

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

Master of Sacred Theology Thesis

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

1-1-1928

Hellenism and Christianity

Philip Albrecht

Concordia Seminary, St. Louis

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/stm>



Part of the [Religious Thought, Theology and Philosophy of Religion Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Albrecht, Philip, "Hellenism and Christianity" (1928). *Master of Sacred Theology Thesis*. 594.
<https://scholar.csl.edu/stm/594>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Concordia Seminary Scholarship at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master of Sacred Theology Thesis by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact seitzw@csl.edu.

OUTLINE.

Hellenism and Christianity.

Introduction.

1. Definition of Hellenism.

2. Scope of term.

Hellenism and Christianity

A thesis

presented to the faculty of

Concordia Seminary,

St. Louis, Mo.

by

Philip Albrecht.

in partial fulfilment of the

requirements for the degree

of

Master of Sacred Theology. 1928.

O U T L I N E.

Hellenism and Christianity. (continued).

of

III. Hellenistic Christianity in Jerusalem.

Hellenism and Christianity.

Intrôduction.

1. Definition of Hellenism.
2. Usage of term.
 - a. wider sense, -Greek culture. (cities)
 - b. narrow sense, - proselytes, Jews of Diaspora.
 - c. present use. (meaning of Hellenic and Hellenistic)
 - d. use in Scripture, -Grecians; Hellenists.
 - e. indirect references. Synagog and congregation.
3. Hellenistic Judaism.
 - a. conquest of Alexander - beginning of Hellenism.
 - b. causes of Dispersion. (Deportation, Spirit of people)
 - c. effect of Dispersion, -proselytizing.
 - d. later history.
 - x. under Ptolemies. Jews prospered. LXX made.
 - y. under Seleucidae. Battle with Hellenism. Onias
 - z. under Maccabees. Victory of orthodox party.
 - e. Hellenism under Rome.
 - x. condition of Rome.
 1. religious. Decline. Reformation of Augustus.
 2. political, -lack of spirit.
 3. social. Low morality. (literature)
 4. a suicide of a nation, -general darkness.
 - y. Diaspora under this government.

I. Hellenic Influences on Judaism. -fusing of thought.

1. Influence on the Jewish masses.
 - a. entry through Hellenistic Judaism. Emigrants returning
 - b. education and literature. (current events; schools)
 - c. political conditions. Government - taxes - revolts.
 - d. religious influence. External, -favoured spread.
2. Influence on the upper classes.
 - a. intellectual, -studied pagan writers. (Paul)
 - b. political. Sanhedrin subjected.
 - c. religious. Negative effect except through Hellenists
3. The synagog, a means of spreading Hellenism.
 - a. origin of the synagog. Beginning and extent.
 - b. the synagog and synagog schools. Growth; effect.
 - c. influence of the synagog. (on Gentile; on Christians)

II. Hellenism and Judaism (as a Basis for Christianity)

1. Judaism.
 - a. Jesus' life and teaching. A Jew among Jews.
 - b. Judaism in Jerusalem. Strong and strict.
 - c. Peter and Paul. Observed the Law.
2. Hellenism.
 - a. tendency of Hellenism. Disregard for temple cult.
 - b. associations in terminology. Christ; Lord.
 - c. Paul as Hellenist teacher. (religious liberty).

Outline for

Hellenism and Christianity. (continued).

III. Hellenistic Christianity in Jerusalem.

1. The early congregation. (especially Hellenists).
 - a. Conditions for its rise. Classes of people.
 - b. beginning. Disciples. Hellenism in Jerusalem.
 - c. development. Pentecost. (among 5000).
 - d. components. Hellenistic synagog, Act 6,9;9,29, *ity.*
 - e. state of affairs at Acts 6,1. Hellenists in minority
2. The Seven Hellenist Deacons.
 - a. choosing, - by congregation.
 - b. class. Hellenists, Judaists, or Pröselytes.
 - c. duties. Distributors of charity. Preachers.
3. Stephen, the Hellenist preacher.
 - a. preaching in the synagogs. (Hellenistic synagogs).
 - b. accusation. Destruction of the temple.
 - c. Stephen's defense. Story of Israel, Denunciation. *Proof*
 - d. opponents of Stephen. Political leaders.
 - e. execution. Interruption of speech.
 - f. difference in dealing of Jews. Stephen vs Peter & John. *John*
4. The Persecution following his death.
 - a. against Hellenistic Christians. Judaists remained.
 - b. Saul of Tarsus. Hellenist persecuting Hellenists.
 - c. Persecution not against Palestinian Christians.
 - d. dispersion of Hellenists. Judaea, Samaria, and onward *onward*
 - e. some Hellenists remained. Barnabas; Cilicians.
5. Council of Jerusalem.
 - a. Judaism. Strict observance of ceremonies.
 - b. Paul and Barnabas. Report at Jerusalem.
 - c. Argument of Peter and motion of James.
 - d. Result of Council. Independence and religious liberty. *Liberty*
6. Conditions till Destruction.
 - a. Judaism stationary. Under James.
 - b. Ascendency of Hellenism. Foundation of church.

IV. The Spread of Hellenistic Christianity.

1. Factors in this spread.
 - a. command of Jesus. Judaea, Samaria, and the world.
 - b. experience of Apostles. Gentiles more readily believe *believe*
 - c. language. Hellenistic Greek simple and universal.
 - d. Roman government. Travel safe; cosmopolitanism.
2. Palestine.
 - a. Judaea. Much preaching here. Philip; Peter.
 - b. Samaria. Philip: Samaria. Peter: Caesarea.
 - c. Galilee. (by inference only)
 - d. after 70 A.D. Epistle to Hebrew. Dispersion of Jews. *Hebrew*
3. Paul, the missionary to the Gentiles.
 - a. chosen for the work. (Ananias).
 - b. Hellenistic Jew. Neither purely Greek or Jew.
 - c. Hellenist in speech and thought.
 - d. Not a Hellenizer. Educated as Pharisee.
 - e. Hebrew of Hebrews, and yet Greek to Greek.

Outline for

Hellenism and Christianity. (conclusion)

4. Asia Minor.
 - a. Syria. (Damascus; Antioch)
 - b. Phoenicia. (Tyre, Sidon, and Ptolemais)
 - c. Cilicia. (Damascus). Entire land.
 - d. Cyprus. Salamis, and though island.
 - e. Galatia. (Antioch, Iconium, Lystra, and Derbe.
 - f. Asia. (Troas. Ephesus).
 5. Europe.
 - a. Greece. (Philippi, Thessalonica, Berea, Athens, ^{Corinth} Corinth)
 - b. Italy. (Journey. Malta. Rome, Italy)
 6. Hellenism and Gentile Christianity.
 7. Results of Paul's preaching. Gentile Christianity.
- Conclusion:
1. Reaction of Hellenism and Christianity, (Mutual reaction)
 2. Christianity affected Hellenism.
 - a. the Hellenists. Negative and positive.
 - b. the Hellenes. Religious thought and morality of world. ^{World}
 3. Influence of Hellenism on Christianity.
 - a. Hellenism. Language; synagog.
 - b. Hellenic culture. Equality. City-state. Freedom, ^{action} of acti
 4. Christianity not influenced in doctrine. -Jesus and Paul.
 - a. by Hellenists. No distinctive doctrines.
 - b. by Greeks. Different locality, nature, and essence.
 5. Spread and victory of Hellenism.

The purpose of this thesis is to show the relation of Hellenism to Christianity. It will deal especially with the action and influence of the one upon the other in the Apostolic Age. It would be hardly possible that two such great movements as Hellenism and Christianity could exist at the same time without affecting one another.

Hellenism indeed, in the narrow sense, had its beginning much before the Christian era, and had spread greatly by the time Christianity entered the world, so that the Jew of the Dispersion was known in almost every part of the Hellenic world. Into this large organization known as the Diaspora Christianity entered, and, due to its peculiar nature, and the rapidity of its spread, exerted a great influence upon it. Not only were the Hellenistic synagogues changed into Christian congregations, their doctrines and manners of life eventually became entirely Christian. In worship and organization the Hellenist was influenced by the preaching of the Gospel.

Christianity entered into the organization known as the ^{-para,} Diaspora, but only after it had touched another party very distinctly: ^{-ism.} Judaism. It began among the Jews of Palestine, and was originally built up on the religion of the orthodox Jew. But it formed the foundation for both the Hellenistic and Judaistic congregations. There were not two types of Christianity originally, but one. The doctrine of Christ, the fulfilment of the Old Testament prophecies, was the same whether taught among Hellenists or Judaists. It was one in doctrine and principle. Yet, when it touched these various classes, it was understood differently in minor points, and followed out more according to the nature of the individual organization into which it entered. The essential points remained the same, but in details of practise and thorough acceptance of its distinctive nature there ^{was a slight difference in Judaism and Hellenism.} was a slight difference in Judaism and Hellenism.

Christianity had for its foundation the elements common to both the Judaists and the Hellenists, the true Jewish religion, as found in the Old Testament. As we are treating Hellenism though, in this thesis, we cannot enter into the manner in which Christianity was accepted and spread by the Judaists as deeply as when we consider the Hellenists."

Hellenism became the nucleus of the Christian churches of later times, because of its nature as a sturdy Jewish organization, and yet somewhat touched by the Hellenic culture of the age. It was Jewish and therefore could understand the background of Christianity better than the Gentile who became Christian; and yet it was not altogether Jewish in sympathy, so that it could also more readily understand the distinctive Christian doctrines of the new dispensation than their Palestinian brethren.

But Hellenism also aided the spread of the Gospel throughout the cities where the Diaspora had taken hold. This was accomplished in two ways. First, by the Hellenist missionaries, such men as Paul, Barnabas, Stephen, and Philip. These men, being Hellenists, preached Christianity to both Jew and Gentile, becoming thus the means of spreading the Gospel in Jerusalem and through the rest of the world. Secondly, the Dispersion itself was a great factor in this spread of Christianity. The Jews heard the Word before the Gentiles, according to the rule of preaching laid down by Christ himself. Some of them believed and formed the nucleus of the later congregations. These two influences of the spread of Christianity often coincide, as when Paul preached to the Hellenist synagog at Jerusalem, or Barnabas preached to the Jews on the island of Cyprus. But being spread by Hellenists and to Hellenists, Christianity found a foothold in the various organizations known as the 'synagogs of the Diaspora' and then spread throughout the world.

Hellenism and Christianity.

Introduction.

The term 'Hellenism' is derived from the Greek word Ἑλληνισμός, which denoted the Greeks as distinguished from the βαβυλωνῶν, and later, from the Jews. It is connected with the verb ἑλληρίζειν, ^{which} means 'to imitate the Greeks', hence 'to speak Greek'. A Hellenist ^{-ist} then was originally one who had adopted the Greek language, especially, one who imitated the Greeks. From the root meaning many various usages of the term have been derived.

'Hellenism' is used in its widest sense to denote an influence of Greek culture upon any other nation. It is thus used by Schuerer^h when he applies the term Hellenistic to some thirty cities in Palestine. These cities, though being under Roman rule, were "free" cities, self-governing, and had authority to coin their own money. The Greek influence in these Palestinian cities is shown on the coins which are found, dating from the beginning of the modern era. The reference, when speaking of these cities as Hellenistic, is more to the architecture and to the Hellenic system of government, by which the city became a city-state, free in itself, though under the rule of a higher monarch, than to the speaking of the Greek language and the prevalence of Greek culture in general. These cities either remained free under the Roman government or were freed by it; and were either built or rebuilt by the Emperors along lines adopted from Greece, when Hellenic culture spread throughout the land.

In a narrower sense 'Hellenism' is used in two ways. The first is: a proselyte to Judaism of Greek or other foreign ^{-try} ancestry. It is used thus among the Jews of Palestine and other countries in the Roman period, and among the Jewish Christians of the time. --

(1) Schuerer: Geschichte des Juedischen Volkes. pg 82-175.

The second use of the word denotes Jews living outside of Palestine^{-Time} who had adopted Greek, usually in some dialectic form, as their common tongue, and had also yielded more or less to Greek civilization. This implies that in many respects they had ceased to be strict Jews.¹ The latter class- Hellenistic Jews- were known as "Jews of the Dispersion".

This meaning of 'Hellenism', as referring to the Jews of the^{the} Diaspora, will generally be adopted throughout this thesis. As Hellenism may have various meanings at different times, though, and in other connections, it is well to distinguish between its two adjectives Hellenic and Hellenistic. We will use Hellenic as denoting any influence of Greek culture upon the world at large,^r or upon the Jewish nation in particular. The use of Hellenistic shall be restricted to the Greek-speaking Jew, and to his influence, either in the Dispersion or in the home-land. Hellenistic Christianity will then be used of those Hellenistic Jews who have accepted Christianity. It will thus be opposed to Judaistic Christianity,^{etc.} which will denote the Palestinian Jewish Christian.

The term Ἑλληριστῆς is used but two, possibly three times in the Greek New Testament. Acts 6,1 speaks of the murmuring of the Hellenists against the Hebrews. The Authorized Version translates τῶν Ἑλληριστῶν with 'Grecians', while the Revised Version has 'Hellenists' in a marginal reading; as also in Acts 9,29, where the^{he-}arers of Paul's preaching are called Ἑλληριστῆς. There is a difference of opinion as to the third place, for the readings differ. This passage is Acts 11,20, where the Grecians or Hellenists, whichever it may be, are spoken of as Christians of Antioch.

(1) Universal Cyclopedia and Atlas. V, 489.

Though we have only these three direct references to Hellenistic Christians, reference is made to them indirectly throughout the New Testament. There are numerous hints as to Hellenistic synagogues in Jerusalem in Acts, and the later congregations founded by Paul and others are partly Hellenistic. The Apostles preached first to the Jews and then also to the Gentiles. This method they followed out strictly, so that in every church there was a party of Hellenists. Hellenism, chiefly represented by Paul, also had some effect upon the Council at Jerusalem, where it was opposed to the Judaistic party.

The Hellenists, as a rule, accepted Christianity in its full significance more quickly than the Palestinian Jews, as they had been out in the world and had some ideas of how a religion would be without the strict observance of the Jewish Law. Such a condition the Palestinian Jew could not understand. The Hellenists, having come into contact with the Gentiles, would be more willing to preach to them than the Jew who had never been among them, and to whom the very home of the Gentile was unclean.

Hellenistic Judaism was formed by the association of Jews with Greeks. Hellenism first found its way into the life and thought of the Jews in any noticeable degree at about the time of Alexander the Great, (355-323 B.C.). He put an end to the Persian dominion of Palestine, as he also subjected the Persian kingdom itself to his rule. Therefore also the Jews who had remained in foreign lands after the Babylonian captivity were made subject to him. Alexander made himself master of Asia, and even Jerusalem seems to have come peaceably into his possession. There seems to be a nucleus of truth in the story of Josephus, that Jaddua the

high-priest and the leading inhabitants of Jerusalem went out ^{with} with pomp to meet Alexander, and that they were received ^{- succ} with reverence and emotion. Alexander was inclined favorably toward the Jews ^{and} and settled a large number of them in his newly-founded capital Alexandria, where they afterward grew into a large and prosperous colony ^{- an -}.

Alexander and the result of his conquests brought with ^{them} them new ideas and western ways of life, which eventually permeated ^{the} the thoughts and habits of the people he conquered. Greek language ^{and} and Greek literature became widely known, and in the cities of later times the constitution and arrangement of the Greek cities was generally adopted. At first these Hellenic or Hellenistic tendencies, as they were called, were resisted quite effectively at Jerusalem; but in the course of time they also exerted a considerable influence here as elsewhere.

But not only was the spread of the Jews throughout the ^{world} world due to such forcible deportations as the Babylonian Captivity and the bringing of Jews to Alexandria. These at least were not ^{- the -} entirely the cause of the later "dispersion". "Partly through such ^{causes} causes, but largely by impulses acting within a prolific and enterprising race, the world had become full of Jews". The Jews were in the habit of following the main lines of trade and settling at the ^{main} main seats of industry. This they did the more extensively as they ^{were} were granted freedom to do so, and as they received protection on their travels and during their habitation in foreign lands. Special invitations by rulers who prized the Jewish traits of orderliness ^{- their} and thrift also brought many of the Jews out of their home-land,

(1) Dummelow, Commentary. Intr. xlix.

(2) Ropes, The Apostolic Age. pg.48.

to seek their fortune in other countries. Large migrations would thus take place to newly-founded cities.

The Jews, wherever they went, took along with them the Law and the synagog, so that at the Council of Jerusalem James could say: "For Moses of old time hath in every city them that preach him, being read in the synagog every Sabbath day". Judaism indeed remained an exclusive religion wherever it might be preached, but only insofar as the Jews themselves were concerned. They would not go to the heathen, but accepted the heathen if they came to them. Wherever they might be scattered, in Syria, Asia Minor, Greece, Italy, or Africa, they maintained their corporate individuality, and also made successful attempts to win new adherents, -proselytes- from the surrounding Greek population'. This was the beginning of Hellenistic Judaism, out of which Hellenistic Christianity finally developed.

After the death of Alexander, Palestine was the bone of contention between Egypt and Syria; but after the battle of Ipsus in 301 B.C it passed to Egypt, and was ruled by the Ptolemies for the next century. These at first favored the Jews, and as a result the Jews were also contented and prosperous. They were permitted to build synagog and practise their religious rites. Greek culture must have had some influence upon them though, not only in manner of living, but also in their religious practise. The outstanding feature of the Hellenism of this time, and the most important one for all subsequent Jewish religion in the Diaspora, was the ^{trans-}translation of the Hebrew Scriptures into Greek. This translation, the Septuagint, was made, or at least begun, under the reign of Ptolemy II Philadelphus, (284-247 B.C.). Here we have the most (1) Ropes. The Apostolic Age, pg.48.

outstanding example of Hellenistic Greek which is later used by Josephus, Philo, and some of the early Christians. Abounding in Hebrew and Aramaic words, forms, and idioms, it shows not only ^{the} effect of Greek upon Hebrew thought but also the effect of Hebrew on the Greek language.

Under the Seleucidae, who ruled Palestine from about 200 ^{B.C.} B.C. until the Jews gained their independence under the Maccabees, the battle between Hellenism and Judaism began. The Jews were ruled ^{well} well under the Seleucidae, but Hellenizing influences entered in from Antioch, the Syrian capital, which was the stronghold of Hellenistic Judaism. This influence soon brought trouble into the orthodox Jewish party. The rulers seemed to favor Hellenism, and there soon arose a powerful Hellenistic party in Jerusalem. Seleucus IV Philopator accentuated the situation in Jerusalem by repressing the patriotic party and attempting to plunder the temple.

During the reign of his successor, Antiochus Epiphanes, matters came to a head. The Hellenizing party, the sons of Tobias at its head, were driven out of the city by Onias, the high-priest and leader of the orthodox party. Epiphanes intervened, allowing Onias to remain high-priest, but having as assistants tools of his own choosing. Onias, not wishing to be ruled by Epiphanes, retired to Egypt and founded a temple of his own at Leontopolis, 170 B.C., where the devout who had followed him to Egypt worshipped in the future. After a revolt in the city of Jerusalem, Antiochus plundered the temple and put into it an image of Zeus, rearranging the service in the Greek fashion. He also reorganized the state, appointing over it a royal commissioner. A series of uprisings on the part of the Jews now occurred, but these were unsuccessful until the time of the Maccabees,

The Maccabean war was essentially a combat between the orthodox and Hellenistic Jewish parties. Judas Maccabaeus, in a series of victories lasting hardly two years, cleared Palestine of the Syrians and the consequent Greek influence. On December 25, 165 B.C the temple was rededicated, an event commemorated in the Feast of Dedication; and after this, comparative peace and independence was enjoyed until Pompey added Palestine to the Roman Empire in 63 B.C. Through the Maccabean war, however, an end was put forever to the forcible entering of Hellenic principles into Jerusalem. They continued to creep in, but in ways which were not noticed and therefore not objected to. Thus also it happened that the term 'Hellenist', which had been so hateful to the orthodox Jew came to be used without any special prejudice.

Palestine was ruled by Rome at the beginning of the modern era. The Roman world, however, was in a state of decline at the time. The state-religion was nearing its downfall so quickly that the senate became alarmed at the situation and in 724^{A.U.} A.U. C gave to Augustus the right to dispose of the priesthood as he saw fit.² Augustus tried to rejuvenate the state-religion, but with little success. The senate ordered solemn prayers to be said for him, but it was soon the custom not only to say prayers for, but also to him. Temples were built in his honor together with that of the goddess of Rome. The Emperor seemingly objected to such practices, but feebly. In reality he sanctioned them, as he ordered the imperial Lares to be worshipped. Augustus did not succeed in bringing about a religious reform, but rather instigated a political reform, as his manner of living was the direct opposite of the

(1) New International Encyclopedia. xxi, 118.

(2) De Pressensé, The Ancient World and Christianity. pg.422f.

PRITZLAFF MEMORIAL LIBRARY

CONCORDIA SEMINARY

ST. LOUIS, MO.

reform he tried to bring about.

The decline of the state-religion caused all to go to different lines of religious worship. The images in the temples were corrupted, the Penates thrown away after a calamity, and no one ever believed in the gods anymore. This circumstance, accentuated by the immorality of the priests, made the people turn to other sources to obtain deliverance from the fear of death and hidden powers. Therefore they turned to the Mystery-religions, and even the Jews gained many followers. Thus there was a dark, undefined groping after God, which could not be satisfied by the state-religions or the philosophy of the times; but this longing was not fully understood till the religion of Christ had come.

As the religious situation, so was also the political and the social. Family life being broken down the state could not flourish for any length of time. Every one wanted to enjoy life without heeding the state of affairs in the Empire. Hence there was no spirit for increasing the dominion of the Empire, nor zeal to have a judicious and powerful government in Rome itself. In fact, the social condition was one to break down any law and order that would interfere with the fullest gratification of the desires.

Family life, since it was in a state of decline, caused the entire social condition to correspond to the religious and the political. Clement of Rome, as well as Juvenal and Tacitus, give us a glaring account of the moral turpitude of Rome. "Juvenal pictures for us in one stroke, in one striking passage, the degradation of woman in his day, when he describes her as passing with a cynical smile the altar of modesty".¹ Of the men very little need be said except that they were much worse than the women.

(1) Satire VI. quoted from De Pressense, Ancient World. pg.427.

unnatural lust prevailing, and the result of lust, bloodshed. This was especially evident in the circus, where the blood of the gladiators flowed in torrents.

Even the literature was affected by the conditions of the ^{age.} age. Though much attention was paid to it, there was, with the exception ^{-Linn} of such men of genius as Juvenal and Tacitus, a general striving for form, for meaningless, high-sounding phrases. As literature, so also art became corrupt. It was fostered, but decayed because of the age, which had not a true appreciation for beauty.

There was in general at the time a feverish unrest; an ever increasing longing for the enjoyment of life, and the consequent plunging into vices as deeply as possible. The Roman citizen, ^{with} all his slaves and all his luxury was in a state of continual dissatisfaction with life and had a longing for everything that was new and pleasure-bringing. This terrible ennui led to the committing of ever greater crimes. And when there was no more pleasure to be found the Roman would commit suicide in disgust of living ⁱⁿ such times. Such actions really typified the suicide of the entire ^{- in} nation.

But 'in order to determine if the world was prepared to receive Christianity we must look higher than the reckless crowd and the degraded aristocracy, who seem, as they throng to the circus in Rome, to forget that life has any meaning at all'.¹ The groaning in ignorance and the longing for light is shown in some ^{of} the poetry of this period, of which Virgil is the great exponent. Though there was in the pagan world a longing for truth, and certain ideas about a future deliverance, they had not reached their end at the beginning of the modern era. Even through their contact ^{- tact}

(1) De Pressense, Ancient World. pg 456.

with the Jews who had a synagog in almost every city of the Roman Empire they did not receive any such knowledge, for Judaism had itself only promises and symbols to offer. The statement is then not justified, that Christianity was everywhere present in a ^{state} state of society which had not yet received Christ.¹

In such a condition of the Roman world, the Diaspora found even greater opportunities for increasing than ever before. Hellenistic Judaism, holding itself aloof from the corrupting influences of the nation, not joining in the syncretistic tendencies of the age, spread nevertheless under the shadow of existing conditions, encouraged by the protection given them by this strong though declining government. Not only was the growth of the Diaspora aided internally, but in the condition of the world at the time, the Jew saw ample opportunity for proselyting, which was accomplished more easily and quickly than ever before.

I. The Hellenic Influence on Judaism.

The difference between the Jew and the Greek was somewhat, though not greatly, overcome by the effect of Hellenic influences upon the Jewish masses. Paul had uttered a very true statement when he said: "The Jews require a sign and the Greeks seek after wisdom"². This sentence, showing the difference between the Jew and Greek had almost universal application. The Jews, trained in Old Testament study, and filled with the traditions of the elders, expected a deliverer who would do many signs and wonders, and would be attested with miraculous events, as the prophecies indicated to them.³ And yet they expected a purely political deliverer, who would again free all of Israel with his miraculous deeds. Thus they were

(1) M. Havet in *Depressensé*. Ancient World, pg. 468.

(2) I Cor 1, 22.

(3) Foakes-Jackson, *Studies in the Life of the Early Church*. pg. 34.

always seeking a sign, even when Jesus appeared, and with this natural expectancy of the supernatural, it is not strange that they did not believe Jesus even though he did perform miracles.

The Greeks, on the other hand, wanted wisdom. To them, who were always engrossed in speculation, there was little of importance in a sign, except that it pointed to a higher ordering of the universe. They wanted speculation, a better system of philosophy, to outclass and supercede all former systems, which they felt to be inadequate. This nature of the Hellenic, however, influenced the Jewish to some extent, as the educated Jew, by reading the Greek works on Philosophy, imbibed some of the atmosphere proclaimed through them. This was especially true of the Jewish Alexandrian school, which greatly indulged in speculation and allegorizing.

Not only did Hellenic thought enter into Hellenistic Judaism, but it also through the latter entered into the life of even the lower classes in Palestine. The Jewish emigrants, for social and religious purposes, kept themselves in contact with Jerusalem and occasionally resorted to it for the great Feasts. Consequently they could hardly avoid transmitting Greek tendencies and ^{influ-}influences to their own people.

The Jews at this time were generally taking a large part in education and literature.ⁱⁿ It is an acknowledged fact that the Jews of this time not only desired information about current happenings, but were also interested in what was being taught at the schools. The first of these was no doubt actuated by the expectancy of a new kingdom and a new ruler in this time, and they wanted to have information on current events in case this ruler should arise and

(1) Stanley, History of the Jews. I, 409.

want a following. The second condition is shown by the reports that the Jews, even the lower classes, received and repeated the humor used in the class-room of the schools by the instructors. Puns and riddles are reported to have been spread throughout the land. These conditions, though not necessarily Hellenistic in themselves, were surely the result of the Hellenic influence brought into Palestine by the Jews of the Dispersion and Roman culture at large. The Greek language itself greatly aided in bringing about these conditions, as it was used almost universally, having become so simple that it could be understood even by the uneducated. It is even probable that the Jew in Palestine at the time of Christ ^{could} for the most part speak Greek. But this will be treated more thoroughly later.

The political situation was controlled by the Roman government, which had organized Palestine into a province with a special ruler, according to the Greek manner of government. Schuerer shows this, when he proves that many of the cities of Palestine even were constituted as city-states.¹ The Romans, however, demanded taxes from all of Palestine, and enormous ones, so that the Jews were really also suffering under the burden of the Roman government. The tax of one/fifth to one/tenth on produce, a personal tax, and customs on imports and exports must have oppressed the Jews considerably. The common people then, as a result of the oppression, hated the government of the Romans and expected a Liberator from their yoke. So great was the influence of Hellenic tendencies upon the masses.

There were at this time many seditions and revolts begun in Palestine; and in the rest of the world the Jews were a turbulent

(1). Schuerer, Geschichte des Juedischen Volkes. 82ff.

and discontented faction, not at all popular with the Hellenic population of the cities.¹ "The Jew was at this time a fighter and a formidable one, not only because of his intense fanaticism, but because he was consumed with a desire for world-domination, which he conceived had been foretold by the prophets. He felt himself, moreover, a member of a nation which had a real corporate existence apart from the rest of the Empire".² So great was the danger of outbreaks on the part of the Jews that the Governor was at the Feasts of the Jews personally, to forestall any insurrections^{-tion} at such a time.³ Hellenic tendencies therefore had a negative^{effect} effect on Jewish political conditions.

Religion among the Jews was influenced only externally by Hellenic culture. "With intercommunication of distant countries brought to a state of perfection the world had not hitherto known, the organization of Judaism was elaborate and efficient".³ The Roman^{Roman} Law could not interfere with their religion, as it was national and therefore protected. The Sabbath rest was sanctioned, even in the Roman army. Through such freedom the Jews were given their opportunity for action. The progress in wealth and numbers among the Jews of the Diaspora was alarming, and this was increased yet^{through} through proselytizing. To the synagogues Greek men and especially Greek women were attracted. "The lofty and rigorous moral precepts, the noble monotheism, the observance of the Sabbath, and the distinctions between clean and unclean food won large numbers of persons to adopt something of the Jewish religion".⁴ Thus the Jewish religion was able to spread greatly during this time of political _ _

- (1) Foakes-Jackson, Rise of the Roman Empire. pg.93.
- (2) Luke 23,1.
- (3) Foakes-Jackson, Rise of the Roman Empire. pg 93.
- (4) Ropes, The Apostolic Age. pg 48.

unrest, and gain many followers from the numbers of Gentiles in the cities where they had their synagogues. Judaism was then influenced in some degree by Greek thought and culture, as this ^{was} also was in turn influenced ^{by} Judaism to some extent.

As the common people came in contact with Hellenic culture, so also the upper classes, in Jerusalem as elsewhere. The more educated studied pagan writers in the higher schools after acquaint-^{-aint-}ing themselves with the Scriptures and the expositions of the Talmud. Thus it happened that Philo and some of the gnostics ^{-press-} expressed ideas and formed theories which closely correspond to the ^{thoughts} thoughts propounded by Greek philosophers. Paul has often been erroneously classed in this group of Hellenic thinkers. But Paul, though he was educated in Greek and used Hellenic speech, was not Hellenic, as he did not spread the doctrines which were current among the Hellenic people of the time. Paul was a Pharisee of the Dispersion,^{-ism,} but not affected by his surroundings in such a manner as to have his thought influenced by them. "Paul was an able and thoroughly trained Jew, who had gained from his residence in a Greek city that degree of Greek education which complete familiarity with the Greek language and the habitual use of the Greek translation of the Scriptures could bring. At bottom he ever remained the Jew, in his feelings, in his background of ideas, and his mode of ^{thought} thought, but he knew how to make tolerably intelligible to Greek readers the truths in which, as he came to believe, lay the satisfaction of their deeper needs."¹

Paul was always fundamentally the Jew, with whom what he knew of Greek habits of thought and ideas rested for the most ^{part} part as a veneer on the surface, or was used by him merely as a convenient tool.² He used the Greek language, being a Hellenistic Jew,

(1) Ropes, The Apostolic Age. 104.

(2) Ropes, id. 122.

but that was not because he could not speak any other. Being well-educated, he could also converse in Aramaic, the common tongue of Palestine, and possibly also knew Hebrew, which was so closely related to Aramaic, and the basis for studying the Old Testament Scriptures. The incident in Acts¹ which shows Paul speaking to the people of Jerusalem in 'Hebrew' which probably means Aramaic, proves two things, 1. Paul was expected to speak Greek; and we ^{can} assume from this, that the people of Jerusalem on the whole had ^{at} least a little knowledge of the Greek language. 2. That Paul, though being a Hellenist, could also speak Aramaic to become as he ^{he} says all the more 'all things to all men'. Greek language and Greek thought was therefore also to some extent influential among the educated Jews.

There was especially a very distinct Hellenic effect upon ^{the} the upper classes of the Jews in the political life of the country. Though Palestine was under the rule of a Roman governor, and more generally under a king who was in turn subject to Roman authority, the rule of Rome was that which dominated all of Jewish life. The Jews had lost all power of their own, their Sanhedrin even, the highest power in the land, not having the power of executing anyone². This situation, that their highest authority was ruled by a ^{sign} foreign power, was one which annoyed the Jews very much. They expected a Liberator from this evil at any time, even trying to put Jesus into such a position when they wanted to make him their king ^{to} after he had fed the five thousand people.

Just as the Sanhedrin was limited in its power along political lines, so also in religious affairs. Herod indeed had tried ^{to} to ingratiate himself with the Jews by building them a great temple,

- (1) Act 22,2.
 (2) John 18,31.

but the effect of this was at once counteracted by his action of giving the people another high-priest of his own appointment, setting aside their old custom of high-priestly hereditary ^{-cess-} succession to office. Thus there was a negative effect upon the Jewish religion by the Hellenic principles of the Romans. The language of the Jews was of course effected by the Greek, as it must have been quite well known even in Palestine, to judge from the trade and ^{the} the various Hellenistic synagogues in Jerusalem. The people from different countries gathering in their synagogues shows us that they must have had the Scriptures and prayers in Greek form, as there were ^{so} so many people belonging to them.' But, though the Greek language entered into Palestine and came to be generally used, the effect of Hellenic thought and principles upon the Jews as a nation was almost entirely negative.

Though there was no great influence upon Judaism by Hellenic thought and culture in general, there was an effect produced by Hellenistic thought. The Jews of the Dispersion came into contact with the Greek world, and though they did not secede from the ^{temple} temple-worship and disregard the religious ceremonies, they held a more liberal attitude ever against paganism. Nevertheless the Jews who has returned to Jerusalem had done so because the temple was still a holy place to them, as II Maccabees shows. So, even though they were influenced by Hellenistic ideas, they still held to the Jewish ceremonial law. There was a tendency, however, to withdraw from the strict observance of the Law, so that we can well understand how Stephen spoke more boldly than the other disciples about the temple being destroyed according to the words of Christ. He, being a Hellenistic Jew, at once realized the importance of that

(1) Weiss, Das Urchristentum. pg 120.

saying of Christ, and wanted from the beginning of Christianity ^{to} to have this doctrine understood. The other disciples, following ^{the} the example of Jesus, remained silent for the time about any doctrines ^{- in} that were liable to arouse the hatred of the Jews. They still regarded the temple-worship highly and even took part in the ^{offer-}offerings, as it would appear from the words of Matthew¹; while the Hellenistic movement tended toward the complete disregard for all temple-worship and bringing of offerings.

As the temple was only at Jerusalem, its influence was not very wide-spread, except for the Jews who returned to it every ^{year} year, or were living in the vicinity. Another system of worship therefore ^{- for} arose- the synagog, which existed where the temple was practically ^{- all} unknown, for it was possible to have a synagog where there were ten men above the age of thirty to join it. Since the synagog remained after the temple fell, it follows that it had a much ^{great-}greater influence than the temple-worship itself upon Christianity.

Jewish tradition traces the origin of the synagog as far back as the time of Moses. As a permanent institution it ^{- at} originated probably in the period of the Babylonian captivity, when a place for common worship and instruction had become necessary. The term "house of prayer", *oikos proskytis*, or simply *proskytis*, used by ^{- at} Isaiah², was the term preserved by the Hellenist Jews as the name of their synagog³. After the return from the Exile, congregational worship, consisting in prayer and the reading of sections from the Bible, developed side by side with the revival of the cult of the temple and thus led to the building of the synagogs. In the year 70 A.D. there were supposed to have been 394 synagogs in Jerusalem alone.

- (1) Matthew 5, 23.24.
- (2) Isaiah 56,7; 60,7.
- (3) Jewish Encyclopedia. XI,619.

There were numerous synagogues in every larger city. Paul preached in various synagogues in Damascus, and there are synagogues mentioned in all the cities: Antioch in Pisidia, Iconium, Ephesus, Philippi, Thessalonica, Beroea, Athens, Corinth, and Salamis.¹ The Hellenistic influence in these synagogues is shown mostly by the names they bore, for some of them were dedicated to some political ruler of the country. The Jews in Egypt dedicated a synagogue to Ptolemy, and those in Rome one to the Emperor Augustus. Hellenism took ^{hold} hold of these synagogues, in their name, in their size and beauty, and ⁱⁿ in their decoration and inscriptions.

The synagogue was at first merely a place of gathering and of public worship. After the Captivity though, it also took up the matter of education. As the greater stress was laid by the Jews on religious education, it was natural that the synagogues also developed into places of learning. After the training which the child received at home, it was put through schooling at the synagogue, until the time when regular schools connected with the synagogue arose, about the first century before Christ. The teachers were at first the Priests and Levites, then the Scribes.

But not only the children were taught in the synagogue. There were regular instructions in the Law and in the Prophets connected with the weekly meeting of the synagogue, in the form of a discourse conducted on the basis of the Scripture reading for ^{the} the day. As any scholar might deliver this lecture or discourse, a ^{new} new idea could easily be spread through this medium, especially since all the synagogues were connected as the links of a chain.² As the prayers and Scriptures were put into Greek, so we can conclude ^{that} that at some places also the sermon was in Greek, and if in the Diaspora,

(1) Acts 13,5-14; 14,1;16,13; 17,1; 17,10; 17,17; 18,4.7.

(2) Stanley, History of the Jews.III, 109.

would be Hellenistic to the extent to which the speaker was Hellenistic.

There was naturally a greater influence exerted by the ^{synagog} than by the temple cult. The records of the New Testament tell us that the Jews were powerful and clamorous in almost every city, ^{at} at least in every one of importance. They then had at least one, and sometimes more ^{synagog}s in every city. Here they held their ^{services} and practised their religious rites. These ^{synagog}s were often attended by Gentiles who were not even proselytes. The Jews ^{though,} made every effort to increase their number by proselytizing, and at the same time manifested great zeal for the Law.¹ Not only did the ^{synagog} have a great effect upon the Gentiles, so that Greek men and even Greek women went to the ^{synagog}, and it was common for a respectable Roman to attend the Jewish services; it also had some effect upon Christianity. From the order and worship of the ^{synagog} and not from that of the temple were copied parts of ^{Christ-}Christianity.

As the ^{synagog} was spread more widely than the temple and remained longer, it was natural that from it the general features of Christianity developed, especially the government, the institutions, and the devotions of the Christian communities. This is exemplified by the fact that the meeting-places of the Christians were known as 'Synagog^s' or 'Meeting-houses'; and, afterwards, by the adoption of an almost identical word, "Ecclesia", 'Assembly-houses'.² The fact that the ^{synagog} had more influence upon ^{Christ-}Christianity than the temple is shown partly by the differences between Hellenistic and Judaistic Christianity, as the Judaist wanted to hold all the ceremonies connected with the temple-worship, while

(1) Foakes-Jackson, Rise of Gentile Christianity. pg.67.
 (2) Stanley, History of the Jews, III,409.

the Hellenist was content to have the synagog-worship. This was especially true in regard to admitting new(Gentile) members into the church.

II. Hellenism and Judaism(as a Basis for Christianity.)

When Christianity entered the world it had to be accepted by both the Palestinian and the Hellenistic Jew. Each of these had its difficulties. To the Jew Christianity was inclined to become more like the temple-worship, extremely ritualistic, while to the Hellenist it was apt to merely a system of philosophy superimposed on and supplanting gradually the old Jewish religion.

Judaistic Christianity seemed to have support for their ground in the life of Christ. Since Jesus was a Jew, lived among Jews and addressed his teaching first to the Jews, there could be no doubt that it was to them that his disciples should first ^{preach.} preach. And since Jesus had been conscientious about fulfilling the Law, they might well think they too should follow his example. Much of his teaching would have been unintelligible if addressed to the Gentiles, for it is not possible to communicate ones ideas to anyone unless there is a common background. The men to whom Jesus spoke knew the Law, the Prophets, the Psalms, and followed the traditions. He did not declare new truths but emphasized and gave fresh life to old ones.¹

The Pharisaic of Judaistic Christians held to the words of Jesus that he had not come to destroy but to fulfil the Law;² that he had paid the half-shekel to the sanctuary;³ that he had sent the lepers to the priests after healing them;⁴ that he had observed the Feasts;⁵ and that he had sent out his disciples to preach not to

- (1) Foakes-Jackson, Rise of Gentile Christianity. pg 75.
 (2) Matthew 5,17. (3) Matthew 17,24.
 (4) Luke 17,14. (5) John 7,10.

the Gentiles or Samaritans, but to the lost sheep of the house of Israel.¹ Their opinion was that they could indeed preach to the Gentiles, but they should make them full proselytes first and ^{until} until that time should not have any intimate dealings with them.²

Even Jesus, though, opposed the too extreme carrying-out³ of the Law and the false interpretation of it which the Pharisees employed. The Apostles themselves were shown that their attitude was not quite correct when they began preaching. Whereas the Jews did not at once accept the Gospel, not even the Jews in the Diaspora, and often opposed it very strongly, the Gentiles accepted it eagerly. This then almost forced the Apostles and the other Christians to carry out Christ's command to bring the Gospel into all the ^{earth.} earth. They found out through sad experience that the message was also intended for the Gentiles.

In the entire first century, but especially until the destruction of Jerusalem, there were two parties of Christians in the city. The Judaistic party was the stronger and ruled the ^{church} church after the persecution following the death of Stephen.⁴ This party was headed by James the brother of Jesus.⁴ He seems, according to Josephus and Palestinian Jewish tradition to have been a typical Jewish saint.³ At the head of a party composed mostly of strict Pharisees and Jewish Christians, he maintained that the Gentiles should be circumcised and should bind themselves to fulfil the whole Law. Christ had said that one must hold the whole Law, and according to the theory which this party held, this 'Law' referred to the law of the Old Testament. All Gentiles were to them unclean and not to be associated with. Although this was the case, it ^{seems} seems

(1) Matthew 10,6.

(2) Foakes-Jackson, Rise of Gentile Christianity. pg.75.

(3) Moore, History of Religions. pg 120. vol.II.

(4) Gal 2.12.

(5) Act 15,5ff.

that the Pharisees even of the Jews did not have to live up to this doctrine strictly when they were outside Palestine. There were also some among the Christians who had already adopted the policy of Peter, that "in every nation he who fears God and works righteousness is acceptable to him".¹ This idea, that all the Gentiles should come to the knowledge of the truth was kept down, though, in Jerusalem by the more rigorous Jewish opinion.

The believers were at first scrupulous about attending at ^{the} the temple, and holding the laws of the Jews. Peter could declare that he had never eaten anything common or unclean.² Even Paul is represented as a strict observer of Jewish custom., and careful not unnecessarily to wound the religious prejudices of the people of Jerusalem.^{3,4} Paul, being a Pharisaic Jew, would observe the Law, though it is also true that he was a Hellenist, and not strictly ⁱⁿ accord with the radical doctrines and theories of the Judaistic party. The fact that he was a 'Hebrew of the Hebrews' will be treated ^{-ed} later.

Insert page 22b.

Hellenism, over against Judaism, tended toward the complete ^{-ed} disregard for all temple-worship and bringing of offerings.⁵ Hellenistic Jews were more liberal in their thought, as they had lived among different nations and had received some of the spirit of freedom found in the outside world. In their teaching they naturally emphasized the difference between the Christian and heathen religions. They brought out its monotheism, the rejection of idols, and the abstinence from heathen vices. Their converts would then attend the synagog, keep the Sabbath, and perhaps even abstain from unclean foods such as the sacrificial meat, and keep the diet

(1) Acts 10,35.

(2) Acts 10,14.

(3) Acts 21,18-26.

(4) Foakes-Jackson, Studies in the Life of the Early Church. pg.21.

(5) Weiss, Das Urchristentum, pg.121.

The Christians of Jerusalem were for the most part Judaistic. Some of them even went to the extremes in carrying out their way of living, and expected other people to live the law of Moses also. These we may call Judaizers. The difference between a common Judaistic Christian and a Judaizer would, of course, not be known as long as they were in the same place. One could change from the one to another. Thus Peter was at first only a Judaistic teacher, but when he came to ^{Antioch} Galatia and did not eat with the Gentiles any longer, he became a Judaizer Gal. 2,11, as he refused to associate with the Gentiles before they became circumcised. Therefore his action was also censured by Paul.

In the same manner we have also in the Epistle to the Galatians another mention of Judaizers. These were also men who had come from Jerusalem, but they were much different from Peter. He merely opposed Paul negatively and indirectly, but not associating with the Gentile Christians. The Judaizers of Galatia also opposed him directly, for he says that they tried to break down the doctrine which he had taught the Galatians, and to break down his authority. They were then indeed Judaistic Christians, but they were more than that. If they had held their doctrine, they would not have opposed Paul, but taking away the Christian liberty of the Galatians, ^{-laus} contrary to the results of the council of Jerusalem, they became the object of Paul's censure. They were then not typical of the congregation of Jerusalem, but men who had gone to an extreme in their teaching, even trying to force it upon the Gentile Christians.

Both these Judaizers were severely opposed by Paul for their actions, the one for opposing him indirectly and passively, the others actively and directly. But these tendencies were merely separate cases of an extreme form of Judaism, not at all typical of the Judaistic Christian of Jerusalem.

laws. Though such converts were not circumcised, they thought themselves in the way of salvation, and we can believe that the Jews thought them to be converted and associated with them.

The terminology of Christianity, the names and titles applied to Jesus by his disciples especially, had a different meaning and different associations in Greek and to the minds of the Gentiles. 'Messiah', so full of significance to the Jew, literally translated "Christos" (anointed) had for its verbal equivalent the term *ὁ κυριός ἦν*. In Greek the article was in most cases sufficient specification, and men said *ὁ κυριός Ἰησοῦς*, "the Lord Jesus", or among themselves merely, "the Lord". This became the characteristic title of Jesus Christ in Gentile Christianity.¹

"Kyrios" then, which had many religious associations in Greek, was ^{generally} used instead of the term "Christos", which did not have these. It was a standing epithet in the worship of various deities of Egypt, Syria, and Asia Minor. The Roman Emperors assumed the title "Kyrios" (Dominus) as the most unequivocal assertion of their divine authority. There were 'Gods many and Lords many' and ^{- the} Gentiles who heard that men could be saved only through the Lord Jesus ^{Christ} Christ, would without question understand 'kyrios' as a divine title. This was made doubly certain by the association with salvation. Saviour, (*Σωτήρ*) also was a title or epiclesis of many deities, as well as deified Hellenic kings and Roman emperors.²

A few words might here be said about Paul as a Hellenistic teacher. He contends that the Law, though 'holy, just, and good', need not be observed by the "Gentiles". "Let no man," he says, "judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holy day, or of the

(1) Moore, History of the Jews. II, pgl20.

(2) Moore, II, 121.

Sabbath;⁴ in other words, in keeping the Law as the Jews of his day observed it. The Hebrews or Judaists, on the contrary, are referred to the Law as it was given in the wilderness; to the worship of the Tabernacle, and not even to that of the temple. The Hellenists ^{could} still keep the Law, but they were not asked to by the Apostles. ^{Paul} Paul does not discourage the Jewish Christians from legal observance, ^{but} but contents himself with insisting that it is not necessary or desirable for Gentiles.² Everyone would then accept as much of the ceremonies as he wished, without, of course, binding anyone else to them. The Hellenists could then be expected; at least the greater part of them, to live less according to the Law and traditions than the Judaistic party. And when preaching to the Gentiles the whole ceremonial ^{Law} Law was put aside except in such cases where the feelings of the Jews should not be offended. This was especially the policy of Paul.

Hellenism thus beginning under the cover of Judaism, but soon making itself known, finally superceded Judaism and was the direct means of spreading the Christian religion throughout the world, beginning at Jerusalem and reaching to the ends of the earth.

III, Hellenistic Christianity in Jerusalem.

According to Foakes-Jackson³ there were five classes of people to be approached when the disciples began spreading Christianity. These were: 1. Men like the original apostles, who were Palestinian Jews speaking Aramaic or Hebrew. 2. Greek-speaking Jews, or Hellenists. 3. Jewish proselytes. 4. Heretical Jews, that is Samaritans. 5. Gentiles in sympathy with Judaism and Gentiles in general. The first class remained comparatively unmolested in Jerusalem upon turning Christian. The second class, Hellenists (of Jewish faith) according to Acts and their actions over against Paul were at least

(1) Coll. 2, 16.

(2) Foakes-Jackson, Rise of Gentile Christianity. pg. 166.

(3) Foakes-Jackson, Rise... pg 67ff.

as intolerant of Christianity as the natives of Jerusalem, and equally indisposed to accept the new doctrines. When these then accepted Christianity, the hatred of their former associates was brought down upon them, because of their equally bold attitude ^{after} after accepting Christianity. These two classes it is only necessary for us to treat in this paper.

Jesus' disciples were very likely largely Galileans and returned to their home-land after his death. At the ascension, though, they were told to return to Jerusalem. Here, then, we find them at Pentecost, and here they also made their headquarters for their first work. They soon won over to their faith many of the residents of Jerusalem, and, as their circle widened, there ^{-ed} entered not only Palestinian, but also Hellenistic Jews, who were largely represented in Jerusalem at this time, and even proselytes, who were also numerous in the city.

From the time of Antiochus Epiphanes to Herod there had been ^{been} a party of Hellenists in Jerusalem. They remained there even after the Maccabean war, increasing more and more. This number was augmented by those Jews who returned from the Diaspora, either for a time or as a permanent residence.¹ As a result of this we have in the sixth chapter of the book of Acts² already an account of some Hellenists belonging to the congregation.

The beginning of the Hellenistic movement of Christianity, ^{-it,} or the first contact of Christianity with Hellenism occurred at Jerusalem on the Day of Pentecost. Before this time the disciples had remained hidden at Jerusalem, and had conducted their meetings in secret, waiting for the appearance of the Holy Spirit³. The congregation comprized about 120 persons at that time.⁴ There were

(1) Weiss, Das Urchristentum. pg.119. (2) Acts 6,1.
 (3) Acts 1,4. (4) Acts 1,15.

three thousand people added to the congregation on the Day of Pentecost, not all of whom were Palestinian Jews, as a comparison of Acts 2,9-11 with v.41 will show. There were Jews and proselytes from various nations present who heard the preaching of the apostles, and some of these were converted among the number of three-thousand. Many of these were Jews who had come to Jerusalem for the festival of Pentecost, if they were not temporary inhabitants of the city. Of these Jews of the Diaspora many were added to the congregation, making it partly Hellenistic!

This band of believers increased daily², and soon the congregation numbered five thousand people³. Here also, though we do not find any references to Hellenists being converted, we can easily draw this conclusion from Acts 4,1, where the statement is made that the disciples spoke to the people, that is, to the people in general. There must have been quite a number of Hellenists in the congregation, though we can gather from the account of the dispersion after the death of Stephen that they were still in the minority. To these the name Ἑλληριστῶν is applied⁴. They were strong enough to make a protest against the Judaistic party, which was made up of natives of Galilee and Judaea, and numbered among them even some of the Hebrew priests⁵. Being impressed by the saintliness of the Apostles and their sincerity of teaching, the Hellenists could be expected to accept the new doctrine even more readily than their Palestinian brethren, who were acquainted more thoroughly with the haughtiness of the Pharisees of Jerusalem.

The early congregation was still faithful in attendance at the temple, and in obedience to the Jewish Law; but in addition

- (1) Weiss, Das Urchristentum. pg 98-100. (2) Acts 2,47.
 (3) Acts 4,4. (4) Acts 6,1.
 (5) Walker, History of the Christian Church.
 (6) Acts 2,46.

they had their own special services among themselves, with mutual exhortation and "breaking of bread" daily in private houses. Organization of the church was very simple. the Apostles usually being looked upon as leaders. Later a "committee" of seven "deacons" was a governing body, and soon the church seems to have been under the leadership of one man, James the brother of the Lord. "Elders" are also mentioned later, though it is still a question whether they were merely the older members of the church, or were officers not improbably patterned after the Jewish synagog.

At the time of the events recorded in Acts 6,1 there were many Jews of the Dispersion who had become Christians. Hellenistic synagogues were frequent in Jerusalem. The Cyrenians, Cilicians, and Asiatic Jews had synagogues in Jerusalem, as also the Alexandrians, whose synagog in Jerusalem is also mentioned by tradition. Paul was perhaps a member of the Cilician synagog at this time, as it seems to be the same one in which he preaches at his return to Jerusalem after his conversion. The Jews were numerous, as references show that there were at least 480 synagogues in Jerusalem at the time, increasing till at the time of the destruction in 70 A.D there were some 394 synagogues present, many of them Hellenist.

The expression synagog in the book of Acts is not merely an expression denoting the building. It means the people of the various cities who gathered together at the same place of worship, and formed a congregation, though the membership may have been constantly changing. Simon of Cyrene is a known example of one who is thought to have belonged to the Roman synagog together with his sons Alexander and Rufus. They seem to have been acquainted at least with the addressees of the Gospel of Saint Mark, Mark 15,21.

- (1) Walker, History of the Christian Church. pg22.
 (2) Acts 6,9. (3) Jewish Encyclopedia. XI,619.
 (4) Acts 9,29. (5) Weiss, Das Urchristentum. pg 119.

Acts 6,1 is one of the most compressed stories possible, giving besides an episode of exceptional value, various indications of the spirit and time of early Christianity. Dummelow says in his commentary on this passage: "The Hebrew-speaking Jews, who were in a majority in the church of Jerusalem, were inclined to despise and neglect the minority who spoke Greek". This condition would seem strange to us, would we not know that at the time there actually was such a disdain for Greek-speaking Jews. They were not considered heretics, or avoided as Gentiles, but were looked down upon as such who had lost their original language. McGiffert says: "Even when they were loyal and orthodox in their Judaism, the Hellenists were not always treated by their Palestinian brethren with the same measure of respect that was shown the Jew who had never made his home among the Gentiles".

It may well be said that, as a result, this traditional prejudice made itself felt even among the Christians of the congregation at Jerusalem, and hence had something to do with the way the widows were treated at the distribution. That it was intended as a malicious measure is hardly probable, but it also seems from the entire passage that it was not a mere oversight, which could be corrected by the mere mention of it to the Apostles. The murmuring implies also that the Hellenist part of the congregation was quite large. There was a general disorder. Though much in the minority, the Hellenist faction in the congregation could have been great as the entire number of members was above five thousand. It is also of note, that the Hellenists did not murmur against the Apostles, but against the Hebrews. The ministration of food was indeed under the supervision of the Apostles, but actually performed by the Hebrews, the Judaistic members.

(3) Compare Acts 6,1 with verse 2.

(1) Mc Giffert, History of Christianity. pg 76. (2) Act 4,4&6,1.

(3) Compare Acts 6,1 with verse 2.

The Apostles, realizing that they could no longer adequately oversee the distribution, called a meeting of the congregation to elect officers for this very purpose. This resulted in the choosing of the seven "Hellenist" deacons: Stephen, Philip, Prochorus, Nicanor, Timon, Parmenas, and Nicolas. It is mentioned that the last of these was a proselyte from Antioch¹, but of the rest nothing is said as to their ^{former} religious connection.

Various views are expressed on this subject. Some think that the one half of the number was Judaistic, the other half Hellenists, excluding Nicolas, of course. The reason for this ^{would} be that they had the duty of caring for all the people, not only for the Hellenists. Others think only part of them were Palestinian, ^{-ian,} the greater part, however, Hellenistic. This is the view of Mc ^{Giff-} Giffert, who says: "It is altogether probable that both parties were represented" for, "the effort would naturally be made to avoid ^{all} all cause of complaint in the future, by giving both parties a fair representation on the committee". This theory sounds modern, but is nevertheless quite possible. The view of Weiss, however,² seems the more probable. He thinks the men were all Jews except one, Nicolas, but that they were Hellenists, as their names, which are all Greek, show. This is also the traditional view, and accepted for lack of more convincing evidence.

The "Hellenist deacons" were appointed primarily to take ^{care} care of the distribution of charity in the church. They were also given the gifts of the Spirit through prayer and the laying-on of hands³. To them was given the power of performing miracles⁴, the Holy Ghost ^{Ghost} and wisdom⁵, and the ability to preach⁶. That their duties were of a

- | | |
|---------------|---------------------------------------|
| (1) Acts 6,5. | (2) Weiss, Das Urchristentum. pg.120. |
| (3) Acts 6,6. | (4) Acts 6,8. |
| (5) Acts 6,3. | (6) Acts 6,10. |

more general nature later, ~~as~~ is seen from the life of Philip, when he makes a short missionary trip through Samaria.¹ Thus they became virtually also ministers of the spiritual side of the congregation.

Of the seven men chosen by the congregation, Stephen appears in the book of Acts as the most important, at least the most prominent. He especially was a man 'full of faith and the Holy Ghost'.² He had power to perform miracles but was also a great preacher. Speaking in the synagogues of the Hellenists, he could not be overcome in argument by those hearing him. Not only in one synagogue did he preach, but in a number of them. The synagogue of the Libertines³ was perhaps the synagogue to which the Jews from Rome belonged, as they were considered freedmen after being brought to Rome by Pompey as prisoners of war, and afterwards emancipated from slavery.^{- cry.} The Cyrenians were from the capital of Upper Libya, which consisted of one-fourth Jews. The Alexandrian synagogue was a great one, as Alexandria was about two-fifths Jewish at the time. Stephen probably preached much in the Cilician synagogue, as Paul belonged to this one, and he is mentioned at the execution of Stephen. Asia, the Roman province, also had its representation at Jerusalem, especially the cities of Ephesus, Smyrna, and Pergamos. Their synagogue is likewise mentioned as one of those who opposed Stephen.^{- ed}

Stephen, then, seems to have spoken in various synagogues, and the men from all of them gathered to check his teaching. Foreign Jews, all speaking Greek, could be expected to intermingle, and it could not be supposed that Stephen would confine himself to one synagogue. Of the matter which he taught in the synagogues we have no record, but it seems that he did not strictly hold to the ceremonial^{-ial}

(1) Acts 8,5ff. (2) Acts 6,5. (3) Acts 6,9.

law, as the Jews oppose him on this point first.¹ Their accusation is only that he had said, the temple would be destroyed, and Jesus would change the rites delivered by Moses. Stephen is given an opportunity to defend himself against the accusation, and delivers an address which shows that he was a great preacher.

He speaks to his opponents as Jew to Jew, as brother to brother, as son to father. They were Hellenists and he also. Thus he can tell them the whole story of Israel in a short form,² as the history of his own people, and they say nothing against it. He reviews the history from Abraham to Solomon, and then makes a ^{quick} quick application to the present time. The heightened pace of vv 51-53³ of Acts 7, accusing the Jews of transgressing the commands of God in every imaginable way, is indicative of Stephen's oratory. It is generally accepted that Stephen was inviting martyrdom with this accusation, but it is also possible that with these words he made one last and bold effort to arouse their conscience, as he knew that otherwise he should be killed unless they succeeded in making him recant his doctrine. He staked all on one last thunderbolt of oratory.

The opponents of Stephen were not converted by his speech. they were strict Jews, though of Hellenistic origin, and held to ^{all} all the temple ordinances and ceremonies. His doctrine therefore disagreed with them. Not only were they enraged about his doctrine, though; he now also hurt their pride by denouncing them as murderers and heretics. It appears from the speech of Stephen that the accusation had been not so much on grounds of wrong doctrine as trying to eliminate the temple-service. He therefore leads up to —

(1) Acts 6, 11, 14.

(2) Acts 7, 2-50.

his final point by showing the promises of God, and His presence without the temple. He shows that the tabernacle was not kept in one place, and that the temple could have been built in any other place, and finally adduces proof from the Old Testament that God does not dwell in temples made with hands. This was direct proof against the Jews and a strictly logical defense. They did not even try to reply, but used force to gain their end.

It is significant that it is not the Pharisees who brought the accusations against Stephen as in the case of Jesus. It was here the elders and the scribes¹, and even the Sadducees², who at this time opposed the Christians; in other words, the political rather than the religious leaders of the Jews³. Not so much then were they concerned about the doctrines as about the secession from Judaism.

These Hellenistic Jews, then, did not give Stephen an opportunity to finish all he wanted to say. They became enraged when he told them they had not kept the Law, and began their uprising against him while he was yet speaking. The thought of 7,16 is incomplete, probably being the beginning of another denouncement by Stephen. The Jews then rushed upon him while he was still speaking, and without awaiting the decision of the judge, the high-priest, took him out of the city and stoned him. Thus he was killed by those with whom he had formerly been a member of the same ^{same} synagog.

The case of Stephen seems to show a difference in the dealing of the Jews. Peter and the rest of the disciples were also called before the council of the Jews⁴, but merely told not to ^{preach} preach

- (1) Acts 6,12. (2) Acts 5,17.
 (3) Mc Giffert. History of the Christian Church. pg.82.
 (4) Acts, chapter 5.

Jesus anymore. The statement of Gamaliel seems to show that the Jews at the worst expected the Christians to begin an uprising, and not to originate a new doctrine. They were not called up for blasphemy, as Stephen was, so we can conclude that they did not preach against Jewish customs quite as openly as did Stephen. From the teaching of Stephen we can then conclude what was the behaviour of the Hellenistic Christians. They realized more than the Judaists the far-reaching import of the doctrines of Christ, and preached them openly. Perhaps the hatred of the Jews for the Hellenists ^{also} caused them to be persecuted as soon as they seemed to become heretical. At any rate the persecution of the Hellenists began soon after the death of Stephen.

A short account of the persecution at the death of Stephen is found in Acts 8,1, and then expanded in vv 3ff., later to be continued in ch.9. The account given us here is far from complete. The greater part of the congregation was forced to flee, but the Apostles remained. It is quite evident then what this report implies. The Apostles, being Judaistic Christians, were allowed to remain, as they were more liberal in their views about the temple and the observance of the Law. They were at least not so readily suspected as the Hellenists of being heretical². We can infer that the persecution was directed particularly against the Hellenists, who aroused ^{-ed} the anger of the Jews more than their orthodox brethren. This also appears from the statement that there were devout brethren at Jerusalem¹ to take care of the body of Stephen.

That this was mainly a persecution of Hellenist Jews against Hellenist Christians is brought out the more strongly by the account ^{-count}

(1) Acts 8,2.

(2) cf pg. 34b.

that Saul of Tarsus was the leader of the persecution. Being of ^{the} the Cilician synagog, he thought it his duty to root out this heresy, ^{which} which had taken hold of some of his countrymen. He entered into the ^{houses} houses of these Christians, taking men and women to prison for entertaining ^{ing} their belief that the Jewish Law was of no account, thus forcing ^{the} the rest to flee. Philip especially is mentioned as one of those who ^{had} had to leave Jerusalem at this time.¹ From his conversation with the Eunuch, when he does not mention anything about the temple, and does not even ask the Eunuch whether he is circumcised, nor ask him to ^{have} have this done first, we might ascribe Hellenistic ideas to him. But a final proof that the persecution mainly affected the Hellenists is found in the action of Saul, continuing his persecution at Damascus, whither the Gospel had spread in the mean-time; He desired to bring all those of the new faith to Jerusalem for a trial, as neither he nor the Sanhedrin had the right to execute anyone without the ^{sanction} sanction of the government.

It seems then, that the Judaistic Christians were not much annoyed by the leaders of this persecution. The Jewish people were not repelled to any great extent by the idea that Jesus was the Messiah, as the narrative of Peter and John healing the lame man ^{shows} shows.² Their main objection was that the Christians preached the resurrection and they were afraid a tumult or insurrection might arise, were they allowed to continue their teaching openly. The statement of Gamaliel implies that their doctrine of Jesus being the Messiah would soon ^{die} die away, if it were not based on facts; and if it were, everything the Jews could do would not exterminate it. The main worry of the Jews was that the Christians should not wise up in revolt. It appears ^{that} that the priesthood was not so much concerned about a new doctrine being preached, but thought this sect would make trouble, for which the nation would be responsible, and be punished. The object of the priests ^{is} ^{is}

(1) Acts 8,5. (2) Acts 4,1.10.16ff.

quite intelligible, namely, to avoid any possible disturbance ^{which} might arise should they sanction a movement which might lead to fanaticism.⁴ This would explain also why Saul evidently intended to accuse the offenders he brought in before the Roman tribunal.

Since the persecution was intended against the Hellenist party in particular, the expression "and they were scattered abroad" also refers especially to the Hellenist party. Forced to flee from Jerusalem, they came first to the regions of Judaea and Samaria. Only of Samaria have we any more definite notice here, as there Philip worked, preaching in the cities. Peter's travel throughout Palestine was perhaps not on account of the persecution,⁵ but only a missionary trip, or a tour of inspection in the congregations ^{- towns} already founded. Thus we find him at Caesarea and Joppa Acts 10. The story of the scattering after the persecution is again taken up in Acts 11,19. The Christians went as far as Phenice, Cyprus, and Antioch. Their work here was only among the Hellenist Jews ^{who} were living in these cities, as the Hellenists also ~~(first)~~ observed the rule of preaching first to the Jews and then to the Gentiles.

Soon, however, some of the men from Cyprus and Cyrene, who had gone there perhaps from Jerusalem, also came to Antioch and began preaching the Gospel.³ Contrary to those who had been there before, these men began preaching to the Gentiles also. "Grecians" here means 'Gentiles' as it is in opposition to the term 'Jews' in the preceding verse, which refers to the Jews of the Dispersion. Thus we have in Acts 11,20 the first instance of Jews preaching ^{- the} the Gospel to Greeks in general. And "thus Christianity was carried ^{to} to as remote regions as Caesarea, Damascus, Antioch, and Cyprus."⁴

- (1) Foakes-Jackson, Rise of Gentile Christianity. pg 64.
 (2) Acts 8,1. (3) Acts 11,20.
 (4) Walker, History of the Christian Church. pg 24.
 (5) cf. Acts 9,31&32.

After this persecution following the death of Stephen there were very few Hellenists remaining at Jerusalem. The dispersion carried them to various lands where they might be safe. Yet there were some who braved the storm of indignation of the priests and did not leave their ^{present} home. Among those who remained, Barnabas is found, he who is later to inspect the newly-founded congregation at Antioch. Joses, or Barnabas, is first mentioned as a priest, or Levite, who had accepted the Christian faith. He was a rich member of the synagog of Cyprus before he became a Christian. Barnabas is also mentioned in connection with Paul, for it was he who first introduced Paul into the Christian church of Jerusalem. Paul probably converted ⁶ some of his former fellow-members of the Cilician synagog, when he spoke to them upon his return as a Christian, for he "spoke" boldly and "disputed" with them in the synagog. His work among the Hellenists or 'Grecians' of Jerusalem did not continue very long though, for they were intending to treat him as they had treated Stephen, thus forcing him to flee.

The great body of Christians at Jerusalem at this time were Judaistic. They still held to the temple-service, and considered the Mosaic Law binding upon all Christians. Peter had been shown that he should not hold too strictly to Judaistic principles ⁴ when he was even commanded by God to eat 'unclean' food, and enter into the house of a Gentile. Upon his return to Jerusalem, he was censured by the congregation for eating with Gentiles. When he had explained his action to them, they thanked God for accepting the Gentiles also, but did not make a move to adopt the same measures. ⁵

They continued to preach Christ over and above the regular Jewish

(1) Acts 4,36.

(2) Acts 9,27.

(3) Acts 9,29.

(4) Acts 10.

(5) Acts 11,18.

(6) *See 55.11.*

r ligion. Acts 15,1 shows that it was a generally accepted principle in Jerusalem, that the Christians live up to the Law of Moses. It had almost become a doctrine of the Church and a sign of orthodoxy. Therefore, when certain men came from Jerusalem to Antioch in Syria, they taught that circumcision is necessary for salvation. This brought on a great argument between Paul, and Barnabas and the Judaizers, which terminated in the Council of Jerusalem in the year 49.

Paul and Barnabas went to Jerusalem to come to terms on the point of making the Gentiles accept the Jewish ceremonies. They wished to come to some general conclusion with the apostles and elders of the congregation, so that they would in the future not be bothered by such men as those who had wanted all the Gentiles circumcised.

From the account in Acts it seems that Paul and Barnabas were given the floor first; and reported all that had happened to them while preaching to the Gentiles. Then some of the Pharisaic Christians arose and proposed that all Gentiles should be circumcised in accord with the Law of Moses. There was some indcision about this point at first, as the elders of Jerusalem thought they were upholding the doctrines of their two great teachers, Peter and James.

It was Peter who made the first definite move in the right direction. He remembered the lesson he had recieved from the Lord on the house-top at Joppa, and in the house of the Centurion of Caesarea, where the Gentiles had recieved the Gospel without being circumcised; and the Holy Ghost had fallen on them. Giving the result of his argument, he said the Gentiles could be saved without bearing the yoke of the Law which the Jews carried.

(1) Acts 15,5ff.

This was affirmed by Paul and Barnabas, and the whole matter summed up in a motion by James.⁶ The Judaists, according to his motion, were to remain, as they had been, obedient to the Law of Moses.² This can be followed out of the position over against the Gentiles. The Gentiles were not to be placed under obligation to perform the Law. Only from four things should they abstain: from ^{pol-}pollutions of Idols, and fornication, the fundamentals of a moral ^{life;} life; and they should yield to the Jews in not eating things strangled and blood.³ These last were not wrong in themselves, but they ^{-should} should not offend the Jews by doing them. All the Sabbath laws and ^{-circum-}circumcision need not be kept by them, however, As a proof for this ^{Paul} Paul says that he did not even circumcise Titus, whom he had taken ^{-with} along to make a test-case out of him, being a Gentile Christian.

The Hellenistic and Judaistic parties of Christianity thus agreed to be independent. Paul and Barnabas were to preach to the Gentiles, and preach only the Gospel of ^{Christ} Christ and general morality ^{-ity} in their manner and life, Peter, James, and John at Jerusalem ^{would} would continue to preach also the observance of the temple-ordinances. Such a compromise could not work everywhere though, as there ^{-yet} was yet the case of a mixed church to consider, which would come under neither of these two classes. Peter fell a victim to this circumstance ^{-not} when he came to Antioch.⁴ He at first adapted himself to conditions ^{-times} and ate with the Gentiles; but when Judaists came from Jerusalem, which was mainly Judaistic, to visit the congregation, he did not want to give offense to these and absented himself from the common table. Thus he offended the Gentiles, and Paul, hearing about it, reprimanded him.

(1) Acts 15, 19 ^{krinōō de} (2) Acts 15, 5.

(3) Acts 15, 20.

(4) Gal. 2, 11-16.

Judaism, left to its own teaching by the Council at Jerusalem and the teaching of Paul, continued in its observance of the Law. The congregation was almost entirely Judaistic now, under the leadership of James the brother of Jesus, who is described by Josephus and Palestinian Christian tradition as a typical Jewish saint. At the head of the church composed of Pharisees and strict Jewish Christians, he insisted that all of the Jewish law be held.¹ Though he, as also Peter, had a correct knowledge of Christianity, as shown at the Council, they, in their practise, held the same views as the Pharisaic Christians.² In such a state the congregat^{-tion} remained and flourished, with the exception of minor persecutions, such as the execution of James the brother of John and the imprison^{-ment} of Peter, until the time of the destruction of Jerusalem under Titus. The Christians then fled to Pella, and from there spread out over all the earth, as they could not again enter into the city of Jerusalem.

Christianity though was carried throughout the nations by Hellenistic Christians more than by Judaistic.³ It used Judaism, and indeed, Hellenistic Judaism, as a foundation on which to build^{-up} the greatest church of all times. It did not copy the Hellenist part of the Jewish religion, but the orthodox part; and yet the Hellenistic party, being the more liberal, was the one which finally gained the ascendancy and ruled out almost completely the Judaistic or Pharisaistic party after the destruction of Jerusalem^{-land} and under the later persecutions.

(1) Acts, 11,3.

(2) Gal. 3,12.

(3) I Thess. 11,3.

IV. The Spread of Hellenistic Christianity.

Hellenistic Christianity, when it had overcome Judaism, preserved the records of Hellenism, and we now know much of the extent of the Dispersion and its strength in different localities. Thus we also know much about the conditions into which Christianity^{-ity} entered. From the book of Acts especially we know how Christianity spread among these cities in which the Jews had settled.

In the beginning, and among the Judaistic party, the Gospel had been confined quite well to Jerusalem. Jesus had said, however, 'Ye shall be witnesses unto me both in Jerusalem, and in all Judaea,^{sa,} and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost parts of the earth!' This command implied missionary activities also in other lands. The story of the book of Acts now gives a history of the stages of the spread of Christianity. This spread was aided by persecutions, as the Christians preached wherever they went, when they had to flee into other countries. 'A great obstacle to the progress, though, was the intense loyalty of most believers in the Law and traditions^{-tions} of Judaism. It was only when they broke with customs of strict Judaism, that they became liable to persecution²; and this accounts for their unwillingness to do so as well as for the original strength and energy of Judaizing Christianity.²'

The original idea of the Christians, that they had to make^{make} the Gentiles full proselytes before they could accept them into Christianity and associate with them, hindered the spread of the Gospel to quite an extent. Upon preaching the Apostles learned the correct way of dealing, as the Gentiles accepted the Word more readily than the Jews. The treatment which Gentiles should receive caused some difficulty, but after Paul had won his point at the

(1) Acts 1,8.

(2) Foakes-Jackson, Rise of Gentile Christianity. pg.74.

(3) cf. policy of Act 4,16ff with that of Acts 6, 14f;7,58f.

council at Jerusalem, they were allowed the utmost freedom and were accepted into membership upon being baptized. The Apostles and Christians were thus virtually forced to follow out Christ's command to bring the Gospel to the ends of the earth.

The Greek language was a great factor in the spread of early Christianity. Hellenistic Greek had become quite simple, and was in a state where it could be understood even by the common people. It had also become quite universally used in the course of time. Though simple, it was broad enough to allow the ideas of Christianity to be more easily expressed. It is natural that the Jews gave up the stiff Aramaic for this language as soon as they were outside of Palestine for a time. The language then, influenced Christianity to quite an extent in its spread. It is significant that Paul, Barnabas, and their assistants were mostly Jews of the Dispersion or Gentile Christians, having a knowledge of the Greek language from their youth, thus being more able to carry on their work among both Hellenists and Gentiles.

Another factor in the spread of Christianity was the Roman government. The strict regulations of the government made travel safer for the missionaries, as also the citizenship of Paul and Silas often stood them in good stead as protection ^{not} against persecution. As the roads were patrolled, Paul and his companions were fairly safe on their travels. It is true that Paul as well as other Apostles suffered much persecution, but they would very likely have suffered more, had it not been for the rigorous enforcement of the law, for which Rome was especially noted. The prevalent ^{sent} spirit of cosmopolitanism, which was very strong in the Roman Empire, was also a great factor in the aid which the Christian missionaries had in the performance of their duties.

(1) Compare policy in Hellenic cities in Schürer: Geschichte des Juedischen Volkes, I, 85ff. Also Ramsay: Cities of ST.P.

The Christians were scattered abroad throughout Judaea and Samaria after the death of Stephen¹. The Christians, and indeed the Hellenistic Christians especially, were scattered throughout Palestine, and began preaching to the Jews². It was natural that they preach the Gospel first to those who were nearer to Jerusalem, as they did not have cause to go into distant lands at once. When Saul became the leader of the persecutors, had finished his work at Jerusalem, and had gone to other cities, the Jewish Christians had to flee to more distant lands. This fact is shown by the reference: "Therefore they that were scattered abroad went everywhere preaching the word"³.

Within the land of Palestine there was again a division, though, as Acts 8,1 shows. First they preached in Judaea and Samaria, then in the rest of Palestine. We have references in Acts only to three districts where they preached the Word: Judaea, Samaria, and Galilee. Thus mainly Hellenistic Christianity spread throughout Palestine by those evading the persecution.

We find only two references to the missionary activities of the early Christians in Judaea. We can, however, easily infer that there was much preaching being done there, for the disciples very likely continued Jesus' work. That only two instances of the preaching are recorded is due to the fact that these were incidents⁴ of particular note, and the general activity was quite well known, and in fact, self-evident, considering the command of the Lord.

Philip is mentioned first as preaching in Judaea. He is shown travelling down from Samaria to the road that leads from Jerusalem to Gaza³. As most of this road was in Judaea, he probably converted

(1) Acts 8,1. (2) Acts 8,4.
 (3) Acts 8,26ff. (4) Acts 11,3.

the Ethiopian in Judaea also. Philip was one of the Hellenist 'deacons', which probably accounts for his not mentioning any ^{part} of the Mosaic ordinances, ^{especially circumcision} when talking to the eunuch. Baptism and faith were to him the fundamentals of the Christian religion, as shown from this interview.

Immediately following this discourse, there is another reference to Philip, which shows quite extensive preaching throughout the western part of Judaea. He preached at Azotus and in all the surrounding cities, till he came up into Samaria to Caesarea. An extended ministry is here spoken of in one verse.⁴ If the other Christians, who were scattered abroad, preached as Philip did, all of Judaea would have heard the Gospel in a short time, as we can readily believe actually happened.

Another statement in Acts again gives a reference to the preaching of the Word in Judaea, this time by one of the Judaistic preachers, Peter. "He passed throughout all quarters",² which means mainly the land of Judaea, and came down to Lydda, where he preached and many became Christians.³ The following account tells us that there were disciples at Joppa who sent for Peter, while he was preaching at Lydda.⁴ There were already many who believed at Joppa, but the miracle of Peter- the raising of Dorcas- became known, and many more were added to the faith.⁵

The churches in Judaea in this time, as well as those in Galilee and Samaria had rest from persecution and multiplied greatly.⁶ Thus the Gospel was spread throughout Judaea, given its impetus by the Hellenistic party in the church.

That Hellenism had an influence in the spread of Christianity is shown also in the accounts we have about the spread of --

- | | | |
|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| (1) Acts 8,40. | (2) Acts 9,32. | (3) Acts 9,35. |
| (4) Acts 9,38. | (5) Acts 9,42. | (6) Acts 9,31. |

the Gospel in Samaria. Philip first went to the city of Samaria, preaching the Gospel to the Samaritans, and "The people with one accord gave heed to the things which Philip spake, hearing and seeing the miracles which he did,"⁴ This shows that there was at once a number of believers in Samaria, and that they joined themselves into a congregation, for the Apostles were asked to come from Jerusalem to establish their faith. Preaching and baptizing was the main part of the activity of Philip here also, as Act 8, 13 shows. Returning to Jerusalem, Peter and those with him also preached the Gospel in other Samaritan cities.²

The conversion of the Samaritans is also recorded in Acts 10, Peter here being the missionary. This incident is the first recorded of Gentiles being converted. Peter, the Judaistic Christian^{-st-}, first received a revelation from God telling him that the Old Testament Law was abolished. He then followed true Hellenistic principles when he went to the house of Cornelius in Caesarea Stratonis, preaching the Gospel also to the Gentiles. All who heard him were converted³, as the Holy Ghost fell upon them. Peter here followed the same procedure as Philip, accepting them into the congregation upon being baptized. Thus the congregation was the first to be founded in Caesarea, where Philip preached at a later time⁴.

Peter's converts in Caesarea were not Palestinian Jews, nor Hellenists, but Gentile Christians, not even circumcised.⁵ His attitude over against them is summed up in the words: "I perceive that God is no respecter of persons."⁶ Though he may have changed his attitude at times during the ensuing years, he knew the correct^{-not}

(1) Acts 8,6. (2) Acts 8,25. (3) Acts 10,44.
 (4) Acts 8,40;21,8. (5) Acts 10,28&45. (6) Acts 10,34.

course now, and defended his actions over against the Jews at Jerusalem⁴.

Of the spread of Christianity in Galilee we are told nothing in the book of Acts except general statements, as: "Then had all the churches rest throughout all Judaea, and Galilee, and Samaria, and were edified"². On the basis of such remarks we can conjecture that the disciples did some preaching in Galilee before the ascension and again after the ascension before Pentecost, as Jesus had told them to go to Galilee and await his appearance there. In Galilee he probably also appeared to the five hundred brethren at one time, so that there would have been believers in Galilee already before the disciples were scattered throughout the land of Palestine. But the early Christians perhaps also went there to be safe from the Jews, as Jesus did, since there were many Hellenic cities in Galilee³. Though there is no direct mention of Hellenistic Jews in Galilee, these can be inferred from the environment.

In later times Palestine was still very much Hellenistic. This is exemplified by the Epistle to the Hebrews. This epistle, evidently written to the Hebrews in Palestine, presupposed that its readers were Jews, that is, familiar with the temple arrangements and ceremonies⁵. On the other hand, the Alexandrian influence, the references to the total abrogation of the Law,⁶ and especially the Greek language ^{seem to} show that the letter was written to Hellenist Jews. The letter may have been written in Hebrew or Aramaic originally, but the proof then would be the same, as it would + then have been translated early, proving that Greek was spoken quite universally at the time⁴.

- (1) Acts 11,4ff. (2) Acts 9,30.
 (3) Schuerer: Geschichte des Juedischen Volkes. pg.82ff.
 (4) Foakes-Jackson: Rise of Gentile Christianity. pg.160.
 (5) Fuerbringer: Einleitung in das Neue Testament. pg.82.
 (6) Fuerbringer: Einleitung in d. N.T. pg.80.

It is quite natural that even Palestine should have been Hellenistic in later times, as the destruction of Jerusalem forced also the Judaistic Christians to flee. None of the Jews could return to Jerusalem, but we can understand that Hellenists would have been permitted to dwell in Palestine under the strict Roman rule soener than the Judaists, because of a closer association with the Gentiles in language and thought.

Jesus told the disciples: "Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature," and again, "That repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem." The Gospel had now been preached in Jerusalem and in all Palestine. It should yet be preached in all the rest of the world. This preaching had already been begun by those who had fled from Jerusalem, but not on a great scale. It was time for a greater missionary activity, and this was begun with the appearance of the Apostle Paul.

Paul was the 'chosen vessel' of the Lord, "to bear his name before the Gentiles, and kings, and the children of Israel". This statement, made by God himself to Ananias, will suffice to show that Paul was chosen to be the apostle to the Gentiles, and so fulfil the command of the Lord to preach the Gospel throughout all the earth.

There is some difficulty in explaining the character and party to which Paul belonged. He is said by some to have taken most of his doctrine from Greek philosophy, or at least to have used Hellenic thought in his Epistles. Again, it is claimed that he was of the Judaistic party, because of his statement that he was a

(1) Mark 16,15.
 (3) Acts 9,15.

(2) Luke 24,47.
 (4) Ramsay, Cities of St. Paul. pg.30ff.

"Hebrew of the Hebrews"¹, and that he was an Israelite of the seed of Abraham, of the tribe of Benjamin.^{2,5}

It is indeed a fact that Paul was a Jew. He was born and educated at Tarsus. The son of a Pharisee, he was trained in the noblest of Jewish thought. Himself a Pharisee, he learned the Law and traditions. As a strict Jew, he kept the temple ceremonies scrupulously. Yet we cannot say that Paul was a ~~Pharisaistic~~^{Palestinian} Jew, or that after he became a Christian he was a Judaistic Christian.

Neither was Paul influenced by Hellenic thought. His doctrines may often seem to correspond with certain phases of Greek literature, or with Greek philosophy, but they are used in a different sense, have a much deeper meaning, and were given him by divine inspiration. God revealed them to him; he did not acquire them from the study of the Greek philosophical systems. His thought may seem to correspond to that of the existing Roman world, but such a correspondence is merely coincidental, arising in Paul from his Christian knowledge. His actions are due, it is claimed, to the current ideas of cosmopolitanism and freedom, but Christian liberty is the cause of Paul's behaviour being as it is. Thus Paul was not a Hellenist in the sense of Hellenic.

He was a Hellenist inasmuch as he was a Hellenistic Jew. Having his home at Tarsus, he was a Jew of the Diaspora. As such he spoke the Greek language, which appears from his letters and the preaching among the Gentiles. He was a free citizen in a Roman city, therefore his father must have been free also. As one Jew could hardly be free in a city, there were probably a number of them at Tarsus, forming a colony and having their own synagog⁴.

(1) Philippians 3,5. (2) II Cor 11,2; Rom.11,1.

(3) Foakes-Jackson, Studies in the life of the Early Church, pg.21/

(4) Ramsay, Cities of St.Paul. pg 174.

Paul's father and he himself then belonged to this synagog at Tarsus.

Not only was Paul of Hellenistic speech though. He probably absorbed some of the thought of the Greek world about him, associating with the people of Tarsus. Ramsay says that in Tarsus, as far as the scanty evidence justifies the opinion, the Jews seem to have been regarded in a less degree than elsewhere as an alien element. This would account for Paul's knowledge of Greek customs and circumstances, which he at times makes use of in addressing the people. Such a knowledge would not have influenced his religious thought, however, or the doctrine of his epistles.

It is evident from his life that Paul never was a Hellenizer. There is no reason to believe that he even received a formal Hellenic education. He must have in his youth, though, observed many things going on about him that gave him ideas as to the nature of Hellenic thought. Thus he became familiar with the political and religious atmosphere of the larger world outside his orthodox Jewish home. He was at an early age educated in this home according to the custom of the Jews. In this connection he also calls himself a Hebrew of the Hebrews in Phil 3,5. He means by this that he was brought up in a home that not only had the correct Jewish doctrine, but also insisted on retaining the Hebrew language in the home and educating the children in it. The Hebrew, or, as it were, Aramaic, may have been used by him only as a secondary language, as the fluent Greek of his epistles shows that he must have been acquainted with this language from his youth. His education under Gamaliel also shows that he was not influenced by Hellenic ideas, this being the stronghold of Pharisaism.

(1) Ramsay, Cities of St. Paul. pg 139.

(2) Walker, History of the Christian Church. pg.26.

(3) Dummelow Commentary on Phil 3,5.

Thus Paul, having an objective knowledge of Greek thought ^{and} and culture, yet remained true to the Jewish religion and principles until converted to Christianity. The witness of the Law and the prophets was an integral part of his thought. In the wisdom of ^{men} men he refused to partake. "And yet Paul could not possibly withdraw himself from the Greek world in which he lived. His epistles correspond curiously in structure to the private letters which every year brings us from their long burial in the sands of Egypt."¹

Paul indeed preached to the Gentiles as well as to the ^{Jews} Jews on all his missionary journeys. More wonderful, though, than his eloquence and his miracles was the spirit he displayed over ^{at} against the Romans when he wrote that it was his heart's desire that the Jews should be saved. He would gladly be 'accursed' if he could only save his brethren according to the ² flesh. Paul finds it hard to understand how Israel could fail to accept the Gospel; and accounts for it partly by recollecting that the prophets had always foretold that a remnant only should be saved, and partly by the fact that in Scripture God had chosen Jacob and rejected ^{-tel-} Esau.³ Israel not accepting the Word, it was preached to the Gentiles, who now also received their opportunity to be saved.

Thus it was a Hellenist to whom was intrusted the major portion of spreading the Gospel among the nations. Paul could well claim that he was a Hebrew of the Hebrews and yet say that to the Greek he became a Greek. Being thus fitted for his work, he began it immediately after he had been converted.

Asia Minor was the first scene of the activities of Paul. He preached here after his conversion, - at Damascus, then in Arabia, Damascus again, and later in Syria and Cilicia.⁴ - - - -

(1) Ropes, The Apostolic Age. pg.122. (3) Foakes-Jackson, Rise of Gentile Christianity. pg. 91.
 (2) Rom.9,3. (4) Galatians ch.1.

He again labored in Asia Minor on his great missionary journeys, but since we cannot trace his journeys here, we will attempt to treat his activities according to provinces, together with the growth of the church in the various cities.

Paul preached much in the provinces directly north of Palestine. Much of his time was spent at Antioch and Damascus in Syria, in Tyre and Sidon as also in Ptolemais in Phoenicia, and in Tarsus in Cilicia.

The first preaching of Paul was in the city of Damascus, ⁱⁿ in Syria, the most important city in the province. That there were numerous Jews in the city we see from the fact already that Paul at once began to preach in the synagogues after he had been converted. ^{-ed.} Some of the Christians from Jerusalem had preceded him here, it seems, since Ananias was a Christian, and special mention is made of the disciples in the city. ^{2.} Paul preached first at Damascus, then fled to Arabia, and on his return again preached in Damascus, ^{3.} until the Jews in the synagogues forced him to flight again. ^{New} The New Testament tells us no more about the history of the church at Damascus, but the Hellenistic Christians must have formed a congregation there as they were strong enough to merit Saul's journey ^{4.} to Damascus to persecute them already shortly after the death of Stephen and the persecution at Jerusalem.

In the description of the sending of Paul and Barnabas on their first missionary journey, we have an account of the congregation of Antioch in Syria. This was one of the free cities or Hellenic cities of the Roman Empire. Being near the sea-coast, and having at the same time facilities for handling trade by land,

(1) Acts 9,22.

(2) Acts 9,19.

(3) Galatians 1,17&18.

it became a center of commerce, and consequently grew into a large and beautiful city. Thus also the Jews were attracted to it, both for the opportunities for trade, and because they would there have equal rights with other citizens.¹ There was a Jewish synagog at Antioch, where the Hellenists carried the Gospel as elsewhere, since we have in Acts 6,5 already a reference to Nicolas, a proselyte from Antioch.

The Word was first brought here by some of the Jews who had fled from Jerusalem during the persecution. These had preached first to the Jews², and then also to the Greeks.³ There may not have been many Jews in the city, for we do not hear that many Jews were converted to the faith, and even in later times there were mainly Gentiles in the congregation. The Jews who were there, however, were of the dispersion, and formed the Hellenist part of the congregation. Barnabas, the Hellenist teacher, was sent to strengthen these new Christians, and he later introduced Paul into their midst also, the two working together for a whole year.⁴

At the time of the sending of the apostles on their first journey, there were some Hellenists in the congregation, as we see from the account.⁵ Among those mentioned we have first Barnabas, the Hellenist teacher, who was already mentioned in Acts 4; then Simeon, called Niger, his Roman cognomen; Lucius of Cyrene, evidently a Hellenistic Christian, as the name at least indicates. Then there is mentioned Manaen, who had been brought up with Herod. This does not indicate whether he was a Hellenist or not. Paul himself is finally mentioned by his Hebrew name Saul. These were the teachers, and as the teachers, so the congregation must have

(1) Taylor, Paul the Missionary. pg 72. (2). Acts 11,19.
 (3) Acts 11,20. (4) Acts 11,25ff. (5) Acts 13, 1ff.

been Hellenistic.

Here the converts to the faith were first called "Christians", and here also the question came to an issue, whether the Christians of Gentile birth should live up to the Jewish Law or not. If they did, Christianity would be nothing more than a Jewish sect; otherwise it could become a universal religion, but at the cost of much Jewish sympathy. To this end also Paul strove and finally succeeded.

Christianity also spread into the Phoenician cities of Tyre, Sidon and Ptolemais. Tyre is mentioned as a stopping-place of Paul on the third missionary journey.² There is little information about the Christians of the place except in this one reference. Paul remained there seven days, probably, according to his custom, preaching in the synagogues and exhorting the brethren. He found disciples there who had perhaps come from Jerusalem and were in all probability Jews who were living there only for commercial reasons, therefore Hellenists. He may have stopped there on his second journey already, or perhaps even on the first, and founded the congregation, though it is more likely that it was founded from Jerusalem.

From Tyre Paul went to Ptolemais, also a coast city. He remained there only one day, saluting the brethren.³ There must have been a well-established congregation of believers in the city at this time, though nothing more is said about it. The Gospel was brought here from Tyre and Sidon, or at about the same time as to these cities.

Sidon had perhaps also been visited by Paul on one of his early journeys, but it is not until his final trip to Rome, that

(1) Walker, History of the Christian Church. pg 25.

(2) Acts 21,3. (3) Acts 21,7.

any mention is made of this coast-city of Phoenicia. Then there is only a scanty remark to the effect that Paul had an opportunity to visit some of his friends while passing through the city.¹ Either he had been here before, then, on some of the Christians from Jerusalem whom Paul had known had also come here and settled. Except for the more general statements such as Acts 11,19, which show that disciples came to Phoenicia or passed through it, there are no references in the New Testament as to the strength of the Christian church of this time in these cities.

In connection with the nearer provinces we can also treat Cilicia, the home-land of Paul. The Christians of this country are first mentioned in the account of the Council of Jerusalem,² letters being sent to them from the Jerusalem church; and we can gather from the tenor of the letter that they were mainly Hellenistic Christians, into whose midst Judaizers had come.

Paul and Silas also visited Cilicia on the second journey, and it seems that there were numerous churches there. "And he went through Syria and Cilicia, confirming the churches."³ Paul had preached at Tarsus after being threatened by the Hellenist Jews in Jerusalem,⁴ and from there Barnabas again brought him to Antioch.⁵ After this no more is said about his preaching specifically at Tarsus, Paul had given the impetus to the rise of Christianity in Cilicia it seems when he visited the land after his conversion, and from that time on it had spread continually until there were many churches there. These Christians were for the most part Jews, as there was a great Jewish settlement at Tarsus, and Paul would have here also adhered to his principle of preaching to the Jews —

- (1) Acts 27,3. (2) Acts 15,22. (3) Acts 15,41.
 (4) Acts 9,30. (5) Acts 11,25.

first and then also to the Greeks. We have, then, intimations of a strong band of believers in Cilicia already at the time of the second missionary journey.

Cyprus, an island of the Mediterranean Sea, can also be treated here, as it was near the coast of Cilicia. In this stronghold of vice and idolatry there were numerous Jews.¹ Paul and Barnabas made Cyprus the first scene of their missionary activities on the first journey. They preached in the synagogues at Salamis.² Though we do not know the results of their preaching, we know that they preached to the Jews first also here, and that the Jews were ^{numer-}numerous in the city. The statement in Act 13,6 shows that they went through the island, and we can well supply 'preaching the Gospel' here. At Salamis no record is given of their preaching, but it is implied in the opposition of Elymas. The conversion of Sergius Paulus, the deputy of the country, indicates that Paul and his companions had spoken to the Jews and were already preaching to the Gentiles.

Some of the victims of the persecution of Jerusalem who had left their homes, had already been on the island and perhaps had preached the Gospel also to the Gentiles, as they did when they came to Antioch from there.³ The congregations founded by these Christians were probably also visited by Paul and Barnabas on the first journey. Barnabas, however, a native of the island, again returned to the place upon separation from Paul for a more intensive activity among his countrymen, taking with him John Mark.⁴
Barnabas, himself a Hellenistic Jew, probably also here began his

(1) Taylor, Paul the Missionary. pg92ff. (2) Acts 13,5.
 (3) Acts 11,19. (4) Acts 15,39.

work among the Hellenist inhabitants of the island, later extending his preaching to the Gentiles population.

One of the first and most extensive activities of Paul was that in the province of Galatia. He touched there during all his missionary journeys and remained at the cities of Galatia rather long at times. That they were especially dear to him is shown by his epistle to the Galatians, in which he exhorts them to stand firmly on the doctrine which they had learned from him.

The first city of Galatia to be visited by Paul was Antioch in Pisidia.¹ This was a Hellenistic city. The civilization which Rome spread throughout the East was bilingual, and it was therefore probable that Greek was even used in the home-life of the city.² Greek, therefore was also the language used in the synagog of the Jews. Since the Jews were in such a Greek environment, and had been for three and a half centuries influenced by Hellenic culture, they were Hellenized, Greek-speaking, and able to move freely and win success in the free competition of a Hellenic, self-governing city.³

Paul and Barnabas came to Antioch already on their first journey. On the Sabbath they went into the synagog of the Hellenists, taking their seat in a place reserved for those who wished to speak.⁴ Paul here preached his first recorded sermon, addressing himself first to the Jews and then to the Gentile converts. In his preaching he spoke particularly to the Jews, but it was the Gentiles who wanted to hear more of this teaching.⁵ Some of the Jews were converted as well as Gentiles on this first Sabbath.⁶ On the next Sabbath there were a great number of people who were willing to hear the Apostles. The Jews then became envious of Paul and Barnabas,

(1) Acts 13,14. (2) Ramsay, Cities of St.Paul.pg. 278.

(3) Ramsay, Cities of St.Paul,258. (4) Acts 13,14ff.

(5) Acts 13,42. (6) Acts 13,43.

and tried to dissuade the people from listening to them. The Apostles thereupon turned to the Gentiles¹, thus angering the Jews the more, so that they stirred up the city against the apostles and expelled them from the city. Many of the Gentiles had been converted by their preaching though². These converts were confirmed in ^{the} the faith when they returned from their trip through the cities of Galatia. They exhorted them, ordained elders in the church, and prayed with them; and commending them to the Lord, they continued their journey.³

Leaving Antioch, Paul and Barnabas came to Iconium, also a city in Galatia.⁴ This also was a Hellenistic city, the Hellenic influence entering by the Greeks who settled there from the time of Alexander the Great onward. That it was more Hellenic than the other cities of Galatia is shown by the fact that Luke calls the inhabitants of the city in general 'Hellenes', whereas he speaks of the people of the other cities as "the multitude".⁵ That there were Jews of the Dispersion in Iconium is certain, but their number is not known, except that they did not here make up any great part of the population.

Paul and Barnabas upon coming to Iconium also here went into the Jewish synagog and preached to Jews and Greeks, many of whom believed.⁶ It can be expected that in such a city there would be quite a number of proselytes to the Jewish faith from the Hellenic population, especially as the Jews were Hellenistic. The audience of the Apostles then included the congregation, both the Jews and the Gentiles. Remaining in the city for some time, the apostles did many miracles besides preaching in the name of Jesus,

(1) Acts 13,46. (2) Acts 13,48.

(3) Acts 14,22.23. (4) Ramsay, Cities of St. Paul. 343.

(5) Acts 14,1. (6) Acts 14,1.

so that they had a large number who held with them.¹ long. Thus

Even in Iconium the stay of the Apostles was cut short by the Jews. Those who did not accept the teaching were offended that they should turn to the Gentiles and receive them into the church. They roused the Gentiles to aid them in an uprising against Paul and Barnabas. These men heard about the intended mobbing and left the city. They again returned by way of Iconium again², and confirmed also the Christians of this city.

Two more cities of Galatia need to be mentioned here, Lystra and Derbe, in the province of Lycaonia. Both of these cities received a large part of their importance from being situated on Roman roads; the Jews therefore also settled there.³ The cities on the whole were crude and ignorant. Being educated in the Greek tongue, the people thought they were Hellenized, but they did not even have much knowledge of the Greek language. Hence they were also steeped in idolatry, thoroughly heathen.

To these cities the Apostles came, preaching the Gospel and healing the sick.⁴ After the healing of the lame man, the people of Lystra, who yet spoke mainly a native dialect, thought Paul and Barnabas were gods come down from heaven, and wished to sacrifice to them. The apostles found it difficult to calm this idolatrous people. Hardly had they been persuaded though to cease from honoring them as gods, when Jews came from Antioch and Iconium, who persuaded the natives to stone Paul. Though the great mass changed their opinion quickly, there were some who believed.⁵ These Paul and Barnabas confirmed after returning from a short trip to Derbe. On the second journey Paul again revisited these cities with Silas, taking Timothy along from Derbe.⁶ In the

region of Lycaonia there must have been many Jews, as Paul had to
 (1) Acts 14,4. (2) Acts 14,21. (3) Ramsay, Cities of St. Paul, 399.
 (4) Acts 14,7ff. (5) Acts 14,20. (6) Acts 16,1ff.

circumcise his assistant Timothy before taking him along. Thus Hellenistic Christianity was present also in this region, and the churches mentioned in Act 16,5 were partly Hellenistic and partly Gentile. On the third journey Paul again passed through these cities and strengthened the disciples.¹

The Roman province of Asia was the scene for much of the missionary activity of Paul. Many congregations were founded here, in the cities, by the disciples from Jerusalem, coming there during the dispersion, and by the apostles in general, as there are seven great churches there in later times, at Philadelphia, Pergamos, Smyrna, Sardis, Ephesus, Thyatira, and Laodicea. We cannot treat all of the churches in Asia, but will concern ourselves only with those of the larger cities, and then only insofar as they are connected with Paul.

The first of the cities of Asia to be visited by Paul was Troas.^{Troas} On the second missionary journey, leaving Galatia, Paul and Silas came to this city. How long they remained there is not known, but they probably did some preaching before being called to go to Macedonia.² As this section is the beginning of a 'we-section' it may be assumed that Luke had been preaching at Troas and was taken along by Paul at this point. That Paul preached here at this time and had results is indicated in the letter to the Corinthians.³

Paul again returned to Troas on the third journey, taking with him many of the disciples, and, arriving there from Ephesus, remained there seven days.⁴ On the last day of his stay, he preached to the Christians, and it is here that we have some information --

- (1) Acts 18,23. (2) Acts 16,7-11.
 (3) II Corinthians 2,12.13. (4) Acts 20,4ff.

about the early congregations and services. They were gathered together on the house-top, a large upper chamber. The congregation at Troas must have been quite large, as the place required many lights to light it up. Even though it was a large place, it was crowded, people sitting even in the windows. The gathering was on the first day of the week, commemorating the Resurrection of Jesus. The congregation celebrated the Eucharist and heard a sermon. This one account then shows us something about the number of Christians at Troas at this time, and also about the organization and services used in the church.

Ephesus, the capital of the province of Asia, was also visited often by Paul on his journeys. In this city, a center of commerce and trade, where the oriental, the Jewish, and the Grecian came together, Christianity had already begun before Paul came to the city. Aquila and Priscilla had been active there, as also Apollos to some extent. Greek thought and culture flourished in the city; but also idolatry, and that in a severe form. It was the home of Philo, the great teacher who applied Hellenic thought to the Old Testament and thus obtained many followers in the city.

Paul first came to Ephesus at the end of the second journey, together with Aquila and Priscilla. Here he preached in the synagog of the Jews, continuing his practise of preaching first to the Jews and then to the Gentiles. Leaving there against the wishes of the Ephesian congregation, he left the work in charge of Aquila and Priscilla and went down to Jerusalem. Apollos then came to Ephesus and was instructed by Aquila and Priscilla, whereupon he also preached in the city, converting many Jews.³ Thus a great

(1) Taylor, Paul the Missionary, pg. 301/

(2) Acts 18, 18.

(3) Acts 18, 28.

Hellenistic congregation had its beginning. ^{in Asia Minor, but also in}

On the third missionary ^{journey} Paul again came to Ephesus, and this time for a more extended ministry. He preached in the synagoges for three months, converting many and spreading the Gospel among them. Then opposition arose again, and again from the Hellenistic Jews. Paul had to leave the synagog and from that time on disputed in a Greek school.¹ The Greeks as well as the Jews thus heard the Word, and it spread throughout all Asia through the efforts of Paul. The Christians were becoming so numerous at Ephesus that the trade of the silversmiths, who made images of the gods, fell off, and these caused an uproar in the city. Paul then left the province, going to Macedonia again, and returned only when he was about to go to Jerusalem and not see them again.² The church was by this time well-established, as Paul could call the elders together and have them meet him at Miletus. A great church thus grew out of Paul's mission among the Hellenist Jews of Ephesus and among the Gentiles who were converted to the faith when the Jews refused to accept the Gospel.

We have mentioned, that the word spread throughout all of Asia through the efforts of Paul and the Christians of Ephesus. It was, however, also spread into all the other provinces of Asia Minor. On the Day of Pentecost there were people of all nations in Jerusalem, Hellenist Jews, who, hearing and believing, went to their homes and preached the Gospel. It is probable that in this way Pontus, Cappadocia, and Pamphylia received the Gospel. Paul himself preached in Perga in Pamphylia³, but not for an extended time. Thus Christianity was brought to all the provinces of ^{world} Asia Minor according to the command of Jesus to preach in all the wor

(1) Acts 19,10.

(2) Acts 20,17.

(3) Acts 14,25.

Not only was the Gospel preached in Asia Minor, but also in Europe. While Paul was at Ephesus, a man appeared to him in a vision, asking him to come over to Macedonia and help those living there. Obedient to this call, which he considered a sign from God, he departed to Macedonia, and thus began his work in Europe. He preached in Greece on his second and third journeys, and had an opportunity of also spreading the Gospel in Italy during his stay there as a captive. In discussing his mission in Europe, and the spread of Christianity there, we shall also merely consider the cities in which Paul remained for any length of time.

Passing over into Greece, the first city Paul came to ^{after} entering Macedonia according to his plan was Philippi.¹ This was a flourishing Roman colony on the Via Egnatia, connecting the East and the West. It was very popular for all manner of people, not only because of its opportune location, but also because of the freedom which one living there would enjoy, as it was in every way a Roman province. It is surprizing that only a few Jews were there, the number not being large enough to support a synagog; but it may be that the Jews who lived here forgot all about their home-land and worship through constant association with the Romans.²

After remaining in the city a few days, the Apostle and his company went down to the river on the Sabbath, to the house where the Jews held their prayer-meetings, since there was no synagog.³ They spoke first to the Jews who had assembled there, mostly women,³ and among these even a proselyte from Thyatira. Before the imprisonment of Paul and Silas, they must have preached for some time

(1) Acts 16,12. (2) Taylor, Paul the Missionary. pg 226.

(3) Acts 16,13.

at Philippi, as there seem to have been a number of brethren who were converted by the time they were released from prison and left the city.¹ Towards the end of the third journey Paul again visited the congregation.² The church grew steadily though, so that Paul could address himself to the bishops and deacons of the congregation^{-tim} of Philippi in about the year 63 A.D in his epistle to them. He thus indicates that he had founded a large, well-organized church.

Leaving Philippi, Paul went along the Egnatian way to Thessalonica, the next place in which he preached. This city was the capital of one of the four divisions of Macedonia, and governed^{-ed} as a free-city. As it was a great sea-port, it was a meeting-place^{-d} of people of all nations. There were accordingly many Jews in Thessalonica, and many synagogues, though only one synagogue is mentioned specifically in Acts. This was perhaps the most prominent one?^{-ent}

Paul came to this city and immediately began to preach^{the} to the Jews.⁴ On three successive Sabbath days he spoke in the synagogue, arguing with the Hellenist Jews and Greeks. Some of the Jews and many of the Greeks were won over to the faith.⁵ When a band of lewd^{lewd} Jews plotted against him, he and his companions were forced to flee.^{1st} The congregation, however, grew rapidly, and not only increasedⁱⁿ in Thessalonica, but spread throughout the surrounding country, so that the Apostle could already in the first letter to them praise^{-a} them for spreading the Gospel not only through Macedonia and Achaia, but throughout all the land.^b

When Paul was forced to flee from Thessalonica, he went to Berea, a small and secluded city some fifty miles south of Thessalonica.. Here he hoped to be able to work without disturbance^{from} from

- (1) Acts 16,40. (2) Acts 20,6.
 (3) Taylor, Paul the Missionary. pg.243. (4) Acts 17,1ff.
 (5) Acts 17,4. (6) I Thess 1,8.

the Jews who were seeking to take him. He also preached in the synagog here, and was at first unmolested.¹ The Jews received the Word readily and many of them believed, as well as many of the Greeks, searching the Scriptures daily. When some of the Jews ^{from} Thessalonica came down again, and again began an uprising, Paul ^{also} had to flee from this city. Silas and Timothy remained a short ^{time} yet, working among the Hellenists and Greeks, until Paul called them to Athens.

Paul waited for Silas and Timothy to come to him at Athens. This, once the capital of Attica, was still one of the most important cities of Greece. It was "the intellectual metropolis of the ancient world- the mother of arts and eloquence"². It was the ^{mother} mother of philosophy and Hellenic culture, and in it religious life was as bad as its morals.

Into such a city Paul was bold enough to go while waiting ^{for} his travelling companions. When he saw that the city was given up completely to idolatry he wanted to help them.³ At this place ^{again} he acted according to his principle of preaching to the Jews first. He entered into the synagog, disputing with the Jews. Not only did he preach to them, though; he also went out into the market-place, talking with whomsoever he met. When the philosophers heard of him, ^{him} they asked him to explain his new doctrine to them. Paul then made his sermon to them on Mars hill, speaking on 'the unknown God'. Even here, in the center of speculative thought, he converted some to the plain truths of Christianity.⁴

Upon leaving Athens Paul came to Corinth and remained there for some time⁵. Corinth had been destroyed in 146 B.C, but built _

- (1) Acts 17,10. (2) Taylor, Paul the Missionary.pg.259.
 (3) Acts 17,17. (4) Acts 18,34.
 (5) Acts 18,1ff.

up again by Julius Caesar and made into a Roman colony. Being a center of commerce, it soon became rich, and the results of riches followed- luxury and vice.

Coming to Corinth, Paul found Aquila and Priscilla there, who had come from Rome, and being a tentmaker as they were, remained with them. He reasoned in the synagog every Sabbath and persuaded Jews and Greeks¹. Many were won over by his preaching and believed². Paul continued here for a year and six months, teaching the people, till another uprising made it necessary for him to leave. That the church at Corinth grew and prospered is shown in the first epistle to the Corinthians. This epistle is addressed mainly to Gentile Christians. Not many of the Jews were converted therefore. Had it been Jewish, it would not have needed so much instruction on the elementary principles of morality, nor such warnings against idolatry. Its worship must have been disposed to become irregular and orgiastic, a meeting which became a Babel of confusion when each tried to exhibit his spiritual gift without regard for the rest of the assembly³. Had they been an entirely Jewish community, they would not have needed the stern admonitions about bodily purity which the Apostle gives to a still semi-pagan community like that of Corinth⁴.

From these central points of the Greek land where the Apostle preached and founded churches, the Gospel spread throughout Greece. Given an impetus by Paul, the doctrine was spread by the Christians wherever they went, just as the believers of Thessalonica did, for which they merited Paul's praise in a letter.

The Gospel had now been brought through all of Asia Minor and

(1) Acts 18,4. (2) Acts 18,8.

(3) I Cor. 11,21;14,23.

(4) Foakes-Jackson, Studies in the Life of the Early Church. pg.32.

Greece. It had yet to be brought to Rome and Italy before the spreading was complete. This was accomplished by Paul when he was taken prisoner and brought to Rome because he appealed to the higher courts.

On the way from Jerusalem to Rome the company was shipwrecked and so chanced to remain on the island of Melita or Malta three days⁴. Paul performed two miracles on the island, so we may suppose that also some of the barbarian people were brought to the faith. Going to Syracuse, they remained there three days and then went to Puteoli, where they again found members of the church,⁵ remaining with them a week.

When Paul came near Rome, the brethren came out to meet him.⁶ This implies that there had been members of the church at Rome. The congregation there was probably founded by disciples of the faith from Jerusalem, much before Paul came there as captive, though it was not very well known as yet. Paul then summoned the Jews together to talk over his captivity with them. Here he again testified of his faith. After he had talked to them the whole day, some believed and some did not. Thus there was a beginning also here of Hellenistic Christianity, and also of an opposition against Paul. For two years he dwelt in Rome and taught the Gospel to all who came to him. Because of Acts 28,28 it is probable that most of these converts were Gentiles, though many of the Jews may have turned to him also.

Thus the Word of salvation had been brought now to the ends of the world, fulfilling the words of Jesus. Paul, however, had —

- (1) Acts 28,1-10.
- (2) Acts 28,14.
- (3) Acts 28,15.

been disappointed in the results of the preaching. He had expected all the Jews to accept the Gospel.¹ On the contrary, there were not very many of the Jews either of Palestine or of the Diaspora who accepted the truth. Those who did receive it, though, became the nucleus of later Christianity, as they aided in the spread of the word more than the Jews or Gentiles, being already familiar with the underlying principles of Christianity. The Apostles also turned to the Gentiles when their fellow-Jews would not accept ^{the} truth. They made no distinctions between the Jews and Gentiles ^{then}, so that their work readily had effect also among the Greeks. Thus in reality a separate body was formed in the church- Gentile Christianity. Christianity appeared to these, as it could not to the Jews, as a new religion. The back-ground and setting of the Jewish Christian were lacking in them. Making faith in the Lord Jesus the condition for salvation for the Jew and Gentile alike, they set themselves over against Judaism as well as against ^{the} Heathenism as a distinct and exclusive religion.⁴

The nucleus of the congregation remained Hellenistic. In all the cities, where they preached, the Apostles spoke first to the Jews, some of whom believed, forming what is known as Hellenistic Christianity. Having need of less instruction than the ^{the} Gentiles, and being of sterner moral quality,³ it was greatly through their efforts that Christianity spread and prospered, and the churches founded remained true to the faith. _ _ _ _ _

(1) Moore, History of Religions. pg. 119, vol.II.

(2) Compare pg. 49, par. 2.

(3) These were the Jews of the Diaspora, well-versed in Old ^{the} Testament prophecies, and, before becoming Christians, obedient to all the laws of Moses. Holding to the moral Law and being versed in it, they had this foundation of Christian living, and aided the spread of Christianity more than the Gentiles, who had to learn even the principles of morality, in the Apostolic Age.

Conclusion.

Since we have followed through the contact of Hellenism with Christianity at the beginning of the modern era, we have yet to consider what influence the one exerted upon the other. There was surely an influence of Hellenism upon Christianity, as there was also some influence upon Hellenism on the part of Christianity. Two such tendencies could not act in the same circles without leaving some impress on one another. To what extent they did influence each other is, however, difficult to determine.

Certain it is that Christianity influenced Hellenism. It had a very decided effect upon Hellenistic Judaism, both negative and positive. The Jews of the Hellenistic synagogues in Jerusalem realized the difference between Hellenistic Jews and Christians, and persecuted them. In this way Christianity caused the Jews to antagonize their own countrymen, as the doctrines which the Christian accepted seemed blasphemous to the Jew.

Christianity exerted a positive influence upon Hellenism when Hellenists became Christians. They were taught the Christian doctrines of faith in Christ Jesus and forgiveness without sacrifices. Freedom from the Law was emphasized, and the equality of the Jew and the Gentile in the kingdom of God. These factors caused a great change in the Hellenist when he became a believer.

Not only did Christianity have an effect upon the Hellenists; it also influenced the Hellenes and the world at large. In Acts 17,6 the Jews of Thessalonica say: "These that have turned the world upside down", referring to the Christian missionaries. Christianity did not only affect the religious thought of the age,

but the morality of the world as well. Insisting upon a strict moral life in their doctrine, and proving it with their conduct, the Christian congregation became a foundation for a higher morality of the world as well as for the true religion. The conduct and thought of the entire Hellenic world was eventually affected by Christianity, especially in later centuries.

As Hellenism was influenced by Christianity, however, so Christianity was in turn influenced by Hellenism. The language of the Hellenists, New Testament Greek, was quite simple and yet ^{had} become almost universal, making the spread of Christianity less difficult. The Evangelists had need of but one language--Greek.

The spread of Christianity was also influenced by the ^{thought} of Hellenism. The Hellenists more readily understood the full significance of Christianity than the Palestinian Jews upon being converted, especially in its distinctive doctrines and universality. Realizing that it was neither purely the Jewish nor a heathen religion, they were at once more zealous in spreading it as a ^{new} religion.

Since the Hellenists were connected more closely with the ^{institutions} of the Christian church were copied in their general features from this institution, particularly in the Diaspora. The 'meeting-house' was patterned after the synagog and the ^{order} of service developed largely from the synagog worship. No ^{opposi-}tion was found in the teachings of Christianity to such doctrines as baptism, the Eucharist, and the mystical union, because the Hellenists had become acquainted with similar lines of thought in the Greek world. They did not copy these thoughts from the ^{Greeks} but could understand them, when they were taught them by the Apostles.

A secondary influence was exerted upon Christianity also by Hellenic culture. Hellenistic Greek had come to be used through the influence of this movement, as it was derived directly from the Greek. Through Hellenism, Hellenic culture also had a bearing upon Christianity inasmuch as it gave to the world ideas of freedom and equality of nations, and originated the organization known as the 'city-state', which made the spread of Christianity less difficult because of the dispersion of the Jews in the various cities.

General conditions in the Roman world and Asia Minor, which are all to some extent influenced by Hellenic thought, were such as to aid the Christian missionaries. Current ideas of liberty and cosmopolitanism greatly aided the spread of the Gospel. Freedom of speech and action as well as the protection given even to strangers and foreigners was conducive to missionary travel. Thus conditions in the Roman world at large easily afforded an opportunity for the preaching of the Gospel of Christ.

However much Christianity was influenced through Hellenistic Judaism and Hellenic culture in general, in its organization and spread throughout the world, it was not at all influenced by them in its doctrine or essential points. It was strictly an exclusive religion, given by direct revelation of God.

Neither Jesus nor Paul could have been influenced by Hellenic thought. Jesus lived and preached in Palestine. Besides having his doctrine from himself, his religion was based on orthodox Judaism, since he did not come into contact with Hellenism enough to influence him. He lived and moved among members of the exclusive Jewish religion, and he taught his doctrine to these same people, who did not recognize anything conflicting with Judaism at first.

Nor was Paul affected by Hellenism. He received his doctrine ^{by} by divine revelation, Gal 1,15. Though born in the Diaspora, he was not Hellenic, as he was educated in the house of his father, a Pharisee, and then in Jerusalem, - in the orthodox Jewish religion, which did not permit of Greek ideas entering into theology. He himself says that his doctrine, the doctrine of Christ is 'to the Greeks foolishness'. 1 Cor. 1,23.

Christianity was not influenced in doctrine by the Hellenist ^{- ist} Jews. They had no distinctive doctrines. Essentially they were Jewish, observing the Law and the prophets and even the traditions. Doctrinal differences then would have been due to Greek thought. Even through ^{the} traditions they did not influence Christianity, as the Gospel directly opposed and objected to such traditions. They gave up the traditions as well as the Old Testament ceremonies upon becoming Christianized.

Greek thought gave to Christianity no part of its religion. Not only was the origin of Christianity in a different part of the world, the condition of the world was such that Christianity could not have been influenced by it. Though there was a slight knowledge of morality among some of the writers of the time as Seneca, Pliny the Younger, and Plutarch, their morality was far from the true morality of the Christian, being merely a morality of abstinence. Though there were many pearls even in the philosophy ^{- ophy} of the Greeks, the string upon which they were strung together is altogether different from that of Christianity. ^{allms} Though Paul seems to have a philosophy which approaches the Hellenic, he could not have received it from this source except through the medium of Hellenistic Judaism, which was impossible, or by his contact with

(1) De Pressensé, The Ancient World and Christianity. pg. 445.

his hearers, equally impossible. His doctrinal thought was complete^{-plete} at once, having been given him by divine revelation.

The Greek religion could have had no bearing upon Christ-^{-ism}ianity, as it was not secure in doctrine itself. The state-religion was in such a condition of decline that few still believed in it. The religion there was, was gross idolatry, mainly a system of debauchery. The 'mysteries', which arose at the fall of the state-religion and began to spread over all the land, had no greater opportunity for influencing Christianity than the religion of the state. Neither Jesus nor Paul could have come into contact with them to any great extent. Similarities in words of thoughts occur, but with very different underlying doctrines and principles. There were certain ideas of truth present in the pagan world^{about} about a future deliverance and a dark, undefined groping for light, but it remained for Christianity to bring light into the darkness.

The appearance of Christianity in all its significance was as amazing to the Greek as it was to the Jew and the Roman. "The world was surprised to see an Israelite, Oriental by race, but Greek in the wide penetration of his sympathy, Roman in the majesty of his authority."

The religion of Christ was a distinctive religion.

(1) Stanley, History of the Jews. III, 416.

Hellenism, in its relation to Christianity, can be explained as a tendency which enabled the Jew more readily to accept the Gospel, and caused him to be more zealous in bringing it throughout the world. In this way Hellenism became the foundation of the greatest church of all times, and the cause of its wide spread. The Hellenist missionaries, as well as the Hellenist recipients of the Gospel were active in this respect.

Christianity was not built on the Hellenic part of Hellenistic Judaism, and yet the Hellenistic party of the Jews, being the more liberal, was the one which finally gained the ascendancy and ruled out almost completely the Judaistic or Pharisaistic party. When the Gospel was brought to the nations in general, there was still another division of the church: Gentile Christianity. There was then finally a great fusing of the Jewish and Greek elements into one with the Hellenists, which was also accomplished through the principles of Hellenistic Christianity.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

- Angus: The Mystery-religions and Christianity. 1925.
- Deissman: Licht vom Osten. 1908.
- DePressensè: The Ancient World and Christianity. 1898.
- Dummelow: The Holy Bible with Commentary. 1915.
- Foakes-Jackson: History of the Christian Church. 1918.
- Foakes-Jackson: Rise of Gentile Christianity. 1927.
- Foakes-Jackson: Studies in the Life of the Early Church. 1924.
- Glawe: Die Beziehung des Christentums zum Griechischen Heidentum. 1913. 1913.
- Gregory: Einleitung in das Neue Testament. 1909.
- Hayes: The Greek Culture and the Greek Testament. 1925.
- Holy Bible, Authorized Version.
- Hort: Judaistic Christianity. 1904.
- Jewish Encyclopedia. 1905.
- Kretzmann: Popular Commentary. 1923.
- Machen: The Origin of Paul's Religion. 1925.
- McGiffert: History of Christianity. 1922.
- Moore: History of Religions. I&II. 1922.
- Nestle: Novum Testamentum Graece. 1920
- New International Encyclopedia. 1926.
- Orr: Neglected Factors. 1899.
- Ramsay: Cities of St. Paul. 1907.
- Ropes: The Apostolic Age. 1921.
- Schirlitz: Greek Dictionary. 1893.
- Schuerer: Geschichte des Juedischen Volkes--. I&II. 1898.
- Staley: History of the Jewish Church. III. 1913.
- Taylor: Paul the Missionary. 1909.
- Universal Encyclopedia and Atlas. 1905. C.K.Adams.
- Walker: History of the Christian Church. 1917.
- Weiss: Das Urchristentum. 1917.
- Young: Analytical Concordance. 1885.