

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 Expositor* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php

ately wicked"—and that every man is responsible for his own sin only.¹

He was not able, however, to advance far in this direction. His great successor, Ezekiel, advanced much further, recognising not only that the seat of evil is in the individual heart, but that the hope of righteousness lies in a change of heart—that the only cure for degeneration is regeneration. It is only, however, in the New Testament that we find the perfect balance of both sides of the truth. In the teaching of Jesus the individual is always the *prius*; he stands apart from all and transacts directly with God; a single soul is more precious than the whole world; and there is joy in heaven over one sinner that repenteth. Yet religion, though it begins, does not end here. Christians are members one of another; together they form one body; and the founding of the kingdom of God, by the regeneration of society, is the common task of the Christian society.

JAMES STALKER.

HORT'S LECTURES ON "JUDAISTIC CHRISTIANITY." ²

It is not too much to say that, from Eusebius to Neander, Church historians, generally, treated "Judaistic Christianity" as a topic which scarcely demanded notice. It was enough to know that the "Fathers" regarded this phase of Christian development as heretical. It was no part of the original inheritance, but a pretentious and troublesome intrusion into it.

Neander, and his pupil F. C. Baur, however, brought this despised section of original Christendom into notable

¹ xxxi. 29, 30.

² *Judaistic Christianity*, a course of Lectures by the late F. J. A. Hort, D.D. London: Macmillan, 1894.

prominence. The latter made this stone which the builders had rejected the head-stone of the corner. His hypothesis failed, first, because it was placed in subservience to an *a priori* philosophical system. The Hegelian thesis, anti-thesis, and synthesis were to explain everything. But, secondly, when the Tübingen scheme reduced the books of the New Testament to the level of second-century forgeries, it forfeited credibility. Considering that the theory of Baur and Schwegler—especially in its details—has been so completely refuted by later critics, it is remarkable that its effects should have been so wide and extensive.

The change of attitude towards the long-observed elements in primitive church history, to which we refer, has been much more conspicuously recognised abroad than in our own country. R. Rothe, in his celebrated *Anfänge*, felt himself required to account for the phenomena of Jewish Christianity. Every one knows how closely M. Renan followed the Tübingen School. But the most important contribution to the whole subject—as Dr. Hort allowed—is that which A. Ritschl made in his *Entstehung der altkatholischen Kirche*. In his second edition (1857) Ritschl revoked some important opinions advanced in the earlier publication of the book, and clearly revealed the innate weakness of the original scheme of Baur and Schwegler. But he also brought into clear light the reality of that great division in the Primitive Church. Ritschl's investigations have not been without effect upon the later representatives of the Tübingen School—as Hilgenfeld, Weizsäcker and Pfeiderer—who have produced the theory with various modifications. Dr. Hort notices also the dependence of the late Bishop Lightfoot on Ritschl, to whom Bishop Westcott and other English writers have, in their turn, been indebted.

Notwithstanding its importance and interest, however, the history of the first age of the Church has not attracted

much original enquiry amongst ourselves. Dr. Hort had no English book to recommend to his students as their guide in its study except Lightfoot's *Essays*. They might read Lechler, Ewald, and Schürer, now translated, but Ritschl's standard work—as does Rothe's *Anfänge*—remains in the original German.¹

English readers are, therefore, greatly indebted to the literary executors of Dr. Hort for their publication of these Lectures. "These Lectures were not, I believe" (the Editor says), "primarily designed for publication, but they afforded a convenient opportunity for summarizing and bringing to a focus the results of a life-time devoted to the patient and single-minded consideration of these fundamental questions" (Pref.) A more formal treatise would, no doubt, have supplied more fully the evidence on which conclusions have been reached, and some points would have been more fully elaborated. The area traversed is very extensive, and all available information has been carefully considered: but to concentrate so much learning and argument, into the space of a volume of two hundred pages, is a feat which no genius less lucid and well-controlled than that of Dr. Hort could have accomplished.

We shall best serve the interests of our readers if we briefly indicate the judgment of Dr. Hort on the principal topics included in his survey of the subject, and afterwards refer, a little more at length, to certain matters on which the lecturer's verdict may be open to criticism.

I.

Dr. Hort begins with a study of "Christ and the Law." Our Lord did not direct His followers to leave Judaism:

¹ Dr. Hort's Editor, Mr. I. O. F. Murray, M.A., refers also to the recent translation of Weizsäcker's *Apostolische Zeitalter*, and of Harnack's *Dogmengeschichte*. He does not appear to be aware of any English book which discusses the subject of Dr. Hort's lectures.

He said that He had come to fulfil, and not to destroy the law. To "fulfil," however, was not to observe the letter, but to cultivate the spirit. "The Gospel calls not for less righteousness, but for more." The law "remained binding within its own limits, but it was to be filled out and deepened with a new spirit."

Turning next to the narrative of the "Acts," the lecturer remarks that the word *κοινωνία* (Acts ii. 42) is not to be joined with *τῶν ἀποστόλων*, as in the Revised Version. "It must be some outward expression of the new fellowship with the general body of the Christian believers, answering to the special relation to the apostles." Again, in Acts xi. 30, "Hellenists" is a better reading than "Hellenes," and it suits the facts, inasmuch as there is a solemn and more distinct reference to the occasion on which Paul "turned to the Gentiles." The incident at Antioch in Pisidia "is the true turning-point at which a Gentile Christianity formally and definitely begins, and so a Judaic Christianity becomes possible." Yet the Hellenes in the Syrian Antioch, if not precisely *Hellenists*, might yet be attendants at the synagogue.

The "decree" (Acts xv.), was not made up of the "seven commandments of the sons of Noah," nor were they "Levitical injunctions which the Pentateuch itself makes binding on strangers," or "concessions to the Judaic side." They were intended to guard against the uncleanness of idolatry, and to represent the feeling of mystery entertained with regard to blood. The forbidding of "things strangled" is not easy to explain. However, the decree was local in its effects, and was seldom referred to in the later history. In regard to the demand for circumcision, Dr. Hort remarks that Paul consented that Timothy should submit to the rite because he was already a Jew in all but that, and conformity would assist him in mission work. But Titus was not circumcised (Gal. ii. 3). Here Dr. Hort has

changed the view which he formerly held, viz., that Titus was circumcised, but not by compulsion.

In regard to "St. Paul and the Three," Dr. Hort holds that "what St. Paul rebuked (Gal. ii. 11) was not a doctrinal but a moral aberration of St. Peter; he was simply unfaithful to his own convictions." Since St. Paul continued to be on good terms with those in Jerusalem, it may be inferred that St. Peter and the rest considered him to be in the right. The attitude of St. James is not quite so clear. If he held that "a man must become a Jew in order to become a Christian . . . we should have evidence here of a fundamental difference between the leaders of the Apostolic Church"; but the New Testament does not go so far as this. Still, that "certain came from James" to Antioch suggests "some direct responsibility on his part." At any rate there was no hypocrisy with James, "though there might be retrogression." We shall return, however, to this critical point.

The lecturer passes over the schism at Corinth, but allows that those who called themselves "of Cephas" might have looked towards the Jerusalem apostles. When reviewing the circumstances connected with St. Paul's last visit to Jerusalem, Dr. Hort strangely fails to quote the important passage—"Thou seest, brother, how many thousands there are among the Jews of them which have believed; and they are all zealous for the law." We venture to think that if that statement of St. James had been fully considered, Dr. Hort could scarcely have spoken of the "duality within Christendom" as "temporary" (p. 83).

Dr. Hort thinks that in the commotion which led to St. Paul's arrest the Jewish Christians were excited by the unbelieving Jews. He says that the "offering" of St. Paul was "possibly in connection with a previous vow, possibly also, I cannot but suspect, in connection with the Gentile contribution to the Jewish Church." But one cannot easily

see how an offering in the temple should be an appropriate celebration of the Gentile generosity to Jewish Christians ; and *v.* 26—“ Until the offering was offered for every one of them ”—seems, necessarily, to connect the Apostle with the four men who had, like him, a vow.

The “ philosophy ” referred to in Colossians ii. 18 “ is not a speculative theosophy lying outside of Jewish usages, but as embodying the plea put forward on their behalf.” Dr. Hort modified the opinion he formerly held—with Lightfoot, Ritschl, and Rothe—that the Colossian heresy was due to Essene influences. There is no plain evidence of the prevalence of Essenism outside of Palestine, the “ Therapeutæ ” of Philo are a problem yet ; magic, so rife in Asia, was not specially practised by the Essenes ; and the fourth Sybilline book, which might have thrown some light on the subject, was possibly by a Hemero-Baptist. The Judaizing movement at Colosse was thoroughly legal and involved circumcision ; but had some new elements as angel-worship, and also some lower views of the personality of Christ.

The pastoral epistles also are from St. Paul, notwithstanding features “ which legitimately provoke suspicion.” The “ Gnosis ” (1 Tim. vi. 20) was not that of the second century, though its elements existed. As might be expected, Dr. Hort’s discussion on the supposed formulæ of Gnosticism is worthy of careful study.

The Epistle of James belongs to the apostolic age, and was written by the head of the Church at Jerusalem. It replies to “ a misuse or misunderstanding of St. Paul’s teaching,” and, therefore, was not an early composition. It was addressed to the Jews of the dispersion, and the Gentiles are simply left out of the account. But it is not safe to assume, he says (notwithstanding *συναγωγή*, ii. 2), that they formed distinct congregations from those of the Gentile Christians. Hegesippus may have borrowed his account of James from Ebionitic sources, in which (though, in general,

confirmed by Josephus) there are differences of date and detail which make it uncertain.

St. Peter, writing probably from Rome, gives a more universal teaching. He "writes as one whose commission is universal," and "all that Palestinian Christianity represented is out of sight." "There is no trace of transitional conditions." On the other hand, the Epistle to the Hebrews was intended for the Christians in Palestine. The writer does not speak of the spiritual fulfilment of the Mosaic law, but of its entire abrogation. Yet it is not clear that the Jews are asked to separate themselves from their unbelieving countrymen, though they are bidden to "accept the position without the camp." The Apocalypse also indicates the recognition of all Christians as belonging to the true Israel.

In this too brief review of the interpretations, given by Dr. Hort, of the critical moments in the history of the Apostolic Church, it may be seen that the points to be considered are numerous and debatable. Their solution will depend very much upon the standpoint of the enquirer. Dr. Hort's view of the general question undoubtedly is that although the Jewish Christians were temporarily separated from the Pauline churches, yet they were really one with them; and, at the end of the apostolic age, Peter and John addressed all believers as members of the same Church.

II.

We now turn to Dr. Hort's review of the history of the Church of Jerusalem after the destruction of the city. The chief witness is Hegesippus (in Eusebius), who seems to have derived his information from a lost Ebionite work, "The Steps of James." Hegesippus was not a Jewish Christian in the strict sense. One of his observations about "things which no eye can see" was not anti-Pauline, as the Tübingen writers affirmed, but was spoken against

Gnostics, who regularly used such phraseology. The Hebrew descent of Hegesippus is, says Dr. Hort, merely an inference by Eusebius; and, with Ritschl, Weizsäcker, and most recent authorities, he regards him as a Catholic Christian.

Eusebius (*Hist. Eccles.*, iv. 3), gives a list of fourteen bishops who came after James into the presidency of the Church of Jerusalem. This information he supplies from Hegesippus. But Eusebius, and most of the older authorities, assert that the Christians of Jerusalem retired from the city before its destruction, and fled to Pella beyond the Jordan. Did they remain there? If so, the "fourteen bishops" were really elected and stationed over the Church there, though it might still be known as the "Church of Jerusalem."

It is, however, generally assumed that the Jewish Christians returned from Pella, and though exposed to many dangers, re-established themselves among the ruins of the fallen city. Here the fourteen successors of James presided over a trembling flock until the revolt of Bar-Cocheba and the victory of Hadrian scattered both the shepherds and the sheep. From that time, A.D. 140, the Church at Jerusalem was chiefly Gentile, and had a Gentile bishop. Jewish Christianity of the apostolic type disappeared from the scene.

Dr. Hort, however, is of opinion that "sooner or later, a more or less complete return from Pella to Jerusalem must have taken place, unless Hegesippus' account of the death of Symeon and of later bishops is a fiction, which is most unlikely" (p. 177). But Eusebius does not mention this return, and we may therefore suppose that Hegesippus did not. All that the latter says of the Church and its bishops may have referred to its history in Pella. The only direct evidence which Dr. Hort adduces for this return is from Epiphanius (*De Mens. et Pond.*, xiv., xv.). The latter states that Aquila, the translator, was converted by the teaching

and miracles of Christians from Pella while he was residing in Jerusalem. But this account is not generally credited. Moreover, it is said that Aquila's translation was accepted by the Ebionites, and that circumstance places him outside the circle of such Jewish Christians as Dr. Hort supposes went to Pella. He says (p. 175) that the migration to Pella "would probably consist mainly of those who best represented the position formerly taken by St. James, and those whom the Epistle to the Hebrews had persuaded to loosen their hold on the ancient observances." It is not very likely that Christians of this class would have influenced the Jewish Aquila.

But Epiphanius also says that when Hadrian came to the city he found it levelled, with the exception of a few buildings, among which was "the upper room" in which the apostles first met. Even of this mythical structure, however, he only says that there was "a small church." Then elsewhere (*Haer.*, xxix., xxx.), he describes the Nazarenes and the Ebionites as dwelling in Coelo-Syria—"in Decapolis about Pella," for the disciples, after the overthrow of the city had "spent their time there" (*διέτριβον*). Thus Epiphanius contradicts himself, or, at most, only says that a "small church" of fugitives found shelter in the *débris* of the ruined city, while the majority remained in Pella and its vicinity. It is too much to suppose that the feeble congregation at Jerusalem, to which he refers, had fourteen bishops, if it existed at all.

But Rothe, Ritschl, Lechler, and Lightfoot do not refer to this supposed "return." The last two certainly imply that the Gentile Church of *Ælia Capitolina* was the natural and direct descendant of the Church of Jerusalem; but by doing this they confound two things which essentially differ. Neither do we find any help in another suggestion of Dr. Hort's. He says (p. 175) that "through an attack of Vespasian the country about Pella was taken, and the

Christian colony, which had already reached the place, was swept away, A.D. 68." But how then shall we account for the testimony of Epiphanius that the disciples dwelt there, and that the Nazarenes abounded there in after days? Who, in this case, was Aristo of Pella, whom Lightfoot and Hort delight to regard as a specimen of the reformed Jewish Church? Nay, who was Hegesippus himself?

But here we come upon a second and yet more important question: Did the Jewish Christians forsake Judaism? As we have seen, Dr. Hort replies in the affirmative. With Dr. Lightfoot, he thinks that this was one effect of the destruction of the city, and the entire subversion of the ritual of the temple. Yet, they are compelled to allow that the fourteen bishops after James were all of the "circumcision"—and that does not encourage the view that Judaism became of no account. To escape this difficulty Ritschl points to the time of Hadrian as the period when the great transition occurred. He has the authority of Sulpitius Severus (*Histor.*, c. 31) on his side, who says that then "the Church of Jerusalem had no presbyter except of the circumcision," and that Hadrian's exclusion of Jews "benefitted the Christian faith, because almost all then believed in Christ as God while continuing in the observance of the law." The actual significance and value of this testimony of Sulpitius has been much discussed; but, at any rate, it is clear that if the Jewish Christians did not forsake the "Law" until the times of Hadrian, it was not the destruction of the city under Vespasian, seventy years before, which produced the great change. Lechler was so impressed with the difficulties of the situation that he finally concluded that the change was *gradual*. The objection to this view is, that positive evidence of any change at all is entirely absent.

Aristo of Pella is generally referred to (Lightfoot, *Galat.*,

p. 152, etc.) as one who, while he held the Catholic doctrine, was yet a Jewish Christian. But too little is known of him to base any serious argument upon it. He had a Greek name, which was without Jewish associations, as in the case of Hegesippus. Bishop Lightfoot adduces also the "Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs," which Ritschl once attributed to a Pauline Christian; but, subsequently, ascribed to an orthodox Jewish Christian. We observe that Dr. Hort omits all reference to this singular document. Recent criticism has disclosed so much interpolation in it, that it is now believed to have been a Jewish composition, which was manipulated for Christian purposes. Its withdrawal imparts a serious loss to the scheme respecting the Jewish Christians which Bishop Lightfoot propounded. At the same time we must not forget how very superior was the position taken by the learned and lamented bishop on this whole subject to that which had prevailed. It may be said that the scientific investigation into the history and constitution of the primitive Church was introduced in England by Dr. Lightfoot.

It is not difficult to understand why there should have been a strong desire to prove that the great schism in the apostolic Church was not permanent. Such a fact would reflect strangely upon the conception of unity which has been, and is by many still so largely held. It would also imply, as Ritschl says, that the "Catholic Church" began to treat as heretics those who followed most literally the example of the twelve apostles. But "facts are stubborn things," and Dr. Hort was too candid and truth-loving to reject them even when they threatened theories he sincerely cherished. Let us quote his own words:

"Till the voice of God was heard in quite other accents, a Palestinian Church could not but be more or less a Judaic Church. This temporary duality within Christendom is constantly overlooked or misunderstood: but, if we think a

little on the circumstances of the case, we must see that it was inevitable. Moreover, the dualism can never have been sharp and absolute, on account of the existence of the Diaspora. Little as we know in detail of the religious life of ordinary circumcised Jews of the Dispersion, it is plain that when they became Christians their manner of life must have been intermediate between that of Palestinian Christians and Gentile Christians " (p. 83).

Here we find Dr. Hort in full recognition of the "duality within Christendom," which extended from the first missionary journey of St. Paul until A.D. 70. But even this "duality" was itself double: for there was first the difference between the Jewish Christian and the Gentile believer in general; and secondly, there was the variety presented by the Diasporic Jewish Christians who were "intermediate" between the strict Jewish Christian and the free Gentile Christian. The genuine "unity" of the period was without doubt that of St. Paul's composite churches, where both Jew and Gentile met in one fellowship, rather than that of the Church of Jerusalem which received no Gentiles. But even this "unity" was "temporary." The Gentile element in the Pauline churches gained the ascendancy, and "Judaistic Christianity" was excluded from the Gentile churches of the second century. Instead of the "duality within Christendom" being only "temporary," we venture to think that it was an abiding condition so long as the Jewish Christians were regarded as anything but heretics. When Catholic unity was attained in the second century, the "dualism" which Peter and Paul had recognised was suppressed; and, as Justin, Ignatius, Aristides, and the Epistle to Diognetus show, the traffic with Judaism was considered to be schismatical if not heretical. By Irenæus and Origen, Jewish Christianity was known only as the system of the Ebionites, who were held to be heretical.

We may express the hope that Dr. Hort's "Judaistic Christianity" will stimulate many in England to a fresh study of the facts of apostolic and sub-apostolic history. The appeal to the "Primitive Church" will become much more real and decisive when we know more precisely what the actual conditions were. At the beginning of the inquiry no one can afford to slight the final words of the late Bishop of Durham, in his *Epistle to the Galatians* (p. 374): "However great may be the theological differences and religious animosities of our own time, they are far surpassed in magnitude by the destructions of an age which, closing our eyes to facts, we are apt to invest with an ideal excellence."

W. F. SLATER.

THE SPEECHES IN CHRONICLES.

A REPLY.

THE article upon "The Speeches in Chronicles," from the pen of Professor Driver, which appeared in the April number of the EXPOSITOR, demands from me some words of reply, (1) because he has misrepresented or misunderstood my meaning, and based most of his argument—indeed (p. 255) he challenges me upon—such misrepresentation; (2) because I venture to differ from some of his pronouncings upon the idiomatic character of certain speeches; (3) because I wish to refute the unworthy charge of *suppressio veri*. In so doing, I hope that I "may succeed, incidentally, in placing before students some facts that may interest them."

I. For the sake of clearness, let me put in parallel columns my own words and Dr. Driver's quotation from them.