

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

The First Struggle for Catholicity.¹

BY THE REV. A. W. F. BLUNT, M.A.

*Vicar of Carrington, sometime Fellow and Classical Lecturer of
Exeter College, Oxford.*

THE Church of Christ is Catholic in at least two senses. In the first place, it declares that in Jesus Christ is to be found the absolute fulness of truth, in so far as man is capable to receive the revelation of God. No further theophany is necessary, for nothing further can be revealed to human comprehension. There may be, there must be, truths as to God's Being and Nature, as they are in themselves, which we do not know and never shall know under human conditions. But all that can be known by man with regard to God lies in the manifestation of the Incarnate Word of God ; and all truth that man can ever learn must be capable of being subsumed under that revelation. In the second place, the Church is Catholic in its purpose ; it is for all mankind. It has in charge the absolute fulness of God's grace, in so far as man is able to use it. No further outpouring is necessary, for nothing further can be given to human need. The complete perfection of God's love is beyond our powers of appreciation. But all that we can realize of that love has been shown to us by Jesus Christ, and is conveyed to us in experience by the operation of the Holy Spirit.

That is the Church's claim. The verification of that claim can only be made in history. The truth of the Church's message, the grace of the Church's mysteries, are proved to be really Catholic, only if they are found experimentally to be capable of answering all the various requirements of the various natures of men. The Church shows its Catholicity by being able to satisfy all that man asks, to assimilate and complete all the

¹ Based on a course of four lectures to the Nottingham Branch of the Church Reading Society.

aspects of truth that man anywhere sees, to assimilate and perfect all the qualities of character that man anywhere displays. Each individual, therefore, in his measure, and each nation in its measure, as they pass into the fold of Christianity, brings a new verification of that Catholicity. Each in turn brings the contribution of his or its own individuality to the building up of the Body of Christ ; and the Church still justifies its claim to be Catholic by its capacity to receive and use and consecrate these contributions. Each extension of the Church is a stage in the process by which the Church's Catholicity is developed. For every nation and every type of human mind has to be accommodated in a Church that is, in ideal and in design, the Body of the Perfect Man.

The first stage in this process is narrated for us in The New Testament. The Church began as a Jewish sect. The problem was whether, when the chance occurred, it would take it or not, whether it would be able to find room for the aspirations of the great Græco-Roman world outside the circle of Jewish nationalism, and yet at the same time to perpetuate the best elements which Judaism itself could bring to it. We already know the answer ; and only a summary recapitulation is needed of the struggle by which Christianity managed to slough off the nationalistic Judaism out of which it arose. That struggle had four stages, not clearly separated from one another, but still roughly distinguishable. In the first stage the Christian Church is, as has been said, a sect of Judaism. The Christians still observe the Mosaic law and frequent the Temple ;¹ they still cherish as a central belief the Messianic hope of the nation,² with this only difference, that they claim to know the coming Messiah's name. They do not attempt to be schismatic. They are tolerated, and even to some extent favoured, by the Pharisaic party³ and the people in general,⁴ a favour only increased⁴

¹ Acts ii. 46, iii. 1, v. 12.

² In Acts xxiii. 6 St. Paul makes the perfectly honest and legitimate point that he is called in question "touching the hope." Cf. also Acts xxviii. 20.

³ Acts v. 34, xxiii. 9, vi. 7, xv. 5.

⁴ Acts ii. 47, v. 13, and the number of conversions is further evidence.

by the occasional attacks which the unpopular Sadducees make upon them.¹

In the second stage, the Church is still Jewish at the centre, but it allows its circumference to be extended by the admission of Gentile adherents. This development, prepared by the work of St. Stephen, Philip the Deacon, St. Peter, and the unknown Hellenists who preached at Antioch (Acts xi. 20), was brought into unavoidable prominence by the work of St. Paul; and the decree of Acts xv. marks the point at which the duality within the Church receives official recognition. By that decree the Gentile Christians were altogether absolved from the necessity of submitting to circumcision and of obeying the whole law of Moses.² But no exemption from this law was granted to Jewish Christians.³ The issue between Faith and the Law was not settled. It might still be maintained that circumcised was a superior form to uncircumcised Christianity; and no rules were laid down as to the social relations between Jews and Gentiles in the Christian Church.

This stage could obviously only be temporary.⁴ Compromises of all sorts would have to be made. Probably a Jewish Christian anywhere would for a time continue to attend the Jewish synagogue. So, too, the Gentiles are exhorted by St. Paul not to offend the consciences of their weaker brethren. It is even possible that for a time Jewish and Gentile Christians

¹ Acts iv. 1, v. 17.

² For a luminous discussion of the terms and text of the decree *cf.* Professor Kirsopp Lake's "Earlier Epistles of St. Paul," chap. ii. and Appendix. My general indebtedness to this masterly book must be apparent to all who have read it.

³ Acts xv. 19; and in xv. 21 it is obviously anticipated that Judaism was to be recognized as a religion which might proselytize and yet continue in a friendly relation to Christianity.

⁴ We cannot say how far the Christian leaders expected it to last. Obviously their aim was to hold the two parties together, and to keep the peace between them. Partly, perhaps, they trusted to time, and hoped the question would settle itself in practice without the need for downright legislation; this, indeed, is what happened. Partly, however, they did not even yet, with the exception of St. Paul, grasp the essential principle at stake. And St. Paul was probably glad to accept any compromise which would allow him to go on with his work. Neither he nor the other Apostles wished for a schism. And if he could continue his mission, the chances were that time would be on his side.

might be to some extent organized separately, in places where there were enough of both to make a coherent body for each.¹ But as time went on, if there was to be any Church life at all, one side would have to accommodate itself to the other. And, since the decree of Acts xv. had categorically stated that Gentile Christians need not be circumcised, it was obvious that any accommodation must come from the Jewish side. Therein, indeed, lay the real importance of that decree. It did not settle the principle, but it permitted the practice which in process of time would settle the principle for itself by sheer usage. At Jerusalem, indeed, the Church became, under St. James's leadership, increasingly Jewish.² Even after the Roman attack on Palestine had driven the Christians to Pella and elsewhere, they apparently still adhered to their Jewish practices.³ But the suppression of the rebellion of Bar-Cochab in A.D. 132 was followed by the foundation of Aelia Capitolina on the site of Jerusalem, and by the issue of Hadrian's edict forbidding all Jews to enter the new city upon pain of death, but making an exception in favour of those who declared their severance from Judaism by renouncing its distinctive observances. So far as we can discover, the majority of the Christians in Palestine accepted the favour, and the Church of Aelia came into existence as a Gentile community with a Gentile, named Marcus, as its Bishop. On the other hand, those Christians who refused to abjure the Mosaic Law remained in Pella and other places, isolated from connection with the Catholic Church, and probably infuriated with the Christians of Aelia, who would seem to them a church of renegades. In consequence, by isolation and reaction, they soon drifted into heresy and eventually faded into obscurity. But, while such was the course of events in Palestine, or at least in Judæa, in the Dispersion there was a gradual

¹ This is undoubtedly the case at Antioch (Gal. ii. 12 *et seq.*), where it is clear that Gentile and Jewish Christians ate at separate tables, possibly in separate buildings. And *cf.* K. Lake, *op. cit.*, chap. iii., for the arguments that 2 Thessalonians is addressed to the Jewish section of the Church at Thessalonica, as if it had a distinct existence apart from the Gentile section.

² Acts xxi. 20. For St. James *cf.* Euseb. Hist. Eccl. ii. 23.

³ Hegesippus is our authority for this fact.

rapprochement of Jewish and Gentile Christians (and we must note that one of the most significant features of this stage is the gradual ousting of Jerusalem, for all purposes of practical influence, from its premier position in Christendom, in favour of Gentile Churches like Antioch, and, later, Ephesus and Rome). This *rapprochement* was due partly to the force of circumstances (*e.g.*, the growing preponderance of the Gentile element in the Churches), to the pressure of the Gentile environment, and to the practical necessities of Church life in the cities of the Dispersion. But, of course, it was immensely stimulated by the tradition of St. Paul's teaching.¹ And, when he vanishes from the scene, his work, so far as the Dispersion is concerned, is done. His later years seem to have been comparatively immune from any violent antagonisms on the part of Judaizing teachers among the Gentile Christians.² And we find in none of the other New Testament literature any trace of real opposition to his main tenets.³ The Christian Churches of the Dispersion are by now

¹ Or rather, St. Paul's fuller teaching, as found, *e.g.*, in Gal. iv. 21 *et seq.* For it is clear that he was at times disposed to qualify such an uncompromising rejection of Mosaism (*cf.* the brilliant discussion of this point in Harnack's "Date of Acts and Synoptic Gospels," chap. ii. A). His position was ambiguous; but its ambiguity was possible only then, because the traditions of the Jewish Dispersion, in which Jews had for centuries associated with Gentiles, and found means of evading the Jewish Law to do so, were still living. The time came soon, when national feeling was so inflamed by national misfortune that Judaism once more shut itself up in its shell of exclusiveness, and the Jew became an irreconcilable alien in all lands. And St. Paul's position was exactly what was needed to safeguard the good elements of Judaism until they had mixed so thoroughly with the Gentile elements that their superficial connection with Jewish observance could safely be dropped—*i.e.*, until the spirit of Judaism had so soaked into Christianity that the letter of Judaism was no longer needed.

² Philippians and Colossians show mere echoes of the struggle. In the Pastorals (if they are by St. Paul), it is not Judaistic doctrine but mere Jewish trifling that is denounced.

³ The First Epistle of St. Peter shows no sign of distinction between Jew and Gentile, and its dogmatic teaching is similar to St. Paul's. The Epistle of St. James (even if it is not from a much earlier date) is much more a polemic against the antinomianism which might falsely be deduced from Paulinism than a polemic against St. Paul himself. Jude and 2 Peter are free from any hint of the necessity of circumcision, or of the view that the observance of Mosaic Law is a superior method of life. Hebrews is steeped in Pauline feeling, and hints not obscurely that Judaism is to be renounced (viii. 13, xiii. 13). The Apocalypse may possibly be taken to exhibit a covert depreciation of St. Paul in its exaltation of the Twelve Apostles, and

overwhelmingly Gentile. An occasional Christian may remain a Jew, but the tendency to an absolute renunciation of Judaism and the Gentilizing of the Christian Church has triumphed.

In the third stage, therefore, we may say that the Church as a whole becomes predominantly Gentile, without, however, violently ridding itself of its few Jewish adherents. In the fourth stage, Judaistic Christianity comes to an end within the Church, and outside it subsides into heresies, mainly local and of small influence. Ignatius¹ roundly asserts that to use the Name of Jesus Christ and yet observe Jewish customs is absurd, or virtually a confession that we have not received grace. And Justin Martyr² tells us that in his time there were some Christian Jews whose Christianity was orthodox, and who did not proselytize among Gentile Christians; these he was personally prepared to admit to be Christians, though he says that many Christians would have nothing to do with them; but he also notices the existence of Christian Jews who deny the Virgin Birth of Christ. In fact, Judaistic Christianity had now become severed from the Catholic Church, and Ebionites and Elxaites were acknowledged heretics. None of the Ebionite communities was received into the Oriental patriarchates. The Church has by now emerged as a Catholic body, where Judaism and Gentilism are alike merged in the system of Catholic Christianity.

Such in broad outline was the course of the struggle between Jew and Gentile in the Christian Church. We must now attempt to appreciate the underlying spirit of the whole controversy, and the nature and value of the Jewish elements which were incorporated into the Church system that arose out of the struggle. And, in thus trying to estimate the debt of Christianity

is thoroughly Jewish in language and ideas; and yet its Christology is Pauline, and though it gives a certain precedence to the Jewish Christians (the 144,000), yet the Gentile Christians (the multitude of every nation and people and kindred and tongue) are redeemed not by any obedience to the Jewish Law, but simply by the blood of Christ.

¹ "Ad Magnes." x. Other Ignatian references are given in Hort's "Judaistic Christianity," lect. x.

² "Trypho," chaps. xlvii., xlviii.

to Judaism, we shall do well at the outset to clear the discussion of all the superficialities that are too often allowed to obscure the true issue. We need not concern ourselves with a history of Pharisaism, in the popular sense, within the Christian Church. The historical Jewish Pharisees were mainly characterized (1) by a high sense of obedience to written rules, (2) by a pedantic formalism that flowered into insincerity. Popular cant has forgotten their conscientiousness, and uses the term "Pharisee" as synonymous with hypocrite. In such a sense there are and have always been Pharisaic Christians. But such Pharisaism is not in any special way a Jewish heirloom. It is endemic in all religions, and is due to two universal causes: firstly, every religion, even the lowest, recommends a standard of life or belief which is above the average of the society in which it exists; and in every society there will be some people below the average who cannot rise to the standard of the religion, and therefore tend to ease the strain by finding satisfaction in mere external conformity. Secondly, every religious society is apt to suffer by success. It wins many adherents, and its membership tends to become adulterated. No doubt one religion may be more apt to breed Pharisees than another. A religion with a definite and stringent moral code is harder to practise than one with a laxer standard, and the difficulty generates evasion among the weaker members. But these would not generally profess conformity to the religion at all, if it were not for its material attractions. Thus the breeding of Pharisees eventually results as much from the circumstances of the society as from the character of the religion.

Again, we need not here inquire how far the Christian system is indebted in any of its externals to Jewish examples. It is possibly correct to say that the Christian type of hierarchical organization was originally borrowed from the Jewish synagogue, and to establish a connection between the Christian Sacraments and various Jewish rites. But these facts are not more than superficial. If the Church was to be a society at all, it was bound to have some kind of official organization, and it was

likely to borrow the framework from that system with which at the outset it was best acquainted, and from which it was historically an offshoot. Similarly, if Christianity was to be a religion at all, it was bound to provide some kind of rites and sacrifices for those who professed it. However the Christian rites originated, their spirit is a development of religious notions and an attempt to satisfy religious needs that are universal to humanity, and not specially characteristic of Judaism.

These observations having been made, we can now turn to the question which is our real concern—viz., how far the spirit of Christianity has preserved any of the spirit of Judaism; how far Christianity has perpetuated principles which can be traced to its spiritual inheritance from the Jewish Church; how far, in other words, Christianity has been able to keep a ground of appeal to the Jewish type of mind. To understand and answer this question, we must clearly recognize that the struggle, of which we have sketched the history, was a struggle between two competing types of human mind. It was more than a conflict between Nationalism and Universalism. Judaism was under no intrinsic necessity to be exclusively nationalistic. No doubt the general, as distinct from the highest, tendencies of Jewish religious feeling were best represented by the Pharisees, and the Pharisees tended to set up an ideal of bigotry and exclusiveness.¹ But occasional signs of a more liberal view are not wholly absent in popular Jewish literature.² And the highest teaching of the evangelical prophets had repudiated the crudely nationalistic idea; whilst the Judaism of the Dispersion had to some extent managed to accommodate the uncircumcised within the circumference of its membership, even if it only admitted them into the

¹ Their view is well represented in 2 Esdras vi. 55: "O Lord, Thou hast said that for our sakes Thou didst make the world. As for the other nations, which also come of Adam, Thou hast said that they are nothing, and are like unto spittle, and Thou hast likened the abundance of them unto a drop that falleth from a vessel."

² *E.g.*, Pss. Sol. xvii. 38: "The Messiah shall have mercy upon all the nations that come before Him in fear." Apoc. Bar. i. 4: "I will scatter this people among the Gentiles, that they may do good to the Gentiles."

outer ring of that circle.¹ The real issue in the early Church was not merely whether Christianity was to be externally a religion for the Jews only or for the whole world, but whether it was to appeal only to the Jewish type of mind and aspiration or to other types as well. It is the question that repeatedly occurs whenever Christianity comes into touch with new sections of the human race. Can it find a means of responding to their special kind of spiritual needs and ideas, or is it unable to discover a point of contact with them?

This question, as it first came up in Church history, took the form of a controversy between the Jewish and the "Greek" types of temperament. The issue might have been framed crudely as follows: "Is Christianity a religion for those who want a code of rules to obey, for the disciplinarian, or is it for the mystics, for those who want a new power of life by which to live? Is the Christian God the transcendent Law-giver, or the Immanent Life-giver?" Of course, the distinction between disciplinarian and mystic is not absolute, for mystics are often among the strictest conformists to set rules. Nor is it even quite just as between Jews and Greeks. There were Jews who had more than a tinge of mysticism in their composition,² and there were Greeks who lived by fixed formulae of conduct—*e.g.*, the Stoics. But, broadly speaking, and taking the average type of each side, it is not far wrong to say that the Jew was naturally disposed to a legalistic, the Greek to a mystical, view of the function of religion. And the main factors in the controversy are perhaps capable of being classified under three heads: (1) The question between Ethics and Sacraments; (2) the question between future and present; (3) the question between institutional and mystical.

1. The Jew thought of religion in terms of law, righteousness, and moral conduct. He grounded his belief upon the idea that God was a God of righteousness—*i.e.*, a God of a certain

¹ Cf. the very interesting discussion of the tendencies to liberalism among the Dispersed Jews, in K. Lake, *op. cit.*, chap. ii.

² Psalm cxxxix. is in the language of the purest mysticism. And the conception of the Shechinah made real and vivid the thought of God as dwelling presently in the midst of His people.

ethical character. His Will, therefore, was that man should live a certain kind of life. But, to be obeyed, this Will must be expressed for man in set terms. The Law was this expression; it embodied the rules which God wished man to obey, and these rules covered the whole of man's life. The natural result was the growth of a system of casuistry—viz., the tradition of the scribes, which was a practical commentary on the Mosaic Law. It had its good and its bad points. It was strongly ethical¹ and allowed no action of life to fall outside its purview, and it emphasized the duty and value of obedience and discipline. But it tended to encourage a legalistic morality,² to place shackles on the free action of the human spirit, and to foster the notion that man could by his works earn merit in the sight of God.

On the other hand, the Greek thought of religion in terms of spirit, mystery, and a presently realized life with God. For him, therefore, Sacraments were the centre of religion. He based his belief upon the human desire, innate and instinctive, for a higher power of life, for a communion with the Divine, wherein the invisible world was realized and all mysteries and all knowledge could be learnt. The mysteries and the Oriental cults professed to place man in this relation, and to produce in their devotees an ecstatic rapture, in which man became the vehicle of Divinity. This type of religion is indeed only called Greek by a misuse of language; for the Eleusinian mysteries seem undoubtedly sprung from Eastern Orphism, and the Bacchic cult was as Oriental as the later cult of Mithra. The mystery-religions are importations into genuine Hellenism. But by the time of St. Paul, Hellenism had become inextricably confused with these Oriental cults,

¹ The golden rule in its negative form was attributed to Rabbi Hillel; and another Rabbi is quoted as having said: "Be not as slaves that minister to the Lord with a view to receive recompense, but be as slaves that minister to the Lord without a view to receive recompense; and let the fear of heaven be upon you." The Sermon on the Mount is in much of its substance the lineal descendant of the best Jewish moral teaching, which was based on the conception of Divine righteousness that had grown up under the influence of Prophets, Psalms, and Law.

² The legalistic tendency should not be exaggerated. The Prophets and Psalms were still a force in the national religion. But the Law was the predominant force.

which had acclimatized themselves in the Græco-Roman world. The resulting compound is generally called Hellenistic ; and it was this type of religion which was competing with Judaism for the possession of the Christian Church. The merits of this type are the merits of Sacramentalism—*i.e.*, the emphasis on the ideas of communion with God, of eternal life as a present possession, of spiritual realities as the ultimate objects of religious aspiration ; its defects are that it encourages a depreciation of external conduct, that it lays a disproportionate stress on excitement,¹ and that, in its less violent forms, it is compatible with a selfish quietism. The only mystery-religion which had any clear ethical feeling was Mithraism ; and this had not yet risen into prominence by St. Paul's time.

These, then, are the two types in one aspect ; and it is from this point of view that the question assumed its most patent importance in the Early Church. All St. Paul's discussions of faith and works, law and grace, are concerned with this underlying problem—*viz.*, that he had to present Christianity as a sacramental religion, mainly because the Sacraments were of Christ's own institution, but also because that was the only type of religion likely to appeal to his Gentile hearers ; and that nevertheless he had to avoid the danger of an unethical sacramentalism, in which mystery might become magic by being divorced from all relation to practical conduct.

2. The Jewish religion was strongly eschatological. The whole outlook of the Old Testament, from Genesis to Malachi, is forward. And the Apocalyptic literature only added detail, colour, and definition to the Messianic hope. The Jewish Christian did not renounce this hope in embracing Christianity. To him the expectation of the Parousia of Christ was absolutely central. The Pauline Epistles are full of this idea, and the Apocalypse closes on the promise, "Behold, I come quickly." Thus, like the Jews, the Jewish Christians believed in a future

¹ Though we owe to the Oriental cults that they legitimized the element of rapture in religion, which Hellenic and Roman religion alike tended to discourage.

resurrection, though they conceived of this as physical in its nature. On the other hand, the Greek expected a present rapture into eternal life, without the intervention of death, through the mysteries. None of the mystery-religions seems to have had any idea of a general resurrection of the dead. Mithraism again is the only exception, but, as has been said, this had not yet come into vogue in the world of St. Paul. The Greeks, therefore, on the whole did not look to a future completion, but expected it now and at once. To obtain it was the object of their mysteries, and their conceptions of immortality were therefore exceedingly vague, whilst the idea of a future Messianic reign was quite foreign to their thought.

Here, again, Christianity had to make up its mind. Was it to make eternal life future or present? Was it to relegate communion with God to the after-life, or to make it a possible possession of this life? St. Paul's dealing with the problem is contained especially in 1 Cor. xv. He mediates between the two views.¹ Eternal life begins now, at baptism, in which the Christian at once enters into a share of the life of Christ risen through death. But, because this life is eternal, therefore physical death can make no difference to it. The dead Christian is not extinguished; and there will be a resurrection in the Parousia, when the Christians will rise in bodies of spiritual substance, and the Messianic Kingdom will be inaugurated. That this would soon take place was St. Paul's and the primitive Christian belief. But, as the event delayed, the Christians learnt to project their expectation into the distant future, and to lay more stress on the present possession of eternal life; though at the same time they never renounced the eschatological hope.

3. The third question is not that of a social *versus* an individualistic religion. Both types were social: the Jewish type by its character as the religion of a nation; the Greek mysteries as being the rites of a brotherhood. The question is rather that of a religion of authority *versus* a religion of the spirit,

¹ Cf. K. Lake, *op. cit.*, chap. iv.

and is indeed only another form of the difference between ethical and sacramental religion. The Greek asked for the power of a new nature and a direct relation to the Divine. He cared nothing, therefore, for constituted authority in religion; that became unnecessary, since the god could communicate directly with him. His priest was a mere hierophant. Nor did the Greek care for a historical basis to his creed. In this respect he was more modernist than the most rabid exponent of the latest modernism. The Divine voice within could speak through the most mythically-based mysteries, and that was all that he asked for. But the Jew asked for a constituted authority and mandate. The Scribes and Pharisees were real legislators of his moral code and authorized teachers of his religious belief. Thus the Jew was appealed to by a religion embodied in an institution. So, too, he never forgot that his religion was intimately connected with the national history. The basis of the Mosaic Law was that God had spoken to Moses on Sinai. The basis of the Temple ritual lay in the historical legislation of the Pentateuch. The substratum of Jewish religion was the national history of God's relation to the Jewish people.

These being the issues in the problem of early Christianity, it becomes easy to see that the Church has attempted to compromise between the two sides. The sacramental theory has on the whole been dominant, but with a very large admixture of the ethical interest. The idea of a presently realized eternal life has been paramount, and yet the eschatological hope has never been abandoned. If we consider the debt of Christianity to Judaism under the same three heads, we find: (1) That Christianity inherited its moral standard from the Jewish spirit. It is hard for us to realize that licence and obscenity could ever have been a constitutive element in religious practice. And the fact of our difficulty is a measure of the power which the ethical outlook of Judaism has exercised on Christianity. For the Hellenistic religions were in general avowedly tolerant of ceremonial and ritual immorality; and Christianity had a very hard fight to quell this tendency among its Gentile converts. The Epistles

to Corinth show the danger ; and it was constantly recurring. Gnosticism and Manichæism were in certain forms but recrudescences of the old theory. The Church conquered the tendency and adjudged the sects who professed such a theory to be heretical ; the body was the temple of the Holy Ghost, and moral conduct was a proper verification of spiritual faith. And it owed this view to the Jewish influence working in St. Paul and the other early leaders to produce a repulsion from any theory which seemed to weaken the moral demands of God.¹

2. The eschatological hope which Christianity inherited from Judaism served at first to produce in Christians an other-worldly detachment from the life of their time. But thereby, as the organization of the Græco-Roman world fell to pieces, the Church was enabled to survive by the mere fact of its aloofness from that culture.² And in time, when it was realized that the hope of a new world in the near future was an illusion, the expectation became an ideal. The Messianic kingdom, which had been anticipated as near at hand, became the ideal for which the world was gradually to prepare. The Church was able to hold up an other-worldly picture before mankind, as that which was to be the end of their efforts to better this world ; and so it became a force of practical improvement of the present.

3. The Jewish desire for a historical and institutional basis for religion remained in two forms within the Christian Church. In the first place, Christianity was saved from evaporating into nebulous vagueness by the growth of the New Testament Canon, which provided the historical groundwork of the Christian Creed. Thus the Church was enabled to reject the fancies of Montanism and all other tendencies which aimed at substituting mere personal ecstasy and inspiration for a religion with a basis in a historical act of revelation. In the second

¹ Cf. Glover, "Conflict of Religions in Early Roman Empire," chap v. : "It was the Jew who brought to the common Christian stock the conception of sin," etc.

² This is the point which is brought out in illuminating fashion in K. Lake, *op. cit.*, chap. vii. *ad fin.*, and in this paragraph I have done little more than summarize his arguments.

place, Christianity became the religion of an organized Body, with rules and rites and officers. This characteristic degenerated often enough into Ecclesiasticism, whereby the society is exalted at the expense of its head, and the Church becomes the source of rule instead of being the organ of Christ's government. But, apart from such perversions, there is no doubt that the coherent organization of the Church was the fact which helped it to keep Christian tradition, faith, and practice, articulate, definite, and systematic.

In order to show more clearly the value of our Jewish inheritance, we may take the instance of one Christian doctrine, and that the doctrine which superficially might seem the most alien to Jewish and most akin to Hellenistic modes of thought. The doctrine of the Holy Spirit is the basis of all Christian mysticism. The Holy Spirit is the source of personal inspiration, working within man, unseen and uncontrolled by him, working through the rapture of prayer and the mysterious media of the Sacraments, to produce in man the sense of God's presence, to raise his being to a higher power by the communication of the Divine Life, to enable him to realize freely here and now the eternal life which he seeks. So far the doctrine is, though on a higher plane of theology, at one with the mystery-religions, speaking much the same language, and moving in the same range of ideas; and so far everything is vague; ecstatic communion, inarticulate rapture, a sensation of new life, so far we are taken, but not much farther. But the Christian doctrine has also its other, its Jewish, side. The Holy Spirit is connected with the historic Incarnation, the Spirit is the Spirit of Christ. He is also the Spirit of righteousness, and the fruits of the Spirit are seen in the moral qualities of a particular character, the character which is after the pattern of the historic Jesus. He is, moreover, the Spirit of an articulate Church life, the Spirit of unity and order and method, and His normal working is through the society to each individual member of it. He is the Spirit of Life, but of an organic life, of that life which fills the Body of Christ, and so is imparted to each member of that Body.

Thus the Spirit gives not only new life, but a new life of a special ethical character, by its historic basis in the historic Incarnation, and its institutional medium of operation in the divinely ordained society.

Thus the Jewish spirit survives in Christianity to save its doctrines from the form which they might have taken, if the Hellenistic spirit had been allowed to prevail undiluted and unmitigated. It is clear enough that this was a real danger. The constant warnings to "try the spirits"¹ make it plain that there was among the early Christians a great output of ecstatic prophesying and utterance, which needed regulation and testing. The phenomena of Montanism show the danger actually coming to a head. And modern instances of sudden and ecstatic conversion continue to illustrate the fact that such a type of inspiration is not always accompanied by a real change of practical conduct. Similarly, as has been said, the occurrences alluded to in the Corinthian Epistles are evidence that early Christianity was not free from danger of lax morality under the pretext of religion, and this danger, too, came to a head in some sects of Gnosticism and Manichæism. Christianity, therefore, while trying to meet the demand for a mystical, personal, spiritual religion, yet tried to avoid the exaggerations which might attend on an exclusive regard to this demand, by laying a strong emphasis on the historical basis and moral outcome of Christian Faith. As such, it is debtor to both Jew and Greek. To the Greek it owes² its mystical spirit, its insistence on personal faith, and on the direct relation of God to each soul

¹ Cf. 1 Cor. xii. 3; 1 Thess. v. 20, 21; 2 Pet. ii. 1; 1 John iv. 1. They recur in later Christian literature—e.g., Didache xii. 1. Cf. my "Studies in Apostolic Christianity," p. 85 *et seq.*

² I would not be understood to assert that these elements were additions to the "simple Gospel" of Jesus Christ. They are all implicit or explicit in that Gospel. All that Christianity is and shall be it owes to Christ. But it was these two types of mind which respectively looked in His Gospel for these respective elements, and insisted on their importance. That is, indeed, the result of every new accession to the Christian Church. Every new convert or section of converts has to elicit from Christ the elements in His Gospel which specially appeal to them; this is the work of the Holy Spirit; and so the full-orbed truth of our Lord's revelation may at last be seen perfected.

whom He inspires. To the Jew it owes its strong ethical sentiment, its insistence upon its historical foundation, and its institutional system. To the Greek, it owes its belief that God is the immanent fount of spiritual life in the soul; to the Jew, its belief that God is the transcendent ruler and law-giver of the Universe. From the Greek, it has learnt to know the present as days of Communion with Eternity; from the Jew, it has learnt to anticipate the future as the Day of ultimate Judgment. It is thus an attempt at a synthesis of two opposite elements. We may, if we like, accept Mr. Houston Chamberlain's language,¹ and call it "a hybrid." But it is a hybrid because it aims at covering both sides of life—the inward and the outward. It declares that conduct by itself is not enough, that conduct must have a soul, a motive-power in the rapture of communion with God; but it declares also that feeling, however exalted, must have a body, a means of expression in the life of obedience, discipline, and fellowship. It resists, by the force of its Greek inheritance, the tendency to externalize religious principle, to make religion a mere system of acts, with the propensity of such a view to encourage formalism, precision, casuistry, and dry pedantry. But it also resists, by the force of its Jewish inheritance, the tendency to evaporate religious practice, to make religion a mere series of emotions, with the propensity of that view to generate vagueness, inarticulateness, indiscipline, and intoxicated sensationalism. It teaches that God is a Father, that man is saved by the blood of Christ, and that the Holy Spirit is the life-giver. But it also teaches that God is the God of Love and Holiness, that Christ is a definite historical individual of a definite ethical character, and that the life which the Holy Spirit imparts must bear fruit in a character and conduct after the model of Christ.

Thus it combines the appeal to both types of mind, and tries to provide a response to both types of need. And in doing so

¹ In that most interesting and suggestive but somewhat irritatingly pretentious and prejudiced book, "The Foundations of the Nineteenth Century."

it shows its right to call itself so far a really Catholic religion. The question was to arise again in other contexts for answer. In the age of the Teutonic conversions, the Church had to show that it was able also to consecrate their manly virtues of fortitude, courage, independence, and self-respect, and that so it was a religion for them as well as for Jew and Greek.¹ And in the present time it is faced with the duty of discovering and formulating the right relations, in which it can find room for the stored wisdom and traditional qualities of the ancient Oriental nations, while at the same time the extraordinary speed with which western culture and civilization are developing new thoughts and aspirations presents the Church with another problem in adaptation. In each case the question is that of Catholicity, not in the narrow sense in which the word is abused by party and denomination, but in the wider and truer sense, viz., the question whether Christianity can prove itself to be a religion for all mankind, by being able to assimilate and consecrate the various characteristics which each nation in turn bring to it, and so to build up the Body of Christ to that fulness, in which every joint, according to the working in due measure of each several part, supplies its share in the fit framing and knitting together of the whole Body, and in the increasing of it unto the building up of it in love.

¹ This is the truth which has been felt, but perversely worked out, in Mr. Garrod's interesting essay, entitled "Christian, Greek, or Goth?" in his book of studies called "The Religion of all Good Men."

