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The purpose of this thesis is to set in perspective, as far as is possible, the eschatology of the Early Church. The work required for it has been undertaken in the conviction that this is a significant area of investigation. It is impossible to gain an adequate picture of Early Church life and theology, if any one facet of thought, which was important to the people of the time, is left out of consideration. It is also felt that the writers and thinkers of the early centuries stood so much closer in their thought forms to those writers who set down the words of the Scriptures, and especially of the New Testament, that what they thought is a probable indication as to how the Scriptural writers themselves thought. It also seems to be true that the Church of Jesus Christ today has little to say concerning eschatology, and when it does speak, does so with an uncertain voice. The recovery of an understanding with regard to the assumptions of hope of the Early Fathers must put Christians today in a better position to make their own assessment in the field of eschatology. The study undertaken for this thesis has presented a constant challenge to the faith and understanding of the writer.

It was originally intended to take the study through to the Council of Nicaea in 325 A.D. The volume of work made this impossible, but it is believed that the conclusions reached about the development of thought up to c.250 A.D. indicates the trend of thought up to that watershed in the Ancient Church.
Title: Eschatology in the Early Church, with special reference to the theses of Dodd and Werner.

The subject of this thesis is the eschatology of the Early Church, and the period covered in review, stretches from the Sub-apostolic age up to the middle of the Third Century A.D. The field is a wide one, but the additional clause in the title helps to give focus to the investigation. The particular interest of the thesis is in the question how the Early Church reacted to the so-called 'delay' in the Parousia of Christ in glory. C.H. Dodd is known familiarly as the propounder of 'realized eschatology', while Martin Werner places emphasis upon the futurist element in the eschatology of the Primitive Church. Despite obvious differences in their outlook, they are in agreement that the delay in the Coming of Christ in glory produced a reaction in the Church in the direction of a diminution of emphasis upon eschatology. In practice this meant that the futurist aspects of eschatology received less attention. If the joint thesis of Dodd and Werner at this point is sound, one would expect to find evidence in the period under review of such a change in outlook, dictated by an embarrassment over the delay in the Parousia. It is the contention of our thesis that the evidence does not agree with what we should expect to find, if Dodd and Werner are correct.

The procedure of this thesis has been to examine for the most part the significant literature of the period before us, together with such evidence as is to hand concerning the practices of the Church and her organization in this early period, with a view to elucidating its interior attitudes to eschatological matters. The field is a wide one. Usually individual matters have been directly examined, where the literary output of particular writers has been in view, as the Parousia
of Christ in glory; the resurrection of the dead; Final Judgment; the period of persecution and apostasy under Antichrist prior to the Parousia of Christ; and so on.

The thesis proceeds to deal with the eschatology of the Early Church after an introductory chapter dealing with 'The Present Position in the Interpretation of New Testament Eschatology'. The purpose of this chapter is to set out how the modern eschatological debate arose, so that the relevance of the evidence presented by the Early Fathers may be the more readily appreciated. In particular, the treatment accorded the present position in New Testament scholarship is designed to show how the 'realized' and 'consistent' eschatology schools developed. In the close of the chapter the point is brought out that, despite very real divergences in interpretation, Dodd and Werner, who represent these schools of thought, are in agreement that the delay in the Parousia led to a transformation of thinking in regard to eschatology.

Chapter II deals with 'The Apostolic Fathers and the 'Preaching of Peter''. The evidence of the writings usually grouped under the heading of the Apostolic Fathers are dealt with first of all. Despite the variegated nature of the material in these writings, the general fact emerges that, in varying degrees, futurism and elements of 'realized' eschatology, are held in balance. The 'Preaching of Peter' is also dealt with at the end of this chapter, representative, as it appears to be, of the theology of the Ebionites. This helps to complete the picture, so far as the literature of the Sub-apostolic era is concerned. It also serves as a foil to the more orthodox literature of the emerging Catholic Church. The salutary feature is that the 'Preaching' confirms the impression that futurist and 'realized' elements of eschatology are held in balance. No evidence emerges which convincingly shows embarrassment on the part of the Church
at this time over the delay in the Parousia.

Chapter III is entitled 'Eschatology in the Sub-apostolic Age,' and seeks to gather up evidence from this era which expresses itself in movements rather than expressly in literature (though they do this too), and to assess its relevance for our investigation. The significance of Jewish Messianic movements in this period is dealt with. R.M. Grant's theories about the connection of the growth of Gnosticism with the disappointment of eschatological expectation, Jewish and Christian, are assessed. Millenarianism, which flourished in Asia Minor especially at this time is examined. Finally, a section dealt with the sacraments of Baptism and Eucharist (particularly with reference to their practice) in their eschatological reference.

Chapter IV deals with the Apologists, pride of place being given to the contribution of Justin Martyr. In particular, Justin's emphasis upon the 'Two Advents' of Christ is noted.

Chapters V, VI, VII and VIII, dealing respectively with the evidence called from the writings of Irenaeus, the Alexandrian Fathers (Clement and Origen, but Methodius of Olympus and Dionysius of Alexandria are mentioned), Hippolytus, and Tertullian, confirm the impression that there is no evidence for a playing down of futurism in the eschatological expectation of the Early Church up to the mid-third century. Among these Fathers, Hippolytus is especially important in that he uncovers, as we believe, a mentality and outlook on eschatological issues which is quite common in his day but which we might have understood less, if he had not set it out for us. Tertullian reveals certain characteristic emphases which were to become typical of Western Christianity even in regard to his eschatology. There is a greater sense in his writings, as the sole genuine exponent of Latin Christianity among the writers studied, that Christ is coming for an elect people who are set over
against the world: Greek Christianity was more conscious of the concept of the recreation of the universe through the resurrection of Christ, but this element is not absent in Tertullian himself.

In Chapter IX, under the title 'Eschatology in the Early Church to the Mid-Third Century', we seek to draw together the threads of our discussion. After a summary of results, in which we review the evidence (noting, as we go, some of the implications,) we seek to set out the major features in short compass and to assess their significance. In reviewing the evidence we constantly have in mind the common contention of Dodd and Werner. Here we seek to set out in short compass the eschatological Hope as the Early Church envisaged it — so far as it is possible to treat the Early Church as a unity in this way. In this section the aim is to show first of all how the Early Church viewed her Hope, and it is claimed that this was not in fact dictated in any major degree by the question of the 'delay' in the Parousia. In a final section the results of our findings are applied in more detail to the theses of Dodd and Werner. It is appreciated that our brief in this thesis is to deal with Early Church eschatology with special reference not just to the common thesis of Dodd and Werner but in connection with their individual theses. Here we seek to compass this point, but it is held that the individual developments of Dodd and Werner, together with their "schools", represent a fundamental common misunderstanding concerning the reaction of the Early Church to the 'delay' in the hope of the Parousia, which suggests that to some extent they have misunderstood the nature of that Hope as conceived by the Church in the period under review, particularly with reference to the question of imminence.

The conclusions reached in the final chapter may thus be summarized:

The Church did not think of the Parousia of Christ in glory (in isolation from His first παρουσία in humiliation or from His continuing Presence (παρουσία) with the Church in worship, mission, and suffering;
The Church did not think of the Parousia in glory as a separate Event but as the climax of a whole series of predestined events: a profound theology of history underlies the more usual thinking of the Church about coming events, which include the reign of Anti-christ;

Behind her expectation for the End of the age lies a prophetic background of understanding (especially are Daniel, chapters 2 and 7 influential here), which helps to explain the particular nature of her concept of imminence: it is held that in its origins imminence is probably to be understood in terms of the fact that in the Incarnation the fifth world-empire of Daniel 7 arrived in advance. This means, among other things, that although the end of the age is pressing now upon the world, Christ cannot come until the Roman empire (conceived as the fourth world empire of Daniel's vision) has been divided up and Antichrist has emerged.

It is concluded that the eschatology of the period under review is best described as 'inaugurated', that it works for the most part with a profound and continuing sense of God's Lordship even in the non-Christian world, that it encompasses a whole theology of history. Part of this is that space must be given for the conversion of the Gentiles (and possibly of Israel) before Christ comes in glory.
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CHAPTER I : THE PRESENT POSITION IN THE INTERPRETATION OF NEW TESTAMENT ESCHATOLOGY
THE PRESENT POSITION IN THE INTERPRETATION OF
NEW TESTAMENT ESCHATOLOGY.

Introductory Survey.

There is perhaps no aspect of New Testament studies which presents such a medley of conflicting emphases and of independent scholarly judgments as that relating to the sphere of eschatology. There are, doubtless, various reasons why this should be so. We may select two major considerations for reference. The first relates to the comprehensiveness of the subject; the other takes cognizance of its intimate connection with the witness of the New Testament writers to Jesus Christ.

New Testament eschatology includes within its scope a number of themes. It is true that these are related to one another, yet the comprehensiveness of the subject tends to make for confusion and makes it difficult to grasp it in its wholeness. The Kingdom of God, the Parousia of our Lord Jesus Christ, Resurrection and the Judgment Day, the state of the dead between the two advents of Christ, the possible restoration of the people of Israel, and the place of the Church's world mission in the proclamation of the present reign of Christ in His ascended majesty at the Father's right hand --- all these are themes which fall within the sphere of discourse. Any one of them taken by itself presents formidable problems, not least because it deals with a matter outwith ordinary human experience and has perforce to lean heavily upon symbolism as a means of conveying truth; when, however, these themes are viewed together it becomes difficult to disentangle them. Detailed questions suggest themselves, as, for example, whether the resurrection of the unregenerate will occur at the Parousia of Christ or only after a period of Christ's reign upon earth. Constantly we are harassed by doubts whether such questions are meaningful and whether perhaps they may not
have risen from pressing biblical images farther than they ought to be pressed. Nor is the situation helped by the fact that the various writers of the New Testament present us with considerable variety of expression, thought, and emphasis.

The other major source of difficulty is that it is only possible to understand the eschatology of the New Testament in its relation to the understanding found therein of the Person and Work of Jesus Christ. This is doubtless true in a general way of the doctrine of the apostles, yet its relevance in the case of eschatology is such that it is probably wiser to regard this subject in the New Testament documents as an aspect of the Person and Work of Christ rather than as a relatively independent, though related, theme such as the doctrine of the Church.

It may be thought that, if this be so, this factor should not make for difficulty, but rather for simplicity. We are thus given a co-ordinating principle in dealing with a wide subject. Yet this also means that problems of eschatology must be seen, on any New Testament basis, as bound up with such intricate questions as that of the significance of the term 'Son of Man', as employed by Jesus, and that of the correlation of the diverse interpretation of our Lord's ministry in, let us say, the Fourth Gospel and the Epistle to the Hebrews. It means, further, that the reference of eschatology is not wholly, as its derivation would suggest, to 'the last things', but also to present Christian and world experience viewed in the light of the ultimate results of Christ's mission to the world. This fact is reflected in the bewildering variety of circumstances in which the adjective, 'eschatological', is deemed appropriate. Some such instances are perhaps misuses of the word, but it is clear that eschatology in the New Testament does, in fact, have relation to present experience seen under a particular aspect.

If this is not so true elsewhere, as in the Old Testament, this is
primarily due to the fact that there we do not have to come to terms with the fact that in Christ the 'new age', the 'last age', has dawned.

The study of New Testament eschatology is, therefore, an exacting task. Yet it is a rewarding and an urgent task, just because of the factors mentioned, namely its comprehensiveness and its essential relation with the understanding of the mission of Jesus and the secret of His Person. William Hanson, in an early work, described the study of New Testament eschatology as one of the 'gateways' to an understanding of the theology of the apostolic writers as a whole. This judgment would be supported by all effective scholars.

The concern of this thesis is not with the eschatology of the New Testament writings as such, but rather with the evidence of the understanding of eschatological themes witnessed to by the writings, institutions, and development of the Christian Church from the sub-apostolic age to the mid-3rd century after Christ and with the implications of this evidence for modern scholarly assessment and interpretation of New Testament eschatology itself. In particular, we shall be at pains to ask whether the evidence of the period which is to be our study supports the understanding of the New Testament in terms of a 'konsequente Eschatologie', which stresses its futurist element, or a 'realized eschatology', which lays emphasis upon the fulfilment in Christ of age-long Israelitish eschatological expectation. Johannes Weiss and Albert Schweitzer were those who formulated the first of these approaches to eschatology. Recent continental exponents of this view are Fritz Buri and Martin Werner. Particular attention will be paid to the vigorous defence and exposition of this view in the latter's 'The Formation of Christian Dogma'. The 'realized eschatology' school derives primarily from Professor C. H. Dodd's interpretation of New Testament

1 Christ's View of the Kingdom of God: a study in Jewish apocalyptic and the mind of Jesus Christ. Clarke, London, 1918.

2 First published in German under the title, 'Die Entstehung des Christlichen Dogmas'.
eschatology in two important books. Broadcast addresses under the title 'The Coming of Christ', (1951) make it clear that Dodd has himself modified his original position.

It is clear, of course, that our task is not simply to assess evidence for and against two clear-cut and mutually exclusive interpretations of New Testament eschatology and of early Christian expectation. It is being increasingly realised in the world of scholarship that there were, probably both in the teaching of Jesus Himself and in the thinking of the apostles, elements in their eschatology that were definitely 'futurist', while certain others can only be explained as suggesting that in Christ and His mission the anticipated final Age had already dawned. It is felt that what is needed is some form of 'rapprochement' between 'konsequente Eschatologie' and 'realized eschatology', which will take adequate cognizance of both these elements as recorded in the New Testament documents. Joachim Jeremias of Göttingen, W.G. Kümmel of Marburg, and Oscar Cullmann of Basle are among those who have done most to attempt to formulate such a mediating position.

It is our intention briefly to sketch the historical development of what may be termed the two major rival interpretations of New Testament eschatology, and then to review the major mediating positions proposed. This work must necessarily be restricted to a relatively brief compass, since considerable work has been done on the present position in the interpretation of this particular aspect of New Testament theology. Further, our task relates more directly to the evidence of the Church Fathers, in so far as it throws light on this discussion.

Before we proceed to this task however, it is wise to note in short compass what are some of the major points of difference in interpretation and to attempt a more precise indication of what kind of search we are engaged upon in our whole investigation. We cannot do the second of these things without filling out our picture of the problems somewhat.

---

1 'The Parables of the Kingdom'. Nisbet, London, 1935.
We have already seen that eschatology in the New Testament documents relates to a number of issues. Perhaps the most inclusive way of looking at these matters is to ask whether and in what sense the Lord and the apostles believed that the Kingdom of God had come in Jesus' ministry, and in seeking an answer to the question to what extent, if any, they considered that it had yet to come. As we have seen, the exponents of 'realized eschatology' lay the stress upon the element of present fulfilment of Israel's hopes in the mission of Jesus. More precisely, what is said is that Jesus understood that in His ministry the Kingdom of God had come. Sayings which seem to suggest a futurist interpretation in the mind of the Master must be variously interpreted or regarded as misinterpretations of the mind of Jesus, imposed upon the text through the altered perspective of the apostles who had witnessed the events associated with the death, resurrection, and ascension of Christ. It is not denied that the apostles anticipated the early return of Christ in glory, though it is usually asserted that this hope grew dimmer with the passing of the years and is, therefore, more in evidence in Paul's Thessalonian correspondence than in, let us say, the Fourth Gospel. Those who do not accept a realized eschatology, but lay stress rather upon the futurist elements in Jesus' hope find their interpretation confirmed by the expectation obvious to us all in the understanding of the apostles, as witnessed to by the Epistles and Gospels. Such scholars, however, also frequently uphold the view that disappointment of hope led to a diminution of emphasis upon the Parousia, at which, it was supposed the Kingdom of God would fully come to reality.

Two basic questions are, therefore, suggested to us. Did Jesus Himself believe that in His mission the Kingdom of God was come? Or, did He hold that there was some important and significant sense in
which it would not come until the Parousia in glory of the Son of Man? Secondly, what evidence is there within the New Testament documents for the concept of a development in thinking regarding the Parousia and final establishment of the Kingdom of God?

Further questions suggest themselves. If Jesus did truly look towards the advent in glory of the Son of Man, did He give reason to suppose that this event would come to pass very shortly, possibly within the lifetime of his own generation? How do we relate such an expectation upon the part of Jesus to the statement put upon His lips that "this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations; and then shall the end come." (Matt. 24:14, a variant of Mk. 13:10)? Is there, in fact, perhaps some evidence that Jesus expected a certain time-gap, be it longer or shorter, between His ascension to the Father and the end of the age? Is the evidence of Mk. 13 and its parallels in Matthew and Luke admissible? Or, must we feel that modern scholarship's grave uncertainties regarding the 'Little Apocalypse' as an accurate and reliable consecutive account of an utterance of Jesus are valid, and, therefore, exert very great care regarding how we employ isolated sayings of Jesus from this 'apocalypse' as evidence? How far were such possible Dominical expectations of a delay before the 'parousia' of the Son of Man, taken over by the apostles?

How are we to understand the sense of imminence bound up with the apostolic expectation of the Parousia? One simple answer may be that it was based upon a like Dominical expectation. This, however, is perhaps not a final answer, even if we assume for the moment that it is a sound one, so far as it goes. Was this sense, both in the case of the apostles and of Jesus, the result of what is known as 'prophetic foreshortening', in which the prophet's realisation of the certainty of the fulfilment of God's saving purpose leads him to speak in terms
of its early fulfilment?

This is one of the most important of the issues before us, for it leads to another question: Is this sense of immediacy detachable, in principle, from the expectation of an historical event through which the reality of the present reign of Christ from the Father's right hand would be made manifest? Does the fact of the non-fulfilment of the Parousia hope within a short time of Christ's death and resurrection carry with it the seeds of an ultimate inability on the part of the Church to believe in the reality of such an event within history as such?

These are only some of the problems which confront students of the New Testament and of early Church history. It is clear, however, that they are all very difficult issues and that it is impossible for an investigation, which is especially concerned with the eschatology of the Early Church from the sub-apostolic age onwards, to deal with them all at length. These issues have already been ably canvassed, though it is doubtful whether we could say with reference to some of them that any consensus of opinion has yet emerged. What we must do, however, is to note those particular points of difficulty which may prove to be the 'growing points' in an investigation of this kind, in so far as their apparently intractable character underlines the importance of them and forces us to look at them from new perspectives and in the light of any new evidence which scholarly investigation may bring to light.

In our study it is important that we should not become unduly involved in the discussion of such issues as the nature of Jesus' understanding of the Kingdom of God, though this is an important and related issue. As we said above, New Testament eschatology is intimately connected with the explication of the Person and Work of Jesus Christ. This suggests, therefore, that what we must be at in
this present investigation is the search for such an understanding of
the faith of the early Christians in Jesus Christ under the aspect of
the promise contained in His Person and Work as will make intelligible
the reaction of the Early Church to her continuing mission upon earth,
when her expectation of an early return of her Lord remained unfulfilled.
Such an understanding should, for example, help us to assess how
seriously the Church would take the delay of the fulfilment of her
hope, though we must be careful that dogmatic understanding is not
allowed to bend or falsify the historical evidence in any way. It is
our conviction that an investigation which takes cognizance of the
relation of early church eschatology to the centralities of her faith
will not lead to falsification, but rather to illumination of the
documents and developing institutions of the Church and to a proper
understanding of them. Only one consideration seems able in logic to
militate against such a view of the situation. This is the possibility,
which must always be kept in mind, that the development of eschatological
expectation did not retain its vital connection with the Church's under­
standing of the life and work of Jesus Christ.

The nature of the approach to our study that we believe is required
may be illustrated with reference to one of the most central of those
difficulties earlier enumerated and one which should prove to be a
necessary 'growing point' for understanding simply because of its
seemingly unresolvable character. We refer to the question how we are
to understand the sense of imminence which characterised the early
Christian expectation of the Return of Christ. It seems that we may
be helped in this difficult matter by two different though not mutually
exclusive approaches to the problem. One seeks help through new
evidence regarding the character of Hebrew thinking, the other takes
its stand upon dogmatic considerations. We look first at the new
evidence of which we speak. In his important book 'Theologie des
Alten Testaments', Gerhard von Rad has denied that the modern familiar concept of absolute linear time is found in the Old Testament. Norman Perrin thus sets forth von Rad's position:

"In the Old Testament time is punctiliar; it is conceived of as a series of moments or seasons each one of which is connected with a particular event. There can be no time without an event, and no event without a time, and there is no thought of a climactic future towards which time moves but only of a continuing rhythm of events and their times, of times and their events."¹

Now, although Perrin notes the importance of von Rad's view as stressing the essentially historical character of the events within the compass of Old Testament eschatological hope and as being suggestive of an essentially historical element within the hope of the early church, he does not comment upon the possible implication of his contribution to the question of the reaction of the church to the 'delay' in the Parousia of Christ. What we must now ask ourselves is whether, if the early Christians had also "no thought of a climactic future towards which time moves", though they conceived of the Parousia as an event somehow within history, it is proper for us to speak of a 'delay' in the Parousia and whether the Early Church would have been likely to regard it as such. Is not the very conception of a 'delay' bound up with a modern conception of absolute linear time, which may be out of place in any attempt to understand the thinking of the Early Church? Or, on the other hand, must we say that certain recorded utterances of Jesus can only be made intelligible, if we accept that they imply the 'nearness' of the Parousia in a sense identical with, or closely related to, that with which we moderns are familiar? We do not attempt at this

stage to answer this question. Our concern has simply been to illustrate how certain important points of difficulty in the eschatology of the Early Church may be made clearer by fresh understanding of the evidence itself as viewed against its particular historical background.

We turn now to the second approach spoken of above. It may be that the conviction of the Early Church regarding the imminence of the Parousia and her reaction to its 'delay' is to be the better understood through a new appreciation of her understanding of the Person and Work of Jesus Christ. Oscar Cullmann, adopts the view that the early Christians, being in agreement with Hebrew thought, were in fact working with a conception of linear time (such as von Rad has now denied), that they undoubtedly anticipated the early appearing of Christ in glory, but that we must not on the basis of these facts jump to the erroneous conclusion that the delay of the Parousia must have posed a serious challenge to their faith in Christ. He has maintained that the period between the first and second advents of Christ is to be regarded as an 'overlap' of the Old and New ages. The Christian Church knew that the new age had been superimposed upon the old, that it had in fact begun, and that it is only man's lack of faith which blinds him to this reality. Cullmann has expressed his view of the relation of the present world situation to that which is yet to come by saying that in the death and resurrection of Christ 'D-day' was reached, but that the 'V-day' of the Kingdom of God is yet future. Now, if the basic fact is that Christ has already begun His heavenly reign, then it is a relatively minor affair that this has not yet been made manifest to all. The day of final victory is assured, even if it be not yet here. Therefore, the delay in the Parousia, though it did come as a

---

surprise to the Early Church, could not have been in any sense a severe jolt to her faith. Such a view, it may be mentioned in passing, contrasts markedly with that set out by Martin Werner. It is Werner's contention that it was the severe jolt to the Church's faith and understanding, occasioned by the delay in the Parousia, which was responsible for the development of dogma in the form that we believe to be historical. This 'development' represented, on Werner's view, a distinct break with the earliest Christian understanding of the life and mission of Jesus and an adjustment of her primitive eschatological expectation. Such a view has been developed by Werner in a rather extreme form and this scholar's presentation of the development of early Church dogma has not met with great acceptance, in consequence, but it is interesting as representing the out-working of a view which thinks that the Early Church must have been considerably disturbed by the 'delay' in the Parousia.

The above discussion has helped, we believe, to clarify our objectives and the appropriate approaches towards these objectives. The most important single element in regard to our approach would seem to be the search for an adequate understanding of the faith of the early Christians in Jesus, especially as viewed under the aspect of promise. The second must be an adequate grasp of the whole background of thought, especially in the realm of eschatological expectation in Palestine prior to the time, and at the time, of Christ. As for the objectives, the primary one may be said to be the acquisition of such an understanding of the eschatological faith and expectation of the Early Church as will make intelligible her reaction to the 'delay' in the Parousia of Christ. Closely bound up with this is the aim to establish from the available evidence what in fact this reaction was, a matter which is not at all so clear as we might expect. Our further aim is to review the whole
gamut of Early Christian eschatological expectation and to endeavour
to relate it to what we believe to be fundamental, namely, the Church's
expectation of the final unveiling of the Kingdom of God. In this it
seems probable that we shall find that this final act in the eschatological
drama is not an isolated event, in the reckoning of the Early Church, but
rather the last in a series of 'moments' in the outworking of the divine
plan of redemption for the world.

Development Towards 'Consistent Eschatology'

We turn our attention now to a sketch of the historical origins
and development of the movement known as 'konsequente Eschatologie'—
in English 'thorough-going eschatology' or 'consistent eschatology'.
We have already mentioned the names of Johannes Weiss, professor at
Marburg around the turn of the present century, and Albert Schweitzer,
whose remarkable career made him such a well-known figure. Properly
speaking, the work of Weiss must be said to be preparatory to that of
the school of thought designated by the term 'konsequente Eschatologie',
of which Schweitzer was the founder member. The work of Schweitzer
in the field of eschatology has been very influential in modern theology
and New Testament scholarship, though it must be said that his own
interpretation of the evidence of the New Testament has not gained
general acceptance. 'Consistent eschatology' has had a greater vogue
on the continent of Europe than in Britain or in America, but even there
it is but one important understanding of the eschatological hope of the
eyear Christians. What is undoubtedly is that the publication of
Schweitzer's "Von Reimarus zu Wrede" in German in 1906 and in English
in 1910 under the title, 'The Quest of the Historical Jesus' has made
the whole church and scholarship in general, aware, in a way that it
had not been previously, that the message and mission of Jesus can only
be made intelligible in strict relation to His fulfilling of, and deep
interest in, the eschatological hope of the Jewish people. Schweitzer himself and other members of what has come to be known (through Schweitzer's own opposition of 'thorough-going eschatology' with the 'thorough-going scepticism', as he characterized it, of William Wrede, professor at Breslau) as the 'consistent eschatology' school went on to develop their views with reference not only to the teaching of Jesus but also of St. Paul and the primitive church at large. The 'Quest' itself has now run to its sixth edition in German, the title from the second edition being 'Geschichte der Leben-Jesu-Forschung'. The sixth German edition was published in 1951 and the third English edition (under the original English title) in 1954.

What precisely may we say 'consistent eschatology' means? The following quotation from a work by W.G. Kümmel well sums up its essence, as first set forth by Schweitzer:

"that Jesus in close connexion with Jewish apocalyptic made the announcement of the imminent end of the world the central theme of his message and expected his appearance as the Son of Man on the clouds of heaven, first in his lifetime, and then in direct connexion with his death."¹

It may be well to set this forth at the outset, since it will be presumed in the historical sketch of its origins and development, upon which we must now embark.

Schweitzer's 'Quest of the Historical Jesus' not only sets out his own distinctive contribution, but it provides us with a useful summary of the development of modern thought regarding the interpretation of the message of Jesus up to his own time of writing in the opening years of the twentieth century. We shall not assume that this necessarily takes cognizance of every important factor, since every theologian and scholar

is to some extent limited by his own principles of interpretation and
sets forth the material in such a manner as to lead up to the contrib-
ution which he himself wishes to make. Nevertheless, it has to be
said that Schweitzer's summary makes fascinating reading and is generally
recognised as being a classic study of post-Reformation interpretation
of the teaching of Jesus in relation to its eschatological presuppositions.

As it is our desire to examine 'konsequente Eschatologie', it is
important to look at this historical development through Schweitzer's
eyes, even though we must not do so uncritically. This would seem to
be the best way of making a beginning to the task of reviewing and
evaluating the contribution of this approach to New Testament eschatology.
What then are the great names mentioned by Schweitzer? We will treat
briefly of his understanding of the contribution of the major figures
and influences.

The first figure to be examined is that of HERMANN SAMUEL REIMARUS
(1694-1768), a person whose work only became known and important
through the attention paid to it by David Friedrich Strauss in the
middle years of the nineteenth century. He was the champion in his
lifetime through certain published works of a rationalist approach to
religion, but his really significant work was not to receive full pub-
lication until after his death and even then it was only published in
partial form by Lessing. The 'Wolfenbüttel Fragments', as they came
to be known, created quite a stir. They were published at Brunswick
between 1774 and 1778.

The most important of these Fragments for our purpose is that
entitled, 'The Aims of Jesus and His disciples'. Schweitzer sees its
importance, as did Lessing, as consisting in the fact that here for the

1 The Quest of the Historical Jesus. Adam and Charles Black, London.
1945, pp. 13-26. (trans. by W. Montgomery, B.D., from the first
German edition, Von Reimarus zu Wrede).
first time a serious attempt was made to review the life of Jesus and His thought in accordance with the principles of exact historical science.

The chief contention of Reimarus in this Fragment was that Jesus understood by the Kingdom of God what his contemporaries understood. He further averred that Jesus had said that He would shortly bring in the Kingdom. All that people were required to do was to repent and believe that Jesus was about to introduce the Kingdom. The fact that no special explanation is given in the Gospels of the content of Jesus' and the disciples' proclamation regarding the Kingdom of God shows that Jesus meant by the term what others of His day were looking for, namely, deliverance from the Romans. The disciples were sent out on their teaching mission in order that they might stir the aspirations of the Jews who looked for their national and political redemption.

Jesus' demand for a deeper morality than that required by the Mosaic Law is, according to Reimarus, the only point in Jesus' preaching in which He went beyond the ideas of his contemporaries. Even this did not involve, however, a break with the Law. Rather was this new morality a fulfilment of the old commandments. Those elements in the Gospels which reflect Christian dogmatic conceptions, such as the Trinity, and the 'metaphysical' Divine Sonship, cannot be regarded as original. It is denied that the institution of Baptism and the Lord's Supper indicate any real break on Jesus' part with historic Judaism. Matt. 28:19 is rejected, or at least said to be unreliable, because it implies a universalism, which Reimarus thought to be alien to Christ's thinking, and because it implies the doctrine of the Trinity. Further, the fact that Jesus Himself did not baptize and is not reported as having commanded baptism in the case of any of those whom he influenced, make it questionable whether baptism really goes back to Jesus at all. As for the Lord's Supper, this was to be viewed simply as an episode at the Last Paschal Meal of the kingdom which was soon to give place to
the Kingdom of God. The view of it as the institution of a sacrament of the Christian Church in a sense which cuts it loose from the Passover, is a mistaken view.

The rationalism which Reimarus shared with many other thinkers of his day is clear in the general tone of what is related above. What is distinctive is his insistence that Jesus' message has to be understood against its Jewish contemporary background and that this means that it has to be regarded as essentially eschatological, as having reference to the inauguration of the Kingdom of God. Schweitzer, followed by all competent modern scholars, would reject the view that Jesus thought of this Kingdom in the sense of an earthly political unit in which the Roman power had been overthrown, but Reimarus' erroneous thinking at this point should not make us blind to the reality of his contribution. We are perhaps also apt to miss his significance because we today take it for granted that Jesus' message has to be seen in its contemporary Jewish setting and that this means taking cognizance of elements in the temper of the time which related to the Jewish expectation of the Kingdom of God. We should realise that our appreciation of these facts goes back through Schweitzer, and Johannes Weiss before him, to Hermann Reimarus.

Schweitzer owes a great deal to Weiss, but both Weiss and Schweitzer learned much from Reimarus. This is true not only in what has been set out above but also in a number of detailed points of interpretation of the course of Jesus' ministry and of the Lord's own development of thinking with reference to the inauguration of the Kingdom of God. This constitutes our justification for looking further at Reimarus' views.

Reimarus' views regarding the period at which Jesus expected the popular uprising, which He believed His ministry and teaching would provoke and which would lead to the overthrow of the Romans and the establishment of the Kingdom of God, have influenced Schweitzer
considerably. Twice Jesus is said by Reimarus to have thought this uprising at hand, but on both occasions He was mistaken. The first was when Jesus sent out the disciples on their teaching mission. Only thus can we understand the difficult saying of Matt. 10:23: "Ye shall not have gone over the cities of Israel before the Son of Man comes". The second was when, at the 'triumphal entry' into Jerusalem, Jesus thought to force the issue. It was Jesus' miscalculation on this occasion which led to His crucifixion. Jesus' surprise at the turn of events is witnessed to by His agonized cry from the Cross: "My God! My God! Why hast thou forsaken me?"

The disciples were at first shattered by Jesus' death, but they recovered from this blow to their faith in Jesus by falling back upon a second kind of Messianic expectation present in Israel and witnessed to by the Book of Daniel, the apocalyptic literature, and Justin's 'Dialogue with Trypho'. Jesus and the disciples had relied on the political ideal of the prophets that a scion of David's line should reign over a united and glorified Israel. Now the disciples fell back upon the apocalyptic conception of a heavenly prince who would appear upon the clouds of heaven. In order to foster belief in this conception, the disciples perpetrated the fraud of concealing the body of Jesus until it was beyond recognition. The apostles were, of course, obliged to find reasons to explain the delay of the Parousia to their simpler and sincere brethren. Reimarus says that this vast fraud was brought about through the unwillingness of the apostles, who had forgotten how to work during their period with Jesus, to return to work. This theory can only be called grotesque. It is not only offensive to faith, but it betrays a surprising lack of historical sense, in one whose contribution consisted precisely in its insistence upon viewing Jesus' mission and teaching over against its background. Albert Schweitzer would agree with this judgment, yet he says that despite its anti-Christian
character as a "piece of Deistic polemics", its basic historical insight is very great and significant, so much so that,

"in the light of the clear perception of the elements of the problem which Reimarus had attained, the whole movement of theology, down to Johannes Weiss, appears retrograde."²

The next considerable figure, in the account given by Schweitzer, is that of DAVID FRIEDRICH STRAUSS (1808-1874). Here we shall concern ourselves only with the anticipations in his 'Life of Jesus' of the positions of Weiss and Schweitzer. It should be noted that four editions of this book were published, and that it is to be carefully distinguished from his popular 'Life of Jesus for the German People' of 1864, in which, to quote Schweitzer, he "renounced his better opinions of 1835, eliminated eschatology, and instead of the historic Jesus, portrayed the Jesus of liberal theology."⁴ The 'Life' with which we are going to deal here was published first in 1835. In the following year a second edition was published, agreeing with the first. In 1838-39 a third edition was published, in which surprising concessions were made by Strauss to the views of his opponents, but in 1840 the fourth edition confirmed and reaffirmed the positions of the first and second editions. It is with the views of the first, second and fourth editions that we are here concerned, since they represent Strauss' distinctive contributions.


²op. cit. p.23

³op. cit. p. 68ff.

⁴op. cit. p.96.
Strauss was a stormy petrel in his day. What shocked people was his extensive use of the category of 'myth' to explain how the Gospel records were to be understood, used in conjunction with a profound scepticism regarding the recoverability of reliable history from many of the recorded scenes. We know how much modern scholarship has taken up Strauss' views concerning myth in the Gospels, and in this respect this work must be regarded as significant and forward-looking. With reference to the scepticism, however, most would feel that it requires considerable tempering both with faith and with positive historical judgments.

It is noteworthy that Strauss' use of mythology to explain what he believed to be the proper interpretation of certain recorded biblical incidents is an example of the application of the Hegelian principle that synthesis is reached by a process of thesis, followed by antithesis, being combined and producing a new creative principle. In this case the thesis was the supernaturalistic interpretation of, let us say, a miracle-story; antithesis was represented by the naturalistic explanations of the rationalists, which often seemed strained to the impartial mind; while the interpretation that a truth is being portrayed in symbolic terms seems to do justice, so thinks Strauss, to the whole situation. This fact of Hegelian influence is to be noted since it seems clear, as we hope to show later, that the whole development of the viewpoint associated with 'konsequente Eschatologie' has been influenced by Hegelian points of view.

Four points in Strauss' thought call for special mention. The first relates to his remarks regarding the way in which Jesus speaks concerning 'the Son of Man'. Apart from Matt. 12:8, in which Strauss feels the reference might be to 'man' in general, Jesus seems to be referring to the Son of Man as a supernatural person, distinct from Himself, but to be identified with the Messiah. In the difficult passage
in Matt. 10:23 Jesus appears to think of Himself as the forerunner of the Messiah. This can only be accounted for, thinks Strauss, on the supposition that these sayings represent the thought of Jesus before He knew Himself to be the Son of Man. What is interesting here is Strauss' seizing upon the third-personal curiously detached way of referring to the Son of Man, which Weiss and Schweitzer also were to think demanded explanation. Only these thinkers were not to explain it as did Strauss: rather were they to give an explanation, around which their whole explanation of Jesus' eschatological conceptions found its source and inspiration. For them Jesus thus spoke because He was not yet become the Son of Man, but the impossibility of declaring outright that in these 'Son of Man' passages Jesus was referring to another, rests on the fact that they imply a unique relationship between Jesus and the Son of Man, a relation verging on identity but not adequately explained on this hypothesis. For Weiss and Schweitzer Jesus was the One Who was to become the Son of Man: this is the understanding which makes intelligible, in their view, certain cadences in the 'Son of Man' sayings.

Strauss sought to get beyond the alternative which lay at the root of Reimarus' insistence that Jesus looked for the establishment of a political kingdom. The alternative was that between a political or spiritual view of the Kingdom of God as conceived by Jesus, Reimarus' choice seems to most of us repugnant. Strauss asks if we are seeing the whole position clearly. He thinks Reimarus is right in saying that Jesus expected an earthly, political kingdom, but he insists that in the thinking of Jesus this kingdom was to be brought in, not by the sword, nor by Christ Himself, but through the supernatural intervention of God. Thus viewed, the conception of the Kingdom as a political entity loses much of its crass materiality. There is here surely an element of profound insight, and it was one taken up into the interpretation
of Jesus' eschatology by the 'consistent eschatology' school.

Strauss took up Reimarus' view regarding the Last Supper as simply an episode at the last Paschal Meal of the era which was soon to give way to the messianic kingdom. He developed this thought and asserted that it could only mean that within a year's time the pre-Messianic dispensation will have passed away. Strauss is so much a sceptic in his handling of the records that he is uncertain, however, whether Jesus' eschatological sayings have been sufficiently accurately reported to make this saying bear this meaning, in its original utterance. Schweitzer was to take up this idea, unhindered by what he would call Strauss' lack of historical sense, which resulted from a literary approach to passages in their isolation from one another. Schweitzer made it a part of his lucidly developed theory.

Although Strauss felt that the detail in the recorded predictions by Jesus of His passion and resurrection suggest that here we are dealing with 'vaticinia ex eventu', yet perhaps Jesus did foresee His death, and possibly He went to His death in the conviction that only thus could He adequately fulfil His messianic role. Again, to Strauss the problem is insoluble owing to the indecisive character of the Gospel records. There is here, however, a hint of the view of Schweitzer that Jesus was to fling Himself upon the wheel of fate, in order that He might forcibly bring into existence the Kingdom of God through concentrating upon Himself the final 'περιποιήσ' or tribulation. At the same time, it is true that at this point Strauss' lead is not so clear and is equally susceptible of explanation as pointing to his general appreciation of the spiritual earnestness with which Jesus viewed the Cross and not necessarily as indicating a narrowly eschatological interpretation of this, such as we find in Schweitzer.

Not a few hints are found in what is set forth above of the developed views of Schweitzer and his school. Strauss stood in not
a few ways halfway between Reimarus and Wrede and he gathered up elements of Reimarus' contribution in his own.

We must take brief note of the role of Bruno Bauer (1809-82), whose work as a biblical critic is significant for our present investigation in that it helped to establish that 'thorough-going scepticism' to which Schweitzer's 'thorough-going' eschatology was consciously opposed. The contribution of Bauer in this regard issued from the conviction which grew upon him that Mark's Gospel alone could lay fair claim to provide us with genuine history, and that its emphasis upon the messianic concept is not in keeping with evidence regarding what contemporary Jews believed. This conclusion is now seen to be insupportable. It is not presently believed that we have only Mark's account to rely upon, since the additional material in both Luke and Matthew is considered to be more than mere literary expansions of Mark's brief note of certain points, and even the question of the historicity of John's Gospel, viewed by Bauer as a work of art, is under fresh review. Further, we know today how much the Jewish people in Palestine in Jesus' day were concerned with eschatological, and in particular messianic, hopes. It is, however, largely as a result of the later work of Weiss and Schweitzer that we have become aware of this concern with eschatological matters in Jesus' day.

Bauer also influenced 'konsequente Eschatologie' through a few more particular points of difficulty in the narrative of Mark, to which he called attention. The later movement was not to accept Bauer's answers to these difficulties, but it did develop by providing its own solutions to them, made conscious of them through Bauer's work. Thus, Bauer thought the story of the Mission of the Twelve inconceivable as history: the disciples were not told what to preach, and they were warned

1 Schweitzer's study, op. cit., pp. 137-160 forms the background to the comments made.
of persecutions that they were to endure during this mission, which did not materialize. Again, Bauer found it curious that the narrative attributed miracles to Jesus but was sufficiently honest to admit that these did not bring conviction regarding His messiahship. Further, the general assumption of secrecy in regard to Jesus' messiahship seemed to Bauer to reflect a situation of unreality so far as history was concerned. Bauer's explanation of all these incidental features of the Marcan narrative was that in fact Jesus never claimed to be Messiah. Such a claim would in any case have meant little to Jesus' contemporaries. The whole concept of messiahship developed first of all through the thinking of Jesus' followers after His death, It is Mark's awareness of these facts which is reflected in his presentation of Jesus' career in terms of the 'messianic secret'. The latter mirrors his subjective consciousness of the difficulty of presenting Jesus in a way which was not objectively in accord with the facts of the career of Jesus.

All of these problems in the Marcan account were to receive an explanation of a different character in Schweitzer and his followers, one not in terms of 'thorough-going scepticism' but one in terms of 'thorough-going eschatology'. Clearly, if one accepts that throughout Jesus' mission was guided by eschatological interest and the awareness of messiahship, it would be possible to explain both the content of the disciples' preaching on their Mission and the expectation of persecution: the former would require to conform to that veiled presentation of Jesus' messiahship, which is thus assumed throughout the Marcan account, while the latter could be accounted for by an historical assumption by Jesus of the proximity in time of 'eschatological woes', which did not in fact appear. The miracles -- as also the parables which presented a conundrum to Bauer (since they were intended, as Mark 4:12 tells us, only to be understood by the disciples, and were not in fact understood fully even
by them) -- may be understood in terms of the 'messianic secret' as signs or indications for those who were thought of as wise. Apocalyptic literature had emphasized the concept of an elect community within Israel which would be given understanding of the times in the last days, and who would be given deliverance from the fiery trials of the final period of tribulation, which was conceived of as ushering in the messianic kingdom.

It is clear, therefore, that though Bauer's explanations were not to be accepted by Weiss and Schweitzer and the 'konsequente Eschatologie' school of thought, he did pinpoint certain features of the Marcan account which were fastened on by the latter in their own understanding of Jesus' ministry. The provision of these significant features, together with the general stimulus offered by his sceptical outlook in regard to the historical account that we have of Jesus' ministry, represent the contributions of Bruno Bauer to the development of 'consistent eschatology', which self-consciously established its claims over against such an outlook.

It behoves us now to come more closely to those figures who were the immediate precursors of 'thorough-going eschatology'. We select for especial mention the names of Timothy Colani, W. Baldensperger, and Johannes Weiss, though the contribution of others will be noted in passing. The work of these men, to be appreciated, has to be set against its background, which was that of an age in which liberal Christianity was gaining ground, in which the 'simplicity' of Jesus' preaching of the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of men was being set forth at the expense of the 'complicated' system of Pauline thought, and in which modern categories of evolution and lines of philosophic and psychological understanding were being made the basis of biblical interpretation. The eschatological question, as formulated and resolved by the persons named above, was to recall biblical scholarship to the
attempt to set the New Testament records squarely in their own historical setting and to allow them to speak to the Church out of that setting. It was further to challenge the contrast made between the Pauline thinking and the message of Jesus, in so far as a deeper understanding of the latter, in the context of the study of Jewish thought forms contemporary with the Master, was to make it appear much more complex than the liberals had thought.

COLANI was convinced that Jesus entered upon a Jewish situation in which there were wide divergences of thought regarding the coming messianic kingdom. In particular, the prophetic and apocalyptic conceptions were at variance, in that the former looked for the coming kingdom as one pertaining to this world whereas the latter looked for the catastrophic dissolving of heaven and earth. Jesus set aside both of these conceptions by accepting the title of Messiah only in the sense of the Lord of a spiritual present kingdom. With the idea of the Davidic messianic kingship He would have nothing to do. In place of the apocalyptic predilection for catastrophe He set the concept of development, while the world, and not Israel alone, became the sphere of the Kingdom.

Timothy Colani (1824-1888)\(^1\) wrote his definitive work, 'Jésus-Christus et les croyances messianiques de son temps' in 1864. One of his most influential findings is only briefly noted by Schweitzer, yet it is of considerable importance: Mark 13 and its parallels in Matt. 24 and Luke 21, a major source of information regarding our Lord's eschatological expectations, is to be viewed as interpolated by a Jewish-Christian discourse, composed probably before the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D.70. What was original in this account was an exhortation given by Jesus in which He predicted the destruction of the temple.

\(^1\)Cf. Schweitzer, *op.cit.* pp.222-224.
We devote a paragraph to this matter, since it has been enormously influential. James Moffat in 1911, felt himself able to say that "this hypothesis of the small apocalypse" is now a *sententia recepta* of synoptic criticism.\(^1\) This verdict is for the most part regarded as an established finding of scholarship today, as when Moffat penned these words. Thus, Norman Perrin, in commenting on G.R. Beasley-Murray's work, *Jesus and the Future* (1954), says that what he regards as the latter's failure to demonstrate the authenticity of the Marcan apocalypse "confirms the almost universal tendency of modern New Testament scholarship not to rely upon it in any attempted reconstruction of the teaching of Jesus."\(^2\) While Perrin's words are doubtless guarded and justified, they perhaps give the impression that any defence of the authenticity of this apocalypse is doomed from the start. A review of the careful citations of scholarship on both sides in this issue, as found in Beasley-Murray's book, is, however, revealing: while it is true that a majority of New Testament scholars refuse to accept its authenticity, there are a number of eminent scholars who have written in opposition to the 'little apocalypse theory', while there are others whose positions may be described as mediating ones. Thus, Beasley-Murray notes that R.H. Charles, Vincent Taylor, R. Bultmann, G.S. Duncan, W.F. Howard, F.C. Grant, and A.M. Hunter have written in support of the theory, though displaying understandably individual differences in their exposition of it. However, it is interesting to observe that among those who accept the authenticity of Mark 13 are to be included the following:


\(^2\) *op.cit.*, p.134

\(^3\) *Jesus and the Future: an examination of the criticism of the eschatological discourse, Mark 13, with special reference to the Little Apocalypse Theory*. Macmillan. London. 1954. Chap.2:Charles (pp.59-62), Taylor(69-70), Bultmann(70-71), Duncan(77), Howard, F.C. Grant, Hunter(80). Detailed citations are given.
It is clear, then, that the difficult question concerning the authenticity of Mark 13 is by no means settled. A.M. Hunter has said that "Mark 13 is the biggest problem in the Gospel" and with this judgment many New Testament scholars would be in agreement. Apart from the question of authenticity, there are a number of related points which attract our attention in this passage. If it is not authentic, is it to be viewed as containing a Jewish or a Jewish-Christian discourse? What are the precise limits of the 'Little Apocalypse' supposed to be contained in this chapter? Usually it is defined as consisting of vv. 5-8, 14-20, 24-27, 30, 32, 35-37. Nevertheless judgments on this issue vary considerably. The juxtaposition of vv. 30 and 32 in the one discourse is awkward and would seem to convict Jesus of being involved in a manifest contradiction. This has suggested to some that, whether or not Jesus is responsible for the discourse, or only for that which keeps the discourse together, it is improbable that both verses refer to the final consummation. Possibly v. 30 refers to the destruction of Jerusalem. If Mark 13 in its totality is an authentic utterance of Jesus as a unit, how are we to understand it? In particular, how are we to reconcile its apparent emphasis upon signs of the coming Parousia with the usual interpretation of such passages as Luke 17:20ff.? 

1 G.R. Beasley-Murray, op.cit. Detailed citations in support of the statement that these writers, Dalman-Michaelis, accept the authenticity of Mk. 13 is given by Beasley-Murray, p. 167. Rowley's attitude is noted on pp. 158-159 and Cullmann's on p. 160.


3 Morgenthaler, Bo Reicke, H. Riesenfeld, O. R. Piper, however, also accept its authenticity.
is it rather the truth of the matter that, when we put this chapter alongside contemporary Jewish and somewhat later Jewish-Christian apocalyptic expressions, the sanity and sobriety of this utterance of Jesus is at once apparent, as also the fact that perhaps the import of this chapter is not to encourage a slavish dependence upon signs of the End but rather serves the purpose of 'paraclesis', exhorting the disciples in the coming days of persecution to look up for 'their redemption draweth nigh'? Or, again, may the true solution of the many problems associated with this difficult chapter be that all its utterances are authentic in the sense that, taken individually, each word came from Jesus, but that the editorial composition of these words has been such as to distort the significance of Jesus' words? We cannot at this point propose a discussion, far less a solution, of these matters. What it is basic to assert, however, is that the question of the authenticity of Mark 13 is by no means a closed issue. And any investigation of the eschatology of Jesus cannot afford to sidestep this difficult problem. While the eschatological hope of Jesus is presupposed in all His teaching and receives concrete expression elsewhere, this passage is too long and too unhesitatingly accepted in the Early Church for us to put it aside and feel we have anything like an adequate picture of Jesus' mind on the whole gamut of eschatological expectation.

It is noteworthy that Colani interpreted Jesus' use of the term, 'Son of Man', as being indicative of Jesus' identification of Himself with His fellow-men and as a repudiation in an indirect fashion of highly apocalyptic messianic conceptions. Quite a few scholars have agreed that the term indicates Jesus' self-identification with His fellows in their humanity, but of recent years this view has been decreasing in popularity. It may be that Jesus transformed certain Jewish apocalyptic expectations, but the use by Him of a figure which
features so prominently in the Books of Daniel and of Enoch can hardly be without significance. Most advocates of Colani's interpretation have, it is true, asserted that Jesus derived this usage not from apocalyptic literature, but from the book of Ezekiel, in which the prophet Ezekiel is frequently addressed by the Almighty as 'son of man'. While the question of the precise significance of this term as used on the lips of Jesus is one of the greatest problems of New Testament scholarship and one should hesitate to deny that the use in Ezekiel may not have in part coloured Jesus' use of it, the dominance of its use in Jewry in apocalyptic literature is highly suggestive that the term as used by Jesus must have basically an eschatological reference.

Central to Colani's presentation of Jesus' life and mission was his conviction that Jesus' conception of the Kingdom of God, which was to come, was utterly spiritual and was not at all moulded by apocalyptic ideas. If this be so, it follows that for Jesus to envisage a glorious Return or a Second Advent in glory would have contradicted the whole character of His ministry. How then are we to explain those passages which undoubtedly attribute to Jesus a hope, which looks for the violent irruption of God to set up His Kingdom? Schweitzer remarks that Colani was aware that such sections were so numerous in the historical tradition that they could not be explained away symbolically in many instances. The only alternative is to excise such passages as not representing authentic utterances of Jesus. Is it not true that in many cases excision is resorted to, not primarily because the documentary evidence suggests it, though it may doubtless be capable of some measure of literary justification, but rather because 'a priori' conceptions dominate the mind of the interpreter? Beasley-Murray has made a good case for the view, in regard to Mark 13, that the prevailing motive of

\[\text{op.cit. p. 31.}\]
such men as Strauss, Colani, and more recently T.F. Glasson, in their whole approach to Jesus' eschatology, has been the accommodation of our understanding of Jesus' expectation for the future to that which those outside the Christian faith would be able to accept, such as T.H. Huxley in recent years. However laudable the motive, must we not insist that the Christian faith can only be understood from the inside? Is it justifiable to excise passages, ultimately because they make Jesus seem ridiculous to modern man? To reason thus is not to allow our thought forms to come under the judgment of the Word of God. Beasley-Murray says aptly of Colani's treatment of Mark 13 that "it is a rigid application of an undeviating principle, that of 'thorough-going non-eschatology'."¹

WILHELM BALDENSPERGER² published in 1888 his book, 'Das Selbstbewusstsein Jesu im Lichte der messianischen Hoffnungen seiner Zeit'. The very title reflects the growing awareness of New Testament scholarship in the latter half of the nineteenth century of the scope and significance of Jewish apocalyptic for an adequate appreciation of the mission and message of Jesus. This scholar was sure that by Jesus' day the messianic views which we associate with the books of Daniel and Enoch had gained the ascendancy in the popular expectation. Instead of explaining Jesus' messianic consciousness and eschatological expectations simply in terms of this reconstruction of contemporary Jewish thought, however, Baldensperger asserted the presence of a dual note in Jesus' hope, which corresponded to a dual element in His own religious consciousness. Thus, Jesus looked for a Kingdom of God, which combined spiritual and eschatological elements. We may wonder whether this is a correct

¹ op.cit. p. 16.
antithesis, but Baldensperger employed it. With this dual conception in His mind, Jesus essayed the task of founding and upbuilding this Kingdom, while recognising that its completion and consummation could come only by the intervention of God in power. This outlook reminds us of that of Strauss, the difference being that, whereas Reimarus and Strauss thought Jesus shared the popular expectation of a this-worldly political kingdom, Baldensperger realised that Jesus thought of the Kingdom of God in more spiritual terms. This aspect of his conception was dominated really by Ritschlian conceptions, notably that of the Kingdom of God as a community of love. Where Baldensperger departed from Ritschl was in his endeavour to take seriously the sense, witnessed to in the New Testament, of expectation in Jesus of a consummation which will not be achieved by human effort but must come down from God. There is here surely a profound insight and a genuine willingness to come to terms with the witness of the New Testament documents, as also with what we now know of the Jewish-Palestinian background of eschatological expectation in Jesus' day and prior to it.

Baldensperger placed emphasis upon Jesus' unique sense of oneness with God. In this emphasis there is surely value and insight, despite Schweitzer's criticism of Baldensperger's conformity to the usual 'metaphysical' interpretation of Jesus' self-consciousness. Of more recent years there has been a reaction from the intense absorption, which was to be manifested from Baldensperger's day onwards and right to the time of the Second World War, in the self-consciousness of Jesus. This reaction stems from a sense of hopelessness regarding the attempt to recover such knowledge: Schweitzer suggested that the recovery of the 'real Jesus' might not be so helpful as we had anticipated. Later scholarship was to go one further by suggesting that in any case it was virtually an impossible task as the records of Jesus' life and words have been so overlaid by the thinking of the Early Church, and as for
such a matter as Jesus' inner consciousness, who even among the disciples would be in a position to vouch for this? Nevertheless, however difficult we may judge it to be to recover this self-consciousness and however true it may be that our faith derives from the objective witness of the apostles to Jesus in the fulness of His life and action, it remains true that Jesus must have had a consciousness of relationship with God and of vocation. This much is clearly presupposed in the records of the four Evangelists. It is only when we pry into matters relating to the development of this consciousness that we perhaps deal with matters that are not intended for our scrutiny and are, in any case, beyond our ability to reconstruct satisfactorily. What is valuable in Baldensperger's emphasis is his realisation that Jesus' sense of vocation can only be adequately understood in the light of His sense of communion with the Father. As William Manson has more recently stressed, Jesus' conception of His messianic office emerged out of His sense of oneness with the Father, and not vice-versa. Baldensperger's emphasis at this point seems sound and is relevant for our present consideration, since Jesus' conception of the coming Kingdom of God is bound up with His interpretation of His own Person and Work.

As we have seen, Baldensperger made room in his estimate of Jesus' conception of the Kingdom of God for a spiritual and an eschatological aspect of this phenomenon. Until the period associated with Caesarea Philippi, the spiritual aspect predominated in Jesus' mind, in the sense that Jesus was prepared to do His work in the conviction that God in His own good time -- yet conceived of as imminent -- would bring in the Kingdom in its fulness. From this time onwards, however, Jesus discovered a new sense of vocation: He believed Himself called upon to die, in order that the Kingdom might come into being. This judgment did not entail a victory for a 'spiritual' conception of the

Kingdom at the expense of the 'eschatological', for it enshrined a creative decision on Jesus' part which gathered up into itself elements from both sides. Jesus' self-offering would create a people who would become the 'saints of the Most High' so intimately associated with the Danielic conception of the Son of Man, while He Himself would return in glory after His death as this apocalyptic figure, invested with the authority of the Judge of all creation.

We turn now to the contribution of JOHANNES WEISS. This is of quite outstanding importance. He published his book, 'Die Predigt Jesu vom Reiche Gottes' in 1892. A second edition appeared in 1900. It was the view of this book which was to be taken up so eagerly by Albert Schweitzer and, through the impact made by the 'Quest of the Historical Jesus' rendered a formative influence in the estimation of Jesus' thought from the first decade of this century right up to the present time. Schweitzer puts the matter thus: "The general conception of the Kingdom was first rightly grasped by Johannes Weiss."

What is the essence of this conception? It is, in a word, that in Jesus' thought it was imminent but wholly future. In such events as the exorcism of demons the imminent Kingdom may exercise a present influence, but it itself has not yet arrived. It follows from the nature of this expectation that it must be conceived in purely supra-mundane apocalyptic categories. The Kingdom of God is not a brotherhood of love, conceived in Ritschlian terms. Nor is it a political kingdom. It envisages a whole new order of things in accordance with the usual apocalyptic way of looking at things. We may recall Strauss at this point. He had conceived of Reimarus' posing of the alternatives as being those of a spiritual or a political character as defective, judging that
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1 Cf. Schweitzer, op.cit. pp.237-240 and passim
while Jesus conceived of it as political, He saw its foundation in the
irruptive activity of God. As over against this view Johannes Weiss
saw clearly that the conception of a final and decisive intervention by
God, in which the general resurrection from the dead and the Judgment
Day are involved, presumes a whole new order of things. Thus a mere
political upheaval instituted and established by God, must be set aside
in our thinking.

Jesus' earthly ministry was essentially at one with that of John
the Baptist. It was His task to proclaim the coming of the Kingdom in
the near future and to summon men to repentance in preparation for the
imminent arrival of this Kingdom. The 'differentia' between the
ministry of Jesus and that of the Baptist consisted in the fact that at
His baptism Jesus became convinced of His election to fill the role of
the Messiah: this role was conceived of, however, as purely future.
Jesus' earthly ministry was, however, of a piece with that of John the
Baptist.

Early in His ministry Jesus expected the almost immediate inbreaking
of the Kingdom, preceded by the period of tribulation spoken of in most
apocalyptic literature. It is with this in mind that He sends forth
the Seventy, not to bring in the Kingdom through His teaching nor through
instigating political subversion, but to proclaim the imminence of the
Kingdom and to inculcate the adoption of an ethic indicative of repentance
and suited to such an hour in the history of the world, thus preparing
men for the dawn of the New Aeon. However, the passage of time forced
Jesus to realise that He had miscalculated the nearness of the Kingdom.
In reflection upon this, He became convinced that the coming of the
Kingdom had been delayed out of the mercy of God on account of the hard-
ness of men's hearts and their unwillingness to repent, and that God had
charged Him with the task of dealing with the corporate guilt of the
people through an atoning death before the Judgment Day instituted the
Kingdom of God. The Judgment Day would be heralded by the appearance of the Son of Man upon the clouds of heaven in great glory. Jesus was identified with this figure of apocalyptic vision, by virtue of His role in suffering and death during His earthly ministry, and this inbreaking of the Kingdom of God would certainly come within a generation at the most. Such was the picture painted by Johannes Weiss and such was the sketch of Jesus' life and ministry taken over and developed by Albert Schweitzer.

ALBERT SCHWEITZER'S CONTRIBUTION to the understanding of what we may call the problem of eschatology in the understanding of Jesus' life and ministry was set forth in two books, the latter of which is by far the better known. In 1901 there appeared his 'Das Messianitäts- und Leidensgeheimnis. Eine Skizze des Lebens Jesu' -- 'The Secret of the Messiahship and the Passion: A Sketch of the Life of Jesus.' This was followed by the famous 'Quest' in its German original edition in 1906, which was translated into English in 1910. The former of these two books has a title very similar to an important book issued by William Wrede of Breslau in the same year: 'Das Messiasgeheimnis in den Evangelien. Zugleich ein Beitrag zum Verständnis des Markusevangeliums' -- 'The Messianic Secret in the Gospels. Forming a contribution to the understanding of the Gospel of Mark'. Though the titles are similar, the positions adopted by the two books are very dissimilar. Schweitzer's later 'Quest of the Historical Jesus' was to take up this fact and to set Schweitzer's views in direct opposition to those of Wrede, who advocates what Schweitzer called 'thorough-going scepticism'. Both writers addressed themselves to the problems associated with some of the apparent contradictions of the historical life and career of Jesus which we have noted in our own historical sketch above -- such matters as the contrast between the miraculous deeds of Jesus which indicate His messiahship and His keeping of His status a secret. Whereas Wrede's
conclusion was a sceptical one, Schweitzer's was that in eschatology we find the key to the riddles posed by Jesus' career, as it is recorded. In a scientific account of any phenomenon, it is important to understand it in terms of its origin though it is doubtless a mistake to think that the circumstances of its origin necessarily provide a full account of it. Thus, it is important to see Schweitzer's position over against the historical background that has been set out and in its opposition in intention to the out-and-out scepticism of William Wrede of Breslau. Schweitzer was convinced that there were only two contestants for our belief, worthy of the claim, thorough-going scepticism or thorough-going eschatology, and whether we agree or do not agree with his presentation of the situation, the knowledge of his intention throws a flood of light on his position. Wrede was the successor of men such as Bruno Bauer and Gustav Volkmar (1809-1893), and it was in opposition to their attitudes that Schweitzer formed his views, influenced positively by Johannes Weiss. What did Wrede and Schweitzer have in common? This is the first question that requires to be asked, for despite the radical difference between the two scholars, they were at one in demanding that modern scholarship face up to the question of the apparent inconsistencies in the record of Jesus' ministry. They both felt it simply would not do either to excise passages which did not fit in with one's prior scheme or to explain them in the light of very dubious suppositions regarding psychological motives, which receive no confirmation in the text itself. Mark's text was especially in view in the case of both scholars, as the priority of Mark had been adequately established for them. What both thorough-going scepticism and thorough-going eschatology were doing was to help theologians to read this text with simplicity. "The simplicity consists in dispensing with the connecting links which it has been
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1 Cf. Schweitzer, *op.cit.*, pp.225-228
acquainted to discover between the sections of the narrative (pericopes), in looking at each separately, and recognising that it is difficult to pass from one to the other.\textsuperscript{1}

Schweitzer expressly sets forth the agreement between Wrede and his own 'Sketch' of 1901 regarding the problems of the Marcan account of Jesus' career. We select just a few of these for mention. How do the demoniacs know that Jesus is the Son of God? How did the Messianic entry come about, without provoking the interference of the Roman garrison? Why is it ignored in the later controversies, as if it had never taken place, though if it truly were messianic in character and implication, it would have provided the Jewish authorities with good grounds for condemning Jesus? Why does Mark 4:10-12 assert that the parables are designed to conceal the mystery of the Kingdom of God, when the explanations given by Jesus to His disciples contain no mysterious element? What is the mystery of the Kingdom of God? Why is Jesus' Messiahship at once a secret and yet not a secret? Why does Jesus first reveal His messiahship only at Caesarea Philippi? Why does Jesus indicate His messiahship only by the title 'Son of Man'? And why is this title so far from being prominent in primitive Christian theology? We may remark that the above are but a few from the impressive list adduced by Schweitzer as requiring an answer. He takes two pages of the 'Quest' to set forth these questions in consecutive form.\textsuperscript{2} Wrede and Schweitzer were able to go even further in their agreement. The disconnectedness arises from the fact that two representations of the career of Jesus have in the Marcan narrative been crushed

\textsuperscript{1} Schweitzer, \textit{op.cit.}, p.331
\textsuperscript{2} \textit{op.cit.} pp.332-334
into one. The one representation sets forth the outward sequence of Jesus' ministry in a straightforward fashion. The other is the interpretation of this ministry in terms of a dogmatic element: the Messianic secret, together with all the secrets and concealments which this involves. Thus the disconnectedness belongs to the narrative, as we have it. In Schweitzer's words, it portrays Jesus at once as the Messiah and not as the Messiah! To depict Jesus as the Messiah, but not in the sense expected by the Jewish people, is, says Schweitzer, a concession to the self-contradiction of the Marcan representation on the part of the advocates of a rational psychological interpretation of the text, who want to smooth out the difficulties found therein. ¹

It is here, however, that Wrede and Schweitzer, thorough-going scepticism and thorough-going eschatology part company. "The inconsistency between the public life of Jesus and His Messianic claim lies either in the nature of the Jewish Messianic conception, or in the representation of the Evangelist."² Where Wrede chooses the latter alternative, Schweitzer chooses the former. This constitutes the watershed between the two accounts. The brilliance of Schweitzer's interpretation undoubtedly stems from his insistence upon dealing with the Marcan account as we have it and from his ability to offer a creative interpretation of the whole and especially of the points of difficulty which it presents. Schweitzer at any rate is clear that we must either accept this eschatological solution, which he offers, or "the literary solution, which regards the incongruous dogmatic element as interpolated by the earliest Evangelist into the tradition and therefore strikes out

¹ op.cit., p.335
² op.cit., p.335
the Messianic claim altogether from the historical Life of Jesus.

Tertium non datur.¹ Not by any means all would agree with this statement of possibilities, but Schweitzer's conviction enables him to expound his interpretation in a single-minded way.

As Weiss anticipated in outline Schweitzer's presentation, we will simply marshall briefly the major points of emphasis in Schweitzer's construction of the ministry of Jesus,² as set forth in Mark's Gospel. Especially, however, will we seek to show where Schweitzer went beyond Johannes Weiss. The latter interpreted the teaching of Jesus eschatologically, but in the main he failed to apply this eschatological principle to the Marcan narrative as a means of interpretation of the career outlined therein. It is for this reason, according to Schweitzer, that Wrede was able to ignore the eschatological interpretation of Jesus' mission: it had not been applied sufficiently boldly to the interconnections of Jesus' life and mission.

Firstly, Jesus' early preaching, from the period of His contact with the preaching of John the Baptist at Passover time until the Mission of the Twelve, consisted largely in the proclamation of the near approach of the Kingdom of God. Though aware of His messiahship from His baptism, this is not important from the historical point of view, "since history is concerned with the first announcement of the Messiahship, not with inward psychological processes." The Mission of the Twelve may well have been immediately before the harvest. Upon the return of the disciples, Jesus journeyed northwards from Galilee and only resumed His teaching on the way to His death at Jerusalem. Thus we have to account for a period of concealment, of withdrawal from public ministry. Schweitzer finds

¹ op. cit., p. 335

² Schweitzer's own contribution is developed op. cit. chapter IX, 'Thorough-going Scepticism and Thorough-going Eschatology,' pp. 328 ff, espec. pp. 348 ff.
the explanation of this in the non-fulfilment of Jesus' prediction, found at Matt. 10:23. Jesus withdrew in dismay to consider the implications of this non-fulfilment: Here ended the first period of Jesus' ministry. It was to be followed by the conviction that God had appointed Him to die, concentrating upon Himself the tribulation of the last days, thus turning the wheel of history, so to speak. This theory of a change in Jesus' understanding of His own role makes sense of the Marcan narrative which simply sets forth, without attempting to explain, the facts concerning Jesus' preaching in the two periods of His ministry and the fact of His withdrawal after the return of the Twelve.

Secondly, we must take seriously Mark 4:10-12, in our understanding of the place occupied by Jesus' parabolic teaching in His ministry. This passage is to be interpreted in terms of the doctrine of predestination. The truth offered by Jesus' preaching and teaching is only for those who are predestined to understand. This predestination strain is found in apocalyptic literature and reappears in Jesus' teaching and in the presuppositions of His ministry. It becomes explicit in the parable of the marriage of the King's son, Matt. 22:1-14, especially 14: "Many are called, but few are chosen". This concept of predestination also lies behind the teaching in the Beatitudes. A man's predestination may be inferred from his outward manifestation of the marks of his election.

Thirdly, we may ask: what is the secret of the Kingdom, of which we have been told? It must consist in more than the mere news of its near approach. In any case John the Baptist had already openly heralded its near approach. The thought is that, just as harvest succeeds the time of sowing, so surely will the coming of the Kingdom of God succeed the time of sowing, seen in the ministry of John the Baptist and the early ministry of Jesus. The secret does not consist in the idea of development, but in the thought of the givenness of the harvest. Our sowing does so little to bring it. So in the mystery of God He will.
bring in His kingdom -- and that right early! For, while Schweitzer says that the mystery or secret does not relate to the near approach of the Kingdom, but rather its givenness by God in response to the mission of John the Baptist and Himself, yet he does suggest that there is a play on the idea of the literal harvest and God's harvest of His Kingdom: the harvest now ripening upon the earth in the fields is the last before the breaking-in of the Kingdom of God!

Fourthly, Schweitzer made much not only of the non-fulfilment of the prediction of Matt. 10:23. What about the non-fulfilment also of the sufferings which were to precede the day of the Son of Man and which, in their Matthean setting, were clearly expected to fall upon the disciples during the Mission upon which they were sent out by Jesus? Why, indeed, should Jesus anticipate persecution of the disciples at this period, since neither His disciples nor Himself had had to anticipate nor experience persecution up to this point? Schweitzer rebelled at the 'rationalistic' expedient of saying that this section must have reflected the experience of the later Church after the crucifixion and the resurrection of Jesus. It is worth noting, in the passing, that even so conservative a scholar as Beasley-Murray judges that the original setting of the words clearly cannot have been preserved.

In the fifth place, Schweitzer firmly held that the 'Coming One' of the expectation of John the Baptist was not the Messiah, but Elijah, who, as the prophecy of Malachi affirms (4:5-6), was to be sent to Israel by God before "the coming of the great and terrible day of the Lord", in order to lead the people to repentance. John never thought of Jesus in any other way, and his messengers were sent to ask Jesus whether He was indeed Elijah. This explains much. The people did not accept Jesus as the Messiah, because, in accord with the teaching of the Pharisees and the scribes, they looked for Elijah's return prior to the dawn of the messianic age. Their excitement at the ministry was provoked by
John's proclamation that the 'Coming One', i.e. Elijah would soon appear. As for the Messiah Himself, when He did appear, it would be upon the clouds of heaven, in conformity with the apocalyptic pattern envisaged in the Book of Daniel (7:22ff.) and the Similitudes of Enoch. Where the more usual exegesis of Mark I breaks down is in an importing back into the expectation of John of an understanding commensurate with our Lord's assessment of his ministry. Jesus said that John fulfilled the role of the expected Elijah, hence we deduce rightly: Jesus must Himself have been the Messiah. But this is not to prove that John himself had any such understanding.

Sixthly, in the light of the above we can see that Jesus could not have enacted a 'messianic entry' into Jerusalem. This explains why the high priest was unable to present witnesses to establish that Jesus had made messianic claims. This was why finally he had to resort to direct questioning, to which Jesus' reply of Mark 14:62 is well-known. If our Lord had made an open claim in the presence of a multitude to be the Messiah, surely witnesses would not have been lacking. Schweitzer cites Wellhausen, Wrede, and Dalman, as amongst those who deny that the ovation received by Jesus at His entry into Jerusalem had any messianic character whatsoever. What is true in the estimation of these scholars and of Schweitzer is, as the latter expresses it, "the entry into Jerusalem was -- Messianic for Jesus, but not Messianic for the people." The preparation for the entry, especially the riding in upon the ass, is intended by Jesus as fulfilment of the Messianic prophecy of Zech. 9:9, but it is not recognised as such. How then are we to explain the ovation accorded Jesus? Only, says Schweitzer, on the basis of the understanding of the people that Jesus made His entry into the city as Elijah.

A final point concerns the Feeding of the Five Thousand and the Last
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1 op. cit. p.392
Supper, both of which are seen as 'eschatological sacraments'. The significance of the former was veiled at the time, since those present did not know who He was who thus made them His guests. In the latter case, however, Jesus made explicit the reference of the simple ceremony. Both events look forward to that Great Eschatological Banquet, which popular eschatological apocalyptic expectation looked for at the establishment of the Messianic Kingdom. Schweitzer comments:

"Apart from the assumption of the eschatological sacraments, we can only make the history of dogma begin with a 'fall' from the earlier purer theology into the sacramental magical ---------------."¹

One further point should be briefly noted. It concerns one of the best-known features of the thinking of Albert Schweitzer. He held that the ethic taught by Jesus was based upon the assumption that the end of the age was due to come very shortly indeed. Hence he termed it an 'Interimzeit'. Many who know little of Schweitzer's total view are aware of his outlook at this point. In essence Schweitzer asserted with complete consistency that the provisions of Jesus' ethic were based on Jesus' eschatological outlook, and it was affirmed that the breakdown of that eschatological framework involves the followers of Jesus in a readaptation of what is eternal in Jesus' outlook to a different view of the world from that held by Jesus. One reaction to this judgment was the assertion that Jesus' ethic does not really depend, except possibly in a few details, on his particular eschatological expectation, but that it emerges from the depth of His unique relationship to God and is appropriate for all who follow Him.

It now falls to us to pass some critical and evaluative comments upon the whole movement culminating in Schweitzer, which we have traced. Werner's theory will be dealt with in detail later.

¹ op.cit. p.378
some positive advantages of the position occupied by this school of thought. No movement within the Church ever fails, directly or indirectly, to throw up some positive contributions to her understanding of theology.

Part of the greatness of Schweitzer's contribution stems undoubtedly from his attempt to deal historically with the life and mission of Jesus. In doing so Schweitzer consciously strove to get beyond the position of Johannes Weiss while profiting by the latter's insights and endeavouring to carry them to their logical conclusion. Weiss had made his contribution as a corrective to the liberal, Ritschlian interpretation of the teaching of Jesus outlined impressively by Adolf Harnack and other scholars at the turn of the present century. He started theology upon a fresh and fruitful line of enquiry. However, since his aim was to correct a current interpretation of Jesus' teaching, it followed naturally that he did not develop at length the implications of the eschatological interpretation of Jesus' message for the understanding of Jesus' career. This deficiency it was which Schweitzer sought to make good.

That Schweitzer's interpretation in terms of the significance of the various features of His historic mission, as recorded in the Gospels, was a brilliant one, cannot be denied. It has all the appeal of any piece of historical reconstruction assisted by the romance which attaches to the 'long ago'. Especially perhaps did it gain by his courageous refusal to have done with the awkward 'gaps' or apparent inconsistencies in the record: in fact, it seemed to make capital out of these very points. In its interpretation of the change of emphasis in Jesus' message after Caesarea Philippi, in its concept of the 'messianic secret', and in its explication of the apparent contradiction seen in Jesus' performing of miracles which convinced no one -- in all these ways the reconstruction of Schweitzer was creative and offered a solution of difficult points in the narrative.

One danger in Schweitzer's interpretation of the development of
Jesus' thought is that, brilliant as it is, it looks at the Gospel narratives from a relatively external point of view. His judgments would be more compelling, if there was greater evidence to hand in the actual recorded utterances of Jesus for the development supposed by him. The danger is present that Schweitzer has imposed, however unintentionally, a pattern upon the incidents of Jesus' career, which is alien to that in Jesus' own mind.

Schweitzer certainly intended to treat the gospel records historically, and his portrait of Jesus, both by his insisting on taking cognizance even of those passages which a liberal theology found awkward, and by his grasp of the supra-mundane aura with which the records invest Jesus, is surely a considerable gain upon what preceded it. In a recent book Bishop Gösta Lundström quotes appreciatively the points which William Sanday marshalled in favour of Schweitzer's exposition as far back as 1907:

"1. He (Schweitzer) keeps much closer to the text than most critics do; he expressly tells us that his investigations have helped to bring out the historical trustworthiness of the Gospels; 2. He does not, like so many critics, seek to reduce the person of Christ to the common measures of humanity, but leaves it as he finds it; 3. By doing this, he is enabled to link on, in an easy and natural way, the eschatology and Christology of the Gospels to the eschatology and Christology of St. Paul and St. John." ¹

Lundström helps us with our positive criticism of Schweitzer also. He shows clearly that Schweitzer is only willing to let the documents of the New Testament speak for themselves, so that we may see how fantastic is the picture which they present and so be ready to reject it

and make room thus for an attitude in which we leave behind the 'Jesus of History' in order to allow the 'spirit of Jesus' to speak to us:

"As a modern thinker and theologian, Schweitzer cannot accept the realistic eschatology which, according to him, Jesus embraced.—For the sake of truth we are obliged first to emphasise and then to sacrifice eschatology."¹

Many scholars see Jesus as a thoroughly reliable guide in most of His teaching, but as being in His eschatology simply a child of His time. For Schweitzer and 'konsequente Eschatologie' the problem is rather more acute, as it is recognised that all Jesus' teaching is permeated by certain eschatological presuppositions and is dominated by the eschatological perspective. It may well be that to speak thus does in fact exaggerate the part played by eschatology in the mind of Jesus, but this is at any rate how Schweitzer and his followers view the matter. In consequence, for them all that is left is the rather nebulous and vague guidance afforded by the 'spirit of Jesus'.

**Development Towards 'Realized Eschatology'.**

With these few remarks, we pass now to an examination of the positions grouped around what has come to be known as 'realised eschatology'. This movement is associated especially with the name of Professor Charles H. Dodd of Cambridge and has become enormously influential in Anglo-Saxon theological assessment of the meaning of the 'last things'. Although some historical treatment is necessary, this need not be so extended as in the case of 'konsequente Eschatologie', since it has emerged self-consciously as a corrective of what are considered to be some extremes in the emphases of the futurism, seen not only in thorough-going eschatology as a movement but also in the whole
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line of development associated with the historical development already traced which leads up to Johannes Weiss, Albert Schweitzer, Fritz Buri, M. Werner, as also to W. Michaelis and others, who are chiefly "futurist" in their eschatology. We shall examine Dodd's position first of all, making allowance for his own development of thought over the years, and seek to trace the factors which have influenced it. In doing so the contribution to Dodd's thinking of such men as A.T. Cadoux and R. Otto will be noted and assessed. C.H. Dodd has not written much of recent years in this field and one suspects that many of his followers are more affected by the views set forth in the 'Parables of the Kingdom' (1935), 'The Apostolic Preaching' (1936) and 'History and the Gospel' (1938) than the more moderate outlook of the four broadcast addresses published under the title 'The Coming of Christ' (1951). This helps make our task rather complex.

'Realized eschatology' has had an enormous influence in Britain and in America, so much so that it has been described as a case of almost complete acceptance. There are not wanting signs, however, that Anglo-Saxon scholarship is becoming more conscious of having over-emphasised only one side of the story. There is a tendency to move away from the phrase, 'realized eschatology' (the early Dodd) to 'eschatology that is in process of realisation' (Jeremias) or 'inaugurated eschatology' (G. Florov'sky). Nevertheless, the emphasis in English-speaking lands remains upon the present experience, within the earthly mission of Jesus and the ongoing life of the Church, of the things associated with the 'last aeon'.

We note certain foreshadowings of the new emphasis associated with C.H. Dodd in the work of William Manson, A.T. Cadoux and Rudolf Otto. (E.C. Hoskyns\(^1\) was another thinker who placed emphasis upon the finality

\(^1\) Cf. especially his 'Cambridge Sermons' Univ. Press, pp. 1-38 ('Eschatology')
of the new age introduced by the Incarnation).

WILLIAM MANSON'S BOOK, 'Christ's View of the Kingdom of God', was published in 1918 and represented a reaction against the implications for Christian Ethics of Schweitzer's position. He is clearly influenced in part by the need in the era introduced by the Great War to stress the firm content of a Christian ethic. Manson asserted that Jesus' ethic was no 'Interimsethik' but a solid presentation of the demand made upon our lives by the presence of the One Who was Son of God and Son of Man. The concern of the book is not just with the status of the Sermon on the Mount, but it is discernible as one of the major interests and concerns of the writer. In order to defend the dependability and enduring character of Jesus' ethic, Manson found that he must do justice to the Person of Jesus Christ. The end result was an assertion of the absoluteness and finality not only of the ethic but of the whole revelation made in Jesus, not excepting that of the Kingdom of God. Manson shied clear of the total emphasis upon futurity found in the concept of Jesus as the 'Messias designatus'. In a real sense Jesus was the Son of Man and in Him the Kingdom of God was in some sense made manifest, though doubtless largely in a proleptic sense.

A.T. CADOUX'S CONTRIBUTION is made in two books, the former of which appears to have influenced C.H. Dodd in some measure. These books are 'The Parables of Jesus' (1930) and 'The Theology of Jesus' (1940). C.H. Dodd's own contribution to the eschatological debate has been made in the context of a discussion of the meaning of the term 'Kingdom of God' upon the lips of Jesus, especially as this teaching is reflected in the parables which He gave concerning this Kingdom. It followed that he was particularly interested in any studies which served to throw light upon such parables of Jesus and, indeed, upon His parables in general. Nor was Cadoux's general assessment of Jesus' teaching concerning the Kingdom considered unhelpful.
Cadoux considered that it was Jesus' understanding of His mission that He was to purify Israel's religious worship, making it more spiritual, and to call His people to fulfil their destiny of spiritual leadership of, and service to, the nations. Emphasis is placed upon the saying of Matt. 9:37; Lk. 10:2, that the time of harvest was now come. The Parable of the Self-growing Seed (Mk. 4:26-29) is interpreted in the light of this saying. The growth of the seed until the harvest is due to mysterious influences which are in God's hands. However, this secret influence has already had its way. Man's part is to gather in the harvest. Thus, in the ingathering of the harvest, which was now ripe, through the ministry of Jesus and His disciples, the Kingdom of God was coming into its own as a present reality. The important contribution here is the thought that the parable describes a process which has reached completion and which has to be consummated only through Jesus' ministry, conceived essentially as the task of the harvester. This thought was to influence C.H. Dodd considerably.

The place allowed to man's co-operation in the establishment of the Kingdom of God suggests that no catastrophic end to the world, as we know it, was looming imminently ahead. Rather what opened up to Israel was a vista of service to the nations and of deepened spiritual worship. Such difficult verses as Mk. 9:1 suggest that, though the Kingdom had entered in the ministry of Jesus, yet this was not to be identified with its consummation. In accordance with this view, Cadoux interpreted the coming of the Son of Man not as the end of the world and the Day of Judgment, but as a symbol of ever-renewed opportunity of service. The exhortation to watchfulness in connection with the Son of Man sayings gives weight, it is suggested, to this judgment. It must be said that this is not a very convincing view, as it appears to give an air of artificiality to the passages. Further, Mark 13:20, if not so definitely
as Mk. 9:1, suggests a crisis which is to come, if only after the passing of a generation. It is difficult to believe that the day of the Son of Man has no connection with this event, apocalyptically understood in conformity with current Jewish thought-forms.

It is true that Cadoux does not deny the existence of a futurist element in Jesus' outlook, as witnessed to in the Synoptic Gospels. In this he is at one with the judgment of other scholars who are associated with that emphasis upon the present character of the Kingdom of God, namely, H.A. Guy, A.M. Hunter, R.H. Fuller, and others. Thus, Cadoux does recognise that Mk. 9:1 suggests a curtailment of this earthly Kingdom, as we know it: his inconsistency, if he be in fact guilty of this, is that he does not align this fact with the statements regarding the day of the Son of Man. He notes also, as evidence of the temporary character of the present scheme of things, the petition 'Thy Kingdom come', within the Lord's Prayer.

The total effect of the view of Cadoux is that the mission of Jesus was viewed by the Lord Himself as opening up a new door of service and opportunity for all who would respond. This was to be terminated sometime within a generation, it is true, by the consummation of the Kingdom, an event which can be only in the hands of the Father, but the emphasis is upon watchfulness in the worshipping community for such opportunities of service as the Son of Man may afford His people.

We turn now to the work of C.H. Dodd himself in its historical development, before examining the contribution of Rudolf Otto, since it seems important to gain an over-all view of the development of Dodd's thinking and literary contribution, which had commenced before Otto's work became influential upon him. The first contribution, in which his view of 'realized eschatology' is implicit, was a paper delivered to the 1927 Canterbury Conference of German and British theologians, entitled 'The This-Worldly Kingdom of God in our Lord's Teaching'.
Further contributions to this subject have been made over the years. Rudolf Otto's important book, 'Reich Gottes und Menschensohn', was published in 1934 just a year before C.H. Dodd's definitive contribution, 'The Parables of the Kingdom'. We shall follow the procedure of noting the course of Dodd's contributions prior to 1934 before we turn to Otto. Thereafter we shall examine the further development of Dodd's views.

In his early work C.H. Dodd finds two concepts of the Kingdom of God within the mind of Jesus: the one is the rabbinical idea that the Kingdom of God is realized in human experience when we submit to the will of God, the second is the prophetic-apocalyptic concept which, however, is made to yield in Jesus a significance for the present period of Christ's ministry.

The latter view was fortified by a linguistic argument. The \( εφθασεν \) of Matt. 12:28; Lk. 11:20 is interpreted as meaning that the future has become present on the basis of the fact that \( εφθάνει \) in the Septuagint represents the Aramaic word 'naga' and in the Theodotean text of Daniel 'meta', which both have the unequivocal sense of 'arriving'. Dodd did not here develop this point at further length, but from these small beginnings stems the fact that no discussion of the eschatology of Jesus published today appears able to avoid an involved linguistic discussion of the meaning of \( εφθασεν \), as also of the word \( χριστός \), concerning which at this early stage Dodd did but suggest that it might carry a similar meaning to \( εφθάνει \).

Kümmel, for example, feels obliged to treat of this matter at length in his book, 'Promise and Fulfilment'.

---


2 op. cit., pp. 19-25.
Already too Dodd's characteristic emphasis upon the so-called 'parables of growth' appears. Later he was to comment appreciatively upon Cadoux's conception that these referred to a period whose natural conclusion had been reached in the time of harvest signified by Jesus' ministry. Here Dodd simply noted that the fact that growth was a property of this world signified that these parables speak of a progressive development of the Kingdom of God within this world-order. However, Dodd averred that the consummation of this process of development involved the passing of life to 'a higher plane'. This we take to be an early indication of the thought, which is characteristic of Dodd's whole treatment of the eschatological theme, that the goal of human history can only be understood in terms of its transfiguration through the irruption into history of the eternal order.

The work of RUDOLF OTTO is of considerable importance for the themes which lie before us, especially with reference to his influence upon C.H. Dodd and in connection with his contribution to the discussion of the meaning of the term, 'Son of Man', upon the lips of Jesus. Otto was a many-sided intellectual giant and he brought to his studies of the life and teaching of Jesus a thorough acquaintance with the historico-scientific study of the development of religion, which had such a vogue from the early days of this century up to its fourth decade. His views are hard to classify on account of their breadth and originality. His two most important works are his 'Das Heilige' of 1917 (translated into English as 'The Idea of the Holy' in 1923), and his 'Reich Gottes und Menschengesohn', 1934 (Eng. version, 'The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man', 1938). The latter is the more important for our present task, though the former serves to throw considerable light upon his basic presuppositions and leading conceptions.

Otto's main contribution was made with reference to the attempt made by the 'consistent eschatology' school to be consistent, to live
up to its name. His basic studies in the phenomenology of religion suggested to him that there is in apocalyptic a basic irrationality, and that it is, therefore, to set out on a false track to seek to make all the elements of Jesus' message, (apocalyptically understood), harmonious. Jesus did in fact, said Otto, teach both that the Kingdom was imminent in the future and that it was presently operative as an in-breaking realm of salvation. Two things are worthy of note about this presentation. First, Otto argued for a 'present' conception of the Kingdom of God in the teaching of Jesus not by denying apocalyptic but by, as he said, understanding its true nature and essential 'irrationality'. Second, Otto did not thus deny the existence of a future element in Jesus' expectation. It is remarkable that at the present time the idea that, though the concept of a 'present' Kingdom is found in Jesus, the character of this present Kingdom is determined by that which it foreshadows, is gaining ground. There has been of recent years a greater willingness to see that both 'consistent' and 'realized' eschatology schools have made their point and that we must discover some principle of balance between these two emphases in Jesus' thinking. In the estimation of such men as Nils Dahl and the Roman Catholic exegete, Rudolf Schnackenburg, it is the present which is seen in the light of the future and not vice-versa. This again accords with Karl Barth's emphasis upon the essential continuity of the post-Incarnation with the pre-Incarnation congregation as a community of hope, which yet enjoys proleptically the glory which is to be unveiled at the Parousia of our Lord Jesus Christ. There is much, we would suggest, in Otto's own set of philosophical preconceptions which helped him to place the emphasis upon present experience rather than upon future consummation, and sufficient reliance in him upon the Platonic dichotomy between eternity and time to make him inclined to see the significance of the future hope as a mythical representation of the eternal invisible realm, yet he was too great and too objective a scholar
for him to allow these preconceptions to mould his presentation of the nature of apocalyptic both in Jesus and elsewhere. It is not here suggested in any glib fashion that Otto has solved what no one else has solved, but it is taken as noteworthy that there is much in Otto's account which connects with the position towards which the modern eschatological debate appears to be leading, and it is to his great advantage that his views were backed up by a considerable authority in the sphere of the phenomenology of religion.

There emerges clearly in Rudolf Otto something that had been lacking in Cadoux's estimate of Jesus' thinking regarding the Kingdom of God. For the latter it was a present reality, but for Otto and for Dodd it was the presence now of the eschatological age and all associated with it, an important difference. Otto made this clear by depicting this present irruption of the Kingdom of God as a victory for the power of God over the forces of evil, which are ranged against God. Otto made much of Persian influence upon late Jewish apocalyptic, although he was careful not to over-emphasize it. Lundström sums up this aspect of things succinctly: "What apocalyptic gives is the sharp dualism between that which is not God's world and the sphere in which His will is done. Otto leaves it an open question whether the division into an earthly sphere and a heavenly one is due to Iranian influence, but wherever the idea of a divine conflict is to be found, Iranian influence is clear. Traces of it are to be seen in the apocalyptic literature."¹ What we are here concerned with is not so much the question of the source or origin of this element of 'conflict' between the power of God and the forces of evil which is evident in the New Testament. What, however, is of importance is that here is an account of the Kingdom of

¹ op. cit. p.177
God in the thinking of Jesus which takes cognizance of an important factor and makes sense of it in the light of Iranian influence and apocalyptic. But the most important point of all is that this explication of these passages proves to carry with it an interpretation of the Kingdom of God which can only be described as a present one. Such passages as Matt. 12:28; Lk. 11:20 have long been among the stock in trade of those who urge the present character of the Kingdom of God in the thinking of Jesus. Now, however, in Otto's presentation we are enabled to see this not just as an isolated utterance of Jesus but as throwing light on the way in which He viewed His whole ministry and revealing it as, in His mind, a real entrance of the Kingdom of God into the human scene. It has further a twofold advantage. First, it views this 'presence' of the Kingdom of God under the aspect of conflict, a presentation which accords with the facts of human experience and allows for a future consummation of the conflict. Second, it takes seriously the unity of word and deed in the Person and Work of Jesus Christ. We are no longer concerned merely with Jesus' words, however much we should revere these, but they give to us a dynamic conception of the presence of the Christ, which well accords with that characteristic Hebraic emphasis upon the activity of the God, whose vicegerent the Messiah was to be.

Otto's contribution is also significant as indicating that the coming of the Kingdom of God in the ministry of Jesus does more than issue a call to decision. It is the good news whereby men may hope to be released from the chains that bind them. In so far as C.H. Dodd was influenced by Rudolf Otto, this may help account for the characteristic differences that appear between 'realized eschatology' and Bultmann's eschatology of 'decision', which is profoundly influenced by the dialectical theology, which was at its height between 1918 and 1931, as well as by existentialist philosophy. Of course, Dodd was himself too original a thinker to get all his ideas at second-hand, but Otto's
influence here also was a real factor in the situation.

Otto lays stress upon the essential hiddenness of the Kingdom of God. This concept also he derives from apocalyptic literature. There was in the latter an emphasis upon truths of an esoteric character which only the 'wise' could understand. Otto saw the significance of some of Jesus' parables to consist in their presentation of a reality which only the enlightened would discern. So was it with the parables of the Treasure and the Pearl of value. So also with the parable of the Mustard-Seed. Cadoux, as we have seen, saw in the parables of growth the fact that the harvest of the Kingdom of God was now come; C.H. Dodd in his early writings had hailed with approval the idea that these parables indicated the this-worldly character of the Kingdom; the peculiar contribution of Otto at this stage in the development of the eschatological debate was to show that the point of such parables was that one day the present real but hidden growth of the Kingdom of God would be made manifest. Again Otto felt able to demonstrate the relation of such an understanding of these parables with elements in the apocalyptic literature of late Judaism.

Otto rejected vigorously the ideas which lie behind 'Interimsethik', though he gave no detailed study of Jesus' ethic. The essential irrationality which belongs to apocalyptic produces an element of paradox in this sphere also. Although Jesus expected undoubtedly the imminent end of the world, He yet authorised moral requirements which assume the continuance of society as we know it. It is noteworthy, with regard to Jesus' ethic, that for Otto, as we might say, the new element in it was not anything which Jesus added to the Mosaic Law, but the possibility of fulfilling the demands of that Law, which the presence of the Kingdom of God provides. This fact connects with what is said above regarding Otto's view of the presence of the Kingdom.
of God in Jesus' mission as 'gift' as well as 'demand', and, indeed, as gracious gift first and foremost.

Otto made an important related contribution to the question of the meaning of the term 'Son of Man', as used upon the lips of Jesus and in the evangelic records. This was for him again a purely transcendental concept, and, therefore, Jesus is no more than the 'Messiah-Son of Man' designate (the terminology finding its background in the Book of Enoch), just as the Kingdom of God itself is now only 'throwing its shadow into the present'. We saw above that for Otto, although the Kingdom of God was now a present reality it was so only in so far as it throws our gaze forward to the final reality that is yet to be unveiled: so too Jesus represents the Son of Man, but that term really refers to His office at the final unveiling or apocalypse. He is the 'Messiah designate' only.

In his survey of modern conceptions of the Kingdom of God, Bishop Lundström makes much of Otto's contribution to the general discussion and he makes well one point, which is perhaps worth stressing: "It is, however, according to Otto altogether erroneous to represent the relationship between Jesus and the Kingdom as being that Jesus brings the Kingdom -- such an idea is altogether alien to him -- no, on the contrary, it is the Kingdom that brings Jesus with it. The Kingdom exists, but it is not yet here and now the Kingdom of Jesus: He is to inherit it some day. For God, in consideration of Jesus' obedience in suffering, is to give Him the Kingdom after He has passed through death." Otto uses the Greek term, ἀυτοκράτωρ, to describe the manner of the coming of the Kingdom in the mission and ministry of Jesus. Lundström criticises this aspect of Otto's thinking, perhaps justly, as making the conception of the coming of the Kingdom of God too impersonal. Be this as it may, all this is simply the result of Otto's

---

1 op. cit. p. 189.
consistent adherence to the transcendental concept of the Kingdom as a 'mysterion'. It is at any rate well to be aware of this element in Otto's view, as it is one which may be all too easily passed by as we seek to draw lines connecting Rudolf Otto and C.H. Dodd. For in the latter the personal note is surely that which is to the fore. Indeed, as we shall see, though Otto had some influence upon C.H. Dodd's thinking, there is much in the latter which is not explicable upon Otto's premisses.

This last point serves to throw more light upon the essential character of Otto's estimate of the Person and Work of Jesus of Nazareth. Jesus' words and acts are viewed as 'charismatic' in character: they mediate the transcendental realm, which is now operative in them hiddenly, but is one day to be revealed openly. Clearly what lies behind this is the fact that ultimately Otto places the emphasis upon the present reality of the Kingdom of God only as a foreshadowing of an essentially future reality. It may well be that C.H. Dodd, T.W. Manson, and certain other scholars tend to be guilty rather of so emphasising the 'present' reality of the Kingdom that its future manifestation becomes ultimately unnecessary. This is seen in the fact that the latter scholars tend to explain away the futurist references regarding the Kingdom in the Gospel or to see them as not fundamental to Jesus' thinking, a mere accommodation to the thought-forms of the age in which He lived. Thus the relative emphases of a Rudolf Otto and a C.H. Dodd serve to highlight the exceedingly difficult nature of the ultimate eschatological problem: what is the unique nature of the 'Christ-event' that it deserves at once to be set forth in 'present' and 'futurist' terms, not just, so to speak, in parallel columns, but in such a way that some interior logic binds them together and demands just this expression of the reality of the Kingdom of God, which is so intimately related to Jesus' life and mission?
We now set out what we believe to have been the major points of Dodd's mature contribution to the eschatological debate. We may begin by noting that the linguistic considerations, advanced tentatively prior to 1935, have been stated and repeated with decision and emphasis, despite the fact that certain scholars have taken Dodd to task on this score. Perrin is probably justified in concluding that "Dodd's interpretation (of Mark 1:15 and related sayings) has not established itself, nor has it been driven from the field; the question of the Kingdom as present or as future in the teaching of Jesus has to be settled on grounds other than the interpretation of these sayings." R.H. Fuller has insisted in a careful treatment that ∊γύγεω means 'to come near', even 'to reach up to', but not actually 'to arrive'. Vincent Taylor inclines to the translation 'is at hand' in Mark 1:15. On the other hand, Matthew Black has argued that, though 'is at hand' would have more justification as a literal rendering of ∊γύγεω in Mark 1:15, yet there may well be justification for paraphrasing, 'has come'. W.G. Kömmel is confident that Mark 1:15 carries the sense of 'coming near' not of 'arrival', and he remarks that the few passages quoted by C.H. Dodd from the Septuagint (e.g. Jonah 3:6: ∊γύγεω ὁ λόγος πρὸς τὸν βασιλείας) in which ∊γύγεω bears another meaning that 'coming near' "only prove that the translators of the Septuagint occasionally stretch the meaning of ∊γύγεω to the marginal case of 'approaching to'." This point, as Kömmel mentions, had previously been made by J.Y. Campbell and K. Clark in scholarly contributions to religious journals. It would seem that the linguistic debate is only a symptom of a deeper cleavage of opinion between two opposing camps.

Dodd's 'Parables of the Kingdom' constituted a major contribution at once to the interpretation of the parables and to the question of Jesus' understanding of the Kingdom. His position in essence is that we must recover the original 'Sitz im Leben' of Jesus' parables and

1. *op. cit.*, p. 66
that this is not given in the evangelic records as we have them. A historical reconstruction, however, shows this to have been the crisis constituted by the ministry of Jesus. Thus the 'parables of crisis' (The Faithful and Unfaithful Servants, the Waiting Servants, the Thief at Night, and the Ten Virgins) have been wrested from their original reference in their present admitted interpretation in terms of the Second Advent in our Gospel records. The 'parables of growth' are now viewed as having reference to the harvest which takes place in Jesus' ministry. These parables are those of the Sower, Tares, Seed growing secretly, and the Mustard Seed. Those of the Leaven and the Dragnet have a similar import. The basic thought in all this is the need for recovery of the original 'life situation'.

A further feature of Dodd's thinking concerns his interpretation of passages in the Gospels which seem clearly to carry a futurist reference. Certain of these passages refer to the Parousia or Second Advent (not a biblical term). With the latter Dodd's procedure is either to assert that they did not originally carry the interpretation which is given in the Gospels in the light of the then prevailing eschatological system, (an identical point with that made with reference to many of the

---

1 Matt. 24:45-51; Lk. 12:42-46.
5 Mk.4:2-8
6 Matt.13:24-30
7 Mk.4:24-29
8 Matt.13:31-32; Mk.4:30-32. Lk.13:18-19
10 Matt.13:47-48
parables), or to give an interpretation which eliminates the apparently
futurist element. It should be said that, in general, Professor Dodd
does not deny the presence in the New Testament of certain clearly
futurist sayings, which have a bearing on Jesus' message. However, he
divides these into two groups. There are those which foretell coming
historical events and those which foretell events of a completely super-
natural nature, which relate, in Dodd's view, in a manner typical of
apocalyptic, to a realm beyond space and time. The former explain
the genuinely historical reminiscences of the Synoptic Apocalypse with
reference to the destruction of Temple and of the city of Jerusalem --
this illustrates in Jesus a typically prophetic 'disaster eschatology'
-- while the latter relate to the Parousia, the Day of the Son of Man,
the Resurrection, and the Last Judgment.

It should be noted that Dodd has in later works qualified some of
the views asserted in the 'Parables of the Kingdom'. A frequently
quoted passage makes this point well:-

"There are some mysterious sayings about the coming of
the Son of Man which I have passed over too lightly.
There are passages where we are told that before he
comes there will be a breakdown of the physical universe
-------- the total impression is that the forecasts of the
coming of Christ in history ----- are balanced by fore-
casts of a coming beyond history: definitely, I should say,
beyond history, and not as a further event in history,
not even the last event".¹

It is also a fact that Dodd has agreed in principle to Jeremias'
proposed modification of the term 'realized eschatology' to one which
has been translated as 'an eschatology that is in process of realization'.²

¹The Coming of Christ. p.16-17.
²The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel. p.447. n.I.
Dodd's interpretation of certain future events as referring to a realm beyond space and time is at least questionable. Perrin reminds us¹ that Dodd seems finally to distinguish three eras in the coming of the Kingdom of God: first, the coming of the Kingdom in the ministry of Jesus; second, the coming 'in power' (based on a certain interpretation of Mk. 9:1) in the Resurrection of Jesus, in Pentecost, and in the reality of the Church; and, finally, the coming beyond history, mentioned in the quotation from Dodd's 1951 broadcast address. What is new in this statement of his position by Dodd is that, whereas he had formerly been inclined to view the coming of Jesus in the flesh and the growth of the Church as exhausting the New Testament witness to Jesus' teaching on the coming of the Kingdom, he now agrees that references to "the breakdown of the physical universe" cannot be understood purely symbolically of the overthrow of evil forces in the present age. He is convinced, however, that it refers to an event beyond history. In contrast with this Joachim Jeremias judges, in a review of Dodd's thought, that the distinction between coming historical events and coming events of an altogether supernatural character, as Dodd envisaged it, is not the real distinction in the mind of Christ: rather that distinction is between events prior to the Parousia in glory and the event of the Parousia itself, together with what happens after that event.²

Again it is arguable that Dodd's emphasis on a fulfilment of a process begun in history beyond history is unduly influenced by a Platonic conception of the dichotomy between time and eternity and it is at least doubtful whether this conception really influenced the contemporary

Judaism of Jesus' day and can, therefore, be reasonably said to have been a factor in Jesus' thinking. This aspect of Dodd's work has come under heavy criticism from varied sources. R.H. Fuller, Floyd V. Filson, and others have asserted that a concept is here introduced which has no place in first-century Judaism. W.D. Davies has alone sought, in his 'Paul and Rabbinic Judaism', to defend Dodd's interpretation at this point. He has maintained that "there is an element in late Judaism in which the age to come is conceived of as existing eternally in the heavens, and the souls of the righteous as entering it after death." The idea of such a parallel unseen supra-historical realm, which exists side by side with the sensible realm of space and time, and in which historical processes might be supposed to find a fulfilment which necessarily beggars ordinary description, if discoverable in first-century Judaism, could go far towards substantiating Dr. Dodd's account. It is noteworthy that so few stand with C.H. Dodd at this point, eminent authority as he is. Much can be said for an alternative understanding of some of the passages quoted by W.D. Davies, in terms of the conception of the pre-existence of the historical realm of apocalyptic vision, a view which yet places all the emphasis upon the fact that these things have a present existence in the unseen realm only as foreshadowing what is to take place in flesh and blood upon the earth 'in the last days'. Dr. Perrin discusses this matter in an admirable fashion. We quote:

"In so far as an apocalypticist could conceive of heaven he could conceive of it as a realm in which were to be found the things that would come down to earth with the breaking down of the barriers in the


final acts of the eschatological drama. That the Jews were thoroughly conversant with such a conception can be seen from the readiness with which the early Church accepted the idea of the ascension of Christ into heaven until such time as he should return from there to earth."¹

Dr. Perrin also argues strongly on the basis of the universally accepted fact that Jewish apocalyptic normally envisages the earth as the stage of the final act of the eschatological drama. He takes issue² with Paul Billerbeck who had claimed³ that in I Enoch 71, Slavonic Enoch, and the Assumption of Moses there was evidence for the existence in Jewish apocalyptic of the idea that the consummation of salvation would take place not on earth but in heaven. Despite the weight of Billerbeck's authority, Dr. Perrin seems to join issue successfully in his review of the passages concerned from those books.

It would seem, therefore, that Dodd's interpretation of the apparently futurist sections of the message of Jesus is at least dubious. It should also be remembered that, although there doubtless are sections which speak of the Kingdom of God as being in some sense a present reality, the futurist passages predominate. Dr. Dodd is himself, of course, aware of this last fact and seeks to justify his emphasis by reminding us that

"Whatever we may make of them, the sayings which declare the Kingdom of God to have come are explicit and unequivocal. They are moreover the most characteristic and distinctive of the Gospel sayings on the subject. They have no parallel

¹ op.cit., p.70
² op.cit., pp.71-73.
³ Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midraš, 4 vols, 1922-28; here, IV, p.806.
in Jewish teaching of prayers of the period. If therefore we are seeking the differentia of the teaching of Jesus upon the Kingdom of God, it is here that it must be found.\(^1\)

This point is well made and must be reckoned with. However, it is to be noted that Dr. Dodd himself does not consider this consideration so conclusive that he considers it unnecessary to offer some explanation of these passages which have an apparently futurist interpretation.

Undoubtedly, however, Dodd's most important single contribution is his handling of the parables of Jesus. If he can make good his claim that these largely illustrate the theme of the presence of the Kingdom of God in Jesus' life and ministry and that these represent the major section of Jesus' teaching, then this must be a considerable factor in our assessment of Jesus' view of the Kingdom of God.

Is it really true, as C.H. Dodd asserts that it is,\(^2\) that the parables were intended to convey to Jesus' generation at large the significance of His life and ministry? In order to agree with Dodd, we have to regard as a Marcan misunderstanding of the mind of Jesus the statement that the parables were intended to conceal rather than to reveal truth. The whole aura of secrecy with regard to Jesus' messianic claims of which the 'konsequente Eschatologie' school has made so much is an important factor in this matter. Rudolf Otto's interpretation of some of the parables as enshrining the essential hiddenness of a truth which only the enlightened would understand, seems to be more in line with the traditional character of Jewish apocalyptic.

C.H. Dodd admits that the 'parables of crisis', such as the Ten

---

1 The Parables of the Kingdom, p.49

2 *op.cit.*, chapter VII, Conclusions, p.195 ff.
Virgins and the Great Feast, are referred, in the Gospel records as we have them, to the coming crisis of the Parousia of Christ, but he holds that this represents later Church interpretation and that, when Jesus gave these parables, he had in mind the crisis which was posed by His own ministry and mission in Galilee and Judaea.¹ This judgment is reinforced in Dodd's mind by a careful consideration of the earliest strata of preaching in the Primitive Church, as reflected in the 'kerygma' as Paul understood it and in the early chapters of the Acts of the Apostles, with a view to substantiating the contention that the Church in the very earliest days had an appreciation of Jesus's interpretation of His mission which was in agreement with Dodd's own understanding of it. Dodd holds that in that primitive proclamation the crisis was seen as consisting in the mission of Jesus, which had reached its climax in His death, resurrection, and the experience of the disciples at Pentecost.²

Dodd's understanding of the parables of growth also requires careful consideration. Do such parables as those of the Sower and the Grain of Mustard Seed speak of a slow growth, interpreted in Dodd as having now reached maturity? Or, do they rather signify the hiddenness of the process of development and its dependence upon what God does, as distinct from the husbandman? The former represents the view of Cadoux, adopted by C.H. Dodd; the latter represents the insights of the line of thought associated with Johannes Weiss and Albert Schweitzer. Otto's view was perhaps a middle-of-the-road one, and one wonders whether it was not perhaps the soundest of all. Otto recognised that they do speak of a growth, but he agreed with the

¹ *op.cit.*, chapter V, Parables of Crisis, p.154 ff.
² The Apostolic Preaching and its developments, chapter I, The Primitive Preaching, p.7ff. Vide, e.g. p.24: "The Kingdom of God is conceived as coming in the events of the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus--.--."
'consistent eschatology' school of thinking that the emphasis is upon the wonder of the consummation of this growth, conceived of as a futum historical reality, as essentially an achievement dependent upon God's gift, and at the same time he laid more stress than did 'consistent eschatology' on the reality of the present growth of the Kingdom of God as a hidden reality. By his emphasis upon the hidden character of the present reality, Otto was able at once to do justice to the tension between present and future realities, manifest in the Gospel records, and to anchor the teaching of Jesus in contemporary thought forms of Judaism. While scholars may differ as to the measure of Jesus' reliance upon the characteristic thought forms of late Jewish apocalyptic, it can hardly be maintained that the concept of organic growth and development is native to the prophets of Jewry as over against the apocalypticists.

Although Dodd judged that in the earliest preaching of the apostles the emphasis fell on the fact that in Christ the new age had dawned, he did not deny that the apostles expected the imminent Parousia of Christ in glory: the Parousia was viewed, he tells us,\(^1\) as an event which would confirm the reality of the Messianic Age which was already entered upon from the time of Christ's Resurrection and of the Pentecostal experience. Dodd considers that, as time passed and the Parousia expectation remained unfulfilled, Paul's attitude underwent a change\(^2\). In one place he puts it in this way:

"It is noteworthy that as his interest in the speedy advent of Christ declines, as it demonstrably does after the time when he wrote I Corinthians, the 'futurist

\(^1\) Cf. op. cit., p.32

\(^2\) Cf. 'The Mind of Paul: Change and Development' in the Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, vol.18, No.1."
eschatology' of his earlier phase is replaced by - 'Christ-mysticism'. The hope of glory yet to come remains as a background of thought, but the foreground is more and more occupied by the contemplation of all the riches of divine grace enjoyed here and now by those who are in Christ Jesus. -- This was the true solution of the problem presented to the Church by the disappointment of its naive expectation that the Lord would immediately appear; not the restless and impatient straining after signs of His coming which turned faith into fantasy and enthusiasm into fanaticism; but a fuller realization of all the depths and heights of the supernatural life here and now."¹

Dodd goes on to tell us that "it is in the epistles of Paul - that full justice is done for the first time to the principle of 'realized eschatology' which is vital to the whole kerygma. -- In masterly fashion Paul has claimed the whole territory of the Church's life as the field of the eschatological miracle."² It is, however, supremely, in the Fourth Gospel that 'realized eschatology' comes into its own: "In the Fourth Gospel the crudely eschatological elements in the kerygma are quite refined away."³ It is admitted that the eschatological outlook survives in John 5:28-29, but it is observed that the evangelist places the emphasis (Jn. 5:24-26) on the eternal life which is the present possession of all believers in Christ. Again, in John 14-16 Jesus' promise that He will "come again" (14:3) is treated as realized in the presence of the Paraclete, the Holy Spirit. Dodd sees in this a deliberate subordinating of the 'futurist' element in the eschatology

¹ The Apostolic Preaching and its developments, p.63.
² op.cit., p.65.
³ op.cit., p.65
of the Early Church to the 'realized element', which, in his view had
been from the first the controlling element in the apostolic kerygma. Dodd sums up the difference between Paul and John in regard to this
process of reducing the original eschatological element by saying that,
while Paul reinterprets eschatology in terms of the 'Christ-mysticism'
which is bound up with the Church's life in the Spirit and views the
death and resurrection of Jesus as eschatological facts in the sense
that they have introduced the Messianic Age, John makes the whole life
of Jesus a revelation of His glory. John, therefore, takes further
than Paul the process of reinterpretation of eschatology.

Mediating and Other Positions.

We turn now to an investigation of what may be termed mediating
positions in the eschatological debate. JOACHIM JEREMIAS, W.G.
KÜMMEL and OSCAR CULLMANN are worthy of note as representing views which
may help us to profit by the insights of both 'consistent eschatology'
and 'realized eschatology' schools and approximate to a solution of the
eschatological problem. Some consideration will also be given to
the position of Rudolf Bultmann, who has had an enormous influence on
New Testament interpretation. Cullmann's outlook will best be brought
out in contradistinction from that of Bultmann.

The contribution of JOACHIM JEREMIAS to the eschatological debate
has been made chiefly in the following books:-

Jesus als Weltvollender (1930)
Die Gleichnisse Jesu (1947)
(Jeng. trans: The Parables of Jesus)
Jesu Verheissung für die
Völker (1956)
(Eng. trans.: 'Jesus' Promise to the Nations')

1 op.cit., p.66.
2 op.cit., pp.68-69.
The first of these serves to lay bare the presuppositions of much of Jeremias' thinking, while the latter two make important contributions to our understanding of different aspects of Jesus' teaching, which have an essential bearing on His expectation for the future. 'The Parables of Jesus' represents the most important work on the interpretation of the Dominical parables since C.H. Dodd's book and has a significant difference of outlook, which has become increasingly clear in the successive editions of the book. 'Jesus' Promise to the Nations' is a monograph rather than an exhaustive treatment of its subject, but it makes an extremely significant contribution to the debate regarding Jesus' attitude to the Gentiles and His conception of God's purpose of grace towards them, the essential point being that Jesus anticipated the ingathering of the Gentiles only when the Kingdom of God was established. If this be so, clearly this has significance for Jesus' understanding of the sense in which the Kingdom of God was already breaking through in His own ministry.

In what way does Jeremias' interpretation of the parables differ from that of C.H. Dodd? The difference has not always been appreciated: Perrin accuses J.A.T. Robinson of failing to appreciate that there is a significant difference. Jeremias agreed with Dodd that Jesus did consider that in His life and ministry the Kingdom of God had come. However, he holds 1 that Jesus also anticipated another great crisis, which would inaugurate the Kingdom of God in its fullness. Jesus saw the Kingdom of God both as present and as future.

Certain Anglo-Saxon scholars have also confessed that both elements are present in Jesus' teaching regarding the Kingdom. However, one discovers on close examination that their view is really quite other than that of Jeremias. The tension between present and future

---

1 The Parables of Jesus, S.C.M. London, 1954. (The German original, Die Gleichnisse Jesu was first published in 1947. The fifth edition was published in 1960. The English translation is from the third German edition of 1954. The second and fourth German editions included considerable revision.)
realities is generally explained away and is not viewed as an ultimately irreducible factor, as it is in such scholars as Jeremias and Kümmel. Thus, in his book, 'The New Testament Doctrine of the Last Things', 1948, H.A. Guy distinguishes two elements in Jesus' future expectation. The 'day of the Son of Man' was conceived of by Jesus as a day of divine judgment upon His generation, called forth by its impenitence in the face of His message: this was fulfilled in the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70. So far as the references to the coming of the Kingdom are concerned, their apparently future reference perhaps indicates that Jesus viewed the Kingdom as "essentially timeless."

In this Guy's position is closely similar to that of C.H. Dodd. The insistence upon the need to find some place in our scheme of thinking for the destruction of Jerusalem as part of Jesus' expectation for the future is surely a strong point in Guy's thinking, as it is in Dodd's. Yet the point which presently concerns us is that Guy does not really postulate any ultimate tension between present and future elements in Jesus' conception of the Kingdom. He cannot therefore be aligned alongside Jeremias.

In similar fashion A.M. Hunter regards Mark 14:25, Lk. 22:16, 22:30, and Matt. 8:11 as references to a transcendent order beyond time and space. Other indications of the expectation of Jesus for the future are made to refer to the Resurrection or to Pentecost and the growth of the Christian Church. Again there is no radical disjunction between present and future historical events. With the position of such scholars (with whom Vincent Taylor should be numbered), we may compare the judgment of Rudolf Schnackenburg, who says that in the Person and

---


4 Gottes Herrschaft und Reich. Verlag Herder Freiburg. 1959. pp. 17ff. 87f. This book has now been translated into English under the title 'God's Rule and Kingdom'.
Work of Christ we have to do with a fulfilment of the messianic promises which is not yet the final consummation, or, alternatively expressed, with the beginning of the time of salvation, which moves forward towards a new climax. This is much more in line with the thinking of Jeremias than are the views of the English scholars mentioned above. Such a judgment carries with it too an important corollary of which we should not lose sight: the expectation of the Early Church of a future crisis at the Parousia is essentially in keeping with Jesus' own expectation.

Jeremias' manner of presenting the evidence for the future element in Jesus' eschatological teaching is suggestive and helpful. Certain parables are viewed as anticipating in the future the fulfilment or completion of what has already begun in the present. In the light of this expectation the present is portrayed in such parables as 'a time of hope'.\(^1\) The parables of the Mustard Seed and the Sower, which are classed by Dodd as 'parables of growth', are regarded by Jeremias rather as 'parables of contrast'. Their message is that God is able to bring in, and will in fact in the future bring in, His Kingdom despite present unfavourable appearances. Noteworthy in this difference of interpretation is that, whereas Dodd sees the culmination of the period of 'growth' as having arrived in the ministry of Jesus, Jeremias sees the reality, as yet unsuspected by many, as to be revealed at a time still in the future when Jesus uttered the parable. Jeremias also views certain other parables and parabolic sayings of Jesus (such as His references to the Signs of the Times) as portraying an imminent but still future catastrophe in the light of which the present becomes a 'time of crisis'.\(^2\) Here again, though Jeremias uses terminology

\(^1\) The Parables of Jesus. pp.89-92.

\(^2\) op.cit., pp.120-126.
deceptively reminiscent of that of Dodd, it seems clear that the emphasis is upon Jesus' future expectation.

It is doubtless true that Jeremias sees both the present and future elements in Jesus' eschatological thinking and teaching. Yet C.H. Dodd himself does not altogether deny the presence of both elements, though he does indeed appear not to allow for any radical disjunction in Jesus' expectation. What is important, however, for our present purposes is to see that it is not the admission of both elements in Jesus' thinking which is important, but how a scholar understands the relation of these elements.

Jeremias' discussion, it is found, of Jesus' attitude towards Gentiles and towards mission to the Gentiles is both startling and suggestive in its findings, in his book, 'Jesus' Promise to the Nations'. It also has a direct relevance to the issues presently before us. It helps too to fill out Jeremias' conception of how Jesus viewed the period of waiting between the crisis imposed by His ministry and the crisis of the Parousia. For if both of these are to be viewed as historical events -- even if the latter also be an event which ends history as we know it -- it seems natural to suppose that Jesus had some ideas regarding the intervening period, which becomes in principle measurable, though here again its extent may be known only to the Father.

Jeremias calls attention to a major problem regarding Jesus's attitude towards the ingathering of the heathen nations into the Kingdom of God. He gathers together his evidence for Jesus' outlook in impressive fashion. Firstly, he calls attention to the logion at Matt. 23:15:

"Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye compass sea and land to make one proselyte; and when he is become so, ye make him twofold more a son of Gehenna than yourselves." It is recognized that

Jesus was here condemning a superficial proselytizing, yet his words fall strangely on the ear when we reflect that this is the only recorded allusion of Jesus to the missionary zeal of Israel, which was never greater than in the period between the Maccabean revolt and the suppression of the Bar Cochba revolt in 135 A.D. Secondly, our attention is directed to Matt. 10:5f.: "Go not to the Gentiles, and enter not into the province of Samaria; but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel." This is Jesus' instruction to his disciples when he sent them forth on mission. It is noteworthy that this whole section, the story of the sending forth of the Twelve presents great problems. V. 23 with its reference to the inability of the disciples to cover all the cities of Israel before the coming of the Son of man is one, while the reference to persecutions which did not materialize at this juncture (v. 17f.) is another. Jeremias holds v. 5 and v. 23 together, thus cutting the ground from beneath the suggestion that v. 5 applied only to the first sending of the disciples. As he says, it "indicates that the proclamation of the message in Israel would not be terminated even by the parousia." Confirmation of the restriction of the mission to Israel is seen in the number sent forth -- though Jeremias also considers that the twelvefold aspect of the disciples envisages a mission destined to be finalised in the final restoration of all Israel in the eschatological restoration. Jeremias recognises that these two sayings in vv.5 and 23 belong to Matthew's special material, but he essays the task of reinterpretation in the case of a series of pre-resurrection sayings of Jesus which envisage a mission of the disciples to the Gentiles. These passages are:- Mk. 13:10; 14:9

1 op.cit. pp.19-20.
2 op.cit. p.20.
(parallel, Matt. 26:13); Matt. 5:13; 10:18; 21:43; 22:9; 25:40; Lk. 10:1; 14:23. Supporting evidence for the view that Jesus in his lifetime sent his disciples only to Israel is found in the behaviour of the primitive church in regard to the Gentiles. The third striking consideration adduced by Jeremias is the restriction, which he believes he can demonstrate, of Jesus' own missionary activity to Jews. Such an incident as that recorded in Matt. 15:24 or that found at Matt. 8:7 (interpreted by Jeremias as a question, not an assertion) are viewed as demonstrating that Jesus' being persuaded by the faith and importunity of the Gentiles concerned is good evidence of the general restriction of His ministry.

Clearly this argument depends in part for its force upon its cumulative character. To take the headings of Jeremias' sections in his first chapter, Jesus pronounces a stern judgment upon the Jewish mission, Jesus forbade His disciples during His lifetime to preach to non-Jews, Jesus limited His own activity to Israel. Taken together, these findings impressively illustrate an attitude of Jesus which may at first surprise us. If the picture given is an accurate one, it calls for explanation, and this Jeremias proceeds to give in terms of Jesus' eschatological expectation.

It is true, of course, that Jeremias' exegesis of various passages and his interpretation of what Jesus originally meant, particularly with regard to the second point, are capable of being challenged. Jeremias himself is aware that in some instances Luke may omit some word of Jesus which would seem to imply an unfavourable attitude on the part of Jesus towards the Gentiles, to whom he Luke was a missionary, but, on the other hand, he readily admits, for example, that the logion

of Mark 14:9 with its parallel at Matt. 26:13 was understood by Mark and Matthew as presupposing a world-wide mission which would celebrate the act of the unnamed woman throughout the world in her pouring of a box of precious ointment over Jesus' head.\footnote{op.cit., p.22.} It is impossible for us here to say more than that it must be recognized that the Evangelists at times have rather differently understood certain words of Jesus and are even sometimes at variance with reference to the settings of these sayings.

Jeremias turns\footnote{op.cit., p.40 ff.} from the negative findings of the first part of his work to set forth three positive propositions, which help set Jesus' hope regarding 'the nations' in perspective: Jesus removes the idea of vengeance from the eschatological expectation; Jesus promises the Gentiles a share in salvation; the redemptive activity and Lordship of Jesus includes the Gentiles. Jeremias again builds up his case with care and precision. Particularly impressive is his insistence upon the universal significance of the term 'Son of Man'. Here he refers to the universal sway of the enthroned 'Son of Man' of Daniel 7:13ff. The connection is also firmly made with Jesus' thought of Himself as the Suffering Servant, whose task was, of course, universalist in its setting in Deutero-Isaiah (Is. 42:1,4; 42:6; 49:6; 52:13; 53:12).

The resolution of the apparent contradiction of the three negative and the three positive findings, noted above, is discovered by Jeremias in the conception that Jesus regarded the ingathering of the Gentiles as an eschatological act of God, an event reserved for the last days. Matt. 8:11ff., in particular, is interpreted in the light of Is. 2:2ff., with its parallel in Mic. 4:1ff. Further, Jeremias flings a flood
of light upon Jesus' cleansing of the Temple, which is interpreted in the light of Is. 56. The latter passage envisages the homage paid by the nations to Israel's God in Zion, in a sanctuary set up in the 'last days'. The word, which Jesus quotes in denouncing the money-changers, comes from Is. 56:7, and this helps substantiate that in this action Jesus sought to cleanse the Temple by way of preparation for the coming ingathering of the nations and the universal act of homage which the last days were to bring.

All of this is clearly of paramount importance for an understanding of Jesus' eschatological expectation. Jeremias says that Jesus' limitation of His own earthly mission to the nation of Israel was as much for the sake of the world as was His death on the Cross. "Jesus' preaching to Israel was the precondition, his death for countless hosts rendered possible, and his parousia will bring into being, the people of God of the New Age, and the Kingdom of God over the whole world." ¹ Thus the completion of the whole task of Jesus opened the way for the Gentile mission. "The missionary task is a part of the final fulfillment, a divine factual demonstration of the exaltation of the Son of Man, an eschatology in process of realization." This means that Jesus regarded the age of the missionary Church as part and parcel of the divine plan for the ingathering of the nations. ²

Jeremias also reminds us that the eschatological ingathering of the nations, envisaged in Is. 56 and taken over by Jesus, presupposes the prior scattering of God's people. ³ This is a recurrent theme of apocalyptic. This suggests, then, that Jesus viewed His life and ministry as fulfilling the preconditions, not only for the mission to

¹ op.cit., p.73
² op.cit., p.75
³ op.cit., p.63ff., espec. p.64
the Gentiles but also for the period of tribulation which must precede the day of God's final vindication. In such a setting more room is made than is usually conceded for the portrayal of the dominical utterances found in Mark 13 and its parallels, where Jesus appears to think in terms of a historical period leading up by its trials to the final consummation.

RUDOLF BULTMANN was a voluminous writer and almost all his works have a relevance to the theme of eschatology. It seems clear that the impetus to his de-mythologising programme stemmed originally from a desire to come to grips with the meaning of the eschatological passages of Scripture. With a relentless logic, Bultmann then carried into all his biblical interpretation the lessons which he believed he had learned from the peculiar problems of mythology which he had faced in association with the eschatological issue. This is made clear especially in the essay, 'The Message of Jesus and the Problem of Mythology'.

The contribution of Rudolf Bultmann to the eschatological debate becomes clear as we look at three aspects of his thinking, namely, his attitude towards history in relation to the Gospel, the role of myth in the New Testament, and the significance of the sense of imminence with reference to the inbreaking of the Kingdom of God. It is only necessary for our present purpose to indicate the bearing of Bultmann's thought on the general understanding of New Testament eschatology and its relationship to the issue between 'realized' and 'futurist' eschatology.

It is clear that in the tension between the 'Jesus of history' and the 'Christ of faith', Bultmann placed emphasis upon the latter. Nevertheless, Bultmann did not consider this a true alternative. He

---

1 Contained in Bultmann's book, 'Jesus Christ and Mythology'
S.C.M. London.
insisted that truly historical accounts of the past are not primarily concerned with bare facts. This is the role of chronology. History is the past reaching out towards us, seeking to encounter us. When we apply this to the New Testament records concerning Jesus of Nazareth, the historicity of these records does not, we now see, depend upon the recoverability of what happened but rather upon their ability to shape our lives. In fact, most scholars today would agree that history is much more than the mere recital of facts. The very presentation of what has happened in other days demands a principle of selectivity and interest. The stress, however, in Bultmann's thought fell much more heavily upon the ability of the past to encounter us, when applied to the Gospels, than had been usual among New Testament interpreters. Anglo-Saxon theology has tended to receive Bultmann's stress at this point with caution.

It is interesting that younger followers of Bultmann, men such as Ernst Kasemann, Ernst Fuchs, and Günther Bornkamm, have been demonstrating in recent years a somewhat greater interest in the 'quest' of the 'historical Jesus' than had been common in Bultmann's camp. It is well known that Bultmann was himself extremely sceptical concerning the recoverability of the real facts about Jesus, though this was not for him a matter of concern. Scholars do in fact disagree about the question whether Bultmann recognized any real continuity between the actual Jesus of history and the crucified Christ of dogma. Bultmann's own stress, however, was certainly upon the Christ Who is presented to faith and by faith in the Gospel records.

What is the significance of Bultmann's attitude towards history, and towards the tension between the 'Jesus of history' and the 'Christ of faith', where the eschatological debate is in view? The point is that there seems to be a congruity between his attitude towards events of the past in their relation to us and an attitude towards the future and our relationship to it. Regarding the past, broadly we may say that Bultmann considers that we cannot know it except as it is mediated to us by those who interpret it for us, and that we should not wish to get behind this union of 'fact' and its 'interpretation'. In the case of the Christian Gospel, it is this union of the actual occurrences of the career of Jesus of Nazareth and their interpretation which constitute for us the 'Christ event'. Bultmann is predisposed by this way of looking at things, where the past is concerned, to judge that what lies ahead is equally (indeed more) unable to be ascertained, and to consider that in any case, if it were available to us, it would be no concern for faith.

It is evident that it is over against such an understanding of our relationship to events in history, past or future, that the category of 'myth', as Bultmann employs it, comes into its own. If we understand that what Christian faith helps us towards is 'authentic existence' in the present (here Bultmann's reliance upon Heideggerian existentialist terminology is manifest), then we are reconciled to dealing with realities of past or present as they are mediated to us. We are no longer concerned to get behind these presentations to what actually happened or will happen. It is inevitable, Bultmann thinks, that the presentation will reflect the 'Weltanschauung' of those responsible for it. Hence the supernaturalistic presentation of Jesus' career in terms of miracles, and the explanation of what lies ahead of the Church and the world in terms conformable to a primitive science and cosmology.
Bultmann has this to say concerning myth in relation to eschatology:

"The mythical eschatology is untenable for the simple reason that the parousia of Christ never took place as the New Testament expected. History did not come to an end, and, as every schoolboy knows, it will continue to run its course. Even if we believe that the world as we know it will come to an end in time, we expect the end to take the form of a natural catastrophe, not of a mythical event such as the New Testament expects. And if we explain the parousia in terms of modern scientific theory, we are applying criticism to the New Testament, albeit unconsciously."¹

Bultmann knows that there are other challenges which New Testament mythology has to face apart from natural science, but it is the latter which perhaps poses the greatest problem, in Bultmann's view, for literal acceptance of what the New Testament has to say about the Parousia of Christ in glory. The non-occurrence of that event at the time when the Primitive Church expected it, is viewed as confirming that to take the idea of the Parousia of Christ literally at all is erroneous.

What Bultmann has to say about the New Testament sense of imminence has to be understood against this background of judgment concerning what is available at any time to the Christian's knowledge and concerning the role of myth. The Christ of the Parousia in glory represents the lively understanding in the primitive Christian community of the sovereignty of the God revealed in Christ over all the hidden future. The sense of imminence with reference to the Parousia reflects the vividness with which that belief in the sovereignty of God was held. In part the belief in the nearness of the end of the age derives from

the common thought-forms of apocalyptic. However, there is more to the Christian conviction regarding the proximity of the Parousia of Christ than that. Thus, Bultmann says:

"... the primitive community interprets its present according to the scheme of traditional Jewish apocalypticism, i.e. the scheme of mythological eschatology and its doctrine of the two aeons. But while Jewish apocalypticism lives in the consciousness that the old aeon is rushing towards its end and looks forward with hope and longing for the coming of the new one, seeking on all sides for the signs of its approach, the Christian community is convinced that the new aeon is already breaking in and that its powers are already at work and can be discerned."

Thus, Bultmann finds the essential character of the Christian sense of imminence in regard to the end of the age in its appreciation of the overlapping of the age that is to come with the present age, an overlapping which has been a reality since the decisive events of the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ. Bultmann's account at this point is not distinctive, but it is sensitive and does justice to the dependence of the sense of imminence upon the aspect of 'realized eschatology' in the primitive Christian consciousness.

Does Bultmann's overall presentation of New Testament eschatology lean towards an interpretation of a 'realized' or a 'futurist' character? There seems quite a marked stress upon the 'realized' element: The sense of imminence of the end of the age, as we have seen, was in his account largely based upon the realisation that the last age was in some sense already present. This does not mean, however, that Bultmann did not take seriously the futurist elements. He believed that the primitive Church was influenced by mythological conception, but he recognized that that Church believed that Christ would literally come soon on the clouds of heaven. Accordingly, he considered that "already

in the New Testament itself the delay of the expected parousia is felt.\textsuperscript{1} Within the primitive Christian consciousness both the reality of the Second Advent and its nearness in time were understood literally, so that inevitably delay caused impatience and even despair. This is reflected, Bultmann held, in the synoptic tradition with its admonitions to watchfulness and its emphasis on the unexpectedness of that Day's arrival (Matt. 24:43; par. Luke 12:39f.; Matt. 25:1-13; etc.), in other warnings that the Day will come unexpectedly (I Thess. 5:2-4; Rev. 3:3; 16:15), and notably at II Pet. 3:1-10, where the author has to defend the Parousia expectation against serious doubts.\textsuperscript{2}

One serious criticism which may be levelled at Bultmann is that in his use of it the term 'eschatology' and its derivatives cease to have their traditional meaning and do not in fact refer to 'last events' at all. Eschatology comes to be interpreted in existential terms, while the temporal element in it is viewed as a mere form or wrapping which can be discarded. The existential meaning of eschatology is its core, while its relation to temporality is an accommodation only to contemporary thought-forms. Such a view is one which may have a certain appeal, but its adoption means the abandonment of 'eschatology' in the sense dictated by the derivation and history of the term.

OSCAR CULLMANN has an important contribution to make to the modern eschatological debate. One of his most significant emphases is upon the temporal character of New Testament eschatology, and this is made in conscious and direct opposition to the reduction of eschatology in its proper sense which is found in Bultmann. Cullmann

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{1} \textit{op.cit.}, p.295.  \\
\textsuperscript{2} \textit{op.cit.}, p.295
\end{flushright}
says that what is central to the New Testament is a conception of 'salvation-history'.\(^1\) When this is understood, eschatology falls into its proper place, being neither unduly emphasized nor, on the other hand, denigrated. Cullmann takes as his starting-point the conviction that history stands under the guidance of God and that within history in its broad outlines there is a special sequence of events in which God makes Himself known and works out His purposes. Primarily this sequence of events is discovered in the history of the Chosen People, in the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ, in the ongoing life and mission of the Church, and in the consummation of history at the Parousia of Christ in glory. It is the period of the Incarnation which is fundamental to this sequence of events and times. It is here that both salvation-history in general and indeed all history are brought into line with God's purposes, and it is this period which gives orientation both to the past and the future. Cullmann makes it clear that the decisiveness of the Incarnation does not rob the future of its reality, but rather guarantees its meaning. He says in one place:

"We should remember that the whole history of salvation past and future is summed up in Christ. So to say that decisive future events are anticipated in the life, death and resurrection of Christ, and that therefore nothing is now left that is still to be realized, is like arguing that because events in the Old Testament recur in the Christ event, it is not necessary for them to have happened at all prior to the coming of Christ. Again, it must be remembered that in the New Testament the vertical and the horizontal do not exclude each other. A new event is coming which is more than an uncovering of what is already present."\(^2\)


\(^2\) op.cit., p.177.
It is clear, therefore, that Cullmann takes most seriously that certain events lie ahead of the Church and the world in God's providential dispensing of history, and that he accepts these events as being of a genuinely temporal character.

Cullmann has much to say concerning the tension between 'realized' and 'futurist' elements in New Testament eschatology, and he offers a penetrating critique of present day schools of thought which emphasize one element at the expense of the other: here he has in mind the 'realized eschatology' school of C.H. Dodd and his followers, on the one hand, and the 'consistent eschatology' school of Albert Schweitzer and Martin Werner, on the other. The distinctive feature of Cullmann's presentation is that he not only finds both elements in the New Testament, but that he refuses to treat either element as of lesser importance than the other. He says:

"The new element in the New Testament is not eschatology, but what I call the tension between the decisive 'already fulfilled' and the 'not yet completed', between present and future." 1

Cullmann's claim is that the 'realized eschatology' school places emphasis on the present reality of salvation and does not do justice to the futurist element in New Testament thinking, while the 'consistent eschatology' school falls into the very opposite error of laying such stress upon the futurist elements that it does not take with sufficient seriousness the New Testament sense of an 'already fulfilled' salvation.

It is central to Cullmann's thought that the 'time of salvation' of the Incarnation does actually have a foundational character for 'salvation-historical' events in both past and future time. We have already seen that this fact guarantees the genuinely temporal character

---

1 op.cit., p.172.
of the 'last things', on Cullmann's view. This factor also means for Cullmann that the Incarnation does not merely bring salvation in a decisive manner into the present in Jesus' life and mission; rather does he take very seriously that that time of salvation fulfilled certain prior history which in a unique fashion pointed forwards to it. Cullmann has these concepts in view as he criticize Bultmann's existential interpretation of the eschatological message of Jesus:

"If Jesus' teachings must really be interpreted existentially, then every saving event is a punctual present as an encounter with the 'wholly other', and only that. It is no longer a present bound to salvation history. In that case there is not actually any fundamental distinction between epochs in salvation history such as we see to be the presupposition for all biblical salvation history."

Bultmann is thus criticized from the standpoint of biblical salvation-history, as Cullmann understands it. Bultmann thinks of a continuous 'now' of 'address' and 'decision'. Cullmann judges that Bultmann is here influenced at least in part by a conceptuality derived from existentialist philosophy. What is required, however, is that we view the present of decision in biblical fashion as deriving its character from the fulfillment in the Incarnation of the past (and future) epochs of salvation-history. This means that we cannot treat either the past or future, with which the Incarnation is integrally related in biblical thinking, as being purely mythological and, therefore, able to be dispensed with.

Cullmann discovers in the tension between the 'already fulfilled' and the 'not yet completed' the basis for a proper understanding of New Testament eschatology. It is found already in the teaching of Jesus (Matt. 4:17; cf. Lk. 11:20; Matt. 12:28), and it is seen as most significant that, despite real differences between the thinking of Jesus and the Early Church, in this regard there is no break whatever between them: The major difference that Cullmann has in mind is

1 op.cit., p.169.
that Jesus, in contrast to Luke and other New Testament writers, only reckoned on a very short intermediate period of time between His death and resurrection, on the one hand, and the Parousia in glory, on the other. Most important is the way in which Cullmann brings out the fact that those who stress either a purely present or a purely futuristic expectation in Jesus of the Kingdom of God do not find this salvation-historical tension in the original New Testament message, but only in the so-called 'early Catholic' writers of the New Testament, notably Luke.

It is thus from this standpoint of the essentially temporal tension of salvation history that Cullmann puts aside both the theses of Schweitzer and Dodd. He recognizes that it is Dodd, rather than Schweitzer, who lays stress upon what does in fact constitute the "revolutionary newness in Jesus message"\(^1\), that is, the conviction that the Kingdom of God is already here. In fact, however, Dodd does not take into account the tension between present and future. He makes what is still to come, in Jesus' preaching, "at most an appendage of no fundamental importance"\(^2\).

He has viewed the futuristic sayings as being conditioned by the age in which Jesus lived, instead of seeing that the nearness of the coming Kingdom is based on the fact that the crucial event has arrived. Futurism in Jesus' message was no concession to familiar apocalyptic expectation. Rather it was based upon the fulfilment in His Person and Work of past and future salvation-history. Thus Cullmann refuses to reduce the temporal element in Jesus' proclamation, and urges against Dodd that both present and future feature in Jesus' message, in such a way that to treat either as secondary is to fail to grasp the salvation-historical tension in which they are held.

---

\(^1\) *op.cit.*, p.174.
\(^2\) *op.cit.*, p.174.
Cullmann considers that Schweitzer and his followers also eliminate this tension which is proper to salvation-history. However, they do this, not by ignoring the emphasis on the present experience of salvation, but by regarding it as a secondary, makeshift solution which only emerged when the Parousia did not take place as soon as had been anticipated. Bultmann is viewed as following the lead of Schweitzer, in that he too considers that the 'delay' in the Parousia constituted a problem for the Church. Cullmann insists over against this approach that the tension between 'already' and 'not yet' existed even before the expectation of the Parousia had been disturbed in any way by the course of events. Whether Cullmann is justified in aligning Bultmann with Schweitzer in this matter may be questioned. In the quotation which we offered above from Bultmann, page 82 considerable grasp of the significance of the operation of the new aeon already in Christ's ministry, is displayed. The real difference between Cullmann and Bultmann seems rather to consist in their divergent understandings of the nature of that 'present' element in Jesus' concept of the Kingdom. At the same time it is true that Schweitzer and Bultmann are in agreement in that both see the 'delay' in the Second Advent as posing a problem for the Church, and as occasioning 'community interpretations' of Jesus' words which place emphasis upon the suddenness with which Christ will come.

Cullmann judges that, while Jesus' conception of a temporal future coming of the Kingdom is integral to the salvation-historical tension of his eschatology, the actual dating of the end, as due to occur within the time of the generation then living, "belongs among those elements of salvation history which undergo a correction in connection with new events without the constant being affected."¹ The thought is that

¹ op.cit., p.180.
the failure of the Parousia to come within a generation does not interfere with the fact that already within Jesus' own message we find the same salvation-historical tension, as we find in the Church when the Second Advent was beginning to be later in its arrival than had earlier been anticipated. Cullmann expressly cites the passage from 'Kerygma and Myth', I, which we quoted above (page 81), and dissociates himself from the judgment that, when the imminence of expectation is disappointed, the whole notion of the futurity, i.e. temporality, of the end is demonstrated to be non-essential. He further is convinced that the Early Church was not deeply disturbed by the delay, and did not conclude, as a result of that delay, that the hope of the Parousia must be reinterpreted, that is, in non-temporal terms. He does not view the emphasis on watchfulness, for example, in the Synoptic Gospels, as the projection of the Christian community's concern over the delay and as an attempt to maintain the hope of the Second Advent in the face of increasing disillusionment.

Perhaps the contribution of Cullmann which is popularly known is the analogy which he made in his book, 'Christ and Time,' between the situation of the Church in the present age and the position of the Allied forces in Europe between D-Day and V-Day during the Second World War. The essential thought here is that of the overlap of the ages, that which is to come having entered the present age in Christ. Cullmann's general viewpoint on New Testament eschatology is latent in this figure, for he is at pains to do justice both to the present and the futurist elements in the expectation of Jesus and of the Primitive Church.

Cullmann is also known for the stress which he laid in *Christ and

---

1 Christ and Time. p. 84 and passim.
Time' on the Hebraic concept of time, which is in his judgment a 'linear concept'.¹ This is contrasted with the Hellenistic concept of time which is viewed as 'cyclic' in character. Not all scholars are agreed with Cullmann's judgment concerning the distinction between these two concepts,² that we can in straightforward fashion apply one to the Jews and another to the Greeks. Delling³ directly contradicts Cullmann's view by regarding the linear conception as Greek and as held possibly only by St. Luke among New Testament writers. The judgment of Cullmann is that the Hebraic understanding of time was determinative of Jesus' understanding. This Hebraic concept was, in Cullmann's view, a 'linear concept'. Time was conceived by the Jews, so he says, in a non-cyclic fashion. It might be represented diagrammatically by an unbroken continuous line. This line was thought of as divided by two decisive events. The Jews regarded it as divided by the Creation and again by the Parousia, the latter being the decisive redemptive act of God. In this way three different periods of time are yielded: time before the Creation, time between the Creation and the Parousia, and time after the Parousia. Since for the Jews it was the Parousia which was the decisive redemptive act, they regarded the period between Creation and Parousia as prior to the time of redemption. Cullmann holds, however, that "Jesus' understanding was different from this in that he regarded the decisive redemptive activity of God as already taking place in his own ministry; for him this did not coincide with the Parousia." Jesus thought that the events of His death and

1 op.cit. pp.51-60.
3 Delling's major contribution is found in his book, Das Zeitverständnis des neuen Testaments.Gütersloh,1940.
resurrection would constitute the decisive stage in the ushering in of the Kingdom of God, so that for Him the decisive mid-point in history was already impending. This is the truth in 'realized eschatology' but it remains true that Jesus still looked for the Parousia as a real event yet to come. Only when the Parousia became a reality did Jesus anticipate that the final victory would be won. It is in this context that Cullmann says that in Jesus' ministry D-Day was ventured upon, but V-Day was yet to come. W. G. KÜMMEL is a most careful and pains-taking exegete. Cullmann finds support in his exegesis at various points.1 Kömmel criticises Dodd's interpretation of the Greek terms 'ἡ'Neill' and 'ὁφαρ'ειν', as used by Jesus. He is sure that Jesus thought of the Kingdom of God as still future, though close at hand, even if it be true that its influence is already making itself felt in His ministry.2 In this regard he agrees with the understanding of Jesus' outlook discovered among followers of the 'consistent eschatology' school of thought.

Kömmel underlines the temporal character of the future event of the Parousia, and adduces various texts (Mk. 14:25; Lk. 17:22; etc.) which presuppose a definite interval of time, be it long or short, between the departure of Jesus and the Parousia in glory.3 Kömmel's overall position on this matter is best summarized in his own words:

"... Jesus did indeed count on a shorter or longer period between his death and the parousia, but - he equally certainly proclaimed the threatening approach of the Kingdom of God within his generation." 4

1 Promise and Fulfilment pp.23-24.
2 Op. cit. Compare especially Chapter 1, 'The Imminent Future of the Kingdom of God'.
It is primarily his exegetical work confirming both the temporal character of the Parousia and its relative imminence which Cullmann is appreciative of. C.H. Dodd judged that, although the Parousia was thought of by the primitive Church as temporally imminent, the fact that it did not take place almost immediately produced a reinterpretation of eschatology. The contribution of Kümmel, however, if it be sound, leads away from the likelihood of such a judgment, since it enhances in our minds the possibility that from the beginning Jesus prepared his disciples for the possibility, at least, of some delay in the Parousia. In similar fashion, Kümmel's contribution at this point undercut the judgments of Schweitzer, Werner, and others of the 'consistent eschatology' school concerning an expectancy by Jesus of the end of the age either during His own lifetime or immediately subsequent to His death and consequent upon it. Clearly Kümmel's interpretation of Jesus' teaching comes closer to the assessment of it made by Cullmann than by either Dodd or Schweitzer. For Cullmann agrees that Jesus did anticipate the Parousia within a relatively short period of time, certainly within the lifetime of His own generation. His disagreement with the view, which, as we shall see, characterizes both 'realized eschatology' and 'consistent eschatology' schools that the delay in the Parousia must have provoked a reinterpretation of eschatology, is not unconnected with the judgment that Jesus did look for an early fulfilment of the Parousia hope, but not an immediate one.

Kümmel's position may be termed a mediating one between the positions of 'realized' and 'consistent' eschatology in so far as he takes issue with C.H. Dodd, on the one hand, and yet clearly disagrees with the judgment of Schweitzer concerning the immediate effect that the delay in the Parousia had upon the Church. His is also a genuine mediating position in so far as he does lay stress upon the unique role
which Jesus understood Himself to have. He does this in such a way as to help us see that, despite his criticism of Dodd at various points, he agrees that in Jesus' thinking a real element of 'realized' eschatology is found. He says:

"Jesus linked the present in a quite peculiar way to the future by speaking of his return as judge and by making the attitude of men to the earthly Jesus the criterion for the verdict of Jesus, the eschatological judge. This in itself turns Jesus' presence into a real eschatological present, instead of its being merely a period for awaiting the eschatological consummation." 1

1 op.cit., p.153.
The alleged delay of the Parousia as the pivot of the debate concerning the development of eschatological thought in the early Church.

What we have endeavoured to do in the above survey is to trace the historical origins of the modern eschatological debate concerning the bearing of the teaching of the New Testament. We have dealt with the emergence of the school of 'thorough-going' or 'consistent' eschatology in Albert Schweitzer. We have dealt with the contribution of C.H. Dodd and noted how 'realized eschatology' has come into its own, especially in Anglo-Saxon scholarship. We have also taken stock of some of the mediating positions, notably those of Joachim Jeremias and Oscar Cullmann. Rudolf Bultmann has been included in our survey because his general influence upon New Testament scholarship has been considerable and because his existentialist interpretation of the language of eschatology has tended to draw away attention from the real clash between 'realized' and 'futurist' interpretations of the message of Jesus and the New Testament in general. This factor required to be noted.

The emphasis of the above study has been upon the recovery of the true meaning of the thought and language of Jesus in regard to the coming of the Kingdom of God, and with reference to the Parousia in glory. Nevertheless some attention has been paid to the way in which Schweitzer, Dodd, and others have interpreted the development of thinking within the pages of the New Testament itself concerning eschatology. This element has come to the fore especially as we have considered whether such notes in the Synoptic Gospels as the stress on watchfulness and preparedness for the Day of the Son of Man are original to the message of Jesus or represent accommodations of the Early Church to the delay in the Parousia in glory.

What requires to be done finally is to set forth in brief compass
precisely what the schools of 'consistent' and 'realized' eschatology have taught, in the light of their understanding of Jesus' message, concerning the reaction of the Church to the delay in the Second Advent, both as it is witnessed to within the New Testament writings and beyond them. The fact is that the whole modern eschatological debate concerning the development of eschatological thought in the Early Church pivots on the question how the Church interpreted the growing period of years since Christ's Ascension and His Return. In looking at the various approaches towards the question concerning the attitude of the Early Church we shall have occasion to note the contribution of Martin Werner, who is an exponent of the 'consistent eschatology' school of thought. Werner's major interest has been not in the original teaching of Jesus on eschatology (he accepts the assessment of Schweitzer), nor even on the development of Church thinking in the Apostolic Age, as witnessed to in the Pauline and Johannine literature, but rather in that development in the sub-apostolic age and beyond. His conviction is that the delay in the Second Advent provoked a complete reinterpretation of eschatological expectation. This had consequences for the whole of Christian doctrine.

MARTIN WERNER expresses very clearly what 'consistent eschatology' thinks concerning the development in eschatology consequent upon the delay in the Parousia of Christ in glory. He says in one place:

"The delay of the Parousia of Jesus, which after his Death became increasingly obvious, must, in view of the non-fulfilment of the eschatological expectation, have grown into a problem which was conducive to the transformation of the original eschatological problem. The heart of the problem, however, lay in the fact that, in consequence of the delay of the Parousia, a contradiction between the eschatological scheme and the actual course of history began to be apparent."

In the light of this historical judgment, the rest of what Werner has to say in this passage is significant:

"By the eschatological doctrine becoming thus a problem and making doctrinal amendment necessary, it could be expected that the representation of the past history of Primitive Christianity should also have been affected. This contingency took the form of distortion through the incorporation of unhistorical features, which, as expressions symptomatic of the doctrinal problem, are also significant for the history of doctrine."\(^1\)

As an example of 'distortion' Werner cites the character of the 'Resurrection Appearances' of Jesus in "the secondary accounts of the Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles".\(^2\) These are contrasted with the (earlier) Pauline account of the Appearances. An acute element of contradiction is found in these "secondary accounts", which is dictated by the fact that the Appearances of Jesus should, according to the original eschatological outlook, "Properly have been his final 'Appearance,' his Parousia, but that such they had not proved to be."\(^3\) Werner notes, therefore, on the one hand, Parousia-motifs (angel attendants, Parousia-clouds, the celebration of the Messianic Banquet), and, on the other, the questions and doubts expressed by the disciples and the statements of the Risen Christ (e.g. Acts 1:9-11; Mk. 16:19, cf. Mk. 8:38; Lk. 24:30, 41-43).\(^4\)

It is open to doubt whether Werner's illustration commends his point of view. It is difficult to observe in these narratives any sense of confusion and disappointment. Be this as it may, Werner interprets them in the light of his own judgment concerning the delay in the Parousia and the consequences that, in his view, this must have had. This judgment becomes in fact a criterion of historicity. Werner expressly sets this historical basis for forming judgments about the reliability of New Testament passages, as found in the 'Consistent Eschatology' methodology, over against the more literary criterion of Form Criticism,
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\(^{1}\) op. cit., pp.22-23.
\(^{2}\) op.cit., p.23
\(^{3}\) op.cit., p.23
\(^{4}\) op.cit., p.23.
as employed by C.H. Dodd among others.\(^1\) It is interesting that, while Werner judges that Form Criticism, by its atomizing procedures with in dealing units of Scripture, destroys the cohesion of passages and leaves the Form Critics to their own subjectivity in estimating the reliability of the units as history, he himself can be very downright in his assertions concerning what is reliable and what is not in the New Testament records. He claims to be using an objective criterion of historicity, but all his judgments, and those of the 'consistent eschatology' school in this field, stand or fall with the true worth of that criterion.

Werner's contention is that the Resurrection of Jesus had been anticipated to be the initiation, within at most a very brief period of time, of the Resurrection at the end of the age. One very considerable group of Jewish Christians in Asia Minor held, he reminds us -- his authority is Epiphanius, but Werner seems to assume a larger group holding this view, than Epiphanius' authority justifies -- that, although Christ had been crucified, He was not yet risen: the reason for this was their conviction that, if the ultimate events bound up with the end of the age tarried, then Christ could not have risen. The next crisis, we are told, emerged with the dying-out of the whole of the first generation of believers. "The first occasions of the death of baptised believers undoubtedly had provoked thought in the Pauline communities."\(^2\) Paul's explanations in I Thess. 4:13-18 and I Cor. 15:51ff., were designed to show that those who had died in Christ would not be at any disadvantage at the Parousia, as compared with

\(^1\) *op. cit.*, p.10ff.
\(^2\) *op. cit.*, p.25.
those still living at that time, in that they would be raised to share
with the latter the glories of the Messianic era, while the other dead
would not be raised until the end of this era. Werner considers,
however, that the dying-out of the whole first generation without the
fulfilment of the Parousia hope must have brought about the realization
that "the Apostolic Age was not, in terms of the primitive Christian
expectation, the beginning of the final epoch." It was this change
which "proved itself in effect to be the turning-point of that subsequent
crisis of Christianity which, starting in the Post-Apostolic period, led,
by virtue of the process of Hellenization, to Early Catholicism."2

The above citations from Werner are sufficient to indicate the
general standpoint of the Consistent Eschatology school of thought.
So far as the development of Early Christianity is concerned, it is sure
that the delay in the Parousia provoked a transformation of eschatological
expectation. This gathered force with the end of the Apostolic era.
In saying this it brings to clarity conclusions inherent in the whole
line of thinking which runs through Johannes Weiss to Albert Schweitzer
to Martin Werner and Fritz Buri in our own day. It should be noted
that Franz Overbeck (1837-1905),3 Basle theologian and student of the
development of doctrine, was one of the precursors of the view that
the delay in the Second Advent produced a ferment in Early Christian
thought and provided a principle of development for it: this principle
was at its simplest one of 'de-eschatologisation'.

It is not always appreciated that, despite the very real differences
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1 op.cit., p.25.
2 op.cit., p.25.
3 Overbeck came to reject completely historic Christianity. He
expounded in his lectures a 'secular Church history' (profane
Kirchengeschichte).
between the 'realized' eschatology school and the 'consistent eschatology' school, they are in agreement concerning the effect that the delay in the Parousia had on the future course of Christian expectation. Werner has been made our spokesman so far as the 'consistent eschatology' school is concerned. C.H. Dodd makes certain remarks in his book on 'The Apostolic Preaching and Its Developments' which shows how much agreement is in fact present concerning the effect that the delay in the Parousia had.

We have already shown that Dodd's own views have altered somewhat over the years with regard to 'realized eschatology'. He is now in agreement that it is probably better to speak with J. Jeremias of an eschatology 'that is in process of being realized'. Further, his 1951 broadcast addresses show that he now feels that at an earlier stage he had not made sufficient of certain mysterious utterances of Jesus which speak of a breakdown of the physical universe. At the same time it should be clear that from the beginning Dodd has been aware that, even if references to the consummation of the age in Jesus have to be interpreted over against the general framework of apocalyptic thought and language, Jesus doubtless thought in a fairly literalist fashion concerning that consummation. Further, Dodd has recognized throughout that it was part of the earliest apostolic preaching, both as witnessed to by St. Paul and by the early speeches in the Acts of the Apostles, that the Messianic Age would shortly reach its consummation in the Return of Christ. However, Dodd is convinced that emphasis on Christ's Return as Judge and Saviour at the consummation of the age is not what receives emphasis in the apostolic kerygma. It was the Death and Resurrection of Christ which were central, and these were viewed as having inaugurated the Messianic Age. What this means for Dodd's understanding of the place of the Second Advent in the earliest days of
the Church is set out in this statement:

"The more we try to penetrate in imagination to the state of mind of the first Christians in the earliest days, the more we are driven to think of resurrection, exaltation, and second advent as being, in their belief, inseparable parts of a single divine event. It was not an early advent that they proclaimed, but an immediate advent. They proclaimed it not so much as a future event for which men should prepare by repentance, but rather as the impending corroboration of a present fact: the new age is already here, and because it is here men should repent."¹

Dodd goes on in the above passage to note that, contrary to the commonly held opinion, the apostolic preaching, as recorded in Acts, does not lay the greatest stress on the expectation of a second advent of Christ (only in Acts 3:20-21 is this hope fully set forth, and only at Acts 10:42 is Jesus described as Judge of the quick and the dead).

Our major interest in Dodd's outlook, however, at this point is to show that though he has throughout his career held a balanced outlook (with varying emphases, it is true) on the place that the consummation of the age occupied in Jesus' mind and that the Second Advent held for the earliest Christians, he judges that the futuristic note was sufficiently important and thought of sufficiently literally that, when that Day was delayed, it provoked a major reinterpretation of eschatological thinking in the Early Church. This, however, is precisely the conclusion arrived at by the 'consistent eschatology' school of thought. Dodd, having outlined the primitive Christian expectation as one of stress upon the reality of the new age that had dawned which yet anticipated its corroboration at the Second Advent, goes on to say this:

"In the earliest days it was possible to hold this conviction in the indivisible unity of an experience which included also the expectation of an immediate overt confirmation of its truth. The great act of God -- now trembled upon the verge of its conclusion in His second advent.

As time went on, the indivisible unity of experience which lay behind the preaching of the apostles was broken. The Lord did not come on clouds. For all their conviction of living in an age of miracles, the apostles found themselves living in a world which went on its course, outside

¹The Apostolic Preaching and its developments. p.33.
the limits of the Christian community, much as it had always done. The tremendous crisis in which they had felt themselves to be living passed, without reaching its expected issue. The second advent of the Lord, which had seemed to be impending as the completion of that which they had already 'seen and heard', came to appear as a second crisis yet in the future. So soon as only a few years had passed, say three or four, this division in the originally indivisible experience must have insensibly taken place in their minds, for they were intercalary years, so to speak, not provided for in their first calendar of the divine purpose. The consequent demand for readjustment was a principal cause of the development of early Christian thought.¹ (Italics mine)

We thus reach the at first surprising conclusion that both the 'realized' and 'consistent' schools of thought concerning New Testament eschatology pivot their whole understanding of the development of Christian thought concerning eschatology (naturally with consequences for other Christian doctrines) upon the reaction of the Church to the delay in the Second Advent. On the other hand, an Oscar Cullmann, while recognizing that Jesus expected the consummation of the age within a short period of time, a generation at most, does not think that the delay provoked any major change in Christian thinking concerning the hope of the Parousia. Other mediating positions are possible. Thus, Kümmel has reminded us of the existence of passages in the Gospels which suggest the possibility at least that from the beginning Jesus was aware that there might be an extended period of time until the consummation of the age.

The purpose of this thesis is to explore the literature of the Early Church, as far as the mid-third century after Christ, in order to elucidate whether in fact the Church was jarred in her thinking by the delay in the Second Advent, and also to assess the significance and character of her thinking in general terms on eschatological matters.

¹ op. cit. pp. 34-35
CHAPTER II : THE APOSTOLIC FATHERS AND THE 'PREACHING OF PETER'
In some instances the text employed has been that of the SourcesChrétien series, in others that of the Griechischen ChristlichenSchriftsteller series, while in other cases again recourse has been taken to the text of the Loeb Classical Library, in the edition ofKirsoop Lake. This will require to be set out below for each sectionof the following chapter of the thesis. The general intention hasbeen to make use of the Sources Chrétien series, where one wasoffered, and where this was not possible to use the German GriechischenChristlichen Schriftsteller series. Where neither was available thetext edited by Kirsoop Lake was used.

The documents dealt with in this chapter are as follows:

i.  **I Clement.** The text used is that published in the firstof two volumes under the title: The Apostolic Fathers, with an English translation by KirsoopLake. Wm. Heinemman, London, and Harvard Univ. Press. Cambridge, Massachusetts. The printingemployed was that of 1965, but this work wasfirst issued in 1912, and no alterations havebeen made to the original printing.

I Clement is not dealt with either in the S.C. or G.C.S.series, The Loeb Classicial Library edition by KirsoopLake has two volumes. The first deals with I Clement,II Clement, the Epistles of Ignatius, the Epistle ofPolycarp to the Philippians, The Teaching of the TwelveApostles (or the Didache) and the Epistle of Barnabas.
The second deals with the 'Shepherd of Hermas', the'Martyrdom of Polycarp', and the 'Epistle to Diognetus'.

ii. **II Clement.** The text used is again that of the Loeb ClassicalLibrary, volume I of the edition by Kirsoop Lakeof 1912. Neither of the two major critical series,mentioned above, has yet produced an editionof II Clement.
iii. The Epistles of Ignatius

The text employed is that of the Sources Chrétiennes series. This is given in volume 10 of that series of critical editions of the Fathers of the Early Church. This volume deals with the Epistle of Polycarp to the Philippians and with the Martyrdom of Polycarp, in addition to the Epistles of Ignatius. The title of this volume is now given: Ignace d’Antioche, Polycarpe de Smyrne, LETTRES, Martyre de Polycarpe. The Greek text, an Introduction, translation (into French) and notes are given in this volume by P. Th. Camelot, O.P. This work was published by Éditions du Cerf, Paris, in 1958. The publication of 1958 was of the third edition of the original work, revised and augmented.

The Sources Chrétiennes series has been appearing at regular intervals since 1942. The collection of works is directed by H. de Lubac, S.J., and J. Daniélou, S.J. The general secretary responsible with them for the edition of the series is C. Mandésert, S.J. This is the most recent critical series to deal in an authoritative manner with the Early Fathers, though individual volumes in the German Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller series sometimes prove to be more recent than those in the Sources Chrétiennes series.

iv. The Epistle of Polycarp to the Philippians

The text employed is that of volume 10 of the Sources Chrétiennes series, the details of which are given above.

v. The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles

The text of the Loeb Classical Library, edited by Kirsopp Lake, has again been employed in this instance. This work is also found in volume I.

Neither Sources Chrétiennes series nor Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller series has edited the text of this work.

vi. The Epistle of Barnabas

The text here again is that of Lake's edition in the Loeb Classical Library, volume I. This work again does not appear either in the French S.C. or the German G.C.S. series.
vii. The Shepherd of Hermas

The Sources Chrétienues text has been employed in this instance. The critical edition is number 53 of the S.C. series. This critical edition of 'Le Pasteur' was prepared by R. Joly (1968).

viii. The 'Preaching of Peter' in the Pseudo-Clementine Homilies and Recognitions.

The 'Preaching' has to be extracted from the Pseudo-Clementine Homilies and Recognitions. The text employed for the latter has in this instance been that of the Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller series. The Homilies is number 42 in that series, and the Recognitions is number 51.

The general title of both volumes is 'Die Pseudoklementinen'. Both volumes were prepared by Bernhard Rehm and were published by the Akademie-Verlag, Berlin. 'Homilien' appeared in 1953 and 'Recognitionen' in 1965.

The Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte is the full title of this series. This series has been in existence since its initiation in 1897 with a volume on the works of Hippolytus. It was originally the work of the Kirchenväter Commission of the Prussian Academy.
The writing known as I Clement is in the form of a letter which was sent by the Church at Rome to the Church at Corinth protesting against the deposition of certain presbyters (lxvii.6). Traditionally this letter was ascribed to Clement, third or fourth bishop at Rome according to the extant episcopal lists.

Robert M. Grant remarks that in 1 Clement "there is very little explicit eschatological doctrine, for the letter is a practical one, devoting its attention primarily to the present and to the past as affording warnings or models." Grant goes on, however, to note certain references of an eschatological character. Both he and all other commentators make special reference, as might be expected in this connection, to chapters xxiv-xxvi, which deal with the concept of the resurrection of the dead.

The basic thing to be remembered concerning this Epistle is that it is practical in tone. However, for this very reason, its assumptions and implications regarding eschatology, as concerning other theological matters, are highly significant. They are much more likely to be traditional in character than if they were argued in an elaborate fashion. The evidence of the Epistle has always occupied an important place in discussions regarding the nature of the ministry, since its publication during the 17th century. So far as eschatology is concerned, it has much less to say than II Clement (not by the same author), which is usually coupled with it. Nonetheless, a close investigation suggests that presuppositions of an eschatological character are quite central.

F.S. Marsh makes the comment that "the passage dealing with the

---

Resurrection interrupts the argument of the Epistle, and it is not quite evident why the subject is introduced at all. It does not seem to have had any connection with the Corinthian disagreement. Possibly it may have been suggested to the writer by a recent perusal of 1. Co. 15 (see XLVII.1)\(^1\). It certainly seems possible that a perusal of Paul's first Epistle to the Corinthians may have been a factor in the situation, but one wonders whether, even if this be so, the reason may not lie deeper than this: Paul's discussion of the resurrection emerged partially, no doubt, out of practical difficulties on the part of the Corinthian Christians regarding it, but surely in part because the resurrection represented the final triumph of those who remained faithful to Christ. It is significant that Paul closes the 15th chapter of his Epistle which deals with the Resurrection, with the words: 'Therefore my beloved brethren, be ye steadfast, unmoveable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, forasmuch as ye know that your labour is not in vain in the Lord.' (v. 58) May not a similar connection have existed in the mind of the writer of I Clement?

The thought seems to be basic to I Clement that the Corinthians stand in need of repentance, for without repentance they will not receive the inheritance. The point, then, of the section regarding the resurrection is that they must not receive encouragement in wrongdoing and disharmony from the thought that in any case there will be no resurrection. God remains faithful to perform his promise, however long it may be delayed. If this explanation of the placing of this particular section be sound, it suggests the possibility that this thought is always in the background. I Clement does more than plead for harmony at Corinth.

on the ground that, if it be not restored, it will remain a standing
shame to the whole Christian Church in the eyes of the world. Christ
came to give repentance to His people. If the Corinthians do not
exhibit this grace, how can they belong to the number of the elect?
(cf. XLVI.4).

SIGNIFICANT PASSAGES.

It seems best to set out below, with comments, a list of passages,
obviously not exhaustive of those with eschatological reference, which
are especially revealing with reference to the presuppositions of the
writer as he deals with the grave situation of disharmony at Corinth.

II: 4-5. "\.γόν ᾧ ν ἐμὲς τὲ καὶ νυκτὸς ὑπὲρ κάσης τῆς
ἀδελφότητος, εἰς τὸ σώζοντα μεν ἔλεος καὶ συνειδήσεως
τῶν ἁριμοὺ τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν αὐτοῦ. εἰλικρινεῖς καὶ
ἀκραῖοι ἔτε καὶ ἀμνηστίκαι εἰς ἥλιονες."

These words refer to the Corinthians' condition prior to the
controversy. It is contrasted with the new situation, in which
ἐκλογὴν βαδίζειν καὶ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας τὰς καρδίας
αὐτοῦ τὰς ποιήσεις, ἡλίου ἁδικον καὶ ἁσβεί
ἀνειληφτές, δι' αὐτό καὶ ἁμαρτάνει ἐναληθεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον."

(III: 4.) The thought seems implicit that the Corinthians' conduct dis-
countenances the certainty of their belonging to God's "chosen" ones.

(VII: 4) "Ἀνενόομεν εἰς τὸ ἁμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ γνώμεν,
ὡς ἐντιν τιμίων τῷ πατρὶ αὐτοῦ, ὅτι δι' τῆς ἠμετέρων
σωτηρίας ἐκ χυθέν καντὶ τῷ κόσμῳ μετανοιάς
Χρίστης ὑπηνευκέν." 

A contrast is frequently drawn between the conception of justifi-
cation by faith in God's grace in Christ, found in St. Paul, and the
emphasis of this letter upon works and especially repentance. Faith,
it is acknowledged, is frequently noted as a virtue, but, it is claimed,
it is in I Clement only one virtue among others, not the source of the
virtues, as in St. Paul's thinking. However, Grant disagrees with the
judgment of R. Knopf that what Clement has done is to combine the Pauline doctrine of justification by faith along with a bad doctrine of synergism, as in Jas. 2:22, Eph. 2:10, and the Pastoral Epistles. He comments quaintly that "one might suppose that the advocacy of works of love could be found in the major Pauline epistles." Nor does Grant accept Knopf's imputation that Clement represents here an advance towards the position of the Catholic Church, where the implication is that Catholicity is a matter of works and not authentic Christianity. Surely the point of VII:4, at any rate, is that what the Corinthians required was true repentance and this Christ gives. It was given us as our proper subjective response to God, and it was made possible by an obedience of Jesus that was unto death. The immediate thought of this passage, in its context, is that without this repentance, judgment and death will fall upon the Corinthians. But God will accept their repentance, as He did formerly that of the men of Nineveh (VII:7)

XI:1 With reference to the Salvation of Lot at the destruction of Sodom and the turning of Lot's wife into a pillar of salt because she looked back, Clement makes it clear "οτι τοις ἐλεήσουσα ἐπὶ αὐτῶν οὐκ ἐφακάλειπεν, τοῖς δὲ ἐτεροκλίνεις ὑπέρχουσα εἰς κόλπον καὶ ἔκπνομον τίμημαν." The point of the reference is surely very clear at this point.

It may be said, of course, that the above examples only prove that God will judge the sin of those Corinthians, who are responsible for dissension at Corinth, and that, if eschatology be in view at all, it is 'personal eschatology' that is involved. It seems clear, however,

2 R. M. Grant, op. cit., pp. 119-120.
3 Ibid.
that in all these instances, as elsewhere in this Epistle, the
Corinthian Church is seen as the inheritor of the promises made to
Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. The Church is the true people of God, and
just as sin and apostasy came between God and the blessing of national
Israel, so sin will destroy the community. At least it will have to be
purged of uncleanness. Precisely how or when God will judge is not
made explicit in these passages, but the dominant thought would appear
to be that, just as the promises were always ahead of the patriarchs,
so they are ahead of the Church, and sin may prevent the fulfilment
of the promises.

XVII:1 The significance of this passage for eschatology is indirect.

It portrays the patriarchs as preaching the coming of Christ —
"λέγομεν δὲ Ἡλίαν καὶ Ἐλίσαι, ἔτι δὲ καὶ
Ἰεσεκιήλ, τοὺς προφητας. πρὸς τούτων καὶ τοὺς
μεμαρτυρημένους." The Old Testament era is viewed as having been
the era of promise. Though these men of old achieved great things for
God and were privileged to see God's purpose in advance, they were
humble-minded. So too, we should not hinder God's work. We have
benefited from their obedience. (XIX:1) We ought to help things forward:
"ἐπαναδραμομεν ἐπὶ τὸν ἐξ ἀρχῆς παρεδομένον
ἡμῖν τῆς εἰρήνης σκοπὸν ... " (XIX:2). We have to have sympathy with God's "το µεγαθεµεν...βαλµή" (XIX:3). The underlying thought is that God is slowly revealing or
unravelling His purposes before men. Our lives should be governed by
our understanding of this fact. The thought is latent that God's
providential activity in history is still reaching out towards its
future consummation.

XXIII:2ff. This is an important passage. The 'scripture' quoted in
vv. 3-4 is paralleled in very similar words at II Clement XI: 2-4.
An additional sentence is given in the quotation in II Clement. The
latter work tells us that the quotation comes from "(ὁ προφητικὸς λόγος),"¹

¹ II Clement XI:2.
but the work in question is not known. I Clement XXIII:2 begins by exhorting the Corinthians not to waver nor to take seriously doubts.

The quotation and its introduction are set out below: "κύριω υενθανε ἡμῶν ἡ γεραφή αὕτη, ὅποι λέγεις, Ταλαιπωρώ εἰσιν οἰ δίψυχοι, οἱ διστάζοντες τῇ φωνῇ, οἱ λέγοντες, Ταῦτα ἱκονομεῖν καὶ ἐπί τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν, καὶ ἰδίου, γεγενόκαμεν, καὶ οὐδὲν ἡμῶν τούτων συνβίβασκεν. Ὅλον λάβετε ὑμεῖς οὖν παρὰ μὲν φύλλοις, εἰτε βλαστῶσθανεῖν, εἰτε φύλλοι, εἰτε ἁπάντως, καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἑρμῆς. εἰτε σταφυλὴ παρεστηκώι. ὑμεῖς, ὃτι ἐν καιρῷ ὅλην εἰς πέπειρον κατανεῖ σοὶ καρπὸς τοῦ ἐνόμου. ἐπὶ ἀληθείας ταῦτα καὶ ἐξηγήσεις τελειοθήσεται τῷ βούλημα αὐτοῦ, συνεπιμμετοχούσας καὶ τῆς γραφῆς, ὃτι ταῦτα ἔγειρι καὶ οὐ χρονίει, καὶ ἐξηγήσεις ἔγειρι σοί καρποὺς εἰς τὸν νόμον κύτῳ, καὶ δὲ ἁγίος, δοῦ ὅμεις προσδοκάντε." The reference to those who say, We have heard these things -- etc., is found also at II Peter 3:4-5. Some scholars have thought, as Kirsopp Lake notes, that the apocryphal work which is here quoted may have been the lost pseudepigraphic work known as the book of 'Eldad and Medad', but there is no certainty concerning this. The thought of the passage is important at any rate. Martin Werner mentions this passage as one indication of the presence of many within the Church who were disillusioned by the delay of the Parousia of Christ. He cites in this connection the passages in I Clement and II Clement referring to the same question. He cites evidence from the 'Ascensio Jesiae' also which suggests that difficulties and doubts regarding the Parousia were producing conflicts within the Early Church.


Clement's Epistle at any rate, indicates the way in which the Roman Church felt that such doubtings should be regarded. It quotes with approval from the apocryphal 'graphe' the answer to this problem, that God has His own programme for His purposes which cannot be hurried, but which is sure. The illustration of the development of the vine is employed to make the point. It is noteworthy that II Clement offers a more detailed interpretation at this point: "οὗτος καὶ ὁ λαὸς του πατρὸς εἰς τὸ καὶ τὸν οἶκον καὶ οἰκίαιν ἐκεῖνον ἐστὶν ἔρχεται ἐς ἑαυτόν." In so far as this interpretation apparently stood in the source from which both I Clement and II Clement quoted, it is arguable that I Clement may presume such interpretation also. If this be so, it suggests that I Clement anticipated not simply the Return of Christ, but a whole series of eschatological events, some of which, it is arguable, were already being experienced. Mark 13 and Matt. 24 bear witness to a Christian tradition placed on the lips of Christ, which looked for a period of tribulation and persecution prior to the end of the age.

Chs. XXIV-XXVI. These deal in their entirety with the concept of the resurrection of the dead. The purpose of this exposition of the certainty of the resurrection is given at XXVIII:1: "νῦν τῷ ἐλέει τῶν μελλόντων κρατῶν."

Such shielding by divine mercy will be conditional upon reverence for God and the giving up of "μικρὸς ἐπιθυμίας."

The proofs of the resurrection are given as the resurrection of Jesus, the succession of day and night, of seedtime and harvest, and the example of the phoenix - a legendary Arabian bird, which was supposed to live 500 years, die and produce from its remains a worm which grew wings.

1 XI. 4.
and conducted the bones of its parent to the altar of the Sun at Heliopolis in Egypt. This admixture of motifs from the life of Christ, nature, and pagan mythology may seem strange to us, but this is reminiscent of a transition from ancient to modern models, which is rhetorical in style, and which is found here and there in the epistle. (e.g. ch. 5).

Werner Jaeger¹ has pointed out that one of the most significant features of this Epistle is its mixture of scriptural and non-scriptural motifs. Grant² thinks that part of the explanation of this, at least, is that for Clement, God revealed Himself in nature as well as through the Scriptures.

It would seem that the major emphasis of chs. XXIV-XXVI, however, is not upon proving the resurrection, but rather in laying emphasis upon the thought that the resurrection will occur at the right time, in God's moment for it. This thought is implicit in all the examples given, as in the illustration of the vine (XXIII:4). The important thing, therefore, in the story of the phoenix is that the worm, whose parent was the phoenix, deposited its parent's bones on the altar of the Sun at Heliopolis "πεντακοσιοστοῦ ἔτους πελάγηρωμένων." (XXV:5). The underlying thought is that, despite the delay, God cannot lie or be unfaithful to His promise (XXVII:2).

Ch. XXVII:5-6 is particularly clear in this regard: "ὅτε θέλει καὶ ὥς θέλει κοινοὶ πάντα, καὶ οὐδὲν μὴ περέλθῃ τῶν δεδομενωμένων ἐκ αὐτῶν. πᾶντα ἐνώπιον λύτω εἰσίν, καὶ οὐδὲν λέγεται τὴν βουλὴν αὐτῶν." The use of the Greek word, 'Ἐγγύς', in paragraph 3 of this same chapter, is perhaps significant. It is employed in a number of passages


² op. cit., p. 39.
in the New Testament, which are of importance with regard to eschatological thought (Mk. 13:28 ff., par. Matt. 24:32 ff.; Lk. 21:29-31; Rom. 13:11; Phil. 4:5, cf. 3:20; Rev. 1:3; 22:10). Further it is the root of the verbal form, 'εγγύς εἰν' used by Jesus in His proclamation concerning the approach of the Kingdom of God (Mk. 1:15, par. Matt. 4:17; of the missionary charge to the disciples Matt. 10:7 = Lk. 10:9). What is actually said in this paragraph is that we should "consider that all things (πάντα) are near (εγγύς) to him (God)." The use of this Greek word is at least suggestive of the possibility that the writer is alluding indirectly to one or more of the New Testament passages mentioned above, and is saying in effect: 'The promise was that certain events were coming near. Despite the time that has passed, God's promises are sure. To God the time that has passed is not long.' Is it possible that the whole section XXVII:1-5 is a commentary on Mk. 13:28-31? The use of the word 'πάντα' is reminiscent of its use at Mk. 13:30, as that of the term 'εγγύς' is reminiscent of its presence in Mk. 13:28, 29. If this is in fact the case, the passage is then seen to deal in a very definite fashion with the problem of the delay of the consummation of the age. The thought is probably present, even if there be no allusion to Mk. 13:28ff. or its parallels in Matthew and Luke, but such a linkage, if it exists, presents the matter more forcibly.

XXIX. In the few chapters including and following chapter 29, the basic thought is of a continuity between Israel and the Church. While other nations received angels to look after them, Israel had God Himself to look after her. (XXIX:2). This statement is introduced by the thought, characteristic of this Epistle, that the Merciful Father "..... ἐκλογῆς μέρος ἢμας ἐπισκέψειν ἐωτῷ." (XXIX:1). In chapter XXXI the underlying continuity is explained: it is the continuity of faith. Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob all exercised faith, including obedience. God has honoured
that faith. Through their line came the priests and the Levites, the Lord Jesus, the kings and rulers of Judah, and a posterity like the stars of the sky: the interpretation here should perhaps be of those who have faith, i.e. of the Church. We too, must obey, if we are to inherit the promises (XXXIV:7: "καὶ ἡμεῖς..... ὡς ἐξ ἐνὸς στόματος βοήσσωμεν πρὸς ἀνότον ἐκτενοῦ..... ἐς τὸ μετέχους ἡμῖν γενέσθαι τῶν μεθύμων καὶ ἐνδεξάμεν ἐπαγγελίων ἀποτελεῖν."

Other motifs are introduced, such as that of copying the example of the Creator Who rejoiced in his Works (ch.XXXIII), but the eschatological note is the silver cord linking the whole. XXXIV:3 quotes the scripture: "ἐὰν ὁ κύριος καὶ ὁ μισθός δῶνοι ἵνα ἐρωτάων ἑαυτοῦ ἀκοῦσίν· ἐκτενοῦταί τοῖς ἑδραμένους (XXXIV:3). The number and beauty of these are known only to the Most Holy One Himself: "ἡμέρας ἐὰν ὑπακούσαι τεθηνικοῖν ἐς τὰς ἀμαμῖν τῶν ὁμοιονόματων, ὅπως μεταλαμβάνει τῶν ἐπιγγελμένων διαρκείαν" (XXXV:4) This is to be achieved through true obedience to God's will.

Chs. XLff. are concerned with a parallelism between the fixed orders of the Old Testament times and the orders established by the apostles. The concern of this Epistle is with the acceptance of proper order and with repentance due on the part of those who had rebelled against it. Ch. XLIV tells us that the apostles had foreseen contention for the title of overseer: "διὰ τούτων ὁμοιοὶ τὴν αἰτίαν κρόνωσιν εἰληφότες τελείων κατεύθυναν τοὺς ἀνθρωπολόγους, καὶ μετέχοντες ἐκποιήσαν ἐξάκωσιν, ὅπως, ἐὰν κοιμηθῶσιν, διασέβασθαι ἑτέροι δεδομένους ἄνδρες τῆς νεοτυχίας αὐτῶν." (para. 2)
Whether this be a sound historical judgment or not, it is noteworthy that Clement interprets the situation in such a way as to suggest that the apostles anticipated the possibility, at least, of a continuing period prior to the Return of Christ. The very expression, "falling asleep" (κοινωθεὶ), it may be noted, used here as in the New Testament, is suggestive of those who rest until the Day breaks.

This section and that in the following chapter appears to place the emphasis upon God's judgments in history. Sin carries its own reward with it. Thus, Pharaoh and all his host were engulfed in the Red Sea because they had hardened their hearts after the signs and wonders had occurred in Egypt through God's servant, Moses. These went down alive into Hades (LI:4), but the righteous abide in God until His Kingdom be revealed from heaven (L:3). There may be present here in the thought of the writer, though it is by no means certain, the concept of a final judgment within history, the time of great tribulation, prior to the revelation of God's elect at the end of the age. L:4 with its conflation of Is. 26:20 and Ezek. 37:12, may imply this.

LVIII:1. Here we find a curious reference to the believers and obedient as those who "pitch their tents trusting in the most sacred name of His majesty" (a reference to Wisdom) Again, the thought of the believers, as being, like Israel, 'in via', is dominant. The whole concept is fundamentally eschatological. LIX:2 again breathes the prayer that the number of the chosen may be kept unbroken. LXIII:1 speaks of the suspending of futile disorder. The passage says that it is right that we should take up the position of obedience
We may sum up the evidence of this Epistle with reference to Eschatology. Far from being absent, it is the silver thread that runs through it. Even where it is not explicit, it is everywhere presupposed. Thus, other motifs are clear, such as the need for unity in the body, for unity in the face of a disbelieving world, for learning from the example of Israel after the flesh, and so on. The whole purpose of the various points of the argument, however, is to ensure that the number of the elect may not be broken. The Church is the community of the elect, but only the Last Judgment will reveal unalterably those who compose it. To have been baptised and to be a member of the community presupposes that one belongs to "the elect" (οἱ ἐκλεκτοὶ): our deeds, however, must prove it. There were many in the Israelite community who belonged to the community but never received the promises through disobedience and unbelief. Repentance is enjoined in this Epistle, because such characterises those who truly belong to Christ's Church.

The emphasis upon the concept of election is significant, for this thought is found chiefly in apocalyptic writings, where eschatology is to the fore. Election looks backwards to God's fore-ordination, eschatology to the outworking of God's purpose in a way that cannot be undone.

While here and there the intermediate place of bliss may be in mind (as in L:3), the emphasis is upon resurrection, upon being shown to be among the number of God's elect, i.e., at the Return of Christ to establish His kingdom. The thought of God's visitation in judgment in history is present (as in LI:4), and in two places (XXII:2ff., L:4) the concept of an intensification of judgment prior to the end of the age has been noted as a possible interpretation of the text. Again, at least one passage (XLIV:2) seemed to suggest an apprehension on the part of the Apostles of a prolonged period of waiting for the appearing of the Church's Lord.
Certain specific questions now require to be put and answered. Is the eschatology of this letter purely futurist? or does it contain 'realized' elements? Does it see the delay in the Return of Christ as a serious problem? What light does it throw on the development of eschatology at the time of writing (circa 75-100 A.D.)? We seek to answer these questions in a few brief paragraphs.

Predominantly the eschatology of I Clement appears to be futurist in character. The passages noted above show clear evidence of this. Chapters XXIV-XXVI, with their emphasis on the resurrection, and especially with their thought that this event will come in its due time, lay this stress. Chapter XXVII with its use of ' ἐγκαίνια ' and its insistence on God's faithfulness to fulfil His promises, points in the same direction. Moreover, the continuity between Israel and the Church, as in chapters XXIXff., is used to demonstrate that, just as God has fulfilled in Christ and His Church the promises made to the patriarchs, so certain promises yet lie ahead of the Church.

One feature which points strongly to the stress on futurism is the reiterated thought that, if we as faithful men obey God, then -- and only then -- shall we inherit the promises (cf. XXXIV.7). It is not just that the inheritance is portrayed as future, but our possession of it is made dependent on our moral endeavour, our obedience. We noted with reference to VII:4 R.M. Grant's defence of I Clement against R. Knopf's charge that it combines the Pauline doctrine of justification by faith with a bad synergism. Grant's reply has an element of truth in it. Further, as we pointed out, VII:4 does assert that it is through Christ that the grace of repentance has been given to the whole world. Nevertheless, it does seem true that there is something less here than the full assurance of salvation which St. Paul seems to have
enjoyed (cf. Rom. 8:28ff.) While Paul does think of the Church as 'in via' and of individual believers as being in danger of judgment, if disobedience supervenes (cf. I Cor. 10), there is a note of present possession in his thinking, a present experience of, and confidence in, God's salvation, which is somewhat less prominent in I Clement. It seems clear that this is a reflection, in the doctrine of justification, of the rather greater stress on the futurist element in eschatology in I Clement as compared with what is found in St. Paul's writings, where present and futurist elements are held together with greater tenacity. Both elements do in fact seem to be found in I Clement, but they are not strongly welded together, and it is primarily the futurist element which prevails.

The expression, "δι' αὐτὸν ἐκ πολλῶν," occurs here and there (e.g. XXVII:1; LI:1; LVII:7). Usually, it is true, it is the content of the hope which receives stress, yet again the term is significant, as showing that the stress of this letter falls upon that which lies ahead and which will be ours, if we do not come to destruction through disobedience.

Yet there are elements of 'realized eschatology' in I Clement. This fact emerges primarily in connection with the doctrine of the Church in this letter. Clement's thought seems to be that, while the individual believer may through disobedience fail to receive a share in the inheritance of God's people, yet that people as a community will get there -- as surely as the Israelites reached the Promised Land. It is implicit in such a passage as XVII:1 that, just as Christ's 'day' finally supervened upon prophetic foresight, so the Church will reach her reward. As XXIV:1 clearly grasps, Christ in His resurrection is the first-fruits of a future resurrection, and it is here the fulfilment of God's promises to His servants which is in view rather than the thought of
judgment of the wicked. There is to be a 'people of God' who will benefit. Again, the implication of XXXV:4 is that there undoubtedly will be a number of those that endure (ο δριθμὸς τῶν ὑπομενόντων) and who will receive the promised gifts.

The references to "the elect" (οἱ ἐκλεκτοί), which we noted in our survey, do show that in fact I Clement has a lively confidence about the Church as a community. What does seem to be true however, is that, even with reference to the Church the prize lies ahead. This note again is stressed rather than that of present possession. The stress on the Church, however, represents, even if imperfectly, a certain grasp of the New Testament sense that already the Church lives in the 'last age' and has tasted of the powers of the world to come. Not only is the use of the term, 'οἱ ἐκλεκτοί', significant of this fact. Another factor which points in the same direction is found in the stress that is placed on church order. This is in evidence in chapter XXXVI, where Christ is portrayed as 'ὁ ἱερέως τῶν προσφερόντων': there is a sense of solidarity with Christ and with fellow-Christians in this chapter, as in the following chapter, where the metaphor is that of an army in which Christ is the leader, and in which each soldier finds his appropriate place under centurions, tribunes, prefects, and generals. The solidarity is not only with one another, but through intermediaries, to whom we should be subservient, with Christ, Who is our victorious leader. He issues "blameless instructions" (para. 1). Later in this chapter the figure changes to that of the body, in which the proper place of each part within the whole is stressed: probably an allusion to I Cor. 12:14ff. is intended. It is however, in chapter XLff. that the clearest stress falls upon the idea of each finding his due place within the people of God. In XL there is an emphasis on doing "κάνων τέξει... ὅσα ὁ διεσπόρησ ἐπιτελεῖν ἐκέλευσεν κατὰ καιρὸς τεταμένους."
Further, each has his appointed and appropriate acts of service, from the High Priest down through the priests and the Levites to the laity (para. 5). Chapter XLII brings out this understanding and its implications most fully. Here we are told (para. 1-2):  "'Ο, ἱερέων ἐνεργεία συνέτοι ἐν τῷ Κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ. Ἰησοῦς ὁ Χριστὸς ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἔσκεπτον. ὁ Χριστὸς σὺν ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἔθεσεν καὶ ὁ ἱερεῖς ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ ἐγένετο οὖν ὁ μάθημα εὐκάλπης καὶ ἀδημοσίως Θεοῦ." Kirsopp Lake renders 'μαθηματικά' adverbially as meaning "in both ways", but the sense is probably better by rendering "both", where the thought clearly is that both Christ and the apostles came in their proper order in accordance with the will of God. In paragraph 4 we are further told that the apostles appointed certain converts "ἐκ ἐπισκόπου καὶ δισκέυου τῶν μελλόντων πιστεύων". What is implicit in this chapter, and throughout these chapters, is a dynamic understanding of God's manner of working out His purposes. First, God sends Christ; then, Christ appoints the apostles; then the apostles in turn appoint "bishops anddeacons". We have already noted (above, page 114) that the apostles are also said to have made provision for the appointment of other approved men in the place of these same bishops, if they should die (before Christ's Parousia). The thought is that the people of God is moving towards its predestined goal in an order appointed by God. Obedience to the rulers of the Church is important, because only thus does the individual find his place in a movement that is ordained by God. Clearly, however, this means that in a truly significant manner the Church is seen to be even now set within the ongoing purposes of God and to be in a unique manner under His direction. Is not this 'realized eschatology'?  

What becomes evident as we review this combination of futurism

1 op. cit., p. 81. Vide also n.1 on same page.
with certain notes of 'realized eschatology' in I Clement is that the binding link is found in a strong sense of confidence in God's providential activity in history. This is brought out magnificently in chapter L in the passage noted earlier (above, page 115). God has guided His people in every age to this very day. It is noteworthy that the word at L:3 for 'visitation' in Greek is 'ἡ ἐπισκοπή'. This is the word regularly used in this connection. In view, however, of the concern for participation in the people of God under her due leaders one wonders whether there is not a special significance in the use of this term. In the previous chapter (XLIX) there is a stress on love as over against schism (para. 5), and in L:2 the writer's prayer is "οὐκ ἐν ἰδίᾳ εὑρεθώμεν δύναμιν προσκλίτεσθαι ἐνθρωπισμῷ, ἵκος τοῦ πεντάχρονος αἴματος". The point is that involvement in schism separates us from the people of God who are to be manifested when Christ comes to exhibit His 'ἐπισκοπή' in the day when His Kingdom is visibly established. In all of this the latent thought is that God is now guiding His people in due order, but that this will reach its due goal when Christ's 'ἐπισκοπή' is made visible.

It is the stress on God's providential activity in history as leading up to the end of the age which primarily holds together 'realized' and futurist elements in the eschatology of this letter. This sense of God's providential care is heavily dependent on the scriptures of the Old Testament, but it is probable that it is influenced also in part by Stoic thought. Chapter XX contains a magnificent peroration in which God's control of the universe is displayed in such a way as to bring out its peace and harmony. R.M. Grant brings out well the fact that "the chapter reflects Clement's concern for cosmic order and was

---

constructed --- in relation to dissent at Corinth. --- Clement's point is that peaceful, providential order, established throughout the universe by God, exists for the benefit of mankind. The point is essentially Stoic in origin ---". Grant admits Jewish parallels, but notes that the very order in which Chapter XX deals with the harmony of the universe --- the heavens, day and night, sun, moon, and stars --- are dealt with in contemporary literature such as the Placita of Aetius, the pseudo-Aristotelian De Mundo, and the twelfth Oration of Dio Chrysostom. In any event, be the origin Jewish or Stoic (and it seems likely that there is an admixture of influences), I Clement can never be said to have a purely futurist note on account of its lively sense of God's providence in nature and in history.

We have noted already (above, page 110) Martin Werner's citation of the passage at XXIII:2ff. as indicative of the presence of disillusionment within the Church concerning the delay in the Parousia of Christ. Be this as it may, it is interesting that this letter does not give the impression of being perturbed by the delay. It feels it has to deal with the issue. As we have seen, probably chapter XXVII also has a bearing on this point. Yet the dominant note throughout, and especially perhaps when dealing with this question, is that God is in control of history. Already he has acted in past days, now He is operative in His Church, and in due time He will bring the age to its consummation. Chapter LXI uses of God the very expressive phrase, 'ο θεός ἄρχων ζωής και θανάτου'. He is in control of history. He has given the power of sovereignty to rulers and governors upon the earth (LXI:1 with LX:4). He has made a provision for the leadership of the Church during an extended period awaiting the Parousia (XLIV:2). All history serves

1 op. cit., pp. 43-44
God. It follows that, whatever evidence I Clement flings on the presence of doubt in some quarters concerning the delay of the Parousia, it feels no difficulty in rebutting such doubts.

This should be said in closing. The stress on futurism in this latter does not lend support to the thesis of Martin Werner, Fritz Buri, and the 'consistent eschatology' school, when they judge that after the apostolic age the expectation of Christ's Parousia became an embarrassment and, therefore, emphasis was placed rather upon the present experience of Christ in worship, service, and sacraments. Rather present history is seen as tending towards the consummation of the age.
This work is to be regarded as a sermon rather than a letter. This is made clear in chapter XIX where the writer states that he is reading aloud: this implies that he is doing so in some kind of formal meeting where worship is in progress. R.M. Grant comments that "the preacher proceeds from one thing to another simply by the association of ideas, sometimes by verbal association. Repentance is a central theme in chapter 8-18, but there is no clear logical development." Kirsopp Lake, however, is probably correct in his summary statement that "the main object of the writer is to inculcate a high Christology, a pure life, and a belief in the resurrection of the flesh".

The origin of this work is unknown. It was apparently ascribed to Clement of Rome as early as the third century A.D., since Eusebius, writing early in the fourth, seems to reject this ascription. Western writers of the early centuries do refer to a second epistle of Clement, but it is clear that their reference is to the pseudepigraphic epistle of Clement to James, which has close association with the Pseudo-Clementine Homilies and Recognitions. Various theories have been propounded as to its origin, some associating the work with Rome, others with Corinth or Alexandria. On the whole, a Roman origin seems the most probable.

Adolph Harnack thought that II Clement was the letter which, according to Eusebius, Sæter, bishop of Rome, c.166-174, sent to Corinth. He suggested that this letter was kept in the archives of the Corinthian

---


3 Hist. Eccl. IV.XXIII.II.
Church together with I Clement which had earlier come also from Rome. Later, when both letters were copied, the true facts were forgotten, and both were supposed to have come from Clement. If Harnack's theory be accepted, the date of the book is, of course, settled within fairly narrow limits. Generally, however, it is agreed that a date between about 120 and 170 seems the most likely. The absence of any clear opposition to Gnosticism (though some stress is laid on Christology, and - in chapter IX - on the reality of His flesh) is possibly more suggestive of a date before about 150 than one after it.

The eschatology of this work is quite pronounced, and may, therefore, be dealt with in relatively short compass. Its main lines can be set out with clarity, and no major problems are found in regard to its interpretation. Its eschatology is primarily futurist in character. There is clear evidence that the writer fully believed in coming resurrection and judgment, which were associated with the Return of Christ in glory. It is the two former of these which receive the stress, but it is understood that these take place at the Parousia.

Chapters I-VIII lay stress upon the need for repentance towards God in view of judgment to come. It seems that it is primarily baptized persons who are in view; the danger is that they will be led astray. In particular, a contrast is made between this world and that which is to come (chapters V-VI), but it is especially in chapter IXff. that it is made clear that the division between these two periods is set in the future, and that the contrast is not between life before death and a new kind of life after it: it is rather a division between the period before the resurrection or the Parousia and one after it.

---

1 Chronologie I, pp.438ff.
We note briefly some of the significant passages, and the motifs that they exemplify. The first two chapters introduce us to an element of 'realised eschatology' and at the same time underscore what is to be a major theme of this work. Through Jesus Christ the Gentiles have been brought into light. This is clearly a new situation very definitely dependent upon the coming of Christ in the flesh. This, however, makes it most important that we should not think little of our salvation. If we do, then we shall obtain little. The writer says:

"'Αδελφοί, οὕτως σεί ήμᾶς φρονεῖν περί Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ώς περὶ θεοῦ, ώς περὶ κρίτου ζωτῶν καὶ νεκρῶν. καὶ οδ οὗτος μικρὰ φρονεῖν περὶ τῆς σωτηρίας ἡμῶν. ἐν τῷ γὰρ φρονεῖν ἡμᾶς μικρὰ περὶ αὐτοῦ, μικρὰ καὶ ἐλπίζομεν λαβεῖν." (1:1)

What seems to be involved here is a doctrine of synergism, which goes hand in hand with the traditional eschatology. The thought is that much has been conferred upon the Gentile (and other) converts. When Christ comes in glory, then it will be made manifest how obedient we have been to the new light and grace received through Him. The writer says of those whom he is addressing, as of himself, that "ἐκάλεσεν γὰρ ἡμᾶς οὐκ ὄντας καὶ ἔθελεν σέ ἐκ μὴ ὄντος εἶναι ἡμᾶς."

This seems to be an allusion to the words of Hosea, chapter I, especially verse 10. The interpretation is that the Gentiles were not a people of God, but have now obtained mercy. The stress on God's intervention in history in Christ and in the inclusion of the Gentiles within the economy of God represents here the note of emphasis on the present experience of salvation. The Gentiles are not named, but they are clearly in view in chapters I-III. Nor is it said that the
ingathering of the Gentiles is a feature of the End-time. Nevertheless, it seems likely that this understanding is implicit. If so, then the Epistle shows evidence of an element of 'realized eschatology' at the very outset. The other element is the stress upon the accountability of those who have thus been privileged, and it is in this connection that the stress falls on the future day of reckoning. The standpoint is not that of the New Testament writers, certainly not that of St. Paul. There seems little, if any, appreciation of the Pauline insight that in Christ a man has passed out of a legal relationship with God into one of grace (though I.3 does speak of the relationship of 'sonship', curiously applied in such a way as to make Jesus Christ the 'Father'). The expectation is that if we are faithful, we shall be acknowledged by Christ, if not we shall be denied (chapter III). This does, of course, reflect the saying of Jesus recorded at Matt. 10:32-33; Lk.12:8-9. Nevertheless, there is not the New Testament grasp of the fact that salvation is a present reality: rather is it something which lies in the future and which will be ours if we cooperate with the grace and light that has already been conferred. The truth is that Biblical thinking generally works within the tension of 'now already' and 'not yet'. Something like this is found here: already the Gentiles are called into a closer relationship with God in Christ, but the full reality awaits the end of the age. What is unbiblical is the stress upon the future in such manner as to undermine the confidence that the God Who has already begun a good work in us will complete it. Be this as it may, it is clear that the synergism of these chapters (which runs, indeed, throughout the book) works within an eschatological framework which is itself in accordance with the tradition handed down from Primitive Christianity.
In chapters V-VI the sense that Christians are but pilgrims in the world comes across very strongly:

"Οθεν, ἀδελφοί, καταλείπετε τὴν παροικίαν τοῦ κόσμου τούτου ποιήσωμεν τῷ Θεῷ τοῦ καλέσαντος ἡμᾶς, καὶ μὴ φοβηθῶμεν ἐξελθεῖν ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου τούτου." (V.1).

It seems evident that the writer has in mind "going forth out of the world" by death in martyrdom for Christ's sake. A quotation follows whose source is uncertain: it refers to Christ's followers as lambs who need have no fear of wolves "μετὰ τὸ ἀποθάνειν αὐτὰ" (para.4).

The quotation closes with words which are familiar to us from Matt. 10.28, of which it is reminiscent. Here, it is true, the emphasis is upon obedience to Christ in this life, with death as the termination of Satan's testing of us. This, however, no more denies a belief in the end of the present age as the true junction between 'this world' and 'the world which is to come' in the mind of this writer than it does in the mind of Jesus Himself. Paragraph 5 of this fifth chapter again emphasizes the note of sojourning:

"--- ἡ ἐπιστολὴ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ τούτῳ τῆς οἰκουμενῆς τῷ ἔστιν καὶ ἔστιν καὶ θανάτῳ καὶ ἐφανερωμένον τῷ Χριστῷ μεγάλῃ καὶ ἑτερανθίᾳ ἐστὶν, καὶ ἐναπτυσσόμενος τῆς μελλόντος βασιλείας καὶ ἰδίᾳ κυρίϊοι." (V.5).

What this demonstrates is that the sense of eschatological pilgrimage is deeply ingrained in the thought of the writer. In chapter VI this sense is heightened where it is said:

"ἐστὶν δὲ οὗτος ὁ ζῶν καὶ ὁ μέλλων δύο ἐξ Θεοῦ." (para.3).
We are reminded by the language at this point of the contrast made in the Pseudo-Clementine literature between the Two Ages, the present being one over which Satan has sway, while the future age is that which belongs to Christ (vide page 256 of this thesis). There the thought seems to come from the 'Preaching of Peter' which is imbedded in that literature, and probably the Essene concept of Two Spirits has been influential. What is rather salutary is that in the Pseudo-Clementine literature this contrast of the two ages, the present belonging to Satan and the future to Christ, is made the basis of the judgment that it is inappropriate for those who have given themselves to Christ to seek to enjoy the things of this world. Something very similar seems to be in mind here at II Clement VI. The writer makes the comment that we have noted above concerning the two worlds (plainly in the sense of 'ages') being at enmity, and then goes on (Paras. 4-6) to say, in effect, that we must abandon the things that belong to this age in order to enjoy that which is to come. The similarity of reasoning suggests the possibility that in the background of II Clement lies the same understanding that seems to underlie certain passages derived from 'The Preaching of Peter' in the Pseudo-Clementine literature. What appears to be heterodox in that document is the view that the Evil One and Christ are equally powers appointed by God to govern consecutive ages. It seems unlikely that the Christology of II Clement is as defective as that of the 'Preaching of Peter', but something not dissimilar to the concept that Satan and Christ govern consecutive ages may possibly be in the background of thought in II Clement. If so, it must be judged that this again is a departure from the vital New Testament and Primitive Christian sense that already in the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ the New Age has begun.

1 Clem.Hom.XX.II.1-6.
2 Clem.Hom. XV.VII.4
Chapter VII thinks in terms of the athletic contests with all striving for the crown. The writer thinks of the severe judgment given to those who cheat in such contests, and applies this picture to those who do not keep the seal of Baptism. He applies Jesus' words at Mk.9.44(46,48) to the situation of such. Again, the emphasis of this writer on judgment has especially in mind those who have been sealed by Baptism but who in some way do not give proof of their calling. Again it is the sense that salvation is rather a future experience than a present reality which underlies this understanding, though doubtless the aregesis of the passage is not altogether at fault in that Jesus does have in mind in it those who cause Christ's "little ones" to stumble, both the judgment on all such and on those who are so influenced.

Chapter IX deals in a quite straightforward manner with the resurrection of the flesh and makes clear that judgment relates not simply to anything experienced after death:

"καὶ μὴ λέγετιν τις ὑμῖν, ὅτι αὐτὴ ἡ σάρξ ὃν κρίνεται οὐδὲ ἀνίσταται. γνῶτε· ἐν τίνι ἐσώθητε, ἐν τίνι ἀνεβλέψατε, εἰ μὴ ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ ταύτῃ ὤνεσ; --- ὅπως ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ ἐκλήθη, καὶ ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ ἐλεύσοσθε. εἰ Χριστός, ὁ κύριος ὁ σώσας ἡμᾶς ὅπως τῷ πρώτῳ πνεύμα, ἐγένετο σάρξ καὶ ὦτως ἡμᾶς ἐκλήσεν· ὦτως καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ σαρκὶ ἀπολύσαμεν τὸν μισθὸν." (paras. 1,4-5).

Chapter X once again contrasts "ἡ ἐνθαδε ἀπολαύσεις" with "ἡ μελλοντικὴ ἐπαγγελία". This leads into the emphasis of Chapter XI that the promise of God will surely come in God's own time. It is in this context that the passage occurs which also appears (with one sentence less) in I Clement, and which we noted in our study of
that work (vide above page(s) 110). This concerns the 'double-minded' (δύο ἥπειροι), who doubt in their heart whether God will ever fulfil his promise. As in I Clement XXIII, it is clearly the Parousia of Christ that is in mind. The sceptical frame of mind attributed to certain scoffers at II Pet. 3.4 is reflected in these passages, which probably derive from a common source. The additional clause in II Clement appears in paragraph 4:

"οὗτοι καὶ ὁ λαός μου ἀκαταστασίας καὶ θλίψεις ἐσκέψεται ἐπεὶ τὰ πολλά προέδρον ἀγαθά." Just as we noted in our discussion of the corresponding use of this quotation concerning 'double-mindedness' in I Clement, that I Clement may presume this interpretation of the parable of the vine tree itself, which appears in both renderings of this quotation. The parable asserts that first the vine tree sheds its leaves, then comes a bud, then the unripe grape, but only after this comes the full bunch. II Clement XI.4 is then an interpretation of this which suggests that the Church is now at that predetermined stage in the divine plan in which persecution and difficulty is its lot, and that only later can we expect the Parousia. We noted with reference to I Clement that, if this interpretation stood in the source from which it is probable that I and II Clement derive the quotation, then probably I Clement tacitly assumes the Christian tradition (Mk.13- Matt.24) which looked for a period of tribulation and persecution prior to the end of the age. This is explicit in II Clement. It is not clear whether this period of difficulty is thought of as covering the whole of the period between the departure of Jesus Christ and His Coming in glory or only a part of it.
Chapters XI and XII refer to the 'kingdom' as lying ahead in the future: this seems to be the more general usage in the early days of the Church. Thus, XI.7 says that, if we act righteously before God, "we shall enter into his kingdom" and receive the promises referred to by Paul at I. Cor. 2:9 (alluding, it would seem, to Is.64:4;65:17).

Again, at XII.1 we are exhorted to wait for the Kingdom of God, "ΕΠΕΙΘΑ οὐκ οἴδαμεν τὴν ἡμέραν τῆς ἐπιφάνειας τοῦ Θεοῦ." The theme of the time of the kingdom is developed in this latter chapter with the aid of a saying, whose source is unknown, but which is found also in Clement of Alexandria's Stromateis, III.XIII: this is to the effect that the kingdom will come "when the two shall be one, and the outside as the inside, and the male with the female neither male nor female." Indirectly this saying and its brief development in II Clement XII reflects an Early Church estimate of virginity as a higher state than marriage and as anticipating the conditions of the coming Kingdom of God. It seems to assume that the laying aside of the physical functioning of sexuality entails the abandonment of sexual differentiation. However ill-founded such an assumption may be, the whole discussion at this point reflects the conviction that the kingdom is to be thought of as lying still in the future. Whatever God may have done in Christ for His people, the 'kingdom' lies further ahead.

Chapter XIV is a difficult, but significant, passage. It refers to the Church as the first church. If we do the will of God, we are told, "ἐσσόμεθα ἐκ τῆς ἐκκλησίας τῆς Πρώτης, τῆς Πνευματικῆς, τῆς Πρὸ τῆς Ηλίου καὶ σελήνης ἐκτισμένης." (para. 10). The contrast is not with any second Church. Rather the thought is that the Church has existed in the purpose of God from the beginning. Consonant with this is the statement in paragraph 2 that Jesus "ἐφανερώθη δὲ ἐπὶ ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν, ἵνα ἡμᾶς σωτηρία." The Church has been planned by God from the
very beginning and now in the last days, i.e. at the end of age, Christ—portrayed as male—has come to claim his bride, the Church, depicted as female. The further development of thought in this chapter is involved but significant. Already the Church was manifested in the flesh of Jesus. If, therefore, we abuse the Church, then we will not receive Christ, who is shown as Spirit over against the Church, which is flesh. The thought seems to be that the Church presently reflects the weakness of Jesus Christ in the humiliation of the Incarnation, but He is coming again in glory: if we belong to the Church in her time of weakness, we shall be honoured by Christ at His coming again in the full power of the Spirit Who raised Him from the dead. It is possible that the Second Advent is not in mind here and that the reference to receiving Christ as the Spirit simply means that outward identification with the Church will not give the gift of the Spirit unless there is faithfulness in that outward adherence. This seems less likely, but in any event the Church is seen here as a community established through the manifestation of Christ "in the last days". It is clear, therefore, that, although the kingdom itself may still lie ahead in the thinking of the writer of II Clement, the Church is a creation of God in the end of the age. The element of 'realized eschatology' is again present in this understanding.

In the remainder of this work not much is added to what has already been noted, in so far as eschatology is concerned. XVI.3 is significant in that it refers to the day of judgment as "already approaching" (\(\text{\varepsilon\rho\chi\epsilon\tau\omega\; \eta\gamma\)}). Allusion is made in this connection to Mal.4:1, possibly also to Is.34.4 but more probably to II Pet.3.12. Chapter XVII.4ff. refers very explicitly to the theme of the Parousia of Christ:
Again, the treatment in the subsequent passage (paras. 6-7) exhibits the peculiarity that the day of judgment is thought of, at least primarily here, as upon "those among us who were impious and perverted the commands of Jesus Christ". (para. 6). In any event, the theme of Christ's Parousia is definitely set forth in this chapter. Finally, XIX.3-4 may be noted, which contrast the suffering for a short time in this world with "the immortal fruit of the resurrection" (Τὸν Ἀμφιτοτὸν Τῆς Ἀναγεννήσεως Καρπὸν, para. 3).

**The Eschatology of II Clement: An Assessment**

It remains to assess the eschatology of this work, and its significance. There can be no doubt that it accepts belief in the Parousia of Christ, and future resurrection and judgment, which plainly take place at Christ's Appearing. Nothing is said regarding the reign of Antichrist or events leading up to the End. A futurist eschatology is, however, clearly in evidence.

So far as the note of 'realized eschatology' is concerned, this comes across best in connection with the thought (chapter XIV) that the Church is a product of the End-time in which Christ appeared in the last days to save her. It may well be that certain speculative notions
lie in the background of that chapter concerning a heavenly marriage of Christ and the Church, but the discussion of this is not relevant to our present theme. It does seem likely, however, that whatever speculative notions may have influenced the writer, he thinks of the Church as only coming into being, though long planned, in the end of the age. The note of emphasis on God's present dealings with His people, understood tacitly as a feature of the end of the age, again emerges in the first three chapters in the stress on the ingathering of the Gentiles into a closer relationship with God through Christ.

This is implied by the fact that the Church was founded by Christ in the End-time, and it is in the Church that the Gentiles are gathered together with the older People of God, the Jewish race, or such of Jewish stock as trust in Christ. Again, in chapter XVII though the passage quoted above (page 134) from paragraphs 4-5 relates to the day of Christ's Appearing, the writer can hardly fail to see the significance of the present ingathering in the Church as a proleptic anticipation of it. Further, XVII,3 lays an emphasis upon frequent assembly of church members which seems to have in the background the understanding that the Church assembly anticipates the Final Assembly at Christ's Appearing. It seems evident, therefore, that an element of 'realized eschatology' is present in this work. It is true that 'the kingdom of God' is thought of as future, but it is not denied that in some degree this is anticipated now by the obedience of Jews and Gentiles within the fellowship of the Church to the commandments of Christ.

This work has certain peculiarities. Thus, it lays stress, as we have seen, upon the judgment of those who apparently belong to the Church but become disobedient to the commandments of Christ. This is connected, it would seem, with the strong sense of eschatological
pilgrimage. The basic understanding probably is that, just as Israel after the flesh was delivered from Egypt but not all reached the Promised Land through disobedience, so salvation is a future rather than a present reality, though God has already acted upon behalf of His people. This sense of pilgrimage and awareness of the possibility of falling by the wayside is not in itself heterodox. If, however, the understanding be present, as it is in the 'Preaching of Peter', that this age belongs to the Devil and the following age to Christ, this does represent a heterodox point of view, and a retreat from the Primitive Christian understanding that from now onwards Christ reigns both in heaven and on earth, and evil only exerts any sway at all by Christ's restraint. Again, the Pauline understanding of grace is not clearly in evidence at all. It would seem that through obedience baptized members of the Church strive for the crown, but that it is by no means certain that they will get it. While Paul allows for this possibility, the assumption is much more heavily present in his writings that He Who has begun a good work in us will complete it at the day of redemption. In Paul it is God Who works throughout; here it is rather that we complete what Christ has begun. This does not, however, make the eschatology of II Clement unbiblical: it only means that the futurist element is heightened. Clearly, if salvation is thought of less as a present experience and more as a future hope, futurism will be emphasized.

There is no hint of concern about the delay in the Second Advent. The passage in chapter XI, which is found substantially also at I Clement XXIII, certainly indicates the presence of those who were dubious concerning the fulfilment of the hope of the Parousia. At the same time there is no suggestion here that the writer approved of this attitude, or was himself seriously disturbed by the delay in that Event. All the
evidence suggests the contrary. Not only does the tone of his remarks in chapter XI not favour such a view, but we must bear in mind the significant fact that it is futurism which is heightened in this work rather than the stress on the present experience of salvation. If Dodd and Werner are sound in their judgment that the delay in the Parousia occasioned concern and reinterpretation of the eschatological Hope, the opposite should have been in evidence: futurism should have been played down, and the present realities of salvation emphasized. This we do not find in this work.

The eschatology of this book could be described as 'inaugurated' in that the Church is already a reality, and the Gentiles are already being ingathered, both significant of the approaching End of the age. Nevertheless, the somewhat heavier emphasis upon salvation as a future rather than a present reality makes it less appropriate to describe this eschatology as 'inaugurated' than that adopted by Primitive Christianity and reflected in the documents of the New Testament. We can say that both 'futurist' and 'realized' elements are found, that futurism is more heavily emphasized than the other element, and that there is no evidence in this work in support of the common understanding of the 'realized eschatology' and 'consistent eschatology' schools of thought that the delay in the Second Advent produced any 'de-eschatologizing' process by means of a reduction of emphasis on that which is to come.
Ignatius of Antioch is usually regarded as the most important of the 'Apostolic Fathers' and this for a twofold reason: he impresses as being a highly individualistic Christian thinker, and he is the first to witness unequivocally both to the three fold ministry (bishop, presbyters, deacons) and the monarchical episcopate. It is true that not a few commentators have regarded him as unbalanced and neurotic in his passionate longing for martyrdom, but most recognise in him a thinker of stature, if one devoted to practical ends in the churches. It seems clear that there were theological reasons for his attitude towards suffering for Christ, while some portion of the impression of eagerness in this regard made on us by the records derives surely from the florid and exuberant style, which is characteristically Asiatic. Moreover, Ignatius is not so taken up with martyrdom as to be unconcerned about exhortation and instruction of the churches to which he writes. His attacks upon Docetism and some form of Judaizing heresy, together with his emphasis upon the need for the preservation of the unity of the Church, through subservience to the bishop, make us aware of how firmly Ignatius had his feet upon the ground.

The researches of Theodor Zahn and J.B. Lightfoot appear to have established very adequately which 'Ignatian' letters are to be taken as genuine and which passages were interpolations within them. We here assume the authenticity of the Seven Letters to Ephesus, Magnesia, Tralles, Rome, Philadelphia, Smyrna, and to Polycarp, Bishop of Smyrna, and of the shorter text as now generally accepted for these letters largely through the researches of these two scholars and others who have followed in their train. Our remarks will be confined to what we know of Ignatius from this source, and the other spurious letters and interpolations will be disregarded.
BULTMANN'S INTERPRETATION OF IGNATIUS.

It has frequently been noted that Ignatius pays less attention than most of the other writers belonging to the Apostolic Fathers to eschatological matters, and in particular that he has little to say regarding the Second Advent. This last point, it has been suggested, is not surprising in one who was pursuing his course speedily towards Rome and death. Rudolf Bultmann, however, without denying that futurist conceptions of eschatology have some place in Ignatius' thinking, notes that "the parousia is the appearance in history of Jesus (Phila. 9:2, cf. Mag. 9:2), who 'was made manifest at the end of time.' (Mag. 6:1). Precisely in his historical appearance the cosmic catastrophe that apocalyptic eschatology looks for in the future has already taken place (Ign. Eph. 19). Whereas the eschatological picture of the future fades, one finds hope directed toward individual salvation, toward 'eternal life', 'immortality', and 'imperishableness'."¹

Bultmann judges that, apart from Ignatius, none of the authors of the later New Testament writings or among the Apostolic Fathers "has understood the Christian faith as an existentiell attitude."² In order to demonstrate this point, a penetrating analysis is offered of the way in which past and future are understood in these writers, and a contrast is made with the thinking of Paul, John, and Ignatius. Thus, most of these writers, we are told, think of the Christian's unregenerate past as a period of ignorance of God and of vice. With this, so far as it goes, Paul would agree, but it would not be by any means a sufficiently radical assessment of the situation for him. "For Paul understands the past primarily as an existence under the power of flesh, sin, and the law, i.e. he looks upon the falleness of the natural man as something much more

² op. cit., p. 316.
radical than anything that could be sufficiently described as ignorance of God and immortality."¹ Because this radical understanding is lost after Paul, except in John, God's gift of freedom to a man in Christ that is procured by baptism "is primarily understood as the forgiveness of sins committed before baptism and thus as something through which man has been given a new chance. A symptom of this is that here and there the problem of (grievous) sins committed after baptism can appear as a serious problem."² It is evident that, as Bultmann says, there is here a line of connection. If our previous life was but a period of ignorance of God, negatively conceived, then it is possible that a meeting with God may be followed by a further period of ignorance, though this time this would have to be rather more positively conceived. Even so, however, any positive character it might now take on would derive from man's wilfulness. Bultmann judges that for Paul, on the other hand, our former life was a state of positive ignorance in which men lay imprisoned by evil spirits. It was to right this situation that Christ came. This concept highlights the dramatic character of Christian redemption. It means too that the past is not merely a chronological period which has been superseded by a new era. It was a positive force whose influence extended from the past over all man's future. But the redemption wrought by Christ has destroyed this influence. Thus this redemption also has the character not of a chronological event now past, but of a liberating force whose ultimate end will be our presentation justified before the Father. On such a view baptism must do much more than deal with our former sins. What Bultmann has here argued is that for Paul, as compared with most later writers, the past has invaded the present as a living force, this being true both of the Fall and of the 'Christ-event'.

¹ op. cit., p. 317. ² op. cit., p. 318
Bultmann turns from dealing with the past to work out the implications for the understanding of the future that result from what he judges to be an insufficiently radical view both of man's fallenness and of the redemption wrought by Christ, which is "procured" for us in baptism.

"In keeping with this, the future eschatological salvation is not, as it is with Paul, already present in a paradoxical manner, but rather is exclusively future - to the extent that it is not at work in the sacramental powers that are mediated by the church. --- the unity of the possession of the Spirit with the imperative (cf. Gal 5:25!) is not made clear. The believer's emancipation from the world is not understood as something positive, but rather as something negative. It consists in the renunciation of desires and vices and, in extreme cases, becomes the practice of asceticism."

Bultmann sees as one symptom and result of this a failure to appreciate that suffering is a positive way whereby the power of the Lord comes into its own. For Paul such suffering for Christ's sake was a sharing in the passion of Christ and a participation in His body. Instead of this, it becomes seen merely as a necessity that one day will be followed by an age in which there is no suffering. One can immediately see, if Bultmann is right, certain linkages between Paul and Ignatius which help to make less bizarre and more meaningful Ignatius' attitude to his own impending martyrdom in Rome.

Bultmann judges that, despite significant differences from Pauline thinking and despite, in particular, the fact that it is 'death' and 'life' which govern Ignatius' thinking rather than considerations relating to 'righteousness', forensically conceived, Ignatius does share with Paul a conception of the 'interim character' of the present: "It is by no means merely a chronological concept for him." Again, Ignatius

---

is thus to be understood, here essentially at one with Paul: "Man's
lostness prior to Christ is really understood by Ignatius as fallenness
under a power over which he cannot become lord; and his emancipation
from it does not mean that he is now made ready to rely on his own power
and must thenceforth take care for his salvation through his works, but
rather that he now stands under a new power so that the future salvation
is already present." Bultmann recognizes that there is room in Ignatius'
thinking for a resurrection day and other salvation-events, futuristically
conceived, but he considers that there is an emphasis upon a 'realized
eschatology'.

Bultmann feels, however, that Ignatius himself does at times adopt
a more futuristic way of looking at things than Paul does: "Thus freedom
is not, as it is with Paul, something that is already present but rather
is something future that will first be realized in the resurrection.
(Ign. Rom. 4:3)" This, he feels, is why it was necessary for Ignatius
to choose to die in Christ's passion and why martyrdom was conceived of
as such a worthy goal of the Christian life. Bultmann traces this dis-
tinction to Ignatius' different understanding of 'the flesh' which he
characterizes as only 'half-Pauline'. This difference consists in the
fact that, "for Ignatius, the 'flesh' is not primarily the sphere of sin
(as in Paul,) but the sphere of transitoriness and death." On this
account, in so far as 'flesh' is primarily the sphere of transitoriness
and death, it is only really done away with in death -- this despite the
very real union of 'flesh' with 'spirit' in Jesus Christ.

1 op. cit., p. 323 2 op. cit., p. 327.
3 op. cit., p. 323.
THE EVIDENCE OF THE IGNATIAN EPISTLES.

With this assessment of one eminent commentator in the background of our thinking, the best course now seems to be to turn to the Ignatian Epistles themselves, noting some of the more important passages which appear to have a bearing on eschatology or to reflect eschatological presuppositions.

THE EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS.

XIII. "Ἑσχατοί καιροί. Λοιπὸν ἔσχατοι, φοβηθῶμεν τὴν μικροπομπὴν τοῦ θεοῦ, ὅταν μὴ ἔχωμεν εἰς κρίσιν γένηται. ἦ γὰρ τὴν μέλλουσαν ὀργὴν φοβηθῶμεν, ἥ τὴν ἐνεστῶσαν χρῆσιν ἄγιαν ἔσχατοι, ἐν τῶν δύο μόνον ἐν χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ εὔβολων εἰς τὸ κλῆσιν ἔχεις." 

The above passage shows that for Ignatius we live in the 'last times'. It is evident that it is the coming of Christ in the flesh which makes the present era one of grace; it is the same gracious activity of God in Christ which warns of judgment to come for those who do not respond to that grace.

It is noteworthy that Ignatius thinks of our union with Christ now as the experience and guarantee of 'living' (ζην).

This section epitomizes Ignatius' understanding of eschatology. It relates to that which is to come, but in Christ we already experience the grace of the 'last times' and are now made secure for eternity.

A number of passages lay stress on the present experience of union with Christ in the fellowship of the Church.

In chapters II and IV-VI Ignatius is concerned to lay emphasis upon the responsibility of members to obey the bishop and presbyters of the Church. The reasoning which is implicit in this exhortation (no actual
dispute occasions the word given, cf. VIII:1) emerges most clearly perhaps at III:2: "... Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, τὸ διάκριτον ήμῶν ζήν, τοῦ πατρὸς ἡ γνάμη, ὡς καὶ οἱ ἐπίσκοποί, οἱ κατὰ τὰ πέρατα δρισθέντες, ἐν Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ γνάμη εἰσίν."

The phrase, "Jesus Christ our inseparable life", is central here. It is in union with Christ that we have life -- clearly now, already -- and this life is found within the fellowship of the Church, as directed by the living Christ through regularly appointed officers. Chapter IV makes clear that for members and presbyters to be in unison with the bishop reveals our membership in Christ (ήντε τοῦ ὕπο ὑπο, para.2).

It is in the united Church that we sing through Christ (clearly present there) to the Father.

VII:2 significantly speaks of Jesus Christ in these terms: "Εἰς ὕπερ... αρχικός τε καὶ κυριακός, γεννητὸς καὶ ἴγινητὸς, ἐν αἱρέσεις τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ ἡ ἰδπιος ἡ ζωή, καὶ ἐν Μαρίᾳ καὶ ἐν τῷ πατρὶ, πῶς ἐν ποιμ Inherits ὑπος ἐν τῷ πάντῃ, Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ὁ λύσας ἡμῶν."

The underlying thought is that in the Incarnation Christ has brought life into the midst of our death, our mortality, and it is this Christ Who is assumed in the earlier chapters, upon which we have commented, to be the life, and the source of life, of the Church. This passage is clearly directed against docetic views of Christ's humanity, but the balance between His divinity and His humanity is nicely preserved. It is appropriate that such a Lord should dwell in the human fellowship of the Church.

In IX, in the middle of a somewhat elaborate figure concerning the members of the Church as stones in the temple of the Father, in which it is said that the cross of Christ is the engine whereby we are raised to our respective positions and that the Holy Spirit is the rope employed (para.1), Ignatius remarks: "Εστὶ οὖν καὶ σύνοδοι πάντες, \"
To be a Christian or a member of the Church is to be in Christ, and to have Christ in you. Chapter XIII develops the same theme in dynamic terms when it avers that "θαν γάρ πνεύμα ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ γίνεσθε, καθιστόντως μὴ δύναμαις τοῦ σατάνα, καὶ λύται ὁ ὀλεθρος αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ ὀρθοσει ἤμων τῆς πίστεως."

Chapter XV returns to the theme of Christians as 'temples', in which God dwells (para. 3). Chapter XVI warns against those who destroy families (οἱ ὁικοφόροι), that is, by heresy (cf. para. 2) that such will not inherit the kingdom of God. Nor indeed will those who listen to them. The implication of this is that the Christian community is the heir who will enter into his possession in the coming Kingdom of God, but heresy will exclude one from that community, whose is the promise.

Chapter XVII very beautifully and powerfully expresses the thought that "διὰ τοῦτο μέρους ἔλεαν ἔπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτοῦ ὁ κύριος, ἵνα πνεῦμα τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐρεθησίαν." It goes on "Μὴ ἠλείρεσθε δυσοδίκων τῆς διασκεδάζων τοῦ ἁρχοντος τοῦ άνθρωπος τοῦ αἰώνος τοῦτου, μὴ αἰχμαλώτισθης ὡμᾶς ἐκ τοῦ προκειμένου ζηῶ."(Para. 1)

XIX:1-2 speaks, in a way that is characteristic of gnostic literature but appears to have a background in Jewish apocalyptic, of how the ruler of this world (ὁ ἁρχων τῶν αἰῶνων), was not made aware of the virginity of Mary, the mother of our Lord, nor of her giving birth to the Lord, nor of His death. If he had known, he might have been able to interfere in some way, so the facts were kept from him. He did not realise that Jesus of Nazareth was the Son of God. However, the accomplishment of Christ's work was displayed "to the ages" (τοῖς αἰώνιοι
para. 2) through the blazing forth of the star, which is depicted in the Gospels as seen by the Magi. Jean Daniélou has made it clear that the importance attached to the star is a very primitive Jewish-Christian motif. Ignatius, however, continues: "Ὀθεν ἔλυτο πίκα μαγεία καὶ πᾶς δεῖμας ἡρανιστο κακίστη ἢμνοια καθηρεῖτο, παλαιά μεσίστιν διερθείστω θεοῦ ἀνθρωπίνως ρουσουμένου εἰς καυστήτη αἰδίου βίου ἡρκήν δὲ ἐλήμβανεν τὸ παρά θεοῦ ἀναργυρεῖν. Ἐνθεν τι πώλην συνεκινεῖτο διὰ τὸ μελετάσθαι θειότου κατάλυσις." Schlier and others have wished to interpret this passage in terms of Hellenistic astrological ideas, but Daniélou judges that it has its explanation in a collection of Jewish-Christian 'testimonia' to Christ as the Messiah. "There seems to be in this passage", he goes on, "an allusion to the domination exercised by the stars over the world, and to the magical and astrological practices that were an expression of it. Nevertheless, the allusion to magic may also in this context refer to the Magi. If so, then it is both the astral powers and the Magi, their ministers, who are stupefied by the appearance of the new star which marks the end of their reign." This passage is uniquely rich in theological concepts of importance. Interpretations differ to some extent, but this much is clear. The passage indicates in vivid terms that Christ's coming in the flesh destroyed the old kingdom, i.e. that of the ruler of this world, and what God had long prepared for had its beginning. This resulted from God's coming in human form. Immediately prior to this passage Ignatius has told us that Jesus Christ "... ἡγεῖται θηρίῳ καὶ ἐβαπτίστι βη, καὶ τῷ πάθει τῷ ὑόῳ καθκρίσθη." (XVIII:2). The water referred


2 op. cit., p. 221.
to is that of the baptismal pool. Thus it is in the Church that there is manifested the new order. This impression is confirmed by the statement that the result of the coming of the new star was that death should be abolished.

XX is a significant chapter. Its theme is "the dispensation according to the new man Jesus Christ." Ignatius promises that, if it is permitted to him, he will write again to the Ephesians (there is no evidence that he did) and he says with regard to this second book: "προσδηλώσω ὑμῖν, ὡς ἠρέμωμεν οἰκονομίας εἰς τὸν καιόμεν σὺν βρώμον 'Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν, ἐν τῇ αὐτοῦ πίστει καὶ ἐν τῇ αὐτοῦ ἀγαπή, ἐν πάθει αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀναστάσει." (Para. 1)

Paragraphs 2 and 3 Assert that Ignatius will be more likely to fulfill this undertaking if he knows that the Ephesians are regularly meeting together "ἐν χρωτὶ ἐς ὑπάκουοι... ἐν μην πίστει καὶ ἐν Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ" in obedience to the bishop and the presbytery "καταργύστω σινοῖς, ἐν ἄρτον κλήσεις, ὡς ἐστὶν φάρμακαν ἀναιμίας, ἀντίδοτος τοῦ μὴ ἀποθανεῖν, ἀλλὰ ζῆν ἐν Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ διὰ πνεύμον." The latter part of the above passage is very well known, with its reference to the bread of the Eucharist as "the medicine of immortality, the antidote so that we should not die". What, however, is important to grasp is the connection of thought in this whole chapter. The dispensation of the new man, Jesus Christ, relates especially to His faith and love, suffering, and resurrection. The reason why Ignatius will be more willing to develop these themes if the Ephesians do not forget orderly assembling together is surely because by so doing they bear witness to the same faith and love, they too die to the ways of sin, and they are raised to newness of life. The thought is that the Church is the community of Christ: Christ's 'οἰκονομία is worked out in the common life of the Christian community. That is why
the 'εἰς ἐσφράγισμα' is life-giving. There is in context no evidence of any view of the sacrament of the Eucharist which understands it in terms of semi-magical conceptions. Rather, it is implied that to belong to the Christian community (and Baptism and the Eucharist typify and realize such membership) means to be set within the 'οἶκον ουμία' of Christ, which is worked out in the present age through the Church.

This epistle to the Ephesians is very rich in its witness to the Ignatian understanding of the importance of the union of Church and individual (in the Church) with Christ. What must, however, be borne in mind is, as XI:1 makes clear, that this life in Christ within the Church is possible only in these 'last times' because Christ has come in the Incarnation to provide us with this new life, and that this time of grace is to be followed by that of judgment.

Citations from other writings will be less frequent because Ephesians is especially rich for our purposes and because we will normally cite only what adds to what has already been noted.

THE EPISTLE TO THE MAGNESIANS.

I:2, asserts Ignatius' prayer that in the churches there may be a union of the flesh and spirit of Jesus Christ, "Who is at all times our life" (τοῦ δὲ πνεῦμα ἡμῶν ζην). Ignatius expects that this union with Christ will issue in the reduplication in the experience of the Church of the experience of Christ. This is implied in the final sentence of this chapter: "ἐν ὦ δικομένοντες τὴν πᾶσαν ἐκπειρασμὸν τοῦ ἐρχοντος τοῦ ζηνος τοῦτον καὶ διαφυγόντες Θεοῦ τευχομέθα." The reference to "the ruler of this age" is significant. It occurs throughout these epistles of Ignatius. It bespeaks the thought that in this age Satan is rampant, but that in the age to come Christ will
reign. This does not overlook Christ's very real victory, which is now experienced by the Church. Nevertheless, it does show that Ignatius looks forward eagerly to the coming age, and sees the experience of the Church and her individual members in this one as corresponding to the period of Christ's suffering prior to His resurrection. Clearly, however, individual members of the Church may "attain" unto God in their own personal experience of endurance for Christ's sake. It is this conviction which undergirds Ignatius' own journey to martyrdom at Rome.

V: 1-2 deals with the fate of believers and unbelievers. Here the emphasis is upon personal choice and responsibility for one's destiny: "Επεὶ δὲν τέλος τὰ πράγματα ἢκει καὶ ἐράκειται τῇ δύο ἡμέρᾳ, ὡς τε θάνατος καὶ ἡ ζωή, καὶ ἐκκατοστὸς ἐς τὸν ὕδιον τόπον μέλλει Χριστῷ. Ἡσυχαίρα γὰρ ἐστιν νομίσματα δύο, ὡς μὲν θεοῦ, ὡς δὲ κόσμου, καὶ ἐκκατοστὸν ἀνακοίνωσεν ὕδιον Χαρακτηρα ἐπικείμενον ἢκει, ὡς ἀπίστοι τῷ κόσμῳ τοῦτῳ, ὡς δὲ πιστοὶ ἐν ἀγίᾳ Χαρακτῆρα Θεοῦ πατρὸς διʼ Ἱησοῦ Χριστοῦ ........."

VI: 1 makes a passing allusion to Jesus Christ as One Who "πρὸ διαφων παρὰ πατρὸ τὴν καὶ ἐν τέλει ἐφανὴ" (para. 1). This is suggestive, not only of Ignatius' appreciation of the difference that Christ's coming has made, but of the fact that it heralds the end of the age which is fast approaching.

Chapters VIII-X warn against any living in accordance with the mandates of Judaism. The persecution which the ancient prophets endured shows that they, like Christians in this age, were living according to Jesus Christ, even though they lived before His day on earth. The prophets were His disciples in the Spirit and they looked forward to Him as their teacher (IX:2). Ignatius continues: "καὶ διʼ τοῦτο, ὡς δικαίος ἀνέμενον, παρὰν ἤγειρεν αὐτοῖς ἐκ νεκρῶν."
It is possible that this is a proleptic reference to the final resurrection of the Old Testament saints, but more probably the thought is that Jesus, by His Descent into Hades, liberated the righteous dead and led them into Paradise. If so, this is another example of Ignatius' appreciation of the difference that Christ's victory has already made, this time within the realm of the dead.

This whole section shows the understanding that the Old Testament saints do not support in any way Judaism, as over against Christianity. Chapter X:3 puts it thus: 

"Θ......... Χριστιανισμὸς ὃν εἰς Ἰουδαίομος ἐπιτευγμένος, ἀλλ' Ἰουδαίομος εἰς Χριστιανισμὸν........"

The thought is that the Old Testament dispensation is not properly understood by the Judaism contemporary with the Early Church: it only makes sense as pointing forward to Jesus Christ. IX:1 makes the contrast between the old days in which the saints lived for the Sabbath, and the "new hope" (ἡ καινότης ἐλπίδος) through which they came to live for the Lord's Day (κατὰ κυριακὴν). Clearly, what preceded was only shadow, and must give way to the substance brought before us by Jesus Christ. Clearly, this again emphasizes the reality of the salvation already experienced, whatever Ignatius may believe concerning what lies ahead of the Church and the world.

Chapter XIII:1 uses a curious phrase, where it is exhorting diligence, in fulfilling the ordinances of Christ and the apostles with a view to the prosperity of the Magnesians "in the flesh and in the spirit, in faith and love, in the Son and the Father and the Spirit, at the beginning and the end (ἐν Ἰησοῦ καὶ ἐν τελείῳ) ------" (italics mine). Ephesians XIV has a similar passage, where it speaks of faith and love towards Christ as the beginning and end of life: "ἐν Ἰησοῦ μὲν πίστει, τέλος δὲ ἀγάπῃ. Τὰ δὲ δύο ἐν ἐνότητι γενόμεναι θεὸς ἐστιν, τὰ δὲ ἄλλα πάντα εἰς καλοκαιρινὸν ἄκολουθε ἔστιν."
In both passages the thought seems to be inherent that the life of believers in Christ through the Church is both an end and a beginning: it represents the end of one way of life and the commencement of a new one. This again represents a way of thinking which shows how in Christ the Christian has already passed from one life to another and yet has only begun a new life whose continuance stretches before him into eternity.

**THE LETTER TO THE TRALLIANS.**

II:2 refers to Jesus Christ as 'our hope' (ἡ ἐλπίς ἡμῶν), with the added comment that if we live in Him, we shall be found in Him (ἐν ᾗ διάγνωστε ἐσφέρεθες ὑπὸ σομεθα). This is Ignatius' normal way of referring to Christ as 'our hope'. The term is used objectively. Christ is the content of our hope, and the thought is that, if we live in Him now, He will be our destiny in the day when the books are opened and the secrets of men made known.

**Chapter IX** emphasizes the reality of the flesh and career of Jesus Christ: "οὐ ἀληθῶς ἐγεννηθη, ἐβαγέν τε καὶ ἐπιευ, ἀληθῶς ἐδιεχθη ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου, ἀληθῶς ἐσταυρώθη καὶ ἀπέθανεν, βλεπόντων τῶν ἐκουρασίων καὶ ἐπιγένεται καὶ ὑποκοινωνίων. οὐ καὶ ἀληθῶς ἐγέρθη ἀκό νεκρῶν, ἐγείραμεν αὐτὸν τοῦ πατρὸς εὐηθείας, οὐ καὶ κατὰ τὸ ὄμοισμα ἡμῶς τοῦ πνεύματος αὐτῶν ὀφθαλμὸς ἐγείρει ὅ πατήρ αὐτοῦ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, οὗ Χριστὸς τὸ ἄλθεντα δὴν οὐκ ἔχομεν." (Para. 1-2)

Here the stress on the reality of Christ's flesh is bound up with the thought of the reality of His resurrection, and therefore of our future resurrection, since even now we live in Him. The future tense, ἐγείρει, is significant. Such a phrase in the Introduction of this letter as "τῆς ἐλπίδος ἡμῶν (Jesus Christ) ἐν τῇ εἰς αὐτὸν λυστατεί ",
might make us think that Ignatius only thought of a spiritual resurrection which we experience in our repentance and baptism into Christ. It is evident, however, that the thought is rather that Christ has physically risen in triumph over death by virtue of His obedience to the Father, is therefore now our life throughout union with Him in the Church, and shall be in a fuller manner the content of our destiny in our future resurrection from the dead.

Chapter X reinforces the anti-docetic argument. This is important, as it is bound up with the insistence of Ignatius on future physical resurrection. He says that, if the flesh of Christ was only a semblance, they why should he suffer physically for Christ in the arena (at Rome)? It is because Christ really suffered that sometimes oneness with Him demands martyrdom or suffering.

XII:2 has a very vivid figure, which expresses most forcibly the relation of Christ to His Church and her future destiny: "Οὔ δόματα οὖν κεφαλὴ κυρίας γεννηθῆναι ζῆνεν μελῶν, τοῦ θεοῦ ἐνσωστὸν ἐπαγγελλομένου, οὗ ἐστίν ὕποτος." Christ has already been born (through His resurrection). This fact presages and guarantees the resurrection of those who belong to Him. Probably this resurrection of believers relates here, in Ignatius' thinking, to the whole experience of 'new life' in Christ, culminating in the physical resurrection of believers at the end of the age.

THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS.

The concern of this Epistle is naturally directed especially towards Ignatius' approaching martyrdom in the city of Rome. The burden of the Epistle is that the Roman Christians should not seek to prevent Ignatius from going to his death. He considers that this is a special privilege. His impressive commentary at II:2 is that God has deemed him worthy "εὐρεθῆναι εἰς δύον ἅκη λατολῆς μετακεραυνημένος. Καλῶν τὸ δύον ἅκο τοῦ κόσμου πρὸς θέου, οὐ εἰς μὴν λατεῖλαν."
What is implicit here is the conviction that in martyrdom he will be united with Christ in His death and will, therefore, also be raised with Him. Probably the thought of resurrection carries with it in this setting the thought of immediate victory over Satan after death as well as the concept of ultimate physical resurrection at the end of the age. This passage, however, again documents Ignatius' emphasis on union with Christ both in suffering and in resurrection.

In Chapter IV Ignatius declares: "... εἰς πάσης ἁμαρτίας ἀφελεύθερον γενήσομαι Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ ἀναστήσομαι ἐν αὐτῷ ἔλευθερος." (para. 3). Bultmann thinks that in his attitude towards martyrdom Ignatius goes beyond Pauline concepts: "-- what is definitely un-Pauline is that Ignatius sees in martyrdom a kind of guarantee, that he does not simply accept it as ordained by the Lord, but, so to speak, makes it into a work that gives him security, and that he thereby prevails upon the Roman congregation to do nothing to hinder his martyr's death."¹ Bultmann may be sound in his judgment at this point. Nevertheless, it would seem that probably what underlies Ignatius' reasoning is no thought that his actions can coerce God in any way; rather it may well be that he sees martyrdom as a peculiarly effective sacrament, peculiarly effective because this step of obedience puts him beyond temptation. It is significant that after the sentence quoted above from Ignatius, he goes on to say that already in his bonds (as he journeys towards Rome) he is learning to give up all desires. Ignatius' point is that, when his martyrdom is complete, when he has been found worthy (cf. I:1), he will be beyond the danger of desire -- for physical safety

¹ op. cit., p. 328.
or anything else which might come between him and God. Martyrdom is
for Ignatius the supreme commitment in union with Christ.

It is here 'personal eschatology' that is involved. This is not
surprising in one contemplating his imminent death for Christ. There
is no suggestion in this emphasis, natural in the circumstances, that it
has displaced the wider Christian Hope in his thinking. It is simply
that the present experience of Christ and the immediate opportunity of
union with Christ in death have occupied the centre of his thinking.

VI further illustrates Ignatius' concern for the next age and the
resurrection into it which is bound up with separation from the things
of this age: "Οὐδέν μοι ἐρεῖται τὰ πέρατα τοῦ κόσμου οὐδὲ
λιταστείαι τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου. Καὶ καὶ ἂποθανεῖν εἰς
Χριστὸν Ιησοῦν, ἢ λιταστείαι τῶν περάτων τῆς γῆς.
Εἶπον εὖ, τὸν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἀποθανόντα. Ἐκεῖνον θέλω,
tὸν δὲ θεῖας ἀναστένα. Τὸ δὲ τοκετός μοι ἐπίκειται.
Σύγγνωτέ μοι, ἵδε ἄλφας, μὴ ἐμποδίσητε μοι ἐκεῖνον,
μὴ θελήσητε με ἂποθανεῖν, ....... " (Paras. 1-2

The very next chapter refers to the evil designs upon him of "the
ruler of this age". ( 'O ἀρχον τοῦ αἰῶνος ). Ignatius
feels endangered until that age has dawned or until he personally has
persevered through suffering for Christ into the liberty and maturity
which lies beyond it. In VI:2 he asserts that when he has suffered in
the arena, then will he be a man ( ἱσχυρὸς ἄνδρας ).
Clearly the point is that it is only in following Christ's example (cf.
para. 3) that he can attain unto the spiritual manhood of the Risen Christ.

THE EPISTLE TO THE PHILADELPHIANS.

Chapters II and III warn of the dangers of heresy and schism in
the Church. III:3 says: "Μὴ πλανάσθε, ἰδελφοί μου. Εἰ τίς σὺν
The implication once again is that the Church is the people of God who are due to inherit in the coming age the Kingdom of God. For Ignatius this Kingdom appears to be future rather than present. Nevertheless the Church belongs not to the present age but to that age which is to come. The Church's present situation is analogous to that of Jesus Christ prior to His resurrection: the way of the Cross comes first, and this means, amongst other things, separation from heresy and schism with all the self-assertiveness that is bound up with them.

Chapters V and VI again see the Old Testament prophets as hoping in Christ and waiting for Him (ἐις άιτων ἔλεισεν καὶ άιτων ἐκμένειν, V.2) and sees only death in Judaism (VI:1): this is because the Old Covenant looked forward to Christ and is already fulfilled in Him.

Chapters VIII and IX lay considerable emphasis on the resurrection -- that of Christ and that which His disciples immediately enter upon through union with Him, especially in suffering.

In VIII we are told that for Ignatius' the charters' (Ἀφεθάνατον) are not other than Jesus Christ. The opposition is probably to schismatics or heretics who wish to interpret the Old Testament Scriptures in their own special way. Ignatius says that τλ ἔβικτα Ἀφεθάνατον ὁ σύγκροσον άιτοῦ καὶ ὁ θάνατος καὶ ἡ ἐναστασις άιτοῦ καὶ ἡ πίστις ἡ δι' άιτοῦ" (para. 2). Chapter IX portrays Christ as "the door of the Father" with Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and the Prophets and Apostles and the Church all entering through Him. What this means is that the unity of God's purpose is evidenced in the divine ordering of dispensations in relation to Jesus Christ. The Gospel, however, is said to have prominence over
the older dispensation — "Τὴν παρουσίαν τοῦ σωτῆρος, κυρίῳ ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ, τὸ κάθος αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν ἀνάστασιν ".

(Para. 2). The point is made very clear in the explanation given: "οἱ γὰρ ἀγαθοὶ προφῆται κατηγοροῖν εἰς αὐτῶν. τὸ δὲ εὐαγγέλιον ἀπάρτισμα ἐστὶν ἰδρυμάτων.

The thought is that all who look to Christ, whether Old Testament saints or members of the Church now in existence, are within the sphere where Christ's resurrection brings to them 'incorruption' (ἡ ἀφαρσία). This is because all such are united with Christ, and derive benefit from Him.

THE EPISTLE TO THE SMYRNAEANS.

In chapter I strong emphasis is placed upon the reality of Jesus Christ's flesh and earthly career. He is said to have been truly nailed (to the Cross) under Pontius Pilate and Herod the Tetrarch for our sakes, "καὶ ἔρχεται σύστημα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνες διὰ τῆς ἀναστάσεως εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνες καὶ πιστῶς αὐτῶν, εἰτε ἐν Ἰουδαίωσ εἰτε ἐν ἑβραίοις, εἰν ἐν οἴκῳ τῆς ἐκκλησίας αὐτῶ ". (para. 2). The word 'ensign' (σύστημα), probably refers back to certain passages in the prophecy of Isaiah, where the word is used in such a way as to suggest that God's divine commands are executed by earthly forces, even when the latter are unaware of obeying such a command. Is. II:12 is perhaps especially in mind: it speaks of raising an ensign for the nations and regathering the dispersed of Israel and Judah from the corners of the earth. Here Ignatius sees the Resurrection of Jesus Christ as establishing in God's due time a community, the Church, in which Jews and Gentiles are at one in the fellowship which springs from the life of the Risen Christ.

Chapters II and III lay heavy stress upon the reality of Christ's
Resurrection and of His Resurrection body. Lk. 24:39 is quoted (III:1) and it is noted that after the Resurrection Christ ate and drank with the disciples, though united in spirit to the Father. The thought is latent here, as elsewhere in Ignatius' epistles, that Christ remains a man after His resurrection. In IV:2 Ignatius notes that, as he faces the prospect of the wild beasts in the arena, it is "the perfect man himself" who "gives strength" to him (Λυτοῦ μὲ ἐνδυναμοῦντος τοῦ τελείου ἕθους). We recall the passage at Romans VI:2 where Ignatius asserts that after his own martyrdom he will be a man. Clearly, the concept of Christ's resurrection is taken with the utmost seriousness, and His humanity is envisaged as eternal. It is this thought of an eternal manhood which seems to undergird all that is said about union with Christ - in the Church, in the sacraments, and in martyrdom and suffering for the Name. From the side of the Risen Christ union with His Church is appropriate and possible because He has never left His manhood aside. Nevertheless, that humanity has been glorified, as ours will be in the resurrection at the end of the age. What happens, however, in the Church is that the powers of Christ's risen humanity are passed on to us in advance.

VII:1 probably asserts Ignatius' expectation of a coming Judgment Day: "Μηδείς πλανάσθω· καὶ τις ἐκουμένως καὶ ἂ δήξῃ τῶν ἀγγέλων καὶ οἱ ἄρχοντες ὅμοιοι τῷ καὶ ἄρχοντοι, εἰς μὴ πιστεύσωσιν εἰς τὸ αἷμα Χριστοῦ, καὶ κείμενος κρίσις ἐστίν." The context suggests that Ignatius' reference to angels and to other high authorities, which are themselves subject to God's judgment, is that officers of the Church should not grow high-minded through their position: they too have to give an account to God of their stewardship of office.

Chapter VII is important. It refers to the attitude of heretics to the Eucharist and to communal prayer: "Εὐχαριστίας καὶ προσευχῆς ἀπέχονται, διὰ τὸ μὴ δομολογεῖν τὴν εὐχαριστίαν σάρκα εἶναι τῶν
Does this passage teach transubstantiation? or consubstantiation?

In context what Ignatius appears to be saying is that the Church is the 'locus' of the Risen Christ in all His glorified humanity. Heretics separate themselves from those acts in which the unity of the Church is most visible -- the Eucharist and prayer. Later in this chapter (para. 2) Ignatius speaks of the Gospel as that through which the Passion has been revealed to us "and the Resurrection accomplished" (καὶ ἡ ἀνάστασις τετελεῖσται). The ἡμῖν probably extends in meaning to the clause concerning the accomplishment of the Resurrection of Christ. The thought is that Christ is risen and lives in His Church: she is an organism indwelt by Him. This being so, both Eucharist and prayer, to say nothing of preaching and other aspects of churchly life, are vehicles of grace, by means of which members "attain to the resurrection" (cf. para. I). Whatever view of the service of the Eucharist is implied by this, it seems clear that the basic factor is that Christ lives in His Church. The thought is latent that this is appropriate because in His Passion and Resurrection He remained man and so is able through the energy of the Holy Spirit in this age, to be a present reality in the fellowship of eating, drinking, and praying, once solemnized by our Lord's command: "This do ye --- " (I Cor. II:25). The Church is the fellowship of Christ's Resurrection.

THE EPISTLE TO POLYCARP.

Chapter II has a passage which well sums up Ignatius' attitude to his day and age: "Ὁ καιρὸς ἀπαιτεῖ σε, ὅσ kuberaνηταί ἁνξιοὺς καὶ ὅσ Χειμαζόμενος λιμένα, εἰς τὸ θεόν ἐπιτοχεῖν.
In contrast with the strenuousness of discipleship we read in chapter III of the One Who is above our 'times': "Τούς καιρούς καταμέτωπε. Τον ὑπὲρ καιρού προσδόκα, τὸν ἄχρονον, τὸν ἀόρατον, τὸν δι' ἡμᾶς ὠρατόν, τὸν ἀληθεύτην, τὸν δι' ἡμᾶς παθητόν, τὸν κατὰ κάτω τοῦ τὰῦτον δι' ἡμᾶς ὑπομείναυτα." (Para. 2)

Christ entered into our 'καιρόι', but the implication is that by doing so and conquering the difficulties, He has made resurrection strength and glory available to all who endure suffering in union with Him.

**ASSESSMENT OF IGNATIUS' ESCHATOLOGY.**

How, in the light of the above evidence, are we to assess the eschatology of Ignatius? It seems clear that Ignatius' special contribution is the stress upon the Church as the sphere in which Christ's Risen Humanity displays its glory and power. The Church stands within the 'οἴκον υἱοῦ' of Christ in His resurrection-power. Since this is how Ignatius envisages the Church, it is natural that he should be concerned about the unity-in-truth of the Church, and speaks sternly concerning heresy and schism. How can anything that belongs to 'death' coexist in any way within the Church?

It would be possible to interpret what Ignatius says about Christ's death and resurrection, and what he has to say concerning the Church as the sphere of Christ's Risen life, to mean that all the emphasis is placed upon the past and the present, rather than the future. Thus, Bultmann, as we saw above (page 139) notes that the Greek term 'parousia' (ἡ παρουσία), is significantly used in Ignatius only of the
Incarnation. It is not applied to the Second Advent. This is true of Philad. IX:2, which Bultmann cites, and where alone the word occurs in the Ignatian epistles. At Magnes. IX:2 it is the verbal form, the participle, 'παροισία', which is used, and here it certainly does refer to the immediate aftermath of the Incarnation in Christ's Descent into Hades, and has no reference to the Second Advent. The use of the verbal form, 'ἐφανερώθη', at Magnes. VI:I does again allude to the Incarnation. It is indeed noteworthy that Ignatius does not speak of two 'parousiai', one in humiliation and one in glory. It is not at all clear, however, that Ignatius does not expect what we normally term the Second Advent. Bultmann is aware of this, but he judges that in Ignatius' thinking the centre of interest has shifted to what Christ has done and its realization within the Christian community. How are we to assess this view?

Much of what Bultmann says may well be justified. The problem of post-baptismal sin is not to the fore, as in such a work as 'The Shepherd of Hermas'. This may well be because Ignatius has a more Pauline understanding of how in baptism Christ's redemption not only eliminates the past but breaks the power of sin over us, in such a way that we do not require to be responsible ourselves alone for our future actions. It is possible that even Ignatius' understanding of martyrdom is not really based, as Bultmann thinks that it is, on an only 'half-Pauline' understanding of 'the flesh' (ἡ σάρκα). It may be that he simply views this as a supreme way of being called upon to render obedience, and thinks of its blessedness in terms analogous to that of Jesus Christ in His resurrection glory, with the weakness and temptations associated with His Passion behind Him. Thus understood, Ignatius would not view martyrdom as a work by which we secure something, but rather as a further and final manifestation through grace given to endure the trial,
of the operation of Christ's power within our lives. Nor would he view 'the flesh' as 'the sphere of transitoriness and death,' but he would be vividly aware of its proneness to fall before temptation. Be this as it may, it seems true that Ignatius exhibits a very clear understanding of what Christ's 'parousia' in the Incarnation means for the people of God, the Church.

The question is to what extent Ignatius' references to future resurrection (and judgment, cf. VI:1 -- though here the reference to a particular coming Judgment Day is not explicit) are mere accommodations to traditional thinking, probably unconscious accommodations. We have to recall that St. Paul, with whom Bultmann is anxious to align Ignatius, also spoke in the terms used by Ignatius, and yet he very definitely believed in a futurist eschatology. Doubtless Bultmann would reply to this that Paul's own understanding moved away from a futurist eschatology towards just such an emphasis upon the present experience of Christ in the Church as we find in Ignatius. This may be so, but it has not yet been established that any such growing emphasis upon the present experience of Christ ever truly displaced in Paul's thinking, the hope of Christ's Coming in glory. It is interesting, too, that where Bultmann finds Ignatius to have veered away from the Pauline understanding, it is more in the direction of a stress upon the future that is said not to be warranted in Pauline thinking. This does not suggest that Ignatius was wholly dominated by the emphasis upon present experience of Christ, though it is true that the matter that Bultmann has in mind at this point refers to what the individual has to obtain at death rather than any expectation of a future hope.

We must, however, bear in mind certain suggestions in the evidence surveyed above. Thus the statement at Ephesians XI that these are the 'last times', when combined with the warning that we do not allow Christ's grace in this present era to become a source of judgment to us
and with the exhortation to fear the judgment that is to come, does not read like a mere accommodation to traditional thinking. Again, the fact that the Church, though already experiencing Christ's resurrection-life, is portrayed as heir of the Kingdom (cf. Eph. XVI:2), is suggestive of the expectation of a future further gift of the actual Kingdom of God to His children. Again, the very heavy emphasis of the Ignatian epistles upon 'resurrection', bound up as it is with the strong anti-docetic note in Ignatius' thought, may very well relate to 'resurrection-life' now in the Church, but the very anti-docetic strength of Ignatius' emphasis militates against the view that he does not envisage an actual physical 'raising' of the structure that goes into the grave. Christ's resurrection was a real one, a true one, says Ignatius. Can we doubt that he imagined that ours would be of the same order?

It has to be conceded that Ignatius has less to say in direct terms concerning the future aspect of eschatology, except where the resurrection is in view, than certain other writings amongst the Apostolic Fathers. To view what indications of futurism that there are, however, as accommodations to traditional thinking is unjustified, unless very good reasons can be brought forward for so doing, and these appear to be lacking.

In view of the implication of Ignatius that the Church is the heir of the Kingdom, it may be better to avoid the term, 'realized eschatology', as the best description of Ignatius' thought. Certainly there is more that is immediately and obviously consistent with the emphasis of present experience in Ignatius, but the present participation in the Church in Christ's resurrection-life is viewed as stretching before the Church into eternity itself.

There is no evidence either in this relative emphasis on present experience that the delay in the Second Advent has caused any embarrassment.
That can be at best in the case of Ignatius, only an argument from silence, and, when we bear in mind the emphasis upon resurrection and the implication of a future physical resurrection far from complete silence, for that event would certainly be expected to occur at Christ's Advent in glory.

Ignatius, it may be said, lays the emphasis on the resurrection-life experienced in the Church, but he looks to the future, at Christ's Coming, for the complete fulfilment of that present experience. Individual believers do doubtless by martyrdom, however, anticipate something at least of that final triumph by their union with Christ in martyrdom. Ignatius' own impending death would help to make him more conscious of this fact. This must also account for the rather greater stress on the individual and on 'personal eschatology' in Ignatius than in most other contemporary writings.
Eschatology is not prominent in this Epistle, written by Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna in the first half of the second century, to the Church at Philippi. Nevertheless it is clearly traditional and largely futurist in character. The letter deals primarily with practical matters, and it is therefore not to be expected that eschatology should receive any special development.

Opinions differ concerning the date of the martyrdom of Polycarp. Older scholars put it at c.167 A.D., but, while scholarship is now divided, the balance of opinion appears to have swung in favour of a date in 155 or 156. In any event, Polycarp had a long career as bishop of the Church in Smyrna, being already bishop there by c.110, since Ignatius wrote to him as such on his way to martyrdom. According to Irenaeus 1 Polycarp wrote several letters, but this is the only one extant. It was occasioned by a connection with Ignatius' progress towards martyrdom shortly before it was written. This gives us an approximate date for the letter. It is clear (cf.XIII.2) that the Philippians had written to Polycarp asking his help in making a collection of the letters of Ignatius. As Kirsopp Lake puts it 2, this letter is in the nature of a 'covering letter' for the copies which Polycarp sends of such Ignatian letters to which he had access. At the same time Polycarp takes opportunity to note with concern the error of Valens (chapter XI), which is not specified, and warns the Church against the dangers of apostasy (especially chapters VII-X).

1 *Adversus Haereses*, W.XXXIII.4

P.N. Harrison has suggested that the present text of this Epistle is actually a conflation of two of his letters. This would help to explain why Ignatius should be spoken of in chapter IX as if he were already dead and in chapter XIII as if Polycarp were uncertain as to his state. Harrison judges that chapter XIII is a brief acknowledgement to the Philippians of their communication about Ignatius' letters almost contemporary with his visit, while chapters I-XII represent an independent letter written to the Philippians much later in Polycarp's life. The issue is not important for our present purpose, and we therefore find it convenient to treat the letter as one.

So far as eschatology is concerned there is clear evidence of Polycarp's belief in future Judgment in connection with the resurrection of the dead at Christ's Appearing. The most direct reference occurs at II.I, where the present reign of Christ over all things in heaven and earth is stressed and where the text goes on to speak of Christ as One. Here we see the Judgment related directly to Christ's Parousia in glory, and it is made clear that the Judgment is to be both of the living and the dead. This cannot relate merely in a metaphorical way to spiritual qualities, for the following paragraph shows that the One Who raised Christ from the dead will also raise us up. Although Judgment is in view in this chapter, it is interesting that our being raised up is made conditional upon our doing God's will. This means that primarily it is Christian people who are in view, and that it is more the positive reward of righteousness that is in view than God's condemnation of sinners.

Both II.3 and V.3 imply that the Kingdom of God lies yet in the future. In II.3 Jesus' words at Matt.5:3,10 are run together, with their thought that those who are poor or who suffer now for righteousness' sake will receive the Kingdom of God. Despite the use of the present tense both in Matthew's Gospel and in this passage, the sense in both places requires a futuristic understanding of the Kingdom. At V.3 allusions are made in the one passage to I Pet:2:11; Gal:5:17; and I Cor.6:9,10, together with the latter's reference to certain immoral kinds of persons as not being about to inherit the Kingdom of God. No more than in the New Testament itself do these references mean that there is little stress on the present experience of salvation, but the usage reminds us of an Early Christian understanding of the fact that the term, Kingdom of God, really refers to the day when God's sway will be undisputed, which is not yet.

In certain passages in this short letter one notes a sharp contrast between this present age and that which is to come, which reminds one of language employed in II Clement and which is even more marked in the 'Preaching of Peter' imbedded within the Pseudo-Clementine Homilies and Recognitions. Thus, we read at V.2:

"Ε" (the Lord) ἐὰν ἐχθριστήσωμεν ἐν τῷ νῦν λῴην, ἀπόλυσόμεθα καὶ τον μελλόντα, καθὼς ὑπέσχετο ἡμῖν ἐνείρι ἡμᾶς ἐκ νεκρῶν, καὶ ὃτι ἐὰν πολιτεύσωμεν ἡ ἔξωσ αὐτοῦ, καὶ συμβασιλεύσωμεν αὐτῷ, εἰ γε πιστεύσωμεν."

Similarly at IV.1 we are reminded that we brought nothing into the world and can take nothing out of it (cf. Job 1:21), while V.3 thinks it good for us to be cut off from the lust after the things of the world.

This language may be perfectly traditional, but one senses in the passage in V.2 a certain heightening of the contrast between this age
and that which is to come, which appears in II Clement and even more decisively in the 'Preaching of Peter'. The tendency is to place so much emphasis on the coming age that the awareness of the present experience of God's grace given in the end of the age is lost sight of. There is only a hint of this here, but the language does convey that hint.

The question may be asked whether any note of 'realized eschatology' is clearly present in this letter. If there is, it is implicit. This is not to deny that much is said about the present realities of Christian living. It is, however, only when this is expressed definitely in terms of Christ's Coming in the flesh in the end of the age, that this can properly be referred to in terms of realized 'eschatology'. It does seem, however, that such an element is implicit in the thought of the Church which is understood throughout. There is quite an emphasis right from chapter III onwards on the need for faithfulness in the face of temptation, heresy and persecution: the thought seems to be that these assaults must not be allowed to dislodge us from our 'citizenship' in the community of the Lord, that is, of Christ. V.2, already quoted, again makes this point. Here, in context, this citizenship is thought of as being that of the Lord, who was the servant of all. This reminds us that the community has been founded by Jesus Christ. Moreover, the thought of V.2 is that if we are worthy citizens of Christ's community now, we shall also reign with Him (i.e. after the resurrection in the Kingdom). Thus, by implication the Church is envisaged as the community which exists between the Two Advents.
VII.2 carries a warning against false teachers (as does paragraph I of that chapter) and exhorts the Philippians significantly to return "ἐν τῷ ἐξ ἐκείνης ἡμείς ἐρωτεύουμεν τὸν λόγον." Is there a hint here of the understanding that heresies were due to emerge before the Return of Christ? (I Tim.4.Iff.; II Pet.2.Iff)

Irenaeus was later to make much of the fact that heresy was more recent, and could be identified by this fact. The point is that Polycarp seems anxious as a shepherd of souls to preserve the Philippians within the fellowship to which belongs the future, and he may envisage heresy as one prophesied means by which the Devil will in the end of the age seek to subvert persons from that community so understood. This means that both the Church and her Gospel would be tacitly understood in thoroughly eschatological terms. It seems definite that the Church is understood as a community of the End-time. It may be less sure that Polycarp really sees heresy in terms of prophecy of the end of the age, but it is by no means improbable. What all this means is that the Church in any event is viewed as an eschatological community already enjoying citizenship in the community whose are the promises of God. This must be reckoned a recognition within the Epistle of 'realized eschatology'.

We may say, then that futurism predominates in regard to the eschatology of this Epistle, but that the note of 'realized eschatology' is not absent. There is a tendency to heighten the contrast between this age and that which is to come. This may be connected, as in the case of II Clement, with a certain tendency to legalism, which has the effect of making salvation a future rather than a present reality. What is certain is that there is no evidence of concern over the delay of the Parousia of Christ in glory, and that futurism is not played down, but rather heightened, a fact which does not fit in with the assumption of Dodd and Werner that the delay in the Parousia produced an embarrassment in the Early Church and led to a diminution of emphasis upon futurist eschatology.
THE TEACHING OF THE TWELVE APOSTLES.

The work commonly known as the 'Didache' or 'The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles', has, since its first publication in 1883, been a centre of much discussion and controversy. Much of this only indirectly affects our interest. It has been concerned primarily with the provenance of the book and, in view of the first six chapters' consisting of a manual of ethical behaviour under the theme of the 'Two ways' markedly similar to the contents of the Epistle of Barnabas, chapters XVIII-XX, with the question of the relationship between the Epistle of Barnabas, this work itself, and any common source of the Two Way document. The question of the provenance of the work does have quite a close bearing on the relationship of the book to eschatological matters, and this relationship is twofold. If, for example, J.P. Audet1 and J. Danielou2 are sound in their judgment that the basic stratum of the whole book is Jewish-Christian and is to be dated before the Fall of Jerusalem in 70 A.D., this should help to explain certain features of the book, including the eschatologically oriented Aramaic prayer, 'Marana tha', at chapter X:6. On the other hand, any discoveries that may be made regarding the eschatology of the work should be regarded as throwing light on the true nature of eschatological expectation in Syria or Palestine (to which areas the work is usually assigned in terms of its origin) prior to 70 A.D. that is, in the era of Primitive Christianity. It must be said that, though the view of Audet and Danielou seems to be gaining ground, it is probably too early to speak of a consensus of opinion on the matters of date, origin, and provenance.

2 The Theology of Jewish Christianity. Darton, Longman & Todd. 1964.
Therefore, one has to draw conclusions with caution when speaking of the bearing of the provenance of the work on its eschatology or when seeking to draw conclusions from the eschatology of the work concerning the Christian Hope of the supposed source of the work.

A fairly common statement regarding the Didache's eschatology is that it is not prominent, certainly not nearly to the same extent as in the Epistle of Barnabas. It is argued that, in particular, the Two Ways document shows in the Didache little interest in eschatological matters, while in the Epistle of Barnabas the eschatological note is rather stressed in the setting of that same Two Ways document. Thus, we find this comment in a treatment of the Didache and the Epistle of Barnabas by Robert A. Kraft:

"---Didache 1-6 shows no real interest in eschatology. This is especially striking by comparison to Barnabas 18-20, which shares with the rest of the epistle an atmosphere charged with present eschatological drama.---"¹

Kraft goes on to argue that "in the Didache eschatology is either subsumed under liturgy (8:2; 9:4; 10:5-6) or forms an appendix (ch. 16) in which the reader is admonished to be ready when the last times finally do arrive, and he is made aware of certain future preludes to the consummation. Barnabas and the Didache are in two different worlds at this point. Their common ground is almost entirely limited to the Two Ways ethic."²

These remarks offered by Kraft are instructive. Our concern here is not in the comparison with the Epistle of Barnabas, as such, but with the presuppositions which seem to underlie Kraft's assessment of the eschatology found in the Didache. Two points require to be made. First, the fact that the eschatology in the work in view is found only

² op. cit., p. 7.
in liturgical or closing contexts does not in itself show that eschatological issues were not prominent in the mind of the writer. Doubtless it must be conceded that the fact that eschatological interest shows through in liturgy could represent a merely traditional interest in the liturgical source and tradition, but this is not necessarily the case. Second, Kraft stresses that the writer of this work, or its compiler, does not expect the consummation of the age immediately: this is taken to mean that eschatology is not a dominant interest. What this last point presupposes is that eschatological interest, if it is to be viewed as dominant, must stress the note of immediacy. This notion derives ultimately from the very prevalent conception that the primitive Christians expected the Parousia of Christ at a very early date, at most within one generation from Christ's death and resurrection, and that when this did not take place this sense of immediacy faded. With such a presupposition in mind, any eschatology that does not have the immediacy of the consummation of the age, so understood, in view, must be regarded as less emphatic in character. Our point is that this presupposition requires careful consideration and should not be glibly received. If Audet is correct in his judgment that the whole work in its original form predates 70 A.D: it is surely a most significant fact precisely that such an early work does not present an eschatology with such an emphasis on immediacy, so conceived, in relation to the consummation of the age. This would mean, in fact, that the basic platform on which Kraft's judgment is apparently based, would be faulty.

It may be agreed that the Two Ways document, as set forth in the first six chapters of the Didache does not lay heavy stress on eschatological matters. Yet this is in part what we would expect, if it is a Christian adaptation of a Jewish document, and further, if it be argued that despite this Jewish source the Epistle of Barnabas does stress
eschatological interest even in this Two Ways section, we must see
that what the Didache does not emphasize in chapters I-VI is 'present'
eschatology: it does not have what Kraft terms, in respect of Barnabas,
"an atmosphere charged with present eschatological drama". In other
words, if we remove from our minds the supposition that eschatology must
be highly charged with the sense of 'immediacy' (which is what Kraft is
concerned about), then it is no longer apparent that even the first six
chapters of the Didache have little interest in eschatological matters.

THE FRAMEWORK OF CHAPTERS I-VI: ITS RELEVANCE TO ESCHATOLOGY.

It will be our procedure now to examine the first six chapters for
their eschatological bearing, if any, and then to look at the other
specified sections of the Didache which seem to deal especially with
eschatology (8:2; 9:4; 10:5-6), with special attention to the
'appendix' in chapter XVI. In looking at the first six chapters it is
clear that what we need to study closely is the framework. It is here,
if anywhere, that eschatology is likely to be introduced, since the
assumption that the groundwork is a Jewish document for the instruction
of proselytes adapted to Christian purposes, seems sound. Certainly,
even so far as originally Jewish content is concerned, it would not be
likely that the futurist note would be entirely absent. Thus, at
chapter IV:7 we find a comment, which may not derive from the Jewish
groundwork of these chapters, but which could yet have come from it,
since its tone is in keeping with Jewish thought, as well as with the
Christian understanding: `οὐ διστάσεις δούλων οὐδὲ δισούσ
γογγύσεις· γνώσθη γὰρ, τίς ἐστιν ο τῶν μισθοῦν
καλὸς ἀντιποδότης'.

The concept of divine judgment, and of punishments and rewards, is both
thoroughly Jewish in tone and 'eschatological', even if the judgment

1 op. cit., p. 7.
in view be seen as falling during the course of this world or this life. In this passage ethics and eschatology belong together, as so frequently in Early Christian thought which lays quite heavy stress on the note of coming Judgment, when it thinks of the consummation of the age.

However, it is the framework of chapters I-VI which must now occupy our attention. It is interesting that S.E. Johnson has argued\(^1\) that the whole Didache represents an expansion of the Gospel of Matthew, especially of Matt. 28:19-20. We recall the words 'τοῖς Ἐβραίοις' in the title in certain texts, including the Codex Hierosolymitanus, discovered by Bryennios in 1873. When we go on to note that the first six chapters provide 'teaching' in catechetical form, that chapter VII discusses Baptism, and that liturgical instruction and models occur in chapters VIII-X which could be taken as corresponding to the injunction to teach all nations "to observe everything that I have commanded you", we can appreciate the thought that part of the Didache is an expansion of Matt. 28:19-20. Beyond this, it is noteworthy that in chapters XI-XV most of the quotations come from Matthew's Gospel (Did. XI:7-Matt. XII:31; XII:1=Matt. XXI:9; XIII:1=Matt. X:10, etc.; XIV:1=Matt. V:23; XV:3=Matt. V:22-26 and XVIII:15-35), and that the eschatological 'appendix' in chapter XVI is based on the 'Little Apocalypse' of our Lord with the closest affinities to the Matthean form of it, rather than the Marcan or the Lucan. Our interest in this matter at present is that this has a bearing on the kind of eschatological framework into which, we would claim, chapters I-VI of the Didache have been placed. It is true that H. Koester denies the Matthean influence on the Didache, except in 1:3-5 along with Lucan influence. His conclusion is that the Didachist's primary source was the oral tradition.\(^2\) Nevertheless, the position

---


adopted by Johnson has a certain appeal in view of the evidence, and our concern here is not with the whole of his thesis, though this may well be sound, but only with the way in which his thesis would help us to understand the setting of the Didache, chapters I-VI.

What we have suggested so far in regard to the Didache as a whole is that we cannot view it as little concerned with eschatology simply because the concept of an imminent consummation of the age does not seem prominent. But, if this be so, and we wish to claim that eschatology is in fact one definite interest of the Didache, we have to be able to show what kind of eschatological interest is displayed. Johnson's view, we believe, provides the clue to this, not only for chapters I-VI, in giving the originally Jewish material now adapted for Christian purposes a setting, but also for the whole work. If a dominant interest of this book is found in an expansion on the theme of Matt. 28:19-20, then it is clear that the eschatology of the work, such as it may be, will have to be consistent with the missionary interest of that section at the close of Matthew's Gospel. It seems in principle unlikely that a work which has this special interest in the ingathering of 'the nations' should stress the note of 'immediacy' with reference to the close of the age. Rather we should expect to find a view of eschatology that is consistent with the thought of the way in which God by His Spirit is in this age gathering in the elect from all nations prior to the end of the age. It is not that the Parousia of Christ in glory, together with the immediately preceding appearance of Antichrist and the related events of Early Christian expectation, are not in view, but rather that the writer or compiler(s) of the Didache think(s) of the present age of missionary expansion as reaching out towards the consummation. This understanding may be 'submerged', but it is one which makes sense of the Didache and explains both certain outcroppings and how a document which may well be very early, in its
original form, seems to have little to say on eschatological matters. On this view, then, the truth is that the Didache has a definite eschatological understanding in view, but that it is concerned with missionary teaching and expansion as fulfilling that part of the divine providence which our Lord had revealed as requiring to be passed through prior to the consummation of the age itself.

We shall have occasion later to look briefly at the 'appendix' in chapter XVI. Meanwhile, however, it is relevant to what has just been said about the eschatological understanding, which forms the framework of chapters I-VI, to note what part of the divine economy of history has been reached at the time of the composition of the Didache. Thus, chapter XVI, after an initial exhortation to 'watch' and 'be ready', since we do not know ἐν ἡ ὁ Κύριος ἡμᾶς ἔρχεται (para. 1), and a reminder that the whole period of faith will not profit us if we are not perfected in the last time (para. 2: this assertion is also made at Barnabas IV:9), goes on to remind us that in the last days false prophets and corrupters are to abound, this it would seem, with increasing tempo until Antichrist himself appears. (paras. 3-4). When we compare these comments with Matthew 24 it becomes apparent that they are a fairly close representation of Jesus' words in vv. 10-13, in particular, within that chapter. What it is most instructive to observe is that Matt. 24:14, the very next verse, asserts that "this gospel of the kingdom will be preached throughout the whole world as a testimony to all nations; and then the end will come" (R.S.V.) What this means is that the compiler of the Didache has this verse in mind, even though he does not expressly cite it, and further that he sees the era of persecutions and the emergence of false prophets as contemporaneous with that of the preaching of the Gospel to all nations. This helps to show what are the basic presuppositions in the mind of
the Didachist. He sees the present age in which he is ministering as that which, in the divine providence, precedes the end. The teaching given in this work is with a view to the fulfilling of Jesus' command, as recorded at Matt. 28:19-20, and seeks to instruct those who among the Gentile nations await with those of Jewish race, with whom they are now one in Christ, the consummation of the age.

We proceed now to examine briefly those scattered sections which seem to have some kind of direct bearing on eschatological matters. Two of those listed earlier (above, p.172) fall within chapters IX-X, which belong together and concerning which there has been much discussion, especially in regard to the question whether they prescribe a 'Eucharist liturgy' or relate to the Agape practised by the Primitive Church. A brief reference, however, should first be made to chapter VII, with its discussion of Baptism. It has already been noted (above, p. 173) that the discussion of Baptism in the Didache helps to suggest that the Didache is in part an expansion of Matt. 28:19-20. Here we wish simply to comment on Did. VII:1 which actually relates the act of baptizing to the prior giving of the instruction found in the Two Ways section, in chapters I-VI. Here we find these words: Ἠ.ΤΩΚΑ ΠΡΩΤΑ ΠΡΟΕΠΩΝΤΕΣ. ΚΑΤΩΝΩΣ ΕΙΣ ΤΟ ὉΩΜΑ. This explicit placing of Baptism after the giving of the prior instruction certainly seems to confirm not only that the Didache is a catechetical document but also that in these early chapters, if not in the whole work, Matt. 28:19-20 is in view. We have already noted the bearing upon eschatology of such an interest in this Matthean passage. We may add the remark here that the Didachist not only thinks in general terms of the age of preaching to the nations as preceding the close of the age (as confirmed, for example, by his implications in XVI:1-4, as pointed out above, p. 175), but that any reference to the last verses of Matthew's Gospel can
hardly avoid having eschatological overtones, for they clearly envisage the preaching of the Gospel as bounded by the terminus of the age. Jesus promises His Presence to His disciples peculiarly in terms of the missionary task assigned to them, and it is implicit in Matt. 28:20 that that task will be completed by the consummation of the age.

It should also be noted that chapter VII, in company with the immediately following chapters in particular (VIII-X), implies an understanding of the Church which is eschatologically oriented. J. Danielou and other scholars note the insistence on 'ἐν ὑψώσει' as a distinctly Jewish Christian feature. In chapter VIII note is taken of the instruction to pray thrice daily which is in agreement with the practice of the Essenes and of the Qumran community. Danielou also notes the Jewish Christian character of the prayers of blessing in chapters IX and X, namely, their allusion to the Wine of David, the use of the expression 'Θεοῦ' for Jesus, and the reference to the tabernacling of the Name. Again, the 'Maran tha' cry at the end of chapter X "is the most precious relic of the primitive Aramaic liturgy of Jerusalem."¹ The relevance of this for our present interest is that any linkages with the Qumran community, or with the thought-forms of the primitive Jewish Christian community, immediately suggest the concept of a community dominated by the expectation of God's fulfilment of His promises. The Qumran community was plainly one with a keen sense of eschatological expectation. Entrance into their community was into a group of people imbued with such outlook and hope. As for the primitive Christian community, it differed only in thinking that God's promises had only just been fulfilled in Jesus of Nazareth -- though some of them might still be in process of fulfilment and others might lie at some unknown distance in the future.

That the concept of the Church imbedded in these middle chapters

¹ **op. cit.**, p. 29. All the comments of Danielou, noted in this paragraph, are found at this place.
of the Didache really is eschatologically oriented can be seen by more than an oblique implication from the Jewish Christian character of them. This is very obvious in the sections to be noted at VII:2; IX:4; and X:4. It is perhaps most readily apparent in the last two. Both of these passages think in terms of the 'gathering' of the Church 'from the ends of the earth' (IX:4) or 'from the four winds' (10:5) into God's Kingdom. Although the context of discussion in both instances is the prescription of prayer either for the Agape or the Eucharist, there are more immediate allusions in the concept of the 'gathering' of the People of God. In IX:4 the comparison is with the sowing of the seed of the grain and its unification in the loaf of bread and possibly to the scattering of Christ's followers prior to the crucifixion of the Lord. In X:5 the futurist note is more prominent and the thought is that God will preserve His Church from all evil and bring it at last into His Kingdom. Probably the preservation of the elect members of the Church during the final period of tribulation and persecution prior to Christ's Advent in glory is here in view. Certainly such woes must have been included in the phrase, 'απὸ παντὸς πανηγροῦ'. The verb, 'τελεσθῆναι', is also suggestive of this interpretation, since it was frequently employed of the martyrdom of individual Christians in the days of the Early Church. What is implicit in these two passages is a parallelism between the experience of the Church and of her Lord. Just as Jesus suffered (the common reference to broken bread in symbolism of the death of Christ seems to make the assumption of such a reference in IX:4 fairly safe), so it is expected that the Church should suffer prior to her experience of resurrection at Christ's Appearing in glory. Further, the allusion in X:5 to deliverance from every evil probably has a reference backwards to chapter VIII:2, where the Lord's Prayer is set forth and the words, 'ἐξ ἀλλήλου ἑκατὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ πανηγροῦ', occur. It is
commonly asserted that this phrase in our Lord's Prayer probably had in its origin and early understanding a definite reference to coming 'eschatological woes'. All this helps to strengthen our case that what is implicit right through the passages cited in chapters VIII-X of the Didache is an understanding of the Church as the People of God which is eschatologically determined. The Church is the People of God that is now being gathered together from all four corners of the world and which will stand revealed, in her true enrolment and assemblage, when she has passed through the final period of testing which will usher in the Kingdom of God. It is noteworthy that 'the kingdom' seems to refer to that which is still to come rather than that which has already arrived. At the same time the very fact that the Church is being gathered from all four corners of the world indicates clearly that she has only come into existence since the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ and the fulfilment of the command of the Risen Lord to 'teach all nations --'. The eschatology imbedded, therefore, in this concept of the Church, is of an 'inaugurated' character. It reminds one of those grandiose Jewish Christian portrayals of angels in such literature as 'The Gospel of Peter', in which their feet are on earth but their heads in 'the sky' or in 'heaven'. The Church is a community whose future is laid up for her by God.

The reference at IX:5 to letting no one eat or drink from your , which must at least refer to some kind of fellowship-meal, and the connection of those who are to be permitted so to eat and drink with the baptized, underlines the eschatological implications both of Baptism and the ceremonial fellowship meal envisaged, whether it be technically best regarded as an Agape or a Eucharist. At first sight all that it emphasizes is the exclusive character of the community. Yet in context one has to take cognizance also of the inclusiveness of the
community. It includes people from all corners of the world, and its exclusiveness consists in the fact that it is looking not to the present world for its hope, but to the coming Kingdom of God. Thus, both Baptism and Eucharist (or its equivalent) are set in a thoroughly eschatological context. If certain are not to eat or drink with the saints, in agreement with our Lord's word at Matt. 7:6, the thought is latent in the Didache that 'οἱ κόσμος 'have no part in the coming Kingdom of God.

In the passage at X:6, we have a clear indication of eschatological interest and it is difficult to believe that the phraseology and expression are purely tradition:

"έλθειν Χριστός καὶ πάρελθεῖν ὁ κόσμος ὅτοις, 'Εστίν ἡ θεία Δύναμις. εἰ τις ἁγιός ἐστιν, ἐρχόμενος εἰ τις οὐκ ἐστι, μετανοεῖτω, μηρὰν λήτη. ζωὴν." 

The Coptic version replaces the first clause with the expression, 'May the Lord come'. In any event, what is looked for is clearly the Appearing of Christ in glory. The reference to the transitory character of this world-system (κόσμος) and the expression of desire for its passing is probably not to be viewed as the expression of a world-denying eschatological outlook. The 'Marana tha' cry's appearing in this section probably shows that the linkage of thought is with such a passage as Rev. 22:20: "Ναι ἐρχομαι ταχύ. ἡμᾶς ἐρχομαι, κύριε Ἰησοῦς.

If this be so, it is an indication that what the Didachist looks for is not the denial or repudiation of this world-system, but its glorification in the age that is to come. What the Book of Revelation looks for is 'a new heaven and a new earth', not the complete repudiation of 'worldly' values. What the Didachist repudiates is not 'this world', but he does long for the passing of 'this age'.

CHAPTER XVI: APPENDIX? OR CLIMAX OF BOOK?

We turn briefly to chapter XVI. We have already had occasion to
note that paragraphs 3-4 seem to be a fairly close commentary on Matt. 24:10-13. We noted too that the Didachist seems to see this age as that of Gospel proclamation and accompanying persecution and apostasy. We must now note in a little more detail what this chapter of the Didache sets out as its full expectation. In the first paragraph we are exhorted to be 'ready' (ἐτοιμοῖο), since we do not know the hour in which our Lord may come. This is an allusion to Matt. 24:44 (cf. Mk. 13:35 -- the form of words is decidedly Matthean). The exhortation to 'watch' is derived from the same context (Matt. 24:42), while the reference to making sure that the lamps are not snuffed out again relates the thought to the Parable of the Virgins in Matt. 25. It is interesting that the Didachist can quote these references to uncertainty regarding the day or hour of the Lord's Coming without implying, as we would naturally assume, what has been termed an 'any-moment' expectation. The following paragraphs make this abundantly clear. If this seems inconsistent, it is a repetition of an inconsistency which already appears in Matthew 24. That chapter and its parallels in Mark 13 and Luke 21 all refer to future events, including the reign of Antichrist (so at any rate the Early Church Fathers generally understood): what is actually spoken of clearly there is a time of great tribulation, which is to be accompanied or followed by signs in the heavens and then the Appearing of the Son of Man in power and glory. And yet there we find also the exhortation to be ready since we do not know the day or hour when our Lord will come. It is particularly interesting that the Didachist seems unaware of any tension between these perspectives.

In paragraph 2 of this chapter we have an exhortation to the gathering together of the saints, since 'the whole time of faith will not benefit us, unless we are perfected in the last time'. The reference to being gathered together (προκύψαι δὲ συναγησθεῖσθαι), is interesting. It confirms that for this book the Church is understood
essentially in terms of her eschatological orientation. It is not simply that to gather together is likely to give mutual comfort and strengthening, however true this may be. Rather the thought is that such gathering together presages the final gathering together of the Church into the Kingdom, such as is spoken of at IX:4 and X:5. The latter part of this paragraph is paralleled at Barnabas IV:9:

"ο ὑπελήξεις ἡμῶς ὀ τὸς χρόνος τῆς πίστεως ἡμῶν, ἡμῖν μὴ νῦν ἐν τῷ ἄνομῳ καὶ τοῖς μέλλουσιν σκυνδάλους, ὥσ πρέπει νιώθου θεὸν ἀντιστῶμεν, ἵνα μὴ σχῆ παρείσδυσιν ὥ μέλις."

The explanation of the concessive clause is interesting, for it helps us to understand the meaning of the conditional clause in the Didache. It is quite clear in the passage in Barnabas that there is a twofold reference in mind. The first, in context, is to the passage at Deut. 9:9-16 which recalls how Moses received the covenant from God in the mountain (Horeb), but while he was there with God the people under Aaron made the golden calf. Pseudo-Barnabas seems to understand (cf. Barn. XIV:1, 4) that, though Moses received the covenant, the Israelitish people never did. In Barn. IV the point, then, is that, though God calls a people, that is not in itself a guarantee of final salvation. Christians must remember this! The second implication, however, is not to the past, but to the future: a time of great stress is coming, and it will not be sufficient to follow God now, if we do not resist unto death in that period. The first part of Barnabas IV deals with Daniel 7 and thus it is clear that what Pseudo-Barnabas has in mind are the coming pressures of the period of the 'little horn' of Daniel 7:8. The thought seems to be that this testing will reveal at that time which of those who name Christ's Name will prove to be the elect ones by their steadfastness. It is surely this understanding which also undergirds the clause, "unless you be perfected at the last time", 182.
Where it occurs in the Didache.

Paragraphs 3 and 4 of Didache XVI have already been dealt with (above page 173). They confirm, amongst other things, that in paragraph 2 the Didachist really has in mind the coming time of 'lawlessness' (λογομηχανία). The term, 'λογομηχανία', is the very one employed by St. Paul in 2 Thess. 2 and this serves to confirm that the Didachist understands 'ὁ κόσμος ταυτον' as the Antichrist, spoken of in that chapter by the Apostle. Thus, the Didachist in these first four paragraphs of chapter XVI warns the converts from Gentile lands to be ready for their Lord's Coming, since they do not know when it will be, and then goes on to think of the present period of Gospel expansiveness throughout the nations (which makes necessary this work) as one of increasing apostasy in the Church and of persecution, which intensifies until the arch-deceiver himself of prophetic prediction appears - the antichrist of 2 Thess. 2 - and the terrible period, spoken of by our Lord (Matt. 24:22), arrives.

Paragraph 5 confirms that in paragraph 2 the meaning of the conditional clause is truly that only those who do not deny Christ in the period of 'eschatological woes' will be saved. The phrase, 'ὑπὸ αὐτοῦ τοῦ κατὰ θεματος', is somewhat of a puzzle. It can mean, "by the curse itself" or "by that which is cursed" or again, as Robert A. Kraft translates, "by him who was accursed". Kraft notes, however, that "Georg--has something like 'from this frightful curse' (i.e. the fiery test, or destruction)." This seems to accord best with the general meaning, though it is impossible to be certain about this. Kraft is not sure whether the 'πιρωσία', referred to here, has to do with judgment taking place before the Lord's Return, but he inclines to the view that what is envisaged is the climactic crisis for mankind before the Lord's Return, alluded to by Jesus -- in the 'Little Apocalypse'.

1 op. cit., p. 176. Note j. 'Georg.' refers to a complete Georgian version - 19th cent. MS. Translation itself may be as early as the 5th century.
This seems to be the best solution, and it accords with the understanding that we have suggested for paragraph 2. The alternative possibility in Kraft's mind is that what paragraph 5 outlines is a view of judgment which not only takes place before the Lord's Return, but which makes judgment at Christ's Coming superfluous. He notes in this connection that the Codex Hierosolymitanus ends in XVI:8 with the statement that "the world will see the Lord coming on the clouds of heaven", thus ruling out the further words witnessed to by the Georgian version and by the evidence of the Apostolic Constitutions, which speak of the purpose of Christ's Coming as being to give to each man in accordance with his works. In this connection it is further noted that in paragraph 7 the resurrection is not of all the dead, but only of the saints, as a sign of their endurance and triumph.

What are we to understand by paragraph 5 and the reference to the resurrection of the saints only in paragraph 7? Kraft does not discuss the possibility that the Didachist is working with a millenarian scheme in mind. This would allow for the climactic crisis of the End-time, which is a kind of judgment on the world but not such as to rule out Final Judgment, and for that Final Judgment, which would follow, but only at the end of the millennium. In this whole context Kraft outlines strictly two possibilities. One is that paragraph 5 deals with "the final world conflagration envisioned in some sources (as 2 Pet. 3:10, 12) -- with a Stoic background", while the other is "the climactic crisis for mankind before the triumphal return of 'the Lord'...".¹ He elects the second alternative, and actually wonders whether one can combine with this outlook the view that this climactic crisis is envisaged by the Didachist as judgment in such a way as to rule out a Judgment Day

¹ op. cit., p. 176.
when Christ has actually returned.

Paragraph 6 speaks of the emergence of 'σημαία τῆς ἀλήθειας'.

It is interesting that, in following what is said at Matt. 24:30-31, the Didachist takes rather seriously the concept of a visual sign in the heavens and an auditory one impinging on the sense of hearing. Taken literally Matt. 24:30 gives the impression that 'the tribes of the earth' will see the sign of Christ's Coming in the heaven (presumably this means here, the sky) before Christ actually arrives, and that the sending out of Christ's angels to gather together the elect will be accompanied by a blast of the archangel's trumpet. Whether the Didachist thinks that the gathering together of the elect is for the purpose of delivering them from persecution as this reaches its climax immediately prior to Christ's Appearing is a question that may be raised. Paragraph 5 seems to show that it is rather for the purpose of gathering together those who have remained faithful, but it may be that there is envisaged their being caught up to meet Christ in the air, as Paul speaks of in I. Thess. 4:17. This is not so unlikely as may at first appear, since that Pauline passage thinks of this being caught up in conjunction with the prior resurrection of the dead in Christ. Significantly Matt. 24 says nothing about the resurrection of the dead, but it is the third sign in the Didachist's thinking in this section: the other two are the spreading out of the sign in heaven and the sounding of the trumpet. In any event, what is portrayed graphically here, in faithfulness to Matthew 24 and probably I Thess. 4, is an event of cosmic significance, which has profound consequence for heaven, earth, and the underworld. All three areas are shaken to their foundations by Christ's Appearing.

Paragraph 7 has an explicit reference to I Thess. 4:16 in that it qualifies which of the dead are to be raised, namely, those who are in Christ. The reference here is quite clear, but what we have is a
paraphrase rather than quotation. It is only in paragraph 8 that we reach the actual seeing of the Lord as coming on the clouds of heaven (Matt. 24:30). It is interesting that paragraphs 5, 6 and 8 all begin with the use of the Greek word, 'τὸ ἐρχόμενον', which seems to put it beyond doubt that the Didachist is thinking explicitly in terms of an order of events -- first, the period of great tribulation; second, the period of the signs, visual, auditory, and in terms of the resurrection of the saints; and third, the actual seeing of Christ coming on the clouds of glory by the world. What this demonstrates is that chapter XVI of the Didache thinks explicitly and literally in terms of Matthew 24 and I Thess. 4. There is no spiritualizing of concepts, and the significance of this section can only be minimized by referring to it as an 'appendix'. It may well be that it should properly be viewed as the climax of the work. It is for such events that the Church, now being gathered from the nations, awaits.

ESCHATOLOGY IN THE DIDACHE: AN ASSESSMENT.

What may we take as the significant points from the above review of the eschatological teaching and implications of the Didache? First, there is a very significant combination of the note of immediacy in expectation with the recognition that certain events had yet to be fulfilled before Christ could come. There is no sense of tension over this. If this document be in fact in its basic form prior to 70 A.D. in origin, this helps us to see that it was assumed that there were to be certain clearly defined stages in the divine pattern of history prior to Christ's Return. Certainly, it is possible that it was thought that all these events might come fairly quickly, but the basic standpoint is one which allows for such stages while talking of 'immediacy'. The Book of Daniel is almost certainly in the background of thinking, since references to the Son of Man and His coming on clouds picture for us a scene which is derived ultimately from Daniel 7. Is it possible that
what the Didachist understood was that, if four world empires had already passed, the fourth—the Roman-being now in power, and if the Son of man, in the person of Jesus of Nazareth, had anticipated His Coming in glory by appearing first in humility, then the Advent in glory could not be far behind—however long or short a time it might be in terms of years? This is in any event, not impossible. A second and related point is the interest of this work in the Church as an eschatologically oriented community. This again seems to fit in with the interest of Daniel 7 in the "saints of the Most High". We have observed this above in discussing chapters IX and X especially. The stress in this work on the gathering of the Church from the nations also accords with the interest of Daniel 7 in the service of the Son of Man by "all peoples, nations, and languages." The concern of this work for the Church in relation to eschatological perspective is considerable. One may say that the Church is defined in terms of eschatology. She is the community of those who are to inherit the kingdom. Is this especially the 'kingdom' of Daniel 7:18? It is at least a distinct possibility. The correlation of XVI:2 with Barnabas IV:9, and the implication of the context of Barn. IV:9 with its discussion of Daniel 7, suggests that this is much more likely than would appear from the lack of direct reference to Daniel 7 in the Didache. A third, and final point is that this work may not be primarily concerned with eschatology, but it is so concerned with the Church. If, however, it be true that the Church be defined in terms of her relationship to eschatological events, then eschatology is in fact a most significant factor in this whole work. We should judge that this is in reality the situation.

We may say then, that the eschatology of this work is definitely futurist, while observing that it expects certain events to intervene before the Parousia of Christ in glory. This is worked out positively
with reference to the missionary programme of the Church and negatively in that certain prophesied events have to occur in terms of persecution of the People of God before the End. This finding is particularly salutary, if a date for this work before 70 A.D. can really be sustained. It is true, of course, that if the date be so early, the absence of any reduction of futurism in eschatology will not invalidate the thesis of Dodd and Werner that the lengthening passage of time produced an embarrassment over the delay of the Parousia and a consequent diminution of emphasis upon futurist eschatology. The fact that the work is so early might be given as the reason why the futuristic element had not been reduced. At the same time what is very significant, if this early date is to be accepted, is that in fact we do not find in it any sense of expectation that Christ will arrive at any moment. In fact the futurist note is present, but is very soberly presented. Both the expectation of the fulfilment of certain prophesied events and the expectation of opportunity to fulfil the Great Commission given by Christ suggest indeed the likelihood that the writer or compiler(s) felt it unlikely that Christ would come in a very brief period of time. The question which this raises is whether in fact the whole theory of a fervent expectation of Christ's more or less 'immediate' Coming in glory which burned fiercely at first and gradually cooled off, is not an entire misrepresentation. C.H. Dodd, indeed, thought that even the passage of a very few years must have created the need for some transformation in the eschatological understanding of the Primitive Church. Of this there is no evidence in this work.

'Realized' and 'futurist' elements are held together in this work in easy balance. The doctrine of the Church and the emphasis on her mission represent the note of 'realized eschatology'. The whole understanding of this work makes it clear that the Church and her mission are
products of the Incarnation, envisaged as initiating the End-time. At the same time, there seems latent a deep appreciation of stages in God's plan for this final Church age, and there is no sense that the very last hour is yet upon the Church. Again, it is an inaugurated eschatology which is most clearly in evidence. Perhaps the most significant feature of this work is the way in which it probably derives its understanding both of the 'futurist' and the 'realized' elements from the Book of Daniel, in combination with the Little Apocalypse. The very final events are yet ahead, but the Church is the community which goes to meet them in the strength of her Lord.
THE EPISTLE OF BARNABAS.

This tractate has an interest similar to that of the canonical Epistle to the Hebrews: its concern is to remind us that in Jesus Christ the long expected events of salvation have decisively occurred. Like that Epistle, however, what has already been achieved in the Incarnation does not displace that which is to come. It may, therefore, be most accurate to speak with regard to this Epistle of an eschatology that is in process of realization. The thought is present in 'Barnabas' of a predestined and foretold series of events, which are now coming to pass. "ἐγινόμενον γὰρ ἡμῖν ὁ διεσκότης διὰ τῶν κρατήσων τὰ κερεληθοῦσα καὶ τὰ ἐνεστῶτα, καὶ τῶν μελλόντων δοσὶ ἀρχῆς ἡμῖν γεέως, ὡς τί καθ’ ἐκκλησίαν ἐνεργοῦμεν, καθὼς ἐλήφθης, ὁφείλομεν πλησιότερον καὶ ὑψιλότερον προσάγειν τῷ ρόβῳ αὐτοῦ." (1:7)

The whole argument of this work makes this clear, indeed. The time of Israel (also a time of misunderstanding on her part) belongs to the past, the Incarnation marks the transition to the present, and gradually there unfolds before the Church the events that have been forecast which culminate at the Parousia of the Lord.

POSTPONEMENT OF THE END?

R.M. Grant thinks that Barnabas is concerned to postpone the end for as long as he can. In saying this Grant relies upon a line of reasoning which sees a contradiction between statements which assure us that the day of the Lord is at hand and the interpretation of the present era in chapter XV as being a sixth period of one thousand years since the creation of the world, that had to run its course. The relevant passage in chapter XV quotes Gen. 2:2 and comments: "προσέχετε, τέκνα, τί λέγει τὸ συντελέσθαι εν ἐς ἡμέραις. τούτο λέγει, ὅτι ἐν ἑβακιοχιλίῳ ἐτέσιν συντελέσθη αὐτὸς καὶ συμμακαντε. ἡ γὰρ ἡμέρα παρ’ αὐτῷ σημαίνει χίλια ἐτη, αὐτὸς δὲ μοι μαρτυρεῖ λέγων· Ίδο, ἡμέρα κυρίου ἐσται ἐς χίλια ἐτη, ὡς τίνι, ἐς ἡμέρας, ἐν τοῖς ἑβακιοχιλίοις ἐτέσιν συντελεσθήσεται τὰ σομακαντε." (Para.4)
Grant says: "If Barnabas' readers were as intelligent as he says they were, they could not have failed to realize that according to Jewish chronology the world was no more than 5,500 years old, and the end was therefore not very close."¹ With reference to this matter, it may first of all be remarked in general terms that a tension between statements of eschatological imminence and apparent provision for a period of waiting, however illogical it may seem to us, had appeared before Barnabas. It is witnessed to in the Old Testament scriptures, as well as being a feature of the New Testament writings, with which it is possible that 'Barnabas' is contemporaneous. What makes this fifteenth chapter of 'Barnabas' difficult is its delimitation of time. One wonders, however, how literally these periods of one thousand years are to be taken. May it not simply have denoted a long period of time? When we remember how apocalyptists were able to juggle events to fit periods, Grant's line of reasoning does not seem very convincing. We have to remember that Grant himself believes that the continuing passage of years and particularly the failure of the Fall of Jerusalem to lead up to the Parousia produced the need for an apologetic to account for the continuing delay of the Parousia; such a situation is reflected in the words at II Peter 3:8 concerning a day's being with the Lord as a thousand years, where v.9 makes it explicit that there were those who doubted on account of this delay. Doubtless there were outsiders to the Church who criticized thus and doubtless there were those within the fold of the Church also whose faith waxed dim, but this does not mean that the Early Church felt it necessary to produce an elaborate construction of events to refute such charges. As usual, in the writings of the first two Christian centuries, the Church's point of view was that it required faith to see the hidden meaning in a series of events. All apologetic could do was to demonstrate the appropriateness of the outward happenings to prophecy.

or Christian interpretation. No proof could be afforded, but from within the standpoint of faith the events could be so presented as to be con-
formable to the Christian understanding of history. Grant's jibe regarding the "intelligence" which the writer of 'Barnabas' assumes in his readers misses the mark: the point is that what 'Barnabas' assumes its readers possess is spiritual discernment. With such, it is highly doubtful whether any elaborate attempt to reconcile the expectation of the imminent Parousia of the Lord with the 'time-lag', by means of an explanation in terms of a protracted section of the current thousand years still to be run, would be considered necessary or helpful. If it be said that, even if 'Barnabas' meant simply a long period of time, the argument of Grant holds good, it must be replied that it is what is known regarding current Jewish chronology that gives Grant's reasoning its sharpness at least. Without such a fixed point in the current millenium that Jewish chronology thus provided, it cannot convincingly be established that this tractate assumed that a considerable portion of it remained to be outworked in concrete history.

Apart from the arguments presented above, it would appear, however, that the major concern of 'Barnabas' is not with questions of chronology at all. What Barnabas XV really deals with is the way in which Christ and the Church make meaningful the story of creation in six days and the account of God's day of rest that followed. Jean Daniélou has shown that the Early Church had a considerable interest in the Hexaemeron and its significance. Barnabas apparently has in mind also an 'eighth day' which is to follow a millenium on the seventh 'day' that is to have its duration under conditions of time and space. This chapter is important for the consideration of millenarianism. It is noteworthy that, if
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Barnabas was really concerned to imply a 500 year-delay before 'the End', he was apparently equally concerned with an 'eighth day' beyond an earthly millennium or 'seventh day' at the end of the 500 year period that still remained of the 'sixth day'.

Paragraphs 5-8 of chapter XV present the evidence in this connection. Commenting on the words, "And he rested on the seventh day" (Gen. 2:1), Barnabas tells us what the futuristic significance of this statement is: "τοῦτο λέγει: ὅπως ἔλθων ὁ ὄς αὐτοῦ καταρρήσει τὸν καιρὸν τοῦ ἀνάμων καὶ κρίνει τὸν ἀσεβῆς καὶ ἐλλάδει τὸν ἥλιον καὶ τὴν σελήνην καὶ τοὺς ἄστερας, τότε καλῶς κατακλύσεται ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἐβδόμῃ." (Para. 5)

Paragraphs 6 and 7 make it clear that no one has at present the power to keep holy the day which God made holy. It will only be τότε (para. 7), i.e. on that seventh day (clearly envisaged as a 'thousand years' like the previous six 'days'), when we rest thoroughly (καλῶς κατακλύσαμεν) and when there is no longer any lawlessness (μηκέτι οὐκ ἐστὶν τῆς ἀνοίας), that we shall be able to keep the Sabbath properly. It is significant that the concept of this period is one of rest. Paul thinks at II Thessalonians 1:7 of the Second Advent as a granting of rest to those who are afflicted (εἰκερ δίκαιον παρὰ θεῷ καταποδοῦναι τοὺς θλίβοντιν ὑπὸ θλίψιν καὶ ὑπὸ τοὺς παραδόντας ἰσον μεθ' θημῶν) and II Thessalonians 2:1-12 makes it clear that it is ἡ ἀνοία that the saints will be given rest from that time. In paragraph 8 Is. 1:13 is dealt with: "Your new moons and sabbaths I cannot endure."
Barnabas thus interprets: "οἰκτε, πῶς λέγει; οὐ τε νόν σάββατα ἐμοί δεκτα, ἀλλὰ ἡ κεκοιμηκα, ἐν ἀνακαθάλας τε πάντα ἥμισσον ἡμέρας ὑμῶν κοίμησαι, ὁ ἐστιν ἅλλος κόσμου ἔχειν." In context this must refer to another age beyond the period of rest, the millennium. Barnabas does go on to say: "διὸ καὶ ἔγομεν τῇ
These words make clear that Barnabas recognizes some sense in which already jubilation is in order, since Christ has already risen on the eighth day of the week. That which guarantees the coming of that age or world beyond even the period of rest, is already accomplished, and Christ is entered on His victorious reign at God's right hand. Nevertheless present accomplishment does not make needless future actuality.

It is clear surely that Barnabas is not concerned primarily with periods of time (though this is in his mind), but rather is concerned to show us how in Christ the 'final day' prior to the establishment of God's kingdom on earth has been realized. God's plan, Genesis tells us, was to finish His work of creation in six days. Christ by His life and Work, has made this possible. All of this is in the context of a series of parallels being made in the Epistle of Barnabas between the Old Covenant and the New, or, to put it more nearly as Barnabas expresses it, between the older mistaken Israelitish understanding of the covenant and the true interpretation which has recently been vindicated by the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ. Thus, water in the Old Testament foreshadows Baptism, and the temple foreshadows the Church (chs. XI and XVI respectively): similarly, the true meaning and fulfilment of the Old Testament institution of the Sabbath is the coming period of God's rest, which issues from the work of Christ. If this be so, then Barnabas is concerned not merely with chronology but with a time that has a filled content. It is hard to deny altogether that Barnabas is concerned with theology, but this is because Hebraic thinking, which appears to be fundamental here, does not think, as has been pointed out in recent discussions of comparative concepts of time,\(^1\) merely about time as a frame-
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work: this is how we tend to envisage time. Rather it thinks of times as being part of events, be they past, present, or future. Thus, although Barnabas thinks in terms of an 'eight-day' period, revealed in the Genesis portrayal of the Hexaemeron augmented by the fulness of revelation in Christ, what binds these eight days together is no abstract conception of time as a frame of reference within which events are situated. Rather is it the conception of God's faithfulness to His covenanted mercy and purpose. 'Barnabas' says to us that God has in Christ achieved the decisive culminating point of all His work. This is the true meaning of the Old Testament institution of the Sabbath, whose meaning was misunderstood by most of the Israelites but which should now be apparent -- only faith is necessary to its discernment, Christian faith. Thus, it would appear that this book is not concerned, at least primarily, to give an apologetic for a delay in the Parousia; rather it sets itself to show how in Christ the decisive event has taken place that illuminates both past and future history and that witnesses supremely to God's faithfulness to His purposes and to His covenant.

THE COVENANT AND THE CHURCH.

In many respects it may be said that the fundamental theme of this work is that of the Epistle to the Hebrews, namely, the relationship between the Old Covenant and the New. It is generally held, however, that the Epistle of Barnabas betrays its inferiority by its undue emphasis upon misapprehension on the part of those of Old Testament times concerning the true import of the Law and Covenant. This is usually contrasted with the attitude both of the Epistle to the Hebrews and of St. Paul in his writings. W. Eltester says that "more emphatically than anywhere else in early Christianity, the relationship of the O.T. with Judaism is severed."1 The anti-Jewish tone of this work has generally led to the rejection of it as being Jewish Christian in origin.

and character. Daniélou, however, appears to us to have ably demonstrated persistent features of this didactic work which are Jewish Christian. He further reminds us that "criticism of the sacrifices of the Old Law, and polemic against official Judaism already existed among the Essenes; a fortiori, therefore, it is hardly surprising to discover it also among Jewish Christians." This latter point, made more emphatic by the Qumran discoveries and the connection usually made between Qumran and Essenism, seems to have made some impact upon a number of recent scholars, including R.M. Grant.

Grant finds it hard to make much sense out of the arrangement Barnabas has given his materials. This difficulty he connects with the fact that "the bulk of his book is essentially a collection of proof texts". He quotes, apparently with general approval, the division of this material by Prigent into three kinds, viz., (1) texts useful for anticultic polemic, (2) Jewish midrashic traditions, (3) messianic texts. He notes that Prigent treats the rejection of the dietary laws as belonging to the midrashic traditions, but feels that perhaps it goes rather with the anticultic texts. We mention this matter, because the treatment in Barnabas of the dietary laws is frequently seen as the most glaring example of a patent artificiality in Barnabas' apparent repudiation of the conviction, normal to early Christianity, that such laws were in fact originally intended by God for the Jews and were intended to be taken literally. Barnabas thinks thus not merely regarding the dietary laws, but regarding the Law generally. It is, however, very hard for us to imagine that these dietary laws in particular had originally a 'spiritual' significance. What we would wish to question in Grant is his suggestion that there is a certain incoherence in the work. The interpretation of the Law given (as in the matter of the dietary provisions) does indeed fall strangely

---

2 op. cit., p. 34
3 op. cit., p. 76.
upon modern ears, but, if moral allegories are found, can we deny that
they are to be found also in St. Paul’s writings? What Grant means
is that, in his zeal to show Christ as the fulfilment of the Old
Covenant, Barnabas has gone far beyond St. Paul and other early
Christian writers, such as the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews,
who were prepared at least to allow a certain historical value to the
Old Testament provisions of the Law in their own day and within their
own dispensation. It seems true that this Epistle does go further
than the New Testament writers, but one questions whether the gulf
between Barnabas and these canonical writers is as great as has been
suggested. Further, Daniełou appears to have suggested a perspective
from which much falls into place.

In discussing the Jewish Christian characteristics of the work,
Daniełou sees the question of literary genre as of importance. Most
scholars agree that this is not really a letter, but is rather a didac-
tic work, such as the Epistle to the Hebrews, which used the epistolary
form merely as a literary device. However, Daniełou goes much farther
than this in his discussion of its genre. “Here the Qumran manuscripts
-- provide the decisive touch-stone. For not only is it now known that
the Jews had collections of messianic testimonia, and that the Christians
used them, but above all the discovery of the Midrash of Habakkuk, and
of fragments of midrashim, of the other minor prophets, proves that there
existed among the Essenes a literary genre which is precisely that of
which the Epistle of Barnabas gives us the first Christian example.
In such works the prophecies are applied to contemporary events regarded
as fulfilling the eschatological promises. The only difference is that
the Epistle applies the method not to one continuous text, but to a
collection of testimonia.”¹ Daniełou sees also the constant reference

¹ op. cit., p. 34.
to 'γνώσις' (II:3) as significant of an emphasis upon eschatological realities. "In the case of the Midrash of Habakkuk the purpose is to impart knowledge of the mystery, the hidden meaning of the prophecies -- that is to say, their fulfilment in the Teacher of Righteousness and in the other contemporary events which are also events of the End (DSH VII, 1-8). To this the sense of 'gnosis' in the Epistle of Barnabas is exactly parallel." If Danielou be sound in his judgment, it seems likely that Grant's division into anticultic polemic, Jewish midrashic traditions, and messianic texts, however helpful in suggesting particular points in the argument of the Epistle, is superficial and overlooks an underlying unity of purpose. Seen in the light of the eschatological midrashim of Qumran, the artificiality of the understanding of the Old Testament dietary laws also finds some meaning. Quite clearly, the Epistle of Barnabas was not the first Christian work to see a fulfilment of prophecy in Jesus Christ and the Church. This is already found in the New Testament writings and especially in the Gospel according to St. Matthew. What was new was a way of looking at apparently immediate provisions and scriptures and finding in them an eschatological significance. Here it was not just prophecy that was involved but the whole earlier cultus. Further, here it was not isolated texts or provisions that were thus interpreted, but the whole argument of the Epistle is to give out for those with spiritual receptivity the hidden significance of God's dealings with the Jews in their every detail. The question may remain for us whether we can accept such reasoning, but the discovery of a literary background to the Epistle of Barnabas enables us to see that Barnabas was no more eccentric in his view of Judaism and its understanding of the Old Testament.
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1 _op. cit._, p. 34.
Rather we are now enabled to see that this Epistle uses another literary genre than that employed in the New Testament to set forth the realization of God's purposes in Jesus Christ. This must affect our estimate of the meaning and value of this work. At least it will prevent us from looking askance and in isolation at its view of dietary provisions. This will be seen only as one facet of a total argument for the finality of Jesus Christ.

The literary genre employed is bound up with the conception of this Epistle regarding the relationship of the Christian Church, on the one hand, and the Jewish nation, on the other, to God's covenant. Chapters IV and XIII are especially revealing in this regard.

In chapter IV the readers of the Epistle are exhorted (para. 6) not to be like certain persons who say "οἱ ἔλεγη τῇ διαθήκῃ ἐκεῖνων καὶ ἐμῶν ", where 'ἐκεῖνοι' plainly refers to those of Jewish nation and 'ἐμεῖς' to those of Christian faith. Paragraphs 7 and 8 recall how Moses was in the mountain with God for forty days and nights: and received the covenant from the Lord in the form of the tables of stone written by the finger of God. When Moses heard of the defection of Israel under Aaron in the matter of the worship of the golden calf (Exod. 32) he went down from the mountain and in his anger broke the tables of stone at the foot of it. Barnabas puts it thus: "..... καὶ εὐηκεν Μωϋσῆς καὶ ἔριψεν τὰς δύο πλάκας ἐκ τῶν χειρῶν αὐτοῦ: καὶ συνετράβη αὐτῶν ἡ διαθήκη, ὥσι καὶ τὸν ἡγαγμένον Ἰσαὰκ ἐγκατασφραγισθῇ εἰς τὴν καρδίαν ἡμῶν ἐν ἑλκίδι τῆς πίστεως αὐτοῦ." (Para. 8)

What is the importance of this relationship of the covenant with the Church, in regard to eschatology? It is interesting that chapter IV is markedly interested in eschatology and that the discussion of the question to whom the covenant belongs, is placed in a decidedly eschatological setting. Thus, the opening paragraphs of this chapter characterize the present as a time of lawlessness, which is soon to be
followed by "τὸ τέλειον σκίνδαλον" (para. 3). This is a reference to the final period of great tribulation or persecution under Antichrist. This is made more clear by the quotation of Dan. 7:24, which speaks of the emergence of ten kingdoms on the earth, after which a "little king" shall arise who shall subdue three of the ten kings (para. 4). This is followed by a further quotation from Daniel 7, this time from vv. 7-8, dealing with the emergence of the fourth beast, very wicked and powerful and "Χαλεποτέρου παρὰ κάτω τὰ θηρία τῆς θηλέως", from which sprang ten horns, and from which horns sprang one little horn which subdued three of the greater horns (para. 5). Clearly, what the Epistle of Barnabas is saying is that the fourth beast, which was to be greater than the former three, is the Roman empire, and, therefore, that we can look shortly for the emergence out of it of ten kingdoms. This, in turn, will soon be followed by the coming to power of Antichrist, as identified with the victorious 'little horn'. This interpretation is in keeping with the comment that the "final stumbling-block" is at hand. Now, it is in this context that the writer goes off, seemingly at a tangent, to condemn those who wish to share God's covenant between the Jews and the Christians. Surely, however, the writer himself views this discussion as in keeping with what has preceded. The point of Daniel's vision (chapter 7) was that four world empires were to arise, during whose period of dominion Jewry's role would be relatively obscure at least. Then the fifth world empire would be established as God's kingdom, and of that kingdom there would be no end (Dan. 7:14, 27). The question is surely apposite: to whom under God would this kingdom belong? To the Jewish nation? or to the Christian community? When we recall that the fifth empire is portrayed as established under "one like a son of man" and that all nations are depicted as serving Him, one can grasp the passage of thought in the mind of the writer of
Barnabas, even although he does not refer to this universalist note of the fifth kingdom in Daniel 7 in any direct fashion. It is true, of course, that Daniel 7 appears to oscillate between viewing the 'one like unto a son of man' as an individual and treating him as a figure for the community of the 'saints of the Most High' (v. 22), so that a more nationalist interpretation, in term of the subjection of other peoples to the Jewish race, was a possibility. Barnabas, however, is sure that the interpretation must be in terms of Christ's rule over saints of every nation, who are made one in the Church. In the closing paragraph of this same chapter Barnabas, in exhorting Christians to persevere with a view to the coming trial, makes it clear that, in his view, the nation of Israel, though it had received great signs and wonders from God, had been finally abandoned (καὶ οὕτως ἐγκαθελθέθης άντρος, Para. 14).

We see, then, that the flow of thought in this chapter is that we are now living in the last days, the fourth world empire of Daniel's vision already being upon the scene; that the period of Antichrist's reign must follow fairly quickly; and that beyond that lies the giving of the kingdom to a community of saints, who belong to all nations and who are already represented on earth in the Christian Church. It is interesting in this connection that paragraph I clearly thinks of 'lawlessness', which is to characterize Antichrist's reign (cf. II Thess. 2:3), as already operative in the present evil time. Tacitly, this seems to be paralleled in the writer's mind by the proleptic anticipation of the coming Kingdom of God which is found within the multi-racial people of God, the Church. It is at least evident that this chapter sets the Church very definitely within a series of divinely ordered and foretold events, whose culmination will soon take place in the establishment of Daniel's fifth world empire, the glorious Kingdom of God. God's covenant has thus been taken from the Jews and given to the Church.
In so far as the Kingdom of God was historically to follow the previous
four world empires (Jewry being from the first of these, Babylon,
submerged in judgment) it is appropriate that the Church should appear
late in world history, as she has done: the Church is thus viewed as
essentially a product of the 'End-time'.

Chapter XIII confirms that it is not "the first people" (δ λαδ...)
who represent the heir to God's promises, and that the
covenant (η δια θηκή) is not for them, but for us (είς
η μας, para. I). The figures of Esau and Jacob are alluded
to (paras. 2-3), as also mention is made of Jacob's giving to Ephraim
the place of preference over Manasseh, who was the elder brother, in
his final blessing. (para. 4-6). The climax is reached in the case of
Abraham (para. 7). Gen. 17:4-5 is conflated in thought and expression
with Rom. 4:11-14, and v. 15ff. of Gen. 17, with its promise of a further
son (Isaac), is clearly in the background of the writer's thought:
"Ἰδοὺ, τέθεικα σε, Ἀβραὰμ, πατέρα ἐθνῶν τῶν
κιστελωντῶν δι' ἄκροβουστίας τῷ θεῷ." The thought is that, just as the line of promise came through the last
son Isaac, so the promise that Abraham should be a father of nations
(interpreted as meaning, father to the Gentiles through their faith in
Christ Jesus) has been accomplished through the new people of God, "this
people" (οὗτος δ λαδ, para. 1), and not through the lineal
descent of Jewry.

The eschatological element is less prominent in this chapter, as
it deals with the covenant, but it is implied. God's promise to Abraham
was not to be fulfilled by means of his immediate descendants after the
flesh, but now at the end of time through the revelation of Jesus Christ
and the ready acceptance of Him evidenced among the Gentile nations.

Barnabas vi. is a chapter which takes up a number of Old Testament
passages and shows their fulfilment in Christ. Particularly important for our present purpose is the statement in paragraph 11: "ἐκεῖ ὤν ἀνακαίνεσις ἡμῶς ἐν τῇ ἁρέσει τῶν ἐμαρτιῶν, ἐκοινώθη ἡμᾶς ἄλλου τόπου, ὡς χιλιάδων ἐκεῖν ἡμῶν ψυχή, ὡς ἐν δῇ ἀνακαίνεσιν τῶν ἡμῶν.

The next paragraph goes on to quote Gen. 1:26. The thought is plainly that the Church is God's new creation through Jesus Christ -- and this is a present reality. Again, the writer quotes the injunction in Gen. 1:28: "Increase and multiply and fill the earth", and says that it was addressed to the Son of God. The procreation of spiritual children is the means by which the Son fulfills this command. Again, in paragraph 13 we read: "καλάν σοι ἔπιστεύς, πῶς ἡμᾶς λέγει. δεύτεραν κλάσαν ἐκ' ἐσχάτων ἐκοινώθη, λέγει δὲ κύριος: 'Ἰδοὺ, ποιῶ τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ὡς τῇ πρώτην.'

In the following discussion (para. 13 ff.) the statement of Moses concerning entering a land flowing with milk and honey (Exod. 33:3), together with the words of Ezekiel, concerning the taking out from 'them' (Barnabas understands of those whom the Spirit of the Lord foresaw) of hearts of stone and their replacement with hearts of flesh (cf. Ezek. II: 19; 36:26), are referred to the existence of the Christian community. The Church is then God's new creation and the means whereby the Son glorifies the Father. Ps. 43:4 and Ps. 22:23 are both fulfilled through the praise of the saints, where the thought seems to be that it is Christ who confesses the Father in their company. The element of 'realized eschatology' is prominent in this chapter in this application of Old Testament scriptures.

The elements stressed to this point rather place emphasis upon the way in which the writer of Barnabas is aware of the End-time as
realized in present experience. Thus, the Church is, as we have seen, essentially a product of the end of the age. Further, the thought of Christ as having risen on the eighth day from the dead was seen in chapter XV to indicate that, though the Hexaemeron witnesses to the course of human history and to what is outstanding of God's purposes for it, Christ's triumph is complete and is the guarantor of the coming triumph. What is marked here is a kind of emphasis upon the present realization of God's purposes, as heralding and indeed implementing in advance the end of the age, which does not, however, by that very token do away with the belief in a very definitely historical end to the present sequence of world-empires in the establishment of Christ's Kingdom on earth. Bearing in mind the earlier discussion with Grant's point of view concerning the attitude of this Epistle to the delay in the Second Advent, and the conclusion which we reached that in fact the Epistle betrays no real concern over that delay, it would seem that we have in this work a fair balance between the elements of 'realized' and futurist eschatology.

FUTURIST ELEMENTS IN BARNABAS' ESCHATOLOGY.

So far as the future is concerned, definite allusions to its part are not lacking. Rudolf Bultmann judges that for Barnabas salvation is a future thing. He feels that Barnabas has an understanding of Christian existence which goes beyond that of Hermas, James, and the Didache. This to him gives it a position of superiority. Its concept of 'righteousness' is normally ethical, rather than forensic, though this sense is also familiar to Barnabas. However, "salvation is a future thing (VI: 17-19; XV: 5-9); believers are already at the last time (IV: 3,9; XXI: 3) and have to prepare themselves by conscientious fulfilment of 'the new law of our Lord Jesus Christ' (11:6), or of the 'ordinances' (11:1; X:11, etc.) or 'commandments' (IV:11; XVI:9, etc.)
'of the Lord' -- for the judgment according to one's works lies ahead (IV:12; cf. XV:5; XXI: 1, 3), the judgment which Christ as the coming Judge will hold (V:7; VII:2). In the same passage Bultmann has put it thus: "Christians are not, for him, already rightwised."

Here he has in mind the passage at Barnabas IV: 9-10: "..... ἵνα μὴ σχῆμα παρεῖδοιν ὁ μέλας. * φέρομεν ἀπὸ πάντων μετακινήσεως, μισήσαμεν τελείας τα ἄργα τῆς πονηρᾶς ὠδοῦ. μὴ καὶ ἐντούς ἐνδονότες μονάδετε ὡς ἢ ἡ δεδικαιωμένοι, ἄλλ' ἐπὶ τὸ ἀυτὸ συνεργήσαμεν συνέγραψεν περὶ τοῦ κοίνῃ συμπέραντος.

What Bultmann sees as of great value in all this is its subordination of the present to the future, for to Bultmann such an emphasis signifies a deep understanding of the radical demand upon the present which the eternal God makes upon us through the concept of the future, which is pregnant with possibilities of good or evil. We need not, however, share Bultmann's understanding of the significance of futuristic references to be grateful for his appreciation of this passage. For it underlines the fact that the 'realized eschatology' of this Epistle does not displace a looking towards future events. It is noteworthy in this regard that IV: 9-10 regards the present time as "ὁ ἄνωμος καιρός" and that it clearly sees it as one in which coming events of lawlessness have already been inaugurated. 'Offences' (σκένθοι) are to come. Thus this Epistle looks not just for the Parousia of the Lord but for the predicted period of great tribulation. It is assumed that the Church must pass through this. And the concern of this passage in Barnabas is that the believers should flee vanity so that they may be able to stand for God in that testing time -- "for they are not yet rightwised", as Bultmann has it. Here the thought is close to that in a passage noted...

2 op. cit., p. 163.

*Bultmann evidently takes the clause beginning *καὶ μὴ* with the sentence that follows, but Lake's text does not so punctuate.
in the Shepherd of Hermas, (Simil. IX:XXVIII:6) where it is suggested that firmness under persecution guarantees one's belonging to the Church, which is an eschatological community. Similarly, by implication, weakness under persecution can cancel out a life of service for Christ. This is virtually said in Barnabas 4:9 also: "..... προσέχωμεν ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις: οὔτεν γὰρ ὑφεληκότες ἡμᾶς ὁ κύριος τῆς κίτρυνος ἡμῶν, ἐὰν μὴ νῦν ἐν τῷ ἀνόμω καιρῷ καὶ τοῖς μέλλονσι σκυνάλοις, ὡς κρέπει ὑστὸς θεοῦ, ἀντιστάμενε,.....". The thought of this whole section is that we must flee sin, so that we may be strong to stand firm when the 'offenses' come. This consideration is reinforced in IV:14 by an appeal to the example of Israel: "Ετὶ δὲ κέκεινο, ἄδελφοι μου, νοεῖτε: ὅταν βλέπετε μετὰ τηλικωτά σημεία καὶ τέρατα γεγονότα ἐν τῇ Ἰσραήλ, καὶ οὕτως ἐγκατελειτοθεὶ αὐτοῖς: προσέχωμεν, μήποτε, ὡς γέγρακατε, κολλοὶ κλήτων, ὀλίγοι δὲ ἐκλεκτοὶ εὐρεθῶμεν." While the importance of the whole of Christian living is in view, the emphasis in this section lies upon the testing time that is to come and spiritual preparedness now for the coming of that testing time.

It could indeed with some justice be maintained that in the thought that we are not already made righteous (IV:10), this Epistle retreats from a New Testament awareness of salvation as a present reality and experience. A similar passage occurs in chapter XV, and has been alluded to earlier, in connection with the conditions which will obtain during the millennium or time of rest. The full text of this passage says: "Ἰδὲ ὅπερ τὸτε καλῶς κατακαυχόμενοι ἀγιάσομεν αὐτὴν, ὅτε δυνησόμεθα αὐτοὶ δικαιωθέντες καὶ ἀπολύσασθε τὴν ἑκαγγέλιαν, μηκέτι οὕσις τῆς ἀνομίας, κακῶν δὲ γεγονότων πάντων ὡς κυρίῳ· τότε δυνησόμεθα αὐτὴν ἐγίασαι, αὐτοὶ ἀγιασθέντες πρῶτον." (Para. 7) It is fairly clear what Barnabas means to imply. In the millennial era, as he envisages it, sin will be restrained and all things will have
become now. This is not true at the present time. Christians are liable to temptation, and Barnabas' great fear is that they may be separated from the true people of God who are to be blessed in that time. Nevertheless it is doubtful whether this is a New Testament way of speaking, when it results in the thought that only then will believers have been "made righteous" or "made holy". This concept also seems implicit in the 'two ways' section in chapters XIX-XX. This seems to be an indication of a way of thinking which holds too far apart the present and futurist aspects of eschatology, when this is applied to the individual believer's experience of Christ. Despite the relative stress on present and futurist notes in interdependence and balance in this Epistle, here it would seem that there is a retreat from the New Testament standpoint.

A few explicit references to the future events of the Parousia of Christ in glory and the future resurrection occur. We note these briefly now. In chapter VII Barnabas deals with typology implicit in the ritual of the Day of Atonement, especially in regard to the sending away into the desert of a goat bearing the sins of the people. In the account of this which the writer has in mind, the statement apparently occurred that all were to spit upon that goat, were to goad it, bind scarlet wool about its head, and then drive it into the wilderness. The one who leads the goat into the wilderness is at the last moment, it seems, to take away the wool and place it upon a shrub (para. 8). Barnabas says: "τι οὖν τούτο ἐστιν; προσέχετε· Τὸν μὲν ἐνα ἐκεῖ τὸ θυσιαστήριον, τὸν δὲ ἐνα ἐκικατάρατον, καὶ τὸν ἐκικατάρατον ἑστεραμνέων; ἐκεῖδὴ ὤγουται αὐτὸν τότε τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν ποίησις ὤγουτα τὸν κόκκινον κερί τὴν εἴρηκα καὶ ἔρωτιν· Ὡν ἄντος ἐστιν, ἔν ποτε ἡμέτερος ἑσταυρώσαμεν ἐξουθενύοντες καὶ κατακεντήσαντες καὶ ἐπιπύωντες· ἀληθῶς οὗτος ἦν, ὁ τότε λέγων ἐκατον ὑδὶν θεοῦ εἶναι." (Para. 9)
Barnabas also employs a text which says that the two goats used on the Day of Atonement, one for the purposes of sacrifice, the other to be sent into the wilderness, will be "alike, beautiful, and equal" (ὁμοίοις τούς ταύτοις, καλοὺς, ἰσούς). This represents the fact that "όταν ἱδώσαι αὐτὸν τότε ἵνα ἠμείναι" they will be astonished at the similarity of the Coming Lord with Him Whom they crucified. (para. 10). The placing of the wool amid the thorns is said to be a type of Jesus placed in the Church, the thought being that those who would attain to Christ's kingdom must do so through suffering. (para. 11) The idea in the background would seem to be that the Church is called upon to suffer now with Christ, so that one day she may reign with Him. She must repeat in her career the pattern of Christ's mission, which consisted of ministry, suffering, and then resurrection. Another significant passage is found at V.6-7, where it is said that the prophets received grace from the Lord (Christ) of whom they prophesied. The passage goes on:— "αὐτὸς δέ, ἵνα καταργήσῃ τὸν θάνατον καὶ τὴν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀνάστασιν δείξῃ, ὅτι ἐν σωμαί ἐδει αὐτὸν φωνερωθῆναι, ὡς καὶ ἐνακολουθήσῃ, ἵνα τοῖς πατρίσιοι τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν ὑποδεικνύῃ, καὶ αὐτὸς ἐνακολουθῇ τὸν λόγον τὸν καινὸν ἐτοιμάζων ἐπιδειξῃ ἐκ τῆς γῆς ἐν, ὅτι τὴν ἀνάστασιν αὐτὸς ποιήσως κρινεῖ." In this passage Christ's own Resurrection is seen as the demonstration of the future resurrection of all men from the dead, as also that the latter will be accomplished by Him. It is also said that He will judge the risen, so that the concept of resurrection is aligned both with His Parousia (since it is to be achieved by Him) and with the concept of judgment to come. The thought of judgment to come is in evidence in the 'Two Ways' section in chapters XIX-XX. (cf. Didache I-VI).

A strong contrast is present throughout this Epistle between the present evil age and the good age which is to come. In this way a clear distinction between the two throws a certain emphasis upon the future.
We have already seen this implicit in XV:7 with its emphasis upon that coming time when we shall have been made righteous and when there will be no more sin. We also observed in IV:1 the thought of the present era as one of lawlessness. In this case the thought is that this lawlessness anticipates the final terrible era of lawlessness under Antichrist before the Parousia of Christ. It is evident that the whole present era is seen as one of evil. II:1 has the same thought: "Ἡμερῶν οὖν αὐτῶν πολλῶν καὶ αὐτοῦ τῶν ἐνεργοῦντος ἐκκλησίας τῆς ἐποχῆς ὑπέλυχεν αὐτοῦ προσέχοντες ἐκθετεῖν τῷ δικαίῳ κυρίῳ."

L.W. Barnard comments:

"In eschatological teaching the Epistle and the Qumran texts exhibit a similar outlook. Both believed that the last times had dawned when the works of evil were everywhere in the ascendant, Satan and his hosts having been let loose. The prime need in the present was therefore to guard against the entry of Satan (described in the Epistle as the Black One and in the scrolls as Belial) into the human heart."

It is important to observe that, if the teaching of Barnabas be indeed similar to the Dead Sea Scrolls at this point, what Barnabas teaches is not just a contrast between the present evil age and the good age to come: rather the thought is that the present era is evil because it represents the black night before the dawn, because we live at the end of the present age.

There seems little doubt that for Barnabas we do live in the last days. This has already been seen in connection with Israel's displacement and the institution of the Church as a product of the End-time. A further reference in XVI:5 confirms this where a passage from Enoch 89:55, 66, 67 is quoted, which avers that "in the last days (ἐκ' ἐκατὼν τῶν ἡμερῶν)" the Lord will deliver the sheep of his pasture, together with their fold and tower, to destruction. Barnabas sees the destruction of the Temple (70 A.D.) as an indication that we now live in the last days. This is here seen, not only negatively in

---

that the Temple has been removed, but also positively in that in Christ a new temple is being built for the Lord (para. 6ff.). This sense of living in the last days again flings emphasis on what is to come.

One final note may be mentioned which points in the same direction. This is a certain emphasis upon hope (ἡ ἐλπίς) which runs throughout the Epistle. Thus at 1:6 we are told that "ὅτι ἐλπίς ἐλπίς, ἵνα τέλος πιστεύω ἡμῶν". Hope is related to faith (ἐν ἐλπίδι τῆς πιστεύως αὐτοῦ, IV:8), to salvation (ἐλπίζων σωθῆναι, 1:3), and to life (ἐν ἐλπίδι κωπῆς αὐτοῦ, 1:4; 1:6). Again, VI:9 uses the expression; "hope upon (that) Jesus" (ἐλπίζωτε.....ἐπὶ τῶν.....Ἰησοῦν), while XVI:8 speaks of "hoping on the Name" (ἐλπίζωτε ἐπὶ τὸ ὄνομα). What is implicit in these and other similar passages, which use the Greek words, ἐλπίς and ἐλπίζω, is a sense of straining towards that which still lies ahead of the people of God. At the same time, the use of this terminology well expresses the curious interrelation of present and futurist elements in the standpoint of this Epistle. Thus, at XVI:8 we are told: "λαβόντες τὴν ἀφεσιν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν καὶ ἐλπίζωτε ἐπὶ τὸ ὄνομα ἐγενόμεθα καίνοι, καὶ οὖς ἵνα κτισόμενοι διδ ἐν τῷ κατοικητήρων ἡμῶν ἐλθόμενον ὁ θεὸς κατοικεῖ ἐν ἡμῖν."

THE EPISTLE OF BARHAVAS - A BAPTISMAL CATECHISM?

We have already noted that this work is really a tractate, and not an epistle. This view is accepted by most scholars, though it is deviated from by a few, who judge that it was some situation of immediate urgency which called forth this letter, thus understood to be a direct exhortation to a given situation of persecution by Jews. Most of these scholars who view the epistolary form as merely literary regard this as a catechetical manual, or a manual of instruction for candidates for baptism. The first chapter speaks of "τῷ μεγάλῳ.....καὶ πλουσίῳ τῶν τοῦ θεοῦ δικαιωμάτα" for those to whom it is addressed. It is
this reference, which may be taken to refer to the endowment of the
Spirit given in baptism, taken in conjunction with the author's desire
to add to the knowledge of those addressed (1:4), which lies behind
statements to the effect that the work is dedicated in its commencement
to the newly baptized, or those contemplating baptism. Thus W. Eltester:
"In its designation for those who have been newly baptized the letter,
particularly in its outline, suggests the baptismal catechisms of a
later period. Hence we have before us in the Epistle of Barnabas the
written result of baptismal instruction."¹ Jean Daniélou avers that
"the book is a catechetical manual in two parts, dogmatic and moral.
The second part is a treatise on the Two Ways analogous to the one in
the Didache; the first is a collection of 'testimonia' accompanied by
a commentary, and grouped according to a catechetical plan."² One or
two facts may briefly be noted. Firstly, the letter lacks the
formalities of the letter of antiquity. This in itself may not be
decisive, but is suggestive. Secondly, the fact that the second part
of the book is definitely a Manual of moral instruction which is closely
paralleled in the Didache (I-VI) lends weight to the view of the whole
as a catechetical manual. While it still seems possible to regard
this as an ordinary letter to a given situation, it does seem probable
that the whole of the work and not just the second part of it reflects
catechetical teaching. Such a view of the work gives it certainly
an added interest and significance and would help to explain its
survival despite its pseudonymous apostolic authorship. Historically,
it has significance, if this view be sound, as has the Didache, "in
the preservation of what were originally Jewish-Christian forms in a
Gentile document which is fully catholic in the sense of visualizing

¹ op. cit., p. 357, col. 2.
² op. cit., p. 33
Christianity as a world-religion."¹ Thus pronounces P. Carrington with reference to the Didache. He also sets forth its preservation within Christianity of the forms of Jewish proselyte catechisms. Theologically, too, however, a catechetical form gives reinforcement to the whole teaching of this work. It appears likely its second half depends, like the Didache, on an earlier form. The work as we have it appears, however, to be homogeneous. Both in its reflection of an earlier form in the teaching on the Two Ways in the latter part of the work and in its wholeness, its views are to be seen as indicative of attitudes inculcated in new converts and of instruction given. Moral advice was proffered and this was set in the context of an interpretation of the Old Testament scriptures which made truly possible adherence to the true life of piety within the context of the Christian Church, the true Israel of God. Thus, its eschatological teaching, both implicit and explicit, is to be viewed as not private in character but public property in the provenance of the church situation from which the book sprang. The origin of the book is obscure but tradition and internal features appear to favour an Alexandrian or Egyptian origin. The point is that, in the mind of the writer, it would appear, his exhortations and counsel has meaning because those he addresses are within the covenant of God in Christ. It was for such that the promises had from the beginning been designed. If this be so, eschatology, realized and futurist, was of the very stuff of the author's thinking.

The question has also been raised in recent years whether the Epistle of Barnabas is a Paschal homily. The question is whether this work reflects a special concern for the annual special celebration of Easter, for which we have evidence for Asia Minor and Rome in the second half

of the second century A.D. Melito of Sardis' 'Homily on the Passion' and the 'Apostolic Tradition' of Hippolytus, together with the Paschal Homily traditionally attributed to the same writer, whose basis appears to be Hippolytean, provide the major evidence for the nature of the Easter celebration after the middle of the second century. If the Epistle of Barnabas gives certain indications of the nature of the Easter celebration in the early part of the second century (probably at Alexandria), it would thus acquire an added historical value. It is not our purpose to assess the likelihood of the view that Barnabas does provide us with such indications, but simply to note that L.W. Barnard has suggested that it does. The point is that, if he is correct, it may help to explain the curious intermingling of the notes of realized and futurist eschatology in this work. These would be to the fore in a baptismal catechism, but they would be even more to the fore in a homily to be read at the Easter festival (when baptisms usually took place in the Early Church). Barnard reinforces his argument by alluding to the frequency of references to the verb, 'πασχα', which seems generally in the Early Church to have been (falsely) thought of as explaining the term, 'Pasch'. It is noted that the events of the Exodus and entry into the Promised Land are prominent in the Epistle, though used not so much as historical types but rather as a basis for allegorical interpretations (cf. especially IV:7-8; VI:8-17; XII:2-9; XIV:1-4). It is manifest that, if Barnard's judgment is sound, we have an explanation of the tendency of the Epistle to stress a present experience of deliverance, summed up in the sense of a covenant relationship between God and the Church, which yet strains forward to the coming fuller entry into blessedness, the whole being conceived in profoundly historical terms.

---

ESCHATOLOGY IN 'THE EPISTLE OF BAHMARAS': FINAL ASSESSMENT.

Our discussion of the nature of the eschatological teaching of this Epistle has had, in the very nature of the case, to be conducted throughout our survey. Its prominent feature has been seen to be its judgment that we stand in the midst of a series of God's acts by which He is guiding history to its fitting conclusion.

The Epistle gives no evidence of real concern over the delay in the Parousia of Christ in glory. It rather sees the Church as a covenanted people of God who now in the last days anticipates the End, which cannot be far behind. The thought of the Church as a community of the End-time is understood in terms of an interpretation of Daniel 7. This shows that, though the Church is seen to possess now the promises of God, yet her present covenant-relationship with God does not exhaust God's intentions for her. Shortly, Antichrist will emerge and be destroyed by Christ's Coming and then the saints shall rest for a 'thousand years', after which there will be, it would seem, a further transformation of their condition. The catechetical character of the whole Epistle, and the possibility that it is a Paschal homily, reinforce the historical way in which present experience of salvation is viewed. Christ has achieved His triumph and is now at God's right hand, but He will come again to give His saints rest and to vindicate His cause completely.

The futurist notes are very definitely in evidence, as we have seen. References to the Coming of Christ in glory, to the future resurrection, to judgment all occur. The thought of the two ages throws the futurist note into sharper relief. The stress on the evil of this present age is probably suggestive of the fact that this age is tending quickly towards its close in a final outburst of lawlessness prior to Christ's Advent. In the case of the attitude of the Epistle to the present righteousness of the individual believer, we noted that the
stress on the futurist note is probably greater than can be justified by the New Testament: being made righteous has become a future expectation rather than a present reality.

We conclude that this Epistle provides no evidence of panic over the delay in the Second Advent, and that it does not support the judgment that embarrassment over that delay resulted in a reinterpretation of eschatology in terms of present experience at the expense of a belief in really future events.
'THE SHEPHERD OF HERMAS'.

This work has a fascination all its own. Not only so, but it has considerable importance, and that from a number of points of view. Firstly, it has significance as an example of early Christian 'prophetism' - a phenomenon which apparently disappeared between 100-120 A.D., but which Montanism sought to revive in the middle of the second Christian century. The only other full-scale prophetic work that we possess is the canonical Book of Revelation. Then again, the work has considerable importance as reflecting the concern of the Church, especially in the face of persecution, with the question of backsliding and apostasy. The attitude of Hebrews, chapter six, to the question of repentance lies in the background. Noteworthy too, in this regard is the fact, recorded for us by Eusebius, that the Syrian Gnostic Elchesai announced a further opportunity of repentance in the third year of Trajan's reign, i.e. in 100 A.D. Finally, the book is important for its bearing on eschatological matters, especially in their relation to the doctrine of the Church. Fundamentally, it views the Church as an eschatological community. The Church is viewed as a proleptic anticipation and realisation of the people of God to be revealed at the Parousia of Christ.

Views regarding the date of this work differ, but the general view seems to be that, although it may have found its final form while Hermas' brother Pius was bishop of Rome, approximately about 140 A.D., the first four visions were written about 95-97 A.D., the remainder following a few years later. A reference to Clement in the second vision, together with considerations regarding the unlikelihood of its being accepted by Irenaeus as scriptural if it stemmed wholly from the mid-2nd century, are basic to this judgment. These considerations appear reasonable and
sound. While we cannot have complete certainty, we may then assume that the evidence of this work deals mainly with the period immediately following that of I Clement and also therefore consequent upon the persecution of Domitian's reign, 94 - 95 A.D. The connection with persecution has a relevance not only for the date, but also for the meaning of the concern of this book with repentance.

'LIVING UNTO GOD'.

R.A. Grant judges that "the role of eschatology is rather ambiguous in the Shepherd of Hermas. Clearly enough, Hermas thinks in eschatological terms. --- These statements are relatively clear, but one wonders how literally they should be taken. Far more important, it would appear, is the constantly reiterated formula, 'Live to God.' As Barbaret has pointed out, it resembles what Paul says in Romans 6:10,11 and Galatians 2:19: it means 'living in relation to God'; and such a life is not explicitly or peculiarly eschatological in character."1 Here however, Grant's presuppositions come nakedly to the surface. Surely for Paul at least, living unto God was essentially an 'eschatological' life, in the sense that it was made possible by God's decisive intervention in Christ and presupposed the coming complete fulfilment of all God's promises. It is modern theorising that has stripped ethics of its eschatological cloak and it is doubtful whether this stripping had occurred, even subconsciously, in the 'Shepherd of Hermas'. It is true that, read through modern spectacles, some references to 'living unto God' appear to have little or no stress upon eschatology, but we submit that these have to be interpreted in the light of other such references, which do make this connection explicit.

A considerable number of references to living unto God occur, as we might expect, after the 'Visions', in the second section, the Mandates. The Second Mandate condemns evil-speaking. While penalties for sin are
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spoken of, it is not clear whether these are envisaged as historical in
class or as relating to the final judgment." 'Ο... οὕτως ἀκλὸς
dιακονῶν (i.e. the service of reverence', η σεμνότης, II:4) τῷ θεῷ
ζηστεί. Φύλασσε οὖν τὴν ἐντολὴν ταύτην, μὴ σοι, λελάθηκα,
ινα καὶ μετανοίωνεν καὶ οὐκ οἶκοι οὖν εὑρέθης, καὶ
καθαρὰ καὶ τάκακα καὶ ἁμείνας." (II:6-7). Again, (VIII:6 con-
tains this section) "Τοῦτων πάντων δὲ ἐγκατεστάθη τῷ θεῷ.
Ἐγκατεστάθη οὖν ἀκοὶ πάντων τούτων, ἡ μεγίστη τῷ θεῷ καὶ ἐγγυστὴ μετὰ τῶν ἐγκατεστασιῶν αὐτῶν.
In this latter passage, it might seem that living unto God consists in
the practice of such self-restraint. This, of course, must be part
of the meaning of the passage, but the context suggests that it is by
doing such things, practising self-restraint and the positive virtues,
that Hermas may be 'saved', (δειν ηθος σωθήσω), (VIII:8), and in
Scripture this is a markedly eschatological term. Mandate VII is another
section which might appear non-eschatological in tone in its reference
to living unto God, but the basic thought of this Mandate is that the
'fear of the Lord' should govern a good man's actions. A genuine regard
for God's judgments is part of this. Against such passages as we have
quoted, where the eschatological reference might be momentarily in doubt,
we may place such passages as the following, where the reference is clear
and explicit: Mand. XIII:5; XIV:III:6; V:1:7; XII:II:3. Another
passage from Mandate XII may be cited: "Πιστεύσατε οὖν τῷ θεῷ ὑμεῖς οἱ
διὰ τῆς ἁμαρτίας ὑμῶν ἀπεγνωσκότες τὴν ζωὴν ὑμῶν καὶ προστίθεντες
ἁμαρτίας καὶ μεταβαρύνοντες τὴν ζωὴν ὑμῶν, ὥσπερ ἐκπεμφῆτε πρὸς
τὸν κύριον ἐξ ὕλης τῆς καρδίας ὑμῶν καὶ ἐφανερώθη τὴν δικαιοσύνην,
τὰς λοιπὰς ημέρας τῆς ζωῆς ὑμῶν καὶ δοκεοῦσης αὐτῶν ὁ ρόδις κατὰ
τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ, ποιήσας ἀεὶ τοῖς προτέρως ὑμῶν ἁμαρτήσας
καὶ ἠξετάτε, δύναμιν τοῦ κατακυριεύοντος τῶν ἐρωμάτων τοῦ διαβόλου.
Τὴν δὲ ἀπειλήν τοῦ διαβόλου ὅλης μὴ ῥοδήσατε· ἠτοιν γὰρ ἐστιν ψευδο
νεκροῦ νεοφέ. Ακούσατε οὖν μου οὕτως καὶ ἐνσέσθε τῷ θεῷ.
(VI:2-3) Clearly what is in mind here is that despair which settles on
a man's soul when he realises that he is lost. In this condition he adds
to his sins. The devil holds him captive. For such, however, the Gospel has reassurance: whosoever repents and follows this through with his living will ultimately be delivered. Whether the 'cure' relates to a present deliverance contemporaneous with our surrender of will or refers to an ultimate deliverance from the sphere of temptation is not quite clear, but the latter is at least implicit: there is a glad note of assurance here about the believer's ultimate triumph, and this rests not upon the vicissitudes of his experience but upon an already won victory that will be finally manifested.

THE 'ONE REPENTANCE' PROVISION: ITS ESCHATOLOGICAL IMPLICATIONS.

This last passage is symbolic of a truth that we tend to forget: this work was not intended originally to cast despair into the souls of Christians, but rather to inspire to dedication. If the Fourth Vision tells us that apostasy can be forgiven only once, it does tell us that it can be forgiven once. This was a necessary word in view of what were apparently current fears, which were based partially upon an uncertainty deriving from the experience of men apostasising in the face of persecution and in part, it would seem, upon one interpretation of the passage in the Epistle to the Hebrews, chapter six, concerning the impossibility of a renewal unto repentance of those who had tasted of the powers of the world to come. This much at least is clear in the Twelfth Mandate: Hermas' concern is every bit as much to reassure as to warn. Both elements are present in the 'Shepherd'. Here, at Mandate XII:VI:2, we are told that God has already provided a cure for our 'former' (προτεροίς) sins. The adjective is significant: our sins belong to the old life. The new life is one in which provision has been made for victory.

What, however, of the case when apostasy does occur? This is one of the major concerns of this book. Hermas tells us that a Christian
may be given one opportunity of repentance (Mand. IV:III:6); "μετὰ τὴν κλήσιν ἐκείνην τὴν μεγάλην καὶ σεμνὴν ἕως τὴς ἐκπαιδευσέως ὑπὸ τοῦ δισεκατον ἡμερήσιον...." It is noteworthy how restrained is Hermas' language.

What he is against is continual sin followed by repentance. Further, he has especially in mind lapsing under 'severe temptation'. (ἐκπαιδεύειν means 'to put to a thorough test') Hermas is by no means concerned in this book only with apostasy under persecution, but it seems clear that this was a special concern, not only on account of the intrinsic seriousness of denying Christ but also because the thought is in the background that the persecution of Domitian's reign was but a forerunner of the Great Tribulation, soon to burst upon the Church. The different ways in which a man can fail in his living unto God are well canvassed in the various sections of 'the Shepherd', but Mand. IV:III:6 probably has apostasy or denial of Christ especially in view. It is not surprising that this should receive especial emphasis in a work dealing with repentance, in view of the strong word of our Lord Himself regarding the denial by the Father of him who denies the Son (Matt. 10:32; Lk. 12:8).

We get some help in our understanding of what Hermas has in mind in this Fourth Mandate by an application of the principle, which is made to the case of marriage. At I:8 an instructive comment is made in the context of a discussion regarding the appropriateness of a husband, who has divorced his wife on account of her immorality, receiving his wife back, if she repent. In the background is the biblical understanding of divorce as a legalized separation rather than an annulment of marriage vows which leaves the parties free to remarry. The shepherd replies to Hermas' question, whether the repentant divorced wife should be received back, in these terms: "Καὶ μὴν..... ἐὰν μὴ παραδέχηται ἀυτὴν ὅ ἀνήρ, ἐμαρτάνει καὶ μεγάλη ἐμαρτημον ἐκείνη ἐπισκέπται, ἀλλὰ δεῖ παραδέχηται τὸν ἡμερήσιον καὶ μετανοεῖται, μὴ ἐπὶ πολὺ δὲ τοῖς γὰρ δολοῖς τοῦ θεοῦ μετάνοια ἐστίν μία. Ἡ τὴν μετάνοιαν οὖν ὁ ἄνὴρ ἐρεῖ οὖ ὁ γάμος ἐστὶν σαρκί ὅ ἀνήρ."
What is implicit here is a fruitful parallel between baptism and marriage. The wronged husband is to hold himself in readiness for his wife's possible repentance: this is why he must not remarry. This recognition of repentance is, however, something that by its character can only be given once, in the situation of divorce. Marriage was intended to be an act that could not be undone. On the biblical understanding, divorce does not strictly undo it: rather it shows us its reverse side. What it meant is depicted most beautifully in the prophecy of Hosea. If the wife whose sins have been such as to lead to actual divorce repents, she may be received back. If, however, she again sinned and had to be divorced, this time, says Hermas, it would have to be final. What is implicit here is the logic of a situation that deals with a covenant that has binding force. Petty aberrations may be forgiven and borne with again and again, but to have constant marriages, divorces, remarriages, this would make nonsense of what is intended to be a once-for-all act. This is because marriage has a public character. Adultery also has a character that is public. It puts the marriage to a public shame. Such guilt leading to divorce may be forgiven in remarriage once, but only once.

It is significant that this exposition regarding divorce and remarriage makes explicit reference to the slaves of God having only one repentance and that it occurs shortly before the passage in the same Mandate dealing with the one opportunity of repentance towards God.

That this parallel is really in mind is confirmed by the fact that, after the discussion regarding our opportunity to repent, consequent upon sinning under 'severe temptation', the discussion comes back to the question of marriage. Now, the question is whether, if one partner to a marriage 'falls asleep', the other may be free to marry again.
The answer is in the affirmative, but the one who does not remarry brings great glory to God. (Mand. IV:IV:1-2).

This implicit parallelism is surely most helpful and suggestive for an understanding of Hermas' thinking. Just as marriage was intended to be an act that cannot be undone, so baptism is intended to have binding force. However, just as adultery must lead to divorce, so apostasy under persecution, actual outright denial of Christ, must lead to the exclusion of the apostate from the Church. However, Christ holds Himself in gracious readiness for the repentant sinner, even as the party divorcing his wife must not remarry but hold himself in readiness for the day of his wife's possible repentance. It would be as destructive of the meaning of baptism to annul its force and to restore it again and again; as it would make the wedding ceremony meaningless to make it capable of continual reaffirmations. Where sin, whether in marriage, or in regard to baptism, has led to an actual sundering of normal relationship between the parties concerned, it is the logic of the once-for-all character of the marriage act or the baptismal act, that repentance can be granted only once. If the logic of this approach, dependant as it is upon the once-for-all character of baptism -- and behind this, the once-for-all character of atonement in Christ -- is really fundamental to Hermas' thinking, there can be little doubt that it was reinforced by the expectation of an imminent test of repentance, the coming period of 'great tribulation', foretold by Christ (Mk. 13; Matt. 24, cf. Vis. II.11:7). That public confession of Christ or denial of Him was of such paramount importance to Hermas, seems clear from a reading of Similitude IX:XXVIII:6, which deals with persecution. This passage reads thus: "..... δοκείτε ήργον μέγα πεποιηκέναι, εάν τις ὑμῶν διὰ τὸν θεὸν πάθῃ. Ζωὴν ὑμῶν ὁ Κύριος χαρίσει, καὶ οὐ νοεῖτε· ἀλλὰ ἁμαρτίαι ὑμῶν κατεβάψαν, καὶ εἰ μὴ πεπόνθατε ἐνεκεν τοῦ ὀνόματος κυρίου διὰ τὰς ἁμαρτίας ὑμῶν τεθύνηκεῖτε ἂν τῷ θεῷ."
What this passage suggests is that a public witness to Christ in the face of persecution may well counterbalance a situation in which one was in danger of losing one's soul. Again, this is surely because Hermas thinks in such characteristically Hebraic manner regarding the bodily nature of the Church. A confession or a denial under torture or threat of death either affirms or repudiates one's baptism.

Attention has been paid to this matter for two major reasons. Firstly, it seems important to come to grips with the central concern of this book, which is relative to the question of repentance. Secondly, this concern itself reflects certain eschatological presuppositions. These have a bearing not only upon the coming Kingdom of God, but also and, indeed, especially, upon the Church as the elect community that points beyond itself to the final gathered community at the end of the age. In this context, too, it is clear that baptism, as the rite of initiation into the Church, must have eschatological significance also.

What is implied by Hermas' way of thinking regarding baptism and marriage, confession or denial of Christ under persecution, and the 'one opportunity of repentance' (μία μετάνοια) is that the Church itself is an eschatological community, that is to say, that it seeks by its nature, membership, and witness to anticipate the final ingathering of God's people at the end of the age. Only thus can we make sense of Hermas' attitude to the one repentance, understood as relating to a second opportunity of acknowledging Christ under persecution. For, we may ask why various relatively petty unfaithfulnesses should not debar us from the Kingdom of God. If we understand Hermas aright, his answer is that such sins may well debar us (this is implicit in the passage from Simil. IX:XXVIII:6, quoted above), but that only the final ingathering will reveal this. The Church is the community of the Spirit in which proleptically an ingathering has already occurred that anticipates
that which will occur at the Parousia. It is desirable that it should
be composed here on earth of committed Christian men, men whose commit-
ment is not only expressed but in some sense is realized through baptism.
What baptism does is to save us from an excessive individualism and to
remind us that it is primarily the Church community that is being saved,
and that we find our salvation through membership of this community.
If someone actually and openly repudiates the bond of union with God's
people on earth by making foolish his baptism, then the Church can have
no other course than to exclude him from the community. This reasoning
does not in any way play down the significance of conversion or inner
turning to God, but biblical thinking, in characteristic Hebraic
fashion, cannot think of such a turning which is not accompanied both by
meaningful acts of service and also by open identification with the
community of God. The significance of baptism into the earthly
community is that it draws attention to a tension that is characteristic
of biblical thinking: the tension between 'now' and 'then'. A conversion
experience that is not completed in baptism tends to set up a different
tension: that between inner and outer experience, but this tension is
redolent of Hellenistic rather than of biblical thinking. Thus,
'conversion-baptism' sets one within the earthly community that awaits
the Parousia of Christ. The recognition of the physical character of
the Church is, then, at the same time a recognition of its eschatological
character. It is true that in the Church we are now at one with saints
and martyrs in the presence of Christ, but this is only through an
anticipation of the final ingathering made possible by Christ's
resurrection and our faith.

It is because the Church is only an eschatological community and
not the final 'gathered community' that the concept of a further one
opportunity of repentance has reference only to overt acts of such a
drastic character as completely to repudiate the significance of one's belonging to the community that presses forward to meet her coming Lord. Apostasy in the face of persecution seems especially in mind in Hermas' thinking, though it is likely that he would have judged that certain other sins should lead to removal from the Church. Adultery would be one of those sins, for it implied a breaking of the baptismal union with Christ and His Church.

Roman Catholic theology has a considerable interest in the 'Shepherd of Hermas' as indicating the early existence of a doctrine and system of penance for sins committed. Johannes Quasten\textsuperscript{1} gives an interesting summary of the contribution of Hermas to the doctrine of penance, as viewed through Roman eyes. The account given here is balanced and not in any way extreme. He makes two comments that bear especially upon the eschatological understanding of Hermas that lies in the background in the 'Shepherd'. First, Quasten states that "it is not Hermas' intention to give the impression that he is the first to announce to the Christian sinner pardon for his sins, or that this is only an exceptional concession. In reality the author wishes to make it clear to Christians, that his message offers not the first but the last opportunity to obtain pardon for sins committed. This is what constitutes the new element of his message."\textsuperscript{2} Quasten is at pains here as a Roman Catholic to maintain that the doctrine and practice of penance was already a well-established feature of Church life, so that what Hermas had to offer was not a new feature or a concession to frailty. On the one hand, Hermas was opposed to some teachers who judged that "there was no penance except baptism"\textsuperscript{3}

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{2} \textit{op.cit.}, p.98.
  \item \textsuperscript{3} \textit{op.cit.}, p.98.
\end{itemize}
(thus, Hermas' message was one of hope); on the other, he reminded
the sinner that this opportunity of repentance was a final one (this
was the note of warning and constituted the new element in his message).
Under another heading, Quasten tells us that, according to Hermas,
"penance has a universal character; no sinner is excluded therefrom,
neither the impure nor the apostate. Only the culprit who will not
repent is excluded".\(^1\) Taking these points together, Quasten's inter-
pretation appears to be one which makes much of the eschatological
emphasis of Hermas' message: the opportunity for repentance is soon
to be removed. Quasten does not say how this removal is to be effected,
but presumably he means, through the renewal of persecution. This
interpretation of Quasten seems to be supported by another comment of
his: "Penance must be prompt and produce amendment \(\ldots\). Promptness
in penance is urged on eschatological grounds. It must be effected before
the construction of the tower, the Church, has become an accomplished
fact, for building operations were suspended to grant the sinner time
for repentance."\(^2\) Quasten is building here upon the fact of a 'correction',
as he terms it, of the Third Vision, (II-VIII) which is given in the Ninth
Similitude (IX. \(\psi\).1-2; XIV:2), where both passages are concerned with
the portrayal of the Church under the figure of a Tower. "But what is
entirely new is that the construction of the tower is delayed for a
time, in order to afford opportunity for many sinners to repent and
thus be received into the tower."\(^3\) The thought seems to be that the
final period of persecution prior to the End is impending; until it
arrives there is opportunity for those who have fallen to repent. Once
it comes there will be no further opportunity because it will inaugurate

\(^1\) op. cit., p.98.
\(^2\) op. cit., p.98-99.
\(^3\) op. cit., p.96.
the events leading up to the Parousia and last Judgment.

This account requires careful consideration. It gives serious attention to the eschatological perspective. The thought of a coming 'great tribulation' is found not only in our biblical record in the 'Little Apocalypse', but also at Vision 11.11. 4-7 in the 'Shepherd'.

We have already suggested that the knowledge of this impending period of tribulation gave urgency to the call for repentance. However, our interpretation was that the 'one repentance' that was spoken of related only to apostasy and was demanded by the nature of baptism. Thus, whether this were the final tribulation or not, a further reception into the eschatological community of the Church after one denial and readmission would be inappropriate. Hermas' parallel with marriage seems to support this view, rather than that offered by Quasten. Yet Quasten is surely right in calling attention to the thought, which is present, that the great tribulation (or, persecution, Greek ἐλίγψ 11.7) is about to begin. The point was that persons who had apostasized might now repent. If they did not, they would soon lose opportunity of readmission to the Church. At the same time, they should know that, if they did receive readmission, their faith would very soon be put to severe testing again. To fail a second time could only lead to judgment and exclusion from the community of grace.

Quasten gives room, as we have seen, to eschatological considerations in his understanding of Hermas' message regarding repentance. Yet, as we have indicated above, it may well be that he makes what is only a reinforcing consideration the basis of the argument. On the other hand, in his view of the Church, Quasten, in consistency with Roman Catholic teaching, fails to do justice to the eschatological nature of the Church. Thus, we are told that "the doctrine of penance in Hermas is already thoroughly permeated with the idea that the Church is an institution
necessary for our salvation. Hence Hermas speaks of prayer offered for sinners by the elders of the Church.\textsuperscript{1} Again, eschatology has relevance only because the great tribulation and the Parousia will remove opportunity to join the Church or to gain readmission to it. These statements show that the important thing is that we should belong to the Church, which is a divinely ordained institution and the channel of grace to a lost world. However, the biblical character of such thinking has to be challenged just because it fails to do justice to the finality of the Incarnation and to eschatology. Further, it cannot be substantiated, in our judgment, that such thinking is characteristic of 'the Shepherd of Hermas'. It would seem to be more true to the New Testament to say that in Christ and His Atonement the Church was both founded and made complete -- one, holy, catholic, to use later terminology, and that the manifestation of this community awaits the Parousia.

Quasten's view seems finally to fail because it makes the 'eschaton' subservient logically to the present era of the Church. Repentance in the face of severe persecution is for Hermas of vital moment, not because the Church is the community of grace, statically conceived, to which we must belong or perish, but because it is for the final ingathering of those of His people still subject to the conditions of space and time as we know it that Christ returns and to have denied Christ before men will mean that He will deny us before His Father in heaven. To deny our baptism is to deny our part in that purely eschatological community for whose final redemption the world awaits at Christ's Appearing. Not all who are baptised must be justified at the Last Judgment. Nor can we limit a sovereign God to justifying only such as have been baptised.

\textsuperscript{1}op.cit. p.99.
But to have dissociated oneself with Christ and His people upon earth, which means normally to deny one's baptism, this is to incur the wrath of God. We see, therefore, how thoroughly eschatological is Hermas' conception of both the Church and the one further opportunity of repentance, of which he speaks.

Vis. II.11:4 is a frequently quoted passage in this book. Its offer of forgiveness for all repenting of former sins but warning that this opportunity will not be renewed is consonant with the concern of this whole work for repentance. Less well known, however, are the words of paragraph 5, where it is stated that the days of repentance for the just are at an end, but "..... τοῖς ..... ἔστιν ἑαυτὸς ἐσχάτης ἡμέρας.

If the writer believes, as seems likely, that the "ἡ θλίψις ἡ ἐμφάσεως ἡ μεγάλη", of which he speaks in II.7, is that which is to precede the consummation of the age, then the period during which opportunity of repentance was to be made available to the heathen beyond the opportunity now afforded baptized persons, could not have been conceived as long. This sentence, however, makes plain the basic understanding of the Gospel in this work: in essence repentance is available until 'the last day'. If it is denied to baptized persons, where serious public sin is concerned, beyond one occasion, that is because in baptism the judgment on our sins is advanced in time and dealt with by means of the victory of Christ. The mission of the Church stretches out to the end of the age even as it stretches out to 'the nations'. When we recall the significance of the Greek term, 'τὰ ἔθνη', in the Septuagint as referring to the non-Jewish world, we begin to realize that what is implicit is indeed a geographical extension of the sway of the Gospel which keeps pace, so to speak, with its historical extension until the end of the age. It is significant that in the Ninth
Similitude twelve mountains are featured and the explanation is given of them that "τα ὁρη ταῦτα τα ὀδεσκα ὀδεσκα εἰσιν πυλαι κατοικοῦσι ὁλου τον κόσμον, ἐκηροῦθη οὖν εἰς ταῦτα ὅ υιὸς τοῦ θεοῦ διὰ τῶν ἀποστόλων" (XVII:I).

This confirms that Gospel outreach to 'the nations' is seen in eschatological perspective, that is, as continuing until the last day, because in the Ninth Similitude the mountains are introduced in that stones are brought from them and find a place in the Tower, which is the Church.

Various passages, as we shall see, make it clear that the Tower is very definitely thought of as a building which is limited to a certain time for its completion. Thus, geographical extension to the nations keeps pace with historical extension towards the Parousia of Christ in glory.

THE FIGURE OF 'THE TOWER'.

The figure of the Tower has been alluded to on a few occasions. It is one of the most significant features of the 'Shepherd of Hermas' and we must now look at it and see what its implications are. This figure first occurs in the Third Vision. The Lady who is addressing Hermas in that Vision waves a glittering rod and enables Hermas (whose vision is even then tardy) to see "πύργον μέγαν οἰκοδομημένον ἐκ ὑδάτων λίθων τετραγώνως λυμπρούς." (II:4). This Tower was four-square and was being built by six young men who had accompanied the Lady when she met Hermas on this occasion. Stones were being brought and were being used in the building. Some stones were brought from the deep sea and some from the land. All the stones from the deep fitted in with other such stones so that the joins between them could not be seen.

Some of the stones from the land were put into the building, while others were cast away. (para. Sff.). Certain stones lying round the tower were not used in its building for varying reasons, some being rotten, some having cracks, some being too short, and so on. In chapter IIIff.
the details are explained. The water on which the Tower is built is clearly intended as a reference to baptism, though this is not made quite explicit. The various suitable stones used in the Tower are explained of the "apostles and bishops and teachers and deacons" (V.10), of those who have suffered for the name of the Lord (V.2), of those who kept the commandments of the Lord (V.3), together with the young in the faith (V.4). Like explanations are given of those stones which were rejected. Stress is laid on the fact that many of these stones may ultimately find a place in the Tower when they have been broken and shaped. Thus round white stones can only be fitted into the building when they have been made square: this signifies that certain men with faith have to lose their riches before they are used. (VI). It is unnecessary here to give all the details, but it is important to note that the Lady tells Hermas at VIII:9, in answer to a question about the times whether the end were already here, that the tower is still being built. She goes on:-

"Ως ἑών οὖν συντελεσθῇ ὁ κόρος οἰκοδομημένος, ἔχει τέλος. Ἀλλ' τοιχὸ ἐποικοδομηθεῖσθαι. Μηκέτι μὲ ἐπεραίται μηδέν." 

In IX:5 those who have an over-abundance of food are urged to give to those who are hungry: ἐὼς οὖν ὁ κόρος ἐπετελεσθῇ μετὰ γὰρ τὸ τελεσθῆναι τοῦ κόρου βελήσετε ἡμαθοποιεῖν, καὶ αἱ ἐσεῖ πέκον.

It is made quite explicit at III:3 that the Tower is the Church (also identified with the Lady herself who is addressing Hermas and who has been responsible for his Vision of the Tower). Clearly, therefore, the figure is a dynamic one. It envisages the Church as being built in accordance with a divine plan, from the foundation upwards, upon apostles (the first generation) and those suffering for the faith and ordinary believers and recent converts. This building is, however, eventually to reach completion. Here we see God's providential activity in history reaching out towards a definite point when that
In the Ninth Similitude the figure of the Tower is returned to, and in chapter XIII:1 it is again said explicitly that the Tower is the Church. There are some differences in this account from the first and also some significant new details. The Tower is now built on a great white rock (explained as the Son of God, XII:1). In its side a door was recently hewn. This latter point is significantly explained thus:

"Ὅτι... ἐκ τῶν ἡμερῶν τῆς συντελείας φανερῶς ἐγένετο, διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ἐγένετο ἡ πύλη, ἵνα οἱ μέλλοντες σωθῆσθαι δι' αὐτῆς εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν εἰσέλθωσι τοῦ Θεοῦ." (XII:3)

The most significant new feature in this account is the pause which is introduced at V:1ff: "Καὶ ἐπέτελε ἰδίᾳ ἡμέρᾳ ἡ οἰκοδομή, οὐκ ἐπέτελεσθε δὲ ὁ πύργος. ἔμελλε γὰρ πάλιν ἐποικοδομεῖσθαι. ἐγένετο δὲ ἀνοιχτῶς τις τῆς οἰκοδομῆς."

In paragraph 2 of this same chapter the reason for the pause is given that the Tower cannot be completed "until its lord come and examine this building, in order that, if certain stones are found rotten, he may exchange them. For the tower is being built in accordance with his will." At XIV:2 the pause is explained as an opportunity for certain persons who had found a place in the Tower but had lost it through developing lusts, to repent. It seems clear that, as Quasten says (vide above, page 226), the introduction of the pause or delay is in order that opportunity of repentance may be given. This appears to be an explanation of the delay of the Second Advent in terms of the giving of opportunity to certain persons to repent. It is interesting that here it is the repentance of persons who had been earlier given a place in the building, which is in view. In V:1ff, the emphasis is upon the need for the Lord to satisfy Himself with each stone placed in the Tower, but clearly the implication is that until He comes there is opportunity
for repentance.

This figure of the Tower is one of the major features of "The Shepherd of Hermas". It is important both for its emphasis upon the divine providential process of upbuilding as reaching out towards the end of the age, and (in Similitude IX) for its introduction of a pause in the building operations, clearly designed to explain the delay in the Second Advent. The pause is probably also connected in thought with the further opportunity of repentance, spoken of at Vis. II.11: 4-5, because it is understood that now is the time of repentance but very soon the 'final persecution' will break, which will test the quality of repentance engaged in during the delay before its arrival. Beyond that persecution lay its termination in the Second Advent itself.

One other feature of the symbol of the Tower is significant in regard to the eschatology of the 'Shepherd'. We read in Vis. III. II:6 that the stones which had been taken from the deep sea fitted so well with the other stones which were being used "ὅτε τὴν ἐρμογὰν αὐτῶν μὴ φαίνεσθαι". Hermas goes on to say: "Ερμίνιετο δὲ ἡ οἰκοδομὴ τοῦ πόρου ὡς ἐς ἐνὸς λίθου ὑιοκοσμήμενη." This fitting in of the stones, the one with the other, is explained at V.1-2 of the agreement of the apostles and bishops and teachers and deacons (the square and white stones) among themselves and of those who have suffered for Christ's sake with them. There is more in this than a simple account of the harmony of outlook between all of Christ's people. When we recall that (as we saw above, page 231) these various kinds of stones represent in vision III the generations of Christians, namely, the first followed by those persecuted (mostly after the first generation), taken together with others who have been faithful but have not been called upon to suffer for Christ, and finally the recent converts, it becomes clear that what is envisaged by the close-fitting
quality of the stones is the perfect manner in which God in His providence is directing the upbuilding of His Church. This will continue until the Tower is completed. Thus the unity of the Church, as portrayed under the symbolism of the Tower, is viewed in a thoroughly eschatological context.

In Similitude IX the same concept is implicit. At IV. we are told of four "στοιχεῖα... εν τοῖς θεμελίωσι τοῦ πύργου" (para. 3). These were grouped in lots of ten, twenty, thirty-five, and forty. The explanation is given at XV:4 (we note that without explanation the twenty of the second tier has been changed to twenty-five): "Οἱ μὲν πρῶτοι..... οἱ ι̣ ὃι εἰς τὰ θεμέλια τεθείμενοι, πρῶτη γενέα. οἱ δὲ κε' δευτέρα γενεα' ἀνδρῶν δικαίων. οἱ δὲ λε' πραφήται τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ διάκονοι μύτοὐ. οἱ δὲ μ' ἀπόστολοι καὶ διδάσκαλοι τοῦ κηρύγματος τοῦ οἴου τοῦ θεοῦ." (III.5, etc.)

In IV a distinction is made between these foundational stones which came "ἐκ τοῦ βυθοῦ" (III:5, etc.) and the remainder of the stones which came from the twelve mountains. Here again clearly we have the theme of the development of the Tower according to a definite divine plan. The building is in a due order. We are told now that the stones from the mountains are of different colours, but that "ἐταν εἰς τὴν οἰκοδομὴν ἐτέθησαν οἱ λίθοι οἱ ποικίλοι, ὁμοίως ἱγένοντο λευκοὶ καὶ τὰς χρῶς τῆς πρώτης ἡλλασσόν." (para. 5). What we have again here is the theme of the unity of the Church. Once again, however, it is clear that this unity is conceived in terms of a predetermined development towards the time when the building is to be completed. Thus the unity of the Church is again seen in thoroughly eschatological terms. It seems probable that in Similitude IX the thought of the expansion of the Church into the Gentile world after the laying of its foundation in Jewry, is implicit in the
conjunction of the stones from the twelve mountains with the foundational ones.

**THE FIGURE OF THE LADY WHO GROWS EVER YOUNGER.**

The Tower is a figure of the Church. So also is the "ancient lady" (γυνὴ πρεσβύτερη, vis.II.2; ἡ πρεσβυτέρα, vis.II.1:3 etc.) who keeps appearing to Hermas throughout his experience of the Visions and explains them to him. We are told expressly that at Vis. II.IV., a "very beautiful young man", that is clearly, an angel, says: that the ancient lady is not the Sibyl, as Hermas had surmised, but the Church.

He is asked by Hermas why she is old, and the answer is given: "Ὅτι... πάντων πρώτη ἐκτίσθη· διὰ τοῦτο πρεσβυτέρα· καὶ διὰ τὰς ἡμέρας τοῦ κόσμου κατηρτίσθη." (Para. 1)

At Vis. III.X Hermas inquires why it is that on three separate occasions when the Lady has appeared to him, she had done so in different forms. In the first vision she had been very old and sitting on a chair (para. 3). In the second vision, she looked younger in the face, but her body and hair were still old. In this vision, she stood (para. 4). In the third vision, however, "ὅλη νεωτέρα καὶ καλλίς ἐξερευνητὴ, μόνη δὲ ταῖς τρίχαις πρεσβυτέρας εἶχεν· ἵλαρα δὲ εἰς τέλος ἢν καὶ ἐπὶ συμφελίου καθημένη." (Para. 5)

In chapters XI-XII the explanation is given by the "young man". This explanation is quite significant. The first vision portrays the Lady as old, like elderly people who are feeble after their involvement with the occupations of this life and who have nothing to look forward to but death. In the second vision the more youthful countenance is explained by the analogy of an elderly person who receives new strength of spirit because he has received an inheritance. The comparison to this point takes explicit cognizance of the undue preoccupation of Christian people (Hermas himself is the type) with the things of this world, followed by
the encouragement received from "the revelation, which the Lord revealed to you (plur.)", i.e. presumably the revelation that repentance would be accepted (cf. Vis. II.II:4). In like fashion the general youth and beauty of the Lady's appearance and figure in the third vision is due to the strength received to do good, in consequence of the encouragement given through the revelation. The fact that the Lady is seated on a couch stands for the security of those who have repented and are the true people of God: "Καὶ ὅτι ἐγὼ συμφέρειν εἰσὶς καὶ οὕτως, ἰσχυρὰ ἡ θεία, ὅτι τέσσαρες πόδες ἔχει τὸ συμφέρειν καὶ ἰσχυρὰ ἐστηκεν· καὶ γὰρ ὁ κόσμος διὰ τεσσάρων στοιχείων κρατεῖται. Ὅδε μετανοήσαντες διότελος νεόν ἐσούσι, καὶ τεθεμελιωμένοι, ὅτι ἐγὼ δύσης καρδίας μετανοήσαντες." (XIII.3-4)

What is implicit in this explanation of the three forms of the Church is once again a profoundly eschatological concept. The true people of God, the Church, advances through failure and repentance towards stability of faith. This is a dynamic presentation of the ongoing life of the Church. When we bear in mind Vis. II.II:7, however, it becomes clear that what is meant is stability in the fast-approaching time of 'great persecution', so that the dynamic movement of the Church in her development reaches out towards the consummation of the age. The increasing youthfulness of the Church stresses the fact that the Church is not simply to be perfected at that consummation by events external to her own life, but is already pressing towards that end through the energy of the divine Spirit within her. The point that even in the third vision she retains white hair bespeaks the fact that the creation and completion of the Church has been in the counsels of God from past eternity.

THE SENSE OF ESCHATOLOGICAL PILGRIMAGE.

The Similitudes in particular display a strong sense of eschatological pilgrimage. This becomes clear at the very beginning of the Similitudes.
The Shepherd exhorts Hermas in Similitude I not to seek worldly wealth, and reminds him that he is a stranger in this world: "$\text{Οἶδατε ... ὅτι ἐν ξένης κατοικεῖτε ὡμεῖς οἱ δούλοι τοῦ θεοῦ. η γὰρ πολίς ὡμῶν μικράν ἐστὶν ἀκό τῆς πόλεως ταύτης.} $" (Para. 1)

Similitudes II-IV show the same thought in a slightly different form. In number II the figure is that of the elm and vine trees. The vine bears more and better fruit when it is supported by the elm, which bears no fruit itself. So does the poor man by his prayers support the wealthy Christian whose soul is endangered by his wealth. The theme here is that preoccupation with this world's wealth is unwise. In the Third Similitude Hermas is shown many trees which all appear to be dry and without leaves. The striking explanation of their similarity is given:

"$\text{:"Οτι ... οὖτε οἱ δίκαιοι φαίνονται οὖτε οἱ ἁμαρτωλοί ἐν τῇ ζωῇ τούτῃ, ἀλλ' ὡμοίως εἷσιν. ἦ γὰρ ζωὴ οὗτος τοῖς δίκαιοις Χειμάν ἐστι, καὶ οὐ φαίνονται μετὰ τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν κατοικοῦντες.}" (Para. 2)

The thought is that this present period of winter will be followed by the summer of the next age in which the differences between saints and sinners will be manifested. The concept of the next Similitude (IV) is very similar. In it Hermas sees again many trees, some budding and some withered. The trees which are budding are the righteous who will dwell in the age to come; "$\text{:"ο γὰρ ζωὴν οἱ ἡφαίστειοι θερεῖν ἐστίν τοῖς δίκαιοις, τοῖς δὲ ἁμαρτωλοῖς Χειμάν.}" (Para. 2)

**THE PARABLE OF THE VINEYARD.**

The Fifth Similitude provides us with the parable of the Vineyard, in which a slave achieved honour, because he not only obeyed the commands of his departing Lord regarding the care of the vineyard, but he also went beyond strict commands in order to please his Lord. This parable is noteworthy on two accounts. First, it is said to be the first clear
example in the Fathers of the concept of supererogatory virtue. Second, since the slave is explained as being the Son of God, the parable seems to suggest an adoptionist Christology. Further, the details of the parable are rather confused and seem to confuse the Spirit and the Son. It may not immediately appear from this where eschatology comes into the picture. However, it would appear to be implicit in the reason why the parable was given, which is revealed in the context. At VI:5-7 it is explained that "τὸ πνεῦμα τῷ ἁγίῳ τὸ προσόν, τὸ κτίσμα πάντων τὴν κτίσιν, κατακτήσειν ὃ θεὸς εἰς σῶμα, ἦν ὑπολειτο· αὕτη οὖν ἡ σάρξ, εὗρεν· κατακτήσει τὸ πνεῦμα τῷ ἁγίῳ, ἐδούλευσε τῷ πνεύματι καλῶς ...... μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου εἰλικρινῶς. ἦν οὖν τῷ θεῷ ἡ σαρκὶ τῆς ομοίας τιμής, ὅτι οὐκ ἐμφάνισε ἐκ τῆς γῆς ἧς ἦν ἡ προσώπη τὸ πνεῦμα τῷ ἁγίῳ. Σύμβουλον οὖν ἔλαβε τοῦ νῦν καὶ τοῦ ἐγγέλου τοῦ ἐνδόξου, ἣν καὶ ἡ σάρξ αὕτη, δουλεύσασα τῷ πνεύματι ἀμέσως, σὺν τοῖς κατακτησάμενοι καὶ μὴ δοξή τοῦ μισθῶν τῆς δουλείας αὐτῆς ἀπολύθηκεν· πᾶσα γὰρ σάρξ ἀπολύθηκεν μισθῶν ἐνεργείᾳ ἀμέσως καὶ ἀστίστως, εὗρεν· κατακτήσειν." It is perhaps somewhat confusing that at V:2 the slave is said to be the Son of God, while at VI:5, as evidenced in the section quoted above, it is 'the flesh' (ἡ σάρξ) that is the slave. Yet it is hardly surprising that there should be this apparent conflict, for the sequel seems to demand that 'the flesh' (ἡ σάρξ) has reference not only to Jesus of Nazareth (who appears to be the pre-existent Son of God incarnate, if this interpretation be sound) but also to all in whom the Spirit dwells. Properly understood, what we have in this parable is not an adoptionist Christology, confused in the manner set out by those who see a conflict regarding the identity of the slave. Rather what we have is the grand assertion that through the indwelling of the flesh of Jesus by the Holy Spirit, all flesh has been given the opportunity to become undefiled. This, in fact, is the real interest of the parable. Thus,
Hermas concludes in VII:1-2: "Ἀκούεις νῦν, φησίν: τῆς σάρκες σου τέλευτα φύλασσε καθάρεν καὶ ὄμιλτον. Ἰνα τὸ αἴσθημα τὸ κατοικήσαν ἐν αὐτῇ καρπυρηγήγῃ αὐτῇ καὶ δικαιώθῃ σου ἡ σάρξ. Βλέπε, μὴ ποτὲ σου ἐκὶ τὴν καρδίαν ἁνδρὶ τῆς σάρκας σου τέλευτα φθορῶν εἶδει καὶ παραχρῆγῃ αὐτῇ ἐν μισεῖς την. Ἐν μισεῖς τῆς σάρκες σου, μισεῖς καὶ τὸ αἴσθημα τὸ ἁγνὸν καὶ μισεῖς τὴν σάρκα σου ὑπὸ τής "

The whole point of the parable is not an excursion into an explanation of the Person of Christ, adoptionist in character. It is that through the indwelling of human flesh in the Incarnation of 'holy Spirit', our flesh has been given a new significance and we a new responsibility for the lives that we lead in the flesh. It is not just the flesh of the man, Jesus, but the flesh of all men that was 'adopted' in the Incarnation. We can either allow this adoption to be meaningful in our lives or we can frustrate it. But we must be answerable to God for what we do with the fact of this adoption. If we defile our flesh we defile the Spirit -- since in Jesus of Nazareth, God adopted the flesh -- and we will not live. The context makes it clear that 'living' (ζωῆς) has again reference to 'living unto God' (ζωῆς τῷ θεῷ) (VII:4).

This means, then, that this whole parable reminds us of the coming eschatological judgment in vivid terms, through showing us what the Incarnation means in relation to the Judgment Day. It is not merely that then we shall face a holy God: it is rather that we will have to stand before a God whose 'holy Spirit' was thrust forth into the human flesh in order to redeem it. The supposed reference to the concept of 'supero-rogatory virtue' seems designed primarily to show how God enabled the flesh of sinful, mortal man to do what, apart from the Incarnation, it was unable to do. III:3, however, does suggest that there is some truth in the usual interpretation.
THE ESCHATOLOGY OF 'THE SHEPHERD OF HERMAS': ASSESSMENT.

What we must do now, in the light of the above survey of passages in the 'Shepherd', is to assess in what direction the evidence of this work points, so far as the development of Early Church eschatology is concerned.

There is again a definite emphasis on futurist eschatology in this book. This is in evidence throughout the work. The Tower is gradually raised, and even although a pause has been made, the completion will not take long and is expected to take place soon. Similitudes III and IV think significantly of the present age as winter and that which is to come as summer. This represents a very definite -- and a characteristically Jewish -- thought of the two ages, in which the one is seen to follow the other in time. Further, the whole thought of the book, with its emphasis upon repentance, assumes that repentance is presently possible for the heathen (II:5), and a central interest of the book is the proclamation of one opportunity of repentance to baptized persons prior to the onset of the 'great persecution' and the subsequent consummation of the age. The latter, as we have argued against Quasten, is a matter of principle. Nevertheless, it is agreed that the regained status of repentant persons is soon to be tested by the 'great persecution' (II:7). What is implicit, both in regard to believers and unbelievers, is that the Day of Judgment is approaching. Now we can repent and be saved (even if this be limited to one occasion for serious sin, in the case of baptized persons); then the time of repentance will be past.

It is surely significant that a work, reflecting thought at Rome during the early years of the second century A.D., thinks in such a definitely futurist manner about eschatological matters. This does not at all agree with what appears to be the common understanding of
'Consistent' and 'realized' eschatology schools of thought that the delay in the Second Advent produced a reinterpretation of eschatological thinking. The Return of Christ is clearly in view in this book, though the thought of approaching judgment and the consummation of the age are more directly in view. It is, however, assumed that these occur at Christ's Coming in glory.

The question of the delay of the Second Advent does seem to be in view in the concept of the pause (ἡττήξης) in the building of the Tower. This section alone justifies the conclusion that judgment and consummation occur at Christ's Coming. Does this suggestion of a pause provide evidence of serious concern over the delay in this event? It certainly suggests that the Advent is viewed as so imminent that its non-arrival appears in the nature of a delay. It is interesting to observe in this connection that, even though it is anticipated that this event will not long be delayed, it is considered that it will not eventuate until after a period of intense persecution of the Church.

What is most important is that Hermas gives no evidence of being harassed by the delay in the Second Advent. It is a pause given by God in His sovereignty, so that there may be opportunity for repentance.

There are definite elements of 'realized eschatology' in this work, as well as those futurist ones already noted. These are bound up with the doctrine of the Church and the understanding of Baptism. The thought of the gradual growth of the Tower in accordance with a divine plan, the thought of the Church as getting younger and younger as she approaches her final deliverance at the end of the age, the eschatological understanding of the unity of the Church as she reaches out towards the end of the age; all these are factors which reveal the presence of a kind of realized eschatology. What is most significant, however, is that 'realized' elements do not displace 'futurist' elements. No embarrass -
ment over the delay in the Second Advent has led to a reinterpretation of futurism in which the latter is replaced by 'realized' elements. Indeed, it is arguable that the reason why the concept of a 'pause' in the building of the Tower is introduced is because the Church is so aware of God's presence and guidance that it is hard to believe that the end can be far removed: thus understood, the 'pause' does not so much explain why the end has not yet come as does it rather indicate that so much has been achieved that very little remains to be done before the completion of the building.

If the account which we have given above (pp. 212-224) concerning the position of apostates be sound, then it is clear that it witnesses impressively to the way in which baptism was viewed as setting believers within the Church of Christ, within the community that awaited her Lord from heaven. It is just because baptism does thus set people within this context as a conscious and deliberate commitment to Christ that apostasy in the face of persecution, or such serious sins as adultery, make a mockery of that profession. Clearly to belong to the Church through faith and baptism is very important, even although it is nowhere suggested that the present experience of Christ thus gained makes the future of the Church less important. In this connection an impressive passage occurs in Similitude IX, where the forty stones in one of the foundation tiers of the Tower is explained of those who had died before the Incarnation. The point is that the forty come up out of the deep (ἐκ τοῦ βυθοῦ), and it is explained that the apostles and teachers who preached in the name of the Son of God, having died, ἔκθεσαν καὶ τοῖς προκεκομισθέντοις καὶ αὐτοὶ ἔσωσαν αὐτοὶ τὴν σφραγίδα τοῦ κηρύγματος. Κατέθηκαν δὲν μετ' αὐτῶν εἰς τὸ ὕδωρ καὶ καίναι ἀνέβησαν. Ὅλη αὕτη μὲν ἱωτὲς κατείχαν καὶ θύωτες ἀνέβησαν, ἐκεῖνοι δὲ οἱ προκεκομισθέντες νεκροὶ κατείχαν, θύωτες δὲ ἀνέβησαν. (XVI.5-6)
The thought is that the apostles preached or proclaimed to the Old Testament saints the good news concerning Christ (more usually this is conceived in terms of Christ's Descent into Hades) after their own death. Not only so but the reception of the Gospel from those who had believed and had been baptized had the effect of bringing these older saints into the full possession of the benefits of the Gospel, together with those who had been physically baptized. They were thus made one with the solidarity of Christ's Body which is the Church. What is implicit here is a concern for the community of the Church in its physical constitution. This is guaranteed and realized in water-baptism. It is such a community which awaits the Lord from heaven.

The proclamation of Christ's first Advent and achievement by Christian saints on their descent into Hades at their death overcame the difficulty caused by the inability of the Old Testament saints to be baptized, and made them members of the same community.

The eschatology of this work is best thought of in terms of divine providence and future consummation of God's present activity in history. In this way futurist and realized elements of eschatology are held together. Nowhere is there any retreat, however, from futurism. So far as there is movement away from New Testament attitudes it would seem in fact to be towards a rather greater emphasis on futurism at the expense of the assurance of present possession of salvation. Despite the impressive notes of realized eschatology in regard to the Church and Christian Baptism, there is an element of synergism in the outlook of this work, especially prominent in the Mandates, which goes hand in hand with a rather Jewish setting of the two ages one after the other. It is true to the New Testament to think of this age as being followed by the next, but it also characteristically thinks in terms of what has been termed an 'overlap' of the ages. Where this is stressed, there
is a greater assurance than the 'Shepherd of Hermas' seems to display, that judgment is for the Christian past already. The 'Shepherd' has little to say concretely about the Work of Christ or the present assurance of salvation: believers are very much 'in via'. It depends upon their future life whether they will be found among God's people at the end of the age. (Mand. 1:2; 11:7, etc).

Futurism and realized eschatology are thus held in balance in this work although the tendency is to exaggerate futurism at the expense of the note of present experience. This is especially evident in regard to the matter of forgiveness for sin, which seems to depend on whether one repents of past sins, or of serious sins if a baptized person, before the end of the age. The doctrines of the Church and of Baptism help, however, to redress this situation. The realization of a 'pause' before the Second Advent underscores the futurist note, in that the Second Advent is looked for. No serious embarrassment over its delay is, however, expressed, and its eventuation in God's due time is thought of as the coming consummation of a divine ordering of history. This concept of providence may owe somewhat to Stoicism, but most, it would seem, to the Old Testament Scriptures.
'The Preaching of Peter' in the Pseudo-Clementines

The so-called Clementine Homilies and Recognitions derive their name from their attribution to Clement of Rome, in whose name they are written in the form of a report of Clement's wanderings in company with the Apostle Peter. It is generally recognized that these documents have in fact nothing to do with Clement of Rome, and in their present form they are usually dated by modern scholarship as late as the fourth century A.D. Scholarship is undecided which is the earlier work, though opinion generally favours a somewhat earlier dating for the Homilies. The general view at the present time is that the Homilies and the Recognitions are not directly dependent, either upon the other, but rather that they are variant developments of a lost common 'Grundschrift'. This latter is probably to be dated in the early 3rd century, though H.J. Schoeps favours a date between 160 and 190 A.D. 1

It is the character of this 'Grundschrift' which is of interest to us in our assessing of the eschatology of the Early Church in its various sections. Although diverging in details, H.J. Schoeps 2, J. Daniélou 3, and Oscar Cullmann 4 are all in agreement that this 'Grundschrift' was either an Ebionite work or was itself derived in part from a source which was indicative of Ebionite theology. The


Early Church writer, Epiphanius (4th century), refers to a work called 'The Itinerary of Peter' (περίπολοι πετρου) which he included among the holy books of the Ebionite sect. It would seem that it was this work which was the 'Grundschrift' of the Clementines. However, the Itinerary of Peter was itself composite in character, and its most important source was the 'Preaching of Peter'. J. Daniélou refers to the latter as "an Ebionite work of the second century which preserves the theology of Ebionism." ¹ Daniélou goes on thus to formulate the relationship between the Itinerary of Peter, the Preaching of Peter, and the Clementines: "This Preaching of Peter was combined at some time during the third century with other documents to form the basic stratum common to both the Recognitions and the Homilies, and it is this compound stratum which is to be identified with the Journeys of Peter." ¹

It is this 'Preaching of Peter' with which we are especially concerned at the present moment. If it is truly a second-century work which preserves the theology of Ebionism, then we can expect to gain from it some understanding, amongst other things, of the eschatology of this Jewish Christian sect. This seems important, if we are to gain a comprehensive picture of the development of this aspect of Early Church thinking, Daniélou lists the 'Preaching of Peter' along with information given by Epiphanius in his 'Panarion' as a most important source of knowledge concerning Ebionism. It is only, however, in very recent years that the existence and significance of this work has been recognized. Even today many summaries dealing with Early Christian literature appear to confound the 'Preaching

¹ op. cit., p.59.
of Peter', with which we are here concerned, with another work of the same name, usually referred to under its Greek title, Κύριος Πέτρος, which is regarded as the earliest work of Christian apology, probably dating from the earlier part of the 2nd century, and known now through only a few surviving fragments\(^1\). Danielou explicitly notes the distinction between the two works with this title\(^2\).

The first problem that faces us as we seek to discuss the 'Preaching of Peter' that lies at the base of the 'Itinerary of Peter' and of the Clementines, is how its contents are to be identified. This can only be achieved by means of reduction from the Clementine Homilies and the Clementine Recognitions. The task of identification of what should be regarded as included in the 'Preaching of Peter' is made considerably easier by the inclusion in chapter CXXV of Book III of the 'Recognitions' of a summary of the contents of teaching given by Peter and supposedly already despatched to James, the Lord's brother and bishop of the Church in Jerusalem. It will be worthwhile to note in outline what this teaching consisted of:

- **Book 1.** An account of the True Prophet. How the law is to be understood, in accord with the genuine tradition of Moses.
- **Book 2.** An account of the beginning. The relationship of God to the immensity of space.
- **Book 3.** Concerning God and what has been ordained by Him.
- **Book 4.** Many are called gods, but there is only one true God according to Scripture.
- **Book 5.** There are two heavens, one visible and temporary, the other invisible and eternal.


\(^2\)op.\(cit\), p.59, n.12.
Concerning good and evil. The co-operation of evil with good, within the divine providence.

What matters the twelve apostles dealt with before the people in the Temple.

The explanation of seemingly contradictory words of the Lord.

The law has been given by God, is alone righteous and pure, and it alone cleanses men.

Concerning carnal birth and spiritual birth, the latter through Baptism. Discussion concerning the freedom of the human will, which is affirmed.

This teaching may for the most part be identified, scattered as it is through the Homilies and the Recognitions. It is usually held that the Recognitions are somewhat less Judaic in character than the Homilies. This may be due to two factors consistent with a common substratum, the 'Preaching of Peter', understood as consisting of teaching as outlined in the scheme of books noted above. The first is that the 'Preaching of Peter' has been admixed with other material in the formation, not only of the Itinerary of Peter (which would have affected both Homilies and Recognitions), but also with the imbedding of the 'Itinerary' in the Clementine documents. At this latter stage it may be that the material, with which the common substratum was admixed, was somewhat variant in character, thus accounting for the somewhat less Judaic character of the Recognitions. The second factor, however, is probably the more significant. This consists in the fact that we only have the Recognitions in a Latin translation made by Rufinus. The latter confesses to having taken certain liberties with the text, and these would doubtless be of such a character as to modify any theological extravagancies of the Recognitions. On the whole, therefore, the Homilies probably represent a more faithful account of the 'Preaching of Peter' than the Recognitions, though we shall refer to
both works in seeking to establish the eschatological presuppositions and ideas of that work; nor should we exaggerate the differences between the Homilies and the Recognitions.

It seems necessary to outline briefly what is at present held in scholarly circles concerning the teaching and practice of the Ebionites. In doing so we shall have to note briefly how the view that the 'Preaching of Peter' is derived from this sect, modifies, or adds to, our knowledge of the Ebionites. This has a definite bearing on the question of the eschatology of the sect. Our interest in this is to seek to establish the eschatology of the Ebionites. Even if, however, later scholarly research were to disprove the connection between the 'Preaching of Peter' and the Ebionites - which seems very unlikely - the eschatology imbedded in the so-called teaching of Peter, as given in the document identified as the 'Preaching', would have significance as indicative of a somewhat heterodox view in its relation to eschatological issues. For it is clear that the general theology of the 'Preaching' diverges to a not inconsiderable extent from what came to be regarded as fully orthodox Christian teaching. The eschatology bound up with such teaching will, therefore, be likely to reflect this heterodoxy, and may even be of assistance in helping us to trace, by contrast, the development of the more characteristic and orthodox modes of thinking in this field.

The Ebionites were a community of Christians who flourished especially on the Eastern bank of the River Jordan and they were probably Aramaic-speaking. It is a mistake to confuse them with those Aramaic-speaking Christians who fled to Trans-Jordania before the Fall of Jerusalem in 70 A.D. The latter were perfectly orthodox. The Ebionites must also be distinguished from the Nazarenes, who separated from the main body of the Christian Church because they regarded the
Jewish laws concerning the Sabbath and regarding circumcision as still obligatory upon Christians. The latter used a version of Matthew's Gospel, written in Aramaic but transcribed into Hebrew characters, as their only Gospel. This showed some unusual developments, but was not heretical in any way. We are indebted primarily to Epiphanius for information concerning the Nazarenes and their Gospel of Matthew. This group, as such, may have differed from the rest of the Church regarding the question of attitude towards the Mosaic law, but the Nazarenes do not appear to have been heretical in outlook. 

Oscar Cullmann has propounded the theory that the Ebionites were in all probability a group of converted Essenes. Jean Daniélou gives his support to the likelihood of this judgment. What is known or can be inferred concerning the Ebionites seems to be in agreement with our growing stock of information concerning the Essenes. It is important to make such linkages as can be made, as it may well assist us to observe lines of development in heresy and especially in the direction of Gnosticism, which will throw light on that phenomenon. There has been much discussion concerning the emergence of Gnosticism. From the days of Adolf Harnack onwards it was assumed that this was the result of an acute Hellenisation of Church teaching - not that all such Hellenisation led to heresy, since the Church also established her formal dogmas with the aid of Hellenistic concepts. Nevertheless, it was Hellenic modes of thought, it was believed, which led to Gnosticism.

---

1 Cf. Daniélou, *op. cit.*, p. 56.
3 *op. cit.*, p. 57.
Of more recent years the suggestion has been propounded more powerfully that the origins of Gnosticism are to be sought in heterodox Judaism. There is hardly any consensus of opinion that is recognisable at the present time, but the general direction in which scholarly opinion is moving does seem to suggest that Gnosticism has to be understood primarily over against a background of development from heterodox Judaism and very early heterodox Jewish Christianity, perhaps in combination with infiltrations of Persian dualism and an Hellenistic preoccupation with \(\gamma\nu\nu\omega\sigma\iota\). The concept that Ebionism — whose theology, it is believed, the 'Preaching of Peter' sets forth — has strong links with Essenism is, therefore, not insignificant for the study of the development of Christian doctrine, orthodox and heterodox. Daniélou judges that there were probably three stages in a development towards Gnosticism.\(^1\) In speaking thus, he makes a distinction between earlier modes of thinking concerned in some degree with \(\gamma\nu\nu\omega\sigma\iota\) and Gnosticism proper, in which a full system is offered and dualism is no longer subservient to the \(\mu\nu\alpha\rho\pi\kappa\alpha\) of God. The first stage is found in the milieu of heterodox Judaism. It was in this setting that the heterodoxy of such figures as Simon of Samaria and the Nazarenes developed. Stage two only came after the Fall of Jerusalem in 70 A.D. and after the death of James, the brother of the Lord and Bishop of the Church in Jerusalem. During the episcopate of Simon, who succeeded James as Bishop of the orthodox Palestinian community, a number of heresies were introduced. These were of a Jewish character and provenance. It would seem that Ebionism is to be fitted in at this point in the historical development, if Daniélou's ideas

\(^1\) op. cit. chapter 2, 'Heterodox Jewish Christianity'. This division is implied throughout this chapter. Cf. espec. p. 70.
are well grounded. It was only in a later third stage that what we know distinctly as Gnosticism came into being, this in the movement associated with Marcion, and in connection with the followers of Valentinus and Basilides, as well as other rather less well-known figures. The acknowledgement of this three-stage scheme of development even as a possibility serves to enhance the significance of the present study of Ebionism, with special reference to its eschatology.

The two aspects of Ebionism which are usually stressed in summary treatments of the movement are its defective Christology, which appears to have been adoptionist in character, and its predilection for Jewish customs and usages which derived from the understanding that the true Law of Moses had never been abrogated. The Mosaic Law, however, was held not to have included originally and properly any references to bloody sacrifices. This is one of the points at which Ebionism shows most clearly a link with Essenism which was notably opposed to the sacrificial system. We can see too how the Fall of Jerusalem, with its putting aside of the Temple sacrifices, would readily be interpreted by Christians influenced by Essenism as the vindication by God of what they had always believed.

In other respects as well Ebionism shows points of contact with Essenism. Here the evidence is largely bound up with the assumption that the 'Preaching of Peter', imbedded in the Clementines, is an Ebionite work. Thus, in that literature we find not only a rejection of bloody sacrifices, but also a strong stress on Christ as the 'true Prophet' (Hom.I.XIX), combined with the thought of Adam as the first incarnation of the true Prophet - "this is a direct echo of the Essene doctrine of the succession of the prophets". The doctrine

\[\text{op.cit.}, \text{p.60}\]
of 'false pericopes', mentioned at Hom. II, XXXIX, is also a most salutary instance of a doctrine which is not in accord with orthodox Christianity, but which agreed with Essene suppression of certain elements which were offensive in their eyes. Such treatment of the Old Testament is evident in the Essene 'Book of Jubilees'.

A further concept, which is known to have typified Essenism, and which is explicitly referred to by Epiphanius in his 'Panarion' as a characteristic of the Ebionites, is that of the Two Spirits. This appears in the 'Preaching of Peter' and helps to show the Ebionite character of this work. It will be in connection especially with this that the character of Ebionite eschatology will be able to be developed.

Again, on the side of practice, the Ebionites, according to the same authority, engaged in daily ritual baths — a feature of Essenism which has become prominent in our minds since the identification which is commonly made between the Qumran community and some form of Essenism. At the same time it is noteworthy that the Ebionites added to these daily ritual baths a baptism of initiation, surely a distinctively Christian feature.

Our present concern is with the eschatology of the 'Preaching of Peter', as imbedded in the Clementine Homilies and Recognitions. It will be the clearer if the above sketch of the chief features of Ebionite theology, especially in their relationship with Essenism, is in mind throughout.

1 Mentioned by Daniéelou, op. cit., pp. 60-61.
2 Mentioned by Daniéelou, op. cit., p. 61.
3 Panarion. XXX.16.
One of the features which Epiphanius mentions as characteristic of Ebionism is the doctrine of Two Spirits. It is also one of the most fundamental features of Ebionism and has fairly wide implications for understanding many aspects of the movement and its theology. The two 'Spirits' are Christ and the Devil, and it is important to observe that, though this is a dualist concept in Ebionism, both are still subordinated to the sole monarchy of God. Therefore, we cannot in a meaningful way characterise Ebionism as Gnosticism. It is only where an ultimate dualism or multiplicity is posed that the Jewish and the Christian concept of the sole monarchy of God is abandoned. Nevertheless, the conjunction of Christ and the Devil as subordinates to God, when taken together with certain explicit statements concerning Christ, seem clearly to deny the true divinity of Christ and thus to give Ebionism a heterodox, if not a Gnostic, character.

The connection of this concept of the Two Spirits with eschatology becomes evident in the following quotation from the Panarion of Epiphanius, cited by Daniélou:

"They (the Ebionites) say that God has established two beings, Christ and the Devil. To the former has been committed the power of the world to come, and to the other the power of this world. They say that Jesus was begotten of human seed, and chosen, and thus called by election Son of God, Christ having come upon him from on high in the form of a dove. They say that he was not begotten by God the Father, but that he was created, like the archangels, but greater than they. ———."

This opposition of Christ and the Devil is clearly part of a wider contrast between two worlds or kingdoms. Bound up with it is the concept of two ages, one present and one still to come. Clearly this has a superficial resemblance at least with the general Early Christian...

1Panarion XXX.XVI. Cited by Daniélou, op. cit., p.56
conception of two ages, 'οὗτος ὁ άιών' and 'ὁ άιών ὁ μελλων'.

In so far as primitive Christian thought was influenced by apocalyptic concepts, we would expect to find points of contact with this Ebionite view of Two Spirits and Two Ages. It is again clear that Ebionism was influenced by Essenism in this matter. Therefore, a common apocalyptic background to primitive Christianity of an orthodox variety, on the one hand, and to Ebionism on the other, would suggest the likelihood of somewhat in common between these eschatological concepts which employ similar terminology. At the same time the uniqueness of Jesus and the appreciation of this by orthodox Christianity in the early days of the Church might well be expected to make an important 'differentia' between the two concepts even where the terminology is similar, and this in fact seems to be the case.

That this concept of the Two Spirits is Ebionite is confirmed by the appearance of this teaching in the 'Preaching of Peter'. According to chapter CXXV of Book III of the Recognitions, Book VI of the 'Preaching of Peter' dealt with good and evil, and with the co-operation of evil with good in the divine providence (vide above, p.24E). A clear example of this teaching, doubtless derived from Book VI of the 'Preaching' occurs in the following passage:

"καὶ ὁ πέτρος Ἀκούσατε, ἐφη, ταχυραῦν τῆς περὶ τοῦ πονηροῦ ἀρμονίας τῆς ζητήσεως. ὁ θεὸς δύο βασιλείας ἔρισεν καὶ δύο λιῶνας συνετήσατο, κρίνας τῷ πονηρῷ δεδομένη τὸν παρόνια κόσμον διὰ τὸ μικρὸν τέ αὐτῶν εἶναι καὶ παρέρχεται ὁ ἔρεως, τῷ δὲ λαόθω διόρθωσιν ὑπέσχετο τὸν μελλοντα λίωνα, ἀτε ὅ ἐρα-μέγαν ὅντα καὶ λίδιον."
Man is said to have been created with free-will. His body consists of three parts and is derived from the female. His spirit consists of three parts, but is male.

"ΕΚΤΕΡΑ δὲ τῶν τριῶν μιὰν ἔχει τὴν ρίζαν, ὡς εἶναι τῶν ζύμων ἐκ πνεύματος οὕτω, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἄρρενος. διὸ δὴ καὶ δύο κύτως οὕτω προσέθησαν, νόμου τε καὶ ἀνομίας — δύο τε βασιλείαι ἡρώθησαν ἢ ἢ μὲν τῶν] οὐρανῶν λεγομένη, ἢ δὲ τῶν ἔτι γῆς νῦν βασιλευόντων. ἄλλα καὶ σύν βασιλείας ἐπάθητος, ἢν ὁ μὲν τοῦ παρόντος καὶ προσκιάρου κόσμου νόμῳ βασιλευέται χειροτονηθηκαί, ὡς καὶ ἐπ’ ὁλέθρῳ πονηρῶν χιρίων ἐκράθη — δὲ ἔτερος, καὶ ἀκότος βασιλείας ὑπάρχειν (τοῦ εἰσομένου κόσμου), στέργει πάσαν ἀνθρώπων φύσιν — "

(Hom. XX.II.1-6).

In the chapter following this quotation (III) it is made explicit that of the two powers mentioned each acts against the other by the command of God. The Evil One does certainly feel gratification at punishing those who have chosen to lead evil lives, but this punishment is in accordance with justice, and does in fact help to fulfil the will of God. He is viewed at the end of chapter III as being the result of a temporary combination of elements originally sent forth by God. 'Peter' goes on to say in his discourse:

"ὁ οὖν πονηρός. πρὸς τῷ τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος κόσμου τέλει υπούργοπος ἀκριβῶς. τῷ θεῷ, ἀτέ δὴ οὐ μᾶς οὐσίας ἔν. τῆς πρὸς κακίαν μονῆς μετασυχριθεὶς ἀκριβῶς γανέσθαι δύναται, οὔδε γὰρ νῦν κακόν τι ποιεῖ, καίτοι κακίας ἐν, νομίμως κακούχειν εἰλήφως τὴν ἔξοσίαν."

(III.9-10)
It is also said, in the body of this chapter that "οἱ δὲ ἡγεμόνες ὁτοι τὰ χεῖρι χεῖρες εἰσὶν Θεοῦ προλαμβάνειν ἐπιθυμῶς τὸ ἀντιὶ. Θελήμα ἐπιτελεῖν." (para. 4)

So far as the righteous and sinners are concerned, it is possible even for an unrighteous man to repent and to be saved, while a righteous man may bring punishment upon himself for sins committed, "ἐπὶ τελευταῖς ἡμερινές" (para. 4), i.e. on account of sinning at the close of a career of righteousness.

What is heterodox in the above is the concept that the Evil One and Christ are equally powers appointed by God to govern consecutive ages. There is, it is true, a superficial resemblance between what is said here and the concept of the Two Ways found in such Early Christian writings as the Didache and the Epistle of Barnabas. The fact is that the Two Ways concept is Jewish in origin, and appears to have had a specially close connection with Essenism and such communities as flourished at Qumran. When certain Early Christians, however, adopted it, they modified the presuppositions which underlay its usage in heterodox Judaism. It would seem that Ebionism, as a heterodox form of Christianity, took over the concept of the Two Ways without modifying it.

Our present concern is with the eschatology bound up with this concept. One can see clearly that there is in the 'Preaching of Peter' a definite concept of a future age, and it is made clear in the Clementines that this age is to be initiated by a Day of Judgment (cf. for example, Hom. IX.XIX.1). So far this is orthodox Christianity.

The thought of future Judgment is present in the two chapters from which the quotations, made above, were taken: while the Evil One rejoices in punishing now such as choose to lead an evil life, the reference in III.4 to the possibility of unrighteous men's repenting, thus reversing the previous direction of their lives, and of righteous men sinning at
the end of their lives, makes this clear. One might be tempted to suppose that such judgment was thought of as taking place after death, were it not for the fact that this comment is set in the context of the discussion of the Two Spirits and the Two Ages.

In the Homily XV, Peter is portrayed again as making very clearly a distinction between Two Kingdoms and Two Ages. This is most explicitly set forth in chapter VII:

"ο Πέτρος ο προφήτης παρενεβαλεν ἡμᾶς ὅτι ο Τύχης ὑλῶν δημιουργοῦσα καὶ θεὸς δυσιν τισιν ἀπενερέμησα βασιλείας οὐκ ἀγαθῶς κακωμεν. οὐ γὰρ τὸν μὲν κακῶν τοῦ παρόντος κόσμου μετὰ νόμον τὴν βασιλείαν ἑώρησαν ἐκεῖνοι ἐξουσίαν κολασίαν τοὺς ἀποκαλοῦντας, τῷ δὲ ἀγαθῶν τὸν ἐσόμενον ἠδίον ἀκοῦεν."

(para. 4)

What is interesting in this chapter is the inference which is made from the concept of the Two Kingdoms. Those who in free-will elect to live for the present kingdom "τῶν ἐσομένων ἀγαθῶν οὐδὲν ἐξασθη" (para. 5). In corresponding fashion it is inappropriate for those who have chosen to live in accordance with the future kingdom to treat as their own the things of this world. Thus, disdain for luxury, ease, property, and such like, is seen to be rooted in the belonging of the righteous to the age that is to come: their 'good time' is yet to be. It might seem that the punishment of the unrighteous in the coming Age is conceived of rather negatively, viz. a failure to possess the enjoyments of the righteous. The same impression might seem to be given by a further section of the same speech by 'Peter' as recorded in the following chapter (VIII), where 'Peter' says that the unjust "τοῖς ἐσομένοις ἀγαθῶι ἀνδρὰς ὑπὲρ συντρόφουσιν." (para. 1).
Yet a remark by 'Peter' in chapter IX shows that in fact judgement to come is conceived in much more positive terms. At the end of this chapter 'Peter' says that what distinguishes the saved is that they do not possess anything i.e. in this present life. Afflictions are sent by God in this present life on persons who do not act in purity of heart in order to detach them from present possessions. "προορίζεται υπαρκής ζωνίων σωθησίων κολάσεως." (para. 6).

Those who are here in view are not those who have chosen the things of this present world and are, therefore, entitled to such possessions, but those who have chosen the future world (cf paras. 1-2). It is clear, however, that the thought is that the unrighteous are due to enter upon 'eternal punishments'. The afflictions are sent upon the righteous, when they are in danger of being diverted from their true aims by the good things of this life, in order that they may not become detached from the righteous whose eyes are on the coming Age and in order to confirm their solidarity with such persons.

THE 'PREACHING'S' CHRISTOLOGY AND SOTERIOLOGY DEFECTIVE, BUT THE INCARNATION VIEWED AS PIVOTAL

Thus, a central thought in the Clementines is that of the distinction between the Two Ages. The concept of judgment, as we have seen, is bound up with this distinction, and such judgment is not thought of primarily in terms of punishment after death, but rather in terms of temporary chastisements for the righteous, which are intended to be remedial in character, and future judgment for the unrighteous when the Coming Age dawns. There is indeed a thorough-going legalism in the distinction which is made between the righteous and the unrighteous, and one searches in vain for the authentic New Testament concept of the forgiveness of sins and newness of life as made available in Jesus Christ and his redemptive Work. Christ is conceived of as the 'true
Prophet'. As such, He brings fresh teaching which is designed to deliver us from ignorance of coming Judgment and to fill out our understanding of what righteousness consists in. Behind this lies the Essene concept of the succession of prophets (mentioned above, page 252). One of the clearest statement of this teaching in the Clementines is at Hom. III, chapter XX, where it is asserted that the man fashioned by the hands of God was given the Holy Spirit of God. The passage goes on to assert that he alone has the Holy Spirit who has kept reappearing in the world from the very beginning. This series of appearings or reappearings is terminated by the coming of this Person in his own times "εἰς "ις ζητεῖ Χριστέως, εἰς ζητεῖ τὴν ἀνάπτυξιν." (para. 2)

This last coming probably has reference to the incarnation of this figure in Jesus of Nazareth, but it is possible that it is rather to the appearing of this figure at the end of the present age that we must here look. If the appearance in mind is in fact the Incarnation, then it would seem that that coming must have had decisiveness of some kind, even if the stress falls on the concept of his teaching. If the coming that is in view is one at the end of the age, then one cannot argue specially from this passage towards any concept of decisiveness in the 'Preaching of Peter' with regard to the coming of that constantly reappearing figure in the ministry of Jesus of Nazareth.

What seems certain is that the Teacher, in so far as he is identified with the incarnation of the Christ in Jesus of Nazareth, is thought of as performing His work through the perfection and the extension of His teaching among all the nations. Probably, if there be a special note of decisiveness regarding the incarnation of Christ in Jesus, it is bound up with the fact that through him the Way of life
is opened up, or made more readily available, to those of Gentile race. This is hinted at in Hom. III, chapter XIX, where, referring in context to Jesus who spoke of the Pharisees as sitting in Moses' seat (Matt. 23.2, vide Chapter XVIII), Peter says:

"οτός τῆς καθέδρας ἐγερθεῖς, ὥσ πιστὴν ὑπὲρ τέκνων, τοῦ ἀπὸ κάιώνος ἐν κρυπτῷ ἀξίων παραδίδομένα κρύσταλλον, μέχρις ἀτῶν ἐθνῶν τον ἐλεόν ἐκτείνων καὶ ψυχὰς πάντων ἔλεων, ἰδίου λίματος ἡμέλεια." (para. 1)

Closely bound up with this matter is the emphasis placed in the Clementines on Jesus of Nazareth as the Prophet spoken of by Moses at Deut.18.15-19. This passage is explicitly quoted and applied to Jesus of Nazareth at Hom. III, chapter LIII.2-3. Deut. 18.15 is applied to Jesus also, by implication, at Rec. I,XXXVI. This equation of Jesus of Nazareth with that Prophet, spoken of by Moses in a predictive manner, suggests strongly that the 'Preaching of Peter' does see something quite decisive as having taken place through the ministry of Jesus. That this decisiveness was bound up with the extension of the Gospel to the Gentiles seems implied by the discussion in Rec.I, chapter XXXVII, which follows upon the reference in the previous chapter to the prophecy of Moses concerning a great coming Prophet (the general Early Church understanding of Deut.18.15ff was that it was prophecy). In chapter XXXVII, the thought is that it was the task of the Prophet to inaugurate a new era by doing away with the sacrificial system, which (chapter XXXVI) was permitted to Israel up to this time because God deemed it better to let the Israelites sacrifice to Him than sacrifice to other gods. 'Peter' goes on to say that God appointed one place in which it would be lawful for the Israelites to sacrifice (XXXVII.1). He then says:
"hoc autem totum eo prospectu gerebat, ut cum tempus opportunum venisset et didicissent per prophetam, quia deus misericordiam vult et non sacrificium, viderent sum qui eos doceret locum dei electum esse sapientiam eius, in qua conveniret offerri hostias deo, hunc autem locum, qui ad tempus videbatur electus, incursionibus hostium et excidiiis saepe vexatum, et ad ultimum quoque audirent penitus excidendum, ad cuius rei fidem etiam ante adventum veri prophetae, qui esset hostias cum loco pariter repudiaturus, saepe hostibus populatus est et igni incensus ~~~~" (Rec. I. XXXVII. 2-3)

The theology of this passage is most interesting and significant for our understanding of the basic outlook of the Clementines and especially of the 'Preaching of Peter'. It is clearly implied that God did elect the Israelitish people in a special way to be His people, and permitted them a sacrificial system but the latter was designed to endure only until such time as the Prophet should come, through Whose coming it became unnecessary and indeed inappropriate any more to offer sacrifices at Jerusalem. The destruction of Jerusalem is evidently the significant action of God in setting aside the sacrificial system. Nevertheless, chapter XLI tell us that, when Jesus died on the Cross, the veil of the Temple was rent asunder, "velut lamentans excidium imminens loco". The plain implication of this last reference is that what set aside the Temple and its sacrificial system was the death of Jesus. Further, immediately following upon this remark in chapter XLI 'Peter' goes on to say that, though all nature was moved by the event of the death of Christ, the Israelites are not even now moved to the consideration of such great happenings, and (chapter XLII), insofar as the Gentiles had to be called in to fill up the room left vacant by the unbelieving (Jews) the preaching of the Gospel has now been sent into all the world. What all this amounts to is that the 'Preaching of Peter' — unless Rufinus or someone else has tampered with it — takes very seriously the decisiveness of the event of Christ, and even of the death of Christ, but relates this especially to the extension of the illumination and reconciliation afforded by the truth of God to all the nations.
It remains true that there is no evidence even in Rec.I, chapter XLI, which is explicit, of any concept of forgiveness offered through the Cross. It is rather that the teaching which the Jews formerly enjoyed, is now made available in a higher form (no sacrifices are now necessary) to men of all nations.

The importance of this for our present purpose is that we must seek to evaluate the decisiveness of the Incarnation and the Cross of Jesus in the 'Preaching of Peter' in order to understand whether there is any kind of 'realized' or even 'inaugurated' eschatology in this work. We would submit that it is clear from the passages quoted above that, even if the soteriology of the Clementines should prove defective when compared with New Testament and with more orthodox Christian theology, there is some definite quality of decisiveness which is attached to the coming of Christ in Jesus of Nazareth and especially in relationship to His death. Recognitions I, chapter XLI, does indeed say that, when Christ was hurried by wicked men to the Cross, this deed was turned by Christ's power to good. Further, the parallel in that chapter is with the deliverance wrought by Moses in the conflict with Pharaoh in Egypt: there is solid New Testament foundation for this comparison (cf. I.Cor.X). It may be, of course, that Rufinus has altered the original text, so it is unwise to build too much on it. The point remains, however, that, even if the note of redemption through Christ's blood, at least in its concept of a gracious bearing of man's sin, is not clearly in evidence — and this is probably true, quite apart from the question whether Rufinus has altered the text of the 'Preaching' — both the Homilies and the Recognitions seems to bear evidence to the fact that the 'Preaching' did think in terms of a decisiveness which pertained to the ministry of Jesus of Nazareth.
It cannot be denied that any view which thinks in terms of a series of incarnations of the Christ, beginning with Adam and reaching its consummation in Jesus of Nazareth, lowers the uniqueness of Jesus. The Christology, as well as the soteriology, of the 'Preaching' is certainly defective. And yet there is much in the 'Preaching' which follows at a little distance the outlines of a more Biblical and orthodox approach. Even much orthodox Christian thinking in the early days of the Church thought in terms of special theophanies of the Word of God and of the impartation of the Word to the Israelites through God's servants, the prophets. This, however, is something different from the view found in the Clementines, which does indeed seem to do violence to the uniqueness of Jesus. It remains true at the same time that such a passage as Rec.I.XLI. speaks in moving and reverential terms concerning what was accomplished by Jesus of Nazareth. There is the clear sense in this passage that an event with cosmic significance had taken place in the death of Jesus. This is seen in the darkening of the sun, in the tearing asunder of mountains (not mentioned in the New Testament), in the opening up of graves, as well as in the anticipatory rending of the veil of the Temple. Not only so, but there is imbedded what seems in itself a quite Biblical and orthodox conception, namely, that what Jesus accomplished not only effected changes in nature, but also effected an important change in time, i.e. in the dispensations: from this time the sacrificial system was abrogated (the destruction of the Temple only had the effect of signifying what had already happened in the Cross of Jesus) and the Gentiles were incorporated into God's purposes in a more direct fashion than prior to this time.
This concept of dispensations is bound up with a theology of history which appears to be imbedded in the Clementines and is in itself quite Biblical. If the theology of the Clementines and of the 'Preaching of Peter', in particular, is defective, this appears to be in regard to the content of its Christology and its soteriology, but the concept of Christ's death effecting a change in the situation regarding the sacrificial system and the relation of Gentile nations to God is entirely orthodox. It is also surely a profoundly Biblical concept. It is one which does not think in a static way concerning history, but sees it as the area of divine activity. That the 'Preaching' has such a theology of history is not an insignificant finding, for such a theology always has close links with, and implications for, eschatology.

The picture which is now emerging of the 'Preaching' is of a document, defective theologically in certain quite important respects, but which yet has somewhat in common with more orthodox thinking. In particular, we have seen that it believes in two ages, the one succeeding the other; in judgment at the end of this age; and in a factual change in relationships between God and certain peoples at the death of Jesus of Nazareth.

THE CONCEPT OF SUCCESSIVE AGES ELABORATED

The concept of division of ages is confirmed in a rather more elaborate picture of times or eras that is given at Hom.XVII.IX, where 'Peter' is discussing with Simon Magus concerning the figure of God. 'Peter's' concept in this passage is quite profound and appears to be harmonious with Biblical thinking. God is portrayed as the source of the universe. It is His power which upholds the world and it is from Him that it takes its rise. The thought is that God is not a
part of the universe. To say that would be to debase Him. It is in connection with this thought that the idea, first of six infinites in terms of space, and then of six temporal periods, emerges. The connection of thought is most instructive, and helps us to understand the methodology of the thinking in the 'Preaching'. 'Peter' says:

"Τούτο οὖν τὸ ἐξ ὑπεράκον πάντα δέχεται ἀπειρον ἀνάγκη εἶναι, καθ' ἐκεῖν τὸν ὁντὸς ὑπερ πάντα ἐν σχήματι, ὥς ἐν ἀπειρῷ μέσος ἐστὶν, τοῦ πάντος ὑπάρχων ὄρος. ἀπ' ὑπερ οὖν ἁρχόμεναι καὶ ἐκτὸς εἰς ἀπεράντων ἀγχον τὴν φύσιν. ἣν ὁ μὲν ἀπ' ἑαυτοῦ λαβὼν τὴν ἁρχήν δικνείται ἐστὶν ὄρος λαβὼν, ὥς ἐς βάθος κάτω, ὥς ἐς ἐπὶ δέξιαν, ὥς ἐς ἐπὶ λαβὼν, ὥς ἐς ἐμπρόσθεν, ὥς ἐς ἐπίστευσαν, ἐς οὐς ἑαυτὸς ἀποβλέπειν ὡς ἐς ἁρχήμον πάντα δέχεται ἵσον χρονικὸς ἐς διστήματιν συνελεύσαν τὸν κόσμον. Αὐτὸς δὲ πάντας ἀνάπτυξεν ἐν καὶ τὸν ἁρχόμενον ἀπειρον ἀιῶνα εἰκόνα ἁρχῆν, ἁρχήν ὡς καὶ τελευτῆ. ἐς αὐτὸν γὰρ τό ἐς ἀπειρὰ τελευτῆ καὶ ἐς ἑαυτόν τὴν ἐς ἀπειρον ἐκ τῆς λαμβάνει." (paras. 2-4)

The thought of this passage is quite profound. It portrays God as the source of the universe. God is not contained in or by space, since He is its Lord. So too He is not confined by time, but is its Lord.

In consequence, both material and temporal extensions derive from God. The conceptual framework which is here implied is that of seven heavens, as also that of seven ages. The Gnostics were much concerned with the mystery of the 'hebdomad', to which Peter makes explicit allusion at the commencement of chapter X. Daniélou judges that the Primitive Christian conceptual framework thought of three heavens, not seven, gaining this view from Judaism. The concept of seven heavens does,
however, appear in Jewish Christian texts, becoming a characteristic feature of Syriac Jewish Christianity. Its source is in Irano-Babylonian influences, not Judaism, which shows no evidence of it even in writings contemporary with the Early Christian period. Danielou notes that some Jewish Christian writings do retain the 'three-heaven' doctrine, and judges indeed that "the Pseudo-Clementines, which represent a traditionalist and anti-syncretist tendency, reduce them to two". It does seem clear, however, that the passage before us now alludes at least to the 'seven heaven' concept. The basic thought is that it is God Who completes the cosmos. He is the One Who completes the seven heavens, without being exhausted by them. So too in the matter of the seven ages. We know that there was much speculation in the days of the Early Church concerning the mystery of the Hexaemeron, and its eschatological significance. 'Peter' says, in effect, that God not only completes the six ages from the creation of the world, being Himself the One Who is or brings the Sabbath rest (an idea paralleled in the Epistle of Barnabas, chapter XV), but, since He is eternal and not limited by such ages not contained within them, He gives them 'extension to infinity'. We should judge that the seven-age scheme is used here as a foil to show that God is infinite and that He is not limited by it any more than by any sevenfold extension in space. The prime interest of the passage is not, therefore, in a concept of seven ages. At the same time it does reflect in a profound fashion the thought of God's sovereignty over history, past and future. The thought of actual divisions between the ages is more peripheral in this passage, it is true. It is assumed in the

\[1\] op. cit. p. 174. The sentences in the paragraph above culminating in this quotation are based on this whole section in Danielou, op. cit. p. 174.
passing. This, however, does not make it less impressive. It is assumed that, whether there be seven or any other number of ages, God is guiding history towards a predestined conclusion. A theology of history, which reaches out towards the 'eschaton', is thus imbedded in the 'Preaching of Peter'.

What has been documented so far may seem to place emphasis upon the futurist aspects of eschatology. The concept of 'two ages', of coming Judgment, and even of a series of 'ages' as guided by God towards a purposed end, may appear to place the centre of gravity in the future. However, it is clear from such a passage as Rec. I, XLI, that the thought is not merely of two successive ages, but of the supervision of the age that is to come through what Jesus of Nazareth has accomplished in His ministry and death. This means, by implication, that there is a 'realized' element in the eschatology of the Clementines. This probably comes out most clearly in connection with the understanding of Christian Baptism, which is found in these writings.

THE UNDERSTANDING OF BAPTISM: ITS ESCHATOLOGICAL IMPLICATIONS

At Recognitions, Book I, chapter LIV, there is a discussion concerning the rising of Christ from the dead and concerning Baptism, which brings out very clearly the presuppositions of the 'Preaching of Peter' concerning the decisiveness of Christ. 'Peter' says:

"cum enim iam inmineret ortus Christi ad sacrificia quidem reprimenda, baptismi, vero gratiam largiendam, inimicus ex his quae praedicta fuerant ades te tempus intellagens, diversa schismata operatur in populo, ut si forte prius peccatum potuisset aboleri, secunda corrigi culpa non posset." (para. 1).

Three things are linked together in this passage, viz., the resurrection of Christ, the abolition of the sacrificial system, and 'the granting of the grace of baptism'. Peter goes on to note that the Sadducees, Dositheus, and Simon Magus had emerged, through the artifice of the
Enemy, so that the benefits of Christ's Baptism might not be made available to those led away by them. Significantly, the Sadducees, Dositheus, and Simon are all said to have denied the resurrection of the dead (i.e. at the end of the age). The implication is that such disbelief would hinder belief in the resurrection of Christ, and therefore render ineffective to the disbelieving the grace conferred through His Baptism upon all who believe in Him. At the same time the scribes and Pharisees, though receiving John's Baptism and holding the word of truth contained in the Mosaic tradition, have hidden the truth from those for whom they are responsible. The thought here seems to be that John's Baptism pointed forward to Christ, as did the prophetic word contained in the Law of Moses, but the Pharisees have made their Baptism ineffective by not pointing to the One through Whom both John's Baptism and the relevant prophetic word are given meaning. In like fashion, some of the followers of John the Baptist are condemned because they have proclaimed their own Master as the Christ. In all these cases disbelief in the resurrection, that is, in the One Who was raised from the dead, has vitiated the grace of Baptism into Christ, both for the proponents of these views and for those who were led away by them.

In this passage the 'former sin' seems to refer to that of sacrifice, which, as we saw earlier (pages 261-2 above, with reference to Rec.1, chapter XXXVI), was only permitted to Israel until that 'great Prophet' should come who is spoken of at Deut.18.15. The 'secunda culpa' spoken of must mean the repudiation of the grace of Baptism. The thought is that the Evil One, foreseeing the abolition of the sacrificial system which is regarded by 'Peter' as a tolerated evil, wishes to lead people into a sin which cannot be abolished, namely, rejection of Christ and the grace that is conferred through
His Baptism. The death and resurrection of Christ has abolished the sacrificial system, but in view of the very finality of Christ and His Work, such a sin as Christ-rejection could not be corrected, and would lead to the spiritual destruction of those guilty of it.

This passage seems to make a great deal of Christian Baptism. What is said elsewhere in the Clementines confirms the impression that decisive things are seen as taking place in it. It is for the 'Preaching of Peter' much more than our pledge of loyalty to Christ and belief in Him, though the stress on belief in Christ in the present passage (where the unbelief of the Pharisees and the followers of John the Baptist is noted) shows that Baptism is not thought of as operating in complete detachment from faith. The emphasis, however, is on what God achieves for us through Baptism into Christ. We now have to see how this is understood, and to show how it brings out the element of 'realized eschatology' in the 'Preaching'.

It seems clear that a contrast is being made in this passage between the sacrificial system and Christian Baptism. The first belonged to the previous dispensation of God; the second belongs to that which God has now established through Christ. Again, the contrast is between the first Moses and the second Moses, the 'great Prophet', of whom Moses spoke. Thus, what underlies the significance of Christian Baptism is a theological understanding of history. The reason why a 'grace' (gratia) is conferred through Baptism is not that it has any magical properties, but that the Mosaic dispensation of sacrifice has now been set aside, and in view of the fact that Christ has actually achieved this and made another 'grace' available through belief in Him, which is realized in the waters of Baptism, to avoid such commitment in Baptism is to confuse the dispensations. It is true that in other passages, such as Hom. VIII, chapters V-VI, Moses
and Jesus seem to be set somewhat more on a level of parity, in so far as believing in either brings salvation, so long as belief is accompanied by obedience. However, this fact does not fling doubt on the general concept in the Clementines that the Mosaic dispensation has been superseded. Hom. VIII, VII, advances the view that the Jews, having had their eyes blinded to the reality of Christ, are not thereby condemned, if by doing what Moses commanded, "δι' ἡγνόησαι μὴ μισήσωσιν." (pars. 1). Nor, it is said, will the Gentiles be condemned who do not know Moses, if by doing the things spoken by Jesus, they too do not hate the One Whom they do not know i.e. Moses. No doubt the Essene conception of the succession of prophets lies behind this view, and it seems clear that it does represent a quite heterodox Christian view.

It is difficult to deny that such a view does not sufficiently emphasize the uniqueness of Jesus Christ, and that therefore it is defective Christologically. At the same time, it may well be that there is an implicit disagreement between the theology of Hom. VIII, VII, and that of Rec. I, LIV. The latter, possibly under the influence of correction by Rufinus, seems to think of more serious consequences as flowing from failure to recognize Christ and to accept His Baptism. Be this as it may, it remains true that at Rec. I, LIV, the significance of Christian Baptism is derived from the theological understanding of history set out above. And, though Hom. VIII, VII, may work with a different Christology and soteriology, there is nothing in this section to deny that the proper order of dispensations is that of Moses followed by Christ. This order again implies that of 'sacrificial system-Baptism' as a further proper order.

It is manifest that there is present in this understanding of Jesus of Nazareth as setting aside the Mosaic order a distinct recognition of the finality of all that is bound up with Him. Baptism is more final than sacrifice; openness of God's special favour to Gentiles
as well as to Jews is bound up with it; and the new dispensation with its greater inclusiveness, which is mirrored in Christian Baptism, is dependent upon the 'ortus' of Christ. The inclusiveness of the new dispensation is not explicitly alluded to in Rec. I.LIV, but we have already seen (above Page 261ff) that for the 'Preaching of Peter' the abolition of the sacrificial system was connected with the new era, introduced by Christ's death, in which the Gentiles are gathered into the fold. All this is, therefore, implicit, and the thought is that Jesus Christ has by his death and resurrection abolished sacrifices for Israel, brought the Gentiles into parity with the Jews, and created a new community of obedience, to be entered by the inclusive rite of Baptism. This rite by its inclusiveness and by its replacing of sacrifices witnesses to the decisiveness of the activity of Christ, to which it points: in such Baptism the ethnic remoteness of the Gentiles is overcome, and the dispensation of exclusiveness in 'grace' is set aside.

Our concern with this is that it all witnesses to the decisiveness of the activity of Christ, and the present benefits accruing from it. Another way in which Baptism witnesses to the present efficacy of Christ's achievement is seen in the putting to flight of demons, which results from its practice. The 'Preaching' does not indeed seem to think of Baptism as achieving this apart from faith, although the power conferred on faith in Baptism enables one to drive away demons and their effects even from other people. Nevertheless, the concept of deliverance from demonic power and diseases, which result from their presence within our bodies and control over them, is set forth. And this deliverance is through Baptism. It is true that the extensive demonology of the 'Preaching' is a sign of its heterodox Christian character, and of its links with Jewish heterodoxy. Much that is said,
especially perhaps in the 'Homilies', on the subject of demon possession makes rather curious reading. Thus, Hom.IX, IX thinks of the entrance of demons into our bodies through sacrifice and idolatory. Thus, 'Peter' says:

"οἱ γὰρ δαίμονες διὰ τῆς λύτορος ἀποστολῆς τροφῆς ἔχουσίν ἐκχόντες υπὸ τῶν ὑμετέρων χειρῶν εἰς τὰ ὑμετέρα εἰσκρίνωσαί σώματα. ἐνδομυχίσαντες γὰρ πολλῶ τῶν Χριστοῦ καὶ τῇ φυγῇ ἀνακρίνατοι."

(Hom. IX.X.3-4)

One result of this is that, upon the dissolution of the body in death, the soul cannot free itself from the demon, with which it is united, and when the demon is consigned "ἐν τῇ τῶν ὀλίγων συντελεῖᾳ τῇ πρωτείᾳ τοῦ καθαροῦ πόρο" (para. 4), the soul is necessarily punished with it, to the delight of the demon. 'Peter' goes on to tell us in the next chapter (X) why the demons wish to enter men's bodies: it is because as spirits they have no bodily organs and are, therefore, unable of themselves to enjoy the pleasures associated with the body, viz. meat, drink and sexual expression. 'Peter' continues:

"ὁ θεὸς πρὸς τῇ τῶν δαίμονων φυγήν ἐνάσει καὶ ἡ ναστεία καὶ ἡ κακοῦχία οἰκεῖστατον ἐστιν θονήμα. εἰ γὰρ τῶν μεταλλάκτων χειρῶν εἰσέρχονται εἰς ἀνθίταν σώμα, ῥηλον ὀτι κακοουχία φυγαδεύσατοι."

(Hom. IX.X.3-4)

However, Christian Baptism releases one from the control of such demonic spirits:

"ἐν δὲ τῷ παρόντι, λευκῷ ποταμῷ ἐς προφητεία γε καὶ ἀκάλλυ ἀπολογοῦμενοι ἐπὶ τῇ τρισμακρίᾳ ἐπονομασίᾳ οὐ μόνον τὰ ἐνδομυχίσαντα ἐμὲν πνεύμata ἀπελάσαι δυνῆσεσθε, ἀλλ' αὐτοὶ
It seems clear that quite a rich, if somewhat heterodox, theology of Baptism underlies this and other related passages. Thus, the physical entrance of the demons into certain human bodies takes place through idolatry and sin and in connection with the physical offerings made to false gods. In like fashion it is through recognition of, and obedience to, the true God, and by means of a physical element, the water of Baptism, that the demons are driven out. It may be that the thinking of the 'Preaching of Peter' verges on a magical way of understanding, in so far as it lays stress on the demons' entrance into our bodies through food offered to idols. Yet, it is clear that the real contrast is between the power of demons and the power of God, and between subservience to demonic spirits (however unconscious) and subservience to the living God. The transferral from the dominion of one power to that of Another does not take place in any automatic or fated manner, but in accordance with the acquiring of understanding and free commitment by a person to Christ. The moral and spiritual element is thus preserved. It is true certainly that commitment to Christ leads to the fleeing of evil spirits from others, sometimes even by the presence of the committed man alone. The behaviour of 'Peter' in the Clementines, in healing diseases induced by the demons, illustrates this principle. Some justification for this stress on the power of the believer over evil spirits is doubtless found in the records which came from the Gospel tradition concerning the healing ministry of the disciples of Jesus, and such a verse as Acts 5.15 reflects the conviction that the very presence of Peter brought healing to the sick.
The important question is why Christian Baptism should result in such routing of demonic spirits. The thought is surely that such Baptism reflects the changed situation in which we now live in the aftermath of the victory of Jesus of Nazareth. The effectiveness of Christian Baptism is not magical: it is rather conveyed sacramentally through water and faith, in view of the objective alteration in man's relationship to God which has taken place through Christ's ministry, death, and resurrection. This is implied in the earlier part of the chapter (Hom. IX.XIX) from which the last quotation was taken:

"ο -- θεός πάντα δύναται, ἐκεῖνος γὰρ ἐστὶν ἀγαθὸς καὶ σικκιώς, νῦν πάσιν μακροθυμῶν, ἵνα οἱ βουλομένοι ἐφ' ὅς ἔτραχκαν κακοῖς μεταμελεθήσετε καὶ πολιτευσόμενοι ἐν ημέρᾳ, ὑπὲρ τὰ πάντα κρίνεται, τῶν κατ' ἐξήν ἀπολογόσων. Αὐτῶν νῦν ἄρξαι τὴν ἀγαθὴν γυμνότητα λειτία, θέω πειθόμενοι ἀντιλέγειν ὑμᾶς ταῖς κακοῖς ἐπιθυμίαις καὶ ἐννοίαις, ἵνα δινῇ τὴν ἀνακαλέσθαι τὴν πρώτην τῇ ἁρμοστότητι παραδοθεῖσαν σωτηρίου θεοσκείαν."

(paras.1-2).

The statement that God is "now long-suffering to all" is significant, as is the reference to the "first saving worship committed to mankind". The 'Preaching' does not work with the view that God Himself has changed in any way, but it does take seriously the fact that the original relationship of all men to God was broken and that until now God had made Himself known in a special manner to the Jews alone. However, the victory of Christ has introduced a new dispensation, and the ignorance under which proper-thinking Gentiles laboured for so long has been dispelled. In order to get the benefit of this changed situation, all that anyone has to do, Jew or Gentile, is to put aside evil lusts and thoughts, and to commit oneself to Christ in the waters of Baptism. Baptism thus symbolizes the recovery of man's lost
original relationship with God and the consummation of an age-old process whereby God has been guiding history, in that now all men are given 'good knowledge' through the Christian proclamation, and can receive not only knowledge but deliverance through believing self-committal in Baptism.

Baptism thus operates first of all on the basis of the fact that objectively Jesus Christ has achieved His victory, has furnished us again with our "first saving worship", and has opened up the era of full knowledge and reconciliation for men of all nations. The stress on the act of Baptism itself and the deliverance which is associated with it, is not unique in the Early Church. Again, we see even in this insistence the understanding that such commitment in water witnesses effectively (rather in the manner of prophetic symbolism) to the fact that the person being baptized is identified in the whole of his being with the changed situation which Christ has effected. Though in Christ the true worship is restored and made available to men of all nations, it is only such as repent and obey Christ who benefit by His achievement, and Baptism effectively links one with the community where this benefit is realized.

There is a further aspect to this matter. It is a distinctive feature of the 'Preaching of Peter' to emphasize the power of demons over men through idolatry and modes of life consistent with demonic desires. We saw that the demons gained control through the fellowship and solidarity with them, expressed (however unconsciously) and realized through offerings made to idols. Clearly, in similar fashion Christian Baptism lays one open to the influence of Christ. It is important, however, to observe that the reason why it is thus effective is not only that it lays one open to the influence of Christ but that Christ Himself by His victory overthrew demonic power at its centre. This
is part of the meaning of that change in the dispensations which has been effected by Christ's triumph. The reference to the "τρόπιον κατα " (Hom. IX.XIX,4; quoted above, pp.273-4) has in mind the overthrow of evil which Christ has effected by His resurrection (cf. Rec.I,IV,1, with its reference to the limitation of the power of 'the Enemy'). It seems clear that the limitation in extensiveness of the sway of evil spirits, which is coincident with the abolition of the sacrificial system (including that of Israel), must rest upon some power exerted by Christ intensively. And this in fact seems to be effectively demonstrated in the 'ortus' of Christ. The power of Peter and other believers in Christ to overthrow the power of demons and to dispel the diseases resultant from their presence and operation is seen in its proper setting when we observe the mighty triumph of Christ over evil in the overcoming of death. Behind this lies a sensitive appreciation of the grip of death on humanity as an effective and concrete expression of God's judgment on human sin, and of the power of sickness and death as the witness to the hold over men which demons have through the separation from God that results from sin. It is true that the 'Preaching' does not seem to say much concerning the forgiveness of sins, legally conceived, but there is the sense of a great victory over evil forces in Christ's 'ortus', which lies at the base of the effectiveness of Christian Baptism.

THE TWO ADVENTS OF CHRIST

It may be argued that all of this may be true, but that it does not establish any kind of 'realized eschatology'. It is clear, however, that what the 'Preaching' has in mind is not just a certain decisiveness which attaches to the victory of Jesus Christ, but a quality of finality. History has reached its goal in Him — however defective at points the
Christology, or the soteriology, may be. We have seen that Jesus of Nazareth is viewed as the 'great Prophet', spoken of at Deut.18.15, and it is clear that no one greater than He is looked for. Moreover, at Recognitions, I,LXIX, we have a distinct reference to the 'two comings of Christ' (James, the Lord's brother, and bishop in Jerusalem, is being spoken of):

"cumque et de lege plenissime disputasset ac singula quae de Christo sunt, purissima expositione protulisset in lucem, ostendit abundantissimis probationibus, quia Iesus est Christus et in ipso universa quae de humili eius adventu fuerant praedicta, conplentur, duos enim eius praedictos esse docuit adventus, unum humilitatis quern et implevit, alium gloriae qui speratur implendus, cum veniet dare regnum credentibus in se et servantibus omnia quae praecipit."

Certainly in this passage the One Who came in Jesus of Nazareth fulfils previous prediction concerning Him, and it is He and no other Who will come at the end of the age. It may be that this passage again reflects the correcting pen of Rufinus. Yet it is clear that the whole theology of 'two Spirits' and of 'two ages', which we noted earlier (pp.256-258) and which is expressed in such a heterodox manner that it almost certainly does represent the thought of the 'Preaching' in its original form (Rufinus had no opportunity to tamper with this), is not inconsistent with what Rec.I,LXIX, says: that theology is a somewhat different development of the theme of the Coming Age from the normal Early Christian development, but it is entirely congruous with the eschatological hope of Christ's Return in glory. What all this means is that the situation achieved for us through Jesus of Nazareth as the 'great Prophet' is one which is congruous with that which is to come. Not only so, it is evident that Christ's achievement is considered to be fundamental in some way to the coming of the future Kingdom, and through faith and Baptism converts are seen to anticipate now the blessings of that future age. The Christian belongs to the future age; those who reject His way (unless they are in ignorance, but do not really hate Him Whom
they do not know, i.e. Jesus Christ) are living for the present age, unaware that the Herald of the new age has been amongst men.

THE THEORY OF SYZYGIES: ANTICHRIST AND CHRIST

The finality and the future reign of Christ are asserted in one passage in terms of the theory of syzygies, or pairs, by which it is stated that every true prophet is preceded by a corresponding false prophet. Both Oscar Cullmann and Jean Danielou take note of this Jewish Christian theory. As Cullmann puts it:

"The aim is to show that of two complementary elements the one which is prior chronologically represents the principle of evil, while the second which follows represents the principle of good. This theory of pairs provides the criterion for distinguishing the representatives of the good principle from those of the evil principle, and this principle is their chronological relationship."

This theory is developed both at Hom.II.XVI-XVII, and at Rec.III.LXI.

Other minor references occur in the Clementines, and the theory is implicit in the whole record of 'Peter's' following up of Simon Magus, wherever the latter goes. Simon is the former and represents the principle of evil, while 'Peter' as the second of the pair represents the good principle. We take special note here of the treatment from the 'Preaching of Peter' accorded this matter at Hom.II, XVI-XVII. 'Peter' says:

"ὦς ἐν ἀρχῇ ὁ θεὸς ἔις ἀν, ὀδήρθη δέ ἡγεῖται ἀριστερά, πρῶτον ἐποίησε γόνον ὅμοιον αὐτῷ, ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν, [καὶ] οὕτως κατὰ τὸ ἐξῆς πᾶσας τὰς συμβολὰς συνεστάσατο. ἔπει δὲντοι ἀνθρώπων οὐκέτι οὕτως, ἀλλὰ πᾶσας ἐναλλάσσει τὰς συμβολὰς. ὦς γὰρ ἀπὸ αὐτοῦ τὰ πρῶτα κρείστηκα, τὰ δεύτερα ύπερτο, ἐπὶ ἀνθρώπων τὸ ἐναντίον εὐρίσκομεν, τὰ πρῶτα Χείρονα, τὰ δεύτερα κρείστηκαν."

(XVI.1-2)

Examples of these pairs in mankind are unrighteous Cain followed by righteous Abel; Ishmael, who was not elect, and Isaac, who was; Esau the profane and Jacob the pious (ὁ εὐσεβής); the high priest (Aaron), then the law-giver (Moses). 'Peter' goes on, in the following chapter, to allude to John the Baptist under the name of 'Elias' as prior to Jesus Christ, and to Simon Magus (by whom some scholars think that there is an indirect allusion to Paul) as preceding Peter himself. The section which immediately follows sets forth very clearly that Jesus is seen as the One Who is to be vindicated at the end of the age. Not only so, but it also throws light on the adherence of the 'Preaching' to the common Early Christian expectation of the coming of Antichrist. A certain interpretation of a section of the Little Apocalypse (Mark 13 and parallels) is also imbedded. This section reads:

"οὕτως δέ, ὃς ὁ ἄλεθής ἡμῖν προφήτης εἰρήκεν, πρῶτον θεοῦ δεῖ ἐλθεῖν εὐαγγέλιον ὑπὸ πλάνου τινὸς καὶ Εὐθείᾳ οὕτως μετα καθαίρεσιν τοῦ ζηγίου τοπου εὐαγγέλιον ἄληθες κρύφα διαπερφθήκαι εἰς εὐανόρθωσιν τῶν ἐσωμένων ἔρεσεων καὶ μετὰ τιμᾶ ἑαυτῷ προς τῷ τέλει πλάνον πρῶτον ἀντίΧριστον ἐλθεῖν δεὶ καὶ τότε τὸν οὕτως Χριστὸν ἡμῖν Ἰησοῦν ἀναφηκών καὶ μετὰ τοῦτο καυντίον φωτὸς ἀνατείλατος πάντα τὰ τοῦ σκότους ἀφανὴ γενέσθαι." (XVII.4-5)

The major point here is that the final series of pairs is Antichrist and Christ Himself. Jesus as the Christ is seen as due to return at the end of the age, and with His Appearing everything which pertains to darkness must disappear. Thus, there is no doubt that the 'Preaching of Peter' conceives not only of Christ's Return in glory, but sees that event as bringing to an end the age-old series of syzygies. The statement that "our Jesus must then (i.e. after Antichrist's manifestation)
be revealed as the Christ in reality" shows plainly that what is to happen at the End-time consists in the vindication of Jesus of Nazareth and those who belong to Him. The reference to Antichrist is interesting, because it shows that the 'Preaching' works with the common Early Christian assumption that Christ will come in glory only after Antichrist has been revealed. This demonstrates too that the 'Preaching' does not have an 'any-moment' expectation of the Parousia of Christ. The reference to a 'ψεύδεις - ἑκατογέλιν' is probably a reflection on the utterance of Jesus recorded at Matt.24.5, Mk.13.6, and Lk. 21.8. The thought seems to be that these passages in Jesus' apocalyptic discourse relate to false teaching prior to the setting up of a desolating sacrilege in the Temple at Jerusalem. By implication Simon Magus is the purveyor of the false teaching and, by the theory of syzygies, Peter follows hard on his heels wherever he goes, bringing the true gospel. We recall that the 'Preaching of Peter' naturally purports to refer to the early period of Christianity prior to the destruction of Jerusalem, which is here spoken of, therefore, as still future. The allusion to the heresies that are to come after the destruction of the Temple appears to relate to what is said at Matt.24.24, Mk.13.21 (Luke has no parallel at this point), which seemingly speak of further heresies (i.e. false gospels) which are to come on the scene after the destruction of the Temple. At that time, also, by the theory of syzygies, the true gospel will require to be sent out after it and for the purpose of correcting such heresies. The point of the 'Κρύφα' is presumably that Matthew and Mark present that period after the desecration of the sanctuary in Jerusalem as a time of great tribulation, when perhaps the true gospel could not be proclaimed openly. Thus, we have two illustrations of the theory of syzygies, one before and one after the desecration of the Temple, and
these two illustrations are to be followed by a third and final one:

'Προς τῷ τέλει' when Antichrist will appear and will be succeeded by Christ Himself.

THE RESURRECTION AT THE END OF THE AGE

The above passage is one example of what appears to be true generally. The 'Preaching of Peter' shares more with the common Early Church expectation than one might be tempted to suppose from the somewhat hererocox character of its Christology and soteriology. One final reference must be made to its eschatological convictions. The resurrection of the body is scarcely alluded to directly, though it is almost certainly implied in the references, which we have already noted, to the Coming of Christ at the end of the age. The resurrection is surely implicit in the references to the Two Ages and in the suggestion (vide above, p.258) that judgment is given at the juncture of these ages. One passage, however, makes quite explicit in a passing allusion the concept of bodily resurrection:

"τὸ ἄρτετῶς πατέρα ἰδεῖν ὑπὸ μόνον ἂστίν, διὰ περὶ δὲ οὐχ ἔμοισιν ἐν γὰρ τῇ ἀναστάσει τῶν νεκρῶν, ὅταν τραπέντες εἰς φῶς τὰ σώματα οὐάγγελον γένωνται, τότε ἰδεῖν δυνήσονται."  

(Hom. XVII XVI.4-5)

The content of this passage may be somewhat speculative in its theorising concerning the nature of the resurrection-body as light, but it seems clear that the passage does have in mind the transformation of the whole man and is not in itself heterodox in character.
ESCHATOLOGY IN THE 'PREACHING OF PETER': AN ASSESSMENT

In drawing this survey of the 'Preaching of Peter' to a close, we would summarize our findings by asserting that all the evidence shows that the heterodoxy of this work does not extend to its eschatology, but is concerned rather with its Christology and soteriology. Undoubtedly, the concept of the Two Ages has close links, as we have seen, with a quite heterodox view concerning the Two Spirits, but the actual concept of a succession of ages is consistent with the general conceptions of Primitive and Early Christianity. Judgment and resurrection are also in view, though the latter receives little emphasis, and the basis of the former may seem to be very legalistically conceived. It is Christian Baptism and its interpretation in the 'Preaching' which shows best an implicit theology of history, which is quite profound, and an appreciation of the givenness in the present age of the benefits of Christ's achievement. The eschatology of the 'Preaching' - and, therefore, presumably, of the Ebionites - may best be described as 'inaugurated'.

The 'Preaching' significantly betrays no evidence of concern over the delay of the Parousia of Christ in glory. Not only is nothing said to indicate such concern, but the distinct presence of a futurist eschatology militates against the view that such concern lies in the background. The Parousia itself, together with resurrection and judgment at the end of the age and the preceding reign of Antichrist, are confidently expected. Combined with this is a sense of the finality of Jesus Christ, which helps to keep the balance. This is the more interesting when we consider that this sense is aligned with the heterodox notion that the Christ has been incarnated many times since the world began.

The thesis of Dodd and Werner receives no support in this document.
THE APOSTOLIC FATHERS AND THE 'PREACHING OF PETER': REVIEW OF ESCHATOLOGY

In studying each of the documents within the writings known as Apostolic Fathers and in dealing with the 'Preaching of Peter', we closed by attempting some assessment of their eschatology and its significance for our present investigation. All that requires to be done now is to bring this together in short compass, so that we can see more clearly in what direction the evidence points.

The purpose of including the 'Preaching of Peter' along with the writings of the Apostolic Fathers has been twofold. First, this document represents a relatively brief piece of material which should not be ignored and which helps to support our thesis that the Early Church did not 'de-eschatologize' on account of an embarrassment over the delay of the Parousia of Christ in glory. This means that it is best to deal with it alongside material with which it seems to be approximately contemporary. Second, the Apostolic Fathers and the 'Preaching' serve as foils to each other, in that the relative orthodoxy of the one in Christology and soteriology and the relative heterodoxy of the other in these same areas do but serve to accentuate the element of agreement which exists in the area of eschatology.

Certain works included within the writings of the Apostolic Fathers have not been dealt with in this chapter. Thus, no reference has been made to the Martyrdom of Polycarp, the Epistle to Diognetus, or the Fragments of Papias. The first of these documents is not of importance in the study of Early Church eschatology. The Epistle to Diognetus is dealt with in Chapter IV, which studies the eschatology of the Apologists, while the contribution of Papias is considered in Chapter III under a discussion of millenarianism in the Second Century.
Broadly, the conclusions that we have reached in our study of the writings dealt with in this chapter may be set out thus. There is no evidence of diminution of futurism in eschatology, but rather in some documents of a heightening of it. There is no evidence of concern over the delay of the Parousia of Christ in glory, though there is indirect evidence that this did trouble certain people. The writers themselves betray no genuine concern over the matter. Combined with this uninhibited and untroubled expectation of the Parousia in God's good time there goes a recognition that in some sense the End-time is now upon the Church and the world: usually this emphasis has close connections with the doctrines of the Church and of the sacraments of Baptism and Eucharist. Most important, perhaps, is the discovery that the eschatology of these writings is best described as 'inaugurated'. Positively there is the sense that God is active in the Church, her sacraments, and her mission. Negatively, there is in some documents an appreciation that only when certain events which precede the End itself have taken place can we look for the Parousia. The Church and the world are set now on a course initiated by God but it will not receive its completion until God's time has come.

The Apostolic Fathers are orthodox documents as over against the heterodoxy of the 'Preaching of Peter'. Yet compared with the documents of the New Testament and the Pauline insistence on God's free grace in Christ they seem for the most part very legalistic in tone. This must be viewed as reflecting a diminution of appreciation of salvation as a free gift in Christ which was appreciated by Paul and, it would seem, in varying degrees by the Primitive Church. It is true that the Jewish Christian group centred around James, the Lord's brother, in Jerusalem laid greater emphasis on the observance of certain external rites of a Jewish character than did Paul. At the same time it is
doubtful whether even there do we find in the very early days of the Church the sense which comes across in most of the writings before us in this chapter, that, though we have truly received God's favour through Jesus Christ if we have identified ourselves with Him and His community in Baptism and life, our ultimate salvation depends in large measure on how we cooperate with the grace already given. This understanding is not lacking in St. Paul (Cf. I. Cor. 10) nor in the Epistle to the Hebrews, but there is there a stronger sense that the One Who has begun a good work in us will complete that work. The Epistles of Ignatius show a deeper understanding of the characteristically Pauline stance, which has been so emphasized in Protestant Western orthodoxy since the Reformation on its legalistic side: even here the emphasis does not fall upon a right relationship with God as a legal status, but there is a deeper appreciation than elsewhere in the writings now before us of the fact that salvation is God's free gift. Thus, these documents show for the most part a distinct element of synergism, and this impression is heightened when we turn to the 'Preaching of Peter'. What is important for our purpose is that it is in connection with this synergistic element in the theology of these writings that an increasing stress falls on a futurist eschatology. If salvation depends in part upon our attitudes and action now, then clearly we will only have assurance of our salvation at the Parousia of Christ when temptations to disobedience, apostasy, and heresy will have fallen away.

Closely connected with this synergistic element and the relatively greater stress on futurism in eschatology than what is found in our New Testament documents goes an appreciation of the Church as an eschatologically oriented community. This is not in itself in disagreement with New Testament emphases, but it is closely
associated with the synergism of which we have spoken. The basic understanding (which comes across most clearly in the 'Shepherd of Hermas') is that by confession of faith in Baptism we are admitted to the community which awaits her Lord from Heaven. The very physical character of Baptism, as of the Eucharist which confirms our membership within the eschatological community and nourishes us in her faith, indicates that the Church is an earthly community, whose redemption must be of a bodily character at her Lord's Appearing. The synergistic element becomes associated with this in so far as it is thought that our continuing membership in the community depends primarily upon our obedience rather than upon God's completing within us what He has already begun by His Spirit.

The most important finding in terms of our present investigation is that the writings before us display no embarrassment over the delay in the Parousia, though they do indicate (as in I Clement XXIII-II Clement XI) that the passage of time since Christ's resurrection and ascension to the Father did constitute a problem for some. The judgment whether the writers before us were themselves troubled over the passage of time may seem to be a subjective matter. Thus, some writers judge, in the light of such passages as those mentioned above or in the light of the 'pause' in the building of the Tower in the 'Shepherd of Hermas' (Simil.IX.V.I), that the writers of these documents are seeking to find excuses for the 'delay', or that, if they do themselves accept that it is God's purpose that the Parousia should be delayed, they are themselves put to difficulty to answer the doubts of those who are troubled. Other commentators do not find evidence of concern, genuine difficulty, on the part of the writers whose works we have been studying. Is there, then, any more objective way of arriving at the truth of the situation? The nearest approach to this seems to
consist in an investigation of the contents of the solutions offered
to the passage of time since the Ascension of Christ to the Father.

To judge the tone of an argument may be highly subjective matter,
but to consider the content offers some more objective basis for
assessment in that we can consider how related to Scripture and Church
practice is the answer given.

What do these writers say, then, in regard to the passage of time
since the Ascension of Christ? The answer seems to be twofold. First —
and perhaps the more obvious point in these writings — Christ delays in
order to allow the Church to be built up and so that all the elect may
find their place within it. Another way of expressing this is to say
that this is the age of the Church and her mission to the nations,
and that Christ will only come when those from other nations have been
gathered in. This note is most clearly in evidence in the 'Teaching
of the Twelve Apostles' (Didache). Closely connected is the thought
of the 'Shepherd of Hermas' (Simil. IX.XIV.2) that the 'pause' (ἐκβολή)
was introduced into the building of the Tower so as to allow opportunity
of repentance to some who had fallen away from the purity of their
Christian profession. Thus, extensively and even intensively, Christ's
Coming in glory awaits the ingathering of His people. The second point
is that certain events have been prophesied as due to take place before
the Parousia of Christ. This comes out perhaps most clearly in the
Didache and in the Epistle to Barnabas. Thus, Didache XVI, with its
reflection of Matthew 24 and in particular Didache XVI.2 with its
reference to the necessity of being perfected in the last time (Cf.
Barn.IV.9), appears to reflect the understanding that a period of
great difficulty and persecution must precede the Parousia of Christ.
Barnabas IV clearly anticipates a time of great 'lawlessness' before
the End (cf. II Thess.2). Most significant too is the implication of
this chapter (cf. para. 4) that Rome is the fourth world empire of
Daniel, chapters 2 and 7 (chapter 7 is especially in view). Probably
these two documents share in an implicit way a great deal in their
attitude to world history and its development towards the Parousia.
More clearly than any of the other documents presently before us they
demonstrate the sense that the Church is in the midst of a predetermined
progress of events towards their prophesied goal. What is especially
significant is the way in which the Didache relates what we have already
said regarding this being the age for missionary expansion by the Church
and what we are now saying about the necessity that certain events should
occur before the Parousia of Christ. The Church seems to be thought
of in terms of the inclusive community of Daniel 7: thus, not only is it
necessary that there should be a delay in order to allow the elect from
all nations to be gathered into the Church, but in the divine plan it
is only when this has been effected that the final era of persecution
will break. Here there is a marked schematization of history. It is
salutary that what we have termed the 'positive' factor, that of waiting
for the completion of the Church's mission to the nations, and the
'negative' one of waiting for certain happenings immediately prior to
the End, are brought together, and that both seem to derive from a
certain understanding both of Daniel 7 and Matthew 24. The 'Shepherd
of Hermas' also witnesses to the understanding that the Parousia will
not take place before a final era of persecution.

It is impressive that the 'Preaching of Peter', despite its.
heterodox Christology and soteriology, clearly accepts belief in the
Parousia of Christ, in resurrection and in Judgment. It again
witnesses by means of its theory of syzygies to belief in the coming
reign of Antichrist. This document also has an impressive theology
of history which lies behind its attitude to Christian Baptism; this
shows that the inclusion of the Gentiles under God's special favour (signified in the inclusiveness of Baptism) is the result of what Christ decisively achieved by His coming among men in humiliation; that is, in Jesus of Nazareth. Here again, therefore, we find acceptance of a futurist eschatology (Parousia, resurrection, Judgment, even the reign of Antichrist before the Parousia of Christ) in combination with a profound understanding that the Church is a product of the End-time and that God has in Jesus Christ inaugurated the final period of world history before its consummation. In essentials, therefore, the 'Preaching' portrays in very similar terms the same understanding of eschatology. It is true that the contrast between the present age and that which is to come is even more heightened in the 'Preaching' than in any of the Apostolic Fathers, but this does not distort the general agreement both with the Apostolic Fathers and with Primitive Christianity, in so far as eschatology is in view.

It is clear, therefore, that all of the documents under review reflect an understanding that the Parousia will take place in God's good time. This is the thought of I Clement XXIII-II Clement XI. Certain documents make it clear that the Church mission must be given time to achieve its purpose, while the thought appears in certain that Christ will not come before the final era of persecution or reign of Antichrist. Barnabas IV seems to imply that Rome is the fourth world-empire of Daniel's vision in Dan. 7: this means that ten kingdoms must yet appear to be followed by Antichrist's reign before Christ will appear. Both of these elements, viz., the stress on time for the mission of the Church and the understanding of a pattern of history yet to be outworked, are at their strongest in the Didache and in the Epistle of Barnabas.
The congruity of this double strain of reasoning both with Scripture (Daniel 7- Matthew 24, also Matt. 28), together with the heavy involvement of the Church in her preaching mission at the time when these documents were produced, suggests that this was no 'ad hoc' argumentation produced to meet a situation of difficulty, namely, that caused by the 'delay' in the Parousia of Christ in final triumph. It rather belongs to the very stuff of her life - as witnessed to in her mission to the Gentiles, the inclusiveness of Christian Baptism, and her courage under persecution: the latter depended upon her sense that rulers only governed by Christ's sovereign permission and until He came to establish His Kingdom. It is this which underlies what is recorded in such a work as 'The Martyrdom of Polycarp'.

We conclude that the documents under review together afford no support for the joint thesis of Dodd and Werner that the delay in the Parousia produced embarrassment and a 'de-eschatologizing' process. The congruity of explanation of the 'delay' of the Parousia with Church life and practice suggest that the writers before us were not in any kind of difficulty over this matter. Further, the tendency to heighten futurism, rather than to play it down, evident in such works as II Clement and the 'Preaching of Peter' notably, does not agree with what we should expect to find, if the thesis of Dodd and Werner be sound.