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CHAPTER III : ESCHATOLOGY IN THE SUB-APOSTOLIC ERA
It seems necessary before proceeding with our investigation of the literature of the Early Church as produced by the Apologists and theologians to take stock of one or two aspects of Early Church history and development which would otherwise tend to be bypassed in such a study as this. In doing so our interest is in the general development of the Church in the period between the end of the New Testament era and the time of the Apologists. We have already had occasion to deal with the writings known as the Apostolic Fathers and with the 'Preaching of Peter'. It remains true, however, that that literature is occasional in character, and it is difficult to see just how representative it is. Moreover, the Church is often portrayed as having undergone immense changes during the period when the writings known as Apostolic Fathers were produced. It is, therefore, important to pause and to consider directly certain issues concerning the development undergone during this period, and their significance for our present investigation.

Much has been written concerning the development of Christian doctrine during the period between approximately 70 A.D. and 140-150 A.D. Unfortunately little is known with certainty regarding its process and it has been largely a matter of conjectural reconstruction, in which the determinative theological attitudes of those reconstructing have had to play altogether too large a part. The Church has been spoken of as entering 'a long dark tunnel' around 70 A.D. from which it only emerged in the days of the early Apologists. It has further been asserted that it emerged from that tunnel strangely altered in her characteristic theological emphases and internal structure. No where perhaps, it has been suggested, was this more true, so far as doctrine is concerned, than in the case of eschatology. The earlier emphasis upon the imminence of our Lord's Parousia in glory is said to be
lacking even in the writings known since the 17th century as 'The Apostolic Fathers' which almost alone serve to light up this dark period. The notion that the doctrines of the Church during this period altered considerably, as did her organization and worship, derives very largely from the work of Adolph Harnack at the turn of the present century.¹ According to Harnack the Church emerged from these years concerned with structure and offices whereas she had entered it troubled only by the need to fulfil her function of evangelism, a function aided by God's gift through the Spirit of diverse abilities and soon to be terminated by the reappearing of the Head and Lord of the Church in glory; her simple services of initiation and remembrance of her departed Lord had become charged with new sacramental significance, derived largely from the Church's contact in Asia Minor especially with Hellenistic-Oriental mystery religions; the Pauline grasp of the truth of 'justification by faith' had been altogether lost sight of, as a result of the Fall of Jerusalem in 70 A.D. and the consequent removal of the Church's centre of gravity out of its Jewish background - the 'judaising' controversy belonged to a situation that had now passed away.

Despite occasional protests over isolated points in this portrayal of the so-called development from the 'primitive community' to the 'Catholic Church', the picture as a whole has been remarkably influential until very recent years. It remains so, but attacks are now being made on it from a number of points of view. These are important. It is true, of course, that those branches of the Christian Church which have laid stress upon continuity with the apostolic age, particularly through the doctrine of 'apostolic succession', have always been unready to accept

the whole of this picture, especially as it applied to the question of the structure of the Church and her ministry. However, doubts regarding the picture are now emerging through a number of independent lines of enquiry and from scholarship which cuts across denominational barriers. Thus, greater knowledge regarding the Jewish background of Christianity "has provided fresh parallels to the organization of the early Church, which render the simpler solutions of earlier scholars untenable."¹ Thus says Robert M. Grant with reference to the supposedly more complex picture of Church organization provided by the Apostolic Fathers. Grant has in mind, in particular, the organization of the Qumran community, reflected in the Dead Sea Scrolls, as supplying us with fresh evidence in this matter. So far as doctrine and sacraments are concerned, recent years have seen a swing towards the interpretation of the New Testament largely in terms of its Old Testament and Jewish background. This has been paralleled in patristic study by the insistence of such men as Jean Daniélou² upon the deep Semitic roots of the Church fathers generally and, in particular, of those of the second Christian century. The understanding of Baptism and of the Eucharist is not generally viewed today in non-sacramental terms, but the roots of this sacramentalism are found within Jewish thought and practice and so do not represent any discontinuity with the understanding of our Lord and/or the primitive Christian and apostolic community. It would still be more generally accepted that there is a strong contrast between the theology of the New Testament in general

and that of the second-century church, and that this would be no where more marked than with reference to the relatively smaller place given in the latter to the eschatological hope. However, it is being increas-
ingly realized that no simple contrast at least can be drawn. Thus, we cannot speak simply of one straight-line process of development, since different communities were involved. Did primitive Jewish Christianity, for example, develop in the same way as Hellenistic Christianity? To what extent was the former profoundly affected, as some recent reconstructions have suggested it was, by the Fall of Jerusalem in 70 A.D.? Further, has not the overall picture been misleadingly drawn owing to an undue dependence upon such documents as the 'Apostolic Fathers'? Granted that the latter have considerable importance, their immediate provenance is often in doubt. In such a matter as eschatology, for example, G.W.H. Lampe makes well the point that "some of the most striking eschatological teaching of the early Fathers is to be found in homilies whose context is sacramental, and particularly in those whose setting is the rite of initiation. This rite brings the saving events of the past and the future events in which salvation is to be consummated alike into the present experience of the believer. -- Preaching delivered in that context is naturally the element in patristic literature to which we should go to discover the plainest exposition of eschatology. It is also the teaching which, by reason of its official and public character, can most justly be considered part of the regular tradition of the Church as a whole."¹ Lampe's remark is a passing one, in a non-argumentative context, but it is

suggestive nonetheless. Further, it must be said in general that, while we must not come to the patristic evidence determined to read into it our own presuppositions, it ought not to be left to the most 'Catholic' sections of the Church to assume some measure of continuity between 'Primitive' and 'Early' church. There ought to be within our faith a predisposition towards the discovery of some continuity.

So far as literature is concerned, the beginnings of the period before us overlap with most of the New Testament writings which were later to become canonical. Its end takes us up to the commencement of the Church's Apologetic literature, though not to the beginning proper of systematic theological treatment of doctrine, which may be said to have commenced at the end of the second century A.D. with the work of Irenaeus and Tertullian. Historically, this period is significant and fraught with interest for the development of the Church. It commences with the Fall of Jerusalem in 70 A.D., as the result of an upsurge of Jewish nationalism and eschatological expectation. It terminates approximately with the fated uprising against Roman dominion under bar Cochba and its bloody subjugation in 135 A.D. Culturally and ideologically, this period witnessed the emergence of Gnosticism in various forms, tantalisingly difficult to describe in terms of system, a movement which was both influenced by and which itself influenced the growth of Christian doctrine. This period also witnessed the emergence of the Canon of the New Testament, of the 'rule of faith', and of the 'Catholic' conception of the Church. Manifestly, this period is of great importance for any understanding of the development of Christian doctrines and institutions.

We seek now to set out certain major areas of interest, which appear to have significance within this period for the eschatological debate. We shall then look at these in turn, although we must be
prepared to find that one area of interest overlaps with another.

These areas are:

1. Jewish messianic movements in their relation to the eschatology of the Christian Church.

2. The emergence and growth of Gnosticism - its significance for Christian theology, in general, and for Christian eschatology, in particular.

3. Millenarianism as one expression of Christian eschatology.

4. The witness of conceptions of Church and sacraments in relation to Church eschatology.


It is a fact that Jesus' day was one in which messianic expectation had come alive. Various reasons may be adduced for this fact, not least the consideration that the period of freedom from external domination under the Maccabees had given way to Roman rule in 69 B.C. The very reimposition of external constraint may have suggested to the apocalyptic mind that the Kingdom must soon be given to God's people, for it was frequently supposed that there would be a final period of oppression and conflict before the end came. This was true of Jewish apocalyptic before the theme was taken over and adapted to a Christian interpretation. Beyond this, there is possibly an element that defies precise explanation: events cast their shadow before them and there are always those who are sensitive to God's impending action - in a real sense it may be possible to say that such awareness is part of God's activity. The prophets gave vivid expression to this fact by their symbolic actions whereby they considered that they not only symbolised that which was to come, but they allowed themselves to be used by the coming events. Part of this sense of expectation in Jesus' day consisted of the sense of the hiatus between the days of the great
prophets and Jesus' own day. John the Baptist was the first prophet for a period extending into centuries. It was commonly considered that an outburst of prophecy would be a sign of the dawning of the messianic age. The Christian Church itself was to consider that the gift of the Spirit with its related expressions in prophecy and ecstatic utterance signified that already the Church lived in the last age.

Interpreters who judge that apocalyptic owed much to a spirit of desperation and pessimism find it not surprising that the expectation of a soon coming messianic age should have inspired to military action against the Roman overlords of Palestine. The Zealot movement was a live one in Jesus' day. In A.D. 6 there was revolt in Galilee under one named Judas. It was his given aim to oppose the payment of taxes to Rome and to establish a theocracy. In A.D. 44 there was fear that a statue of the emperor, Caligula, would be set up in the temple - an action which would probably have triggered off a reaction comparable with the Maccabean revolt, which resulted from the defilement of the temple under Antiochus Epiphanes in 164 B.C. From this time onwards, there emerged various messianic enthusiasts who inspired many to follow them in expecting miraculous indications of God's favour. All of these were sternly put down by the Roman authorities. From 62 A.D., in particular, a spirit of expectancy gripped the Jewish people. Miraculous sights were seen, voices were heard, and in 66 A.D., the unrest issued in active revolt from the Roman dominion. This was to issue in the destruction of the Temple. A.D. 70. A still later revolt, 132-135 A.D., resulted in the exclusion of the Jews from their sacred city of Jerusalem. On all of these occasions it was the apocalyptic hope which buoyed up the mass of the people: it was realised that unless God intervened the situation was, from a merely military point
What are we to make of this apocalyptic movement? Did it represent a minority viewpoint, perhaps even a heterodox viewpoint within Judaism, which on certain occasions gained the upper hand? To take the second question first, D.S. Russell reminds us that there was no 'normative' Judaism before the end of the 2nd century A.D. He takes G.F. Moore to task, because the latter argues that, since the apocalyptic books were never recognized by Judaism, it is wrong to make them as a primary source for our understanding of Judaism. Russell says that on the contrary, J. Bowman, E. Kautzch, W.D. Davies, and others have shown that "apocalyptic represents a most significant development within the Judaism of the inter-testamental period."\(^1\) Judaism prior to 200 A.D., was many-sided. As W.D. Davies tells us, the rabbinic sources represent the triumph of one stream within Judaism, the Pharisaic, and even of only one current within that one stream, that of H. Johanan b. Zakkai.\(^2\)

"Dietrich Rössler of Göttingen makes the same point in his monograph, 'Gesetz und Geschichte', in which he discusses the theology of Jewish apocalyptic and Pharisaic orthodoxy: "Aber bis zu dem grossen Einschnitt der Zerstörung Jerusalems waren die Verhältnisse keineswegs abenso eindeutig. Bis dahin gab es keine Orthodoxie und also auch keine Heterodoxie."\(^3\) This is a most important point, as non-experts tend to get the impression that the apocalyptic movement represented the thinking of a few dreamers and pessimists. On the contrary, 

---


\(^2\)Paul and Rabbinic Judaism. London. 1948 (p.5ff.)

apocalypticism represented one important and influential strand in
Jewish thinking in the intertestamental period. Further, it seems
likely that we cannot deduce from the extent of Galilean influence
upon apocalypticism that the latter represented a fringe movement within
Judaism. Matthew Black and others have demonstrated of recent years
that the Judaism both of the Dispersion and of Palestine itself, were
influenced by similar internal processes of development - a development,
at least in the 1st century B.C., in the direction of apocalyptic and
baptizing non-conformity.¹

What then of the character of apocalyptic itself? As H.H. Rowley
says, apocalyptic works, even the two apocalyptic books within the
canon of Holy Scripture, the Book of Daniel and the Book of Revelation,
are frequently treated as being 'spiritually negligible' in their con-
tent. Rowley's insistence that pseudonymity was not intended to
deceive the writer's contemporaries in ancient times, and that it
probably never did so, helps us recapture something of the sense of
immediacy of spiritual challenge in their works. This interpreter of
apocalyptic stresses the close links of prophecy and apocalyptic, but
he puts neatly their difference: "Speaking generally, the prophets
foretold the future that should arise out of the present, while the
apocalyptists foretold the future that should break into the present. -
The apocalyptists had little faith in the present to beget the future.
That is why they are so often, and so unfairly, called pessimists.
They saw not wicked men heading for disaster so much as innocent men
suffering direst agonies for their faith, the righteous Remnant in
the crucible of affliction, and they looked for a great divine inter-
vention in history in the immediate future."² If the apocalyptists

¹ The Scrolls and Christian Origins.
² The Relevance of Apocalyptic. Lutterworth Press. London. Third
were pessimists, it was not concerning God that they were pessimistic. Much is often made of the apocalyptists' conviction that God's kingdom should be beyond history. To say this only underscores their inability to see the coming kingdom as emerging out of the ongoing processes of history. Even here, however, caution is required in our judgment. Some apocalyptic works did in fact lay more stress than others upon the supramundane character of the circumstances in which the longed for Kingdom of God could be realized. We need not deny that purely despairing elements within the Jewish people would have their influence in apocalypticism. There would be 'false apocalypticists' as there had been 'false prophets'. This in no way discredits the apocalyptic movement as such. Above all, we require sympathy as we turn to apocalyptic, otherwise it will not yield to us its secret meaning.

What is the connection between the foregoing discussion and the development of Christian eschatology? Various lines of connection may be traced. First, it is surely not insignificant what value is placed upon the whole Jewish apocalyptic movement in its development from approximately 200 B.C. to 100 A.D., which is as far as we need presently trace it. After all, Christianity grew out of a Jewish situation. Whether it outgrew its origins is another question, but at least it is clear that we cannot hope to understand primitive Christian apocalyptic except over against this background. The estimate that we place upon Jewish apocalyptic will have necessarily some effect upon our attitude towards Christian apocalyptic. In the second place, it is known that the effect of the disappointment of all the Jewish messianic hopes was that there was a diminution of emphasis upon Jewish eschatological hopes in the years following upon 70 A.D., and especially after 135 A.D. It has been suggested that 70 A.D., had a similar influence upon the development of Christian eschatology, especially in
Jewish-Christian circles. This matter will be taken up under the next sub-section, but we may anticipate here to this extent by saying that, so far as we can see, Grant does not adduce one scrap of evidence linking the growth of Gnosticism with the destruction of Jerusalem, 70 A.D. What he does demonstrate is a close connection between Jewish apocalypticism, both in its Jewish and its Jewish-Christian forms, and Gnosticism. This connection has, however, been more ably demonstrated and more thoroughly documented by Jean Danielou. Further, the latter has been more careful to stress that the line of development is not necessarily a direct one from Judaism or Jewish Christianity to Gnosticism. It is true that Grant does safeguard himself here in certain statements, but the essential logic of his position seems to rest upon the assumption that constantly delayed hopes, both in Judaism and in Jewish Christianity, led to the considerable development of Gnosticism. Danielou simply maintains a common background - a rather different, though related, point.

Of the two points raised in the last paragraph, the first has been placed first because it is not only important in itself but also because our judgment on this matter will almost certainly prove to be fundamental to our attitude to the second question. It seems unfortunate that so many modern scholars place such a low estimate upon the value of apocalyptic eschatology, as upon apocalyptic literature. It is criticized on various counts. It is said to be pessimistic, other-worldly, bizarre in expression, rigidly deterministic - especially in its later forms in the 1st century A.D., and thereafter. It has come to be viewed as a sort of bastard child of prophecy. There have been protests from such scholars as H.H. Rowley and David Russell, but this attitude of mind persists.

The criticisms regarding the bizarre forms of expression may be
ignored. For one thing, this does not touch the heart of the matter. Here we are dealing not with the content of apocalyptic - a particular kind of eschatology, but with its literary expression. There seems no more reason to deny apocalyptic its right to a literary genre of its own than any other expression of thoughts, which cannot easily be expressed in prosaic language. How are we to express on the flat plane of literary form the thought that eternity and time are so to meet at some future point beyond present experience that eternal values will be realized while human values are conserved? It may be that the language does not always do adequate justice to both sets of values at one time, but this is surely not surprising. Apocalyptic expression inevitably seeks to portray what is ineffable and beyond the human mind to grasp, prior to its actual fulfilment, except in symbols. The difficulties may be compared to those of the geographer who has to represent the contours of a two-dimensional flat surface. In addition to all of this, the same allowance should be made in the sphere of apocalyptic literature as elsewhere for forms of expression which fall strangely upon our ears simply on account of the passing of the centuries. So far as the criticism dealing with pessimism is concerned, this has already been dealt with. It may, of course, be argued, that there is something unhealthy about a view of the world and history which cannot see God's kingdom as emerging out of them rather than having to irrupt into them. Yet there is much here that is clearly consonant with the message of the prophets. To the Hebrew mind, it is true, the world is God's creation: the body is treated as something good, history is viewed as the sphere of God's providential care, nature in its glory points to the greatness of God. Yet man is a creature who is fallen and it is only an elect community, with whom God has entered into a gracious covenant in His electing grace, that is given to know something
of God's nature and purpose for men, and this is only through God's 'Word', given through the prophets especially in interpretation of specific saving events within Israel's history. Further, do not human experience and the ongoing course of the centuries themselves suggest that a divine utopia is not the end product of a gradual development within history?

It remains to look at the criticism of apocalyptic, especially of later Jewish and Jewish-Christian apocalyptic, that it was deterministic. R.M. Grant quotes Martin Buber, the Jewish scholar, as observing that the later apocalyptic writers lost their faith in a genuine historical future: "Everything here is predetermined; all human decisions are only sham struggles."\(^1\) Again, "Wherever man shudders before the menace of his own work and wishes to flee from the radically demanding historical hour, there he finds himself near to the apocalyptic vision of a process that cannot be arrested."\(^1\) Perhaps this criticism is justified in certain instances, but what are Buber's presuppositions?

In the first place it should be stressed that, in point of fact, not all apocalyptic literature does emerge out of the situation in which present disaster begets historical pessimism. A good example of this is seen in the Book of Jubilees. This book is normally dated in the second century B.C., probably stemming from the Maccabean period. It is certainly apocalyptic in character: its dualism is more marked than that of the Book of Daniel, its concern is with the periodization of history - a characteristic apocalyptic interest, its form is that

---


The quotations are derived from an article, 'Prophecy, Apocalyptic, and the Historical Hour', published in the Union Seminary Quarterly Review, XII, No. 3 (March, 1957), pp. 16-18.
of an ἀποκάλυψις given to Moses at Sinai. However, it not only sees the messianic age as having already set in - its author looked for no catastrophic event, but for a gradual coming of the kingdom. Men's days would gradually grow longer, until they attained a thousand years (Jub. XXIII:27). Significantly and in keeping with the absence of the catastrophic note, nothing is said of the resurrection of any section even of the people of God. Doubtless, it is true that the catastrophic element is predominant in apocalyptic literature generally. Doubtless, too, it is true that this became more the situation by the 1st century A.D., and no doubt the failure of eschatological expectations, on which military adventures had been based and had collapsed, did much to produce an aura of pessimism in late Jewish apocalyptic. It remains doubtful, however, whether pessimism and determinism go hand in hand all along the way. Rather does it appear throughout the apocalyptic literature that history is the unfolding of a predetermined plan. Whether this 'predeterminism' is in apocalyptic literature at its best of such a character as to leave room for human volition in action is quite another matter.

Then again we must ask ourselves whether the failure of certain military undertakings of the Jewish people, which undoubtedly leant heavily on apocalyptic inspiration, did not rest on a misunderstanding of earlier Jewish prophecy and apocalyptic, a misunderstanding which would not be shared by the Christian community. The Christian Church in the early days believed that it was the true heir to the Old Testament prophecies - prophecies not only of the coming Christ and Kingdom, but also of the promised outpourings of the Holy Spirit and of the ingathering of the Gentile nations into the fold of God. Both Paul and the Early Church fathers, in general, saw the Christian Church as the true heirs of Abraham. Further, they saw the promises as
having from the beginning had not only Jesus of Nazareth, but also the Christian Church, Pentecost, the wide-world mission, and the whole scheme of eschatological events in view, though darkly through the mists of time. What these early prophets had been uncertain of was the times when these things should be: "The prophets who prophesied of the grace that was to be yours searched and inquired about this salvation; they inquired what person or time was indicated by the Spirit of Christ within them when predicting the sufferings of Christ and the subsequent glory. It was revealed to them that they were serving not themselves but you in the things which have now been announced to you..." (I Pet. 1:11-13. R.S.V.)

The early Christians, so far as the New Testament and Early Church literature shows, were firmly convinced that these earlier prophecies related to them and to their day. Modern critical scholarship may be unconvinced that many of these prophecies had originally any relationship to the times of Jesus Christ. Two things require to be said concerning this attitude. First, even if this approach be sound, does it not matter what interpretation has been given a passage over a long period of time? Thus, many of the passages that were given a Christ-reference or a Church-reference by the early Christians had already been given a messianic or eschatological reference by the later Jewish community. Clearly, it was impossible for this community to relate it to Jesus of Nazareth before the Incarnation, but it did colour the Old Testament prophecy. Now who is to say that we can entirely separate off the original prophecy from its understanding in the community to which it is addressed or, at least, that inherited it? In an age when oral tradition was dominant, it seems very hard to make clear delineations of this kind. May not, in fact, the attempt itself to make them be wrong-headed? Second, it ought surely to be taken
very seriously that such a passage is found in Holy Scripture as that in I Pet. Whatever our view of the inspiration of Scripture, we have to reckon with the fact that at this point, for good or ill, modern critical scholarship seems to separate us off from the view of the earliest Christian community, that stood closest to the events that all Christians are interested in interpreting. We may judge, if we will, that this view of fulfilment of Old Testament prophecy is not essential to an adequate understanding of Jesus Christ. We may be right in this, but it is certain that the majority of early believers would not have agreed with us. Now, if we take seriously such a passage as that in I Peter chapter one, it surely suggests that prophecies, which, being misinterpreted by the Jewish nation, encouraged military adventures that led to disaster, would not cause surprise to the Christian Church. These false Jewish interpretations rested on the rejection of Jesus' messianic claim. There was nothing to encourage despair or pessimism in Christian breasts. The Christians had found their Messiah. They lived daily in accordance with His will, so far as they were enabled by the power of the Holy Spirit. In their gatherings around the Word of God and the Memorial Feast, they found the Presence of Christ. This Presence would not suggest to them that God had no future consummation in store for His people and for the world, but it would grant patience and certainty to her: Christ's Presence in Word and sacrament was a living pledge of the future hope. So far as the destruction of Jerusalem was concerned, was this not actually prophesied by our Lord? The partial fulfilment of Matt. 24 - Mk. 13-Lk.21 would mean more to the Church, in view of her continuing experience of God's faithfulness in her life, than its partial non-fulfilment. Would she not in fact adjust to her experience of delay of the Parousia, as she had when the Lord was removed, as He had said
He would be? After all, Old Testament seers had not reckoned on two Advents of Christ. This posed no problem to the Primitive Church.

Although the early Christians knew that Christ, the Church and the world-wide mission were a fulfilment of Old Testament promise, they were not concerned over the fact that the Old Testament clearly did not discern that two Advents would be required. Similarly, if it be true that the Church anticipated the Parousia within a short period of time, when in her continuing experience she found that the Fall of Jerusalem was not immediately followed by the Parousia, would she not again realise that prophetic insight does not assure us always of the 'times' and 'seasons'? Further, had not her Lord Himself said that "of that day or that hour no one knows, not even the angels in heaven, nor the Son, but only the Father." (Mk. 13:32 R.S.V. par. Matt. 24:36)?

The point is that, whereas to the Jews the Destruction of Jerusalem was totally unexpected, arising as it did out of an estimate of God's programme which ignored Jesus of Nazareth, to the Christians, far from implying a disappointment because it was not followed by the Parousia immediately, it was a fulfilment of prophecy. Jesus had predicted the judgment upon the city. In a real sense, this event was God's judgment upon His chosen people for their rejection of their Messiah. As we have already argued, the fact that this was not immediately followed up by the Parousia would not be likely to provoke unbelief or a keen sense of disappointment, since the Church was aware that it belonged to the nature of prophetic insight that it was frequently vague concerning the 'times' when certain prophesied events should be. She would be heartened by partial fulfilment of Mk. 13 - Matt. 24. She would also, be encouraged by the way in which her Lord had kept faith with her through the gift of His presence by the Spirit in their solemn gatherings - thus important was her conception of the place that her corporate life in its various manifestations had.
Thus, it would appear that it ignores a most important factor to assume that the early Christians, Jewish or Gentile, would suffer a grievous disappointment through the way in which the destruction of Jerusalem tailed off without any visible reappearing of the Lord in glory. This factor is that non-Christian Jewish apocalyptic had failed to read aright her prophecies of other days - they had rejected Jesus Christ. Christians would be much more likely to judge that in Jesus Christ the true key to apocalyptic had been given. Nor would they have cause to be disappointed by the turn of events.

It must further be pointed out that, however puzzling it may be, the New Testament affords evidence of a double strain with reference to the Parousia of Jesus Christ. If there are passages which suggest an imminent Parousia, there are other passages which suggest a likelihood of a delay. G.E. Ladd has drawn attention to the fact that in the Early Church "the expectation of the coming of Christ included the events which would attend and precede His coming. The early fathers who emphasized an attitude of expectancy believed that this entire complex of events - Antichrist, tribulation, return of Christ - would soon occur. This is not the same as an any-moment coming of Christ."¹ Ladd's point is that we do wrong to separate the Parousia from these events. If the primitive Jewish Christian community judged that the Jewish War of 66-70 A.D. heralded the commencement of the final tribulation, she must soon have become aware that in this she had miscalculated. In point of fact, early Christian thinking regarding the end of the age was very complex - not only a period of tribulation, but a period also of apostasy is anticipated. While some writers may have judged that these expectations were in process of being entered upon, or even fulfilled, it seems clear that for most of them these

events were still in the future, however near that future might be. How, then, could the Church have anticipated Christ's appearing in glory 'at any moment'? Not only so, but these passages which refer to the importance of reaching all nations with the message of the Christian evangel seem to imply a somewhat extended period of time, as a possibility that must be reckoned with, prior to the Parousia of their Lord. Indeed, it would seem that the mission of the Early Church can only be understood in depth when its eschatological dimension is taken very seriously: in her proclamation of the Gospel, the Church was hastening to meet her returning Lord. Again, we have to ask whether the significance of the Parable of the Pounds (Luke 19:11-27) was not that it helped prepare the disciples for a reasonably lengthy wait for the return of their Lord? If we begin with the assumption that this and other parables were reinterpreted in such a way by the Church we have to ask whether it is impossible to believe that Christ could have foreseen the probability of a long or extended period of mission and in His teaching prepared the disciples for it. Why should it be axiomatic to doubt Christ's ability to foresee such a situation? It would seem, then, to sum up, that, in view of these circumstances also, it is extremely unlikely that the Church would be upset by the failure of the Jewish War to inaugurate the Final Tribulation and Parousia of Christ. Jewish messianic movements may have their significance for Christian eschatology in the early days of the Church. We need not deny that there would be elements within the Church that were influenced by Jewish thinking rather than by true Christian faith. When are Christian men ever wholly influenced by thinking which is from within faith? Jesus Himself recognized beforehand the danger of this happening and sought to forewarn his disciples. They were not to be persuaded by false messiahs, or by miracle-workers. It remains true, however, that there is no evidence
of a wholesale collapse or weakening of faith as a result of the delay of the Parousia either at the time of the Destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70 or simply as the years lengthened from the time of Christ's earthly ministry. Thus, the significance of Jewish messianic movements, as also of the increasing pessimism of Jewish apocalyptic literature towards and after the end of the first Christian century, is primarily negative in character: it affords a striking contrast with the relative buoyancy of the Christian Church whose interpretation of Old Testament prophecy and of earlier apocalyptic had not been proven by history to be a will of the wisp.

2. The Emergence and Growth of Gnosticism.

In his book, 'Gnosticism and Early Christianity', a compendium of lectures delivered by the author in the United States of America in 1957-1958, R.M. Grant seeks to set out and to establish certain conclusions regarding the relationship of Gnosticism and Jewish religious thinking, both in its Christian and non-Christian expressions, in the first and second centuries A.D. The drift of Grant's argument is well presented in the first chapter of his book. He begins by acknowledging that Greek elements in Gnosticism are significant but pleads that, at the risk of a one-sided statement, there is need to present very plainly the Jewish element -- "or rather the very heterodox Jewish element" -- in Gnostic thought that has been neglected. It is Grant's purpose in this book, after dealing with the sources of Gnosticism and after attempting a statement of its salient features, to "try to show that it originated in a crisis in Jewish apocalyptic thought during the first two centuries of our era."
We must carefully distinguish the two elements in Grant's thinking which are mentioned above. First, Grant seeks to show that Gnosticism owes much to heterodox Jewish thinking, as well as somewhat to Greek thought. Grant is not alone in saying this. Danielou, Quispel, and other thinkers are in agreement. There is a broad consensus of thought emerging at the present time which sees Jewish influences, especially such as were of a border-line, if not quite definitely heterodox, character, as being linked closely in some way with the emergence of Gnosticism. Not all say, however, that it is quite as simple a matter as one of direct cause and effect relationship. Grant seems to realize that there is some danger of overstressing the Jewish contribution at the expense of the Greek or Iranian or other possible elements, but he feels that this aspect has so long been neglected that it is important to give it considerable emphasis, even if need be to overemphasize it, in order to assure its recognition. In all of this, it may be well to keep in mind the reminder of Gregory Dix, that Hellenistic culture, while predominantly Greek in the centuries before the coming of Christ, was in fact the result of an admixture and mutual interpenetration of Greek and Near Eastern cultures, and that in the early centuries of the Christian era a spiritual renaissance in the Eastern section of the former empire of Hellas changed its role from one of passivity to one of determination of much of the character of Hellenism. It now became more deeply religious. Thus, when we talk of the question of Greek or Semitic origins for Gnosticism, we have to bear in mind that Gnosticism emerged in the greater area of Alexander's former empire, where 'Hellenism' was not in any case purely Greek but was itself already the result of a fusion of influences. In any event, it is not with this first emphasis of R.M. Grant that we need concern
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1Jew and Greek. Dacre Press, Adam and Charles Black. London, Chapter I. 'The Conflict of the Syriac and Greek Cultures.'
ourselves deeply. Our purpose does not include any full-scale examination of Gnosticism and its sources, which would in itself be a very large task. It is rather with Grant's second suggestion that we must concern ourselves: this is the view that Gnosticism represents a deeschatologizing of apocalyptic-eschatological hopes resultant upon the Fall of Jerusalem or the suppression of the revolt under bar Cochba. Grant modestly confesses that this is "the only novelty" in his book. 1 We have already argued, that, if this should account, or help to account, for the emergence of Gnosticism - and from a Jewish background, at that -- it seems intrinsically less likely that such a 'Deeschatologization' of eschatology would take place among Christians, who knew that Jewry had been, at least temporarily, set aside, and who were engaged in a growing mission to the Gentiles. We might add that, if Jesus truly predicted the collapse of Jerusalem - and most scholars, whatever their exact understanding of the 'Little Apocalypse', are prepared to see this as an authentic element in that Dominical discourse - Christian expectation could hardly have been taken completely by surprise. The story of the flight of the Jewish Christians in Jerusalem to Pella at the beginning of the Jewish War in 66 A.D. reflects some memory of our Lord's prediction. Further, even if it be true to life and to the Gospels that again and again the disciples did not fully benefit by Jesus' warnings, which were intended to prepare them for catastrophic events (as the death and resurrection of the Lord), it remains true that, when the events fell out as predicted, understanding was born, which was assisted by the remembered prophecy. So surely it would be in this case also. The fulfilment of Jesus' utterance concerning Jerusalem

1 op. cit. Preface, p. VIII.
would not be likely to induce disbelief in other sayings of Jesus, recorded in Mark 13 and its parallels: rather it would have been likely to quicken, amongst Christians, eschatological expectation. Doubtless, however, it is true that, to the extent that Christian expectation looked for the coming of the Day of the Son of Man in close connection with the Fall of Jerusalem (we should not just assume that this was the general expectation), the non-occurrence of the Parousia at that time might have been a factor militating somewhat against complete confidence in the apocalyptic Hope. Even in this situation - and it seems likely that some Jewish Christians had expected the close combination of the two events - it was possible for Christian expectation to adjust to the realities and to reinterpret our Lord’s meaning. In this connection, it is interesting that Luke 21:24 envisages a period of downtreading for Jerusalem under the Gentiles. Since there is no allusion to this in Mark 13 or Matthew 24, many scholars judge that this verse, written as Luke’s Gospel was circa 80 A.D., represents an accommodation to the situation that Jerusalem has fallen while the Day of the Son of Man has not yet arrived. While this is possible, it is worth reflecting that it is not impossible that Jesus really did utter this word, and that Luke, with his characteristic interest in the world-mission of the Gospel, the mission to the Gentiles as well as to the Jews, recalls this Domínical utterance. The very circumstance of the Fall of Jerusalem would thus be interpreted as not only fulfilling Jesus’ prediction, but as demonstrating effectively in history the setting aside of Israel and the extension of God’s grace to the Gentile nations in the present age. On this view, the fact of Luke’s writing after the Fall of Jerusalem is certainly not an insignificant factor, but it is simply the external factor, itself conceived as providential in character, which calls to mind a genuine word of Jesus.
One is conscious, in seeking to deal with Grant's explanation of the rise of Gnosticism, that the whole question is made much more difficult by the lack of any significant consensus of opinion among scholars about the very nature of Gnosticism. Questions of origin, nature, and sources are inextricably intertwined, but are formally distinguishable. Thus, Grant's thesis -- and Grant admits that this may not be the complete explanation of Gnosticism -- is really a theory of origin, which implies a source a background which is apocalyptic in character, and which at the same time implies much concerning the nature of Gnosticism, viz. the presence of 'pessimistic dualism', etc. Similarly, Hans Jonas, takes the concept of the 'Unknown God' as the fundamental unifying principle of all Gnosticism: this means that it is essentially dualistic in nature, and closely connected with this understanding of its nature is lavish illustration of Gnosticism from Mandaean sources.\footnote{The Gnostic Religion. Beacon Press. Boston. \textit{Trans. from the German.}}

The Mandaeans were powerfully affected by Iranian dualism. While a majority of modern scholars are dubious about a pre-Christian origin for Mandaeism, G. van Groningen seems correct in his judgment that Jonas' total evaluation of Gnosticism is bound up with his attachment to Rudolf Bultmann's judgment that Gnosticism was pre-Christian in origin and that the New Testament writers were dependent on Mandaean literature for the 'Redeemer myth' and other related teachings.\footnote{First Century Gnosticism. E.J. Brill. Leiden, 1967, p. 26.} None of this rules out the possibility that either R.M. Grant or Hans Jonas is correct, but it does show how intertwined are judgments concerning the nature of Gnosticism with the estimates made concerning origin and sources. None of the evaluations made of Gnosticism seems very convincing. The impression of
agreement between various points of view is somewhat superficial. Even where genuine agreement is present, as, for example, between Grant and Jonas above regarding the presence and significance of dualism in Gnosticism, this fact becomes less impressive when we realize that the scholars concerned reach the same conclusions from somewhat different premises. Thus, Grant would trace dualism in Gnosticism to dualism in apocalyptic and behind this to Jewish borrowing from Persia during the period of the Captivity. But essentially Grant's view rests on the fact that for him certain correspondences between Gnosticism and apocalypticism are bound up with a dualistic understanding of apocalyptic. It is only because of this assessment of apocalyptic - one which a D.S. Russell would contest - that Grant, not unnaturally, looks around for a source of this dualism in Jewish apocalyptic and finds it conveniently to hand in influences commencing in the Captivity period. On the other hand, Jonas' view bypasses Grant's close connection with apocalyptic in tracing dualism to its ultimate origins in Iranian thinking.

It seems clear that we cannot go further than to note this rather unsatisfactory state in regard to studies dealing with Gnosticism. Our concern is only basically with the question of 'de-eschatologization', but it is important to realize that Grant's suggestion, while it should be dealt with on its own merits, is only one attempt to understand a phenomenon which so far seems to have defied precise analysis and explanation. G. van Groningen suggests that many accounts deal with what are the characteristic features of the Gnostic movement without explaining the driving force which lies behind the movement. His own explanation of this driving force is that Gnosticism represents the attachment of a primitive 'scientism', in parasitic fashion, to the power inherent in Christianity. This thought has much to commend it

but whether this does full justice to Gnosticism as a movement may be more questionable.

We turn in a little more detail to Grant's views. We have already set out theological reasons which suggest the impropriety of the 'deeschatologization' motif to Gnosticism where it was found in close links with Christianity. At the same time it has to be admitted that Grant's view carries considerable appeal in these days. This would seem to emerge from certain prior judgments, which must be elucidated. Thus, it is the presupposition of Grant's view that the primitive Christians were possessed of a vivid expectation of the imminence of Christ's Return in glory. It is this supposition which makes so plausible the thought that Christians would expect the Parousia to follow closely on the Fall of Jerusalem in 70 A.D., the more so perhaps as such passages as Mark 9:1 and 13:30, with their parallels in other Gospels, seem to suggest that the Parousia would not be delayed by more than a generation, usually taken in Jewry as a period of forty years, and this was almost exactly the distance in time between Christ's death and resurrection and the collapse of Jerusalem before Titus.

What is known concerning the flight of the Jerusalem Jewish Christians to Pella seems also frequently to be viewed as indicating the assumption of the Jewish Christians concerned that what was about to take place in Jerusalem was the anticipated final outbreak of evil prior to the Parousia of Christ. Grant does not mention this, but this judgment is a common one, and is bound up with the assumption that these Jewish Christians were anticipating the Advent of Christ in glory soon after the Fall of Jerusalem in 70 A.D. Nothing should, however, be built upon the flight to Pella because Early Christian documents are in fact silent concerning the fat of the Jerusalem Christian community and concerning the Jewish War. It is only when we come to Eusebius in

the fourth century that we find the account of the flight to Pella, although it is reproduced, with some slight variations, by Epiphanius in the fifth century. ¹ S.G.F. Brandon shows what considerable historical difficulties are associated with this tradition. ²

In all of this discussion we have to be careful not to impute to Grant assumptions which he does not make. He may not think much of the Pella tradition. He may not have in mind particularly the passages which may seem to suggest that the Parousia would not be delayed by longer than a generation. He does not express himself explicitly on either issue. It seems quite clear, however, that he assumes that the first generation of Christians anticipated the imminent Return of Christ in glory. This has become virtually an accepted finding of modern scholarship, and all the evidence is that Grant believes in it. This assumption requires, however, to be assessed critically. There are indications in the Gospels of the assumption of a fairly long period required for the mission to the Gentiles, and it is possible to fit this in with the obvious expectancy of an imminent Return of Christ by thinking of imminence only in terms of Early Christian understanding of such prophecy as that contained in the Book of Daniel. We find in such writers as Tertullian and Hippolytus, at a somewhat later date, the judgment that Rome was the fourth world empire of Danielic prophecy (chapters 2 and 7). This seems, indeed, almost to have been a commonplace of Early Christian thinking. If, however, this was the case, room had to be made in time for the disappearance of Rome and the emergence and destruction of Antichrist before the Parousia could take place. Further, such a


perspective suggests how 'imminence' was understood. What was meant was that, viewed in terms of a divine programme of history, four world empires were now either past or, in the case of the fourth, already now for some time present: the fifth and final world empire, to be established at Christ's Parousia, was the next world empire that was due to appear, even though Antichrist must first briefly reign. This understanding will have to be set out elsewhere, as in our study of Tertullian and Hippolytus, but it is relevant here, as it calls in question an assumption which seems to underlie the thinking of Grant as of so many modern interpreters. If, in fact, the Jewish Christians were not thinking in terms of a general view of imminence, but were, in company with other Christians, possessed of a particular prophetic background which gave significance and content to that attitude, then we should not expect to find deep dismay among them when the Fall of Jerusalem was not followed by the Day of the Son of Man. This is not to discount the possibility that some may have tended to forget such a prophetic background to the concept of imminence and been inclined to look for a Parousia in the immediate future in a more general understanding of 'imminence'. The Epistles of Paul to the Thessalonians appear to document the existence in some quarters of such a tendency.

G. van Groningen offers quite a pertinent critique of R.M. Grant's thesis that Gnosticism emerged from the debris of Jewish-Christian eschatological-apocalyptic hopes. His major argument is that Grant's evidence is far from adequate and is capable of alternative explanation. Groningen begins by noting Grant's judgment that a religion, rather than a philosophical system, must provide a point of departure for Gnosticism. In view of his own understanding of Gnosticism as an expression of the spirit of scientism, the desire to manipulate our world for our own ends expressed, however crudely, in primitive magic and, in much more
sophisticated fashion, by modern technology, Groningen can only conclude that Grant is misled. He does agree, however, with Grant that Gnosticism has closer links with religion than with philosophy. The particular religion selected by Grant as par excellence the source of Gnosticism is a Judaism which has been affected by Iranian dualism. This is Jewish apocalyptic. Grant notes that the three systems, said by Irenaeus to have been the oldest forms of Gnosticism, were those associated with Simon Magus, Menander, and Saturninus. These were active in the general Palestinian and Syrian world, and were thus at the very heart of Judaistic territory. "Some of the features of these systems -- are definitely similar to Jewish teachings, e.g. the creation of the world, the rebellion of angelic powers and the descent of a saviour to defeat the angels." Groningen comments, first, that the chasm between Judaists and Samaritans was wide and that Simon Magus was a Samaritan, and, second, that the doctrines mentioned "could just as well be ascribed to Christian sources as to Judaistic sources. In fact, the descent of the Saviour is a specific Christian Doctrine." It is in line with Groningen's general solution of the Gnostic problem to see a linkage throughout with Christianity rather than with Judaism, since the former is seen as a source of power upon which Gnosticism, with its scientist attitude, feeds in parasitic fashion. Groningen's point seems, however, quite a sound one. These doctrines do belong just as much to Christianity as to Judaism. van Groningen has other points to make, though we shall not follow him into every detail of his criticism of Grant's position. He is probably sound in saying that Grant's use of the auxiliary verb 'must' is question-begging. (Grant had said, for example:....

"...apocalyptic hopes were extremely important. When they continued to shatter, severe religious adjustments must have been necessary.") 1

Grant, Groningen avers, is not really sure: he is making assumptions. Grant's development of his theme does somewhat give this impression. At the same time Grant does have some reason on his side, where the affecting of Jewry's hopes by events is concerned. Thus, Grant reminds us that the Bar Kochba revolt was apparently inspired, as to the time of its continuance, by Bar Kochba's belief, or that of his theological adviser, that three and a half years was foretold in the book of Daniel as the period of struggle before divine help arrived. The point, however, that non-Jews, for example, Jew-hating Samaritans, would not be likely to be affected by this Jewish disaster, nor would be likely to reinterpret the expectations of the Jews, is cogent.

Grant speaks of certain 'bridges' between apocalypticism and Gnosticism. Grant finds significance in the transformation of certain "calendrical notions" of Jewish apocalyptic which he believes were transformed into "Gnostic theologoumena." 2 It is noted in this regard that the Dead Sea sectarians placed emphasis upon the observance of the correct calendar given to them by divine revelation and maintained in opposition to the calendar in use at Jerusalem. Thus, Grant finds a connection between the four luminaries, spoken of in the Gnostic 'Apocryphon of John' as the product of a union between the aëons, Christ and Imperishability, on the one hand, and the four dominant archangels of God in Iranian and post-exilic Judaic thought. The
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2 op. cit., p. 41.
Numerical similarity is reinforced by certain likenesses in names, though it must be said that, as only one of the four is involved, this linkage is none too convincing. Again, Gnostic literature speaks of seven spirits, either including the creator-god or subordinate to him, which seem to resemble the seven archangels of the Jewish apocrypha and pseudepigrapha. Connected with this is the fact that the Apocryphon of John sees these seven spirits as set over the heaven: this seems to mean their identification with the seven planets. One recalls in this connection Daniélou's stress on the seven-heaven scheme, as over against the more normal Judaic and Christian scheme of three heavens, as characteristic of Syriac Jewish Christianity. Grant, however, thinks that while the names of these seven spirits in Gnostic literature are Jewish, their functions are more closely connected with Iranian thought. Here again some connection between Gnosticism and Iranian or Jewish thought is discovered. Once more, the number thirty, which is so prominent in Valentinianism as indicating the total community of heavenly aeons, is thought to be related to the number of days in the ideal lunar month. A Valentinian statement to this effect is noted, as well as the fact that "such a month is found among the Essenes, in the books of Enoch and Jubilees." Again, the Valentinian Pleroma consisted of the Ogdoad, followed by other twenty-two aeons, grouped into ten produced by the fifth and sixth aeons and twelve produced by the seventh and eighth aeons. In this connection it is significant that the Valentinians say that the first eight aeons, the Ogdoad, can be found in the Book of Genesis (Beginning, God, Heaven, and Earth; Abyss, Darkness, Water, and Spirit),

1 The Theology of Jewish Christianity. p. 174.

2 op. cit., p. 52.
and that Genesis goes on to mention twenty-two works of creation, thus completing the number thirty. The Book of Jubilees also observes that the works created by God during the six days of creation were twenty-two in number. "The Valentinians have translated creation by emanation, and have transferred the scene from this universe to the one above."\(^1\)

In like fashion, it is suggested that the Fall of Sophia, which reduces the number of aeons in the Pleroma to twenty-nine, may be connected with the fact that in the apocalyptic Book of Enoch only half of the months have thirty days, while the other half have only twenty-nine days. Enoch suggests that the reason why his divinely inspired calendar does not work properly, and requires such variation, is due to human sin. Grant sees a reflection of this thinking in the concept of Sophia's Fall.

Grant goes into considerably greater detail than we have outlined above. Some of his 'bridges' seem overpressed: it is difficult to be sure that in every case there is a real connection. On the other hand, such a connection as that between the Valentinian Pleroma and the Book of Genesis and the Book of Enoch seems not unconvincing. One recalls the great deal of speculation which went on in Judaism concerning the Hexaemeron, and it is known that Gnostic thinking did take this up into its speculations. Jean Danie\'lou has documented the considerable interest in the whole concept in Judaism, Gnosticism, and Early Christianity.\(^2\)

G. van Groningen is probably a little inclined to brush aside what may in some instances be real insights. At the same time his general comment on Grant's thesis has force: "Bridges are usually not construed to refer to sources, but to connecting links."\(^3\) One gains the
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3 op. cit., p. 50.
impression that much of the evidence which Grant adduces may only
demonstrate common links in esoteric Judaism, Gnosticism, and
Christianity, with earlier source material. This would not rule out
the possibility, indeed the virtual certainty, that in some instances
there has been borrowing by Gnosticism from either Judaism or Christianity.
It should be stressed, too, that, even where Grant's investigations and
theorising seem most convincing, they do not necessarily represent the
complete solution. Thus, van Groningen's reminder that, according to
Hippolytus, "the cosmogony, cosmology, the duality, the aeonic
emanations (in Valentinianism) are in conformity with Pythagorean
numbers and measures,"\(^1\) opens up alternative possibilities to those
mentioned by Grant. van Groningen goes on: "Indeed, anyone who care-
fully tries to follow Pythagorean numerology and Valentinian emanations
and the detailed working out of their arrangements and relationships finds
Hippolytus to be very correct."\(^1\) Probably the truth is that both Grant
and van Groningen contribute to our understanding of the Valentinian
emanations. Grant's reasoning seems as convincing as before, especially
in view of explicit Valentinian affirmations, where at any rate the
connection with Genesis is in view.\(^2\) At the same time Hippolytus'
contribution cannot be too summarily dismissed. It is true that not a
few authorities are unsure about the reliability in his account of
Gnosticism: the chronological sequence of various sects and their
originators, for example, differs from that given in other sources. At
the same time Hippolytus is reputed to have been a student and follower
of Irenaeus, upon whom we were dependent for so much of our knowledge
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\(^1\) op. cit., p. 172.

\(^2\) Cf. Irenaeus, 'Adversus Haereses, I.XVII.' (Harvey, p. 166).
of Gnosticism until the discovery of the Nag Hammadi documents. This suggests that explanations may yet come to light for these variations in Hippolytus, and that we should not at any rate summarily dismiss or ignore Hippolytus' judgments. Further, in the case before us Hippolytus' assertion of connections with Pythagoreanism is verifiable in principle. It may be more difficult to show by what historical means Pythagoreanism has come to influence the Valentinian heresy, but the actual numerological connections suggested are capable of being checked, and such checking does indeed suggest a linkage such as Hippolytus suggests. But, if there be such a connection, some of the force of Grant's argument is lost. It may still seem likely that a link exists with esoteric Judaism, but the idea can scarcely elude us that behind both esoteric Judaism and Valentinian emanationism stood Pythagorean influence, or alternatively, the view that Valentinianism was influenced by two disparate sources, Pythagoreanism and esoteric Judaism. Either of these conclusions may be correct, but if either one is, then Grant's thought that Valentinian emanationism comes from esoteric Judaism and consists of a translation of the latter's terms into Gnostic ones under the influence of a weakening of apocalyptic interest, becomes less convincing. It may still be this last influence which accounts for the particular use made of Pythagorean numerology or of any esoteric Jewish sources, but van Groningen's reminder of Hippolytus' explanation of Valentinian emanationism is sufficient to show how many possibilities there are in the explanation of either Valentinianism or any other Gnostic heresy. Grant requires to show over quite a wide range of cases a linkage distinctively with Jewish sources, since his thesis is that Gnosticism represents a 'deeschatologizing' of apocalypticism. It was uniquely in Jewry that apocalypticism developed, even if Iranian influences contributed to that development.
One of the major points, and a strong one, which van Groningen makes is that it is not true that the dualism of Gnosticism corresponds with that of apocalyptic. This is a general consideration, but one which makes it less likely that Gnosticism has borrowed from apocalyptic. Of course, even on Grant's view, allowance is made for a transformation of borrowed material, in so far as its general orientation and use is concerned. Nevertheless, the assumption does seem to be present that the presence of dualism in both is a reality, and that this strengthens the argument for a borrowing by Gnosticism from apocalypticism and a general development out of it. D.S. Russell, in his book, 'The Method and Message of Apocalyptic', has made a careful study of the subject of dualism in apocalyptic. He reaches the conclusion, as van Groningen reminds us, that "the Apocalyptic does not think dualistically" and that "the apocalyptists had dualism which did not and cannot contradict their monotheism." \(^1\) van Groningen makes use of Russell's conclusion, and distinguishes carefully between moral dualism and a dualism of being. In particular, he stresses that Jewish apocalyptic does not think either of men or angels as evil "as to their physical existence". He says of the apocalyptic literature: "Men who are evil can become good; they can because they are not essentially evil. As to the fallen angels and evil spirits there is no reference to their essentially evil character either. They are considered evil, morally and spiritually by choice and design." \(^2\) The monotheism of the apocalyptists, their confidence in the goodness of creation as such, and their belief in the resurrection of the body all support the judgment of Russell that there is no ultimate dualism in apocalyptic. All of this helps to undermine
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Grant's thesis that Gnosticism emerged out of Jewish apocalyptic, even if Grant allows, as he does, for the transformation of the latter. Grant's thesis assumes some fundamental measure of agreement between the two, which is necessary to the transformation of the one into the other. The fact that the two are actually quite dissimilar in regard to the question of dualism goes far towards destroying that assumed ground of agreement between the two.

It is true that Grant is more careful than some thinkers concerning what kind of dualism apocalypticism believed in. He does not himself say that apocalyptists taught an ultimate dualism. Thus, he says, in speaking of Gnosticism and comparing it with apocalypticism, that "the temporal and ethical dualism of apocalyptic has become a physical and metaphysical dualism."\(^1\) This clearly implies the recognition by Grant that the dualism of apocalyptic is not "physical and metaphysical." In that case it might seem that van Groningen's careful differentiation of the dualism of apocalyptic from that of Gnosticism is irrelevant, where it is Grant's particular presentation that is in view. In this regard it should be noted that van Groningen does not mention Grant by name at this point. Grant's point is that the dualism of apocalyptic has been transformed by the disappointment of apocalyptic hope into something else. Nevertheless the fact remains that, for all Grant's carefulness in what he says of apocalyptic dualism, he does seem to think of some real measure of affinity between it and Gnostic dualism. This fact may now be illustrated. In the subsequent discussion immediately following on the quotation from Grant, made above, Grant goes on to note a

\(^1\) op. cit., p. 176.
distinction between the teaching of Paul and John in the New Testament. Whereas Paul speaks of the 'constitution' (στάσις) of this world as passing away, John thinks of this world as being in some sense the domain of Satan. Certain comments, made by Grant, are significant. Thus, Grant says, of John, "a strong dualism, at least an ethical dualism, occurs in his treatment of the cosmos." Again, "this dualism, on the verge of becoming metaphysical, is even more strongly expressed in the First Epistle of John -- (2:16-17 is quoted). The point is that in these comments Grant reveals something of his tendency to see in any kind of dualism a leaning towards that complete separation which is "physical and metaphysical". While it is true that Gnostic thought found language in Paul, and especially in John, which was congenial to them, it is not by any means necessary to find in them any tendency such as is expressed by saying that "their dualism is on the verge of becoming both physical and metaphysical. John comes closer than Paul does." Even so, in this passage the contrast is still between apocalyptic dualism, which is conceived of as ethical, and Gnostic dualism, which is physical and metaphysical, and towards which on Grant's view, Paul and John are tending. Elsewhere, however, Grant reveals that he shares fully the judgment that apocalypticism as such represents a flight from reality. We have earlier noted his quotations from Buber (page 304 above). Grant is not sympathetic to apocalypticism. This in itself does not show that he sees in it any other than what he claims to see, so far as dualism is concerned, namely an ethical dualism. At the same time, it is clear that Grant's rather negative estimate of apocalypticism leads him to view it as a rather unnatural, pessimistic, non-historical way of viewing this world, and this seems to imply that in apocalyptic this world is viewed as having almost an

1 op. cit., p. 177.
autonomy of an evil or hopeless character. In Grant's view, it is because the apocalyptists had this rather unbalanced tension between a world that was in a complete mess and a God who alone could save it that, when their expectation of God's intervention was disappointed, they came to view this world's autonomy as complete: God had not intervened because He was unable to do so, because this world and its ruler lay outside the sphere of His control. Speaking of Jonas' definition of gnosis as "anti-cosmic and eschatological dualism", Grant makes his position clear. The anti-cosmic element emerged from the belief that the God of this cosmos had failed to act on behalf of His people, while the eschatological element was Jewish, and ultimately Iranian, in origin. Grant says significantly:

"Apocalyptic writers had already laid tremendous emphasis on the badness of the world, but they expected God's intervention. They had speculated about the heavens above and the angelic and demonic powers which dwelt in them. When their hope of immediate victory was denied, they recognized themselves as strangers and afraid in a world their God had never made. "

Thus, although van Groningen does not explicitly mention R.M. Grant when speaking of the two kinds of dualism involved in apocalypticism and in Gnosticism, and while Grant might seem to be unaffected by van Groningen's reasoning at this point, this latter impression is factually faulty. Grant does in fact think of apocalyptic dualism as one tending, through the generally negative character of that literature, towards a specifically ontological dualism, though it was to take the events of frustrated hope in God to complete the process.

One final point may be made. If Gnosticism represents a 'deeschatologization' of apocalyptic teaching, Jewish or Christian, one would not expect to find an eschatology within Gnostic systems themselves. However, as R.M. Grant himself says "it cannot be said that

1 op. cit., p. 37.
in Gnosticism there is no eschatology. The Apocryphon of John and the systems of Basilides and Valentinus provide clear evidence that Gnostics were deeply concerned with eschatological doctrines. Grant puts this fact to one side because he thinks that "the crucial line of division lies in the discussion of God's control over the world." From remarks made elsewhere, it is clear that for Grant the 'ascent of the soul' that has \( \gamma \nu \nu \sigma \iota \sigma \) takes the centre of interest, in place of the original apocalyptic interest, out of which Gnosticism emerged. He never develops, and does not appear to see the significance of, the admission made above. It is well known, however, that in Valentinianism, to take one example, in Jonas' words, "the spirits transformed by knowledge rest in the middle region of the Ogdoad where their Mother of Spirits (Sophia) clothed with them awaits the consummation of the world." It is at least curious that any eschatology remains, if Gnosticism emerges from the debris of apocalypticism.

The purpose of this section has not been primarily to reach conclusions concerning the nature and origins of Gnosticism, but to examine Grant's contention that Gnosticism represents a de-eschatologization of apocalyptic teaching. There seems little doubt that most doctrinal teaching that went under the name of Gnosticism was very properly seen by the Church to be incompatible with her own thinking and fundamental tenets. Thus, Gnosticism involved the repudiation of the body. This was not congruous with the Hebrew-Christian attitude towards the body and the world as God's

1 op. cit., p. 175.
2 H. Jonas, op. cit., p. 196.
creation. It is not denied that Gnosticism meant the transformation of Christian eschatological teaching as of all other aspects of her thought. What is being maintained is that Grant's thesis rests on dubious assumptions and is somewhat less than satisfactory. Our present interest in his thesis is, that if it should appear sound, it would bolster and support the judgment that the Church was influenced by the collapse of Jewry, through the Fall of Jerusalem and the failure of the bar Cochba revolt, to put aside apocalyptic concepts, which underlie belief in the imminent Return of Christ. We have sought to show that in fact the parallels adduced between Jewish apocalyptic literature and Gnostic thought, on the one hand, and thinking, on the other, are not convincing, and, in particular, that it is not at all clear that Jewish apocalypticism and Gnosticism tend to meet in their dualistic attitudes. Grant adopts on the main a negative attitude towards Jewish apocalypticism, and indeed towards apocalypticism in general. It would seem more true to the facts, however, that apocalypticism and Christian orthodoxy had somewhat in common than that this apocalypticism and Gnosticism had strong affinity. In any event, we reach the conclusion that, even if Gnosticism does mean a radical transformation of Christian eschatology by its repudiation of the body and matter as evil and by its related tendency to think of time as swallowed up in eternity, there is no evidence that Gnosticism came into existence because it rested on an apocalypticism, which was in effect a flight from history and which was proved to be such by the terrible events that came upon the Jews. The Christian Church had no cause to be disturbed by the events that came upon the Jewish nation. There is no evidence that she did in fact at this time give over her futurist emphasis - so far as we do have evidence for these years, it all seems to suggest that her sense of futurist eschatology was heightened, not diminished.
3. **Millenarianism.**

Millenarianism was to be widely represented in the notable thinkers of the Early Church up to the middle of the third century of the Christian era, and in some degree up to the time of Tyconius and Augustine. This at any rate is true of the thinkers whose writings are extant and, therefore, available to us. This is not, however, to assert that its influence was everywhere present. It would seem, for example, that its representation at Rome was much weaker than in Asia Minor. It remains significant, however, that so many of the early thinkers or writers, whose works are extant, think in millenarian terms.

We shall have occasion again and again in this investigation of Early Church eschatology to discuss the millenarian views of a particular thinker. Here, however, our interest is more specific. Our task is to note the presence and character of millenarianism in the early formative period between the writing of the later books of what came to be viewed as the New Testament and that of the Apologists and Anti-Gnostic writers. We have already had occasion to note its presence in the Epistle of Barnabas in the Apostolic Fathers. It now falls to us to note the significant influence of Papias; to investigate the character, forms, and provenance of millenarianism at this time; and to estimate its abiding significance, if any, for the development of Early Church eschatology. In the nature of the case, this must be a relatively brief survey, majoring on the facts so far as they can be elicited, with the focus of interest on the light that this phenomenon sheds on the nature of Early Church eschatology.

Jean Daniélou has done much to show how and where millenarianism developed. It is his contention that millenarianism in its classic form is a one-sided Jewish-Christian development, emanating predominantly from Asia Minor, which seeks to present the common and important Early Christian belief in the Parousia of Jesus Christ in glory. He sees it as unduly reliant upon Jewish apocalyptic and messianic concepts, and finds primarily two faults with it. First, it seeks to give detail concerning what is
essentially unknowable before the time, borrowing the details from canonical and non-canonical Jewish messianic expectation. Second, it is unduly literalist in its understanding. At the same time it fails to distinguish sufficiently clearly that certain prophecies, in the Old Testament and in the Book of Revelation alike, relate to the conditions that are to exist in a 'new heaven and a new earth' rather than to the period between Christ's Return in glory and the final 'renewal of all things'.

In a penetrating discussion of the whole question of millenarianism, Daniélou himself distinguishes three broad types of expectation, which might fairly be said to fall within this category.

The first, according to Daniélou, is a kind of millenarianism which is found in the New Testament, not only in the Revelation, but also in 1 and 11 Thessalonians, and 1 Corinthians. Daniélou says succinctly:—

"It implies no more than that there is to be a period of time, the duration of which is unknown, and which in the last days will cover the return of Christ, the resurrection of the saints, the general Judgment and the inauguration of the New Creation".

It is significant that Daniélou does see in certain Pauline utterances, as well as in the Book of Revelation, a view of the Parousia of Christ which makes room for a period of time which must elapse between the resurrection and transfiguration of the saints and the Last Judgment. What Daniélou wishes to make clear is that neither Paul nor John defines the extent of this duration (he considers that the 'thousand years' is simply an effective symbol of longevity in the 'Revelation'). Nor do they deal with its nature in terms of any exceptional fertility of the soil or harmony of the animal creation or in any other way. All that
Paul and John assert is that during this period of unspecified length the saints will reign with Christ. Thus, although Danielou criticises classic millenarianism for its undue filling out of this framework, he does regard this framework as having a Pauline and Johannine basis. Behind its outcropping in the New Testament passages noted lies the fact that it was the common early Jewish-Christian understanding of what the Parousia involved.

The second kind of millenarianism may be said to be 'millenarianism proper', that is, the doctrine as we commonly think of it today, its classic presentation. This consists in an elaboration of the framework already noted in Paul and John, an elaboration in terms of the symbolism of Jewish apocalyptic. The 'primary document' for this is the 'Revelation' of St. John, but in the view of Danielou, 'Revelation' is the source rather than the justification for this elaboration. It is 'Revelation' which speaks of the 'thousand years', and it is the same book which speaks in terms inspired by Ezekiel 36-48 concerning the onslaught of Gog and Magog upon the saints and the 'beloved city' (20.9) and concerning the descent from heaven of the New Jerusalem. But 'Revelation', as we have seen, views the 'thousand years' in Danielou's judgment, primarily as a symbol of longevity associated with the "paradisal state of existence" from which Adam fell. This thinker judges that "the chronological aspect of the millennium is secondary".1 And the portrayal of the descent of the new Jerusalem from heaven is placed by 'Revelation' at the end of the reign of the saints, not during the millennial era itself, a fact which many millenarian theories were to forget.

The third kind of millenarianism was that associated with Ebionite

---

1 cf. cit., p. 393.
messianism, which is "a continuation of Jewish temporal messianism and corresponds to the 'Judaic' tendency that was to be condemned by the Fathers of the Church. Its main feature is the very material character of the expected messianic kingdom. Connected with this understanding was a millenarian exegesis of such passages as Mark 10:29-30, where the phrase, "now in the present time", was interpreted in terms of temporal and material blessings during the millennial era on earth. This exegesis was to affect some interpreters, who belong to the main stream of millenarianism: one such was Irenaeus.

It should be clear from the above account of the various types of millenarianism that it was quite a significant feature of eschatological thinking in the period with which we are presently concerned. In the judgment of Danielou, however, "the doctrine of the earthly reign of Christ persisted above all in the Asiatic Jewish Christian community", but "does not appear to have endured in orthodox Jewish Christianity as a whole". It would seem that the original concept of Christ's coming reign on earth ceased to be thought of, in Jewish Christian circles outside Asia Minor and areas influenced by the Asian tradition, in terms of a predestined period of time (of whatever length) between the resurrection of the saints at Christ's Coming and the Final Judgment. Danielou notes, in particular, the application, by the Jewish Christian community in Rome, of passages which were used by millenarians, to the reign of the saints with Christ in the present Church era between the Advents. Thus, he observed that II Peter 3.8 quoted the classic text of millenarians, namely Ps.90.4, "With the Lord one day is as a thousand years", and applies it to "the period between the Incarnation and the final catastrophe". This "would seem to be an actual instance of understanding the millennial reign as relating to the

---

1 op. cit., p. 385.

2 op. cit., p. 386.
times of the Church." It is also noted that the Epistles of Peter generally make no reference to millenarianism (unless indirectly and negatively at 3.8 as noted), and that neither Clement of Rome nor Hermas make any allusion to millenarianism. The conclusion is that the Jewish Christian community at Rome understood the 'thousand years' in terms of the reign of the saints with Christ in the Church era.

So far we have simply set out Danielou's judgments. There is probably no scholar better fitted to guide our thinking on early Jewish Christianity in general, and he has much to say on millenarianism, some of which we have yet to note, which helps our understanding. Yet we should not simply accept all that he says uncritically. Thus, for example, it certainly seems significant that literature emanating from Rome does not appear to think in terms of a literal millennial reign of Christ on earth, but it is not immediately obvious that I Pet.3.8 is an interpretation of the millennial reign in terms of the times of the Church. We have to bear in mind that the Jews were interested in numbers and in periods of time, especially in apocalyptic circles. For this reason it is dubious surely whether interest in periods of time would be restricted to that of the millennium. We have already noted, in our study of the Epistle of Barnabas, clear evidence, which is admitted on every hand and by Danielou in particular, that the millennium was in some circles set within the context of a scheme of seven millennia. It may be true that it was in the wider Jewish Christian circles of the Diaspora and especially in such an area as Alexandria that this interest developed, but it remains true that this is evidence of Jewish Christian interest in numerical periods of time. How can we be sure that II Peter 3.8 is not simply an instance of the understanding of Ps.90.4 in

1 cf. cit., p. 386.
terms of the duration of the Church age, without any conscious thought that this interpretation displaces a further era of a thousand years at the end of the Church age?

Another point of criticism suggests itself. Granted that Danielou makes a case which appeals strongly to our modern Western minds, when he says that probably the Book of Revelation is not thinking primarily in terms of chronology, when it speaks of a thousand years, but rather in terms of 'paradisal symbolism', we have to be cautious in our judgment. It is significant that the farthest that Danielou will go is to say that the chronological element is not dominant. In this he is possibly correct. He produces quite impressive evidence concerning the presence in the Book of Jubilees of the concept that Adam would have lived in Eden until he was a thousand years old, if he had not fallen into sin (Jub.1V:29-30). This and allied evidence certainly seems to suggest that a major interest in the concept of the saints' reigning with Christ for a thousand years is the idea of a reversal of the results of the Fall. This, however, does not necessarily imply that minds steeped in Jewish concepts would not take the thousand years literally, either in the case of the life of Adam or in the case of the coming reign of the saints on earth with Christ. One would judge that in Danielou's view such literalism is 'Judaic' and unbecoming for Christian minds. He tends, therefore, to import back into the text of the Book of Revelation what he feels is appropriate for Christian thinking, which is not in subjection to 'Judaic' concepts, and concludes that the chronological element in Revelation's account of the reign of the saints on earth with Christ is marginal, whereas the development of this concept of the reign of the saints in Asia Minor not only took this thousand years literally but emphasised this element. We return to the fact that not even Danielou is prepared to deny completely the chronological element's presence in 'Revelation', and we would question whether we can be so categorical
about the leaving of the chronological element to one side as a sound or inevitable development of truly Christian thinking as opposed to thinking influenced by 'Judaic' elements. Our major point in this paragraph is that 'Revelation' may well be taking the 'thousand years' more literally than Danielou wishes to allow. As for the question whether such literalism would not be a kind of bondage to 'Judaic' elements, it seems wise to remind ourselves that we cannot simply assume that Scripture agrees with our presuppositions. Danielou, as a good member of the Roman Catholic Church, clearly considers that we must understand 'Revelation' in this matter in terms of the unfolding mind of the Spirit through the authoritative mouthpieces of the Church over the centuries. He obviously judges that, if the author of Revelation 20 did have in mind a literal period of one thousand years, the Spirit has made it clear to us that this is not of the essence of what is expressed in that chapter. Protestant scholars, viewing Scripture mostly from a somewhat different standpoint, would be in agreement that we cannot be expected today to take the number, a thousand, very seriously. Our present plea is that, whether these attitudes be justified or not, it is not improbable that 'Revelation', while placing the emphasis on the recovery of paradisal conditions for man, does think literally in terms of a thousand years. To the Hebraic mind, as over against the Greek, the precise definition of the period of the reign of the saints would be in agreement with their concreteness of thought.

It is true, of course, that apocalyptic makes much use of symbolism, and it may be that the 'thousand years' was intended simply to indicate a very long period of time. It seems fairly certain, however, that, whether or not the duration is to be taken with exactness in the intention of the author, Revelation 20 does have in mind a reign of the saints on earth with Christ. Here we come to a more subtle aspect of Danielou's repudiation of the literal thousand years' reign. Does he intend to put aside only the literalist understanding of the duration of this reign? Or, while
admitting that John and Paul both thought in terms of a separation in
time on earth between the resurrection of the saints and the Final
Judgment, is he tacitly setting aside this separation? Let us ask our-
selves what is the effect of not taking the duration of this reign of the
saints literally? It might only mean that we thought of this reign as
taking place on earth between the two resurrections, but as covering not
necessarily a thousand years. One rather doubts, however, whether this
is what Daniélou means to be at. Daniélou recognises it as an element
common to 1-11 Thessalonians, 1 Corinthians, and 'Revelation' that there
is to be such a reign of the saints on earth and that it is to be bounded
by the two resurrections, that of the saints at the beginning and that of
the sinners at the close for Final Judgment. It is not so clear, however,
that he thinks that the Church is committed to so believing. When he
says, for example, that the Roman Church understood the thousand years in
terms of the reign of the saints in the present Church era, does that
imply simply that the period of one thousand years has been transferred
as a symbol to the Church in the present age? or does it mean the
transferral of the whole concept of a reign of Christ on earth at the end
of the age to the present reality of Christ's reign on earth through the
submission of the Church to Him? One gains the impression that for
Daniélou the Parousia may well involve Christ's Return to this material
earth, but that it will involve such a transformation of it that prophets
and apocalyptic visionaries can only formulate symbolic representations
of it. Thus understood, it would seem that Daniélou would accept a measure
of truth in the representation of the Parousia of Christ in glory as being
in the context of this world, but that he places no reliance on the thought
of any significant separation in time between the two resurrections: this
is rather for him the form which is imprinted upon the Christian Hope in
primitive Jewish Christian circles.
Our present purpose is not to set out what seems an acceptable view of millenarianism, and with this in mind to criticize Danielou's concepts, though the above discussion doubtless indicates the direction in which our own thinking tends. The point is that it has been impossible to set forth the various types of millenarianism, as indicated by one of the chief interpreters of this period of the development of Christian doctrine, without also indicating on what premisses the division into types is made. It is at least arguable that Danielou, in distinguishing between the primitive Jewish Christian concept and the classic millenarianism which developed in Asia Minor, does not allow for a sufficient measure of continuity between them. The reason for this would stem from his own assumption, which may, of course, be justified, but again may not, that the separation in time between the two resurrections is simply the form of primitive Jewish Christian thinking about the Parousia and should not bind us any more than, in his view, it bound the major stream of the Church in the early centuries. It is true that Danielou concentrates in his criticism of classic millenarianism, not so much on its retention of a period between the two resurrections, but rather on the colouring which is given to this period in terms of concepts such as the greatly enriched fertility of the soil and the reconciliation of the animal kingdom; these latter, he tells us, properly belong not to any interim period between the resurrections, but rather to the vision of the consummation of all things. The point that we would make in this connection, however, is that it may well be Danielou's almost tacit repudiation of any significant separation in time between the two resurrections which in fact underlies his attitude at this point also. It is true that Danielou has a real point when he reminds us that in the Book of Revelation, we are told nothing regarding conditions during this envisaged millennial reign, and that both the reference to increased fertility (22:2) and the descent of the New Jerusalem from heaven (21:1-2)
are made with a view to the period after the close of the millennium and subsequent to the Final Judgment. He may well be on good grounds in asserting that we should not make much of what Scripture passes by in comparative silence. It may also be true that it is when we ignore this principle that we run the risk of giving to the millennium a 'mythical' character. At the same time, if one takes seriously the concept of a separation in time between the two resurrections it is hard to see how one could avoid such application of the concepts of increased fertility to the soil and the reconciliation of the animals to this particular period—however more it may be appropriate to conditions after the 'renewal of all things'. Thus, if one takes seriously the concept of this separation in time, it is not easy to believe that during it nature will be 'red in tooth and claw': this is clearly viewed in Scripture as not ideal and as a result of a far-reaching disruption of the natural order. As for the increased fertility of the soil, Genesis tells us that the ground was cursed for Adam's sake (3:17-19), and it seems understandable that any exegesis which takes the millennial era as more than symbol should see as applicable to it the removal of a curse which was due to man's sin. How is Danielou able to assert with such confidence that Old Testament prophetic passages, such as Isaiah 11:6-9, relate to a 'new earth' rather than to this interim period? The only conclusion, which makes Danielou's view coherent, is that he does not in fact believe that we should take the separation in time between the two resurrections seriously, at least not as representing any more than the primitive Jewish Christian form of the Parousia hope. For, if such a period of time be not taken seriously, it is evident that such passages as Isaiah 11:6-9, cannot refer to it.

It has seemed necessary to engage in this somewhat extended critique of Danielou's analysis of the millenarian hypothesis, since, if our criticism is valid, we must see millenarianism not as a onesided development of a mere primitive Jewish Christian form of the Parousia hope, but as a
development more or less congruous with a primitive Christian expectation even in its detailed schematization: such an assessment does not commit us to viewing all millenarian developments as equally appropriate developments of the original Pauline and Johannine anticipation of a period between the two resurrections when the saints are to reign on earth with Christ. Basically what we are doing at this point is not to champion a millenarian hypothesis—though it seems much more difficult to set aside as unbiblical and fantastic, than many scholars today allow—but rather to assert that, historically viewed, the lack of true continuity between the primitive Jewish Christian view and the millenarianism of Asia Minor is only capable of being established, when certain presuppositions are made whose reliability is most questionable. This is not unimportant for the general historical problem of the 'tunnel period' in Early Church history. If it be true that millenarianism in its developed forms in the mid-2nd century A.D. not only represents a continuance of the primitive Jewish Christian hope of the Parousia (as Danielou, at least, allows), but one inherently congruous with the essentials of that Hope, then once again it significantly removes the impression that Christianity changed greatly in its outlook between the end of the Apostolic Age and the era of the Apologists.

It is high time to look at the actual evidence of Papias, which it has been found convenient to deal with at this point rather than in our investigation of the Apostolic Fathers. A major problem in this connection is that we do not possess any works of Papias extant: we only have certain fragments which have been quoted by such writers as Irenaeus and Eusebius. Usually the evidence of Papias regarding a millennium is judged in conjunction with that of 'the elders' or 'presbyters' (συν πρεσβυτεροι) on the same subject, as recorded by Irenaeus. Thus, it is Irenaeus who provides us with the evidence of the latter. He says:

We note here the theme of the reconciliation of the animals, as well as that of the superabundance of the earth. Irenaeus goes on:


Eusebius also provides important evidence regarding Papias' views:

"The same writer (Papias) published other accounts also purporting to have reached him by an unwritten tradition, as well as some strange parables and teachings of the Saviour, and certain other things of a somewhat mythical character. Among these he says that there will be a millennium after the resurrection of the dead, when the kingdom of Christ will be established on this earth in material form. I believe that he assumed these things by twisting the Apostolic interpretations without duly considering that the language employed therein was figurative and implied a hidden meaning. He certainly appears to have been a man of very meagre intelligence, as any-one would say that judged him by his own words. For all that, he is also partly responsible for the fact that so many ecclesiastical writers after him, on the plea of the man's antiquity, held the same opinion as himself, as, for example, Irenaeus and whoever else had expressed like veins."

It is clear, from the above quotations from Irenaeus and Eusebius that we have to deal with the evidence, not only of Papias, but also of

'the elders'. Who were these 'elders'? It is notoriously difficult to say in many contexts just how official is the bearing of this term in the sub-apostolic age. It seems fairly clear, however, from the quotation, given above from Irenaeus, that Papias was such an 'elder', since he, like the 'presbyters' or 'elders', had had contact with John, the Lord's disciple, and that such 'elders' were people who formed the connecting link between the apostles and later generations: they were people who had been in touch with the apostles themselves or other eyewitnesses of our Lord's glory. Whether the John in question be the Apostle John, the Evangelist, or another John who was a disciple but not an apostle of the Lord, does not alter the impression given by Irenaeus that the significance of the 'elders' is that they witness to evidence or reportage from those who actually knew the Lord in the days of His flesh.

What are we to make of this evidence of 'elders' and of Papias? Daniélou agrees that the reason why a man of the stature of Irenaeus takes millenarian teaching seriously is because it goes back to the very first Christian community. Nevertheless, he is quite sure that, though the ascription of such teaching to our Lord is an "unsolved mystery"¹ Jesus did not actually issue such teaching. Daniélou's caution about accepting such evidence based on traditions of unwritten teaching of Jesus is understandable, yet it is pertinent to enquire how Daniélou can speak with such assurance on this matter. Certainly there appears to be a certain extravagance in the statement attributed to Jesus concerning the fruitfulness of the vineyards, which accords ill with the accustomed sobriety of Jesus' utterances as recorded in the canonical Gospels, and which appears to have more in common with the style of the apocryphal Gospels and Acts. This undoubted fact, however, does not in itself dispose of the whole issue, because all that it seems to establish is

¹ op. cit., p. 383.
that the present form of the statement is unlikely to be authentic. The fact that both Papias and the 'elders' attribute such teaching to Jesus, when taken in conjunction with two other factors, first, the assumption in primitive Jewish Christianity as evidenced in 1-11 Thessalonians - 1 Corinthians-Revelation of a period of rule by the saints on earth between Parousia of Christ in glory and Final Judgment, and, second, the widespread character of millenarian teaching right up to 250 A.D. and even beyond, suggests that, though the reportage may not be accurate, it is unlikely that it has no foundation.

It may be useful briefly to trace the development of millenarianism in its various exponents. Daniélou notes the presence of a primitive concept of the reign of the saints on earth, consistent with that found in the Pauline and 'Revelation' passages mentioned above, which is found in the Ascension of Isaiah. Here the actual period of one thousand years is not mentioned, but a clear differentiation is made between the period of the reign of the saints on earth after the overthrow of Beliar (Antichrist) and a later stage, in which the saints are to be transformed in such manner that their bodies will be left behind in this world while they proceed to heavenly realms.¹ This work is generally dated today in the first century A.D. and is regarded as chiefly, if not entirely, of Christian origin, though doubtless resting on traditions derived from Jewish sources. Papias, however, is the first explicit witness to millenarianism of the more developed kind. If the Ascension of Isaiah antedates the Book of Revelation, Papias follows explicitly upon the thought of Revelation 20, developing it, however, if the witness of Irenaeus be reliable, in terms of a concept of greatly increased fertility of the soil and of reconciliation within the animal kingdom (not suggested of

¹ op. cit., pp. 378-379.
the millennium itself in 'Revelation'). Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, Hippolytus, and Tertullian were all to accept the idea of a millennial reign of the saints on earth. Methodius of Olympus (d. circa 311 A.D.) was also to accept the millenarian outlook, seeing the millennium prefigured by the time spent by the Jews in tabernacles in the desert. It is interesting to observe in Methodius the consonance of thought with such an early authority as the Ascension of Isaiah: both seem to view the reign of the saints on earth as a period of bodily glorification, to be followed by a further transformation in which present bodily conditions are completely left behind. Most of these writers, with the exception of Hippolytus, represent the tradition of Asia in that they either lived in Asia or derived from it. Only of Justin and Hippolytus is this not true.

Not only orthodox writers, such as those mentioned above, but heretics like Cerinthus (fl. circa 100 A.D.), who was a Gnostic, accepted millenarianism, and, according to Eusebius, Caius asserts that Cerinthus thought of the thousand years as a period to be spent in nuptial feasting. Belief in the appropriateness of marriage to the period of the millennium was to reappear in Commodian, the Christian Latin poet of Africa (usually dated in mid-3rd century A.D.). It may be that Eusebius has exaggerated the sensuousness of Cerinthus' outlook, but even if he has in some degree it is not surprising that a Gnostic writer should have such an outlook since Gnostics tended generally to err in regard to moral issues either by being libertine in their approach or ascetic in outlook: the point is that Cerinthus' acceptance of millenarianism is evidence of the wide provenance of the teaching in Asia Minor circa as early as 100 A.D., while his stress on sensuousness in regard to it is doubtless his own and does not reflect upon millenarianism in general in an adverse fashion. Nevertheless,

1 Noted by Danielou, op.cit., 384.
Eusebius and others at a later date clearly see millenarianism as lending itself to this kind of abuse in conception. Further, we are told by Dionysius of Alexandria that Cerinthus believed in the restoration of animal sacrifices during the period of the millennium. It is clear that it is impossible to reconcile such a view with mainstream Christianity, even with the main position of primitive Jewish Christianity. Daniélon notes that it was probably this kind of millenarianism which Marcion inveighed against, "when, according to Tertullian, he criticised those who expected a restoration of the Jews in Palestine during the thousand years, nor should it be forgotten that Marcion was himself an Asiatic."

Again, however, it seems fair to regard such a view as a characteristically 'Judaic' (as compared with Jewish Christian) understanding of the millennium. The fact that there is such widespread testimony to a millennial reign, even in non-orthodox circles, is impressive evidence of the strength of this tradition in Asia Minor.

Daniélon judges that Cerinthus has to be understood, so far as his millenarian views are concerned, over against the background of a virulent Jewish messianism in Asia Minor among certain Jewish Christian groups. This went "so far as to look for the restoration of the power of Jerusalem and the Temple worship. This should be related to the fact that there was a very strong Jewish element in Asia, which influenced the Christian communities and kept alive, even among Jews converted to Christianity, the hope of a temporal reign of the Messiah. This messianic fever was never so lively, as between A.D. 50 and 70, that is to say, at the period when the influences which shaped Cerinthus were active, and its special intensity in Asia (elsewhere it was not so strong) is probably connected to some extent with the fact that whereas at Alexandria and

1 op. cit., p. 385.
Rome Judaism was obliged to exercise prudence, in Asia it was less threatened and could be more virulent.

What seems sound in the above judgment is that Jewish elements in Christian thought were destined to be less modified by admixture with Hellenism in Asia Minor than elsewhere. The reasons for this are probably very complex. Since the days of Alexander the Great, Asia Minor had formed the landbridge between two ways of thinking, Greek and Semitic. From about 100 B.C. Semitic, rather than Greek, elements achieved dominance in that Hellenism, which was strictly the product of a fusion of Greek and Semitic thinking. The presence of millenarian teaching both at Alexandria and Rome is known. Its greater dominance in Asia Minor may be explained by the historical background of the area, as indicated above. Daniélou seems to understand the dominance of this kind of thinking in terms of Jewish 'messianic fever', which influenced Christians as well as Jews, where the Christians were themselves converted Jews, and he appears to be satisfied that it was a variation in Roman military presence in Asia Minor which accounts for the intensity of this 'fever' in that area. What seems dubious in this treatment is Daniélou's tacit assumption that millenarianism, in its developed form, is an expression of Jewish 'messianic fever' and his failure to explain why millenarianism should so develop in Asia Minor but not in Palestine, even although the Holy Land was the scene of intense Jewish eschatological expectation in the period 50-70 A.D. which is important for its influences on men like Cerinthus and was not truly suppressed even by the Jewish War of 66-70 A.D. as the Bar Cochba

---

1 ibid., p. 385
revolt of 135 A.D. makes clear. No doubt it is true that variations in the strength or obviousness of the Roman military presence had some effect upon the expression of Jewish messianic ideas, but it seems clear that this is not sufficient reason to explain the development of millenarianism in Asia Minor. We would judge that the peculiar interpenetration of cultures, Greek and Semitic, in this area may provide a better clue to understanding this development. As for the thought that millenarianism was influenced by the intense messianism of the period leading up especially to 70 A.D., it again seems questionable whether this element is as significant as Danielou judges it to be. It may be true that this had some marginal effect on Jewish Christians in Asia, but there seems little definite evidence of such influence. Romans 9-II provide evidence for a Pauline stress on God's purpose for the Jewish people and of his conviction that ultimately this people would acknowledge Christ. His missionary principle seems to have been that the Gospel was for the Jew first, but also for the Gentile. It was Jewry's rejection of Christ which was the hinge on which the whole Gentile missionary programme depended. Other Early Christian writers, as we shall see, take seriously the primacy of the Jew, even although the Church incorporates both Jew and Gentile. This being so, it seems not unnatural that any Christian who in those early days of the Church accepted both this primacy of the Jews and belief in millenarianism, should understand those Old Testament passages which anticipate Zion's future glory in terms of the period of the millennium. It surely does not demand intense messianic expectation, expectation of the type which produced or helped to produce the Jewish War of 66-70 A.D., to produce belief that in the millennium the city of Jerusalem is to be restored or even to judge that during this period all nations will flow unto Jerusalem? What does seem unthinkable for a Christianity which is not bound by Judaic elements
is any concept of the restoration of animal sacrifices: for truly
Christian thinking Christ is our sacrifice and to conceive of such a
restoration would be to reverse the dispensations, and, in Pauline
terminology, to crucify Christ afresh. It is surely clear that it is
Danielou's repudiation of any separation in time between the two
resurrections, except as the particular form which the hope of the
Parousia took in primitive Jewish Christianity, which predisposes him
to view any statements which think in truly historical terms concerning
the millennium, as literalist, and since the Jews were unwilling to
see in Christ and His Church a fulfilment of Old Testament prediction,
as 'Judaic'. Our basic point is that, if Danielou were more ready to
see genuine continuity between the primitive Jewish Christian hope of
the Parousia and developed millenarianism, and if he did not treat the
thought of a separation in time between the two resurrections in that
primitive Hope as a mere form which is not binding on the Church, he
would be in a position to view millenarianism much more sympathetically,
while recognizing that as a phenomenon, which is basically congruous
with the primitive Jewish Christian hope of the Parousia, it is yet
capable of being interpreted in ways not fully consistent with
Christian teaching, that is, for example, 'Gnostically' (as in Cerinthus)
or 'Judaistically' (again Cerinthus and doubtless those whom Marcion
opposed in Asia Minor).

What is the basic significance of millenarianism in the period
before us for the development of eschatological concepts in the Church?
It is surely that the primitive Jewish Christian form of the Parousia
hope was preserved with integrity. The very development, even if it
was carried too far at times and given a prominence that it may not
have deserved, shows that once again we must discover in this 'tunnel
period' a continuity with the Apostolic Age. The actual assertion of
a gap in time between the two resurrections is recognized as a feature of primitive Jewish Christianity and is no more predictive of detail concerning the future than the equally, if not more widespread, conviction regarding the coming of Antichrist. It may well be true that, judged by the Scriptural norm as given in Revelation 20, most millenarian accounts are much more expansive. In particular, it seems to be true that Scripture gives us no justification for attributing to this period either a renewal of the earth's fertility or a reconciliation within the animal kingdom or any rebuilding or renovation of the city of Jerusalem or renewal of the fortunes of God's ancient people. Yet, if Scripture gives no clear justification for it, these concepts, we submit, are not inconsistent with the period between the two resurrections, where this is understood as referring to a definite period of time and is not treated symbolically. The primitive Jewish Christians undoubtedly were not thinking symbolically, as most modern commentators allow, both in respect of Revelation 20 and the references in I-II Thessalonians and I Corinthians (though not all commentators find in these Pauline passages a definite reference to two literal resurrections bounding a period of reign on earth by the saints): it may well be that the actual figure 'one thousand' in 'Revelation' is but a figure of completeness (though, as we have seen, even this is open to doubt), but the concept of such a reign on earth over an extended period of time is accepted by most modern commentators as present in the passage. Where concepts do merge with millennialism which seem to be repugnant to Christian thought or which seem inconsistent with the Christian Gospel, these features seem to have little to do with eschatology as such but represent other heretical elements, as, for example, the placing of undue stress on the Law which has received its fulfilment in Christ.
We may say, therefore, that millenarianism, whatever its defects, suggests how seriously the Church in the sub-apostolic age took the Jewish Christian primitive form of the Parousia hope. It is surprising generally to what a large extent the Gentile Church felt bound by the Old Testament Scriptures: they learned from them and accepted them as God's Word. We must not assume that the Early Church would feel free to regard the concept of a period in time between the two resurrections as a mere form which could be set aside. The Early Church opted to abide by the Jewish Christian concept of the resurrection of the body with all its concreteness. Why should it have been unwilling to do likewise in this matter? In fact the two cases are not simply parallels but are related. It was the determination to think in realistic terms concerning the resurrection body which made the idea of a reign of the saints on earth with Christ seem credible in the first place, though, of course, the actual concept of two resurrections required belief in a separation in time between the resurrection of the saints and that of the ungodly.

A further feature of this issue is that the Christians in the 2nd century were living prior to the formation of the Canon of Scripture. In this period they were, however, from the beginning conscious of the divine inspiration of the Old Testament scriptures, as interpreted in the light of Christ. Even if we feel inclined to be dubious about statements regarding the reconciliation of the animals and so on during the millennium, because we find no such explicit statements in our New Testament, it is only fair to recognize that, given a literalist understanding of the separation in time between the two resurrections the colouring given to this period is not simply invented or apocryphal, but is the result of the application to it of motifs found in the Old Testament. We submit that there is a big difference between the
attitude of a Church which employs notions of their own invention or borrowed from clearly apocryphal sources and one which, even if on occasions mistakenly, applies motifs called from the recognized sources of the faith.

It is interesting to recall that not only Gnostic thinkers like Cerinthus, but also the Montanists accepted belief in a millennial reign on earth. This further helps to establish the wide provenance of millenarian thinking in Asia Minor. It is also, however, significant in that there is little evidence that even in a community so committed to the practice of prophetic gift did the main inspiration for belief in the millennium come from special 'revelations'. It is clear that belief in a millennium is no special creation of their prophetic 'revelations', though, if it were not for the presence of belief in a period between the two resurrections in I-II Thessalonians and I Corinthians, it might be possible to argue that the whole millenarian concept in Early Christianity derived from the prophetic 'Revelation' of Saint John. What is true is that the Montanists appear to have adapted the common millenarian teaching to their own predilections, as in envisaging the New Jerusalem as descending to earth at Pepuza in Phrygia. It is certainly impossible to find justification either from the Old Testament scriptures or from the recorded utterances of Jesus or in any of the writings which make up our New Testament (including 'Revelation') for such an assertion. The confidence felt in making such statements plainly derived from the Montanist emphasis on 'prophetism' and their failure to agree with the understanding of the Church at large, only now beginning to be fully articulate, that all doctrine has to be tested by the Old Testament scriptures and the utterances of our Lord and His Apostles. As Daniélou and others have pointed out, the only reason why such thinkers as Irenaeus accepted
millenarianism lay in its apparent foundation in Dominical utterances, eked out by Revelation 20 (and, we should add, the application, appropriate or otherwise, of certain Old Testament prophetic passages to this envisaged millennial era). One further matter in which Montanist prophetism expressed itself in a manner closely connected with belief in the millennium was in the statement that the arrival of the New Jerusalem and the new age would be heralded by heavenly portents, in particular by the vision of the Heavenly City in the skies. Tertullian tells us that such prophecy had been made and assures us that in his day this prophecy had been fulfilled during the expedition of the Emperor Severus against the Parthians the appearance of the city had hung in the sky for a period of forty days.\footnote{Adversus Marcionem III.XXIV.6}

Clearly a community which made much of the prophetic gift would be liable to make such predictions, and in so far as it thought in terms of the imminence of the end of the age would be ready to find these predictions fulfilled. Yet none of this demonstrates any significant reliance of the development of millenarianism upon Montanism. It is possible that the rather curious assertion of Tertullian in one place\footnote{Adversus Marcionem .III.XXIV.} that the saints would not all rise from the grave at the beginning of the millennium, but gradually, at different times, in accord with their deserts, was derived from Montanist teaching, especially as the passage in which Tertullian says this came from his Montanistic period. Even so, it is clear in all of this that Montanism is only adapting, or building on, a common millenarian tradition in Asia Minor.
The most serious point of criticism concerning the whole concept of a millennial reign of Christ with His saints on earth is that it appears, even in its simplest form as found in I-II Thessalonians and I Corinthians, that is, as the teaching of a separation in time between the two resurrections, to have no explicit authentication in the teaching of Jesus. It is not our purpose here to attempt any final assessment of the justification for millenarianism in the Early Fathers. Our concern here is only with the development of millenarianism in the sub-apostolic age. It is, however, germane to our purpose to note two facts: first, whether or not Jesus actually gave any teaching concerning such a reign of the saints on earth between two resurrections, while He was here on earth, it was the belief that He had done so, as reported by the 'elders' which sustained this belief (assisted by a millenarian exegesis of such passages as Mark 10:29-30); second, the fact that Paul in I-II Thessalonians and I Corinthians (most clearly perhaps at I Cor.15:23-24) seems to assume on the part of his readers the knowledge of some gap in time between the two resurrections, shows that he was not teaching something new for the first time. In regard to the second of these points it also seems clear that Paul has no consciousness of teaching anything other than the common primitive tradition in this matter. But, if this really represents the situation, how could such a tradition have emerged, unless it had some foundation in the attitude of Jesus? At the very least there is a serious problem to be explained in regard to the presence of such a common primitive Jewish Christian tradition of a gap in time between the two resurrections, if this tradition had in fact no Dominical foundation. One way out of the difficulty is to treat the presentation in terms of a gap in time between the two resurrections as the form which the Parousia tradition took in its primitive Jewish Christian setting, affected doubtless by
current Jewish apocalyptic thought. This form would rightly be laid aside when the Church moved out into the Gentile world. Our Lord's silence would, on this view, be significant. Our own plea at this point is that, in view of the way in which the Gentile Church took over so much from primitive Jewish Christianity, and in view of the further fact that the common primitive Christian tradition, as witnessed to by St. Paul, was shaped by it and is assumed in passages which became part of canonical scripture, we cannot lightly pass over belief in a millennium. It should not be overstressed, but, from a purely historical point of view, there is no evidence that it was treated less historically than belief in the coming of Antichrist, who was certainly envisaged by the Early Church as a figure in future history.

Belief in a millennium was historically and theologically related to an insistence on the literalness of the hope of resurrection at the end of the age. It might have been expected to help overcome 'gnosticizing' spiritualisation of eschatology in the 2nd century A.D. Possibly it did have this effect, but it is interesting to find a Cerinthus among those holding to millenarian teaching. It may be argued, of course, that this was exceptional, and that stress on millennial teaching was in fact a reaction against Gnostic spiritualizing which went too far in the other direction. Be this as it may, it seems clear that this belief, though more dominant in Asia Minor than elsewhere, was widespread in the sub-apostolic age and was a development of the primitive Jewish Christian presentation of the concept of the Parousia, with its separation of the two resurrections.

There is no evidence that belief in, or stress upon, millennial teaching went hand in hand with an emphasis upon the imminence of the Parousia. It is arguable that the general tendency of such belief was to instil into Christians a consciousness of the large time scales which God
employs in His dealings with men, and to create a greater willingness to wait for God's appointed time for the fulfilment of His promises. It is true that it is equally difficult to get evidence for this, but it would not be unnatural that this should be the effect.

Church and Sacraments in Relation to Eschatology

We have already had occasion to note the eschatological implications of certain emphases in interpretation of the Church and/or Baptism and Eucharist in our discussion of the Apostolic Fathers in Chapter II. It is our intention here to gather up some more general points regarding the implications of Early Church practice and understanding in the period immediately under review, but extending it to include the evidence of Melito of Sardis (died c.190 A.D.).

Jean Danielou brings out well the fact that "Christian Baptism is related to Jewish customs." It may be more difficult to decide which Jewish antecedents exercised the greatest influence. The baptism of John the Baptist, Essene initiation, and proselyte baptism may all have exercised some influence upon the Christian rite in its earliest development.

Our concern is not to discuss the development of sacramental usage in Palestine and elsewhere, but simply to note certain recurring features which attest what was considered central in them, so that we can discern what relevance they have in regard to eschatological expectation.

With this in mind, we note Danielou's judgment that the preparation for Baptism included a moral instruction arranged on the pattern of

1 op.cit., p.316
the Two Ways (cf. Didache I-VI and Epistle of Barnabas XVIII-XXI); a period of fasting; and a personal undertaking to break with the old life and observe the precepts that have been taught. It is not certain that Jewish usage exercised an influence on the most primitive practice (cf. Acts 8:35-36, where understanding is the sole requirement for Baptism), but when the need was felt to organize instruction it would be natural to turn to Jewish antecedents. Little information is to hand on the earliest beginnings of the catechetical system, but it seems clear that its importance was most readily seen among Gentile converts from heathenism. It would seem that either the instruction given to proselytes before Baptism or the initiation ritual of the Zadokite order may have provided the model for the development of such instruction. The Two Ways concept which seems to have dominated the actual instruction given was certainly Jewish in origin. Both the period of instruction and the avowal of commitment to Christ and His people emphasize the element of commitment as a personal choice on the part of the converts. This remains the situation even if infants were baptized. Danielou thinks that the latter was a Jewish Christian custom which disappeared in pagan environments and only reappeared at a later date. Be this as it may, the infants baptized, if such they were, were those of persons having consciously chosen to follow Christ. This is not unimportant for our present purpose in so far as it underlines the fact that Baptism was the mode of entrance into the community of those who await their Lord from heaven. Under one aspect it was regarded as a 'seal' (σφυγής) and this would only be given to those who had repented of their sins and had intentionally and meaningfully

1 *op.cit.*, p.323.
2 *op.cit.*, p.329.
committed themselves in public fashion. The point is that the genuinely Christian concept of the community of God's people is of those who withdraw from certain practices and ways and identify themselves with those for whom Christ comes. It is true that such withdrawal and such positive commitment to a community could exist in isolation from the eschatological Hope, but all the evidence suggests that it was into a community understood in terms of that Hope that in fact converts entered in through Baptism.

The reference to fasting is significant of the awareness of what God does in the act of Baptism. We recall the rich and somewhat heterodox baptismal theology of the 'Preaching of Peter' at this point. It was very concerned to remove the convert from the sphere of demonic influence. Danielou reminds us that "-- in contemporary Judaism purification involved not only interior conversion, but also deliverance from demons, and this was especially important in the case of pagans." 1

The theology of the 'Preaching of Peter' may reflect the admixture of quite heterodox notions (that is, notions heterodox both from the Jewish and from the Christian angle), but the concept that converts to Christ are in Baptism delivered from demonic control is not in itself heterodox. The practice of fasting is clearly connected with the purification of the convert, and suggests that the regular understanding of it was that it prepared one to pass under the sway of the Lord Christ in place of that of demonic influences. Here the note of 'realized eschatology' is to the fore. Again, it must be confessed that such an understanding is not necessarily related to eschatological insights, but there seems no doubt that in fact the Christian communities in the period before us did understand that the deliverance from demons

1 op.cit., p.321.
which was now offered in Christ and in Christian Baptism was a product of the End-time. This latter fact was reinforced by the fact that now for the first time in history, the true God, the God of Israel, welcomed Gentiles through Baptism into the true community of His people.

One feature of the ceremony itself deserves some attention. Didache VII.I recommends that Baptism should be in 'living water' (ὕδωρ ζωή). This is represented as the primitive custom, though it is not indispensable to the proper practice of the rite (VII.2). The basic thought connected with the origin of this practice seems to have been that water which is not running freely does not truly cleanse. To people in Eastern lands to this day it seems inappropriate to keep laving on the body water which has already received the impurities from the body that it was designed to remove. Static water is not, therefore, considered an appropriate symbol for cleansing of the whole man, inner and outer. There are, however, other more directly theological implications of the usage, which depend upon the presence of certain Biblical texts in the background of thought. It is especially in connection with these that an eschatological element may be discerned in the practice. In the Old Testament the phrase, 'ὕδωρ ζωή', occurs in a few contexts to indicate that God is the source of life. We note, in particular, Jer.2:13; Song of Songs.4:15; We quote once again from Danielou, upon whom we are dependent at this point: "In Ezechiel and Zacharias this living water denotes the eschatological outpouring of God's life. We may quote Zachariah 14: 'Living waters (ὕδωρ ζωή) shall go out from Jerusalem."¹ The passage in Zachariah has in mind the end of the age,

and to the extent that such a passage formed the background of Christian thought in reference to Christian Baptism (it is not asserted that it was always present to the mind in a fully conscious manner), the convert and the welcoming community of God's people would have the sense that every time an act of baptism took place the convert was caught up in a movement of God which would only be consummated in the end of the age. As for the Book of Ezekiel, Daniélou has in mind particularly the outpouring of God's Spirit that was to be given in the end of the age. (Ezek. 36:25-27). John the Baptist seems to have this prophecy in view in the words recorded at Matt. 3:11. For John the water baptism precedes the spiritual baptism that is to be given with the gift of the Spirit. How could the Early Church doubt, as it saw the evident joy and change in the hearts of even Gentiles, as they stepped out of the waters of the baptismal pool, that such a prophecy as that in Ezek. 36 was being fulfilled before their eyes? In the New Testament itself the phrase, ὧδωρ ἕως occurs only at John 4.10ff, in the course of Jesus' discussion with the woman at the well of Samaria. Daniélou notes, however, the presence of the reference at Jn. 7:37-39 to living water as a symbol of the Holy Spirit. This symbolism reappears at Rev. 22,1 where the Greek of the English phrase, "water of life" is ὧδωρ ἕως. In all of these references it is suggested there is a close association with the gift of the Spirit. In the last He is seen in connection with His life-giving function as the One Who gives immortality and recreates the conditions of the Garden prior to the Fall. This is what the imagery depicts. It is interesting that "mosaics in baptisteries often depict the baptismal spring of living water surrounded by the trees of life." Most of these date

1 op. cit., p. 46
from a somewhat later period than that now under review, but it is not unlikely that these motifs are present from an early period. Danielou also judges that the familiar symbol of the fish as a symbol standing for the Christian is not wholly explained in terms of the Latin explanation that \( \chi \rho \nu \), fish is the acrostic for "Jesus Christ, Son of God, Saviour": "-- on the other hand, the fish generally appears in a baptismal context."\(^1\) Allusion is made in this connection to the words of Ezek.47:8-10, where reference is made to streams that are to issue from the Temple.\(^2\) The point is that all these references suggest a view of Baptism as significant of the fact that the initiate lives in the End-time or is projected into a series of events by his Baptism which will only receive their consummation in the end of the age.

The notions discussed above are developed not only by Danielou but also by Oscar Cullmann. Indirectly, Cullmann brings out well the thought that Baptism bespeaks the fact that we live in the end of the age by his comments concerning the use of \( \chi \rho \nu \) at John 4. He points out that the well of Samaria was a place sacred to the Samaritans and that the words of the woman (v.12) indicate that it was a holy well. "Jacob, the giver of the water of this well is quite clearly placed over against Jesus, the giver of another water, and this antithesis is particularly meaningful if it carries with it the idea that the holy water of Jacob's Well loses its significance as soon as it is compared with the infinitely more effective water of Baptism."\(^3\) In Christ the old dispensation has been done away with and that of prophecy, that which was to come in the end of the age, has appeared.

---

1 op. cit., p.50.
2 op. cit., pp.50-51.
It is, of course, difficult to be sure how the ordinary convert or Church member understood Christian Baptism. It is easier to reach judgments concerning individual writers, who develop their thought. The evidence of Christian practice in these early days is suggestive, however, by its connections, of the understanding that in Baptism one was brought into alignment with the End of the age, both through the already accomplished opening of that end of the age through Christ's death and resurrection and through anticipation of the Final Gathering together of God's people into the body of which one is first brought through faith-baptism.

What of the sacrament of Baptism in literature not so far dealt with in our previous chapter? The 'Paschal Homily' of Melito of Sardis now provides us with certain further insights into second century thinking regarding Baptism. The theme of the work is not indeed Baptism but rather the Sufferings of Christ. Yet these Sufferings are understood in parallel with the event of the Exodus, and the thought is implicit that just as the Israelites were baptized unto Moses in the Red Sea, so are we unto Christ. (I Cor. 10). It is true that emphasis is placed not so much on the actual deliverance of the first-born in Egypt of all not sprinkled with the blood of a lamb, but the whole Exodus event is in view. It is into the full benefit made available for us by what Christ has wrought in His Death and resurrection that we are set who through faith and Baptism belong to the Christian community, the Church.
We know that in the second century it was customary for baptisms to take place on the night of Easter. It was also usual for the baptismal rites to be followed by a post-baptismal catechesis. This meant that this catechesis was being given around the time of the Jewish Passover, and so these catecheses became Paschal homilies. Of these that of Melito of Sardis is an example. Daniélou says of this catechesis — it replaced the haqqadah on the liberation of the Jewish people at the time of the Exodus, which inaugurated the Jewish Paschal meal. It is noteworthy in this regard that I Peter may well be a baptismal catechesis, and it is significant that the liberation of the Christian in his baptism is compared with the liberation effected at the Exodus.

We see, therefore, that Melito's Homily forms part of a regular pattern in Church life at the time. His Homily lays greater stress upon the suffering and death of Christ than on His resurrection. This is probably bound up with the fact that Melito, as an Asiatic, held to the Quartodeciman view, thus holding Easter and the appropriate baptisms, together with the subsequent delivery of the Homily, on the 14th Nisan, the day of Jesus' crucifixion. It is clear, however, that the whole event of Christ's death and resurrection is in view and that the element of Christ's triumph through suffering is what Melito has in mind. The note of triumph comes out very well at the very end of the text of the Homily, as we have it. Christ's triumph in resurrection over Hades is celebrated and Christ is made to say:


We note here the promise of future resurrection, though the stress of the passage falls on Christ's present Exaltation.

Characteristic of this work, as also of the later Paschal Homily of Hippolytus, is an elaboration of the theme that in Jesus Christ types have come to fulfilment in the Great Antitype. This lays emphasis on the fact that in Christ the long awaited promises of God have found fulfilment, so that the last age is already here. It was to be in the last days that these promises were to be realized. We have, thus, a profound element of 'realized eschatology' in the work. This was characteristic of all the examples of this

---

102 l. 786 - 103, 1,800. The text employed here is that of the Sources Chrétiennes series, Vol. 123 page 122. This edition of Melito's Paschal Homily is the work of Othman Perler.
literature that are extant. In Hippolytus, indeed, the typological element was expanded in much greater detail than in Melito's Homily. Nevertheless, the theme is basic to this literature and shows that Baptism itself was seen as reflecting the fulfilment of Old Testament type and expectation in Jesus' death and resurrection.

Both 'realized' and futurist elements are present in this literature, and certainly are found in Melito's Paschal Homily.

G.W.H. Lampe says:

"In this homily there is a splendid expression of the two elements of realisation and future hope which must always characterise Christian eschatology. Like the Hebrews redeemed from Egypt and preserved by the blood of the paschal lamb as the seal that marked them as God's possession, the new people of God have already been freed from bondage and 'sealed in soul with the Spirit of Christ and in body with His blood.' They have been rescued from darkness to light, from death to life, from oppression to an eternal kingdom. The age of fulfilment is thus emphatically declared to be present here and now, inaugurated through the redemptive work of Christ. Yet the homily ends with the Lord's promise for the future: 'I am the resurrection; I am your king. I lead you up to the heights of the heavens. I will show you the Father who is from the ages; I will raise you up by my right hand.'"

Lampe, in thus closing a part of the section which we have ourselves quoted in Greek above (page 365), takes note of the balance found in this work in its understanding of eschatology. It seems fair to see in this attitude the characteristic Christian understanding at the time of what Baptism signified. And the significant factor is that both 'realized' and futurist elements are discovered. In his baptism a Christian man believed that he was put in touch with powers released through the Achievement of Christ in the End-time but he was aware that his salvation was not yet consummated. It is true that the emphasis falls upon the present experience of salvation, but this is what we should expect to find where new converts are being initiated into the Christian community. It does not argue the presence of any embarrassment over the delay in the Parousia of Christ in glory.

1 op.cit. p.23.
with a consequent diminution of emphasis upon the future.

The Eucharist also served to preserve the Hope of the Church and it helped to keep alive the understanding of the Church as an eschatological community. We know that in the second century, the Christian initiation concluded with the Eucharist feast. This fact underlines what the Church has always understood, namely, that Baptism is initiation into the Christian community and that the Eucharist is the celebration in fellowship of those who remain within the community of Christ's People. This implies that, if the one sacrament is eschatologically conditioned in Early Christian thinking, this will be true of the second rite also, and it is clear that in fact this was the situation.

With reference to the Eucharist the 'Maranatha' cry expressed at Didache X.6 is salutary. We did not discuss this matter at length in our treatment of the Didache, but simply noted the presence of the expression. Here it is our intention simply to draw attention to the fact that, as Cullmann puts it, "the Didache tells us that the Maranatha was also pronounced during the Last Supper within the framework of the Eucharistic liturgy. It must therefore have played a very important part in primitive worship, since Paul quotes it in Aramaic in an Epistle written in Greek —— since it was on this day (Sunday) that Jesus appeared to the disciples while they were at their meal, he was asked to reappear during the Supper ——; and as this spiritual presence of Christ in his Church is the pledge of his glorious return at the end of time, this ancient prayer is both a recalling of his appearance on the day of the Resurrection, and an appeal for its renewal at the moment of the holy Supper, and an announcement of his final Parousia, which is also to take place in the setting of the Messianic feast."¹

¹ *op. cit.*, pp.13-14.
What Cullmann brings out magnificently in this quotation is the way in which the Παροσία of Christ in His humiliation is linked in Early Church understanding with the Παροσία of the Lord to His people in the Supper and with the Παρουσία of Christ in His future glorious Return to earth. To the extent that the Early Church really thought in this way, this is a salutary reminder of the balance of the Church: Christ had come, was now present to His people, and would come again at the end of the age in glory. Here eschatology is given its place — and a not obscure place at that — but it was set in perspective. Christ’s Triumph was already achieved and the Church lived in the light of this: it was for this reason that her Lord was able to visit His people in their solemn rite of memorial and rejoicing. The early date of the Didache might again suggest that it was written before the delay in the Parousia in glory had shaken the faith of Christians in that Hope. The evidence, however, is rather that this ‘Maranatha’ cry was retained: this must at least have helped the Church to remember her Hope and to believe in it.

Cullmann considers that "the Didache knows — only the pre-Pauline type of Lord’s supper celebration, which belongs to the original community where the connection with Jesus’ Last Supper and his death is still absent." Cullmann’s interest here is in the fact that in this early stage of development the emphasis was placed upon the presence of Christ as being the focal point of Christian fellowship. This element later came to receive less emphasis. Cullmann appreciates this early emphasis, however, and takes note of the prayer of the Didache at IX.4. We alluded to this prayer in passing (vide above, Chapter II, page 178), observing its emphasis on the essential unity of Christ’s People. Cullmann thinks that this prayer is consistent

1 op.cit., p.19.
with the stress on the unity of Christ's People derived from His presence that is found in the understanding of the Supper discovered in the Didache.

We mention this point, because it is the rediscovery of the Eucharistic service as one of fellowship which seems best placed to help us understand the perspective of the Early Church, even in the period now before us, with reference to the coming παρουσία of Christ. Cullmann seeks to show the presence of such a perspective in John's Gospel.\(^1\) If his interpretation be sound, then what we find in the Didache continues this line of thinking, in which the παρουσία of Christ at Easter, the Lord's Supper, and the end of the age are intimately related and lie, as it were, along one base line. There is no evidence that this understanding, though buried over even by the time of St. Paul and partially through his influence with other motifs, was ever completely lost sight of. We find then, once again, that Eucharist must be thought to have stood with Baptism during the 'tunnel period' as reminders of the eschatological realities, both in their present and futurist references.

ESCHATOLOGY IN THE SUB-APOSTOLIC ERA: AN ASSESSMENT

We come, therefore, to the close of this discussion of four isolated but significant phenomena of the 'tunnel period', namely Jewish Messianic Movements, Gnosticism, Millenarianism, and the Sacraments in their relationship with Eschatology. All of these are relevant to the theme of this thesis, because they carry eschatological overtones, where they do not deal directly with eschatology itself.

\(^1\) _op. cit._, chapter II, The Gospel according to St. John and Early Christian Worship, _passim_, e.g. p.113.
What has come through to us in our study of every one of them is that there is no evidence that the Great Church, the Church as over against certain persons and bodies who separated themselves off or were excluded by the majority, seriously compromised its understanding of the Last Things. There seems no real evidence that the Church was disturbed by what befell Jerusalem and the Jewish nation, not in any event as an element that was difficult to reconcile with her faith in Christ and the fulfilment of His purposes. Gnosticism posed a serious threat to the Church and drew away a considerable number of persons from the fellowship. It may well be that Gnosticism and 'de-eschatologizing' go hand in hand. What seems not proven is that it was a disappointment over the delay in the Parousia which provoked Gnosticism. The theory of R.M. Grant does not appear to stand up to close scrutiny, though not a few scholars are influenced by his line of reasoning. Millenarianism represents a reminder of the brightness with which the hope of the Parousia burnt in some areas at least, even in the 'dark' tunnel period. As we have seen, it indicates among other things, the concreteness of Christian expectation with reference to resurrection and Return of Christ and, in all probability, is not to be viewed as eloquent of a fanatical withdrawal from present reality under the influence of a world-denying kind of apocalyptic, but rather an appreciation of the slow and inexorable march of God's Providence through its predestined epochs to its goal. Finally, our study of the sacraments of Baptism and Eucharist have reminded us of the continuing presence in the Church of a profoundly eschatological understanding of Christian life. The most significant feature here is the balance between present or 'realized' and futurist elements which emerges. Probably this is somewhat better documented with regard to Baptism than in the case of the Eucharist, since we have
to infer to some extent what Early Christian expectation was from
evidence deriving from a somewhat earlier period; nonetheless such
evidence as there is suggests the continuance in practice of symbols
in themselves evocative of such an understanding (as the 'Maranatha'
cry).

What emerges from this survey is that the Church shows no
evidence of being disturbed by the delay in the Parousia of Christ in
glory. Rather does she exhibit a faithfulness to her traditional Hope.
It is on the circumference of her life that this Hope is whittled down
(though even here not entirely removed) by Groups of Gnosticising
tendency. Where the Jewish Christian elements were preserved, there
the Hope seems to have been strongest. Where platonising influences
came in, as in such centres as Alexandria, with the radical dichotomy
between the 'κόσμος ὑπόστασις' and the 'κόσμος ἀιδῆσις',
there the greatest danger asserted itself to abandon Biblical
concreteness, both in regard to space and time, so that the resurrection
of the body tended to be transformed into a doctrine of progress
through heavenly spheres after death and the hope of a real end to
history became lost in the notion of an endless progress through
different 'aeons'.

The common supposition of Dodd and Werner that the delay in the
Parousia must have produced a change in the outlook of the Church on
eschatological matters is, therefore, not documented by the study of
the above movements that we have undertaken, and serves to confirm
the impression gained through our study of the Apostolic Fathers and
the 'Preaching of Peter' that the Church in her main stream went ahead
in a straight line, busy with her mission to the nations and conscious
of her Lord's Presence with her in worship and sacrament.
CHAPTER IV

THE APOLOGISTS

The great majority of the citations in the following pages are taken from the two Apologies of Justin Martyr and his 'Dialogue with Trypho'. In these cases the text which has been used throughout has been that of E.J. Goodspeed in his work, 'Die ältesten Apologeten', published by Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht of Göttingen, in 1914. Also taken from this critical edition are the citations from the Apology of Aristides, from the 'Appeal on behalf of the Christians' written by Athenagoras, and the 'Address to the Greeks' by Tatian.

E.J. Goodspeed did not in this volume deal with Athenagoras' Treatise on the Resurrection of the Dead. The text employed for the quotation from this work on page 394 is that of the series entitled Texte und Untersuchungen. This is volume IV in that series, and the full title is: 'Athenagorae Libellus Pro Christianis. Oratio de Resurrectione Cadaverum.' This edition of Athenagoras' two works was undertaken by Eduardus Schwartz, and it was published by J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung at Leipzig in 1891. We have only used the text of this edition for Athenagoras' work on the Resurrection, as E.J. Goodspeed's work on his 'Appeal' is a more recent critical edition.

The quotations from Theophilus 'Three Letters to Autolycus' are given according to the text given in the Sources Chrétiennes series, number 20. The full title is 'Trois livres à Autolycus', and this editing was undertaken by J. Sender. The publication of this edition was as recent as 1948.

The Sources Chrétiennes series again supplied the critical edition used in quoting from the 'Epistle to Diognetus.' This edition (No.33) is the work of Professor H.I. Marrou of Paris, and was published in 1952.

The two fragments from the works of Justin Martyr, found on pages
373.

392 and 444, are quoted in accordance with the text given by Migne's edition (1857). They are found in volume VI of the Patrologia Graeca series. We set out briefly below where these are found.

The fragment appearing on page 392 is given as in column 1596 of the text of Migne's edition. This is there given as paragraph Δ in a fragment taken from the Codex Coislin. 5. An English translation of this fragment appears in volume II of the Ante-Nicene Christian Library, edited by Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson, and published by T. & T. Clark in Edinburgh, in 1867. This volume dealt with Justin Martyr and Athenagoras. The fragment in question appears on pages 357-358 of that Edinburgh edition. The precise section quoted on page 392 below appears on page 358 of that work, in English translation. It is there described simply as being from a manuscript of writings of Justin Martyr.

The fragment appearing on page 444 is given as in columns 1592-1593 of the text of Migne's edition. This fragment comes from the writings of John of Antioch and bears the title 'Ἐκλογὴ κεφαλαίων ἱθροισθέων ἐκ διφόρων βιβλίων' in Greek, or 'Delectus capitum collectorum ex variis libris' in Latin. It is cited as belonging to the Codex Reg. 873. The English translation appears in the same volume of the Ante-Nicene Library as the other fragment mentioned above, and is found on page 356 of that work.

Both fragments have been quoted from the Greek text as given in Migne, though they are given also in their Latin form in the Migne edition.

It is to be observed that, although we speak above of the two Apologies of Justin Martyr, the Second may really be best treated as an Appendix to the first, as Goodspeed judged. The issue is not of importance for our purposes. It is generally held that the last two chapters (XI-XII) in the 'Epistles to Diognetus' have no connection with the preceding ones. The issue again does not affect the judgments made in this chapter concerning the thought of this work on eschatological matters.
THE WRITINGS OF THE 2ND - CENTURY APOLOGISTS.

INTRODUCTION.

The early apologetic writings of the Christian Church have at times suffered from a tendency to regard them as 'ad hoc' presentations of the truth of the Christian faith, in which heavy borrowings have been made from Hellenism rather than from the interior logic of faith itself. That these writings have been addressed to particular situations is, of course, true, though this is one factor, if not so dominant a one, in the production of all literature. What is not so apparent is that the writers of this impressive literature have failed to reflect deeply upon the inner springs of their faith in Jesus as the Christ. The width of thought of these men may be gauged by the fact that as a class they wrote not just in defence of the faith to those of Gentile and Jewish persuasion, but they also wrote against the heretics. It is regrettable that most of their writings against the heretics have been lost, but the very fact of a witness to the existence of such writings is significant. It shows us that these men were responsible for a considerable literature: it is an accident of history, which may yet be rectified, that most of it belongs to the apologia for the Church's faith to those wholly outside the Christian community. The literature against heretics would doubtless have depended more heavily upon matters of common agreement among those professing some kind of allegiance to Jesus Christ. It is a matter of importance that the writers whom we know as apologists did this more general reflection upon Christian theology. It demonstrates that Christian theology proper did not in fact begin with Irenaeus and the end of the second Christian century. Perhaps we may say that systematic theology commences with that period but it did not build, when it did come, simply upon Paul, John and the Apostolic Fathers.
The point is that the apologetic literature of the second century and the apologists themselves did carry forward the development of Christian theology. The whole idea of an evolution of thought could be challenged, so we do not say that it contributed to such. It is true, however, that in so far as any stage of history is influenced by the events and thoughts of the past, Irenaeus and his successors were powerfully influenced by the contributions of the Apologists as well as other early Christian writers and writings. This may well be especially so, in so far as these writers relied upon a common tradition conceived of as deriving from the apostles themselves. It was in this century that the Christian canon of scripture gained clarity, as did the conception of the One Body of Christ as opposed to schismatic fellowships. The Apologists themselves have a part in this definition of the Church's boundaries, here in respect to the delineation of the Rule of Faith.

The purpose before us is then to assess the significance for eschatology of the characteristic attitudes and contributions of these writers, not just in their definitely apologetic literature, but in all their writings. If it be true that the Apologists were theologians rather than persons engaged in isolated defences of the Christian faith against particular charges, then we can expect that eschatological themes will receive treatment, as in fact they do, and that our understanding of the Church's attitude to those things that lay before her will be enhanced by our study. It is most important that we should know what the Christian Church felt in the mid-2nd century regarding the 'parousia' of her Lord, regarding the resurrection, immortality, death, and especially the martyr's death, and allied themes. Our study of the Apostolic Fathers has suggested that New Testament attitudes towards a future hope have not been abandoned. We must ask whether the lengthening time perspective altered this. In what direction does
the evidence point? It is interesting that one of the regular themes of the Apologists was the reasonableness of belief in a coming day of resurrection for all men. This theme was presented by them with firmness and eloquence and served a high ethical understanding of life as the Creator intended it to be lived. If the apologists were really Hellenists pure and simple in their endeavour to win the Gentile world, then such a theme would not have received the attention that it did. It is true, as James Barr has recently reminded us,¹ that the distinction between Hebraic and Hellenistic thought-forms may have been overplayed. Nevertheless, the insistence upon a coming Judgment Day in which men would be judged in the body for the deeds done in the body was not characteristically Hellenic and the interesting thing is that the apologists pressed home upon the Gentile world in a markedly vivid way that all men would have to give account of themselves before God at a point just beyond the present horizon. By means of this attitude, the apologists really take the offensive. The term 'Apology' with its modern connotation and overtones of meaning is really an unfortunate term to describe most of the treatises with which we are dealing. It may well be that in this literature, as in the writings of Ignatius of Antioch, considerable attention is paid to death, especially the death of the Christian, and that there does not always appear to be quite the vividness of expectation of the Lord's appearing that is generally believed to have been characteristic of the Church prior to the close of the first century. However, it may well have been that, faced with the urgency of loyalty to Christ in the experience of persecution and martyrdom, the Church came to lay more stress upon death as a kind of proleptic anticipation of resurrection. It would seem, however, that this was especially so, where death by

martyrdom was in question. The thought is implicit that, if other believers have to await the resurrection morning for their moment of participation in Christ's triumph, the martyr has it in his glad surrender of his life into God's hands. Such reasoning may raise problems in our minds, but a careful historical survey has to note its presence and also to seek out its presuppositions. The concept of such an immediate entrance into Christ's glorified presence and of sharing in his triumph immediately upon his martyrdom has been seen, especially by Roman Catholic commentators, as lying behind Justin Martyr's words to the prefect Rusticus as recorded in 'The Martyrdom of the Holy Martyrs', in which Justin's testimony and death are preserved for us. "Rusticus the prefect said, 'Do you suppose, then, that you will ascend into heaven to receive some recompense?' Justin said, 'I do not suppose it, but I know and am fully persuaded of it." J. Quasten finds in chapters V and LXXX of the 'Dialogue with Trypho' this teaching regarding martyrdom: "According to Justin the souls of the departed enter first into Hades where they remain until the world comes to an end. The only exceptions are the martyrs. But even in Hades the good souls are separated from the bad ones." 1

We must remember that Roman interpretations, for good or ill, are coloured by their views regarding the state of Purgatory into which most Christians enter upon their death. An immediate entrance into glory suggests, therefore, to such interpreters a special honour, which may seem in certain ways to anticipate Christ's final triumph over the last enemy, death. We cannot deal further with this matter at this point, for to do so would not be germane to our purpose. Sufficient has perhaps been said, however, to make it clear that the

recurring insistence upon the 'immortality' which comes to the Christian at least is not conceived of in Hellenistic terms. It does not represent an abandonment of Judaic and New Testament concepts of the resurrection of the whole man, body and soul, in favour of an Hellenistic concentration upon the soul as that which has a natural endowment for eternity, whereas the body is due to perish. The interest in death in the Apologists where it is conceived of as a foretaste of the final renewal of all things, is intended to claim even this area of apparent defeat for Christ. Karl Rahner\(^1\) brings out well the thought that for the Christian death is not simply to be negatively conceived as the cessation of life and therefore an intruder in God's universe: this is only one side of the story, true though it may be. The other side is that death can be Christianly accepted as the consummation of one's life and its final commitment into the hands of God. Thus seen, he says, it is a further stage and experience in a whole series of salvatory experiences, which commence at one's baptism and will be completed at the 'parousia' of Christ. This statement accords well with the attitude of Justin Martyr and the other Apologists. The Christian hope of New Testament times has not been abandoned by them. Rather is it that they accept the opportunity of death, especially in martyrdom, as a providential disposition, whereby they may bring to bear upon the present the triumph yet to be revealed in a manner analogous to that in which other moments of difficulty may be transformed by anticipation of that perfect freedom that is yet to be given to the children of God.

The Christian interpretation of death found in the Apologists and their emphasis upon the concept of the resurrection have been insisted upon above because these represent more than one aspect of these writings.

---

They betoken their spirit. These writings were not produced by men afraid to die, but by men who went to their death gladly. They do not represent any hysterical plea to the Roman Emperors or senate to relent in their at times callous indifference to the suffering of their Christian subjects. If the Apologists besought these persons to abandon their policies, it was because their course of action involved them in an unreasonable and impious assault upon God's people, for which they would have yet to give account to God. Such an attitude has nothing servile in it. From another aspect of the matter it must be said that one of the principal things that the Romans could not understand in Christianity was the Christian's apparent indifference to life. Justin and the other apologists are not afraid to die for their faith but they wish to discharge a debt in endeavouring to show to their persecutors the reasonableness of the faith for which they were dying. All of this means that preparedness for martyrdom was the existential situation from which these writings derive in very large measure. Further, it was a part of the apologia itself not only to show the rationality of the Christian faith, but also to demonstrate that to die on its account was neither foolish nor ultimately world-denying. Justin answers the question why Christians do not commit suicide. Basically, his answer is that this world belongs to God and is therefore good: the Christian, however, must not put the love of it before the love of the age that is to come. It follows from all of this that our survey of eschatological matters and attitudes in the Apologists will demand close attention not only to what is said regarding the Parousia of Christ, the resurrection, and the Judgment Day, but also to what is said regarding death, especially the martyr's death, and regarding the intermediate state between death and the resurrection morning.

The apologetic literature of the Second Century has a considerable bulk and is an impressive witness to the vitality of the Christian faith.
It is by no means coldly philosophic in character, but is an attempt to grapple with the understanding of life, especially in its more practical aspects, from a base of faith in Jesus as the Christ. This literature contains some matters of general importance for theology, which are not without their eschatological overtones. We may mention in this regard, by way of example, the use of the Logos concept and the way in which Old Testament passages and institutions are viewed as finding their fulfilment in Jesus Christ. These belong perhaps especially to the 'realized eschatology' of these writings. They too, however, must receive their share of attention. However, it may be most helpful with regard to those passages which deal with events still future to deal with them one by one in systematic fashion. Our first section will therefore deal with the statements of this literature regarding the Parousia, the Resurrection, the Judgment Day, and the Millennium. A second section will pay attention to the missionary programme of the Church, viewed as pressing upon the world, calling it to decision for or against Christ, as well as being itself a sign and activity of the outpouring of the Spirit upon the Gentiles in the last days; it will deal with death, particularly in martyrdom; and with the intermediate state. A third and final section will relate to ways in which Christ and His Church, together with her sacraments, were viewed as fulfilments of Old Testament predictions of that which was to come. Here it will be appropriate to see to what extent the Apologists saw the Kingdom of God as already present in the Christian era.

The Apologists have a considerable literature attributed to them. We shall pay special attention to the two Apologies of Justin Martyr and to his Dialogue with Trypho, the Jew. The works of Quadratus, Aristides, Aristo of Pella, Tatian, Athenagoras of Athens, Theophilus of Antioch, Melito of Sardis, and the anonymous Epistle to Diognetus also, however, provide sources for material, especially in regard to the recurring
themes of judgment and the resurrection of the body. The pseudo-Justinian works, the 'Cohortatio ad Graecos', the 'Oratio ad Graecos', and the 'De Monarchia', also belong to the Apologetic literature.

THE PAROUSIA OF CHRIST IN GLORY.

Let us first, then, take stock of the witness of this body of literature to the Parousia of Christ itself, to our Lord's Return in glory. In JUSTIN MARTYR these references are less numerous in explicit form than references to the Day of Resurrection and Judgment. It is clear nonetheless that he everywhere assumes that the resurrection and final judgment will take place at Christ's Second Advent. An allusion occurs in the First Apology, chapter XLI:1 which is rather typical of the indirect reference which is usual in Justin. Justin seeks to establish from Ps. 110: "Ὄτι δὲ ἐκ τῆς ἀγαλματίδος τοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν ὁ πατὴρ τῶν πάντων θεὸς μετὰ τὸ ἀναστήσας ἐκ νεκρῶν αὐτοῦ ἐμελέτη, καὶ κατέχειν ἔως ἐκ παντελεὶς τοὺς ἐκθραίνωντας αὐτῷ δαιμόνιας, καὶ συντελεσθῇ ὁ ἐριθμὸς τῶν προεγγραμμένων αὐτῷ λαχανίων γινομένων καὶ ἐναρέτων, δὴ οὗς καὶ μνησίω τῇ ἐπικύρωσιν Πέτωντας, —

Clearly, the implication is that it is at Christ's Return that the consummation of all things will occur. Noteworthy, too, in this passage is the reason given for the delay in the Return of Christ; that the full number of the elect may be filled up. Chapters XLIX:LI of the First Apology demonstrate that Christ's humiliation, ascension, and coming again were predicted in the Old Testament scriptures. It is noteworthy in this regard that Justin is able only to bring forward one scriptural passage to substantiate this thesis with reference to the Second Advent, at least in this continuous argument. At the end of chapter LI, Dan. 7:13 is quoted, its authorship mistakenly being attributed to Jeremiah: "Ἰδοὺ ὁ θεὸς ἁλφιῶν ἐξελήφθη ἐπάνω τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, καὶ οἱ ἄγγελοι αὐτῶν ὃν αὐτῷ."
In the following chapter (LII) however, Justin says explicitly that "οὐκ ἂν τοῦτον παρεξήγησαν οἱ προφήται· μίαν μέν, τὴν γεννημένην, ὡς ζήτημα καὶ πάθητον ἀνθρώπου, τὴν δὲ δευτέραν, ὅταν μετὰ ὁδός ἐξ ἑώρων μετὰ τῆς γυναικῆς αὐτοῦ στρατιάς παραγενθήσαταί κεκρυμένη, ὅτε καὶ τὰ σώματα ἀνέγερε πάντων τῶν γεννημένων ἀνθρώπων καὶ τῶν μὲν ἔξιον ἐνούσιμοι ἐφθαρσάν, τῶν δὲ ἄσικων ἔν αὐτοῖς ἐνούσια σύμφωνα μετὰ τῶν φαύλων δαμόνων εἰς τὸ διόνυσον πῦρ περιήλθεν."

Justin goes on to substantiate this statement with a series of scriptures that have been welded into a unity. Apart from one joint reference to Ezekiel 37 (The Vision of the Valley of Dry Bones) and Isaiah 45:24, the major supporting series of references is taken from Isaiah 63:17; 64:11; and Zechariah 12:3-14. Zech. 12:10 is perhaps the pivotal part of the quotations, so far as the Second Advent of Christ is concerned. Justin renders it thus: "καὶ ἐκέντησαν τὴν πρὸς φυλήν, καὶ τὸν φάκον εἰς τὸν ἔξεκέντησαν..." Thus, Justin is able in his total outlook to adduce other passages, such as Zech. 12:10, as having reference to the Second Advent, as well as such a passage as Dan. 7:13, which is more obviously susceptible of such an interpretation. Implicit in Justin's way of handling Scripture is the assumption that all scriptures are coherent and may, therefore, be extracted from their particular environment and conflated with passages from other sections in order to build a homogeneous whole. Noteworthy, too, is the fact that Justin apparently assumes that the meaning of scripture passages has to be interpreted not only in the light of other passages but also in the light of God's faithful acts whereby he brings to fulfilment His covenant promises. Thus, in the light of the 'Christ-event' -- to use a modern term -- Justin can see that Zechariah 12:10 refers to Jesus Christ. It is often said that Justin, in company with most of the early Church Fathers, was a fundamentalist in his doctrine of the inspiration of the scriptures. However this may be, it would seem that more stress has to be laid,
than frequently has been laid, upon the unity of word and deed in God's dealings with men, in Justin's attitude.

The Second Apology of Justin contains no explicit reference to the Parousia of Christ, but the thought of the Judgment Day is everywhere apparent. As we have already indicated, to Justin the themes of Judgment, Resurrection, and the Parousia of Christ are to be understood as one. This is everywhere assumed. Thus, though we may say that in the conflation of passages noted above in the First Apology, chapter LI, it is Zech. 12:10 which most specifically appears to relate to the Second Advent, it is somewhat doubtful whether Justin would have made this distinction himself. In terms of the remarks made in the last paragraph regarding Justin's conception of the unity of word and deed in God's dealings with men, it may be said that to him the appearance of Jesus of Nazareth and his ministry, death, and resurrection, had made clear what was not beforehand apparent, viz, that it would be at Christ's Second Advent that the general resurrection of the dead and the final judgment would take place.

In the 'Dialogue with Trypho' the theme of the Two Advents is a recurring one, as is to be expected in the record of a discussion with one of Jewish race and religion. The Jews were and are convinced that their promised Messiah has not yet come. Justin saw both truth and error in their interpretation of the Old Testament, though mostly error. The Messiah was yet to come, but what the Jews had failed to see in their hardness of heart was that He had already come once. Justin had to reinterpret Scripture for Trypho in order to demonstrate that both the humiliation and the coming glory of Jesus Christ are there foreshadowed. In general, it may be remarked, Justin appears to see a relation between Scripture forevision and its fulfilment in God's activity in Christ analogous to what Paul refers to in Romans, chapter one, where it is the
relationship of the created order to God's power and being, which is in mind. Just as the heavens are a pointer which the enlightened mind can discern as such, so the Old Testament scriptures are pointers to a divine purpose fulfilled in Jesus of Nazareth, which under the influence of the Holy Spirit can be discerned as such. It is important to observe, however, that for Justin this enlightenment, when it comes, is a quickening of the natural faculties, so that faith is a rational process. It is this judgment which causes Justin to don the philosopher's garb. Unfortunately, it has often been misunderstood so that Justin has been portrayed falsely as one whose aim was to accommodate the Christian faith to categories and terms borrowed from contemporary Hellenistic philosophy. Henry Chadwick is much more just when he says that "it is an expression of the optimism and extrovert confidence of Justin's programme for harmony and cooperation between faith and reason that there is nothing whatever in the traditional pattern of Christian teaching which he feels it necessary to explain away or even to mute."¹

In chapter XIV of the 'Dialogue' Justin sets out very clearly his attitude to the concept of the Two Advents, as delineated in the Old Testament: "Τῶν ΤΕ Λόγων Τούτων Καὶ Τοιούτων", (Justin has been quoting Isaiah 55: 3ff.), "ἐφημένων δὲ τῶν προφητῶν, ἐλεγον, ὅ Τούφων, οῖ μὲν εἰρήνης ἐις τὴν πρώτην παρουσίαν τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἐν ἰάσει καὶ ἡμέρας καὶ σελήνης καὶ βυθὸς φανήσεσθαι· κεκηρυμένος ἦστιν, οί δὲ εἰς τὴν δεύτεραν παρουσίαν, ἄνεος καὶ ἐπάνω τῶν νεφελῶν παρῆσθαι, καὶ ὁ Ἰσραήλ οὐκ εἰς τοὺς οἴκους τῶν προφητῶν καὶ Δαβίδ προειπτον, εἰρήμενοι εἰσίν." (Here, once again, Justin wrongly attributes scripture, the words of Zech. 12:10 are here ascribed to Hosea and Daniel): The concept that the words of scripture belong together with the deeds of God whereby they are fulfilled is quite integral to the Dialogue, for what the Dialogue deals with is not merely the way in which Jesus of Nazareth fulfilled the

predictions of prophetic days, but also with that prophesied rejection by the Jews of their Messiah, whereby 'the times of the Gentiles' are ushered in. There is much in the Dialogue that seems harsh in the attitude of Justin to the Jews, but we have to set this against the background of Justin's strong views regarding this rejection as viewed scripturally as a 'hardness of heart'. Justin does but follow in the tradition of the prophets of old when he condemns Israel for her lack of spiritual perception. Despite God's goodness in deed as well as in word, Israel lacks perception. This has always been true of her. This too is why she has been unable to recognize her Messiah. If she had had true spiritual insight, then the meaning of scripture would have been understood when Jesus came in His humility and lowliness. It is a proof of spiritual inwardness now to be able to discern the doctrine of the Two Advents. This doctrine had not indeed been clear to anyone prior to Christ's first advent and rejection, but now in the light of the happenings in Galilee and Judaea, together with Christ's resurrection and ascension and the sending of the Holy Spirit upon the Church at Pentecost, it is evident to men of faith. This faith is at once rational as evidenced in scriptural prediction and spiritual as dependent upon enlightenment from above whereby the meaning of the sacred page is made plain. Thus, the whole argument of the Dialogue with Trypho implicitly builds around the concept of the Two Advents, and is dependent upon the conception that the word of scripture can only be understood in the light of God's activity, whereby He seeks to bind His covenanted people to Himself. It is this outlook which is responsible for Justin's considerable use of the so-called apologetic 'argument from prophecy'. Really Justin offers no argument which can be effective in the absence of the inner illumination of the Holy Spirit. What he does do everywhere is to adduce scriptures which can be understood in a certain way from within a faith, that is grounded in particular historic events in the ministry of Jesus of
Nazareth. Only the Holy Spirit can authenticate this account to the heart of a man, Jew or Gentile, but when this authentication takes place it makes meaningful in a particular way tracts of Scripture which were obscure prior to the coming of Christ and the outpouring of the Spirit. This entails the judgment that much of what the prophets wrote was not wholly clear to themselves.

Most of what Justin has to say has to do with the first of Christ’s Two Advents, since from the Christian point of view it is this one which is under dispute with Trypho. Thus, such passages as Is. 5:18, 20, which pronounces a woe upon those who call evil good and good evil, are regarded as a prediction of Israel’s rejection of her Messiah at His first advent. (XVII:2). This explains the relative paucity of references even in the 'Dialogue' to the Parousia, although the doctrine of the Two Advents is itself fundamental to the argument of this book. Chapter XXXI however, deals directly and significantly with the Second Advent. In the previous chapter Justin had set forth that the demons were subdued through the preaching of the name of Jesus, consequent upon Christ’s first advent.

He goes on: "Εἰ δὲ τῇ τοῦ πάθους αὐτῶν οἰκονομίᾳ τοσοῦτον δύναμις δείκνυται παρακολουθήσας καὶ παρακολούθοντας, τόση ἡ ἐν τῇ εὐδοκίᾳ γινομένη αὐτῶν παρουσία; ὡς ὕπο γένος θυρίων εἶπαν νεφελῶν ἐλεύσεται, ὡς Δανιὴλ ἐμήνυσεν, ἀγγέλων σὺν αὐτῷ ἀφικνουμένων." (XXXI.1)

Justin goes on to quote not just Dan. 7:13 but the whole of Daniel 7:9-28. It is important to observe that in this chapter (XXXI) and the next, Justin relates the 'little horn' which will emerge after 'ten horns' have first sprung from the fourth world empire of Daniel’s Vision, (Daniel 7) to the revelation of the man of sin: "ὅλις τοῦ βλάσφημα καὶ τῆματι ἐκ τῶν ὑψιστῶν μέλλοντος λαλεῖν ζῆν ἐπὶ θύρας ὄντος, ὁν καὶ καρπὸς καὶ ήμιον καρποῦ διακαθέξειν Δανιὴλ μηνεῖ.(XXXII.3)

Justin endeavours to show how foolish is the Jewish interpretation of this
phrase, "a time, and times, and a half", as relating to a period of influence of the man of sin extending at least to 350 years, for the Jews, says Justin, treated each 'time' (καιρός) as meaning 100 years, therefore logically they were committed by their own assumption at this point to think of a period of his influence of at least this duration. This, of course, the Jews do not make explicit, because, Justin thinks, it is manifestly an absurdity. What is significant in all of this is twofold. Firstly, Justin champions a spiritual interpretation as against a literal interpretation. Here he does what Danielou believes characterizes Origen's interpretation of Scripture at a somewhat later date: he avoids the pitfalls of literalism, on the one hand, which was the Jewish error, and the Marcionite, Gnostic error on the other, which also viewed the passages literally but repudiated their correspondence with reality. In the second place, Justin thinks of the Second Advent as the end term of a series of eschatological events, still future. Christ will not come prior to the revelation of 'the man of sin'. Here we see once again evidence of the strength within the Early Church tradition of the concept of Antichrist, developed in Mark 13 - Matthew 24 and in II Thessalonians, chapter 2.

Justin adduces both Psalms 72 and 110 in chapters XXXII - XXXIV of the 'Dialogue' as having reference to Christ and His coming. Justin understands these psalms eschatologically. Significant is his interpretation (XXXIV) of the words, 'The Law of the Lord is perfect' — perhaps a reference to part of Ps. 33:4. Justin says, "ὁποῖον γὰρ ὁ νόμος τοῦ Κυρίου ἀκρίμος εἰρηται, ὡς τοῦ μετ' ἐκείνου μέλλοντα ἀλλὰ τούτι μια «Μωυσέως ἐξηγεῖσθε, τοῦ θεοῦ βοῶτος καὶ νόμου καὶ καὶ καὶ καὶ και ἰδιεθηκός διαθήσεσθαι." (para.1)

This comment is fundamental to an understanding of the total view of Justin regarding the relation of the old economy and the new. Justin goes on to show how some of the references of Ps. 72 cannot be applied literally to king Solomon. One thinks in this regard of the painstaking researches of Sigmund Mowinckel and other Old Testament scholars of recent years into the idealised conception of kingship, which was common in the ancient Semitic world and which had its influence upon Israel also, although Israel's faith modified and reinterpreted the conception. Mowinckel himself has recognised that such origins of certain phrases in relation to kingship underwent an extensive development and further reinterpretation, often in an eschatological direction. In the light of all of this, it becomes a burning question: Was Justin really wrong in asserting that the fundamental bearing of Psalm 72 and the like was futuristic? It is noteworthy that Justin seems often to assume that an extended passage of scripture proves something which we cannot easily discern in the text. Thus, in this passage (XXXIV:2) Justin speaks of how Christ is King, Priest, and God, and so on -- "καὶ Παλάσιον ἔγνωμένοι καὶ Παραγενόμενος πρῶτον, εἰτα εἰς οὐρανὸν ἄνερχόμενος καὶ πάλιν Παραγενόμενος μετὰ δόξης καὶ διώνιον τῷ βασιλείαν ἔχων κεκαρακτήτω, ὥς απὸ πασῶν τῶν γραφῶν ἀποδείκνυμι." He goes on to quote, in support of all this, Ps. 72. Now, this psalm might seem to speak of Christ's glorious reign, but it would be difficult to establish from the text itself that Christ's suffering, ascension, and Parousia are spoken of. Justin is able to speak in this way not because of any intellectual blindness on his part, but because he believed that the psalm had to be interpreted in the light of what God had made clear to men of faith through the events concerned with the career of Jesus Christ.

In Justin's writings it is not only Christ's two advents which are viewed as foreseen in Scripture but many matters connected therewith, such as Jesus' rejection by the Jews and the consequent proclamation of the Gospel to all nations, the descent of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost, and the giving of the ordinances of Baptism and the Eucharist. Nevertheless, it is Christ in His first advent Who is the centre of all these happenings, whose end number in the series will be the Parousia in glory. Chapter XLIX of the 'Dialogue' illustrates once again, from a slightly different perspective, the consuming interest of this work in the Two Advents. Trypho objects to the view that Jesus of Nazareth was the Messiah on the basis that Messiah's coming was to be preceded by the return of Elijah who would anoint a man born from men as the Christ. This is said in the context of Trypho's contention that the adoptionist view of Jesus' divinity is to be preferred to the regular Christian view. This is the significance of the stress upon the phrase, 'a man (born) of men'.

Already in ch. XLIII Justin had endeavoured to demonstrate that Christ's generation could not be discerned -- this on the basis of Isaiah ch. 53. They was also to Justin the significance of the 'Emmanuel' sign of Isaiah, chapter 7. Christ was not a man born of men, or, as we should say, an ordinary member of the biological series. Here Justin was asserting in plain biblical language and reasoning what the later theological doctrines of Anhypostasia and Enhypostasia were to assert, viz., that Christ was in content or nature a man, but that his origin was not human, but from above. Trypho, therefore, seeks to show (chapter XLIX) that it was a man born from men who was to be baptized or anointed with the Spirit of God through Elijah. Justin's reply is significant. He asserts that this prophecy has primary reference not to Christ's first advent, but to His second. Thus, Justin looked forward to a still future coming of Elijah. The One Whom Elijah will then
anoint will be indeed a man, though one who in origin was from above as 
Jesus’ Virgin Birth demonstrates. However, just as Christ’s Coming in 
glory has been preceded by His humiliation, so Elijah’s anointing has 
been foreheralded by the way in which John the Baptist witnessed to 
Jesus as the Christ. This reply is interesting. The real interest of 
the passage is not so much in the way in which Elijah’s spirit is seen to 
have rested upon John the Baptist, but in the parallel between this 
situation and that of the two advents of Jesus Christ. Justin closes this 
chapter with the conclusion that the power of God was in Christ in His 
first advent only in a “concealed” manner. Therefore, the first advent 
is but an anticipation of the second.

It is unnecessary to prove more than that the concept of the Two 
Advents is fundamental to the Dialogue with Trypho. Chapters XL, LII and 
CX are among the more prominent passages, not mentioned above, which make 
much of the Second Advent. Dialogue XL is interesting in that it is an 
example of a characteristic interpretation of Old Testament ritual, where 
it possesses a dualistic element, as significant of the dualism of eschato-
logical reality. Thus, the two goats used in the ceremony of the Day 
of Atonement (Lev. 16) are taken to indicate the two ‘παρουσίαν’ 
of Christ: ‘καὶ ὃς ἐν τῇ θυσίᾳ δὲ τράγοι δύο ὄμοιοι κελευσθέντες 
γίνεσθαι, ὥσπερ ὁ ἐστιν ἀποστολικός ἐγίνετο, οἱ δὲ ἑτεροὶ ἐστὶ προσφέροντες, τῶν δύο 
παρουσίας τοῦ Χριστοῦ καταγεγραμμέν μεταξὺ μιᾶς, ἐν ἑαυτῷ ὡς ἀποστολικὸν αὐτοῦ 
παρεπεμφαντο ἵππος ἢ παρθένου τοῦ λαοῦ ὑμῶν καὶ ἢ ἑρείπια, ἐπιθυμάλωτε 
αὐτῷ τὰς χεῖρας καὶ ἀκατάσχατες αὐτοῦ, καὶ τὴς δεύτερας δὲ 
αὐτοῦ παρουσίας, οὐ̇ ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ τοῖς τῶν Ἰερουσαλήμ ἐπισκοπήσασθε 
αὐτόν, τῶν οὐ̇κ ὑπὲρ οὕτως ὑμῶν, καὶ προσφέραν ἠν ὑπὸ̇ πάντων 
tῶν μετανοοῦν δουλουμένων ἡμῶν ἐμπρωταίον’ — (para. 4)
This interest in ritual duality recurs in the Dialogue in chapter CXI, 
where the two goats are again briefly mentioned (para. 1). In the 
ensuing passage Justin sees a similar reference in Israel’s victory
over Amalek (Exod. 17:8ff.), where Moses, stretching out his hands, is viewed as a type of Jesus on the Cross, and Joshua who leads Israel to victory presages the victorious Christ. The latter appears to be interpreted in terms of the majesty of the Risen Christ, already apparent, but also in such a way to include the glory of His Second Advent. Justin says: "καὶ πάλιν ἐν οἷς ἔστιν Μωυσῆς καὶ Ἰσραήλ τὸ δέντρο προκηρυσσόμενον συμβεβλητὸς ἦν καὶ λεγόμενος. ὃ μὲν γὰρ αὐτῶν τὰς χεῖρας ἐκτείνεσθαι ὑπὸ τοῦ βοῶν τῆς Μέχρις ἐστέρακα δέμενον, ὡς ὡς πολλαγομένων τῶν Χειρῶν, ὡς ὡς ὡς ἔλυσα ὅλου τούτου διέκκυσιν ὡς δὲ τὸ Ἰησοῦν ὄνοματι μετανοεῖτε ὅτι Τῆς ἰδίας, καὶ ἑνίκη Ἰσραήλ ὅν τε καὶ τοῦτο εἶπεν ἀμφισβήτησιν. τῶν ἀνήρικων ἑκείνων καὶ προφητῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ νοημίων γεγονόμενον, ὅτι ἀμφίσβητοι τὰμυστήρια εἰς αὐτῶν βαστάσωσιν οὐκ ἦν δυνατός, λέγω δὲ τούτων τοῦ σταυροῦ καὶ τούτων τῆς τοῦ ἀνάματος ἐπικλήσεως ἐνδο γὰρ μόνου ἡ ἴσχυς αὐτῇ ἐστὶ καὶ ἢν καὶ ἐστιν, ὅπερ καὶ τὸ ὅνομα πᾶσα ἡρῴδεις δεδειν, ἑυδινεύω ὅτι δι' αὐτοῦ καταλύει Θεοί μέλλουσιν." (Paras.1-2)

The sequel discusses the parallel between the saving efficacy of the blood on the lintels in the Exodus from Egypt and the coming deliverance of God's people from 'death': "ὡς δὲ τῶν ἐν Αἰγυπτίων ἐστώσ. τὸ ἀίμα τοῦ Πάσχα, οὕτως καὶ τῶν πιστεύων προσέτεκτεν ἐκ Θεόν τὸ ἀίμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ" (para.3).

Similarly the scarlet thread given to Rahab is viewed as a symbol of the blood of Christ. This parallel, however, like that concerning the blood on the lintel, seems to envisage a future victory when only those, identified by the sign of the blood, will be saved. This future event can hardly be other than the Parousia of Christ, though this passage does not explicitly name it.

It is significant that in a fragment of Justin's works we find the same theme of duality in the ritual provisions of the Old Testament. First of all, reference is made to the two birds which were to be used for the cleansing of a dwelling rendered unclean through the presence
of leprosy within it (Lev. 14:49-53). One was to be slain, while the other bird was dipped in its blood and released. "By the two birds Christ is denoted, both dead as man, and living as God." The symbol of a bird is appropriate, we are told, because Christ came from heaven.

The symbolism of releasing the second living bird after daubing it with the blood of the other, is explained by the fact that "the living and divine Word was in the crucified and dead temple (clearly a reference to the body), as being a partaker of the passion, and yet impassible to God."

It is said that the chief purpose in this provision was not with regard to leprosy, but with reference to the forgiveness of sins and the representation of Him (Christ) Who was to be sacrificed for sins. Immediately after this the figure of the goats is again taken up. Here the wording is important: "Ὁ τῆς ἀποστολῆς τράγος τῶν τύπων τῶν τῶν ἄνθρωπων ἁμαρτίας ἀναλαμβάνωντος ἐξετέλει. Οἱ δὲ δύο τὴν μίαν περιείχον τοῦ ἐν ἡμῖν ἐκκλησίας ἐπού σικονομίαν. Ἠπραγματεύσεθε γὰρ διὰ τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν, καὶ αὐτὸς ἁμαρτίας πολλῶν ἀνῆνεγκε, καὶ διὰ τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν παρέδοθ᾽." 

Again in this reference the Second Advent is not explicitly mentioned. Rather the differentiation would appear to be between the situation of Christ's humiliation and that of His triumph which commenced in His Resurrection. At the same time such a passage as that quoted above from Dial.XL shows that the thought of the two goats did relate, in Justin's mind, to the Two Advents.

The difficulty in some of these instances to show that the Second Advent is in mind, as distinct from Christ's triumph in His resurrection or through the power of the preached word in the missionary proclamation of the Gospel, is significant. It shows that to Justin there was, as he says in the fragment cited above, one economy of God. It is this writer
who first explicitly speaks of two 'παρουσία'. It is important to observe that, despite this fact, Justin does see these two 'παρουσία' as moments in the one economy of God. What happens from Christ's resurrection in the conversion of 'the nations', in the routing of demonic forces, in Christ's sovereign control of history, all this is of a piece with that final triumph, when His glory will be made visible to men.

Dial. CX well expresses Justin's attitude to the relation of the two Advents. The Old Testament (Micah 4:1ff. is especially in mind) has made certain predictions. These have already been to some extent fulfilled. "εἰ δὲ λοιπὰ τὰς προφητείας ἐν τῇ δεύτερῃ αὐτοῦ παρουσίᾳ ἀποβεβηκτή" (para.5) As we have said, it is really to Justin that we owe the whole concept of the 'Second Advent' as such. It is true that the words of Heb. 9:28 had paved the way: "So Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many; and unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation." Nevertheless, it was the exigencies of the continuing dialogue with Jewry regarding the interpretation of the Hebrew scriptures, as exemplified in Justin, which thrust forward the concept of a 'second advent'. In Justin this concept does not destroy the sense of the unitariness of God's present dealings with His Church and with men generally with that which is to come at the end of the age. However, care has to be exercised with such terminology, which is only peripheral in the New Testament, that it does not cause us to detach the Parousia (the more biblical term) from God's present dealings with us in Christ.

It cannot be said that the concept of the Parousia of Christ features very largely in other second-century apologetic literature that is extant, yet it is not completely lacking. It must be remembered too that, as for Justin Martyr, the concepts of a coming day of Judgment and of universal resurrection are tacitly viewed as occurring through the revelation of Christ from heaven. These two concepts receive considerable attention
in this whole literature. The general concept of the future hope of God's people is well in evidence. Thus, Aristides in describing the Christian way of life for Antoninus asserts that Christians are nearer to God than other people: "Εξουσί τοις ἐν τούτω αὐτῷ τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐν τοῖς κυρίοις κεκληρωμένοις καὶ πάντως φυλάττοντες προσόκειντες ἑαυτῶν νεκρῶν καὶ ζωῆς τοῦ μέλλοντος αἰῶνος." (XIV.3)

In such an age the phrase, 'the world to come', or, 'the age to come', looks not towards a life after the death of the individual believer but rather to a coming dispensation of time, ordered by the divine providence, wherein the limitations of the present age will yield place to the clearer vision of that which is to come. The thought is common to the Apologists that the future age is to consummate the present one. Athenagoras asserts that the resurrection is to include those dying in infancy and cannot, therefore, be for the purpose of judgment alone." Ἐξ ὧν δὲ πάντως ἀνίστασθαι τοὺς δὲ ἠλλοις καὶ ὅπῃ καὶ τοῖς κατὰ τὴν πρώτην ἡλικίαν τελευτήσασθαι καὶ αὐτοὶ δικαίωσθαι, οὐ διὰ τὴν κρίσιν ἡ ἐνίστασθαι γίνεται κατὰ πρῶτον λόγον, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὴν τοῦ δημιουργοῦσαν γυμνὴν καὶ τὴν τῶν δημιουργοῦσαν φύσιν." (Treatise on the Resurrection of the Dead, chapter XIV.) It has to be confessed that Athenagoras speaks throughout of God, not of Christ. Yet his thought of a continuity between the present age and that which is to come has much to do with the characteristic underlying thought of the apologists and of the Christian martyrs in general: they would be good citizens of Caesar because the present governments are appointed by God (cf. Rom. 13), but to worship these governments or Caesars would be wrong, because it would allow a transient dispensation to arrogate to itself a permanency which was not God's purpose for it. It is important to lay stress upon this aspect of apologetic writing and to see that this does not represent a mere accommodation to the demands of the Roman emperors. The age which is to come may be viewed, from one angle, as disruptive of the present age (cf. II Pet. 3:10ff), but from another, it was to be a continuation of that which was come already. It was natural and not
unfitting that the early Christians should lay stress upon this aspect when they were accused of being anti-social and world-denying. This has much to do also with the apologists' insistence upon the rationality of the Christian faith. Reason, social awareness, good hope -- these are all qualities which ordinary men believe in. The apologists said that Christians had more right to lay claim to them than others.

It is noteworthy that the supposed 'Fragments of the Lost Work of Justin on the Resurrection' introduce a reference to the physical resurrection of Jesus Christ. The authenticity of these fragments has been disputed, but it is reasonably probable. They have been preserved for us mostly in the 'Sacra Parallela' of John of Damascus. The work on the Resurrection itself, from which the quotations are made in John of Damascus, appears to be attributed to Justin Martyr by Methodius. Opinions on the whole matter are divided at the present time. So far as the reference to Jesus' resurrection is concerned, its significance is that in this work, as compared with that of Athenagoras on the Resurrection, a Christological reference is introduced. Two facts, however, stand out. The first is that the earlier sections of this work on the Resurrection are in many respects parallel to that of Athenagoras. Many of the same problems are discussed, such as that of the possibility of the regrouping of the elements of the body which have passed into other bodies or substances (Athenagoras, ch. IV: Justin, beginning of ch. 11 in passing reference). Interestingly, Justin in chapter VI considers that the resurrection is consistent with the opinions of the philosopher. Athenagoras remarks: "οὐ γὰρ καλύπτει κατὰ τὸν Πυθαγόραν καὶ τὸν Πλατάνον γενομένης τῆς διαλύσεως τῶν σώματων ἐξ ὧν ἡ ἀρχὴν συνέστη, ἀπὸ τῶν αὐτῶν ἀυτὰ καὶ πάλιν οὐστήνοις." (A plea for the Christians XXXVI:3). Nevertheless, the Christocentric note is quite prominent in Justin, whereas in Athenagoras' treatise on the Resurrection it appears to be entirely absent. The question does emerge,
however, whether the parallels suggest that Athenagoras' treatise may also presuppose certain Christological assumptions, even although they are not integral to the argument of the work. We do not say that it is so, but it is an interesting, if tantalising, possibility. The second major point to be made regarding the so-called treatise of Justin on the Resurrection is that it is Jesus' resurrection which is to the fore--not His Second Advent or Parousia. At the same time, the reference to Jesus' resurrection in chapter IX is aligned with the concept of His Ascension, and the concepts of Ascension and Return of Christ are at least correlative in most Early Church thinking. It is not just that Jesus is risen but that He has assumed a place of majesty at God's right hand, whence He must reign until God has put all enemies under Him. This was usually worked out in the Early Church in terms of Psalm 110. None of this is explicit in Justin's fragments regarding the theme of resurrection, but it seems probable that it is implicit.

With reference to the EPISTLE TO DIOGNETUS, one reference of interest may be noted. At VII:6, the point at which a break occurs in the text, we read that God Who has had such patience with man, not sending His Son as a tyrant but "with meekness and gentleness" (VII:4), will, however, send His Son as judge: "πέμψει γὰρ αὐτὸν κρίνοντα, καὶ τίς αὐτὸς τὴν παρουσίαν ὑποστήσεται;" It is worth noting that the author saw no contradiction between the nature of Christ's first and second 'parousia'. Also interesting is the fact that the term used in para. 6, 'parousia', is again used at VII:9 (after the gap in the text): "οὐχ ὁτις ὁσιοὶ πλείονες κολαξοῦνται, τοσούτῳ πλεονεχοῦς ἄλλους; ταῦτα ἀνθρώπου οὐ δοκεῖ τὰ ἔργα. ταῦτα δύναμις ἐστὶ θεοῦ· ταῦτα τῆς παρουσίας αὐτοῦ <ἀείματα>" On this passage, James A. Kleist says: "Cf. Mal. 3:2f. 'His Coming': at the end of the world (See Matt. 24:27). In 7:9 the same term (παροιμία )
means Christ's 'abiding presence' in the Church. It is unfortunate that the break occurs in the text between these two references to the term 'parousia'. The first reference seems almost an anti-climax to the previous remarks concerning God's gentleness. Probably the missing section would have made clearer the way in which the writer understood any contrast between Christ's first and second Advents. However, in addition to noting that at any rate the gentleness of the first did not apparently exclude the terribleness of the second (cf. Mal. 3:2f), the thought seems implicit in VII:9 that Christ returns not only at the end of the age but also through the Church's mission. We cannot make too much of this, because the juxtaposition of the two references to 'parousia' may be an accident, if the intervening lost section be lengthy. Nevertheless, it is significant that, as in the New Testament, the same term can be used in two different ways. This raises the question: how different really are these ways? Is not the 'Second Advent' really simply the end-term of a whole series of eschatological events, for which the world has long waited? Thus, Christ's coming to His Church by His 'abiding Presence' (if Kleist be right - he favours this translation at VII:9) is not really different in character from that at the 'Second Advent'. It is worth remarking, in confirmation of this with reference to the Epistle to Diognetus, that its writer's problem is not with the 'delay' of the 'Second Advent', but with that of Christ's 'First Advent'! (cf. chapter IX, where his explanation of this 'delay' is given). His answer to this is that it was in order to allow the world time to realise its need of God. However, our major point here is that probably the writer saw no
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problem in the delay of the Second Advent because to him such terminology
would, in essence, have been wrong-headed. There were not 'two Advents'
but one, initiated in the Incarnation, confirmed at Pentecost, and
reaching its consummation at the Parousia, where this means the full
revelation of the truth about Christ to all men of all ages. Probably
the 'lacuna' in the text forbids our making too much of this with
reference to the 'Epistle', but the double use of the term 'parousia'
is at least suggestive of this kind of understanding in its author's
mind. Nor is it at VII:9 just by some natural extension that Christ
remains with His church. It is rather through the missionary proclamation
of the Gospel. Where people witness in death, more are added to the
Church, and Christ's abiding Presence with His Church is experienced.

Hendrikus Berkhof has made much of this concept of Christ's reign of
victory from the Cross and Resurrection onwards, in which missionary
proclamation is the agency of a reduplication within ongoing history of
the events of Christ's initial coming to earth in the Incarnation. "We
can -- describe the event of the Kingdom which was set in motion by Jesus'
cross and resurrection, and which is being realized throughout the world
by the missionary endeavour, as an analogy of the Christ-Event which is
being realized throughout the world. We believe that in these words
we have expressed the core of the New Testament view of history."¹

Berkhof believes that what is central in New Testament thinking is that
the first Advent was decisive because it set in motion forces within
history which will only reach their consummation at what we today
frequently term the 'Second Advent'. He sees this as indeed an event
from without but also at the same time as the consummation of a movement
from inside history in which the Risen Christ drives history towards its

¹ Christ the Meaning of History. S.C.M. 1962, p.79. (Trans,by
Lambertus Buurman from the Dutch, Christus de zin der geschiedenis,
predestined goal through the preaching of the Gospel. Averring that this works through a reduplication of Christ's resurrection, as also of His cross, within history, Berkhof remarks of the evidence of the resurrection power in the missionary enterprise: "This fact is without parallel in history. Faith in Christ seems to find root in all races and cultures, and in every defeat finds new power for its continuance." It is for the sake of this last quotation in particular that the above references to Berkhof have been introduced at this particular point, for what he says in it is strikingly relevant, we believe, to what the Epistle to Diognetus has to say at VII:9. There Christ comes in power to reign through the cross of suffering and through a missionary proclamation, which, in martyrdom, reduplicates the victory of Christ's Cross. In our second major section regarding missionary proclamation viewed as pressing the forces of darkness towards final revolt and destruction, more must be said regarding passages such as this, and Berkhof's findings regarding the New Testament will serve as a useful guide to an understanding of some passages in Justin Martyr and other Apologists, such as this just quoted from the Epistle to Diognetus. It has seemed appropriate, however, to adduce this understanding of the missionary proclamation in this setting, since VII:9 of the 'Epistle' would seem to relate all this to the final 'parousia' of our Lord in glory at the end of the age (VII:6).

FUTURE JUDGMENT AND RESURRECTION.

The concepts of judgment and of resurrection are really twin in character, so far as the Apologists are concerned. We cannot completely

1 op. cit., pp. 124-125.
identify them, but they overlap to a considerable extent. As we have already seen, for Athenagoras at least the final resurrection was not just for the sake of judgment but was also, perhaps basically, in order to make sense of God's original purpose in creation. This may seem a highly speculative manner of reasoning, but we must remember the extensive theorising about the Hexaemeron, of which Danielou makes much, and this helps us to realize that, even although there may be much in Athenagoras' tone in his treatise on Resurrection which seems philosophical, yet this reasoning has its parallels in Early Church speculations which found the meaning of the original creation in the New Creation in Christ. This is not, it is recognized, what Athenagoras says, but there is a parallelism in what is implicit, which is not inconsiderable. The original creation must receive an eschatological justification and explication. So far as judgment is concerned, this is not confined in the apologetic literature to a coming Day of the Lord but it is certainly at this future point within history that it is thought that it will reach its full expression and awful reality.

It seems unquestionable that Justin Martyr and the other apologists sought, wherever it was possible, either by explicit reference or by allusion, to bolster the Christian conviction at this point by reference to contemporary philosophical judgments or ideas. We have already remarked that, on any view, an emphasis on a coming day of resurrection and judgment is proof of the Apologists' unwillingness to compromise Jewish-Christian concepts for the sake of winning Gentile converts, and that such a view was not characteristically Hellenic. We believe this is true, yet note must be taken of certain remarks of James Barr, which have relevance. Barr reminds us that Aristotelian thought was much
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closer to Hebraic thinking in its understanding of the relation of body and soul than was Platonic. He judges too that the animus against 'Greek thinking' is a relatively modern development. With this in view, for example, he produces passages in which Calvin is grateful to acknowledge dependence or support in Greek writings. One is reminded of the interesting comment of T.F. Glasson¹ that the concept of reincarnation is not psychically dissimilar from the concept of resurrection. Perhaps Glasson sees them as closer than they really are, but it remains true that we must not 'absolutize' differences between Greek and Hebraic thinking. Tatian is interesting in this regard. He is frequently accused of having an implacable hatred of the Greeks and of Greek culture, but this is surely an exaggeration. We may perhaps illustrate from his 'Address to the Greeks' the way in which much Christian apology made use of points of agreement with Greek culture, which yet did not go nearly so far as the Christian revelation. Thus, in chapter VI, Tatian is at pains to defend the concept of the resurrection. He connects this with the thought that God has originally created all things (end of chapter V) and goes on: "Καὶ διὰ τοῦτο καὶ σωμάτων λειτουργίαν ἐσεσθαί πεποιθεύκαμεν μετὰ τὴν τῶν ὅλων συντέλειαν, οὕτως οἱ Στοικοὶ δογματίζουσιν κατὰ τιναίς κύκλωις περιόδους γινομένων ἀεί καὶ ἀπογινομένων τῶν αὐτῶν οὐκ ἔπει τι χρήσιμον, ἐπεὶ οἱ τῶν καθ' ἡμῶν λίθους παντοκράτορος [καί] εἰς τὸ παντελὲς διὰ μόνων τῶν κυθρώτων τὴν σύστασιν ἐσεσθαί χαρίν κρίσεως." (VI.1)

It is instructive that Tatian saw a measure of similarity between the Stoic concept of the cycle of the ages and the Christian doctrine of the consummation of all things. In this same section Tatian displays the characteristic concern of the Apologists for the resurrection of the body

and affirms its reality with great eloquence and fine feeling: "καὶν πῦρ ἐξαφανίση μου τὸ σωκρίον, ἐξατμίσθεις τὴν ύλήν ὑπὸ κόσμος κεχωρηκε. καὶ ἐν ποιμαίοις καὶ ἐν θαλάσσαις ἐκθύσκετος καὶ ὑπὸ ἀριστὰς διαστάσεως, τας γείες ἐναπόκειμαι πλουσίου δεσπότου." (VI.2)

The concepts of resurrection and of judgment have been noted in the apologists at large, especially in their relationship to the concept of the Parousia of Christ. We have noted the close connection of these themes in Justin Martyr himself. The thoughts of resurrection and of judgment are always correlative.

We have already noted (page 396) the reference in the Epistle to Diognetus at VII:6 to the future coming (ἡ Παρούσια) of Christ as Judge (ὁ κρίνων). One or two other references to impending judgment occur in this Epistle which is rightly noted for its emphasis upon God's mercy and patience. VI:7 judges that it is only the presence of Christians in the world who preserve it now from judgment: Εὐκέκλεισται μὲν ἡ φυσῆ τῶν σώματι, συνέχει δὲ αὐτῇ τὸ σῶμα· καὶ Χριστιανοὶ κατέχονται μὲν ὅσα ἐν φρονίᾳ τῶν κόσμων, αὐτοὶ δὲ συνέχουσι τὸν κόσμον."

The same thought occurs in the Apology of Aristides, chapter XVI:

"Et mihi haud dubium est quin Christianorum propter precationem mundus consistat."

(para. 6).

Thus, the presence of Christians is a factor deferring judgment upon the world at large in these passages. We shall have occasion later to note a similar concept in Justin Martyr's thought. Nevertheless, it is clear that for these Apologists such deferment does not mean the removal of judgment-to-come. The Epistle to Diognetus VII:6 already shows that. In a note on VI:7 James A. Kleist makes reference to God's willingness to spare Sodom if ten just men were found in it (Gen. 18:32), and to God's saving the entire ship's company for the sake of St. Paul when
the latter sailed to Italy (Acts 27:24). He also, however, wisely, makes the connection with the fact that "the world must last at least till 'the full tale of the Gentile nations is complete' (Rom. II:25 Knox)."

Probably the thought in these passages in the Epistle to Diognetus and the Apology of Aristides is not so much that the goodness of God-fearing men preserves or even defers judgment, as a kind of power restraining God's anger, but rather than their presence indicates the total community of believers whose number has to be completed and for whose sake God defers judgment. In any event, the very thought of deferment indirectly flings emphasis upon the conviction of these early Apologists concerning the reality of the judgment that is to come.

THEOPHILUS gives a penetrating account of God's forbearance of judgment in his Ad Autolycum, Book II. He asserts that it was God's kindness to man which led to His casting man out of Paradise. Thus, man was not permitted to remain in sin for ever, i.e. to indulge his sin, with all the consequences of judgment that this would necessarily have produced.

His ejection was a punishment whereby in time he might expiate his sin and gain the opportunity of restoration (XXVI).

Theophilus goes on to say: "Διὸ καὶ πλασθέντος του ἀνθρώπου ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ τούτῳ μυστηριώδως ἐν τῇ γένεσι πηγαίνεται, ὡς δὲ αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ παράδεισῳ τεθέντος. Εἰς τὸ μὲν ἄμαξαν ἐπὶ πεπληρωμένου δὲ ἐτέθη, τὸ δὲ δεύτερον μέλλῃ πληροῦσθαι μετὰ τῆς ἀνάστασιν καὶ κρίσιν. Οὔ μὲν ἀλλὰ καὶ καθ' ἑαυτὸν σκέεσθαι τι, ἐπὶ τῶν πλασθέντων ζωὴν ἐκ τῆς ζωῆς, ἀναχωνεύστατο οὐκ ἀναπλάσθεται εἰς τῇ γένεσιν καὶ νοῦ μὲν καὶ διάκληρον, οὕτως γίνεται καὶ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ διὰ θανάτου. Δυνάμει γὰρ τεθραυσταὶ οὐκ ἐν τῷ ἀναστάσει ὡμής εὐθείᾳ, λεγὼ δὲ ἀπόλιτος καὶ δίκαιος καὶ ζωοῦντος."
Here Theophilus takes cognizance of the two accounts of man's creation (Gen. I: 1-2; 3: 2:4ff.) to see therein a symbolic reference to man's one creation in past time and his future recreation in the resurrection at the end of the age. Thus, Theophilus witnesses also to belief in coming resurrection and judgment. Clearly, the righteousness spoken of above in the resurrection body has in mind the condition of those who are acceptable with God. The fact of judgment is explicitly mentioned, however, and though the interest of the passage is focused on the recreation of man as a whole, it is not denied that there is to be a Judgment Day.

THE MILLENIAL REIGN OF CHRIST ON EARTH.

We turn now to the concept of the millennial reign, as it is dealt with in Justin Martyr and the Apologists generally. The question may be asked whether it is important for our purpose to know what the Apologists or others thought on this matter. Does it affect the issue bound up with the alternative posed by 'realized' and 'consistent' eschatology? It would seem that at least indirectly it does. If it can be shown that millenarian concepts are primitive-Christian in character, they will help us to understand the original Christian schematization of history and to see that the Parousia, though a most important moment in the divine scheme, can be viewed as one of a series of eschatological moments, although certainly the most important one, as also that the Parousia must be in some real sense historical, if it is to be followed by a further period on earth prior to the Final Resurrection and Last Judgment. Any references in the Apologists must needs be quite striking too, in view of the character of their literature. As L.W. Barnard reminds us, it can hardly be said that Justin Martyr's reference to the millennium in the 'Dialogue with Trypho' has no real significance in view of his ignoring of this theme in the Two Apologies: "to have stated boldly the collapse of all
earthly power and the rule of Christians under Christ in a rebuilt Jerusalem would have been very untactful, to say the least, in an 'apologia' intended primarily for the non-Christian world. Justin does not adduce the theme in his Apologies directed towards the Gentile world, but he cannot ignore it in handling the exegesis of Old Testament scripture, as he talks with the Jew Trypho. Barnard's own further explanation that Justin held two views, one holding to an earthly millennium and the other to a view of the New Jerusalem as "an immediate, spiritual, eternal land or inheritance," may, however, also be questioned. Is it true that Justin's statements are contradictory? And is his holding to both views really the result simply of 'circumstances' affecting his eschatology?

Barnard thinks that Justin may have been influenced in his discussion with Trypho by the fact that the great Jewish War of 132-135 A.D., associated with the Messianic pretensions of Bar-Cochba, was still in progress. In talking with a Jew, Barnard affirms, Justin could hardly avoid discussing the question, 'What is to become of the ruined Jerusalem?' We may immediately agree that this historical circumstance probably provided the occasion for the discussion, but it seems doubtful whether it could have been avoided with a Jew in discussion at any time. Further, as Barnard himself says, this view is not merely insignificant in Justin. What we would wish to question is the assumption that there is an inconsistency between two differing views concerning Jerusalem in the future in the various works of Justin.

Relying on Justin's language at Dial. CXIII:3-5 and Dial CXXXIX:5, Barnard says:

"It is possible to infer from this that the general resurrection and judgment, the renewing of heaven and earth,

2 op. cit., p. 165.
and the establishment of an eternal kingdom with Jerusalem as its capital all occur together. Justin's language is certainly capable of a spiritual interpretation and is in line with much New Testament eschatology.

However, in the Dialogue another view is found. Justin introduces the idea of the millennium or a thousand-year reign of the saints in Jerusalem which is inaugurated by a resurrection of the righteous and closed by a resurrection of the righteous and the wicked after which follows the final judgment. There is no doubt that Justin held that Jerusalem would be physically rebuilt."

(Barnard then quotes from Dial. LXXX:5 in support of the presence in Justin of this second concept).

It is significant that Barnard says that Dial. CXIII: 3-5 and Dial. CXXXIX:5 are capable of a "spiritual interpretation". Tacitly, Barnard thus admits that these passages could be made to fit in with what is found in what he describes as "another view". Certainly it is a fact that these passages indicate nothing with clarity concerning a millennial reign. The emphasis in them upon the eternal character of the possessions given may not seem to fit in with belief in a millennium, which presumes a final outbreak of evil and violence at the end of that period, followed by the final judgment and general resurrection. Nevertheless those who subscribed to a millenarian view frequently passed over that final outburst of evil, because it is viewed only as an interruption of what is initiated at the Second Advent. In this regard, it is noteworthy that in Dial. LXXXI:4, one of the passages quoted by Barnard in support of the millenarian view in Justin, passes over without mention the fact of such a final outburst of evil.

We quote this whole passage: "καὶ ἢστεία καὶ πάρ
ἡμῶν ζητήσειν ἡμῶν Ἰωάννης, εἰς τῶν ἑπτάδας τοῦ Ἰησοῦν, ἐν ἀποκάλυψις γεγομένη ὅποτε ἡ ζήτησις ἐν Ἰερουσαλήμ τούς τῶν ἡμετέρων Χριστοῦ πιστεύοντας προσφέρετε, καὶ μετὰ τὸν ἅγιον καθολικόν καὶ συνελήφθη φάναι, εἴς τινας διαθήκης ἁμαρτών τῶν ἁγίων παραδοσεῖς καὶ κρίσεις, ὅπερ καὶ ὁ κύριος ἤστείαν εἶπεν, οὕτω γαμήσοντων οὕτω γαμήσονται, ἢλλα ἵσονται ἐν ἔννοιας, τεκνὰ τοῦ θεοῦ τῆς ἐνεστάσεως ἑότες."
In view of Justin's ignoring the final outburst of evil in this passage, although it is certainly presupposed, being present in the source upon which he relies, it is at least possible that we cannot read into the emphasis upon the eternal character of the possessions given the saints, as mentioned in Dial. CXIII:3-5 and Dial. CXXXIX:5 or into the silence of these sections concerning either millennium or final outbreak of evil, that Justin does not there think in millenarian terms.

Barnard, however, thinks that two different views are found in the passages mentioned and further judges:

"It is a hopeless task to reconcile this belief in an earthly millennium in Jerusalem with Justin's other opinion that the new Jerusalem be an immediate, spiritual, eternal land or inheritance."¹

It is his deference to the evidence from Justin's works which will not allow him to dismiss the millenarian concept as of no significance to Justin. We have already noted his explanation why that concept does not appear in the two Apologies. Interpreting such passages as Dial. CXIII:3-5 and Dial. CXXXIX:5 in the "spiritual" way that he does, he can, therefore, reach no other conclusion than that Justin has two views, which cannot be reconciled. Barnard judges that "circumstances affected his (Justin's) eschatology",² in that the Jewish War of 132-135 A.D., provoked a discussion concerning, or treatment of, the future of Jerusalem which leaned towards the more materialistic view of it. It is recognized that Justin was not simple-minded or incapable of logical thought. The reason why he could hold two views, without reconciling them, was that he "can use the mythical and quasi-physical language of apocalyptic according to his theme - although he admits that many Christians do not subscribe to his quasi-physical views."³

1 op. cit., p. 165. 2 op. cit., p. 165. 3 op. cit., pp. 165-166.
Barnard's interpretation is a possible one. We submit, however, that it is equally, if not more, likely that Justin has one coherent view, which is millenarian in character, and that his silence regarding the millennium in Dial. CXIII:3-5 and Dial. CXXXIX:5 (and the final outburst of evil which brings it to a close in Johannine thought, cf. Rev. 20:7-10) is to be explained in terms of a view which sees the millennium as the beginning of 'eternity' and which views the circumstances which close the millennial era as a brief interruption only of the glories inaugurated by Christ's Parousia in glory at the beginning of the millennium.

Justin appears to think in terms of the continuance of procreation during the millennium (Dial. LXXXI:3-4), ascribing Jesus' words regarding the abandonment of marriage only to the period after the millennium. Daniélou discusses the concept of the millennium in Early Christianity. He thinks that the most radical view of the millennium is one in which it is seen as a time of material pleasures in which procreation continues: this was the view of Cerinthus, and it would seem that it was Justin's also. Daniélou distinguishes two other millenarian schools, which were less radical. A moderate group, among whose adherents should be named Papias and Irenaeus, admit material pleasures and the fruitfulness of the earth, but not the continuance of procreation, while the least radical view, that of Methodius of Olympus, thinks of the millennium as essentially a cosmic sabbath and, therefore, as a period in which there is a cessation, not only of the fruitfulness of the earth, but also of human procreation. One can, however, understand that such a question as the continuance of procreation would be somewhat difficult to determine, if one once assumed a millennial reign prior to the final consummation.

---

1 op.cit., pp.377ff
of all things. For Daniélou, the concept of an earthly reign without procreation seems most consistent with the concept of a parallelism with the existence of Adam prior to the Fall, a concept which seems basic to Justin's own thinking. In this connection we should take note of Dial. LXXXI:1-2, in which Justin sees the concept of a millennial reign of Christ as a fulfilment of Is. 65:17-25. Particularly apposite is Justin's quotation of Is. 65:22 in the Septuagint version, where the words occur: "--- according to the days of the tree of life shall be the days of my people". (para. 2) This saying is underlining the promise of longevity in a future period. Now, this saying is really an addition to the original Hebrew and represents a speculative interpretation. The important point, however, is that Jubilees IV:29-30, an apocalyptic work of the second century B.C., avers that Ps. 90:4, in speaking of a thousand years as being but a day in heaven, helps us to understand that Adam died before he became a thousand years old in consequence of his eating of the forbidden tree of knowledge. Adam, we are told in the Genesis account (5:5) died when he was nine hundred and thirty years of age. Justin also quotes Ps. 90:4 in this same connection and in the same passage (Dial. LXXXI:3-4). It seems clear, therefore, that, as Daniélou states, in Justin the concept of a millennial reign is understood as a reversal at the end of time of that which happened at the beginning of time.

Daniélou is a most able guide in connection with early church concepts of the millennium and he shows persuasively that probably, in its origins, the actual concept of a period of one thousand years is to be viewed as simply an indication of longevity. Once again, the remark in Jubilees IV:29-30 comes to mind. This would suggest that, in its origins at least, the stress was placed not upon an actual time period

---

1 op. cit., p. 390 ff.
of one thousand years but rather upon the concept of longevity. The evidence for this is reinforced by the fact that in 4 Ezra (an apocalyptic work of the 1st century A.D.) the coming Messianic era was conceived of as being of four hundred years' duration. It may be that Justin with others had come in practice to take the duration mentioned fairly seriously, however, while conceiving of it as underlining the longevity associated with the millennial reign. At any rate, Is. 65 speaks of longevity and the reconciliation of the animal kingdom in the one breath, and both references are quoted by Justin Martyr in the passage in Dial. LXXXI already mentioned. This may seem to indicate that, in its origins, as Danielou feels, the length of the coming reign of Christ on earth may be simply a detail indicative of the character of that reign.

It should be noted that Martin Werner considers that the origin of the millenarian concept in the early church is to be found in connection with speculations regarding the Cosmic Week and its completion in the final week of Sabbath rest. The Epistle of Barnabas seems to afford support for a connection in Alexandria and possibly some other circles with such speculation, but the evidence in Justin Martyr seems rather to suggest that the concept emerged out of the paradisial colouring of the coming Messianic reign of Jesus Christ. Danielou notes Werner's view and challenges it largely on the basis that the environment of the Epistle of Barnabas is completely different from that of Asiatic messianism. It seems clear that the millenarian concept is Jewish Christian in origin and that, in consequence, anything not of definitely Jewish
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Christian origin is more likely to be secondary. Asia Minor was, of course, an area in which Semitic and Hellenistic culture had intermingled to a more than ordinary degree.

As our present subject embraces the Apologists generally, note perhaps should be taken of the fact that Theophilus of Antioch avers (Ad Autolycum, III:28) that the Emperor Aurelius Verus died five thousand six hundred and ninety eight years after the creation of the world. As Danielou\(^1\) says, this appears to be an attempt to place the birth of Christ in the year 5,500, i.e. to place it in the middle of the sixth cosmic week. Theophilus does not make any mention of such cosmic speculation, but it is probably presupposed. Further, the Roman presbyter, Hippolytus, in his commentary on Daniel (IV:23) gives support to the existence of such speculation by saying that just as God made all things in six days, so six thousand years, i.e. six cosmic days, must be fulfilled before the future kingdom of the saints is established, when they shall reign with Christ. Now, in connection with these references, Martin Werner considers that they are simply attempts to explain the delay of the Parousia. He quotes from a passage wrongly ascribed to Cyprian (Ps. Cyprian, De Monte Sina et Sion, IV) which he judges to be very ancient, which sets Christ's Passion in the 6000th year after Adam. In the 'Dialogus' of Adamentius (113) it is the Birth of Christ which is thus located. "But that this event can also still be located in the year 6000, i.e. the year of the End of the World, is truly remarkable. For, when the delay of the Parousia had extended to the period of a century, it was definitively nonsense to date the Death of Jesus for the year 6000, this being also the time for the End of the World. If the duration of the world were to be retained at 6000 years, then it became necessary to set the ever-

\(^{1}\)op. cit., p. 401.
future Parousia in the year 6000, and, correspondingly, transfer the date of the Death and of the Birth of Jesus respectively backwards."¹ Theophilus of Antioch and Hippolytus are expressly cited as evidence of this retrospective dating. "For Hippolytus the new dating of the Birth of Jesus in the year 5500 was especially important, because he obtained thereby an effective argument against the periodic revival of the expectation of the Parousia; for, if one, living in the 2nd century after Christ, placed the Birth of Jesus in the year 5500 and expected the Parousia in the year 6000, he could easily prove that there were still centuries to wait before this future event."²

On the whole it seems doubtful whether we can make as much of this as Werner wishes to make. What these passages signify by implication is the belief in a period of earthly Sabbath at the end of the age in which we now live. The placing of Christ's birth or death at the mid-point of the sixth millennium of the cosmic week is probably intended to denote Christ's centrality to it: it is He Who gives meaning and direction to this week. The Syriac community of the 2nd century exemplified a considerable interest in chronological considerations: Bardaisan held that the world would last 6000 years and supported this view by calculations on the revolutions of the planets.³ This is not surprising in an area of influence connected with the older Babylonian astrological and mathematical interests. What seems clear, however, is that the date of the Parousia is not set forth as the sole or primary interest: rather is the interest in God's schematization of history.

What may we say, then, concerning this subject of the millennial reign of Christ in Justin Martyr and the Apologists generally? First we must

¹ op. cit., p. 38. ² op. cit., p. 39. ³ Cf. Danielou, op.cit., p.402
say that the dominant interest in Justin derives from an interpretation of Is. 65 connected with the Book of Jubilees: it sees the millennium as a return to the paradise conditions prior to the Fall. It takes up Jewish ideas and places Jesus Christ in the centre of them. On the other hand, in Theophilus of Antioch, who is attempting to work out a Christian theology of history, interest centres in the concept of a cosmic week. Danielou makes the important point that there is a vital difference between these two kinds of conception of the millennium. "This view (that found in Syria and Egypt) differs profoundly from the Asiatic conception in that it implies the cessation of God's creative action, whereas in the Asiatic view this was intensified."1 Secondly, Justin Martyr and the whole millenarian concept of the Jewish-Christian variety which stresses elements relating to paradise, contains within it, if only in germ, a recapitulation concept of history, which may be the source and origin of that concept as developed by Irenaeus. If this be so, the millenarian concept, and all that goes with it, has played an important part in the developing Christian interpretation of history and eschatology, even where the concept of the millennium no longer holds a central place. This concept is not merely an attractive and artistic way of looking at connections between the first things and the achievement of Christ, either in the Incarnation or at the Parousia: it is rather a profound interpretation of the meaning of all history, as understood in terms of Christ Who interprets and fulfils the Creation, at the same time as He changes defeat into victory and brings God's plans to ultimate fruition. Thirdly, the millenarian concept in all its forms suggests that the Parousia, while given an important place in Christian concepts, was not all-dominant. The whole concept either of recurring or successive epochs is characteris-

1 op. cit., p. 403.
tically Hebraic and breathes with the atmosphere of the divine patience: its message is that in God's own time His purposes will reach fulfilment. It may of course, seem inimical to true Christian thinking to make the Parousia just one of a series of future moments, instead of that supreme event which completely abolishes both sin and the present conditions of life. It is interesting, however, in this regard, to recall that, if Justin Martyr's thought on the millennium and the future age is indeed throughout a unity, as we have argued above, the millennium remains an epoch after the Parousia, but it is founded upon the Return of Christ in glory and seems to be viewed as the first stage in God's outworking of His plans for the future of His people.

THE MISSIONARY OUTREACH OF THE CHURCH: ITS ESCHATOLOGICAL IMPLICATIONS.

We turn now to the second major section in our study of the Apologists, that which deals with the missionary programme of the Church with reference to its eschatological presuppositions and implications. It is in this context also that it seems most fitting to consider the martyr's role in relation to the coming Kingdom of God and the whole question of the intermediate state of all believers prior to the Parousia. In all of this Justin Martyr, especially in his 'Dialogue with Trypho', will prove to be our major source book, though the 'Epistle to Diognetus' and other strands of apologetic literature will also play their part.

It seems important to set forth clearly the areas of eschatological interest, for these may not immediately be self-evident.

First, we have to ask whether the missionary outreach of the Church is seen as realizing the Kingdom of God? If the answer is in the affirmative, we have to ask whether this makes any future coming of Christ redundant in the eyes of the Apologists? Bound up with this is the question
whether in some mysterious way the faithfulness of God's people in witness is thought of as bringing pressure to bear upon God to bring in His Kingdom in its fulness by some overt demonstration of His glory, such as we associate with the Parousia of Jesus Christ?

A second area of investigation asks whether the present missionary outreach to 'the nations' is part of a definite divine scheme of history? In this regard the relation of Jew and Gentile is important. Justin Martyr is important in this connection. Is it simply a fact of history, neutrally conceived, that the Jews rejected Jesus and that now the Gentiles are being gathered into the fold of God's people? Or, alternatively, is there some divine mystery bound up with the hardening of heart experienced and demonstrated by Israel towards God's prophets and finally towards His Son, which, in the divine providence, opened up the way for the ingathering of the Gentile nations? What does this imply regarding further eschatological moments whereby God's reign will be inaugurated? Is it possible that some such moments may antedate the Parousia of Christ? Has God finally put aside the Israelitish people? Or, is it His plan through their conversion to demonstrate to the Gentile nations the truth of the Christian Gospel? All of this will take us into difficult country, but it is an area that cannot be ignored. It is important in any eschatological survey for its own sake: it also will carry implications regarding the Apologists' attitude towards the so-called delay of the Parousia.

Third, the question of martyrdom raises interesting questions bound up with eschatology. Why were the martyrs given such an honoured place in early Church thinking? Did this derive solely from their devotion to Christ? Or, was it that they were thought of as somehow bringing nearer the day of the coming of Christ's Kingdom? It will be evident that this question is bound up to some extent with the first area of
investigation delineated. It is not a fanciful one in view of such indications of attitude and thought that we find in the canonical Book of Revelation. We remember the interest of this work in faithfulness to Christ under persecution. Such a passage as Rev. 6:9-10 comes to mind with its concept of the impatience under the altar of God of the souls slain for the Word of God: their cry went up, 'How long ---?'

Again, we recall that in Revelation 20 those who are raised at the beginning of the millennial reign may appear to be only those who have suffered martyrdom for Christ's sake. This consideration may lead fittingly on to the question concerning the state between death and Judgment Day of all God's people. If there is no urgency about the resurrection of non-martyred saints, why is this so? The answer must be bound up with the way in which God's coming Kingdom casts its shadow before it.

Let us begin by looking at the first area of investigation indicated.

(i) Do the Apologists have much to say, in fact, about a realization of the Kingdom through preaching and witness? If so, how is this conceived of? It may be that in seeking to answer this question, we will impinge of necessity upon the answer to the questions raised in our second area of investigation concerning a possible divine scheme of history. At any rate, it seems important to let Justin and the other apologists speak to us in their own way.

An instructive passage is found in I Apol. XLV, where Justin portrays the missionary outreach as the cause of the delay of the consummation. Ps. 110:1 is quoted, as is frequent in Justin's works. Christ is apparently thought of as reigning from God's right hand since His ascension. On the one hand, this reign is achieved through the preaching of God's Word -- the words, 'The Lord shall send to Thee the rod of power out of Jerusalem' from Ps. 110 are explicitly interpreted as "τοῦ λόγου τοῦ ἴσχυρον, ὡν ἀπὸ Ἰερουσαλήμ οἱ ἀπόστολοι ἀυτοῦ ἐξέλθουσαν παντὶ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν --- " (para.5)
— but, on the other hand, God delays the consummation until "...ὅ ἡμῶν τῶν προεγγυσμένων αὐτῷ ἀγαθῶν γινομένων καὶ ἐναρέτων ..." (para.1)

This passage is most significant as indicating the positive reign of Christ already begun through the preaching of the Word consequent upon the resurrection and ascension of our Lord, yet not completed in a 'consummation'. We may say that the eschatology of this section could best be described as 'inaugurated'. In some sense the proclamation of the word of God by lip and deed does effect Christ's reign: there is nothing pessimistic in Justin's proud boast that the word is proclaimed 'everywhere'. (Παν τῷ Χῳ) Nevertheless, this proclamation is bound up with a factor restraining Christ's return. The word 'κατέχειν', used also in II Thess. 2:6-7, is employed. Strictly speaking, the proclamation does not delay the end. Nevertheless, it cannot be said either to bring the consummation of the Kingdom nearer to the appointed time, or to make such a consummation unnecessary.

Two passages, one from Justin's Second Apology and one from The Epistle to Diognetus (which we have already noted above, page 402, together with a further reference from Aristides' Apology), seem to assert something very similar concerning the way in which Christians help to preserve the world — although the passage in Justin (chapter VII) has a more explicit statement to make concerning the delay of world destruction.

II Apol. VII has the following passage:—"Ο Θεός καὶ Επτιμεῖται ο Θεός τὴν σύγχυσιν καὶ κατάλυσιν τοῦ παντὸς κόσμου μὴ παιρήσῃ, ἤν καὶ οἱ φαυλοὶ ἁγγελοὶ καὶ φαίμονες καὶ ἱνθρωποὶ μηκετὶ ἄστειον τὸ σπέρμα τῶν Χριστιανῶν, ὃ γινώσκει ἐν τῇ φύσει ὅτι αἰτίοιν ἐστίν." (para.1)

Fundamental to this chapter is the conviction that the former world-destruction that we know as the Flood is to be succeeded by one with fire.
The Epistle to Diognetus VI:7 asserts:
"The soul is enclosed in the body, yet it is it that holds the body together; so, too, Christians are shut up in the world as in a prison, yet it is they that hold the world together." (Greek on p. 402 above).

Indirectly, both of these passages are alluding to Christian preaching, since it is Christians, who by their testimony preserve the world, that are in view. Once again, the thought appears to be that the very success of the Christian mission may delay the destruction of the world. It is noteworthy that this chapter in the Epistle to Diognetus (para. 9) goes on to suggest that the persecution of the Christians makes for their increase in numbers: this implies, if it does not state, further delay in order to permit others to repent and to believe the Gospel. The passage in Justin undoubtedly has in the background the biblical record of Noah as a preacher of righteousness. Noah and the Flood are explicitly mentioned in paragraph 2. We recall that it was only after long years when the work of building the ark was completed that the Flood burst upon the earth.

One other passage may be noted from Dial. CXVIII: "ὠστε μᾶλλον πανσάμενοι τοῦ φιλεριστείν μετανοήσατε πρὶν ἐλθεῖν τὴν μεγάλην ἡμέραν τῆς κρίσεως, ἐν ᾗ κατέσθαι μέλλουσι πάντες οἱ λαοὶ τῶν φυλῶν ὦμῶν ἐκκεντησάντες τούτων τῶν Χριστῶν, ὡς ἐπὶ γραφὴς ἡπείδειχα προειρημένον."

Here there seems to be no particular implication either of delaying or of hastening the coming day of judgment through response to the preaching of the Christian message.

Justin Martyr's doctrine of the Logos does not fall within the scope of our investigation, but it has indirect implications for this matter. At least it serves as providing background stage effects. Justin believed that the Logos, who served as the basis for all human rationality and who led pagans such as Socrates to some understanding of truth had
personally appeared among men in Jesus Christ (I Apol. V: 4; II Apol. X:8).
Thus, though Christ had only come among men late in time, He had always
been active. In Israel He was active during the Old Testament dispensa-
tion, and it was He Who appeared to the patriarchs (Dial. CXXVI-CXXVIII).
All of this means that the Christian message is no isolated phenomenon,
but is the end product of a divine purpose in history, manifest even in
paganism but now demonstrated more clearly in the Gospel: such a divine
purposiveness, it is implied, has a goal. This is why it is vital to
repent and to believe on Christ.

By way of summary we may say, then, that the proclamation of the
Gospel is viewed certainly by Justin Martyr and the writer of The Epistle
to Diognetus as closely bound up with God's purpose for humanity. Ps. 110
is frequently quoted in Justin's writings and (Dial. XXXII:6; VI:14; etc.)
everywhere it appears to imply Christ's present reign from the Father's
right hand. This means that in a certain sense the Kingdom of God is a
present reality. Certain passages appear to suggest the possibility, at
least, that the acceptance of Christ, which logically depends upon
preaching of the Christian message, helps to preserve the world. The
Logos concept heightens the sense of destiny as the message is proclaimed.
This is the End Time: it is God's patience and the faithful witness of
believers, perhaps especially in martyrdom, that lengthens the time prior
to the consummation. Positive and negative elements intertwine in this
account: Christ now reigns, yet it seems clear that this does not
remove the need for a final manifestation of all things at Christ's
appearing. Thus, both realized and futurist eschatology are given their
place. Perhaps the emphasis is upon futurism in the sense that the
Church's eyes are towards the future. There is no suggestion, however,
of anything panicky in the Church's wait: there is no sense that excuses
are being made to explain the delay of the Parousia.
One passage at Dial. XXXII appears to add somewhat to the above account. This chapter alludes to Ps. 110 (para. 6). Particularly interesting, however, is a reference to 'the man of sin', the latter part of which was noted above (page 386) in another connection. The full passage reads thus— ἐρῶ ὑμῖν καὶ ἀλλοις λόγους τοὺς εἰρημένους διὰ Δαυεὶδ τοῦ μακάριου, ἐξ ὧν καὶ κύριον τὸν Χριστὸν ὑπό τοῦ λιτίου προφητικοῦ πνεύματος λεγόμενον νοοῦτε, καὶ τὸν κύριον πάντων πατέρα ἀνέγοντα λύτον ἐπὶ τὴν γῆς καὶ καθίζοντα αὐτὸν ἐν θείῳ αὐτοῦ, ἐως ἃν θῇ πάντα ἐκρούσας ὑποτοσίων τῶν ποιῶν αὐτοῦ ὁπερ γίνεται ἐξ ὧν ἐς τὸν οὐρανόν ἀνελήφθη μετὰ τὸ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστήναι δὴ ἡμέτερος κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς τῶν Χρόνων συμπληρωμένων καὶ τοῦ βιβλίου καὶ τολμηρὰ εἰς τὸν ὄμος μελλόντως λαλεῖν ἡγή ἐπὶ δύραις ὄντος ὑπὸ καρδιὰς καὶ καρδίας καὶ ἡμῖν καρδίαν διεκαθέσθαι Δαυιδ ηὗτος. " (para. 3).

The important point here is that in ch. XXXII and the following chapter, Justin argues that, whereas the Jews mistakenly refer this psalm to Hezekiah as its subject, this cannot be because it speaks of 'the Lord' as 'a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek'. Now, the distinguishing feature about Melchizedek was that "—καὶ οὖτως τῶν ἐν ἀκροβυστία ἰερεὺς ἦν, καὶ τὸν ἐν περίπολι δεκάτας αὐτῶ προσενέγκαντα Ἀβραάμ εὐλόγησεν, οὗτος τῶν αὐτοῦ ἱερεῖς καὶ κύριον ὑπὸ τοῦ λιτίου πνεύματος καλούμενον θεὸς τῶν ἐν ἀκροβυστία γενήσεται ἐξήλου." (XXXIII.2)

What Justin hopes to show from this reference is that Christ's kingly session at God's right hand in the present age is one in which He acts as a Priest on behalf of the Gentiles, i.e. the ascended Lord Jesus, through the missionary proclamation of the Church, fulfils Ps. 110. It is of Him and the missionary proclamation to the Gentiles that the Psalm speaks. What is new, however, in this passage at XXXII:3 is that Justin conflates the passage with the vision of the Four Beasts in Daniel 7.

Here the son of Man is given an eternal kingdom that shall not pass away, but this apparently follows the putting aside of the dominion of the Four Beasts, especially of the latter which was more fierce in appearance than the others. Further, this last was responsible for the persecution
of God's people. This was true especially through one of the horns in this beast's head:—"— of the horn that had eyes, and a mouth that spoke very great things, whose look was more stout than his fellows, I beheld, and the same horn made war with the saints, and prevailed against them, until the Ancient of Days came, and judgment was given to the saints of the Most High, and the time came that the saints possessed the kingdom." (Dan. 7:20-22). The reasoning of Justin is to some extent submerged and difficult to follow. At the same time, it is all the more significant, as it indicates that he felt no great need to explain himself. The thought appears to be that as in Daniel's vision, the fourth beast with its horn was succeeded by the dominion of the saints of the Most High through the Son of Man, so the coming of 'the man of sin' (the little horn spoken of above) must precede the establishment of Christ's Kingdom. Now, this kingdom in Daniel 7 was to be universal in character—"And there was given him (the Son of Man) dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all nations, people and languages should serve him—" (7:14). But, through the missionary proclamation, which, as we have already seen, is part of Christ's reign, this kingdom is already established or in process of realization. But, if this be so, then surely the appearing of 'the man of sin' which was to precede the giving of dominion to the saints of the Most High, cannot be long delayed? Christ's reign has begun: this suggests that the final contest with evil prior to the full establishment of Christ's rule cannot be long delayed, and that the consummation itself lies only just beyond that. Therefore, Justin implies, it is time to understand and to repent, while yet there is time.

What does the above imply? It suggests surely that the missionary proclamation of the Church, as widening the area of Christ's rule, is bringing about the situation in which the 'man of sin' must soon appear and herald the final end itself.
It is interesting that Justin brushes aside the interpretation of the 'time, times, and a half' as meaning at least three hundred and fifty years, which follows from the alleged Jewish assumption that a 'time' equals 100 years. (Dial. XXXII:4-5) The reason why Justin can put it aside is because the reign of Christ through the missionary outreach makes a long delay unthinkable. Although history has disproved Justin's conclusion at this point, it helps to show how Justin understood everything not only in terms of Christ's life and earthly mission, but also in terms of Scripture made meaningful by recent events in the life of the Church.

We submit that, although Justin evidently did not anticipate a long period of dominion by the 'man of sin' in view of Christ's reign having already been inaugurated since the Ascension of our Lord, he did not in fact believe in what has been termed an 'any-moment' coming in glory. In this regard Hendrikus Berkhof has an interesting passage in which he criticises both Dodd and Schweitzer for their common belief that the Gospels are full of 'Naherwörtung'. For Dodd, Jesus in His Person and mission realized this coming; for Schweitzer -- and Werner -- it has been seen as in the immediate future in Jesus' expectation. But Berkhof says that "both opinions are in contradiction to the synoptic witness which, on this point, we explain as follows: Although the Kingdom of God had been brought near, and through the death and resurrection of Jesus had actually arrived, a new, earthly period followed which was not contradictory to but introduced by the Kingdom. Jesus is the end and the beginning of history; end as well as beginning. 'Naherwörtung', indeed, but of the Kingdom in its mystery; of the Kingdom in the 'Gestalt' of a historical period which stretches from the realization of the Kingdom, by means of Jesus' death and resurrection, to its still future unveiling."  

1 *op. cit.*, p. 67.
for us the interesting thing is that what Berkhof says of the Synoptic Gospels is precisely what may be said of Justin Martyr. It is only from this perspective that we can understand the patient expectancy of this Apologist. Such an understanding also makes room for the appearing of 'the man of sin.' It is noteworthy that Berkhof in the chapter mentioned goes on to discuss the way in which Mk. 14:62 combines quotations from Ps. 110:1 and Dan. 7. Behind Justin's combination there lies a venerable tradition going back to the Evangelists themselves.

Thus, the missionary programme of the Church is positive in character. It exemplifies and enacts Christ's heavenly rule. It presupposes a beginning of history as well as an end, to use Berkhof's phraseology. This is Justin's perspective, one in harmony with the Evangelists and one that makes his patient expectation, with its room for 'a man of sin', intelligible.

The above discussion suggests that Justin at any rate has assumptions which are incompatible either with 'realized' or 'consistent' eschatology. It assumes a plan of God for history, and, taken in conjunction with what has been said earlier regarding the millennium, implies a definite concept of Christ's Return as a visible, concrete, historical, event which is to follow the revelation of 'the man of sin' in persecution of God's people and which will precede the glorious reign of Christ on earth. Such an understanding is by no means unhistorical. The mission of the Church plays its part in extending Christ's reign and in provoking the reaction of persecution upon God's people. We can see, thus, how the theme of witness and the Christian's attitude to death, especially the martyr's death, is integral to the whole concept of a periodization of history that is central to Justin's thinking. This scheme he got not from his own imagination, but from a Church interpretation of the Old Testament which related such passages as Ps. 110 and Dan. 7 in a unitary fashion to his
own day with its vital mission to the nations. The proclamation, if it hastens Christ's appearing, does so not by man's constraint, but in the sense that it is an unfolding of what has hitherto been promised. How can God's people fail to look up and expect their redemption, when they thus see prophecy unfolded as history before their eyes?

We have already indicated that for Justin the outreach to the nations of the missionary programme, was conceived as part of a definite divine scheme of history. We also implied at least that Dan. 7, as applied to Christ's present reign, has in mind the bringing of all peoples under Christ's rule. We must now ask what Justin believes more precisely regarding Jew and Gentile and how this fits in with this scheme of history, in which he believes. What evidence, too, would there be in the other apologists to support any conceptions that he may exhibit?

It is at once apparent from the reference in Dial. XXXIII that the words of Ps. 110, verse 4, were interpreted by Justin to imply the approach to the uncircumcised, i.e. the missionary programme to the Gentiles, in particular. Dan. 7 likewise clearly has in mind a kind of rule over all nations through the proclaimed word of witness concerning Christ. We must now ask, however, how the extension of Christ's reign to the Gentile nations is connected with Jewry's rejection of the truth. A number of points must be made in this regard, and it may be wise to quote Justin's actual words on some occasions.

First, the rejection of Christ by the Jews both in His lifetime and during the present mission of the Church, was foreseen. Ch. CXXXIII of the Dialogue is a central passage in this regard. Isa. 3:9-15 and Isa. 5:18-25 are quoted at length. In chapter CXXXI-CXXXII of the Dialogue Justin has recalled God's wonderful works on Israel's behalf, especially through the Exodus and the entrance into the Promised Land by Jesus (Joshua). Many other incidents too demonstrated God's power. Now Justin
goes on (ch. CXXXIII): the reference in Dial. CXVIII to the 'tribes' mourning has a special reference to Israel. The fundamental text is Zech. 12:10 which speaks of the Israelites as having pierced One for whom at His appearing they shall mourn, i.e. they shall recognize their error. It is noteworthy that, in context, the passage in Zechariah looks forward to a day of national conversion for Israel, Zech. 13:1ff. Justin in Dial. CXVIII seems to have in the front of his mind, however, the need for repentance prior to Christ's appearing. It is difficult to elucidate Justin's thinking at this point. Just as Christ's reign has begun through worldwide preaching prior to the revelation of 'the man of sin', so too perhaps Justin thinks of a fountain being opened to the house of David and the inhabitants of Jerusalem for uncleanness already and of the Jews as, therefore, already being under an obligation to repentance.

Second, the theme of Gentile responsiveness, as compared with Jewish obduracy against Jesus Christ, is a prominent one (CXXXI:2-3; etc.). Bound up with this is the repeated explanation that the acceptance by the Gentiles had been foreseen and predicted in Holy Scripture. Indeed, one might say that this is a dominant theme in the Dialogue with Trypho, as one could expect in a work recounting a conversation with one of Jewish race and faith.

Ps. 110 has already been mentioned and is everywhere associated by
Justin, tacitly or openly, with the mission of the Christian Church to
to the nations. Other references to the mission to the Gentiles and to
tan responsive are numerous. A typical reference is found in
Dial. CXIX. Here an exegesis is offered of Deut. 32:16-23 where God
says through Moses that He will turn away His face from His people and
will provoke them to jealousy "with that which is not a nation" (οὐκ ἐθνεῖ)
Again, in the following chapter (CXX), the promise
in Gen. 26:4 and Gen. 28:14 to Isaac and Jacob, respectively, that all
nations of the earth would be blessed in their seed, is interpreted as
finding fulfilment in that in reality this blessing only came down through
Judah, and Phares, and Jesse, and David, i.e. this means that being
Abraham's child is not a matter of birth alone but of responsiveness to
Christ, Who emerged through one branch of David's line. Again, Gen.
49:10 is interpreted of Jesus Christ and His appeal to the Gentile
world: "οὐκ ἐκλείψει ἡρῴην ἐξ Ἰουδα καὶ ἡγούμενος ἐκ τῶν
μηρῶν αὐτῶν, ἐκ υἱοῦ ἐλθῃ ὑμῶν, ἁπτόμεναι καὶ ἀποκαταστάσαι
προσάγεται ἐθνῶν." (quoted thus, para. 3).
Is. 54:1, with its reference to the children of the desolate being
many more than of her that hath a husband, is expressly asserted in
I Apol. LIII to be a prediction of the responsiveness of the Gentiles
and the relatively high number of Gentiles who would respond as compared
with that of the Jews. Again, in the same chapter, the scripture at
Is. 1:9 is cited thus as applicable to Israel: "Εἰ μὴ κύριος ἐγκατελίπτεν
ἡμᾶς στάθμῳ, ἢς Σαμὴ καὶ Θὰμμα ἐν ἐγεννηθεὶς." (para. 7) Some
words found in Jer. 9:26, but mistakenly attributed to Isaiah, are also
cited which compare Israel's uncircumcision of heart unfavourably with
the Gentiles' uncircumcision of the flesh (para. 11).

A major recurring theme is that circumcision, the Sabbath, festivals,
etc. are but signs: Israel's error is that she has elevated them into
the place of actual means of salvation in themselves. This underlines
the thought that for Justin it is not simply that the Jews are unresponsive while the Gentiles are responsive. Rather this is a mystery predicted beforehand with reference to the Christ and his rejection by the Jews and already manifest in Jewish dealings with the prophets whom God sent. In this context, Justin believes that circumcision, the Sabbath, etc., have been given not because of Jewish superiority but rather on account of Jewish obduracy of heart. This matter is dealt with at some length in the Dialogue with Trypho, chapter XVI and chapter XIXff. One or two passages may be cited: 

"η γὰρ ἀπὸ Ἀβραὰμ κατὰ σάρκα περιτομὴ εἰς σημεῖον ἔσοδος, ἵνα ἔτε αὐτῷ τῶν ἄλλων ἔθνων, καὶ ἦμων ζῳορισμοί, καὶ ἵνα μόνοι πάθητε εἰς φόνον εἰς δίκη πάσχετε, καὶ ἵνα γένοιτο αἱ Χαίρει υἱῶν ἔρημοι καὶ οἱ πόλεις πυρίκαυστοι, καὶ οἱ καρποὶ ἐνίππον ὑμῖν κατεσθίσοντο, ἕλλοτριοι, καὶ μηδεὶς εἴς ὑμῶν ἐπιβαίνῃ εἰς τὴν Ἰερουσαλήμ." (XVI.2).

The last clause contains a reference to Hadrian's edict after the Bar-Cochba uprising, forbidding Jews from entering Jerusalem on pain of death. Circumcision of the flesh is that which sets the Jews aside. It was a marking given indicative of God's purpose to set aside His people for judgment.

"Oü γὰρ πᾶσιν ἀναγκαῖον αὕτη ἡ περιτομή, ἀλλ' ὑμῖν μόνοις, ἵνα, ὥσ προέφην, ταῦτα πάθητε εἰς φόνον εἰς δίκη πάσχετε" (XIX.2).

There can be little doubt that in all of this Justin believed that the Israelites were culpable and responsible. This does not mean, however, that we can rule out the concept of some mystery whereby God hardened their hearts. Such would seem contradictory perhaps to our modern western susceptibilities, but this does not make it contradictory in biblical thinking. Justin evidently is basing his attitude to the Jews on that of the biblical prophets. In this regard the judgment of von Rad concerning the need to take seriously and as it reads, the record of God's hardening of the Israelites, is important. This occurs in his discussion of Isaiah's thought, in vol. II of his 'Theology of the Old Testament'.

---

What Von Rad says of Isaiah and of biblical thinking in general is that the concept of hardening is a mystery which relates to the concept of 'salvation-history'. Lest this should be thought simply an unusual extravagance in a great scholar, it is noteworthy that von Rad's thinking on this and similar themes has evidently been one of the formative factors in Cullmann's masterly development of the concept of salvation-history, as outlined in his 'Salvation in History'.

The point is that both von Rad and Cullmann see this concept of hardening as bound up with eschatology: it is part of a theology of history that is imbedded at least in parts of the biblical witness. Now, it has to be admitted that it is hard, perhaps impossible, absolutely to establish that Justin Martyr has this conception. Nevertheless, the references to the prophets and especially to the concept of hardening suggest the possibility of this understanding. There can be little doubt about the dependence on prophetic concepts. The only question is whether von Rad is right and whether, even if he is, Justin Martyr thus interpreted them. The heavy emphasis upon responsibility in Justin is often thought to derive from philosophic insights. It hardly seems necessary, however, to look there for its origin: there is plenty in the prophets about responsibility, and probably Justin got his understanding in their writings.

There is a haunting sense right through the Dialogue that Israel's rejection of Jesus Christ and the Gentiles' acceptance of Him is the result of a divine mysterious order of things which is part of a wider plan which will issue -- possibly at least -- in the conversion of Israel, and in the establishment of the Kingdom of God on earth with

1 op. cit. pp. 151-152.

Jerusalem at its centre. It is noteworthy that in chapter XXI (para. 3) of the Dialogue and elsewhere Justin speaks of the dispersion of the nation of Israel as a sign of His judgment. The Old Testament, however, poses dispersion and regathering as mysterious opposites. Dispersion means judgment, but regathering implies God's favour being restored when God's time of judgment is overpast. This raises the question whether Justin has at the back of his mind all the time the knowledge that restoration follows judgment. Many perhaps could agree almost immediately with this, at least as a distinct possibility. Not all might agree, however, that beyond this the whole movement of rejection, illumination, restoration is part of a divine plan. To the mystery of blindness and rejection (cf. Is. 6) there corresponds the divine purpose to give light and blessing. Romans 9-11 should ever be in our mind at this point in our consideration. Is this not what Justin is suggesting throughout? God has made the Jews reject the prophets and finally Christ -- though the Jews are indeed culpable -- in order that salvation may be extended to the Gentiles? When this has been accomplished, however, it is unthinkable that Israel should be left in ignorance and unbelief. It would seem, too, in this regard that the millennial reign envisaged by Justin is not without significance in this regard. That reign appears to be thought of as centred in Jerusalem. But Jerusalem is the heart of the land given to Abraham and his descendants. An earthly kingdom with Israel at its centre has meaning here as explaining all that Justin has in mind. Nor again should we think of this as some unusual view on Justin's part. In view of such a section as Romans 9-11, surely we must hold that Justin gives evidence of the continuation of the Pauline hope and expectancy? The very difficulty of proving that all of this is tacitly in Justin points to the fact that Justin assumed this doctrine: He was making no innovations, though not all believers may
have accepted this whole scheme: he himself says that not all accept the millennial hope, at least not quite in the form that he accepted. (Dial. LXXX:2)

We return to the theme of circumcision, Sabbath, and similar institutions as having been given in order to single out the Israelitish people for judgment. Similar remarks are made in Dial. XXII regarding the sacrificial thinking. There seems a double strain in these passages: first, they serve to highlight Israel's sin and to bring judgment; second, they point beyond themselves in a mystery to the intention of God to perform some act or acts of salvation whereby He will rescue His people. This concept too did not come to Justin as a personal creation. It derives from Pauline concepts. Rom. 7:8-9 teaches that it is by the law and ordinances that sin came alive. The thought appears to be that the law was sent to show us our weakness. This might seem an unmerciful dispensation of things, but the theme of 'Romans' is that law was that which prepared the way for grace. Is not this also Justin's concept? The Jews have made the mistake of hanging on to what were ever intended only to prepare the way for the reality of the Christ Who was to come, Jesus of Nazareth.

It is significant, then, that there appear to be quite a few parallels with Paul's thinking in Romans. The references to the circumcision and to the law, and to the Jews' mistaken understanding of their meaning, have close connections with the Epistle to the Romans. The pertinence of the teaching of Romans 7 has already been noted. The question of circumcision is quite central not only to 'Romans' but also to 'Galatians'. Rom. 3:1 makes it clear that circumcision does set the Jews apart--though it is not said that it was for judgment. Rather the thought is in this passage that Jewish unbelief will not be allowed ultimately to frustrate the purpose of God. Justin may be said perhaps to have heightened dramatically the purpose and result of the giving of circum-
cision and the law -- the thought is not, however, absent from Paul.

Noteworthy, too, is the parallel between Rom. 4, with its so-called rabbinic reasoning that Abraham was accepted for his faith while still uncircumcised, and the judgment that Christ's High-Priesthood is of the order of Melchizedek, who was uncircumcised. The connection may not be close, but we are moving here on the same circle of ideas. Striking also is the fact that the reference in I Apol. LIII:7 to Is. 1:9 is quoted also in Rom. 9:29. Here the verse relates to the righteous remnant, but we know that in Paul's thinking this remnant is an earnest of God's restoration of the whole people. We conclude that these parallels and allusions are good evidence that Justin has the same view as Paul: the blindness of the Jews is only for a season. If their casting away has brought blessing to the nations, how much more will their fulness mean?

Justin Martyr also quotes on a number of occasions from Deut. 32 (Dial. CXIX: CXXX; etc.). It is interesting that Paul quotes Deut. 32:21b at Rom. 10:9, in a context which makes it clear that for him God's provocation of His people to jealousy does not mean their ultimate setting aside. In Dial. CXIX:2 Justin quotes the whole section, Deut. 32:16-23. Again, at Dial. CXXIII:3 Justin conflates Deut. 32:20 with Is. 42:19ff. Even where Justin is not citing the precise verse referred to by Paul, we must bear in mind that both writers have the same passage or context from Deuteronomy 32 in mind. The fact that Paul can use certain passages from Deut. 32 which pronounces judgment on Israel and yet believe in her ultimate restoration shows that we should not be too hasty in deciding on the basis of the passages in Justin Martyr which appear almost derogatory of the Jewish race that Justin has abandoned hope of her ultimate restoration.

It is interesting that Deut. 32 is in the background of two passages where Justin develops the thought of the Church as a new people of God,
a third race. In Dial. CXIX:3f Justin comments (immediately following upon his quotation of Deut. 32:16-23): "καὶ μετὰ τὸ ἑλπισθῆναι τὸν δίκαιον ἐκείνον ἡμεῖς λαὸς ἔτερος ἐνεχθῆμεν, καὶ ἐκλωτήσαμεν στάχυς καίνοι καὶ εὐθεῖαις, ὡς ἐφακοὶ οἱ προφῆται· καὶ καταφέυγοντες ἐβνὴ πολλὰ ἐπὶ τὸν κύριον ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ εἰς λαόν, καὶ κατασκηνώσασθαι ἐν μέσῳ τῆς γῆς πᾶσης. ἡμεῖς δὲ οὐ μόνον λαὸς ἀλλὰ καὶ λαὸς ἁγίος ἐσμεν, ὡς ἐδείχκαμεν ἡμήν. καὶ καλεσθοῦμεν κύτων λαῶν ἡγιασμένων ὑπὸ κυρίου. οὐκόν οὐκ εὐκαταφρονήσας δημός ἐσμέν οδῷ βαρβαροῦ πολέων οὐδὲ ὁποῖα καράν ἡ ἐφραϊμ ἐνη, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἡμᾶς εξελέξατο, δ Θεὸς καὶ ἐκφάνης ἐγενήθη τοῖς μὴ ἐπυρωτωσθείν αὐτῶν. Ἰσαω Θεός, εἰμι, φησί, τῷ ἐθνεί, οἱ οὖν ἐπεκαλέσασθα τὸ ὅνομα μου. τούτο γε ἐστιν ἐκεῖνο τὸ ἐθνος, ε οἶκον τω Ἀβραάμ, ο θεὸς ὀπλέκετο, καὶ πατέρα πολλῶν ἐθνῶν ἡμῶν ἐπηγγέλατο, οὐκ Ἀραβῶν οὐδ᾽ Ἀγγελίτων οὐδ᾽ Ἰσωμαίων λέγων." (parae. 3-4)

Again, in Dial. CXXIII shortly after the allusion to Deut. 32:20 (para. 3), Justin quotes from Jer. 31:27 and Is. 19:24f: "τοιγαρον Ἐγερώ, φησι τῷ Ἰσραήλ καὶ τῷ Ἰσραήλ στέρμα ἀνθρώπων καὶ στέρμα κυριών καὶ διὰ Ἁγιοῦ περί ἀλλο Ἰσραήλ οὕτω φησι τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐστίς ἢς ἐστὶς ἢς ἐστίς ἢς ἐστὶς ἀσαβρίοις καὶ ἀγγελίτοις εὐλογημένοι ἐν τῇ γῇ ἂς ἐν χειρὶ κυρίος Κυρίως λέγων. ἐλογημένοι ἐστὶς ὁ λαὸς καὶ ο ἐν ἀγγελίῳ καὶ ο ἐν ἀσαβρίῳ καὶ ο ἐν κυριوء λαὸν;——"

The thought in these two passages is that God has set Israel aside in order to bring into being a new Israel of God, a third people who are neither Jews nor Gentiles but are a new creation of God established through the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ at a particular point in history. Thus, the Church is here set within a theology of history.
As we have seen, however, the thought seems latent that it is God's purpose ultimately to renew His people. Clearly, however, such renewal is going to be of such a character that Jew and Gentile will equally be God's people. This means, among other things, that this present new third race is a proleptic anticipation of the establishment of God's Kingdom at the end of the age, when Jew and Gentile will equally enjoy God's blessings.

It is not clear whether Justin believes that this fulness of Israel will only come in at Christ's reappearance or earlier. The references to Israel's mourning do not necessarily imply that there will be no conversion of Israel prior to the end: it is rather taken as indicating national Israel's repentance for her long period of blindness. If the conversion of Israel does precede Christ's appearing in Justin's thought this would be further reason for ruling out the concept of 'Naherwartung' in Justin. It seems doubtful, however, whether we can make this assertion with too much confidence — though it is by no means an improbable interpretation of Justin. If Paul's view lies in the background and Justin did believe that the conversion and fulness of the Jews would bring much greater blessing to the nations than did her rejection of Christ, whereby salvation was extended to the Gentiles, it could be that Justin thinks of this blessing as associated with the Messianic reign of Christ on earth, i.e. the millennium. On the other hand, it may refer to the powerful effect upon the nations of observing Israel finally acknowledge Jesus of Nazareth as her Messiah: this might introduce a revival of religion prior to the Parousia. This is simply, we judge, too obscure in Justin to allow of a definite interpretation, since he but reflects concepts difficult in the New Testament itself.

Justin remarks in one place (Dial.XVII) that the Jewish people had been responsible for more active persecution of the Christians than other nations. They had had a special animus against Christ and His
followers. This reinforces the fact that for Justin the Jewish people were confirmed in obduracy of heart until in God's providence they should be given sight for their sinful blindness. However, persecution did come from other quarters also. Much of what Justin has to say in his two Apologies relates to the fact of persecution and to the Christians' attitude in the face of death. Here again, it seems clear that the experience of persecution, with the resulting necessity for martyrdom, was seen by Justin as fulfilling prophecy and as being set within an eschatological framework. This fact gave heart to the Christians. Further, this has somewhat to do with Justin's attitude towards martyrs: they are given an honoured place not just because of their faithfulness unto death but also because they serve as an indication of the progress of Christ's reign and the proximity of the Second Advent.

We have already seen that Justin saw the Church's mission not as coercing the hand of God in any way, but as being, on the one hand, a positive exertion of the kingly rule of Christ, and, on the other, as being a fulfilment of prophecy which anticipates the full glory of Christ's coming reign. What God had begun He must surely shortly complete. The initiative ever lies with God: the mission is simply an indication of the nearness of His purposes to completion. Now the experience of witnessing even unto death would seem to have been viewed as a high-point in the mission of the Church. It is doubtful, however, if we can go further than this. A martyr's death does not force God's hand any more than does the ongoing of the Church's mission in general, but dying for Christ is a forceful way of indicating that the Gospel is being taken to the heathen -- usually it was they who were exacting the death penalty, even if the Jews set them on the Christians, as was sometimes the case. Probably, however, Hendrikus Berkhof is a good guide once again, not only to biblical thinking, but also to Justin's thought, when he says that the Early Church understood that the Church was to
experience the analogue of Christ's earthly ministry. Out of His death came resurrection: so the Church thrives and grows on persecution. Further, it is proper that the servant should be as His Lord. There is more to it, however, than that bald assertion. Just as the forces of evil were provoked by Christ's presence into active hostility and, indeed, to growing hostility which reached a climax in the crucifixion, so it is God's purpose for the world and the result of the Church's mission, whereby Christ extends His kingly rule, that opposition should mount against the Christian cause. Thus persecution from without and apostasy from within mark the advance of the Church towards the predestined goal when she shall be glorified. The martyr's death thus marks at once the present advance of Christ's rule in that in this way Christ's name is glorified among the heathen, and it indicates the proximity or growing near of the final consummation in that persecution was to be growingly a feature of the age prior to the Return of Christ.

Does this way of looking at things underlie Justin Martyr's attitude to persecution -- and also apostasy -- with reference to the Second Advent? It seems clear immediately that Justin accepted that a 'man of sin' was to be revealed prior to the Parousia of Christ. Here Justin relied on Dan. 7. This figure is mentioned in chapters XXXI-XXXII and also in chapter CX of the Dialogue with Trypho. Chapter XXXII, as we have already seen, asserts that "he whom Daniel foretells -- is already at the door --." In chapter CX Justin introduces his reference into a passage in which he is discussing the fulfilment of Mic. 4:1ff. in terms of his doctrine of the Two Advents. Already in the Christian community the Gentile nations are making their pilgrimage to Zion and especially is this manifest in their setting aside of the instruments of warfare and of hatred. As a foil to this, it is mentioned that Christ's coming in glory shall cut short an implied brief but terrible outburst against the Most High and

1 *op. cit.*, e.g. pp. 78-79, 100, 101-103. This is really a major theme of the whole book.
His saints by the 'man of apostasy', and the chapter goes on to speak of present persecution: Justin does not seem to say that the Antichrist is already present, but he implies that the present persecution of believers in Jesus Christ is symptomatic of that final outburst of impiety which is to herald the end of the age and which may well be just round the corner. Indeed, chapter XXXII of the 'Dialogue' is evidence that Justin did believe just this: the 'man of sin' would be revealed at any moment.

Thus, the experience of persecution and of martyrdom would always be seen in an eschatological framework. Both positively and negatively, both in terms of the extension of Christ's rule and in terms of its evidence of the growing power of Antichrist whose appearing would herald the Second Advent, it served this end. It is interesting in this regard that apostasy strictly refers, of course, to betrayal from within. Berkhof illuminatingly sees Judas Iscariot as representing this element in our Lord's experience. Perhaps too the rejection by the Israelitish people has a close connection with the concept of apostasy. If the Church is to reduplicate in her experience that of her Lord, she can expect treason from within. Apart from Berkhof's theory of reduplication, it is evident that certain passages in the New Testament anticipate a "falling away" within the Church -- cf. 2 Thess. 2:3; 1 Tim. 4:1; 2 Tim. 3:1ff (not so evidently of Church herself); Matt. 24:22-24; 1 Jn. 2:18 'antichrists', who "went out from us" because "they were not of us." Dial. XXXV asserts that schisms, heresies, etc., already visible are the direct fulfilment of scriptural prediction in this regard -- cf. Matt. 7:15; 1 Cor. 11:19; and Matt. 24:11.

The Marcionites, Valentinians, Basilidians and others are seen as those who style themselves Christian but who follow man-made opinions.

---

1 Cf. op. cit., p.114.
Both in the New Testament and in Justin, persecution from without and apostasy from within seem to be thought of as closely related and are not always, indeed, clearly distinguished, as it would seem. Thus, in Dial. CX the man of sin has become the 'man of apostasy'. Now in Dan. 7 it is not clear that the 'man of sin' is one who attacks God's people from within. Nevertheless, Justin almost certainly relied on Early Church tradition when he thus in passing speaks of this figure as the 'man of apostasy'. Passages such as I Jn. 2:18 and 4:3 with their reference to the spirit of Antichrist -- a term which came to be understood as a reference to the man of sin of Dan. 7 -- seem to have in mind apostasy from within God's people. Thus, Justin appears to be in harmony with primitive tradition in seeing opposition from without and within as reaching a climax under some mysterious figure designated as the Antichrist. Doubtless Justin thought of present persecutions and heresies as anticipatory of the final onslaught of evil. It is only in this context that we can properly consider the attitude of Justin towards the martyr's death.

Justin would surely have felt that his attitude towards martyrdom, as viewed in this eschatological context, was justified, even if he could have known that the consummation was delayed longer than the 350 years which he thought unthinkable (Dial. XXXII:4-5). All persecution, heresy, and schism was symptomatic of that which was to come, however long it might be delayed. Thus, we should not think Justin's views dependent on mere calculations: rather they rested upon a profoundly biblical theology of history -- a history which, once again, is seen to
be schematized. We may now set out Justin's expectation in some such order as this: First Advent -- persecution, growing apostasy in faith and action, the revelation of Antichrist, possibly the conversion of the Jews, the Second Advent, the millennial reign of Christ on earth, a final release of Satan and his minions, their defeat and casting into the lake of fire, and finally the creation of new heavens and a new earth. The theme of the divine patience becomes clearer as each facet of Justin's expectation comes to light. So also does the crassly historical character of his anticipation of God's kingdom.

Justin has much to say on the subject of martyrdom and persecution. Most of this is found where he is addressing the heathen world that was bringing persecution upon the Christians. (I Apol. 1-VIII; LXVIII; II Apol. 1-IV; VIII-IX; XI-XII; XIV). Here his concern appears to be a pastoral one towards those who will bring judgment upon themselves at Christ's Appearing unless they discover the impiety of their deeds. This is something for which they will have to give an account at the Judgment Day. It is perhaps natural that the death of a Christian by martyrdom should be set in such a context -- the martyr's vindication and the human judge's condemnation. Nevertheless it is a very significant account and one which holds corollaries for the death of all Christians, and, indeed, of all men. Death is not the supreme moment of introduction to bliss or judgment -- though especially in the case of Christians future blessing may cast its shadow before it. The completion of God's purposes for His saints will take place at the Second Advent of Christ. In this regard, it is noteworthy that there is no definite suggestion in Justin Martyr that only the martyrs will be raised to life at the beginning of the millennial reign. The major point, however, is that in our whole consideration of death with reference to the Christian community, it has to be seen certainly not as the final entrance to glorification in Christ. Thus, our concern with this theme does not emerge out of any
concern for 'personal eschatology', as it has sometimes been called, for its own sake. Justin and the Apologists generally saw death as a victory for Christ, a significant and honoured means of extending Christ's sway -- but the final victory comes for the servant only when it comes for His Lord. To treat death otherwise would be unduly individualistic and unbiblical and Justin and the other apologists are true to the biblical emphasis. Thus, the death of believers is understood with reference to Christ's achievement on the Cross and in the Resurrection with its present consequences and with reference to the coming consummation of God's purposes at the Second Advent. We are not claiming here that all is immediately made self-evident regarding the state of the dead between death and the resurrection of the saints, but only that death is always viewed primarily with reference to the dynamic movement of the forces unleashed in the Resurrection of Jesus Christ and to be consummated at His Return in glory.

The themes of death and resurrection are constantly alluded to in the Apologists; this was because the Graeco-Roman world found it easy to believe in immortality, or, in some cases, reincarnation: what the Christians believed in, however, was a once-for-all resurrection. Perhaps the most unique factor of this, as compared with either doctrines of personal immortality or reincarnation, was its public character. This resulted from its assimilation to the Jewish theme of the Day of the Lord and the primitive Christian concept of this as carried through at the Parousia of Jesus Christ in glory. The resurrection morning is to reverse the roles in which judges and judged now find themselves. Justin and others are constantly anxious to explain that Christian willingness to die, coupled with the seemingly illogical refusal to commit suicide, emerges from a positive attitude towards God's creation which will find fulfilment in resurrection and what follows. II Apol. IV asserts in very
positive terms the Christians' regard for the good creation of God: - 'ει ὁ δὲ πάντες ἐκνωτὸς πνεύμονεν, τὸν μὴ γεννηθέντας τίμω καὶ μαθητευθέντας εἰς τὸ θεῖα σιδεράματα, ἡ καὶ μὴ εἶναι τὸ άνθρώπους γένος, ἐδού ἑτ' ἡμῖν, κατιοι ἐσομέθη, ἐνάντιον τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ βουλὴ καὶ λατοῖ ποιούντες, ἔκα τούτο πρᾶξαμεν.' (para. 3)

It seems clear throughout in Justin that the weight of emphasis both with reference to blessing and judgment falls upon the Second Advent.

Nevertheless, some significant passages may be adduced regarding the intermediate state. Thus II Apol. 11 closes by saying, in recounting the martyrdom of one Lucius, that "ὁ δὲ καὶ Χάριν εἰδέναι ὁμολόγης, πολλάκις διοικητῶν τῶν τοῖσυν ἀπολλάξεαι γυνικάκις καὶ πρὸς τὸν Πάτερα καὶ βασιλέα τῶν ὀυρανῶν πορεύεσθαι." (para. 19) Again, in I Apol. XIX it is stated that Christians heed the words of our Lord (Matt. 10:28) about fearing not those who kill the body but rather "Τοῦ μετὰ τὸ ἀποθάνειν διαναίμενον καὶ ψυχὴν καλῶς ἔνδειον ἐν μνήμει Justin goes on, "ἂν δὲ γεβάνης ἐστι τόπος, ἐνθα κολαβήσατε μέλλοντι οἱ λόγικοι βιώσαντες καὶ μὴ πιστεύοντες τοῦ ἔγενοσθαι δόχα ὁ θεός διὰ τὸν Χριστόν ἐσώμεθα." (Para. 9). It is not quite clear in this passage whether hell is a future state or a present reality. The evidence seems to favour the emphasis falling once again on the future act of judgment. It is really only the words "after death", as quoted from the lips of Jesus, that cause any doubt.

For the reference is to soul and body's being cast into hell: this surely presupposes the prior resurrection. Further the definition of hell, cited above, seems to envisage its habitation by those who have not believed what Christ has taught us will come to pass. These disbelieved things are, however, surely resurrection and judgment. Chapter XIX of the First Apology really is concerned to defend the credibility of the resurrection. This context, then, seems to favour the understanding that those who do not now believe will have their disbelief condemned when they are raised to the expectation of judgment. However, it should also be noted that the previous chapter makes it clear that "αἰώνιος πάντων γενοῦσα
Justin has also said that it would be a piece of unlooked-for luck (ἐρρανον) for the preceding kings if their death had issued in insensibility. The reference even here to 'eternal punishment' (κόλασις αἰωνία) as laid up seems to presuppose that the intermediate state will be miserable for the wicked, but that it will be resurrection and judgment which will initiate them into 'eternal punishment'. In the case of Christians, too, final blessedness for Justin seems to have been thought of as given at the Parousia: there is no thought, however, of present disability except that which results from separation from body. Even this latter is not mentioned, but it seems implied in Justin's emphasis upon God's purposes finding completion in resurrection and Christ's earthly reign.

What underlies Justin's view would seem to be the so-called apocalyptic doctrine of the Two Ages or Aeons. We have seen how definitely historical is Justin's concept, in so far as it relates to impending persecution, apostasy, resurrection, judgment, millennial reign, and final judgment. There is nothing supra-historical about Justin's view of any of these events. Justin and the other Apologists claim that they are not those who deny life but only the subservience to the gods or spirits of this present age. It is in this context that we can understand what may seem otherwise to be the rather pointless references to demons (cf. I Apol. XIV and LVI, II Apol. V, etc.). The demons represent the means whereby mankind was historically led astray. Therefore, it is entirely consistent to hold that at Christ's death and resurrection these evil forces were in principle overthrown and that in the age which is to come they will be in bondage (as in the millennium) and eternally cast aside into the lake of fire (after the final judgment). Strictly, the
references to such demonic forces are not an argument to explain evil in the world. Rather it emerges out of the far richer Semitic-Christian concept of the world in its relation to the upper world and the underworld. Such conceptuality had a greater appreciation in Hellenism too than in our modern world. Our present purpose, however, is to show that even the reference to this demonic element is thoroughly eschatological in character. Justin is dominated throughout by his concept of Christ's Two Advents and the concept of Two Ages. The last is perhaps less dominant. The truth is that for him, the concept has been reinterpreted from Jewish apocalyptic in terms of the actual facts about Jesus Christ, as faith perceived them, viz, that Christ had once come and would come again in glory. This made it difficult to get a simple division between Two Ages. Thus, in Christ's first ministry the old era with all its dominions and principalities had been set aside. Nevertheless, they were still active in deceit and would only finally have their power broken at His coming again in power and great glory.

Chapter LIV of the First Apology is significant with regard to the question of the demons and the origins of heathen mythology. Here this mythology is said to have been inspired by demons as a counter to the truth as it is in Jesus Christ. This suggests the thought that the demons were seen as significant of the old order, especially beyond the Jewish world, where the prophets had been sent by God. Thus, the Christian mission found itself in headlong collision with the old order. particularly when the Gospel spread out beyond the confines of Jewry. Thus, the Christian mission was an eschatological sign, significant as it was of the casting down of Satan and the end of the age, when all nations would gather together in a renewed Jerusalem.
with Christ at its centre. The closing chapters, indeed, of the First Apology (LIVff.) are devoted to explaining demonic reaction to the prophetic word.

The actual proof of this connection of the demons with the old order and, thus, with eschatological motifs, is perhaps hard to come by, in any definitive form. Nevertheless, it does seem to be presupposed and such an understanding makes sense of much of the First Apology. It may well be, in this regard, that the theme of the holy angels in connection with Christ's second advent has a symbolic significance: the day of their participation in Christ's glory signifies the overthrow of the demons. We may well note again in this connection, ch. LII:3 of the First Apology (quoted in the Greek, above, pp. 392).

"For the prophets proclaimed in advance two advents of His: the one, that which is already past, when He came as a dishonoured and suffering Man; but the second, when, in accordance with prophecy, He shall come from heaven in glory, with His angelic host, when also He shall raise the bodies of all men who have lived, and shall clothe those of the worthy with immortality, and shall send those of the wicked, in eternal sensibility, into everlasting fire with the demons."

Ch. LVII attributes opposition and the martyrdom of Christians to the operation of the demons. Thus, the hostility of the pagan world to Jesus Christ was not something neutral: it was, though unconsciously, a reaction inspired by the Word of God as it was proclaimed.

The importance of the above discussion is that even the references to demons are seen to represent not a fantastic concern with an unreal and certainly invisible world, but with the realities of the rise of various pagan religions and present opposition to the Gospel that emerged historically from the transgression of the angels (II Apol. V:4) and will be nullified at the Second Advent. It is in this context of a deeper demonic dimension that the struggle between the preached Word of God and pagan authorities is to be understood. This is the existential setting also for the discussion of the death of the Christian. The
ordinary death of the believer is never directly mentioned by Justin: significantly death by martyrdom is either for him the norm or the ideal.

Some of the fragments of Justin's writings, recorded by Irenaeus and others, significantly bear upon the part played by Satan and his angels: Τὴν αἰτίαν τῆς καθ' ἡμῶν ἀνενότητον ἐπιβολῆς τοῦ διαβόλου παρατίθεμεν μεταίγοντες. "Οτι πρὸ τῆς τοῦ Κυρίου παρουσίας οὐχ ἦσε τραβὴς οὕτως τῆς ἐκουτοῦ τιμωρίας τὴν δύναμιν ὁ διάβολος, τῶν θεών προφητῶν ἀνθρωποτροπίας ἦτην διαγορεύσεως, ὡς ἡ οἰκίας τῶν προσώπων τοῦ Ἀσσωρίου παρὰ τὴν κατὰ τὸν διάβολον ὑπεραρχηγόν ἐκτρωχισμὸν ἐπεκαλυπτείτην. 'Εν οἷς δὲ τοῦ Κυρίου παραγενόμενοι τῷ διαβόλῳ σαφῶς ἀποκείσανταί καὶ ἐτοιμασθήκαν τῷ αἰῶνι ἐπὶ τοῦ τούτος ἀγέλοις ἡμᾶς ἡμᾶς τοῖς αὐτοῖς ὅπερ παλαιτώ πιστοῖς ἐπιβολήσειν, πολλοὺς ἔχειν βουλόμενοι κοινωνίας τῆς ἐκουτοῦ ἀπεισοδεύσεως. ὡς αὐτὸν μὴ μόνον αἰρετοῦντο ἐνεχομένος, φυλάξα σωτὴρ καὶ βασιλικὰ συγκροτούμενος παρασκιβάζεται.

What is highly significant in this passage is that the theme of the hostile activity of the devil and his minions is set in the context of the Two Advents. It is the First Advent that has made clear their final destiny, and this is responsible for that intensification of opposition to God's cause that has already been noted as implicit in Justin, as in such passages as II Thess. 2. Noteworthy, too, in this particular fragment from Justin is the reference to the devil's 'apostasy'. This may well explain much concerning the use of this term, already noted, in connection with the revelation of 'the man of sin'. The thought may well be that the devil is himself an apostate, so that all rebellion against God's Christ, even when it comes from outside His people, is apostasy. At any rate the concept of a cosmic fall, prior to that of our first parents in the garden, is everywhere presupposed in Justin. From the dramatic point of view, this eternal order which stands behind the substantial visible order serves as a foil to the episodes of conflict in this world between God and the forces of evil. However, Justin was
an unconscious dramatist: he dealt with the realities of the situation, as he interpreted them from Holy Scripture, the Gospel, and the apostolic tradition.

We come, finally, under our consideration of the eschatological implications of the Church's mission, together with its demonic and earthly opposition, to note briefly that Johannes Quasten does not seem able to substantiate his view that Dial.IV and Dial. LXXX establish that the souls of the martyrs do not remain in Hades until the end of the world and that they are solitary among the saints in this regard. Really what Quasten mainly is at pains to assert that these chapters impress, is that even in Hades, the intermediate state between the advent of Christ in humiliation and that in glory, the souls of good and wicked are differentiated. The differentiation where the martyrs is concerned appears to be based on one interpretation of Rev. 20, as constituting a foundation for Dial. LXXX. It is not certain that Rev. 20 in fact does differentiate between ordinary Christians and martyrs: perhaps the truth is rather that it thinks of martyrdom as the most fitting Christian death, without implying that those who die from 'natural causes' would be at any disadvantage. After all, to the early Christians such death, so long as it did not emerge from denial of Christ, would be seen as the result of a providential dispensation.

One wonders if for Justin any of the believers are in Hades. Perhaps II Apol. 11:19, with its reference to going to the King, (quoted above, p. 440), evidently taken by Quasten as evidence of the intermediate state of the martyr, expresses the condition in Justin's thinking of all believers who remain faithful. Jean Daniélou has impressively cited evidence\(^1\) for the Jewish Christian character of the doctrine of the Descent

\[^1\] op. cit., p. 217  \quad \[^2\] op. cit., p.p. 233ff.
into Hades for the purpose of preaching or announcing deliverance to spirits held captive. As Jewish Christian motifs are found elsewhere in Justin, it may be that this also is assumed. Of this, however, there is no certainty.

CHURCH AND SACRAMENTS: THEIR ESCHATOLOGICAL PRESUPPOSITIONS.

We turn at length to the question, how the Church and her sacraments reflect eschatological presuppositions in Justin and the Apologists. We have already seen, in an indirect fashion, that the Church herself is an eschatological reality, in the sense, that she consists of men and women of all races, and that the present setting aside of Israel and extension of the salvation of God to 'the nations' is itself the result of a divine ordinance, foreseen within the prophetic tradition. We have also noted in passing, the Justinian concept of her as the third race, with its eschatological implications. We must now explore further whatever may be of relevance for eschatology concerning the Church's nature. Not only her existence, but also her mission -- one of the most important aspects of her being -- have already been noted as set within an eschatological framework. What of her nature, so far as this can be abstracted from the considerations or elements already noted?

Perhaps the best way into this theme is connected with the rites of Baptism and the celebration of the Eucharist. These have a marked connection with the membership and, therefore, the constitution of the Church. References in Justin form a link between our earlier theme of demonic opposition to God and the Christian gospel and the understanding of these Christian rites. For, in I Apol. LXII and LXVI Justin asserts that the devils have imitated the washing and the common meal of the Christian Church. In regard to the latter, for example, he avers that the rites of the Eucharist have been imitated in the mysteries of Mithras
through devilish instigation. Jean Danielou has some helpful comments to make in this regard. He notes from I Apol. LXI:2 that Justin confirms evidence from the Didache that in Jewish Christian circles baptism was preceded by a fast by the candidate of a few days' duration. Danielou asks:

"What was the significance of the fast? Justin makes its object 'the remission of sins' (I Apol. LXI:2). The fast is clearly linked with some kind of purification. Now in contemporary Judaism purification involved not only interior conversion, but also deliverance from demons, and this was especially important in the case of pagans. The author of Barnabas writes: 'Before we believed on God, the abode of our heart was -- a house of demons.' (XVI:?). The best interpretation, therefore, would seem to be that Judaism attributed to fasting the power of casting out devils. This would bring us to the origins of the later baptismal exorcism. Justin associates fasting with prayer, and this recalls Mt. 17:21: 'This kind (of devil) is not cast out save by prayer and fasting.'"  

(The Theology of Jewish Christianity, pg. 321). The quotation is from A. Benoit, Le baptême chrétien au Second Siècle, p. 11).

What is significant in Danielou's remarks is the reference to the need, especially in the case of pagans, for the removal of demonic influences. We submit that the interior logic of this is that baptism places the converted pagan into the sphere of Christ's kingly rule and so is eschatological in its meaning, in the sense that it views the Church as a community created by the advancing fulfilment of God's purposes through the First Advent. Baptism places the pagan and the Jew within the present reign of Christ. The Eucharist confirms our continuing obedience to this reign and anticipates one's acceptability at the Second Advent of Christ.

Chapter LXIIff. of the First Apology are frequently quoted on account of their important historical evidence about the way in which the Christian Church practised the rites of Baptism and the Supper in the mid-2nd century A.D. It is seldom remarked, however, that Justin's actual reason for discussing them at all is to demonstrate that demons have attempted to imitate what they anticipated would emerge at Christ's Advent.

¹ The Theology of Jewish Christianity, pg.231. The quotation is from A. Benoit, Le baptême chrétien au Second Siècle, p.11.
from references in the prophets (Is. 1:16-20), and have sought to copy our Lord's historical procedure and words (Ezk. 22:19, etc.). Thus, heathen religion is set within the context of demonic opposition to the progress of the Gospel. True Christian Baptism and celebration of the Eucharist indicate, therefore, by contrast, continuity with God's providential dispensation for our salvation foreseen by prophets, as also subservience to Christ's kingly rule, made manifest where men acknowledge Him, even in lands beyond Jewry, to which in earlier days the knowledge of salvation was confined.

The implication is that the Church is understood in thoroughly historical terms. She stands at a particular point in history determined by boundaries established by God. These boundaries consist in the Two Advents of our Lord. From a somewhat more positive view of the effects of the First Advent in transforming the character of history, the Church lives in the experience of the reign of Christ already begun in the Resurrection and Ascension of Jesus Christ which is to be consummated at His Appearing in glory. In view of Justin's view of a coming millennial reign of Christ on earth, this present reign is not to be conceived of in otherworldly terms, but rather is a subordinating of the conditions of our sojourn in this world to the realities of Christ's achievement and coming complete victory upon the earth.

Christ's present reign is made visible in various ways, though only by faith do we apprehend these. For Justin Christ makes His action visible as He did His Presence when He was here among men, but blindness hinders many from seeing. Noteworthy in this connection is the reference in I Apol. LXI by Justin to baptism as 'ζωτισμός' - illumination. Justin has here the pagan world primarily in view and he considers that those who are brought into the sphere of Christ's reign through repentance and the washing of baptism have their eyes opened.
'Illumination' is often said to be a Hellenic term, the implication being that it is late, secondary, and attuned to Greek emphasis upon the spirit as compared with the body. Rather would there appear to lie behind it, certainly in Justin's interpretation, a dynamic sense of a historical process which was being driven towards its ordained consummation through Christ's death, resurrection, ascension, and continued reign through His proclaimed Word. May not such a passage as Is. 9:1 with its reference to the coming of light to a hybrid Galilean community, together with the Johannine reference to Christ Jesus as 'the light of the world' (τὸ φῶς τοῦ κόσμου, 8.12; cf. 1:4,7,9; 3:19,20,21; 11:9,10; 12:35,36,46), have laid the basis for the consideration that in baptism people were delivered from the darkness of heathenism and brought into a light which the Jews had known somewhat of, even when they had not lived by it and had not fully understood its import or significance?

Baptism is here and there in the Dialogue (e.g. chs. XIV, XVIII, and XIX) contrasted with the circumcision, or washing, or ritual which the Jews practised. Dial. XLIII:2 may be quoted in this regard: "καὶ ἡμεῖς, οἱ δὲ τούτων προσχωρήσαντες τῷ Θεῷ οὐ ταύτιν τὴν κατὰ σάρκα παρελθόντας περίτομαν, ἀλλὰ πνευματικάν, ἐν Ενώκ καὶ οἱ ὄρμοι ἐφύλαξαν ἡμεῖς δὲ διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος ἑαυτῶν, ἐπεὶ ἡ ἁμαρτία ἐγένειμεν, διὰ τὸ ἔλος τὸ πάρα τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐλάθομεν, καὶ πᾶσιν ἐφέτοι ὄρμοις λαμβάνειν." The reference to Enoch is of the same kind as that already noted concerning Melchisedek in the case of Ps. 110. Neither Melchisedek nor Enoch belonged to that dispensation in which circumcision was given to the Israelites as a symbol of God's purposes in salvation and judgment. Thus, baptism again is set forth as the inclusion in that community which is open to all who hear the Gospel, repent, and are baptized. Baptism is more than mere bodily washing: "Τῇ γὰρ ὀφελοῦ ἐγείνου τῷ βαπτισμάτος, ὁ τὴν σάρκα καὶ μόνον τὸ σῶμα φιλοῦμεν; " (Dial. XIV:1) Justin speaks in very definite terms in the I Apology, chapter
accompanied by repentance, faith, fasting, and prayer. Justin says: "οδοι, ἐν πεισθαυν καὶ πιστεύων ἠλθεν ταῦτα τα ἐπὶ ἡμῶν ἑωράκαμεν καὶ λεγόμενα εἶναι, καὶ βιώσων ὑπὸς ὑποχωρίας, εὐχασθής τε, καὶ λείπειν νηστειοῦντες τῷ τού Θεο τῶν προσκυνημάτων ἔφεσιν διακοσμοῦτας, ἡμῖν συνεχουμένων καὶ συνημετούριων αὐτῶν. οὕτως λέγω τινὲς ἡμῶν ἐνα νῦν ὑποκύπτων, καὶ τράπεζον ἀναγεννήσεως ἐν καὶ ἡμῖν αὐτοὶ ἀναγεννηθήμεν, ἀναγεννήτως ἑπτάνυχίμιον ἂν πρὸ τοῦ πιστοῦ τῶν ἱερά ἐν καὶ διασπόρου ὠλοτού καὶ τοῦ σωτηρίου ἡμῶν 'Ιησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ πυθμένως ἐγίνον, τῇ ἐν τῷ υἱῷ τοῦ Μούσα ἐκρυθέντα, καὶ ἡμῶν Χριστοῦ εἰπεν: ἄν ἡμῖν ἀναγεννηθήτε, οὐ μή εἰσίν ὑμεῖς ἐκ τῆς βασιλείας τῶν οὐρανῶν." (para.2-4).

It seems clear that, although the true baptism is more than mere external washing, it is nonetheless such a washing. 'Regeneration' seems especially bound up with the act of Christian baptism: this seems to suggest that this act incorporates into the true people of God, whereas circumcision and other rites do not have this value. This is not explained by Justin, but such an interpretation makes sense of Justin's emphasis at once upon the need for baptism and the fact that the true baptism is more than one which is a mere bodily washing. The link with the baptism received by 'us' of which Justin speaks suggests something of the corporate character of baptism which Justin ever presupposes.

In this he was, of course, in line with the earliest Christian thinking on the subject. It is not always clear, however, to us today, and so it sometimes seems as if the act, as an act, accomplishes something. Justin's point is that this is the community with which we must be identified, since this is the community of Christ. No heathen group will suffice but only that which has been established by Christ.

The point of the above discussion is that the emphasis upon baptism as a means of entrance to the Christian Community helps to reveal the eschatological character of the Christian community, the Church, herself. She is a community of men and women, Jews and Gentiles, called into being through a definite historical episode, the death, resurrection and
ascension of Jesus of Nazareth. Further, entrance into this community, which represents those who may hope to enter the kingdom of heaven is by a washing which was prophesied long beforehand by Isaiah the prophet (Is. I: 16-20, cf. I Apol. LXI). Further, there seems latent the suggestion that, although we shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven apart from repentance and baptism in Christ's name, yet this in itself does not guarantee our final attainment. Significant, perhaps, in this regard, is the emphasis upon "the remission of sins that are past" (ἐν προηγμενῶν ἁμαρτίαις I Apol. LXI:2). Justin may, indeed, implicitly lack the confidence of deliverance from sin that Paul had. For Paul deliverance was from sin as a principle, not just from past wrongdoing. Noteworthy, too, is Justin's comment that those are baptized who "undertake to be able to live accordingly (i.e. in accord with the teachings of the Christian community (βλ. οὖτος ἡ μοναδικὴ ὁμοίωσις para. 2). At the same time, whatever Justin's view may lack, it clearly has in the background the experience of the Israelitish people who were delivered from Egypt but did not all reach the Promised Land. Thus, Justin's concept of the Church is eschatological, in the sense that the Church is seen as the community of those who are aiming to do God's will and at last to receive final deliverance. Dial. CXIII brings out well the thought of Jesus Christ as the One Who leads us into the eternal possession, whereas Jesus (Joshua) was the one who under God led Israel after the flesh into a temporary inheritance. This chapter makes abundantly clear that, in saying this, Justin has in mind, not the distinction between a visible and an invisible kingdom, but rather that between a temporary and an eternal reign upon earth and from Jerusalem (whether in the millennium or in the renewed earth). A section from paragraph 4 of this chapter well sums up Justin's thought: "ὅ μὲν γὰρ πρόσκαιρον ἐδώκετε αὐτοῖς τὴν κληρονομίαν, ἐὰν οὐ ἄρα Χριστὸς ὁ
The presuppositions regarding future act of God in time at Christ's Parousia and beyond carry corollaries or parallels regarding extension in location also. Just as the Kingdom is to be revealed in time, so it has to have geographical location also. Both Dial. CXIII and CXXXIX make this latter point clear. Justin says: "ἀγιότητα ούτω τῶν ἐν Θεῷ πατρῴου πολεμίων σωτηριών παρεγένω, ἵνα τὰς ἰδιότητας τῶν λαχάνων μελλοντων γίνονται." Thus, the land of Canaan. Thus, the Church of Jesus Christ has to be seen not as a community of people who are to be removed to heaven, but rather as those who will inherit within the land of Palestine the promises given to Abraham. The concept of time cannot properly, indeed, be divorced from that of space or location. Now we must, however, give emphasis to this aspect. If the future of the Christian community is conceived of as being in the world during Christ's millennial reign, centred in Jerusalem and Palestine, and beyond, then a physical mark or symbol of belonging to Christ is appropriate. For it is in a resurrected body clearly that such a life with Christ will be enjoyed. One has to admit that this seems to be implicit rather than explicit in Justin. Nevertheless, it does make sense of all the evidence.

Both Baptism and the Eucharist probably have behind them a strongly realistic parallelism with the events associated with the Passover, the Exodus, and with pilgrimage sustenance of the Israelites by manna and quails between Egypt and Canaan. All this is most compressed, but it
is perhaps all the more impressive in Justin just on this account. I Apol. LXVI is the significant chapter with reference to the Eucharist, which perhaps gathers up most meaning into itself, in so far as it presupposes deliverance whereas Baptism does but anticipate it. In line with Paul's account of the institution of the Eucharist and the other Gospel accounts, the note of memorial is marked. This puts the meal into line with the Jewish Passover concept. Thus, what Baptism and the Eucharist do is to identify each succeeding generation of Christians, in whom God's Word has been effective, with that very earthly pilgrimage which once Israel went upon. Just as the Passover Feast created such an identification for the Israelites, so the Christian sacraments in some real sense anchor us in the historical event of the Death and Resurrection of Jesus Christ and give us heavenly sustenance on our way. By participation in the Passover ritual the Jews deemed that each generation experienced, or shared in, the events of the first Passover night and what ensued. Similarly, Baptism and the Eucharist anchor us in the historical events of Jesus' death and resurrection. Since Jewish ritual and Christian sacrament alike deal with real history, and since they both look forward to coming event (for the Jews there was a lively expectation, at least in late Judaism, of a New Exodus), and since both past and future events have historical action upon the earth in view, Christian initiation and continuing membership have to be as public and 'earthly' acts as marriage or joining the army.

It will be evident from the above how profoundly historical and 'earthly' are Justin Martyr's conceptions of God's purposes for His people. The Church, together with her sacraments, are so viewed by Justin as to undergird this conviction arrived at through our whole study of Justin's views about the Two Advents, resurrection, millennium, judgment, the Church's mission, and about the Church herself and her
sacraments. Subsidiary issues, related to eschatology, such as that of the intermediate state of the dead between death and resurrection, all bear out that Justin's whole thinking is rooted in the Two Advents. This is perhaps the most distinctive conception of all and possibly is his unique contribution to eschatology. The note of hope runs through all, and this hope is very materially, as well as spiritually, conceived. Yet this hope is based on equally historical and geographical happenings in Palestine.

It would be a mistake, however, to imagine that for Justin the Church is deserted by Jesus Christ between the Two Advents. He is present through the Spirit and in His reign over sin and in His conquest of pagan deities, who are but demons. The double significance of the very term 'parousia' in Greek, as indicating both presence and arrival, probably has its meaning for Justin throughout. It is clear (in Dial. LI:2, ἐν τῷ μεταξὺ τῆς παρουσίας αὐτοῦ Χρόνῳ - "in the time in the midst of His coming"; and elsewhere) that time is now filled because of Christ's coming, in a way it never was before. Thus, Justin has what may best be described as an 'inaugurated eschatology', neither wholly realized nor wholly futurist. What Justin saw so clearly, and what exponents of both realized and futurist eschatology in our own day have failed to discern, is that time has been filled in such a way that it is not absorbed in eternal meaning but is at once confirmed in its historical character and given the promise of a complete unfolding of its inner meaning before the eyes of all upon the earth, when God's patience reaches its fulfilment in Christ's visible enthronement. Such an eschatology gives evidence of profound connections with New Testament teaching and appears, in Justin, to have connections throughout with Jewish motifs.
The above study has given pride of place to Justin Martyr, who undoubtedly must be viewed as the most significant figure among the Apologists. Certain concepts which we have noted, such as the thought of the Church's mission as being set very definitely within an eschatological framework, find much greater documentation in his writings than elsewhere. Broadly, however, it is true that Justin does but set forth more fully concepts which are implicit throughout the writings of the Apologists.

It seems very clear that the Apologists were possessed of a futurist eschatology. This is true of them all. They looked for the Parousia of Christ in glory, though more characteristically it was the future resurrection or judgment which was stressed. It was however, at Christ's Parousia that they expected the resurrection and judgment to take place. In Justin Martyr we have the first explicit thought of Two Advents. As we have seen, he does also, however, consider that these two 'parousiai' fall within one divine economy (ἡ ὁικονομία). The fragment cited on page 392 above, and the passage from Dial. L1:2, mentioned on page 454 above, are very significant in this regard. Justin appears to think at once of two 'parousiai' within one economy, and of time as it now is 'in the midst of His (Christ's) coming' (ἐν τῷ μεταξὺ τῆς παρουσίας αὐτοῦ Χριστοῦ). What Justin has done in a new way is to separate off in imagination the two great moments of the one economy of God which has been at work since the Incarnation. Earlier writers had applied the term, ἡ Παρούσια, to either first or second Advent, before him. It belonged to his genius to set them schematically the one over against the other. Nevertheless, the passage at Dial. L1:2 shows that fundamentally for Justin it is one parousia with two uniquely significant moments. The parousia bespeaks Christ's continuing presence with His people in this age as well as His past coming in the humiliation.
of the flesh and His future coming in His glorified humanity. We noted (above, pages 397-398) also that chapter VII of the Epistle to Diognetus possibly implies the thought that Christ returns not only at the end of the age but also through the Church’s mission. This judgment is bound up with the use of the term, 'παρουσία' at VII:9.

At least it is clear that all the Apologists stress the futurist note in eschatology. Besides the Parousia of Christ in glory, the future resurrection and future judgment, we have also noted in Justin Martyr quite a definite anticipation of the coming of Antichrist prior to the Parousia, as well as the concept of a millennial reign of Christ on earth after the Parousia. The Apologists generally seem to think in terms of the Parousia of Christ as effecting resurrection and judgment for all men immediately thereafter, but Justin’s view presumes the deferment of the final resurrection of non-believers and their judgment until after the millennial reign of Christ. We have examined Barnard’s judgment that in some passages Justin appears to interpret the millennium in a "spiritual" manner, but have found this judgment not proven and rather unlikely.

In all of the above the futurist note is heavily stressed. If it be true that embarrassment over the delay in the Parousia led to a process of deeschatologizing, we find no evidence for it either in Justin or in the Apologists in general. It is argued that greater stress on the present realities of Christian experience resulted from this embarrassment. What we find, however, in the Apologists is a consistent stress on events which lie ahead of the Church and the world in time. Thus, the evidence does not substantiate the view that a process of deeschatologizing took place. We do find, markedly in Justin Martyr, and also in the Epistle to Diognetus to some extent, the emphasis upon the way in which in Christ’s Incarnation and Work the promises of Old Testament
times have been fulfilled and Christ's Reign has been inaugurated. This, however, never displaces the assurance that what has been begun in the Incarnation has yet to be consummated at the end of the age, this being coincident with Christ's Advent in glory.

Is there any evidence of concern over the delay in the Second Advent? It seems quite clear that there is none. The writer of the Epistle to Diognetus, as we saw, is more concerned to show why Christ's first advent was so long in coming, so late in time, rather than with any lateness in the second advent. Probably both in Justin Martyr and in the Epistle to Diognetus the understanding, which we have brought out above concerning the one economy in two 'parousiai' or the one 'parousia' which spans the time between the advents, provides the basic reason why no concern is exhibited in these writers. If Christ is already with His people, then there is not the same sense of His absence, as there would be if a greater stress had been laid on His present physical removal from His people and from the gaze of men and nations. Another important factor, which emerges clearly in Justin Martyr, is that he does not work with an 'any-moment' expectancy of Christ's Parousia in glory. This must be preceded, in his understanding by the appearance of Antichrist and his final persecution of the saints of God. This concept is probably assumed in the other Apologists, but it is quite explicit in Justin. What is unique to Justin's presentation of this matter is the fact that he does not simply anticipate the emergence of Antichrist, but he has a strong sense that the present mission of the Church is provoking Satanic opposition within the world. This is the dynamic element in Justin's thought. The more Satan sees his sway undermined by the progressive building up of the Church through the conversion of the elect, the more is his antagonism aroused.

There is present in Justin Martyr a strong sense of the masterful way
in which God is driving history to its predestined goal, which ill fits with any concern over delay in the Parousia. Certainly, Justin thinks that Christ's Parousia could not be delayed by as long as three and a half centuries, as Trypho implied by his interpretation of Daniel, but the reason why this seemed incredible to Justin is clearly because God had already achieved so much of His plan and fulfilled so many of His promises, that Justin cannot conceive of a long delay. In general it may be said that the Apologists do not display signs of anxiety over the relatively long period of time that had elapsed since Christ's death, resurrection and ascension until their day.

There are elements in Justin Martyr, in particular, which reveal the presence of a 'realized eschatology' in his thinking. Again, however, the term 'Inaugurated eschatology' is better, since, as we have seen, these do not displace the futurist expectation. This is discovered in Justin's understanding of the Church and her sacraments of Baptism and Eucharist. It is also evident in his dynamic understanding of the mission of the Church whereby Christ's rule is extended throughout the present world. It is this last note which is Justin's most unique contribution. It is bound up with a sensitive appreciation of the fact that the Church is destined to work out in her career the pattern of Christ's own earthly life. Suffering is to be followed by the victory of resurrection. This is implicit in much of what Justin has to say concerning the persecution endured by the Church as a means whereby the Word of God triumphs in the world. We noted that Justin again and again employed Ps. 110. He also employs Ps. 24:7 as referring to Christ's Ascension (I Apol. LI:7; Dial. LXXXV:1-2, where the subjection of demons to Christ's name is interpreted in terms of His rule from God's right hand; Dial. CXXVII:5, where Ps. 110:1 is also cited). What is implicit in these uses of Ps. 24 and Ps. 110 is the
thought that Christ, by virtue of His death and resurrection, reigns
(since the Ascension) at God's right hand. The Church, however, suffers
on earth, working out the pattern of her Lord's earthly ministry. More-
over, the thought is that Christ's rule is extended by this very
suffering for the Name of Christ. Thus the thoughts of Christ's present
rule and of the witness-in-suffering of the Church in her mission are
correlative. Clearly, however, such an understanding bespeaks the
present reality of the Kingdom of God, both in the obedience of the
Church and in the conquests that her suffering witness effects.

Christ's present Kingship is, however, linked in Justin's thought
with His priesthood (cf. page 420 above). Christ is a priest for ever
after the order of Melchisedek (Dial. XXXII:7). This priesthood, as we
saw, is a feature of the present Church age, in which Jews and Gentiles
are united together in the Church. Christ's priesthood was seen to
have a special relevance to the ingathering of the Gentiles in this
present age. We noted also the concept of the Church as the New Israel
or the 'third Israel' (above, pages 431-433), where the Church is seen
as being essentially a new phenomenon in world history and one which
anticipates the final situation at Christ's Return when Jews and
Gentiles will jointly receive Christ's blessings. The Church is thus
seen to realize now what is to take place at the end of the age. She
is able to do so because with the Incarnation Christ's triumph is
already taking effect within the world.

We saw too that Justin has somewhat to say concerning demons and
their activity even in the present age. It may seem that, if Justin
were fully true to New Testament emphases and to the 'realized' note
in thinking concerning the victory of Christ, he would think less
concerning their activity. This, however, would be to misunderstand
Justin, for he sees the demons as overthrown when the Gospel is
proclaimed (vide page 443 above). This at any rate seems to be implicit
in his thinking, and it is consonant with Justin's whole theology of history that he should be realistic both about Christ's present victory and about the activity of demonic forces in the present age. For Justin, as we have seen, actually believes that Christ's victory on the Cross and in His resurrection provokes increasingly desperate demonic opposition. It is no lack of emphasis on Christ's victory which leads to a recognition of demonic operations, but a theology of history which links the two. We noted also that Baptism is thought of as 'illumination' (φωτισμός), and that this seems to be linked with the deliverance, especially of Gentiles through the mission of the Church, from demonic influence and control (pages 446-447 above). Thus, the Church is tacitly viewed as the sphere where the dynamic thrust of the Church's mission has disrupted the power of demonic control. This too is a powerful element of 'realized eschatology' in Justin's thinking. It looks back to Christ's past victory, but his theology of history demands that it be seen in an eschatological light also, for Gentile ingathering is a phenomenon of the end of the age and anticipates the final situation at Christ's Parousia when Jew and Gentile will alike benefit from Christ's rule.

Baptism and Eucharist are viewed respectively as inserting believers into the sphere of Christ's kingly rule and of nourishing and sustaining them within that sphere. They were foreshadowed under the Old Covenant, so that they bear the marks of belonging to the new dispensation of power in Christ. Their inclusiveness of Gentiles is only one sign of this fact. We saw that the reference in I Apol. LXI:2 to "remission of sins that are past" may reflect some withdrawal from the full Pauline sense that remission may be from the sins of the past, but that the deliverance is from sin as a principle (pp. 450-451 above). Nevertheless, the dynamic style of Justin's thinking probably accounts for such a reference to "past sins", which is after all perfectly legitimate in
itself. Dial. CXIII (especially paragraphs 6-7) makes clear the implicit parallelism between Joshua and Jesus, showing that Justin thinks of the Church as still 'in via': the circumcision of Christ (applied, of course, to the baptized believers) is thought of as a second circumcision which applies to the heart. Thus, it is dubious whether Justin can fairly be said to retreat from a New Testament sense of the present benefits that we derive through Baptism and Eucharist from Christ. It is simply that, at times, his thinking is in line with the sense of pilgrimage characteristic of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

It is primarily in Justin Martyr that the 'realized elements' of eschatology receive emphasis. In the other Apologists it is more futurist elements such as resurrection and final judgment which are most apparent, where eschatology is concerned. The Epistle to Diognetus is, however, an exception to this. This Epistle is very sure that we are now living in the time for which God in His wisdom waited in order to reveal His salvation. He speaks in chapter IX of this as "the time of righteousness which is now" (δυν τῆς δικαιοσύνης καιρός), para. 1. This time was established by the giving of God's Son as a ransom for us (para. 2) -- "'Τὸν Χιιον ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁνόμων, τὸν ἅκακον ὑπὲρ τῶν κακῶν, τὸν δίκαιον ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁδικῶν, τὸν ἀφθαρτὸν ὑπὲρ τῶν φθαρτῶν, τὸν ἀθανασίον ὑπὲρ τῶν θανάτων"

Paragraph 5 goes on in a well-known passage to speak of the "sweet exchange" (ὡς τῆς γλυκείας, ἀνταλλαγῆς) whereby our wickedness should be concealed in Christ and His righteousness should be extended to us. The point is that the writer sees this as true now, now in this long-delayed time. Clearly these benefits belong to the end of the age. The passage is invested with a very powerful sense of the present effectiveness of what Christ has achieved. It is worth reminding ourselves, however,
that once again this 'realized' note does not displace an expectation of Christ's 'parousia' as Judge (VII:6). Once again, realized and futurist elements are held in balance.

We conclude that the Apologists are characterized by retention of belief in a futurist eschatology, which does not agree with the judgment that dismay over the delay of the Second Advent produced a deeschatologizing process. In some Apologists, at least in Justin Martyr and the writing known as the Epistle to Diognetus, the realized note is strong, but it is significant that this element does not oust the futurist element. An 'inaugurated' eschatology seems the best overall description of that of the Apologists as a whole.
CHAPTER V : IRENAFUS
In this chapter we are dealing with the literary output of only one writer. It is, therefore, somewhat simpler to set out the texts employed. Even so, we have to take account of two major works of Irenaeus. These are the *Adversus Haereses* and the 'Demonstration of Apostolic Preaching'. The second is much shorter than the first, which runs to five lengthy books. Even so, the 'Demonstration' is an important book, and gives us further insights into Irenaeus' thought. Although known to Eusebius (Hist.Eccl.) it had become lost and was only recovered early in this century in a 13th century Armenian MS. The discovery was made by K. Ter. Mekerttschian. The work was later edited by its discoverer in conjunction with E. Ter. Minassiantz in Texte und Untersuchungen, volume XXXI.I, which appeared in 1907.

The fact that the 'Demonstration' is available in full only in Armenian has meant that quotations from it have had to be made in this thesis in translation. The English translation employed has been that of J.A. Robinson, published at London in 1920. The most notable feature of this document, in terms of our present investigation into the eschatology of the Early Christian Fathers, is that Irenaeus does not mention the concept of the millennium in it, whereas this doctrine is very clearly set forth in the *Adversus Haereses*. It has been suggested that this may indicate that the 'Demonstration', which appears to be a later production than his work confuting heresies, shows a development of thought away from millenarianism. An argument from silence is always very shaky, and this seems to be true here also. It is a possibility, but in view of the firmness of the grip of millenarian concepts on Irenaeus' mind in the *Adversus Haereses*, must be reckoned a rather remote one, in the absence of any express denial of millenarian teaching.

The *Adversus Haereses* consists of five books. The Fifth Book is
the one which deals most directly with eschatology, therefore, the
number of citations in the following chapter from Book V is greater than
from the other four Books. Until recently the only relatively modern
editions of the text of the five books were those of W.W. Harvey and A.
Stieren. Stieren's edition was published at Leipzig in the years 1848–
53, while Harvey's was published at Cambridge in 1857. Naturally Harvey's
edition has been considerably used in Anglo-Saxon circles. It is this
dition which has been used in dealing with quotations from Books I and II
of the *Adversus Haereses*. The *Sources Chretiennes* series has recently
issued an edition of Books III–V of this work, and it is these which have
been employed in dealing with citations from these three Books. So far
four volumes have been published in this series dealing with the *Adversus
Haereses*, nos. 34, 100, 152 and 153. No. 34 deals with Book III, No. 100
with Book IV and Nos. 152–153 with Book V. Introductions are included
with the actual editions of the text and critical notes on the same.
The critical edition of Book III was published in two sections, the
first (introduction and notes) appearing in 1952. This was produced by
F. Sagnard. The editing of Book IV was undertaken by Adelin Rousseau
in collaboration with Bertrand Hemmerdinger, Louis Doutreleau, and
Charles Mercier. Its publication, again in two sections, occurred in
1965. It was only in 1969 that the introduction (No. 152) and edition
of text (No. 153) of Book V appeared, Rousseau collaborating again in
them with Doutreleau and Mercier. It is the *Sources Chretiennes*
text which has been used where Books III–V of the *Adversus Haereses*
are concerned.
IRENAEUS

INTRODUCTION

It has long been held that Irenaeus is the first Christian thinker, at least within the Catholic tradition, who may properly be termed a systematic theologian. Irenaeus doubtless learned much from Marcion and Valentinus, even though his reaction to their Gnostic thinking was largely in the negative. It is also clear that to some extent he carried forward certain developments of thought manifest in the Apologists of the mid-second century A.D.—though, once again, the degree of indebtedness may be variously assessed. It remains true, however, that Irenaeus was a powerful and influential Christian thinker, who attempted to combine the varying elements of Christian thought, in a more comprehensive way than previously attempted, into a dogmatic scheme. In saying this we are not unmindful of the redundancies in Irenaeus' major work, 'Adversus Haereses', nor of the chiefly practical pastoral interest of the Bishop of Lyons. Nevertheless, however practical may have been Irenaeus' interests and concerns, he reveals a greater ability in the setting forth of the interconnections of Christian doctrine than is discovered in any Christian thinker prior to his time.

Various estimates of the sources of Irenaeus' theology are given. Adolph Harnack saw these as what he viewed as the 'moralistic' theology of the Apologists, Gnostic theorising (mainly, though not wholly, by way of inspiring rebuttal), and the New Testament writings, recently formed into a canon.¹ The last source was responsible, ¹

it was argued, for a fairly heavy reliance upon Pauline concepts, though sometimes a new meaning or content was given by Irenaeus to Pauline phrases and ideas. It is important to endeavour to assess to what extent Irenaeus is a creative thinker, formulating new ideas, and to what extent he represents primitive Christian thinking. Harnack, whose influence upon treatmeants of the development of dogma in the second century A.D. has been immense, judged that 'primitive' Christianity and 'Catholic' Christianity are considerably different in character, that the Apologists and various other little known Christian thinkers alone fill a gap between 100 and 180 A.D., and that, in consequence of internal changes within the Christian churches in the second century, Irenaeus and others writing about or shortly after his time have to make a fresh start in Christian theorising. This start was entirely new, it has been held, in so far as it was systematic, and fresh, in so far as it involved a departure from the presuppositions and attitudes of the earliest period of Christianity's life and growth. It is commonly held that the eschatology of the primitive period was a major portion of that which was carried over from the first century unaltered. To many this eschatological element has been offensive, the more especially because Irenaeus adopted a form of millenarianism.

Our concern is with what evidence Irenaeus provides for us concerning the content and development, if any, of the Church's eschatological ideas. The fifth book of Irenaeus' great work, the 'Adversus Haereses' (Against Heresies) is in particular the area in which we should look for a comprehensive treatment of his eschatology. However, eschatological references are scattered throughout the five books of this work, as also in his 'Demonstratio', Demonstration of...
Apostolic Preaching), his shorter and later work, which is extant.
In addition, however, to direct and indirect references to eschatological
themes, we can gain much from a study of the leading themes of Irenaeus'
theology as a whole. What cannot be harmonised with the chief
preoccupations in a man's system of thought is probably not to be taken
too seriously, though, of course, we much reckon with the fact that
great thinkers are not always consistent.

It will, therefore, be our concern to show that certain eschatological
concepts are integral to, and imbedded in, the very stuff of Irenaeus'
theology. In particular Irenaeus' recapitulation theory, together with
the characteristically Eastern stress upon incorruptibility as a major
blessing of the Gospel, will be examined. We shall endeavour to show
the relation of Irenaeus' eschatology to this complex of ideas. In
this connection, rather than separately, the question concerning
Irenaeus' millennialist views will be faced. This order seems logical,
in so far as we believe that the concept of an earthly millennium
was for Irenaeus a concept consistent with his whole view of God's plan
in history. This study will lead us to an examination of Irenaeus'
concept of history.

A second major area will centre around Irenaeus' references to
the demonic element in history. Considerations concerning Antichrist
in the thinking of Irenaeus will be seen to have an intimate connection
with his view of the original apostasy in heaven, with the Fall, with
demonic working in history. Harnack regarded this emphasis upon
the demonic as a concession upon the part of Irenaeus in an area
of his theology where he was influenced by moralistic Apologetic
concepts, a concession to the typically Gnostic sense of the need for
redemption.¹

¹ op. cit., p.237.
This whole thesis will have to be examined, in order to bring out clearly Irenaeus' presuppositions. A third major area of concern in Irenaeus' major work is that of the preservation of Christian truth against heresy. In Irenaeus' day the concept of a 'regula fidei' (rule of faith) was more clearly emerging. We must examine the origins of this idea, and ask ourselves to what extent historical considerations (resistance to the Gnostics and others) predominated, and to what extent there is concealed within it a powerful theological element. Thus, we have to ask ourselves whether Irenaeus did not see the heresies which he was combating as prophesied beforehand by Jesus Christ and as part of a pre-determined programme of history. To what extent have Irenaeus' views on tradition, apostolic succession, and connected themes, a basis in a particular view of history, which is eschatologically oriented?

Correlative to the concepts of truth and heresy are those of the Church and the sects. What views did Irenaeus hold concerning the Church? This investigation must needs merge to some extent with the preceding one. His view of the sacraments of Baptism and the Supper, together with his concept of Church offices, may well be found to yield a strong pastoral emphasis, where the pastor is the one who is entrusted with the flock of God for whom he must give account at the Judgment Day.

Irenaeus' view of the Holy Spirit will require special investigation also, in so far as the Son and the Spirit are seen as the 'hands' of God, and in so far as the Church age is uniquely the dispensation of the Spirit. Discussions of Irenaeus' view of tradition and apostolic succession, which leave his understanding of the Spirit's role to one side, are necessarily vitiated. The Spirit has a unique connection with eschatology in a theology that sees all history as
the stage upon which God by His Spirit drives man towards his predestined goal and in which the consummation of this process in the final resurrection is viewed as uniquely the activity of the Spirit of God.

These are the themes which shall engage our attention. We may perhaps sum up in advance certain conclusions which we believe this study will properly lead us to, as this will help us the better to see Irenaeus' part in the development of eschatology in the Early Church. Essentially Irenaeus seems at one with primitive Christian eschatology. His emphasis upon a restored earth suggests to us that millenarianism requires closer attention and greater respect than it is usually afforded. Irenaeus uniquely combines the concepts of the end of the age as an irruptive event and as the consummation of God's historical purposes; the latter receives the emphasis.

Harnack assures us that Irenaeus' thinking contained two dominating ideas. These were, first, the conviction (suggested by his opposition to Gnosticism) that the Creator of the world and the supreme God are one and the same, and, second, the conviction that Christianity is real redemption and this effected through the appearance of Christ. Irenaeus' major work seeks to adapt to these two fundamental thoughts all the materials found in Holy Scripture and in the Church's rule of faith. In this Irenaeus was not entirely successful.

"His archaic eschatological disquisitions are of a heterogeneous nature, and a great deal of his material, as, for instance, Pauline formulae and thoughts, he completely emptied of its content inasmuch as he merely contrived to turn it into a testimony of the oneness and absolute causality of God the Creator..."

Harnack finds much of this repetitious and wearisome but considers

---

1 op. cit. p. 237
that it was this very repetitiousness that gave it effectiveness. It was only "the insufficient Christological and especially the eschatological disquisitions" which "spoiled the enjoyment of the work in later times." 1

If what Harnack is here saying is that Irenaeus gathered Christian thinking, both within Scripture and the Church's summary of her faith, around certain leading ideas, whereas another creative synthesis might have adopted certain other leading ideas around which to group the material, probably no one will register dissent.

It is, for example, doubtless true that Irenaeus betrays a characteristically Eastern emphasis upon incorruptibility, whereas Western thinking was characteristically to become much more concerned about those aspects of the Gospel which deal with the forgiveness of sins and man's standing before God, legally conceived. However, one suspects that Harnack's criticism is intended to be somewhat more damaging than that. There is the suggestion that to some extent, at least, Irenaeus has attempted to force into a mould certain elements which are not really homogeneous. With this judgment we would wish to disagree.

Harnack himself had a ready appreciation of Irenaeus' achievement within its limits. He fruitfully compares the Gnostic explanation of the world and of redemption with that offered by Irenaeus. The Gnostics, he tells us---

"saw in the empiric world a faulty combination of opposing elements, and therefore recognized in the redemption by Christ the separation of what was unnaturally united. Irenaeus, on the contrary, who began with the idea of the absolute causality of God the Creator, saw in the empiric world faulty estrangements and separations, and therefore viewed the redemption by Christ as the reunion of things unnaturally separated--the 'recapitulation'. (Vincendae invisibilis)" 2

1 op. cit. p. 237 n.2.

2 op. cit., p.238.
Harnack sees as the merits of Irenaeus' view his realisation that Christianity must offer redemption; that "this speculative thought", i.e. the conjoining of Creation and Redemption through 'recapitulatio', put him in touch with certain aspects of Pauline thinking; and that it put Christology in the centre. Harnack appears to have thought of Gnosticism and speculation in the one bracket, for to him the 'recapitulatio' theory, whatever its attractiveness, hovered on the brink of Gnosticism. Two things only delivered it from this fate. One was Irenaeus' adherence to the eschatology of the 'elders'. The other was the other "dissimilar theory" that "Christ, as the teacher, imparts to men, who are free and naturally constituted for fellowship with God, the knowledge which enables them to imitate God, and thus by their own act to attain communion with Him." 1

What appears curious in this assessment made by Harnack is that the eschatology is represented as an element that Irenaeus received from tradition which was almost accidentally to hand. It appears clear, however, that, even if Irenaeus' eschatology were traditional, it was no accidental feature in his thinking. 'Creation--incarnation-final restoration': this concatenation of events or times seems fundamental to Irenaeus, the Incarnation being the pivot of the whole. In similar fashion, Harnack's assessment of the concept of Christ as the Teacher as a deposit from the Apologists seems hardly to do justice to the integral way in which Jesus' teaching was for Irenaeus bound up with Christ's redemptive enterprise. To Harnack this emphasis was essentially 'moralistic'. We submit that, to Irenaeus, it was necessary to an adequate and

1 op. cit. pp. 239-240
comprehensive view of redemption. Part of what Christ offers men, bound in their sin in Irenaeus' view (despite Harnack!), is the knowledge which looses their chains or the light which shines in darkness produced through the demonic deception and enslavement of the human race.

Whether or not Irenaeus' 'recapitulatio' concept overemphasizes certain aspects of New Testament thinking (perhaps especially Pauline and Johannine elements) at the expense of others, whether or not it be judged an adequate structuring of dominant Christian ideas and convictions, there seems little doubt that all the parts of Irenaeus' system neatly belong together. In this whole eschatology does not play the most central part, but it is one of the three leading motifs, viz. Creation, Incarnation, Restoration, and it is not the least important since what is to be expresses the purpose of Creation.

THE CONCEPT OF RECAPITULATION

The concept of recapitulation has been variously interpreted and is certainly elusive of easy definition. Whether, however, 'recapitulatio' or ἐνεμάτησις means the restoration of Creation or the perfection of Creation, it is certain that for Irenaeus creation and its fulfilment are, as it were, on the one base line, and that that base line runs through Jesus Christ and the Incarnation. Creation, Christology, and Eschatology are here linked in a uniquely decisive fashion. Gustaf Wingren shows a profound understanding of this link. He comments that "the thought of the Son as being the first-born before the whole Creation, and the One in whom everything has been created, is inseparably linked with the idea that everything is to be judged by the Son." ¹ What is central in Irenaeus' thinking

is neither Creation nor Eschatology but the Incarnation, or, if we like, Christology. This Christology, however, is not thought through in static but rather in dynamic terms: it is concerned primarily with Christ's Work rather than His Person, or with His Person in action in creation and in redemption. Especially is Christ's activity viewed in its relationship to its effect upon man. Man, again, is viewed not as a static entity but as one created for a purpose. It is man's failure to fulfil his destiny through the Fall that provides the ground and occasion for Christ's redemptive enterprise. Redemption, however, is not merely an exercise which restores man to his original state, but it is rather the fulfilment of that which was never fulfilled on account of sin. Thus again the static concepts are displaced in Irenaeus and dynamic concepts replace them. This allows for redemption and creation to be viewed as essentially one movement and Jesus Christ is the base line through which God's action passes at all times.

1. The Image of God

Wingren notes that the concept of the divine image, based on Gen.1:26, is most significant for an understanding of Irenaeus' thinking in this connection. For it is not just that man is made in God's image but that this image is Christ.\(^1\) So man was made in the Son of God: this is why it is through the Incarnation of the Son that man is first made capable of realizing his destiny, a destiny which will only be fully realized in the consummation of all things. It is a fact that Gen.1:26 keeps recurring in Irenaeus in widely differing contexts. This appears to show how fundamental the concept of the Imago was for Irenaeus. Especially important, however, is the thought that Christ is the Imago.
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This concept is made explicit at Demonstratio XXII:

"For He (God) made man the image of God; and the image of God is the Son, after whose image man was made: and for this cause He appeared in the end of the times that He might show the image (to be) like unto Himself."

Therefore, only through the Incarnation, in view of the Fall, can man's destiny become fulfilled. Irenaeus' theology, more than that of any other of the ancient Fathers of the Church, stresses the humanity of God. Adam's repudiation of his destiny debarred him from true humanity. Therefore Creation can only reach its original goal through Christ's reversal of Adam's choice.

We shall now endeavour with some examples to illustrate the interconnection of Creation, Incarnation, and Consummation through the understanding of Jesus Christ as the One through Whom man for the first time really becomes man. For this is basic to our understanding of Irenaeus' eschatology. If this base line be sound and if we are dealing not merely with a parallel between Creation and Redemption in Christ but rather with a dynamic thrust of God towards the fulfillment of man's destiny, it is manifest that the Consummation conceived of must be one here on earth, in space and in time. It indicates in advance that Irenaeus' eschatology must be realist in character, and Irenaeus' millenarianism finds here its true theological source and ground, whatever historical links it may also have.

The interconnection of the beginning and the end of all things may perhaps best be set forth initially by a consideration of the five passages in the 'Adversus Haereses' which quote Gen.1: 26. The first two references (I.xxiv.1 and I.xxx.6) deal with the concept, accepted by the followers of Saturninus and other Gnostics, that man was made in the image of angels. Closely connected with this repudiated Gnostic concept is Irenaeus' assertion (iv. xx.1):
"Non ergo angeli facerunt nos neque plasmaverunt nos, neque enim angeli poterant imaginem facere Dei, neque alius quis praeter verum Deum, neque virtus longe absistens a Patre universorum. Neque enim indigebat horum Deus ad faciendum quae ipse apud se praefinierat fieri, quasi ipse suas non haberet manus. Adest enim ei semper Verbum et Sapientia, Filius et Spiritus, per quos et in quibus omnia libere et sponte facit, ad quos et loquitur, dicens: Faciamus hominem ad imaginem et similitudinem nostram, ipsa a semetipso substantiam creaturarum et exemplum factorum et figuram in mundo ornamentalum accipiens."

In bald terms what this passage denies is that God needed angels to make man. It is noteworthy, however, that God's personal trinitarian activity in creation is largely the very meaning of making man in the divine image. Thus, the concept of the Image of God is for Irenaeus in this passage not so much a static concept but rather a dynamic one: man's being is the result of the intention of the threefold Divine Being. Clearly Irenaeus considered that the idea that angels made man out of their image, or that man was made by some inferior deity, concealed the implication that God either could not make man Himself or that man was not the product of the divine intention. What is at stake for Irenaeus is much more than the question whether man's constitution, conceived as a static entity, mirrors the divine: the question is whether, as Gen.I: 26 indicates, man is in fact the object of God's very special favour and intention. A wrong interpretation of this passage is no mere academic matter: rather it involves a denial that God has a special purpose of humanity. Thus, we have to see that from the beginning God had a purpose for mankind and Gnostic theories err primarily in that they conceal the true grandeur of God's personal and direct intention. Further, although it is God's intention which is primarily in view in the 'Imago' concept, rather than the thought of any parallelism between God's constitution and man's constitution, yet it is made clear that man's constitution is the result of the divine intention and cannot
therefore be set aside under any of its aspects, both the 'substance' and 'form' of what was made coming from God Himself. This is adequate and impelling reason for defending man's bodily constitution as something which cannot be set aside. Although the emphasis is upon God's intention in the 'Imago' concept, it is possible that a more static concept of the divine and human constitutions is also in view: if this be so, then again man's bodily constitution must mirror the divine constitution. To the Hebrew mind this would by no means have been an impossible conception. God's ineffability did not necessarily consist in possessing a non-bodily constitution. Rather it consisted in the surpassing glory of that constitution, however conceived.

The passage at Book iii, chapter xxiii, is possibly the most important as it is certainly the most discursive of the treatments of the 'Imago' concept. Here Irenaeus is concerned to refute the heretical statement of Tatian that Adam will not be saved. Irenaeus says:

"Mentiuntur ergo omnes qui contradicunt eius saluti, semper seipsos excludentes a uita in eo quod non credant inuontam quae perierat: si autem illa non est inuenta, adhuc possidetur in perditione omnis hominis generation." (para. 8)

This passage has some very illuminating comments to make concerning man's creation, fallen condition, salvation, and destiny, and the reference to the 'Imago' concept is integral to the chapter as a whole. The following are its basic ingredients.

i. It is asserted that it is as descendants of Adam that we possess 'his title, i.e. that we are made in God's image:

"Nos autem omnes ex ipso; et quoniam sumus ex ipso, propter quam ipsius hereditauius appellationem." (para. 2).
ii. God would not be so unfair or lacking in compassion as to deliver the children of the one originally taken captive without delivering that one as a prime consideration.

(Para. 2).

For this reason God pronounced a curse not against man personally but against the ground. Man had to toil upon the earth with the sweat of his brow while the woman received the pains of childbirth together with subjection to her husband: these were fruits of the changed situation. Irenaeus thus explains the purpose of this:

"ut neque maledicti a Deo in totum perirent, neque sine increpatione perseuerantes Deum contemnerunt." (Para. 3).

iii. The curse did fall in its fullness upon the serpent, upon the one "who is chief of the apostasy" (qui princeps apostasiae est). Hell was prepared for him and his angels, since it was he who caused man to offend. Obdurate persons may fall under this condemnation, however, but Adam showed repentance (Para. 3). As a result of this situation, we read:

"Eum enim odiuit Deus qui seduxit hominem; ei vero qui seductus est sensim paulatimque misertus est." (Para. 5).

Man had been beguiled, Irenaeus notes, with the false promise of immortality. (Para. 5).

iv. God drove Adam out of Paradise and away from the tree of life, lest his sin should become an eternal one. Death is thus to be construed as an act of God's mercy and as a sign of His intention to provide salvation for men.

"Prohibuit autem eius transgressionem, interponens mortem et cessare faciens peccatum, finem inferens ei per carnis resolutionem quae fieret in terra, uti cessans aliquando homo uiuere peccato et moriens ei inciperet uiuere Deo." (Para. 6).
v. Enmity was put between the serpent on the one hand and the
woman and her seed upon the other. God's promise was that
the woman's seed should bring triumph and deliverance to man.
Christ Jesus fulfils this promise. Therefore, His task is to
reverse man's situation. The 'dragon' (draco) was to be bound
and man delivered from death (cf. Rev. 20: 2). Antichrist,
who was to be rampant in the last days, would certainly be
overcome.

"Domino igitur uiuificante Hominem, id est Adam, suacuta est
et more." (para. 7).

Death is the objectification of sin; yet it is no arbitrary
consequence of sin, but the result of God's will and signifies
His gracious intention of ultimate triumph: this is Irenaeus'
meaning.

The implications of this passage in Book iii should be noted
carefully. By implication, it should be observed first of all, 'the
image of God' was not something, some entity or even some state lost by
man through Adam's transgression. For we today share the image with
Adam. Owing to this fact both Adam's sin and Jesus Christ's reversal
of it have consequences for us. The nearest approximation to Irenaeus'
meaning for 'image of God' must, therefore, be the one noted earlier,
viz., that the human race as a whole is the object of God's purpose of
grace and of His salvation. This is essentially a dynamic concept,
one concerned with God's purposes and activities. To say that man
is made in the image of God means, therefore, that he is the recipient
of a unique divine favour.

The human race is also seen to be a unity that cannot be broken
up. This guarantees the historicity of Adam's wrong choice when
deceived by the serpent. Adam is no mere 'Everyman'. He is in a
sense mankind, but not in such a manner as to exclude the historical
genesis of our dreadful apostasy. The concept of apostasy is seen
as the projection upon the human plane of that which began in heaven
among the angels. All this implies a period of innocence before that
of guilt. This is important for our understanding of the eschatology
of Irenaeus, for salvation through Christ is seen as the reversal
of all this. This implies a salvation in time, an affirmation of
our humanity, the fruit of Christ's right choice for mankind. This
does not lead us back to the period of innocence but for the first
time to the proper fruit of the choice that men originally answered
or made in the wrong way. Some of this is implicit in this chapter;
some of it is quite manifest.

The concept of immortality, as opposed to death, is quite
prominent throughout. It has been recognized that the Eastern branch
of the Church generally placed greater emphasis upon this aspect of
the Gospel, that it brought incorruptibility to men. This feature
may be derived from the psychology of those in the eastern end of
the Mediterranean basin in the early centuries after Christ. However,
Irenaeus views it in the light of a profound exegesis of the Genesis
account of the Fall, for who can doubt that the whole Genesis account
is implicit in his thinking and arguing, and that Gen.1:26 is but a
significant outcropping of that solid assumption? Often we in the
West tend to think of this Eastern emphasis as materialistic. To
Irenaeus it was a biblical way of looking at things, to be entirely
realist and to give the body its due place in the divine 

If death was the merciful interim provision of God, Christ's salvation
must mean its total abolition.

This passage at iii:xxiii is noteworthy in the interconnection
that it gives to certain ideas that are always latent in Irenaeus.
It connects the theme of 'recapitulation' with that of incorruptibility: it sets death in its biblical perspective as an intruder in God's universe. It sees the sin that required undoing or reversal as the result of a cosmic Fall, and basing itself upon the doctrine of that Fall, it gives a profound analysis of man as the recipient of God's favour, in that man is presented with the choice of remaining obdurate and perishing with Satan and his angels or of turning to Christ and being freed for his original destiny, an incorruptible one. It relates Creation and Redemption: it shows that the work in the Incarnation is to complete what was begun prior to man's deception in the Garden. Above all, it shows the Imago concept as one bound up with God's intention and loving creative and redemptive activity. It even introduces Providence and the divine patience in history as interim measures of God designed to serve His ultimate purpose of grace realized in Jesus Christ.

The fifth passage which mentions GenI:26 is Book IV in the Preface, paragraph 4. This gives a remarkable anthropology:

"Homo est enim temperatio animae et carnis, qui secundum similitudinem Dei formatus est et per manus ejus plasmatus est, hoc est per Filium et Spiritum, quibus et dixit: Faciamus hominem."

What this passage is endeavouring to show is that man in his physical constitution was designed by God and that it is man thus designed who receives the salvation of God. Thus, the Gnostics by their repudiation of the body do violence to the handiwork of God. The 'flesh' is said to be 'God's workmanship'. Thus, the anxiety to show that God is the creator is not a disparate interest from that which is concerned to teach the reality of the Incarnation, of the resurrection of the body and related doctrines. Irenaeus' thinking is essentially a unity. The basic understanding of Gen. I: 26 is
again in terms of God's intention.

By implication all of the passages cited see the 'image of God' as man made by and in God, Father, Son and Holy Spirit. Man in his total constitution is the object of God's love and favour in creation, providence, and in redemption. In so far as God's intention stands firm and man's constitution is not abolished, this image remains; though Irenaeus never debates the question whether the 'image' has been defaced or removed or remains. Eschatology is not in the centre: God's redemption in Jesus Christ properly occupies the focal point. Yet salvation is towards something and it is the inclusion of man's physical nature in God's salvation, both now and in the hereafter, that Irenaeus is concerned about, when he turns his attention to man.

11. Uses of Concept and Terminology of 'Recapitulatio'.

It seems clear that, though the Imago concept has much to tell us by implication regarding the continuity of creation, incarnation, and final redemption, yet actual uses of the concept and terminology of ἡ ἁλαζίωσις or 'recapitulatio' should be one major source of insight regarding Irenaeus' whole concept of the continuity of God's activity in history. The concepts which are integral to Irenaeus' thinking are mainly dynamic concepts, ones which deal with God's activity, such as ἡ ἁλαζίωσις and οἰκονομία the latter relating to God's disposition of things. The former is especially central. Wingren remarks with justice that we cannot with Loofs isolate the doctrine of ἡ ἁλαζίωσις from the rest of the teaching of the Adversus Haereses and on this basis erect a theology of Justin Martyr (from whom Irenaeus may have got the concept) and 'Irenaeus selbst' with reference to 'recapitulatio' which is quite independent of and unrelated to, the principal sources of Irenaeus' major work. As Wingren truly says,
"In point of fact it is 'recapitulatio' which creates unity in the theology of Irenaeus, whatever the source of this concept may be." 1

Wingren goes on illuminatingly for our understanding of this concept to say:

"Recapitulation means the accomplishment of God's plan of salvation and this accomplishment is within history, in a time-sequence, and is not an episode at one particular point of time. It is a continuous process in which the c[phi]covox[gamma], dispositio, of God is manifested by degrees." 1

Of this concept, though not of the term, the passage noted in BookIII XXIII; 5 is an excellent example: here it refers to God's showing compassion on deceived mankind "by degrees, and little by little" (sensim paulatimque). This passage has this concept, central to Irenaeus and 'recapitulatio', of a movement within history, a gradual unfolding of the saving activity of God. Nevertheless, it is significant that the term is not used in this passage, because, although c[phi]covox[gamma] has reference to the whole of God's ordering of our salvation, the concept of 'recapitulation' appears to belong properly to the Incarnate Christ.

"It is only the Incarnate One, the One who has been made flesh, who recapitulates. All that Christ does from His birth at Bethlehem until the judgment of the world He does as the One who was incarnate." 2

Wingren goes on to note in this last passage that Christ's humanity is part not only of His death, but also of His resurrection and dominion over the world. The corollary of this is that Christ's humanity is not laid aside. It is in this humanity that 'recapitulatio' will reach its climax. Although Wingren does not clearly draw the line of connection at this point, we see here by implication that the part

1. op.cit., p.81
2. op. cit., pp.82-83
of the divine movement of recapitulation which yet has to be consummated will be fulfilled in time because it will be consummated by a Christ who is and remains fully human. Thus, the realism of Book V of the Adversus Haereses has its basis in a profound conviction about Christology, about Christ's Person and Work. It is not just Christ's flesh but Christ's human choices which guarantee for the world a destiny in time and in space.

Thus we have to do, in Irenaeus' concept of recapitulation, not with a metaphysical theory of flesh, statically conceived, but with the idea of a movement in history, essentially dynamic in kind. Again, we observe Irenaeus' dynamism—not a philosophy but a theology of history. Irenaeus' concept appears to have a biblical basis, taking over and developing Paul's thought at Eph.1;10, where the Greek word for 'recapitulatio' occurs in a verbal form. It is not quite clear from an important passage in Book IV.vi: 2 whether Irenaeus was developing a hint from Justin Martyr, but the ultimate basis seems to be Pauline. *1 It may be useful, in this connection, to look briefly at some of the passages which quote Eph.1;10, as they may be supposed to show us how Irenaeus understood that verse and the related concept

---

*1

This passage reads:

"Et bene Justinus in eo libro qui est ad Marcionem ait quoniam: Ipsa quaque Domino non credidissem alterum Deum annuntianti praeter Fabricatorem et Factorem et Nutritorem nostrum; sed quoniam ab uno Deo, qui et hunc mundum fecit et nos plasmavit et omnia continet et administrat, unigenitus Filius venit ad nos, suum plasma in semetipsum recapitulans, fima est mea ad eum fides et immobillis erga Patrem dilectio, utraque Domino nobis praebente."

of recapitulation.

Eph. I:10 is quoted by Irenaeus at I.X.1. Here the list of articles of faith, commonly believed in the Church, is set forth. This list stresses the concept of dispensations proclaimed by the prophets, the Ascension in the flesh by Jesus Christ, "καὶ τὴν ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν ἐν τῇ δόξῃ τοῦ Πατρὸς παρουσίαν αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὸ ἀνακεφαλαίωσας τὰ πάντα καὶ ἀνωτέρω πάνω σαρκὶ πάσης ἀνθρωπότητος."

Two things are notable in this passage. First, the distinctively futurist emphasis of Eph. I:10 is preserved and the concept is brought into line with the idea of the resurrection from the dead. Second, it seems hinted at in this passage that the common faith of the Church is in itself a sign and anticipation of that unity which will be demonstrated and realized by Christ's appearing: "η μὲν γὰρ ἐκκλησία, κατὰ πάντα τὴς οἰκουμένης ἡσύχασε τὸ καθὲ ἡ συνεκκαθάρισσα, παρά τῶν Ἀποστόλων, καὶ τῶν ἐκείνων μαθηταῖς παραδόθη τῇ πίστει." At Book III.XVI.5ff. Christ Jesus' coming to gather all things to Himself is seem as "per universam dispositionem" (para.5). At the beginning of paragraph 7 these words occur:

"Nihil enim inceptum atque intempestivum apud eum, quomodo nec incongruens est apud Patrem; praecognita sunt enim omnia a Patre, perficiuntur autem a Filio sicut congruum et consequens est apto tempore."

It is noteworthy too, in this section, that although the final drawing together of all things plainly lies ahead, yet in some sense it is already done in Jesus Christ. Thus, Irenaeus' eschatology is bound up with a Christology, which lays stress upon Jesus' humanity:

"In omnibus autem est—homo plasmatio Dei; et hominem ergo in semetipso recapitulatus est—".

It is hard, in the light of this, to see how Irenaeus can be accused of an inadequate Christology.

Central to the outworking of recapitulation in Irenaeus are
chapters XVIII and XXI of Book III of the Adversus Haereses, together
with some passages from Book V. Chapter XVIII ends with these words:

"Si autem non factus caro parebat quasi caro, non erat verum opera eius. Quod autem parebat hoc erat, Deus hominis antiquam plasmationem in se recapitulans, ut occideret quidem peccatum, evacuaret autem mortem et ululificaret hominem: et propter hoc uera opera eius." (para. 7)

This whole chapter, especially the closing sections, makes it clear that Christ's redemptive achievement rested on His being both divine and human and upon His passing through every stage of life, so that God and man could be brought into concord throughout. This is why here and elsewhere the concept of the Virgin Birth is important to Irenaeus. Again Irenaeus' refusal to think in static terms comes out at this point. Sin had to be combated at the points where it was and has been effective. This involved a voluntary identification of the Word of God with man in the likeness of His experience and also Christ's free choice not only of these situations but His free choice of the right from within them, so that Adam's error is undone and reversed.

Irenaeus refused to think of man except as a unity in solidarity; hence the identification of the Word of God had to be with the likeness of our first parents. As III. XXI. 10 puts it:

"Si igitur primus Adam habuit patrem hominem et ex semine uiri natus est, merito dicerent et secundum Adam ex Ioseph esse generatum. Si autem ille de terra quidem sumptus est et Verbo Dei plasmatus est, oportebat id ipsum verbum recapitulationem Adae in semetipsum faciens, eiusdem generationis habere similitudinem." *1

What is involved here is no mere desire for point-to-point correspondence with Adam's state, for its own sake only: Irenaeus saw that only as One

---

*1 Ei toýn ou pòutos Adam èexe patéra lêvrístw, kai ek òspérmatos... ègevnèsth, eikos esti, kai toû òspitérou Adam lexein èwtais èk Iwthf gegevnhsth. Ei òk òkeívous ek vês elêphth, plásthke de èwta ò theos..., òkai kai toû òkkhefamaioswçous ðe òwton [toû úpto toû òtheou... pellamaioswçon àovróspitousw], òkai òthe epèchous tì gegevnhsew èxhèn ómióttita.

The above Greek text for this passage is given in a quotation by Theodoret in his Dial.I (Schulze 52, Clark 2 f.15'4-II). The section in brackets is omitted in Clark's critical edition. There is no significant variation between the Greek and Latin texts at this point.
thus woven into human flesh could our Lord become man and undo Adam's error without Himself being involved in human wilfulness which belongs to the whole human race since the Fall. Thus, the Virgin Birth is demanded by the doctrine of recapitulation, not because it gives a point-to-point correspondence with Adam's condition, but because it puts Jesus Christ at the point where the source of man's distress can be dealt with: thus from Virgin Birth onwards right up to death itself, Christ is engaged in a dynamic movement of engagement with the results of man's deception in the Garden.

Very significant, indeed, in this account is the importance attributed to the removal of the power of death. Various motifs gather together to produce this result.

First, there is the fact that Irenaeus has the Genesis account of the Fall always in mind. Death is there depicted as the result of sin, and is interpreted by Irenaeus, as we have seen above, to be an act of grace on God's part designed to preserve man for the possibility of deliverance and to keep him from eternal judgment which was designed for the devil and his angels. Second, incorruptibility is shown as being the natural condition of man, in the sense that such was God's original intention for man, an intention now again creatively and triumphantly made known in Christ. What corruptibility suggests is the decay of what God had made, and the interest of passages such a chapter as III.XVIII.7 is with vivification and the open declaration that death is "no king but a robber" (latronem et non regem). Third, always implicit in Irenaeus is the judgment that if death is but an interim measure, given in God's kindness to lessen the effects of sin, then clearly the condition of believers which follows Christ's triumph, where they are still subject to death, is but a lengthening of the period of sin's apparent dominion before sin and death are finally put away. Thus,
the eschatological note is a necessary part of Irenaeus' concept of God's purpose for creation: he could never have rested content with a 'realized eschatology'. This becomes especially evident in Book V, where the implications of Irenaeus' recapitulation concept for eschatology becomes a theme of major interest. To this we now turn.

The concept of recapitulation is quite integral to the Demonstratio as well as to the Adversus Haereses. The scheme of the former book is to deal with the work of each individual Person in the divine Godhead in turn. Thus, the Father is portrayed as the Creator, the Son as the Agent in creation and as the One Who became man "at the end of the times", while the Holy Spirit is depicted as having guided the Fathers under the Old Covenant and as having been poured out in a new way upon mankind "in the end of the times." (VI). In the chapters which follow this early statement, the story of mankind is set forth, in relation to its original creation by the Father and Adam's Fall together with its consequences, right through from the Garden to the Incarnation, the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ and the descent of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost with the implications of that event for mission.

Thus, the recounting of the respective work of Father, Son and Spirit is related to the history of mankind.

It is, therefore, primarily, in regard to the section dealing with the Incarnation that the work of the Son is set forth, but the scheme of the book sets the scene for the dynamic way in which that work is understood. What has gone before has shown how Adam fell into sin, with the consequences of his error. It has traced man's continuing sin and God's grace under the Old Covenant. Now, with the coming of Christ, it is understood that His task is to reverse the consequences of man's sin. We note briefly one or two passages which make clear the understanding of 'recapitulatio' in the Demonstratio.
VI. "The second point (in the rule of faith) is: The Word of God, Son of God, Christ Jesus our Lord, who was manifested to the prophets according to the form of their prophesying and according to the method of the dispensation of the Father: through whom all things were made; who also at the end of the times, to complete and gather up all things, was made man among men, visible and tangible, in order to abolish death and show forth life and produce and community of union between God and man." (italics and brackets comment mine).

XXX. This chapter speaks of the sending of the prophets to the Jews and to Jerusalem. These men were heralds of the revelation of Jesus Christ, the Son of God, "declaring that from the posterity of David His flesh should blossom forth; that after the flesh He might be the son of David, who was the son of Abraham by a long succession; but according to the spirit Son of God, pre-existing with the Father, begotten before all the creation of the world, and at the end of the times appearing to all the world as man, the Word of God gathering up in Himself all things that are in heaven and that are on earth."

The italicised words (thus italicised in J. Armitage Robinson's translation) are, of course, a direct quotation from Eph.1:10.

XXXI. The passage which immediately follows on the words quoted from chapter XXX is interesting, as showing the connection in Irenaeus' mind between the concepts of recapitulation and incorruptibility.

It reads thus:-

"So then He united man with God, and established a community of union between God and man; since we could not in any other way participate in incorruption, save by His coming among us. For so long as incorruption was invisible and unrevealed, it helped us not at all: therefore it became visible, that in all respects we might participate in the reception of incorruption. And, because in the original formation of Adam all of us were tied and bound up with death through his disobedience, it was right that through the obedience of Him who was made man for us we should be released from death: and because death reigned over the flesh, it was right that through the flesh it should lose its force and let man go free from its oppression."

Clearly physical death is here seen as the consequence of the Fall.

This consequence, however, is the result of God's deliberate punishment of sin, a punishment, which--as we saw earlier (page 477) and with reference to the Adversus Haereses(III.XXIII.6.)--is mixed with mercy, in that it keeps man's sin from becoming eternal in character. Christ's resurrection in the flesh reverses the
situation of man's servitude under death, but Christ's resurrection rests upon His obedience to the Father. Thus, we find here the concern about incorruptibility which is typical of so-called Eastern Christianity. At the same time, it is clear that deliverance from death is not thought of in a "metaphysical" manner as the result of the union of God's being with our flesh: rather is it that Jesus Christ, by His perfect moral obedience, makes possible a physical resurrection which shows in realistic terms that the sentence of death, passed by God on man's sin, has now been dealt with, and that freedom from death is God's purpose for man. Not only does this passage show us that Irenaeus does not think in a metaphysical way about incorruptibility, it also shows the link between ' recapitulatio' and incorruptibility, because what is envisaged is the reversing of Adam's disobedience and subsequent death by the obedience of Jesus Christ and the ensuing gift of immortality in the resurrection. This is not merely a matter of parallelism: it is rather that Christ removes for all men the entail of Adam's sin. Just as Adam's sin meant death for all men, so Christ's obedience means that man is freed from sin's oppression.

XXXII. This chapter continues with the theme of recapitulation. It sees a congruity between the making of Adam from virgin earth (God took the dust of the earth and formed man) and Jesus Christ's birth from the Virgin Mary. Neither Adam nor Jesus Christ issued from an act of human procreation. This congruity made it possible for Christ to create a fresh beginning for mankind. Irenaeus says:

"So then the Lord, summing up afresh this man (i.e. Adam and his posterity), took the same dispensation of entry into flesh, being born from the Virgin by the Will and the Wisdom of God; that He also should show forth the likeness of Adam's entry into flesh, and there should be that which was written in the beginning, man made after the image and likeness of God" (first set of italics and bracketed words mine).

XXXIII. Here the contrast is made between the "disobedient virgin"
(Eve) and the "Virgin who was obedient" (Mary). The same parallel is worked out in Adversus Haereses III.XXII.1 and V.XIX.1. It is also found in Justin Martyr (Dialogue C) and in Tartullian (De Carne Christi XVII). Irenaeus thus sums up the relevance of this parallel:

"--it was necessary that Adam should be summed up in Christ, that mortality might be swallowed up and overwhelmed by immortality; and Eve summed up in Mary, that a virgin should be a virgin's intercessor, and by a virgin's obedience undo and put away the disobedience of a virgin". (italics mine).

The emphasis falls not upon Mary's achievement, but upon the principle of recapitulation. The above passages show clearly that the concept of 'recapitulatio' is central to the Demonstration as it is to the Adversus Haereses. Again, the concept is present, even where the actual terminology is absent. Chapter XXXIV has a magnificent passage which portrays Christ's obedience even unto death as putting away the "old disobedience", and goes on to speak of Christ's Cross as being visibly inscribed upon the universe. This whole passage reads:

"Now seeing that He is the Word of God Almighty, who in unseen wise in our midst is universally extended in all the world, and encompasses its length and breadth and height and depth—for by the Word of God the whole universe is ordered and disposed—in it is crucified the Son of God, inscribed crosswise upon it all: for it is right that He being made visible, should set upon all things visible the sharing of His cross, that He might show His operation on visible things through a visible form. For He it is who illuminates the height, that is the heavens; and encompasses the deep which is beneath the earth; and stretches and spreads out the length from east to west; and steers across the breadth of north and south; summoning all that are scattered in every quarter to the knowledge of the Father."

Probably the thought at this point depends upon a passage in Justin Martyr's First Apology, chapter LX. Justin attributes to Plato the words: Ἐ Χ ἴασεν ἡ φῶτον ἐν τῇ πάντε (of Timaeus XXXVI.13). Justin accuses Plato, who, as he avers, knew Moses' writing, of misunderstanding the story of the Brazen Serpent—which was, of course, a type of the Cross of Jesus Christ. The term, Χ ἱασμι, refers to the form of the letter 'X'. Plato seems to be speaking of the soul of the universe
in this passage in the Timaeus. The point which Irenaeus is making is that the Word of God was the Agent in creation and is the One Who sustains the universe. In the visible Cross of Calvary this sustaining power which maintains the universe is visibly manifested. And just as the power of the Word brings the remotest confines of the universe into touch with those that are nearer, so that same power operating through the Cross brings men from all parts of the earth (i.e. Jew and Gentile) to the knowledge of the Father. Christ is here depicted as the Word of God, but it should be noted that it is this same Word as congruous with our humanity (as Agent in creation, as Sustainer of creation, and now as fully man Himself in the Incarnation) Who guarantees the future of humanity. The contrast is with man's "old disobedience" and its consequences. Man under the sentence of death, on account of his sin, is brought from every part of the earth into the true knowledge of God through the achievement of the Word of God on the Cross, Who is at once God and Man. The theme of 'recapitulatio' is implicit in this.

Book V of the larger work is specially concerned with eschatology. Recapitulation is specifically mentioned in a number of places, including V.XII.4 and V.XIV.2. We will look briefly at these in turn before noting some other passages where the term is lacking but the idea is fundamental. The former tells us much not only about recapitulation but also about Irenaeus' doctrine of the Holy Spirit and of the Spirit's relationship with the created order."Quemadmodum enim corruptelae capax est caro", Irenaeus begins this section (V.XII.1),"sic et incorruptelae, et quemadmodum mortis, sic et vitae". The flesh is thus seen as neutral, not as opposed in itself to what is spiritual. In section 4 of the same chapter Irenaeus continues: "Fructus autem operis spiritus est carnis salus. Quis enim alius
This section calls attention specifically to the thought that by putting on the new man (Col. 3:10), in the image of the Creator, we are thinking of the recapitulation of fallen man. This passage, then, sees "the salvation of the flesh" (salus carnis) as the final fruit of the Spirit's working. There is something magnificent in the concept of this final state as representing the "maturity" (maturam) of the flesh. Resurrection is then seen in Jesus Christ, through putting on Whom inward and outward benefits accrue to a man. It is He who recapitulates, but our union with Him will lead to our physical resurrection at the end of the age: this is the plain meaning of Irenaeus. Significant, too, for Irenaeus' doctrine of the Spirit is that His Person and Work are presented dynamically, in terms of what He does for the flesh. The Spirit has, indeed, an invisible character, but the effect of His working is to fulfil God's original purpose in creation and this includes incorruptibility of the flesh.

V. XIV.2 informs us that Christ was recapitulating the original man: this was why it was necessary for Him to assume flesh and blood. To have assumed any other substance would not have sufficed for our salvation. Christ was "non alteram quandam, sed illam principalem Patris plasmationem in se recapitulans, exquirens id quod perierat."

V.2 is also an instructive chapter in this regard, even though the term 'recapitulation' is not used, either as a noun or in verbal form. In this chapter Irenaeus assures us that in the Incarnation God came to His own property. Christ has not snatched us away unrighteously as if we were rightly someone else's property: "quantum attinet quidem ad apostasiam, juste, suo san guine redimens
Here the reference is to the Fall of the angels. From Satan and his minions Christ does indeed snatch man, but this is a righteous act, for we do not properly belong to the devil but to God. To us in the Incarnation He shows His grace. This, however, means, says Irenaeus, that we vainly despise "universam dispositionem Dei" (para.2).

Irenaeus goes on to collate with the flesh and blood of our Lord, on the one hand, and the body rendered incorruptible, on the other, the bread and wine of the Eucharist: "Si autem non salvetur haec (i.e. caro, flesh), videlicet nec Dominus sanguine suo redemit nos, neque calix Eucharistiae communicatio sanguinis ejus est, neque panis quem frangimus communicatio corporis ejus est."

Irenaeus' reasoning is involved and difficult in what follows, but it is significant and important. He sees it as meaningful that bread and wine, fruits of the created order, are used in the Eucharist. These normally strengthen our bodies. However, it is clear that for Irenaeus this is only an analogy of a special way in which they are used by the Spirit of God in the Eucharist and what the Eucharist symbolises and effects in regard to our union with Jesus Christ.

"Quando ergo et mixtus calix et factus panis percepit verbum Dei et fit Eucharistiae sanguinis et corporis Christi, ex quibus agetur et consistit carnis nostrae substantia, quomodo carnem negant capacem esse donationis Dei quae est vita aeterna, quae sanguine et corpore Christi nutritur et membrum ejus est?" (V.II.3).
What Irenaeus seems to mean is that our participation in the elements of the Eucharist is an effective symbol of the resurrection of the body at the end of the age. The reasoning is twofold. Firstly, bread and wine nourish the physical body, so we as persons are nourished by that actual raised body of Christ which Paul tells us (Eph. 5:30) we are united with: this is effectively symbolised by the Eucharist, which is indicative of our belonging to that community which derives its substance from Christ, the Church. Secondly, this nourishment is effective, but its effectiveness can only be understood eschatologically, not magically. Very significant is that which follows in this section: "Et quemadmodum lignum vitis depositum in terram suo fructificat tempore, et granum tritici decident in terram et dissolutum multirlex surgit per Spiritum Dei qui continet omnia, quae deinde per sapientiam in usum hominis veniunt, et percepientia verbum Dei Eucharistia fiunt, quod est corpus et sanguis Christi, sic et nostra corpora ex ea nutrita et reposita in terram et resoluta in ea resurgent in suo tempore, Verbo Dei resurrectionem eis donante in gloriab Dei Patris: qui huic mortali immortalitatem circumdat et corruptibili incorruptelam gratuito donat.—" (V.II.3).

A parallel is made between man's body and the corn of wheat falling into the ground: God has a purpose for man's body in the future, which will involve a transformation of it analogous to that which happens to the bread and wine in their new useful state (physical benefit is here in view). However, the reference to the corn of wheat's going into the ground is almost certainly an allusion to the saying of our Lord that it was necessary for Him to die. The whole thought, therefore, is that the bread and wine of the Eucharist are not only physically beneficial, nor even simply that they provide an analogy for the resurrection body or life, but rather that they derive their meaning and effectiveness from the body of the Risen
Lord to which they point. Hence the Eucharist as a symbol of unity with Christ in His risen bodily humanity, does nourish us and prepare us for our full communion with Christ in the freedom of our raised bodies at the end of the age. It is easy to see how the whole passage could be interpreted in terms of transsubstantiation. Rather, however, does the thought seem to oscillate between the physical death and resurrection of our Lord, on the one hand, and the coming resurrection of our own bodies at the end of the age, on the other. What is significant is that Christ's earthly body is taken very seriously: this seems to imply that we cannot identify the elements of the Eucharist with this body which is to appear at the End. Nevertheless these elements identify us with Christ, they do nourish us (perhaps not only spiritually but also physically), and they point forward to our release from bondage at Christ's Appearing. Irenaeus sees it as immensely significant that it is physical elements, elements which are part of God's creative activity, which are so honoured in the Eucharist: this is a symbol and foretastes of that which is reserved for our own bodies on the resurrection morning. Further, it is the concept of recapitulation which runs throughout the whole passage: it is the restoration of God's own handiwork which is at stake and it has been achieved in principle already by Christ's redemption.

V.19 is a significant passage for the concept of recapitulation. Irenaeus thinks that there is divine intention in the form of Christ's death on a 'tree' (lignum) as cancelling out the disobedience of our first parents over the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. Here too the deception that was practised in the Garden is revealed for what it was. Irenaeus goes further in suggesting that Mary's co-operation with God as a virgin forms a contrast to the sin
of Eve. (cf. Demonstratio XXXIII, noted above, pp. 489-490.) It is not
Mary who is exalted, however, but the thought undoubtedly is present
that Mary by her attitude is caught up into the divine plan and she
seems to serve as a minor key in the theme of recapitulation:

"... sicut illa seducta est ut <non> obaudiret Deo, sic et haec suasa est
obaudire Deo, uti virginis Evae virgo Maria fieret advocata..." (V.XIX.1).

The essential thought in this passage, is that Mary was the counterpart
or balance of Eve. This does not alter the basic truth that it is
Christ who recapitulates Adam's sin. Mary only helps, as it were,
in providing the setting for the activity of the Lord. Just as
some of the passages that deal with recapitulation stress the
eschatological or the historical note, so this one may have implications
for Irenaeus' understanding of the Church. If Mary does in any way
stand for the Church, her role is subordinate to that of Christ and
should not be over-emphasized.

The figure of Antichrist serves as another minor key in the
theme of recapitulation:

"Et propter hoc in bestia venienter recapitulatio fit universae
iniquitatis et omnis doli, ut in ea confluens et conclusa omnis virtus
apostatica in caminum mittatur ignis." (V.XXIX.2).

iii. The Coming Millennial Reign of Christ on Earth.

Adversus Haereses, chapter XXXII ff. deal especially with the
view taken by Irenaeus of God's coming Kingdom on earth. This is
seen in a form of millenarianism and this must be seen as in line
with Irenaeus' whole concept of recapitulation. Let us see what the
significant features of Irenaeus' millenarianism are, when compared
with others who advocated this kind of teaching. It should be
noted that the doctrine is not explicitly mentioned in the 'Demonstratio',

but probably too much should not be made of this fact. Irenaeus further develops a millenarianism similar to that found in Papias. According to Daniélou, it is not as radical as that of Justin Martyr, who, as we saw above, Chapter IV, page 408, conceived of the millennium as a time of material pleasures, in which procreation continues. This was Cerinthus' view and was shared by Justin. The least radical view was seen to be that of Methodius of Olympus, who thought of the millennium as a cosmic sabbath in which there is to be a cessation not only of procreation but also of the fruitfulness of earth. Irenaeus is said to follow closely upon the thinking of Papias, holding quite strongly to the concept of material pleasures and the fruitfulness of the earth, but not thinking in terms of the continuance of procreation. This view seems, however, to require qualification (vide below, page 601). We see in Adverses Haereses XXXIII. 3-4 the thought of the renewal of the earth, which was to become abundantly fruitful. Probably Irenaeus has here in mind the thought of a return to the conditions in the Garden before the Fall and the cursing of the ground for man's sake. Irenaeus adds in the same passage that Papias has seen the reconciliation of the animals as occurring at this time. This is remarked upon by him with concurrence and approval. Daniélou interprets this evidence to mean that Papias at least had in mind a first resurrection "in which the just will have a transfigured body, but it will still be earthly and will be followed by a second more complete transformation." ¹

millenarianism, and endeavour at the same time to ask how his millenarianism is related to what we have already noted concerning his theology in general and his view of recapitulation in particular.

Doubtless Irenaeus' millenarianism was not original with him: Nevertheless he had a unique facility for taking such individual deposits of tradition and making them part of a consistent whole.

Danielou's judgment that the quotation at II Peter 3:8 of Ps. 90:4 is probably an exegesis of the latter that was intended consciously to refute millenarianism, by ascribing the thousand years to the times of the Church, has already been noted above, (Chapter III. pp 335-336). Danielou observes that Irenaeus does not exclude this exegesis in terms of the period of the Church, acknowledging that the prophecy of the reconciliation of the animals may legitimately be applied to the union of the nations in the Christian Church (A.H. V.XXXIII.4), but judges that this interpretation cannot account for the whole prophecy (V.XXXV.1). At the same time "his real target is not this typology of the Church, but the allegorism of the Gnostics, which emptied the prophecy of its historical content by transferring it to the timeless world of the Pleroma." 

It was thus primarily, we are told, to combat this Gnostic exegesis, and only secondarily to defend Asiatic millenarianism, that Irenaeus devoted to the question those chapters of the Adversus Haereses with which we are presently concerned. Whether this judgment be completely sound is a matter of individual judgment. Normally Irenaeus' criticism of Gnostic views is integrated with his own positive doctrine to a remarkable degree.

Irenaeus does indeed explicitly set certain prophecies both of the Old Testament and of our Lord within the context of the earthly

1 op.cit. p.386.
reign of the Messiah. Thus, Matt.26:29 and Mk.10:30 are understood as fulfilled in this future earthly period.

Irenæus says:

"Neque enim sursum in supercælesti loco constitutus cum suis potest interlegi hihens vitis generationem, neque rursus sine carne sunt qui nibunt illud: carnis enim proprium est et non spiritus qui ex vite accinitur potus." (V.XXXIII.1).

Again, in the following paragraph, Irenæus quotes the word of Jesus discovered at Mk.10.30 (par. Matt.19.29; Lk.18.29-30). The Marcan and Luken renderings include the phrase "now in this time" (νῦν ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τοῦ αὐτοῦ) Mk.10.30 or "in this time" (ἐν τῇ καιρῷ τοῦ αὐτοῦ) Lk.18.30. In the Latin text of the Adversus Haereses this is rendered by Irenæus "in hoc saeculo", that is, "in this world". Irenæus builds on this phrase retained in the Marcan and Lucan renderings and uses it as a basis for finding the fulfilment of Jesus' promise during the Millennial age on earth. He says:

"Quae enim sunt in hoc saeculo centupla et prandia exhibita pauperibus et cena quae redduntur? Haec sunt in regni temporibus, hoc est in septima die quae est sanctificata, in qua requievit Deus ab omnibus operibus quae fecit, quae est verum justorum sabbatum in qua non facient omne terrenum opus, sed adjacentem habebunt panem a Deo, pascentem eos epulis omnibus." (XXXII.2).

Certain Old Testament texts are interpreted of this period including Is.65:18-22, with its promise of longevity for the inhabitants of Jerusalem (V.XXXIV.4). Again, Is.32:1; 54:11-14; together with I Paruch 4.36 etc., and the whole of chapter 5, are explicitly referred to the times of the earthly kingdom of Jesus Christ -- these refer to the rebuilding of Jerusalem (XXXIV.4 and XXXV.1). This is distinguished by Irenæus from the New Jerusalem which only appears after the creation of the new heaven and earth at the end of the
period of earthly reign (V.xxxv.2). In this, as Danielou truly says, Irenaeus faithfully follows out the concept of 'Revelation' in which the new Jerusalem only descends from heaven after, or at the end of, the millennial reign of Christ (Rev.21.1ff). "The feature peculiar to Irenaeus in this passage is the idea of the millennium as a first familiarisation with incorruptibility, a conception to which he returns later: 'Man will truly rise, and be truly raised for incorruption, and grow and become strong during the times of the kingdom, in order that he may be capable of receiving the glory of God.' (V.35.2).

This concept of the millennium as a period in which the saints are familiarized with incorruption is Irenaeus' most distinctive contribution to the understanding of that age. Certain passages set this forth very clearly:

XXXII.1

"Quomdiqum igitur transferuntur quorundam sententiae ab haereticis Rexinibus et sunt ignorantes dispositiones Dei et mysterium justorum resurrectionis et regni, quod est principium incorruptelae, per quod regnum qui digni fuerint saeculum assuescunt capere Deum, necessarium est autem dicere de illis quoniam oportet justos primos in conditione hac quae renovatur ad apparitionem Domini resurgentes recipere promissionem hereditatis quam Deus promisit patribus et regnare in ea, post deinde fieri judicium."

XXXV.1

"Haec enim talia universo in resurrectione justorum sine controversia dicta sunt, quae fit post Adventum Antichristi et perditionem omnium gentium sub eo existentium, in qua regnavent justi in terra, crescentes ex visione Domini, et per ipsum assuescunt capere gloriam Dei Patris, et cum sanctis angelis conversationem et communionem et unitatem spirituum in regno capient. Et illi quos Dominus in carne inveniet exspectantes eum de caelis et parpessos tribulationem, qui et effugerunt iniqui manus, ipsi [autem] sunt de quibus ait prophetas: 'Et derelicti multiplicabuntur in terra.'"

1 op. cit., p.388.
The implication of this paragraph should not go unnoticed. Despite Danielou's judgment that Irenaeus does not think in terms of procreation during the millennial era, it would seem that what Irenaeus here says is that those who are raised from the dead shall be rulers and will not engage in procreation, but that those who have passed through the tribulation under Antichrist and who are alive on the earth when Christ comes, are to multiply on the earth: this plainly implies their engagement in procreation.

XXXV.2.

"Quonod~ enim vere Deus est qui resuscitat hominem, sic et vere resurget homo a mortuis et non allegorice, quamadmodum per tanta ostendimus; et sicut vere resurget, sic et vere praemeditabitur incorrupta et augebitur et vigebit in regni temporibus, ut fiat capax gloriae Patris; deinde omnibus renovatis, vere in civitate habitabit Dei. 'Dixit' enim, inquit, 'sedens super thronum: Ecce nova facio omnia. Et dicit Dominus: Omnia scriba, quoniam seriones fidiales et veri sunt. Et dixit nihil: Facta sunt'."

The reference to Revelation 21.5-6 shows that Irenaeus thinks of things as only being made new after the millennium. It is the scheme of Revelation 20-21 which is in his mind.

It is noteworthy that certain possible correspondences between Irenaeus and the apocalyptic work, II Baruch, may be traced. We mention them here briefly in order to bring out more fully, by implication, what Irenaeus himself thinks. Thus, in connection with the thought of the millennium as a time of familiarisation with incorruptibility it is interesting to note the statement of II Baruch LXXIV.2: "For that time is the consummation of that which is corruptible, And the beginning of that which is not corruptible."

It must be borne in mind, of course, that II Baruch is not thinking in terms of a millennium prior to eternity, but is thinking about a future messianic era on earth which seems to be thought of as stretching
into eternity. Nevertheless, the passage quoted is not dissimilar in thought to Irenaeus' conceptualization of the millennial era.

Another point which suggests itself as an interesting comparison has to do with the conditions of the earthly reign of the Messiah. H.H. Rowley says of II Baruch: "Of the person of the Messiah nothing is said, but the glories of the Messianic age are described in sensuous terms. Behemoth and Leviathan will be eaten for food, and the earth will yield the richest fruits (2 Bar.XXIX.3f.). On one vine there will be a thousand branches, and each branch will bear a thousand bunches, and each bunch will contain a thousand grapes, and each grape will bear a cor, say a hundred and twenty gallons, of wine (2 Bar.XXIX.5)." With this we may compare the otherwise unknown saying attributed to our Lord in Adversus Haereses, V.XXXIII.3 concerning the fruitfulness of the earth: this is depicted especially in terms of the growth of corn and vines. "---the Lord used to teach in regard to these times, and say, The days will come, in which vines shall grow, each having ten thousand branches, and in each branch ten thousand twigs, and in each true twig ten thousand shoots, and each one of the shoots ten thousand clusters, and on every one of the clusters ten thousand grapes, and every grape when pressed will give five and twenty metretes of wine.---." (noted in Chapter III, page343). The similarity of thought with that of II Baruch is quite striking.

A further possible connection between II Baruch and Irenaeus suggests itself. II Baruch undoubtedly considers that natural procreation will continue during the messianic age—cf.LXXIII:7.
"And women no longer then have pain when they bear, Nor shall they suffer torment when they yield the fruit of the womb."

We know that "the Jewish apocalyptic tradition had linked with the exceptional fecundity of Nature that of men also: 'The righteous shall live till they have begotten a thousand children' (I Enoch X,17)." We recall what we have said above (page 500) in commenting on A.H. V.XXXV.1.

Probably the connection between Irenaeus and II Baruch is that of works which belong to a common tradition. This may be a more likely explanation than that of supposing any direct dependence of Irenaeus upon II Baruch, though this possibility should not entirely be ruled out.

Irenaeus is aware of stages in God's programme as V.XXXV.1-2 makes clear. Nevertheless, it would seem that both 'the kingdom' and what follows are conceived as having their substance in time. Irenaeus' insistence on the historical may be directed primarily at the Gnostics, but it emerges from a profound conviction regarding the continuing humanity of the Risen Lord Jesus. Against all conceptions which would treat of the future world in a purely symbolic manner, Irenaeus sets the fact of the indissoluble humanity of Jesus. This guarantees first of all that the future world is a world in which the earth with all its human values is reasserted, however glorified or transfigured it may be. Further, Irenaeus judges that the coming of Jesus implies a time-division within the future world. On his view it is hard to relegate the 'future world' to the period after the earthly reign of Messiah. If there is an essential continuity between the millennium and what follows it, guaranteed by Jesus' risen humanity, then the future world surely invades this world with the personal return of our Lord. At the same time Jesus Christ has a dual role, as God and as man. In all of this Irenaeus never loses sight of the recapitulation theme: this seems to mean for him that,

1 _op.cit._, p.394.
when Jesus as man, as Second Adam, has reigned for one thousand years (a period apparently symbolising for him the time span which Adam would have attained, if he had not succumbed to the Tempter), then there supervenes that new era in which God's undisclosed purposes for man are to be revealed. That does not mean that Jesus then ceases to be man or that we cease to be men, but it does mean that only then is Adam's undisclosed future made available to him. In all this the concept of recapitulation is fundamental.

We summarize now our findings concerning Irenaeus' view of the millennium. It seems clear in the first place, that for Irenaeus, in so far as redemption in Jesus Christ implies the assertion of our human values, this predisposes towards belief in a coming Kingdom of God on earth, i.e., in space and in time. This is implicit in his whole treatment of the latter concept. Belief that God's Kingdom is to be established on earth does not, however, in itself, demand belief in a millennium. This came to Irenaeus, it would seem, from the Book of Revelation, on the one hand, and from Papias and the Elders, on the other (vide above, page 497 with reference to A.H. V. XXXIII, 3-4; also Chapter III, page 342.)

Secondly, it seems probable that Irenaeus shares the view that we saw Justin Martyr to hold, that what is to happen at the end of time is to be a reversal of what happened at the beginning (vide Chapter IV, pages 409.) This had special reference to Dial. LXXXI:1-2, in which Justin saw the concept of the millennial reign of Christ as a fulfilment of Is. 65: 17-25. The reference, in particular, to the words of Is. 65:22 in the Septuagint version, was noted: This says: "...according to the days of the tree of life shall be the days of my people" (para. 2). A reference from Jubilees
IV: 29-30, helped us to understand that Adam died before he became a thousand years old in consequence of his having eaten of the forbidden tree of the knowledge of good and evil. We reached the conclusion that Justin shared this view. The question now is whether Irenaeus may not also have shared it. We saw above (page 495) that at A.H. V.XXXIV.4 Irenaeus quotes this same passage from Is.65; only he stops short at v.22. Verse 22, however, is the important verse: it is it which refers to the tree of life. Irenaeus in that passage seems to have in mind especially the concept of longevity, because his quotation does not go on to include the words which deal with the reconciliation within the animal kingdom. It seems probable, therefore, that Irenaeus also holds to the view that Adam, by means of his transgression, failed to reach the age of a thousand years and that he sees the millennium as the future predestined period when men will live to the thousand year limit. This, however, is not an insignificant finding, because it helps to establish that Irenaeus understands the millennial concept in terms of his recapitulation concept: what Adam failed to achieve through his sin, man will then achieve through the curbing of sin effected by the Man, Christ Jesus. In our investigation of Justin Martyr's views on the millennium, we commented (Chapter IV, page 473) that his stress in his millennial concept upon elements reminiscent of paradise (i.e. the Garden of Eden) was significant in that it seemed to contain, if only in germinal form, the recapitulation concept of history, and that Irenaeus may have got it from him and from this whole way of thinking. Both thinkers seem to see in longevity the fruitfulness of the earth and the reconciliation within the animal kingdom, signs of a return to the conditions of the Garden. It is perhaps significant in this regard that, as we
have seen, Irenaeus appears to be somewhat nearer to Justin's concept of the millennium than Danielou allows, in that Irenaeus does, with Justin, envisage the continuance of procreation during that era: he does, however, make it clear that such procreation will only be carried out by those who are alive at the Parousia of Christ and who have survived the persecution and horrors of Antichrist's reign. There is no such restriction in Justin's statements. Certainly, neither think of the millennium as simply a period of "nuptial pleasures." This further measure of agreement with Justin, in whom the germ of the recapitulation concept seems to appear, suggests that Irenaeus gets his recapitulation concept, if not from Justin, certainly from that way of thinking which Justin represents, in which the future reign of Christ on earth leads us back to the conditions of paradise. We are reinforced too, by the comparison with Justin, in the conviction that the concepts of the millennium and of recapitulation do belong together in Irenaeus' thought.

Thirdly, it is clear that whatever Irenaeus may have taken over from Justin or from a certain tradition, he has his own contribution to make. The thought of the millennium as a period of familiarisation with incorruption is what is distinctive in his presentation of it. This appears to be bound up with the heavy stress in Irenaeus on certain related concepts, namely, those of recapitulation, the continuing humanity of Jesus Christ, and incorruptibility. What Irenaeus appears to be saying is that once men have lived on earth under Christ's rule for the period which Adam failed to reach on account of his sin, then they will be led forward to their destiny. This is a dynamic concept. Our future is not simply to recover the past, but to recover what the past situation of paradise would have brought within our grasp, if sin had not spoiled everything. This
future is, however, interpreted for us in terms of the achievement of
the Man, Christ Jesus. In His resurrection life we see our humanity
glorified. This represents our destiny, and it would seem that the
double element in man's future—a millennial reign with Christ on earth,
followed by whatever eternity may have in store for God's people—
corresponds to the element of 'newness' that we see in the glorified
humanity of Christ. It is in this that we see revealed what Adam's
future would have been. It is man, the whole human race, that is
recapitulated in Christ, and beyond the longevity, fruitfulness and
bliss of the millennium, which is, so to speak, 'paradise restored',
there lies an even greater future with God which is ours because
Christ has become one with us. We are to gain that future in and
through Him, and it is obviously one in which death will be completely
put aside, one of incorruption. Irenaeus' quotation of Is.65:18-22
it is worth noting, carries the hint that death is not completely
dethroned during the millennium, for sin still seems to be a possibility,
if the words of v.20 are taken seriously. It is true that Irenaeus
does not comment specifically on this verse, but the thought of a
familiarisation with incorruption during the millennium could be
interpreted in such a way as to make of the millennium a probationary
period. It would still be true that Satanic opposition to God would
have been put aside during this period, but, on such a view, it
might remain possible for a man's own wilfulness to bring judgment
upon himself, in the form of death. Whether or not this is to read
too much into Irenaeus' concept and his citation of Is.65:18-22,
it is clear that in Christ man's appropriate destiny in that era is
one of incorruption, which seems to be thought of as being in some
way attained after the achievement of the thousand year period. Such
a destiny is one of incorruption, one in which Christ's resurrection
glory, which is the power of an endless life, is conclusively settled upon His people.

The concept of the millennium is not unimportant in itself, as part of eschatological thinking, but its importance in Irenaeus is that it is related integrally to his whole understanding of salvation in terms of recapitulation. Two final comments may be in place. First, we began by saying that too much should not be made of the silence of the Demonstratio on this subject. It can be argued that the Demonstratio, as a later work, shows a development in Irenaeus' thinking away from the millenarian concept. In view of the facts that both the Adversus Haereses and the Demonstratio make much of the recapitulation concept and that in the larger work millenarianism is understood in close relationship with the recapitulation concept, such a judgment seems hazardous. In any case, an argument from silence is always somewhat shaky ground. It may more convincingly be argued that Irenaeus' silence in a shorter work shows his sense of balance. He believes in the millennium, but it does not occupy the centre of his thinking, not even where eschatology is in view. It may well be too that Irenaeus' silence in a shorter work is connected with the fact that he never discusses the final outbreak of evil at the end of the millennium. We must assume that Irenaeus believed in this, since he thinks, as we have seen, in terms of the scheme of Revelation 20-21. His silence concerning that final outbreak of evil corresponds to his dynamic way of thinking about man's destiny in Christ in terms of the outworking within the saints of God of Christ's resurrection life, first in regaining 'paradise lost' and then going on into our predestined future beyond that. Such a perspective does not necessarily exclude mention of the final defeat of Satan after his release at the end of the thousand years.
(Rev. 20: 7-10), but it makes understandable its being passed over in silence. What this means is that essentially for Irenaeus the millennial era is continuous with what lies beyond it. The shorter statement of the Demonstratio assumes this perspective and so passes over the millennium in its concentration upon the recapitulation of our destiny, one of incorruptibility, which is achieved for us in Christ Jesus.

The second point is that Irenaeus' way of thinking about the millennium helps us to realise how hard it is to fit Early Church thinking on this subject into neat categories. Daniélou speaks of three types of millennial theory—a radical view (Cerinthus and Justin) which thinks of procreation as well as great fertility in nature during this period; a moderate view (Papias and Irenaeus) agreeing to increased fertility but not thinking in terms of procreation; and the least radical view, that of Methodius of Olympus, with its concept of the millennium as a cosmic sabbath (no increased fertility of the soil and no continuance of procreation). Irenaeus' adherence to belief in the continuance of procreation by a particular group of those on the earth during the millennium suggests that, if such categorizing is sound, Irenaeus may be somewhat misplaced. Perhaps Daniélou would judge that, since it is only a group who are thus to procreate in Irenaeus' statement, this feature can virtually be ignored, and it remains appropriate to classify Irenaeus in the way which he has done. If this is Daniélou's reasoning, it is not, however, very convincing. One forms the impression that Irenaeus and Justin cannot properly be put into different categories in their thinking about the millennium: rather do they belong together, Irenaeus' restriction of procreation to a particular group being simply a difference in detail.
THE DEMONIC ELEMENT IN HISTORY

We turn now to our second area of investigation. It may be asked what relevance there is for Irenaeus' eschatology in his concept of the demonic in history. However, it would seem that there is, in so far as the millennial reign of Christ, together with what lies beyond that, are essentially on one base line with the whole of the historical process from the Creation onwards. In two ways, in particular, it appears that this concept has relevance. First, as we have already noted, Irenaeus accepted the concept of Antichrist. Now, this figure is seen as the 'recapitulation' in himself of the forces of evil which have been released in the world since the Fall (vide above, page 496). Thus, an understanding of the concept of the demonic in history in Irenaeus' thinking has a direct link with one important feature in his understanding of the events of the End Time. Second, not only the Antichrist, but the whole demonic element in history emphasizes the realization of Irenaeus that the world is a scene of struggle, that the Incarnation is to be understood as a period of struggle, and that the present interim period between the Two Advents is, from one point of view, also a time of conflict. This emphasis upon the demonic may seem to some to make Irenaeus' whole outlook hopelessly antiquated and difficult to follow: be that as it may, it remains true that this is an integral part of Irenaeus' total view and that it is an aspect of considerable value in that it helps us to see how 'un-metaphysical' is Irenaeus' conception of the Incarnation. Irenaeus always thinks in a fluid manner: this is why for him the Incarnation is not conceived statically as the assumption of the substance, flesh, but rather is thought of as the dynamic thrust of the divine will into the very arena of the creaturely, and especially of human
Therefore, we cannot understand the concept of 'recapitulatio' apart from the concepts of the demonic element in history and of struggle between God and Satanic forces. This does not mean that we must so concentrate on the concept of struggle that we ignore those involved in it and so treat the 'demons' as mythical elements. To Irenaeus they were a profound reality and we may well discover that the adoption of such a view of the Incarnation as Irenaeus had involves us in a growing disinclination to write off all that is said about the demons as 'mythical'. In so far as the reign of Christ on earth and the 'kingdom of the Father' (Regnum Patris) are won for us through the Incarnation, the understanding of Irenaeus' concept of the Incarnation that comes from a look at his view of the demonic element in history will be well worthwhile. Further, it may well have a more direct bearing upon our understanding of the millennial reign as a period of 'rest' from struggle: this will connect up with concepts of the millennium as a 'seventh' day in God's programme for the world found in The Epistle of Barnabas (XV. 3-8) and others (e.g. Hippolytus, Lactantius, Methodius of Olympus). It is also reflected in Irenaeus (Adversus Haereses, V.XXX.4).

The overarching concept which gathers up the idea of conflict with demons and that of Antichrist is that of apostasy. Irenaeus sees the apostasy on earth as the result of a situation, in which man is to some extent the victim of deceit, the deceit of the devil. In A.H. V.XXX.I there is a discussion concerning the number of the Antichrist, which, of course, is given in 'Revelation' as six hundred and sixty-six. (13:13). However, as Irenaeus points out, by his time some manuscripts read this as six hundred and sixteen, "--pro sex decadis una decade volentes esse." (V.XXX:1)
"Now, this might seem a small matter, but to Irenaeus it has a symbolical significance,

"-numerus enim qui dicitur sex similiter custoditus recapitulationem ostendit universae apostasiae ejus quae initio et quae in mediis temporibus et quae in fine erit -" (V.XXX:1)

The chapters before and after this quotation make it clear that, for Irenaeus, what is referred to are three supreme occasions on which Satanic opposition to God presents itself in a deceitful form on the earth: the first was through the instrumentality of the serpent in the Garden, the second was in the Temptation of our Lord, and the third will be in the appearing of the Antichrist, who will be pre-eminently a deceiver. In Ch. XXX and subsequent chapters the dominant interest is in that which is yet to come. Where the second is involved, it may be that the whole of Irenaeus' meaning is not exhausted by Christ's Temptation and that the testing of God's people is included but that Temptation would seem to have a central place in his thinking.

What is important here is that we find the same parallelism with regard to the temptation and deception of the Devil as we find elsewhere in Irenaeus in regard to his whole scheme of recapitulation. This, we recall is concerned with our first parents and their sin, the Incarnation, and the coming reign of Christ on earth where the effects of the curse of God upon the earth will be removed and where the punishment of man's sin, death, will be set aside. This connection comes out very clearly, with reference to the Garden and the Incarnation, in A.H.V.XXXI. <

Beginning with the Protevangelion in Gen.3:15 Jesus is set forth as born of the Virgin just as Adam was originally made without the assistance of woman in any procreative act, and it is asserted
that,

"neque --- justi victus fuissest inimicus, nisi ex muliere homo esset qui vicit eum." (V.XXX:1)

In saying this Irenaeus asserts three doctrines, almost in passing namely, the Virgin Birth, the necessity of the Incarnation, and the unity of the Creator God and the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ (since Christ comes in accord with the promise contained in Gen. 3:15).

Irenaeus goes on, in this chapter, to show that the promise of Gen. 3:15 was fulfilled not merely in Christ's birth of a Virgin, or in his assumption of human flesh and blood, but also in His resistance to the Tempter. Paragraph 2 deals at some length with the Tempter and the temptations of Jesus in the wilderness. The Tempter is referred to as "the apostate angel" (apostatae angelus, V.XXI:2) on a number of occasions in this passage, thus showing that Irenaeus has at the back of his mind the conception of a cosmic Fall. Such a Fall in heaven seems to be presumed in Bk.III.XXIII.3. A parallel is drawn between the temptation to Adam and Eve's having been concerned with eating (of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil) and the first temptation of our Lord, who was hungry after fasting. The important thing, however, is that through Jesus' rejection of temptation, we receive life. The whole purpose of Christ's Incarnation (and victory over temptation—we are told Jesus fasted in order to give the enemy an opportunity of attacking him para.2) is that,

"---quamadmodum per hominem victum descendit in mortem genus nostrum, sic iterum per hominem victorem ascendamus in vitam, et quamadmodum accepit palam mors per hominem adversus nos, sic iterum nos adversus mortem per hominem accipiamus palam." (V.XXI:1).

Chapter XXII shows that Christ overthrew Satan by means of the words and commandments of the Father God of the Old Testament. At the end of section I Irenaeus uses the figure derived from the Gospel of the "binding of the strong man" (Mk.3: 22-27 Matt. 12:22-24). Thus,
Jesus by His obedience in the face of temptation bound the strong man Satan. Paragraph 2 speaks in strong terms of the deceitfulness of Satan, a feature which was to reappear in Irenaeus' description of the Antichrist. Chapter XXIII carries further the parallelism between the Fall in the Garden and the Victory of Christ, the emphasis here being on the thought that just as Adam died in the day that he fell into sin, namely the sixth day, so our Lord recapitulated in Himself the sixth day (He died on the day preceding the Sabbath) i.e. on the Sabbath, "quae est sexta conditionis dies, in qua homo plasmatus est, secundam plasmationem ei, eam quae est a norte, per suam passionem donans." (V.XXII:2)

Ch. XXIV further expounds the deceitfulness of the devil, who falsely promised Christ the kingdoms of this world, if only He would bow down and serve him. It is pointed out that, in reality, it is God who gives power to the rulers of this world. What is central in all of this is the thought that Jesus Christ, unlike Adam and Eve, was not deceived and so overcame the devil on man's behalf.

It is, however, in chapter XXV.ff that we come towards the heart of Irenaeus' portrayal of the Antichrist of the End-time. His deception emerges in his taking to himself power that only God can give. He is an illegitimate king, in contrast to those earthly rulers who presently hold their position by God's decree. Thus, the presence of Antichrist is a particular affront to God's majesty. This figure is plainly viewed as that of a man. He is not the devil himself, but is endued with all the power of the devil. It is instructive to note that this figure is cast into the lake of fire after his defeat by God prior to the earthly reign of Christ.

Ch. XXX.4 sums up what Irenaeus thinks of this figure's manhood and fate:-
"Cum autem devastaverit Antichristus hic omnia in hoc mundo, regnaverit annis tribus et mensibus sex et sederit in templo Hierosolymis, tunc veniet Dominus de caelis in nubibus in gloria Patris, illum quidem et obaudientes ei in stagnum ignis mittens, adducens autem justis regni tempora, hoc est requiotionem, septimam diem sanctificacionem, et restituens Abraham promissionem hereditatis, in quo regnit autem Dominus multos ab oriente et occidente venientes recumbere cum Abraham, Isaac et Jacob."

By contrast the devil is only cast into the lake of fire finally, according to Revelation 20:10, after the thousand years reign of Christ. The point that is being made by Irenaeus is that the reign of Antichrist represents a deliberate embodiment of evil that God cannot possibly tolerate, and that this particular affront results in the devil's over-reaching himself, so that this human figure is removed from all influence. Revelation XX. 2-3 adds that Satan is bound for the period of the thousand years. This is to say that, having committed himself to an out and out battle with God and having lost, the devil's influence is removed on earth for this period of time.

It is clear that Irenaeus believed in the figure of Antichrist in the most literal manner, and that he would have deplored any 'spiritualising' of it. Chapter XXV.5 brings out well, by implication, the thought that Antichrist serves as Satan's counter-move to the Incarnation. Throughout this whole section Irenaeus is concerned to show that the God of the Old Testament prophets and promises is the same God Whom Jesus proclaimed. With this in mind Irenaeus tells us that it was the same angel Gabriel who interpreted to Daniel the vision foreseeing, as Irenaeus understands it, the Antichrist, and who proclaimed to Mary "--manifestum adventum et incarnationem Christi." (V.XXV:5)

Doubtless Irenaeus' main point is to illustrate the continuity of revelation in the Old Testament and in the New Covenant, but there
appears to be a parallel also between Gabriel's foretelling of him
"qui in se recapitular omnam diabolicum errorem"
and the Incarnation of our Lord.

The importance of all of this is that it shows Irenaeus' view
of history, the Incarnation, the coming of Antichrist, and the
coming earthly reign of Christ, to be a unity. The coming of
Antichrist is for Irenaeus a future visible manifestation of Satan's
power in which the devil will over-reach himself and the kingdom of
Christ will be introduced, when our Lord comes to put down this
insurrection. Clearly Irenaeus conceives of Antichrist's reign as
quite different in character from any thing that precedes it (at
XXV.2 he quotes with approval the words of Matt.24:15,21) as
different from other evil reigns which God has tolerated. These last
foreshadow Antichrist's coming rather in the way, it would seem, that
righteous kings foreshadowed, however dimly, the glory of Christ's
coming reign. Not only does the reign of Antichrist offer a Satanic
parallel to the Incarnation, in that evil has now embodied itself in
some sense on earth, but it also directly opens the way for Christ's
earthly reign during the millennium. Antichrist, so to speak,
provokes God's action. The Temptations of our Lord during his
ministry in lowliness on earth, which we have already noted as
adduced by Irenaeus as evidence of Satan's deceitfulness, take on
in this context a special dramatic character. For instead of Christ's
receiving power from the devil on this earth, He removes it from
Satan's representative, Antichrist, and curbs the devil's power for
a thousand years. Thus seen, the temptation of the devil to Christ
to bow down and serve him, was not so much an attempt to get Christ
to think in materialistic or earthly, as compared with spiritual,
terms: rather was it to get Christ to anticipate the seasons that
the Father hath put into His own power. Christ will reign on earth, but it was not the Father's will that this should be during his first coming and certainly not as conferred on him by Satan. The millennial reign of Christ becomes, therefore, God's answer to the reign of Antichrist, just as that reign was in itself a Satanic counterpart to the Incarnation.

It is not without significance that it is part of Antichrist's impiety that he sets up his kingdom in Jerusalem. Cf. XXV.4:-

"--transferet regnum in eam, et in templo Dei sudebit, seducens eos qui adorant eum quasi ipse sit Christus".

For Irenaeus the Lord's reign from Jerusalem replaces that false usurpation of power in that place by Antichrist. Further, the period of 'rest', the 'hallowed seventh day', of which we read in XXX.4, is seen as a restoration to Abraham of God's promises to him. It is clear that Irenaeus still thinks in what many would describe as a crassly materialistic way about Christ's kingdom. It is surely for this reason that Irenaeus thinks of Jerusalem being rebuilt in the days of Christ's earthly kingdom and prior to the giving of the New Jerusalem, when the New Heaven and the New Earth are brought into being. It is perhaps noteworthy that Irenaeus makes much of the New Jerusalem but that he says nothing of a 'new temple': this is presumably because Jesus Christ is seen as constituting the essential glory and meaning of the temple, and He will bodily reign from Jerusalem on earth. Chapter XXV.2 makes it plain that Irenaeus felt obliged to defend the institution of the temple as "--per dispositionem veri Dei factum est." This is in fact no incidental or unwilling confession on the part of Irenaeus. Possibly the major theme of the whole of the 'Adversus Haereses' is an insistence on
the unity of God the Father and God the Creator. Since Irenaeus

does not think statically, this means for him the unity of all God's
historical acts, and of creation and redemption. Thus, his concept

of 'recapitulation' which sees all history from Creation right
through to the reign of Christ on earth (and beyond) as a unity, is

not an interest diverse in character from that dealing with the denial

of 'two Gods'. It is all of a piece. In this particular instance,

this means that, since God set up the temple, it cannot lightly be

set aside. This is why Antichrist's possession of it represents a

major affront to God in Irenaeus' thinking.

Dionysius of Alexandria attributed to Cerinthus views similar
to those of Caius, as outlined by Eusebius, in which the millennium

is said to be a 'time of nuptial feasting'. Dionysius, however, added

the detail, as Daniélou notes, that Cerinthus believed in the

restoration of animal sacrifices (vide Chapter III, page 347). Daniélou

adds that it is strange that, in his account of Cerinthus,

Irenaeus makes no mention of millenarianism and he concludes,

therefore, that Irenaeus presumably did not regard Cerinthus as

heretical on this point. We have already seen that Irenaeus may

well uphold a view of continued procreation during the reign of

Christ on earth. This may suggest the thought that he believed

also, as Daniélou thinks he may, in the restoration of animal

sacrifices in the Temple at Jerusalem. However, we cannot build

too much on an argument from Irenaeus' silence. In any case it

would seem a repudiation of Irenaeus' essential way of thinking to

portray him as believing in such a restoration. We may refer to

Book IV:XVIII in this regard. There Irenaeus asserts:

"Et non genus oblationum reprobatum est: oblationes enim et
illic, oblationes autem et hic, sacrificia in populo,
sacrificia et in Ecclesia; sed species immutata est tantum,
quipple cum jam non a servis, sed a liberis offeratur." (para. 2)
The important point for our present purpose is that Irenaeus sees the species of sacrifice as having altered.

In the above, we have been endeavouring indirectly to bring out lines of connection between the reign of Antichrist and the millennium or 'period of rest'. The one precipitates the other, and leads into it, in the divine programme. Connected with the concept in Irenaeus' mind is the final persecution of the saints.

"Et propterea tribulatio necessaria est his qui salvantur, ut, quodammodo contriti et attenuati et conspersi per patientiam Verbo Dei et igniti, sibi sint ad convivium Regis." (V.XXVIII:4).

This passage comes at the end of a chapter dealing with the Antichrist; it could relate to all persecution, but the idea of persecution under the Antichrist is certainly not excluded. Chapter XXIX. perhaps makes this more explicit. II Thess.2:10-12 is quoted early in chapter XXVIII; now in Chapter XXIX. Mk.13:19 par. Matt.24:21 is explicitly quoted, while it seems probable that the whole contents of that chapter in Matthew's Gospel are in mind here. Chapter XXIX.I reads thus:-

"Et propterea, cum in fine repente hinc Ecclesia assumatur, erit, inquit, tribulatio qualis non est facta ab initio neque fiet: novissimus enim aetatem justorum, in quo vincentes coronantur incorruptam." V.XXIX:1

One or two comments should be made on Irenaeus' thought at this point. First, Irenaeus uses this passage from Mk.13 - Matt.24 to indicate that the Church will be required to endure the persecution of the period of Antichrist's reign. He speaks later in this same chapter of a prophecy of "-- eam quae in fine futura est justorum succensio." (XXIX:2).
prophecy of this period of Antichrist's reign. This is in itself a blow against that 'pre-tribulation rapture' theory of the Church during Antichrist's reign which has been advocated in some fundamentalist circles in recent centuries. Second, there can be no doubt from the language employed that Irenaeus, like Justin Martyr, is thinking of a definite period of great apostasy which is to precede the Parousia of Jesus Christ-hence he too cannot subscribe to an 'any moment' theory of the Second Advent. Clearly, too, Irenaeus did not think that this period had yet arrived upon the world. Third, Irenaeus tacitly lends support to the thought that this period when it comes, will be quite brief. If the whole of Mk.13-Matt.24 is in his thinking, as seems probable, doubtless Mk.13:20 par. Matt.24.22 would undergird the way in which with a few strokes of the pen he sketches the brief terrible events of those days. Probably indirectly this lends support to that interpretation of Mk.13:30 par. Matt.24:34 "--This generation shall not pass, till all these things be fulfilled", which understands 'ἡ γενεὰ' as referring to a yet-distant time which will yet be brief. Fourth, the concept that the time of tribulation and apostasy will be sudden and brief is supported by the Scriptural analogies for it, which are adduced. In XCIX.2 Irenaeus refers to Noah's generation which was "infamous" (nequissinam) and given over to wickedness, as Genesis informs us, and to the experience of the 'three wise men' of Daniel 4, who were placed in the furnace of fire. It is true that the emphasis is not placed upon the shortness of the time of testing, when these parallels are adduced; nonetheless it is implicit. Fifth, these parallels are important in themselves. Behind the reference to Noah stands the language of Jesus, set forth in Matt.24:37. This emphasises by comparison, the abruptness of the coming of the Son of Man, at least where unbelievers are concerned.
It is in this context too, that the reference to "the two in the field" and the "two women grinding at the mill" occur. These are the texts chiefly used by those of the 'pre-tribulation rapture' school. It is instructive to note that Irenaeus deduces from their presence in this context no such understanding: rather his thought would be, it would seem, that when the Son of Man comes, the one will be prepared and the other will not. This is, of course, the significance of the Parable of the Ten Virgins, which follows in the very next chapter. Apart from this further support for the rejection of any such 'pre-tribulation rapture' theory, however, it is surely significant that the flood is taken as a symbol of the coming judgment. The thought was quite common in Jewish apocalyptic literature that, since the previous judgment of the world had been by water and God had set his rainbow in the sky as an indication that He would never again in this way judge mankind, judgment at the end of the age would be by fire instead. Instructively, the story of the casting of the three wise men into a furnace (Dan.3) is seen as an anticipation of the coming horrors of Antichrist's reign and of the final judgment of God. This reference, again, might seem to suggest the deliverance of the saints in the midst of persecution, since the flames did not harm the wise men. However, the real point of the analogy, as Irenaeus sees it, is that the wise men were ordered to worship the king, Nebuchadnezzar, just as the Antichrist will demand worship at the end of the age. Whereas in Dan. 3 the flames are those of the wrath of Antichrist, Irenaeus appears to view the cataclysm at the end of the age as being in part the wrath that is unleashed against "the righteous" but also as representing the judgment that is to come upon the earth. However, in Irenaeus' thinking this is not the Final Judgment. Rather does this period of cataclysm and fire provoke God
to save His people and to begin to renew the earth during the reign of Christ on earth: the Final Judgment occurs only at the end of that earthly reign.

Two questions emerge regarding Irenaeus' concept of the 'final apostasy' and the millennial reign which is to follow. The first concerns the role of the Jews in all of this. Are they, in his view, to turn to God, as Justin Martyr seems to think? The second turns on the same point: if they are to turn nationally to God, when is this to happen? Unfortunately these questions are not easy to answer, as the immediate interest of Irenaeus in the question of the Jews and their conversion is not nearly so apparent as in such a work as Justin Martyr's 'Dialogue with Trypho', where the whole Jewish question is naturally uppermost. It certainly seems clear in Irenaeus that the Kingdom of God on earth is to be centred in a Jerusalem rebuilt (A.H.V.XXXV.2). This is suggestive. Although it cannot be imagined that Irenaeus would support the restoration of animal sacrifices to God during this period of the Kingdom, it again seems manifest that this is only because Christ personally represents God's presence among men, and, possibly more importantly in this connection, man's true worship of God. Thus, the millenarian reign has a Jewish flavour to the extent that Jerusalem has not been set aside. Further, Antichrist's preceding reign is in Jerusalem. He is spoken of as being received as 'Christ', i.e. as Messiah (V.XXVIII.2). Thus, the land of Palestine and the city, Jerusalem, are literally involved in the events of the End-time in Irenaeus' thinking. This cannot be without significance. The naming of the Antichrist as Christ at least surely requires investigation.

Does this reference to the Antichrist, as one worshipped as Christ, imply that the Jews will accept this figure as their long
awaited Messiah? V.XXVIII.2 speaks of this figure of the End-time thus:

"in templo Dei sedente, ut sicut Christum adoren illum qui seducentur ab illo." XXVIII:2.

Further, great emphasis is laid upon his deceitfulness in all the references in Irenaeus, including the chapter in which we find this assertion. Again, it is surely significant that Mk.13-Matt.24, one of Irenaeus' principal sources where this doctrine is concerned, warns against the believers' being deceived by persons claiming to be the Christ, or giving information as to where the Christ is to be found. It is hard to know how sound a reconstruction may be of what is not made explicit in Irenaeus. Nevertheless, these references cannot simply be set aside. Further, if Irenaeus had believed that the Jews were to be the persecuted people in this period of tribulation--as certain modern fundamentalist groups believe--(the Christians on this view being removed from the scene in a previous 'rapture'), then it is curious that he does not exempt them from the general state in which all men are to be deceived by Antichrist. It would seem logical to judge that Irenaeus thought that the Jews would accept Antichrist like everyone else, and, in view of the language used (the Messiah) and the location (Jerusalem) to assume that he saw the Jews as taking a leading part in his worship. It is worth noting that at chapter XXV.4, the words of our Lord, recorded in Jn.5:43 are interpreted by Irenaeus as a reference to the Antichrist. These words are thus recorded: "Ego veni in nomine Patris mei, et non recipitis me: cum alius venerit in nomine suo, illum recipietis."

Irenaeus judges that Jesus meant the Antichrist by "another". In view of the fact that it was the Jews who rejected Jesus, is it not implied that they will give a lead in mistakenly accepting another as their Messiah and the intended King of all nations? Further,
all of this fits in with that kind of parallelism which Irenaeus sees as part of his recapitulation concept. Just as the Fall occurred in the Garden of Eden and concerned the eating of a tree's fruit, so the temptations of our Lord had to do with eating as a result of hunger. Similarly here, just as Jesus was rejected in the days of His flesh by His own people, is it not the thought that at the end of time they will do this again, this time not passively by rejecting him, but actively by rallying around another? Irenaeus would not judge that in this kind of parallelism there was any artificiality of interpretation, because he would see history itself as predetermined by God, so that the man of discernment in spiritual things only reads off, so to speak, what is in fact there to be read by all who can read.

In our investigation of Justin Martyr's concepts we came to the conclusion that it was not clear whether Justin believed that the 'fulness of Israel', of which he speaks, would only come in at Christ's Appearing or earlier. We must note now that, so far as Irenaeus is concerned, we have found nothing to suggest that the Jews will repent and accept Christ prior to the End: rather is it the thought that the agony of Jewry's rejection of her true Messiah is to be re-enacted during the days of Antichrist. Surely it is in this light that we have to think of the persecution of the saints, i.e. of the Christian Church. The rejection of Jewry's Messiah spills over upon the followers of Jesus. Irenaeus says nothing directly concerning Israel's repentance, but presumably, since Christ is to reign from Jerusalem, it is thought that it is in the messianic age that Israel knows her Messiah and worships Him in concert with all the nations.

Some account should be taken of the description of the reign of Christ on earth as a period of 'rest'. Daniélou judges that the
reference to rest at II Thess. 1:7 is Paul's description of the earthly reign of Christ prior to the Last Judgment. I Thess. 4:17 appears to support this interpretation, and references to the second resurrection and the entry into incorruptible life can be harmonised with this conception of things. We note that at II Thess. 1:7, where 'rest', ἡ στήσις is mentioned, the thought is that deliverance will be granted from persecution. In the immediate context it might seem that it was all persecution of Christians that was in Paul's mind, but the very next chapter makes clear that 'rest' cannot supervene immediately, since the 'man of sin' has not yet been revealed. Thus, the period of rest follows Antichrist's persecution of the saints in Paul's view, and Danielou thinks that this is in Paul's view a temporary period of time prior to the handing over of the Kingdom by Christ to the Father (as indicated in I Cor. 1), i.e. this period of rest is another name for what Revelation describes as the millennial reign of Christ on earth.

Where Irenaeus is concerned, what is of especial interest is that he brings the concept of a period of rest into line with the idea of the "hallowed seventh day" (septima diem sanctificatam.) This is explicit in the passage at V.XXX:4, already quoted(above, page 516). Danielou thinks that the concept of the "hallowed seventh day" is borrowed from Hellenistic spheres of influence. What seems important however to comment on with reference to this aspect of Irenaeus' millenarianism is that in Irenaeus, as in Scripture, the earthly messianic reign follows always the eschatological or final period of persecution of the saints of God, and that it is this order

1 op. cit., pp. 378-379.
2 op. cit., p. 376.
which helps to define the millennium as a period of rest.

It is at least to be noted that Irenaeus evidently thinks of rest as the consummation of victory over the forces of darkness, over the Antichrist. Thus Irenaeus' manner of dealing with this theme, in which he expressly mentions the Sabbath, gives justification for considering that a concept based on the thought of redemption is present. In dealing with the Old Testament concept of the Sabbath, von Rad comments that in the reasons adduced in Exodus 20 and Deuteronomy 5 for keeping the Sabbath day, in the two notations regarding God's rest from creative activity and His deliverance from Egypt into the freedom of Canaan, a 'consummation pattern' is visible. It would seem that this thought may well help us to understand Irenaeus' thought of the millennial Sabbath, the day of rest. This period on earth will give the true fulfilment of the creation; at the same time it will provide the true enjoyment of 'rest' for the people of God, which was promised to Abraham long centuries ago, (cf. the quotation in V.XXX.4. in the passage before us, from Matt: 8.1 which sees Gentiles sharing with the patriarchs in the promised Inheritance.) Significantly, just as the provisional fulfilment of the latter promise was given only after the conflict with Pharaoh in a contest which reached a suitable dénouement at the crossing of the Red Sea, so in the end of the age the final fulfilment corresponds to the complete overthrow of the forces of darkness under the Antichrist. Certainly in Irenaeus the demonic conflict with God's purposes reaches its climax in the reign of Antichrist and the related
persecution of the people of God, and to this the 'rest' of Christ's reign on earth is the divine counterpart.

One final point may be noted in connection with the demonic element in history and God's victory over it. We noted earlier (page 471 above) that Harnack considered that Irenaeus combined with his eschatology the "wholly dissimilar" theory that Christ, as the teacher, imparts to men, who are free and naturally constituted for fellowship with God, the knowledge which enables them to imitate God and thus, by their own act, to attain communion with Him. It seems clear, however, that to Irenaeus the knowledge which Jesus Christ imparts is a part of His redemptive achievement. The teaching of Jesus where ethical instruction may be in view, is not in fact frequently cited. One of the few allusions, and the only explicit reference to 'teaching' as such, is at A.H. II.XXXII.1: here the stern ethic of Jesus is set in contrast with the teaching of those Gnostics who advocated the widening of human experience by indulging in practices which were evil. Rather Irenaeus' emphasis is that Jesus by His attitude, overcoming of temptation, and deeds, taught men the truth about the Father. Jesus witnesses to the reality of the relationship between the Creator and Father God, denied by Marcion and others. Thus Irenaeus says in A.H. I.XXVII.2 that Marcion is reduced to removing from Luke's Gospel what is said concerning the generation of the Lord and that he sets aside "de doctrina sermonum Domini multa --, in quibus manifestissimæ conditorem hujus universitatis suum Patrem confitens Dominus conscriptus est."

Thus, Irenaeus sees Jesus as One Who by His words and attitudes brings us the truth about God. In particular, Jesus is portrayed, as we have already seen, as rescuing man from the deception of Satan. We have seen that deception has been a prominent element in the Garden
of Eden, in the Temptations of Jesus, and that it will be so in the career of Antichrist. Against this Jesus stood out in His refusal to be deceived. Perhaps too the thought is implicit that at His Parousia all deceitfulness will be removed and all men will be enabled clearly to apprehend the truth. Now, in none of this does Jesus' teaching or impartation of truth appear to be a dry moralism. Irenaeus is concerned about the revelation of the one true God, about the continuity of revelation in the Old and the New Covenants as guaranteed by Jesus' appearing and sacrificial death, about the demands which the revelation of such a God, Who is faithful to His promises, makes upon our lives. Further, everywhere the fallenness of man, which is only reversed by Jesus Christ, is assumed, so that man's ignorance is not that of the innocent child, but of the man who has lost his way and has been blinded through the deception of Satan.

In the context of our discussion of the element of struggle between the demonic element in history and God, it should, therefore, be noted, that in Irenaeus we find no moralistic concept which is at variance with the theme of redemption. Rather it plays quite an important part within the whole theme of redemption, that in Jesus Christ the truth about God and the Word which is from God stand finally revealed. Harnack seems to think that the moralistic element in Irenaeus stems from the influence of the Apologists. It is significant in this regard that, so far as Justin Martyr is concerned, we noted the presence of a viewpoint not dissimilar to that which we have just noted as the true meaning of certain references in Irenaeus. Thus, we noted earlier (Chapter IV. pp. 442-444) with reference to chapter LIV of Justin's First Apology the concept that the heathen mythology, which the Christian mission encountered, was inspired by demons, and the thought that the Christian mission was the effective
sign of its downfall. Here we can at least trace a connecting link with the concept, prominent in Irenaeus, that deception by Satan and his minions, has been an effective part in man's downfall. To this Irenaeus sets the Christian answer, as does Justin, that Jesus Christ dispels error and leads us into all truth. Thus, Irenaeus' teaching is set always in a context of the divine redemptive activity, purposed under the Old Covenant, effected under the New by Christ, and to be finally revealed at the Appearing of the Lord at the end of the age.

THE REPUDIATION OF HERESY

We turn to the third major area of interest in Irenaeus, where eschatological presuppositions have to be laid bare and examined. The Adversus Haereses and the Demonstration were both written in order to make clear what are the lines of true Christian faith and in order to reveal the true character of heresy and all theological error. Thus, this section leads on naturally from the above discussion of the demonic element in history, and on the deceitfulness of Satan, as evidenced in the Garden of Eden, in the Temptation of Jesus, and as yet to be fully demonstrated in the influence and reign of Antichrist. Our central thesis at this point is that for Irenaeus present persecution was an anticipation of the 'Great Tribulation' under Antichrist at the End of the Age, and that in similar fashion, and closely bound up with the foregoing, heresy is seen as a proleptic anticipation of the deceitful beliefs that will be introduced even into God's people, or those who pass for such, in the End-time. This is why heresy is regarded with such a sense of withdrawal and with such horror. Set in the background, as a kind of dramatic foil to this, is the conviction, already mentioned, that Satan is a fallen angel and that all sin and error is ultimately, therefore, of the
nature of apostasy. Satan is an apostate angel. Adam is a fallen man. In him the whole human race is at enmity with its true destiny. Owing to this origin of sin and evil, sin and error appear in their most characteristic light when they are found within the company of God's people. This fact makes more luminous for us the tragedy of Israel: she too is an apostate people. It is fitting, that is, consistent with the divinely revealed pattern of history, that at the End of the Age the supreme assault upon the true people of God should emerge from one purporting to be the true fulfilment of the divine purposes: the element of deceit is to the fore. It is in this strongly theological, and strongly eschatological context, that we have to understand the whole concern of Irenaeus' theological work. Especially is this the case in regard to the Adversus Haereses.

Let us now set out the documentation for the claims made above.

A passage which makes quite explicidy and remarkably clearly the connection between heresy and the work of Antichrist (spoken of here as the dragon, in conformity with Rev.12:14) is found in Book II, chapter XXXI. of the Adversus Haereses (paragraph 3):­

"fraude autem universa, et adinspiratione apostatica, et operatione daemoniaca, et phantasmate idololatriae per omnia repleti, oraeursores vero sunt draconis ejus, qui per hujusmodi phantasiam abscedere faciet in cauda tertiam partem stellarum, et dejiciet eas in terram: quos similiter atque illum devitare operari dicuntur, tanto magis observare eos, quasi magorem nequitiae spiritum perceiverint. Quam prophesiam si observaverit quis et eorum diurnam conversationis operationem, inveniet unam et eandem esse eas cum daemoniis conversationem."

This passage not only makes very clearly the connection insisted upon above: it also, by its emphasis upon miracles or seeming miracles, reveals that understanding of the unity of word and deed,
which is essentially biblical and certainly Hebraic. Although Irenaeus calls in question in paragraph 2 of this same chapter the ability of the heretics to effect cures, especially of external conditions, or to perform really worthwhile wonders, yet he obviously believes in demoniacal possession, and thinks that the words and deeds of men so possessed go together. In the actual section quoted, the idea seems implicit, moreover, that what is to happen at the end of the age in the working of the dragon presupposes an eschatological present working of the demons which is anticipatory of that which is to come. Thus the progress of heresy serves as a minor key in the shadow that is cast before them by coming events. The prophecy mentioned seems to be that in Rev.12:14, but the words of Mark 13 and its parallels may be supposed also to have affected the thought. There Jesus warns of the wonderful works that will be done by 'false Christs', who apparently anticipate the Antichrist.

One interesting remark concerning the witness of heretics to the truth is made by Irenaeus at A.H. I, XXII, where he asserts that the present refusal on their part to acknowledge the truth will make them false witnesses against themselves. He goes on:- "Qui quidem resurgent in carne, licet nolint, uti agnascant virtutem suscitantis eos a mortuis: cum justis autem non annumerabuntur, propter incredulitatem suam." (Para 1)

A vivid and dramatic contrast is made between their present error and their future unwilling but involuntary witness to the truth which they have denied. Passages such as these show that for Irenaeus there is always in the background of his thinking a contrast between this present age of error and deceit and the coming age of truth and righteousness.

Book III,2 has an important statement to make regarding heretics.
Irenaeus asserts that the heretics follow neither Scripture nor the true tradition of the apostles. He says that, when they are confuted from Scripture, they lay claim to an oral secret tradition. I Cor.2:6 is the motto text and the proof text for all such. Irenaeus' chief contention with them in this chapter is that this makes the Scripture of private interpretation. Again, at times the heretics, when presented with the apostolic tradition, simply aver that, whereas the apostles and even Jesus were at times in error, having varying sources of inspiration, they themselves have a superior knowledge or wisdom. It is in opposition to such attitudes that Irenaeus develops his positive attitudes towards Scripture and tradition. The following chapter in Book III (3) endeavours to show how the tradition of the apostles is guaranteed by our knowledge of the succession of bishops. Irenaeus appears at this point to be concerned simply to show that the heretics must needs adopt a position of private judgment or interpretation, since all the evidence concerning the apostolic tradition points to a different view of truth from that held by 'Gnostics' (a gloriosissimis duobus apostolis Petro et Paulo). There is no evidence among those who had most direct contact with the apostles of any 'secret' tradition. It is especially pointed out that the Church at Rome, which was founded by "the two most glorious apostles, Peter and Paul," and which reflects the true faith, since all men everywhere who are faithful bring it to her, gives no evidence of the existence of a secret ἀποκριτική truly derived from Jesus through the apostles. This chapter is, of course, most important for our understanding of the nature of the Church and for the concept of apostolic succession. It seems, however, that, whatever else may be said on the basis of it and by interpretation of it, Irenaeus' primary concern is with
the fact that there is no evidence of a secret tradition in those centres, notably Rome, where we might expect to find traces of it, if it ever in fact existed. The succession of apostles serves to show that the Church has the true understanding, since by this link she is connected with the primitive Church.

Connected with the reasoning of Book III, chapters 2 and 3, is the assertion made in the chapter immediately following (iv) that the heretics do not derive from apostolic times and have appeared on the scene only relatively recently. Thus, we are told that Valentinus only came to Rome in the time of Hyginus, who is here said to have been the ninth bishop of Rome. Marcion only appeared during the bishoprick of Anicetus (para. 3). This lateness of the appearing of the heretics reflects the fact that their teachings were innovations, not based on the historical foundations of the Gospel. Possibly the truth is latent, too, that such lateness suggest that these heresies represent a phenomenon of the end-times, foretold by Jesus. In regard to the question of Rome's primacy, the thought seems implicit that not only does truth flourish at Rome, but heresy also. Satan attempts to keep pace with the truth wherever the latter is strongest. Is this not why we read of Valentinus and Marcion as having 'come' to Rome or flourished in Rome? It is assumed that it is here that truth and error are seen in greatest conflict. This fact seems to militate against an interpretation which sees anything unique in the Roman Church's character as over against that of other Christian churches. It is a historical fact that truth, guaranteed by the presence of the two major apostles, has flourished in Rome from the earliest Christian times: this also explains the presence of such noxious heresies in the midst of this Church or city. The one is a demonic imitation of the other. In Book V, chapter XX Irenaeus
reiterates the assertion, which, as he says, he has been at pains to establish in Book III, namely, that the heretics are of much later origin that the bishops to whom the apostles committed the churches. He goes on in this chapter to see the oneness of doctrine within the Church, as compared with the widely varying statements of various heretical schools, as evidence that the tradition preserved in the Church is historical and factual. In paragraph 2 of this chapter he makes an illuminating comparison of the interest in "plus aliquid praeter veritatem." --with that temptation offered in the Garden of Eden: it is contrary to God's will to seek a knowledge beyond that given by God Himself.

"Ipsi enim confitentur se:netipsos agnitionem habere boni et mali, et super Deum qui fecit eos jaculantur sensus suos impios. Supra igitur sentiunt quam est mensura sensationis." (VXX:2).

This may be more than simply a fruitful analogy. Does it not imply that just as Satan was responsible for the Fall in the Garden, the Temptation of Jesus, and finally will be responsible at the end of the age for the deceitfulness of Antichrist, so now he is at work in the operations of the heretical 'Gnostics'? The method of operation is one with that resorted to in the Garden. Thus, the appearing of the Gnostic heretical sects is on the one base line of Satanic or demonic deceptiveness. It, therefore, anticipates the final period of deception. It is in contrast with those who are led astray by such deception that Irenaeus sets the Church "Plantata est enim Ecclesia paradisus in hoc mundo". (XX:2).

Danielou has pointed out 1 that the concept of the Church as a garden

---

planted by God is an early Jewish Christian concept, nourished by Old Testament figures for Israel as the people of God. Here it is employed to set the Church forth as the place where by the Holy Spirit we are led into that truth which God deems it wise for us to have. The Spirit is given us through that historic union of Spirit and man, which is the basis of the Church, Jesus Christ. Thus, connected with the distinction between truth and heresy is a further distinction between the community of truth and the splintered sects, composed of those who are deceived into seeking a supposedly greater knowledge than that given in Jesus Christ and who thus are removed from the place of blessing. The Church is thus brought into relation with historical realities of the past, and the future. So far as it is related to the future community that will be harassed and beset during Antichrist's reign, it is given eschatological orientation.

It would seem important to see what reference Irenaeus makes to scriptural passages which foretell that heresies will arise and plague the Church and to see how by his use of these passages he understands this phenomenon in regard to the End-time. A particularly instructive passage in A.H. III.XIV.2 deals with the prophecy of 'fierce wolves' (lupi graues) that would harass the flock (grex) the Church after Paul's 'departure' -- these words were addressed to the Miletan elders, and are recorded in Acts 20:29-30. What is important to observe in Irenaeus' use of this scriptural record is that he clearly relates the function of the 'bishops and presbyters' (episcopi et presbyteri) to the emergence of heresies which had been prophesied. In this chapter Irenaeus is saying that Luke, as one entrusted with the task of writing a Gospel and as the constant companion of St. Paul, was obviously unaware of any hidden and unspeakable mysteries, in which the Gnostic heretics make their boast. In this same paragraph Irenaeus
says that Paul always taught with simplicity what he knew. More important, however, is Irenaeus' assertion, which follows immediately on his account of Paul's meeting with the Ephesian 'bishops and presbyters' at Miletus, that, "--sic apostoli simpliciter et nemini invidentes quae didicerant ipsi a Domino haec omnibus tradebant--"

The point is that the 'bishops and elders' are envisaged as the custodians of what has been delivered to them. And what was delivered to them was so delivered, in part at least, so that the Church might be delivered from error in the days of the 'evil teachers' (mali doctores) that would surely arise. This helps us to see that Irenaeus founded his attitude to heresy on such Scriptural predictions as these. Somehow they formed an inevitable part of evil's reaction to the proclamation of the message of truth. As for the bishops and elders, they have importance, but this importance derives from the Gospel tradition, which has been handed down to them from the apostles, and from their function as 'overseers' (episcopi) who seek to act as shepherds protecting the flock of God--the word 'shepherd' is not here employed, but the reference to 'the flock' and to 'wolves' surely implies this.

Almost incidental references and allusions here and there in the Adversus Haereses indicate the setting in which Irenaeus places the Gnostic heretics. Only in some cases by studying the context of the Scriptural passages, in terms of which he thinks of these heretics, do we understand all that is implicit in Irenaeus' thinking. Thus, in II.XXI.2 Irenaeus is concerned to assert, in contradiction of Valentinianism, that the twelve apostles were not a type of the aeons within the Valentinian Pleroma. The specific point in section two of this chapter is that Valentinians have reckoned only with the twelve apostles: where, however, are they
going to place Paul? Of what aeon was Paul the type? Possibly, Irenaeus conjectures, Paul would be said to be a representative or type of the Saviour, who derives his being from the collected gifts of the whole Pleroma. In Greek mythology Hermes (or in Latin, Pandoras) was seen as being the messenger of the gods. He in some sense summed them all up, and he was their representative. Hesiod says of this Hermes: "fraudulentiae, sive seductionis verba, et subinvolantes mors inidit eorum sensibus --" (II.XXI:2) in order to deceive men and to lead them astray. This deception was made effective through the efforts of Leto, the Mother of men, who stirred men up, without the knowledge of the Demiurge, to give profound and unspeakable mysteries to itching ears. What Irenaeus means, of course, is that the interpretation of Paul given by the Valentinians would correspond with that of one whose words were made effective by demonic influences, contrary to the true Creator of men, and were received by those with "itching ears" (prurientibus aures). The expression derives from II Tim.4:3. Another reference to the re-formation of Pelops, who had been cut in pieces by the Father, a story which is found in Pindar, derives from the inspiration, says Irenaeus, of that 'Mother' (Mater) who deceives ears ready for unsound doctrine. Pelops in Pindar corresponds to Hermes in Hesiod. Both bespeak the urgency of demonic influences to deceive. Irenaeus concludes that men who heed such tales have their "consciences seared by her" (ex qua -- compuncti --". i.e. by the Mother of them all. Here the allusion is to I Tim.4:2.

1. Works and Days.I.77, etc.
2. Olymp.I.38 etc.
What it is important to observe is that, in context, these passages are speaking of the fact that "ἐν διστέροις καιροῖς ἀπαστήσονται τινες τῆς πίστεως, προσέχοντες πνεύματι πλαύνοις καὶ διδασκαλίαις δαμασκέων, ἐν ὑποκρίσει ψευδολογίων, κεκαυτηριασμένων τὴν ἴδιαν συνείδησιν," (I.Tim.4:1-2). This chapter in I Timothy, goes on to speak of the view that persons should not marry, and that 'meats' (ἐπωμένα) were to be refused. Apparently the writer had in mind some Jewish form of Gnostic heresy. The passage in II Tim.4 also has in mind the emergence of those who will be unable to accept sound doctrine, but shall be turned away to fables. Thus, a seemingly incidental set of references in a rather obscure passage of the Adversus Haereses bespeaks the assumption in Irenaeus' mind that the apostles had foretold a period of apostasy from the truth. The emphasis in these passages on the deceitfulness of demons is good evidence of the interconnection, both in the New Testament and in Irenaeus, between the emergence of such heresies and the final appearing of the Antichrist, the arch deceiver, on earth.

Irenaeus nowhere states the original sources of the conviction that a period of great deception would come on the earth, such as is mentioned in the passages quoted from I and II Timothy, but he is concerned to show that he has apostolic authority for seeing in the Gnostic heresies that which had been predicted. He appears to have thought of this period of heresy as leading up to the appearance of Antichrist. We must assume that in his mind the apostles derived their doctrine concerning such a period of heresy from the words of our Lord as recorded in Mark 13: 5-6, 21-22; par. Matt.24: 4-5, II-12.

In relation to our present theme we must now turn our attention
to the concept of a 'regula fidei' - a rule of faith. What did this mean in the thinking of Irenaeus? and whence did he think that it was derived? Are we to understand that it emerged simply as a reaction to the growth of heresy? or is there not implicit in Irenaeus' thinking a theology of tradition--closely bound up with his concept of the Church--which makes the concept of a rule of faith for him something traditional in character rather than simply a convenient summary of faith necessitated by historical exigencies? Doubtless Irenaeus would have seen the 'rule' as necessary in view of the emergence of heresy, but the point is that for him the historical emergence of heresy had been prophesied and was a sign of the approaching End. Further, the thought seems imbedded in his thinking that the faith was originally committed by the apostles to the 'elders' so that the Church would be prepared for the problems of heresy when, in accordance with prophecy, they arose. The 'rule of faith' is for him a summary of that tradition which was handed down through prophetic foresight and had been guarded and protected by the Holy Spirit through the appointed line of 'bishops and elders'.

Adolph Harnack saw one of the important features of the Catholic Church, which he judged to be a development from the primitive Church, 'community of faith, hope, and love', as the authority given to divine Church law. Harnack accepted that some principles were necessary to any organization, but believed that the peculiar authority given to them and the particular way of looking at them which obtained in the Church, after the clash with Gnosticism and Marcionism, was what was essentially Catholic. ¹ He judged that Sohm, a contemporary

¹ op.cit., pp.1-2
interpreter, overemphasized this element, but he thought that it was one important element in Catholicism.¹

"The whole essence of Catholicism—consists in the deification of tradition generally. The declaration that the empirical institutions of the Church, created for and necessary to this purpose, are apostolic, a declaration which amalgamates them with the essence and content of the Gospel and places them beyond all criticism, is the peculiarly 'Catholic' feature. Now, as a great part of these institutions cannot be inwardly appropriated and cannot really amalgamate with faith and piety, it is self-evident that such portions become legal ordinances, to which obedience must be rendered. For no other relation to these ordinances can be conceived. Hence the legal regulations and the corresponding slavish devotion come to have an immense scope in Catholicism, and well-nigh express its essence."¹

It is very largely through Harnack's influence that the rule of faith has been thus seen, together with the canon of the New Testament and apostolic offices, as representing a medium of attributing to contemporary phenomena of churchly thinking an authority not always properly due the doctrine or office or writing or (rule) in question.

Whatever validity there may be in some of Harnack's claim in this passage, it is instructive to note his own concept of authority. This evidently is that that which authenticates itself to the individual "inwardly" should be taken as truth. However, he would say, much which came to be regarded as requiring to be believed because the Church asserts it, is not of this character. Our present concern is not with the question whether this situation did in fact arise. Rather must we compare with Harnack's concept of authority that which is implicit in Irenaeus' thinking. This would seem to be rather more objective than that which Harnack had in mind. Thus, A.H.III. IV. speaks of the barbarian Christians receiving the Gospel tradition verbally rather than through written documents, and it is evident that for Irenaeus this Gospel tradition is the spoken counterpart to the written word concerning Christ. This shows that for Irenaeus

¹ op cit., p.2, n.I.
the tradition was none other than that which resulted in what we
know as the New Testament, even if its contents were slightly differently
defined from that which we accept today. Further, III.V makes it
clear that the apostles built on Christ Jesus and that He is Truth:

"Veritas ergo Dominus nostri existens, non mentiebatur; et
quem sciebat labis esse fructum, non utique Deum confiteretur
et Dominum omnium et summum Regem et Patrem suum,---perfectus
imperfectum, spiritualis animalem, is qui in Pleromate esset
eum qui extra Pleroma." (para 1.)

What is implicit here is that Jesus (and the apostles after Him) are
on one base line with the God of the Old Testament scriptures. Thus,
Irenaeus' concept of that which has authority and ought to be believed
is bound up with the Old Testament Scriptures, which heralded the
Coming One and taught divine truth, with the Jesus of Nazareth, who
fulfilled these Scriptures, and with the Church where, through the
Holy Spirit, we are given to see that it is Jesus, followed by the
apostles, who makes those Scriptures of olden time intelligible. The
objectivity is found in the coherence of apostolic truth with the Old
Testament Scriptures and their historical fulfilment in Jesus Christ.
Doubtless not all would concede that Jesus reveals the God of the
Old Testament. This, however, is precisely Irenaeus' point. The
apostolic doctrine does not deal with a God who is revealed 'de novo'
in Jesus, but with a God Whose purpose reaches its fulfilment, long
heralded, in Him. This means that even Jesus has to be apprehended
by means of a God-given set of scriptures, and it is the consistency
of Jesus with such Scriptures that reveals Him to be Who He is. He is
certainly Lord of these Scriptures, yet in the divine providence it is
through His consistency with what had previously been revealed that
the Spirit witnesses to Him. Clearly there is a measure of objectivity
in such a view, though Irenaeus would clearly concede, and even
assert, that it is only through the Holy Spirit that this coherence
can be discerned. The point is that there is an objective coherence, even if it is only by faith that this objectively existing coherence can be discerned. The question may be asked, however, why this apprehension of truth cannot occur outside the Church. Irenaeus' attitude would seem to be that, since truth objectively consists in the coherence of Jesus of Nazareth with the content of Old Testament teaching and prediction, and since the apostolic doctrine is the objective apprehension and explication of this coherence, then we can only be confronted by this truth of this consistency, as the Holy Spirit Who was operative in Jesus' fulfilment of the Scriptures overspills into our lives: this, however, He can only do on the one base line of a movement which moves from the prophets to the Christ and out again from Him to the apostles. The Church is essentially apostolic because it is the community of the Spirit, the locus of His operation in revelation and conviction of sin, righteousness, and judgment. Thus, for Irenaeus the 'rule of faith' is that coherence with the interpretation of the divinely ordained complex of prophetic word and Christ-event in flesh and blood, which is given through the Spirit by the apostles. It was not arbitrary nor 'de novo' interpretation of the Church. It was rather a summary of that faith which was consistent with apostolic memory and interpretation. The 'rule of faith' is thus related to a conception of the Church which sets her within a theology of history. God's movement from the Old Covenant to the New envisages His further and ultimate purposes.

It is hard to give chapter and verse for what has been argued above in Irenaeus' works, it is certainly assumed by his method of argumentation. Thus, Irenaeus is concerned throughout to show that
the heretics are wrong in their doctrines because they are wrong
in their understanding of the Old Testament (or, in their setting
of it largely to one side, as in Marcion) or in their understanding
of the interaction of Old and New Covenants through Jesus Christ.

In Book III of the Adversus Haereses his argumentation moves
naturally, in refutation of the Gnostic heretics, from the apostolic
understanding of Jesus to exegesis of Old Testament passages of
Scripture, which reveal that the Father Whom Jesus knew was none other
than the God of Israel.

Apart from some comments which may be made on Irenaeus' concept
of the sacraments, our thinking has ranged in this last discussion
over matters set out in our third and fourth sections of study. An
interpretation of 'the rule of faith' cannot, with reference to Irenaeus,
be discussed except in regard to the doctrines of the Church and
tradition. We may conclude, in terms of our interest in the
eschatological presuppositions of Irenaeus' whole teaching, that he
regarded the emergence of heresies as a sign of the End-time and that
over against this he set the true teaching which corresponded with
Old Testament Scripture and the apostolic tradition, in written and
spoken form. The function of the bishop, in particular, it would
seem was to preserve the flock of God from these errors which were due
to emerge prior to the final assault of Satan upon God's people through
Antichrist.

CHURCH AND SACRAMENTS

To some extent any view of the Church must be defined by its
attitude towards the ordinances of Baptism and of the Lord's Supper.
It is also true that the attitude adopted towards Ordination and
towards Church offices has a close bearing on this theme. Our
concern is not to investigate exhaustively Irenaeus' views of the
Church, of Baptism, of the Eucharist, or of Christian ministry—with especial reference to the role of the bishop and the presbyter. Rather is it to see how for Irenaeus the whole concept of the Church itself was eschatologically oriented, and to see how this is made clear by statements concerning Baptism, the Eucharist, and the bishop's role in the Church.

In A.H. Book III.IV.1, Irenaeus speaks of the Church as like a 'bank' (depositorium). He says:

"Tantae igitur ostensiones (i.e. of the apostolic Church tradition) cum sint non oportet adhuc quaerere apud alios veritatem quam facile est ab Ecclesia sunere, cum apostoli quasi in depositorium diones plenissime in eam contulerint omnia quae sint veritatis, uti omnis quicumque velit sumat ex ea potum vitae. Haec est enim vitae introitus: omnes autem reliqui fures sunt et latrones. Propter quod oportet deuitare quidem illos, quae autem sunt Ecclesiae cum summa diligentia diligere et adprehendere veritatis Traditionem."

Clearly this passage contrasts the Church and all sectarian and especially heretical parties. The Church is given great dignity. Yet it is important to observe whence her dignity derives. She is the custodian of the Gospel and it is the Gospel alone that makes her great. She alone is the entrance to life not on account of any virtue intrinsic to her but because she has had passed on to her, and through her, the water of life. The Church is, so to speak a receptacle. The riches of the Gospel have been entrusted to her: it is these which make her wealthy.

We have to ask what concept of the Church is latent in this figure. It is one in which the Church is created by the Gospel tradition. Although in one sense she may contain it, in another sense it contains her. Without this word of truth she would be as nothing. This further suggests that not only her content but her limits, her membership, has to be defined in relation to the
Gospel. Thus Irenaeus does not think of the Church primarily as an institution but rather as the place where the apostolic memory, tradition, and interpretation reigns: this being so, those only truly belong to the Church who benefit from her treasure. The emphasis undoubtedly is on the treasure: yet the function of the Church is to dispense her wealth and only those who receive her wealth truly belong within her confines.

Paragraph 2 of this same chapter speaks of many of the barbarians who have accepted and carefully preserved the Gospel tradition. It is asserted that they do this by means of Christ Jesus, who, having been received up (into heaven) in splendour.

"--in gloria venturus (est) Salvator eorum qui salvantur et Iudex eorum qui iudicantur et mittens in ignem aeternum transfiguratores veritatis et contemptores Patris sui et adventus eius."

What is implicit in this statement is that the acceptance of the Gospel, as traditionally preserved in the Church, indicates a belonging to the community of salvation, due to be revealed as such at Christ's Coming. This is set over against those persons who "transform the truth", i.e. Gnostics and other heretics, who will be judged by Christ at His Appearing. In this way the thought is reinforced that the meaning of Church membership—and, therefore, of Christian Baptism—is eschatological in character: the Church is a community of hope—it marks off those who are due to receive blessing at Christ's Appearing. In other passages emphasis is, of course, placed upon present proleptic anticipation of these benefits, but here the emphasis is focused on the Church's eschatological character. It is interesting that, despite Harnack's judgment that the Catholic Church became an authoritarian institution as she established a 'rule of faith', Irenaeus sees acceptance of this 'rule' as a sign of 'belonging'
within the Christian community, since to be a member of the Christian Church is to be related to the Gospel events through tradition and to be related to Christ's acceptance at His Parousia through clinging to this same 'tradition'. It now becomes apparent also why Irenaeus and the Catholic Church repudiated the heretical sects with such virulence. It was only in a dark world in the circle of light and truth created by the Gospel tradition that men and women could know God, i.e. within the Church. Instead of seeing the Church as one human society among others where earnest persons of mutual faith met together, Irenaeus saw the Church as the 'growing point' of the New Humanity, which would be revealed at Christ's Second Advent. All else was in darkness. This included the sects. In fact, in some respects the heretical sects posed a special danger. It is always a psychological fact that we react more strongly from those with views apparently close to our own, but different, since they could more readily lead people away from what we believe ourselves. However, Irenaeus, if he realised this, had much more than this in mind. He saw heresy, i.e. the danger from within, as the epitome of evil, since all human sin derives from the apostasy of the Wicked One. Thus, the Catholicity of the Church, as Irenaeus conceived it, derived not from an incipient institutionalism, but from the Church's eschatological character as custodian of the Gospel tradition and precursor of the New Age. This is not to say, of course, that unduly authoritarian elements never entered in, but it is to show what was Irenaeus' understanding of the Church, especially over against the sects.

There is a surprising paucity of references in Irenaeus' works to Baptism and the Eucharist. Probably it is because he is concerned with Christian truth that it is God's Word and the Gospel tradition
which receives emphasis. One passage which deals with the Eucharist has already been noted, This is found at A.H.V.II. Here we traced earlier (pp.492-495 above) the concept of recapitulation which is implicit. The elements of the Eucharist, the bread and wine, were seen to be significant in that they belong to the created order; they imply the way in which at the Parousia our earthly bodies will be transformed but will not be set aside. Clearly the elements are spoken of in this passage in such a way as to yield an eschatological insight. The thought was also adduced as implicit in this section that the risen body of Jesus, which is presently at God's right hand and in which He will return in the Parousia, communicates its strength and assistance towards us. In sections 2 and 3 of this chapter Irenaeus speaks of the bread and wine, as elements in the Communion Feast, which Christ has "sum corpus confirmavit" (para. 2), and he speaks also of our "receiving increase" (augetur) from this body, i.e. the ascended body of Jesus. In section 3 Irenaeus is careful to distinguish the Eucharist (Eucharistia = quod est corpus et sanguis Christi), from that body in its ascended majesty itself. Yet clearly the Eucharist is a vehicle, created as such by the Word of God, whereby the energies of Christ's risen majesty may flow to us. This is never thought of magically or mechanically. It is God's Word, i.e. His expressed will, which thus creates a vehicle of these elements. Further, if Christ thus bestows energies upon us which may affect even our physical bodies, this is but an anticipation of that final quickening of our presently mortal flesh which is to occur at His Advent in glory.

Here again the thought of the Church as an eschatological Body of Christ is in view. Just as the Christian tradition, in its verbal form, constitutes the community of believers, so the ordained
sacrament, which speaks pictorially of the Gospel, constitutes the
members of the fellowship as true Body of Christ in so far as it
V.11:3.)
nourishes them (corpora ex ea nutrita). This nourishment extends to
their human bodies and anticipates the way in which the whole man will
be accepted by Christ at the Parousia. Again, this does not operate
apart from Christ's intention and will. Nor does the consecration
given by the elements bring a man salvation apart from his faith and
obedience. This, of course, is not discussed, but it seems clear,
in view of Irenaeus' whole outlook, that he would view a wrongful use
of the elements as 'consecrating to destruction'. The major point
is that there would seem to be a parallel that we can draw (Irenaeus
does not do it explicitly himself) between the way in which he sees the
Gospel tradition as constituting the believing fellowship and the way in
which he sees the Eucharist as nourishing us in the whole of our
being. In both cases, the effect is with a view to our identification
at the Parousia as the people of God. Clearly, if this be a sound
understanding of Irenaeus' thinking, it is the Gospel which is here
dominant and not an outward ceremony. The point is that, since
salvation affects the whole man and the whole created order, it is
appropriate that physical symbols such as Baptism and the Eucharist
should be employed by God and should seal us for unveiling as members
of Christ's Body at His Appearing. In all of this the Church is
again seen as a community or entity which derives its being, both
inwardly and outwardly, from the Gospel made effective to us through
the risen ascended Christ Jesus, and which expressly awaits its
fulness and display at the Second Advent.

We turn now to the question of Irenaeus' attitude to church
'offices', such as these of the presbyter and the bishop, in order
to elucidate what this may teach us concerning his eschatological
understanding of the Church. We have already had occasion to note (page 535 above) in connection with Adversus Haereses III.XIV.2 and the remarks based on Paul's commission to the Ephesian elders, that the 'bishops and presbyters' were viewed by Irenaeus as preserving the Church as good 'shepherds' in that they preserved by tradition the truth of the Gospel. Another passage which illustrates Irenaeus' attitude to those who possess office in the Church is found in A.H. IV.XXVI. The theme of this passage is that Christ is the hidden treasure in the Old Testament Scriptures; that the meaning of these Scriptures could only be perceived by spiritually minded men after the fulfilment of mysterious predictions in Jesus Christ; and that the Church is the company of those who perceive this hidden meaning in these Scriptures. The presbyters are to be obeyed (paragraph 2), because they are divinely appointed representatives of the people of God. Irenaeus says:-

"Quapropter eis qui in Ecclesia sunt presbyteris obaudire oportet, his qui successionem habent ab Apostolis, sicut ostendimus, qui cum episcopatus successione charisma veritatis certum secundum placitum Patris accequerunt--."

Irenaeus makes it clear that the authority of the 'presbyters' is none other than that of the Church, because he goes on to say that we should hold in suspicion "--reliquos vero qui absistunt a principalis successione et quocumque loco colligunt--". Instructive, too, is the comparison made in the sequel with Nadab and Abiad (Lev.10:1-2) and with Korah, Dathan, and Abiram (Num.16:33). Both these stories, but the latter especially, demonstrate vividly how opposition to the divinely appointed leadership of Moses and Aaron was drastically dealt with by God. It would seem that such a verse as Num.16:33 was much in the mind of Irenaeus: "--and they perished from the midst of the assembly." The reference to Lev.10 has heresy especially in mind and
the reference to Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, has schism in mind. A further example of schism and sin is seen in Jeroboam, under whom the Northern Kingdom of Israel was established as a separate entity from Judah. With this in mind (and probably especially the words of I Kings 14:10) Irenaeus says:

"--qui autem scindunt et separat unitatem Ecclesiae, eandem quam Hieroboam poenam percipiunt a Deo--."

What is implicit in all of this is an insistence that the Church of God, as constituted by God through the Gospel and through divinely appointed leadership, is the true people of God. We have already seen that, in a manner subordinate to the truth of the Gospel, the Lord's Supper helps to constitute the people of God as such in so far as it is a physical symbol of the truly physical character of the people of God—a truth which indirectly points us to the fact that it is on earth and in the End time that the people of God are to be revealed as such publicly and finally. It appears to be in some such manner also that Irenaeus understands the offices of bishop and presbyter. In a manner subordinate to the truth of the Gospel, they help to preserve the people of God from such heresy and schism as would lead the people astray and would prevent their participation in the ultimate possession of the promised inheritance: this much is the plain message of A.H. IV.XXVI. when we reflect upon all that is alluded to in Lev.10 and especially in Num.16. Significant surely is the fact that in the latter passage, despite the judgment on Korah and his associates, the people of God are infected with the spirit of rebellion and, in consequence, God sends a plague upon the whole assembly of God's people: a remnant is saved only through the priestly intervention of Moses and Aaron who consecrate and atone for the community by taking fire from off the altar of God among the
congregation in the censers. By implication the leaders of the Church have a twofold function—to call forth judgment on heresy and schism and to intercede for the congregation of God's people as a whole. The basic understanding is one expressive of solidarity, as in Leviticus and in Numbers: the people of God are one, rather than a gathering of individual units, and heresy and schism must be put aside and expelled, lest the whole people of God ultimately fall under the judgment of God. The Church's leaders are divine appointees who, under God, help to preserve the people as the people of God. This they do by obedience to the declared will of God. Thus, the Church's ministry, as her sacraments (for what is true of the Eucharist is surely true of Baptism also), through subordination to the Gospel, helps to preserve people for the purposed end that God has in view for them. Paragraphs 3 and 5 of this same chapter indirectly witness that this goal is to be achieved at Christ's Coming. The references are in both cases to the need for leaders within the Church of God to be faithful, lest they be judged at Christ's Appearing. Matt.24:45ff., with its parallel in Luke 12:45, is the parable that is in mind, but it is clear that Irenaeus understands the Lord Who delays His coming as speaking of the Second Advent of the Lord of the Church, Jesus Christ. Surely this demonstrates that both leaders and people of God are to receive judgment or approval at the Parousia of Christ, and that all that is said about the Church's ministry has in mind the coming fulfilment of God's purposes for His people. By implication, the need for authorities within the Church—always under God and the Gospel of Christ—is that the Church is an earthly people 'in via', as surely as was Israel in Old Testament times under Moses' leadership. The leadership given through divine gift (cf. paragraph 5) is in itself an eschatological sign, a sign that the Kingdom of Christ is earthly
and future. In a supporting manner, Irenaeus clearly sees in this chapter that presbyters and bishops belong to the same tradition as patriarchs and prophets. It is the Son of God in the Incarnation Who divides the dispensations (referred to in paragraph 5), but it is the one divine economy of grace. Thus, the Church's ministry is connected with the period before Christ and it strains towards the fulfilment of God's purposes for the Church in much the same way as did the leadership of Israel in early days. Nor is this just analogy: the New Testament community is the continuation of the older community of God in Old Testament times.

THE HOLY SPIRIT AND THE END OF THE AGE

We turn now to the fifth and final section of this survey, where we must look at the way in which the Holy Spirit is seen throughout Irenaeus' works to be a personal Agent Who drives the Church towards her predestined goal— and not the Church only but the very framework within which the Church is to stand at last, confessed by God as His own. Doubtless any section of Irenaeus' theology could be shown to be affected by his eschatological perspective, which by now we have demonstrated to be an integral part of his thinking. However, it is especially needful to make the connection of eschatology in Irenaeus with the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, and this for two reasons. First, this enables us to see the close connection of that with which eschatology deals and God's personal intention. Second, we tend to think so much in Hellenistic thought-forms of what is meant by 'spirit', whether divine or human, that it is important to stress that God's intention for men in future days takes account in Irenaeus' understanding of man's whole constitution, body as well as soul and spirit.

We have already had occasion to note the famous passage in
A.H. IV.XX.I in which the Word and Wisdom of God are equated with the Son and the Spirit as 'His own hands'. (suas---manus). When this section was discussed earlier, (above pp. 474-76) the point was made that this passage is concerned primarily to show that the 'image of God' of which it speaks in context is a way of explaining that man is made in the way that God intended him to be made. It was agreed that man's bodily constitution may in some more substantial way be thought of as mirroring God, but the emphasis is upon the divine intention.

Now, it is in this context that the Son and the Spirit are thus spoken of as being 'God's hands', i.e. as carrying out the Father's intention.

What we now have to stress is that man's creation in his bodily constitution is the result of the divine counsel, of the Godhead's intertrinitarian resolve and execution. There was no Person within the Godhead which was set to one side in this decision. When, therefore, we think of the Holy Spirit we cannot think of some support from within the divine Godhead for a future 'bodiless' condition for man--for this would reverse the divine intention and the original creative act.

If the whole theme of the Adversus Haereses were not recapitulation, there might be some justification for arguing that what God originally planned for man was only intended as a brief experience, prolonged through the Fall. The recapitulation concept is, however, clearly integral to Irenaeus' thinking, and thus what the Incarnation has achieved is to redeem man in the body. Further, it has been clearly shown in the foregoing that for Irenaeus those physical aspects of the Church's present experience, which we have had occasion to note, viz., Baptism, Eucharist and the Church viewed as Body of Christ related by the Spirit to the raised body of Jesus Christ at God's right hand, gain full meaning only through their pledge of
man's continuing existence in the body, even if that body be given
new powers. The bedrock of all of this is the Incarnation, and it
should be stressed that for Irenaeus this means that it was by the
energy of the Spirit that God and man were united in Jesus Christ.
It is extremely significant that it is by the Holy Spirit that Christ
was raised for the dead. This is the fullest guarantee imaginable
that what God plans for His people in future ages does not nullify
man's bodily constitution. At A.H.V.II.I Irenaeus quotes Rom.8:23
asserting that just as God raised up Jesus by the Spirit, so we who
belong to Christ shall also be raised by the Spirit. In the same
chapter he argues persuasively that man does not possess natural
immortality. It is the gift of God through the Incarnation and
through the raising of us up by the Spirit at the end of the age.
In this clearly the Spirit is given a vital eschatological role,
which yet confirms His original participation in the act of creation
and which received its validation and confirmation in the decisive
act of joining God and man in the Incarnation.

The following chapter (VIII) reminds us that the gifts of the
Spirit in the present Church age have an eschatological significance.
Irenaeus says (para.1): "Nunc autem partem aliquam a Spiritu ejus
summis ad perfectionem et praeparationem incorruptelae, paulatim
assescentes capere at portare Deum: quod et pignus dixit Apostolus,
hoc est pars ejus honoris qui a Deo nobis promissus est".  

The argument continues that, through the Spirit, we are rendered
spiritual even now. Nevertheless this spirituality does not involve
the repudiation of the body. "--hoc autem non secundum jacturam
carnis sed secundum communionem spiritus fit" (para. 1).
This takes us very close to the heart of Irenaeus' thinking on this
subject which is that it is God's intention at the last to quicken us by His Spirit so that we shall be raised immortal. There is an inner consistency in Irenaeus' thought. God has made us in the body by the Spirit; God has confirmed the essential irreversibility of what He has done, in the Incarnation and especially in the Resurrection of Christ; God, therefore, plans to quicken our mortal flesh at the Parousia of Christ and meanwhile He grants us anticipations of this in that we are given the consciousness of being the sons of God. Irenaeus continues in a splendid passage:

"si igitur nunc pignus habentes clamamus: Abba, Pater, quid fieri quando resurgentes facies ad facies videbimus eum, quando omnia mentra affluerenter exsultationis hymnum protulerint, glorificantia eum qui suscitaverit ea ex mortuis et aeternam vitam donaverit? Si enim pignus completens hominem in se habitum jam facit dicere: Abba, Pater, quid faciet universa Spiritus gratia quae hominibus dabitur a Deo? simul hos eis efficiet et perficiet voluntatem Patris: efficiet enim hominem secundum imaginem et similitudinem Dei." (para. 1)

This passage is very striking in that it shows us man in his resurrected future state as receiving the 'complete grace of the Spirit'. Clearly there is no dichotomy between the Spirit's transcendent being and our bodily condition. The reason for this is also given, in that it is the Father's will that we should be conformed to the image and likeness of God. Our earlier study of the concept of 'the image of God' should make it clear at once what this means, viz., that we should be made like Jesus Christ. And Christ is in the body. If our physical constitution were completely done away with, yet would Christ's remain: if we say otherwise we deny the finality of the Incarnation and Resurrection of Jesus. Thus we see that in Irenaeus the Spirit does not lead us away from the bodily life but is even now preparing us for the gift of incorruptibility, which refers to an endless quality of outward and inward life in fellowship with God.
Our stress in these references to the work of the Holy Spirit in the eschatological setting has been upon the compatibility of God's transcendence with our humanity, which involves our bodily constitution. The chapters in Book V of the Adversus Haereses which deal with Christ's millennial reign show the consistency with which the concepts of Creation, Incarnation, and Fulfilment work themselves out in Irenaeus' thinking. It might not have seemed necessary to stress this emphasis upon man's bodily constitution and upon this world, in showing the Spirit's relationship with the End-time. It is true that there are few references to the Spirit in the section dealing with Christ's coming Kingdom upon earth, but the reason for this appears to be that Christ, who is God and man in union, is there conceived as physically present and reigning on earth. So far as the emphasis, that we have placed, is concerned, this has been necessary, because in fact it is true to Irenaeus. But it has also been emphasized because it bears out our conviction that in Irenaeus' writings eschatology cannot be 'spiritualised' or treated as a vivid pictorial way of placing us before existential realities. It is talking in the most matter-of-fact and literal way possible of things that Irenaeus believes will happen in space and in time at the End of the age. To interpret him otherwise is not to do justice to his intention.

Although the Spirit is thus to quicken man at the Parousia of Christ, nevertheless there is no respect in Irenaeus' writings for the body or what is outward (or inward) that is not sanctified by the Spirit. Thus, when Irenaeus talks of Baptism, or the Eucharist, or Church offices, or the Gospel tradition, he does not think of these things that belong to our humanity and our earthly limitations as having intrinsic value. It is by the Spirit that they achieve
the purpose for which they were given. In A.H.III.IV.ff the Spirit corresponds to the tradition. The latter is the vehicle, but it is the Spirit Who enables men to see the objective correspondence between this tradition and the Spirit-inspired witness of the Old Testament Scriptures. The succession of the Church and her bishops, again, belongs to the physical character of the Church. In itself this would be meaningless, if it were not for the fact that the Church of which they are an integral part is the community of the Holy Spirit. Thus A.H. IV.XXVI.2 speaks of the succession of the episcopate as having received the gift of truth—and is as much the work of the Spirit as deceit is of Satan. It is really only by the Spirit that the succession of the apostles, i.e. their consistency with patriarchs, prophets, and Christ, can be detected. The physical continuity of their tradition derives from God's acceptance of us in our humanity, and therefore continuity of report and tradition must demand transmission from one to another, but it is the Spirit that gives life to this continuity. Thus, any concept of 'apostolic succession' in Irenaeus is not purely mechanical in character. There is indeed, in concept, an unbroken succession of tradition, but this appears to refer to that which constitutes the Christian community. It would not seem that there had to be in Irenaeus' view an unbroken succession of bishops or presbyters, though Irenaeus was able to trace such in Rome up to his day. If for any reason gaps appeared in the line, one would judge that Irenaeus' insistence upon the Spirit's quickening power would lead him to see the Spirit as reconstituting the line—always with reference, however, to the truth of the Gospel which must be transmitted through human word or pen or act. In like manner, when we think of the 'spiritual body' (corpus spiritale; V.VII:2), in Irenaeus' concept, it would seem that this is for him less a
definition of the resurrection body than a statement that our present bodies are to achieve the incorruptibility which it is God's intention to give His people in the Resurrection Day. It is not an alternative to our present constitution, but a quickening of the same. A.H. V.VII.2 refers to 1 Cor.15 and makes it clear that Irenaeus is indeed thinking in this dynamic fashion. Just as the sacraments are nothing in themselves, so the resurrection body is simply our present body raised and changed.

SUMMARY AND FINAL ASSESSMENT OF IRENAEUS' ESCHATOLOGY

The above discussion could not be summarized easily, but it is clear that in Irenaeus' mind certain convictions were firm in regard to eschatological matters. These may be tabulated only, in the following way. First, eschatology is for Irenaeus an integral part of his thinking. It is subordinate to an emphasis upon the achievement of Christ in His Incarnation, Death, and Resurrection followed by Ascension, but it is the outworking of the same for the future. Second, eschatology does not deal with an End-time isolated from the past or the present Church-age. Irenaeus works with a dynamic theology of history, in which God by His Spirit drives the world towards its predestined goal at the Parousia of Jesus Christ. Third, Irenaeus does not subscribe to an 'any-moment' concept of the Parousia: the End must be preceded by the reign of Antichrist and the persecution of the people of God. Regarding Israel's role at this time Irenaeus is not explicit. Fourth, present persecution and present heresy anticipate, as a kind of 'realized eschatology', the terror and deceitfulness of Antichrist's reign. Fifth, in a more positive fashion the Church in her worship, preaching, and sacraments also anticipates the coming fellowship of God's Kingdom. Sixth, all that lies ahead, including the Parousia is historical in the fullest
sense possible: this involves that it deals with realities and events in space and time, however these, together with ourselves, may be transformed. Irenaeus' theology is intensely realist. It is this fact which expresses itself in his firm—and not peripheral—views regarding the coming Kingdom of God on earth prior to the Final Judgment. A final point is that what undergirds the whole of Irenaeus' thinking about eschatology is his conviction that what God purposes for humanity in the future is the outworking of His original intention. The doctrine of recapitulation is central to all his thinking.

It is clear that such an outlook has no truck with modern views that regard New Testament eschatology as primarily symbolic in character, the symbol introducing us vividly to existential reality. Even compared with those who take a futurist eschatology seriously, Irenaeus is unusual in his emphasis upon the irrevocably physical and temporal character of the events of the End-time.

One important area of judgment relates to Irenaeus' view on the so-called 'delay' of the Parousia. There is no evidence that this posed a serious problem for Irenaeus. He did not anticipate it immediately because the preceding events had not yet burst upon the Church and the world. Negatively, persecution and heresy were seen as indicative of a growing opposition of Satanic forces to the Gospel. Positively, Christ's Presence was mediated within the Christian fellowship through the 'rule of faith', through the guardianship of Christ's ministers, through sacraments—this anticipated the coming complete fellowship of Christ's Kingdom on earth. Thus, although the Parousia had not yet come, it was being heralded. Those with spiritual discernment could observe its approach. Perhaps if Irenaeus had believed that Christ had
emphatically taught His Return within a generation of His death and Resurrection, he would have been troubled. Irenaeus’ silence regarding this may indicate that the judgment that Mark 13:30 - Matt. 24:34 referred to Jesus’ own generation does not correspond to Irenaeus’ assessment. Mk.9:1 and Matt.10:23, both passages suggestive of the imminence of the End, are passed by in silence in Irenaeus’ writings. It seems probable in view of what we have been able to bring out concerning Irenaeus’ concept of Antichrist’s reign, that any possible reference in context in Mark 13 - Matt.24 - Lk.21 to the Fall of Jerusalem was understood not as a reference to that which happened in 70 A.D. but to that which is yet to happen when Antichrist will pose His unique affront to God’s majesty by assuming control in a widely persuasive manner of the seat of government intended for Christ’s coming reign on earth. We submit that the fact that Irenaeus notes no problem regarding Mark 13:30 is salutary—the more so, in view of his realist approach to biblical statements. Irenaeus in his whole conceptual theological scheme is aware of God’s dynamic presence in history, to which there corresponds the doomed opposition of Satan’s forces, which are building up for the final conflict. It was primarily Irenaeus’ sense of present history’s involvement in God’s active purposes, which kept him from problems regarding any ‘delay’ in the Parousia of Christ.

One further aspect of Irenaeus’ attitude to the question of the nearness of the End of the age should be briefly noted. An instructive passage at A.H.V.XXVI.1 says:

"Manifestius adhuc etiam de novissimo tempore et de his qui sunt in eo decem regibus in quos dividetur quod nunc regnat imperium significavit Johannes, Domini discipulus, in Apocalypsi edisserens quae fuerint decem cornua quae a Daniele visa sunt, dicens sic dictum esse sibi."—Rev. 17:12-14a is then quoted). (Italics mine).
What this passage reveals is that, in Irenaeus' view, the Roman empire of his own day was the fourth world empire, represented by the fourth beast, terrible and strong, of Daniel 7:7. The 'ten horns' is a reference to Rev.17:12 which falls within the passage subsequently quoted. Irenaeus clearly understands the 'ten horns' of Rev.17:12 as referring back to Dan.7:7, which had ten horns. These ten horns are understood as due to succeed the fourth beast or empire. What this means, in practical terms, is that Irenaeus considers that after the passing of the Roman empire, ten kingdoms would arise. Further, a later section of this first paragraph of A.H.V.XXVI makes it clear that Irenaeus is following throughout what Daniel has to say in chapter 7: the horns are to be followed by another little horn (plainly, though not here explicitly, understood with reference to Antichrist) who will supplant three of them, and establish itself. The picture in Irenaeus' mind is, therefore, that the Roman empire is at some future time, sooner or later, to be divided into ten kingdoms. Immediately thereafter Antichrist will emerge, conquering three of these kingdoms (cf.Dan.7.8). Antichrist's reign is thought of (A.H.V.XXV.3), in terms of Dan.7.25 (--hoc est triennium et sex menses-- ) as lasting only three and a half years. It will be cut short by the Appearing of Christ in glory and the end of the age. It follows that Irenaeus cannot expect the Second Advent of Christ to occur at any time. Not only must Antichrist first appear, but also Antichrist's advent must be preceded by the division of the contemporary Roman empire into ten kingdoms. None of this is suggestive of a situation in which Irenaeus was likely to be perplexed over the delay in the Second Advent of Christ.

The position, then, which emerges with regard to Irenaeus'
eschatology is that it is unequivocally futurist. We have seen in the
evidence adduced that he takes seriously a literal Second Advent,
resurrection of the saints, millennial era on earth, final resurrection
and judgment. At the same time there is no sense of harassment over
the fact that these realities are not yet upon the Church and the
world. This is, as we have seen, partially because certain other
events (division of the Roman empire and emergence of Antichrist)
have not yet taken place, although they are due to precede the Second
Advent, and partially because the events that are to come are already
casting their shadow in advance (persecution and apostasy, on the one
hand, and the ongoing experience of Christ in the Church, in sacraments,
and in mission, on the other). The phrase, "at the end of the times",
which keeps reappearing in the text of the Demonstratio, is suggestive
of Irenaeus' outlook: he sees the Church as belonging to the end of
the age. The Incarnation, together with the death, resurrection and
ascension of Jesus Christ, have inaugurated the final era of God's
plan for history. Thus understood, it is clear that the End cannot
be far removed. Yet, an understanding of the books of Daniel and
Revelation suggest that, though four of the world empires prophesied
by Daniel have made their appearance, all but the fourth having also
passed into the mists of time, the Appearing of Christ will be
defered until certain prophesied happenings have taken place with
reference to the division of the Roman empire and the emergence of
Antichrist. Irenaeus gives no indication how soon he thinks that
these events are in terms of actual time, but from the point of view
of what has already been fulfilled of Daniel's expectation and from
the point of view of what God has achieved in Christ "at the end of
the times" it is clear that for him the End cannot long be deferred.

Both the absence of any sense of embarrassment over the delay
in the Parousia of Christ in glory and the undisguised futurism of Irenaeus' expectation, make it clear that the evidence from Irenaeus' writings do not support the judgment that the Early Church reinterpreted eschatology on account of the 'delay' in the Parousia. There is indeed imbedded in Irenaeus' leading concept of 'recapitulatio' an understanding of eschatology as inaugurated with the Incarnation, which demonstrates that his view of the last things is not purely futurist. Yet what God has done in Christ and what He is doing in the Church age only indicate that we live "in the end of the times", not that that End has actually arrived. The thought of the divine οὐκ οὐκομαί is implicit throughout: God arranges and disposes history according to a plan whose vital feature was the achievement wrought by Christ in His life, death, resurrection, and ascension. What Irenaeus' writings witness to is essentially an 'inaugurated eschatology'. This is thought of as evidenced in this age in the existence of the Church, in her experience of the sacraments, and in mission, but what is especially clear in Irenaeus' thought is the realization of the way in which God uses even the hostility of Satanic forces to serve His purposes. Even the hostility of Satan and his opposition to Christ's cause will but help to produce the situation in which God's 'recapitulation' of man and his destiny will be out-worked. Unique too in Irenaeus' eschatology is the thought of man's destiny as retrieved through Christ's adoption of our humanity, an adoption which was no temporary phase. Man's destiny is assured in the Man, Christ Jesus.