, translated in matter as well as in form. The matter constructed was not the old scholastic matter, and so the new definitions and theorems were not identical with the old. What entered the speculative Greek intellect a religion and a history came out a theology, as much a creation of the metaphysical mind as if the place had been an academy or a school instead of a council." 3

1. Workman, Christian Thought, Page 3.
2. Snowden, Old Faith and New Knowledge, Page 178.
3. Fairbairn, The Place of Christ in Modern Theology, Page 89.



The writings of Justin, — and indeed of all the
apostles in Christian literature. — Most of the latter are
terrestrial & vulgarly slightly apologetic in character,
but the few terrestrial apologetic literatures are mostly
Justin's line that of Justin. Justin stands as the head of
a new type of Christian writings.

It is not possible that Justin's work should
be met by pagan criticism upon a new plane. The whole
statistical world of argument was in the hands of Justin.
The pagans who had made a special apologetic school of argument
in the philosophical schools. Justin's general, but not
experience in writing apologetic literature is
the mother of Justin's apologetic literature. It is here that the
first real beginnings of the scientific apologetic literature
are found.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF JUSTIN'S APOLOGETICAL WRITINGS

As Christianity was viewed with fear by the pagan world,
of conduct and intellectual belief, a definite system
had to be invented by the Christian religion. Justin's
philosophy in making Apologetics first in importance,
not in importance, among the branches of apologetic
literature.

CHAPTER IV

The early Church was thrown back upon its own resources,
in order to prove to the pagan world the
true origin and character of Christianity as the greatest
religion adaptable to the whole human race. Justin's work

1. Acts 2 is quite apologetic, as are the
Epistles of John, Colossians, and the Revelation.
But they do not employ the means of philosophical
argument that are found in Justin's writings.
E. Schaff, Propaedeutica.

The writings of Justin,--Apologies--were a new departure in Christian literature. Some of the later New Testament works were slightly apologetic in character. But the New Testament apologetic literature is vastly different from that of Justin. Justin stands at the head of a new type of Christian writings.

We must remember that Christians in Justin's day had to meet pagan criticism upon a new plane. The whole rhetorical vehicles of argument were in the hands of skillful pagans who had made a special age-long study of rhetoric in the philosophical schools. Christians generally had no experience in writing apologetics. But necessity proved to be the mother of invention. And it is here that we find the first real beginnings of the scientific use of apologetics.

As Christianity was assailed both from the point of view of conduct and intellectual belief, a defense-mechanism had to be invented by the Christian religion. Schaff follows Schleiermacher in making Apologetics first in Chronological order, not in importance, among the branches of systematic theology. 2

The early Church was thrown back upon its own intellectual resources, in order to prove to the pagan world the divine origin and character of Christianity as the perfect religion adaptable to the whole human race. Whether or not

1. Acts 2 is quite apologetic, as are the Epistles of John, Colossians, and the Pastorals. But they do not employ the means of metaphysical argument that are found in Justin's writings.

2. Cf. Schaff, Propadeutics. (especially of the first three books), the rapid spread of the faith, its moral fruits, its reasonableness, its fulfillment of all truth, and its equality

this was necessary has been argued pro and con. It has also been asked,-- was the resulting apologetic something that put a straight-jacket on the Christian Church; or was it something that sheathed the new faith, protecting and conserving it from a false development? And we must answer, "Yes," and "No."

In a sense, apologetics is the oldest branch of Christian theology. It rises not only from an outward attack but from an inward necessity. The impulse to justify Christianity before the bar of reason must be answered. Indeed apologetics is an integral part of theological science. It may have had the tendency to crystallize the simple free faith of the early Church, but the crystallizing process was a necessity in the face of its inner and outer conflict. Every age produces its own apologetics adaptable to the prevailing tendencies and wants, and as a result all apologies of whatever age are relatively true. The history of apologetics is a history of the stratification of Christian convictions in the face of a critical world. That is one of the startling features of

We have need for a new apologetic today, as in every age. Christianity must use the methods of its critics and vindicate its conduct and its faith. It must make itself respectable to its age on its philosophical side. In our study of Justin we need to make allowances for some of his statements, since his apologetic was a product of an age that demanded his dwelling upon some points which to us today are intellectually impossible, or have taken a relatively unimportant place. Even at that some of his chief arguments for Christianity are valid; fulfilled prophecy, miracles, (especially of transformed lives), the rapid spread of the faith, its moral fruits, its reasonableness, its fulfillment of all truth, and its capacity

of adaptation to all classes of men. Some of these to us are not as 'puncture-proof' as they were to Justin, but many of these external and internal evidences are capable of retaining their convincing force. At present the internal and moral evidences are of more weight than the external. Nevertheless, Justin's Christianity centered in Christ as that fact that gave him his clue to life and the world. We have not progressed in this respect!

Justin represents one in the source of that long line of apologetic writers and debaters among whom are Clement, Origen, Tertullian, Augustine, Aquinas, Luther, Knox, Calvin, and a host of others whose spiritual children are still engaged in the defense side of the Christian faith.

Let it be remembered that in spite of the exclusiveness of the Jews in regard to their religion, they had never built up a complicated defense-mechanism on the basis of metaphysical dialectic. This was something entirely foreign to the Jewish mind. That is one of the startling features of the Old Testament faith. The religious convictions of the Jews were simply posited, never submitted to argument. Their apologetic rested upon command and not upon reason. They looked for the moral nature of the truth of God as well as the religious nature. With the Greek it was entirely an intellectual problem. Cairns 1 remarks that "The Hebrew mind has not the slightest trace of any dialectic reasoning as to the Being of God." The Old Testament writers came to be sure of God by quite a different way from the laborious processes of the earliest apologetic text-books.

1. Reasonableness of Christian Faith,
Page 44, 45.

Another interesting feature of Justin's apologetic was that he had to contend on two fronts, the Jewish and pagan. This is another reason why it is wrong to classify Justin as a partisan in the Jewish-Gentile or the Paul-Peter controversy. We see that Justin is facing attacks from Judaizers and from Gnostics on a strictly Christian basis. He is no member of any faction, he is a Christian, orthodox and representative. I think we can maintain that the Christian group at this time was an independent, spirit-united, charismatic group. The Jews of the Diaspora had much to find fault with in the Christian faith, from the humble birth of Christ to his ungodly death. They also argued that the Christian movement was certainly not of God since it attracted only people of humble birth among the Gentiles, and very few Jews. The Pagan attacks have already been outlined. In short,-- the monotheism of Christianity, its unheard-of intolerance, its lack of ritual, its low-brow adherents, its unclassical simple literature, its social exclusiveness, the padded reports of its Agape feasts and Communion services, at which Christians were supposed to have eaten human flesh and in which many suspicious orgies took place,-- were its chief hindrances.

In the face of all this Justin stands out as one of the first apologists of all Christian history who helped to build a logical system of offensive and defensive truth in and around the new faith. He sheathed the tender plant by using all that his background had equipped him with. He helped to preserve the faith by holding its current within defined intellectual channels. If the soul is the only essential thing, it nevertheless cannot exist in this kind of a world without a body. And so it has been and ever will

be in the history of Christian apologetics.

Real "religion has changed less than theology, if at all, and constructive theology has changed less than apologetics. This is because the grounds of religion in human nature lie deeper than thought and much deeper than argument." 1 But since man is not only religious, but thoughtful, and at times argumentative, there must be a place not only for theology and systematic belief in religion, but for the sake of self respect, there must follow a reasoned statement and defense of that belief. And in spite of the fact that quite a reversal has taken place of late in Christian apologetics, it cannot be denied that we need a respectable apologetic today, that can give a reason for the faith we have in the redemptive experience of God in Christ, and one that is based upon contemporary thought-life and temper. The older apologetic has much of value for us, if not in content of argument, at least in type and method of defense. Whether Justin's apologies were read by the people of note he intended them for is irrelevant. His apologies were timely and contemporary. They comforted the saints, if they did not convert the pagan! It is to be pitied that apologetics, which are a necessity, have the tendency to halt and crystallize the free flowing of vital religion. That may be the reason for the lack of dynamic in modern Christianity in some quarters.

Professor Shedd 2 seems to have expressed a real elemental truth when he says that the chief need for apologetics is because the outside world thinks revelation contrary to reason,

1. Macintosh, D.C. Reasonableness of Christianity, Chapter I.
2. History of Christian Doctrine, Vol I, Page 121.

This question of the uniqueness of the Christian revelation is the standing objection of skepticism in all ages. Justin may have done some shallow and freakish reasoning at times, but taken as a whole the problem stated by Shedd was his problem as it is ours. The harmonization of faith and reason, science with revelation and religion with speculative philosophy is a contemporary problem as it will be with every age. And yet the attacks on the Christian religion, basically one, are diverse. "They spring out of the peculiar culture of the age, and take on a hue by which it can be distinguished. At one time it is deistic infidelity, at another time pantheism, then epicurean naturalism, or a frigid and arid rationalism, and the variety is seen in the Apologists. Like meets like. Each form of error is countenanced by a correspondent form of truth, and thus the great stream of debate rolls onward." 1

"The human mind will continually be forced to renew its attempts to grasp and retain in scientific form the truth which it has believingly appropriated in order that it may maintain this ^{truth against unbelieving} civilization, and that it may satisfy its own cravings after unity and clearness of philosophical view." 2

But how amazing a thing it is that the Christian religion has been able to live on in spite of the attacks made upon it. Perhaps E. Stanley Jones 3 is right,--the Christian religion really needs no apologies. Christ suffers at the hands of his apologists. He stands alone, well able to take care of Himself in any culture and age. Apologies may come and go, but Christ goes on forever. He is above apologies. Although our small minds make their systems,

1. Ibid, Page 104.
2. Lotze, Mikrococosmos, II, Page 481.
3. The Christ of the Indian Road.

He knows none. He is above them, and undoubtedly suffers by the cramping limitations which our pride of intellectual definitions place upon Him!

Nevertheless Justin is the real father of scientific apologetics, and his children will be forced, by the nature of Christianity and its adherents, to "follow in his train." Ideally, apologies for the Christian religion are not needed, but actually they are a necessity.

... although not as strictly persecuted. The possibility was constantly present, and some Christians, for example, could be called to account unless willing to confess.

Although martyrdom was solitary, yet there were no lack of those who were often social. He was never far from the company of others.

Scenes of martyrdom produced great excitement. Spectators who had never before seen such a display of religion to respect, as Justin's case indicated, were impressed by what they saw on the scaffold, or what they heard from friends. THE SIGNIFICANCE OF JUSTIN'S MARTYRDOM
CHAPTER IV
... offered themselves for condemnation. There was a great attraction about martyrdom; it was looked upon as the highest possible achievement for the Christian. It was a passion in which each Christian felt it a privilege to share. Sometimes they offered themselves for condemnation without being accused or condemned.

Hilman somewhere remarks that "they called us martyrs." It is certainly true in a majority of cases. The early church was very emotional. The dead martyrs were hailed with triumph, and were regarded as having received the highest honor of God. Not only that but later developments were to substitute martyrology for the mere veneration of martyrs. By his meritorious death the martyr was supposed

Martyrdom was very frequent in the early Church, although not an every-day occurrence. The possibility was constantly present, and once apprehended, the Christian would be called to account unless willing to apostacize. 1

Although Martyrdom was solitary, yet from Justin we learn that it was often social. He was accused and executed with others.

Scenes of martyrdom produced great excitement. Spectators who had never before seen much in the Christian religion to respect, as Justin's case indicates, were impressed by what they saw on the scaffold, or what they heard from friends as to imprisoned Christians, who had accepted all the consequences. Christian onlookers, lukewarm in their enthusiasm, could not resist the impulse of sympathy and indignation, and they in turn stood out and offered themselves for condemnation. There was something attractive about martyrdom; it was looked upon as the highest possible achievement for the Christian. It became a passion in which each Christian felt it a privilege to share. Sometimes they offered themselves for condemnation without being accused or condemned.

Milman somewhere remarks that "Logic makes no martyrs." It is certainly true in a majority of cases. The early Church was very emotional. The dead martyrs were hailed with triumph, and were regarded as having received the highest honor of God. Not only that but later developments came to substitute martyrology for the mere veneration of martyrs. By his meritorious death the martyr was supposed

to have received a superhuman influence in heaven. This led to superstitious worship of martyrs and the abuses of saint worship and vicarious atonement for the sins of weaker Christians.

When the opportunity for martyrdom had ceased, other channels had to be found for the outlet of Christian zeal. Many have looked upon monasticism as a necessary corollary to martyrdom, for in this form of 'living death' we see a self-inflicted, artificially-produced martyrdom.

As to the question whether the persecutions and their effect in martyrdom were a hindrance or an aid to the new faith, there has been a difference of opinion. It certainly kept many lukewarm and interested proselytes outside of the Church. On the other hand, it was an actual inducement to enter the fold. The age was to all indication far from a critical age. I believe that we might call it an age conducive to sacrifice. Many rejoiced to be martyred as proof of their devotion. The Church did everything to encourage the steadfastness of the would-be martyr. Martyrs were worshipped, even before their death. Many scrambled to get a view of them. The would-be martyr knew he would be honored in death and in the future life of the Church. So there was every inducement for the martyr to persevere. Martyrdom was a mental and spiritual mania. Many longed for martyrdom. Polycarp at his execution prayed, "I bless thee that thou didst deem me worthy of this day and honor." Christians possessed an asceticism, a lofty disdain of earthly blessings, and a joy in eternal things. "Some have gone so far as to say that there was a school of martyrdom,

actually training in mind and body for the onslaught." 1

Foalkes Jackson 2 gives as another reason for the increase of the martyr spirit, the fact that ordinary life was dull in the Roman Empire, and that Christianity offered an object for existence. It set up a moral standard worth striving for, it gave men an institution worth working for, it held out hopes for the hereafter and a reward from their comrades in the abiding fellowship. It was a hero's religion.

Of course, Chiliasm 3 and its persistence in the early Church had a profound effect upon martyrdom, and the recklessness with which people considered the paltriness of this earthly life, which would last but for a little while.

Why it is that Christianity has been furthered by such methods and doctrines is a puzzle. But if the end justifies the means, we can say with certainty, that chiliasm, martyrdom, and the persecutions all won more converts than the preaching of the Gospel itself. This passive resistance which seems to us so suicidal, was too strong a force for the powerful Roman Empire, and it soon refused to persist in the slaughter. Later, when the skies were again fair, the Church had to make strict regulations to force Christians to desist from what appears to

1. Faulkner, Biblical Review, Vol. IX, No. 1, Page 46.
2. Foalkes Jackson, Studies, Page 119, 120.
3. With this Chiliasm there was the doctrine of Hell and the Judgment, which would resolve all the cruel injustices and wrongs of the pagan world. There was in Justin's day a sharp sense of righteousness. One must study deep into early Christianity to note the profound effect that Chiliasm had upon the early Christian movement. We shall discuss it more fully in a later chapter.

be almost heedless, coveted, willing martyrdom. It is this fact that produced the monastic impulse.

Thus So during Justin's time, the spirit of martyrdom was a significant factor in the life of the Christian movement. Tertullian later said that the blood of the martyrs " was their seed." The martyr spirit protested against the entire religious policy of the Empire, which tried at first to regulate, then, tolerate all faiths in the truly Roman spirit. Here we are made aware of a fact that is most significant in the study of early Christianity, and that is that Christianity through its martyr spirit signified that it was unwilling to harbor any opinion which did not give it the unique preeminence among the religions of the Empire. It would not compromise. In spite of Justin's high regard for heathen philosophy, there is no support in him for the doctrine of a syncretistic interpretation of early Christianity. What is more, and this is also a significant fact in Justin's attitude and death, the antagonism between the Christian religious movement and the State was growing. The early Christians refused to give divine honor in any way to Rome or the gods which Rome tolerated as the accepted deities of the Empire. Here is the beginning of the breach between the Church and the State which was to become a problem of the first magnitude in the Middle Ages.

In the Roman Empire there was a persistent effort on the part of the powers that be to unify the State by means of religion. Force of arms had accomplished something, but unity of spirit was needed. This the Empire did by making a pan-religion eclectically. The worship of the Emperor as a deified embodiment of the State was inaugurated and its worship was expected from the entire citizenship. The

character of the man who was the Emperor had nothing to do with the sacredness of the office which he held. It was thus that morality and virtue were divorced from religious formality. The national religion was a mere worship-cult. This type of a religion has often proved to be very short-lived.

Not to worship the Emperor and what he stood for was considered nothing less than treason. It was punishable accordingly.

Christianity came into immediate contact with this empire-religion. It set up for itself a Kingdom on the basis of the old theocratic kingdom of the Jews. It claimed to have within itself the seeds of life and power that would make it endure even after all other forms of religion and government had gone into the dust. The Divine King of its empire was to be worshipped by all, before and above the Roman Empire and Emperor. It demanded that every law of the Empire in conflict with the laws of its Kingdom were to give way. Purity of heart was its demand.

This is why the Christians rejected the imperial cults, and sternly withstood the attempt of the Empire to manufacture a pan-religion and blend religion and patriotism. One of the cardinal aims of the Christian religion was to draw a sharp line between the worship of God and the honor due to the state and its leaders. Christianity was set on tearing up political religion by its roots. This is one of the very important significant phases of the persecutions. Of course the Church later succumbed to the State under Constantine, but as yet, in Justin's day, the struggle was quite intense.

At first the Empire had thought of Christianity as a phase of Judaism, very harmless and sectarian. But after a

while, when Christianity refused to take its place alongside of other religions, when it claimed to be the only true religion and faith, it was opposed, not for religious but for political purposes. Christians who refused to give way to Rome, were coming into collision with the government. The Empire was helpless. It could put down a riot in Persia and elsewhere by force of arms. But this sect of Christians at their very doors they could not quell. The persecutions which had begun in ignorance and dislike were continued in hatred and fear. Terror became the chief motive of persecution. The heathen had every advantage on their side, but these were not victorious. One wonders whether the Church could ever have maintained its spiritual character if it had not been for the martyr spirit. Had the Christian religion been willing to be absorbed into the State-cult, it would have lost its very essential existence.

Martyrdom and persecution, thus carried to the extreme from an ethical point of view, did have in them a relative good in that they welded the Christian group together, and paved the way for the development of the Catholic Church. When the persecutions had ceased, then came the time for rationalization. The problem arose as to who had apostasized and who had not, who should remain in the Church, and who should not. From this came splits, as we notice in the Novatians, Donatists, and the Melitians. One interesting fact stands out, and that is that none of the great martyrs were ever accused of heresy. It indicates that the age was not one of a critical analysis of doctrinal faith. Some of the views held by Justin in reference to salvation, and the Logos, and the Holy Spirit, were certainly not strictly orthodox.

Martyrdom was a new phenomenon in the Graeco-Roman world. The attempt of the Romans to establish eclectically a pan-religion by taking the best in all religions, is as old as well as a modern scheme to solve the religious problem. But this scheme fails to recognize that religions, like cultures, are organisms, and that the finest eclectic product lacks an organic life, and eclecticism never produced any martyrs.

Edward Caird reminds us that as noble as was the thought that Greece produced, yet Socrates was the only martyr that the whole tradition produced. We miss, too, as Prof. Sperry¹ tells us, "in the classical world that conflict with the spirit of the age which we find in the prophetic reforming periods of the enduring world religions?" The Greek did not know what intolerance was. He had no conviction strong enough. It is remarkable to see a Greek like Justin gripped by a moral and ethical dynamic. But the classical world was unusually tolerant. The thinkers of Greece never resisted unto blood; they were not sawn asunder, stoned; they did not live in caves of the earth for a moral and religious conviction. Stoicism and Neoplatonism developed later in isolation, the one attempting to vindicate the religion of this-worldliness, the other of other-worldliness. "But generally the Greek ideal was moderation in all things,-- nothing in excess. The result never issued in a saint,-- nor in a gentleman,-- but in a prig."²

1. Signs of these Times, Page 52.

2. Ibid, Page 53.

Over against this easy tolerance of the classical world of religion, the Christians threw their offensive of intolerance. And to the average citizen of the times the Christians' intolerance was offensive! It was unheard of. The martyr Spirit is clearly seen in their Christian ethics, as we shall see in a later chapter. But beneath their ethics lay this reckless martyr-stuff, that in the end conquered the Empire of varied religions, and some of them put up very strong defenses for their preservation.

There was a note of uncompromising exclusiveness in the faith and conduct of the early Christians. In the face of a world of deities and ways of salvation, Dr. J. D. Jones says, "The Christians were exposed to the fierce persecutions of the early centuries because they were not satisfied that Christianity should be regarded as just one means, one method of approach to God. Christianity was not satisfied with a place; it demanded the whole place. It was not content to be regarded as one mode of addressing deity; it was the only mode. It was intolerant of a rival, . . . it lent a might, a passion, and zeal to its preachers. . . . They believed that in Christ they could claim that they had the only Savior. It was this that sent them to the ends of the earth; . . . that lent urgency to their message and passion to their speech." 1

Now this martyr passion has been decried by some eminent scholars. 2 They claim that this intolerance, coming from Judaism, has been harmful in the history of the Church. It has made for persecutions, bloodshed, heresies, schisms,

1. Quoted in H.B. Bruner, Pentecost: A Renewal of Power, Page 133.
2. Cf. Christian Century, Feb. 26, '30, Article by Prof. F. Eakin, "Is a Tolerant Christianity Possible?"

religious wars, and bad feeling on the mission fields.

It is rather a liability than an asset. Undoubtedly this is true. Too often the intolerance as to details of Christian belief has worked unethical havoc in the Church and in the mind of the world. We need to face frankly the "moral equivalent" of historic intolerance.

But this needs to be said in the light of Justin's martyr-spirit and that of his age. Although the meaning of Jesus needs to be studied anew in reference to our modern age, -- yet we certainly need in our day, as then, to champion uncompromisingly and intolerantly the significance of Jesus Christ as a sufficient and unique Savior. "At the very heart of the Christian Church, making it a Church, kindling its passions, prompting its evangelistic efforts, lending to those labors intensity and urgency, there lies the conviction that in Jesus Christ it possesses the one cure for the world's woe." The Christian religion must never lose this conviction. 1

1. Prof. D.W.Riddle of the U. of Chicago has an interesting doctor's dissertation on the social and psychological phases of the persecutions. It has recently been published.

Justin was a product of the Greek culture which had sprung up over the entire Empire and was to a large extent a product of the Hellenistic world. Culture was never before so advanced and the intellectual life so fostered. Justin was a philosopher, if we may call it a profession, as defined by a well-defined professional code. A philosopher was a recognized member of society whose views were respected and revered. Hatch 3 informs us that Justin was a philosopher of the Platonic school.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF JUSTIN
IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF
CHRISTIAN EDUCATION

CHAPTER VI

Justin was not only a liberative one, but he indicated above, one of social prestige.

Let us remember that Justin was a product of the Hellenistic world. And the result was that he gave us a new view of Christianity, as many with him did before and since. He was a Greek lover of education. Hatch 3 remarks, that the Greeks were to create a certain habit of mind in the Christian group. Naturally it was impossible for the Hellenistic Christians coming into Christianity to retain the simplicity of the primitive Gospel. They had been in contact with an education that permeated their whole nature. They were not willing to be simple as the primitive Christians.

1. Monroe, History of Education, Page 231.
2. Hatch, Influence of Greek Ideas, Chap. II.
3. Ibid, Page 48.

Justin has another significance for us in the study of the development of early Christianity. We refer to his significance in the history of Christian education.

Justin was a product of the Greek schools. They had sprung up over the entire Empire and were in a flourishing condition. Culture was never before "so disseminated nor the intellectual life so fostered." 1 In fact the whole educational system, if we may call it a system, was quite co-ordinated by a well-defined professional code. The philosopher was a recognized member of society and was everywhere respected and revered. Hatch 2 informs us that education was a complex affair. All the arts and sciences were taught; Belles. Lettres, Rhetoric, Logic, Dialectic, Philosophy, and the rudimentary sciences. Education, too, had become the possible possession of the common class of people, no more was it the exclusive property of the aristocracy. The teaching profession was not only a lucrative one, but as indicated above, one of social prestige.

Let us remember that Justin was a product of this educational world. And the result was that he carried over into Christianity, as many with him did before and after, the Greek love for education. Hatch 3 remarks, that its effect was "to create a certain habit of mind" in the Christian group. Naturally it was impossible for the educated Greeks coming into Christianity to retain the simplicity of the primitive Gospel. They had been in contact with an education that permeated their whole nature. They put nothing human alien to themselves.

1. Monroe, History of Education, Page 231.
2. Hatch, Influence of Greek Ideas, Chap. II.
3. Ibid, Page 49.

Another fact must be remembered in this connection. Later, in our study of the idea of Justin's soteriology, we shall touch upon it more in detail. But here we must anticipate a little. Justin, like the Greeks with him, placed a great deal of emphasis upon "gnosis" in the process of salvation. Redemption to him was rather an "illuminating" process. Knowledge of Truth is the means of salvation. This he carried over into the Christian group, and from it there proceeds a number of future developments.

Undoubtedly Justin is a major factor in the introduction of the educational emphasis into Christianity. He added greatly to the teaching element in Christianity. He is one of the long line of teachers, among whom are Origen, etc. He is one of the founders of the Christian schools. Faith, to Justin, as Hatch 1 rightly says, is an intellectual conviction and satisfaction. Christianity is made into a body of well-defined, factual, certain Truth, to be used as a curriculum.

He also introduced a peculiar Greek method of teaching into Christianity. " In the Greek schools the method was that of formal selection of a theme or texts from the teaching of a philosophical school, or logical analysis, of certain careful choice of words, of discrimination in phrases and fine shades of meaning, and of formal delivery; the method of the Hebrew synagogue was that of formal comment and exposition; that of the early Church was that of prophesying or impromptu expositions and exhortation." 2 Allegory was used, which came from Greek and Diaspora sources. This same method was

1. Ibid.

2. Monroe, Ibid, Page 223, 224.

adopted by the Christian teachers, and the Church came gradually to impose these interpretations upon the coming generations as a test of orthodoxy. We find Justin using this methodology, which was more Greek than Hebrew; and it was not much later in time that we find the Alexandrian school taking up the same methods. This method was foreign to the primitive Christian group, but it was introduced by the influx of Greeks with their peculiar educational background which they did not and could not shed.

All this has had a profound effect upon theological education in the later history of the Church. These Greek Christians were quick to see that they must equip their ministers and members with a training that was similar to contemporary educational life. They brought into the service of Christian instruction the learning of the Greek philosopher and the eloquence of the rhetorician - - in fact all Greek learning - - was brought into the service of the Church.

From the beginning there had been Christians who were opposed to anything that smacked of heathen culture. They believed that all philosophy ultimately produced heresy (and there may be some truth to it!) 1 They held there could be no compromise with any truth of the world. On the other hand the number increased who believed that there was much of value in the cultural life of the pagan world. They held, as Justin did, that philosophy was but a search for the Truth that Christianity possessed, and that Christianity should include it in its educational program. Justin had found by personal experience that the Truth he found fragmentarily in philosophy

1. Heresy really is produced by the attempt to rationalize the redemptive experience of Christ. As long as men can think there will be differences of interpretations.

was fulfilled in Christianity. When Clement said " The way of truth is one..... But into it as into a perennial river streams flow from all sides", he was voicing what Justin had already marvelously held. Justin held to his position that there should be a reconciliation between culture and Christianity. And it was in the later schools, which followed out the desire of Christians like Justin, that philosophy, rhetoric, logic, astronomy, and practically the entire round of Greek learning was taught as in the Greek schools, but from a Christian point of view. To this school all classes of men came, but they were meant specifically for the training of the clergy under the direction of the bishop.

There seems to be a consensus of opinion that Justin was not ordained. This fact makes it evident that the teaching profession was on the way to becoming an established one. He was welcome in all the Churches, and recognized as an apologist of first rank.

Of course, Judaism too had its emphasis upon education. The synagogue as Moore says, " had features in common with the mystery collegium, a school of philosophy, a mutual benefit society and a court of civil jurisdiction." 1 But the type of education which took place in the synagogue and in the primitive Church was not as systematic, nor as comprehensive as that of the later second century. The Jews of the Diaspora had incorporated much that was typically Greek into their religious rationale, for they too had hoped to make their Judaism respectable in an intellectual sense. But the

1. Angus, Religious Quests of the Graeco-Roman World, Page 32.

new wine was simply not adaptable to the old wine skin of exclusiveness, so that the attempt eventually resulted in failure. Both Jew and Greek contributed to the educational development of the Christian religion. Here again the genius of the Christian religion is manifested, in that it could assimilate all that was valuable and not lose completely its essentiality.

Today this educational problem is a very real one. The principles of religious and theological education found in Justin are as new as the latest expression on the principles of Christian education. In how far shall we incorporate the search for God outside the Christian group into the curriculum of Christian education? In how far shall the humanistic and scientific studies be used in the curriculum of a Christian school, secondary collegiate, or theological? Can they be incorporated? In how far shall we introduce the methods of teaching found in other religions and cultures into our religious education? Shall we use the older philosophical arguments for God in a study of Christian theology? Is Christian education a study of a 'given' revelation, or is it the study of truth everywhere as a revelation of God? Is conversion an act of instantaneous change, brought about by eschatological "preaching", or is it a process brought about by "teaching" of enlightening truth? Is religion "caught" or "taught"?

No one who has made a study of the present tendencies in Christian education can deny that we are living in an age of Greek renaissance in educational circles. In every Christian college the humanities and the sciences take a large space in the curriculum. In what sense are these Christian studies? Justin helps us by saying that they must be taught in such a

way as to point to the Truth which has been fully revealed in Christ. Not a bad definition of Christian education. Whether his thesis is true, is not my question, but that he is our contemporary is evident. Justin, as a Greek, stands at the very source of the introduction of the Greek ideal of education into the Christian religion. Whether that has been for good or ill is a question that we must answer in every phase of this thesis. I do not think it necessarily involves a degradation of the essential Christian faith, -- but I do think that it has worked for ill in some cases. When this has occurred, it has been the fault of extremists who have swung the pendulum too far. And even then, it has not submerged the Christian faith entirely. The gospel has the inherent power to rectify itself.

The Gospel, through these Hellenists and their background, as seen in Justin, now allied itself definitely with the larger spiritual movement of humanity. It became a religion based not only upon the Law and the Prophets but on all the Truth that had been won by the Greek and the Oriental speculation. The Apologists claimed for the Gospel the fulfillment of the world's search for Wisdom.

As a result of this tremendous claim, substantiated by arguments which their generation could readily comprehend, the Christian religion has claimed a harmony with the general movement of all human thought. It has been able to use for its enrichment all the growing wealth of culture and science as being included in its Truth. This has been one of the secrets of the vitality of the Christian religion. It has been able to reach out and capture all good in all

1. This section has a real bearing on the Old Testament Problem.

cultures for its own glorification. This new adventure of Christianity out into the Gentile world caused it to be torn from its strictly exclusive Jewish environment and to be transplanted into the fertile soil of humanity. Jesus is the claimant of all Truth, and Justin would say that nothing humanly good is alien to the curriculum of the Christian's education.¹

Historically Christianity has always laid claim to all knowledge as a handmaid of the Christian faith. The whole realm of discovered truth has been brought in to supplement and enrich the revelation given in Christ. The Christian Church has always maintained that its faith is originally revealed, but it has also held that revelation is not contradictory to the best knowledge of men found in the philosophies and the religions. THE DEVELOPMENT OF

That Jesus came into the world, not to destroy, but to fulfil has been amply proven on the modern foreign mission field. He fulfils all religions that can be designated as religions. Not only that, but He is the completion of the broken arch of science. Harnack writes that to the great questions of why, whence, and whither, science can give no answer. It is Jesus Christ who gives the final meaning to the investigations of science. He also is the keystone of philosophy, of art, of morality, of universal religion.

Justin, although not in possession of the vast resources of scientific knowledge which we possess, nevertheless laid hold of a great idea when he claimed the wealth of all human knowledge for Jesus Christ. As a teacher he is a pioneer in the realm of Christian education. To him and his Greek colleagues we owe the introduction of the Greek method, material, etc., into the Christian faith.

1. Cf., Scott, *The Gospel and its Tributaries*, Pages 129, 130, also Harnack, *Mission and Expansion*.

of Christological doctrine is to see how the most important phase of his life. With it is bound up the whole development of the Hellenistic doctrine of the Church.

No problem of the early Christians was more serious and difficult than the reconciliation of their faith in the deity of Christ with monotheism. Professor [Name] maintains that the Gentiles never had any trouble, for their minds were not naturally encumbered with monotheism. They learned it gradually, and as a result there was no great theological struggle which marked the early development of the early Christian Church.

Not only were **THE SIGNIFICANCE OF JUSTIN** ideas, but they had been **IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF** entirely foreign to **CHRISTOLOGY** which saw a great gulf between man and God. So we see at the close of the Christological problem **CHAPTER VII** linked up with the conception of God. The Jews, and these Gentiles who had learned monotheism, saw that the ascription of deity to Jesus might have to be purchased at the cost of their monotheism.

There was another problem very close to those mentioned above, and that was the formulation of an accurate doctrine of the Person of Christ. At first we find the early Christians believing uncritically in the unity of the Godhead, and clinging simultaneously to the deity of their Savior. It took a very long time for the inconsistency to make itself felt. The Hellenistic culture after coming into the Church tried to make their beliefs more real and intelligent by introducing the more exact forms of thought that were familiar. They had no guiding principle to mark out their path. It was an adventure

1. The God of the Early Christians.

The significance of Justin Martyr in the development of Christological doctrine is to our mind the most important phase of his life. With it is bound up the whole development of the Christian doctrine of the Trinity.

No problem of the early Christians was more vexing and difficult than the reconciliation of their faith in the deity of Christ with monotheism. Professor McGiffert maintains that the Gentiles never had any trouble, since their minds were not naturally endowed with monotheism. 1 They learned it gradually, and as a result there came those great theological struggles which shook the very foundations of the early Christian Church.

Not only were the Gentiles free from monotheistic ideas, but they had been raised up in an atmosphere that was entirely foreign to the Hebrew which saw a great chasm or gulf between man and God. So we see at the outset that the Christological problem is intimately linked up with the conception of God. The Jews, and these Gentiles who had learned monotheism, saw that the ascription of deity to Jesus might have to be purchased at the cost of their monotheism.

There was another problem very close to those mentioned above, and that was the formulation of an accurate definition of the Person of Christ. At first we find the early Church believing uncritically in the unity of the Godhead, and holding simultaneously to the deity of their Savior. It did not take very long for the inconsistency to make itself felt. Men of Hellenistic culture after coming into the Church tried to make their beliefs more real and intelligent by expressing them under forms of thought that were familiar. They had no guiding principle to make out their paths. It was an adventure

1. The God of the Early Christians.

which was new and unfamiliar. These Christians used everything the intellectual world had to offer.

Very early after the death of Jesus we find this Christological problem arising, if not in the acuteness later displayed, yet in germ it was developing. There are evidences of all the later Christological developments in the New Testament. Paul is fertile in expressions which were later cited as proof texts for peculiar doctrines. We must not go into detail as to the Christology of Paul, but we must make a few remarks here to clear up a peculiar notion as to Paul's view of this doctrine.

Paul has no systematic Christology. That Paul's conception of Christ was central to his religion cannot be denied. If the earliest view of Jesus was Jewish, Ebionite and Messianic, we see in Paul an advance on this view. Jesus was not only the promised Messiah, the hope of Israel, the fulfillment of prophecy, glorified and now at the right hand of God. This Ebionite strain is very marked in certain sections of the New Testament. To these early Christians, with their pronounced Jewish monotheism, Jesus was the exalted Messiah. At least there is no reason to believe that the early Jewish disciples defied Jesus (this was utterly impossible to the Hebrew although very clear and ordinary to the Greek) or thought of him as anything more than God's servant and anointed. 1 They had known him in the flesh -- a man among men; with their Jewish traditions, the last thing they could have thought of was to count him as a divine being or identify him with God.

1. McGiffert, Ibid, Page 32.

But with the advent of Paul there emerged a new conception of Jesus. Although Paul never was a systematic theologian, he nevertheless was "the first and greatest of Christian theologians. His influence has consisted, for the most part, in the wealth of separate ideas which he threw out as from an inexhaustible spring." 1 As mentioned once before he has been the quickening power behind all later Christian thought, in him every theology has found its germ, its best proof, and at the same time, its worst disproof. His chief contribution is not to be found in his various doctrines but rather in the profound Christological conviction that God was in Christ as the divine power that redeemed men everywhere. Paul, in this connection has been most unfairly treated by history. He has been accused of perverting Christianity from a simple ethical religion into a Hellenistic theosophy or a Jewish Messianism, which simply ignored the 'Jesus of History'. But Paul was a product of this inevitable meeting of Christianity with Hellenism. Besides, when viewed in the same light of historical research, we find that Paul was a preserver, as was Justin, instead of an innovator. What is more, it is absolutely absurd to accuse a man whose life motto was "for me to live is Christ", of being an imposter who used these terms to cloak a certain subvertive and subtle theological doctrine. With Paul the message was always the main concern. He was a man whose foremost characteristic was an intense personal devotion. Behind the Apostle Paul is his devotion to Christ. Besides, Paul's Christ was no abstract Messiah, nor was it a mythical divinity of the cults. Of course, Paul has used vehicles of thought which came from a source outside his experience. What is more,

1. Cf. Scott, Tributaries of the Gospel,

Paul had two modes of thought, each of which was to play a large part in the future History of Christian thought. He is trained in the Hebrew Law and with it the whole mode of thought characteristic of the Hebrew. Then, again, he is acquainted with those mystical and speculative conceptions so characteristic of the Hellenistic world. He passes from one of these modes of expression to another without the least hesitancy. He is Greek and Jew at the same time. He is a bi-lingual man. At one time he thinks of redemption as a release from the curse of the Law by a forensic act, then again he thinks of redemption as a process of purification, and a process of release from the flesh. So we find that the aim of Paul is everywhere practical, and not theological, that he is the greatest and first of the Christian theologians, and that his cornerstone of theology is an experience of the redemption of God in Christ.

Let us, then, look for a moment at the Christology of Paul. As we remarked, it was central. In short, God was in Christ, through Whom we have fellowship with God and receive the divine Spirit which changes us into a new man. Paul went far beyond the Ebionite conception of Christ. He even goes so far as to put Jesus into the category of deity itself. How Paul ever harmonized his strict Jewish monotheism with this is more than we can understand. There are times when he seems to refer to Jesus as the servant of God in the Ebionite sense. But Paul at his best classes Jesus as divine. He attributes divine functions to Jesus, speaks of him as an object of worship, in whom dwells the fullness of the Godhead, who existed before the actual historical life, and what is more, calls Christ God. Even McGiffert, so radical in his criticism, cites as evidence

to this fact, Romans 9:5. Besides, Paul speaks of the Spirit of Christ and the Spirit of God as proceeding from a common source. Where Paul received the idea of the deity as a spiritual substance and his conception of salvation as redemption from the flesh is a moot question. It may be that the critics are right in asserting that Paul's whole conception was mystical and as a result Paul did not think that some of his inconsistencies needed to be reconciled. But say what we will, Paul does identify his Christ of experience with the Jesus who lived the life of obedience. And what is more, he does identify Christ with God in many instances. Now it is true that Paul does not use the language or the method of the systematic theologian, he is a mystic, and it is as such that he must be interpreted. In fact, the history of Christological thought since Paul's day and including our own times, has revealed nothing more vital than that contained in certain aspects of Paul's writings,-- and never will. The development of certain aspects of Paul's Christology by the theologians has in most cases resulted in an overemphasis upon these aspects and we have lost sight of the totality of Christ's redemptive work by these speculations.

We will never understand the Christology of Paul, if we approach it from the standpoint of one seeking a systematic doctrine. His theology was "that of a converted man",¹ not the cold, patient, rational product of patient theist employing Hegelian dialectics. The living and dynamic center of his Christology was the experience of his glorified Lord.

1. Cf. Mackintosh, H. R. Doctrine of Christ, Page 50, 52

Now there are in Paul texts that taken out of their context, (which is the totality of Paul's experience as we know it), can be employed to prove any brand of Christology. In him are found the roots of every theologian's dogmas. But the powerful personal genius of Paul, made it impossible in his own day, for any particular view of Christ to gain a foothold, at least, while he lived. There are evidences of Christological strife in the New Testament times, as seen in the letter to the Colossians. The inherent germs of conflict were rising as they inevitably would. Words, thought-forms, the general intellectual capacities of Christians were sooner or later, but surely, to be forced to grapple with the problem.

But before we leave Paul to trace the rise of Christological thought, let us make this statement as to Paul's Christology: "it rises above theologies, it is possessed of the sublime and inexhaustible quality which will make it an enduring statement of Christian faith. If Paul's Christology lacks the theological tang, so much the better, for it has upon the stamp of the faith of Christians in all times and all cultures. Paul's Christology still bears about it something that evokes our reflection and eludes it, by its very greatness. This will ever be the form of all Christological development." In Him were all things created, in Him Christian doctrine can never leave its Christocentric moorings. In fact, subsequent centuries only wrote out largely what was in the New Testament. In many instances, Justin does write in larger characters what one sees already in Paul. However, Justin couches his Christology not in the terminology of Paul, but uses a metaphysical language through which he attempts the first

real doctrine of the person of Christ.

Now we find various portraits of Christ in the New Testament. For instance there is the Christ of the Epistle to the Hebrews, the Christ of the Apocalypse and that found in John with its reference to the Logos, which we find in Philo, and later was to become so prominent in Justin and the later orthodox Christologies.

The Christology of St. Paul and that of the epistle to the Hebrews is similar in many points. For the purpose of this thesis there are certain things which we must keep in mind. Prof. H.R. Mackintosh¹ makes this keen observation. He asserts that the Godhead of Jesus is asserted as in Paul, and that the Godhead is so enunciated as compatible with real subordination. He asserts that these two most irreconcilable views are held by Paul, and that they are held by the Christians which "Hebrews" represents. And yet Hebrews has no conscious metaphysical framework, it is rather a treatise of exhortations to persecuted and bewildered Christians. And as a matter of fact, this dual view of the nature of Christ is simply insoluble from the Christian point of view. The faith of the New Testament writings, whether of Paul or the epistle to the Hebrews, is the same as that of all earnest Christians, and that is, that we are conscious of the personal presence of God in Him and this takes in an eternal and preexistent aspect, while at the same time He lived and accomplished his task under the limitations of time. This antinomy of thought is the real cause of Christological development and conflict, and it may be that ultimately this intellectual problem is insoluble. But the epistle to the Hebrews, as well as Paul's writings, are true to the vital instinct of Christian faith when they

affirm both of these irreconcilable views, even if their acceptance as an organic unity cannot be apparent.

In spite of the fact that Paul uses phrases and terms that seem as if he may have borrowed from the Stoics, the mysteries, Alexandria, as well as from his Jewish background, we have to admit upon closer study, that Paul's vital faith was not limited by these apparent accretions. Paul's faith could take any vehicle of expression and mold it by his dynamic faith. He could take the concept of the flesh, as sinful, but by so doing he did not become a follower of the mysteries, nor an ascetic. So it is with the Christology of Hebrews and as we shall see, with the Gospel of John. The early Christian experience as expressed in the New Testament writings possesses a unity of vitality about it, that in spite of the analytical approach of the critics, reveals to us that it was not a syncretism, an eclecticism, but that the Christian experience was centrifugal. It was able to take anything foreign to itself and by the sheer force of its vitality, make it Christian.

We notice this in the epistle to the Hebrews, as well as in the Gospel of John. Modern critics have often traced Alexandrian influences in Hebrews. And upon close observation we can detect a resemblance between its description of the Son and epithets applied by Philo and the Book of Wisdom to the Logos or Wisdom personified. But in spite of the fact that we notice a similarity of vocabulary, is no indication that we can with certainty infer that the underlying system of ideas in every case is the same.

Let us inquire into the nature of the Philonic Conception of the Logos, and see in how far it differs from that found in the epistle to the Hebrews and the Johannine

writings. Let us be cautious in ascribing the term plagiarist to the writer of Hebrews, merely because we find him using similar terms and ideas found in Alexandria. Just to use the categories of his own day, even though he Christianized them, is no justification for branding him a direct copyist. Of course the author of Hebrews carries over to Jesus predicates and epithets that are a part of his religious milieu, but he does it with no intention of copying, but of proclaiming the greatness of his Christ. As Paul did, so did the writer of Hebrews, when he made use of everything in the intellectual life of his day which offered some point of attachment to the Christian teaching. These early Christians, especially Paul, were able to embody in different forms, without losing their grasp of the inward significance of the central truths of their religion. In spite of the tendency of the age towards syncretism, we do not find it in the New Testament. The dynamic of the Gospel was so strong that it was capable of incorporating many truths of the outside world into itself without losing its essential gospel. ~~to the deeper meaning of Judaism.~~

As noted in a previous chapter, the Diaspora Jews, especially in Alexandria, took their full share in the intellectual life of the city. They became anxious to vindicate their religion to their gentile neighbors. They early maintained in the face of the philosophical Greek World, that their religion was a pure philosophy, and that much of the Greek wisdom was anticipated in Moses. Reflecting Jews began the adventure of reconciling their religion to themselves as well. Their new philosophical outlook, their use of the Greek language, brought about a hellenizing of Hebrew thought. In this process of allying Greek thought with Hebrew religion Philo

takes a chief place. He is not only one of the great Jewish thinkers, but one of the profoundest thinkers of all time. His ideas meet us in many instances; for instance in Gnosticism. There can be no doubt that his work had a profound influence upon Christian thought and doctrinal expression. On the other hand, we can feel very fortunate that Greek thought was modified by this Alexandrian Hebraic thought, which in turn infused into the Greek the ethical and religious conceptions of the Judaism before they came into the Christian current of thought. In a way, we find in Alexandria a preparation for much of the thinking that was to pass as orthodox Christian definitions. As noted in the previous chapter, Philo's contributions to the Christian religion are numerous, for he was essentially a Hebrew. He maintained the emphasis upon worship, which was Hebrew, and in this counteracted the emphasis upon Reason, so prevalent in the Greek world. He was able to bring out the spiritual mission of the Hebrew religion. By allegory he sought to penetrate into the deeper meaning of Judaism.

What is more, he employed the Logos doctrine in such a way that it was an advance from the Stoic use of the word and a step toward its Christianizing. The Stoics has seen in the Logos nothing but the controlling principle of the world, all-pervading reason, conceived as an ethereal substance, much like fire. This reason was in man, and the essence of salvation is to adapt oneself to it. But Philo takes this Logos doctrine, and with his monotheism dethrones the Logos from its absolute position, and makes it an agent, distinct from God and the world. (Let us keep in mind that we are approaching Justin and that in what we

are saying we are finding a clue to his Logos conception and its meaning for Christological development). Philo speaks of the Logos as the High Priest, leading men out of the earthly life to God. At times he seems to speak of the Logos as possessing personality, oftener as impersonal. At least the Stoic Logos has been altered. Besides, Philo's God is not the absolute of the Greeks, but a personal God. The Logos is an activity co-operating with men in salvation.

Now it was this Alexandrian influence which gave the early Christian fellowship a clue in the interpretation of its gospel to the Hellenistic world. Paul does not employ the Logos doctrine, yet he comes close to it in Col. 1:15-17. The need was increasingly felt among Christians for a coherent doctrinal statement. Earlier the whole emphasis was upon simple faith, but now in the midst of an intellectual world they had to satisfy their minds and rationalize their teachings. Time made the old Messianic idea inadequate, and as the faith moved into the Gentile world, what ideas were better fitted for the purpose than those developed at Alexandria? The question of the person of Christ, his relation to God and man, that he had power to affect so great and universal a redemption, was asked. So they turned to the Philonic doctrine of the Logos with its necessary subordination, yet with its identification of that Logos in some way with the essence of God. From this handy principle, it was possible to develop Christian thinking that answered the demands of faith. Grave difficulties were to loom up later, but they were not perceived at the outset. It seems like a wonderful "find" for the early Christian group.

Its fatal weakness was to be in its drifting from the essence of a vital faith and its unconscious drifting toward the metaphysical seal, upon which many a shipwreck has taken place. To this we shall devote a paragraph later in the chapter.

Now let us turn to the epistle to the Hebrews again. 1 In it we find Alexandrian influence after a fashion. I think that Professor Scott is too enthusiastic in his conclusions that Hebrews is full of Philonic influences. I think his later, more conservative, sentence is more true to fact. He writes, "The writer to the Hebrews holds out a welcoming hand to Alexandrian thought. He sees in it an instrument whereby the Christian teaching may be unfolded in its larger and deeper significance. But as yet he can only suggest, in experimental fashion, how it may be employed". 2 It is wrong to assume that the Christology of Hebrews is but a phase of Alexandrianism. The very opposite is true. More than anything else we find philosophical ideas being Christianized. The Logos background of Hebrews is certainly not the abstract character championed by Philo. What is more, Jesus, to the writer of Hebrews, actually lived. The Logos doctrine does not displace the gospel history, but is used to enhance it. The epistle is an assertion of the paramount character of Christ and his message. The writer is not interested primarily in philosophy, but in the Christian religion. If Harnack can ask the question, presuming as he did a negative answer, "Can we assume that every presentation of the doctrine of

1. Cf. Scott, Tributaries, Pages 169-171.

2. Ibid, 173

the Logos has passed through the moulding hands of Philo?" we agree with him. But on the other hand we cannot but admit that the Logos term entered the process of intellectual Christological definition very early. It certainly did not appear in Justin without some preparation. What is more, it could not have been so adequately Christianized in a single life-time. But, that the Philonic Logos was bodily taken over is simply not true, whether in the case of Paul, or the writer of Hebrews, or of John, or of Justin.

As to the Logos found in John, it too differs radically from that found in Philo. At least John is very bold in employing the term, which shows some development. I do not think we can find any metaphysics in John's use of the Logos term. Besides, he uses it to emphasize the "Fleischwerdung" of the Logos. John does not go back to the genesis of the Logos theory and make it an allegory. Quite the reverse is true, he disproves the symbolical sense by placing the emphasis upon the actual incarnation. One of the reasons why the Fourth Gospel has been so misunderstood is that it has been contrasted with the Synoptics. Let us remember that in the day of its author there was grave danger from some Christian teachers of cutting the historic roots from under the Gospel. Many were inclined to regard Christianity as a sacred myth with a theosophical character. But the writer of the Fourth Gospel, sharing as he did the Hellenistic idea of redemption as "illumination" and release from earthly bondage, yet, he maintains that Christ was a historical character. He was like many contemporary Christians who keep abreast of the times. He was in sympathy with all the best and finest efforts of men to know the truth. But in spite of that sympathy, he takes his stands firmly on

the historical revelation and looks upon all knowledge, even the Logos doctrine, as something that can serve to illuminate what has already been given in its fullness in Christ.

In John's Gospel we have the connection of the Logos conception of Christ with the Christ of the historical record. How to relate the two, as we have often indicated, was one of the earliest problems of the Christian Church. As long as the New Testament period was dominated by simple faith and the powerful conserving personality of Paul, the dilemma was not so great. But it did not take long before the two elements in the Christological struggle make themselves felt. And with the advent of the strictly philosophical minded Greeks into the Christian fold, like Justin and the later Fathers, the problem became most acute.

Contrary to some modern critics, John did not surrender completely to the Alexandrian influence. Even so moderate a scholar as Mackintosh maintains that we "cannot hold that there is no mutual relation" between John and Philo. But John has Christianized the Logos conception. Instead of the Logos being an impersonal rational order it becomes a word, uttered, revealed speech. To John the Logos is personal, Himself Divine, mediates in creation and entered human flesh as the historical messiah. Thus we see that instead of taking over the Logos uncritically, as an abstract speculation, he Christianized it. He makes use of the Logos that he might make the Christian message more intelligible. If we are more conscious of the influences of Hellenism in the Fourth Gospel, we, on the other hand, are more conscious of the difference between Hellenism and Christianity.

Christ could simply not be explained merely on the basis of Greek ideas of salvation. Not only is salvation wrought by the incarnation, but by moral obedience! Remarkable as it may seem, the Fourth Gospel is a Gospel, in spite of the fact that similarities may be detected in it that bear an Alexandrian stamp. The startling fact is that Philo and the Alexandrians constitute an old world philosophy, while the Gospel is a fountain of new life. And if the Christian religion owes a debt to Philo, it is an external one, for the Christian religion derived some valuable forms from him, as well as a field of human souls. Yet we must look to the original genius of the Christian religion for its power to use these forms of expression without losing its essence. "We hold then that what St. John required and sought for was a term worthy to express the absolute nature of Christ, in whom the eternal, self-revealing God was incarnate; and that this seemed to be furnished by the contemporary religious thought, in which the Logos conception had become familiarly established... He perceived its extraordinary value for the expositor... more than any other word it gave expression to that aspect of Christ's life and work which he regarded as supreme...besides it has about it from Hellenism a certain cosmic width of meaning, and thus furnished a point of contact between Christianity and current modes of religious speculation... but in choosing it he took full precautions insured by his exposition that its Christian import should not be overshadowed by former associations. So far from being captured by and for speculation, the Logos received a connotation which is fundamentally ethical, personal, and soteriological. John was too near Christ to adopt a purely Greek view." 1

As we pass from the Christology of Paul, Hebrews and John, let us remember that although there is no official doctrine of Christ in the New Testament, yet Christians felt that in a unique way he was divine, that they looked to him with trust and worship. He belonged to the sphere of God. How he was related to deity was not so burning a question. Early Christian faith was more practical in its aspects of Christ. Yet Loofs is quoted by Mackintosh as saying that there were no believers in the mere humanitarianism of Jesus in the Early Church. So we can say that although there was no speculative doctrine of Christ in the New Testament, period, yet as Holtzmann remarks, we can find even in St. Paul and St. John the seeds and origins of the later Christological development.

Now when the predicate "theos" was applied to Jesus is uncertain. In the days of the Apologists, Christians were criticized for worshipping Jesus. But this seems to be true, that there was a gradual increase in the idea that Jesus was divine. The increasing distance in time between his earthly existence, the death of the apostolic eye witnesses, and above all, the introduction of the Greek speculative genius, all caused the divinity of Jesus to take a more important place than his humanity. Ignatius has used the term Logos, but not in a technical sense. He had declared a Christology very much like that of the Gospel of John, more experimental than speculative. Besides, he insisted that the humanity of Jesus be preserved, since the whole structure of Christianity depended upon it. Mackintosh remarks that "he nobly represents the living Christological faith of which theology is but the systematic exposition, and the insistent claims of which have ruined many a theory." Ignatius, like the New

Testament writers, keeps his Christology vital and fresh by the sheer energy of his faith. Ultimate realities are posited not by any intellectual argument. In him we find the first stirring of theological interest. To him belief in God and Christ are one and the same thing.

But it did not take long, after the heathen recruits came in to outnumber the Jewish, that trouble began. The early fervor gave way to criticism. There was a surprising unity in their experience of Christ, a charismatic quality pervaded the Church, but when attempts were made to give a scientific definition or interpretation to this experience, unity ceased. The very preexistence of Christ, so Jewish in its significance, when taken into the Greek world could only be understood as the mark of spiritual essence of reality. For awhile the largest freedom was granted the intellectual power of Christians. But the pressure from without, and heresy within, forced the Christian group to attempt some formula of faith that would unite all, satisfy the deepest needs of their experience, and at the same time stay true to Christ's earthly life and the world.

Three things had to be guaranteed in any definition of the person of Christ: 1. He had to be a man with a historical life, who suffered and lived and worked in a real human sense; 2. He has to be a special Divine Word whose presence had always been in the world but now had made a specially powerful manifestation of Himself in the Incarnation; 3. He had to be One who was constantly present revealing Himself with increasing clearness. All these were true to experience, but to harmonize them into a formula was to prove a large and intellectually impossible task.

What is more, the early Church had no education to

expound these things metaphysically. The ancient thought forms were strange to her. Besides she lacked an adequate definition of personality. Then there was language and logic, subtle Greek vehicles which were so hard to teach the vocabulary of the Christian experience. "The history of the terms used in Greek theology has still to be written, and only when it has been will the continuance within the theology of old philosophical questions be made apparent." ¹ How pathetic it was to see the theologians ridiculed by the outsiders as they strained and fought over differences of terms. But how little did these outsiders realize what meanings were wrapped up in these terms for the future of the Christian faith! These terms were but the best vehicles of expression available to give an exposition to their warm faith.

One of the most invidious movements, which Dr. Mackintosh calls an atmosphere rather than a system, was Gnosticism. In its system was the cardinal principle that redemption was to be achieved by a rare kind of knowledge. At the start it is good to know that had this Gnostic mental atmosphere gained a triumphant hand it would have made the Christian religion over into a school of theosophical speculation.

Now these Gnostics placed Christ at the very center of their religion. And they possessed a portion of Christian truth that was in harmony with the Christian faith of all times. Their trouble was not that they emphasized something foreign to Christian faith, but that they overemphasized one aspect over much. Their doctrine of redemption tended to dissolve the reality of Christ's earthly existence, by placing him into a cosmic framework. Harnack ² makes a statement that is worthy of repetition; that to the majority

¹ Fairbairn, Christ in Modern Thought, Page 89 f f.

of Gnostics Christ was a Spirit consubstantial with the Father. What is more, we must remember that the terms OMOOUSIOS TO PATRI were originally Gnostic! Again, the Gnostics recognized that Christ was a revelation, an "in-breaking of supreme remedial energies from above." Plausible and legitimate and true to experience as these postulates were, the Church early recognized what the result of the sole emphasis upon these spiritualizing tenets would be. The Church soon woke up to the dangers involved. Whether the Church really solved exhaustively the issues involved is doubtful. But the Church did keep as close as it could to the Christian experience of redemption, as far as that was possible to do in intellectual definition. The Church wished desperately to preserve the historic character of the Incarnation, as we see it in all orthodox Fathers, especially Athanasius, but the issue against which they contended finally crept into the orthodox fold, and the earthly and ethical nature of the person of Christ evaporated into mysticism and otherworldly dogma, as seen in the Middle Ages, and its conception of Christ.

Now when the Apologists appear on the scene, we find a striking contrast in Christological expression from what we find in the New Testament and sub-apostolic Fathers. Instead of a plain exposition of the facts of redemptive Christian experience we find them propounding a Christian philosophy, and an attempt to transform the ideas of the simple dynamic faith of the Gospel into the speculative and scientific language of their day. In their attempt to make explicit their faith, they set forth the dignity of their Redeemer in a contemporary term:

Logos. 1 It was a speculative vehicle to use, and one filled with many meanings. As Mackintosh remarks, it was an "elastic term", but in the use of it they carried over into the Christian religion the conviction that Christ was God. In Justin, as with the Apologists, we see a new turn in the development of the doctrine of the Person of Christ. 2

Justin marks a step beyond John's idea of the Logos. It is a philosophical step however. We must remember that Justin was an Apologist, and as such was led to make philosophical statements. One feels continually the warmth of the man's faith, his intimate and warm experience of the Christian religion. I do not think that we can call Justin a cold intellectual philosopher. His use of the Logos conception differs more from Philo than with John. 3 We can perceive a deeper religious content in Justin's Logos than that of the Stoic or of Philo. It would be a mistake to interpret Justin in terms of a philosopher solely. His preexistence is strongly affirmed. Christ

For instance, he seems to predicate personality to the Logos. He identifies the Logos with the incarnate Christ, who lived and walked with men. He became flesh from his mother. The Logos is numerically distinct from the Father,

1. Garvie, The Christian Doctrine of the Godhead, page 118, "The taking over of the philosophic idea of the Logos has not been an unmixed blessing to the Christian Church."

2. Harnack, What is Christianity, pages 217-219, "The most important step taken in the domain of Christian doctrine was when the Apologists drew the equation: the Logos-Jesus Christ. This was the determining factor in the fusion of Greek philosophy with apostolic inheritance."

3. Harnack, H. D. 2, 228.

"arithmo heteron ti esti". 1 Yet on the other hand, the Logos is one with the Father. The essence of the Father was not divided when Christ came forth. In the same passage cited above Justin calls Jesus a second God who ought to be worshipped. What is more, the Logos, was revealed not in part but completely. The new Law of freedom has been in him set forth in its entirety, 2 yet He has been operative of old in the Hebrew prophets and in pagan philosophers. The Logos alone is to be called Son. "God begot Himself a beginning, before all creatures, a certain reasonable power, which is called by the Holy Ghost, Glory of the Lord, at other times Son. Wisdom Angel, God, Lord, Logos." 3 God is not changed through this revelation, as a man would not be changed by the utterance of a word. This Logos-Christ is the ONLY begotten of God. 4 He is not an emanation as the light that emanates from the sun. Justin is true to his Christian experience in implying that the inner nature of the Son is not only like, but identical with, that of the Father. His preexistence is strongly affirmed. Christ is both God and man. One thing makes itself evident in a study of Justin's idea of the Logos: beneath the philosophical and methodology there is a singular warm, vital and evangelical experience of Christ in the double sense as both man and God as we find it in the New Testament.

As to the significance of Justin's Logos Christology there are a host of observations which we can make. In general, Loofs is right when he remarks, "The Apologists, viewing the transference of the concept Son to the preexistent

1. Dial., 128, 129.
2. Apol., 2, 10.
3. Dial., 61
4. Dial., 105.

Christ as a matter of course, enabled the Christological problem of the fourth century to arise. They removed the point of departure of the Christological speculation from the historical Christ back into the preexistent and depreciated the importance of Jesus' life as compared with the incarnation. They connected the Christology with the cosmology, but were not able to combine it with the scheme of salvation. This Logos doctrine is not a higher Christology than the prevailing form; it lags rather behind the genuine Christian estimate of the Christ. It is not God who reveals Himself in Christ, but the Logos, the depontentiated God, who as God is subordinated to the Supreme deity". 1

Now there are many observations in this statement of Loofs. However, I am not convinced of his depreciation of the apologists' Logos doctrine. Loofs fails to take into account, especially noticeable in Justin, the fact that beneath the philosophical terminology of Justin there is a vital faith, that is as vigorous as that of the New Testament period. As Justin posits the preexistence of the Christ-Logos, as well as his actual incarnation into human flesh through Mary; he is in harmony with the New Testament faith. Merely because he as a Christian used the terms of his day, is no sign that those terms were used in the contemporary sense. These terms were used in the hope that they would 'talk Christianity'. Besides, we must remember the observation of Harnack 2 that in Justin, as with all the apologists, we do not find a complete fusion of the philosophical and historical elements, they exist side by side. It was not until the next and the fourth centuries that this process,

1. Quoted at close of chapter in Harnack, H. D.
2. H. D. II, 228.

begun by Justin and others, was to make intellectualism gain the victory. It is true that we do not find here an initial introduction into the Christian religion of Greek metaphysics, and with it Greek ethics. But I do not think that Justin can be said to have submerged the redemptive quality of the Gospel under these handy vehicles of expression.

We do also find in Justin a beginning of the two-natures view of Christ. Of course, they were found in Paul and others of his day, but not in so pronounced a philosophical and cosmological way as we find them in Justin. Justin's words are very blunt and plain.

Then, again, we find Justin's idea of Christ's saviorhood consisting mainly in his office as a teacher of monotheism and morality. This was typically Greek and indicated to us the fact that there must have been considerable leeway given in his time in the Christian circles.

Again, the introduction of the Logos doctrine was quite a dangerous thing, for later fallible men were to misunderstand entirely its use by such religious men as Justin, and John before him. It is a tribute to the power of Christ that His religion could adapt it and survive its development in the hands of those intellectually-minded! It has proved such a Godsend to John for it suggested plurality as well as unity, whereby Christ was declared to be God and ^{God remained} at the same time One. And its emphasis upon preexistence gave to Christ a quality that the Christian faith has always held to be vital. But when the Logos began to be used by the apologists it took on a different meaning, it stood for a vast diffused world reason, and its heritage was, to the Greeks, for whom it was intended, strictly metaphysical, not historical or religious. Its reputation being mostly allied with what was foreign to the

Gospel of Christ it carried the Gospel and its Christ out into the cosmological sea, and stranded it from its soteriological shore. It took the Gospel of redemption in the end out into a realm not ethical, religious or moral, but doctrinal and intellectual. The Church from then on changed its whole approach to the Christological problem and began to move along lines of "a priori" deduction rather than from the sure foundation of induction from experimental redemptive experience. Justin's words were no doubt vital to himself, he thought he was doing a real piece of Christian work, but others followed him and took his words not as poetry but as prose. He might call the Logos a "certain rational power", but with it he opened a door to ideas that were to mechanize and demoralize and deethicize that which the New Testament had declared vital. Then, again, if he called the Logos a "caused creation", he opened a wide door for that subordination, which is in the New Testament, yet which resulted in that terrible dualism and inferiority of Christ which caused the Church so much trouble in ARIUS.

But in spite of the fact that we find these traits in Justin, we believe that his heart was essentially evangelical. He was true to the Christian experience. His Logos was essentially a vital and warm realization to his life. He has the highest terms for Christ, He does not worship a mere man. He was only trying to do what men have always tried to do; give a rational apologetical interpretation to men for the faith they have in Jesus Christ. They do a mean job of it, and involve themselves in difficulties of expression that is tragic to behold. The task of giving a rational and intellectual, systematic interpretation to the Person of Christ has been necessary, but it has not superceded or substituted

the New Testament expression of the faith behind the doctrine. The experience of the redemption of God in Christ can be expressed only in mystical terms which must not be pressed too hard, for poetry can never be prosified without grave misunderstanding.

When great systems of doctrine about the Person of Christ are attempted there are a number of things that suffer as a result. The earthly life of Jesus recedes into the background, the ethical teaching and character of Jesus falls by the way, there is a growth in formalism in worship in which much value is attached to acts of ritual, the whole outlook of Christian life becomes morbid and ascetic. The fatal weakness of the Logos doctrine and theology is that it works too much in metaphysical ideas. By defining the nature of Christ solely in terms of His essence, it puts an interpretation into the Christian religion which although not antagonistic to it, is not its essence. The religious qualities of the Gospel are not obscured by this application, but the moral values, which modern critics declare the most predominant part of Paul's religion, are obscured. Of course, the Christian religion has that element in it of a redemptive release from the flesh, it has always had about it that which cannot be contained solely within ethical limits, but Christianity is more than ethics, more than theology, more than any of these externals, it is primarily "The Religion of Power". The defect of this whole Logos development and its kindred growths is not that it dwelt on the conception of a divine world over against this, but that it made this conception the only one, and made it metaphysical. 1 It has always been that Greek vacuous idealistic element which has divorced the moral life from the spiritual.

The resultant effect has been to some extent a "triumph of scholastic terms and moral realities".¹ There is truth in this statement. In many cases there was a shifting of emphasis. This brought with it a theocentric theology which was not sufficiently interpreted in the terms of the consciousness of Christ. And with it there came a substitution of belief in the complicated theory about His person, instead of a downright fellowship and trust in the Redeemer. Verbal subtelties were substituted for moral and religious character. The inversion of the Gospel from an experience of redemption through Christ did work over into a legalism that was hedged about with many sanctions.

Justin prepared the way for all this development, although I think we find very little of it in his own life. But his use of terms and other modes of expression paved the way for the whole process.

But now this does not pre-suppose that, with Harnack, the whole Christological controversy was a mistake and a tragic page in the history of the Christian Church.

To expand a little on the weakness of the Logos² conception employed in the definition of the person of Christ would not be amiss.

We must remember that the Greeks in Justin's day and even before, by their very temper, did not care about the idea that the Son became flesh and blood. To them it was very inconsistent with their idea of deity. Anyone who would bring men an endowment of the spirit from God, must himself possess an unclouded and pure spirit. Therefore, he must not even possess so much as a human mother. He must not even be

1. Fairbairn, Christ in Modern Theology, Page 91.
2. Cf. McFayden, Understanding the Apostles' Creed, Chapter VIII.

capable of feeling pain, fatigue, or any of the human frailties. This danger of dehumanizing the Savior is one of the worst dangers the early Church faced. What is more, it was the Greeks who through the instrumentality of the Logos conception gave the greatest incentive to putting a metaphysical construction under the simple Virgin Birth narratives. These Birth narratives were never intended to be put into definitions, yet these Greeks with their conceptions of Absolute Deity, of life and destiny, and their uncanny, insatiable intellectualism, made the Virgin Birth into a definition upon which they could construct many of their speculations. The Virgin Birth too was one of those simple elements of the early Christian faith which held that Christ was man, born of woman, yet the Word of God was peculiarly united with Him. Justin said that the Logos impregnated Mary. We must bear in mind that the conception of soteriology held by the Greeks required that the Logos become flesh, for only thus could the flesh be raised.

The Logos doctrine was a historic necessity. It became a valuable vehicle for the interpretation of Christ's person. It hastened the full recognition of the divinity of Christ. Although an alien term to the Christian faith, its use had to be guarded very cautiously so that its pagan associations might be purged.

Apart from this weakness mentioned above, it had the tendency to make God more unknown than before. It came to rob Him of his characteristics. It made God into a philosophical absolute, as we shall see in a later chapter.

What is more, the Logos conception made Christ into an inferior God. It made him a link between God and the impure world. When Arius later held that "Logos" implied the infer-

iority of Christ to God, he was doing something with the Logos doctrine that the authors of it has never intended. Although he laid hold of its weakness, he has missed the whole import of the incorporation of the Logos into the Christian religion, which was to preserve the Godhead of Christ, to guard the experience that God Himself had entered the flesh. And when we find Athanasius refusing to use the Logos term, he shows a fuller realization of its weakness. The term was becoming a hindrance rather than a help. So he insisted on another phrase, "very God of Very God"-- to supplant the Logos term which was beginning to show its weakness. That does not imply that the Logos term was done away with; it was merely superseded.

And Then again, the Logos doctrine, although it solved the problem of the humanity of Jesus against the Gnostic tendencies, did not solve the problem of the soul of Jesus. The Logos, it was said, took the place of the human soul. This failed in the end to satisfy the Christian consciousness. Of course, these folks were handicapped by an inadequate psychology. But, lest we go too far afield, we know that the final solution of this problem of the human soul of Jesus went through many struggles, until the irreconcilable (rationally irreconcilable) solution was found in the two-nature and-will definition. This problem is still not solved.

At least, we can see that the later heresies were all a result of the introduction of the Logos and kindred philosophical conceptions into the Christian religion. All of these later heresies were guarded against in the Old Roman Symbol with its emphasis upon God as the creator and ruler of the universe as well as the emphasis upon the humanity of Christ. A very sane Symbol! For had those responsible for

the Symbol lived long enough they would have seen that the standing temptation of Christian theologians has very frequently been to exalt and elevate Christ above the human level, 1 and not the reverse. Neither can we hold, with Professor Machen, 2 that the Christian religion is primarily and essentially one of doctrine. There can be no question that the Christian religion involves doctrine, that is, if we interpret doctrine broad enough. There are essential facts at the root of the Christian religion, it is not a formless, non-doctrinal life and attitude. We think that the Christian religion would have dissolved itself long ago, had it not been preserved by the intellectual definitions given its various aspects throughout its history. And were we to heed the advice of many a liberal critic today, who insists on wiping out or ignoring the products of nineteen hundred years of Christian thinking, our loss would be immense. These efforts of the past generations to classify and define the facts at the basis of the Christian experience of redemption are certainly not to be scrapped. They are true expositions of that experience in the various strata of historical Christian experience. Of course, Professor Machen is correct when he marks that "the Christian movement at its inception was not just a way of life, but it was a way of life founded on a message, not upon mere feeling, nor on a program of work, but upon an account of facts." It is based upon doctrine. Certainly, but how simple are these facts as compared to those deduced by the Nicene and later theologians! Yet there was in the later doctrinal developments a true development in more

1. Cf. Fosdick, Modern Use of the Bible, Lecture VII
2. Cf. Machen, Christianity and Liberalism.

Complex idea of what lay inherently in the New Testament faith. The norm of later Christological development seems to have remained true to the declaration which we noted above, viz., that Jesus was God, and, at the same time, man. The redemptive efficacy of Jesus was double in its action upon Christological development. The norm of any future or present doctrine of Christ must always be the Christian experience tested by the New Testament affirmations of Christ's person.

Now it may seem to be unnecessary and tragic to take the simple naive Christology of the New Testament, and force it to make its way in the Greek world, and other thought-worlds. But the question, "What think ye of Christ?", must be answered by every would-be believer. The answer that Thomas gave in, "My Lord and my God", still receives the benediction of the vast majority of Christians. The person of Christ is the cornerstone of the whole Christian movement. He is the Head of His Church to this day. Dr. Fairbairn is right in saying, "the preeminence belongs to His person, not to His words; His People live by faith, not in what he said, but in what He is; they are governed not by the Statues He framed, but by the ideal He embodied". Thus, it seems to me, that the necessary, and not necessarily tragic, end of Christian theology must be the giving of a minimum (or maximum?) intellectual expression to this truth that was manifest so completely in the person of Christ. The person of Christ is so rich that it needs for its proper explication the varying study and experiences of all individuals, races and civilizations to the end of time.

The man who would scrap Nicaea and the Christological controversies, is doing a grave injustice to Christianity.

He would use the scalpel of scientific inquiry with the hope of amputating this most important, yet unpopular, part of the body of historic Christianity. Besides, he displays a tragic lack of the historical sense. Of course, when Nicaea is taken by itself, out of its genetic context, and studied scientifically, it may seem a silly fracas, a contention of phrases and syllogisms. But when it is studied in the light of its genesis, its underlying Christian convictions, it becomes, as Dr. Workman says, a "crown laid at the feet of the triumphant Jesus." ¹ These men of Nicaea, did not lay down their lives for vague generalities. They knew in whom they believed.

It is a fatal mistake to suppose that the subtle discussions, for which Justin paved the way, were the result of a spirit of philosophy that was alien to the Christian faith. It was not the entrance of a noisy worldly jargon into the holy of holies. What resulted in the later pre-scholastic, intellectual hair-splitting was due to the exaggerated emphasis placed upon details, instead of grasping the root of the question which was basic. This result merits our severest criticism, for that day and for this. Let us remember, that although metaphysical terms were abundantly employed, metaphysics was not the main issue at all. The controversies over the person of Christ were not an attempt to transform the faith into a speculative theology at all, it was due to the linguistic- and thought-background in which men attempted to explain the richness and the breadth of the spiritual experiences which men felt owed their all to Christ! The Fathers employed metaphysics not because they loved it, but because of their loyalty to Christ. But, in the making of their definitions they had to stay close to the facts.

1. Christian Thought and the Reformation, Page 64.

And as poor as were their definitions in which they sought to express all that Christ meant to them, yet, we must realize that these definitions have endured the criticism, the wear and tear of the centuries, just because they, in a real way, embodied the vital experiences, and made redemption through Christ the central fact of all the Christian faith. These creeds remain, primarily, because they are so vitally warm in faith, even though we cannot approve of their metaphysics. These creeds may be likened to the modern age in the same way that a tadpole is likened to a frog. The tadpole is a frog nevertheless. He is true to his genus even then. Had these dogmas of Chalcedon and Nicaea been mere metaphysical speculations they would have perished long ago. What Dr. Glover says¹ of the Logos is true of these early attempts at the rationalization of the person of Christ; "the Logos would have perished had it not been that through the ages it has been borne by the shoulders of Jesus." These rationalizations have lived because they have at their heart affirmations stronger than dialectics, they are true to the facts of history and of experience.

The person of Christ could not have lived in a disembodied state, as formless doctrine. As organization became necessary and inevitable for the Christian fellowship, so intellectual organization became necessary for the doctrine of the person of Christ. As Professor Nagler remarks, "Our conclusion reads therefore: organization was inevitable, it was necessary but not primary. The position of primacy must ever reside with the new life, the new spirit of which Jesus Christ is the course."²

1. Conflict of Religions in the Graeco-Roman Empire, Pages 303, 304.
2. The Church in History, Page 267.

"Every definition is not a misfortune as Erasmus declared. As an aid to clarity, assurance, and solidarity, we must have formulations in religion, as we have them in the various realms of knowledge. The multiplicity of creeds suggests that the Christian religion is too great to be expressed within the limits of one creed; that not one of them or all together can claim infallibility; that diversity in form may be compatible with the vital spirit of Christian unity, provided, of course, that the essence of the faith is the supreme loyalty to a Person and not in loyalty to a creed, " 1

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF JESUS
IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE
1. Ibid, Pages 256, 257.
CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF GOD
AND THE TRINITY

CHAPTER VIII.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF JUSTIN
IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE
CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF GOD
AND THE TRINITY

CHAPTER VIII.

To trace the development of the doctrine of the Trinity, as held by the Christian Church, would require a thorough study of Christian thought for the first five centuries. Besides we would have to duplicate much of what has already been said in the foregoing chapter. The rise of the Christian doctrine of God, from a theological point of view, is very closely connected with the Christological developments. Nevertheless, the whole story of the rise of the theistic idea of God in the Christian Church is full of interest. It was a struggle, as it has been ever since, to maintain a philosophically theistic Christlike God in the face of a critical world. The early Church experienced in germ what the Church has ever since experienced. Bound up as it was with a Trinitarian explanation, it had to guard itself against pantheism, abstract monotheism, all forms of monarchianism and of unitarianism.

As remarked above, the history of the development of the Christian interpretation of God is intimately linked up with the doctrine of the Person of Christ.

Professor McGiffert, in his recent book, has rather reversed the older idea of this development. He maintains on sometimes very flimsy evidence, as he himself says, that the Gentiles looked to Jesus as their God. They prayed to Him and worshipped Him. The time finally came when "the Christians of the world Church had two objects of worship, God and Christ; that is, God the Father and God the Son, both equally divine. "Hitherto historians have confined themselves to the problem: how to explain the addition of the worship of Christ to the worship of

1. Harnack, "Every relationship to God is at the same time a relationship to Jesus Christ." H. D.
2. The God of the Early Christians.

God. If my reading of the early situation is correct, another problem equally pressing is how to explain the addition of the worship of God to the worship of Christ." 1 Everyone will admit that this is a very daring and novel thesis. It has a challenging truth to it, but on its face value seems to be exaggerated. Yet Marcion claimed that a better God had been discovered in Christ, and he was willing to go, as were the Gnostics in general, to the extreme of forcing the Old Testament God to abdicate in favor of Jesus Christ. It was a terrible problem for the early Church to bring about a harmony between these two conceptions of God as Creator and as Redeemer. There can be no question about the fact that this danger was imminent in the early Church. It seems that in the gentile world the conversion to Christianity did not necessarily involve a dogmatic acceptance of the Jewish monotheistic God. At least we know that it took the most strenuous and ingenious efforts of such men like Justin, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Hippolytus and others to prove the fallacy of rejecting or ignoring the God of the Old Testament. This marks one of the most important aspects of Justin's work as a bridge of that vast chasm between the naive Gospel and its later problems. Had this whole problem of God and his manifestation in Christ as a Redeemer been left in the practical and experimental dress of the Gospels, the problem under discussion would never have arisen. But with the theologizing Christ into metaphysics and cosmology a similar process took place in the nature of God, and as a result the mere practical Gospel of salvation became a theology, cosmology and a doctrine of God and a philosophy of the universe.

1. Ibid, Pages 63, 64.

To begin with, the Christian group inherited the monotheism of Judaism. Those Christians who were grounded in the faith adequately and were better able to judge its essential elements and watch its proper development felt that the unity and oneness of God must be preserved at all costs. The pressure of heathenism, let alone its Jewish ancestry, made the group very tenacious in this belief. But, on the other hand, they had to realize that Christianity was not Judaism, no matter how reformed it was. There was an element of newness about it, that genius of universalism. It is remarkable that they did not ignore this aspect. Had the Christian movement in general done this they would have paved the way for the death of the whole movement. We have but to look at the meagre Christology of the Epistle of James and see the secret of the decay of that group which maintained their monotheism at the expense of their Christology. For "Christianity centers in Jesus Christ, it stands or falls, lives or dies with the personality of Jesus Christ." 1 Experience was to prove that no Christian group could survive that did not ascribe a peculiar nature to Jesus Christ, an ascription to Him of deity.

Now the relation of this essential deity of Christ to the essential unity of God must be done in such a way that the intellectual, defining Greek should not find a ditheism. Later, this problem was aggravated by the surgence of the real personality of the Holy Spirit, and the necessity of explaining these three in an intelligent fashion, keeping clear the Unity of Deity and the separateness of expressions and persons.

1. Burkitt, F.C. Quoted in Fosdick, Modern Use of the Bible, Page 208.

✓ There is no reason for us to seek an explanation to the Christian doctrine of the Trinity outside the Christian circle. The Fathers could, from Origen to Augustine, point to passages in Plato's "Timaeus" where the first member of the Platonic triad was spoken of as "Father" and the second as the "only Begotten" as a proof for the authority of the Trinity. 1 But this was only after they had themselves sought for proofs of their doctrine of the Trinity outside of the Christian literature. Often this was done by the Fathers to prove their doctrine. Neither should we seek an explanation for the Trinity in the Babylonian Triad, the Brahman of Brahma, Siva and Visnu, nor in the Parsee, or Egyptian Isis, Osiris and Horius. The Christian doctrine of the Trinity came out of the speculative atmosphere into which its triple experience of Christ came. The Christians were closely related to monotheism and at the same time their Christian experience of redemption could not tolerate a menace to that monotheism. On the other hand the reality of their supernatural redemptive experience would brook no lowering of the person of the Redeemer to a mere function or transitory phenomenon of the Godhead. And though we find references to the Trinity of deity in other religions, nowhere do we find it in such a peculiar way as we find it in the Christian religion. It is nowhere so concrete and definite and real. Scriptures, but there it is a practical

✓ Now no official doctrine of the Trinity is found in the New Testament, yet all the materials are there for its theological construction. Professor Ballie 2 aptly remarks that in Colossians 3: 4 " you have, in their clear

1. Ballie, The Place of Jesus Christ in Modern Christianity, Page 188.
2. Ibid, Page 189.

and proper relationships, all three of the terms which were afterwards built into the doctrine of the Trinity. " The triple benediction at the end of II Corinthians 13, as well as the baptismal formula at the end of Matthew, even though it may not have been spoken by Jesus, all indicate that the Trinity was in existence at an early date. Dean Inge in his "Outspoken Essays" the second series, remarks that "in no part of the New Testament are we encouraged to distinguish thoroughly between the glorified Christ and the Holy Spirit." Professor Morgan 1 says very emphatically that " it is simply not possible to distinguish between the operation of the living Christ and God and no man tries"! Though Paul was a 'redemptionist' and John a 'revelationist' yet we find the triple aspect of the deity in them very certainly. To them there was nothing inconsistent with the unity of God. These two were so diverse in their view points yet so unified in their faith! Professor Ballie says, "it may be truly said that the members of the primitive Christian fellowship were in the habit of regarding God in three different lights, first, in His transcendent Being as inscrutibly above the temporal evolution of the universe; second, as made manifest to them in the love and life and death of Christ; third, as present in some sort in their own hearts and spirits." 2 Yes, the doctrine is germinally in the Scriptures, but there it is a practical, naive and experimental doctrine. " There is nothing of reflection or design in it, nothing 'a priori', nothing that consists in or comes out of the manipulation of abstract ideas." 3 If God is in Christ really, if the Spirit is a

1. Nature and Right of Religion, Page 277.

2. Ibid, Page 188.

3. Mackintosh, Doctrine of the Person of Christ, Page 509.

real renewing power, these facts must, by the very nature of the human mind, be gathered up into a unity. But it follows that we have no right to force upon this naive experience all the distinctions and deductions of later times. The Spirit although not called a personality ("person" was not used until later) nevertheless was distinctly understood to be as personal as God Himself.

As to the details of the argument pro and con in reference to the germinal existence of the Trinity in the New Testament we refer others to the standard Biblical Theologies. However it remains true that after the critics have used textual criticism to substantiate the authenticity of certain phrases, it yet remains unshakeably true that the underlying Christian experience of the total record is triple in its aspects.

But not long after Pentecost, the acuteness of the problem began to be felt from the standpoint of rationality. And after the Apostolic age, the first unfolding of the doctrine which lay implicit in the New Testament faith began to unfold. Was it evolution, development, or as W. T. Davidson says epigenesis-- a progressive differentiation and integration? But there takes place an organization into one whole of all the separate constituent elements of faith through the instrumentality of the environment.

Mr. W. Fulton in a fine article on the "Trinity" 1 traces the development of the doctrine of the Trinity through five stages. The first is the formal identification of the pre-existent Christ of Paul and John with the Logos of Greek philosophy, the taking of Jesus Christ into the speculative sphere. In this we find the first real stirrings of the Trinitarian problem. The second stage is reached in Origen and

his doctrine of the eternal generation. The third stage is in the Nicæan consubstantiation clause; the fourth is when the eternal distinctions in the Divine nature were posited; and last in the promulgation of the idea of the double procession.

It is in Justin and the Apologists that we find the first rational attempt to solve the issue. The Logos conception attempted to utilize the philosophical background and assign a place to the Logos within the revealing activity of God without impairing monotheism and without falling into subordination. It was a noble attempt and when taken for its intentions is perfectly legitimate and helpful. But these terms do not stay put. They have such bad relatives who finally come into play to spoil the original intentions. Try as they would the Apologists did not and could not make clear the concentration of revelation in Christ or His specific relations to the Father. Tertullian was the first to use the word "Trinitas", but Justin is his real precursor.

It is interesting to see how Justin carried over into his attempts to solve the problem of God the categories of philosophy and the relation of the Godhead to the world. They were real vehicles of expression for him, but he did not surmise that definitions and mathematical certainties do not really constitute the essence of the Christian faith. They help,-- they certainly do,-- and they must be used. Plato stood Justin in good stead. In Justin we have God spoken of as the Highest Being, ineffable, and extremely transcendent. He is identified, as in Plato with the Divine NOUS. He is Spirit. He is too exalted to be the subject of definite predicates. We find two strains in Justin here, the Platonic and the Christian. Whether he

used them in their Platonic sense, the Jewish sense, or the Christian sense has been debated by critics to this day. I am convinced that we must make allowances for the nature of his apologetical literature and expressions, and also understand the earnestness of the man. As such he is a Christian. He is using philosophy, not the reverse. He saw clearly the real issues at stake, and his grasp of them and his suggested solutions are most commendable.

Justin, with the Fathers, wanted to set their Christian experience in logical terms and as such had to use the Greek doctrines of diversity and multiplicity, and at the same time maintain an abstract unity within the Divine nature itself. 1 They really were headed, as always is the case, towards Triunity. The Greek ideas of Divine essence, the Absolute substance, simply do not actually convey in unambiguous terms the experiential meaning of Godhead. One doubts whether philosophy can ever express in exact linguistic definition what faith knows to be true to experience. The Logos conception, ingenious and helpful as it proved to be, likewise could not contain the full meaning of the Divinity of Christ which Christian faith knew to be true. Nevertheless "these men were doing their best in the service of the Truth they loved, and it was quite certainly a better best than any of us would have done, if with the same equipment, we had been there to see". 2 What they did was to produce something, as Canon Streeter says in "Reality", "though arithmetically absurd," yet "representatively apt!" 3.

1. "Schon im II Jahr, wird der Christliche Gott in die abstrakten Formen des Platonischen gekleidet und dadurch in eine solche Ferne versetzt, dass das Schwergewicht das religiösen Lebens aus der Welt herausgerückt wird". Wendland, Hell. Rom. Kultur, Seite "234-9. quoted in Angus, Religious Quests, Page 128
2. Baillie, Ibid, 195
3. Page 195.

It is because scholars have failed to realize the Christian earnestness of Justin and his type that they have branded him as a perverter of the Gospel, as they do Paul. Of course Justin prepared the way for Athanasius and Augustine, though Athanasius still possessed that naivete of warm evangelicalism which is found in the New Testament. Justin does stand at the very fountain head of the development of the theological conception of the Christian dogma of God. By his very terminology and attempt to make Christianity intelligent he helped to replace the simple religious aspect of God in the Son and Spirit and superceded it by dogmatic and philosophic identity of the essence of the Son with the Father and at the same time postulating eternally differentiated subjects. As I say, it was not so pronounced in Justin, but the beginnings are there. Besides he got away from the simple Biblical terminology by employing concepts for the construction of the immanent life of God into a cosmology which terms were meant to describe the effect of salvation. Although the New Testament does speak more of the subordination of the Son and Spirit to the Father, Justin started the process whereby the equality and unity of essences was asserted in definitive terms. Harnack says that the whole history of the Trinity from Athanasius to Augustine was the gradual displacement of the Logos concept to that of Son, of the substitution of the immanent and ontological and absolute Trinity to that of the relative and experimental. 1 We do not say that the Apologists, even Justin, had a doctrine of the Trinity. We maintain only that the beginnings of the scientific and theological doctrine are developing in them. They started the process of that development.

In Justin we find very little reference to the Spirit and then it is not systematically related to God or to Christ. The inspiration of the prophets is now traced to the Logos, and then again the Spirit. 1 Justin does not have an independent place for the Spirit. But the Logos conception and the reason for its employment was to make it necessary to work out a definite doctrine of the Spirit. He paved the way for the problem which was solved in its way,-- by not being solved!!! But the so-called solution has always been the more apt, as Canon Streeter says, not for the intellectual definition it gives of a positive mathematical fact, but for the breadth of its comprehension, and for the errors it guards against. The solution of the Trinitarian problem is simply unreasonable. It may be tenable from the standpoint of Higher Reason, namely faith. From that point of view, which may be said to be the orthodox view, the Trinity is regarded simply as a revelation beyond reason. And every attempt to go beyond it to its exact meaning has resulted in heresy. The Church finally said that the solution was this: the three TROPOI UPARXEOS of undivided Godhead were not simply PROSOPA that is, aspects of bare unity, nor were they three OUSIA which was tritheism, but MIA OUSIA EN TRISIN UPOSTASESIN. This is most irrational, but it was experientially true, and it is only that we can explain it.

One wonders if the New Testament expressions, not of systematic theologians, but of hard working missionaries are not the best and only adequate possible solutions to the problem of the Trinity! All of these speculations, however, are quite true to that New Testament experience.

There are many who have argued against the Trinity. There was Servetus against Calvin. Besides Socinus despised

1. Cf. Rees, The Holy Spirit, Page 76.

the orthodox definition. Rationalism, and Schleiermacher too, wanted a Sabellian interpretation rather than the Athanasian interpretation, and he makes out a good case. The battle between the advocates of the economic and the immanent Trinity has gone on into our day, while on the other hand many are practically indifferent to any discussion of the subject.

Yet we are convinced that as long as faith conceives the historical in the eternal, the religious realization of redemption involves an eternal self-revelation of God, as well as a perception of the person of the Redeemer and made real and possessive in the Presence of the Holy Spirit and the Church. Christian experience will always maintain that Christ belongs to the eternal life of God, and the Spirit belongs to Christ and to God. At least the son and the Spirit are assumed to be essentially existent in God. How this takes place is beyond our scientific scrutiny. Temporal categories of thought are insufficient to ferret out these things in the human experience. That there are three persons in one Godhead is absolutely inadequate unless we take into account the limited psychological knowledge which the Trinitarian formers possessed.

The religious value of the Trinity consists alone in expounding the history of revelation as the self-disclosure of the eternal God. As such it is a valuable safeguard against the exclusive, pantheistic, and transcendent interpretations of the Trinity, which would depersonalize, deethicize, dehumanize, depaternalize, and deindividualize the God of a historic revelation.

Now this change of the heavenly Father of the Synoptics to the Trinity of later development has been described by

Hatch, Harnack and others, as a degeneration rather than a development, a corruption of the truth from its earlier simplicity. It is not an enrichment due to a healthy normal growth.

But this is only a partial truth. Of course there was a tendency away from the simplicity of the former Gospel. But what else could we expect? One wonders if Hatch and Harnack have not done as much degenerating as Justin and his successors!! This criticism is too harsh and too unsympathetic. Let us remember that the formulation of practically realized truth is one thing, a tendency to desert the manifestation of the Triune God in experience and in history for abstract speculations concerning the interior relations of the deity is another. In the process the Church was called upon in the second century with its sacred traditions to fashion a concept of God as would interpret the Christian experience in the midst of a new thought-world. Certainly Greek terms were used. But in the use of these philosophical forms of reasoning and the relation of God to the world, the vital nature of the Gospel was not lost. In fact these forms were the best way to preserve the Gospel. They were symbols, encasing vital meanings. The universal nature of the Gospel makes it necessary to face any new culture and conquer it, and adapt it. This experimental and vital truth that God brought about a New relation to man is not destroyed, but reinterpreted. The Christian religion absorbed what it could, rejected what was foreign, and became enriched.

We will never outgrow the inherent truth in the doctrine of the Trinity. It is true! Its scaffold of intellectualism may alter and undergo changes, but the truth which it sustains,

never. That does not say that it is untrue. The tadpole is a frog in a certain stage of his life. When he becomes a full grown frog he cannot deny the fact that he was a true frog, as frogs go, when he was a tadpole. The outer framework of his anatomy may change according to the nature of things, but his genus as a frog is the same at every stage of his life. To know God as Father of all, God as revealed in the historic Son, and God as revealed as the unseen Friend and Companion of our hearts - - that is to know the Trinity of the New Testament and the Trinity of the creeds. 1

The early Christians thought of God as one substance. But they met God in Jesus Christ. The debate resulted in no ultimate philosophy, but in the familiar pattern which served to express the faith of their times. No Church Father could explain its intellectual content except in analogies. Yet the Trinity is a part of the Christian community to this day. In it two streams of Hebrew and Greek thought met. An abiding religious conviction was expressed in terms of transient metaphysics.

Thus it is that these various doctrines serve as intellectual patterns for the vital faith, sheaths for the holding of a powerful weapon, the vessels for the preserving of essential life. As long as men's spirits are connected with their bodies which contain them, whether they be black or brown or red or white, so long will we need

1. "Doctrines are undoubtedly revelations of essential and objective truth; but they are something more than this. Doctrines are descriptions of functions." Kirk, *The Religion of Power*, Page 203. This same interpretation is given by Dean Shailer Mathews when he describes doctrines as social patterns. Cf. *January Journal of Religion*, article I. He also considered doctrine as functional in the Christian group, never as a final interpretation of truth, and are not to be identified with the convictions from which they arise which is abiding framework of all

these containers. And men of varying cultures will variously interpret these basic experiences as they pour them into the vessels of their own temperament.

The key to the development of any doctrinal expression is always found in the total expression of that faith in the New Testament. Professor Scott is quite right in maintaining that what subsequent generations have produced in the way of doctrinal developments have all been evolved from what was inherently germinal in the New Testament. The trouble with men has always been the exaggeration of one element at the expense of another.

A word may be added here as to the significance of Justin in the development of the first standard of faith in the early Church. The hellenizing process had made for a theorizing about nature, the world, and the Christian religion. The instinct of sound-mindedness led the Church to oppose the complete theorizing of the Gospel with a sound common sense. As a result there came forth a simple attempt to reduce this faith to an irreducible minimum which would safeguard what was felt to be vital. Such, in short was the psychological basis for the rise of the Old Roman Symbol. It was a bulwark against the errors of Hellenism, for there are no elements in it which can be specifically applied against any Ebionite emphases. It is a positive assertion of religious facts.

The dating of it has been debated by scholars from all times. At least it must have arisen early in the second century. Kattenbusch has dated it as early as 100 A. D., while Harnack dates it as late as 150 A. D.

What we wish to notice about it is the fact of its tripartite construction which is an important feature in this

early document, and continues to be an important feature in all later Christian development.

In this connection Justin is an important witness. Professor McGiffert¹ argues with weight that the Church at Rome actually administered the rite of baptism in the tripartite name of "God, Jesus Christ, and Holy Spirit." The chief evidence used to substantiate this conclusion he finds in Justin's First Apology LXI where we read that the members upon admission into the Christian fold are led to where there is water, and undergo a washing in water in the name of the Father of All and Lord God and of our savior Jesus Christ and of Holy Spirit." At least, if Justin is not paraphrasing the Matthaic formula for the sake of his Gentile Hearers, there is a difference here between the form in Matthew and this phrase. It is not very conclusive evidence but it does give us an idea that the Roman Church may have been using a formula in baptism which already was looked upon as a standard of faith.

It would not be impossible at all to believe that very early, even in Justin's day, this "Rule of Faith" was in existence as an instrument to check the license of interpretation given to Scripture and the Gospel by fantastic speculators who would allegorize away the Christian faith. The creed, as Justin's language shows, was formulated independently of Scripture as a witness to the common faith and its interpretation.

Today the problem of the relation of theism to Christianity is a vital one, perhaps the most important problem before the Christian religion. The neo realist,

1. The Apostle's Creed.

the Communists after the radical type, the humanists, all are raging a furious attack against the theistic interpretation of the Christian religion. Harry Elmer Barnes has written a book against the whole theistic background of the Christian religion assuming that its very superannuated theology is an anachronism and will result in the "Twilight of Christianity", and what a blessing!

Not only is the "modern mood", as Professor Horton calls it, antagonistic to anything speculative, it is set upon the eradication of the whole idea of anything metaphysical and other worldly. The cynicism of the age is fed by the critical and scientific temper. The war has been blamed for a great deal of the trouble, with which it really has had something to do.

Not only from outside Christian circles has this antitheistic criticism come, but from many professors and students within the Christian Church. What is more many specialists in Christianity have thrust theology aside as a relic of the past, or because they were ashamed of it, they have apologized for their interest in it. Theology, to quote Barth, has really been in disrepute, and what is more it has abdicated its place as the queen of sciences and become the handmaid of biology, sociology, psychology and comparative religion. Barth has begun what promised to be more than a "marginal note," a "corrective", a "pinch of spice" to the modern prodigal from theology. He would transform what goes under the name of modern humanistic religion into a real "theo-logy", a Word of God, and rescue the queen of the sciences from its anthropological abductors.

Now since Schleiermacher, the trend of theology has

towards the scientific and historical in the 19th-

At least this is sure, there are many modern Christians who after the fashion of Eucken practically tell us that we may give up every distinctive doctrine of the Christian faith and still be Christian! This does, as Francis Patton says, lay quite a heavy burden on Christian forbearance! What is more it makes the student of historic Christianity sit up and take notice. The skeptic of the eighteenth century believed in God but denied Christ, but today's skeptic believes in Jesus (or Christ) and denies God. Professor Wieman of the University of Chicago has said many times, and others as well, that the greatest problem of the Christian religion in this generation is the problem of the Christian God.

Justin and his attempt did start this process. As a Greek his immanence coupled with a moral optimism paved the way for the whole development of a subjectivism which culminated in the great system of Schleiermacher, which was a practical spiritual pantheism. The whole basis of that system was the result of the Greek genius in Christianity. The Hebrew felt the awful transcendence of God, between the Maker and the creature a great gulf was fixed. True, in the Bible, God is also immanent. But he is immanent in the world not because He is forced to be, nor is He identified with the world, but He is free, the Creator and Upholder. To the Greek the world and God are rational. There is no fixed gulf between God and man. The gulf is primarily one of degree and not of kind. As a result, as Hyde remarks, the Greek made God in the image of man, while the Hebrew made man in the image of God.

Now since Schleiermacher, the trend of theology has been towards the distinctly Greek elements in the inter-

pretation of Christianity. Man has assumed the chief position and the old Greek proverb that "man is the measure of all things" is the motto in the experience theology of our day. As a result the whole of the Christian Gospel has been humanized and with it the whole concept of God and the Trinity. We are discovering today before our very eyes the dissolution of theology and the general avoidance of theology and Christianity by the intellectuals. Society too has felt the effects, and even it has fallen into a state of dissolution. The chief reason is that the authority in the essential doctrine of the Highest Reality, God, has been dissolved into a human valuation. This has its logical result in the humanism of the day which sees in God nothing but the highest thing that men know. God, to many a modern Christian does not mean a person separated from the world, it rather refers to the unity that pervades the world. This is typically Greek. Of course God is both in the true historical Christian sense. The reason why this problem faces us in the study of Justin is that he has these two strains in him. As we shall see his whole soteriology reveals his Greek background.

A great deal of our modern Christian thought, good in its way, if not taken to extremes, is typically Greek. As mentioned above the difference between God and the world is broken down and the name "God" is used in reference to the mighty world-force in which we live. It is a process and we ourselves are a part of it. God is not necessarily distinct from us but we are a part of Him. This has had the tendency to reduce the older sharp corners off the doctrines once so harsh. It has reduced the idea of sin from that of guilt to mere ignorance. It has made it very diffi-

cult for an ethical religion to operate. It has made of the Incarnation a mere symbol of the general truth that man at his best is one with God. It has made of a God a salubrious Father of all and all men have become brothers. It has given us an unbounded optimism in the future progress of human nature, and has made the highest good but a normal and healthy animal adjustment to our physical environment and a harmonious spiritual contentment, the highest essence of salvation. It has made of miracle an impossibility, or it has been explained on the basis of natural law which we do not yet understand. It has reduced the idea of revelation to a natural basis, and destroyed the real basis of the Christian religion. In short this absolutist and monistic interpretation of God has been but a revival of what the Greek brought into the Church, which has received its full development at the hands of Schleiermacher. The whole idea of historical Christian theism has fallen down. What has taken its place is hard to name. It has its various aspects, the most important of which we term humanism, a vague term today, with a most noble family name!

One can sympathize with the Barthians who have seen the result of this humanization of God. Justin must not be too harshly treated as a pioneer in the introduction of the Greek temper into the Christian religion. He has ample traces of the Hebrew way of looking at things, while on the other hand his Christian experience was closer to the Greek ideas. Nevertheless the Barthians are right in attributing the whole process of the modern approach to God through Kepler and Newton and Copernicus, who destroyed the world view of the Bible. Then the development of the historical sciences produced the criticism that shattered the Bible. Then came

evolution. And with it came the whole avalanche of skeptical relativitism until every standard was shattered and theology became but a phase of the sociology of religion, as in Troeltsch.

"Our modernism of today is nothing but a repristination of Platonism, either taking its form from the more ethically oriented Stoicism or from the Neoplatonic mysticism." 1 At least it is idealistic in the philosophical sense. What its essence is may be briefly stated: that man is essentially one with the Divine Absolute and is divine. The highest and best in man is the divine. Our finiteness is the essence of sin, and redemption comes from a freedom from this so-called disharmony and slavery. This redemption comes either through mystic contemplation or it comes through an energizing of the will.

The chief criticism of fundamentalism by the Barthians is that it petrifies the doctrine of God and kindred ideas, while the chief criticism against modernism is that its doctrines of immanence tend to dissolve theology proper.

The whole discussion of this most acute modern problem by these Barthians is very challenging. The bearing of this Greek immanence upon the Christian of the revelation of God is stimulating. At least a religion based solely upon immanence, monism, which asserts an unbroken continuity of God and man deifies the world and man, it denies the personality of God, and because its revelation is not from an "other" world of knowledge it cannot challenge me to a decision in accepting it and thus denies my personality, for decision is the core of personality. The world of God is set over the world of men, the sole emphasis is

1. Brunner, The Theology of Crisis, Page 11.

upon transcendence. Jesus in that case, becomes more than a mere illuminator, or teacher, or genius, after the Stoic conception. He is the One who has come to man from another world of transcendent quality differing in kind from our own.

Barthianism is a fresh recurrence of the Latin, or, better, the Hebrew type of Christian emphasis upon God as the transcendent One. Instead of an anthropology it wishes to be known as a theology. It comes at the time of crisis indeed. It is again positing what historic Christianity has always felt to be a part of its message, namely that the Christian religion is intimately linked up with a theistic view of the world.

We find that in spite of Justin's Greek temper that he was a theist and realized that the Christian religion must have a theistic basis. In spite of the fact that his soteriology is more Greek than Hebrew, his conception of the Logos while Greek in its emphasis upon the revelation of knowledge, was a unique occurrence and a "once for all" manifestation. He tried as best he knew to keep the balance between these two extremes. And where he does emphasize the one more than the other, it is due to his task, the vehicles with which he had to work, and his milieu. Justin is a theist whose God is both immanent, and transcendent. It may be that the Barthians are heavy on the latter emphasis! But the modern age, at least in America, will have to realize that the Christian religion cannot live in a humanistic atmosphere. Jesus was a theist and the whole New Testament is couched in it. Christian history has demanded it. Christianity is more than a mere way of ethics, more than a mere adjustment mechanism, a philosophy of God, a theosophy,-- it is a religion, a life that is

related to the living personal God. 1

1. Cf. Clark, The Christian Doctrine of God; McConnell, The Christlike God; Roberts, The Christian God, etc.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF JESUS
AS A WITNESS TO A NEW
IN CHRISTIAN SCIENCE

CHAPTER IX

It is interesting to the soteriology of Justin that he has been very severely criticized as a perpetrator of the very fatalistic doctrine of salvation. I suppose that the conception of predestination more than any other point of the theology bears the Greek stamp.

Some of the most important phases of Justin's soteriology may be summed up briefly before we trace their origin and follow out their consequences.

For instance he was typically Greek in maintaining that man has free will and hence the power to choose his own path. Unlike the Latin and to a certain extent the Greek, Justin never maintained that there was a predestination of man and only a foreknowledge of it. In fact all men are saved not with any reference to original sin as an inherited guilt.

**THE SIGNIFICANCE OF JUSTIN
AS A WITNESS TO A NEW DEVELOPMENT
IN CHRISTIAN SOTERIOLOGY.**

It is surprising and yet true that Justin never speaks of the fatalism of the Stoics. He speaks of the necessity of the theologians' desire or consent, but never in through the instrumentality of demons. It was Christ's presence, aiming to overcome the demons. Now Justin says we are cleansed us with his blood, those who believed in Him. In the Dialogue 8 he speaks of the mystery of the cross with which He has bought us. And yet from the context of these passages he seems to be certain that he employs these terms in the fullest and explanatory senses with which they were first employed. It seems that even in these passages he will that the "teaching" element of Jesus

CHAPTER IX

is, Apol. 1, 35, 45, 44; 11, 7; Dial. 86, 102, 140. 2. Dial. 124. 3. Apol. 1, 33; Dial 34, 40. 4. Apol. 1, 42; 11, 30; Dial. 111. 5. Dial. 111.

1. Apol. 1, 35, 45, 44; 11, 7;
Dial. 86, 102, 140.
2. Dial. 124.
3. Apol. 1, 33; Dial 34, 40.
4. Apol. 1, 42; 11, 30; Dial. 111.
5. Dial. 111.

It is inference to the soteriology of Justin that he has been most severely criticized as a perverter of the New Testament doctrine of salvation. I suppose that his conception of redemption more than any other phase of his theology bears the Greek stamp.

Some of the most important phases of Justin's soteriology may be summed up briefly before we trace their origins and follow out their consequences.

For instance he was typically Greek in maintaining that men have free will and hence the power to cast off sin.¹ Unlike the Latin and to a certain extent the Greek, Justin never maintained that there was a predestination to sin, but only a foreknowledge of it. In fact all men are to be judged not with any reference to original sin as an inherited guilt, but like Adam and Eve.² It is surprising and yet true to his temper to reject the fatalism of the Stoics. Sin was not the result of the transgressors desire or consent, but came in through the instrumentality of demons. It was Christ's supreme mission to overcome the demons.³ Now Justin does use the term "He cleansed us with his blood, those who believed on Him."⁴ In the Dialogue⁵ he speaks of the mystery of the cross with which He has bought us. And yet from the context of these passages we cannot for certain say that he employs these terms in the forensic and expiatory fashion with which they were first employed. It seems that even in these passages he holds that the "teaching" element of Jesus

1. Apol. I, 28, 43, 44; II, 7;
Dial. 88, 102, 140.
2. Dial. 124.
3. Apol. I, 32; Dial 34, 40.
4. Apol. I, 45; II, 60; Dial. 131.
5. 134.

was primary. He dwells on the refining, restraining and cultural powers of the Christian soteriology. Yet there is a larger element in Justin, expressed in Irenaeus more fully and satisfactorily. It relates to the physical idea of redemption. Christ saves men, according to Justin, not by mere illumination, but by a personal identification of Himself, as the Logos who created the world, with man who is under the limitations of sin and death. He became like us that we might become what He is. Our fleshly nature must be fused or inoculated with the Divine nature, and thus made immortal. Now that act of Incarnation does not leave men with nothing to accomplish in their salvation. They too must work out their own salvation. Justin, like Irenaeus, has the idea that Christ as very God has come to us not as a portion of the Godhead, but as God Himself breaking forth into human life as a revelation. Although Justin does not explicitly state it, he does anticipate the Athanasian, and typically Greek, conception of redemption. Salvation became the release from death and decay. Christ by his identification with humanity has leavened the lump of humanity and thus makes it possible for man to become divine, which means simply to develop something which is inherent in him. Salvation is almost a quasi-physical change in man, and the work of Christ is construed in terms of substance. With this there is also the truly spiritual element of knowledge which is typically Greek.

It is for this reason that Justin, and Greek theology in general, made the Incarnation the most important phase of Christ's saviorhood. In it He recapitulated the human race and brought "Life" and "Light" to men. This Greek note is evident in John who speaks of Christ as the Lifegiver, the

Lightbringer, the Truthbringer.

That is the reason why the Church in Justin's day was getting away from Paul's idea of a spiritual-body resurrection. But these Greeks brought with them their ideas of a bodily resurrection. Justin himself says that "we expect to receive our bodies again after they are dead and have been laid away."

This Greek Monistic idealism and its effects on salvation had a profound influence upon asceticism. The body being the source of evil, it must be starved and maltreated. Justin was an ascetic simply as a result of his soteriology.

Justin stresses the fact that Christianity is a new Law, it is a new truth. Again this is true to his Greek temper.

There are a number of observations which we must call attention to in Justin's background that through him came into the Christian religion and were emphasized, sometimes unduly.

To the Greek, evil was not in the will, it was in the mind. It was not guilt which required forgiveness, it was rather ignorance which required illumination. The earlier development of philosophy in Greece had been very optimistic. Socrates held that man could liberate himself by shaking off the old conceptions. Redemption through knowledge had always been the grand aim of philosophy. Later there came an alteration of this principle only in degree, not in kind. The Greek mind is a unit in spite of its varied development. They came to realize that the kind of knowledge needed was more than mere man's activity of reason. The knowledge that saves must come by revelation, by direct enlightenment from above. The word "gnosis" applied earlier to all knowledge, now came to be applied to a knowledge invested with a peculiar significance." This is life eternal to know Thee the

only True God," is an echo of the Greek temper. What is more, the bondage under which man suffers is his material existence. And with these two things the Greek longed for a deliverance from the bondage of Necessity. The sense of the inevitable destiny of men, determined by the fates, gave to the Greek world the eternal "note of sadness." In some of these we find the roots of Justin's theology.

In short, to be a Christian in the Greek sense was to be a man at your best. The evil that besets men is not something that separates men from God, it is a temporary non-adjusted relationship. In the Old Testament sin is a "no more" relationship between man and God, but in Justin it is a "not yet." It is the outlook of the evolutionary optimist. The Greek had no sense of moral evil. So too, his redemption was primarily a self-redemption. It was an escape from the demons of the world through knowledge, sacraments, and self-realization. The Atonement received no cardinal emphasis. There is no stressing of sin and grace. Redemption is the recovery of the lost image in man and the restoration of man to his first state.² The highest blessing bestowed upon man is the deification of humanity, and this includes the full knowledge and enjoyment of God. ³ So reconciliation is altogether absent in Justin. He shows no sense of a struggle with sin as we find in Paul; and has no sympathy with the cry, "Oh wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me from the body of this death." Faith in the Old Testament, as Hatch says, is trust in a person, among the Greeks it is a

1. John. His knowledge of the essence of his religion. He is the Greeks-- Angus, Religious Quests of the Graeco-Roman world, Page 60.
2. "Man is a plant of heavenly origin!" say
3. Harnack, H.D., II, 240.

conviction of the intellect and a satisfaction of that capacity." The Greek saw in life a flower ready to bloom with astonishing capacity to respond to the gardener's care. The Hebrew saw in life a flower stunted by some malignant disease which robbed it of the loveliness of bloom and the allurement of fragrance.....For the Greek and the Hebrew are always doing battle for the possession of the mind of man. Perhaps the deepest tension among all the disturbances which have strained the muscles of the minds of men is this fundamental battle between the Greek and the Hebrew view of life." Hough, "Wither Christianity", Page 3. Jesus speaks the reconciling words: to the Greek he says, "Ye are the light of the world," while to the Hebrew He says, "Ye are the salt of the earth."

So we find that the Apologists, Justin included, do not ask the gentile mind to change very much in its attitude towards redemption. They merely take what the gentile longed for, (and was it not essentially the same as the Hebrew longing?) offered it a new certainty and a new encouragement which the Christian religion gives. Christianity becomes to them not a new garment, but the old garment is made over. The life of well-doing is made an assured career. The goal of their religious quests remains quite the same, the method of its attainment too is unchanged, but the Truth which would liberate the mind now is cleared of its haze, it is reinforced with Hope. Many have said that when Justin took that ground he revealed a very inadequate knowledge of the essence of his religion. He is too silent on some of the great affirmations of the traditional faith. He has overlooked forgiveness, he does not demand a downright new birth or a new creature of

the gentiles. His theory of the redeeming work of Christ is couched in terms that make the Gospel only an exemplary symbol of the way to Life. Harnack too remarks about the weakness of the Apologists in identifying truth wherever found in the world with the contents of Christianity and that it was done at the awful cost of neutralizing the significance of all the specific features of the religion they claimed to defend. All of this is very true. Yet it does not take into consideration some very evident facts.

Justin addressed the cultured minds of the day. He was forced to advance concepts which those minds would respond to. They had to insist upon the affinities of the Greek and the Christian thought, not on those features which were alien. I believe that the personal faith of Justin was far richer than the Apologies admit. The feeling of the writings of Justin reveal more to us than we suppose. The Gospel to him was more than an Exemplar Imprimatur of the Logos put in mere moral terms. The writings of Justin are filled with a sense of the newness of life in store for everyone. The love of God and the grace of God in the manifestation of the Logos, though not expressed, is certainly the undertone of Justin's work. There was something more than philosophy there that could make a man forsake all and follow Christ. Their minds were filled with the relation of Christianity to modern thought.

What is more, though the Apologists may have conceived the Gospel in meager terms according to their writings, yet they did respect the great outlines of the Christian faith and remain true to them. It is remarkable that with their intellectual powers they did not take the Gospel farther astray. Though the Gnostics finally and unwittingly destroyed

faith in the incarnation, let us remember that the Apolo-
gists, although they barely grasped it, remained under the
significance of it. Justin's redemption may be very Greek
in its tone, but it still bears about it the idea that re-
demption was a great event, miraculous, issuing from the
loving heart of God. But he does pave the way for the
coming of the Greek element in soteriology which has had
its revivals, and is the most popular interpretation of
redemption in modern circles today. With this aspect of
Greek soteriology we will now busy ourselves.

As stated in another section of this thesis in a
different form, the Christian religion is primarily one of
redemption. Somehow Christians have always believed, whether
liberal or fundamental, Arian or orthodox, Socinian or
Calvinist, that through Christ the superhuman powers of
God have been made available for man's help. It has histor-
ically held to the double aspect of this redemption in Christ,
namely, there has been a rescue from spiritual death and danger,
and a new life's beginning;-- and also a release from ignorance
and superstition and fear and guilt. The Christian religion
has often emphasized the cosmic aspects of this process and
acted too severely, but it has never heralded a Savior who is
not greater than that from which men are to be saved. The
conception of sin has often been made so abstract that it
has required a metaphysical framework on which to work out
the redemptive system. This has been the danger which the
introduction of metaphysical and philosophical thought forms
has brought into the Christian faith. We have but to recall
the monumental system of Augustine. It has a terrible reality
in it. But it is a "system" and has tended to make redemption
something abstract and unreal.

There is truth, real truth, in the facts under the cosmic aspect of sin in the great theological systems. Sin is more than individual, it is social and as broad as the human race is wide. Today our sense of social solidarity brought on by modern means has given us a glimpse of the universal hideousness of sin and our individual contribution to its total aspect, though we may be far removed from it. Sinful conduct is no more individual but social. This has given us a social aspect of salvation.

Sin certainly is more than Justin and the Greeks would make it. It is actual degeneracy. Though his emphasis is true as far as it goes, it needs the other aspect of guilt. Man is in a state of actual degeneracy because he hates rather than loves, he acquires rather than shares. It simply cannot be overcome by advice alone, nor by an illumination of the intellect. The perpetrators of the last war were honor men in the great universities. The Gospel is the "gnosis". Socrates is wrong when he avows that a man's possession of the "knowledge" will result in his doing it. Such knowledge lacks dynamic. That is what Paul found to be the weakness of the Law, it did not have power enough to get itself done!! It was only a schoolmaster, not a savior. But Christians have always felt that what the Law could not do GOD did in Christ. This undeserved gift of salvation coming from a self-giving God is the real dynamic. He initiates the whole Gospel. I think you find this note in Justin, although circumstances made him sublimate it to the aspect of moral influence. Yes, knowledge often puffs up, as we can see today. Our educational efforts are not producing the results we should expect. It is primarily because it lacks the Love that God gives. What philosophy tries to do and does

imperfectly, trust in a Christlike God really accomplishes. The Christian faith has the power and the life because it brings the life into proper relationship with God. This is the appeal of supernaturalism, of theism, and it is an integral part of the historic Gospel. Aristotle and Plato may be the guardians of much in the history of Christianity but they are not the real perpetrators or inspirers of the Christian salvation. They may assist in its expression and help us to communicate it to those whom we teach, but they simply are no more than vehicles. That is the reason the Church lives on, simply because it is the bringer of salvation. Who ever heard of a Platonic school of philosophy perpetuating itself by the sheer force of its soteriology! The theology of salvation may be functional, a pattern-doctrine that can be interpreted according to its constituent elements in a given social milieu, but the life conviction beneath is the same for every age. Jesus Christ is the same-- yesterday, today and forever in the realm of doctrine. Now if Christianity, as some hold, is intrinsically a system of doctrines authoritatively fixed in patterns of other times and lacking moral content, it will be abandoned!

As intimated in a previous section, this Greek conception of salvation by illumination, is today being challenged by the Barthians. Instead of the Greek unity of life of man and God, of monism, of the capacity of man to know God, of the rationality of the universe, of the moral optimism of man, of the essential "not yetness" of man's nature, of the nature of evil as ignorance,--this group posit the opposite position.

1. "Were Christianity a theory of the universe it would have perished long ago."
McFayden, Ibid, 292.
2. Dean Mathews lectures on Social Theology.
Cf. his Faith of Modernism.

There is a moral chasm, they say, between God and man that simply cannot be bridged unless God wills to bridge it. The monism of the universe is broken up into a stark dualism. The rationality of the universe cannot be acclaimed by the natural mind. God cannot be known by the natural man, only hints can be gleaned of His existence in nature. All of man's efforts end in the despair of death and night. Man's nature is "no more" in relation to God, not simply a "not yet" with its hopeful optimism. The nature of evil is not ignorance, it is downright rebellion against God. There can be no salvation without an ACT of God, not merely a word of Truth. This Act of God is a Word, and can be understood only by the decision act of faith. The free will which a man really has is his power of decision. At the basis of life is this eternal contradiction, contra-dictio, that there is no way from man to God. And when a man realizes it he has learned to ask the greatest question in the world. Man is not in a state of arrested development, as the evolutionists teach,-- he is in a state of contradictory principles. Evil is essentially guilt, which has brought about the breach of fellowship between man and God. It involved a loss of ability to return to the Father. Now the only escape from this despair is to recognize the absolute state of helplessness of man, acknowledging that self-trust is the core of evil and trusting in God alone. Forgiveness follows as an act of God which He alone can speak and do because He wills to. God has borne the cross Himself, but he allowed it to be revealed in history on Calvary. He has thus removed the curse of history. When men trust in this salvation they have begun the eternal life in the world of God. And from this there flows the ethical incentive. This reconciliation gives us the right to stand in the eternal

salvation while a part of history and share in the divine life of Jesus Christ. It is not a divine salvation, but the divine salvation of history, given us freely. The Greek idea of man's activity in salvation is emphatically denied. What Luther meant by a salvation by works these Barthians see in the Greek emphasis, which is so predominant today. The Gospel, they claim is an act whereby God comes to man. He resolves the contradiction, He justifies the guilty, He bears the cross from the foundation of the world. God is sovereign and Lord. He is not a fellow-partner, as the Greeks, especially the Stoics would say. And the only way in which to prove this salvation is not by philosophical argument, but by faith,--it must be believed. Whatever can be proved is unimportant. So these Barthians would repudiate all attempts at the definition of Christian experience. It is but the crystallizing of what was meant to be free-flowing. Faith never comes of experience, but experience comes of faith, and faith is not a dogma to be believed, but an act of decision. This makes it impossible for anyone ever to be a Christian on earth, one only knows that God has accepted us, that we have been called through Christ. This will make for no laxity in moral behavior, for this salvation will be the decease of self-will and the reign of God, not as a teacher of salvation, but as a bearer of salvation. The physical life will die, but the new life is eternal. 1.

This whole conception of salvation is certainly a contradiction to most contemporary ideas of salvation. God

1. Cf. Brunner, *Theology of Crisis*; Max Stranch, *Die Theologie Karl Barth's*; Barth, *Word of God and the word of Man*; Articles by Horton, Keller, Richard, Niebuhr, Ernst, Herman, Bixler, Pauck, etc., in various periodicals.

has been relegated to an unimportant place in modern theology, ever since Schleiermacher. 1 The whole recurrence of the Greek emphasis in salvation has a phenomenal growth and adherence. Kant is the real father of the modern Greek renaissance, or we may go back farther than that and find it already coming in the late Middle Ages. Suffice it to say that the foundation of religion for Kant was found not in a given revelation, but it was founded in the nature of man, in human experience as an unprovable postulate. It was Schleiermacher who took this phase of Kant, and in a dry rationalistic age, started a system of theology based upon the promise that man is absolutely dependent upon God. At least theology for Schleiermacher was based in man's religious nature and not in the nature of God or in a revelation. Two generations have drunk deeply at the well of Schleiermacher's refreshing religious treatise, "Der Christliche Glaube," etc. Christianity has taken a new lease on life by calling itself a way of life and not primarily a way of intellectual belief. The first critics of Schleiermacher saw his fallacy and tried to disprove the reality of Jesus' historical existence, for all Schleiermacher's system really needed was the idea of Jesus and not the real man. It was primarily an absolutist and monistic system based much on Spinoza and Hegel. It was a subjective idealism. Then Ritschl came and after a monumental work made fast the historical consciousness of Jesus. This we might say is the kernel of all modern theology, a Ritschlianized Schleiermacherianism. Harnack and Hermann are the two great living exponents of this theology of yesterday!

1. Schleiermacher's modernism is not new at all; it is as old as Justin and Paul!

What will be the outcome? Has Schleiermacher lead us into a blind alley? Or have we not followed him far enough? Is the experience theology with its anthropocentric emphasis upon salvation at the end of its era? Do we need a new start? Has the theology of Schleiermacher made us prodigals to the real THEOLOGY? Is the epistemology of Schleiermacher too uncritical, too Greek, too optimistic, too shallow?

It is this general situation that lies at the root of the Barthian movement. It brooks no harbor for Schleiermacher. He is the culprit of modern theology. He has caused the downfall of the queen of sciences. He has lead us into a blind alley. He has made anthropology into a theology. He has substituted culture, self-will, individual experience for salvation, redemption. He has dethroned all authority in such a fashion that it touches all society which is now in a state of dissolution. He has caused the blight of the flower of Protestantism, which grew up with such promise. But he has put man in the place of God, self in the place of grace.

What the result will be remains to be seen. One thing should be said, that Justin's emphasis lies back of this whole recurrence of the Greek idea of salvation.

The Barthian movement has been severely criticized, but its critics have had to retire. They (Barthians) do not claim to be the founders of a system, and that seems to be their strong point. But they too are crystallizing their opinions, and are becoming in many ways as dogmatic as the factions they criticize. The movement has been called a "desparado Theologie," Dr. W.P. Patterson of Edinburgh, has called it "a species of agnosticism akin to that of Spencer," a Princeton Professor has called it a "form of fatalism",

while Dr. Harnack has called it a "revival of ancient gnosticism." On the other hand Dr. Lang of Halle has called Barth the greatest theologian since Schleiermacher, and Count Keyserling has called him the savior of Protestantism in Europe. European thought is divided on the issues the Barthians raised. Students flock to them. No theological discussion today can ignore, if not the Barthian system, the Barthian atmosphere and "spice."

Whatever the truth may be, the fact remains that their emphasis needs to be struck in this day of rampant individualism in every realm of life, which is threatening the very foundation of every fundamental social institution. And after all theology is to some extent one of the most preservative social institutions. Protestantism needs a dose of despair and pessimism to shock it out of its silly optimism, and at the same time a new dynamic to rouse it out of its cynical, deadening, monotonous, powerless lethargy. It is hoped that Barth may prove to be a savior, by again making the Gospel a "good news" from a far country, salvation a gift from the "deus absconditus."

However, one question needs to be raised in reference to the Barthian reemphasis upon the transcendent element in the redemptive process: Can any system of Christian thought ignore the human, the typically Greek, element in redemption? It has always returned under protest after some theologian or another has banished it as foreign to the Christian religion. Barth is undoubtedly right according to historic Christianity, IN HIS POSITIVES, -- but is he historically

right in his negatives? Time will be the corrective,
and human experience the means, which will balance this
age-old question. Justin's Greek emphasis upon the
individual participation in the redemptive process,
although overemphasized in our day, has its proper,
if not its absolute place.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF JUSTIN
AS A WITNESS TO THE FATHER OF
THE GOSPEL IN THE BOOK

BY

Dr. Fenton in his book on the history of the
... an interesting incident relative to our
subject. Dr. Fenton when President of the
... Seminary, at a moment when the faculty was
... least to fill the vacant chair of
... rather to abolish the chair, alleging that the
... character of the Presbyterian system is
... of defense. Thereupon a member of the faculty, the
... Professor of Dogmatics as we would suppose, arose and
... that Presbyterianism is an integral part of the
... and the Calvinist faith. A new Professor was
... later proved that he

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF JUSTIN

AS A WITNESS TO THE NATURE OF

THE CHURCH IN THE SECOND

CENTURY

This statement of
... many ecclesiastical today.
... churches, once defended with the authority of "ipse dixit"
... character gleaned from
... CHAPTER X of God are today
... in our hands. As a result of the breakdown of the
... character and a realization of the "de facto" character
... that we have, many scholars have been driven back to
... the life and character of the early Church with eyes
... instead of wearing the particular spectacles of an
... real polity, they go into the study with unbiased
...

Canon Streeter, an Anglican, has surprised us with an
... study of the 'Primitive Church.' His chief object
... is this study is to use the language of the subject of
... original origins in relation to the present day
... Christian Religion. For four hundred years theologians

Dr. Lowrie 1 in his book on the problem of Church Unity quotes an interesting incident relative to our subject. Dr. Patton when President of Princeton Theological Seminary, at a moment when the faculty was debating how best to fill the vacant chair of Church Polity, proposed rather to abolish the chair, alleging that the "iure divino" character of the Presbyterian system is impossible of defense. Thereupon a member of the faculty, the Professor of Dogmatics as we would suppose, arose and maintained that Presbyterianism is an integral part of the Presbyterian and the Calvinist faith! A new Professor was secured who later proved that he had no intention of maintaining the traditions of Presbyterianism.

This statement of Dr. Patton's seems to echo the voices of many ecclesiastics today. The organizations of the various Churches, once defended with the authority of "iure divino" character gleaned from the Word of God are today a problem on our hands. As a result of the breakdown of the "iure divino" character and a realization of the "de facto" existence of what we have, many scholars have been driven back to study the life and character of the early Church with open minds. Instead of wearing the particular spectacles of an ecclesiastical polity, they go into the study with unbiased opinions.

Canon Streeter, an Anglican, has surprised us with an unbiased study of the "Primitive Church." His chief object in this study is due to the "importance of the subject of Christian origins in relation to the present day discussion of Christian Reunion. For four hundred years theologians

of rival churches have armed themselves to battle on the question of the Primitive Church. However great their reverence for scientific fact, they have at least HOPED that the result of their investigations would be to vindicate apostolic authority for the type of Church Order to which they were themselves attached. The Episcopalian has sought to find episcopacy, the Presbyterian, Presbyterianism, and the Independent a system of independency, to be the only form of Church government in New Testament times. But while each party to the dispute has been able to make out a case for his own view, he has never succeeded in demolishing the case of his opponent. The explanation of this deadlock, I have come to believe, is quite simple. It is the uncriticized assumption, made by all parties to the controversy, that in the first century there existed a single type of Church Order." 1 Then he goes on to show how at the end of the first century and beyond all the types of Church order usually defended were in existence in different provinces of the Roman Empire.

Frederick Lynch in a review of the recent book of articles on Modern Christianity edited by Dr. L. H. Hough makes this remark, " One misses a chapter devoted to the nature of the Church, for agreement upon this must precede any real step toward organic unity. Is this omission due to the decline of interest of liberal Protestants in the Church?" This latter question seems to be symptomatic of many younger theologians who are the authors of these articles.

1. Canon B. H. Streeter, The Primitive Church, VII, VIII.

Another high Anglican, Dr. Headlam, in a recent book, the Brampton Lectures for 1920, has some interesting things to say in reference to the nature of the Church. In the preface to the second edition, he replies to some of the criticism advanced against his position by Dr. Gore who has always been an advocate for the Anglican conception of the Church. He holds:- "that a definite commission of authority was given to the Apostles; that they were given authority to transmit this to their successors; that they definitely made rules for episcopal ordination; that these rules obtained from the beginning; that a theory of this character actually prevailed in the Church at a time when we first have full information....."

-- all of these articles are assumptions. There is no conclusive evidence for their establishment, while on the contrary there is a great deal of material that definitely conflicts with these positions. His own point of view in the entire admirable and scholarly volume is summed up as follows: "that the Lord gave authority to His Church and a commission of ministry to His Apostles; that in the exercise of that ministry the Apostles, acting as representatives of the Church, appointed persons for office by laying on of hands; that starting from this Apostolic custom the Church gradually built up its organization and its rule of Orders; that we find this established, though not as accepted in any rigid sense in the third century; and that there is still evidence that variation of custom prevailed." He adds that this was not misfortune, but that it gave the Church strength during the time of strain, and that it worked for the unity of the Church. (I wonder if the unity did not work for the order, instead of the reverse?) He further declares that the Anglican is not

justified in declaring other ministries invalid, and that no testimony of Christ or the New Testament makes such an assertion legitimate. But he concludes with the hope that the Church of the future, if it is to be united, must unite upon the basis of episcopal rule and ordination carefully carried out!! He agrees very heartily with Bishop Gore on the essentiality of the episcopal government as the only one to unite Christendom, but his only difference from Gore is that episcopacy must not, like Dr. Gore does, be argued as a theory which is unspiritual and mechanical.

There never has been a dispute as to the nature of the "Church triumphant." It is rather over the visible Church that the controversies have raged. There are four important theories as to the rise of the Church and its form of government. The first is that no form of government was instituted by the Founder of the Church and His apostles, that there was originally no distinction between the clergy and the laity, and that the officers were appointed as need for order appeared. The second view is that a government was originated which could claim to be a "jus divinum" and that it resides in the presbyteriate. The third view is like the second, but it assigns the governing position to a superior Order, that of bishops, and makes the succession pass through them. Then there is the fourth theory, that the entire episcopate is subject to the bishop of Rome who has received his commission direct from Christ. All authority rests in him ultimately.

When these theories are simmered down they represent but two chief positions. On the one hand we have the Sacramental view of the Church as a Divine Institution, while on the other we have the functional view, which views the Church as an institution which grew up as a matter of expediency.

Since the Christian religion could not live in a disembodied state, as Professor Nagler says, it was forced to take to itself a body and thereby perpetuate itself to posterity.

These two main theories represented by the Anglicans on the one hand and Harnack, and others, on the other hand, are certainly not to be accepted in toto. That the minutest details of Church organization were formulated by the Apostles under a special guidance from their Lord, that a definite doctrine of Orders and a definite idea of the Church was expressed, is certainly to be rejected. That the whole future organization was prescribed in detail by the Apostles is certainly a strain of Christian intelligence!

On the other hand Harnack, Schmiedel, and others, cannot be taken too seriously when they maintain that the Catholic Church of the third and fourth centuries was not a development, but entirely a perversion of primitive Christianity. They advocate a discarding of the whole development. Similarly others have claimed that the Church was a development receiving its primary influence from the pagan world. Undoubtedly, influences were bound to flow over from the Gentile world into the Christian Church. There is too much in later Catholicism that has no direct outgrowth from the Christian religion to deny that. But that is not the whole story.

When we inquire into the nature of the Church and its development in early Christian history we are lead to make some radical alterations in our whole conception of the nature of the Church. What is more, we need to inquire into the nature of the Church if we would contribute anything constructive to the problem of Christian Reunion. Mere sentimentality and rhetoric will not unite the Churches, it may cause more divisions than what we already have. We

cannot have Church Unity until men come to a satisfactory intelligent agreement as to the nature of the Christian Society. Is it a Divine Institution with Orders and prescribed government issuing directly from Christ Himself? Or is it a functional institution, which alters itself in varying circumstances? Is it a fellowship, which is not dependent for its authority upon the exactness of its ecclesiastical principles?

Let us inquire into what Jesus thought of the Church. And then let us turn to Justin and see if in him we might find some clue to the development of the Church in the middle of the second century. Of course we must remember that Justin is not primarily an ecclesiastic, he is more of a philosopher. But that should make his witness to the Christianity of his day more valuable. It is the specialist who puts us under the false impression..

Within a few years after the death of Jesus we find a society in existence which called itself by His name and had for its aim the dissemination of the Gospel to the entire world. From the very beginning it was a peculiar group, differing from any other in the world. It made such startling claims as to bring forth from pagan critics the hollow laughter of contempt. Say what we will, the living message of Jesus came to be identified with this visible society of his people.

The origins of the Church are so vague and scanty that we have no right to dogmatize. We know that it came into existence silently and almost unconsciously. It arose out of a mysterious spring fed by silent and mysterious forces. On the face of the facts about Jesus' relation to the Church, we cannot maintain that He founded

a formal organization. His interest was not in institutions, but in men. Whether he had anything to do with ritual or forms, seems to be negated by his discarding of the simple rite of baptism. What is more we find the disciples going out into the world without any prescribed government or principles of any sort. They had no definite guidance. The first forms of government were primarily experimental.

But if Jesus did not initiate a Church in the modern institutional sense, He did gather to Himself a brotherhood of men. It grew and added to itself men and women. These followers of His revered Him and believed in His cause. This company, brotherhood, fellowship,-- formed the nucleus of the primitive Church. This ecstatic group needed a society to preserve what it had. Time and again we notice in the history of the Christian Church where groups have broken off from the organized Church with the hope of escaping organization of any sort, but they have been forced to organize to preserve their very radicality. This early Christian group was a social group as well as a religious. The critics after Harnack's fashion do an injustice to the whole question of the rise of the Church by saying that the Church was foreign to the mind of Jesus. Certainly He did not consciously plan a Church, but it was the inevitable outcome of His movement and His work and His group of disciples.

As remarked above, the Church was a unique society. It possessed a peculiar character from the start. It was a religious society and brotherhood, professing loyalty to the state and yet remaining wholly aloof from it. It had an existence on earth but its real character made it

" a colony of heaven." An early piece of literature describes the character of the Church group very clearly:

"Christians are not distinguished from the rest of mankind either in locality or in speech or in customs... They dwell not in cities of their own, nor practice an extraordinary kind of life." It continues by saying that the Christians live with other folks but that they are sojourners. They bear their share of hardships as though they were strangers. Every country is a fatherland to them and ever fatherland is a foreign country to them. "They are in the flesh but they live not after it. They exist on earth, but their citizenship is in heaven."

The early Christians really perpetuated their apostleship by living under the invisible leadership and guidance of their Lord. Besides they came to think of themselves as an "ecclesia." They claimed to be the "Remnant" of the true Israel. They were the "people of God," the "Israel of God," " the twelve tribes of the Dispersion." They looked upon themselves as a favored nation, and entrance into it was by the rite of baptism and the observance of the Lord's Supper as a sustainer of the spiritual life. They came to think of the Church as an inevitable group to be identified with if one would be in touch with Christ. To be cast out of the Church was to be severed from Christ and certain damnation. They undoubtedly received from Jesus this thought that men were bound together and that the individual can realize his best development only in relation with his fellowmen. Not only that, but there was a living hope in the early group in that they waited for the coming of the Lord. We have no conception of the enthusiasm which filled the early Church. It is simply impossible to hold with Loisy and other high

Churchman that Peter and the apostles met together and deciding to form a society proceeded to draw up a constitution. "The church was created by a burning enthusiasm." 1

Now all of this is not a departure from the teachings of Christ. It is rather an assertion of the central ideas of Christ.

The apologists for Church government of one sort or another are beside the point when they wish from proof-texts to extract their polity out of the New Testament experience of the Church. They (early Christians) professed no government at all. They were an ecstatic group, who thought that organization was one thing to be avoided. Carnal institutions needed to maintain themselves by a fixed rule, but the Church was not an INSTITUTION in this age. It was a heavenly sacramental group and as such was under the direct guidance of the Spirit of God in Christ. This doctrine of the Spirit and its continuance in the process of revelation lead to some extravagance that had to be later checked. The checking of some of these free movements based upon the liberty of the Spirit caused many a protest in the later Church, as we notice especially in the case of the Montanists.

One thing is certain above all, that the early Christian group looked upon themselves as a supernatural and divine society. This conception was not a later development under the influence of a mystical theology. Indeed under no considerations could such an idea of charismatic society have arisen but during the early days of the Church.

So in a way, Jesus is the Founder of the Church that goes by His name. He did not foresee its full coming. But under the distinctive and unique influence of the Spirit,

the Church arose spontaneously and inevitably. Jesus made the Kingdom a reality, He inspired His followers to a new life and a new sense of power, and to make it effectual they formed into a society, differing in character from all others.

Some say that the Christian movement did not originate the Church but that they found it already there. The term and meaning of "ecclesia" was in existence, they argue. But then who would even have expected a movement similar to the Church on the first century to have issues from any possible mode of Jewish nationalism. The Christian Church began in a new and original spiritual impulse. This is the creative and original achievement of Jesus in any case.

Now, as we turn from this first century or New Testament idea of the nature of the Church to Justin, we find many points in common and some that differ. For one thing, we find no exclusive doctrine of the Church as a legal institution, nor of an institution which we find in Cyprian or Jerome. (We must judge Cyprian in the light of his colossal attempt to save the Church. The Apologist in any case must be judged by anything but his specialty!) On the other hand, Justin's idea of the Church was no mere school of philosophy. Nor does it take on the idea of a mechanical group organized after a constitution. Justin has a charismatic idea of the Church. The Church is a divine society of the "illuminated." It is unique. The people in it are supernatural people who possess distinctive moral and spiritual qualities. They represented a group of people whose moral conduct was above reproach. They worshipped a distinctly unique God and Christ. They are a heavenly colony who have no desire to usurp any of Caesar's prerogatives. They are

the true Israel. They possess the true righteousness.

In the First Apology, Justin gives an account of the worship of the Church in his time, which according to Huestis, must have been a service of at least two hours. He writes, "On Sunday all who live in the country or in the cities gather together to one place, and the "memoirs" of the Apostles or the books of the prophets are read, as long as time permits. Then when the reader has ended, the president in a discourse instructs, and exhorts to the imitation of these glorious virtues. Then we all rise together and send upwards our prayers. And when we have ceased from prayer, bread and wine and water are brought, and the president offers prayers and thanksgiving according to his ability. The congregation assent, saying Amen; and there is a distribution to each one present of the consecrated things, and to those who are absent a portion is sent by the deacons. And they that are well to do and willing give what each thinks fit, and the collected gifts are deposited with the president, who succors with them the widows and orphans, and those who through sickness or any other cause are in want, and those who are in bonds, and the strangers sojourning among us, in short, all who are in need."

In this account there is nothing to hint that the "president" was an ecclesiastical officer. The whole description seems to show a spiritual democracy. There is nothing to hint that the validity of the ordinance of the Lord's Supper was dependent upon "orders." What one notices about this description is the remarkable unity of the group. There were no inactive members! All partook of

the Supper, and those absent had the elements brought to them. That they thought of themselves as a charismatic group we cannot doubt. This was the unifying element. There was no mechanical unity of a Catholic System. It was a fellowship cemented together by the Spirit. It certainly was no aggregation of members governed by a constitution. The Church was both a Divine Idea and a fellowship of souls.

In another passage Justin adds a bit to this description. He referred to the bread as something that has been blessed. This food is called, he says, "the Eucharist of which no one may partake unless he believes that which we teach as Christ commanded. For we receive not these elements as common bread or common drink. For even as Jesus Christ our Savior... had both flesh and blood for our salvation, even so we are taught that the food which is blessed, by the digestion of which our blood and flesh are nourished, is the flesh and blood of that Jesus who was made flesh. For the apostles in the memoirs composed by them, which are called Gospels, have related that Jesus thus commanded them, that having bread and giving thanks, He said, 'Do this in remembrance of me, this is my body'; and that in like manner, having taken the cup and given thanks, He said, (This is my blood';, and that He distributed them to these alone." At least the Agape which in apostolic times had been connected with the Lord's supper was in Justin's day dissociated from it. The Agape was celebrated later, in various sections of the Church, but the absence of it in that part of the Church with which Justin was familiar proves that its severance from the Lord's Supper varied in different Churches.

In close connection with the Lord's Supper we find the offering of gifts. This giving of gifts was beautifully conceived as an act of worship. The offering was meant to help the needy orphans, widows, the sick, and the sojourners. They were deposited with the President. But there seems to be no sign of any ecclesiastical organization. The Church is a mutual fellowship. Christians symbolized by this observance the giving of themselves to God who had redeemed them.

Justin, in this respect, refers to the whole service as a PROSPHORA. It was a Christian offering as contrasted with Gentile sacrifices. This in later Christian history was to bear fruits that were quite out of harmony with the whole idea of the Lord's Supper. It came to be thought of as a PROSPHORA which Christian men offer as a sacrifice. The actual idea of a transaction repeatedly offered to God in the form of the Lord's Supper, or Eucharist, had not yet taken place, but the tools were already there out of which it might be made. The Greek idea of conceiving the new life metaphysically in terms of essence, gave an impetus toward the Sacramental use of the Lord's Supper. But this eucharistic "prospora" is found only in Justin. But to return to the gifts, we notice that the charity of the early Church was everywhere one of its distinctive features. "Working with their hands they helped their brethren with the products of their labor." 1 This charity was something wholly foreign to the pagan, for paganism was essentially egotistic. The "new commandment" of Christ was something new. "Such as are prosperous and willing," says Justin, "give what they will, each according to his choice." All

1. Uhlhorn, Conflicts, Page 191.

giving was voluntary. Nothing was received from persons who did not in spirit belong to the Church and nothing was forced. The offerings were considered a part of the Sacramental service. The elements were considered symbols of those victuals which sustained life in the physical sense. There was a close connection in Justin's thought between creation and the bread and wine.

Dr. Lowrie says that it was the distinction of the Catholic Church as compared with the most dangerous heresies which threatened the faith, that it knew how to value justly both the material creation and the spiritual re-creation. These two were early combined in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. Justin implies that Christians praised with prayer and thanksgiving everything that they receive, having been taught that the only honorable way to render honor to God is not to consume anything He has made for man's nourishment, but to use them for themselves and the needy, and at the same time to thank God for the creation and the preservation of the world and for its new creation in incorruptibility through the faith that is in Christ.

In short, the oblations of bread and wine were looked upon as samples of the created universe and symbols of the universal grace and goodness of God. So we see that the Lord's Supper had a double meaning. 1 The memorial of His passion was coupled with a thanksgiving to God for the fact that He had created the world and all in it for man's sake. Of course this was practiced in the early Church where all took bread, their common necessities, their regular meals, with thanksgiving. This is the real spiritual content of this

1. Cf. Apol. I, 13.
2. Dial. 41.

observance and idea of the Lord's Supper. The early Church spiritualized everything. They linked all the events of life up with their new experience of Communion with God in Christ. They even looked upon money and its offering as a spiritual act of communion; it was a charismatic sacramental view of life as a continual offering. This is what caused Justin to speak of the Christian fellowship as composed of people of a "high priestly race" 1 who offer true sacrifices. He goes on to identify these sacrifices as the Christian prayers and thanksgivings, and the Christian commemoration "in food dry and moist, in which the suffering of the Lord is remembered."

There was a lively sense of union in Christ, which was especially brought home in the observance of the Eucharist and the sacramental use of the "Memoirs" and the prophets.

Now there is no suggestion of transubstantiation in all Justin's description of the Eucharist. One could strain the words to get this viewpoint, I suppose. Justin does say that our flesh and blood are nourished by assimilating the bread and wine,-- and the meaning is probably to a future life of incorruption. This "food" is received as the flesh and blood of Christ. The Divine Logos is mysteriously in the Bread and Wine, as in the Incarnate Christ. But 2 we rather find in it a very vital, spiritual and sacramental use of the elements. There is no reference to a literal changing of the elements by words magically used by a special priestly class of clerics. Justin has coupled with the Lord's Supper a deeper meaning that includes the whole essence of the Gospel. The reference ^{to the} Supper shows a spiritual

1. Dial. 116, 117.

2. Cf. Hagenbach, Vol. I, Pages 204, 206; also Angus, Quests, Page 188, etc.

sense of the Lord's Supper. In this he is perfectly right. Those considering Church Union should understand the charismatic nature of the Christian fellowship not as one proceeding from "orders" and ritual, but from the nature of the Spirit-filled group. The Lord's Supper then becomes more than a mere observance, it is a sacramental symbol of the whole essence of the Christian religion.

Baptism was an essential sacrament in Justin's day. Whether infant baptism was practiced in the early Church is not held by an increasing number of scholars. To this Justin has a word of interest:- " We who through Christ have access to God, have not received that circumcision which is in the flesh, but that spiritual circumcision which Enoch, and others like him, observed. And this, because we have been sinners, we do through the mercy of God, by baptism." Justin here speaks of baptism as supplying the place of circumcision. Killen 1 infers that Justin " would scarcely have represented this initiatory rite as supplying so efficiently the Jewish rite of circumcision, had it not been of equally extensive Application." But, on the other hand, this statement is negatived by the statement in the First Apology (65) where baptism presupposes some instruction and was preceded by fasting and preparation. The initiate who has been baptized is an "illuminated" one, and in the order of ceremonies he then is fit to partake of the sacrament. He is called illuminated because his understandings have been illumined. There takes place a remission of sins formerly committed, which shows that Justin's idea of sin was not organic, but rather actual.

1. The Ancient Church, Page 431.

As referred to above, the simple rite of baptism was in Justin's time preceded by fasting and a certain time of probation and instruction. "As many as are persuaded" he says, "and believe these things which we teach and declare are true, and promise that they are determined to live accordingly are taught to pray and beseech God with fasting to grant the remission of sins while we also pray and fast with them." The initiates were all in this case adults. The remission of sins does not come with the baptismal act, it is independent of it. At least it had no inherent efficacy. It marked a new departure in the initiates life under Christian influences and with the inspiration of Christian purposes and aims. And the one who conducts the initiate to the laver is not spoken of as a director of a formula: - Justin says, "we lead him to the laver." It signified a rather democratic group, even if the "we" refers to one delegated by the group. Unless Justin speaks as one of the ordained class, "we" refers to no priestly class which makes the baptismal formal efficacious. There is nothing to show that Justin was ordained. Baptism clears the way to a hopeful endeavor to voluntary efforts to obtain the rewards of heaven through a life of obedience.

Then again, in spite of the unsacramentarian conception of baptism outlined above, we do find a little note of it in the way Justin describes baptism. Justin makes very clear that there is no way to forgiveness except by coming to know the Christ, and by taking the "bath for remission of sins." At least the rite is made essential to the initiation into the brotherhood. As to the meaning of the term "remission of sins," we have already discussed that. There is a beginning of that theologizing whereby one must

conform to an ancient ritual. It is not pronounced in Justin as it is in later writers. But the beginning is there.

So the Church of Justin's time was a brotherhood cemented together in a unique fashion by the Spirit. Another very important element in the unity of the Church of his day was its ethical and moral conviction. In a later chapter we shall see that one of the strong factors in the early Church was its chiliasm. This hope for a better world to be ushered in catastrophically made them cold and indifferent to the world about them. Not that they did not contribute to civil life that was not against their principles of justice, but their real citizenship was in heaven. In short, they represented a united front against the world and all that it stood for. If we cannot agree with the chiliastic inspiration of their strong morality, we certainly agree with their ethical unity.

One reason why the Church was proscribed by law in the empire was because of the secrecy of its meetings. This was not done with any intention to keep secret any of its practices, but more to protect themselves from being apprehended and misunderstood. This absence of esotericism is one of the strong points for the originality of the Christian message and its expansion apart from the mystery cults. Christianity began as a religion possessing a mystery which had been made manifest. It was once a mystery, but now, as Chrysostom said, it is revealed to all, or revealed as far as possible. Justin speaks with the boldest frankness about the Christian doctrines and sacraments. Hatch 1 reminds us that this frank and welcome description of the Christian Eucharist would not have been penned by an apologist of the succeeding century, for

by that time the existence of an exoteric and esoteric type of Christianity was beginning to be recognized.

In harmony with this same thought, we might refer to the question of the Mystery cults and their relation to the Christianity of Justin's day. He makes one very bold statement which offsets any possible influence of the Mysteries upon the Church. In the First Apology (66) he writes that the wicked demons have imitated in the mysteries of Mithras some of the things done in the Churches' observance of the Lord's Supper. At least the Mithra worship was nothing but a devilish imitation of the Christian rite. What in Paul's day would have gone unnoticed, in Justin's day was charged with plagiarism.

A great deal has been written of late as to the possibility of the influence of the Mystery cults upon the Christian religion. Bousset and Loisy and others have thought of the Church as a mystery brotherhood bound together by their worship of a divinity-teacher Jesus. Now it is highly probable that many influences did enter the Christian religion from the cults. But their influence has certainly been exaggerated. With the actual formation of the Christian society they had actually little to do. The idea of fellowship played very little part in the cults. The one chief object of search was individual salvation by some magic formula. But in the Church the element of brotherhood was essential. Besides the cults were drawn together for purposes of worship only. The Christian groups did not make any distinction between social and religious fellowship. The word "communion" as we have seen was a vital one. These cults did contribute a little to the

sacramental side of Christianity, but that the Church took over the ritual, etc., of the cults, is another one of those strains on common sense!

It has been asserted by some that the Church really originated as a model of one of the pagan guilds. Undoubtedly there is truth to this position. Much of the charity of the Church, its finances, its expansion, as Harnack has shown, all received some impetus from these sources. But all the Church did was to take these things and adapt them to the spirit of charity which they had learned from their Lord. All of these attempts to trace the origin of the Church exclusively to one of these pagan influences is bound to be untrue to some very important facts. But the Church proper had its origin and sustaining power from the impulse of a new religion centering in Christ. The Church became but an enlargement of Christ, an endeavor to realize His purpose. This is still its vital function. It is the outpost of that Kingdom announced by Jesus.

This idea has defined itself under varying forms, it has borrowed from historical conditions, but in its essence it springs out of the essence of the Christian Gospel. It has through its priestcraft, its ignorance, its foolishness weakened and sometimes half-destroyed the Gospel. But it has not been the obscurer and perverter of the Gospel to such an extent that its essence has been lost. The Church, like an organized mental definition, has been a necessity. It has involved in its very organization a loss of freedom, it has worked to make religion external, it has made the Gospel statutory rather than vital. But on the other hand, it has given actuality to Christ. Without the Church the Christian religion

would long ago have dissolved itself into a vague humanitarianism, such as we find in some of the small groups which have broken away from Christianity. It has also watched over and preserved those elements which are central to the Christian religion. The Christian society, in the end, has saved the religion. Then, again, the Church has, through its general mind of laymen rather than the theologians, kept the Christian religion down to the earth, it has kept its interpretations closer to human experience. It has provided a cosmopolitan reservoir through the centuries into which many streams have flowed to enrich the Church. It has maintained a true catholicity and has thus treasured up within it the best things of two thousand years.

Today, as never before, the urge to unify Christendom is very pronounced. What stands in the road, to a great many, is the organized Church. But as we have already indicated, the Christian religion simply cannot live in a disembodied state. It must have a society to perpetuate the Christian message. "Had Christianity not organized as a Church it would not have had the power either of survival or expansion."¹ The Christian enterprise could never have become the power in the world that it is if it had remained an unregulated enthusiasm. So the solution to the problem of a disunited Christendom is not the abrogation of organized Christianity in every form. We must secure a higher unity in variety or the unity that will result will only result in schism.

Nor will this unity come by means of referring to a 'once for all delivered' type of New Testament polity on which all denominations can agree. Bishop Gore has gone far beyond the evidence when he would find a particular theory

1. Headlam, Ibid, Page 43.

of the ministry in the New Testament Church and expect everyone to agree on "orders " and the "episcopacy," as "jus divinum" polity. There was inherent in Christ's message and work a future society, but there were no specific instructions given that society whereby it might meet the future crisis. At each stage of Christianity's development we find crises arising, whether against the Hellenists, the Samaritans, the Montanists, etc., and the Church had nothing but its total spirit with which to meet these crises. Its growth in organization was partly functional, and yet its fellowship had at its heart a unique divine dynamic of catholicity.

Nor will this real spiritual unity of Christendom be reproduced by the rigidity of dogmatic definitions. We must remember that there is more than one type of theology in the New Testament. Applying this to Justin's age we see that the same cosmopolitanism holds true. Had Justin lived in the fourth century he might have been branded a heretic, but not in his own day. Professor W. Hermann says, " The Holy Spirit works synthetically, not analytically, and the composition of the New Testament clearly shows this. If Christians seek unity by means of unalterable doctrine then they must give up the New Testament. For in the New Testament there is no unalterable doctrine which embraces the whole scheme of Christian thought.... It is no imperfection, it is rather an excellence, and thoroughly as it should be, that the Epistles of the New Testament are messages of definite circumstances, and not contributions to a doctrinal system which shall be valid for all eternity." Dr. T. R. Glover writes a similar statement when he writes, "Two things stand out when we study the Character of early Christianity-- its great complexity

and variety, and its unity in the personality of Jesus of Nazareth." This idea of unity has been the cause of much disunion. The confessions of faith written by groups with an insatiable tendency to define, fills huge volumes. The unity of the primitive Church, and in Justin's day, was not a coerced union, but a voluntary unity.

Nor will a real synthetic spiritual unity come about through an insistence on a uniformity of temper. There must always be room for temperamental difference of approach to God in Christ. In the early Church, John the mystic, Paul the theologian and missionary, and James the moralist could find room. Simon the Zealot, Matthew the publican, and others are numbered with the faithful.

And no unity can be called Christian that will use unspiritual means to maintain unity or propagate its truth. The Middle Ages maintained a fairly strong external unity, but how? Mostly by a strong temporal power. But the movements that it suppressed when once released from the pressure of State burst forth all the stronger because of the violence with which they had been suppressed. But this external organic unity of powerful coercion was not the kind of unity the early Church possessed and which we find so beautifully described in Justin.

No theory of the Church that makes it a secular society can bring about a real union either. The older theocratic notions of the Church as a militant city of God on earth can no longer maintain in modern society.

Nor is it strictly in harmony with the mind of Christ. One is amazed at the varieties of beliefs fostered and practices allowed in the theology of the Fathers. And yet in spite of it all there was a unity that loyalty to Christ

created. There existed a unity of life and Spirit. At least the fundamental character of the Church was not lost sight of -- it was a fellowship of those who had experienced the redemption of Christ and now lived together in the unity of the Spirit. They possessed a conception of the unity of the universal Church of Christ. Their local organizations never took the primary place in their thinking, they always thought they were a part of the body of Christ, the holy people, the paschal loaf, the true Israel.

So we see that it is not primarily dogma, nor organization, nor coercion, nor orders, nor episcopacy, nor sacraments, nor temper, nor any such thing that can reinstate the unity of the early Church. The only thing that can do that is the reality of our common Christianity. The realization that the Church is not primarily an institution or an end in itself as the Catholic idea makes it, should help us in solving the problem. On the other hand the realization that the Church is more than a mere organization of expediency will cause us to see in it a unique and charismatic society. It is a divine society, although it is not to be identified with the Kingdom of God. The Church is Catholic and the Roman Church has no monopoly on that term. If we would restore what at first was essentially and really Catholic we would be able to restore the complete early tradition of the Church. The fullest and the richest religious life demands both a firm and simple faith and the widest intellectual freedom. It is not the skepticism of the modernist nor the rigidity of the traditionalist that presents Christianity in its most complete form, but the ongoing fellowship of those who have an experience of the redemption of Christ, and who possess a mind that is responsive to everything of

value in the Christian tradition or what the human intellect inspired by that experience and God's Spirit may be able to discern. The Church is primarily a spiritual society. The idea of bringing about a unity by having all the Churches join in one great denomination is certainly not the kind of unity that would correspond with the unity of the Church in early Christianity. History should teach us that organic unity may not result in real unity at all! The early Church never knew of "a" Church, it only knew THE Church. This larger viewpoint is one of the contemporary needs of our age in its attempt to realize union.

The agitation for the unity of Christendom proceeds from many causes. 1 Some of the reasons for the desire of unity are the many evils of a divided Church. The business world, members of which are in the Churches, agitates for union because of the financial waste and poor administrative policies of divided Churches. The problem of underchurched and overchurched districts too has its point. The duplication of organization efforts and educational investments is also cited as a "scandal of Christianity" as it now is. The country Church problem could be better solved as a united Church. The foreign missionary efforts could be better handled by a smaller force of more efficient men, it is claimed. Divided Churches break up the national unity and social unity of otherwise homogeneous peoples. The terrible competition engaged in by the rival denominations, in spite of the comity that is professed, is a sore spot in divided Christendom, and is an emasculation of the ethical and moral potency of the Christian religion. And then a divided Christendom impoverishes the groups themselves. Each denomination develops a peculiar

1. F.D. Kershner, How to Promote Christian Unity, etc. Ainalae, The Scandal of Christianity, etc.

slant of the Christian religion at the expense of others which other types express. The true cosmopolitanism and universalism of the Christian religion is lost. But worst of all, how can Christianity as a unit confront an un-Christian world with a group of Church denominations that are denying by their very existence, the unity of their faith.

Professor Neibuhr¹ in arguing for the unity of the Church on ethical grounds has many things of interest to say. He finds in the whole history of the Church the proneness to compromise, which he says is an evil nevertheless, even if it furthers the good. He calls denominationalism an unacknowledged hypocrisy. It is a compromise between God and the world. It is nothing but a carrying over into the Christian fellowship of the prides and prejudices of the world. It is this compromising spirit which makes the Church as a whole so impotent in the world today. It practices what the ethics of its Founder would never permit. The accord of Pentecost has resolved itself into a babel of confused sounds; while devout men and women continue to confess devoutly, Sunday by Sunday, "I believe in one, holy, catholic Church." Denominationalism in every case brings about disharmony because it always tends to centrality of control and this in turn causes the rise of dissenting sects who champion anew the uncompromising ethics of Jesus. The evil of denominationalism lies in the very fact that the rise of sects is inevitable. The Church then is a failure since it fails to transcend the social organizations, loyalties, customs, and standards. Schism defeats the ethics of Christian brotherhood. He closes the chapter by stating, "denominationalism

1. See his first and last Chapter in "The Social Sources of Denominationalism."

thus represents the moral failure of Christianity. And unless the ethics of brotherhood can gain victory over this dividiveness within the body of Christ, it is useless to expect it to be victorious in the world. But before the Church can hope to recognize and to acknowledge the secular character of its denominationalism. " This is true:- before union can come, there must be a recognition of the fact that denominations are devitalizing the vital ethics of the Christian brotherhood in the face of an unChristian world. The Church which began its career so unitedly has through its denominationalism, suffered a real defeat. It has surrendered its leadership to social and economic and national forces, and as such it offers very little hope for the ethical salvation of civilization. The Christian ideal of a universal brotherhood appeals to all men everywhere, whether of Oriental nationalism or Western socialism. It is the only safeguard and unifier of the total life of mankind. It is the only hope for this distracted world. But if the Christian brotherhood is to be of any value it must transcend the petty divisions of the world and not adjust itself to mere local interests and the needs of one particular class of men. No denominational Christianity, however broad its scope, can suffice for this colossal task. The Church that can take the field and lead the world must be one in which not national or local interests are suffered to infringe upon its international and human fellowship. This is the only type of communism that can combat the dictatorship of the proletariat as of capitalism. In reality, this universal Church has existed from the beginning, it is the Church of the Spirit. It is the increase of that fellowship today that is the hope of Christendom and of the world. It is THE CHURCH that can save the Churches from the

ruin of their secularism and consequent division. It is a challenge to the world to recall its better nature and find peace and unity in the knowledge of the divine love which is the only stable basis for any social life. It is not an easy road, but one of sacrifice,-- it must come through repentance. Christians must look upon their schisms with contrition and not with pride.

We can rejoice that many movements are on foot toward the consummation of the hope of Christian Reunion. More and more Christians are seeing that they do possess a unity of Christian scholarship, a unity of doctrinal essentials, devotional nature, and that they recognize the same qualities in Christian character. The union of the Old and New School Presbyterians, the recent union of Churches in Canada, Scotland, the perfecting of Lutheran international organization throughout the world, the union of South Africa, of the Methodists in England, in India, in China, all speak of a larger unity that is able to embrace within themselves divergent aspects of faith. Various other union projects are in the air. The Presbyterians through their moderator, Dr. McAfee has issued an ultimatum to Christendom of their desire to unite with any Christians. The Congregationalists, Baptists, all have projects in consideration. The Reformed Church in the U. S., in America, the United Brethren, and the Evangelical Synod, and many other denominations have some plan on foot towards the realization of Christian unity.

The Lambeth Conferences, the World Conference on Faith and Order, and Life and Work, the International Missionary Council, the International Society of Christian Endeavour, the Y. M. C. A., the Y. W. C. A., the International Methodist, Reformed and Presbyterian organizations, the Baptist, the

Lutheran, the Congregational, the Church Peace Union, the World Alliance for International Friendship through the Churches, the International Council of Religious Education, The World Student Federation, and especially the Federal Council of Churches, and the like, are all contributing to the realization of Church Union. They are all spinning over all the world an invisible web of spiritual fellowship, whose radiating threads, vibrating to the heartbeat of humanity must link together the diverse elements of race and nation.

To return to the real basis of unity, we again, reiterate, that it will not come through an 'other worldly' 'escape complex' as some theologians maintain. Neither will it result from dogmatic, ecclesiastical, sacramental, "orderly", episcopal, coercive means. Nor can it come by changing the Church into an ethical society or reform association. The supremacy and the necessity of the Church will never be denied. It will always be maintained that the Church is the Body of Christ and that it has a certain divine quality about it. But the confusion as to the nature of the Church and its function in the life of society must be cleared up. The Church is not a mistake. At its worst it is better than a Churchless Christianity. Whether this union can come by organic fusion or by federated effort, is hard to say. It seems as though the indirect method of federation will eventuate in the organic. Whether those who hold that the Church with all of its functions, is an end established by Christ, or those who hold that the Church is but a means to a direct approach to God for the individual, can agree, is yet to be seen. This remains one of the nubs in the Anglican efforts to regain unity. At least, history teaches us that the Church has had a double meaning. It has been a comradeship that

larges our sympathies and reinforces our power by uniting us with those who have followed Jesus before us, or who will follow after us. As a divine institution it has transmitted God's revelation from generation to generation, makes vivid the consciousness of God's presence by common worship, and interprets to individuals and to nations his purpose for mankind. " 1

The price of legal uniformity in a united Church would be too costly in the way of sacrificing conscientious convictions. Hence it is inadvisable. The only real unity must safeguard freedom of temper and worship, and so forth. The Church in Justin's day had unity in their common allegiance to the one Lord of the Church and their devotion to His cause. The way to organic unity for us lies along the same road. There must grow a deeper, broader, and a more catholic spirit in all the Churches. When this happens, as Dr. G. W. Richards, says, there will be a voluntary unity. In fact, the same fervid determination that divided the Church in the seventeenth century will offer the dynamic to unite. No Church today is large enough to hold all Christians. Not one of them is fitted to minister to every type of spiritual temperament and experience. Yet each has a peculiar contribution to make for the enrichment of Christianity. The coming Church must have doors that can open to east, west, north, and south. The world waits for such a Church. The supreme question of the hour is: will such a Church come into existence in time to save our civilization? Or is the human Church caught in our civilization?

A Study of Justin and his Church points the way.

The world were a Christianized society, the Christian group for the ethical purpose. It has been upon the world's social life. Although the Church has never professed to be solely a reform organization, or a pioneer of social work, yet it has been a real factor in the social progress of civilization. The whole ferment of social reform in the world is due to a large extent to the work of Christian missionaries, and these missionaries have not been conscious of their social power. The ethical ferment of the Christian religion, often vaguely perceived, is a certain social force. Christian religion has an ethics, although it is not primarily an ethical movement.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF JUSTIN
AS A WITNESS TO THE SOCIO-ETHICAL
NATURE OF THE CHRISTIAN SOCIETY
IN THE SECOND CENTURY

The Christian Church has been accused of being the decay of the ancient world because it was set in a self-centered institution with little regard to the salvation of the social order. As remarked above,

CHAPTER XI

there is no indication that the early Christians saw themselves as a reform organization ordained for the salvation of the social order. The first, existing movement named after the greatest ethical teacher of the world, passed upon into a cult that yielded little for the improvement of the cultural life of society. Theistic movements found the kingdom of God on earth, and gave the Christian group an "other-world" interest. They remained aloof from the currents of the general life of the Empire, and in spite of these things the writings of the early Christians are rightly thought of as being contemporary heathen. And the influence of their thought continued to be felt outside of the circle of believers.

That is why the late statement: "There can be little

The world owes a tremendous debt to the Christian group for the ethical impress it has made upon the world's social life. Although the Church has never professed to be solely a reform organization, or a placarder of social evils, yet it has been a real factor in the social affairs of civilization. The whole ferment of social upheaval in China is due to a large extent to the work of Christian missionaries. And these missionaries have not been conscious at all of their social power! The ethical ferment of the Christian religion, often meagerly preached, is a certain concomitant. The Christian religion has an ethic, although it is not primarily an ethical movement.

The Christian Church has been accused of accelerating the decay of the ancient world because it developed an interest in a self-centered institution with little or no regard to the salvation of the social order. As remarked above, there is no indication that the early Christians ever thought of themselves as a reform organization ordained for the salvation of the social order. The free, ecstatic movement named after the greatest ethical teacher of the world narrowed soon into a cult that cared little for the advancement of the cultural life of mankind. Chilastic conceptions placed the kingdom of God into the future, and gave the Christian group an 'other-worldly' interest. They remained quite aloof to the currents of the general life of the Empire, but in spite of these things the conduct of the early Christians was highly thought of by many contemporary heathen. And the influence of their conduct continued to be felt outside of the circle of believers.

Lecky makes this fine statement: "There can be little

doubt that for nearly 200 years after its establishment the Christian community exhibited a moral purity which, if it has been equaled, has never for any long period been surpassed." And Lecky has never expressed any bias in favor of the Christian movement.

There was a distinct difference in character in the Christian when compared with the non-Christian. The consciousness of a complete change in character in life, and character is nowhere more beautifully described than in the noble epistle of an unknown author to Diognetus, referred to once before in this treatise. As there described, Christians are like other men in some respects, but in others they are distinctly different. They are not peculiar people either, but they live as though this life was a sojourner's life; they endure all hardships as but little things in comparison with their future life. They marry, have children, but they do not expose their children as the heartless pagans. They have common tables. They are citizens of heaven. They live not after the flesh, they obey the laws of the Empire, yes, they do more than the law expects of them. They love all, though they are persecuted by all. They are put to death, yet they live. They are poor, yet they make many rich; they live in want but they abound in all, they are reviled yet they bless. The heathen noticed that the Christians despised death and were oblivious to carnal pleasures. And all of this moral and ethical earnestness came forth at a time when Christianity offered its initiates no power, no fame, no honor, no wealth, but rather reproach, derision, and constant peril! There were no Christians who merely professed a nominal adherence to the faith, they did so upon personal conviction. Even if we make some allowance

for the lure of martyrdom in that age of 'suicide-complex,' we must admit that there must have been a powerful motive behind the Christianity of that age, apart from mere fanaticism and headless adventure. To the Christian of that age the decision for Christ was a turning point, often away from home and relatives and friends and employment.

A calm and sacred earnestness pervaded the entire life of the Christian community. Their life was like a military service with Christ as their captain. Of course they expected Him to return with power at any moment. But, as they waited, they served under the standard of the cross which proved to be the sustaining symbol of their sacrificial service. In fact, as we noted before, they did not consider themselves true followers of the cross-bearing Christ unless they suffered. As such they often courted persecution and death.

Their whole lives were lived in this morally earnest atmosphere. Not only at home, but on the streets, and in their vocations, they lived the life that became Christ's follower. How difficult this was, when everywhere they met the symbols of heathenism, is hard to appreciate. In the vocations and guilds with their religious rites, political life, social life, in fact every phase of secular life, they came face to face with practices and customs against which they revolted. What an array of practical problems this raised for the Christian wife living with a pagan husband, a Christian slave laboring in a pagan master's home, a soldier in the ranks of the deified Emperor, a worker in one of the skilled professions?

Then we must remember that the Church guarded strictly the morals of the members. Those who were guilty of gross sins were removed from the membership, and that was a practical anathematization to the one so disciplined. It was only after long probation that one so disciplined could be reinstated, and then, in Justin's day, but once.

The age in which Justin lived was not necessarily dissolute. There were many shining examples of honesty and integrity among the heathen. But it was the exception. True, the Empire had grown more humane in its attitude towards slavery and women, but this humaneness was more of a spirit of tolerant pity than it was an active good-will. The ethics of Stoicism, the most advanced type of morality in the Empire, was noble, but it was legalistic and cold. It was an ethic of the earth,-- earthly. The difficulty with a legalistic ethic, as Paul saw years before, was that it could not get itself done! 1 It was weak and lacked a theistic basis to make it vital.

On the other hand we find the Christian ethic was not one of a set code, but a principle of love. It had tremendous dynamic, which rested upon a theistic basis of an objective God. Whereas the Stoic was interested in ethics as the prime requisite of the religious life, the Christian never thought of ethics as such, to him it was an outgrowth of his religious life. Ethics, to the Christian, was a bi-product, and never a generator of religion.

That is the reason why these early Christians made such a tremendous impression upon the family life, sex-life, and every other phase of social life in the days of Justin.

1. Griffith, St. Paul's Life of Christ.

They put a new value on labor, they revolted against the customs practiced in the slavery institution, they put a new meaning into the art of charity; they evaluated the life of childhood; they cared for the widows and orphans; they had a definite attitude on war and militarism; they challenged the prevalent standards which made satiety and self indulgence and obscenity and callousness and apathy and licentiousness ordinary things; they met cruelty with love; they met the general weariness of the age with a happy hope that was rooted in purposeful living.

As we turn to Justin's writings we can find in him a witness to the socio-ethical character of early Christianity. After we have examined some of his statements as to how Christians lived in the middle of the second century, we will turn to examine some of the motives that contributed to the production of their ethics. And we shall see whether these motives have any historical value in the determination of a socio-ethical policy for the Christianity of our own day.

Justin met the critics of the Christians by a plain reference to their purity of life. This has always been the chief defense of the Christians against the sneers of the world. "And when they saw the man made whole, they could say nothing," is the argument of silence that stills the enemies of the faith. It was so in Justin's day. Justin could challenge the pagan princes as did Tertullian after him, by pointing them to the innocency of the Christians and their law-abiding character. Christians were not atheists because they refused to participate in the worship of the Emperor; on the other hand, they were the real theists who worshipped the True God. They were children of the Truth, in whom dwelt the Logos. The influence of their professed faith, the purity

of their lives, their activity in works of love, their silent endurance in the way they met death, all attested to the good conduct of Christians. The First Apology opens with a sharp challenge to the Emperor to prove that the Christians were evil doers, or wicked men. Christians lived their lives in a state of responsibility to God, and God is best served by imitating His virtues, which are temperance, justice, philanthropy and the like. Christians are not covetous of imperial power, their Kingdom is not of this world. And since Christians live as under God's eye, they promote peace; and since they hold this general attitude of responsibility towards God, they cannot be wicked, covetous, conspirators. Each man goes to everlasting punishment or salvation according to the value of his actions. In the light of that fact, men should not engage in wickedness for a little time. It would be far better for the Empire to make this responsibility known to all men than to merely punish the offenders.

Concerning the attitude of the Christians in Justin's day towards home life, sex, the care of children, he has some interesting facts to offer.

Marriage, family life, the conservation of child-life, sex purity, were in a state of decay in the Empire during the second century. Lecky has described the sex life of the age in sombre pictures. To him there were "not many periods in which virtue was rarer than under the Caesars. Never was vice so extravagant. The existence of the female slave, the vileness of the stage performances, the physical exposures at the public baths, all had helped to produce the callousness of the age." It contributed to the ferocity of the sports offered. Undoubtedly the depravity of

the moral world had been accelerated by the wars of the Empire and the general worn-out condition of the civilization. In a world which connived against the integrity of the home what could be the result? Family cares were shunned, children were a hindrance, marriage was a burden, women were not given places on the social world commensurate with their importance. The State became the most important institution and all other fundamental institutions suffered as a result.

Into this social state, the Christians brought a high level of chastity and domestic fidelity. They were warned against lusts. Divorce, so common in the Empire, was not allowed, except in cases where it was next to impossible to live with a partner. The Second Apology opens with the narrative in which a woman after becoming a Christian found it unbearable to live with her dissolute husband. Her Christian friends disapproved of her desire for a letter of divorce, hoping that she might be able to reform him. But his escapade in Egypt proved so disgusting that she found it necessary to secure a divorce. Upon this her husband had her apprehended as a Christian, with the result that the husband had her teacher condemned. She nevertheless was dissuaded from securing a hasty divorce. Second marriages in those days were looked upon as adultery.

In the home life, sex purity was the Christian standard. Throughout the Roman world sexual irregularities were taken as a matter of course among the men. Here and there a moralist raised his voice, but he was drowned, as today, amid the thunder of the mob's ridiculing and hysterical laughter. The unnatural devices for the gratification of the sex appetite are too terrible to mention. Women were divided into two

classes, the wives and the courtesans, the former living in close seclusion and having no part in actual social and public life. Their duties were primarily domestic, they never appeared at the table with their families, they were sexually faithful, and were practically owned by their husbands. The courtesans participated in social life, they were feted and feasted by men, lived carefree lives, and in general enjoyed the hospitality of various men. Christians on the other hand were strictly monogamous. They took their stand against irregular sex relations. They had a single standard, for all were alike responsible before God. Absolute continence for the unmarried was the rule, as Justin states. Even in the family relation, continence was practiced, and the home was established for the rearing of children. "Whether we decline marriage, we live continently." Women enjoyed an exalted status, though not in all respects equal with men. One of the strong points of the Apologists in their vindication of the Christian religion before the pagan world, was the exalted position given to women by the Christians. What is more, abortion was not practiced. Infanticide, which had been provided as a principle in well governed state by both Plato and Aristotle, was decidedly discountenanced by the Christians. To Justin the exposing of children was murder, and the one who practiced it was guilty. Not only the boys, but the girls, who were often sold into slavery, or exposed, rescued and cared for by the practitioners of prostitution, were to be saved. The father's unlimited power over the children born into his home was checked by a higher Law. Children were looked upon as a gift of God. It was not long until they were baptized and thus partook of a share in the Christian

community. Undoubtedly this rigid schedule of ethics in relation to the family life, had a great deal to do in the development of the ascetic side of life which was developed to such extremes in later centuries. 1 Professor Nagler is quite right when he writes, "One of the brightest stars in the crown of Christian achievement nobly abetted by the highest Stoic teaching, was the increased consideration shown to helpless and persecuted childhood during the Roman period." 2 C. L. Brace adds that "Probably, of all practical changes which Christianity has encouraged or commenced in the history of the world, this respect for children is the most important as it affects the foundation of all society and government, and influences a far distant future." 3

The picture that Justin paints of the Christian fellowship was that of a self-contained, intimate solidary fellowship. Lecky says that there has probably never existed upon earth a community whose members were bound to one another by a deeper and purer affection than the Christians, in the day of persecution. This compact body of people had an esprit d'corps that ran counter to the life of pleasure of the world. The cruelty practiced in many of the sports where men and women fought each other to the death was in direct contradiction of the principles of the early Church. The gladiatorial contests were witnessed by great throngs, in which no horror was expressed when thousands of slaves were literally sacrificed in body and soul for temporary pleasure. Trajan had 10,000 victims sacrificed to the god of pleasure in a festival that lasted for 133 days. Women fought each other to the death.

1. Uhlhorn, Conflict, Page 177 & 266
2. The Church in History, 414.
3. Gesta Christi, Page 83.

Everywhere obscene literature was to be found. The immoral plays were the normal things. It was an age of insanity, epilepsy, of suicide. Apathy and satiety characterized the life of the wealthy, and misery and despair of the poor. Thrill after thrill had to be sought to ward off the unbearable weariness of life. Against this extreme worldliness the Christian threw the offensive of joyful, chaste, controlled, sane, prudent, frugal, purposeful living. Against this pleasure-loving world of existence the Christian threw the offensive of responsible living, sacrificial living, which knew no higher joy than the joy of doing God's will, even if it meant persecution, ridicule and death.

Christians, Justin said, were patient when injured, they were free from anger, and were ready to serve all. Labor which was held as a disgrace, was honored and exalted. The fruits of their labors they dedicated to God in their worship services. It must have made a difference to those Christians how they earned their daily bread!! No double standards of ethics here! Whether in daily life or on Sunday, they lived a consistent life that befitted a Christian. They did not waste any of their food, but rather looked upon it as a gift of God, as a sacrament. Their daily bread had a close connection with the Sacrament of the Bread and Wine.

Christians never swore. In the day of irreverence they possessed the virtue that has been called the cornerstone of real character. They maintained their integrity in the midst of a world that had lost its sense of personal worth. Their word too was good, they did not need to exaggerate their statements to make themselves truthful.

Further, they obeyed the civil ordinances, not in the spirit of the day, but with a positive will to better conditions. They prayed for their government. Because of their universal love for all men, they were often called unpatriotic, yet this is the best sort of patriotism. We must remember that the State had been deified, both as a last desperate attempt to save it and as a result of its mysteriously superhuman character. It was revered as a remnant of the "golden age" that was. As such the Christians objected to worship it or any custom or practice connected with it. They were in truth the real patriots, since they would preserve those qualities which were in harmony with god's will. True, their chiliastic conceptions made them disparage the secular life, because they believed this world would come to a speedy destruction, and the Kingdom of God would be inaugurated. But the Christians never refused to obey the empirical ordinances, when they did not interfere with their religious faith. But in such a world, with the ever-present and recurring festivals and local civic activities, so intimately bound up with the old theocratic emperor-- or State--, worship, they were bound to come into frequent and serious clashes.

Besides, in this age of suicide, Christians did not kill themselves. Justin says specifically that to do so is to commit murder. Now the true chiliast could be confronted with the accusation that Justin was confronted with, namely, "since you Christians are looking for a heavenly Kingdom which you will inherit for certain after death, why do you not commit suicide, and hasten the coming bliss?"

It is here that the true mission of the Christian is revealed. He is to be the Light-bringer to the world. To commit suicide

would deprive the world of his mission. The Christians' mission is to deliver the world from its unjust prejudices. Christians are Logoi in their own way. It is far better to depart and be with the Lord, but to Justin, the Christian is under constraint to remain in the world for the purpose of saving it. Hence, in this age of the suicide-complex, when the common practice was to commit suicide when life became unbearably weary and thrillless, the Christian lived on in the state of joy generated by a purposeful life of partnership with God in Christ. Christians had a real purpose in life. When annihilation of life seemed preferable to nausea and disgust, when happiness was looked upon everywhere as a centrifugal taking in, an absorption of all that life had to offer, we find Christians living centripetally, giving and sharing, and in that life receiving the benediction of a happy and joyous experience. It is one thing to describe the Christian's behavior in their world, but it is immeasurably more difficult to describe their dynamic faith. Whether it was chiliasm, or something we in our day may think irrational, one thing is certain, IT WORKED.

Then the Christian ethic had a definite bearing on the institution of slavery. They did not abolish it, but they certainly alleviated some of its rough edges. At first blush the attitude of the early Church towards slavery seems to us to be a disappointment. The Stoic influence in mitigating the lot of slaves stands out in brighter light. Slavery was a terrible institution. It was the cornerstone of the Graeco-Roman civilization. The upper classes saw no inconsistency in holding slaves. The master held the power of ownership over his slaves, whereby he was able to exercise the power of life and death. But the Christian's

attitude toward the slaves was quite paradoxical. They took the institution for granted and made no serious effort to abolish it. Many Christians, even clergymen and bishops owned slaves. In fact they discouraged slaves from revolution for the sake of freedom. The slavery from which all men everywhere should be freed was the slavery of sin and the flesh. A man's real worth was not measured according to his external station, but according to his internal condition. Whether a man was a slave or a master made no difference, that was immaterial. Real freedom was independent of conditions. But a real transformation took place between masters and slaves in the Christian fold. They looked upon each other as brethren. Justin's description of the Christian fellowship reveals a spiritual democracy, in which everyone was abiding in the calling wherein he was called. The slaves as well as the masters were regarded as brothers and as sisters and accepted as full members of the Church. Owners were charged to treat slaves kindly and humanly. To set a slave free was praiseworthy. As Uhlhorn says, "it was not unusual to find a slave an elder in the Church where his master was but a lay member." Besides, slaves in instances became bishops and clergymen. On the other hand, the slave was admonished to be obedient to his master. The harsh treatment of slaves by a Christian was severely condemned. Later it dawned upon the Church more distinctly that there was an inconsistency in the slave-master relation in the Christian fellowship. So we find the practice of manumission as a religious act in the Church during which time the slaves of the Christian were freed. The slave was not to urge manumission, nor did the Church demand that Christian masters free their slaves. It was not

a rule. It was left for the Christian conscience to work out the slave problem by itself. The Church was not a reform institution. It was a religious fellowship. Christian ethics were not the product of a legal adherence to the principles of the Sermon on the Mount. They came as a result of the Christian experience of redemption.

On the question of war, violence and bloodshed, the Christians of Justin's day held some strong opinions. We must remember that the very breath which Christians breathed was filled with the war-spirit. Violence and force were the cornerstones of the civilization in which they lived. One can imagine how uncomfortable must have been the position of a small group who professed pacifism in the midst of a mighty empire that was built on militarism. For nearly two hundred years Christians not only abstained from the use of force, but actually refused to join the legions of Rome. "No Christian ever thought of enlisting in the army after his conversion until the reign of Marcus Aurelius at the earliest" and that "with one or possibly two exceptions no soldier joined the Church and remained a soldier" ¹ until that time. The early Greek Fathers were of one voice in their opinion that war and Christianity were irreconcilable. The Christian literature of the first two centuries is filled with the condemnation of strife and war and slaughter. Harnack has enumerated the ethical barriers in the way of Christians who were considering service in the army: the shedding of blood on the battlefield, the use of torture in the law-courts, the passing of the death sentence by officers, the execution of them by the common officers, the unconditional military oath, and above all the worship of the

1. Cadoux. Early Christian Attitude Towards

emperor and the sacrifices which were expected of the soldier together with the practices of the soldier in peacetime and other offensive idolatrous customs.

Justin has much to say that bears on the war question. "Twelve men went out from Jerusalem into the world and they were ignorant men, unable to speak; that they were sent by Christ to teach all men the word of God. And we who formerly slew one another not only do not make war against our enemies, but, for the sake of not telling lies or deceiving those who examine us, gladly die confessing Christ." In the same paragraph he states that Christians long for incorruption, and as a result they do not take the soldiers oath. Now there is nothing in Justin to warrant us in believing that soldiers had to quit the military profession before they could become Christians. Cadoux very plainly says that "there was no Church writer before Athanasius that ventures to say that it was not only permissible, but praiseworthy, to kill enemies in war, without the qualifications-- express or implied-- that he was speaking only of pagans." 1. Besides, there is no statement in any of the Church Fathers that they did not believe in war. But that they acknowledge non-violence as the Christian principle there can be no doubt. Justin expressly states that principle in the First Apology. "And this is indeed proved in the case of many who once were of your way of thinking, but have changed their violent and tyrannical disposition, being overcome either by the constancy which they have witnessed in their neighbors' lives, or by the extraordinary forbearance they have observed in their fellow-travelers when defrauded, or by the honesty of those with whom they have transacted business." 2

1. Ibid. 246.

2. I Apol. 4.

Justin believes that it is not enough merely to pray for one's enemies, but that there should be an actual desire for reconciliation. The goal of the Christian is vastly different from the goal which the soldier has. Justin looked upon the soldier as one who pledged an oath to the deified state, when he should pledge an oath to Jesus Christ who is the only real Sovereign. He also speaks of the prophecy of beating swords into plowshares not as a spiritual truth, but as an actually fulfilled fact in the Christian irenic group. His quotations in reference to violence and war, are such as to cause us to feel that he took them literally. His temper implies that Christians are to have nothing to do with war. It stood for Rome,-- the world.

But as noted above, we find no direct statements revealing a positive and active pacifism. This strange anomaly is noted in all the writings of the Fathers. There are many causes for it. The expectation of a speedy return of Jesus was one reason. In the light of that belief Christians were not called upon to make a decision in reference to war. They simply ignored it. Then, again, there was difficulty in distinguishing between soldiers and policemen. Besides, the acceptance of the Old Testament with its warfare put Christians in a dilemma. They looked upon the destruction of Jerusalem by military means as a direct punishment of God for the rejection of Jesus by the Jews. Then they employed military terms to express their spiritual warfare. Justin too, clung to the idea of a Jewish military messiah. So we find that by the end of the second century there was a general tendency to compromise the Christian ethic. And then when the Church became a vital part of the empire the strong ethic of Christian group died out. Wars were sanctioned.

Besides, the records of previous years when war was opposed were less likely to be preserved. But in spite of this anomalous situation we know that hatred, revenge, violence, were condemned. The evil was to be overcome by good. What strikes us as very important to remember is this: the Christian was not governed by a code of laws or regulations, on the contrary the Christian ethic in Justin's day proceeded from a religious conviction which resulted in a real brotherhood of the Spirit. The Empire, deified as it was, proved to be the very spirit of anti-Christ. Over against the Sovereignty of Christ the Empire had set the State-Cult. How much of the intense Christian ethic resulted from a direct antagonism toward the whole principle of Emperor-worship, and how much resulted from chiliasm, and how much resulted from the sheer implications of the redemptive experience in Christ is hard to say; but it seems as if the redemptive experience produced the Christian ethic, which in turn was intensified by other circumstances.

Justin writes a beautiful paragraph which sums up the fine features of the Christian life: "We who formerly delighted in fornication, now embrace chastity alone; we who formerly used magic arts, dedicate ourselves to the good and unbegotten God; we who valued above all things the acquisition of wealth and possessions, now bring what we have into the common stock, and communicate to everyone in need, we who hated and destroyed one another, and on account of their different manners would not live with men of a different tribe, now, since the coming of Christ, live familiarly with them, and pray for our enemies, and endeavour to persuade them who hate us unjustly to live conformably to the good precepts of Christ, to the end that they may become

partakers with us of the same joyful hope of a reward from God the ruler of all." 1

In their ethical integrity they were supported by a remarkable group solidarity. Menaced by a hostile environment, holding the same faith in the redemptive power of Christ, motivated by love, sharing and lending mutual aid in their temptations, participating in an informal service from time to time which had nothing of the artificial about it, -- the Christian fellowship was cemented together by a strong bond. Lecky is right when he writes that "there never has existed upon earth a community whose members were bound together to one another by a deeper or a purer affection than the Christians, in the days of the persecution." 2 Every bit of the group life was conducive to fellowship. There was no function that did not spring out of the need of the group's redemptive experience. There was no 'a priori' organization into which they geared themselves. It was a spontaneous communion.

It is not a wonder that this group produced a charitable activity that was novel in that age. As remarked above, labor was upheld as a duty. More, as Harnack remarks, that early group was an employment agency. 3 Members of the group were provided with employment. Mendicancy was never encouraged. Paul had already admonished the Christians that the one who did not labor should not eat. The Church was much like a labor union. In fact, some critics have claimed that the Church was modeled after the guilds of the Empire. But this is an exaggerated statement, since the spirit of the Christian fellowship was unique. The Gospel

1. I Apol 13.

2. Hist. of European Morals, Vol. 1, Page 458.

3. Mission I, 176.

was the unifying principle of the Christian group. But Harnack's observation is very significant when he lays great stress on the social results of this labor side of the early Church.

The Church was noted far and wide for its generosity. When we consider that most Christians were recruited from the lower social ranks, the wonder is all the greater. The Church was especially careful of the widows and the children, especially the orphans. Harnack and Dobschutz both list many kinds of charitable activities in which the Church engaged. The sick, the disabled, the poor, the prisoners, the infirm, all were succored. Not only did their charity include their own number, but it overflowed to the needy pagans as well. "Our religion requires us to love not only our own, but also strangers and even those that hate us," is Justin's creed of philanthropy. 1 This was bound to make a deep impression on the pagan world, since to them such charity was novel. The Roman world was essentially selfish. The State was selfish as well. Beggars were to be driven out. No one shall take any interest in the poor and needy and the sick. If a man cannot withstand sickness, the doctors may experiment upon him. Aristotle said that anger and revenge were lawful passions. Of self denial there is no inkling of interest. Liberality was exercised only towards friends. Compassion is but weakness. Where hospitality was practiced among the rich it smacked of egotism. Of course there was a public-spiritness, as exercised in the distribution of grain to the poor, but it lacked the spirit of good-will and benevolence found in the Christian group. Clubs, and especially the burial guilds, did do a certain amount of charitable work, but it was cold charity,-- it lacked warmth

of dynamic and love for the object of the charity.

But among the Christians, there existed a spirit of love. They called themselves brethren. They served each other. They prayed for all. The stranger who came with his letter of recommendation was heartily received as a brother. "They love each other without knowing each other," was the pagan reply to this phenomenon. In their giving, the principle of voluntariness was practiced. Justin says, "Such as are willing and prosperous give according to what they will, each according to this choice." What was given was taken care of by the president who distributed to each as their need demanded. There must have been a supervision of the poor in Justin's day. There is no indication that the Church kept any of its offerings for capital, it was immediately expended. The present needs were great enough. Besides, in their precarious position, they did not accumulate any wealth. Thus, wealth was not looked upon with favor. Justin recognized the right of property, there is no communism in his day. But Christians shared with one another their goods,-- "We carry on our backs all we possess, and share everything with the poor." 1

And so we find this weak group of devoted Christians existing and thriving in the midst of a mighty hostile environment. It is impossible to think that communities such as these, possessing an energy of faith and love and ethical purity, should remain in the pagan world and exercise no influence upon it. All around these communities was an atmosphere which inevitably made itself felt to the people on the outside. In how far this influence made itself felt in actual alterations of the social customs, habits, and general morals of the pagan world, we have no way of

indicating. It was not until much later that the Christian ethic actually worked a transformation in the Roman world, and that when it became the official religion. This seems to be most unfortunate!

What we wish to inquire into is the dynamic of ethic of the Christian group in the days of Justin. Whence issued this dynamic moral and ethical strength? Why did these Christians have such a tenacity of faith in the ethical content of the Gospel? Are there any peculiar characteristics of their environment, of their faith, that made it possible for them to take their religion so seriously? These are problems which can never be solved exhaustively, yet they do present food for thought for our day in which the ethics of the Christian religion are diluted and compromised. Is it possible, is it advisable, is it Christian, is it right, to imitate the examples of Christians in Justin's day, in this twentieth century?

In the first place, Christianity lived very close to the Jewish religion from which it sprang, and the Jewish religion rested upon a moral basis of extreme practicality. The Greek influence had not yet taken the superior interest in the Christian faith. As noted before, the Hebrew had never taken to metaphysics. He approached ethics from an altogether different standpoint from that which the Greek approached it. To the Hebrew, ethics rested upon a divine command. To the Greek, ethics rested upon something that was consonant with natural law. An infraction of this divine command for the Hebrew involved guilt, which demanded a moral forgiveness. The Greek on the other hand, looked upon an infraction of the highest law he knew as a failure, which demanded redemption, a release from ignorance. So the Hebrew

thought mostly of an atonement coming from God, while the Greek thought mostly of an incarnation coming through man. The Greek had no real sense of his duty towards his fellow-man, religion and morality were separate to him.

No win Justin's day the Hebrew element was still strong. It was fast being supplanted by the Greek emphasis primarily through the entrance of Greeks like himself with the Greek slant on life, into the Christian Church. In Justin we find the beginning of this Hellenization process in earnest, in a philosophical way. Justin has in him elements which are typically Greek and were bound to be the seed that was later to bear a large harvest. After the Gospel had been Hellenized and the Church had become protected by the imperial interests we find a new interpretation given to the Christian life and its resulting ethic. The whole business of subordinating the ethical demands of the Christian religion to the philosophical, metaphysical, and hence mystical and sacramental is primarily the work of Greeks. The West merely put the legal stamp on their work and organized it by their practical genius.

But we want to remember that in the days of Justin Christians thought of themselves as the chosen people, as a separate race, as a holy nation. They were to be different as Israel was different. The Jewish mission for righteousness and morality and monotheism and for a social religion with an individual responsibility carried over into the early Christian group. "Christianity inherited the lofty ethical ideals of Judaism." 1 Because Christianity sprang from Judaism, its birthmark was morality.

What a travesty it proved to be when the Greek mind, which really supplemented and enriched the Jewish inheritance of the Christian faith, took the superior role and removed the ethical fibre of the Christian faith by removing the practical matter-of-fact ethical and moral character of the the Christian faith to the supernal realm and made ideas substitute for facts! To the Jew, God had revealed Himself in pure form or ideas. Dean Inge is quite right when he speaks of the most formidable problem of Christian theology as that of making room for the Jewish philosophy of history by the side of the Platonic philosophy of eternal life. 1 The Greek saw history as in interpretation of philosophy teaching by examples while the Hebrew saw history as a continual vindication of right over wrong,-- as a moral history. I believe that one of the chief reasons for the Jewish disregard of the Christian faith in the Christian Church has been because Christianity took to the Greek ideas and the Greeks took to Christianity.

It was this dominant Hebrew note that caused the early Church to be so strong ethically. Christians, following Judaism, never asked man's approval of God's will, they demanded obedience to the whole of every part, reason and inclination to the contrary notwithstanding. The Christian religion tolerated no divided allegiance. A man's eternal destiny, as Justin said and in that he was a Hebrew, depends upon his submission of his whole life to its laws. He must either accept or reject God who gives the Law.

Others have seen in Justin's eschatology a factor in the making of a strong ethic for the early Christian group. In the next paragraph we shall deal with chiliasm and its effect

upon the ethic of Christianity in that day. What we refer to here is the question of immortality, of future punishments or rewards. Justin does not follow Plato in believing that souls are essentially immortal. But he does say that souls never perish, for that fact would be a godsend to the wicked! 1 He has a few references to the fact that punishment in the world to come will be eternal. That Justin thought of punishment as reformatory is not in the text of his writings, but we should expect to find it in one so Greek in temper as he. If we had more of the actual theology of Justin, I wonder if we would not find a view of a future redemption of all souls? The passages in which Justin affirms eternal punishment are so few, and they are so apologetic in their nature that one is inclined to think that they do not represent his real view on the subject. The typical Greek view on this whole phase of Christian theology was later expressed in Origen. Then too, Justin seems to make immortality conditional in that future rewards are attributed to living according to God's law in this life. 2. And yet he seems to imply that immortality is dependent upon the will of God. That the doctrine of an eternal hell has a real bearing on conduct is evident in the history of Christianity. However, Justin shows us that the vitality of the ethic of the Christian group was not dependent upon the eternality of punishment for the wicked. By far the most important dynamic underlying the ethic of early Christianity is in the belief in immortality. This was typically Greek, and included a vision of God and a life of blessed communion with Him. I do not believe that the

1. Dial. 5.

2. Apol. I, 21, Dial. 130, 138.

doctrine of everlasting punishment made the early Christians moral, it was rather the living of an "immortal life" in the present. The desire for immortality was a real desire in Justin's day. But Justin does have in him two strains, the one based on his doctrine of the 'spermatic' Logos and the freedom of the will together with his idea of salvation which was later to result in the restititional idea of the Alexandrians; while on the other hand he held to Chiliasm which was a typical Jewish eschatology and was later to culminate in the western doctrines of hell and eternal damnation, together with the catastrophic end of the world. Nevertheless eschatology did play a part in making the ethic of the early Christian group so vital and uncompromising.

And now we turn to Chiliasm and its relation to the early Christian ethic. The questions may be asked: Did the expectation of the immediate and sudden catastrophic return of Jesus have any bearing upon the radicality of the ethic of the early Church? Did it give the early Church an ethical character that was unique? Was the chiliasm alone the dynamic of their radical conduct? If that is the case can we hope in our day to make the Church ethically potent without a revival in chiliasm? Is chiliasm a legitimate Christian doctrine? In what sense is it true? If the Chiliasm of the early Church was not inherent in the Christian faith, if it can be proven to be false, can the belief be justified in the results that it issued in? These are knotty problems.

There can be no doubt that the early Church of the first two hundred years believed in the immediate coming of Christ and that at His coming He would inaugurate a thousand-year reign with His saints. "The Church of the

second century was largely influenced by parousian conceptions. " 1 The Christian watch-word was "Marantha" as in the days of the apostles. The writer of the Epistle of Barnabas about 130 identifies the thousand years with the millennium which shall succeed the six thousand years of the earth's history, and, which shall synchronize the Coming. The Didache is definitely chiliastic. Irenaeus, Papias, and Polycarp all have chiliastic references. Justin has a strong belief in the Second Coming. He mentions the setting up of a kingdom of a thousand years, and the place is to be Jerusalem. The second advent stood on the same basis as the first, and was as certain in the consciousness of the Christians. At the same time Justin gives us a hint of what was already taking place in the Christian group in reference to the millennial conception. He writes that "many who belong to the pure and pious faith and are true Christians think otherwise." But he thinks that these folks who hold "otherwise " are deficient, and that all right-minded folks, Christians on all points are premillenarian! There seems to be no idea of a gradual progress of the Gospel until it conquers the whole world. But we must remember that Justin has two strains, and that in the Dialogue he is arguing with a Jew. He is arguing the reasonableness of Christianity on the Jewish basis and as such has to accommodate himself to the Jewish background. On the other hand, the Greek strain in Justin is marked in his general temper, and not in the letter of his text.

Now chiliasm has always produced a reckless Christian conduct in the face of the world. Whether premillenarianism,

has produced a higher ethic than postmillenarianism, or any other millennialism may be hotly debated. But historically considered, millenarianism has had a strong Biblical basis. The whole background of the Christian faith is eschatological. The idea of a general progression of good over evil is foreign to the Hebrew. Certainly it is found in Paul, but it is not primary in Paul. The whole basis of the idea of moral progress, of the progress of the Kingdom of God, is based upon a monistic view of the universe. It is the outgrowth of the moral optimism of Hellenism. It must build upon the law of continuity. It presupposes that man is morally good, not yet perfect, but that he will be in time, by the natural processes of moral growth. It is entirely foreign to the spirit of eschatology catastrophically conceived. Sin, in the case of the anti-chiliast, is a mere appendage of the savage state, it is not a negative positive. The whole idea of God in the Old Testament is chiliastic. He is the Creator, the sovereign King of the universe, and as such He comes down to men. God alone is the actor in the drama on the Old Testament stage of history. God comes not from within man but from without him. God is foreign and transcendent. And when He comes into the world it is a vertical disruption of the historical processes by a force that comes from without. There is no evolutionary idea at the basis of the thinking of the Christian religion. It is anti-Greek. The basis of the Kingdom of God in the New Testament is precisely eschatological. It is God who will put an end to the present disorder, and it is God who will make the Kingdom come. There seems to be no idea of a slow progress of the good and the final overthrow of the evil by evolutionary agency. The Kingdom in the New Testament

is both present and future.

It is this conception that the early Church possessed. It played a great part in producing the ethic of the Church that simply was irresistible. Later, chiliasm was dis-credited and in fact made a heresy. But it put up a hard last struggle in the Allogi and the Montanists. But its importance for our study must not be minimized. Chiliasm, in a way, saved Christianity by taking it through a grave crisis. In a society that was rapidly hastening to dissolution the Church was enabled to hold fast to the belief that God was leading all things to a crisis in which the righteous would be vindicated. Because Christianity was thus fortified for a time of catastrophe, when the crash of the social world came, it alone survived.

Chiliasm holds a fundamental truth of the Christian faith. It is part and parcel of historic Christianity, and from time to time it has been discredited, only to arise again with vigor. The variety of sects based largely upon chiliasm is an indication that there is a basic chiliasm in the Christian religion. There are modern scholars who have discredited the apocalyptic hopes of the Christian religion. They are so advanced (?) in their evolutionary views that they have interpreted Jesus as one who shared the ignorance of the age in which he lived when he uttered some of His truths in apocalyptic phrases. The announcement of some sect as to their prediction of the end of the world is ridiculed and ignored. However, recently scholars have turned their attention to the "eschatological " element in the New Testament. One would scarcely a few years back expect this phase of Christianity to be treated with anything but scorn by the restrained scholars. But there

can be no doubt that an attitude of expectancy, filled with enthusiasm, glows in the New Testament and in the age of Justin. Some have maintained that this atmosphere and future hope of the early Christians can never be maintained again. But, we must remember as historical students, that such a statement is too rash. This apocalypticism has recurred again and again. It is recurring today in the Barthian movement. It has made the figure of Jesus very fresh and has brought to the fore anew an old hope of the faith. It recurred in Augustine's "City of God." It recurred in Bernard of Clugny. It recurred in Cromwell's day, yes, and a few years before Luther's popularity. It is seen in Milton, in Bunyan. Embarrassing as it may be to the followers of Wesley, it recurs in him. History furnishes us with many parallels, -- "apocalyptic times" as we call them.

Chiliasm has never died out entirely for long in the Christian Church. Small sects revived its ideal in the Middle Ages and at later times. Whenever the Church has become too much secularized tender consciences no longer satisfied have revived chiliaistic hopes. A comfortable Church loses its chiliasm, its future hope, its faith that God will triumph! But when the Church of dogma is asked to make room for chiliaistic enthusiasm, the sort of chiliasm inserted is hardly like that of the early Church. The early chiliasm despised dogma. It was no friend of a systematic theology. This destroys chiliasm. This has to be remembered: chiliasm was the most uncompromising enemy of all remodeling of the Christian faith. Harnack 1 may be

1. See his fine article on "Millennium" in Ency. Brit., IX Ed.

right that it can only "exist in an unsophisticated group whose faith is like that of the early Christians."

The whole Barthian movement is an apocalyptic movement. It is based upon the so-called downfall of the Greek evolutionary view of moral progress as chiefly man's activity. It is a return to Biblical idea of eschatology. Contrary to modern criticism of Barth, it is not an ethically impotent movement. Its ethical motive rests upon a regenerated life, upon God. One of Reinhold Niebuhr's criticisms of Barth is his failure to produce a vital social ethics. But we must remember that the Barthian movement is the result of the social question. To the Barthians there is no ethic but a social ethic. The ethic of Christianity, the Barthians claims, must rest upon religion. No crude materialistic, shallow, utilitarian, superficial, biological, pragmatic, ethic is the Barthian ethic. Not a duty or a categorical imperative. All these phases of ethics are good and Christianity does not destroy any of them, but they are not the basis of ethics. The real basis of ethics is man's surrender to the will of God which is produced by God's sovereignty; it rests upon the realization that between man and God there is an eschatological gulf. The Kingdom of God in the Christian sense is eschatological, dualistic, paradoxical, non-ethical, it rests upon a miracle by which GOD ends history. The reason why the Christian religion lacks dynamic is because it has forgotten its truly apocalyptic and eschatological basis. Present Christianity may abound in activities, but it lacks a dynamic action. The Christian ethic which rests upon God's redemption has been displaced by an evolutionary moralism which rests upon the sinful pride of humanity.

We may differ with this interpretation as we please, yet it contains truth, which the history of Christianity amply testifies to. Today we are living in an age of unrest, of an expectancy of social crisis, half longing for soul expansion, groaning for a new messiah of some sort. It may not be so apparent in the rank and file of comfortable Americans, but it is in the atmosphere of those who have developed world-vision. Seers dare to hope that out of the pessimism and gloom of the age there may come forth a life infinitely more just and noble. Yet syndicalism, capitalism, and socialism, present us with an age much like the one in which Jesus and Justin lived. There is among the strong, healthy-minded a spirit akin to the ancient "future-hope."

In the midst of all this the Christian does possess a chiliastic hope, and that hope is based upon the fact that they believe that there is a divine interpretation of history. It is not limited to one aeon. Chiliasm, though pessimistic of the world, has no despair of the spiritual possibilities of human nature and as to the final outcome of the righteous. It refuses to narrow its vision to the present world. Marcus Aurelius, a most noble Stoic, despite his brilliant intellectual capacities, yet possesses the note of despair. He is much like the moralist of our own day. 1 His ethic and morality is dry, it lacks the warmth and dynamic of an ethic that is rooted and grounded in the living God. Yes, the chiliast, as did the early Christians, did forget the present duties, but I wonder if they forgot anything that was essential? Their interim-ethic was not easy to adjust to the old world in which they lived,-- and some didn't .

1. Cf. Lippman, Preface to Morals, a sunless, sad book!!

But the apocalyptic hope did more than hold out a hope of better times, and of immortality. We see in it a desperate fight against the world power of the day. Life to them was bound up with the Empire, and the Empire had become to a fine degree deified. This "anti-Christ" sought to crush the infant Church, and the infant Church resisted more vigorously. The crisis of the times made the apocalyptic hope flame up to a red heat. The ethic of the early Church was tremendously stimulated by their struggle against the world powers which represented the pagan world of religion. It was this apocalyptic hope which was bound up with a Kingdom and a King that proved antagonistic to the Roman Empire. Although the Christians detested politics, the Roman magistrates thought them the most intense and pernicious politicians. The state made little difference between Caesar and God. The three centuries of persecution were in reality a struggle between the claims of Christ and those of Caesar. This consciousness of the Christian group as an Empire lived on and came to fruition in the rise of the mediaeval papacy and the growth of Canon Law.

The fact is very evident that the apocalyptic hope of the early Church made them oblivious to present dangers and endure many things for conscience sakes. This hope is still a vital part of the Christian religion. The early Christians, as Gieseler says, held to the immediate return of Jesus universally, and that only the Gnostics radically opposed it by spiritualizing the Gospel. But it never became a part of the Rule of Faith like other doctrines. The Gnostics rejected the reality of the earth, bodies, and

matter. Not long after there arose a good deal of opposition to the view. Long lapses, and cessation of persecution caused the Christians to adapt themselves more firmly to this earthly life. Then the "Coming" was postponed. Since Christ did not come, many lost sight of the Coming altogether. Besides the Gospel was spreading so rapidly that many Christians thought it would not be necessary for Christ to make another appearance at all to conquer the world. Of course, the extremists usually cause a revulsion of the more sane folks, and that was the case with the Montanists. Then the friendly relations of the Church and the Empire removed the large basis for antagonism. The return of the Lord was not expected, and He was expected to come at the end of the world to make a final judgment and complete the work of His mediatorial Kingdom.

But last and most important for us is the fact that the influence of Greek thought caused chiliasm to be discredited in the East at least. Origen gave it the death blow. The whole belief was spiritualized. Abstract thought had the tendency to alleviate the practical and ethical content of the Gospel. The emotional fervor died out. And, as Professor Richard Niebuhr says, when the higher and intellectual classes commenced to enter the Christian faith more favored in their social and economic conditions, it was inevitable that the ethical note which chiliasm bred should be relegated to another position. "Intellectual and naivete and practical need combine to create a marked propensity toward millenarianism, with its promise of tangible goods and of the reversal of all present social systems

1. Cf. Social Sources of Denominationalism, Page 31.

of rank. From the first, apocalypticism has been most at home among the disinherited."...."These folks have a more radical ethic and a greater resistance to the compromising tendency than the more fortunate brethren. It is in the disinherited that solidarity, equality, sympathy, mutual aid, rigorous honesty in the matters of debt, simplicity of dress and manner, of wisdom revealed to the babes, of poverty of spirit, of humility and meekness, are more in evidence. These folks shun the relativizations of ethical and intellectual sophistications. By becoming a religion of the favored, intellectually inclined, it soon lost that spontaneous energy amid the quibblings of its abstract theologies, it sacrificed its ethical rigorism in compromise with the policies of government and nobility, it abandoned its apocalyptic hopes as irrelevant to the well being of a successful Church."

The Christian group finally conquered the Roman Empire. Their compactness, solidarity, fellowship, intolerant and uncompromising ethics, hope ^{of} life, ^{and} death, conquest of strategic centers, enthusiasm, devotion, boundless faith, intense loyalty:-- their Gospel, conspired together to give the Christian religion the victory. The astute politician Constantine saw that it was with the Christian Church that he had to reckon. And so the Church was made the official religion.

Was this the salvation of the Church? Was it triumph or defeat? It may be that the outward triumph proved to be defeat in disguise. The first three centuries may give us a history of the "Church in the world," but since, it is quite true, that we have a "history of the world in the Church." And in no phase of Christian life does this state-

ment prove more true than in the ethical realm. Protection, wealth, power, glory, imperial favor, caused the influx of many into the membership that had no real knowledge of the Christian religion, caused coercion to be practiced upon nonconformists, and introduced many pagan rites and ceremonies into the Christian religion. As a concomitant result spiritual vitality decreased, and ethical standards were compromised. There came to be a standard of ethics for clergy and one for the laity. Much that has been staunchly resisted by the Christians in Justin's day was glibly passed over. The close linking of the State with the Church was most unfortunate, since the Church became in many instances the handball of politics, a mere State-cult.

On the other hand, whether ethics were sacrificed or not, we wonder whether the Church would ever have been able to meet the great hordes of migrants from the north if it had not been supported by the material and political advantages offered her by the Emperors? As noted throughout this paper, the Christian Church is a divine idea. It has compromised very much in its history, but through it all it has never submerged the Gospel of redemption underneath its adaptations and accretions.

This we must remember, - the ethic of the Church in Justin's day was pure. It proceeded from the redemptive experience of men and women in Christ. The Christian religion was not primarily an ethical code. As such it would have vanished with Stoicism. Underneath its ethics is a dynamic, which is a life of redemption, rooted in God and expressed in the historical Jesus.

Today we realize as never before the ethical implications of the Christian religion. The advocates of the social gospel have interpreted the whole adventure of Jesus as being strictly ethical. Undoubtedly this emphasis has been beneficial and necessary as a counteraction to the older idea of interpreting the Christian religion strictly in terms of belief and creed and ritual. But the advocates of the social gospel have forgotten in some instances the religious basis of the ethic of Christianity. The whole trend toward social service has had the tendency to forget the dynamic behind Christian conduct. The interpretation of the Christian religion, especially the Sermon on the Mount, as an ethical code of laws, is untrue to the Christian conviction. Historically Christianity has always thought of its ethic as based upon faith and upon revelation. The Sermon on the Mount is no mere social program.

Real Christian ethics is based not upon a natural dynamic, it does not make alliances with all sorts of human devices. When Christian ethics yields to such insidious snares, it invariably begins to degenerate. Its dynamic is sapped. The cause of a great deal of the Church's ethical impotency is due to this very cause. It has been intensified by the modern trend in Protestantism towards the substitution of aesthetics for a deep emotional regenerative experience. Besides, the Church has curried favor with the powers that be, with honor, wealth, esteem, respectability. She needs to make friends with the disinherited!

Though we cannot return to the ^{literal} apocalypticism of Justin's day with its detail of belief, we need to revive a sane ^P apocalypticism for our day. We must never lose sight of the

Christian eschatological hope. God is the author of our ethic through his Gospel. He does have a part in the shaping of historical forces. This is what gave the early Church its militantism. What the Church today lacks, among other things, is the militant note. Were it revived in the Church, it would work for an irresistible dynamic.

The real nature of the Church needs to be better grasped by Christians today. The Church is not an organization, it is a fellowship; an environment in which the ethics of Jesus are actualized. The Church Catholic needs to practice the ethics of Christianity! It needs a larger unity. It needs to make itself an unworldly brotherhood which acts as a laboratory for the adventure of ethical living. If it is to bring order into a disorderly world of national discord, of clashing class-strife, etc., it must be able to thrust forth the united offensive of a harmonious ethical group.

In the day when industrialism has brought about a capitalistic system of things, the Church needs to again, as she did in Justin's day, stand out against the slavery produced by the machine and posit the supremacy of personality; she needs to again champion the need of a belief in the idea of human solidarity over against the rampant individualism of the day; she needs to hold high the absolute need of sacrifice in a day when responsibility in many realms is repudiated. If the Church is to stand by, hesitant in making up her mind as to what to do, she may be an accomplice in making revolutionary social changes certain. She need not become a reform organization, but she must seek with a will to eradicate some of the causes that make for social disintegration in any age. If Western Christianity is to avoid the fate of the Russian

Church, which at first was the creator of revolution and then its repressor, it cannot avoid the battle of ideas that underly our whole social and national fabric. The age of materialism, whether organized on a capitalistic or a communistic basis, is the absolute contraction to the ethic of the Christian religion. Self-interest that is legalized by the consent of public opinion and runs to the extreme that it has in Western civilization is certainly not in harmony with the Cross of Christianity. Our science has outrun our morality and religion. The terrible disease that crept upon the Roman world in the days of Justin, is creeping upon our age. Our acquisitive society conceives of life entirely in terms of self-interest, it has dissolved society into individuals, has chosen to trust the future to the gambler's chance, and it has chosen the present immediate satisfactions of sense for the moral values of the eternities.

The West, as Prof. Harry Ward 1 says, needs vision. Its activism has made it all motion with no sense of direction. It is atomistic, chaotic, it has no goal. For what shall man live? "For each," says the Communist. The Christian religion answers, "For BOTH!" Yes, the final issue of the clash between the ethic of Jesus and the morality of our age is over the nature of man, the nature of life, and the nature of God. Jesus has epitomized the issue when he says, "Ye cannot serve God and Mamon." Either Christianity must be able to bring redemption to this acquisitive society, or it will bring this blind age into the twilight that has fallen upon other civilizations.

The Christian religion must not through compromise sell its unique ethic for a mess of pottage. We must cease to be ashamed of the Gospel of foolishness. Our hanker after intellectual and social respectability is often purchased at too high a cost. We must trace back the Christian ethic to God and in the strength of that faith we can make it irresistible to this age. The ethic of Christianity is not merely other-worldly or this-worldly. It is both. The Christian will not rest content with a mere other-worldly aspect of his Gospel. He will resist sin and the devil in all its forms. The Christian is neither a pessimistic quietist nor is he an optimistic activist. The Christian is not a mere social fusser either, he has an active good-will toward the world, which he wishes to save. He is neither a defeatist, an epicurean, nor is he an ascetic. But he is far more than a humanist. His whole ethical conduct is rooted and grounded in the faith of the redemptive grade of God.

A consideration of the process of actualizing the ethics of Christianity in this age is too much out of our field. Whether the ethics of Jesus are meant to be spiritualized, or be literally applied to the age, both are burning questions. This whole problem has been admirably treated by Professor C.C. McGown.¹ At least this is certain, the early Church took the commands of Jesus literally. They could because they expected the immediate return of Jesus at any moment. And they comprised a minority group in the pagan world that was infinitesimal, without civil rights

1. The genesis of the Social Gospel, especially Chapters I and XII.

or political influence. They were not wealthy, and as a result they could laud the virtue of poverty!!'Whether the practice of the Christian ethic involves for us the ideal of apostolic poverty is a debatable question. Poverty is unsocial, unnatural, and certainly not commanded by Christ. But despite some of the factors that contributed to the ethical recklessness and radicality of the Christian group in Justin's day, they did possess the real dynamic of an ethical society which was based upon the life of the Spirit which results from the redemptive activity of God in Jesus Christ. In this they have something of value to teach us.

THE END.

CONTENTS

Introduction

The Problem of Psychology

History of Psychology of Religion and Spirituality

Self-Defining Characteristics of Religious Psychology

The Psychological Substrate of Religion

Methodology of Psychology

Role of the Bible in Psychology of Religion

Index of Subjects and Subjects: BIBLIOGRAPHY

CHAPTER XII

The New Testament and Christian Psychology

The Bible and the Psychological Sciences—General Issues

The Nature of the Bible—General

Psychology and the Bible—General Issues

Self-Defining Issues—General (The Nature of Spirituality)

Index

Suggested Reading in the Study of the Bible: Psychology of Christianity—Gen.

The Bible and the Psychological Sciences

The Treatment of the Bible in Psychology of Religion

Index

The Psychological Substrate of Religion—General

Psychology and the Bible—General Issues

The Bible and the Psychological Sciences—General

The Psychology of Spirituality—General

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Encyclopedias.

The Catholic Encyclopedia.

Hastings Dictionary of Religion and Ethics.

Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge.

The Encyclopedia Britannica, IX Edition.

Encyclopedia of Education.

History of Christianity -- Encyclopedia of the Bible.

Works of Justin Martyr as translated in the Ante-Nicene Fathers, -- together with valuable comments.

The New Testament in the Christian Church -- Moore.

St. Paul and the Ante-Nicene Fathers -- Steward Mains.

The Church of the Fathers -- Pullan.

Apostolic and Post Apostolic Times -- Lechler.

Post-Apostolic Age -- Waterman (Ten Epochs of Church History.)

Neglected Factors in the Study of the Early Progress of Christianity -- Orr.

From Jerusalem to Nicaea -- Moxon.

The Testimony of Justin Martyr to Early Christianity -- Purves.

Das Christentum Justin's -- Von Englehardt.

Christianity in the First Three Centuries -- Baur.

Die Alt Katholische Kirche -- Ritschl.

The Theology of Justin Martyr -- Goodenough.

Justin Martyr-- Semisch.

Church History-- Moeller (Vol. I.)

History of the Christian Church-- Neander (Vol. I.)

History of the Doctrine of Christ-- Dorner (III Vols.)

History of Doctrine-- Sheldon (II Vols.).

History of Dogma-- A. Harnack (Eng. In VII Vols.)--
esp. Vol. II.

History of Doctrines-- Seeberg (II Vols.)

The Person of Christ-- Dorner (Eng. In V Vols.)

History of Doctrines-- Hagenbach (II Vols.)-- old,
but valuable as it quotes much of the source materials.

Christologies Ancient and Modern-- Sanday.

The Person of Christ-- Mackintosh, H. R.

History of the Christian Church-- Walker.

History of Christian Doctrine-- Fisher.

History of Christian Doctrine-- Shedd. (II Vols.) easy
to read.

Making of the New Testament-- Goodspeed.

The Canon and Text of the New Testament-- Gregory.

Continuity of Christian Thought-- Allen.

History of Theology-- Briggs (II Vols.)

Doctrine of Sacred Scriptures-- Ladd (II Vols.)

The Canon of the New Testament-- Westcott.

The Christian Doctrine of Salvation-- Stevens.

History of Theology--Cunningham (II Vols.)

The God of the Early Christians-- McGiffert.

The Apostolic Age-- McGiffert.

The Holy Spirit-- Rees.

The Doctrine of the Atonement-- Mozley.

The Mission and Expansion of Early Christianity--

A. Harnack.

The Doctrine of the Future Life-- Ezra Abbott.

The Apostle's Creed- McGiffert.

The History of Interpretation-- Farrar.

The Rome of the Pilgrims and Martyrs-- E.R. Barker.

History of the Christian Church-- Schaff (Vols. I
and II.)

The Old Catholic Church-- Rainy.

Life in the Primitive Church-- Dobschutz.

The Greek and Eastern Churches-- Adeney.

Christian Thought to the Reformation-- Workman.

The Ancient Church-- Killen.

The Christology of St. Paul-- Rostron.

Church History-- Kurtz.

Church History-- Newman (II Vols.)

The Essence of Christianity-- Brown, W.A.

What is Christianity-- Harnack

The Evolution of Early Christianity-- Case.

The Social Origins of Christianity--Case.

Studies in the Life of the Early Church-- Foakes
Jackson.

Historic Theories of the Atonement-- Robert
Mackintosh.

The Faith of St. Paul-- Ross.

The Meaning of St. Paul for Today-- Dodd.

The Originality of the Christian Message-- R. H.
Mackintosh.

Conflict of Christianity with Heathenism-- Uhlhorn.
The Jesus of History-- Glover, the latter part.
Conflict of Religions-- Glover.
Influence of Greek Ideas and Usages upon the Christian
Church-- Hatch.
St. Paul and the Mystery Religions-- Kennedy.
The Mystery Religions and Christianity-- Angus.
The Jewish People at the Time of Christ-- Schurer--
valuable for its information about the Diaspora.
The Early Christian Ministry-- Lindsay.
The Story of Philosophy-- Durant.
History of Philosophy-- Schwegler.
Great Men of the Christian Church-- Walker.
The First Age of Christianity-- E.F.Scott.
Rise of Gentile Christianity-- Faulkes Jackson.
Rise of Christianity-- Norton.
Beginnings of Christianity-- Fisher.
Story of Social Christianity-- II vols.-- Stead.
Gospel and its Tributaries-- E. F.Scott.
The New Testament in the Light of Modern Research--
Deisemann.
The Faith of Modernism-- Mathews.
Outline of Christianity-- Vol. II.
The Church and the Gospel-- Loisy.
Organization, Early Church-- Hatch.
Problems of Church Unity-- Lowrie.
Source Book in Early Christianity-- Ayer.
Early Church-- Hurst, Vol. I.
Christ and the Four Gospels-- Dale.

Modern Mind and Religious Problems-- Mathews.

The Genesis of the Social Gospel-- McCown.

Does Civilization Need Religion-- Niebuhr.

History of Education-- Monroe.

Bible, Origin, Significance, and Abiding Worth,-- Peake.

The Doctrine of the Infallible Book-- Gore.

Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah-- Ederheim.

Hasting's Bible Dictionary, articles on Canon of
Old Testament, Philo, etc.

International Standard Bible Encyclopedia, articles
as above.

The Reasonableness of Christianity-- Mackintosh-- Chap. I.

Making and Meaning of the New Testament-- Snowden.

Burning Questions in Historic Christianity-- Faulkner.

Valuable Articles in Journal of Religion, Biblical
Review, etc.

The Religious Quests of the Graeco-Roman World-- Angus.

The Sabbath in the Making-- Huestis.

Ecclesiastical History-- Gieseler.

History of Early Christianity-- De Pressensé.

The Attitude of the Ante-Nicene Fathers Toward War--
Lindsay.

Christian Charity in the Ancient Church-- Uhlhorn.

Early Church History To 313 A. D.-- Gwatkin.

Greek Religion-- Hyde.

Stoicism-- Wenley.

Progress in Religion to the Christian Era-- Glover.

Christian Unity-- Briggs.

How to Promote Christian Union-- Kershner-

Christianity and Liberalism-- Machen.

The Basis of True Christian Unity-- Kittlewell.

The Doctrine of the Church and Christian Reunion--

Headlam.

The Church in History- Nagler.

History of Ancient and Medieval History-- Dresser.

History of Warfare between Science and Theology--

White.

Paul in the Modern World-- Peabody.

The Religion of Power-- Kirk.

Old Faith and New Knowledge, --Snowden.

Whittier Christianity--ed. Hough.

Theology of Crisis-- Brunner.

Word of God and the Word of Man--- Barth.

Note-- This bibliography lays no claim to completeness. These volumes have been found most valuable in the preparation of this thesis. Many other articles and books lay at the root and basis of this work, which have been forgotten or are too irrelevant to be mentioned.

