This thesis has been submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for a postgraduate degree (e.g. PhD, MPhil, DClinPsychol) at the University of Edinburgh. Please note the following terms and conditions of use:

- This work is protected by copyright and other intellectual property rights, which are retained by the thesis author, unless otherwise stated.
- A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge.
- This thesis cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the author.
- The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the author.
- When referring to this work, full bibliographic details including the author, title, awarding institution and date of the thesis must be given.
CHAPTER VIII: TERTULLIAN.
In the chapter appended on 'Eschatology in the Thinking of Tertullian', references throughout have been taken from the text, as edited in the series known as 'Corpus Christianorum: Series Latina'. The volumes on Tertullian in that series are two in number, Part I dealing with those books which the editors take to be before Tertullian's acceptance of Montanism, together with the Adversus Marcionem, which in the final edition that we have belongs to the Montanistic period (i.e. after circa 207 A.D.). Part II deals with works believed to date from the Montanistic period of Tertullian's life and career. These two volumes were produced in 1954 and published at Turnhout in Belgium by the publishers, Brepols.

The other well-known series, Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum, has a treatment of the text of Tertullian's works in five volumes to date. The first edition appeared as far back as 1890, while the most recent volume appeared in 1957. These volumes have emanated from Vienna. Kroymann was one of the notable editors in this series. Since the Corpus Christianorum texts were edited in 1954 they represent the most recent critical work on the text of Tertullian, except in the case of those books dealt with in volume 5 of the CSEL series. On occasions comparison has been made with this text, where the meaning seemed dubious, but throughout the text accepted has been that of Corpus Christianorum.

The works of Ernest Evans have also been consulted, especially the De Resurrectione Mortuorum. Evans' edition of this work, clearly very important for any discussion of Tertullian's eschatology, was published in 1960. (London, S.P.C.K.). In two places (pp.15 and 20) we have drawn attention to Evans' views on text in particular places.
We have noted that there is now no known MS. source for the De Pudicitia and the De Ieiunion adversus Psychicos, and that the sole source for several of the works of Tertullian is the Codex Agobardinus, now housed at Paris and once the property of Agobard, Bishop of Lyons, who died in 840 A.D. In all these matters we have accepted the decisions as to the authentic text given by the editors of the Corpus Christianorum.

So far as the books written by Tertullian are concerned, we have accepted the view, normal to modern scholarship, that 31 treatises which are genuinely from his pen are extant, and that some(such as the work on Ecstasy) have been lost, except for fragments. Apart from the works edited and translated by Evans(especially the De Resurrectione Mortuorum and the De Carne Christi) the English translations consulted have been those of the Ante Nicone Christian Library(T. & T. Clark 1867 ff). Nevertheless where a translation of the Latin has been offered, it is a personal translation that has been made (on the basis of the Corpus Christianorum text in each case), unless there is an express citation of the A.N.C.L.translation.

It should be mentioned that in our discussion of Tertullian's views concerning the future of the Jewish people at p.23ff, which is based largely on the Adversus Iudaeos, we have judged, contrary to the normal view, that the whole of this work is genuinely Tertullianic. Chapters 9-14 are commonly taken to be spurious. This has been the common view since the time of Neander in the first half of the 19th century. It is accepted by B.Altaner in his Patrology (English ed.1960) and by F.L. Cross in his book, 'The Early Christian Fathers', published by G.Duckworth in 1960. It is believed that an inferior writer based chapters 9-14 on the Adversus Marcionem, iii. Whether genuinely Tertullianic or not — and it may seem bold to question such a settled scholarly conviction, based partially on linguistic differences between the two parts of the book — it has seemed to us that there is a consistency of thinking on the matters which we had in hand. One of our three quotations from the Adversus Iudaeos comes from the first part of the book, and the other two from the second part of the work.
INTRODUCTION

The whole thought of Tertullian is deeply impregnated with the awareness of that towards which all things are tending, and there is no aspect of it which is unaffected by eschatological perspectives. The eschatology which is revealed by a study of his writings is for the greater part that of the pre-Nicene Fathers generally: it centres on the coming Advent of Christ in glory, the bodily resurrection of the dead, and the reality of the Judgment Day. The customary attention to events preceding the Parousia of Christ is found: the emergence of apostasy within the Church, the appearing of Antichrist, and the persecution of the people of God. It is clear that our Lord's eschatological discourse, (Mk. 13 - Matt. 24 - Lk. 21) filled out by references to the Book of Daniel, the Revelation and, latterly, Montanistic prophetic utterances, constitutes the source of knowledge concerning those events which are to precede the end. Tertullian accepts belief in a millennial reign of Christ on earth. He has instructive remarks to make on the Descent of Christ into Hades and on the state of the dead prior to the Appearing of Christ at the end of the age. There is also an illuminating agreement with the judgment of Hippolytus (who wrote a little later) that Rome is the fourth world empire of Daniel, chapters 2 and 7, and that Christ cannot appear in glory until the Roman Empire has passed away, has been replaced by ten kingdoms in accordance with prophecy, and until Antichrist has emerged out of them.

What has been outlined above will require to be documented, but it should be noted at the outset that it is not in the areas outlined that the distinctive eschatological emphases, or outworkings of the eschatological outlook, are to be found. Perhaps the most unitary concept in Tertullian's writings that of the Kingdom of God, and this is
always understood in a dynamic fashion. It is no static thing, but rather a living force operative in the world, harrying the forces of darkness, and pressing towards the consummation of all things. In accordance with this understanding we find as strong an emphasis in Tertullian on an eschatology that is 'in the process of being realized' as there is on futurist elements: both aspects are held together with considerable balance. It is in keeping with this dynamic understanding of the Kingdom of God that we discover a strong emphasis on the present reign of Christ at the right hand of God - a reign which is manifested in the gifts of the Spirit poured out on the Church (this thought has integral connections with the later Montanism of Tertullian); on the victory of Christ as evidenced in the preaching of the Gospel to the very ends of the world and its glad reception by the heathen nations; and on the sovereignty of God as expressed by the succession of pagan powers of political influence. All history is subordinated, in Tertullian's scheme of things, to the dynamic purpose of God which reaches out towards its completion. Again, closely connected with this is the realistic way in which Tertullian deals with the Covenants made by God with men. He thinks in terms not only of the Old and New covenants, but also of that with Adam, that with Noah, and that with Abraham, and so on. He sees very clearly that in some real fashion these enactments of new covenantal relationships did alter the situation between God and those concerned. It is by means of such covenants that God has ordered the progression of history towards its goal. The use in Tertullian of the term, 'Saeculum', will also repay close attention: it reflects in measure the Biblical contrast between 'this Age' (οῦτος οἶκος) and 'the Age which is to come' (οὐκέτα αἰών). What is very evident in his use of the Latin term is his application of it to the whole 'world-order', conceived of in terms both of space and time. Thus, this 'saeculum' is contrasted, usually in an implicit fashion, with that
'divine order' which lies beyond this one and at the same time with that coming Age of divine appointment which is to break in on this one when Christ comes in glory. It is this profoundly Biblical understanding of all that is involved in the concept of an 'εἰκόνα' that has been incorporated in his use of the Latin term, 'saeculum'. It is also over against the background of this understanding of the 'ages' that are disposed in the divine Providence, that we must see Tertullian's unitary understanding of the pressing of the Gospel towards the ends of the earth, spatially conceived, and the end of the age, temporally conceived. This forms the background to what Tertullian has to say concerning God's operating through pagan rulers, who are themselves unaware of being so used by God, and to his glad sense of triumph in the success of the Christian mission. It is also in relation to all this that we have to see the very serious way in which Tertullian takes the Biblical statements concerning 'the blinding' of Israel. Israel's rejection of her Lord and Gentile acceptance of Christ give silent witness to the predetermination of God in His sovereignty and to the inspiration of the prophets, who bore advance witness to these happenings.

A further area of importance for our understanding of Tertullian's eschatology, especially in its 'realized' aspects, concerns his understanding of the nature of the Church and her sacraments of Baptism and the Eucharist. These yield clear indications of Tertullian's acceptance of primitive and traditional eschatological concepts. His attitude to the matter of Penance must be briefly examined, in so far as this is determined in part by the eschatological perspective assumed. In his view of Baptism one may detect in Tertullian similarities with the thinking of 'the Shepherd of Hermas', in that both seem to see that sacrament as a 'sealing' until the 'Day' of Christ's Appearing and consequently lay
heavy stress on the physical character of Baptism as appropriate to the physical character of the experience of salvation in the resurrection of the body. Tertullian's break with the Catholic Church and his acceptance of Montanism raise interesting questions in this connection as to how he related each community to the redemption of the body and the glorification of Christ's Body, the Church, at the end of the age. Note must be taken also of Tertullian's attitude towards martyrdom, how it seals one in the security of Christ for eternity, and what effect it has on the location of the Christian 'soul' prior to resurrection at the Second Advent. Not unconnected with this is Tertullian's outlook on marriage and celibacy. He undoubtedly sees marriage as permitted, over against the views of Gnostics and of Marcion, but as a 'second best'. This outlook is conditioned, as in the Alexandrian Fathers, Clement and Origen, by eschatological presuppositions.

Of significance for eschatology in Tertullian's thought is his interest in the legalistic aspects of forgiveness and justification by faith in Christ. We discover in him the interest, which was to be characteristic of the West, in the soul's legal standing before God -- Tertullian's own legal mind and training affected his thinking on these matters. Throughout, however, one can also detect the clear impress of Tertullian's eschatological assumptions. The legal standing of the soul before God is worked out with reference to the present life, the period between death and resurrection, and the Judgment Day.

It is interesting that for the most part it is possible to deal with the eschatology of Tertullian as a whole and without having to draw a clear line of demarcation between what was said in his pre-Montanist days and what was said when he had accepted Montanism. Differences of emphasis there may be, but it does seem that there was an inner consistency in the development of Tertullian's thinking, which led him finally into the
Montanist camp. It may be surmised that Tertullian put his own interpretation on the Montanist position. Be that as it may, the result is that there is no considerable change in his eschatology which is manifest as he moves rapidly towards Montanism or even after his actual adoption of it.

Tertullian's adoption of Montanism gives a special interest to his views on heresy and to the way in which truth is transmitted within the Church. Clearly, in his own later thinking the true Church was represented by Montanist attitudes rather than by those which characterized the broad stream of the Church, which we know as 'Catholic'. This helps us to realize that Tertullian's concept of the Church and the way in which truth is vouchsafed to her is not by any means thought out in mechanistic terms. It is true that his 'De Praescriptione Haereticorum' was written before he became a Montanist, and even before he showed marked leanings towards Montanism, but it remains true that Tertullian never found it necessary to repudiate what he had said in that work.

He does not in fact think of the true Gospel tradition as guaranteed by its transmission through churches founded by the apostles and maintained through their successors, the bishops: rather does he see the Gospel as dynamically making room for itself by its inherent power through the apostolic witness and as creating responsiveness in every successive generation. This will have to be discussed later, but the main point which should be indicated here is that we find in Tertullian's concept of the tradition and of apostolic succession an analogue with his view of the sacraments: they are embodied in physical 'signs' but their power resides in that to which the signs or symbols witness. Further, just as the sacraments seal over against the final day of redemption, so the Gospel tradition transmitted by the apostles and their successors preserves those who are obedient to it within the company of God's elect. Again.
they are preserved over against, and until, the final day of redemption, so that even Tertullian's contrasts of heresy with the true Gospel and of schism with the true Church are worked out in terms of this eschatological framework. It is because of the dynamism of his view, as also its eschatological setting, that Tertullian is not embarrassed by his adoption of Montanism and his identification of himself with the Montanist Church. If he had held to a view of tradition and of apostolic succession which was primarily determined by the matter of the 'physical' succession of the truth in certain churches, then there would have been cause for embarrassment. In fact, however, the truth of the Gospel, as he understands it, is never subservient to such considerations, any more than the effectiveness of Baptism or Supper are ultimately dependent on the quality of water, bread, or wine, provided. Here again, then, eschatology is a determining factor in Tertullian's thinking, when we use this term in its widest sense, to include realized and dynamic, as well as futurist, elements within it.

EVENTS OF THE END: RESURRECTION AND JUDGMENT IN RELATION TO THE PAROUSIA OF CHRIST IN GLORY.

It seems best to begin by documenting the more directly futurist elements in Tertullian's eschatology. There is abundance of evidence for his acceptance of the traditional concepts concerning the Parousia, resurrection, and Judgment. The evidence can be culled from a wide spectrum within his writings, but it is perhaps seen most clearly in his Apology, in his books against Marcion, and in the 'De Anima'. It is interesting that, as in Justin Martyr, there is no diminution of emphasis on themes, which might have been expected to make less impression on the non-Christian mind, and which might even have aroused antagonism, such as the coming reign of Christ in glory or the resurrection of the body. There is an evangelistic thrust in all Tertullian's apologetic literature. Such matters as the resurrection of the body naturally
receive emphasis over against Marcion, as over against Gnostic theories, since Marcion did not take the body with sufficient seriousness. The 'De Anima' relates more specifically, perhaps, to the question of the nature of the soul and her state between death and resurrection, but that work carries clear implications regarding the temporary character of that state, and, when taken in conjunction with what is said in the 'De Carne Christi' and the 'De Resurrectione Mortuorum', is very significant. The last-named book does represent, of course, the most explicit treatment that we have from Tertullian's pen concerning the necessity and meaning of the physical resurrection of the body.

The following passages are characteristic:-

"—ridemur praedicantes Deum iudicaturum. Sic anim et poetae et philosophi tribunal apud inferos ponunt." (Apologeticum XLVII: 12)

Here, in context, the thought is that the spirits of error oppose all that is true. Their subtlety in teaching, through poets and philosophers, a judgment-seat in the Underworld, has been to divert attention from the truth of coming Judgment, and to include the truth in the disfavour which is now expressed towards the view proposed by these pagan thinkers.

"Sed quia ratio restitutionis destinatio iudicii est, necessario idem ipsa, qui fuerat, exhibebitur, ut boni seu contrarii meriti iudicium a Deo referat. Ideoque represeentabuntur et corpora, quia neque pati quicquam potest anima sola sine materia stabili, id est carne, et quod omnino de iudicio Dei pati debent animae, non sine carne muerunt, intra quam omnia egerunt." (Apol. XLVIII: 4).

Here Tertullian explicitly teaches the resurrection of the body and that the purpose of its being raised is that it should share in judgment, since it cooperated with the soul in the practice of evil. The statement that "the soul is not able to suffer anything alone without the material substance, that is, the flesh" has been noted frequently as being inconsistent with the teaching of the 'De Anima' that
the soul is itself corporeal and capable of suffering. Taking Tertullian's statement as a whole, it is doubtful whether there is any conflict. The essential principle is set forth that the soul only suffers by means of its corporeal components. A partial suffering is, therefore, possible and appropriate to its experience in Hades (cf. De Anima, LVIII), but it can only receive its due merited punishment (or reward) in conjunction with the flesh, which has been agent of, and partner in, its activities. Tertullian goes on to make the point that, if it is easy to believe that we have come out of nothing, it should be easier still to accept that God will recreate our substance. In the previous paragraph (3) Tertullian has said that it is more worthy of belief that a man should return to his own body than that his soul should occupy the body of another. In the context on this disparaging comparison with the concept of reincarnation, he speaks of the worthiness of the belief that a man should be restored in his humanity, "ut eadem qualitas animae in eandem restauretur, etsi non effigiem, certe conditionem."

The use of the phrase, "etsi non effigiem", makes the point that in Tertullian's understanding the final resurrection did guarantee the complete restoration of the body, but that it would have a different 'form'. Thus, Tertullian does leave room for the glorification of the body, which applies even to those raised for judgment, in the sense that their powers are manifestly increased in that they are now immortal.

In the 'Adversus Marcionem', IV:XXXVIII, Tertullian comments on the passage at Luke 20: 27-38, where the Sadducees ask Jesus concerning the woman who had been married to seven brothers in succession under the Levirate law, whose wife would she be in the resurrection. Tertullian points out that Jesus answers the basic point in the question put to him, which does not really bear on the legal matter: it has to do rather with the question of the resurrection of the body, which the
Sadducees denied. Tertullian's treatment of this passage is instructive in a number of ways. First, he underlines that Jesus did believe in the resurrection of the body. Second, he stresses the fact that the life of the resurrected body would be different in two important respects from that of the present body: it would not any more be subject to death, and it would not be involved in marital relationships. Third, it is implied, taking up the actual words of Jesus, as recorded at Luke 20:35-36, that the absence of marriage in the resurrected state of the body is bound up with the immortality of that body. The implication of this is that Tertullian is assuming, in terms of the story of the Fall in Genesis 3, that both death and childbirth are the result of the Fall. It is, therefore, appropriate that where one consequence is set aside, the other should be also. We thus learn that for Tertullian physical death is positively understood as the result of the Fall and as the continuing effective symbol of the thraldom of sin over us. This sets his thinking in line with that of Irenaeus and the majority of the Greek Fathers in his seeing the resurrection of the body at the end of the age as the concrete expression of God's favour and forgiveness. Fourth, we have here a hint of the view, developed elsewhere, that, though marriage must not be viewed in Marcionite fashion as sinful, it is a second best. Fifth, we find Tertullian bringing out very clearly from Jesus' answer to the Sadducees the contrast between the 'two ages'. In this chapter Tertullian is seeking to deal with the Marcionite interpretation which understands Luke 20:34 (καὶ ἐγενέτο ὁ θάνατος ἐκ θυσίων, Οὐ οἴοι τοῦ ζῆνος τοῦ θανόντος καὶ θανάσισθαι) to imply that marriage was an institution.
tolerated by the just God of the Old Testament, but not approved by
the 'strange God', the Supreme Deity, Whom Jesus was now revealing for
the first time. Marcion seeks to derive evidence for the two gods from
this section in Luke, as throughout his expurgated version of Luke's
Gospel. The interpretation given by Tertullian is sound and instruc-
tive. He points out that the phrase, 'οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ ζωντόντος θεοῦ',
has a temporal reference: now the one sole God permits marriage, but
in the age to come it will be set aside. He says:

"Respondit igitur huius quidem aeui filios nubere, --- uides quam
pertinenter ad causam, quia de aevo venire quaereretur, in quo
neminem nubere definiturus praestruxit hic quidem nubi, ubi sit
et mori -------." (para. 5).

Tertullian's point, soundly taken, is that we must not read into the
passage things that are not there. We must not make Jesus answer
questions which are not asked. He is not primarily discussing marriage,
and is certainly not contrasting the rule concerning marriage made by
one god with the rule of another god. His answer is pertinent to the
question put, which concerned the next world. Again he says:--

"---habes et tempora permis sarum et negatarum nuptiarum, non ex
sua propria, sed ex resurrectionis quaestionone, habes et ipsius
resurrectionis confirmationem et totum quod Saducae i sciscitabantur,
non de alio deo interrogantes nec de proprio nuptiarum iure
quaerentes." (para. 6).

We have adduced this passage, in particular, from Tertullian's writings
not only because it shows his conviction regarding the factuality of
the future resurrection of the body, but also because it shows his
sensitivity to its changed state in the resurrection, his realization
of its concrete significance with reference to forgiveness and redemption,
and also on account of its use of the concept of the two ages. Ter-
tullian rightly sees that this last is integral to Jesus' handling of
the issue. Here, it is the Latin word, 'aevum', which is used by
Tertullian to translate the Greek term, 'αἰῶν'. We see in
embryo, in the way which Tertullian interprets this passage from Luke's
Gospel, the whole manner in which he deals with Marcion's concept of the two deities: it is not that there are two deities or two parallel, or coexisting, worlds -- rather is there one God Who deals differently with His creatures in different ages.

Two passages in the Adversus Marcionem, Book V, show how literally Tertullian understood the resurrection of the body at the end of the age. The first deals with I Cor. 15:50ff. and the second with Phil. 3:21. What is implied in Tertullian's treatment of both passages is an understanding that when Christ appears in glory and the dead in Christ are raised (for Tertullian the unbelieving dead are not raised until the end of the millennium) two things will take place: first, the dead in Christ will be raised, so that "we who are alive, who are left unto the coming of the Lord will not precede those who have fallen asleep" (I Thess. 4:17, R.S.V.); then, in the second place, the raised dead in Christ and those who have remained alive until His coming will be 'changed'. The point is that Tertullian clearly distinguishes between two moments in the experience of believers at Christ's Advent in glory. Tertullian's treatment of the resurrection theme in these passages does, therefore, show both that he believes in bodily resurrection and yet is able to recognize that the recreated life is to have a different quality. What is most impressive, however, is his distinction of the two aspects, viz. actual resurrection and the immediately subsequent glorification of that raised body. One might be tempted to feel that Tertullian has said this only to make the point that what is raised represents the sum total of the organism that was buried and that it is to receive new powers, but that he does not seriously distinguish the two events except for academic purposes. However, this is surely a modern way of looking at things which makes us feel that there is something naive about the concept of a resurrection and glorification in two acts, as it were.
Tertullian shows no sign either of embarrassment or of judging that what he is saying has to be understood as a mere description of the component parts of a unitary experience of resurrection-glorification. All this helps us to realize how literally he understands the future resurrection of the body.

Tertullian comments in chapter X on I Cor. 15:50: "I tell you this, brethren: flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God." (R.S.V.)

He speaks in these terms:


Tertullian’s theme is that the body should share in the kingdom of God, along with the soul, since the deeds done in the body have been atoned for.

He goes on to say that the resurrection of the flesh is not in itself sufficient for the attainment of the kingdom of God. Resurrection is one thing, while the kingdom of God, for the enjoyment of which a transformation of the body is required, is another. Tertullian speaks of the flesh (care) as that which rises again. When we bear in mind the Pauline manner of speaking of 'the works of the flesh', which reappears in Tertullian, we can appreciate his statement that the reason why the flesh must put on incorruption and immortality is "ut scilicet habilis substantia efficiatur regno dei" (para. 14). The thought is that 'flesh', as we know it, is sinful and this fact is exhibited in its corruptibility and mortality. The term 'body' (corpus), on the other hand, is simply the form which the flesh takes. It is, it would seem, for this reason that Tertullian avoids speaking of the resurrection of the body in this place. It is the flesh, which previously had one kind of embodiment, which is through the resurrection to receive another kind
of embodiment. To have spoken of the resurrection of the body might have suggested the continuance after the resurrection of the limitations of the present bodily conditions that we know. Tertullian goes on to assert that it is only the body that is incorruptible and immortal which will be capable of the kingdom of God, and that this transformation will apply only to the resurrected body. The thought is that the change or transformation will supervene upon the body which has already been raised:


In chapter XX Tertullian deals with Phil. 3:21: "Who (Christ) will change our lowly body to be like his glorious body --." (R.S.V.). Again, the point is made: how can Christ change that which has no substance? The thought is that it is only a raised body which will be made 'fit to dwell' (habilis) in the kingdom of God. Thus it is shown by Tertullian that the separation which he makes, that between resurrection of the flesh and its glorification with incorruption and immortality, is not a convenient mental abstraction, employed for argumentative reasons. We might think that to be raised from the dead implied that the change had already occurred, in that our present flesh is incapable of this. Paul, however, is understood to have thought of this raising of our present frames as an act of divine power, rather than as a capability now placed, so to speak, within their competence. Further, the recognition is present that, in the divine plan, a change in these raised bodies only really takes place in any permanent manner as the gifts of incorruption and immortality are added to them. Undoubtedly, Tertullian's intention in all of this is to rebut the Marcionite docetism inherent in
a view of 'resurrection', which does not take the flesh seriously. Nevertheless, the division between the actual event of resurrection and the subsequent 'change', which God confers upon the flesh, is not an abstract separation effected by Tertullian in order to make the point that, whatever else the resurrection-body may be, it is flesh glorified. Tertullian does certainly think of the resurrection-body thus over against the docetism of Marcion, but he believes that he is rightly interpreting the mind of St. Paul in bringing the concept of our 'being changed' into dynamic relationship with the kingdom of God, for living within which this change into a state of incorruptibility and immortality is necessary. Tertullian says, on Phil. 3:21:

"Aut si de eis dictum (i.e. that 'Christ shall change our vile body'), qui in adventu domini deprehensi in carne damutare habe­bunt, quid facient 'qui pri­mi resurgent?' (i.e. the 'dead in Christ, cf. I Thess. 4:15). Non habebunt de que transfigurantur?" (para. 7).

The last sentence in that quotation puts very succinctly Tertullian's point against the Marcionites and at the same time his genuine understanding of Paul's teaching: glorification can only supervene upon flesh which has already been resurrected. Doubtless the distinction was made more real for Tertullian by the manifest difference between the resurrected life of a Lazarus of Biblical record (John 11) which was not incorruptible or immortal in its character, and that which, as Paul was saying, was to be granted upon the resurrection at the end of the age.

In the De Anima Tertullian discusses the concept of the migration of human souls into animals and rails at the notion that this should be viewed as some form of judicial retribution for the kind of life passed previously in a human body. His complaint about this notion -- which he does not take very seriously -- is that crimes will not by this means be punished sufficiently severely nor adequate rewards be given for virtue. By contrast the Christian view is thus set forth:--
"Deus itaque iudicabit plenius, quia extremius, per sententiam aeternam tam supplicii quam refrigerii nec in bestias, sed in sua corpora reverentibus animabus, et hoc semel et in eum diem quem solus pater nouit ----." (XXXIII:11).

Again, in the final chapter of this work. Tertullian interprets the 'prison' mentioned in Matt. 5:25 as referring to Hades, and holds that Jesus is asserting that the soul has to pay there 'to the uttermost farthing' prior to resurrection, i.e. the very smallest offence has to be atoned for. Nevertheless, this does not remove the full imposition of penalties on the body when it is resurrected:

"- nemo dubitabit animam aliquem penare penes inferos salua resurrectionis plenitudine per carmen quoque." (LVIII:8).

The whole of the De Carne Christi is concerned to assert against Marcion and the Gnostics that Christ's flesh was real and that His suffering was real. It is instructive, however, to find Tertullian asserting in the very first chapter of this work that the reason why Marcion, Apelles, and Valentinus deny the reality of Christ's flesh is that they wish to undermine belief in both the resurrection of Jesus and the resurrection of all men at the end of the age. Tertullian sees clearly that Christ's resurrection and ours are closely bound up together; so also, he says, both can be denied through the repudiation of the real flesh of Jesus. The argument may thus be set out: If Jesus rose bodily from the dead, we shall rise bodily from the dead. If Jesus was so to rise, He must have had a real body which first died. But Jesus did not have such a real body (according to the Gnostics). Therefore, He cannot rise bodily, having never had a real body and having never really died. It follows that we too cannot rise bodily from the dead. This reasoning is implicit in what Tertullian does say explicitly:

"Qui fidem resurrectionis ante istos Sadducaeorum propinquos sine controversia moratam ita student in quietare, ut eam spern negant etiam ad carnum partiner, merito Christi quoque carnum quaestionibus destruunt, tamquam aut nullam omnino aut quoque modo alienam praetere humanam, ne, si humanam constiterit fuisset,
praejudicatum sit adversus illas eam resurgere omni modo, quae in Christo resurrexerit." (1:1).

It is, of course the De Resurrectione Mortuorum which deals at full length with the whole question of the resurrection at the end of the age. Here we find asserted, in detail, Tertullian's outlook on the subject, much of which has already been noted in the above quotations: the truly physical character of the resurrection, its purpose being to present us before God for judgment, the justice of the body's receiving punishment or reward along with the soul, and so on. The power of God to raise the body and the appropriateness of God's restoring his original creation are also dealt with, together with a study of the teaching of prophets and apostles on the subject; the latter is seen to indicate clearly, over against the pretensions of Marcion and the Gnostics, that it is the resurrection of that very flesh which has crumbled into dust in the grave that is intended. Tertullian has no difficulty in showing that scripture is concerned not primarily with spiritualized concepts of resurrection, though it is true that Paul can use resurrection as a figure of what has been accomplished in our baptism into Christ:

"Docet quidem apostolus Colosensibus scribens mortuos fuisse nos aliquando, alienatos et inimicos sensus domini, cum in operibus pessimis acabamus, dehinc conspexit Christo in baptismate et conresuscitat in eo per fidem officiae dei, qui illum suscitauit a mortuis -- (Col. 3:13 and part of v. 20 of that same chapter follow). Sed cum ita nos mortuos faciat spiritualiter, ut tamen et corporaliter quandaque meritoris agnoscat, utique et resuscitatos præinde spiritualiter deputans aequo non negat etiam corporaliter resurrectus." (XXIII:1-3).

It is interesting to observe that frequently, when Tertullian speaks of the final resurrection and of judgment to come, he does not refer directly to the Appearing of Christ in glory. It is possible that this is partially because, when he is talking of the resurrection of the dead in Christ, the theme of judgment, which is especially associated with Christ's Person, is less to the fore. It may also be because he thinks
(at least in one place) of the resurrection of the saints as occurring during the millennial reign of Christ on earth and as not necessarily taking place immediately on Christ's Advent but sooner or later according to their deserts. Thus, Tertullian says in the Adversus Marcionem III, XXIV:

"Post cuius mile annos, intra quam aetatem concluditur sanctorum resurrectio pro meritis maturius vel tardius resurgentium, et mundi destructione et iudicii conflagrationes commissa, demutati in atomo in angelicam substantiam, scilicet per illud incorruptelae superindumentum, transferemur in caeleste regnum----" (para. 6).

It may be that not too much should be built upon one passage, and one at that which certainly belonged to his Montanist period. Just a few paragraphs prior to the passage quoted, Tertullian mentions a prodigy, which fulfilled a Montanist prophetic expectation. He has been speaking of John's vision in the Revelation of the New Jerusalem as being let down from heaven (Rev. 21:2). He says that both Ezekiel and John had knowledge of this city. It is difficult to be sure with what degree of literalness he understood what was said of this city, but he certainly attributes the visions of Ezekiel (chs. 40-48) and John (Rev. 21) to forevisions of the period of bliss on earth during the millennium, which he conceived of as preceding the bliss of heaven, which would follow the end of the thousand years and the resurrection of the unbelieving dead and their judgment. Tertullian goes on to say (para. 4) that "the word of the new prophecy which is in accordance with our faith" ("qui apud fidem nostram est nouae prophetiae sermo"), that is, the Montanist prophecy, has foretold that previous to its manifestation a picture of this city would be exhibited to view as a sign of its coming. This prophecy, he claims, has recently been fulfilled during an expedition to the East -- he refers to that of the Emperor Severus against the Parthians -- "Constat enim ethnicis quoque testibus in Iudaeae par dies quadraginta matutinis momentis ciuitatem de caelo pependisse,
omni moeniorum habitu evanescente de proiectu diei, et alias de proximo
nullam." (para. 4). It is thus in this context that he comes to speak
of the millennium and the raising of the righteous dead not all at
once. Apart from this evidence of Montanistic influence, it is
certain that the whole of the Adversus Marcionem, as we have it, is a
revision and enlargement of an original manuscript against Marcion, a
former revision of which had, as he tells us, been stolen. It is
usually held that books I-IV of the Adversus Marcionem date from circa
208 A.D. and Book V from circa 211. Tertullian was already a
committed Montanist, it is believed, by 207, and therefore, by the
time he wrote this passage in III.XXIV concerning a 'gradualistic'
resurrection. Nevertheless, it is well to remember, that, however
much the views of Tertullian may have been modified by Montanism
(towards which he seems to have been steadily moving from circa 202),
there is a certain consistency in the whole scheme of his thinking and of
his eschatology. Therefore, we must not too readily assume that his
view of a gradual piecemeal raising of the believing dead during the
millennium dates from his Montanist, or even his immediate pre-Montanist
period.

At the same time such a passage as that quoted above (p. 862) from
the Adversus Marcionem, V.XX:7 does, by implication, set the resurrec-
tion in relation to the Parousia of Christ in glory. The reference to
"those who rise first" ("qui primi resurgent") is a clear allusion, as
already pointed out, to I Thess. 4:15, where the resurrection is
expressly related to the Appearing of Christ in glory. It may seem
strange, and even inconsistent, that Tertullian should in that passage
(which is also in the Adversus Marcionem and was written when he had
for a longer period been a Montanist) seem to think of the immediate
raising of the dead in Christ and say nothing about its taking place
gradually during the millennium. Probably there is no contradiction here. In V. XX:7 Tertullian's concern, in argument, is to show, against Marcion, that only a raised body can be glorified. He is not concerned to show what he would doubtless have regarded as the detail, viz. that only some of the dead in Christ would rise immediately at the Parousia. We, of course, may not concur in his judgment that such a piecemeal process of raising the righteous dead is in agreement with what is said in I Thess. 4:15. We may urge that, if the dead in Christ are to be raised first, that is, on Tertullian's own understanding, before both they and the living in Christ are 'changed', then this leaves no room for a delay before the raising and transforming of some of the dead in Christ. Probably this criticism would be sound, in so far as it is hard to believe that I Thess. 4:15 can be related to such a piecemeal process of resurrection. At the same time, Tertullian would doubtless reply that, so far as those Christians whom it is God's will to raise at the Parousia of Christ are concerned, there will be no disadvantage over against the living Christians. This, he would doubtless claim, was what was in Paul's mind. In any event, whether Tertullian's view is self-consistent or even consistent with Scripture, is not our present concern. What is important to note is that he does in Ad. Marc. V. XX:7 relate the resurrection of the dead in Christ (even if, by implication, only some of them) to Christ's Advent in glory. Further, even where he explicitly thinks of a gradual process of raising the righteous dead from the grave, as at Ad. Marc. III. XXIV:6, it is clearly his view that the process is initiated by the Return of Christ. Therefore, throughout the assumption is present, though not frequently made explicit, that the resurrection of the body takes place at, or in dependence upon, the Parousia of Christ in glory.

A passage in the De Resurrectione Mortuorum which does make
explicit the fact that the resurrection of the body takes place at (or, in connection with) the Appearing of Christ in glory is found in chapter XXII, which is also most instructive for Tertullian's understanding of those events which lead up to that event, and which shows clear evidence of how much his thinking was dominated by the 'Little Apocalypse' of Jesus (here used significantly in its Lukan form, which would carry more weight with the followers of Marcion, though this book is not written against them alone but with a more positive purpose). We shall set out briefly the teaching of this chapter, noting the reference to the connection of Christ's Advent in glory with the resurrection of the dead as it is unfolded in its proper context of thought. He begins by setting out to establish that the scriptures, which are claimed by the heretics (Marcion and the Gnostics) as referring to a spiritual resurrection in the acknowledgment of the truth or to one experienced by the soul immediately on departure from this life, cannot in fact be interpreted in such a way as to deny its futurist (and literal) meaning. There follows a passage which takes us to the heart of Tertullian's thinking concerning God's action in history and its prophetic forevision:-

"Cum enim et tempora totius spei fixa sint sacrosancto stilo nec liceat eam ante constitui, aequa non licebit ita scriptures interpretari super illam, ut possit ante constitui. In adventum, opinor, Christi uota nostra suspirant, in saeculi huius occasum, in transitum mundi quoque, ad diem domini magnum, diem irae et retributionis, diem ultimum et occultum nec ulli praeter patri notum, et tamen signis atque portentis et concussionibus elementorum et conflictationibus nationum praenotatum." (para. 2).

Ernest Evans in his edition of, and commentary on, the De Resurrectione Carnie (he uses this variant Latin title) remarks on the fact that the sentence above, beginning 'In adventum' is built up of phrases from various places of Scripture: in transitum mundi, the general sense of Isa. 13:13, ὁ γὰρ ὁ ἀνάμνεσις θυμάς, καὶ τὴν χειροπράτητα ἐκ τῶν ἱερεῶν δύναται: diem irae, Zeph. 2:2, ζητεῖν θυμὸν Κυρίου:
retributionis, Hos. 9:7, ἡκασὶν αὐτήκεραι τῆς ἐκκλησίας:
nec ulli --- notum, Acts 1:7: et tamen signis, etc. Luke 21:9 sqq.1
Evans' just comment brings home forcibly the fact that Tertullian correlates widely separated portions of Scripture (as do the Ancient Fathers generally) and that there corresponds to this what is expressly said in the above quotation: he is convinced that certain times have been determined by God and that each will appear in its due course. All have been foreseen by the prophets through divine inspiration, but diligent searching of the Scriptures, it is implied, when combined with the unfolding of history, will place each prediction in its proper place. As a Montanist Tertullian made much of the gift of prophecy, but throughout his whole career prophecy had an appeal for Tertullian's mind and it corresponded to the sense that history was already pre-determined: it was for this reason that prophets were able, under divine inspiration, to read it off, as it were.

EVENTS IMMEDIATELY PRECEDING THE END - TERTULLIAN'S UNDERSTANDING OF LUKE 21.
The above quotation from chapter XXII of the De Resurrectione Mortuorum speaks eloquently of Tertullian's convictions and anticipation of the Coming of Christ in glory. It also, however, illustrates, above everything else, Tertullian's lively sense of the divine appointment of times. He tells us (para. 3), that, if the Lord Himself had not brought together for us authoritatively certain facts (he goes on to refer to

1. Tertullian's Treatise on the Resurrection. Edit. and trans. with a commentary by E. Evans. S.P.C.K., 1960, p. 248. Evans curiously draws the whole phrase, 'in transitum mundi quoque', out of the text, but translates it thus -- "for the world also to pass away". This appears to be an omission in his text, as nothing is said to explain the absence of the phrase in his Latin text in the apparatus criticus. Further, no evidence of any manuscript difficulty concerning the phrase is found either in Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum, vol. XLVII:3, nor in Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina, Opera Tertulliani, Pars II, which place the missing Latin phrase in its proper place without comment.
Jesus' eschatological discourse), then he would have himself searched the prophecies, which had made allusions to these times. It is this concept of an ordered series of times and events which seems to be characteristic of almost all the Early Church Fathers up to the middle of the third century A.D. at least. It is interesting that Tertullian explicitly shares this concept. The Parousia of Christ is definitely anticipated, but only as the climax of a whole series of prophesied times and events. The phrase, "in seculi huius occasum", may seem pessimistic about this age, but it has to be viewed over against Tertullian's optimism about that which is to come: beyond 'sunset' there is anticipated the 'sunrise' of God's new day.

Tertullian's divisions of Jesus' discourse are most instructive. He tells us that Jesus first set in array the Judaic times until the destruction of the city of Jerusalem, and thereafter the general times until the conclusion of the age. (para. 3). Luke 21:24 is then quoted, to the effect that Jerusalem is to be trodden down 'among the Gentiles' (in nationibus), until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled. The purpose of the period of this 'treading down' is given as the ingathering of the elect of the Gentiles, who are to be gathered in 'with the remnants of Israel' (cum reliquis Israelis). Tertullian has thus noted two 'times' (tempora) so far: the first from the period of Christ's prophecy until the destruction of Jerusalem and its Temple in A.D. 70, and the second from that date until the end of the times of the Gentiles. He now distinguishes a third period:-

"--- inde iam in orbem et in saeculum praedicat secundum Israelem et Daniisalem et universum concilium prophetarum futura signa in sole et luna et in stellis, conclusionem nationum, cum stupore sonitus maris et motus refrigescantium hominum prae metu et expectatione eorum, quae imminent orbi terrae.' (Luke 21: 27-28 follow, in quotation)." (paras. 5-6).

This treatment is important, because it helps us to understand how
Tertullian interpreted the eschatological discourse of Jesus, as he found it in Luke 21. The 'inde' of the above quotation cannot, in context, be taken as referring simply to the order of Jesus' narration. Tertullian has already made it clear that Jesus had set out 'ordinem temporum' (para. 3), and what follows the 'inde' quoted above, shows with clarity that Tertullian believed that Jesus had gone on after dealing with the 'times of the Gentiles' (Luke 21:24) to a third and final period, that culminating in the coming of the Son of man with power and great glory (Luke 21:25ff.). It is consistent with this fact that Tertullian, in quoting Luke 21:27-28 renders the clause, 'because your redemption is drawing near', by the future-perfect of the verb in Latin. Thus, 

\[
\delta\iota\tau\omicron\iota\kappa\omicron\upsilon\zeta\epsilon\iota \ \varepsilon\iota\mu\omicron\nu\iota\tau\omicron\sigma\iota\varsigma \ \delta\mu\omicron\nu
\]

becomes in Tertullian's Latin, 'quod redemptio vestra adpropinquaverit'. Evans notes that in the following sentence, in which there is a discussion of the meaning of Luke 21:28, Tertullian employs the present tense. He also remarks, however, on the fact that at Adversus Marcionem, IV. XXXIX:10, Tertullian employs future tenses for all three verbs in the last two clauses of v. 27: thus, the Greek of the New Testament verbs, 'εριγεθις (vos et) levabitis (capita) --- appropinquabit'. Evans adds: "so apparently the MS. and Rhenanus: Pamelius substituted appropinquavat." While in the sentence following the quotation from Luke 21:28 in the De Resurrectione Mortuorum, the present tense is employed ('Et tamen adpropinquare eam dixit'), it is noted that in the corresponding following sentence in the Ad. Marc. IV. XXXIX, the perfect tense is employed, 'appropinquasse'. The point of this detailed discussion of tenses is that the readings, which have the majority MS and other textual

1 op. cit., p. 249.
support, seem to imply that Tertullian rightly understands Luke to have been employing imperatives and vivid present tenses to express what was in the future. The significance, however, of this is what Tertullian further implies: he is saying in effect that 'when these things (mentioned in this third section of Jesus' discussion) shall have taken place' (the precise future perfect of the verb, to approach, which is used), then and only then, will all that follows in the third section of Jesus' discussion, i.e. our 'redemption' (redemptio rostra), be fulfilled. This may not seem a very startling conclusion, but it becomes more significant, when we consider that the much disputed Luke 21:32 occurs in this section: 

\[\text{ἐντόλη} \text{ μοι} \text{ ἐπιταγήσω} \text{ υπακοή} \text{ ἀποκρίθη} \text{ ἡ} \text{ γένεως} \text{ ἅπασα} \text{ πάντα} \text{ υἱοῦ} \text{ τῆς} \text{ ἀνθρώπου}.\]

It is true that Tertullian omits reference to this verse both here and at Ad. Marc. IV. XXXIX. The thought, however, is surely suggested that, for Tertullian, the 'γένεως ἅπασα' spoken of in v. 32 is that which 'will have observed these things'. If this truly be what he meant, this is not an unimportant finding, since this verse has caused so much puzzlement and embarrassment. It is usually taken to mean that the generation of Jesus and the disciples would not pass away until all had taken place. Frequently it is, therefore, claimed that this verse has been taken out of its original context in Jesus' words and thinking. What is implicit surely in Tertullian is the assumption that v. 32 of Luke 21, although not specifically mentioned, relates to that future generation and the compression of its happenings (cf. Matt. 24:22 and Mk. 13:20) within the space of time which one generation takes up.

It may seem that too much is being read into Tertullian's account in the De Resurrectione, even when taken along with the parallel passage mentioned in the Adversus Marcionem, especially in view of the fact that Lk. 21:32 is omitted in both places. The omission may be due in
both instances to the circumstance that Tertullian was only concerned to deal with Marcion's expurgated version of Luke's Gospel, for even in the De Resurrectione it seems significant that all the New Testament scriptures mentioned in chapter XXII are taken from Luke's Gospel: when we bear in mind that all that is said there is related to the concept of the resurrection, it is clear that Tertullian has in mind the Marcionites and the Gnostics with their docetic views regarding the flesh of Jesus and their spiritualization of history, which excluded any literal futurist concept of resurrection. Be this as it may, it is surely indicative of Tertullian's attitude to v. 32 that he quotes, both in the De Resurrectione and the Adversus Marcionem, the parable of the fig tree (vv. 29-31) and v. 33ff. Again and again, when the Fathers of the Early Church thus quote Scripture, they assume a knowledge of the whole passage, including what is not explicitly quoted. At least it may be said that we have here a significant pointer to Tertullian's probable view concerning the bearing of v. 32. The fact that there is no hint of embarrassment about v. 32 (unless it be read into his silence regarding it) is also suggestive of the understanding of it, which we have allocated to Tertullian: there is no hint that Tertullian was troubled because Christ's generation, that of His earthly ministry had passed away, without the fulfilment of certain events related in Luke 21 or without the fulfilment of the Parousia itself.

We return to our account of Tertullian's estimate of what was to lead up to the consummation of all things, as set out in the De Ressurectione, ch. XXII. Tertullian goes on to say that, when these signs are accomplished, i.e. when they begin to come to pass, we should lift up our heads. Clearly he is not referring to what had already come to pass, or had even begun to come to pass in his own day. Luke 21:31 and 36 are run together at this point. The latter ends with a reference to
'escaping all these things and standing before the Son of Man'.

Tertullian then adds these words:-

"----utique per resurrectionem, omnibus ante transactis." (para. 8).

Here, therefore, the resurrection is clearly and explicitly brought into relationship with the Parousia of Christ. The reference to 'omnia ista' that the disciples are to pray that they will have the strength to escape appear to be the distresses which figure in the third period, which Tertullian distinguishes as being spoken of from v. 25 onwards. This, at any rate, seems the way of understanding the reference which makes the whole section vv. 25-36 most homogeneous as a unit.

Tertullian returns to the parable of the fig tree and reminds us that it only comes to flower and fruitage when the Lord actually gives His presence, although it buds prior to His coming. He says:

"Quis ergo dominum tam intempestive, tam acerbe excitauit iam a dextra dei ad confringendam terram secundum Esaiam, quae, puto, adhuc integra est? Quis inimicos Christi iam subiecit pedibus eius secundum Dauid ---? Quis caelo descendentem Iesum talem conspexit qualem ascendentem apostoli uiderunt secundum angelorum constitutum? ----" (para. 9).

He goes on:

"Nulla ad hodiernum tribus ad tribum pectora ceciderunt, agnoscentes quem pupugerunt, nemo adhuc except Heliac, nemo adhuc fugit antichristum, nemo adhuc Babylonis exitum fleuit!" (para. 10).

It is interesting to speculate on the precise sense in which Tertullian used the word 'intempestive'. Is it sufficient to render this word as 'untimely', as the word is rendered by Evans? The Ante-Nicene Christian Library renders as 'unseasonably'. These two English expressions could mean the same. One wonders, however, whether 'unseasonably', in the technical sense, does not express Tertullian's meaning at this point. Is he not saying, in terms of the parable of the fig-tree: It is not only too early to have shaken the earth, to have subdued Christ's enemies, to have brought Jesus down from heaven, because these things have not yet taken place, but such events would be
completely 'out of season', since at this stage in God's outworking of His plan of history the tree has not even budded, far less flowered or borne fruit? This understanding rests, of course, on the assumption that Tertullian understands the parable of the fig-tree, together with all of the section Lk. 21: 25-36, only of the period after 'the times of the Gentiles' (coincident with Jerusalem's implied recovery), but this seems a justified interpretation of his meaning. Tertullian further makes clear, from the above quotation from para. 10 of this chapter of the De Resurrectione, his firm belief in the return of Elijah prior to the Parousia of Christ, as also in the persecution to be unleashed by Antichrist and the (prior) collapse of 'Babylon', i.e. the Roman Empire. These themes are commonly found in the Early Church Fathers prior to the Council of Nicaea and it is instructive to find them in Tertullian also. It is because these things have not taken place that Tertullian is sure that the resurrection, of which Scripture as opposed to the 'heretics' speaks, cannot yet have taken place. It seems probable that Tertullian thought of the three matters, spoken of in this quotation in the reverse order: that is, that the collapse of Rome would first take place, that Antichrist would thereafter appear, and that Elijah would make his appearance. This is the usual order in which the Early Church understood that these events would occur. Hippolytus sets them out in the clearest and most detailed fashion,1 but he was not conscious of innovating in any way. It is true that Hippolytus, following Rev. II's order, sets the emergence of the 'two witnesses' before the emergence of 'the beast', understood as a reference to the figure of Antichrist. Nevertheless, the order of Hippolytus' -- and, it would seem, Tertullian's -- interest is in the collapse of Rome, the emergence of Antichrist,

1De Christo et Antichristo, espec. chapter XLIIff., and In Danielem, IV.L.
and his slaying of Elijah. Hippolytus, in practice, concentrated on Elijah's reappearance as fulfilling the prophecy of the 'two witnesses', without placing emphasis upon the twofold aspect of this witness that is to come. Tertullian here makes no mention of any other witness beside Elijah.

It should be clear that in Tertullian's own mind all these three events were associated with that third period of our Lord's discourse in Luke 21, i.e. that in v. 25ff. If the second period was to conclude with the release of Jerusalem from Gentile control, this would probably be closely associated in Tertullian's thought with the passing of Roman sovereignty, for it was under the Romans that the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 A.D. took place and Early Christian expectation, interpreting the Book of Daniel and the prophecies of the Book of Revelation, anticipated no world-empire after that of Rome, which was viewed as being the fourth world empire of the visions of Daniel, chapters 2 and 7. Thus, in context, what Tertullian is here saying is this: Not one of the events especially associated by our Lord with the third period has yet taken place. The slaying of Elijah has not occurred; nor even the emergence of that Antichrist who is to be responsible for that outrage; nor yet the very disappearance of Rome as a world empire, which must precede Antichrist's appearance. This last point is connected, in the mind of Tertullian with the continuing subjection of Jerusalem under Rome. We thus close our discussion of Tertullian's treatment of eschatological themes in the De Resurrectione, chapter XXII, with the observation that even its closing references to the passing of 'Babylon', and the appearing of Elijah and Antichrist, reinforce his understanding of Jesus' eschatological discourse as dealing with three periods, viz., to the Fall of Jerusalem in 70 A.D., from then until the end of the 'times of the Gentiles', and finally that third period, spoken
of in Luke 21:25ff., which follows the end of 'the times of the Gentiles' and which immediately precedes the Parousia of Christ in glory. It is true that Tertullian does set these three periods within the broader framework of two, namely, that until the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 A.D., and the period therefrom up to the conclusion of the age. It is also the fact that he does not dwell upon the thought of Jerusalem's release from Gentile domination, which we have asserted to be the pivotal point between the second and third periods, or the dividing point of the general second period from 70 A.D. right up to the end of the age. Nevertheless, we have already seen that the force of the 'inde' of para. 5 is shown by the tone and content of what follows (signs in sun, moon, and stars; 'end', or possibly, 'constriction' or 'constraint' -- as Evans translates it -- of nations; and general fearfulness of men concerning what is coming upon the earth). Further, we have to appreciate that Tertullian's passing over the subject of the restoration of Jerusalem at the end of the 'times of the Gentiles' is explained by his assumption of the whole prophetic background of thought concerning the length, and termination, of the 'seventy years' of Israel's punishment, first spoken of by Jeremiah (25:11; 29:10) and taken up by Daniel (9:24ff.); Tertullian would assume the understanding that the period of Gentile dominance over Jerusalem was prophesied as lengthy but as due to come to an end.

Tertullian closes this instructive chapter (De Resurrectione Mortuorum, ch. XXII) by setting forth in characteristically vivid language the 'inaugurated eschatology' which he presupposes throughout:

"Et est iam, qui resurrexit, nisi haereticus? Exiit plane iam de corporis sepulchro etiamnunc febribus et ulceribus obnoxius, et conculcavit iam inimicos etiamnunc luctari habens cum mundi potentibus, et utique iam regnat etiamnunc Caesaris quae sunt Caesaris debens." (para 11).

The only kind of present resurrection that Tertullian will recognize, over against the heretics, is a spiritual rule of Christ which does not
Tertullian's views concerning the events which are to take place prior to the Advent of Christ in glory receive that occasional and allusive attention elsewhere in his writings, which best demonstrates how integral they were to his thinking: they are assumed throughout. Thus, in the *De Anima*, chapter L, in the course of a discussion of the mortality of all men, Tertullian once again alludes to the theme of the 'two witnesses' of Rev. 11 and their relationship with the figure of Antichrist: here Enoch is identified as the 'second witness'. He says:

"Translatus est Enoch et Helias nec mors eorum reperta est, dilata scilicet; ceterum morituri reservantur, ut antichristum sanguine suo extinguant." (para. 5).

We have already alluded to the *Adversus Marcionem*, IV. XXXIX, which broadly supports what Tertullian says in *De Resurrectione Mortuorum*, chapter XXII. It is interesting that in the *Ad. Marcionem*, Tertullian again takes the vv. 20-24 of Luke 21 as referring to the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 A.D. His comment is, indeed, more allusive, in this regard, than in the *De Incarnatione*:

"Sed monstrato dehinc tempore excidii, cum coepisset uallari exercitibus Hierusalem, signa iam ultimi finis enarrat --"(the major portion of Lk. 21: vv. 25-26 follow). (IV. XXXIX:9).

The proximity of reference to the destruction of Jerusalem and the portents of the end of the age might seem to suggest that here Tertullian is bringing vv. 20-24 more into line with vv. 25-36 (of Luke 21) than in the *De Resurrectione*. It seems clear, however, that this is not Tertullian's meaning. Hippolytus seems to think of 'a destruction' of Jerusalem and a future 'desolation' of the same city. Tertullian nowhere mentions such a concept. He is simply saying at this place that our Lord, having dealt with the destruction of Jerusalem, then went on to speak concerning 'the signs of the end of all things'. That very phrase is, indeed, on closer thought, suggestive of what Tertullian
means: if Tertullian holds to the concept of a period of trampling
down of Jerusalem by the Gentiles, then the signs of 'the end of all
things' would not readily be thought of as referring to the same period
of time as that describing the destruction of the city of Jerusalem.
The natural understanding of Tertullian's language is that he finds
Jesus talking concerning Jerusalem's destruction (Luke 21:20-24) and
then of a quite different period, that leading up to the consummation
of all things itself at the coming of the Son of man with glory and
power (v. 25ff.). Unless Tertullian explicitly asserts that vv. 20-24
have a double reference -- and he does not -- he is therefore simply
documenting the order of Jesus' narration of future events: vv. 20-24
deal with that destruction of Jerusalem, which is already past history
in Tertullian's day, while vv. 25ff. refer to that period which immediately
precedes the end of the age. It is interesting to note that, both in
the De Resurrectione and the Adversus Marcionem, in the passages under
consideration, the Latin equivalent of the Greek of Luke 21:26, trans-
lated by the English, (with fear and with foreboding of what is coming
on the world' (R.S.V.) is expressive of the idea of imminence. The
Greek is: 'ἀπὸ φόβου καὶ προσδοκίας τῶν ἐπερχόμενων τῇ ὄικουμένῃ'
In De Resurrectione we read: 'prae metu et expectatione eorum quae
imminant orbi terrae.' (XXII:5). In Ad. Marcionem we have these
words: 'pro expectatione imminentium orbi malorum.' (IV.XXXIX:9).
These are in the form of comments upon Lk. 21:25 rather than precise
translations. The word, 'imminere', really means, of course, 'to threaten',
but in modern English it has come rather more generally to suggest what is
impending or about to come upon us. What is referred to in Lk. 21:25
is the fear in men's hearts in the last days. Tertullian in both passages
is, therefore, referring to the same under these Latin phrases, but it
is noteworthy that the key verbal forms use that word which forms the
basis of our idea of 'imminence'. The point is that in both passages
Tertullian thinks of the signs in Lk. 21:25ff. as indicative of the 'imminent' end of the age. Modern scholarship has much to say about Early Church expectation of the imminence of the Parousia of Christ in glory. In fact, what we have seen so far of Tertullian's observations suggests strongly that he would apply the concept of imminence (making all due allowance for the original stress on the note of warning or danger, which yet does not exclude that of immediacy in time) not to the Church in his own day, but only after the times of the Gentiles were concluded and the signs, characteristic of Lk. 21:25 ff. had begun to manifest themselves.

A further passage of importance which shows us somewhat of Tertullian's attitude to the place of the destruction of Jerusalem in prophetic anticipation is found in the Adversus Iudaeos. Quite a large part of the argument of this work concerns Jesus' fulfilment of the prophecies of Daniel, in particular. Here the setting of the destruction of Jerusalem in the context of the sequel to Jewry's rejection of Her Messiah is explicit, and there is no hint that he thinks that the now past destruction of Jerusalem foreshadows some other desolation at the end of the age, such as Hippolytus seems to suggest. Tertullian says:—

"-- requirenda temporae praedictae et futurae nativitatis Christi et passionis eius et exterminii ciuitatis Hierusalem, id est uastationis eius. Dicit enim Daniel et ciuitatem sanctam et sanctum exterminari habere cum duce venturo et destrui pinnaclulum usque ad interitum." (VIII:1).

The words quoted somewhat loosely from Dan. 9:26 correspond most closely to the text of the Greek Septuagint. Not only does this comment link the thinking of Tertullian concerning the destruction of Jerusalem with the passion of Christ, thus demonstrating that for him the one is in a sense the consequence of the other and appropriately follows it in close temporal sequence, but it also sets this sequence within the
context of Daniel's prediction concerning the 'seventy weeks' decreed for Israel and Jerusalem which were destined to expiate their sins and 'bring in everlasting righteousness.' (Dan. 9:24) For the quotation comes from Daniel's detailed prophecy concerning the destiny of Jerusalem over the 'seventy weeks'. Tertullian brings the destruction of Jerusalem (in 70 A.D.) into relation also with the taking of the Gospel to the Gentiles, for he says just a little further on in the same chapter:

"Sic igitur de eo Daniel praedicauit, ut et quando*et quo in tempore gentes liberaturus esset ostenderet, et quo in anno post passionem ipsius sancta ciuitas exterminari haberet. -- (Dan. 9:24-27 is then quoted)." (para. 3).

Clearly Tertullian interprets the desolation of Jerusalem as symbolic of, and consequent upon, Israel's rejection of Christ and the connected opening up of the Gentile world to the Christian Gospel. There is thus introduced to us, by implication, Tertullian's acceptance of the Pauline thesis (Rom. 9-11) that the rejection of Jesus Christ by the Jews was the hinge on which turned, in the divine providence, the ingathering of the Gentile nations. It is noticeable, in this regard, that the Adversus Iudaeos has nothing to say concerning the ingathering of the Jews at the end of the age, except in a rather negative way. In chapter XIV, in a passage where the two Advents of Christ are in view, we read:-

"Et tunc (at Christ's advent in glory) cognoscent eum, quem pupugerunt, et caedent pectora sua tribus ad tribum, utique quod retro non agnuerunt eum in humilitate condicionis humanae constitutum --" (para. 6).

What we have in this utterance is an allusion to the Septuagint version of Zech. 12:10,12. This was commonly taken by the Early Christians as a reference to the Second Advent of Christ. In so far as it was the Jewish nation which was rejecting her Messiah, and in so far as it was she who bore the major part of the responsibility for the crucifixion
of Jesus, this verse, in its Christian interpretation, thinks primarily of the Jewish recognition of their Messiah at His coming in glory.

In not a few early Christian writings it is difficult to know whether it is anticipated that the Jewish nation will fulfil the Pauline hope of Rom. II:15 in terms of a national repentance and recognition of Jesus as the Christ prior to His Advent in glory and after the period of Gentile ingathering, or in terms of Jewry's enforced recognition of Jesus as her Messiah at and after His Parousia in glory. It might be thought that the latter interpretation would simply consign the whole Jewish nation to judgment and that such recognition would come too late. It does seem rather doubtful whether this is what Paul meant -- the first interpretation above seems closer to his own meaning. At the same time, those Early Christian writers who take seriously the concept of a renewed earth and bring it into line with the concept of the millennial reign of Christ on earth, may understand the thought of Israel's renewal in terms of her genuine repentance at Christ's coming and the leadership of the inwardly renewed and converted Jewish nation in world affairs during the millennium. On the whole it would seem that, if Tertullian does have any very positive thoughts about the renewal of Israel, they must follow this second line of thinking rather than the first.

We should not underestimate in all this the place which Tertullian gives to the concept of the 'seventy weeks' of Jeremianic and Danielic prophecy. They would seem to imply the final end of judgment upon Israel. Nevertheless, it is clear that Tertullian's emphasis is upon the judgment that falls on Israel even at the end of this period. In Adversus Iudaeos, chapters 8 and 11, he sets out his understanding that the sixty two and a half hebdomads of Dan. 9:24ff. began in the first year of Darius and terminated in the year of the birth of Christ.
Similarly, he sees the ensuing seven and a half hebdomads as concluding in 70 A.D. with the Fall of Jerusalem and the destruction of the Temple. Clearly, Tertullian's knowledge of chronology was limited in that he made the period between Christ's birth and this event fifty-two and a half years instead of the seventy-four years that we, in modern times, understand that it was. The present point, however, is that Tertullian looks upon the completion of Israel's period of chastisement as closing, not with release from punishment, but with a further burden of judgment owing to her rejection of her Messiah, Jesus of Nazareth, Whom she did not recognize as the 'Promised One'. He does not say that this further period of punishment is necessarily coterminous with the whole period of future history, from 70 A.D. until Christ's Coming in glory. Indeed, his observations upon Luke 21, which we have already noted, clearly seem to suggest that 'the times of the Gentiles', i.e. that period during which the Jewish nation is 'set aside' and the great ingathering of the Gentiles into God's grace, through the proclamation to all men of the Christian Gospel, takes place, does terminate prior to the final period of world history, during which the Parousia of Christ may properly be said to be 'imminent'. The curious feature, however, in Tertullian's works is that he makes no explicit assertion that, if Israel's punishment for her rejection of Christ does cease at the end of 'the times of the Gentiles', she is then to repent of her error and give a lead to the world in her acceptance of the Gospel. Tertullian does not show any marked sympathy with the Jewish people. It is possible that he does expect a Jewish national conversion between the end of 'the times of the Gentiles' and the Parousia of Christ in glory, but he does not make it clear that he does, and the allusion to Zech. 12:10;12, though not peculiar to Tertullian alone, is so employed as to seem to leave no room in time for such a national conversion prior to the Second Advent of Christ. Possibly the safest analysis of Tertullian's whole outlook on this matter is to say that he does not anticipate any national conversion of the Jewish
nation prior to the Parousia of Christ, but that he does anticipate the conclusion of her national punishment at the end of the times of the Gentiles' some time before the Parousia, and also that he does assume Jewish leadership of the nations during the millennial reign of Christ on earth.

**EVENTS FOLLOWING THE END: THE MILLENNIUM AND THE FUTURE AGE.**

We note briefly now Tertullian's views concerning the millennium. We have already touched on this aspect of his thinking when dealing with the 'piece-meal' or gradualistic view of the resurrection of the saints which he advances at *Ad. Marcionem*, IV.XXIV. That chapter bore clear marks of Tertullian's reliance upon certain Montanistic notions, and there is doubtless a connection between his espousal of Montanism and his attitude towards belief in a millennium. Again, however, we must not assumed that his belief in the millennium is derived from his later Montanism. Apart from any other consideration it is accepted that belief in such a millennial reign of Christ on earth was not restricted at least up to the middle of the third century A.D., though it would seem that concepts of the nature and conditions of this reign did vary somewhat widely and that the belief may not have achieved prominence in certain areas, as in Rome. Tertullian does not show any signs of thinking in that crassly materialistic fashion which seemed to dwell upon the delights of the flesh and to make the millennium a period in which stress is to be laid upon marriage and the begetting of children. Tertullian's strong insistence upon the view that virginity is a better state than marriage, even under present conditions, shows clearly that, whatever he may think about the possibility of marriage and procreation during the millennial era, this will not dominate his thinking. On the other hand, he clearly thinks in a curiously 'realistic' fashion about the descent of the New Jerusalem at the beginning of the millennium. It seems clear that, to understand anything of Tertullian's millenarianism, we have to consider his whole scheme of future events, as he understood them to have been revealed by prophecy.
What Tertullian believes becomes clearer when we consider three passages from his writings, in particular, namely *De Resurrectione Mortuorum*, chapter XXV (together with part of the previous chapter), *Adversus Hermogenem*, chapter XXXIV, and the *Adversus Marcionem*, III, chapter XXIV. We look first at the picture drawn for us in the *De Resurrectione*, chapters XXIV-XXV. Chapter XXIV documents Tertullian's belief in the coming of Antichrist, together with his understanding that the Roman state is the 'retaining force' of II Thess. 2:7, and demonstrates that Tertullian did not entertain an 'any-moment' kind of expectation of the Parousia of Christ in glory: that could take place only when its due time had come and when first the Roman state had been swept away, then kingdoms had appeared (in fulfilment of Daniel, chapters 2 and 7), and Antichrist had appeared:

"-(Tertullian is quoting from II Thess. 2). Ne quia vos seducatullo modo, quoniam nisi variet abscessio primo, huius utique regni, et reveleatur delinquantiae homo, id est antichristus, filius perditionis, qui adversatur et super-ex tollitur in omne, quod dicitur deus vel religio, uti sedeat in templo dei, adfirmans deum se. Non[neministis quod cum apud vos esset, haec dicebam ubiis? Iam enim arcanum iniquitatis agitatur; tantumque nunc tenet [tentat], donec de medio fiat, quis, his Romanus status, duius abscessio in decem reges dispersa antichristum superducet? Et tunc reveleabitur iniquus --- (quotation continues down to end of v. 7 of II Thess. 2)." (paras. 14-19).

The above quotation when taken in conjunction with the underlined comments offered by Tertullian, shows clearly his persuasion. But the ensuing passage in the following chapter (XXV) gives Tertullian's whole scheme of times right up to the final conflagration at the end of Christ's millennial reign. He says:

"Etiam in apocalypsi Iohannis ordo temporum sternitur, quem martyrum quoque animae sub altari uultionem et iudiciis flagitantes sustinere didicerunt, ut prius et orbis de pateris angelorum plagas suas ebat, et prostituce illa ciuitas a deca regibus dignos exitus referat, et bestia antichristus cum suo pseudopropheta certamen ecclesiae inferat, atque etsi diabolo in abyssum interim relegato priaeae resurrectionis praerogativa de solis ordinetur, dehinc et igni dato universalis resurrectionis censura de libris iudicet. ---" (paras. 1-2)
Tertullian does not mention the millennial reign of Christ on earth explicitly in the above passage, but it is clearly understood in the references to the binding of the devil 'interim' - 'for a season' - in the abyss, the mention of the 'first resurrection', and the subsequent contrasting reference to the devil's being 'consigned to the fire'. The 'abyss' and the 'fire' are in contrast, which the Latin of the above section brings out very clearly. This whole passage relies heavily upon the imagery of Revelation, chapters 15ff. The order of things is this: first the martyrs await justice -- this is clearly during the period of Gospel witness to the nations which frequently results in actual martyrdom; thereafter the seven angels entrusted with the seven vials of God's wrath for the end time, are summoned in heaven, which summoning initiates shortly afterwards the actual outpouring of these vials on the earth; the 'harlot city', Rome, is displaced by the ten kings (Rev. 17:12 is the immediate inspiration of this reference, though Daniel's visions, in chapters 2 and 7, are in the background both of Rev. 17 and the mind of Tertullian); the beast, understood as Anti-christ, together with the false prophet, persecutes the church of God; then, Antichrist having been destroyed by Christ's Appearing (this is implied, not stated), the devil is bound for a season in the abyss; at the same time as this binding, the first resurrection, i.e. of the saints of God (possibly the martyrs are especially in mind, when we view the context) has taken place and (again by implication) the millennial reign of Christ has commenced; then, at the end of the thousand years the remainder of the dead are raised in the second resurrection and stand before Christ to be judged out of the books (cf. Rev. 20:12). It is perhaps noteworthy that, if this order is largely dictated by the Book of Revelation, as it seems quite clear that it is, that Book does not have the New Jerusalem brought down from heaven until after this final
Judgment at the end of the thousand years. This raises the interesting question why Tertullian does not, in the passage which we have already studied above (paras. 12-13) from Ad. Marc. III,XXIV, follow the order of Revelation, but manifestly expects the New Jerusalem during the period of Christ's millennial reign on earth.

We turn now to the passage in Ad. Marc. III,XXIV, in order to note certain features, to which we did not give our attention earlier.

Tertullian here makes explicit the double or two fold 'hope' of Christians: they look for a heavenly kingdom, but also for one on earth first of all:

"Nam et confitemur in terra nobis regnum promissum, sed ante caelum, sed alio statu, utpote post resurrectionem in millis annos in ciuitate divini operis Hierusalem caelo delatum, quam et apostolus matrem nostram sursum designat. Et politeuma nostrum, id est municipatum, in caelis esse pronuntians, alicui utique caelestii ciuitati eum deputet." (para. 3).

It is of this city that Tertullian goes on to say a little later:

"Hanc dicimus excipien·dis de resurrectione sanitie et refouendi omnium bonorum, utique spiritualium, copia in compensationem eorum, quae in saeculo vel despeximus vel amisimus, a deo prospectam, siquidem et iustum et deo dignum illic quoque exultare famulos eius ubi sunt et adflicti in nomine ipsius." (para. 5).

Again, Tertullian makes a revealing comment, following directly on the above:

"Haec ratio regni sub caelestis. (Here Tertullian turns to the 'heavenly', as opposed to the earthly, kingdom. There follows the passage beginning, 'Post cuius mille annos', quoted above on page 865, which describes a 'gradualistic' resurrection of the saints of God and which tells us that the thousand years will be followed by the destruction of the world and the conflagration of all things at the judgment.) -- tunc -- demutati in atomo angelico substantiam, scilicet per illud incorruptelae superindumentum, transferemur in caelestis regnum ------" (paras. 5-6).

We have quoted again the words, given above, because we now must note in them the thought that it is only after the Final Judgment that the people of God are to be given 'the substance of angels'. It is interesting to compare this concept with what Tertullian says at Ad. Marcionem, IV.XXXVIII, which we discussed above (page 856ff.). There Tertullian is discussing the interpretation of the question of the
Sadducees at Luke 20:27-33. Jesus' answer is given in v. 34ff. of that chapter in Luke's Gospel. Tertullian quotes Jesus' reply, including the words: "they are no longer mortal, since they are like angels, having become children of the resurrection". (para. 5). The point is that Jesus' reply does not seem to envisage any concept of a distinction between a millennial reign on earth and the future glory of heaven. Jesus' reply envisages rather a unitary concept of the future after the resurrection, which does indeed take seriously the concept of resurrection, but also envisages the two immediate changes in the resurrection-body that it does not die and that it is not appropriately related to the concept of marital involvement in sexual functions. So far as Tertullian is concerned, in that account of Jesus' reply to the Pharisees, he seems to imply that the resurrected are not involved in marital relationships. The question might now be raised, in the light of this other passage at Ad. Marcionem, III.XXIV, whether Tertullian is fully consistent in his thinking. For in this passage he seems to defer the granting of 'the substance of angels' until after the Final Judgment at the end of the millennium. We have to be fair to Tertullian and remember that he is conditioned in his statements on each occasion naturally by the matter to which he was then addressing himself, as also in III.XXIV, by the words of Jesus, which he was quoting. Though we may wonder whether Jesus' words are susceptible of an explanation in terms of a millennial reign of Christ, we may surmise that, if Tertullian were able to explain himself to us, he would make a distinction between being 'similes angelorum' (III.XXXVIII:5) and receiving 'angelicam substantiam' (III.XXIV:6). He would view 'immortality', given at the resurrection and effective during the millennium as one thing, and 'incorruptibility', granted at the Final Judgment, as another. This distinction, in itself, seems perfectly credible, since any literalist interpretation
of the millennium clearly envisages the possibility of sinning, at least at its close through the devil's release from the 'abyss', and it is only after the Final Judgment, after Satan's ultimate defeat at the end of the millennium, that the quality of unchangeability implied in the term, 'incorruptibility', becomes the possession of God's people.

At any rate it is clear from Ad. Marcionem, III.XXIV, that Tertullian does very definitely distinguish the kingdom upon the earth from that which is to succeed the Final Judgment. In general terms there is agreement between what is said here and in the previous passage noted, from the De Resurrectione Mortuorum, chapters XXIV-XXV. The passage from the Adversus Hermogenes, chapter XXXIV, must now be considered. It is very illuminating and casts considerable light on Tertullian's attitude to the condition of things after the Final Judgment. The concern of this book is to show that matter is not eternal and that God created the world 'ex nihilo' -- 'out of nothing'. Tertullian considers that it is consistent with this view that matter should ultimately pass into nothingness again. He says:-

"-- omne ex nihilo constititse illa postremo divina dispositio suadebit, quae omnia in nihilum redactura est. Siquidem et caelum conuolatur ut liber, immo nus quam fist cum ipsa terra, cum qua primordio factum est; caelum et terra praestribunt, inquit; caelum primum et terra prima abierunt, et locus non est inuentus illis, quia scilicet quod finit et locum amittit.--". (para. 1).

Tertullian here mingles Scriptural quotations with philosophical argumentation. In the ensuing passage he goes on to quote Ps. 102: 25-26; Rev. 6:13; Ps. 97:5; Is. 2:19 (a clause only); Is. 42:15; Is. 41:17; and Rev. 21:1. In not a few of these instances a section only of the verse, often in a form different from that whose translation appears in our English versions, is quoted. His concern is, in part, to show that these references are not such as can be spiritualized; they refer to future events of a realistic character.
What lies behind Tertullian's reasoning and his Scriptural quotations is more than a philosophical concept of creation, which could be viewed as speculative: he is endeavouring to translate into statements of fact, which will have implications doubtless for philosophy, what he understands to be the Biblical conceptuality concerning God and our universe. He has been deeply influenced by the Biblical grasp of the reality of God. It is not the kind of understanding, which discovers God as the 'first cause' of things. Certainly, it is the Biblical view that all things have been created by God in heaven and on earth, but God is not discovered basically through any such process of reasoning. Rather the Biblical writers are so sure of the reality of God as the basic datum, that it is our world which is called in question by the overwhelming reality of God: the question is not whether and how God can be, but how God in His majesty tolerates the cosmos alongside of Himself. It is this basic understanding which informs all these Biblical passages (including those quoted by Tertullian here), in which the world is portrayed as trembling at the very presence of God or in which its transience, as over against His eternity, is set forth. God in His sovereignty and grace so arranges things that our cosmos and its inhabitants are granted position, both in space and time, but this universe can have no permanence beside Him because He fills all things; He is infinite in terms of time and space, so that the apportionment of position in each is an act of condescension on God's part whereby He permits our world to have being alongside Him. Clearly, however, such a derivative reality must be called in question by the Presence of the One beside Whom heaven and earth flee away. It is this basic understanding of things, with its true Biblical orientation, which makes Tertullian so sensitive to the meaning of those Biblical statements which describe the transience of our cosmos. The quotation from Rev.
21:1, noted above, simply makes clear for Tertullian what is implicit in this Biblical understanding of God, on the one hand, and of the cosmos, on the other. By its nature our cosmos must pass away. This becomes, therefore, an implication for eschatology of a Biblical doctrine of God and of the cosmos as over against Him.

It is interesting that whatever Stoic influence may be discerned in certain passages of Tertullian's works with reference to his doctrine of God (Richard A. Norris, Jr., mentions Ad. Marc. 1.XI:3 and Ad. Prae. VII:8), it is not in evidence in this passage from the Ad. Hermogenem. God is here no World Soul materially conceived, but the One Who initiates all things, and Who alone is eternal. Further, there seems to be no correspondence between the notion that the world that is to follow this age will be a new creation of God and the Stoic cyclical conception whereby all things will return at last to the first fiery state before embarking again upon the endless wheel of existence in which the other elements (air, water and earth) will emerge.

It is a fact, however, that Tertullian believes in the coming into being at its passing, of another heaven and earth. The very words, 'first heaven' and 'first earth', make this clear. He is concerned in Ad. Hermogenem, XXXIV, to stress the negative aspect over against Hermogenes' concept of the eternal character of matter, which to Tertullian is blasphemy. But he manifestly believes in the new heaven and the new earth of Rev. 21. And it is equally clearly this whole understanding which undergirds Tertullian's awareness that, if there is to be a millennial reign on earth, it cannot endure, but must be terminated in some act of cosmic renewal. The question may still persist why this should have to take place only after the millennium. Tertullian's answer to that would doubtless not be in the nature of an inference from the nature of God or of the cosmos, as in the prior instance: he would, rather, affirm that the reality of a millennial reign on earth has

been revealed by prophecy, and must, therefore, be believed in and
accepted. It is worth noting, too, that what Revelation 21 speaks of
is the emergence, not only of a new earth, but even of a new heaven.
The quotations, taken above from this chapter in the _Ad Hermogenem_,
shows that Tertullian well appreciates this point also: all this helps
us to realize how literally cosmic in its significance is the new act of
creation which emerges in such a way as to displace the old heaven and
earth after the Final Judgment. Doubtless Tertullian sees this as
initiated in the Incarnation, but his eschatological thinking is so
dynamic that he will not undervalue the cosmic significance and reality
of the emergence of that new 'heaven and earth'.

**TERTULLIAN'S ASCETICISM: ITS ESCHATOLOGICAL IMPLICATIONS.**

In the above discussion concerning Tertullian's views with
reference to a millennial reign of Christ on earth, we had occasion to
note that he would probably make a distinction between the condition of
God's people during the millennium, when they would be 'like angels', and
their condition after the Final Judgment, when the Kingdom of God is
thought of as being 'in heaven' and when God's people would actually
acquire the 'substance of angels'. It is interesting, however, to
observe, in view of _Adversus Marcionem_, IV,XXXVIII, that Tertullian
clearly understood that even in the millennial reign sexual functions
would no longer be appropriate to the condition of God's people. This is
in line with his general preference for celibacy as over against marriage.
We must now show that there is an eschatological slant to Tertullian's
thinking on this matter, such as emerges also very clearly in the Alexan-
drian Fathers, Clement and Origen, and in Methodius of Olympus (cf.
Chapter VI, p. 609-614; 643-646; 716-723; etc.). Basically the thought is
that in the period following the Parousia of Christ, both during the
millennium and after it, the physical functions of sexuality will be
laid aside. This is not to say that human sexuality will be terminated. One would judge that for Tertullian such a situation would imply the laying aside of our real humanity, which is not how he conceives our destiny in Christ. As we have noted certain advocates of millenarianism are said to have stressed the 'nuptial delights' of that era. Tertullian is not among them. What underlies Tertullian's attitude to celibacy throughout is his conviction that to choose celibacy is to anticipate the age that is to come. It is, in a sense, an exercise in 'realized eschatology'. Tertullian's adherence to belief in a literal millennium on earth, as over against say 'spiritualizing' of this concept only serves to highlight his devotion to celibacy and the fact that he views the matter from this eschatological angle.

Devotion to celibacy can take various forms, and did so in the Early Church. Christians might voluntarily decide to be 'virgins' (male and female) and not marry. Again, widows (and widowers) might decide not to remarry, and we know that in the Early Church 'widows' constituted virtually an 'order': the women, in particular, became a charge on the resources of the Christian Church, since the decision not to remarry in some instances deprived them of any means of support. Tertullian was strongly against the concept of second marriage, as we shall see, especially as he progressed towards Montanism. Again, it was possible for persons already married to decide to live in 'spiritual marriage', which meant that they shared their lives but did not exercise the physical functions of sexuality in any way.¹ Tertullian has a great

¹ Some of these points are discussed by Jean Daniélou in 'The Christian Centuries', vol. 1: 'The First Six Hundred Years', chapter IX. 'The Christian Community', p. 115-126. This volume was published by Darton, Longman and Todd in 1964. Jean Daniélou and Henri Marrou are co-authors. The work was translated from the French by Vincent Cronin.
deal to say, in some of his practical treatises, on this question of marriage, and of the bridling of the passions even where there is no complete laying aside of the physical side of marital relationships. It would be easy to label his view as 'negative' and unnatural. In fact, he has many things of importance to say which bear on Christian Ethics, and helps to set the concept of marital functions within a framework of discipline, as also within that of God's purpose in them, which is certainly thought of primarily in terms of the procreation of children. Further, even a cursory reading of the two short books addressed Ad. Uxorem make one aware of the very real tenderness that Tertullian felt for his own wife and the high regard in which he held her. One observes the recurring address: "dilectissima (mihi) in domino conserve": there is nothing in the text of these two books to make one feel that this is merely a conventional form of address.

Tertullian's Ad Uxorem, Book 1, is concerned to give counsel to his wife not to remarry after his decease. It is clear, however, that this is advice, rather than an injunction. Further, the balance of Tertullian's thinking is displayed in the fact that he writes a second work to his wife, reminding her that it is better to remarry, that is in the Lord, than to be so led away by passion as to form a marital union with an unbeliever. Tertullian reminds his wife that while Paul advises against marriage and remarriage (I Cor. 7:6-8), he gives instruction that such marriages as Christians contrast, must be 'in the Lord' (I Cor. 7:39). (Ad Uxorem II.I:4). It is true, however, that Tertullian's attitude on the question of remarriage has hardened by the time he wrote the 'De Exhortatione Castitatis' and the 'De Monogamia' (c. 206 and 217 respectively): he now sees even marriage as an 'indulgence' ('indulgentia') of God, and the case of remarriage as an even greater indulgence: the fact that it is not expressly forbidden
does not absolve the Christian from acting with responsibility, and is it not sin to choose the 'lesser' good, if two are offered? Tertullian cannot see remarriage now as responsible Christian living. He expressly tells us that it is only on account of the danger of incontinence that second marriage is permitted (De Exhortatione Castitatis, VIII:2).

Undoubtedly there appears to be a progression and an increasing severity in Tertullian's thinking on this matter, but, while this may be so, it would seem that there is a discernible continuity of thought. Tertullian has the same attitudes towards the question of chastity in his earliest works: it is in the matter of scrupulosity concerning the fulfilment of what is 'better' that his attitude hardens, and this is doubtless connected with his growing attachment to Montanistic principles. It remains for us, therefore, to show the consistent eschatological orientation of his thinking on this matter.

We may note the following passages as indicating the relation of Tertullian's attitude on marriage and on remarriage with his understanding of eschatological matters:

"--Christianis saeculo digressis sicut nulla restitutio nuptiarum in die resurrectionis repromittitur, translatis scilicet in angelicam qualitatem et sanctitatem ----."

The above is from the beginning of 'Ad Uxorem', I (1:5); The following comes from the conclusion of the 'De Exhortatione Castitatis':

"Quanti igitur et quantae in ecclesiasticis ordinibus de continentia censentur, qui deo nubere maluerunt qui carnis suae honorem restituerunt, --- quique se iam illius aevi filios dicauerunt, occidentes in se concupiscientiam libidinis et totum illud, quod intra paradisum non potuit admitti. Vnde praesumendum est hos, qui intra paradisum recipi volent, tandem debere cessare ab ea re, a qua paradisus intactus est." (XIII:4) (Italics mine).

This latter quotation does indeed make clear that Tertullian's view rests not only upon a judgment regarding the conditions of the future age, but also upon an interpretation of the Book of Genesis and especially the story of the Fall in Genesis, chapter 3. On this interpretation, marriage, as we know it, which is certainly a sexual relationship
encompassing physical relationships and resulting in the begetting of children, resulted from the new conditions of life imposed by God after the Fall. There may well be something unhealthy psychologically about Tertullian's attitude towards the physical side of sexual relationships. This comes out in such a statement as:

"-- quae res et uiris et feminis omnibus adest ad matrimonium et stuprum commixtio carnis scilicet, suius concupiscentiam dominus stupro adaequavit. 'Ergo', inquit, 'Iam et primas, id est unas nuptias destruis?' Nec immerito, quia et ipsae ex ipso eo constant pro (bro) quo et stuprum. Ideo optimum est homini mulierem non attingere, et ideo virginiis principalis est sanctitas, quia caret stupri affinitate. Et cum haec etiam de primis et unis nuptiis praetendi ad causam continetiae possint, quanto magis secundo matrimonio recusando praesidia cabunt?" (De Exhortatione Castitatis. IX: 3-4).

Yet we cannot accuse Tertullian of wanting to play down man's physical constitution. He is prepared to inveigh against the Marcionite rejection of marriage, even in that final revision of the Adversus Marcionem, which dates from the period of his Montanistic attachment. It might be argued that Tertullian is indulging in 'ad hominem' argumentation, but the content of such a chapter as the 29th of Book I of the Adversus Marcionem (usually dated c.208 A.D. in this final revision) gives the lie to it. In this section Tertullian gives evidence of his commitment to Montanistic conceptions. The interesting thing about this section, however, is that here we find his championing of marriage as over against Marcion in juxtaposition with his most developed rejection of second marriage, together with the exposition of his reasons for so doing. It becomes impossible, therefore, to accuse Tertullian of mere 'ad hominem' reasoning. His statements in this chapter repay close examination:-

(Tertullian begins by noting that Marcionite baptism is conditional upon virginity, widowhood, celibacy, or even divorce. He remarks that even such precautions do not preserve the contamination of the flesh, since even such persons receive their own flesh through nuptial union. Such an outlook as the Marcionite must doubtless involve the proscription of marriage. Tertullian takes up his argument from this point.)
"Videamus, an iusta (institutio, that of the Marcionites), non quasi destructuri felicitatem sanctitatis, ut aliqui Nicolaiteae, adsertores libidinis et luxuriae, sed qui sanctitatem sine nuptiarum damnatione nouerimus et sectemur at praefaramus, non ut malo bonum, sed ut bono malius. Non enim proicimus, sed deponimus nuptias, nec praescribimus, sed suademus sanctitatem, servantes et bonum et melius pro viribus cuiusque secando, tunc denique coniugum exerts defendentes, cum inimice accusatur spurcitiae nomine in destructionem creatoris, qui proinde coniugum pro rei honestate benedixit in creamentum generis humani, quamadmodum et universum conditionis in integros et bonos usus." (Ad. Marc. 1, XXIX:2).

Thus, even in this chapter which defends the 'rule' (ratio) of the Paraclete, which puts aside second marriage, Tertullian maintains the rightness of marriage over against Marcion. At the same time he does not speak of the marriage state in terms of 'sanctity' (sanctitas): this is reserved for the state of virginity, celibacy, or widowhood. We can thus see that his basic assumptions in this passage are not different in character from those expressed in the De Exhortatione Castitatis. His position seems to be that marriage was given by the Creator for the multiplication of the race. It is therefore 'a disparagement of the Creator' ('destructio creatoris', above) to refuse what He has set before us as unwholesome. Tertullian goes on to say that it is not marriage, but its immoderate enjoyment, which is to be refused. He says:

"Multum differt inter causam et culpam, inter statum et excessum." (para. 3).

Tertullian's justification for thus recognizing the lack of blameworthiness in marriage while viewing it as a good, but not the best state to be in, comes out most clearly in the section which now follows and which expressly mentions the attachment which he felt to the Montanistic rule:

"Sed et si nubendi iam modus ponitur, quem quidem apud nos spiritualis ratio paraclete auctore defandit, unum in fide matrinionium praescribens, eiusdem erit modum figere, qui modum aliquando diffuderat; is colligit, qui sparsit; is caedet
Tertullian goes on to argue that, in reproaching marriage as an evil thing, Marcion removes the possibility of attaining that sanctity which he so much praises:

"Materiam enim eius eradit, quia si nuptiae non erunt, sanctitas nulla est. Vacat enim abstinentiae testimonium, cum licentia eripitur, quoniam ita quaedam in diversis probantur. Sicut et virtus in infirmitate perficitur, sic et abstentia nubendi in facultate dinoscitur." (paras. 5-6).

The essential points in Tertullian's developed position now become clear. First, over against Marcion he maintains that marriage is a divine institution, whose purpose is the multiplication of the human race. Second, marriage is not an evil thing. Third, despite the fact that marriage is not evil, it is (it is implied by Tertullian, not directly stated) a result of the Fall as recounted in Genesis, chapter 3. Fourth, since Tertullian considers that the marriage state, though instituted by God, was so instituted in consequence of the Fall, it is not, in consequence, a state to which the term, 'sanctitas', can be applied. Fifth, Tertullian is not against marriage, but only against second marriage. He implies that to marry a second time, when one knows that the married state is permitted by God but is only an 'indulgentia', is irresponsible. Sixth, the 'ratio' of the Paraclete prescribes a different attitude from that adopted by Marcionites and that held by Catholics ('psychic', as he calls the latter in the 'De Monogamia'): marriage is not evil -- it is good but not the 'better' state for Christians; nevertheless it is permitted (as over against the Marcionite position) by the Montanists as well as by the Catholics: what is forbidden is remarriage. Seventh, if we ask why marriage should be limited to one partnership in a lifetime, the
reply given by Tertullian is partially dependent on his estimate of marriage as an 'indulgentia' by God and the irresponsibility of over-exercizing a right given only by indulgence: the major reason, however, is that the times and seasons are in the hands of God, and God Who gave marriage as a means of procreation and of replenishing the earth has now declared that 'those who have wives, should be as if they had none' (I Cor. 7:29).

It is this last point which is most interesting for our present investigation. It is an example of that realistic manner in which Tertullian takes the changes which God effects in the dispositions of His relations with men and the world, which we alluded to in our introduction. These have yet to be examined more closely. Tertullian's statement that "the state of marriage does not call for the executioner's axe and sickle of sanctity, as being evil; but as being ripe for completion, and as being set aside for that sanctity by yielding to which abundance will come," (para. 5, above), shows clearly his understanding that, although God Himself instituted marriage in the past for the replenishment of the earth and still tolerates 'one marriage', the absence of marriage is that which belongs to the future and the present guidance of God is leading us step by step towards that final conclusion of things. Thus, marriage is not evil, but it is no longer in its infancy: it is nearing the time when it will be set aside, namely, at the resurrection. It is in keeping with this fact that God, Who instituted marriage after the Fall for the preservation of the race (in para. 7 Tertullian has a gibe to this effect at Marcion's expense: "Quomodo enim saluum hominem uolet quem uetat nasci, de quo nascitur auferendo?"), should now curb his indulgence: it is better not to marry now, though marriage is not sinful, while remarriage is inappropriate and inconsistent with the present era of the Spirit, which heralds the new day that is
coming at the resurrection. In this outlook we discern two elements. First, Tertullian is not embarrassed in the least to make God encourage in one time what He discourages in another. There is nothing static about his concept of God's relationships with men. What is right for one 'time' is not necessarily right for another time. Second, Tertullian by implication sees the period after the resurrection as the consummation of the times prior to it. For God is already, by His providence and revelation, pointing towards the new conditions that lie ahead. It is in this setting that the whole question of marriage and remarriage is related to Tertullian's understanding of history and the consummation of history consequent upon the resurrection at the end of the age. If Tertullian's attitude towards the physical aspects of sexual relationships is in any way unhealthy, we must reckon that this was only an underlying psychological element of which he would be unaware, and of which it seems impossible that we should establish the existence. What should be borne in mind is that Tertullian's attitudes throughout are governed by an understanding (whether justified or otherwise) concerning the Fall and what God has in store for His people in future days, which he derives from his interpretation of the Scriptures. Further, apart from his preoccupation with the question of remarriage, the eschatological aspect of his thinking concerning the state of celibacy as 'better' is not unique to himself, but was, it would seem, quite diffusely spread over the Early Christian Church. It is, as we have already noted, very much to the fore in Clement and Origen, and while it may be argued that all that this proves is that a percentage of Christians in the Early Church had unhealthy attitudes towards the physical side of sexual relationships, the very adherence of such a group towards this view must surely give us pause to ask whether there is no Biblical justification for their view. Tertullian's rightness in his view, and his stability as a person, do not fall directly within the scope of our enquiry, but
a proper appreciation of an Early Church mode of thinking, to which he adds his testimony, helps us to take his thinking on this matter more seriously, and the better to take to heart its partial eschatological orientation. Tertullian's attitude is epitomized in the example, with which we leave this aspect of his thinking. In the 'De Monogamia', he portrays very beautifully the constancy of the wife who remains spiritually attached to her husband after his death, and also asserts that in the resurrection the absence of physical, sexual relationships will not abolish the 'spiritual consortship' of the married:

"Enimuero et pro anima eius orat, et refrigerium interim adpos- tulat ei, et in prima resurrectione consortium, et offert annuis diebus dormitionis eius." (para. 4).

"Si autem in illo aevu neque nubent neque nubentur, sed erunt aequales angelis, non ideo non tenebimur coniugibus defunctis, quia non erit restitutio coniugii? Atquin eo magis tenebimur, quia in meliorem statum destinamur, resurrecturi in spiritale consortium, agnitori tam nosmetipsos quam et nostros. ----Ergo qui cum Deo erimus, simul erimus, dum omnes apud Deum unum (licet merces uria, licet multae mansiones penes Patrem eundem), uno denario eiusdem mercedis operati, id est uitaet aeternae, in qua magis non separabit quos coniuxit Deus, quam in ista minore uita separari vetat." (paras. 5-6).

THE SOUL AND ITS STATE BETWEEN DEATH AND RESURRECTION.

It is when we examine the 'De Anima' that we get the clearest picture of the convictions of Tertullian regarding the soul and its condition in the period between death and the resurrection of the body. It is important to examine this matter as it flings light on Tertullian's understanding of death as a separation of the soul from the body, and upon the meaning of the resurrection as a restoration of their partnership in a glorified state. Two points should be noted before we pass on directly to a consideration of the state of the soul after death, as it awaits the resurrection. These are significant for our present purposes. The first is that Tertullian believes that the soul is itself corporeal; the second consists in his traducianist view of the
origin of the soul.

Tertullian's belief in the corporeality of the soul is not one which much commends him to most modern thinkers. The only reason for dealing with the matter at all in our present investigation is that it is inevitably bound up with the twin questions of the origin and destiny of the soul, and the latter brings us face to face with eschatological matters. It is only necessary to note that Tertullian sets himself against the Platonic view of the soul's incorporeality and is glad of the Stoic contrary acceptance of its corporeal nature. (De Anima, chapters V-VIII). In chapter VII of the De Anima, where we have from Tertullian the citation of the passage in Luke 16:23-24 to support his belief in the soul's corporeality, we come closer to an understanding of the central driving interest that the author has in this matter. He has been arguing that the mention of the name of Lazarus indicates that Jesus is talking about real occurrences, and was not speaking only in imaginary terms. At least, Tertullian urges, even if Jesus has no particular person in mind, what He says provides a testimony to the truth of the soul's corporeality. Unless the soul had corporeality, it would be out of place to find in Scripture statements which speak of it as if it had. (cf. being in flames, being thirsty for water, and so on). Tertullian goes on:

"Quid est autem illud quod ad inferna transfertur post diuortium corporis, quod detinetur illic, quod in diem iudicii reseruatur, ad quod et Christus moriendo descendit (puto, ad animas patriarcharum), si nihil anima sub terris? Nihil enim, si non corpus; incorporalitas enim ab omni genera custodiae libera est, immunis et a poena et a fouella. Per quod enim punitur aut fouetur, hoc erit corpus -------". (VII:3).

It is important to isolate the central foci of Tertullian's argument. Otherwise it may fall in a singularly unconvincing way on our modern ears. We might say, for example, that it is simply not true that a soul cannot suffer apart from a body, since we have all had experience of the joys or terrors of anticipation at some time or
other. Yet to rebut Tertullian in this way is surely to miss his point, for he himself uses the figure of anticipatory and non-physical passions and delights of the soul in the last chapter (LVIII) of the *De Anima*, in order to make the point that the soul can endure pleasure or pain while still in Hades and prior to its being reunited with the body at the resurrection: the argument is that, just as the soul can be lustful without expressing this physically in impure relationships, so the soul can anticipate in Hades the torments and delights to be experienced by soul and body together after the resurrection. Tertullian clearly agrees that there is a functioning of the soul in isolation from the body which we presently know. He argues, indeed, in the *De Anima* that although the body sleeps, the soul does not, and is ever active: "-- enim animae nec in uiuentibus dormiunt --" (LVIII:3). Clearly, therefore, Tertullian is himself not unaware of such functions of the soul as occur in relative independence of our present bodies. What he is, nevertheless, convinced about is that the soul is 'something', i.e. that it is a substance of some kind. This is the real force of his argument from the Descent of Jesus Christ into Hades in chapter VII: 'something' is removed to Hades after the separation from the body; it was not to 'nothing' that our Lord descended. The truth is that Tertullian cannot think that anything has being which is not a 'bodily substance'¹. Tertullian puts it with characteristic brevity: "Nihil enim, si non corpus." (VII:3). This implies a different conception of the essential meaning of 'corpus' or its English translation 'body' than we normally give the word. Tertullian displays here a markedly concrete mode of thought, but he is not saying, in terms of our modern quasi-scientific

---

distinction between what is material and what is non-material (as for example, the experience of consciousness), that everything is in that sense material. Rather is he saying that by definition to have existence means to be embodied.

Tertullian is concerned here with the created order, and with a particular entity within it, the human soul, but he is not averse to the idea of God's having embodiment (cf. Ad. Prox. VII:8). He does assume however, that there can be no kind of community between God's substance and its embodiment, on the one hand, and that of men, animals, angels or any other kind of being, on the other. It is this genuine Christian insight that God and man are entirely different in 'substance' which lies behind Tertullian's defence of the concept of 'creatio ex nihilo', which he advances in the Adversus Hermogenem.

The question emerges whether Tertullian's view that the soul is embodied derives from Stoic influences. We have noted that he is grateful for Stoic support of the doctrine of the corporeality of the soul, as over against the Platonic conviction concerning its non-corporeal character. It seems dubious, however, whether this is the real source of Tertullian's conviction. To say that the soul is corporeal fits in with Stoic concepts and not with Platonist views, but other attitudes displayed by Tertullian do not complete this picture. Thus, his stress on God's transcendence which led, as we have seen, to the view that God created all things 'ex nihilo', does not fit in with Stoicism. It may be, of course, that Tertullian is simply inconsistent.

It is true that Tertullian was the first of the Early Christian Fathers to be exposed in considerable degree to the dominance of Stoic philosophy in Roman thought towards the end of the second century A.D. His residence in the West was responsible for this. It is true, too, that Stoicism had undergone a certain development since its inception
in the third century B.C. In general the trend had been towards a certain 'platonizing' of Stoicism; this was certainly in line with the general eclecticism of philosophy in the second century A.D. We know that Tertullian felt a genuine respect for the Roman statesman, Seneca, who was a Stoic. The latter, together with Epictetus and Marcus Aurelius, frequently reflect Platonist conceptions. "Indeed, some passages in these authors praising the condition of the soul relieved from the fetters of the body have an almost Plotinian ring."¹ At the same time there were certain Platonist and Stoic notions which would not mix. Among these are the concepts of God and the soul. To the Platonist neither God nor the soul could be conceived of as material in character, while to the Stoic both were thought of as possessing a tenuous kind of body. Indeed, God pervades all things in a tenuous manner. It is interesting, therefore, that both Platonic and Stoic concepts appear to be found in Tertullian's thought. Richard A. Norris, Jr., says:

"This idea (viz., that God's substance is 'spirit' and that 'spirit' is a 'special kind of body') is a direct borrowing of the Stoic teaching that the Divine is a 'fiery spirit' which permeates and animates the world: a teaching which in principle makes nonsense of the Platonist conception of a God transcendent, immaterial and exempt from the categories of space and time. Tertullian, with no sense of the incompatibility of these two ways of thinking of God, sets them side by side, using ideas drawn from both, in turn to interpret the data of the scriptural revelation."²

In this passage it is particularly the problem of God's corporeality which is under consideration. Norris' explanation of Tertullian's inconsistency is that he took over one way of thinking from the theological tradition which he had received (this was the Platonic

² op. cit., p. 113.
strain and was associated in his mind with the Rule of Faith, which was understood as supporting a harmony of Biblical and Platonic thought), while the other way of thinking (the Latinized Stoicism of his training and environment) "represents his own habit of mind." As Norris says, this may explain where Tertullian got these varying elements in his thought, but it does nothing to solve the problem posed by this inconsistency.

It may well be that Tertullian's views are influenced in some degree by Stoic thought. Certainly it is the consensus of scholarly opinion today that Tertullian was so influenced. It is at least clear that a Latinized Stoicism represented the background of culture and thought over against which he composed his writings. Nevertheless, it seems dubious whether Tertullian is as deeply influenced as he appears to be. We have already noted the passage at Ad. Hermogenem XXXIV, where Tertullian seems to be thinking in a manner much more in line with Biblical and Platonic thought that with Stoic. Norris' very point is, of course, that the two elements do exist side by side. May it not be, however, that Tertullian's unconsciousness of conflict between the two elements in his thought emerges from the fact that he adopted a perspective from which the two would no longer seem to clash. The notion expressed in De Anima VII that "nihil est, si non corpus" has relation in context not to God but to our souls. Nevertheless, it helps to suggest the perspective that Tertullian had in mind: it is the thought, noted above (page 903) that by definition anything that exists is corporeal. This is not our usual understanding of the term, but it seems to be that adopted by Tertullian. Now, the point is that, assuming this understanding throughout, it becomes possible to see how a Platonist and a Stoic concept of the human soul could be reconciled. By Tertullian's definition, the human soul must be corporeal. This seems to fit in with Stoic concepts. But Tertullian could equally accept the Platonist
recognition of the difference between what is external and what is internal and find value in it. Again, with reference to the doctrine of God, Tertullian would the more readily approve in this connection the language of Plato because it stressed God's transcendance - this fitted in with Biblical teaching and attitudes. At the same time Tertullian would be able to accept that God has corporeality, so long as it was understood that this corporeality was of a far different order from that which pertains to created beings.

If the point be pressed that, where the soul is under review, we make corporeality refer to existence within the created order, whereas, where God is in mind, we do not do this, this surely agrees with Tertullian's own usage. Whatever exists has corporeality. Clearly when applied to the created order and to God the application must be different, if the Biblical-Platonic stress on God's transcendance is retained. Again, it may seem that it is not a very meaningful definition of corporeality which is thus given. By this definition everything (including God) must have corporeality in some sense. It may be that Stoic stress on materiality influenced Tertullian and that this was one reason why he chose to think thus. On the other hand, Hebraic thought was also very concrete. We saw in our discussion of the Alexandrian Fathers how what Murdoch Dahl calls the 'Semitic totality concept' may well be present as an assumed ground of thought. (cf. Chapter VI, p.628ff and p.688ff). We saw there that this way of thinking does not think in terms of God as 'Ultimate Reality' and the world or man as 'immediate reality'. Rather on this view is the gulf between created and uncreated to be expressed in terms of duration. The distinction between entities is in terms of their 'glory' and this 'glory' becomes greater as the Godhead is approached. What is significant in this approach is that it may again help us to understand Tertullian's perspective. It is the Western
assumption of a distinction between 'ultimate reality' and 'immediate reality' which makes it seem so improper for Tertullian to be misled by Stoicism or any other philosophy into thinking in 'crude' terms about God as embodied. If, however, Tertullian shares the outlook of the 'Semitic totality concept', then it would not seem improper to him, because the gulf between created and non-created orders would not be envisaged by him in terms of 'ultimate' and 'immediate' reality. The distinction would not be between God as 'disembodied' (which is what we in the West understand by 'spirit') and the world as 'embodied' or 'corporeal': rather it would be between the respective glories of God, Who is supreme, and the various entities within the created order.

It may be admitted that Stoicism may have made a bigger impact on Tertullian's mind than is allowed above. At the same time it does seem curious that Tertullian should be unaware of inconsistencies in his thinking, and any explanation which helps to make his thought more of a unity seems to be worth considering. The account given above has the merit of relying on an expression taken from the De Anima, that is, from Tertullian's own writing. It recognizes the concreteness inherent in such a mode of thinking as can conceive of God as having a corporeality of His own. Yet it explains how Tertullian could think in such a way without being unfaithful to the Biblical - and Platonic - stress upon the transcendance of God.

What is the significance of this discussion in regard to Tertullian's eschatology? It has relevance in so far as it helps us to estimate the depth of Tertullian's reliance upon Biblical attitudes. We have already seen that Tertullian shows in the Ad. Hermogenem, by his insistence on the doctrine of 'creatio ex nihilo', that at the crucial point it is the Biblical insistence on the transcendance of God which has greater influence with him than any Stoic concept. There Tertullian was
reflecting upon the beginning of things. Which set of ideas has the greater dominance, where the consummation of things is in view? Again, it seems clear that it is the Biblical viewpoint. If Tertullian was really deeply influenced by Stoicism, we could have expected that he would think in terms of a cyclical concept of history. Of this there is no trace in his writings. If it be thought that Stoicism has simply modified his thought, it is difficult to find much evidence of this, where eschatology is concerned. Thus, in regard to the doctrine of the corporeality of the soul, Tertullian's view, if it is really influenced by Stoic thought, does not seem to have modified in any marked degree what he has to say about the soul between death and resurrection. We find in Tertullian's writings no dwelling upon an imposition of physical torments in Hades. He does believe that the soul anticipates in Hades somewhat of the punishment that is due to it on account of its sins or somewhat of reward for faithfulness to God. He does think that this would be impossible, if the soul were not corporeal. As we have seen, he takes seriously the language of Lk. 16:23-24 but there is no development of any kind in the direction of a stress on the infliction of punishments conceived in a physical manner, which might have gone with such a conception. It may be that Tertullian's concept led to such an insistence, but it is not present in his own writings. It is interesting too that, though Tertullian believes that the soul anticipates certain punishments and rewards in Hades, there is no suggestion that this fact makes unnecessary a Final Judgment. We have already seen, in regard to Tertullian's judgment of the theme of resurrection, that he considers that it is only just that body and soul should be judged together since both were involved in culpability or in obedience to God.

One further point which should be made is this. Although Tertullian thinks of both God and man as corporeal, we have seen that
he strongly emphasizes the distinction between God's substance and that which pertains to the whole created order. This leads to the situation that frequently references to man's corporeality or the soul's corporeality seem to betoken man's creaturality and limitedness. This is because Tertullian assumes the gulf between God's substance and ours. Doubtless this usage may not seem consistent, but it probably has at least a twofold background. It depends in part on Old Testament references to man's 'flesh' in such a way as to express man's creaturality and weakness. It is probably also bound up with the fact that, whereas, where time is in view, we can speak of man as in 'time' and God as in 'eternity', there is no corresponding term to 'eternity' to describe the surpassing glory of God's constitution as over against man's corporeality. This was as true of Latin, as it is of the English language.

We turn now to the implications of Tertullian's traducianism. This matter is dealt with in the De Anima, chapters IV and XXVff. We tend today to assume that body and soul originate together. It is wise, therefore, to recall the alternatives. These were the Platonic concept of the eternity of the soul and the view that the soul is in each case a special creation of God but is introduced into the foetus in the womb or into the child at birth. It is clear that, since the corporeality of the human soul is thought of by Tertullian in such a way that it depends upon God for its very existence, (this is implied by the concept of 'creatio ex nihilo') the concept of the soul's eternity either in future time or in past time is ruled out. It is true that Tertullian allows for the incorruptibility of body and soul together in future eternity, but this is only the result of a special act of divine grace in the Incarnation, whose final consequences will be conferred (on Tertullian's understanding) at the end of the millennial reign of Christ on earth. To grant such eternity and incorruptibility (the two
go together) in a backwards direction, i.e. into past eternity, would be to do violence to the 'once-for-allness' of the Incarnation. Tertullian, therefore, expressly rules out the concept of the eternity of the soul, whose source as a teaching is Plato. This leaves the alternatives of the traducianist view, which sees our souls as well as our bodies as drawn out from or handed down through our first parents and the whole line of our ancestors, and the view that each individual soul is a special creation of God, formed for a particular body. Tertullian's adherence to the traducianist view comes out already in chapter IV of the De Anima, where he looks back to the account in Genesis chapter 2 of man's creation:

"Consequens --est, ut ex dei flatu animam professi initium ei deputaramus. Hoc Plato excludit innatam et infectam animam volens. Et natam autem docemus et factam ex initii constitutione." (para.1).

What is most important in this statement is Tertullian's conviction that the soul comes "out of the breath of God". There is a clear allusion here to Gen. 2:7. Tertullian thinks of the corporeality of the soul and its origin in God's breathing into man's nostrils the breath of life as two aspects of the same truth. It is instructive to note that, having raised the question of the origin of the soul in chapter IV, Tertullian goes on in chapter Vff. to consider at some length the question of the soul's corporeality, only returning later to the matter of the soul's origin. The quotation above reinforces the understanding of what Tertullian means by the corporeality of the human soul which we have already advanced. The origin of the soul out of the breath of God implies that it had a beginning. This implies its corruptibility and transience. Corporeality, in this sense, is not only a term appropriate to all which is not God Himself, viz. the whole created order, but, in the case of the soul, it refers to that which is 'born' of God. A distinction is made in this chapter between being 'made'
(factum) and being 'born' (natum). There is a peculiarly close relationship between man and God, in that it is the breath of God which animates him. Tertullian's thought is what many would describe as crassly materialistic in this matter. As we have already noted, it is evident that, for him, God, though beyond the corporeality which he ascribes to all that is not divine, has a body of His own:

"Quis -- negabit Deum corpus esse, etsi Deus spiritus est? Spiritus anim corpus sui generis in sua effigie." (Adversus Praxeum, VII:8).

And it is equally evident that in the passage before us in the De Anima, chapter VII, Tertullian thinks of the breath of God as partaking in some way of the corporeal life of God. It is this which animates us. It is important to observe that, in Tertullian's view, this breath of God is given precisely in order to animate our bodies. Thus, the detachment of the soul from the body is unnatural and contrary to the disposition of God whereby God's breathing upon the body animated it.

It is pertinent to our present purposes to remember that, when Tertullian thinks of the soul as the result of God's inbreathing of the body (he does not expressly identify the two -- that would give man some kind of control over God), the materiality of his concept of God's outbreathing must be viewed in the light of what has been said about the infinite difference between God and man. The concept is Biblically derived, and understood in the manner suggested, expresses profoundly the close relationship between God and man, albeit one of complete dependence on man's side. This is one of the points at which Stoic influence might seem clearest. Doubtless Tertullian welcomed its language but it is significant that in the De Anima, chapter IV, it is the Genesis account of creation that is in view (2:7), and that Tertullian expressly takes the soul's origin in God's outbreathing as denoting its beginning in time, i.e. its dependence upon God.
It remains to ask what relevance all this has for Tertullian's eschatology. It is indeed only an indirect relevance that can be traced, but it is present nonetheless. What has been said to this point reinforces the fact that, since man's soul stands in such a close relationship to God's 'outbreathing', it is not to be expected that God will ultimately tolerate the overthrow of the order which he originally instituted. It is true that death has also come by His command, but this is to be seen as an accommodation to the existing situation of man in his sin. The long-range purpose of God in salvation encompasses the restoration of the divine order of things at the beginning, even although it may also be true that, since God is thought of in dynamic terms, His final purposes in their completion will take us beyond man's original constitution.

It is, of course, in terms of Tertullian's concrete understanding of Gen. 2 that we must view his traducianist outlook, as such. If God really imparted His breath to man's frame at the beginning of things, then Tertullian finds it impossible to believe that He kept doing so. Not only does there appear to be a dearth of Scriptural passages unambiguously asserting this (even such a passage as Eccl. 12:7, while stressing the individual 'spirit', does not expressly exclude the notion of the individual's life coming from God by means of one's ancestors and human generation), but Tertullian's taking of Gen. 2:7 as an historical happening is part and parcel of his concrete understanding of what Scripture speaks of. If Scripture characteristically thinks of the soul as embodied, it also thinks of general truths about man and his world as coming to us clothed in particular events. Thus, for Tertullian, as for the Fathers generally the Fall in Genesis 3 is not simply a figurative representation of the story of Everyman: rather it is the latter just because it first actually happened to our first parents. So is it with Genesis 2 also in Tertullian's mind. It records a 'once-for-all'
happening, the inbreathing of human flesh by Almighty God. This again may seem unrelated to eschatology, but we must recall that Tertullian sees what has been accomplished in Jesus Christ as being in a similar fashion a 'once-for-all' event. Just as man was originally made body and soul prior to the fall, so in Jesus Christ the unity of these two, which had been sundered in death, is reaffirmed. Tertullian's traducianism is clearly of great importance for his understanding of human sin and guilt and their transmission. Here, we may note for eschatology the following points. First, Tertullian's positing of the gift of the soul as the 'principle of life' within the body in a 'once-for-all' happening at man's creation, underlines the unnaturalness of death. It would still be possible to believe in death as God's judgment on the individual's sin apart from Tertullian's 'once-for-all' concepts of human origin and of man's sin, but his view is clearly in accord with Pauline thinking, and lends considerable dramatic force to the realization of the plight of man through the Fall. Second, this unnaturalness of death calls for God's rectification of the situation, by a historical saving act in the fulness of time. Thus, Tertullian's analysis of the origin of the soul is connected with his whole understanding of what is often now termed 'salvation history'. Finally, the expectation of this thinker that God must restore (even if He will also better) the original constitution of man, when combined with the present continuance of death, suggests the urgency with which Tertullian views the resurrection at the end of the age as the final act of God in overthrowing the effects of Satanic disruption of His universe.

We must now seek to set forth more precisely Tertullian's views concerning the soul's state between death and the resurrection. The first point to be noted is that in Hades the soul does not sleep. It is indeed, Tertullian's conviction that the soul never sleeps, not even
Tertullian goes on to say:

"Deliberari putas iudicium an incipi? Praecipitari an praeministrari? Iam uero quam iniquissimum otium apud inferos, si et nocentibus adhuc illic bene est et innocentibus nondum! ----- Semper autem expectat anima corpus, ut doleat aut gaudeat? Nonne et de suo sufficit sibi ad utrumque titulum passionis? ----- Mentior, si non de ipsis cruciatibus corporis et gloriari et gaudere sola consueuit. ----- Adeo nouit et apud inferos anima et gaudere et dolere sine carne, quia et in carne et inlaesa si uelit dolet et laesa si uelit gaudet. Hoc si ex arbitrio suo in uita, quanto magis ex iudicio dei post mortem?" (paras. 3-5).

Tertullian brings his argument to completion by saying that, since the soul frequently operates apart from the flesh, for example, in being lustful, it is fitting that in Hades the soul should anticipate the Final Judgment, being punished for those things for which it was responsible without the partnership of the body:

"--Ergo uel propter haec congruentissimum est animam, licet non expectata carne, puniri, quod non sociata carne commissit. Sic et ob cogitatus pios et beniuolos, in quibus carne non eguit, sine carne recreabitur." (para. 6).

Tertullian's whole emphasis is on the resurrection, and the consummation of the age. It is into this framework that rewards and punishments after death have to be fitted:

"Habes etiam de paradiso a nobis libellum (now lost), quo constituimus omnem animam apud inferos sequestrari in diem domini." (De Anima, LV. 5).

Tertullian is convinced that the souls of all men (martyrs excepted) remain in Hades until the resurrection day. He discusses in chapter LV of the De Anima the view that "--Christus inferos adiit, ne nos adiremus. Ceterum quod discrimen ethnocorum et Christianorum, si carcer mortuis idem?" (para. 3). His own judgment, however, is that the servant should not be above his Lord. Christ had to descend first into the lower parts of the earth. Why should it not be so with His disciples? Certainly Christ is now Himself risen, but to follow the pattern of Christ means that we too will descend into those same lower parts of the earth and remain there until the archangel's trump is heard (paras. 2-3). He says:
Tertullian's reasoning shows how much he thinks here in terms of an inaugurated eschatology. He thinks, indeed, of saints and sinners as separated in Hades and already anticipating either rewards or judgments, but he will not think in any way which would logically make the resurrection day unnecessary. He does go on in paragraph 4 of this same chapter to examine more carefully the plea that, though the saints are not yet translated into heaven, they are already in Paradise. The distinction here would seem to be between the kingdom of heaven which is to be enjoyed in future ages in our total raised organism of soul and body, on the one hand, and paradise, which refers to that state of being in God's presence which is possible for disembodied saints. Tertullian thus puts the question and gives his answer:

"Sed in aethere dormitio nostra com puerariis Platonis aut in aere cum Ario aut circa Inunam cum Endymionibus Stoicorum? Immo inquis, in paradisa, quo iam tunc et patriarchae et prophetae appendices dominicae resurrectionis ab inferis migraerint? Etquomodo Iohanni in spiritu paradisi regio revelata, quae subicitur altari, nullas alias animas apud se praeter martyrum ostendit? Quomodo Perpetua, fortissima martyr, sub die passionis in revelacione paradisi solos illic martyras uidit, nisi, quia nullis romphaea paradisi ianitrix cedit nisi qui in Christo decesserint, non in Adam? Nova mors pro deo et extraordinaria pro Christo alio et priuato excipitur hospitio. --- Tot paradisi clauis tuus sanguis est. ---" (paras. 4-5).

Tertullian, with his ascetic spirit, thus makes room for the martyr alone in Paradise, relying for this judgment significantly on the 'Revelation' of John and the Montanist martyr-prophetess, Perpetua. It is interesting, however, to observe once again the link between his asceticism and eschatology. Just as the virgin, celibate, or widow is seen to espouse now the conditions of the coming age, so the martyr has voluntarily chosen to die to the conditions of this present life for the sake of Christ. For such Tertullian judges a special place of honour is revealed through inspired prophecy as laid up. Even so, it is worth recalling
that the position and cry of the martyred, as outlined in Rev. 6:9-11, suggests that their happiness or blessedness is not yet complete. The bliss of Paradise may be greater than that of the other saints in the waiting period until the resurrection, but it is not the same as the bliss of the coming Kingdom of heaven.

The above discussion of Tertullian's understanding of the state of the dead in Christ is necessary for its own sake, in that one's view of this subject is usually reckoned a part of one's eschatology. It is also significant in the case of Tertullian -- as indeed generally among the fathers -- that concern about the state of the dead is never treated as a terminal interest. Death or immortality of the soul, while the body is allowed to decay and disintegrate, is never seen as the end -- Tertullian's overriding interest is in the consummation of the age, in the resurrection of the dead, and in Final Judgment, all conceived of as integrally related to the Parousia of Christ in glory.

Tertullian conceives of the sentences passed at the Final Judgment as irrevocable. His concept of resurrection with a view to judgment, which is of course the common tradition of the Early Church, assumes that sentence will be passed upon the whole man, body and soul together. Thus, he says in one passage:

"Non-poterit quod corpore admissum est non corpore iudicari. Iniquus enim deus, si non per id punitur quis aut iuuatur, per quod operatus est." (Ad. Marc. V. XII:5).

The note of irrevocability is expressed in the following words:

"Deus itaque iudicabit plenius, quis extremius, per sententiam aeternam tam supplicii quam refrigerii ---" (De Anima, XXXIII:II).

We have already had occasion to note this passage (above, page 862), but here it is the eternal character of the judgment to which we wish to draw attention. This is consistent, this note of irrevocability, with Tertullian's whole understanding of the once-for-allness of the Gospel, which demands absolute obedience or consigns to judgment. In the above
passage the contrast is with the purely passing punishment or reward granted through the principle of reincarnation in a lower or higher grade of life. That Tertullian believes that Final Judgment is not to consign the wicked or unbelieving to annihilation is evident from the principle that the punishment given during the period between death and resurrection, which is certainly conceived of as conscious, is to be experienced after the resurrection in the body, as well as in the soul, in order to satisfy justice. If the body has been partner with, and agent of, the soul in the committing of evil (or good), it must share the recompense. However, it is quite obvious from such a passage as that in the Adversus Marcionem, IV, XXXIV, that there is the conviction in Tertullian of the full consciousness of the soul in Hades, whether in torment or in bliss. Tertullian is here commenting upon Luke 16:19ff., where Jesus tells the story of Lazarus and Dives. It is worthy of note that Tertullian here makes more of the distinction between the two regions of waiting after death for the resurrection, and of the 'great gulf' (magnum profundum) between them. The perspective is somewhat different from that in the De Anima, which we have already noted (above, page 901). Yet in essentials the theme is the same. Whereas in the De Anima Tertullian thinks of all souls as waiting in Hades until resurrection, though experiencing anticipatory pleasure or torment in spirit and doubtless separated in different compartments 'a pud inferos', here he thinks of the righteous as entering 'Abraham's bosom' (Abrahae sinus). He says:

"Eam itaque regionem, sinum dice Abrahae, etsi non caelestem, sublimiorem tamen inferis, interim refrigerium praebere animabus iutorum*, donec consummatio rerum resurrectionem omnium plenitudine mercedis expungat ---." (Ad. Marc. IV, XXXIV:13).

Clearly, Tertullian derives the thought of the 'great gulf' from what Jesus says in this passage. However, it is true that there is no special mention of the martyrs in this place. This may well be because the passage in Luke gives Tertullian no opportunity to remark upon this
matter of special privilege for them. However, the reference above to 'Abraham's bosom' as 'sublimiorem inferis', though not 'caelestem', hardly seems to leave room for another such place of special privilege.

The general scholarly opinion today is that the fourth book of the *Adversus Marcionem* is to be dated about 208 A.D., while the *De Anima* is assigned a date about 210. This leaves only a two year difference in time, and one wonders whether one can expect much development in thinking in such a short time. Yet it is not impossible and would explain the seeming discrepancy in Tertullian's thinking. It looks very much as if he advanced in those two years to the position where he held still that 'Abraham's bosom' or 'Paradise' was for 'the righteous', but had become more exacting in his definition of 'the righteous'. On this understanding, the ordinary Christians would still anticipate the joys of heaven in their own compartment of Hades (apud inferos), but would not be admitted to the 'refrigeria' of 'Abraham's bosom' or 'Paradise'. On the other hand, it may be that Tertullian is guided in the *Adversus Marcionem*, IV,XXXIV, by the fact that he is commenting on a particular passage in Luke's Gospel, which stresses the difference between the lot of saints and sinners in the period between death and resurrection, and that we should not read too much into the statement that 'Abraham's bosom' is 'sublimiorem inferis'. In any case, although this phrase is usually translated as meaning "higher than hell", by which is intended "higher than Hades", it is not impossible from the Latin that all that is intended is an area "in the lower areas" which is yet higher than those inhabited by the sinners. It must be admitted that the stress on the 'mundum profanum', taken from Jesus' language at Luke 16:26 ('χσφθ μένα'), does not make it easy to think that Tertullian thus understood the situation, but it is not impossible. If this interpretation be sound, then 'Abraham's bosom' will refer to that very much higher area 'apud inferos', which is

---

kept entirely separate from its lower area where sinners await judgment, while 'Paradise' may even at this time be in Tertullian's mind as a quite separate place, the very Presence of God Himself, where disembodied martyrs await the resurrection morning. A third alternative is that Tertullian thinks consistently in the *Adversus Marcionem* and the *De Anima*, but has a rather involved (and therefore inherently improbable) theory which thinks in terms of a tripartite division. First, there would be the place of the ordinary saints in Hades (this would be in agreement with the *De Anima*)—this is not mentioned in *Ad. Marcionem*, IV, XXXIV, but may be implicit; second, we have 'Abraham's bosom', reserved for the truly righteous; third, there is the 'Paradise' of God—for martyrs only. The reason for noting this possibility at all is that Tertullian does say that 'Abraham's bosom' is not 'heaven'. But Paradise is clearly thought of as the very presence of God, which must be heaven, when it is referred to in the *De Anima*. Possibly all that Tertullian means is that 'Abraham's bosom' is not the same as 'the Kingdom of heaven' where, when it is established, the martyrs, as well as others, will enjoy God's presence in the union of soul and resurrected body. A difficulty with the division between Abraham's bosom and Paradise, if these be viewed as two 'higher stages' than waiting in Hades for resurrection, is that Tertullian suggests in the *Ad. Marcionem*, IV, XXXIV, that Lazarus in 'Abraham's bosom' stands for John the Baptist and Dives for Herod. But, if this be so, then one would have expected John as a martyr to be not there, but in Paradise. All of this seems too complicated to be a valid explanation of Tertullian's thought, and, on the whole, the first interpretation suggested seems the most likely: this would allow for an advance in Tertullian's thinking between 208 and 210 A.D.

What is certain at any rate in the passage, noted above, from the
Adversus Marcionem, IV XXXIV, is that Tertullian takes seriously the consciousness of both Lazarus and Dives in their respective places, and sees their rewards or torments in those places as anticipatory of that reward or punishment, in company with the body after the resurrection, which, we have already noted, is to be eternal in character. There is, therefore, no room in Tertullian's mind for the concept of annihilation. It would, moreover, seem to be inconsistent with his general theological principles even to entertain that concept as a possibility. We saw earlier (above, pages 688, 689), that he did indeed view the whole created order as coming out of 'nothingness' by divine fiat, as kept in being by the divine upholding power, and that he viewed it as consistent with the nature of this created order that it should return to nothingness. It is only the special divine plan of grace in the Incarnation which makes it possible for man and his world to continue in being without challenging the uniqueness of God. This conceptuality might seem at first sight to lend itself to the concept of annihilation. In fact, however, it does not. We tend to have at the back of our minds the image of empty space, when we think of 'nothingness'. But so to think is to dignify 'nothingness' with a positive quality which it does not possess in its own right. It is not as if there were a 'nothingness' alongside God out of which God called our world into being. To think thus is to agree in essentials with Hermogenes and the Gnostics. For Tertullian God fills all things. There is not even a 'nothingness' beside Him. Therefore, while human beings cannot continue for ever or be incorruptible, except by divine fiat and the divine programme, yet what God has called into being cannot just slip away into some shadowy 'nothingness'. Either God's purpose in the Incarnation achieves its goal in the gift of eternal life in fellowship with God, or God's intention is diverted through sin's obduracy into a negation of his purpose, which has in it the positive character
of God's judgment on sin. There can be nothing shadowy about that. It cannot just be a slipping out of existence. That, in the nature of the case, would be impossible, for Tertullian. At the final Judgment the positive character of God's judgment will be manifest in the casting into outer darkness to a conscious existence for eternity apart from God. This is doubtless a very terrible concept, but Tertullian derives it from his understanding of the apostolic witness to the Gospel and assumes it, because it was the normal understanding of Early Christianity.

The question whether, and in what sense, Tertullian believed in a doctrine of purgatorial expiation of sins between death and resurrection, is a difficult one. The passage which perhaps more than any other raises the question is found at De Anima, XXXV. With it, however, must be combined a passage in chapter LVIII of the same book, which deals with the same reference to Jesus' saying at Matt. 5:23ff., especially the words in vv. 25-26 concerning being committed to 'prison' by one's 'adversary' and not getting out until one has paid 'the last farthing'. In De Anima XXXV Tertullian refutes an interpretation of this passage deriving from Carpocrates, who understood the reference to imprisonment within the body in repeated existences by means of metempsychosis, the transference of the soul into the bodies of animals: to this was added the thought, distasteful to any Christian mind, that the only escape from this was by means of paying fully one's debt to commit various kinds of depravities. Tertullian says that the plain sense of Jesus' words is that the 'heathen man' in His story must be the meaning of the 'adversary', and the point of Jesus' word is that we must be guilty of no injustice against such a person or he will take the opportunity to punish us until the injustice has been made good fully. At the same time Tertullian suggests another possible meaning. On this view the 'adversary' refers to the devil, and the thought is that, if one has made a compact with him to renounce
his works by becoming a Christian, any failure to honour this compact
will result in his bringing one before God the Judge, Who in justice
will have to commit one "in carcerem -- infernum, unde non dimittaris nisi
modico quoque delicto more resurrectionis expenso." (para. 3). The same
understanding is suggested in the De Anima, LVIII:8:

"In summa, cum carcerem illum, quem evangeliun demonstrat, inferos
intellegimus et nouissimum quadrantem modicum quoque delictum
more resurrectionis illic luendum interpretamur, nemo dubitabit --".

The words which follow this second quotation have already been noted above
(page 362), since they refer to the fact that the soul suffers somewhat in
Hades "without interfering with the fulness (of suffering) also through
the resurrection of the flesh."

Our present interest is in whether these passages suggest any kind
of purgatorial process of expiation for the Christian. We have already
considered the passage in De Anima LVIII from the standpoint that it
prescribes anticipatory delights for the Christian and corresponding woes
for the non-Christian. In the light of the parallel explanation in
chapter XXXV, however, one has to ask whether it is in Tertullian's mind
that the Christian, who has compacted to renounce the devil and his ways
and has defaulted, may not have to pay for his misdemeanours until the
resurrection ('more resurrectionis'). If so, is this a kind of teaching
of the doctrine of Purgatory?

J.J. Waszink submits what seems the most reasonable interpretation
of the mind of Tertullian on this matter in a note on the phrase, 'more
resurrectionis', at De Anima, LVIII:8. He relates what is said here and
De Anima, XXXV:3, to the passage in Ad. Marcionem, III,XXIV, which speaks
of the millennial reign of Christ on earth and the fact that the saints
will only rise to participate in its blessedness "pro meritis maturius vel
tardius" (para. 6). Waszink comments that we must link the passages in
the De Anima with what is said here, in order to grasp Tertullian's
"Nobody is admitted into the millennium before he has expiated his sins 'up to the last farthing'; the more sins one has to expiate, the later he will take part in the 'first resurrection'. Pagans (by sancti Tert. means the Christians ----) are altogether excluded from this resurrection: they remain in hell till the Last Judgment. According to Tert. and the Montanists in general, the time elapsing between death and the beginning of the millennium can only be short, as they consider the end of the world to be at hand (d'Ales and Bonwetsch are cited in support): hence, though of course the expiation begins immediately after death, for most Christians the greater part of this period will fall within the thousand years of the regnum. ---".

Again, a little further on, Waszink adds:

"Tert. regards the circumstance that the sancti (adv. Marc. 3:24 (420, 7/9): mille annos, intra quam aetatem concluditur sanctorum resurrectio pro meritis maturius vel tardius resurgentium) must expiate even the slightest sins (modicum quoque delictum) by a residence in hell as an argumentum a fortiori in favour of his conviction animam aliquid pensare penes inferos. Nevertheless, he does not believe in a purification of the soul after death (as is also pointed out by J. Bautz, Das Fegefeuer (Mainz 1883), 54): he assumes that the only punishment undergone by those who, without being perfect, are not excluded from the millennium, consists in a postponement of their first resurrection (which, however, does not last till the Last Judgment but till the moment at which they have 'paid the uttermost farthing'; it stands to reason that this moment differs for everybody)-----".

Waszink notes, in this same context, that D'Ales, in his 'La theologie de Tertullien' (Paris, 1905), judges that Tertullian believes in Purgatory, but the quotation, which he adduces from D'Ales, shows that D'Ales is not thinking of any kind of judicial punishment or purification in the period between death and resurrection except that of waiting longer for the privilege of being raised during the millennium:" -- Qu'est-ce que cette attente douloureuse, sinon un purgatoire?" Waszink seems sound in his judgment that this is not what is traditionally meant by the term, 'purgatory', and that it is, therefore, misleading to use it of this concept of

2 op. cit., p. 592-593.
delayed resurrection during the millennium. We conclude, therefore, that what is found in Tertullian's thinking on this matter cannot properly be called a belief in purgatory. There is no concept of imposition of punishments expressed. His concept is, as Waszink says, bound up with his rather curious belief in a gradualistic process of resurrection of the saints. The only feature of Waszink's account which seems questionable is incidental to his main point. He judges that the time between death and the millennium can only be short, for Tertullian, as for the Montanists generally. It is, he concludes, for this reason that Tertullian would see a greater part of the period of waiting for resurrection as falling during the millennium. One wonders how sound is this estimate of Tertullian's concept of the nearness of the Parousia of Christ and the beginning of his thousand-year reign on earth (Tertullian seems throughout to accept this figure as literal and not merely symbolic of a long period of time). When we recall his judgment that Christ could not come until the Roman Empire had passed away, ten kingdoms had emerged out of it, and Antichrist had set up his rule and persecuted the saints, it seems doubtful whether one can dogmatize about Tertullian's expectancy of the nearness of the millennium except in a relative sense. It may well have been only the sense that the fifth and last of Daniel's world empires had now appeared that accounts for such passages as seem to indicate a note of 'imminence' in this writer concerning the 'Day of the Lord'. If this be so, then one would have to modify what Waszink says concerning Tertullian's assuming that the greater part of the period of 'punitive' waiting would fall during the millennium. This does not, however, touch the central point that Waszink is making, viz., that there is no clear teaching of purgatorial experiences in Hades or during the period between death and the resurrection.
We turn now to those more dynamic aspects of Tertullian's eschatology which we noted in our introductory outline. We may well find that the number of matters, which have to be noted under this heading, are fewer, and that the questions which arise in examining these aspects are more straightforward and more directly dealt with by recourse to Tertullian's writings. Nevertheless, it is these dynamic aspects which inform the whole, and which provide the framework, within which much that we have already discussed is held together in Tertullian's thinking. Thus, we have already noted what Tertullian has to say concerning the prophecies of the Book of Daniel; the order of events there outlined prior to the Parousia of the Son of Man in glory; the thousand year interval between the two resurrections. We have also discussed, in the light of Tertullian's handling of Luke 21 in the Adversus Marcionem, the understanding which he had concerning the destruction of Jerusalem as a result of Jewry's rejection of her Messiah; the consequent ingathering of the Gentiles during 'the times of the Gentiles' through the preaching of the Christian Gospel; and the relatively clear separation of the period immediately preceding Christ's Return as set forth in Luke 21:25ff., which is conceived of as subsequent to 'the times of the Gentiles'. What we must now document is Tertullian's sense that in all of this and also in other aspects of his thinking, he sees God as dynamically at work. This is no prearranged pattern of things from which God is conceived of as standing back in Deistic fashion. Rather God is active in it. Not only so, but Tertullian sees God's activity as bound up inseparably with the Work of Christ, which now presses towards the Day of the Lord from within history. Thus, that Day may be conceived of as an irruption into history, but equally it is seen as brought about by the powerful release of the Spirit of God by means of Christ's achievement and its proclamation as
Gospel. These harry the forces of evil and work in a predetermined manner to produce that final outbreak of malignity in the rule of Anti-
christ which demands Christ's intervention at the end of the age. It is not insignificant that Tertullian is fond of the expression, the 'consummation of the age.'

It will help to examine Tertullian's use of the concept of 'the Kingdom of God' or 'the Kingdom of heaven', since it is a focal point for the expression of his dynamic understanding of history and the outworking of God's purposes within it. Robert Frick examined Tertullian's concept of the Kingdom of God, and stresses the fact that he thinks of it very much over against the background of his legalistic cast of mind and thinking. Frick says:

"In der Reichsvorstellung tritt der lokale Charakter zurück, es ist das Reich vielmehr als ein Zustand dem Gericht gegenübergestellt, als der Lohn für unsere Verdienste; so heißt es in einer Ausführung über I Cor. 15:50 (die Übrigen exegetisch mit Irenäus genau übereinstimmt); atque ita dum pro meritis distinctionem resurrectionis opus substantiae, non genus, patitur, apparat hinc quoque carnum et sanguinem nomine culpae, non substantiae, arceri a Dei regno, nomine tamen formae resurgere in iudicium, quia non resurgant in regnum."

1 Die Geschichte Reich-Gottes Gedankens in der alten Kirche bis zu Origenes und Augustin. A Töpelmann, Glessen, 1928, p. 70. Latin quotation is from the De Resurrectione carnis. 50 s. 103, 27ff., ed. Krommann.
Tertullian's passion for strict justice is apparently modified by his understanding of the grace of God. It is true, of course, that it is his emphasis upon justice, as we have said, which leads to his gradualistic view of the resurrection of the saints, but it is surely noteworthy that the saints are admitted at the end of the millennium into everlasting bliss, while those who have rejected God's grace are sent into outer darkness. Even here it is no doubt the case that Tertullian sees this as a meeting out of 'justice' in that the opportunity was given of accepting the Gospel or of refusing it, of repenting of one's wicked ways or of continuing within them. But his concept of justice moves within the wider appreciation of God's grace in Christ. It is only of grace that mercy is offered in the first place. However, within this fundamental recognition of God's dispensation of grace Tertullian certainly does place emphasis upon the element of 'justice' in God's dealings with men, as also upon the fact that God's purposes are ethical in character: the intention of God is to establish righteousness and overthrow wickedness. And this is to be effected in the future coming of the Kingdom of God upon earth at the Parousia of Christ in glory, and to be finalized in such a way that it cannot be undone at the close of the millennium on the Judgment Day.

Frick's account of Tertullian's concept of the Kingdom of God lays emphasis upon the futurist elements. Within this interest he notes varying emphases in Tertullian's comments in his writings. Thus, he refers to the contrast, often remarked upon, between Apologeticum 32 and Apologeticum 41 (together with passages from the De Oratione). Frick says:-

frick goes on to note that this desire for the consummation of the age comes out strongly in the De Orations, where Tertullian deals with the clause of the Lord's Prayer, 'The Kingdom come'. He properly observes that we find here a twofold emphasis. First, it is stressed by Tertullian that God does in fact reign at all times, even now. Nevertheless, the burden of the prayer in this clause is that God's Kingdom may be manifested. Frick quotes the words of Tertullian, "itaque si ad Dei voluntatem et ad nostram suspensionem pertinet regni dominici representa
tio, quomodo quidam protractum quendam in seculo postulant, cum regnum Dei, quod ut veniat oratus, ad consummationem saeculi tendat? Optamus maturius regnare et non diutius servire." He comments:

"Das ist also die Stimmung: heraus aus diesem Sklasendasein in ein neues Leben, wo wir teilhaben an der Gottesherrschaft! Und der Abschnitt klingt aus in dem Gebet: immo quam celeriter veniat, Domine, regnum tuum votum Christianorum, confusio nationum, exultatio angelorum, propter quod conflictamur, immo potius, propter quod oramus!"

Although Frick does take note of Tertullian's comment that there is no time when God does not reign, one feels that he places almost the whole emphasis upon the futurist aspect of Tertullian's thought about the Kingdom. It is easy to be critical in this matter, but part of Frick's difficulty is that it is almost impossible to separate the 'realized' and 'futurist' aspects in the thinking of Tertullian. Thus, the actual passage which Frick notes which stresses the 'realized' element of Tertullian's concept, says this:

"Veniat quoque regnum tuum ad id pertinet, quod et fiat voluntas tuae, in nobis scilicet. Nam Deus quando non regnat, in cuius

1. op. cit., pp. 69-70.
2. op. cit., p. 70. Frick's quotation is from the De Oratione.
What strikes one in this passage is the dynamic way in which Tertullian sees present secular history as in the hands of God. Tertullian does not see realized eschatology only in the reign of Christ in the Church or in the preaching of the Gospel and its spreading to the ends of the earth, but also in the very decisions of kings and monarchs and the processes of history. The point is that, when Tertullian talks in this way, he almost always has in view that towards which God's control of history is moving. Thus, the 'realized' and 'futurist' elements merge insensibly into one another. It is this fact that makes it difficult for any scholar to emphasize purely 'realized' elements in the mind of Tertullian. The distinction can hardly be maintained for this writer. That of an 'inaugurated' eschatology sums up both strands in his thinking in a more unitary fashion. We note in the quotation given by Frick concerning the praying for the 'manifestation' (representatio) of God's Kingdom, that what the Kingdom is said by Tertullian to lead to is 'the consummation of the age' (consummationem saeculi). This sums up Tertullian's approach exactly: God is operating now in history as the sovereign Lord, but all His operations are destined to lead to a 'consummation' of the age, not just some accidental conclusion.

What does seem to be true is that Tertullian, operating within the framework of what we may designate 'inaugurated eschatology', normally reserves the actual phrase, the Kingdom of God, for its visible manifestation at the consummation of the age. Nevertheless, the context, almost always, implies the advance action of that coming Kingdom in God's action in secular history or in the experience of Christian men of Christ's rule in their lives. Again, it is true, of course, that God's

1. De Oratone, V.1.
rule, present and future, is frequently spoken of, when the phrase, 'the Kingdom of God', is not employed. A good illustration of this is found in the De Resurrectione Mortuorum, chapter XXV. Tertullian has been talking in the immediate context of the series of events prior to the end of the age, but his purpose is to argue with 'the heretics' (haereticis) concerning the true nature of the 'resurrection': the heretics see it as spiritual in character and not as a future literal event. Commenting on the series of events set forth in the Revelation of John (outpouring of angelic vials of wrath, collapse of Roman Empire, emergence of Antichrist, and so on), (cf. page 885 above, where De Resurr. XXV is under discussion from a slightly different angle) Tertullian says:

"Cum igitur et status temporum ultimorum scripturae notent et totam Christianae spei frugem in exodio saeculi conlocent, adparet aut tunc adimpleri totum quodcumque nobis ad deo repromittitur et uacat, quod hic iam ab haereticis uindicatur, aut, si et agnitio sacramenti resurrectionis est, salua utique illa creditur quae in ultimo praedicatur ------." (para. 3).

We must not wrest this statement out of context. Tertullian is concerned to defend the corporeal (and futurist) character of the resurrection of the dead. Nevertheless, his statement does reveal the understanding that there is a spiritual resurrection in the present. This is made absolutely clear in the closing words of this chapter:

"Ita nobis magis competit etiam spiritalem defendere resurrectionem ab ingressu fidelii, qui plenitudinem eius agnoscimus in exitu saeculi." (para. 6).

In these two quotations above we meet once again the concept of the age (saeculum) as heading towards its 'exodium' (para. 3) or 'plenitude' (para. 6). The thought of God's dynamic purpose working its way towards its predestined conclusion is plainly present, and it is a determining factor in this passage: the details concerning the series of events, revealed by John in the Revelation are seen within this framework of purposiveness groping its way towards its conclusion.

The section which we have already examined in the De Orat.
chapter V, at the instigation of Frick, also suggests Tertullian's restriction of the term, 'Kingdom of God', for its fulness at Christ's Advent in glory, but is charged with, not only the desire of the saints for the consummation of the age, but also the sense that God's purpose is pressing on towards that conclusion. The very prayers both of saints on earth and martyrs 'sub altari' seems to be thought of as hastening that conclusion -- not as if we can coerce God, but as though God functions through our prayers towards this end, very much in the way in which Old Testament prophets saw God's coming judgments or saving acts as initiated through their utterances. Tertullian says in this chapter that, even if our Lord had not instructed us to pray for the coming of God's Kingdom, we would, of our own volition, have made such supplication. Tertullian adds this vivid phrase:

"festinantes ad spei nostrae complexum." (para. 2).

All that this depicts strictly is the fact that we are "hurrying towards the completion of our hope". This in itself stresses Tertullian's ready sense of the way in which we are already emmeshed in the forward-reaching purposes of God. The thought, however, is also surely implicit that, as we pray, we act in conformity with the fact that our present experience is destined shortly to be consummated. Tertullian goes on:

"Clamant ad Dominum invidia animae martyrum sub altari: Quonam usque non ulcisceris, Domine, sanguinem nostrum de incolis terrae? Nam utique ultio illorum a saeculi fine dirigitur." (para. 3).

Tertullian's reference is, of course, to Rev. 6:10. His use of the word, 'invidia', may seem bold, but he would doubtless assert that this 'jealousy' was not of an ungodly sort. Again, there is latent in this passage and reference the thought that the prayers of the martyrs 'sub altari' hasten the actual approach of the consummation of the age. When we bear in mind the passage in Revelation, chapter six, to which reference is here made, this conviction is strengthened, because there the prayers
of the martyrs are revealed through the opening of the fifth of seven seals, whose unsealing clearly is thought of as heralding and in some sense initiating the end of the age. Clearly, in all of this Tertullian's understanding is dynamic and Biblical: it sees all things as tending towards their consummation in the divine purposes.

Another passage which breathes with the understanding that God is already at work in such a way as to foreshadow the coming resurrection at the end of the age is found in the De Resurrectione Mortuorum, chapter XLVI. Here Tertullian is expounding Rom. 8:8ff. His aim is to demonstrate to heretics that it is not the 'flesh' in itself which is sinful and under condemnation, but the works of the flesh. If judgment is to fall on the flesh, it is because of these 'operations' (operationes). Tertullian says:

"--operatione autem carnis exclusa, quae causa est mortis, salua iam caro ostenditur, causa carens mortis. Lex enim, inquit (Paul), spiritus vitae in Christo Iesu manumisit te a lege delinquentiae et mortis, certe quam praemisit habitare in membris nostris. Ergo iam membra nostra legi mortis non tenebuntur, quia nec delinquentiae, a quibus manumissa sunt." (paras. 9-10).

The thought here is that through the Incarnation and the Work of Jesus Christ the Spirit is now active in the life of believers. Already we are not bound by the law of transgression. This is evident in Christian experience. Yet it is equally true (cf. Rom. 7:22-23) that even now the law of sin, as of death, is still active in our members. The point is that the present moral triumph of Christians, though imperfect, heralds the day that is coming when sin will not tempt us any more. Similarly is it with the concept of death. It is still in control of our bodies. Tertullian sees that Paul thinks of sin as still lodged in some real sense in the flesh, and that so long as this remains true death will continue to have dominion over us. But in Christ, death, as well as sin, has been overcome. Therefore, the present experience in the Spirit of victory over temptation is indicative of the coming triumph
over death. Tertullian thinks in a unitary way of 'the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus', as Paul has it in the passage quoted from Rom. 8:2, as operative now, some benefits being immediate, while others will be made evident only at the resurrection of the body. If this seems artificial, it is no more artificial surely than speaking of the triumph of Christ while men ignore His rule. The dynamic understanding of this passage in De Resurrectione, chapter XLVI, is reflected in Tertullian's statement at the end of chapter XXII of the same book, already noted in another context: "---et utique iam regnat (Christ) etiamnunc Caesari quae sunt Caesaris debens." (para.11).

THE CHRISTIAN MISSION IN TERTULLIAN'S THEOLOGY OF HISTORY.

Two passages in the Adversus Marcionem indicate the way in which Tertullian views the Christian mission to Jews and Gentiles alike, in its relationship to the divine plan for history and its consummation. One comes from Book IV, chapter XXXIX, where Tertullian is discussing the apocalyptic discourse of Jesus, as recorded in Luke 21. At this point he is dealing with vv. 12-19 of that chapter in the Gospel, where Jesus warns of persecutions to be endured for His sake. Tertullian appears to take these words to refer to the persecution of the first generation of Christians in Palestine. This would seem to fit in with that understanding of this chapter which we set out above (page 69ff.):

Tertullian thinks of the destruction of Jerusalem as fulfilling the prediction of Luke 21:20ff. We saw that he apparently divides this chapter into three time references, viz. vv. 12-19 as dealing with the period up to A.D. 70; vv. 20-24 as dealing with the judgment on Jews and Jerusalem, with the indication in verse 24 that Israel's punishment is to last until the close of 'the times of the Gentiles'; and vv. 25ff., dealing with the period immediately prior to the Return of Christ. This summary of Tertullian's understanding of Luke 21 was based on his handling
of that chapter of the Gospel at *De Resurrectione Mortuorum*, chapter XXII. What is said at *Adversus Marcionem*, IV, XXXIX, is not, however, inconsistent with the handling in the *De Resurrectione*. Our present point is that Tertullian thinks of the persecution in vv. 12-19 as that suffered by the apostles and their generation of Christians at the hands of Jews in Palestine, since it deals with the period before the destruction of Jerusalem. Tertullian sees this persecution as the fulfilment of a prophecy in Zechariah 9:15-16 which he quotes from the Septuagint version. It is verse 9 of that same chapter of Zechariah which speaks of Jerusalem's king coming to her, "riding on an ass, on a colt the foal of an ass", (R.S.V.) a passage commonly regarded as being a prediction of Christ's 'triumphal entry' into Jerusalem. Perhaps it is the proximity of this verse, which suggests a connection of vv. 15-16 with the persecution of the Christians by the Jews in Palestine prior to 70 A.D. For we know, as Tertullian did, that Jerusalem did not in fact rejoice at the approach of her Lord (except in a brief and superficial manner, as events proved). It may seem fitting that vv. 15-16 deal, therefore, with the immediate followers of Jesus amid the Jews. The version Septuagint of verse 16 has the curious words:"--as sacred stones they roll--". This is quite unlike the Hebrew on which our English modern versions are based. Tertullian takes up this reference and says:

"Lapides enim sunt et fundamenta, super quae nos aedificamus, exstructi secundum Paulum super fundamenta apostolorum, qui lapides sancti oppositi omnium offensui voluant." (Ad. Marc. IV, XXXIX:6).

This makes it clear that Tertullian attributes these particular verses in Luke 21 to the Jewish persecution prior to 70 A.D., as prophesied in Zech. 9:15-16. Tertullian's desire, as over against Marcion, is, of course, to show that this persecution was prophesied in the Old Testament, since this links the God Who inspired prophecy under the Old Covenant and the God Whom Jesus revealed and for whom these first
Christians died.

The point of the above discussion is that this first proclamation of the Gospel to the Jews prior to 70 A.D. is thus seen as fulfilling Old Testament and Dominical prediction. Not only so, but in terms of our Lord's whole discourse, recorded in Luke 21, it represented the first of three successive periods set out in advance by Jesus, as Tertullian understands this chapter. Therefore, its fulfilment (especially when taken in conjunction with the termination of that first stage in the destruction of Jerusalem, 70 A.D.), serves to confirm belief in the whole discourse of Jesus. Since the first stage has been completed, we can expect the others to be fulfilled also. Stage two is implied to be that of the preaching of the Gospel to the Gentiles, since Tertullian thinks in terms of Jewry's suppression until the close of 'the times of the Gentiles'. This is strictly the period of Israel's setting aside, but Tertullian evidently views it also as that in which, through God's dispersing of the Jewish people, it is Gentiles primarily who are gathered in. This is not simply an accident resulting from the Dispersion. Tertullian, in company with the Early Fathers generally, (cf. Chapter IV, page 24ff; Chapter V, page 324; Chapter VI, pages 697 and 650-653), conceives of the Jewish rejection of her Lord as foretold and sent upon her by God (though this does not absolve her guilt), and further as being the predestined hinge upon which turned the door of opportunity for the Gentile world. Thus, in the divine plan, Israel's setting aside has meant the ingathering of the Gentiles through the preaching of the Christian Gospel. Tertullian makes clear that this is his full understanding of 'the times of the Gentiles' in the De Resurrectione Mortuorum, at chapter XXII, when he quotes Luke 21:24b and explains the statement that Jerusalem will be trampled down among the Gentiles until the time of the Gentiles be fulfilled in these words:
Thus, for Tertullian the present age of Gospel-proclamation among the Gentiles was prophesied by Jesus also, and it is for him now in process of fulfilment. This would also serve to confirm that in due time the third and final period of our Lord's prediction will be fulfilled also. The point of all of this for our present purposes is that it shows us that for Tertullian the preaching-mission to the Gentiles, like the earlier mission to the Jews, is set within a divine framework of history spanning the period between the two Advents and set forth in the eschatological discourse of Jesus at Luke 21. Thus, what we have in Tertullian's thinking is not merely a 'realized' element, which consists in the fact that Christ is triumphing in men's hearts through the preaching of the Gospel among the Gentiles: rather what we have is a present triumph of Christ, viewed in dynamic terms as part of the predestined movement of history towards its prophesied consummation. Again, the 'realized' and 'futurist' elements are inextricably intertwined. This close interweaving is one of the most characteristic individual features of Tertullian's eschatological thinking.

The second passage from the Adversus Marcionem mentioned above (page 934), may be more briefly mentioned. It is found in the last chapter, and almost the last words, of Book IV. Tertullian has just said that in this book his aim has been carried through, viz., that of showing that all that we know about Christ Jesus is consistent with the Old Testament revelation of the Creator. This is true of Christ's doctrines, rulings, affections, feelings, acts of power, sufferings, and even the resurrection -- all of which, says Tertullian, were foretold by the prophets. He goes on:

"...siquidem et apostolos mittens ad praedicandum universis nationibus in omnem terram exire sonum eorum et in terminos..."
terrae uoces eorum psalmum adimplendo praecepit." (XLIII:9).

The allusion of this statement is to Ps. 19:4, and by it Tertullian seeks to show that, even in the matter of preaching the Gospel 'to the nations' (which means, especially, to the Gentiles), Old Testament prophecy is being fulfilled, which makes nonsense of Marcion's separation of Jesus Christ from the Creator God of the Old Testament. From the point of view of our present interest, it is interesting to see the Gospel-proclamation to the Gentiles set in a line of fulfilled prediction which runs through the whole life and mission of Jesus. It is as if this line has been extended in such a way as to include this mission. In view of what we already know of Tertullian's convictions regarding the consummation of the age, this further fulfilment of prophecy must indicate to him the nearer approach of the consummation itself. The proclamation to the Gentiles is thus viewed as part of the movement of God towards history's completion. It also seems likely that the phrase, 'nationibus', which may be rendered, 'to the nations', or, 'among the nations', is an allusion to Luke 24:47. When we bear in mind the equivalent passage in Matthew, chapter 28, which would be meaningful to Tertullian though unacceptable to Marcion, one is left wondering whether Tertullian is making a play on the concepts of the 'συντελεία τοῦ Λίῳνος' of Matt. 28:20 and the 'terminos terrae', to which the Gospel is to be proclaimed on Tertullian's understanding of Ps. 19:4.

Clearly, in Matthew's Gospel the significance of the statement that Christ is with His disciples "always, to the close of the age", (R.S.V.) is that the disciples will never be left to conduct their preaching mission on their own. Therefore, the concept of the extension of the Gospel geographically or spatially already has an analogue in the words of Jesus, as recorded in Matt. 28:20, in that parallel with this spatial extension there moves one in time which reaches out to the 'συντελεία'. 
-- the word which is probably the inspiration of Tertullian's concept of, and emphasis upon, the 'finis saeculi' --- 'the consummation (close, and) of the age.' This makes it more than likely that Tertullian has this analogue in mind. If so, this serves to underline the dynamic understanding of the Church's preaching-mission, which, as we have already seen, is present in this passage in Ad. Marc. IV,XLIII.

GOD'S SOVEREIGNTY IN HISTORY: A THEOLOGY OF COVENANTS.

One final quotation may be given which illustrates that general dynamic view of history and God's movement in it, which everywhere informs Tertullian's writing. It is taken from the Apologeticum and speaks majestically of God's sovereignty over the affairs of time and of history:

"Videte igitur, ne illa regna dispenset, cuius est et orbis qui regnatur, et homo ipse qui regnat; ne ille uices dominationum tempo ribus in saeculo ordinarit, qui ante one tempus fuit, qui saeculum corpus temporum fecit; ne ille ciuitates extollat aut deprimat, sub quo fuit sine ciuitatibus aliquando gens hominum." (XXVI:1)

Tertullian's point, in context, is that Rome is older than some of her gods. Her grandeur and times are in the hands of the true God of all nations of men. Further, it was Jewry's rejection of her Messiah which brought Judaea under the Roman sceptre, while her former independence was not dependent in any way upon the religions of Rome, which she did not honour. When we recall that the above quotation comes from an Apology, we realise that there is nothing craven in this commendation of the Christian Faith. The statement that God "made the age a body of times" is a remarkably clear statement of Tertullian's whole view of history and eloquently sets forth his dynamic understanding of it as apportioned by God and as moving towards its predestined goal.

Closely connected with Tertullian's thought that God composed the age as 'a body of times' is the reasoning concerning the divine Covenants
with men, whereby he refuted Marcion, in particular. Over against Marcion's 'Antitheses' Tertullian brings out the essential harmony of the Old Covenant and the New. To Marcion their 'differentness' proved that there were two gods. Tertullian begins in Book I of the Adversus Marcionem by showing the absurdity of Marcion's conception. By definition, God can only be one 'in-number'. If we then ask which is to be the one true God, the Creator or Marcion's 'strange God', Tertullian argues that the world witnesses to the Creator while there is no real evidence for this other 'god', whom Marcion has introduced. Tertullian's conclusion is that there is one true God Who operates in different ways within different dispensations, within different arrangements for varying times within the present age. It is in this way that the 'antitheses' between the Old and New 'Covenants' are to be explained.

Tertullian comments:

"Separatio legis et evangeli proprium et principale opus est Marcionis, nec poterunt negare discipuli eius quod in summum instrumento habent, quo denique initiantur et indurantur in hanc haeresin. Nam hae sunt 'Antithesis' Marcionis, id est contrariae oppositiones, quae conantur discordiam evangeli cum lege committere, ut ex diversitate sententiarum utriusque instrumenti diversitatem quoque argumententur deorum. ---" (Ad. Marc. I. XIX:4).

Tertullian goes on to argue that the 'separation' (separatio) of law and gospel was unknown before Marcion's time, since he invented the theory. The god whom Christ was supposed to reveal on Marcion's theory, could not have been revealed by Jesus Christ, since we only derive knowledge of this previously unknown God by means of argument from this separation of law and gospel, and that had not yet taken place in Christ's time. Until Marcion, it was doubtless held, says our writer, "non alium deum et legis et evangeli -- praefer creatorem."

What is implicit in this chapter is the judgment that the one God is author both of law and of grace. In the following chapter Tertullian takes up the question regarding the identity of the 'false brethren' who
had crept unawares into the Galatian Church and were troubling the brethren there in Paul's day. It is shown that these were not such as wished the Galatians to transfer their allegiance to "ad alterius dei et Christi fidem" (XX:4) but were Judaizers. They wished to perpetuate Jewish ceremonies which the Galatians should have realized were now set aside. Tertullian refers to: -

"tempora et dies et mensae et annos Iudaicaearum caerimoniarum (which the Galatians were again observing), quas iam exclusas agnouisse debuerant, secundum innouatam dispositionem creatoris olim de hoc ipso praedicantis per prophetas suos, ut per Esaiam: vetera transierunt, inquit, ecce nova, quae ego nunc facio. Sic et per Hieremiam: et disponam testamentum, non quale disposui ad patres uuestros, cum illos eduxissem de terra Aegypti; et alibi: renoue uobis novum, et circumsidimi de uestro, et circumcidmini praeputia cordis uestri." (para. 4).

The important thing for our purposes in this quotation is the clear concept of one God who operates in different ways in the two dispensations. Strictly this word, 'dispositio', refers not to the times within which new circumstances apply, but to the differing 'arrangements' themselves. These 'arrangements', however, lend their own character to the times within which they apply in the divine providence. This is a thoroughly Hebraic way of thinking about 'times' as not mere empty shell or framework, but as positive entities governed by the ruling factors dominant within them. It is the thought of time as 'filled' in the way which von Rad has described for us. In any event it is the one God Who makes different arrangements for different periods of time within this age.

This concept is not very congenial to the modern mind, which, influenced by the assumption of science in examining the physical world that we must think laws and principles to be uniform, tends to place God within the confines of a similar view: God must act in consistent ways so that His behaviour can be reduced to order on investigation. Tertullian, however, would consider that to think thus is to put the

1'Theologie des alten Testaments', II, 12 ff.
Living God in a straitjacket. It is interesting, however, to observe the explanations offered of changes in God's arrangements, which, he would surely claim, are justified by hindsight. It is not wrong to discover a reason for God's activity which we can understand, at least in retrospect, but it is wrong to assume that the one God can only have one set of arrangements for his dealing with the universe or with men. Thus, Tertullian says in another part of the Adversus Marcionem:


Here we find Tertullian using an argument which was not unfamiliar (it occurs in the Clementine Recognitions, chapter XXXVII), to the effect that God accommodated Himself to the desire of the Israelites to worship idols, by allowing them for a season to worship Him under certain forms and by certain ceremonies. This was better than having them relapse into idolatry.

In any event Tertullian's main point in the Adversus Marcionem is that God does have differing arrangements or dispositions for different times within this age. This is clearly at one with that dynamic view of history which we have already noted in him. The differing arrangements are set within a predesigned plan which is moving towards a goal. The stress, however, naturally falls in the Adversus Marcionem on the mid-point between the arrangement of 'law' and that of 'grace', since it is the contrast between these two which suggested to Marcion, against whom he is contending, the possibility and likelihood of the existence of two gods of differing character, one 'just', the other 'good'. That Tertullian does indeed think boldly in terms of Christ Jesus introducing
a new 'dispensation' in which the law was in some sense actually repudiated becomes clear from such a comment regarding those whom Paul opposed in 'Galatians', viz. false apostles and brethren, that "evangelium Christi creatoris transferrent a nouitate praenuntiata a creatoris ad vetustatem recusatam a creatoris." (1.XX:6). Clearly, it is implicit in this passage that the new dispensation in some way betters the old. It is a forward step, not just in a temporal sense, but in terms of God's eternal purposes.

It is clear that in all of this it is not simply, in Tertullian's view, that one dispensation does in fact succeed another, and that we can know this in retrospect. Perhaps some of the reasons for things become clearer on review, but what has now come to pass through the coming of Christ was prophesied beforehand. This lends depth to the impression of a dynamic element in the movement of history: it is purposive, since the new dispensation was prophesied and in due time has been brought to reality. Thus, in one place (Ad. Marc. III.XXI) Tertullian reminds us that at Isaiah 2:2-3, the ingathering of the Gentiles is predicted. In this chapter Tertullian notes that Marcion denied that there was any prophecy of national or Gentile conversion to Christ Jesus. Thus, he understood such a passage as Isaiah 2:2: "all the nations shall come to it (the house of the Lord in Jerusalem)", as referring to the incoming to the Jewish faith of proselytes. Tertullian replies by asserting that there are certain passages which unequivocally refer to 'the nations' or 'the Gentiles'. In this relation he quotes as from Isaiah the words: "And in His name will the Gentiles trust". This utterance is found actually at Matt. 12:21, where the Evangelist paraphrases verse 4 from Is. 42:1-4. Matt. 12:18-20 follow rather more closely the words of Is. 42:1-3. Frequently, in fact, in this section Tertullian's references -- both those he places on Marcion's
lips and his own supporting ones -- are paraphrases of Scripture rather than exact quotations.

Tertullian sees significance in the words of Is. 22 which he takes to refer to the establishment of "the mountain of the Lord" and "the house of God" as taking place "in the last days" (in nouissimis diebus). He finds this prophecy fulfilled in Jesus Christ and the proclamation of the Christian Gospel, through which the Gentiles are coming to the true God, the God of Israel. He notes especially verse 4 of Is. 2 which implies the cessation of hostilities between nations, and sees this fulfilled in Christ. He says:

"Haec aut prophetata nega, cum coram uidentur, aut adimpleta, cum leguntur, aut si non negas utrumque, in eo erunt adimpleta, in quem sunt prophetata. Inspice enim adhuc ipsum introgressum atque decursum uocationis in nationes, a nouissimis diebus adeuntes ad deum creatoram, non in proselytos, quorum a primis magis diebus adlectio est. Etenim fidem istam apostoli induxerunt." (Ad. Marc. III,XXI:4).

The significance of this chapter and its argument for us at present is that it sees the ingathering of the Gentiles through the preaching of the Christian Gospel as a feature of 'novissimi dies'; not only so, but this ingathering is a feature which was predicted in advance. Once again, therefore, as with the contrast between 'law' and 'grace' we find a change in God's arrangements for differing periods of time within this age, a sense of progression towards a predestined goal, and the intertwining of the dynamic and futurist aspects. God's purposes are seen to be unwinding in the ingathering of the Gentiles, but only in accord with a plan for the future, earlier revealed to the prophets.

In close connection with the thought of the new dispensation whereby the Gentiles are ingathered is the concept of the new dispensation of the Spirit. Commenting on the phrase, "the Father of mercies", in II Cor. 1:3, it is Tertullian's plea that the 'accidents' of 'mercies' cannot be attributed to a god whose existence or substan-
tiality has not been demonstrated, i.e. this phrase cannot refer to Marcion’s ‘strange god’, but it is appropriate to the One revealed under the Old Covenant as gracious. Tertullian cites examples of such graciousness. Therefore, he goes on, the ‘testamentum novum’ will pertain to this gracious God already revealed in the Old Testament, who also promised the New. Tertullian puts it thus:

“Sic et ‘testamentum novum’ non alterius erit quam qui illud repromisit, et si non litterae at eius spiritus — hoc erit novitas —, is denique, qui litteram tabulis lapideis inciderat, idem et de spiritu edixerat: effundam de mea spiritu in omnem carnem; et si littera occidit, spiritus uero uiuificat, eius utrumque est, qui ait: ego occidam et ego uiuificabo, percutiam et sanabo. Olim duplicem uin creatoris uinicaus, et iudicis et boni, littera occidentis per legem et spiritu uiuificantis per euangelium. Non possunt duos deos facere quae, etsi diversa apud unum recenseri praevenerunt.” (Ad. Marc. V, XI:4).

Here the contrast is between ‘killing in the letter’ through the law and ‘quickening in the Spirit’ through the Gospel.

A final illustration of this realistic understanding of new ‘dispensations’ may be given from what Tertullian has to say about those who have faith as being the ‘sons of Abraham’. In one passage (Ad. Marc. V,III:9ff.) he notes that all who have faith in Christ are indeed ‘the sons of Abraham’ — he is commenting here on Paul’s discussion at Gal. 3:6ff. He lays stress in this section on the special similarity between the Gentiles prior to conversion to Christ and Abraham in his uncircumcision. Paul is properly seen to make a distinction between having faith and the later gift of circumcision, in the case of Abraham. Tertullian is contending in this section against Marcion’s desire to have two quite separate gods. In particular Tertullian notes that Marcion interpreted Gal. 3:13’s quotation from the Septuagint version of Deut. 21:23: ‘Cursed be every one that hangs on a tree’, in such a way as to understand that the reason why Christ was cursed was that the Creator recognized in Him the emissary of a ‘strange God’. Rather, says Tertullian, we have one God Who has two different dispensations.
Christ takes upon Himself, by the will of that one God, the curse of the Law, so that the transition can be effectively made to the new dispensation of grace. That the dispensation of law was a temporary arrangement is the understanding of Galatians 3 which informs the thinking of Tertullian at this point, and he makes his point well. Marcion had omitted in his expurgated version of Paul's Epistle to the Galatians, chapter 3, all references (vv. 7, 9 and 29) to those with faith as 'sons of Abraham'. However, Tertullian notes this fact and makes the point that it is the one God Who calls Abraham before he is circumcised, but who later leads him to be circumcised. Paul stresses Abraham's call prior to his circumcision in order to make the point that faith is not bound up essentially with the law. Tertullian concludes:

"Denique alterius dei fides (i.e. in the god of 'circumcision') ad formam dei alterius non potest admitti (i.e. to the arrangement of Marcion's newly revealed god), ut credentes iustitiae deputet, ut iustos ex fide uiure faciat, ut nationes filios fidei dicat. Totum hoc eius est, apud quem ante iam notum est." (Ad. Marc. V,III:12).

BAPTISM AND EUCHARIST: THEIR ESCHATOLOGICAL IMPLICATIONS.

When we turn to Tertullian's view of the sacraments of Baptism and Eucharist, one is immediately aware how definitely this reflects his eschatological perspectives. The basic thought which he has in mind, both in dealing with Baptism and in discussing the Eucharist, is that the believer is thereby brought into, or maintained within, the people of God, who represent the New Age but who presently live in a world which is sinful and is destined for destruction. Thus, the concept is again that of what we have termed 'inaugurated eschatology'. The perspective of Tertullian comes out very clearly in his discussion of Baptism at one place in the De Baptismo:

(Tertullian has just mentioned the Holy Spirit's descending upon the baptismal candidate as he comes out of the water. This follows the pattern of Christ's baptism. We are told that the
There are a number of interesting points in this passage. First, there is an implicit comparison of the first Deluge in water in Noah's day with the Deluge of Fire which is destined to come upon the earth. This is a common theme in Early Christian literature. It is found already in II Peter 3. The concept is in the background in a well-known passage in the 'De Spectaculis', where Tertullian has a magnificent comparison between the brutal 'spectacles' of the Roman circuses and gladiatorial shows and the approaching day of Judgment at Christ's Advent in glory.

Tertullian says:

"Quale autem spectaculum in proximo est adventus Domini iam indubitati, iam superbi, iam triumphantis! quae illa exultatio angelorum, quae gloria resurgentium sanctorum! Quale regnum exinde iustorum! Qualis ciuitas nova Hierusalem! At enim supersunt alia spectacula, ille ultimus et perpetuus iudicii dies, ille nationibus insperatus, ille derisus, cum tanta saeculi usitatas et tot eius nativitates uno igni haurientur."

(XXX:1-2).

It is interesting to observe here, not only the belief that the earth is to be consumed 'by one great flame', but also the notion that this will take place in the 'old age of the world' or in 'the oldness of the age'. We note the recurring concern of Tertullian with the 'saeculum' and its running on towards its consummation. At the back of Tertullian's mind in the two passages above (De Baptismo, IX, and De Spectaculum, XXX) almost certainly lies the words of Jesus at Luke 21:26ff (cf. Matt. 24:37ff.) concerning the similarity between the day of the Coming of
the Son of man and the coming of the Flood. The Lukan account, in particular, of Jesus' utterance is relevant to the theme of fire of judgment, in that a comparison is also made with the judgment on Sodom (when Lot alone was saved - a type of the Church), at which time "fire and brimstone rained from heaven--". (Lk. 17:29). Second, the thought is present in this De Baptismo passage that in Christ Jesus and His work judgment has already fallen on our world, but in such a way as to be taken upon Christ Himself. Christian Baptism unites us with Christ in such a way that our sins are judged, yet the penalty is borne by Jesus Christ alone. The symbolism of this fact here is that the people of God are plainly parallel to Noah, his wife, his three sons and his sons' wives. The Church is the community of those in the 'ark', the ark of salvation. This can only mean that God's judgment on sin has already manifested itself in Christ, Who took that judgment upon Himself. Third, we may ask, then, what point there is in further judgment, judgment by fire? The answer to this is surely that such judgment is reserved only for a world that has known the judgment in water and has reverted to sinful behaviour. This is the point of Tertullian's remark that the comparison is not apt which seems to make the aftermath of Baptism parallel to the return of the world to sin after the Deluge. After the Deluge which Christ took upon Himself (and which is conveyed to us in Baptism) the world is destined not for sin and destruction, but for righteousness and peace. The coming Deluge of fire is only to be upon such as have not entered into the Ark of salvation, the Church, by means of Baptism, and have thus not saved themselves from the destruction, which the desolation that Christ endured on the Cross guarantees for all when it is finally unleashed against sin at the end of the age. The present period is one of delay, in which God mercifully waits for all to be gathered into the Ark of salvation. The only
other class for whom such judgment is reserved is for those who after Baptism "renew their sins". The lesson of Noah's Flood is that even those who were in that Ark of long ago could (in their posterity) find further (though different) judgment, if they who were intended to renew the world in righteousness should again pollute it with their sins. Fourth, Baptism is clearly thought of in very physical terms. Tertullian assumes that faith is expressed in Baptism, but it has to be outworked in the waters of Baptism. It is true that in chapter XVIII he urges the delaying of the Baptism of 'parvuli' (as also of the 'innupti'), but the dominant reason seems to be fear of judgment falling on baptized persons who have lapsed and thus come under the certainty of punishment which the very figure of the Flood suggests: such as 'renew their sins' and pollute the earth with their sins are reserved for condemnation. Be this as it may, Tertullian considers that faith, which is primary, must be expressed in 'water Baptism'. The reason for this is that it is a physical Baptism of Fire which is coming upon the earth at the end of the age. A spiritual condemnation of the world and of sinners might suggest the need only for a spiritual or inward turning to God, but belief in the coming Deluge of fire suggests the appropriateness of such a water Baptism as marks one off as not due for condemnation in that coming Deluge. This reasoning is very similar to that which is implicit in the Shepherd of Hermas, when it alludes to Christian Baptism. It means that for Tertullian the very rite of Baptism cannot be understood properly except in relationship to the approaching consummation of the present age in judgment and the subsequent renewal of the earth. Finally, the practice in North Africa of anointing the candidates as they come up out of the waters of Baptism is seen as reminiscent of the return to the Ark of the dove with a leaf in its mouth, which indicated the assuagement of divine wrath and the granting
of God's favour. Clearly the connection with the Spirit's descending upon Christ at His baptism in the form of a dove is in view here also. Thus, the gift of the Holy Spirit is associated with the anointing, which is here viewed as an integral part of, and the completion of, the Baptismal ceremony. The gift of the Spirit is, therefore, significant of the fact that the Christian belongs to the new world that has already been created in Christ and that will be revealed after the destruction of the 'old world' in fire at the end of the age.

Significant too of this eschatological understanding of Christian Baptism is Tertullian's view that martyrdom guarantees eternal life. Tertullian, in company with many other Early Christian authorities, views martyrdom as a 'secundum lauacrum'. He stresses (in chapter XV of the De Baptismo) that Christian Baptism, as over against Jewish Baptism, is 'once' (semel) received: "Semel lauacrum inimus, semel delicta ablununtur quia ea iterari non oportet." (para. 3) However, he goes on in the next chapter to assure us that there is a special 'second Baptism': just as Jesus came, not only by water (understood of His Baptism in the Jordan), but also by blood (on the Cross) -- here Tertullian takes up the words of I John 5:6 -- so the Christian knows that Baptism in water (the first Baptism) may well lead to that in blood (the second Baptism):

"Proinde nos facere aqua vocatos sanguine electos hos duos baptismos de uulnere percussi lateris emisit, quia qui in sanguinem eius credarent aqua lauarentur, qui aqua lauissent et sanguine oporterent. Hic est baptismus qui lauacrum et non acceptum repraesentat et perditum reddit!" (XVI:2).

It was commonly held by the Early Christians that, if one died for Christ's sake before receiving Baptism, then the shedding of one's blood was a substitute for the Baptism in water. One was enrolled among the people of God, not by water, but by blood. Similarly, where gross sin had resulted in excommunication from the people of God.
(usually adultery, or among strict groups denial of the Faith under
persecution -- most churches suspended for the latter, but Montanists,
and strict churches generally, refused readmission even to the penitent),
it was recognized that martyrdom was a legitimate means of re-entry into
the people of God. Tertullian was not yet a Montanist when he wrote
the *De Baptismo* (usually dated circa 200-206 A.D.), but he always took a
rigid view of serious sins. The view that Baptism in blood thus guaran-
teed eternal life may seem a legalistic view, implying that it earned
salvation. However, it is not improbable that the thought is that
such self-sacrifice is an indication of one's belonging to the people
of God, but that, in a situation where grave sin has been previously
committed, only such an act can show the grace of God that is given to
the penitent. Further, the promise of Jesus that He will confess
before His Father in heaven those who confess Him before men is taken
to include such penitents. For our present purposes, the significant
features of all of this are that Baptism in blood, where it takes place,
is seen as a result of the same dynamic movement of God that led one
first of all to water -- *baptism* (the pattern being that of Christ's
life and death), and also that this connects up with Tertullian's view
that the martyrs alone go immediately to Paradise on death. Just as,
in another connection, we saw that celibacy is an anticipation of the
conditions of the coming Kingdom of God, so denial of one's own life
for Christ's sake is seen as such an identification with Christ that
it lifts one into the nearer Presence of God and enables one to bypass
the waiting period in Hades.

References to the Eucharist are more allusive in Tertullian's
writings and their eschatological bearing more concealed. Against
Marcion the point is made that, when Christ took bread and wine and
distributed them to His disciples, there must have been a real body, of
flesh and blood, otherwise the symbolism of the bread and wine would have been empty. Tertullian, alluding to Marcion's docetic view of Christ's body, says bitingly: "faciebat ad uanitatem Marcionis, ut panis cruciferetur." (Ad. Marc. IV, XL:3). This seems to show that Tertullian thinks of later feasts around the Eucharist not in terms of any theory of trans-substantiation (to use later language), but rather in terms of symbol which yet points beyond itself to the real body and blood of Christ, once given for us and now at God's right hand. However, there is rather more in Tertullian's mind than this. He closes the chapter in which the above point is made against Marcion with a quotation from Gen. 49:11, which is taken as a prediction of the sufferings of Christ. In that verse, the reference to 'garments' (which are said to be washed in wine) are understood of Christ's flesh, and that to 'wine' of Christ's blood. What Tertullian does not note, but is almost certainly in view throughout is the previous verse in Genesis, (49:10) where it is said that "the sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor the ruler's staff from between his feet, until he comes to whom it belongs; and to him shall be the obedience of the peoples". (R.S.V.) This, when applied to Christ, was commonly taken in the Early Church to indicate the resurrection-victory of Christ and His present reign at God's right hand, to be consummated at His Appearing in glory. The full implication, therefore, of Tertullian it would seem is that, when we partake of the elements of the Eucharist, we use symbols which point beyond themselves to the real body of Christ, now at God's right hand but destined to appear at the end of the age for the redemption of our bodies. Not only so, but just as Baptism unites with Christ, so participation in the elements of bread and wine is appropriate to the maintenance of our communion with Christ, who has thus won the victory over death and will manifest it at the end of the age. Without
spiritual obedience, the partaking will be an empty, perhaps even a blasphemous form, and will achieve nothing. Nevertheless the plain thought in Tertullian's mind is that it binds us to that body of Christ, which is yet to be manifested for the fulness of our salvation. There is, therefore, a concealed eschatological element in Tertullian's comments in this chapter on the Eucharist.

TERTULLIAN'S LEGALISM: LINKS WITH ESCHATOLOGY.

It has been quite widely held that Tertullian first lays the foundation of the Western Christian legalistic doctrine of grace and merit in regard to the forgiveness of sins. So too he develops the concept -- already, it is suggested, found in the 'Shepherd of Hermas' (Simil. V,III:3) -- of supererogatory work or virtue as constituting 'merit' in the sight of God. It is also manifest that Tertullian is deeply concerned with the question of post-baptismal sin(also a concern of 'The Shepherd of Hermas'), and gradually adopts a severer view of the manner of dealing with grave post-baptismal sins. There is a certain contrast between the De Paenitentia (written c. 203) and the De Pudicitia (c. 217-22), written in his Montanist days. Our concern with this 'legalism' in Tertullian's thought -- if such there truly is -- is to examine its relationship with his eschatological views. It is also in this connection that the question of Penance must be briefly examined, again with a view to any eschatological implications which there may be. The question of Tertullian's legalism and his views on Penance do in fact belong together, so that the treatment of the one does not require to be separated from that of the other.

Bound up with the exposition of Tertullian's view of merit which we find in such a writer as R.S. Franks is the recognition that while for Tertullian "all service of God is meritorious: 'Artificium præmerendi
obsequium est' -- in the stricter sense only non-obligatory services are meritorious. God has ordained a sphere of liberty (licentia), in order to give an opportunity for such supererogatory works. To this class belong patience, acts of voluntary penance, above all fasting, virginity, and martyrdom. In all this region the rule is that of retribution according to law." References in support of these contentions are given from the De Cultu Feminarum, II:10; the De Exhortatione Castitatis, VIII; De Patientia, XV-XVI; De Ieiunio adversus Psychicos, VII; De Exhort. Cast., III; and Ad Scapulam, IV. The Latin quotation itself is from De Patientia, IV.

What is of interest for us is that all these supererogatory works show a clear connection with eschatological views of Tertullian. We have already seen that for him the practice of celibacy is an anticipation of the new conditions of existence in the resurrection-body. (above, pages 89/90). Similarly, martyrs are the only saints to obtain a direct access to Paradise without any period of delay in Hades. (vida above, pages 914-916). In his book on fasting (De Ieiunio) Tertullian adduces various reasons for moderation in food and drink. The eschatological note does not at first appear, it is true, but it is not absent. One concern of Tertullian is that overeating will pander to licentiousness and to weakness in times of persecution. While Tertullian's concern may seem undue, and his criticism of the 'psychici' severe, times of trial do doubtless call for discipline of body, which affects the soul. Nor is evidence lacking from the study of the history of religions that temperateness in eating habits, as well as discipline in sexual matters imposed by celibacy, is not unrelated to heightened
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spiritual perceptiveness. What is noticeable in Tertullian is a concern lest Christians should be left at one level of experience of God and not press on to that which is higher. There is danger in this attitude, the danger to which Gnosticism fell prey, when it divided people into classes -- the ΣΧΡΙΚΩΙ, the ΨΥΧΙΚΩΙ, and the ΤΥΕΥΜΑΛΙΚΩΙ. To be fair to Tertullian, his argument is always that the Gnostics make this largely a matter of destiny, one over which the individual has little, if any, control, whereas the distinction which he comes to make in his Montanist days between psychical and spiritual Christians is one which depends upon our own volition. It may well be that there is still the danger of spiritual pride when people feel they have voluntarily gone beyond their brethren in spiritual zeal. Our present concern is simply to note that there is a dynamic element, whether his views are ultimately justifiable or not, in Tertullian's thinking. God has got better things on ahead for us. Therefore, anything which helps us to reach that further stage in God's Self-revelation is to be sought with military discipline. Not only so, but in all these matters -- fasting, denial of sexual expression and even of life itself (in martyrdom) -- what is evident is that functions are represented which will cease to be meaningful in the new state of existence, which is normally attributed to the resurrection-body. If it is to be granted immortality (or even a kind of conditional immortality until the end of the millennium, when, in Tertullian's view, incorruptibility will be conferred (vide pag557above)), then it is not likely that eating and drinking will be necessary to the new conditions of being, any more than sexual functions will be necessary for the propagation of the species and the prolongation of life thereby. As for the life that is laid down in martyrdom, God is able to grant it again in resurrection-glory. Thus, the dynamic and eschatological
elements are present in Tertullian's mind, though sometimes his eschatological interest is submerged and though it is frequently combined with other factors which derive from his view of the beginning of things rather than the ending of things: thus, Tertullian says that it was through gluttony that sin gained a seat in the flesh, i.e. by means of the eating of the fruit of the forbidden tree. (cf. De Iesu, III).

Our concern here is not whether Tertullian does work with a concept of supererogatory merit. It is possible to argue that, even if the matters that are emphasized in this regard all seem to be matters in which a degree of anticipation of the coming age is in view, Tertullian thought that a certain merit accrued to such anticipation. At the same time it must be said that the observation of this stress on anticipation of the age to come weakens the whole idea that Tertullian himself really thinks in terms of acquiring merit in this way. It would seem, fundamentally at least, to be rather a matter of anticipating the coming age, and being ready for such preparatory disciplines as the dispensation of the Paraclete may now impose on God's people.

Tertullian's Montanism is often attacked -- and doubtless rightly -- on the ground that it is dangerous to add to Scripture, and to set up new revelations as to conduct or anything else. Tertullian's answer to this is that new 'prophecies' must indeed be consistent with Scripture, the Gospel, and apostolic usage, but that we cannot bind the Spirit of God. Thus, in discussing the matter of the rejection of second marriages, Tertullian asks why the Spirit of God cannot lead us step by step, by gradations, through the times. This expresses exactly the perspective of Tertullian on all these related issues. There is an underlying belief in the dynamic movement of God's revelation of Himself to His people. As a Montanist, Tertullian quotes
John 16:12-13, in order to make the point that since the apostolic era the Spirit has been leading His people forward to new challenges and new heights. (De Monogamia, II:2). He goes on in chapter III of the De Monogamia, having discussed various reasons why the previous Dominical and apostolic license in the matter of second marriages should no longer apply, to express very clearly his sense of the gradualistic character of divine revelation: just as there were changes in the dealings of God with His people in Old Testament times and between the Old and New Covenants, so here he reveals this sense within the Christian dispensation itself. He says:

"Igitur si omnia ista obliterant licentiam nubendi, et condicione licentiae inspecta et praelatione continentiae imposita, cur non potuerit post apostolos idem spiritus superueniens ad deducendam disciplinam in omnem veritatem per gradus temporum (secundum quod Ecclesiastes: Tempus omni rei, inquit) supremae carni fibulam imponere, iam non oblique a nuptiis auocans, sed exerte, cum magis nunc tempus in collecto factum sit, annis circiter CLX exinde productis? Nonne ipse apud te retractares: Vetus haec disciplina est, praeclaram dehinc in apostolorum eius tam consilii quam exemplis? Olim sanctitati huic destinabamur. Nihil noui Paracletus inducit. Quod praemonuit, definit; quod sustinuit, exposcit." (III:8).

From all of this it is very evident that Tertullian is working with a dynamic concept of God's movement in history which has the final conditions of the Coming Age in view. It is thoroughly eschatological in tone, whether or not it be ultimately justifiable from Scripture, when Tertullian speaks concerning those 'additional virtues'. And it is perhaps noteworthy that they are hardly supererogatory in the later Montanistic works of Tertullian: they have become obligatory in this dispensation of the Paraclete.

The question concerning post-baptismal sins probably has to be understood also, at least in part, over against Tertullian's eschatological perspectives. We must first note the basic facts about Tertullian's attitude which changed to some extent in this matter.

In the De Paenitentia, written in his pre-Montanist days, Tertullian
describes a form of penance that had to be performed by candidates for Baptism (chapters 4-6), while in the ensuing chapters (7-12) his rule is that baptized persons falling into grave sins (murder, idolatry, or adultery) can receive another form of penance -- but only once: this agrees with the outlook of 'The Shepherd of Hermas', which allowed one remission of such sins, but one only. However, in the De Pudicitia, a distinction is made between 'peccata remissibilia' and 'peccata irremissibilia'. For the graver sins there is now no forgiveness which the Church can dispense. Tertullian adopts the view that God may indeed forgive such serious sins, but that the knowledge of this will be vouchsafed not to Church officials but to persons specially gifted with the Spirit, who are able to discern His mind in particular instances: even so, such cannot be readmitted into fellowship -- they may, however, be comforted with the hope of eternal life, if the Spirit moves a suitably discerning person to communicate the knowledge of forgiveness to the penitent.

Does the above narration of the facts concerning Tertullian's changing attitude indicate a growing legalistic emphasis? Is it because Tertullian comes to make more of God's demands and less of His grace that latterly he thinks so much to be demanded by God from the Christian? Is it a growing legalism which asserts that God must requite with severity post-baptismal sins, such severity being consonant with the great mercy of God first vouchsafed in the waters of Baptism to believing faith and repentant obedience? Certainly Tertullian's attitudes did become severer as the years passed, but our concern is with the theology that underlay this or that was offered in explanation of it. Here it would seem that, as in 'The Shepherd of Hermas' (vide above, Chapter II, page 249 ff), a major factor in
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1. Passim: Vide e.g. Chapter II.
2. Vide chapter III.
3. Vide chapter XXIX.
Tertullian's mind is that the Church is a community that is eschatologically oriented. It is a physically conceived community of the people of God which looks for deliverance from the coming Deluge of Fire at Christ's Coming in glory. It is entered by faith and Baptism, and one is nourished in it by the Eucharist and works consistent with faith and obedience to the Gospel. It is because it is such a community that post-baptismal sin poses such a problem. It is a public community. To have constant failures of a serious kind, even when followed by repentance and imposed penances, is to make a mockery of the community set up by God. This is not just a practical issue, a matter of the impression created on the world outside the Church. The point is that Christ suffered 'once-for-all', so too the human response which is implicit in that Self-offering of Christ as man for us, demands a 'once-for-all' character about our Baptism and our subsequent behaviour.

Tertullian certainly progresses towards the severer view of post-baptismal sin. This, however, is relatively incidental: what is fundamental throughout is this concept of the 'once-for-allness' of Christ's Atonement, and the judgment that to be reached effectively by that grace through faith and Baptism is to be set 'once-for-all' in the people of God. This, however, is a thoroughly eschatological concept, as we have already set out. It looks back to the Atonement once wrought by Christ, but it looks forward to that for which that Atonement, through Baptism, seals us. In chapter X of the De Pudicitia Tertullian expressly repudiates, with strong derogatory language, the 'second repentance' permitted by 'The Shepherd of Hermas', preferring the Scriptures, as he says, of that Shepherd who cannot be broken: In a discussion in chapter XVII of that same book, Tertullian says, having quoted Rom. 6:1-11, these words:

"Igitur senel Christo mortuo nemo potest, qui post Christum mortuus, delinquentiae, et maxime tantae, reviviscere. Aut
si possit fornicatio et moechia denuo admitti, poterit et Christus denuo mori." (para. 8).

The point in this particular passage is not only that a once-for-all death of Christ cannot be repeated -- and this seems logically involved in readmitting to the Church, the very Body of Christ, such as have been guilty of grave sins -- but also that Rom. 6:1-11 sees that death is intended to be followed by resurrection, as in the case of Christ's victory. The dynamic movement of God in Christian experience is interfered with where serious sin ensues upon commitment to Christ.

Doubtless Tertullian shows a certain 'animus' in his writing, the De Pudicitia, against 'the Church of the Bishops', and may well have such a person as Pope Callistus of Rome (217-222) in mind. But there is no adequate reason to doubt that devotional and theological motives are basic to Tertullian's thought. Penance he is prepared to allow -- more, it would seem, as an indication of penitence and true adherence to the Church of God than as a means of earning salvation, in a legalistic conception. Tertullian presumes the understanding that the Church is the community of those, once received through the once-for-all Atonement of Christ, and destined to be once in future time delivered when the world, as we know it, is given over to the Deluge of Fire in judgment.

APOSTOLIC TRADITION AS CONSTITUTIVE OF THE ESCHATOLOGICAL COMMUNITY.

We turn finally to the matter of Tertullian's concept of the Church as implied by the kind of concept of 'apostolic tradition' with which he works in the De Praescriptione Haereticorum. It is important to realize at the outset that Tertullian, in company with Irenaeus, Hippolytus, and many other Early Church Fathers, sees heresy as a sign of the approach of the consummation of the age. Heresy is a sign of the End-time because it was predicted by our Lord and by the apostles.
In chapter IV of the book in view he quotes Jesus' words at Matt. 7:15. He talks of heretics in terms of their being 'ravening wolves' (lupi rapaces) and 'false prophets' (pseudoprophetae), set within the Christian community with intent to subvert it from within. He goes on to say:

"Qui pseudoapostoli nisi adulteri evangelizatores? Qui antichristi, interim et semper, nisi Christi rebelles? Hoc erunt haereses, non minus novarum doctrinarum peruersitate ecclesiam lacerantes, quam tunc antichristus persecutionum atrocitate persequetur nisi quod persecutio et martyras facit, haeresis apostatas tantum. Et ideo haereses quoque oportebat esse ut probabiles qui manifestarentur, tam qui in persecutionibus steterint quam qui ad haereses non exorbitauerint." (IV:4-6).

The above passage shows that Tertullian sees the present outbreak of heresies (Gnosticism, Marcionism, and so on) as pointing beyond themselves to the coming outbreak of persecution under Antichrist. With reference to that threefold division of our Lord's eschatological discourse, as studied from Luke 21 which we discussed above (p.87ff.), it would seem that Tertullian places the period of the emergence of heresies within the Church as being coextensive with the second stage in which the Gospel is preached to the nations and the Gentiles are gathered into the Church. Such passages as I Tim. 4:1ff., would surely convince him that their period was to be later than that of the apostles. Yet their absence of mention in regard to the third period of Jesus' discourse, when the period of world tumult is to be, would enable him to think of them as falling in the second period, prior to the end of 'the times of the Gentiles'. I Jn. 2:19 is quoted at the end of the previous chapter, in order to show that the heretics do not really belong to the true Church, but this demonstrates that Tertullian has in mind the whole context of that verse, which is (v. 18) that the presence of so many antichrists is proof that this is the 'last hour'. What Tertullian seems to derive from this is the judgment, not that the consummation itself is immediately impending (that will only happen when the heavens are shaken), but that the emergence of persons speaking in the spirit
of Antichrist (consistent with the second period of Luke 21) points beyond to the third and final period (when not only are the heavens to be shaken, but Antichrist will rampage in person - Tertullian knows this by bringing references to Antichrist together with this third period).

The point of the above analysis of the meaning and background of this passage from the De Praescriptione, IV, is to show that Tertullian's whole discussion of the Church, 'apostolic succession', and the nature of heresy, is set in a distinctly eschatological framework. Tertullian sees those who are guilty of heresy as of a kind with those who yield up their 'faith' under persecution. Clearly what lies in the background here is a concept of the Church which is eschatologically oriented.

We have already seen, in discussing Tertullian's understanding of Baptism, that Baptism seals one in a physical manner within that People of God, the Church, which will be revealed when the Deluge of Fire is poured out on the earth. Tertullian does not seem to think that they will be delivered from persecution and terror, who belong to Christ on earth in that day, but rather that God will demonstrate at the Parousia of Christ, which will consummate this terrible era that it is to them that the future belongs. Anyone who defects under persecution, whether now or in that day, will show that he does not belong to the true Church -- for denial of Christ 'undoes' one's baptism -- worse, it is an affront against it. It is in a similar way, as the above passage shows, that he thinks about heresy. This too shows that one does not belong to the true Church.

All of this helps us to set Tertullian's horror of flight in persecution (cf. De Fuga in Persecutione, written in his Montanist days) in context. There seems no doubt that he assumes that people denying Christ in the final persecution under Antichrist will be eternally lost -- if only because they will have no opportunity of repentance. This
would suggest to him the thought that those who defect now under persecution are of a kind with those who will yield to Antichrist in that day. This kind of reasoning seems implicit in the first chapter of the De Fuga in Persecutione. Tertullian says that persecution is God’s means of testing and proving, or of rejecting, of His ‘servants’.

He goes on:

“Quis est exitus persecutionis, quis effectus alius, nisi probatio et reprobatio fidei, qua suos utique Dominus examinavit. Hoc nomine iudicium est persecutio, per quam quis aut probatus aut reprobatus iudicatur: porro iudicium soli Deo competit. Haec pala illa, quae et nunc dominica aream purget, ecclesiam scilicet, confusum aceruum fidelium eventilans et discernens frumentum martyrum et paleas negatorum. Hae etiam scalae, quas somniat Iacob, aliis ascensum in superiora, aliis descensum ad inferiora demonstrantes.” (1:3-4).

What is very significant above is the clause which says that God is ‘even now’ (et nunc) winnowing the Lord’s threshing-floor, the Church. The Church is thus seen as a community ‘in via’, moving dynamically towards its goal at the Parousia of Christ and being tested as it does so, in order that it may be pure at Christ’s Appearing. Clearly the final generation will be purified by persecution. But Tertullian thinks of present persecution as sent by God as an anticipation of that final testing for those who are alive now. The Church is, therefore, viewed by Tertullian as a community whose very constitution is determined by the events towards which, in the divine providence, she is pressing forward.

The significance of the above for our present purposes is that Tertullian plainly views heresy also in a similar light. The final sentence of the earlier quotation (p.360) from the De Praescriptione Haereticorum, chapter IV, made this clear. Thus, the conception of the Church which underlies Tertullian’s discussion of heresy is at one with that in mind when he talks about persecution as a testing device used by God. Heresy comes to us in the permissive will of God and those
who are led away by it show that in reality "they were not of us" (I John 2:19). What Tertullian has in mind here is not simply that persecution and the emergence of heresy show our true colours to God - He must already know that surely. Rather is it that by defection under persecution or through the appeal of heresy we publicly repudiate our connection with the true people of God.

Tertullian wrote the De Praescriptione Haereticorum circa 200 A.D., in his pre-Montanist days. Nevertheless we find here the reasoning which doubtless in his view justified at a later date his own defection from what we have come to think of as the Catholic Church. He asserts in chapter XVI of that work that heretics are not to be disputed with, but admonished, according to the rule of St. Paul at Titus 3:10-11. The thought is also expressed in the previous chapter (XV) that the Scriptures do not belong to heretics -- hence the uselessness and danger involved in disputing with them concerning the meaning of Scripture. Again, what is in the background here is the view that the Church is essentially to be defined with reference to the Day that will reveal all secrets and show who it is who is truly on God's side. The Scriptures belong certainly to the Church, which is a visible institution -- that is the very point of Christian Baptism and continuing witness to Christ -- but the Church cannot ultimately be defined in terms of a membership roll or a list of those baptized. It is defined in terms of those who will be revealed at the Last Day and God, by means of persecution and the insidiousness of heresies, proves the outward body that we know as the Church, so that those who hold fast under both attacks may be seen as the true People of God in an anticipatory way. It is with this background of thought that Tertullian says that the Scriptures belong not to the heretics -- they have shown by their heresy that they do not really belong to the Church. Clearly in all of this we find a brand
of thinking which is markedly oriented to eschatological issues.

It is in this setting too that we must see what Tertullian has to say about 'apostolic succession'. In chapter XX of the De Praescriptione Haereticorum, having discussed the commission given by the risen Lord to go and "teach all nations", baptizing them into the three-fold name of Father, Son and Holy Spirit, and having noted that this was a special apostolic task to which Matthias was also assigned, so that the number of the Twelve Apostles might be complete, Tertullian notes that they went out into the world and preached the Gospel to 'the nations' thereof. He goes on to say:

"Et perinde ecclesias apud unamquamque ciuitatem condiderunt, a quibus traducem fidei et semina doctrinae ceterae exinde ecclesiae mutuatae sunt et cottidie mutuantur ut ecclesiae fiant. Ac per hoc et ipsae apostolicae deputabuntur ut suboles apostolicarum ecclesiarum. Omne genus ad originem suam censeatur necesse est. Itaque tot ac tantae ecclesiae una est illa ab apostolis prima ex qua omnes.----" (paras. 5-7).

What Tertullian has in mind is certainly that the apostles were under God first responsible for the true Christian 'tradition'. This is the physical aspect of his thinking. This depositing of the truth by the apostles acts in an external manner to guarantee what is truth, rather like the way in which the sacraments of Baptism and the Eucharist witness to the inclusion of the individual within the People of God, the Church. Yet Tertullian's conceptions are not static. Just as one's Baptism does not in itself guarantee salvation, but is only a presumptive factor, witnessing to one's external identification with the People of God at a given time, so the deposition of truth by the apostles is only an external witness given to the Church. There is no suggestion that the churches founded by the apostles are viewed in static fashion as being in a continuing fashion, by some miraculous power, the necessary custodians of truth. Rather the thought is that the apostles founded certain churches, committing to them the pure truth
of the Gospel in accordance with Christ's commission. Only the Day of
Christ will reveal clearly which persons and which churches have been
truly faithful to Christ, but departure from apostolic truth, like
departure from Baptism under persecution, is a separating off from the
ture People of God, and is possible because God permits heresy in order
to purge and purify His true people. It is difficult to believe that,
with such an understanding, Tertullian would view in any purely external
fashion the concept of 'apostolic succession'. The only succession
is that of Truth, which gathers her own to herself, and whose consum­
mation will be at the Appearing of Christ, Who is the Truth. We see,
therefore, that the concepts of the Church, of heresy, and of apostolic
succession which we find in Tertullian's De Praescriptione Haereticorum
bear witness to the eschatological orientation of his thinking and
the powerful influence which it had on his ideas.
THE ESCHATOLOGY OF TERTULLIAN: AN ASSESSMENT.

It is manifest that broadly Tertullian stands in line with the other writers whose works we have been studying in that his eschatology can best be described as 'inaugurated'. Perhaps the feature which most stands out as we view the eschatology of Tertullian in retrospect is his intertwining of the 'realized' and 'futurist' elements under the influence of a dynamic theology of history. God is viewed as driving history forward towards its goal, and the Church of God is given its place within this divine movement.

It is natural, however, as we reflect upon Tertullian's eschatology to ask whether it represents any new departure, since in him we have the one true representative of the Latin West among the writers whom we have been studying. Other men who ministered in the West, as Irenaeus and Hippolytus, either came from the eastern end of the Mediterranean basin or wrote in Greek, thus coming in some degree under the influence of Greek rather than Roman culture. It should be borne in mind that Tertullian was a Roman 'colonial', and such persons are usually more devoted to the values of the home-land than those who live in it.

One impression which comes across in reading Tertullian's works is that he shares the characteristic Western preoccupation with man. His theology is rather more man-centred than that of most of the other writers studied. This is witnessed to in his legalism, in which he speaks in legalistic terms concerning the individual soul's standing before God. This is not to say that other writers were unconcerned about the individual, but it is true that in Tertullian's thought the individual receives a somewhat greater degree of emphasis. Where incorruptibility is the prime gift of the Gospel, as in the Greek-writing Fathers, this gift is somehow conceived of as given in a more communal setting, that
of the Resurrection, than is the gift of a right relationship with God, which is a more individual matter. It seems probable that Tertullian's emphasis upon the individual, especially in connection with his legal status before God, was at least influential in the West in helping forward the tendency to place emphasis upon the individual soul's lot after death at the expense of the sense that it is the world that needs redemption and will receive this at Christ's Coming in glory. It seems clear from the above survey of the evidence concerning Tertullian's thought that he himself is very sure that the true goal of history will only be reached at the Parousia and that he sees this as an event of cosmic significance. For him 'personal eschatology', as it has been called, has to be set against that background. Nevertheless, the tendency to place emphasis upon the individual soul's status before God may well have been a factor in producing the development in the West of a theology which was deeply concerned about the individual and also about the lot of the soul between death and the resurrection. We have seen that it is dubious in what sense Tertullian may be said to have contributed to a doctrine of Penance, but, viewed against a wider background of history, it may well be that the trend of his thinking made possible the development of an elaborate Aurgatorial teaching. It is significant that no such doctrine in any developed form emerged in the Eastern Church.

Another symptom of Tertullian's concern with the individual is his thought that death is the unnatural sundering of body and soul. It is not that earlier or Greek-speaking writers would disagree with this, but again this concept receives a characteristically individualistic emphasis in Tertullian's thought. This is not very marked, but the tendency does seem to show through. Thus, in the East also death was thought of as God's judgment on sin, and a major feature in Christian expectation was focused upon the gift of incorruptibility. It falls, however, to
Tertullian to draw out fully the implications of this for the individual; the soul is severed from the body. Hence, what the resurrection will do is to restore the unity of the two.

We must ask to what extent this emphasis in Tertullian upon the individual soul's status before God (with its tendency to emphasize 'personal eschatology') and upon death as God's judgment on sin whereby the soul is severed from the body (which again, indirectly, may seem to place emphasis upon the soul's state between death and resurrection) stems from his understanding of the soul, (vide above pages 901-925), which may have been influenced by Stoic conceptions. We suggested that Hebraic conceptions might well have as much to do with Tertullian's thought about the soul as having its own kind of embodiment as anything else. The Roman mind tended to think more concretely than the Greek, and it may be that Tertullian does owe somewhat more than has usually been recognized to such an Hebraic emphasis. Nonetheless, this same tendency to the concrete is doubtless expressed in the Stoic concept, and it may be that, as one living in an area and age in which Stoicism was in the ascendant, Tertullian owed somewhat to it also. One of the corollaries of the Stoic concept of the soul as embodied is that it becomes easier to think in terms of punishments and rewards after death. This in time may lead not only to a developed doctrine of Purgatory but to a reduced emphasis upon resurrection at the Last Day and Final Judgment. In mediaeval times men's minds were convinced regarding ultimate resurrection and Judgment, but often the 'pains of hell' thought of as due to be endured immediately upon death, were more real, because more imminent.

We have already noted that Tertullian rejected the Stoic notion of a recurring cycle of history. His thought is too impregnated with Biblical concepts to allow him to think thus, and we have seen that he makes much of the coming Kingdom of God on earth. History is not for him cyclical.
Nevertheless, the question may emerge whether the Stoic concept of a recurrent renewal of the earth by fire (ἐκ πυρομοίους) may not have had some subtle influence on his thought. Has this concept become attached in some fashion to the notion of the individual after death. Tertullian does seem to envisage Θέαν in Jesus' parable as enduring actual torments of thirst in the kind of embodiment which is appropriate to his state. We saw that Tertullian does not develop this concept, but clearly such a development was to take place in the West. Did Tertullian think thus literally in regard to Θέαν's torments in the parable because, without being aware of it, he was influenced by the Stoic understanding of fire as a cosmic cleansing agency? Had he applied this to the soul? If he has, then Stoic concepts, both of the soul's embodiment and of renewal by fire which cleanses what is not wholesome, will have contributed perhaps a great deal to the development of Western thought.

Another question which needs to be asked is whether Tertullian's thinking is relatively more pessimistic about the world than that of the Greek Fathers. At a later date (after the Council of Nicæa) the latter were to place a strong emphasis upon the recreation of the world through Christ's resurrection. Certainly, it seems true that, in terms of the later development of thought in East and West, Tertullian seems to place a relatively greater emphasis upon the Cross as a judgment on man's sin than Greek-speaking writers did. The latter certainly saw the Cross as condemning man's sin, but they tend to see it as the prelude to the resurrection which heralds the dawn of a new age. In all of this, it must be borne in mind how much Tertullian himself does think in terms of a coming salvation which will encompass all nations of men, but it is probably true that there is a somewhat severer attitude toward sin than among Eastern writers (though neither Clement of Alexandria nor Origen passes over sin lightly). One judges that Tertullian's thought again is suggestive of a tendency,
but that it is a mistake to make too much of this.

The major features of Tertullian's eschatology, as developed in the previous pages, stand forth as those of the Early Church generally. Parousia of Christ in glory, resurrection at the end of the age, Final Judgment, as well as doctrines of Antichrist and of a millennial reign of Christ on earth are all prominent features. However, Tertullian's theology may be estimated in relation to the development of certain Western emphases, where eschatology is concerned, it seems evident that no more than the other writers studied does he provide evidence for concern over the 'delay' in the Parousia. He shows no tendency to play down futurist aspects of thinking, but combines with those a strong sense of God's present guidance of history. His apparent interpretations of Jesus' Apocalyptic Discourse suggests the likelihood that he did not think in terms of Christ's immediate Appearing in glory, though it is true that what he has to say about visions of the New Jerusalem as hanging in the sky suggest that he thought the events immediately preceding the End would not long be delayed.
CHAPTER IX: ESCHATOLOGY IN THE EARLY CHURCH TO THE MID-THIRD CENTURY.
ESCHATOLOGY IN THE EARLY CHURCH TO THE MID-THIRD CENTURY.

It is the purpose of this chapter to gather together the results of the investigation undertaken in the previous chapters. In the introductory chapter on 'The Present Situation in the Interpretation of New Testament Eschatology' we set forth the purpose and scope of our inquiry and related it to the present attempt, in the field of New Testament scholarship, to relate 'futurist' and 'realized' elements of eschatology in the New Testament documents themselves. We reached the conclusion, after an extended survey of the 'consistent eschatology' school of thought, the 'realized eschatology' school and certain mediating and other positions, that the 'consistent' and 'realized' schools, for all their differences, did in fact adopt a common outlook concerning the earliest developing understanding of eschatology, as reflected in the New Testament records, and then in the writings of the Early Church.

What was this outlook shared by the 'consistent' and 'realized' eschatology schools of thought? It was to the effect that at the very beginning the Primitive Church looked for a literal Parousia of Christ in glory and that when this did not come to pass, already within a very few years a process of 'de-eschatologizing' began within the Church. C.H. Dodd's emphasis on the fact that in the earliest days the Resurrection, Exaltation, and Second Advent of Jesus Christ were seen as an indivisible unity, in which the emphasis falls upon Christ's already present achievement and in which the Second Advent is viewed as an impending corroboration of that present reality, has become so well-known that his acceptance that the Primitive Church did nevertheless look for a literal Second Advent of Christ has been obscured. In the case of the 'consistent eschatology' school it is, of course, readily appreciated that a speedy Second Advent of Christ was anticipated.
What it is important to grasp is that Dodd's view of this Second Advent as an 'impending corroboration' of present reality does not alter the fact that on his understanding also the Primitive Church looked for such an Appearing in the most literal way possible. It is not necessary, nor would it be sound, to argue that 'consistent' and 'realized' eschatology schools have no significant differences in their understanding of the eschatology of the Primitive Church. What we have shown is that they both looked for an imminent Parousia of Christ in glory, literally understood, and that both schools are in agreement that, when this did not take place, within a very short period of time a process of 'de-eschatologizing' developed.

If the common contention of both 'consistent' and 'realized' schools of eschatology is sound, we should expect to find evidence of a diminishing emphasis upon a futurist understanding of the Parousia of Christ and all that was associated with it, both within the New Testament itself and in the literary deposits in general of the Early Church. In brief, it is our contention, in the light of the evidence adduced in Chapters II-VIII above, that there is no substantial evidence of such a diminution in the futurist emphasis of the Early Church within the literary records up to the middle of the Third Century. It is understood that the New Testament evidence is not under consideration in this thesis: this has been examined by many others, with varying results, but it is not part of our brief. This is not, however, to deny that any findings from the area that does fall within our scope may well have significance for the way in which the New Testament evidence itself is interpreted.

It is then our contention that the extra-New Testament literature of the Church in the period under review shows no evidence of a diminution of interest in the futurist aspects of eschatology. It is true that
there may be some marginal evidence of this towards the end of this period, especially in the work of the Alexandrian Fathers, Clement and Origen, but even then only in regard to the question of the millennial reign of Christ on earth, concerning which from the beginning there appears to have been less precision and some measure of ambiguity.

It is also a fact that the literature before us reflects concern on the part of certain persons concerning the 'non-event' of the Parousia, but significantly such concern is always depicted as reflecting unbelief or, at least, as not being an appropriate attitude for a Christian person to adopt. It could be argued that, if we extended our literature to include that of the Gnostics, many of whom appear to have had a close connection in the first half of the Second Century with the Church, we might gain a different impression. This is true, but it remains significant that those persons who thought in the way that such literature shows, were, as a matter of historical fact, gradually squeezed out of the Church, as she sought to define the Faith by which she lived.

Our procedure in this final chapter will be to support the general contention made above by a brief résumé of the facts, already accumulated in the previous chapters. Having done this, an attempt will be made briefly to set out how the Early Church saw the Christian Hope, as its understanding developed with the passage of time from the Ascension of Christ. Here the emphasis will not be upon extracting evidence by which we may answer questions posed from a certain perspective, viz. to answer the question whether the Early Church was disappointed by the 'delay' in the Parousia of Christ and, in consequence, began a process of 'de-eschatologization' of theology. Rather, in this section our aim will be to let the documents before us speak for themselves. Finally, some of the detailed judgments of Werner and Dodd regarding the development of Early Church thinking concerning eschatology will be reviewed.
in the light of the approach of her literature to eschatology, which should by that time have become apparent.

**SUMMARY OF RESULTS.**

The following definitely futurist elements in Primitive Christian eschatology have to be taken into account: the Parousia of Christ in glory; the resurrection of the dead (either in two stages, believers before the millennium and non-believers after it, or simply in one happening at the Parousia of Christ); the Final Judgment (again, either at the end of the millennium or at Christ's Parousia in glory); an intensification of evil culminating in a period of 'Great Tribulation' (or, Persecution) under Antichrist; and, finally, the millennial reign of Christ on earth, variously interpreted, but in its classical presentation viewed as a definite period of time, bounded by the Parousia of Christ at its commencement and by the release of Satan (who had been bound) at its close (the latter being followed by Satan's final defeat, the Final Judgment, and the beginning of 'eternity').

We are inclined to think simply in terms of the Parousia, the resurrection of the dead, and the Final Judgment. It is certainly, however, from the standpoint of Early Christian thinking, a mistake to ignore the initiation of the consummation of the age in Antichrist's reign and the related period of great persecution and harassment of the People of God. The millenarian issue is one which yields a greater variety of interpretation, but our summary of evidence will contend that this too was taken more literally and seriously than might at first sight seem likely. One further area of futurist interest which overlaps with both of the latter two areas of interest is that concerning the future of Israel. This again will be found to be bound up, in Early Christian thinking, with a whole theology of history which
spans the period between the two Advents.

Care must be exercised, since all of the above-mentioned points of interest are futurist, not to ignore the very real interest of the Early Church in this period between the Advents and in such notes of 'realized' eschatology as are present in her thinking. Indeed, it will be our contention that in general the Early Church believed in some kind of 'inaugurated eschatology' rather than either a purely 'futurist' or a purely 'realized' form of eschatology.

Other terms not mentioned above are also significant, especially, the Kingdom of God. It is, however, particularly difficult to place, because it seems to span the period between the two Advents and to be related both to present and future aspects of the reality of divine salvation in history.

Some attention will also be given in this summary to the serious way in which most of the writers, with whom we have dealt, took the realities of space and time, when dealing with eschatological matters. This is important because it helps us to assess what is meant by the language employed. It shows, for example, that futurism cannot be 'demythologised.'

The Parousia of Christ in glory.

There is no lack of evidence concerning a continuing belief in this reality as a future event in the literature which we have examined. This is true right through from the writings of the Apostolic Fathers and the Apologists up to Hippolytus and Origen.

It is true, of course, that emphases varied in this literature, and that certain writers and writings make more of this future event than do others. We saw, in particular, that certain writings characteristically lay the emphasis upon the coming resurrection of the
dead and upon the reality of future judgment, subsequent to that resurrection, rather than upon the Parousia of Christ as such. Nevertheless, such emphasis seems to rest upon the tacit agreement that resurrection and judgment depend upon the Parousia of Christ in glory. It is His Coming which signals the resurrection of the dead, and part of His purpose in coming is to act as Judge. This stress upon resurrection and judgment, rather than upon Parousia of Christ in glory as such, is marked in the Apologists other than Justin Martyr.

We give below a brief résumé of evidence on this point of the Parousia.

Apostolic Fathers.

Certain of these documents are more obviously charged with a futurist eschatology than others. Thus, II Clement markedly displays such interest, while the Didache and the Epistles of Ignatius do not at first sight stress the traditional futurist aspects of eschatology. Our study convinced us, however, that all did in fact accept the traditional framework.

In particular, the Parousia of Christ is accepted by all these writings as an event in the future of the Church. It may be true that an Ignatius only uses the actual term, παρουσία, of the First Advent of Christ. Nevertheless, it seems clear that he believed in the reality of a future Parousia in glory.

Some of the most conspicuous references in the Apostolic Fathers are connected with the question of the 'delay' in the Parousia. This is dealt with, as we saw, in I and II Clement, and in the 'Shepherd of Hermas,' in a quite explicit fashion. The treatment afforded the issue gives no suggestion of disturbance on the part of the Church, but it does certainly give evidence that certain persons were asking why Christ's
Coming in glory was delayed, and whether in fact this delay did not show that He would not come at all, at least not in any literal fashion. R.M. Grant thought that certain evidence in the Epistle of Barnabas showed concern over the 'delay' in the Parousia, but we saw fit to question this assessment of the evidence. Again, the Didache is not a document which shows great interest in eschatology on a first reading, but we came to the conclusion that it had a great interest in the missionary expansion of the Church and that this interest assumed a view of the Church as expanding between the two Advents. This was not only present, but, we held, was important in this work. This interpretation of The Didache could be viewed again as an explanation of the 'delay' in the Parousia of Christ. This, however, is no more convincing here than in other cases. It seems clear that where the time-lag between the Ascension of Christ and His Return is noted, an explanation is given, (as to allow the Church to expand and the full number of the elect to be brought in) which may look like 'special pleading' to an outsider, but the tone of the writings in thus explaining afford no suggestion of strain or of conscious attempts at deception. In any event, these notes of the time-lag in question and the character and tone of the explanations given, indicate no retreat from belief in a future Parousia of Christ in glory.

Apologists.

It seems probable that it is to Justin Martyr that we owe the thought of the 'Second Advent', as such, where the Parousia of Christ is viewed in terms of a numerical identity. The thought is almost explicit certainly at Heb. 9:28, but it only receives explicit development in the extant literature for the first time in the writings of Justin. It is, of course, clear, that belief in such a Parousia conceived of as a 'second' Advent was presupposed from the beginning
as, for example, in the writings of the Apostolic Fathers. The greater emphasis, however, upon the 'secondness' of this Parousia, as set forth in Justin's language, is bound up with a tendency to separate off the understanding of Παρουσία as 'coming' or 'advent' from its alternative meaning of 'presence'. The emphasis upon the Second Advent, which characterises most modern thinking about the Parousia, seems historically to owe much to the stress of Justin Martyr. It is notable that such a stress, however justified by the Christian tradition concerning the Parousia in glory, is indicative of a tendency to heighten the futurist aspects of eschatology, which becomes apparent in the Second Century. Such a heightening is a significant factor for our understanding of the development of Early Christian thinking, because it runs counter to what we would expect to find if Dodd and Warner are right in thinking that the Early Church became embarrassed over the 'delay' in the Parousia and accordingly tended to transmute futurist expectation into a more 'realized' understanding of eschatological concepts.

Justin himself keeps the balance by thinking of two Παρουσίαι as falling within one ἐκκοιμησία. Neither Justin nor the other Apologists give evidence of embarrassment over the delay in the Parousia. It is true, however, that both Justin and the Epistle to Diognetus exhibit a keen awareness of the present results of the Work of Christ.

Irenaeus.

Our study of Irenaeus was not analytical in character: rather did we lay stress on the concept of 'recapitulation' and on related themes, seeking to bring out their implications so far as eschatology is concerned. It became clear, however, that there is a quite marked
futurism in Irenaeus' writings, and belief in the Parousia of Christ is central to this futurism. Irenaeus' stress on the millennial concept throws into relief his crassly historical view of what is to come. He sees this millennial era as inaugurated by Christ's Parousia in glory.

The Return of Christ is sensitively viewed in terms of the concept of Recapitulation. The resurrection of the body at Christ's Return and the gradual familiarization of the whole man, body and soul, with incorruptibility (ἀθανασία), is thought of as the outworking in history of what Christ has already achieved through His death, resurrection, and exaltation to the right hand of the Father. It is at the Parousia of Christ in glory that the full significance of Christ's recapitulation of Adam's race will become apparent in living and resurrected followers of Christ.

Irenaeus' emphasis on the concept of recapitulation as related to time between the two Advents of Christ in its positive and negative aspects provides him with an inaugurated eschatology. In consequence, he gives no evidence of being embarrassed by any sense of 'delay' in the Parousia. Extremely significant in regard to this matter is Irenaeus' explicit setting forth of the view, in terms of an interpretation of Daniel 7, that the Parousia will not take place until the Roman Empire has passed away, and Antichrist has overthrown three of the ten kingdoms into which that Empire was due to be divided. It is noteworthy that this thought had already appeared in the Epistle of Barnabas (chapter IV), but it is set forth in greater detail by Irenaeus. It was to reappear in the writings of Hippolytus of Rome and of Tertullian.

The Alexandrian Fathers.

With Clement of Alexandria and Origen we come to Church Fathers who have been accused of 'spiritualizing' eschatology. We noted the judgment of Henry Chadwick that Clement had no time for the primitive
eschatology. Our own investigation did not lead us to accept this judgment. Clement is characteristically interested in the individual and he has much to say concerning 'personal eschatology'. The purgatorial cleansing after death which he envisages for the believer was seen, however, to be terminated by the resurrection at Christ's Appearing. Again, we saw references to a coming Deluge of Fire which demonstrated that Clement's interests have submerged presuppositions of a traditional character regarding the Parousia of Christ in glory. So too with Origen, a study of the Biblical Homilies in particular shows this thinker's acceptance of the Parousia. The whole image of Origen as discounting the traditional eschatology was called in question in our discussion. It is of course possible that Origen is not in fact consistent. In any event, certain passages cited (as, for example, that concerning the collapse of the walls of Jericho, or that concerning the staying of the sun in the heavens under Joshua, in which Origen sees a type of the delay of the Parousia) demonstrate a clear vein of thought in Origen which cannot properly be thrust to one side and ignored. There do indeed appear to be certain less Biblical notes in Origen's thinking, especially as evidenced in the De Principiis, but these do not seem to interfere with Origen's acceptance of a future Return of Christ in glory.

It does seem to be true both of Clement and Origen that they evince a certain distaste for overly materialistic views of the Parousia of Christ and especially of the coming Kingdom of God which is to be introduced by the Parousia. It would seem, however, if our judgment is sound, that this is to be understood in terms of a parallelism, implicit in their thinking, between the risen glorified humanity of Christ and God's purposes for His people in future ages. The attacks on Origen of such men as Methodius of Olympus draw attention to what may have been a real danger in the direction of Alexandrian thinking, as represented by
Clement and Origen, but it seems not proven that either thinker did not accept belief in future resurrection and judgment at Christ's Appearing; nor does the evidence seem adequate to substantiate the not uncommon judgment that these thinkers used traditional language only in a superficial manner. To both of them the Christian Hope was a reality which partook of the essence of the Faith. Neither thinker shows evidence of concern over the delay in the Parousia. It is indeed, arguable that their relatively greater emphasis upon the mystical aspects of Christian experience (notable especially in Origen's devotional works) is not unconnected with the passage of time since the Ascension of Christ. It seems as likely, however, that, when we take into account their sufficiently definite statements regarding the Parousia and their futurist eschatology of the traditional character, we shall be justified in understanding this emphasis in terms of their personal idiosyncrasies or the mystical cast of contemporary Alexandrian Hellenistic Jewish thinking.

Hippolytus of Rome.

Of all the thinkers under review Hippolytus is undoubtedly the one whose thinking is most deeply impregnated with eschatology of the traditional, Primitive Christian, character. His belief in a literal Second Advent is strongly documented. It is set in a thoroughly historical way between the reign of Antichrist and Christ's millennial reign on earth. What is most characteristic of Hippolytus is his theology of history. This was also a noteworthy feature of Irenaeus' thought, but Hippolytus develops it with a greater concern for the futurist aspect of eschatology. He too sees God's providential activity in present history as reaching out towards the end of the age, but he develops at greater length than does Irenaeus the understanding of the
reign of Antichrist as provoking the Return of Christ by which Anti-
christ's audacity is to be overthrown. Further, in his Treatise on
Christ and Antichrist as in his Commentary on Daniel, he develops at
considerable length his understanding of Rome as the fourth world
empire of Danielic prophecy (chapters 2 and 7). We have already noted
this with reference to the Epistle of Barnabas and Irenaeus. It seems
clear that this was a regular Early Christian tradition in interpreting
the Book of Daniel. Its significance is not only that it underlines
the seriousness with which Hippolytus and others take the hope of the
Parousia of Christ in glory. It also serves to indicate the character
of the Early Christian concept of imminence: it becomes clearer in
Hippolytus that when the early Christians spoke about the imminence or
nearness of the Parousia, they intended by this a nearness which is not
measured in ordinary chronological measurements as five or ten years
(or even a generation, usually reckoned as forty years in Jewish
thought). They meant nearness to the End in view of how much of
prophecy, especially that of Daniel chapters 2 and 7, has already been
fulfilled. This is an important point. A C.H. Dodd can say that after
as short a time as three or four years the Primitive Christian expectation
of the Parousia to corroborate the exaltation of Christ, of which
believers were already vitally aware, must have begun to undergo a change
in the light of the delay. 1 If, however, the expectation of imminence
has a particular Danielic background of thought, it is no longer clear
that Dodd's judgment is soundly based.

Hippolytus betrays no concern over the delay in the Parousia. He
does not appear to expect it very soon, in ordinary ways of reckoning.

1 The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments. Hodder and Stoughton,
This may well be the result of the realization forced on the Church by the passage of time that the fulfilment of Danielic prophecy was not necessarily imminent by any ordinary yard-stick. It is likely that only the passage of time would make this clear. Yet if it be true that it was essentially a prophetic understanding of the nearness of the End which from the beginning motivated the Church's expectation of the Parousia (as focused by Christ's utterances as recorded in Mk. 13 - Matt. 24 - Lk. 21), then the 'delay' would not occasion dismay. This accurately represents the feeling-tone of Hippolytus' treatment of the Coming of Christ in glory, when God's prophesied intentions regarding Rome and Antichrist have been fulfilled.

Tertullian.

Once again we find in Tertullian a definite acceptance of belief in the Coming of Christ, combined with an absence of embarrassment over the delay in that Event. Tertullian also shares the judgment of Pseudo-Barnabas, Irenaeus, and Hippolytus that Rome is the fourth world empire of Danielic prophecy. Accordingly, he too does not have an 'any moment' attitude to the imminence of the Parousia. Early Christian thinking in general seems to have postponed the Parousia until after Antichrist's reign, but acceptance of Rome as the fourth world empire of Daniel, chapters 2 and 7, did further postpone the Parousia, so far as expectation was concerned: it meant not only that Antichrist had yet to appear, but that he would appear only after the present Roman Empire crumbled. The raids of the Parthians and others may have led some persons to speculate on the nearness of the collapse of the Roman Empire, but at the beginning of the third century A.D. Rome was still relatively strong. All of this must have had the effect of making Christian expectancy prepared for a certain delay, even after the
passing of almost two centuries from Christ's death and resurrection.

Tertullian has much to say concerning the resurrection of the body. This undergirds the fact that there is no 'spiritualizing' in his cast of mind, either in his post-Catholic days or earlier. There is probably a certain retreat in Tertullian from the glad expectation of Christ's Coming as a consummation of history, that is one aspect of Eastern thinking to this time. Rather does Tertullian see the consummation as hastening for the benefit of a minority who are being saved out of the world. Be this as it may, Tertullian has a firm expectation of a literal Advent of Christ in glory, which will be succeeded by the millennial reign of Christ on earth.

What the above evidence means is that all the thinkers reviewed accept belief in the Parousia of Christ, and they do so without question. Only in the case of Clement of Alexandria and Origen would it be feasible to question this assessment. Even here, as we have endeavoured to show, it cannot be substantiated that they set aside this event or 'spiritualize' it or speak of it merely as a concession to traditional language or thought. This in itself is a not insignificant fact, that all these writers unquestioningly accept belief in the future Parousia of Christ in glory. It is not what we should expect, if there was a serious problem in Early Church thinking over the delay in the Parousia.

Two factors call for special mention in review. The first is that there is no trace of embarrassment over the delay in the Parousia, where the fact is mentioned or implied. At most there is evidence that certain Christians were disturbed about the delay, and such disturbance was seen as an evidence of unbelief. The second is that the concept of imminence seems to be understood, with reference to the Parousia of Christ, in
specific terms of reference: it is not that these writings merely assume in general terms that Christ will soon appear in glory, but rather that in terms of Danielic prophecy three out of five world empires have come and gone, the fourth has now been present for some considerable time, and the fifth has already made its presence felt in the events associated with the Incarnation and also in the ongoing missionary expansion of the Church. All of this means that for these writers the Parousia could not long be delayed, but the prophetic background of thought by which imminence was tacitly defined gave no clues as to how long the period of time until the Parousia might be, in terms of ordinary measurement of time. It was only much later - in mediaeval times - that the year-day principle of understanding Daniel's prophecies began to be employed by the Christian Church, though it had been employed earlier by the Jews. Further, such an understanding of imminence over against Danielic prophecy demanded some interval of time even now some time after Christ's departure from this world, because prophecy had revealed that the fourth world empire (seen by quite a few thinkers as Rome) must first pass, being divided into ten kingdoms, and Antichrist must first emerge, before the Parousia of Christ would take place. At times, especially among the earlier writings, it may seem that the assumption was that these events would quickly take place. If this is so, time provided a remedy for this assumption.

Resurrection and Final Judgment.

We take these two elements together because they belong together in Early Christian thinking. Our survey with regard to these related matters will not be so extended as in the case of the Parousia of Christ, because it was the regular understanding of the Early Church that these events took place either at, or in intimate relationship with, the
Parousia. We have already noted one point of divergence in the literature. Where a millennial reign is envisaged (and this is only markedly absent in the Apologists other than Justin Martyr, and in Origen - in Clement the silence is significant, but there is no repudiation of the concept in its classical form as there appears to be in Origen), the resurrection is thought of as occurring in two stages, first the believers at Christ's Appearing, then the final Judgment of unbelievers at the close of the millennial era when Satan, having been released, has been finally defeated and is cast into the lake of fire. Where the millennium is not in view or is not mentioned, the impression given is that judgment follows immediately on Christ's Appearing. In the case of the Apologists, it may well be that the silence over the millennial reign of Christ was a matter of discretion and that the point really being made was that Christ's Appearing did in fact signal the end of the present world order and situation in which heathen powers exercise their sovereignty unaware of Christ's actual Lordship of history.

So far as the resurrection of the body is concerned, it is perhaps in the Apologists and Tertullian that we find the heaviest emphasis. We noted how surprising it was that the apologetic literature should stress this concept which appeared no more credible to persons in ancient times than it does to modern thinkers. This demonstrates that the Apologists were not prepared to compromise their understanding of the Gospel in order to make converts. The emphasis in Tertullian may be connected with the interest of the Roman mind in the concrete as over against the abstract. None of the literature before us, however, ignores the concept of the resurrection. Again, it is in regard to Clement of Alexandria and Origen that the question is raised whether they were not simply using traditional language when they spoke of the resurrection. Our own investigation convinced us that this was not the case. In
particular, in the case of Origen we considered three possibilities of interpretation, as outlined by Henry Chadwick:

i. the view that the body will be the subject of an eschatological transformation: its form will be like that of our earthly body, but glorified and radiant;

ii. the possibility that discarnate spirits can exist without a body of any kind and that they may only require a material form at a certain stage of education on the way back to God (this situation might recur);

iii. the view that the visible and corruptible part of the universe (including our material frames) will be entirely destroyed, but that the glorious spirits in the upper spheres of the cosmos may yet receive even more glorious forms than they already possess.

Origen preserves a measure of detachment in that he does not dogmatize as to which of these views is correct. We dared to judge, contrary to the view of Henry Chadwick, that the first, rather than the second or third, most nearly represent Origen's most characteristic understanding. It remains true, however, that ultimately Origen does not know which, if any, of these views is correct: what he is sure about is that any form we may be given in the resurrection will be corporeal as over against God's incorporeality (at least there will be an infinite gulf between our form and His), and that this corporeality or form will represent the prolongation and glorification not just of some discarnate spiritual entity enclosed within our present bodies, but rather of the whole man, body, soul, and spirit.

Resurrection is closely related to the theme of the Judgment Day, especially in the Apologists. One purpose of resurrection, at least where sinners are in view, is for judgment. This note is also prominent in Tertullian, in whose writings, even where the saints are in view, the purpose of resurrection is thought of under one aspect as a kind
of positive judgment of worthiness, which will be given to the present few, whom the world does not favour. In fact, the concept of resurrection of the saints as a reward for their faith and faithfulness, runs throughout all the literature, but in the Greek Christian writings, as over against the Latin as represented by Tertullian, the stress falls not so much on the reward of the few, as on the recreation of the whole universe in accordance with God's declared purposes. In the Greek Christian literature the resurrection of the body is the concrete symbol and realization of the removing of God's curse upon the earth and upon man on account of the Fall. It is indeed characteristic of this literature to think of salvation in terms of immortality (ἀθανασία) and incorruptibility (ἄθανατότης) rather than in a legalistic understanding expressed by the concept of justification. On both views the consciousness of sin and the need of forgiveness is present but in the Greek Christian emphasis the accent falls upon the gift of incorruptibility as the concrete realization of the removal of God's judgment on sin. This removal of God's curse is viewed as extending not just to man, but to the whole created order.

Throughout the literature before us, and notably in the writings of Clement of Alexandria and Origen, our future resurrection is related to the already accomplished resurrection and exaltation of Jesus Christ: it is Christ's continuing humanity which guarantees our future resurrection and glorification. The thought is present in Clement and Origen, as we have seen, that just as Christ retained His humanity but shed its present limitedness in the triumph of the resurrection, so our continuing humanity in future ages is guaranteed but in such a way that our powers are to be greatly heightened in accordance with God's inscrutable and as yet undisclosed purposes for His people.

It may well be too that the reality of Christ's resurrection,
already accomplished, is a material factor in the Early Church's expectation of the nearness of the Parousia. If so, it is a tacit factor, but it is probably not the less real for that fact. One is reminded of the outlook of Wolfgang Pannenberg in our own day who insists that the resurrection of Jesus Christ was a harrowing of Hades and that it was a signal demonstration in advance of what is to happen at the end of the age, when Christ shall come in glory and the dead will be raised incorruptible. The thought of Pannenberg is that such an event as the resurrection of Jesus Christ (Who, unlike Lazarus and others, did not return to the thraldom of Death and Hades) has shaken Hades to its foundations and heralds the nearness of the End. Once again, such a concept does not give us a chronological measurement of nearness, not because the End of the age is conceived of in completely non-historical terms, but because nearness is measured over against an Early Church understanding that the Old Testament Scriptures (Daniel again features notably - cf. 12: 2-3) had prophesied a resurrection at the end of the age and already in one Man, Jesus Christ, if in Him only, this process has been inaugurated. The concept of a future Judgment Day is basic to the thinking of all the writers before us. Again the Apologists speak eloquently of this and are not afraid to remind pagan rulers that they will have to give an account to God of their stewardship of the office and dignity conferred on them by God. This Judgment Day will either take place at the Parousia of Christ or as a result of that event.

In Clement of Alexandria and Origen the concept of purgatorial cleansing after death suggests itself. In Origen indeed there is the hope at any rate of the ultimate salvation of all spirits, including even the Devil himself. We saw that Clement's discussion of such cleansing by remorse and divine discipline thinks of it as being terminated by the Parousia of Christ and as applying only to believers.
Origen's speculative reasoning at certain parts of the De Principiis, however, makes him think in terms of a general process of cleansing in future ages, which commences on death. In his view, which lays heavy emphasis upon the free will of spiritual beings including man, this allows for the possibility of fresh yielding to evil after cleansing in future times. On account of this speculative element in Origen's thought, it is hard to think that in his view the Judgment Day, in which he seems to have believed, can with accuracy be described as 'Final' Judgment. Nevertheless, even in Origen's case this Day will be final in so far as it sums up God's verdict on our actions and attitudes during the present age.

The concept of a Descent into Hades is significant in this literature. It keeps recurring, and it is evident that the Descent of Christ into Hades (and/or, that of the apostles, where the Gentiles are concerned, as Clement of Alexandria assures us) is viewed as having improved the situation or lot of believers, of the faithful ones, between death and the resurrection morning. This improvement or change dates from the actual event of Christ's Descent into Hades. We have seen that, whatever precisely this may mean (and no doubt it was no more imaginable to the Fathers than to us), it was always viewed as relevant only to the condition of believers, of the faithful. No doubt Origen's more speculative concepts might raise the question whether for him Christ's Descent into Hades carried significance of a change or betterment of condition for the non-believers but he does not appear to relate the Descent into Hades to these speculative thoughts.

What has been termed 'personal eschatology' does not receive pride of place in any of the writings before us. The overriding interest is in the Parousia of Christ in glory, the resurrection of the dead, and the Judgment Day. Sometimes these events are thought of in terms of
'the consummation of the age'. The individual is not viewed as unimportant, but his destiny is to be made public at the Parousia of Christ. The period between death and resurrection is essentially one of waiting. Where the dead are in view the interest centres on the dead in Christ rather than on the unbelieving dead. In particular, we find in such works as 'The Shepherd of Hermas' and the Epistles of Ignatius a preoccupation with the role of the martyr and his place in the Church as a dynamic structure taking shape under God's direction which may at times imply a special place of honour during this period of waiting for those who have suffered 'for the sake of the Name'. The major point of agreement, however, seems to be that in some way Christ 'led captivity captive' (Eph. 4:8-10; cf. I Pet. 3:18-20), bringing believers into a greater state of blessedness prior to the Parousia itself than they would otherwise have enjoyed.

The 'Great Tribulation' and the Reign of Antichrist.

One of the most interesting and clear results of the investigation which we have undertaken in the foregoing chapters is that the consistent expectation of the Early Church was that Christ would not return in glory until the world had grown more evil in its condition and Antichrist had emerged. We have already noted somewhat of this in our survey of attitudes towards the Parousia of Christ in glory. It now requires to be stressed that all the literature before us assumes this scheme of things. In some of it relatively greater stress is laid on the notion of an intensification of evil which culminates in the emergence of Antichrist (this is true, for example, of Irenaeus' writing), but everywhere it is assumed that a period of intense persecution of the people of God under Antichrist must take place before the Parousia. This means that the 'any moment' type of expectation, as G.E. Ladd has
labelled it,\(^1\) is simply not found among the Early Church Fathers. Notably this is as true of both Clement of Alexandria and Origen as of the other writers and writings studied. This is significant in view of the rather greater measure of detachment to the tradition that can be detected in these two thinkers, even if it be true, as we believe it is, that they are on the whole more orthodox in their thinking than is sometimes allowed.

Where did the Early Church get this tradition? The answer seems to be twofold: from the Book of Daniel and from what we know as the 'Little Apocalypse' (Mk. 13 - Matt. 24 - Lk. 21). This is not unimportant, because it introduces us to another feature of Early Church thinking which seems to have a distinct bearing on the question of attitudes in the Early Church towards the 'delay' in Christ's Appearing. The thought seems implicit in a number of the passages which we have cited from the various writings that Jesus' eschatological discourse had in mind three epochs between His own day and the Parousia. No time limit was set on any of these, but the setting out of such a scheme if this be a sound interpretation, could not fail to make the Church more prepared for some extension of the time before the end of the age.

These three periods were, first, that leading up to the destruction of Jerusalem (in 70 A.D.); second, the period between the destruction of Jerusalem and the period immediately prior to the End, the period known as 'the times of the Gentiles'; and, third, a period of intense persecution of the People of God, relatively short in duration, which may be understood in some instances as that of the 'generation' (γενεὰ) alluded to by Jesus at Mk. 13:30, par. Matt. 24: 34; Lk. 21:32.

\(^1\) This phrase occurs passage in his books, 'The Blessed Hope', Continuation, and 'Jesus and the Kingdom', S.P.C.K., London, 1966.
The evidence for the division of time before the Parousia into three periods is elusive, and is implicit in character rather than explicit. This means, of course, that it may be variously assessed. In our judgment it is a factor of some significance if it can be shown as even likely that some Early Church Fathers in the period under review thought in this way. It would mean that there would be from an early period, if not from the beginning (many modern commentators view the reference in Luke 21:24 to the treading down of Jerusalem until the end of the 'times of the Gentiles' as reflecting Luke's date of writing as after 70 A.D. and as accommodating Jesus' original words to the facts of history), a realization that Jerusalem was to be destroyed before the time of the end of the age, that this was to be followed by a period of missionary expansion among the Gentiles; and finally that a relatively brief period of intense persecution under Antichrist would follow and herald the then impending End of the age. Such a scheme, if it did exist in certain circles in the Early Church, must have created a frame of mind in which Christ's Parousia in glory was in fact not anticipated as being 'imminent' in any ordinary sense of the term, that is, by any ordinary yardstick of measurement (as, say, five or ten years or even forty years).

The elusiveness of the evidence means that not too much reliance should be placed upon it, in isolation from other evidence. The significant point about it, however, is that it fits in well with two other pieces of evidence already adduced, which seem to suggest that the Early Church did not anticipate the Parousia of Christ in any ordinary sense as 'imminent'. The first was the fact that so much is made of Antichrist's reign as due to follow the collapse of the fourth world empire of Daniel, chapters 2 and 7, identified as Rome, while the second, noted above under our discussion of the resurrection concept, was the thought that Christ's resurrection had harrowed Hades and proclaimed the
undermining of its foundations without providing any actual time-framework, for the completion of that harrowing, other than one implied by association with such passages as Dan. 12:2-3.

A further factor which makes one hesitant regarding this interpretation of the relevant passages in the various Synoptic accounts of Jesus' eschatological discourse is that this view is not represented in front rank New Testament scholarship at the present time. Only in certain fundamentalist circles does such an understanding hold sway, and in circles deeply imbued with a concern for the interpretation of prophecy. If, however, our evidence suggests that the Fathers so understood, this would be a significant factor. It would not, of course, prove that this is a correct interpretation of the 'Little Apocalypse', but it would be a factor pointing in a particular direction. Further, it seems sound to judge that those who lived closer to New Testament times, were imbued with traditional Jewish and Christian modes of Scripture interpretation, and shared an outlook on the universe unconditioned by modern science and philosophy, would be more likely to get inside the thinking of Jesus and the Primitive Church than we are today. The only advantage which we possess is that of greater detailed knowledge of history and particular customs due to modern methods of historical criticism.

All we can do here is to review the evidence for this outlook in the literature before us, such as it is. The clearest early evidence of such an outlook comes from the Didache. We recall that this work appeared to be in the nature of a commentary on certain sections of Matthew's Gospel, and had a strong missionary interest. Chapter XVI was seen to be best thought of not as an appendix, but rather as the climax of the work: this means that the strong missionary interest is seen in an eschatological context. The Didache was strongly concerned
with Matt. 28:19-20, but it also reflects in its language and thought certain passages from Matt. 24, notably vv. 10-13 (XVI: 3-4) and vv. 30-31 (XVI: 6). We judged too that although Matt. 24:14 with its missionary interest was not explicitly mentioned, it was in the mind of the compiler of the Didache. What is significant here is that the Didache tacitly assumes a three-fold division of time between Jesus' utterance and the end of the age. The destruction of Jerusalem is not expressly in view, but it seems likely that that event seemed to confirm to those who thought in the same way as the Didachist (the work may well have been composed prior to 70 A.D.) that the middle period of Church expansion among the Gentiles was under way. The first period seems to have been until Christ's removal from the disciples: the Little Apocalypse is concerned with what was to happen to the disciples after Jesus' removal from them. The second period was thought of as one of missionary expansion among the Gentiles. The third related to the terrible events immediately prior to the End. The Didachist thinks in terms of the fulfilment of Matt. 24:10-13 as concurrent with that of missionary expansion, but it clearly understands the events of vv. 29-31 as introducing the Parousia. All commentators would agree with this last point, but what is significant in the Didache is the silence concerning Matt. 24:14 as also the absence of mention of vv. 15-28 of that chapter. XVI: 2 does indeed seem to allude indirectly to the final era of persecution, and XVI: 3-4 may very well be understood, as much of that final time as of the present age. It is the schematisation of this chapter which is significant, as understood tacitly in the Didache. It implies an early period till Christ's removal, an era of expansion among the Gentiles, and then (€i Tακε) keeps recurring in XVI) the final era of persecution.

Again, the Didache refers to Matt. 24:42ff. The section not
alluded to is the difficult verses 32-34 of that chapter in Matthew's Gospel. When we recall that the Didache sees no difficulty over Christ's delay, one wonders if the reason is not that it saw very clearly that Christ would not return too soon, since the period of missionary expansion had to be allowed for. In view of the relatively clear schematisation in the Didachist's understanding of Matt. 24, the question, therefore, emerges whether the Didachist did not think that the 'yéveá' of v. 34 was that of the third and final era?

It has to be admitted that it is difficult to establish that the Didachist thought thus, but we submit that such an account makes sense of the various references of this work. It may be said, of course, that, if the Didache was indeed early, no problem would have emerged in the mind of the Didachist: it was not yet apparent that the destruction of Jerusalem was not to be accompanied or followed immediately by the Parousia of Christ in glory. It remains true, however, that the missionary interest of this work makes it dubious whether a short period of one generation from Christ's death was in mind before a future destruction of Jerusalem and Parousia of Christ. Further, it is not improbable that such an event as the overthrowing of Jerusalem would be attributed to an event prior to the end of the age, rather than at its close in the Appearing of Christ. For apocalyptic thought habitually thought of a deliverance of Jerusalem of a miraculous order, which would in some way repeat in the end of the age, that older deliverance from Sennacherib's forces. For a work which thinks in terms of missionary expansion, i.e. expansion among Gentiles as over against Jews, a destruction of Jerusalem would be a most fitting event, as signifying Jewry's setting aside and the commencement of the ingathering of the Gentiles.

The writings of Justin Martyr indirectly support our thesis. It
is not that he directly reflects upon Matt. 24 or its parallels in such a way as to support what has been suggested. Yet we saw evidence, especially in his Dialogue, that Justin took most seriously the concept of the setting aside of the Jews and the ingathering of the Gentiles. We saw too that the possibility, if not the actual certainty, of the restoration of the Jewish race is in view. More significantly still, the destruction of Jerusalem is viewed as significant of the temporary setting aside of the Jews (vide above, Chapter IV, pp. 42-6 ff.). All that has happened to Jewry both in 70 A.D. and in 132-135 A.D. is because of God's judgment on the Jews because of their rejection of their Messiah. This hardness of heart, which still continued, was at the same time in a divine mystery a 'hardening' sent by God. This hardening is meant to be removed but only at the end of the age. The present period is that of missionary expansion, i.e. expansion among the Gentiles. While Justin makes no reference of a direct kind that would support our thesis with reference to the interpretation of Matt. 24:24, again we significantly find a schematisation of history between the two Advents of Christ which is consonant with what we have in mind. We go no further than that.

We observed Irenaeus' silence regarding the non-fulfilment of Matt. 24:34 and its parallels. This is indeed true of all the literature before us. It is more than usually significant in Irenaeus in view of the realism with which he deals with history, and his lively sense of the divine οἶκον οὐρανοῦ. We saw that for him present history is governed by the 'recapitulation' of Adam's race worked out by Christ: this is yet to be made known positively in the restoration of man at the end of the age, and it is paralleled by the subversive mimicking of a demonic element in history. We suggested, in our study of Irenaeus (vide above, Chapter V, page 560) that his silence is impressive, and, in the light of all that he has to say about Antichrist's coming reign,
that it may suggest that for him the 'ΕΥΚΕΓΕΡΙΑ of Matthew 24:32 is that of that future period under Antichrist, which will be delivered by Christ's Appearing.

Hippolytus is more than usually important in helping us to recover a lost mentality in the Early Church regarding the interpretation of eschatological matters. One of his major contributions relates to his clear and detailed analysis of the concept that the Roman Empire was the fourth world empire of Daniel, chapters 2 and 7. However, Hippolytus is also significant in that he seems to champion an interpretation of prophecy which thinks in terms of nearer and further fulfilments. Thus, Antiochus Epiphanes is expressly thought of as setting forth beforehand something of what is to happen under Antichrist. We saw too that this was not so much in his view a matter of a double interpretation of prophecy, as a double movement of history guided by divine providence. (Vide above, Chapter VII, pp. 775ff.) Hippolytus, in his Commentary on Daniel, judges that Daniel speaks of 'two abominations', one of 'desolation' which refers to Antiochus' desecration of the Temple, and one of 'destruction' (which is not referred to 70 A.D., but to the coming desecration under Antichrist (vide above, Chapter VII, pp. 782ff.).

It may be asked what relevance the above has to the interpretation of the Little Apocalypse. It is not that Hippolytus directly supports what has been suggested regarding Matt. 24:34 and its parallels. It does seem clear, however, that for him the destruction of the Temple in 70 A.D. was not the only event in view in Matt. 24. Such an interpretation of Hippolytus' mind is at least consistent with his interpretation of the passage in Daniel where he finds evidence for 'two abominations'. Again, our discussion of Hippolytus' understanding of Daniel's prophecy of the Seventy Weeks suggested an understanding which at once saw the seventieth week as yet to come and saw it as completed: Christ Himself was seen to
be the content holding these two apparently diverse interpretations together. Again, this bolsters the concept of 'repetitiveness' in history.

The special interest of Hippolytus' outlook is that it is suggestive of a perspective from which prophecy would not, so to speak, reach a terminal point with the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 A.D. Apart from the fact that he plainly viewed Antichrist's reign as still future, Hippolytus' concept of repetitiveness suggests a means by which one of the problems of Matthew 24, and its parallel accounts, may be resolved. It has always been difficult to know whether v. 15 ff. have to be understood in terms of the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 A.D. or of some episode in the end of the age. Now, Hippolytus makes no reference, either in connection with Dan. 7 or Matt. 24, to the events of 70 A.D. This suggests that for him, the destruction of Jerusalem at that time would again be understood as a proleptic foreshadowing of that which is to come, just as this is said explicitly with regard to the desecration of the Temple under Antiochus Epiphanes in 168 B.C. What this means is that Hippolytus may well have so understood our Lord's eschatological discourse as to accept that it may be divided into three sections (an early period where mission to Jewry is in view, a middle period with Gentile mission occupying pride of place, and a final period of intense persecution of God's People prior to the Parousia itself), while seeing the destruction of Jerusalem not only as a pivotal event ushering in symbolically the mission to the Gentiles but as an advance indication of that which is to come. There can be no doubt that such verses as Matt. 24: 21-22 seem extravagant if referred to the sufferings of the period, 70 A.D., great though these undoubtedly were in the annals of human history. Both the language and sequel are suggestive that the final outbreak of evil against God and His holy place is in
view (cf. vv. 23-28). Although Hippolytus does not explicitly apply his view of repetitiveness to Matthew 24, as such, his theory would go far towards explaining the ambiguity of the language. Our Lord's words, if we accept the discourse as essentially authentic, could then involve both such a threefold division of time until the Parousia, such as the Didache seems to understand, and yet refer to such an event as that spoken of in v. 15ff. in such a way as to allow of interpretations both in terms of the events of 70 A.D. and in terms of the very end of the age. This view allows for the Lucan interpretation primarily, if not wholly in terms of the events of 70 A.D., while not exhausting the interpretation of Jesus' original utterance in terms of that event, where Matt. 24:15ff and its parallels are in view.

Such an understanding of Matt. 24 seems consistent with Hippolytus' principles of interpretation, whether or not it can be established that it was present in his own mind. Such a view suggests also the thought that the term γενεά may have had a double reference referring first of all to the generation of Jesus' own day which was to witness the Destruction of the Temple in 70 A.D. and beyond that to the final generation of men whose lot it would be to endure the sufferings of the end of the age. This interpretation has the merit of relating such a word as Matt. 24:34 in genuinely temporal terms to Jesus' own day, as also to this future age, and at the same time of appreciating sensitively the connection in both situations of Matt. 24:34 with Matt. 24:22, where the stress is laid on the fact that God would not allow the sufferings of Christ's followers to continue for long before effecting a deliverance: in the first instance, this would be represented by the symbolical releasing of the Gospel to the Gentiles and the dispersion of the persecuted Jewish saints with the Gospel to them, and in the second, by the overthrow of Satanic forces of persecution by the Parousia of Christ in glory.
Whatever estimate be placed on this application of the principles set forth by Hippolytus to the problems of Matthew 24 and its parallels, Hippolytus documents most thoroughly Ladd's thesis that Early Christian expectation was not of an 'any-moment' character. However imminence be understood with reference to the expectation of the Parousia, it is clear that for Hippolytus Christ was not due to come until a certain series of events had been initiated by God and had reached their predestined conclusion. The presence of references to the reign of Antichrist in all the other literature studied makes us less inclined to judge that Hippolytus' concepts are innovations of his own. It is possible that some aspects of his thinking, for example, the principle of repetitiveness, are. Yet even here it is rather that Hippolytus gives to us the clue to the submerged ground of certain judgments and inferences in the Early Church Fathers generally.

We turn briefly to Tertullian. Here again there is clear evidence as we have seen, that he accepted belief in the coming reign of Antichrist. Also, Tertullian, in agreement with Hippolytus, views Rome as the fourth world empire of Daniel, chapters 2 and 7. Again, Tertullian gives an interpretation of Jesus' eschatological discourse, as set out in Luke 21, which reinforces the Early Church understanding of that discourse in terms of a schematization of history. We recall that in his view, Jesus first set in array the Judaic times until the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 A.D., and the general times thereafter until the end of the age (De Resurrectione Mortuorum, XXII:3. vide above, Chapter VIII, pp. 369-370). Tertullian however, went on to distinguish a third period, that immediately preceding the Parousia of Christ, a period of great affliction. Here again, then, the 'Little Apocalypse' is given, therefore, a threefold division, so that Jesus is understood to divide future time into three distinct sections. Further, we saw
that the 'εὐερά of Lk. 21:32 seems to be best understood here of the generation living during the third and final division of time. We conclude that the regular Early Church understanding, as exhibited in the writers mentioned above, was that the Parousia of Christ in glory would not occur before the reign of Antichrist was a reality. This was understood over against a prophetic background, derived partially from the book of Daniel (especially chapters 2 and 7) and partially from the 'Little Apocalypse' of Jesus. Rome seems to have been understood by many thinkers at this time as the fourth world empire. The inevitable conclusion is that Antichrist will only emerge after the Roman Empire had been broken up into ten kingdoms (cf. Dan. 7:7-8), and therefore that Christ's Return in glory cannot be expected immediately. The mentality of the Early Church is recovered somewhat in the thinking of Hippolytus, who discusses the reign of Antichrist in greater detail than other writers of this early period. Particularly interesting is the reinforcement of the conclusion that expectation is not of an 'any-moment' Coming of Christ by a schematization of future time in the understanding of the Little Apocalypse - this appears in the Didache, is perhaps implied by Hippolytus, and seems clearly in evidence in the writing of Tertullian. Connected with this schematization is the possibility that these writers assume that the difficult saying of Jesus at Matt. 24:34, par. Mk. 13:30, Luke, 21:32, is understood by the writers concerned as referring to the generation alive during the third and final period of world history between the giving of Christ's discourse and His Return in glory.

The Early Church teaching regarding the reign of Antichrist is, therefore, of much more than antiquarian interest. It serves to show that the Church must have anticipated that certain events were to take place before the End. This comes across in three distinct but related ways; though each point is not represented in all the figures dealt
Antichrist must first come. Since Rome is the fourth world empire of Dan. 7, time must be given for prophecy to run its course.

ii. The Little Apocalypse, understood as given by Jesus, gives a threefold division of time leading up to the Parousia. We must not anticipate the due order of the seasons given by God.

iii. The world mission of the Church corresponds to the second time division implied by Jesus in the Little Apocalypse.

What this demonstrates is that the ongoing career of the Church in the world, the very stuff of her being, was viewed in eschatological terms. It is not just that her mission demanded time, if it were to be crowned with success; it was rather that only after its completion would the third and final era, envisaged by Jesus, herald the approach of the End itself. This understanding raises in an acute form the question how the Church could possibly have been disappointed by the delay in the Parousia, if such were her understanding?

The Millenarian Reign of Christ on Earth.

Our discussion of the reported words of 'the elders' and of Papias in Chapter III raised the question whether the classical concept of a millennial reign of Christ on earth is as discontinuous with New Testament understanding of the Parousia as it is sometimes held to be.

We noted that Paul in I - II Thessalonians and in I Corinthians 15 seems, in company with the author of the Book of Revelation, to assume that there will be a period of time during which Christ reigns on earth before handing over the Kingdom to the Father. It may be that this should only be regarded as the form of the Jewish Christian hope of the Parousia, and that the mistake was made when it was taken literally.

We suggested that it was somewhat dubious whether the earliest Christians who were Jews and thought in characteristically Hebraic concrete
terms did mean that this thought of an unspecified period during which Christ was to reign on earth, could be regarded as a mere garment for the truth which it contained. The question what we are to believe today is not really relevant for our present purposes. The point is that, if the New Testament yields evidence beyond the one late Book of Revelation with reference to this concept of such a reign, literally understood, then it is dubious whether the classical development of the concept, which seems to have been especially strong in Asia Minor, can be regarded as a one-sided development.

Of the writers studied a millenarian concept is explicitly in view in the following: Pseudo-Barnabas, Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, Methodius of Olympus, Hippolytus, and Tertullian. These writers accept such a belief with varying emphases in interpretation. It is true that Asiatic influences predominate in this list, but it is evident that millenarianism was not confined to Asia Minor. It is also a fact that while some writers stress this period of Christ's earthly reign as a period of rest, others think of it as a period of increased fertility in nature. The very fact of such differences suggest that a basic substratum has been differently developed by different personalities or influences. It is also significant that even a heretic like Cerinthus accepts millenarianism.

It would be easy to get this problem of millenarianism out of proportion. Its importance should not be unduly emphasized. Further, it should be admitted that it may well not have ever been fully accepted throughout the Christian Church. Yet we submit that the strength of the witness to its existence in the period under review is impressive. It cannot lightly be ignored because it embarrasses the Christian Church today, or because it seems to us today to represent a wrong-headed approach.
Apart from noting its strength as a piece of eschatological understanding in the early days of the Church, we have to ask what its heart is and what bearing it has on the development of Early Church eschatology in general. In regard to the first matter, it seems likely that the actual period of one thousand years should not be pressed unduly, as the figure may well be one eloquent of the concept of completeness, or, more specifically, reminiscent of the thousand years to which, in certain rabbinic understandings, Adam would have lived, if he had not succumbed to temptation in the Garden. Even so, we suggested earlier (Chapter III, pages 331) that Hebrew concreteness suggests the possibility that the actual period of time was thought of literally. Be that as it may, the inner heart of the doctrine is the view that Christ will reign on earth for a period of time before yielding this Kingdom up to His Father. In this sense, 'millenarianism' may well have much in common with New Testament thinking and with Primitive Christian expectation.

What is the significance of this view as present in the Early Church? One or two factors suggest themselves for consideration. To some extent these depend upon the particular way in which millenarianism is understood. First, it emphasizes the literalness with which the Early Church understood the resurrection of the body at the end of the age. The fact that millenarianism aroused so much controversy does suggest, however, that certain Christians were repulsed by an undue emphasis on the continuance in the next age of certain functions presently associated with the body. It may well be, as we have seen in our study of the handling of this issue by such thinkers as Clement of Alexandria and Origen, that it was this very emphasis which accounts for Clement's silence on the subject and Origen's apparent opposition. It seemed distasteful to think, for example, of the continuance of the sexual processes in marital relationship in the age to come, and it may well
have been that men like Cærinthus did emphasize this aspect of the matter. Be this as it may, it remains true that the presence of millenarianism shows the strength of the judgment that the body is to be raised at the end of the age. Even the opposition to millenarianism, as we have had cause to argue, did not in orthodox circles oppose the resurrection of the body, but it was more aware that we must not think of the age to come simply in terms of continuity with this age. The problem seems to be that that age has to be thought of, both in terms of continuity and of discontinuity. The millenarianists may have erred by their stress on continuity; some of their opponents may not have prized this element sufficiently in their estimate of the world to come.

A second factor is that it indirectly shows how historically the Early Church viewed all the events of the End-time. The Parousia of Christ was not thought of as an isolated element, but it was preceded by the reign of Antichrist and succeeded by the millennium. Whatever we think of millenarianism, it is obvious that this betrays a pattern of thinking in which the Parousia was firmly set within an historical series of events. It suggests strongly that those who thought in millenarian terms refused to 'demythologize' when they thought about matters relating to eschatology. They took the categories of space and time with great seriousness. This means, among other things, that the Parousia was an event which would come upon the world at a particular moment known to God alone. Clearly the events associated with Antichrist's reign were thought of in this way. They were conceived of as historical events. They were not thought of merely as symbols, even although symbols were employed to describe them. This means that the Parousia in similar fashion is a real historical event. The way in which the millennium is spoken of helps to underline this fact. It makes the Parousia one Event in an historical series. This may, indeed,
seem to be religiously naive, in that, if we are not careful, the uniqueness of the Parousia is thus set aside. Can we place the Parousia within a series in this way? In fairness to the millenarians, it must be said that they probably appreciated that the Parousia was an entirely unique Event, which terminated history as we have known it. The problem was that a tradition indicated that Christ would reign on earth after this Event. In any case, our minds cannot think in completely non-historical terms. We have to speak of 'before' and 'after' when we think of the Parousia. Further, the conviction that Christ comes in His continuing humanity to earth as the One through whom the cosmos receives its long-awaited consummation implies continuity between what happens 'before' and what happens 'after'. It may be that to speak thus endangered the millenarians' sense of the uniqueness of the Event of the Parousia, but it is hard to see how this danger can be avoided completely, even if we are not millenarians. Christ's Resurrection may mean much more than the Empty Tomb, but it was understood by the Primitive Church as affecting our space-time order to the extent that the body of Jesus was raised. The millenarians were firmly aware that, although the Parousia might bring history as we know it to an end, it would affect profoundly a spatial-temporal order. With this in mind they thought of the Parousia as an historical Event, and were not embarrassed by the judgment that other spatial-temporal events would follow on a renovated earth.

The above discussion suggests that the attitude which developed millenarianism was one diametrically opposed to Gnosticism. As such, it probably did the Church a great service. Many scholars would, however, judge that both Gnosticism and millenarianism represent extremes and that the truth must lie somewhere in the middle between them. Undoubtedly the emphasis upon the restoration of conditions
pertaining to 'paradise', that is, to the Garden, such as the reconciliation of the animals and the restoration of the earth's bounty, have done much to make people think of the concept of a millennium as a 'pipe-dream'. At the same time, as we suggested above (Chapter III, page 341), it is hard to see how such a reign of Christ on earth could be conceived as a real triumph over the forces of evil unless it portrayed the restoration of conditions suitable to the period before the Fall.

A third factor, and one directly related to the theme of this thesis, is the fact that millenarianism seems to reveal a frame of mind which thinks, in characteristically apocalyptic fashion, of the periodization of history. This has a relevance to the question concerning the Early Church's attitude to the delay in the Parousia of Christ in glory. Millenarianism is frequently portrayed as the result of an apocalypticism which bred on disaster and looked for an imminent irruption of the Kingdom of God into history by divine intervention. Thus, even Daniélou sees the prevalence of millenarianism in Asia Minor as stemming from less stringent Roman control and the consequent room given to Jewish apocalypticism to operate. He sees it as significant that a Cerinthus, who came from Asia Minor, grew up in the period during which Jewry was becoming agitated by popular messianism. The question must be asked, however, whether this does justice either to millenarianism or to apocalypticism. Surely apocalypticism was interested in the periodization of history and was not always related to the kind of popular messianism that expected God's immediate intervention in history. At its best apocalypticism was prepared to await God's times and was more than ordinarily aware that God's purposes in history cannot be hurried. It is interesting to consider in this regard that the impression that apocalypticism was always related to fanaticism and the
belief in immediate divine intervention in history induced by desperate outward circumstances, is reinforced by such judgments as that the Book of Daniel stemmed from the Maccabean period. The question is not at the moment whether this is a sound critical judgment. The point is that the Book of Daniel itself purports to deal with events in a future which is quite distant. Yet the Book itself claims to be foreshadowing events over a considerable period of time and not in any sense to be thinking only of immediate events. This may be a device consistent with pseudonymity and consonant with the posture that distant events are being predicted well in advance. Whether this be so or not, the actual stance of the Book suggests the gradualness with which God unravels history in His own good time and according to His all-wise plan. It is worth reflecting that such a posture adopted by the author (s) of the work ill accord with the sense of fanatical reliance on God's immediate intervention in present desperate circumstances which are generally believed to have led to the appearance of the work or parts of it. Further, whatever the truth may be about the origins of the Book of Daniel, it is the fact that it works with the concept that history is unfolding in accordance with a predetermined divine plan that is relevant for our present consideration. Is it not the case that millenarianism has a similar outlook? Such a work as the Epistle of Barnabas sets the coming millennial reign of Christ within a whole scheme of millennia. This is admittedly only one use of the millenarian concept and one at that which is not Asiatic in origin or character (we read nothing in Barnabas of the amazing fertility of the soil or of those other elements which most seem to give the millennium a mythical note to modern people.) Nevertheless, it is significant that this expression of millenarianism conveys very well an attitude which may very well underlie other forms of millenarianism. Much is made sometimes of the fact that Asia Minor
was the centre from which Montanism emerged with its revival of the notion of an immediate Parousia. The implication is that Montanism and millenarianism were spawned by the same infiltration of Jewish apocalyptic concepts of imminence with regard to God’s intervention. It seems difficult, however, to regard Montanism as simply a revival of a stress on imminence, accompanied with fanaticism, when it has become less clear that in fact the Christian Church was possessed of the belief that Christ was coming in, say, three or four years, even in the very earliest days. Certainly such a document as the Didache betrays no such understanding, and many scholars hold that its origin antedates the Fall of Jerusalem in 70 A.D. No doubt there were groups of Christians who in popular fashion seized on the hope of the Parousia as a panacea for all ills and were in danger of retreating from life by means of their attitude. Paul warns against all such in II Thessalonians. But this does not prove that this was the normal Christian expectation or stance.

As for Montanism and millenarianism in Asia Minor, it seems dubious to argue from the derivation of both attitudes from this area that it had a common origin in such a postulated fanatical insistence on the imminence of divine intervention. In fact, millenarianism, as we have argued, lays stress by its very nature on the ponderous but effective ways by which God achieves His purposes. It seems much more likely that the truth is that Asia Minor was an area where Semitic influence was strong, and that this permitted the greater dominance than in certain other areas of notions which had a strong Jewish Christian background.

We conclude, then, by suggesting that, whatever the dangers and defects of millenarianism, it is unlikely that it can properly be aligned with a kind of apocalypticism which laid the stress on immediate divine intervention and thus sought to retreat from reality. Rather, it betrays a strong Semitic stress on the body of the resurrection and
on time as the vehicle which God uses to fulfil His purposes.

**Church and Sacraments.**

In our study of each of the thinkers dealt with in chapters II-VIII above, we have found it convenient to discuss their views concerning the Church and/or the sacraments of Baptism and the Eucharist. Further, in chapter III we dealt with the significance of Second Century practice with regard to the two sacraments mentioned, in order to lay bare its eschatological implications. The fact is that a doctrine of the Church inevitably implies certain attitudes to eschatology, while the understanding of the Church's sacraments reveals very clearly the eschatological attitudes, not just of Church leaders but also of the vast silent majority in the Church, the lay people and those without a voice in theological reflection.

It seems evident that both the doctrines of the Church and of the sacraments will lay a certain emphasis upon the present experience of Christ enjoyed by His people. It is, therefore, all the more salutary when we discover clear evidence of a continuing stress on futurism in connection with these doctrines. In fact, what we seem to find, speaking broadly, concerning the writers studied and the attitudes noted, is a marked balance in the handling of present and future in relation to the past decisive events associated with the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ.

We have grouped together the doctrines of the Church and of the sacraments, because they are in themselves so intimately related. The sacraments are essentially sacraments of the Church. At the same time the Church functions, among other ways, through her sacraments. Both the Church and sacraments are nothing without the Lord Who gives meaning to them. Yet by their very nature and inauguration the sacraments
discover their true meaning in the context of the People of God, and the Church discovers her social nature in the performance of the sacraments.

At the same time, it may be convenient for schematic purposes to deal separately in this review with these doctrines. After doing so, we may be in a better position to assess their joint witness in regard to eschatological matters. Accordingly, we turn briefly, first of all, to the doctrine of the Church. The most significant factor in the survey conducted in the above chapters, where the doctrine of the Church is concerned, may be concisely set forth: normally the Church is understood in a vital relationship to the events of the End-time. Three features stand out in this regard: First, the Church has been formed, it is thought, by the events associated with the victory of Jesus Christ and these events are seen as events inaugurating the End-time. Second, the catholicity of the Church, her inclusiveness of Gentiles as well as Jews, is seen as expressive of her status as a community which belongs to the end of the age. Third, membership of the Church is understood throughout, not only 'sub specie aeternitatis', but as defined with reference to the Last Day. Let us review these three points in brief compass, in order to establish fully their significance.

It is common-place to say that the Church is the creation of Jesus Christ. In some sense this is clearly the situation. Even an agnostic would admit this. The Church exists today because a man called Jesus of Nazareth, whom Christians believe to be the Christ, as a matter of history initiated a movement which has had enormous repercussions on Western society, in particular. In a deeper sense Christians themselves take up Biblical phrases concerning the Church as the Body of Christ or as the Bride of Christ, and understand that in a mystical way the community of the Church, including her individual members, is one
with Jesus Christ in His risen glory. What is often less appreciated is the Church's eschatological relationship with Christ; that is to say, that her being depends upon the events associated with Christ as events of the End-time. This is to say more than that the Church lives in the light given her by Jesus Christ, or to acknowledge that Christ has made a difference to the world and to society—a difference best reflected in the Church. It is rather to recognize that the new situation produced by Christ reflects a situation prophesied to occur 'in the last days'. This means that the Church is not treated as a new social organism, with a certain power for good within the world locked up in her ideals and beliefs, but is rather seen as a community that has been created by an Event, which inaugurated the End of the age.

Among the Apostolic Fathers, the writings of Ignatius are usually judged to place less emphasis upon the Church defined in terms of a futurist eschatology. It is true, as we saw, (Chapter II, page 159) that Ignatius' special stress is upon the Church as the sphere in which Christ's Risen humanity displays its glory and power. Yet, it is to the point to remember that even Ignatius thinks (Eph. XI:1) that we are living in the "last times" (ἐσχατοίς καιροίς). This is not a belief of Ignatius that is unrelated to his doctrine of the Church. For his prayer is that we may be found in Christ Jesus "unto the true life". That is to say that Ignatius thinks of the Church as a community whose true membership will be defined at the last day. Here we discover a relationship of the doctrine of the Church in Ignatius' thinking to a futurist eschatology. We should not, however, miss the implication which is that we live in the "last times", because Christ has come. Clearly the thought is that the Church lives in a situation created by the Incarnation, but which tends by its very nature towards the complete
end of history, as we know it. Not only does the Church live in this situation: she is defined by it. Her existence and membership can only be understood in terms of both past and future events, the Incarnation in the past and the glorious Coming of Christ in the future. This is why it is important to be found in Him. We have mentioned Ignatius' understanding, because he is a writer who seems to place the emphasis upon the present reality of Christ's Presence (παρουσία) in the Church rather than His future manifestation to it in glory.

What is important to observe here is that critics often fail to appreciate that for a writer to have such a 'present' emphasis does not necessarily imply an absence of eschatological orientation. Unless a writer expressly defines the Church in terms of future events at the very end of the age, we tend today to say that he is not deeply influenced in his understanding of the Church by eschatology. What is true, however, is that Ignatius judges that the present existence and status of the Church is vitally related to a past event which, by its very nature, proclaims that the end of the age is upon us. The mind of Ignatius is especially significant in this matter, because, if our interpretation of his thinking be sound, we believe that he uncovers an assumed understanding on the part of most Early Church writers. The Church is defined certainly in terms of that which is to come -- Parousia, resurrection, and Judgment, but even in her present reality she is defined by events that herald the End. We have already argued, (above, Chapter II, pages 16-17) that Ignatius does not think basically in terms of existential decision, when he talks in such terms. Rather is he aware of the element of decision and challenge that issue from real events which lie ahead of the Church and the world.

This understanding of Ignatius that the Church is a community created by the initiative of God through Christ in the end of the age.
is not by any means unique to him. It clearly underlies the thought of
most, if not all, of the Fathers whose works we have been studying.
This note may be more to the fore in a Hippolytus and a Tertullian
than in certain other writers, but it would be difficult expressly to
deny it of any one of them. We saw that even in the 'Preaching of
Peter' there was involved in the understanding of the sacraments, and
especially of Baptism (which initiates into the Church), a profound
theology of history, in which it was understood that new powers had been
released in the world through the Incarnation. Here, too, there was
no thought that present experience made unnecessary the future revelation
of Christ's glory at His Appearing. This means that even in a document,
representing a heterodox group of Christians, the community of God's
People is thought of in terms of the eschatologically oriented change
in our life-situation created by the Achievement of Christ.

A second feature which we have stressed is that the Church in the
period before us, through the representative writers whom we have been
studying, expressed a profound insight into her composition as being
significant of the status of the Church as a community of the End-time.
The fact that men of all nations are acceptable within the Church does
not just indicate the inclusiveness of the Christian Gospel (sometimes
set over against the exclusiveness of Jewish thought in Old Testament
times). Rather the understanding is that the Jewish thinkers were
right to divide the races of the world into two groups - Jews and
Gentiles ('the nations', Τὰ Ἑθνη ). With our modern way of thinking,
it is hard for us to get inside the Jewish mentality, when the term,
'nations', is used. It is not used as a word to express an empirical
reality. It is used to denote those who are not Jews, and the reason
for the delimitation between Jews and all other races of men (despite an
obvious community as men which they also share) is not open to examination
but it is to be appreciated only through revelation by faith. Jews and Gentiles represent one set of pairs in Jewish thinking, which seems to have been taken over, at least by Jewish Christianity. Similar sets of pairs were husband and wife, and master and servant. In each case one unit within the pair had a different status which seems to have been thought of as given by God. One is reminded of Paul's thinking concerning men, women, and God (I Cor. 11:3), where the thought is that, as God was the head of Christ, so Christ is the head of the man, and the man is the head of the woman. In no case are we able to define why one member receives a higher status over the other, except by reference back to an eternal order of things within the very Godhead, where Christ, though fully one with the Father, is obedient to Him. It is over against such a background of understanding derived from the Jewish Christianity of the Early Church's origin, that we have to see the inclusion of the Gentiles within the People of God. It is not as if Christ had made known for the first time what had always been true, viz, that in fact Gentiles had an equal place of favour in His sight along with the Jews. That would make nonsense of God's election of Israel, which is treated as sober reality by all the writers under review. It is rather that as an event symbolic of the end of the age the Gentiles ('the nations') are granted a place alongside the Jews within the People of God.

We have observed repeatedly in our study of the Fathers of this early period of the history of the Church a strong emphasis upon the mystery of the acceptance of the Gospel by the Gentiles and its rejection by Jewry. This is the result of a 'hardening of heart' given by God to His people. Further, this 'hardening' was the predestined hinge upon which opened the door of inclusiveness to the Gentiles. We noted this element as strongly in force first of all in the thinking of Justin Martyr, but we noted its presence with some surprise even in
Clement of Alexandria. It is clear that none of these writers think of this 'hardening' in such a way as to exonerate Israel for her rejection of Christ. The fact remains, however, that Israel did reject Christ. It is understood that this was foreseen by the prophets and that within a certain divine plan of history this period of 'blindness' on Israel's part has its place. This means that Jewish rejection, combined with Gentile acceptance, of Christ, must be understood in terms of a profound theology of history. Such a theology presupposes stages which proceed towards a grand finale. Not only so, the breaking out of the Gospel into the Gentile world is seen as indicating a development which was only meant to take place in the end of the age. Like the giving of the Spirit (cf. Joel 2:28-29; Acts 2:15-19) the extension of the People of God to include 'the nations' signalled the fact that the final era of world history had begun.

What it is instructive to note here is that it is not merely that the inclusion of Gentiles within the Church is seen as significant merely of a changed situation, the era of exclusiveness falling before the Incarnation and the era of inclusiveness succeeding it. It is not just that in this sense the era of inclusiveness must be nearer to the end of the age than the era of exclusiveness. It is rather that this understanding is combined with a profound theology of history, which thinks in terms of a fairly elaborate schematization of history. It is seen as part of a predestined plan of history that Jews should be given a place of honour in God's calling; that they should reject their Messiah when He came to them; that this should signal the breaking forth of God's Spirit upon those of Gentile race; and (in the judgment of most writers, it would seem) that at the close of the age Israel will see her folly and repent (cf. Rom. 9-11). Again, this viewpoint has close links with the understanding that the Fall of Jerusalem in 70.
A.D. was an event caused by Israel's rejection of her Lord and that outward events in their passage reflect the inner purpose of God to drive history towards its predestined goal. What this implies is that such events as the Fall of Jerusalem are not to be understood primarily in terms of socio-political factors or in terms of accidental factors in Roman policy, dictated by the changing attitudes of individual leaders among the Romans, but rather in terms of the divine overshadowing of history.

We see, thus, that the progress from a situation of Jewish exclusive experience of God's favour to the present situation of inclusiveness of Gentiles is the imposition upon the page of external history under the guidance of inscrutable forces released by God of the actual relationship of Jews and Gentiles to God as conceived by Jewish Christianity. The Jew has and retains a place of honour or favour. God did elect the Jewish people to a place of first favour. The releasing of God's Spirit upon the Gentile world only after the Incarnation and the Work of Christ is consonant with this fact. Even within the changed situation, it would seem that the Fathers of the period under review (to c.250 A.D.) assumed that the Gospel was "to the Jew first, and also to the Gentile."

We recall at this stage our discussion in Chapter I of Jeremias' profound interpretation of the mind of Jesus in this matter, as set out in his monograph, 'Jesus' Promise to the Nations'. It has now become clear that what he sees to have been true of the mind of Jesus is reflected in the thinking of the Church Fathers over two centuries of Church History.

We recall our discussion of Jeremias' views (Chapter I, pp.73-78). Jeremias made three significant 'negative' points and balanced them with three 'positive' ones in his estimate of Jesus' attitude in regard to
the Gentiles. The negative points were put thus:

i. Jesus pronounced a stern judgment on the Jewish mission to the Gentiles;

ii. Jesus forbade His disciples during His lifetime to preach to non-Jews;

iii. Jesus limited His own activity to Israel.

The positive points revealed the other side of Jesus' thinking:

i. Jesus removed the idea of vengeance upon the Gentiles from eschatological expectation;

ii. Jesus promised the Gentiles a share in salvation;

iii. The redemptive activity and Lordship of Jesus includes the Gentiles.

This picture was built up by Jeremias in a careful and painstaking exegesis of certain passages in the Gospels. The really significant feature of Jeremias' interpretation consists in his understanding of how the three negative and the three positive findings regarding Jesus' attitude can be resolved. Jeremias considers that this unifying factor is that Jesus regarded the ingathering of the Gentiles as an eschatological act of God, an event reserved for the last days. The restriction of His own mission to the nation of Israel fulfilled the divine plan upon which rested the expansion of the Gospel into the world, among the Gentiles, after His death and resurrection. "Jesus' preaching to Israel was the precondition, his death for countless hosts rendered possible, and his parousia will bring into being, the people of God of the New Age, and the Kingdom of God over the whole world." Not only so, but the missionary proclamation of the Church is thus set within an eschatological framework. What Jeremias sees with such clarity is that for Jesus the age of the missionary Church was to be part and parcel of the divine plan for the ingathering of the nations. He also remarks that the eschatological ingathering of the nations presupposes the prior scattering of God's people, so that Jewish persecution of the Church brought about the very conditions which make possible the
expansion among the Gentiles in depth and thus hasten forward the purposes of God.

We have brought to mind this notice that we took of Jeremias' views because they are so closely related to what we have now been setting forth in the light of what we have observed among the Early Church Fathers. At this point the New Testament records illumine the attitude of the Fathers, and the Fathers help us to see what was almost certainly present to the mind of Jesus. The significance of this for our present investigation is twofold.

First, if Jesus really thought thus, then it makes it at least difficult to see how Jesus could have expected the Parousia in glory within a very short space of time - say, within three or four years of His death and resurrection. It is possible that Jesus might have expected His Coming in glory within a generation but even this does not altogether agree with the expectation of a world-wide mission. Even if Jesus were thinking in terms of the nations around the Mediterranean basin only, it is doubtful whether a fairly short powerful mission is in view. We recall the word of Jesus concerning the woman who showed her love for Him by pouring out her box of ointment upon the Lord. It is true, however, that Jeremias would not agree with this judgment that these words presuppose the expectation in the mind of Jesus of a lengthy mission to the Gentiles. He would see them rather in the context of the ongoing missionary task, and would judge that the Church understood Jesus' words as referring to a longer period, as time passed by, than Jesus originally intended. For Jeremias is convinced that while Jesus did not expect a quite imminent Parousia immediately upon His death and resurrection, He did expect the end of the age within a generation. It may be agreed that it is a highly subjective matter how much be read into the words of Jesus at Mark 14:9: "And truly I say unto you,
wherever the Gospel is preached in the whole world, what she has done will be told in memory of her.” (R.S.V.) At the same time, this passage helps to underscore the fact that we cannot think in terms of a very imminent Parousia in the conception of Jesus.

Second, the linkage between the mind of Jesus and the attitude of the Fathers (with Paul's discussion in Romans 9-11 helping to connect the two) serves to strengthen the impression that the Early Church was indeed working with an elaborate schematization of history in her understanding of what God was doing through the Church and her mission. Even if Jesus anticipated (as Jeremias thinks) the Parousia within a generation, i.e. within the lifetime of some of His disciples or immediately thereafter, the knowledge that Jesus so understood the programme of God that was to be accomplished by His followers after His death and that He so schematized history must have had some effect upon the way in which the Church understood the purposes of God when in fact the Parousia was delayed. Would not the Church in this situation decide simply that the mission to the Gentiles was to be of greater length than she had originally understood? This seems to accord well with the evidence from the Fathers before us. If, of course, Jesus did not in fact mean to say that the Parousia would occur within a generation, then doubtless some of His disciples at least would appreciate this fact, and their impression would help other Christians the more readily to adjust to the 'delay' in the Parousia.

Thus, the doctrine of the Church reflected in the Fathers of the period before us reveals a strong sense that its very composition of Gentiles as well as Jews indicates that the End-time has arrived. This does not mean that they understood that the consummation itself was past or was to occur within a very brief space of time: it simply indicates
that the final period of world history (of however long or short duration) was now present.

One further aspect of what we have seen in the Fathers under review seems relevant at this point. This is the fact that certain of them lay stress upon Jesus as Son of Man. One point here is that this term reflects the universalism embodied in Daniel 7. Hippolytus is an important figure in this regard. We recall our discussion (Chapter VII, pages 798 - 815) of his use of the term, 'Son of Man. We argued in that connection that Jesus' use of the term, as understood by Hippolytus, envisaged the Church as a realization in advance of the fifth world empire of Daniel 2 and Daniel 7. We suggested in this connection that it was improper to interpret the term 'Son of Man' as a convenient 'tag' employed by Jesus: rather Jesus meant that in His ministry the fifth world empire was already pressing upon the world. Jesus, it was held, would have understood Rome as the fourth world empire. This is not merely an excursion for its own sake into the mind of Jesus which is interesting as a piece of antiquarian research. The point is that, if it be true that it is this dynamic understanding of Daniel 2 and Daniel 7 which explains both Jesus' stress on the Kingdom in His teaching and His preference for 'Son of Man' as a Self-designation, then this helps us to understand the particular way in which Jesus viewed the concept of imminence with reference to the end of the age. In all of this we took Hippolytus' implied understanding of the term 'Son of Man' as a guide to the probable mentality of Jesus. We did not claim that it could be proved that Jesus thought thus. We did suggest, however, that Hippolytus so understood what Jesus meant by His use of the term and so himself interpreted Jesus' mission as a factor in suggesting the nearness of the end of the age. The point here was that Jesus' Ministry was seen thus to imply the presence of the fifth world empire on earth in
advance of what Daniel had prophesied. For Daniel had not anticipated a Coming of the 'Son of Man' in humiliation. It was seen that, on Hippolytus' view, the Lord acted masterfully and summed up in Himself not just the prophecies of Daniel but all prophetic inspiration, being Himself the Word of God through whom originally the prophecies were given. He was therefore, not bound by the Danielic prophecies. His actual Coming in humiliation must however, from the viewpoint of Danielic vision, be understood as a Coming in advance. This suggested that the fifth world empire was thus seen to be present in history, while yet certain features of Danielic prophecy were to be fulfilled. Allowing that Rome was the fourth world empire of Daniel's visions (chapters 2 and 7), there were to emerge, according to Daniel, ten kingdoms from it and these were to be followed by the reign of Antichrist before the end of the age. This means that, with such an understanding in mind, the Parousia could hardly be understood as a matter of pressing imminence, when that term is understood in the usual way. Such an understanding suggests that imminence must be understood only over against this prophetic background. Daniel prophesied five world empires. The fourth was to be followed by its division into ten kingdoms. Out of them Antichrist was to emerge. His wickedness would provoke the Appearing of the Son of Man. But Jesus of Nazareth was the Son of Man, and he has already been on earth, in humiliation, while the fourth world empire was still in existence. Rome was (in both Jesus' and Hippolytus' day) still in existence and not in imminent obvious danger of collapse and division. Hence, it follows that the imminence of the Kingdom is that which is consistent with the fact that already the One Who was to usher in the fifth world empire has been on earth.

We have gone over this again at some length because it seemed to be
one of the most important indirect contributions of Hippolytus. It is
the problem of 'imminence' in the expectation both of Jesus and the
Primitive Church which raises in an acute form the whole modern
eschatological debate. The question is asked whether Jesus will have
fulfilled His Promise even if He comes now since He implied that He
would come soon. At least so He was understood, and so the problem
stands. The relevance of Hippolytus' contribution at this point, in
his implied understanding of the term 'Son of Man', is that it shows the
background over against which Jesus spoke of imminence, and/or was
understood by the Early Fathers so to have spoken. The point is that
such a stance gets behind the problem raised in the modern eschatological
debate and goes behind the underlying assumptions both of 'realized
eschatology' and 'consistent' eschatology. Viewed over against such a
background, the question concerning the 'delay' of the Parousia becomes
less meaningful.

It may be asked whether the above is related to the doctrine of the
Church. It surely does fit in closely with that doctrine, since it is
agreed that the term 'son of man' in Daniel 7 has a community sense.
Some scholars judge, indeed, that the original reference is purely
communal, and that the 'son of man' is a collective term for the 'saints
of the Most High'. T.W. Manson made much of the collective sense in his
interpretation of Jesus' use of this designation. Further, if the
argument of the above paragraph (and of the relevant section in Chapter
VII, on which it is based) be sound, then clearly what the Son of Man
has accomplished, by His Visitation in advance of His Coming in glory,
is to create an anticipation of the Kingdom in the form of the Church. To
the first lowly coming of the Son of Man there corresponds the Church;
to the second and future glorious Coming corresponds the Kingdom that
is to be established. This means that the Church should be understood -
if Hippolytus be a sound guide to our thinking - as an advance anticipation of the Kingdom. She is constituted by the surprise advance Coming of Christ in humility, and as such she is in essence a community that can only be defined in thoroughly eschatological terms.

The more obvious point mentioned above in passing is that the term Son of Man reflects the universality of Christ's mission. This is often construed in a general way to suggest that the spirit of inclusiveness is consistent with Jesus' message and life, and so it is appropriate that the Church should consist of both Jews and Gentiles and that this should be reflected in her rite of Baptism as over against Jewish circumcision.

In the light of our above discussion of Jesus' outlook concerning the ingathering of the Gentiles, where we relied on Jeremias' insights into the eschatological framework with which Jesus operated, this picture will, however, hardly do. Nor is it what is implied by the above discussion concerning the eschatological significance of the term, Son of Man, as applied to Jesus. There we saw that by it Jesus may be understood to have indicated the advance Presence on earth of the One in Whom the Kingdom was to come. It is only, therefore, again, in thoroughly eschatological terms that we should understand the inclusiveness of the Church, if we are to understand the Church in terms of identification with such a Lord. In other words, the Church is inclusive only because in Christ the inclusiveness that is to pertain to the final age has been given advance expression in the Christian community. We see, therefore, that the very constitution of the Church does not reflect any general breadth of sympathy for humanity either on the part of Jesus or the Early Church: rather it indicates how thoroughly eschatological is the concept of the Church.

It may be said, of course, that what is said above builds on an understanding of the term, Son of Man, which is arguable and which comes
across mainly in one thinker, who seems to be preoccupied with eschatological matters. It is admitted that Hippolytus' assumed understanding of the term 'Son of Man' as brought out above is a debatable interpretation of the mind of Jesus, but it does make sense of certain New Testament records concerning Jesus (his stress on the Kingdom and his preference for this Self-designation). More important, for our present purpose, it makes sense of the attitudes of most of the Fathers whose writings we have been studying. This is the significant feature of Hippolytus' contribution: he gives the impression of uncovering for our gaze a whole assumed ground of thinking, which lies behind so many more occasional or less extended statements concerning eschatology or allied matters. If this be really the case, then once again the inclusiveness of the Church does reflect a vital connection with eschatology, and with an eschatology, at that, which cannot readily be labelled either 'realized' or 'futurist', but rather gathers up elements of both into itself.

The third major point that we set out (page 101, above), with reference to the doctrine of the Church is that membership in the same is viewed in terms of the Last Day. This sense comes across very strongly in such a work as the 'Shepherd of Hermas', but it is present also in such a document as I Clement. It seems, indeed, to be assumed throughout the Fathers whose works we have been studying. Perhaps, however, this sense is strongest in the early period, that is, as reflected in the writings of the Apostolic Fathers. It is this sense which makes the connection with the study of the sacraments, because it is probable that, as time went by, less was said about this because it was implicit in the institutions of Baptism and the Eucharist. This was probably not the only factor in a diminution of emphasis upon this aspect, but it may well have been one.
It seems best to discuss this in vital connection with our study of the eschatological implications of these two sacraments. The 'Shepherd' of Hermas' again is a document which seems to lay bare an assumed ground of understanding. The basic thought seems to be that the Church is a community of people for whom Christ will come in glory at the end of the age. It is a physical community because it consists of people who are understood in Hebraic fashion as a unity of body and soul, and because Christ came among us as such a Person. It is understood essentially as such a kind of community because Christ rose from the grave, leaving behind Him the empty tomb: this is a reminder of Jesus' continuing humanity. Further, His Coming again in glory is a concept shot through with the affirmation of the value of time and space. The understanding inherent in it is that, though Christ may greatly transform the world at His Appearing, He will do so in a way which does not "dissolve" the universe, but which preserves a continuity with that which has gone before. It is in this context that we have to set the concepts of Church membership and Christian Baptism. This is also the background for the understanding of the Eucharist. To belong to the Church is to enter into a relationship with Christ in a community which is conditioned both by Christ's Coming in humiliation and His Coming in glory.

Some of the profoundest teaching concerning the sacraments is to be understood in this eschatological context. We today tend to place the stress upon the element of present experience of Christ which we find in worship and which receives its climax in the Fellowship Meal. It would seem that there was a lively sense of Christ's Presence in worship and in the Eucharist in the Early Church. It is important, however, to discover the precise perspective if we can, from which this Presence (παρουσία) was viewed. The ambiguity in the term
Irenaeus' concept of the Eucharist, as set out in Adversus Haereses, Book V, chapter II. In this passage Irenaeus speaks of our flesh as being "increased and supported" (augetur et consistit) by the Eucharist of the body and blood of Christ and by the Word of God, which is received by the elements that are partaken of in the Feast. The thought of this passage is, as we noted, involved but suggestive. The conclusion which we reached was that for Irenaeus the bread and wine are in some manner transformed so that they nourish us. Clearly the thought goes beyond that of ordinary physical nourishment, since the elements of the Feast would perform this function whether or not they were consecrated. It is rather the thought, in context, that these elements build us up within the community of God's people. Not only so, but the action of the Eucharist is not conceived of in any magical way. This is seen first of all in that the elements are seen only to become effective in so far as they receive the Word of God. That is to say, that it is only through that to which they point that the elements receive the ability to 'nourish' us. Not only so, but it becomes clear that Irenaeus' meaning is that they 'nourish' us in the sense that they effectively symbolise our participation in the community which is to be made clearly visible at the Last Day. Thus, the elements
do not operate in any magical fashion. They operate symbolically, and yet this symbolism is effective, probably in a manner analogous to the way in which Old Testament prophetic symbolism was effective. It is evident that the language of this chapter could lend itself to an interpretation in terms of the doctrine of transubstantiation. It is recognized that, however faulty that doctrine may be as viewed over against Biblical thinking, it is unfair and inappropriate to label it as magical in character. It does recognize that the transformation created in the elements is the result of a divine miraculous action and comes about through the sovereign action of the Word of God Who gives Himself to the elements. At the same time we submitted that in context Irenaeus' meaning is different in character: it is rather that the elements remain what they were in their inner constitution but symbolise our belonging within the eschatological community in such a way that they effectively bind us to it. The reason for discussing this at all at this point is that, if this contention be sound, we have here a good example from the period under review of the eschatological understanding both of Church and sacrament which underlies common Early Church thinking.

We noted also (Chapter III, pages 363-367) what understanding seemed to lie behind the Paschal Homilies, such as are found in the writings of Melito of Sardis and Hippolytus. The comparison implicit (and frequently made explicit) was that the People of God had been delivered by an Event of which the Exodus in Egypt was but the type. Christ has delivered His people from the thraldom of Satan and sin and has created His Church by His victory in the Cross and the Resurrection. Part of the implication, however, of such a parallel is that the true People of God are not simply those who leave the spiritual Egypt but those who reach the spiritual Promised Land. Now, it is in Baptism
(understood as a meaningful commitment involving the whole man and instituted as such by Christ) that the individual believer enters the People of God. It is in Baptism that he become identified with the deliverance that God has wrought in Christ for His People.

Nevertheless, it is possible to fall from grace by denying Christ in times of persecution or by growing careless in spiritual matters. In particular, certain sins are viewed as most serious and are treated as involving loss of membership in the community of the Church. Thus, we saw in the 'Shepherd of Hermas' that denial of Christ and adultery fall under this category. The very physical character of these acts seemed to be closely related to the seriousness of their consequences. The thought was that the Church is an eschatological community physically conceived for whom the Lord will come from heaven. Therefore, to deny Christ 'physically' (by not bearing suffering for His sake) or by becoming 'joined' to an harlot severs the link forged in Baptism. Clearly such a concept emphasizes the eschatological nature of Baptism and of the Church into which Baptism projects the repentant soul. The imagery inherent in the 'Shepherd of Hermas' is thus eschatological in character. That inherent in the Paschal Homilies is different, but is equally eschatological. As we have seen, it is based on an analogy with the experience of Israel in her deliverance from Egypt and her progress towards the Promised Land. Defection by means of disobedience will lead to judgment and non-arrival in the spiritual inheritance laid up for the true People of God. The point of all of this is that essentially the Church is being viewed as a community defined by two events, that of the Death and Resurrection of Jesus in the past and that of the Parousia of Christ in glory in the future. It is through the past Achievement of Christ that the Church has been created, but the delineation of her true membership will only finally and properly be made known before
heaven and earth at Christ's Return.

Sometimes as we have seen, so much stress is laid on the fact that the true membership of the Church will only be known at the Parousia that rather less emphasis is laid on the reality of Christ's deliverance than is found in the New Testament records and, it would seem, in Primitive Christianity. Certainly St. Paul was sure that He who had begun a good work in us would continue it until the day of redemption. In tension with this we find in him statements which indicate His awareness that one can become a 'castaway'. This element of eschatological pilgrimage and stress on the danger of apostasy is prominent in the Book of Hebrews. Whatever may be the underlying thought in the latter work, we do find, however, in St. Paul that the balance is kept. In some of the writings under review this balance is not so effectively maintained. The tension of the two emphases has been too great, and one stress has been swallowed up by the other. This is connected with a marked element of synergism, especially in the works of the Apostolic Fathers. Something of the kind probably serves to strengthen also the severe ascetic outlook of Clement of Alexandria and Origen. It is not markedly, if at all, true, of the other writers and writings that have been examined. In any event, it is significant that the synergism, however unbiblical it may be, is closely related to the eschatological framework of thought. The idea is that only the Last Day finally unveils the true membership of the People of God.

It is unnecessary here to deal in any detail with other details concerning the Church and her sacraments which underline the eschatological orientation of thought in the period under review. Certain factors may be mentioned, however, in brief form, in order to complete the picture. One concerns Church order in relation to eschatology. Also important is the attitude found in Clement of Alexandria and
Origen regarding Christian Gnosticism.

In regard to Church order, only two brief comments will be made here. In doing so we remind ourselves that, although we cannot assume uniformity of thought as we move from one writer to another, it is often true that a significant passage in one writer uncovers an assumed ground of thinking which is common to the Early Church.

The first point is that the bishops, in particular are seen to have a role which is determined in a manner related to eschatological considerations. Thus, the bishop is the guardian of the souls under him: he is the under-shepherd of the Flock of God. This sense comes across strongly in the Ignatian Epistles. Ignatius is not self-important, but he is concerned that his people, whom he has left behind in Antioch as he proceeds towards his martyrdom, should be properly shepherded. This emphasis is again significant in a writer such as Ignatius who is often regarded as more concerned with 'personal eschatology' than with traditional futurist eschatology. Doubtless, his interest in the individual members of his flock is indicated by this concern. No doubt, too, it could be argued that such concern does not in itself indicate that the events of the End itself are in view. We have already had reason, however, to judge that Ignatius is not in fact concerned with death and what follows after it, in terms of punishments or rewards, in such a way as to exclude belief in the future Parousia, resurrection, and judgment. It would seem, therefore, that his concern about the proper shepherding of the particular Flock of God which had been entrusted to his care was oriented not just towards the standing that his parishioners would be found to have when after death they came under the scrutiny of God but rather towards the destiny of his members which would be revealed at the end of the age.

The second point is that the very concept of 'apostolic succession'
may have in it a fundamentally eschatological note. This seems at least to be true in the case of Irenaeus, as we argued earlier (Chapter V, pages 529 ff.) We saw that for Irenaeus the major issue in the writing of the *Adversus Haereses* was the preservation of truth of the Gospel as over against heresy and of the true Church as over against heretics and schismatics. A number of motifs emerged in connection with this. Thus, it was seen that there was no evidence among those most closely associated with the apostles of any 'secret traditions' such as the heretics often relied upon. The bishops are the representative figures of those communities where the public traditions associated with the Gospel were handed down. A second factor was that heresy was of more recent origin, so that the antiquity of a teaching was a point indicative of the likelihood of its being in conformity with the genuine tradition of the Gospel handed down through the apostles. A third element was that heresy had been prophesied as due to arise in the Church after the Apostles had passed on. The point about all of this is that it shows us the bishops as the official, representative custodians of a Truth which has been handed down through the apostles and now through themselves. Not only so, but this handing down of the truth of the Gospel is set in an eschatological context: heresies are to arise as time passes by, and the thought of Irenaeus is that such heresies are harbingers of the deceptiveness of the coming reign of Antichrist which is to precede the Parousia of Christ. Irenaeus is concerned here primarily with the truth of the Gospel, but this concern is shot through with the realization that this world is a battle-field between opposing forces, and that the conflict will be terminated by the events of the end of the age. Thus, the 'rule of faith' and the 'apostolic succession' of bishops is important because they represent the Truth, as over against heresy, and the true
eschatological community of the Church as over against the company of those deceived by demonic spirits. What this implies is that the Church is an elect company of people created by the truth of the Gospel, just as it is nourished by the preached Word of God and by the sacraments of Baptism and Eucharist, and the officers of the Church, such as bishops and presbyters receive a dignity and status which is consistent with the Truth which they uphold within the Gospel tradition and consonant with their being representative figures within the genuine community of God's people created by that Truth. Just as we judged that for Irenaeus the elements in the Eucharist have to be seen as operative within a strictly eschatological setting, so the dignity attributed to the officers of the Church (and supremely to the bishop, who by Irenaeus' time heads up the hierarchy) has to be understood in eschatological terms. The bishop is important not for his own sake or even because God has endowed him with some special energy (just as the elements in the Eucharist do not change, so he too remains an ordinary member of the Church, not in himself different from other members), but because he represents in an effective way the connection between the Gospel in its infancy as it was handed on from the apostles and the Final Day when all truth will be made manifest at Christ's Appearing.

Also significant is the attitude of Clement of Alexandria and Origen regarding Christian Gnosticism. We recall that Clement made it clear (and with his attitude Origen is tacitly in agreement) that γνώσις builds on the foundation of πίστις, so that he does not fall into the error of those true Gnostics who are outside the Christian fellowship. It is surely salutary that the respect for the Gnostic level of life within the Church and on the basis of faith should be understood, at least partly, as we have seen it to be, in terms of an eschatological outlook: this was to the effect that the Christian Gnostic anticipates the
conditions of the life to come. We may judge that fundamentally this is a withdrawal from life. This may be so, yet it is dubious whether it is fair thus to characterize it. For both Clement and Origen combine this respect for the Gnostic level of Christian living with the affirmation of the God-givenness and value of much that pertains to the more ordinary level of Christian living. Thus, Clement is very definite that marriage is good and to be received as a gift from God: nevertheless celibacy is also a divine gift and is a higher one. The point is that there is displayed in this a certain balance of judgment, which does not suggest the frame of mind of those who would withdraw from life. In any event, it is interesting that this outlook is combined with this eschatological understanding. We have alluded to it here because it helps to complete the picture of Early Church thinking regarding eschatology. It is also significant in that neither Clement nor Origen make much of the sacraments. They seem to regard the latter as pertaining to this age and seem to imply that the Christian Gnostic, if he cannot do without them, anticipates in other ways the day when they will no longer be necessary. Thus, this attitude helps to complete our survey of Church and sacraments in regard to their eschatological implications.

THE ESCHATOLOGICAL FAITH OF THE EARLY CHURCH.

We come now, having surveyed the results of our investigation into the eschatology of the Early Fathers, to note in brief compass what appear to be the really significant points. In doing so, we shall be unable to put completely aside some of the questions which we naturally ask in our modern age, but our purpose here is to let the evidence speak for itself, so that undue emphasis is not placed on one facet as over against another simply because it helps to answer some query which is
in our mind. It will be time, however, when we have done this, to relate what becomes evident especially to the joint conviction of Dodd and Werner that the 'delay' in the Parousia led to a process of 'de-eschatologizing'.

What, then, are the major features of this eschatological faith of the Early Fathers, so far as they can be thus grouped together with appropriateness?

One major feature is that the Early Church clearly thinks both in terms of futurist and 'realized' eschatology as do the writings found in the New Testament. We have submitted that sometimes the tension between 'now already' and 'not yet' is perhaps not kept so well in those documents as in the Primitive Christianity which they reflect. Nevertheless, the Early Church clearly does, in general terms, preserve this balance and sees herself as already launched upon a whole series of predestined events which began with the Incarnation, and especially with the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ, and which will continue until the consummation of the age. The term 'inaugurated eschatology' best sums up, we believe, the general understanding.

The basic standpoint would seem to be that the Incarnation launched the world upon the final era in world history, but that the actual consummation of the age (this term frequently is applied to world history) lies ahead at a definite point in the future, which is known to God but hidden to us. Thus we live, to use modern theological terminology, in the 'overlap of the ages', in that in Christ the world to come has broken into this world or this age, yet not in such a way as to do away with it: the doing away with this age awaits the Parousia of Christ in glory. One is reminded here of the useful analogy of Oscar Cullmann in his book, 'Christ and Time', concerning 'D-Day' and V-Day.'
One or two features in this general picture require emphasis. First, there seems to be little embarrassment over thinking of the future events concerned with the Parousia of Christ in very definitely historical terms. This comes out best in the way in which that Event is aligned with preceding events, in the final outburst of evil against God's People under Antichrist. The latter is certainly viewed as an historical figure: in like fashion the Parousia is seen as an historical event. It seems to be tacitly understood that this Event breaks the mould, that it may in some way mean the end of time. Yet generally this element is not unduly emphasized. The understanding is that Jesus Christ in His First Advent, that past one in humiliation, has already given to history a new dimension of depth. Doubtless, this will be made more evident at the Parousia, but generally it does not seem to be felt as a difficulty to have to talk about that Event as an historical Event. Perhaps occasionally in the writings of Clement of Alexandria and Origen the question may raise itself in one's mind precisely in what sense they consider that the events associated with the end of the age and the Coming of Christ are to be fulfilled. Even here, as we have sought to show, there is much more that is traditional than is often recognized. Thus, Origen seems to have no doubt about the fact that Christ will come in glory. It is true, however, that he is sensitive to the problem that we may be in danger of thinking of life after that Event in terms of too great continuity with that which we now know.

The Church is thus seen to stand, together with the world, between two Events of consummate importance. The First Advent has initiated the final era of world history. Yet the consummation, at once of the whole age and of this final era, lies at some indeterminate point ahead of us. It now becomes important to ask whether this consummation of the age was seen as imminent. The answer to this appears to be
that we have to see in what particular sense imminence was defined for the Early Church. A number of related features must be considered in this regard. It was not just that the Early Church thought of Christ as coming in glory "soon". This is suggestive of a general sense of imminence, which is not unnaturally measured by the life-span of individuals or, at most, of communities. There appears to have been a very definite prophetic background of thought concerning the Parousia and concerning the particular moment in God's on-going purposes in which the Church found herself in her present experience. We seek to set this out below.

One major motif in her understanding of her exact location in the divine movement of history is connected with the thought of the Book of Daniel, especially chapters 2 and 7. This, as we have seen, emerges very clearly into view in the case of Hippolytus, but it is in the thought also of Tertullian, and appears to represent quite a general understanding in the Early Church. We do not say that everyone accepted it, or that everyone was aware of it, but it does seem to be the case that such a background of understanding lies behind many statements and attitudes, where it is not expressly mentioned. Now, the factor which is most relevant in this matter is that these two chapters in the Book of Daniel think of five world empires as destined to emerge between Daniel's day and the coming of the Son of Man in the clouds of heaven. Combined with this fact we must take into account the thought which seems to have been quite common that Rome was the fourth world empire of Danielic prophecy. This being the case, it is evident that the Church's present position in the divine blueprint for history is that it falls under the fourth out of five predicted empires. The situation is, however, complicated by the fact that the Son of Man has already appeared on earth, but not as Daniel prophesied in glory, but rather in humiliation.
It is in this context certainly that Hippolytus sees the Church's position in the divine plan of history. Four out of five kingdoms of prophecy have passed. That alone suggests the imminence of the End. Not only so but the One Who is to rule over the fifth has been among men, and has already established His Church where already His sway is recognized. This too suggests how the End presses upon the present age. Yet, it is clear that ordinary yardsticks for measuring imminence are inappropriate. The sense of imminence has to be defined in terms of the Danielic prophecies mentioned, which in themselves tell us nothing about precise dates. Further, Daniel 7 does indicate that the fourth world empire is to be divided into ten kingdoms (this also is implied in chapter 2) and that Antichrist will emerge (so the 'little horn' is understood) only after the emergence of these ten kingdoms. When the equation of the fourth world empire with Rome is made, it then becomes difficult to believe that the Parousia of Christ which was understood to follow again after Antichrist's reign, could be very soon as measured in ordinary years or by any ordinary yardstick. The measuring rod is strictly prophetic.

It is recognized that not everyone may have shared this position, but in view of the facts that belief in Rome as the fourth world empire of Danielic prophecy seems to have been quite widespread and that Rome in this period still had a fair degree of authority (this was admittedly less true in the third century), it seems difficult to believe that it was generally held that Christ's Parousia in glory was, in the ordinary sense of the term, imminent. It is possible, of course, to argue that apocalyptic thinking is not in fact usually logical in character and that this is the explanation of any tension between 'imminence' and assumptions which implied some extension of time prior to the Parousia. In fact, however, there is little evidence in the period before us of
an 'imminent' expectation of Christ's Coming in the ordinary sense of that term's usage. Further, it seems probable that too much has been made of the elements of discontinuity in apocalyptic thought by people who are unsympathetic to its approach.

The question emerges how it was believed this period between the Two Advents, as it came to be thought of (notably in Justin Martyr's Apology), was to be used, and why it had been given by God. In this respect again a number of motifs emerge. One major one was that this is the age of missionary expansion (this theme, as we have seen, is a dominant one in the 'Didache'). This might seem to be a general commonsense consideration. If God sent His Son to die for the sins of men, of what value would this be, if this 'good news' were not given opportunity to be proclaimed and if people, the world over, had not the opportunity to repent in the light of this Gospel? In fact, however, the pattern of thought is more complex than that. This is an age of missionary expansion in which Gentiles are brought into the community of God, along with those of Jewish race. Further, the taking of the Gospel to the Gentiles, and the coming of the Holy Spirit upon Gentiles under the preaching of the Gospel as a divine seal upon their reception by Him, took place only after the Jewish rejection of their Messiah, and this rejection seems to be seen as a pivot upon which the whole missionary programme turned. Thus, it is not just that Christ's Coming in humility has opened a new era of world history, one of inclusiveness as over against earlier Jewish exclusiveness. It is rather that the Early Church operated with a whole schematization of history. Christ was to come in the flesh; He was to be rejected by Israel in consequence the Gospel is to be taken to Gentiles, who - in accordance with prophecy - will put the Chosen Race to shame by their glad response to Christ; then (possibly after a national conversion of the Jewish race)
the End will come.

What is perhaps most significant in all of this is what 'futurist' and 'realized' elements of eschatology become almost inextricably intertwined in a profound theology of history. Thus, it is not just that the Church's present victorious experience of Christ (a feature of the End-time initiated by the Incarnation) has produced an expansion of the Gospel among people of pagan views. Rather is it that this very inner experience of power, given through the operation of the Holy Spirit in the midst of His people, is a prophesied factor which not only wins Gentiles for Christ but which is due so to harass the Enemy of souls that it will provoke an increasing tempo of wickedness and Satanic opposition which in turn provokes the Appearing of Christ to deliver His people. In this scheme of things nothing is accidental and God is the sovereign Lord of history. He is Lord in a special way in His Church, which is an anticipation of the coming Kingdom of God, but the presence of the Church, both in terms of her very being and her mission, is a feature of God's guidance of history.

We mentioned a number of motifs above which should be discussed in regard to the filling up of this period between the Incarnation and the Parousia of Christ in glory. The first concerned the missionary expansion of the Church, but another has already been brought in: that is the fact that God is guiding pagan history, using the decisions of rulers for His own purposes and actually provoking a particular course of history by means of them. We see how, owing to the very nature of Early Church thinking, it becomes difficult to deal with one point before passing on to another.

The sense of Christ's presence with His People is strong, and this comes out perhaps especially in terms of the theology of the sacraments of Baptism and Eucharist. The interesting feature is that this Presence
does not make unnecessary His Coming in glory at the end of the age, even as it does not render useless His Coming in the Incarnation. The truth is that Incarnation-Presence in worship and service, and Final Unveiling before men and nations, quick and dead, at the end of the age are all on one base line. It is what Christ has done rather than what He does now or will do at the End which is fundamental, but Christ's Presence in worship and His Coming in glory belong together. They cannot be opposed, where the thinking of this early period of Church history is in view. The more Christ is discovered in worship (of which sacraments are a climax), the more eagerly, yet soberly, is His Coming at the End anticipated.

The general picture then of Early Church eschatology which emerges is that the end of the age is eagerly anticipated, yet not in such manner as to play down the significance of what happened in the First Advent of Christ or what is taking place now in God's sovereign disposing of history. All history is now being driven towards its predetermined goal. The Church is placed in the midst of this situation and is taken up in an active way into the process whereby God's purposes are being fulfilled. Eschatology is thus seen in balance with other elements of Christian revelation.

THE IMPLICATIONS OF THIS FAITH FOR THE THESES OF DODD AND WERNER.

It is in the light of the above picture that we must assess the common understanding of C.H. Dodd and Martin Werner that the Early Church had to alter its outlook with regard to eschatology on account of the so-called 'delay' in the Parousia of Christ in glory. In doing so we appreciate that there are considerable differences between the general outlook of these scholars with reference to eschatology: they are, indeed, seen as representatives of different schools of thought in this field. Thus, C.H. Dodd thinks that the 'de-eschatologizing' programme began within a very few years of Christ's death and resurrection and is
certainly reflected in the New Testament corpus of literature. On the
other hand, Martin Werner judges that it was the passage of a considerable
period of time from Christ's death and resurrection which produced a
real change in the Church's thinking. This leads to a different
perspective from that adopted by C.H. Dodd.

For Dodd the Primitive Church looked for an almost immediate
confirmation of the Exaltation of Christ in terms of His visible
Appearing in glory. Even so, it was the Exaltation of Christ that
mattered, and the passage of even three or four years must have led to a
reappraisal of viewpoint concerning the belief in Christ's visible
Appearing. This initially took the form of a diminution of emphasis
upon that outward confirmation. This change of thought is, of course,
affected by the growing number of years from Christ's departure, even
after the initial three or four years had elapsed. Nevertheless on
this view the process of change in outlook began very early and was
related to the fact that, although an outward Parousia in glory was
anticipated, it was never more than the particular form which the
Primitive's Church's understanding of Christ's Exaltation took. This
meant that the non-eventuating of the Parousia as a visible and
catastrophic happening was not a jarring factor upon the faith of the
Early Church. Doubtless, there were those who had taken the Hope in a
more serious way than others. They had placed the emphasis upon the
form, and to the extent that they did so, the 'delay' in the Parousia
would be a factor productive of despair and perhaps even loss of conv-
iction regarding the Christian Gospel. Nevertheless, on Dodd's view
such a stress on the Parousia as an outward Event was never of the essence
of Primitive Christianity, and to the extent that this was so and that
the realisation of this fact grew gradually in the Church almost from
the first, the 'delay' in the Parousia would not be seriously disruptive
of faith. It would simply be that an emphasis would be placed upon
the present experience of Christ in worship, fellowship, and witness.
This would still be realized 'eschatology' in the sense that the Church
exists in the new age created by Christ which anticipates the blessedness
that God has in store for His people (however this may be fulfilled)
and which depends upon the Incarnation which inaugurated the 'End-time'.

On Werner's view, on the other hand, the Parousia of Christ was
from the beginning conceived in more definite terms than as a confir-
mation of the Exaltation of Christ. It is true that Werner follows
Schweitzer in considering that Christ had anticipated the End first of
all before the disciples returned from their preaching mission to Jewry
during His own ministry, and that Christ then thought in terms of the
End as supervening in close association with His own resurrection from
the dead. Nevertheless, the emphasis was upon the event as an outward
one, and the previous experience of deferred hope would suggest the
possibility of a further deferment, when the Parousia did not follow
upon the Resurrection. It was only when a full generation passed that
serious concern became a reality. It is important to see that, bound
up with Werner's understanding, is an emphasis upon the Parousia, from
the very beginning which set it very much within the context of
apocalyptic notions. It was not primarily a confirmation of the Victory
of the Resurrection and Exaltation of Jesus Christ: rather was it
an apocalyptic event which lay ahead of the Church and whose failure to
eventuate must pose a serious challenge to the whole Christian faith.

What are we to say, first of all, regarding the general thesis of
Dodd and Werner that the passage of time led to a diminution of emphasis
upon futurist eschatology? We submit that the sketch given in the
preceding pages of Early Church eschatology, to the extent that it is
sound, suggests that the Early Church as a whole was never seriously
embarrassed about a 'delay' in the Parousia, because its expectation was subtly different in character from the pictures given either by Dodd or Werner. These scholars are at one in seizing on the motif of imminence, and this, it would seem, has much to do with their own development of understanding concerning the development of Early Christian eschatology. It is the failure of Christ to appear in glory "soon", within either a very short or a relatively short period of time, which led to a reappraisal of eschatological thinking, whether this was of a gradual or traumatic order. The above sketch of Early Church eschatology suggests, however, that in the period after all but the later New Testament documents were written, that is in the Sub-apostolic age and beyond (up to 250 A.D.), the question of imminence was not in fact a major point of interest. The notion that the Primitive Church had a fervent expectation of an imminent Parousia is so strongly entrenched that, to say what we have just said, immediately suggests to the mind that the Church must have developed away from such an expectation either towards a greater emphasis upon 'realized' eschatological elements in Christian experience or towards an agonized reappraisal of the faith which produced a considerable sense of discontinuity with the Primitive Church. Our brief has not been to examine the faith of the Primitive Church reflected in the New Testament documents. Nevertheless, the character of the eschatological faith of the Early Church described above cannot but raise the query whether in fact Dodd and Werner have misunderstood the eschatology of the Primitive community. What if, in fact, the Church did not, even in its most primitive period, place the kind of emphasis upon imminence which these scholars assume?

It is concerning this question of 'imminence' that the evidence of the Early Church Fathers outlined in the preceding chapters stands out in the most salutary way. It suggests a particular understanding of what
is meant by that term which does justice both to 'realized' and futurist elements of eschatology and suggests the thought that, if the Primitive Church really were as 'fervent' in their expectation of an 'immediate' Parousia of Christ, the Church soon came to display considerably greater balance in its thinking. The answer that is usually given to this is, of course, that events forced the Church to a reappraisal. It is urged that it was natural for the young enthusiastic community to think in terms of an immediate Parousia of Christ, the more especially in view of the apocalyptic antecedents in Jewry in the intertestamental period. This is indeed a possibility. One is at pains at this point to emphasize, however, that this rests fundamentally on an alignment of the Primitive Church with the least sane and wholesome kind of apocalyptic expectation. Such an alignment is combined with what is in essence a 'psychologizing' theory. And the whole explanation thus given is necessitated by the conviction that it is 'imminence' in ordinary terms which is thought of when the Parousia-Hope is in view.

A mediating position which we noted and which is influential at the present time is that of Oscar Cullmann with his belief that Jesus Himself and the Primitive Church did indeed expect an imminent Return in glory, but that this was not of the essence of the Church's faith. This outlook has perhaps more in common with that of C.H. Dodd than it has with that of Martin Werner. There is probably a profound element of truth in what both Dodd and Cullmann, in their somewhat different ways, are saying: it seems likely that a young community, full of enthusiasm, would tend to 'telescope' the future, but that the passage of time would not affect its faith, to the extent that intrinsically it was not bound up with an apocalyptically conditioned form of thinking. Cullmann does of course lay greater emphasis than Dodd on the continuance of the Church's expectation of the
Parousia in glory, but they do have somewhat in common, and it would seem likely, on general grounds, that many Christians would expect Christ very soon, in ordinary temporal terms, and would have to readjust to the fact of a 'delay' in hope.

What seems not quite in line at least with Early Church thinking even in the balanced outlook of an Oscar Cullmann is that Cullmann is still thinking of 'imminence' in ordinary terms of reckoning. Our point is that the Early Church, at its best and at the core of its thinking, did not so understand the concept of 'imminence' with reference to Christ's Return in glory. Early Church thinking does in fact, we submit, suggest a perspective from which both 'realized' and futurist elements in eschatology fit into their due place, and which explains a hidden Biblical prophetic background of understanding for the concept of 'imminence' which - if it is true also of Primitive Christianity - completely alters the problem around which the whole modern eschatological debate has raged. Our brief, as we have said, is not to examine New Testament eschatology, but the lessons learned from Early Church eschatology must at least raise significant questions regarding the eschatology of the Primitive Church and even of our Lord Himself? Did they anticipate the Parousia in the ordinary sense as 'imminent'? or did they understand imminence in terms of the kind of Biblical-prophetic understanding that, as we have submitted, shows through in the works of Hippolytus and seems to be implicit in much other Early Church thinking and writing?

Modern thinking seems to work with only two possibilities in mind when it thinks of an 'imminent' expectation of Christ's Parousia either in regard to the Primitive Church or the Early Church. One is that it means quite literally that Christ is expected to return in glory within three or four years, or perhaps at most a generation, while the other
is that strictly the essence of the concept is not temporal in character at all: it is rather a way of expressing God's Presence in grace and demand in markedly vivid terms. The third possibility, suggested by the evidence outlined in the chapters above, is that 'imminence' be understood over the very definite 'programmatization' of history which is revealed in such chapters as Daniel, chapters 2 and 7, when they are understood in terms of a fulfilment in Jesus of Nazareth which yet stretches forward to a further Event at a point in the future as yet undisclosed. For Cullmann time is still thought of in ordinary terms in regard to 'imminence', even although he sees that the non-eventuating of the Parousia did not touch the essence of the Church's faith. It is his faithfulness to Biblical realism which keeps him from demythologizing the Christian Hope, and explains his insistence that the Primitive and Early Church communities did indeed keep in view a future Event, even if that Event were delayed. In similar manner, where Jeremias is in view, there is the insistence that Jesus and the Earliest Christians expected the nearness of Christ's Coming, in the ordinary sense of nearness. Jeremias, like Cullmann, may be in the right, but the background to the concept of imminence which emerges in a Hippolytus raises questions even concerning the mind of Jesus and the Primitive Church.

Let us endeavour, then to set out what the full implications are of the eschatological faith of the Early Church for the modern eschatological debate in all its ramifications. As we have already indicated, the question of 'imminence' is not in fact to the fore in the literature that we have been studying. We have sought to show what is thought about this in a manner consistent with the evidence, but the question of 'imminence' is in fact significant for modern thought rather than for the Early Church. Certainly it does not pose a major problem of any kind with reference to the Parousia of Christ in glory. We now seek to
set out all the features of the Early Church's faith which are relevant to the question how we are to conceive of the Coming of Christ.

A basic understanding is that eschatology must be understood in terms of the Coming One, Jesus Christ. This means that the future is not emphasized at the expense of the past or the present, since Christ is the same yesterday, today and for ever. The Early Church was for the most part not concerned with future events but with the Coming One. Connected with this is the fact that Christ is viewed as the sovereign Lord. He is the Lord of space and time and they are made to be subservient to Him. It is tacitly understood that Christ was the Agent in Creation and that He is the sustainer of the universe. This being so, it does not come naturally to those in the Early Church who have faith to ask questions why Christ's Coming in glory is delayed. It is unbelief which suggests that perhaps Christ is not able to fulfil His Promise. The Early Church did not consider that Christ would be limited by spatial disabilities from being observed by all men at His Coming in glory. No doubt this problem has been enhanced by the modern realisation (already, of course, anticipated in ancient Greece) that the world is round. Even so, no ordinary man could be visible at one time to people all over the then known world, to say nothing concerning the dead who are to be raised to behold Him. In essence the modern problems with the doctrine of the Parousia of Christ are the same as those of ancient times. The point is that, just as the Early Church did not consider that Christ would be limited by considerations relating to the nature of the physical world, so it could not conceive of Christ as being frustrated in His purposes by the pressing of time upon Christ's Promise. If the passage of time from Jesus' departure raised a manifest difficulty for thinking people, the feeling-tone with which believing people regarded the issue was conditioned by the conviction that time itself does not have an autonomy of its own — it proceeds as it does only because Christ
permits it so to do. Neither space nor time were allowed to put a strait-jacket on Christ where the faith of the Early Church was at its best. It may seem to many people of modern outlook that the Church could hardly get away from the plain facts that Christ had promised to come soon and had failed to do so. Be this as it may, the Early Church tended to look at the 'facts' in the light of Christ rather than the other way round. To do otherwise seemed to imply that space and time had an autonomy of their own. Given such an appreciation as the Early Church had of the absolute sovereignty of Christ in the universe as in history and in individual lives, it becomes a real question whether their attitude does not have much to commend it. It is clear that what has been said above is not said in so many words in the Fathers studied, but we submit that it is a faithful representation of their attitude.

The second point - and this may not seem easily to fit in with the first - is that the Early Church probably took much more seriously than has been allowed that the mission of the Church would take a fair period of time. It may be conceded that the understanding of the Church as to the length of this would only grow with the passage of the years, but the supposition that the Church-age represented a definite period of time, following upon Israel's rejection of Christ and preceding a possible conversion of Israel prior to the end of the age, does not readily accord with the notion that the Parousia of Christ was 'imminent' in the ordinary sense of that term. Jeremias thinks thus, but judges that the Church did expect Christ's Coming in glory within a generation. In any event, the view represented by C.H. Dodd that the Primitive Church's Hope must have undergone a transformation within a very few years of Christ's death and resurrection is seriously challenged by the witness of such documents as the 'Didache', and by the missionary theology of such men as Justin Martyr.
Combined with this second point is another factor suggestive of the awareness that some 'delay' in the Parousia was likely. This is the Early Church's expectation of the reign of Antichrist. The concept of a reign of Antichrist seems fantastic to much modern thought. It is viewed frequently as a symbol of what is always true with reference to the pressure of evil upon God's people. There seems no doubt, however, that the Early Church understood this as referring, even if in cryptic symbolic fashion, to actual happenings of an unusually evil nature which were to precede the consummation of the age at Christ's Parousia. The fact that modern people usually interpret such concepts in a purely symbolic way makes it more difficult for them to appreciate with what seriousness the Early Church took the concept. The present point is that the Early Church outlook implies the passage of time before Christ's Coming, and that this does not agree with the notion that the Church was living in the expectation of Christ's Coming within a very brief period of time.

What has been said about the Biblical-prophetic background to the expectation of the Early Church, as derived from Daniel, chapters 2 and 7 especially, strengthens this impression. The equation of Rome with the fourth world empire appears to have been quite widespread.

All these, then, are factors which question the soundness of the judgment that the Early Church did in fact anticipate the near return of Christ, if the term 'near' be understood out of this particular Biblical-prophetic background. A final feature goes with them. This is the evidence adduced which suggests that the Early Church may have thought of Jesus' eschatological discourse as dividing history from Christ's time into three periods: to Christ's departure from the earth by death and resurrection, or to the destruction of Jerusalem (the period, as it were, of mission to the Jews); the 'times of the Gentiles' (understood in
terms of the Christian mission to the non-Jewish peoples and their ingathering into the People of God); and the final era of intense heightening of evil and persecution of God's People. We mention this last feature with more diffidence, since its presence is not so obviously widespread. Yet it does seem implicit in the thinking of Tertullian, for example, as we have already indicated.

We said above that this second point, viz., that the Church may have anticipated a not inconsiderable 'delay' before the Parousia, may not seem readily to agree with the first. The reason for saying this is that this may seem to portray the Early Church as wanting the best of both worlds, as it were. How could the Early Church with consistency view Christ as the sovereign Lord of history, in such a way that the fact of the delay in fulfilment of Christ's Promise is not allowed to disturb faith, and at the same time rest its apparent unconcern about the delay in the Parousia on the judgment that an early Return of Christ — in the ordinary sense of 'early' — was not ever in the mind of Christ or the Primitive Church? This seems rather difficult to answer. Yet the very way in which it is posed as a dilemma probably reflects the different perspective from which we moderns tend to approach the matter. If one has some doubt about the truth of the Christian Faith or some particular assertion made in its name, as regards the doctrine of the Parousia in its traditional understanding, then it may seem that the Early Church was desirous of asserting its viewpoint at all costs. What we have to bear in mind is the absolute confidence of the great majority of ordinary believers, as represented by means of their spokesmen, the writing theologians, in Christ and His promises. It is our modern certainty about what cannot be verified empirically which probably lies at rock bottom behind the feeling that the Early Church — if its view has been rightly presented — thus sought to get the best of both worlds.
For the Early Church reality was found supremely in Jesus Christ Who was conceived not just as a figure of history or even as God's Son victorious at God's right hand, but as One Who was actively and vitally present with His People in worship and service. Another feature of this matter is that the attitude adduced regarding the Lordship of Christ over time is an attitude, rather than a belief which actually conflicts with the assumption that Christ and the Primitive Church did not anticipate the immediate Return of the Lord in the ordinary sense of 'immediacy'. Is there any real reason why a proper appreciation of the sovereignty of Christ over history cannot fit in with the judgment that the End must be put far enough in the future to allow for the fulfilment of prophecy and for the completion of the Church's mission to the Gentiles?

A third major feature in the Early Church's approach which kept her, it would seem, from becoming concerned over the delay in the Parousia of Christ in glory was that she was already caught up in a movement of God within history, in which the divine purposes were actively being fulfilled and in which she was aware of the Presence of the Risen Lord. A further feature of this was that the ways in which Christ was active in her own midst and through her in the world were in themselves anticipative of the conditions, which, it was believed, would obtain in the coming Kingdom of God. Sin was being checked, even if only presently with difficulty and with the aid of prayer and fellowship, and Gentiles were sharing with Jews in fellowship as they would in the Coming Kingdom. It seems probable in regard to the latter point that the universalism of such passages as Daniel 7 played a part in shaping thought. So too would the expectation of Jesus with reference to what was to take place after His own death and resurrection (if Jeremias' interpretation in his book, 'Jesus'Promise to the Nation', be sound). Already in the Church the kind of Kingdom foreshadowed in the
expectation both of Daniel and of our Lord Himself was being realized. This must be reckoned as one of the major features in the Christian attitude to the delay in the Parousia. Already the Lord was present in a sovereign way in Word, in sacrament, in prayer, in Church discipline. This realisation of the παρουσία of Christ in the midst did not suggest, as Christ's Parousia in glory was 'delayed' that perhaps it was not to come to pass as a visible outward Event of cosmic significance: rather did it suggest that the Lord Who had been with His people and had promised not to leave them alone even unto the end of the age, would fulfil His further Promise to return to them when that time came.

A final feature which may have had a bearing is suggested by the principle of 'repetitiveness', as we termed it, which we found in Hippolytus. Certain words of Jesus may, indeed, have posed a problem for Early Christian minds, as the years lengthened. Mk. 13:30, with its parallel at Matt. 24:34 comes readily to mind. We have submitted the possibility that such writers as Hippolytus and Tertullian tacitly understood that Jesus intended by the γενεὰ, mentioned in this utterance, the generation of the final period before the End. This view goes hand in hand with the division of history from Christ's utterance into three periods, of which the last is the period of tribulation immediately preceding the End. This understanding was probably not, however, universal in the Church, and such words as Mk. 13:30 must have given room for thought. It is not improbable that the Early Church saw in such a traumatic event as the Fall of Jerusalem a fulfilment of such an utterance without judging that this fulfilment was a complete one or exhausted its meaning. Rather it would be seen, especially as events proved that it was not associated with the End itself, to point forward to the final Event or the circumstances preceding it. Again, this may seem a cavalier way in which to deal with the facts. The Early Church,
however, would have judged that the facts were that God had seen fit so to organize history as to give immediate indications of what was to happen at the consummation of the age. It may be urged that no such reasoning disturbs the fact that if Christ promised to come within a generation, the destruction of Jerusalem was no substitute for this event. It is again dubious, however, whether the Early Church would have so viewed the matter. The facts to them, we submit, would rather have been that Christ—generation. He had judged those Jews who were persecuting the Church, as they had done their Lord, by opening up the community of grace to Gentiles. This, it is true, had already happened, but the Fall of Jerusalem may well have been taken as a special divine visitation confirming what was already taking place. It does seem likely that not a few saw the Fall of Jerusalem not so much in terms of a parallel with the End of the age but rather as an act symbolic of the opening up of the era of mission to the Gentiles. Where this was so, the thought of Christ's immediate Coming in glory would certainly not be in view. In any event, we submit that, where faith was puzzled over apparent non-fulfilment of particular promises which seemed to set a time-schedule which had not been fulfilled as expected, such an event as the Destruction of Jerusalem would be seen as being a part fulfilment and a pointer to faith that God had not forgotten His promise. We recall here the profound concept of Hippolytus that God actually ordains history in such a way that faith can find pointers to eschatological events in immediate happenings. Who can say with confidence that he was wrong?

We conclude by submitting that the theses of Dodd and Werner, different in tone as they may be, rest upon an understanding of the eschatology of the Primitive Church, especially in regard to the question of the 'imminence' of Christ's Parousia which is not that of the Early Church. This is as far as strictly our investigation allows us to go. Further questions concerning the eschatological understanding of the Primitive Church itself may be suggested by it.

Dodd and Werner develop their understanding of eschatology in their
own ways, as we have seen. Werner gives quite an elaborate portrayal of the reshaping of the whole of Christian theology consequent upon the loss of faith in the Parousia. This corresponds to the sense which we have mentioned that the non-eventuating of the Parousia within a reasonable space of time was traumatic in its effects. The details of this reinterpretation of theology in the Early Church are not our concern in this thesis. What is our concern is to state that the basis on which this whole understanding of the development of Early Christian doctrine is based, seems unsupported by the evidence, where the evidence of the writings and practices of the Church from the Subapostolic era to the mid-third century is concerned. Dodd's views, taking into account as they do the very real sense of Christ's Presence with His People, seem to keep closer to the actual faith of the Early Church in the period before us. Nevertheless, it must be said that they both assume, not only for the period of the Primitive Church but for that of the Early Church, a viewpoint, which, we submit in the light of the evidence presented in the previous chapters, cannot be substantiated where the Early Church is concerned.

Werner seeks to show the changes in the doctrine of Christ's Person and Work, and of the Church and her sacraments, in the aftermath of the disappointment of the Parousia hope. The strong point in this is that it shows Werner's appreciation of the very real eschatological element imbedded in such a doctrine as the overthrow of demonic forces by Christ in His death and Resurrection. As he sees, for St. Paul this meant that already in Christ's Victory the end of the old Aeon of evil was initiated. Meanwhile, however, this fact was manifest only in the Church. At Christ's Parousia, it would be made manifest in the whole created order. Werner thinks that the non-fulfilment of the Parousia hope led to a change in the understanding of the Work of Christ
and in the sphere of practical action. Thus, belief in the imminence of the complete overthrow of evil by divine action could make one tolerant of existing scheme of things, whereas the realization that the Parousia Hope was not going to be fulfilled in the way anticipated, or that it would not be fulfilled as soon as had been anticipated, opened up the way for a more positive attitude towards Christian social action. Most scholars would agree that a certain change in Christian doctrine was produced by the so-called 'delay' in the Parousia. Werner's views are very elaborate and rest upon the judgment that the result of the 'delay' was a traumatic experience of disappointment. If the judgment reached at the close of our own investigation be sound, there would still be room for the natural psychological processes of change as they affected Christian understanding of doctrine and practice. It could only be with the passage of the years that the Church realized just how long she might have to wait for her Lord. Nevertheless, our contention is that the basis on which Werner's judgment rests (together with that of much modern scholarship) is a shaky one. It assumes a kind of emphasis on imminence, which is not evident in the Early Fathers, and seeks to answer questions which trouble our modern minds rather than those of Christians in the early days of the Church. If Werner be sound in his outlook concerning disappointment over the delay of the Parousia, it is natural to assume the kind of reinterpretation of eschatology and of doctrine which he envisages. If Dodd be sound in his rather different but related view, we can look for a gradual emphasis upon elements of 'realized' eschatology at the expense of futurism. Our point is that the evidence suggests that the common basis of their understanding is a belief that the Early Church thought that Christ was coming soon in glory and that this was disappointed. In fact, this statement of the matter seems questionable in the light of the evidence in the period from

the Sub-apostolic age onwards. It follows that, if the basis of understanding be unsound, the assumptions based on it will be unsound also. There seems little evidence for Warner's elaborate theories concerning the reinterpretation of all Christian doctrine in the light of the delay in the Parousia, and we have seen throughout this investigation that futurism remained a vital factor in Early Church eschatology.

A word may be spared for the 'mediating and other positions' which we noted in our introductory chapter. Bultmann's view is made out of a deep sense of concern to relate the Gospel to twentieth century life, but the Early Church seems to think in markedly concrete terms regarding eschatological events. As for the views of Cullmann and Jeremias, they seem to do justice to elements within the eschatological faith of the Early Church, yet they seem to fall down in so far as they do not take account of the particular understanding of imminence which has emerged from our study of the Fathers of the Early Church to the mid-third century.

This investigation is now complete. The Church's faith was in a Lord Who had come, Who was present with His People and Who would come again at the end of the age. From this position the Church in her mainstream did not retreat.
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