Library of Historic Theology

EDITED BY THE REV. WM. C. PIERCY, M.A.
DEAN AND CHAPLAIN OF WHITELANDS COLLEGE

THE CHRISTOLOGY OF ST. PAUL

S. NOWELL ROSTRON, M.A.

THE CHRISTOLOGY OF ST. PAUL

HULSEAN PRIZE ESSAY
WITH AN ADDITIONAL CHAPTER

BY THE REV.
S. NOWELL ROSTRON, M.A.
VICAR OF ST. LAWRENCE, KIRKDALE,
LATE PRINCIPAL OF ST. JOHN'S HALL, DURHAM; LATE SCHOLAR
OF ST. JOHN'S COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE

NEW YORK CHICAGO
FLEMING H. REVELL COMPANY
MCMXII

PARENTIBUS FILIUS

HOC OPUSCULUM

D.D.D.

EDITOR'S GENERAL PREFACE

IN no branch of human knowledge has there been a more lively increase of the spirit of research during the past few years than in the study of Theology.

Many points of doctrine have been passing afresh through the crucible; "re-statement" is a popular cry and, in some directions, a real requirement of the age; the additions to our actual materials, both as regards ancient manuscripts and archaeological discoveries, have never before been so great as in recent years; linguistic knowledge has advanced with the fuller possibilities provided by the constant addition of more data for comparative study, cuneiform inscriptions have been deciphered and forgotten peoples, records, and even tongues, revealed anew as the outcome of diligent, skilful and devoted study.

Scholars have specialized to so great an extent that many conclusions are less speculative than they were, while many more aids are thus available for arriving at a general judgment; and, in some directions, at least, the time for drawing such general conclusions, and so making practical use of such specialized research, seems to have come, or to be close at hand.

Many people, therefore, including the large mass of the parochial clergy and students, desire to have in an accessible form a review of the results of this flood of new light on many topics that are of living and vital interest to the Faith; and, at the same time, "practical" questions—by which is really denoted merely the application of faith to life and to the needs of the day—have certainly lost none of their interest, but rather loom larger than ever if the Church is adequately to fulfil her Mission.

It thus seems an appropriate time for the issue of a new series of theological works, which shall aim at presenting *a general survey* of the present position of thought and knowledge in various branches of the wide field which is included in the study of divinity.

EDITOR'S GENERAL PREFACE

The Library of Historic Theology is designed to supply such a series, written by men of known reputation as thinkers and scholars, teachers and divines, who are, one and all, firm upholders of the Faith.

It will not deal merely with doctrinal subjects, though prominence will be given to these; but great importance will be attached also to history—the sure foundation of all progressive knowledge—and even the more strictly doctrinal subjects will be largely dealt with from this point of view, a point of view the value of which in regard to the "practical" subjects is too obvious to need emphasis.

It would be clearly outside the scope of this series to deal with individual books of the Bible or of later Christian writings, with the lives of individuals, or with merely minor (and often highly controversial) points of Church governance, except in so far as these come into the general review of the situation. This detailed study, invaluable as it is, is already abundant in many series of commentaries, texts, biographies, dictionaries and monographs, and would overload far too heavily such a series as the present.

The Editor desires it to be distinctly understood that the various contributors to the series have no responsibility whatsoever for the conclusions or particular views expressed in any volumes other than their own, and that he himself has not felt that it comes within the scope of an editor's work, in a series of this kind, to interfere with the personal views of the writers. He must, therefore, leave to them their full responsibility for their own conclusions.

Shades of opinion and differences of judgment must exist, if thought is not to be at a standstill—petrified into an unproductive fossil; but while neither the Editor nor all their readers can be expected to agree with every point of view in the details of the discussions in all these volumes, he is convinced that the great principles which lie behind every volume are such as must conduce to the strengthening of the Faith and to the glory of God.

That this may be so is the one desire of Editor and contributors alike.

W. C. P.

LONDON.

SCOPE OF THE INQUIRY

THIS Essay is an attempt to ascertain St. Paul's view of the Person of Jesus Christ. It is not easy to define the limits of such an inquiry. In the deepest sense, indeed, for a Christian all theology is Christology.[1] It was so for St. Paul. He makes no distinct formulation of the doctrine of the Person of Christ. Dispute and controversy had not hammered his convictions into rigid formulas. The growth of systematic dogmatism had not led him to divide his conceptions by sharp lines of distinction and clear classification into carefully labelled compartments.[2] But every line of his writings is animated by the faith of his soul, and shines with the light revealed. His theology is the application of his living faith in Christ to the experiences and problems of life and the unfathomed mysteries of eternity.

It will thus be seen at the outset that we part company with those theologians who so treat St. Paul's doctrines that they disconnect the Work from the Person of Christ, not only as a distinction in thought but as a separate field of study. Not only does the Work presuppose and involve the Person, and the Person demand and illuminate the Work, but the Work *was* the Person whose thought, word and deed were throughout consistent. Only when both are presented to the mind as a living whole is it possible to understand in

[1] St. John i. 18.

[2] Cf. "Paul was not a schoolman born out of due time, neither a *dogmatiker*, nor a 'systematic theologian.'" *Cambridge Biblical Essays*, p. 353 (published since this essay was written).

any adequate degree the faith of the great Apostle of the Gentiles. To this fact the course of the history of the Church and of the history of Dogma has borne ample testimony. We may take the words of Polycarp to keep us humble, "*οὔτε γὰρ ἐγὼ οὔτε ἄλλος ὅμοιος ἐμοὶ δύναται κατακολουθῆσαι τῇ σοφίᾳ τοῦ μακαρίου καὶ ἐνδόξου Παύλου*;"[1] yet we may also remember for our encouragement that the same Holy Spirit who breathed His quickening insight into the hearts of Augustine and Luther till they caught, each in his measure, the meaning and inspiration of the Apostle's message, will guide us into that region where the truth in all its parts[2] is laid bare.

I must, in addition, express my gratitude to many writers and teachers whose thoughts, and, perhaps, whose phrases, I have appropriated without direct acknowledgment. My thanks are especially due to J. H. A. Hart, Esq., M.A., Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, who has increased the great debt I already owe to him as his pupil by his generous help in reading through the proof sheets for me, and enriching them with many valuable suggestions.

It is required of the writer of an essay for the Hulsean Prize, that he state what portions of his essay he claims as original. Originality ought not to be sought after for its own sake, and nothing has been further from the intention of the present writer, than to put forward any views because they are "original." What has been done has been simply to study and to endeavour to assimilate St. Paul's own teaching and what some of the great students of St. Paul have written, to pass this through the crucible of another mind, and to set down the product in as orderly a way as possible. In so far as it bears the stamp of the individual this must of necessity be original, and all that can be claimed as original, in that sense, is the

[1] Ep. of Polycarp, § iii.

[2] "*εἰς τὴν ἀλήθειαν πᾶσαν*," St. John xvi. 13.

arrangement of the matter, and the method adopted here of dealing with the subject. Many results have been achieved quite apart from books, but it would be folly to claim them as original, as the writer has only had access to a small portion of the literature on the subject, and he would probably find the same things said, and said far better, elsewhere. In any case, it becomes one to write with the utmost diffidence on a subject so difficult and exacting in time, labour, and sympathy, and it is therefore with a feeling of apology that this essay is published. The last chapter has been added since this essay obtained the Hulsean prize, and deals with the most recent phases of controversy. A bibliography is appended at the end of the volume.

The interval since this essay was presented for the Hulsean prize has been too fully occupied with parochial and academic duties to allow of publication before. It is a pleasant duty to place on record my appreciation of the kind permission of the University authorities, and the courtesy of the publisher, which have enabled me to revise the MS. in some measure, and to indicate generally the trend of opinion on the subjects here dealt with since that time.

SYNOPSIS OF CONTENTS

PAGE

CHAPTER VI

CHAPTER VII

PAGE

CHAPTER X

The Christology of St. Paul

CHAPTER I

Introduction

General Condition of New Testament Criticism.

WITH the growth of the science of historical inquiry there has come into the theological world a spirit of investigation. Excavations resulting in important discoveries in Egypt, Palestine, and Babylonia have shed a new light on the conditions of life, the language, and customs of the Eastern peoples, before and during the time when the Early Christian Church was slowly gathering strength for its conquest of the Gentile world. The attacks of scepticism and agnosticism, and the apparent conflict of Science with Faith have produced a flood of apologetic literature. The most gifted of our scholars, the clearest of our thinkers have been employed in attempts to present the Christian Religion in a way acceptable to a generation living under changed conditions, with different habits of thought, and many fresh problems to solve. This spirit, so necessary for true leaders of religious thought, has not been altogether commendable in its results. While, on the one hand, we have been guided to a richer experience of the realities of our faith, to a clearer understanding of its mysteries, to a stronger sense of the unity of the scattered fragments of life and often to a reverence that has deepened with growing knowledge, on the other hand we have needed caution

lest we should follow blindly those who have been led by their own genius into extravagance, or have adopted the Procrustean method of making the facts fit the theory. St. Paul, his life, work, beliefs, Epistles, and place in the history of the Christian Church have received a full share of attention, and the results have amply justified the study. The importance of such work is obvious.[1] It is a requirement of our lives as Christians to ascertain all we can of the Saviour as an historical Person, of His working in His saints of old, of what He may and ought to be to ourselves. Such historical knowledge is gathered mainly from the documents which make up the "Divine Library" of our one New Testament. Roughly speaking, of these documents the two most important groups are the Four Gospels and the Epistles of St. Paul. On these successively the searchlight of historical criticism has been turned. For long the Pauline Epistles were examined under its piercing ray, but they have stood the test, and have issued triumphant from the scrutiny of the most acute theologians of the last century. Now the centre of attention is different. The Gospels, and of them St. John more particularly than the Synoptists, are the subject of criticism at the moment. Round them investigation is unceasingly busy.[2] In the

[1] "The great fact of Christianity," writes Dr. Alan Menzies, "is that God sent His Son into the world, and how this took place the New Testament is believed to tell us." *Essays for the Times*, St. Paul's view of the Divinity of Our Lord, p. 1.

[2] The latest weighty contributions are however to the Synoptic problem. Such are the *Studies in the Synoptic Problem* (edited by Prof. Sanday, 1911), *Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament* (Dr. Moffatt, 1911), *Introduction to the New Testament* (Prof. Zahn, 1909), *Introduction to the New Testament* (Prof. Peake, 1909), *Expositor's Greek Testament* (edited Sir W. Robertson Nicoll, 1910), *Horae Synopticae* (Rev. Sir John C. Hawkins, 1909), *The Synoptic Gospels* (Prof. Stanton, 1909), *New Testament Studies* (Prof. Harnack, "Crown Theol. Library," xx., xxiii., xxvii., xxxiii.). Generally speaking they confirm the old conservative view in their conclusions as to dates. Dr. Harnack thinks that all the Synoptic

meantime, however, we may turn with restored confidence to the greater part of the commonly accepted Pauline writings, and feel assured of the truth of conclusions based on a careful study of documents which have come victoriously through all the assaults of enemies and the doubts of friends.

Books accepted by the Writer as Authentic.

For the purposes of this essay, it is proposed to accept as the work of St. Paul all his reputed writings except the Pastoral Epistles. The position of Baur, who accepted only Romans, Galatians, and 1 and 2 Corinthians as the work of St. Paul, has long since been abandoned by all moderate critics. There is a very general consensus of opinion in attributing not only the earlier epistles but also those known as the "Christological" Epistles (including even Ephesians, as Dr. Knowling has shown [1]) to St. Paul's pen. Though, then, I believe that the Pastoral Epistles are authentic, I have deemed it wise, in an essay where the arguments for and against their acceptance cannot be discussed, to base all inquiry on ground where agreement is fairly general. There is no doubt, however, that the Pastoral Epistles (as indeed the Epistle to the Hebrews) emanate from a Pauline School, and as such might be accepted as secondary evidence for St. Paul's views of Christ. The Acts of the Apostles has been accepted as historically trustworthy.

Importance of the Subject.

A clear view of what St. Paul taught concerning Christ

Gospels were written by about 80 A.D. See article *Present Position of New Testament Study, C.Q.R.*, October 1911.

[1] *The Testimony of St. Paul to Christ*, p. 111. It is true that Dr. Moffatt (*op. cit.*) regards Ephesians as "a set of variations played by a master hand upon one or two themes suggested by Colossians," and thus considers it to be post-Pauline. This view raises more difficulties than it meets, and the balance of critical opinion is still definitely on the side of the Pauline authorship of the Epistle.

is necessary not only for the scholar but even more for all those who find that religion demands thought, and obey the commandment, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God—with all thy mind."[1] Broadly speaking, its value may be realized by considering its effect in two departments of religious activity.

(1) In the Historical World.

(1) In the historical world. The student of Church History knows what the influence of Paulinism throughout the Church's existence has been. Whenever the mantle of St. Paul has fallen on those who have come after him, it has inspired them with intense fervour for his principles, it has roused earnest zeal for the true faith, it has produced men who have stood far above their contemporaries and have been the bulwarks of right teaching in times of stress. His teaching, it is true, has been carried in occasional instances to extremes of which he little dreamed. Marcion, the first great teacher of the Pauline School after the Apostolic Age, fell into the gravest errors, similar in character to those into which many modern theologians have also fallen. Of him Harnack remarks that, in the 120 years that followed, "Marcion was the only Gentile Christian who understood Paul, and even he misunderstood him."[2] Marcion held with intense conviction that Divine grace is freely given in Christ. He saw vividly the sharp contrasts between the Gospel and the Law on the one hand, and realized with sorrow how much the Gospel teaching differed from current Christianity on the other. He laid the greatest stress on Pauline modes of expression. He and his "companions in distress and reproach" endured privation and even death for the sake of their faith. Yet his Gnostic theory of redemption and Docetic view of Christ's earthly life, his unwarrantable mutilation of the New Testament and rejection of the Old Testament are suffi-

[1] διάνοια; cf. Matt. xxii. 37; Mark xii. 30; Luke x. 27.

[2] *History of Dogma*, vol. i. p. 89, cf. p. 136 n. 2.

cient to justify the refutation of his theories by the Church, and clearly show how far and where he had diverged from the Gospel of St. Paul as from the Gospel of Christ. But the real school of St. Paul consists of such towers of strength as Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, and Origen. They sought to keep the Faith true and balanced, and this often meant reaction and re-emphasis. In later times Augustine in his reaction against Greek influences, the reformers of the medieval Church against the corruption of their day, Luther revolting from the Schoolmen, the Jansenists from the dogmas of the Council of Trent, and Wesley from the coldness of eighteenth-century deism displayed that strong, if sometimes violent, spirit of steadfast adherence to the essence of Christianity characteristic of the Pauline School. Thus and only thus was the Church kept in her true course in times full of doubt and danger.[1]

We can only treat here of the *fons et origo* of this invigorating and cleansing stream, and not of its course as it flows through the history of the Church. Yet for the historian to whose pen that task falls, a study of origins is essential, for neither by its beginning nor by its history alone can any movement be estimated, but by a true appreciation of both in the light of the goal at which it aims. Nor, whether Christianity is St. Paul rather than Christ, on the one hand, or whether Paulinism is but a passing phase in the development of Christian thought on the other, can the student of Christianity in the widest sense afford to neglect the meaning and bearing of St. Paul's influence. In both these connexions Dr. Sanday's remark is just, "No great movement can be rightly judged by its initial stages, or apart from the impression left by it upon the highest contemporary minds."[2] Amongst the latter we may without hesitation and by universal consent class St. Paul.

[1] *History of Dogma*, A. Harnack, vol. i. p. 136. "Paulinism has proved to be a ferment in the history of dogma."

[2] *Outlines of the Life of Christ*, Dr. Sanday, *H.D.B.*

(2) In the Religious Life—How far St. Paul's Christianity is Ours.

(2) In the religious life of the believer. A right view of St. Paul's Christology is also of deep spiritual value. We may not go as far as Professor Bacon and say that, "Christianity, as we know it, is Pauline Christianity." [1] That is a sweeping unconditional generalization and needs explanation. In a sense, it is true, though perhaps not quite in the way its author intends. The line between Pauline and pre-Pauline Christianity cannot be drawn as sharply as Professor Bacon seems to think. Nor can we agree with those who, recognizing in St. Paul's doctrine a step in the development from the primitive to Johannine ideas, cast it aside as useless, unedifying, and of no practical value now that the supreme heights have been attained in the writings of the beloved Apostle.

Views of the Ritschlians Hereon—(1) English.

The Ritschlian school view the matter in two ways. The one section, consisting for the most part of English theologians, followers of the late Dr. Dale, aver that a personal experience will bring to us the Exalted Jesus, who is the same as the historical Jesus of Nazareth. Thus alone can we gain any true knowledge of "the Living Christ." The evidence of His divinity is such that it can be appreciated only by one who has a personal relation to Christ. A "personal relation to Christ" is in Dr. Dale's view a miraculous revealing of the historic Jesus, now exalted in Heaven. [2] It was his belief ". . . that when the true members of the Church are assembled, Jesus is present with them; not only in the sense that the Spirit that was in Jesus is in them, but He is present as an individual, as 'one of them.'"

[1] *Story of St. Paul*, Dr. Bacon, p. 3.

[2] See his book *The Living Christ and the Four Gospels*; also Dr. K. C. Anderson, *The Larger Faith*, p. 56.

(2) Foreign.

The other section, consisting mainly of German theologians, look upon it as impossible for us ever to attain to any knowledge of the Exalted Christ, even by "judgments of value"—the only valid judgments that, according to them, we form. The Historic Christ alone is the object of our knowledge. For them, indeed, as long as they refuse the refuge of mysticism, there is little help in their religious life to be obtained from St. Paul's conceptions.

The True View of the Christ of St. Paul.

We must remember that in the New Testament there are various interpretations of the Christ. There is no one view which can claim to destroy another. In one sense all are the same. He is the same Person throughout. But different aspects of His Person, different phases of His work, have impressed themselves on different minds as the depths of individual lives have been sounded, and His appeal has drawn all men, each with varying power and possibility, to the Cross.

There is a Sense in which St. Paul was the "Creator" of Christianity: (1) In his Presentation of it to the Gentiles; (2) in his more Definite Formulation of the Faith.

While we cannot say then that "Christianity, as we know it to-day, is Pauline Christianity," without further explanation, we may at least assert that in some degree the Apostle was the creator of a Christian theology. First, in the words of Weizsäcker, "he has in fact considered and elucidated the history of the world and the human consciousness in all their aspects from the point which he has chosen as his centre, i.e. the Person and the Work of Christ." Through him, in the main, Christianity fulfilled its true mission, for it became not merely the tenets of a sect of Jews, but a world-wide religion capable of appreciation and adop-

tion by the Gentile world. Though in all its fundamentals held by the pre-Pauline Church, the Gospel was applied by him to the needs of heathendom, its wider sympathies were manifested, its real appeal to the heart of humanity was inimitably expressed. Secondly, though in his Epistles there is no definitely formulated creed, almost all his statements bear the impress of careful thought.[1] The necessity for a detailed creed had not arisen, but the main beliefs of the early Church were already in the process of being formulated. Almost certain traces of this process can be seen in the Epistles. The confession "Jesus is Lord," with all that it implied, was the general confession of believers.[2] There is moreover the "theological argument" of 1 Cor. viii. 6, "To us there is one God . . . and one Lord Jesus Christ"; the Trinity of 1 Cor. xii. 4–6, ". . . the same Spirit . . . the same Lord . . . the same God . . ."; and the final benediction of 2 Cor. xiii. 14. In the Epistles of the Captivity, we have the wonderful Gospel of the Incarnation (Phil. ii. 6–11), the Gospel of the Ascension (Eph. i. 20–23), the Gospel of the Redemption (Col. i. 9–ii. 23), and the Trinitarian phrases of Eph. iv. 4–6, ". . . one Spirit . . . one Lord . . . one God and Father of all," and of Col. i. 3, 4, 8, "Thanks to God the Father . . . faith in Christ Jesus . . . love in the Spirit."

HIS CHRISTIANITY WAS DERIVED FROM CHRIST HIMSELF.

Though, then, in some degree, he was the first to formulate a Christian theology, this is far from implying that St. Paul created Christianity itself. The one central fact for him was Christ Crucified, Exalted and Glorified, the one central experience was the shining of His glory on the road to Damascus. On the basis of the one he founded his

[1] E.g., as Dr. Bruce points out, the phrase "Him who knew no sin, He made to be sin on our behalf" (2 Cor. v. 21) is so tersely expressed, yet so full of meaning, that it must have been the result of careful meditation.

[2] See 1 Cor. xii. 3; Rom. x. 9.

faith, by the light of the other he was guided evermore. From this point of view he looked back on history. He saw its course elucidated and illuminated. He looked at the age he lived in, he saw its need supplied, its yearnings satisfied. He looked forward to the age to come. With the "prospect of faith" he believed in the realization of the high hope of his calling—the attainment of the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ,[1] and in the fulfilment of His Master's purpose—the presenting to Himself of a Church, holy and without blemish.[2] Harnack may well say after a consideration of St. Paul's influence, "Paulinism is a religious and Christocentric doctrine more inward and more powerful than any other which has ever appeared in the Church."[3]

HENCE ITS LASTING VALUE. HIS SOLUTION APPLIED TO MODERN NEEDS—THE VALUE OF THE STUDY FOR THE PRESENT WRITER.

Such exalted views of life as St. Paul attained to are more than ever needed to-day. When men see that all is summed up in Christ, and realize that the heavenly vision, which taught St. Paul Who He was, and what He came to do, may be a living reality in the life, the oppositions and contradictions of science and religion, of love and justice, of slavery and freedom, of individual responsibility and inherited suffering, of the Cross and God's love manifested, and the greatest paradox of all—of Jesus Christ both God and Man, will be dissolved in a higher Unity, in Him Who is all in all. St. Paul has found that true secret of life which reduces all things, joyful or sad, to a unity. He has seen the "one unifying purpose running through all the range of life." The whole of his experiences, even tribulation, anguish, persecution, imprisonment and death was working towards the great purpose for "good to them that love God." The

[1] Eph. iv. 13. [2] Eph. v. 27.
[3] *History of Dogma*, Dr. A. Harnack, vol. i. p. 135.

study of Paulinism will bring its reward as it makes plain the meaning of St. Paul's words "I live, yet not I; but Christ liveth in me." It will bring a faith strengthened, ideas clarified, a heart more on fire with missionary zeal. It will bring contact with one of the most earnest and truly inspired men of all ages, whose struggle was ours, and whose victory may be won if the secret of life in Christ make our weakness strong. Dr. Somerville also was conscious of this when he wrote the peroration to his Gifford Lectures.[1] "As long as there are those who are burdened with memories that are a continual reproach, and who feel the power of evil appetites they are unable to rise above—as long as there are those who tremble before that event that seems to mock all their efforts after a higher life, and who crave an assurance that death has not separated them for ever from friends whom they have lost but cannot cease to love—men will turn with thankfulness to this teacher who shows us what God made Jesus to be when He raised Him from the dead, who announces a Christ Who has put away sin, Who has vanquished death, Who is now by the grace of God the Head of a new humanity and able to repeat in as many as believe in Him the wonder of His own Holiness and Immortality."

General Plan of the Essay.

It is necessary to make one further remark. It appears to the writer that the conception which St. Paul formed of Christ may be conveniently considered as springing from two relationships.

1. His relationship to man. This we hope to approach by an estimate of those elements of the training and reading of St. Paul's youth which remained as a permanent part of his Christology. Then it is proposed to inquire further into his ideas on this subject under the heads of Jesus as the Messiah and of Jesus Christ as the Second

[1] *St. Paul's Conception of Christ*, p. 259.

Adam. A consideration of His Redemptive work will complete this section of the essay.

2. His relationship to God. Under this head it is proposed to study Christ as Immanent, Christ as Transcendent, Christ as Eternal.

It is thus hoped to show how St. Paul regarded Jesus (*i*) as the perfect embodiment of all that man should be to his fellow-man, and to God; and (*ii*) as the Perfect God, of the same essence as the Father, in Whom dwelt all the fullness of the Godhead bodily. But we fully realize how impossible it is to draw any rigid line between these two trends of thought. They are interwoven inseparably throughout.

As we cannot separate the Person of Christ from His work, so we cannot separate His manhood from His Godhead [1] without the most careful safeguards. We shall find such a conception of His manhood that the conviction that Christ was God must lie behind, and such a work of Redemption wrought that perfect God and perfect Man must be united into one Person in Him.

[1] ἐν δύο φύσεσιν . . . ἀδιαιρέτως. Definitio Fidei apud Concilium Chalcedonense.

CHAPTER II

St. Paul's Religious Development

The Importance of this Introductory Study.

IF we would gain a true idea of St. Paul's conceptions it is not only important but essential to consider the course of his religious history. And this for two reasons.

First, by adopting the methods of historical inquiry alone can we gain that true appreciation of and sympathy with writers of bygone days, without which any attempt to grasp their views must end in failure. This fact has only been realized in any general sense during the last century, and it is now the base from which all inquiry is made. Especially is this the case with a writer like St. Paul. So much depends on the interpretation of particular words, on the exegesis of phrases and passages, and on our knowledge of the dates of the Epistles, and of the circumstances which called them forth. Words of technical signification such as Righteousness, Law, Justification, Adoption, Propitiation, occur again and again. Forms of thought and modes of expression belonging to the period were used by him. Failure to inquire what precise bearing these had for writer and readers would be fatal to our purpose. We should miss the gist of that which he intended to teach by his special use of technical phrases if we did not realize what particular meaning such terms conveyed to him and them.

Secondly, for St. Paul, more perhaps than for any other personality in history, "his theology was the outgrowth

of his experience." [1] Entering on the responsibilities and privileges of his Christian life without training in any Christian creed, bound by no ties of sentiment to advance one type of doctrine, he lived his doctrine before he formulated and wrote it. His religion was subjective and reached only after great personal struggle; his theories were not mere speculations but solutions of pressing and real problems obtained after anxious and long sustained thought. He was Christ-taught and Christ-sustained and a revealer of Christ among men. His writings bear witness that they come from one who wrote down what the inmost feelings of his heart dictated, one who had been lifted from the sphere of a narrower Pharisaism into the realm where Christ is all in all.

His Tarsian Home—Its University and Philosophical Schools.

St. Paul was born in Tarsus, the chief city of Cilicia in ancient times. Since 170 B.C. it had been a self-governing Greek city. In it had grown up a university which rivalled, and as Strabo says, even in some respects surpassed those of Athens and Alexandria, and the other great university cities of the Mediterranean. "Rome was full of Tarsian and Alexandrian scholars," writes Professor Ramsay, "so strong was the Tarsian love for letters!" [2] Demetrius the Scientist, Athenodorus the Stoic, Athenodorus Kananites, and Nestor were amongst those famous throughout the Empire for their learning and poetry. Of them all, Athenodorus Kananites, the tutor to Augustus, was the most renowned.[3] He died about A.D. 7, after a long and busy life,

[1] *St. Paul's Conception of Christianity*, Dr. A. B. Bruce, p. 26.

[2] "Tarsus," art. *H. D. B.*, Prof. W. M. Ramsay.

[3] One of his sayings at least was quoted by Seneca. "Know," said he, "that you are set free from all passions when you reach such a point that you ask nought of God that you cannot ask openly." Seneca then adds, "So live with men as if God saw, so speak with God as if men were listening."

leaving behind a reformed constitution in his native city, and an honoured name. To him succeeded Nestor, whose influence probably extended till some time after Christ. "It is very probable," writes Professor Ramsay, "that St. Paul may have seen and listened to Nestor." The philosophy cultivated in Tarsus in St. Paul's time was undoubtedly Stoic, and this fact, too, must be remembered in considering his early training.

Here, then, in this busy seaport, with the continual passage of merchantmen and merchandise from all parts of the world bringing before his eyes the customs and products of many different races and countries, in a university town with its constant influx of new learning and ideas from its sisters, he grew from boy to youth. Can we at all estimate the result of this early environment? We have a few indications of the direction of the answer, sufficient perhaps to give us a very general notion. "In this apostle," writes Professor Findlay, "Jew, Greek and Roman met." [1] This sentence suggests three heads under which we may consider St. Paul when, as Saul, he left his native city for Jerusalem.

Influences of his Early Environment.

1. *Jewish.*

1. St. Paul as a Jew. First and foremost St. Paul was a Jew. "The Jew in him was the foundation of everything that Paul became." He was of the same nationality, a member of the same theocracy, and he had the same share in the Messianic hopes as his Judaising opponents of later days. "Are they Hebrews? (in language and tradition). So am I. Are they Israelites? (in descent and creed). I also. Are they seed of Abraham? (partakers in the Messianic hopes). So am I" (2 Cor. xi. 22).[2] To the Jews he

[1] Art. "Paul the Apostle." *H. D. B.*, Prof. G. G. Findlay.

[2] Ἑβραῖοί εἰσιν; κἀγώ. Ἰσραηλεῖταί εἰσιν; κἀγώ. σπέρμα Ἀβραάμ εἰσιν; κἀγώ.

was as a Jew (*Ἰουδαῖος*), both in nationality and education. He was of the stock of Israel (*ἐκ γένους Ἰσραήλ*); "of the loyal and renowned tribe of Benjamin"[1] '(*ἐκ φυλῆς Βενιαμείν*).[2] He probably spoke the Aramaic tongue, was a staunch adherent to Hebrew traditions (*Ἑβραῖος ἐξ Ἑβραίων*).

But not only was he, generally speaking, a Jew, he had also been brought up as a strict member of the sect of the Pharisees. He was "a Pharisee, the son of Pharisees"[3] (Acts xxiii. 6. *Ἐγὼ Φαρισαῖος εἰμι, υἱὸς Φαρισαίων*). As touching the law, he was a Pharisee, *κατὰ νόμον Φαρισαῖος* (Phil. iii. 5). He was certainly surrounded by the strongest Jewish influences all through the earlier part of his life. We know that there were *ἀρχισυνάγωγοι* or rulers of the Synogogue in Cilicia,[4] and there must almost certainly have been a synagogue at Tarsus. In fact, so powerful and loyal were the Cilician Jews that we find a synagogue of theirs at Jerusalem mentioned in Acts vi. 9. We may safely say that this groundwork of Jewish influence and thought was never destroyed. It remained as a force which affected the opinions of his later life, and determined in some degree both the meaning and importance of his religious experience and the manner of his presentation of the Gospel to the world.[5]

2. *Greek.*

2. St. Paul as a Greek. How far did St. Paul come into contact with the Greek philosophical ideas prevalent in

[1] *Philippians*, Dr. Lightfoot, *ad loc.* [2] Phil. iii. 5.

[3] I.e. he was not a convert as so many Pharisees were.

[4] *History of the Jewish People*, Schürer, vol. ii. Div. 2, pp. 63 and 222.

[5] Harnack's remark "Pharisaism had fulfilled its mission to the world when it produced this man" (*History of Dogma*, vol. i. p. 94) is only true in a limited sense. The Pharisees effected a great work in conserving Judaism after the destruction of Jerusalem under Hadrian.

Tarsus? Was he educated in the Greek Schools or was his training exclusively Jewish? It is not very probable that St. Paul was a member of the Schools in which the Stoic philosophy was taught,[1] though a certain amount of the higher Greek culture must have found its way from his environment into his thought.[2] There are, too, traces of a knowledge of Greek writers in St. Paul's Sermons and Epistles, but only scanty traces which, likely enough, point to Stoic contempt for literature. The two quotations [3] might easily be chance sayings remembered from conversations with Stoic contemporaries. No more would be needed in a man of tact and sympathy to account for the Stoic form of his address at Athens. He was not schooled in Greek learning. He was only a σπερμολόγος a "picker up of learning's crumbs." [4] Indeed his style is not that of one trained in Greek dialectic, though, of course, he spoke Greek. There is no attempt to incorporate, except for

[1] We are aware that Sir W. M. Ramsay holds a different opinion. In his excursus "St. Paul and Seneca," Dr. Lightfoot deals fully with the question. He concludes that the use of Stoic terms by St. Paul does not prove that he had been a member of the Tarsian Schools. "It was probable that Stoic philosophy had leavened the moral vocabulary of the civilized world at the time of the Christian era." See also *Expositor*, Dec., 1911 (Sir W. M. Ramsay), and April, 1911 (Principal Garvie).

[2] Platonic and Aristotelian phrases sometimes occur, e.g., 2 Cor. v. 10, τὰ διὰ τοῦ σώματος (a Platonic expression), also 2 Cor. ix. 8, αὐτάρκειαν (a word very common in Greek philosophy, particularly with the Cynics and Stoics). Aristotle uses the word in a different sense from the Cynic use; and (as in 2 Cor.) very near to προαιρεῖσθαι. See Dr. Plummer's illuminating Commentary on 2 Cor. and Lightfoot on Phil. iv. 11.

[3] 1. τοῦ γὰρ καὶ γένος ἐσμέν:—"For we also are his offspring" from the τὰ φαινόμενα of Aratus of Soli in Cilicia, or from the Hymn to Zeus of Cleanthes, the Stoic. Acts xvii. 28.

2. φθείρουσιν ἤθη χρήσθ' ὁμιλίαι κακαί: "Evil communications corrupt good manners" from the "Thaïs" of Menander and supposed to be a citation by him of a lost tragedy of Euripides. 1 Cor. xv. 33.

[4] So Prof. Ramsay quotes Browning, *An Epistle*. Acts xvii. 18.

the purposes of the presentment of Christian belief, the leading terms and conclusions of Greek philosophy. Christianity is a revelation. Its ethic stands upon its own basis. As a revelation it is apart and supreme, independent of other faiths, though it is their perfection and sum. The undoubted influence of Hellenism over St. Paul may have been an unconscious one—the storing in the sub-liminal self of impressions which in later days flashed back across the " threshold." It may have been, however, at least in part, a directly negative one leading him to look on these Gentile shows as " philosophy and vain deceit."[1] One leading so strict a Jewish life as he did in Tarsus might only have been aroused to contempt of, or perhaps more probably in St. Paul's case, active hostility towards the foolish speculations and the brutal vices of his fellow-citizens. Certainly the idea suggested in Pfleiderer's later exposition of Paulinism is not favoured by our English theologians. He there[2] speaks of a " double root " of Paulinism. On the one hand a " Christianized Pharisaism " embodied in the doctrine of Justification by Faith, on the other a " Christianized Hellenism " seen in the doctrine of salvation by the Risen Christ. These grew side by side. The flower of Jewish zeal is Justification by Faith, and that of the more delicate and hidden Gentile growth is union with the Risen Lord. This ingenious analysis of the sources of St. Paul's fundamental doctrines will not, however, satisfy the demands made upon a solution. We believe that an unbiased study will lead to an endorsement of Harnack's words

[1] See " St. Paul's Attitude to Greek Philosophy," Rev. A. Carr, *Expositor*, 5th Series, vol. ix.; also *The Story of St. Paul*, Prof. Bacon, p. 19. " It is not impossible that the tendency to seek for philosophy which St. Paul seems to reprove in the Corinthians in 1 Cor. i.–iv. ought to be connected with the party of Apollos," i.e. with the allegorical and philosophical Judaism of Alexandria represented by Philo (*Earlier Epistles of St. Paul*, Prof. K. Lake, p. 111).

[2] *Urchristenthum Vorwort*, pp. 174–178, and *Paulinism* (1890).

" Notwithstanding Paul's Greek culture, his conception of Christianity is, in its deepest ground, independent of Hellenism."

Thus a formative influence was introduced into his life which enabled him to take in his Christian days a broad outlook on the world, which gave him acquaintance with the diverse ways and opinions of men, which instilled into his soul a passionate devotion for " Whatsoever things are lovely," [1] a lasting horror of Greek vice, and something of the hollowness of Greek philosophy, and which was therefore one of the most important though least evident forces in the training of the Apostle to the Gentiles.

3. *Roman.*

3. St. Paul as a Roman. In a city where Greek influence was predominant, but where the Roman rule held sway, the environment must have been rather Graeco-Roman than Greek and Roman.[2] But distinctively Roman ideals had a strong and definite appeal for him. He was proud of his status in the Empire. " Civis Romanus sum " was his boast. He had a strong feeling of patriotism toward Tarsus. He was a " citizen of no mean city." With such patriotic pride must have been born ideas of Empire and of Citizenship, of Unity, of Faithfulness, of Discipline, of the dignity and majesty of the Roman Law. It was probably now, at the age of the idealism of youthful vision that the imagination was stirred by the spectacle of the unbroken unity of Rome, by the constant interchange of thought with the scholars of the West, by the sight of the products of many lands conveyed by the long caravans that wound along the roads of the Empire, or the merchant ships that swept her waterways from Alexandria to Spain.

[1] προσφιλῆ (Phil. iv. 8).

[2] It is doubtful whether St. Paul spoke Latin, though on the whole it is probable he did. See a brief discussion in the *Expositor*, 8th Series, April, 1911 (Prof. Souter).

He might easily now catch a first glimpse of that Universal Empire, which, spiritualized by the glowing visions of universalism in the Hebrew prophets, and suddenly seen to be built round Him Who alone was its Shekinah—the Light of the World—he was to claim in later days with all its demands of citizenship and loyalty[1] as a possibility and a necessity for the Heavenly Kingdom of Christ. The Empire was a living Body, Rome the heart, the Emperor the Head, roads and seas the arteries, soldiers, sailors and traders the life blood. So when all this was claimed for the Christian Church, the "pax Romana" became the peace that passeth all understanding. The breaking down of barriers between race and race became a triumph dimly foreshadowing the making of both Jew and Gentile one in the blood of Christ.[2] The growth of equity became a witness to that reign of the spirit over the letter which maketh alive. The Church was the Body, Christ her Head. The work of the Holy Spirit was to bind in the spiritual union of an heavenly citizenship her scattered members. However diverse in race and temperament, they were to be One Family in Earth and Heaven.

[1] πολιτεύεσθε (Phil. i. 27), though the word in the New Testament possibly loses some of its distinctive force. See *Expositor*, Dec., 1909 (Principal Garvie).

[2] Prof. Gardner (*Religious Experience of St. Paul*, p. 93) thinks the true parallel to or preparation for St. Paul's Universalism was in the mystic worships of the time. The devotion of the sectaries of Sabazius, Isis, or Mithras to "their divine patron and to their fellow-believers laid a basis on which ultimately could arise the idea of the Christian Church," binding all in "a mystic communion with its divine Lord" (p. 101), wherein rank, colour and even sex disappear (pp. 92, 93). Many, however, find a likelier source in the Stoic philosophy, the conception of the indwelling Spirit, the πνεῦμα ἅγιον, the spark of heavenly flame, whereby we are all "members of God." Bishop Lightfoot has pointed out (Philippians, Exc. St. Paul and Seneca, p. 290) that this conception is almost purely a physical one—regarding the Universe as "one great animal pervaded by one soul or principle of life." Probably all had their influence, and all indicate how in different ways the ground of the world was being prepared for the Gospel seed.

St. Paul, then, left Tarsus a Jew in the strictest sense of the term. Greek Philosophy had not made him her son, though it had influenced his thought; and probably Greek vice had found in him an open enemy. He had, and never lost, a strong sense of his privileges and responsibilities as a Roman citizen and a grasp of the lessons which the Roman Law was teaching the world.

THE INFLUENCE OF JERUSALEM AND GAMALIEL ON ST. PAUL.

He was sent from Tarsus to Jerusalem to pursue his studies under Gamaliel, the famous Jewish Rabbi. A great deal of confusion prevails as to the identity of this Gamaliel. There were three famous Rabbis of that name. This one, the Elder, is Gamaliel I, the grandson of Hillel. Though himself a strict Jew, he had read widely in Greek literature and was the leader of the Pharisees of the more liberal kind.[1] Under him Saul was trained in Rabbinical methods of thought and reasoning, in all the dialectical subtleties of the Scribes, and in their interpretations of the Law to meet the new conditions of the age. Of all his contemporaries he was the most zealous for the Law. His Jewish training in Tarsus was supplemented by the more rigorous, narrower views of Palestine. He adopted the Messianic hopes of his countrymen and saw, like them, in the sect of the Nazarenes, blasphemers and upstarts; in their Saviour, a Crucified Messiah, a *σκάνδαλον* of the greatest magnitude.[2] So fierce was his zeal that he even broke away from the advice of his more tolerant master on the occasion of the Apostles' trial before the Sanhedrin (Acts v. 34) and took a leading part in the persecution of "the Way." It has been suggested that at this time

[1] The Mishna records that "Since Rabban Gamaliel the Elder died, reverence for the law ceased, and purity and abstinence died away." This was, however, but an exaggerated expression of a sense of loss.

[2] Or the "dreamer of dreams" of Deut. xiii. 1–5. (So Johannes Weiss, *Paul and Jesus*).

his mind reverted to the Stoic doctrines of Tarsus, in his disgust at the "bigotry and provincialism" of Jerusalem.[1] But there is no trace of this attitude on the part of the young zealot.[2] In fact, the only criteria point in the other direction, that he himself was one of the most bigoted and narrow of his contemporaries. At Jerusalem he had been caught by the fierce impulse of Jewish zeal and lifted far above the dictates of his better nature. In his enthusiasm he had done deeds which brought the keenest anguish to his penitent soul in later days. "His great aim in life was to be legally righteous, and his ambition was to excel in the observance of the law." How much this implies! "It means either that this man will never become a Christian, but remain through life the deadly foe of the new faith, or it means that the very intensity of his Pharisaism will cure him of Pharisaism and make him a Christian of the Christians."[3]

The Subjective Preparation for Conversion.

In Romans vii. 7–13 we find an autobiographical note which in all probability refers to this time. He is writing of a time when the Law of Moses was supreme in his life.

[1] We note that Josephus compares the philosophy of the Pharisees to that of the Stoics. Prof. Bacon holds (*Jesus or Christ?* p. 223) that "Paul and the Greek fathers who followed him seized upon the Stoic conception of the Logos, which under the designation Wisdom had long since begun to affect Hebrew, or at least Hellenistic thought." So his "Stoicism" came to him through Jewish Channels. "Even the Avatar doctrine of the descent and ascent of Wisdom is unmistakably adopted by St. Paul, partly in opposition to, partly in rivalry with the widespread conception of the mystery religion" (*Story of St. Paul*, p. 316 ff.). See also Principal Carpenter, *Jesus or Christ?* p. 230.

[2] Prof. Gardner (*Jesus or Christ?* p. 49) represents St. Paul as caught by a spiritual movement in his day in Palestine. He "felt the urgency of the flood of the Spirit." Its first result was persecution of the Church, but his "line of defence was suddenly stormed" and he became its devout adherent.

[3] *St. Paul's Conception of Christianity*, Dr. A. B. Bruce, p. 28.

He discovered that coveting, a mere feeling, was condemned in the Decalogue as sin. Then he knew that the keeping of the Law was impossible. It pointed the way. It brought no power. It coldly forbade, and so provoked to disobedience. As this fact forced itself upon him, it brought his Pharisaical outlook to the test of his unswerving sincerity. He was passing in his own way through the plain universal experience of the awakening of the soul. Conscience awoke. The struggle began. "When the commandment came, sin revived and I died." Hope was dead. When Christ was seen of him (1 Cor. xv. 8), there had been a subjective preparation in process in the heart before the objective appearance of the Risen Christ. In an agony of doubt he would attempt to silence all the internal conflict by furious hostility, by active persecution. He hated the sect of the Nazarenes as the rival of Judaism, yet he was attracted by them. By one of St. Paul's nature,[1] cherished ideals are not easily abandoned, and such an one is never less like surrendering than just before the crisis. But the image of Jesus as the false Messiah, the Blasphemer, was not yet displaced. Judaism had failed to satisfy his deepest wants; it had left him ready to receive the revelation of his life's true mission, that work for which God had separated him from his mother's womb.[2, 3]

The Heavenly Vision and Conversion.

When the revelation came on the road to Damascus, when the whole mistake of his past, darkened with all its horror, was realized, the agonized Saul could only bow in humbled penitence before his crucified, risen, persecuted Master, and cry, "Lord, what wilt Thou have me to do?"

[1] As Dr. Bruce remarks. [2] Gal. i. 15.

[3] The account of the preparation for the Conversion given by Dr. Bruce has been adopted. In itself it is a combination of the points emphasized (1) by Pfleiderer—his previous knowledge of Jesus; (2) by Beyschlag—his intense hopeless struggle for righteousness.

The crisis was over. The old was done. The new man arose. One purpose henceforth filled his life, and made him homeless, friendless, misunderstood, persecuted, and a martyr. What other men prized, he resigned with joy, Christ was his strength, his comfort, his hope, his eloquence, his Gospel, his life. He was a new Creation in Christ.

Did St. Paul's Theology Develop? (1) View of Sabatier.

St. Paul had started on the Christian race. What significance had this conversion for him? What relation does St. Paul's theology bear to the Revelation made to him at this time? In other words, was there development in his views of Christianity, was there a growth in his perception of the Person and Work of Christ, or did his system of Christian thought remain the same from this time onward, formed and fixed in a moment?

In answer to this question three views are advocated. Of these the first was held by Sabatier, who supported the theory of development.[1] He tried to prove this by reviewing successively the "Mission," "Controversial," "Christological" and "Pastoral" groups of St. Paul's Epistles, and by endeavouring to show thereby that there was a marked growth in the conception of Christ and an increasingly comprehensive view of His work.[2] "Having regard to such facts, it is evident to me that St. Paul's mind underwent a vital growth as the years passed, and new circumstances arose to stimulate that ever active and powerful intellect to fresh thought on the great theme which engrossed its attention." There is, as Dr. Bruce points out, no *à priori* objection to the hypothesis of development. Growth in

[1] See *L'Apôtre Paul*, also in English translation.

[2] *The Apostle Paul*, p. 8 ff. The "Mission" Epistles are those to the Thessalonians, the "Controversial" Epistles are Galatians, Corinthians and Romans, and the "Christological" Epistles are those of the Captivity.

knowledge and grace is the ordinary law of life—in the spiritual realm as well as in the natural. St. Paul was indeed inspired, but God spoke in many parts and in many modes by the prophets, and St. Paul may easily have gained increased insight with his wider experience. Do the facts, however, warrant such an inference as Sabatier drew from them?

Objections to this View.

There are two aspects of the matter to consider. (1) There is the extant Pauline literature. Does it afford the alleged evidence of growth? There is no doubt that the earlier Epistles present the Gospel in a rudimentary and simple form, and that the later Epistles gradually become more abstruse and metaphysical in their language and ideas. But does it at all follow that St. Paul at the time he wrote the First Epistle to the Thessalonians had not attained to the great conceptions, or thought out the carefully expressed system of the later Epistles?

We note many indications which lead us to form a different conclusion—(*α*) St. Paul above all things was a careful steward of the mysteries of God. He delivered the message best fitted for the people to whom he wrote, and he answered *their* letters. (*β*) His characteristic ideas are present even in the Epistles to the Thessalonians, which are of the earliest, if not the earliest, of his Epistles. Though the language is simple, undogmatic, untechnical, such as "babes" might understand, yet he called Jesus Christ both "Son of God" and "the Lord." The Thessalonians are described as "waiting for His Son from heaven." The Gospel is the "Gospel of Christ." The "day of the Lord" is the term applied to the *παρουσία* of the Lord Jesus and corresponds to the Old Testament expression "the day of Jehovah." (*γ*) This is also true of other early Epistles than those of the Thessalonians. We take, as an example, the idea

of the Pre-existence of the Messiah.[1] It is undoubtedly taught throughout St. Paul's Epistles, not attained merely by after speculation or thought.

Thus we find it not only in the "Christological" Epistles, but also in such sentences as ἐπτώχευσεν πλούσιος ὤν (2 Cor. viii. 9), in the "Rock" that followed Israel in the Wilderness (1 Cor. x. 4), and in the mention of the mission of the Son, "God sent forth (ἐξαπέστειλεν) His Son" (Gal. iv. 4). All these phrases contain the doctrine by implication. Moreover this same Gospel received "by revelation" (Gal. i. 12) he preached to the Galatians (Gal. i. 8). It was Christ Crucified he had "placarded" or "broadly sketched"[2] before their eyes. It was Christ Crucified and Risen Whom he saw on the road to Damascus. It was a matter of indignant surprise[3] that the Galatians were so ready to receive a different Gospel (εἰς ἕτερον εὐαγγέλιον), which was not another (ἄλλο), but none at all, for there could only be one Gospel. "But though we, or an angel from Heaven should preach unto you any Gospel other than (παρ' ὅ[4]) that which we preached unto you, let him be anathema" (Gal. i. 8).

His message at Corinth was the same. It was Christ Crucified Who was preached (1 Cor. i. 23). St. Paul had not another Jesus (ἄλλον Ἰησοῦν), or a different Spirit (πνεῦμα ἕτερον), or a different Gospel (εὐαγγέλιον ἕτερον).[5]

For the "Christological" Epistles the same Gospel is still the theme. "Continue in the faith" (ἐπιμένετε τῇ πίστει. Col. i. 23). "As therefore ye received (παρελάβετε) Christ Jesus the Lord, so walk in Him" (Col. ii. 6).

[1] See hereafter more fully in chapters on "Christ as Messiah" and "Christ as Eternal."

[2] προεγράφη, Gal. iii. 1. [3] Gal. i. 6. Lightfoot *ad loc.*

[4] The context leads to this meaning, otherwise it might equally well mean "contrary to."

[5] 2 Cor. xi. 4.

At least, then, we may say that the same fundamentals of his faith, which appear elaborated in the fullness of their appeal and power in the "Christological" Epistles, occur also in the earlier and simpler letters. The development, if there was a development, was not of the Content of the Gospel.

(2) The other aspect referred to is the psychological one and will be dealt with under the third head below. It is sufficient here to point out that there is strong evidence for believing that St. Paul's Gospel did not grow during the time he wrote his Epistles. He came to his mission work with the Gospel message and teaching very clearly in his mind.

(2) The School of Pfleiderer.

The name of Pfleiderer represents a school of theologians who also assert considerable growth in the theological conceptions expressed in the Pauline Epistles. So great indeed is the importance they assign to this, that they are led to reject the Pauline authorship of the Christological Epistles, though it is admitted that these belong to a Pauline School. St. Paul himself, they say, did not develop so far. He started a movement which his school completed, and to which it gave effect, by producing the Christological Epistles.[1] We need not criticize this view further than to observe that to reject these epistles as un-Pauline in authorship on such dubious, and in any case inadequate, grounds is too arbitrary a position to win much support; and it finds very little favour with English, or even German, theologians of to-day.

[1] "Having regard to these phenomena," Pfleiderer writes, "I have no hesitation in affirming that this Epistle to the Colossians is not of Pauline authorship, though I am sure it proceeded from a Pauline School, for the affinities between it and the undoubted writings of St. Paul are very marked." Cf. *Hibbert Lectures*, 1885, p. 217 ff.

Most probable View of the Influence of St. Paul's Conversion.

Most probably we may regard St. Paul's universalistic Gospel as going right back if not to the moment of conversion at least to the time of his retirement in Arabia.[1] There under the quiet stars, alone, under the spell of the "silence and sounds of the prodigious plain," and above all in constant communion with God, and under the tuition of the Holy Spirit in the things of Christ, the future Apostle must have learnt the truths which possessed his soul with living power. His Gospel was revealed and intuitively received. It was clearly before him within the first few years or even hours of his Christian life. But there was room for growth. The formulation of that Gospel may have been worked out into tense pregnant phrases and sentences by the slow process of time. Many of his short, concise statements, as pointed out above,[2] bear the mark of careful reflection, though we are apt to overlook this fact when carried away by the rush of intense feeling that makes him live in his letters. First came the intuitions, then the positive doctrines into which he formulated his religion, last of all his "apologetic," probably worked out through painful experience during his life of missionary service, or through the application of his own critical faculty to the assailable points of his teaching.[3] The religious value of St. Paul's doctrine is that it is a transcript of his life. Experi-

[1] Gal. i. 17.

[2] p. 8 n. 1 above.

[3] So Weizsäcker says, "His fundamental principles had been furnished and stamped with the certainty of intuitions by his faith and the manner of his conversion. These he wrought into consistent systems of doctrine by the help of his formal presuppositions, and these systems, in turn, guided him in arranging the material from Holy Scripture, which served him for proof." "For him then every doctrine had a religious value. Yet every religious value construed itself to the mind as metaphysic." *History of the Apostolic Age*, Weizsäcker, vol. i. p. 138 ff.

enced in the depths of his soul, mounting to the sphere of his intellect, it is there fashioned into theoretical form. "Behind and in the Gospel," writes Harnack, "stands the Person of Christ. . . . Theology attempted to describe in very uncertain and feeble outline what the mind and heart had grasped. Yet it testifies of a new life which . . . was kindled by a Person." [1]

We cannot believe that the sole result of St. Paul's conversion was a mere conviction that Jesus was identical with the Messiah, and that the rest is speculation, as many would have us think.[2] He was no mere metaphysician or philosopher; his religion was his philosophy, and his philosophy the life of his soul. The central principle was the inner revelation of Christ. The mystery of His Person could be only comprehended practically. Indeed all knowledge of the Old Testament prophecies, all theories of the origin and future of the world and of the history of mankind were inert and chaotic till Christ came to breathe into them the breath of life and to shape them into meaning. It was St. Paul's actual experience of the Living Christ, the life lived in Him, that taught the Apostle the truths he made known to the world with a σοφία that was ἡ σοφία Θεοῦ.

> "Christ! I am Christ's! and let the name suffice you,
> Ay, and for me He greatly hath sufficed:
> Lo with no winning words I would entice you,
> Paul has no honour and no friend but Christ." [3]

---

[1] *History of Dogma*, A. Harnack, vol. i. p. 133.

[2] Cf. Principal Carpenter (*Jesus or Christ?* p. 230), who, after indicating the presence of all the elements for a doctrine of "descent" like the Indian *avatāras*, writes "The elements of a Christology were all prepared. There was needed only a personality to which they could be attached." See also p. 239 of the same volume where the same Author commends Brückner, Wrede and Cheyne for aiming at showing that the Pauline Christology cannot be wholly explained by inference from the Conversion.

[3] *St. Paul*, F. W. H. Myers.

CHAPTER III

Jesus as Messiah

General Agreement that, for St. Paul, Jesus was the Messiah.

AFTER obtaining this general idea of St. Paul's religious history we are enabled to turn with greater penetration and sympathy to the particular subject set apart for consideration, i.e. his view of the Person of Christ. Amid the clash and discord of conflicting opinions the student is cheered by finding one subject of common agreement.[1] It is a common acknowledgment that Jesus, whatever else He might have been to St. Paul, was indeed the Christ, fulfilling the Messianic hopes and ideals expressed in the Jewish Scriptures. There had been dimly shadowed forth One who was to come (הבא) who would display qualities more than human, bring peace among the nations of the earth, and establish a spiritual kingdom in Mount Zion into which all nations should come. That ideal figure "projected upon the shifting future"[2] had inspired with hope and courage the sinking hearts of his countrymen for centuries, and carried them through the depths of danger and distress. Now the hope of the ages was realized. The Messiah had come in the person of Jesus, and thus Christianity was the spiritual descendant of Judaism, both child and heir.

Before his conversion, St. Paul's ideas of the coming Mes-

[1] On the controversy *Jesus or Christ?* see above p. 204 ff.

[2] *Isaiah, His Life and Times* (Prof. Driver), p. 42.

siah were no doubt of the narrower type which many of his contemporaries held.

THE IDEAS OF THE MESSIAH PREVALENT IN PALESTINE WERE SHARED BY ST. PAUL BEFORE HIS CONVERSION.

Many of the true elements of Messianic prophecy had been left out of account altogether, and others were either disproportionately magnified or minimized in the idea of the national deliverer prevalent at this time. That St. Paul had not grasped the wonderful idea of a Suffering Servant, a Saviour made perfect through renunciation and sorrow, seems clear from the fact that such a description of the Messiah filled him with horror. Jesus had been but a crucified failure. We can see how Christ Crucified and Exalted shining in his heart must have taught him to set aside for ever any Messianic expectations of a material nature. He must have been led to search again the oracles of God committed to the Jew, and as the new revelation gave them a new meaning to him, fresh phases of Messiah's Person hitherto unnoticed, a purified and spiritualized view of what He came to do, lit their pages with the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ.[1, 2]

[1] So he prays that his Colossian converts may be filled with all spiritual knowledge and understanding (Col. i. 9).

[2] The true secret of the spiritualized conception of the Messiah after his conversion is to be found in his theocentric Christology. Sabatier, Beyschlag, and Somerville all start from an anthropocentric standpoint and as a result find St. Paul's fundamental idea in Christ as the Archetype of Humanity, the Second Adam. On the other hand Professor Findlay ("St. Paul the Apostle," Art. *H. D.B.*) and Dr. Stevens (*The Pauline Theology*) hold that the Apostle's doctrine is only anthropocentric in appearance. In reality it is theocentric. Whilst, as a Jew, he would, in a real sense naturally take a theocentric standpoint, yet the unique experience of the "beaming forth of the illumination of the glory of the Christ" (2 Cor. iv. 4; cf. St. John i. 14) produced a new conception of God as of Jesus. His life was thenceforth "hid with Christ in God." His previous training and habits of thought would help him to give

The Effect of the Conversion on his Messianic Conception—Immediate.

We naturally turn first to the scene of the Conversion.[1] As the stricken persecutor lay prostrate on the ground on the road to Damascus, with eyes blinded by the glory of the Risen Christ, and heart humbled by His Presence, the question had sprung to his lips, "Who art Thou, Lord?"[2] It was a question which half contained its own answer. By the word κύριος the LXX translated the Tetragrammaton יהוה. Round it had grown up traditions and associations connected with gracious condescensions of Israel's own and only God, with objective visions and personal guidings in the working out of God's purpose for His people. This

form and expression to the conception which he developed from His theocentric and Christocentric standpoint. Behind all his doctrine was his simple faith in Christ, the awful knowledge that God had chosen him and spoken to him. When he takes and uses the Messianic phraseology of his day, He fills it with a meaning new and rich.

[1] There are three separate accounts of the Conversion in Acts. There is a difference, but not a vital difference, in detail. In the first account in chap. ix. Paul saw suddenly a light shining from heaven, he fell to the ground and heard a voice speaking to him, but "the men that journeyed with him stood speechless, hearing the voice, but beholding no man (*v.* 7). In the second account in chap. xxii., the companions of Paul "saw the light, but they heard not the voice of him that spake" (*v.* 9). In the third account in chap. xxvi., all the company fell to the ground, and the voice spake in the Hebrew tongue (*v.* 14), probably also "It is hard for thee to kick against the goads" (omitted from chap. ix. by L.T.Tr. WH, R.V.) occurs in this account only. The first account is that of the historian, the other two are reports of St. Paul's speeches. The omission in the third account of the vision, visit and message of Ananias is apparently a more important divergence, for Ananias gives the same message (chap. xxii. 14–15) which came from the Lord (chap. xxvi. 16–18). But the circumstances of the speech will explain the omission. In either case he could say with perfect truth that the revelation came from the Lord. The Conversion is referred to in the Epistles in 1 Cor. ix. 1; xv. 5–9; 2 Cor. iv. 4–6; v. 16–19; Gal. i. 11–17; Rom. i. 1–5 and other passages.

[2] Τίς εἶ, Κύριε;

was indeed a manifestation of God. Saul was on holy ground in a holy Presence, and he knew it. But to his question came the clear definite reply, "I am Jesus, Whom thou persecutest." Who was the Jesus suffering from the persecution of Saul? Surely a Jesus Who falsely, blasphemously, impiously, as Paul thought, claimed to be the Messiah. First, the revelation showed Saul his mistake. The veil of nationalism is suddenly rent. The outlook is immeasurably widened in a moment. He is blinded by gazing into the infinity of God's purpose, dazed by the shock of sudden revelation, and silenced by realizing swiftly God's will for his life. God and Jesus Christ and the Jewish Messiah were revealing themselves to him in that awful Presence. He could not grasp its significance at once, but he rose from his knees convinced that he had had a revelation from God, that he had heard the voice of Jesus, that Jesus was the Messiah of his race and a Light to lighten the Gentiles; and that somehow these three, the Lord Jehovah, and Jesus, and the Messiah were one, speaking with the same authority, summoning to the same service. This question indeed "*Τίς εἶ, Κύριε;*" as it was first on his lips, was of primary importance to him. He could never have rested until Christ had taught him all that lay in His words "I am Jesus, Whom thou persecutest." The answer was the Christology of St. Paul.

And afterwards in Arabia.

The revelation of Jesus was probably not completed in the moments of the crisis near Damascus. Saul had still much to learn of Christ, "For I will shew (*ὑποδείξω*) him how great things he must suffer for My Name's sake."[1] During the three years in Arabia the fabric of his faith was slowly formed. Rarely in the history of the chosen of God is that sacred time of preparation laid bare to curious eyes. A

[1] Acts ix. 16.

single note suffices for the boyhood and early manhood of Christ. A sacred mist hides Him from our view when He climbs at nightfall the path that leads up the mountain to that Holy of Holies of His life where He prepares for the labours of the day. A Moses has for forty silent years the consciousness of mission and of his nation's need as a burden on his soul. An Elijah, a John the Baptist, spring suddenly into history, prepared and ready for their work. We know nothing of the silent days before, during which the discipline of thought and life had cleared the mental and moral and spiritual vision.

His Missionary Preaching.

So it was with St. Paul. With doctrines matured and clearly outlined he returned to Damascus. Here he would seem to have established two main theses: (i) that Jesus was the Divine Son of God;[1] and (ii) that He was therefore the Messiah.[2] The second position must, of necessity, have been reached only in his Synagogue preaching and that to Jews generally.[3] So at Thessalonica he reasoned that "this Jesus, whom I proclaim unto you, is the Christ."[4] At Corinth, he testified to the Jews that Jesus was the Christ.[5]

Such in general terms was the message of his bold preaching in the name of the Lord.[6] In Dr. Westcott's words the name "Christ" was "the seal of the fulfilment of the

[1] Acts ix. 20. See below on the "Son of God," p. 50. Cf. St. Matt. xxvi. 63, the Confession of Martha (St. John xi. 27) and the question of Christ—the basis of the Christian Church (St. John ix. 35).

[2] Acts ix. 22, also cf. Rom. xvi. 25. τὸ κήρυγμα Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ is "the preaching which announces Jesus the Messiah" (Sanday and Headlam, *ad loc.*) or "the preaching concerning Jesus Christ." The latter is the better interpretation. The mystery of His working was one that concerned Gentile as well as Jew, it was the breaking down of the wall of partition "the message of obedience in faith."

[3] Unless he showed the fulfilment of such Messianic aspirations among the Gentiles are referred to in Suetonius' *Life of Vespasian*, chap. iv.

[4] Acts xvii. 3. [5] Acts xviii. 5. [6] Acts ix. 27, 29.

Divine Will through the slow processes of life." By this title—Christ—" God teaches us to find the true meaning of history."[1] But the account of St. Paul's sermons and the references in his Epistles show us that he emphasized particularly certain aspects of Messiah's Person, and to the study of these we propose shortly to proceed.[2, 3]

A Brief Account of Contemporary Messianic Hope.

Assuming a knowledge of the portrait of the Messiah in the Old Testament, a brief delineation of the lesser known development of the Messianic hope between the Return from Captivity and the New Testament is, however, a further essential preliminary. Professor Drummond thus sums up the period after the captivity and before the rise of the Maccabees. " The Messianic hope resolved itself into vague anticipations of a glorious happy future, in which the presence of God would be more manifest, but of which a Messiah would form no essential feature "[4] being merely God's instrument or vehicle.[5] In the Sibylline Fragment (*c.* 220 B.C.) there is a picture of a king sent by God, possessing universal power, bringing peace, executing judgment, fulfilling promises, and being subject to the Almighty. It is thought by many that the Book of Daniel was written in the Maccabean period, and, if so, the Apocalyptic nature of the Messianic hope expressed there is possibly influenced, humanly speaking, by Persian Mazdeism which held such

[1] Westcott, *Revelation of the Father*, p. 25.

[2] "The Messianic expectation presented no difficulties to those who, since the time of Augustus, had learnt to believe that the world-cycle was approaching its completion, and that a Deliverer would soon appear to lead mankind into the glories of the golden age of which the poets sang and the Sibyl prophesied." See Prof. Kirsopp Lake's book *The Earlier Epistles of St. Paul*, p. 43.

[3] It must be remembered that we have no full account of his missionary preaching, and that if we had it would not follow that therein was contained all he saw of the fulfilment by Jesus of the Messianic hope.

[4] *The Jewish Messiah*, p. 199. [5] So Philo.

doctrines as the partial Resurrection and the Millennial Reign. A little later (*c.* 166–161 B.C.), the Visions and Dreams of Enoch were written. Dr. Charles thus sums up their conception of the Messiah. "He is a man only, but yet a glorified man; and superior to the community from which he springs. So far as he is a man only, he may be regarded as the prophetic Messiah as opposed to the Apocalyptic Messiah of the Similitudes: and yet he is not truly the prophetic Messiah for he has absolutely no function to perform, and he does not appear till the world's history is finally closed."[1] The Book of Jubilees has only one allusion to Messiah (xxxi. 18), who is to arise from Judah. In the Similitudes of Enoch (95–80 B.C.) the "Son of Man" will appear to judge. He is the "elect one" (xl. 5; xlv. 3, etc.), "the Righteous One" (xxxvii. 3), the "Anointed" (xlviii. 10; lii. 4), and "the Son of Man" (xlvi. 2 ff.; xlviii. 2). Messiah is (i) Prophet and Teacher; (ii) Vindicator and Ruler; (iii) Judge. Thus Messiah is "The Supernatural Son of Man, clothed with the attributes of Deity, and separating the righteous from the wicked. Yet there is no mention of a Second Advent. So to the first disciples a suffering Messiah seemed a contradiction in terms."

The Psalms of Solomon or of the Pharisees do not actually contain the title "Son of God," but one passage (xvii. 26) clearly borrows from Psalm ii.[2] There the Messiah is a vassal king, not a supreme law-giver. He is God's vicegerent. He is not divine, though raised by God Himself (xvii. 23) and endowed with divine gifts. There is no trace of a supernatural birth or pre-existence, yet we have this advance in the conception of Messiah that He is regarded as personal, for the first time in Palestinian literature.[3]

We pass now to some of the most prominent points of contact between the Pauline Christ and the Jewish Messiah.

[1] *The Book of Enoch*, Rev. R. H. Charles, p. 30 ff.
[2] So Prof. Sanday, Art. "Son of God," *H. D. B.*
[3] *Psalms of the Pharisees*, Profs. Ryle and James, Introduction.

1. General Agreement with Old Testament Prophecy.

1. Generally speaking, Christ was He of whom the Old Testament Scriptures spake. Briefly, we gather that St. Paul saw the Messiah's life foretold not only as to His birth, but also in His being condemned (Acts xiii. 27), in His death (Rom. xv. 3, iii. 21–26), in His Resurrection (Acts xiii. 32, 33, Rom. iv. 13–25, x. 7), and in His being made a Minister of the Circumcision (Rom. xv. 8). The followers of Christ are the true heirs to the promise to Abraham (Gal. iii. 29). In fact, all the promises of God were in Him fulfilled and realized (2 Cor. i. 19–20). We are carried far beyond the sphere of Jewish nationalism or Jewish hope, into the region of spiritual perception where we can see the Jewish Messiah as One in Whom dwelt all the Pleroma of the Godhead bodily.

2. Christ the Holy One and the Righteous One.

2. Christ is the Holy One and the Righteous One.

(*a*) Christ is the Holy One. In his missionary sermon at Antioch (Acts xiii. 35), St. Paul applies to Jesus the quotation from the Psalm (xvi. 10), used also by St. Peter in his speech on the Day of Pentecost: "Thou wilt not give Thy Holy One ("τὸν ὅσιόν σου") to see corruption." In St. Mark i. 24 the word is ἅγιος. Professor Swete there sees in the cry of the man with the unclean spirit a recognition of the Messiahship of Jesus, of One Who was wholly consecrated to God and therefore ἅγιος.[1] The word ὅσιος was used by the LXX translators to translate חָסִיד, whilst ἅγιος translated קָדוֹשׁ. The former implies the idea rather of ceremonial cleanness, *sanctus*, as opposed to *pollutus;* the latter implies separation and consecration for God. The ὅσιος, writes Archbishop Trench,[2] is one who reverences those "everlasting sanctities," which rest on

[1] *St. Mark*, Prof. Swete *ad loc.*

[2] *Synonyms of the New Testament*, p. 314

the "divine constitution of the moral universe." It is this kind of "holiness" that is implied in the word and, to one so familiar as St. Paul with the LXX, the distinction must have been present.

All through our Lord's life, He fulfilled the Old Testament idea of the Messiah who should perfectly keep God's law. In the face of the terrible temptations that assailed Him, He approved Himself ὅσιος, and the Messianic prediction of the Psalm was fulfilled when His body saw no corruption.

(*b*) The Righteous One. "ὁ δίκαιος" is used once by St. Paul of Jesus Christ. During his defence on the stairs at Jerusalem, in the narration of his conversion, he mentions the words of Ananias, "The God of our fathers hath chosen thee that thou shouldest . . . see the Righteous One" (τὸν Δίκαιον), Acts xxii. 14. Righteousness is intimately connected with holiness.[1] "The Holy God shall sanctify Himself in righteousness" (Isa. v. 16). In the prophets righteousness was to be a feature of the Messianic reign, "A king shall reign in righteousness . . ." (Isa. xxxii. 1).[2] Moreover the "servant" as conceived by the deutero-Isaiah is "the righteous servant who shall justify many" (Isa. liii. 11). Righteousness has a twofold aspect: (1) It is an attribute of God's nature (cf. Rom. iii. 5, "the righteousness of God"); (ii) it is a character required by God of man. "What God requires is grounded in what God is." Accordingly Christ as the Righteous One is He Who perfectly fulfils God's law, whose character is that which God the Righteous One (St. John xvii. 25) requires, and did require throughout Israel's history. St. Paul sees in Jesus the Righteous One of the prophets (as St. Peter did, cf. Acts iii. 14). But he saw more than the Jews to whom he was speaking would see. There was not merely superficial

[1] The distinction often drawn between ὅσιος as referring to duty towards God, and δίκαιος to duty towards men, will not hold of New Testament Greek or Christian ethics. See Trench, *Synonyms*, pp. 313, 314.

[2] See also Isa. ix. 7; Isa. xi. 5, etc.

obedience to commandments or the observance of rites and ceremonies, nor was there merely the legal conception of one who through his righteousness was acquitted before God in a forensic manner.[1] There was the deeper, ethical significance. Grace and faith have a prominence in his conception which they could not have had for a Jew whose experience was less intense than his own. The Old Testament leads us to think of righteousness as the judicial attribute of God avenging Himself on wickedness and delivering the righteous. When the latter aspect is developed the forensic idea must go.[2] "The Old Testament may be said to culminate in the thought of righteousness as a gift of God," an idea appearing most clearly perhaps in Psalm xxiv. 5, lxix. 28; Isaiah xlvi. 13, li. 5, 8, lvi. 1. This brings us very near to the Pauline position that righteousness is a free gift of God through faith in Christ Jesus. The righteousness we acquire is an "imputed righteousness" not by the Law, nor within the power of the will. But the Righteous One, Jesus Christ, did not need this imputed righteousness. He was perfectly sinless,[3] and therefore perfectly righteous. His own life was lived in perfect conformity to God's law. So in the Gospels, and as applied to Jesus Christ, the word is used in a merely ethical sense without such a distinctly technical sense as the Pauline use establishes. Thus, with St. Paul in this sermon, it means "God-like character," the qualities of a character acceptable to God, which emanate from love as their root and ground. It is St. Paul's testimony to the sinless, perfect life of Christ on earth.

[1] "The righteous were those who kept the Law of God. . . . We are too apt to forget that the Pharisees and lawyers who are held up to reprobation in the New Testament were only one side of Judaism."—Prof. K. Lake, *Earlier Epistles of St. Paul*, pp. 397, 398.

[2] See *St. Paul's Conception of Christianity*, Dr. A. B. Bruce, p. 147.

[3] 2 Cor. v. 21.

3. Christ as of the Seed of David.

3. He was of the seed of David. The conception of Christ as descended from David, as the representative of his house, and the occupant of his throne, was the most general notion of Messiah since the ideal reign of the "man after God's own heart." In times after Haggai (ii. 21–23) the Messianic office of the house of David had fallen into the background, e.g. Jeremiah "a faithful prophet" (1 Mac. xiv. 41), not David, appears to Judas.[1] The word Christ[2] is used first of the expected deliverer in the Psalms of the Pharisees (*c.* 70–40 B.C.). "It was from these Psalms that the impulse, which, in the next generation, caused Davidic descent to be regarded as an essential element of Messianic claims, came."[3] St. Paul recognized the fact that Jesus was born into the world, a descendant of David, according to promise (Gal. iii. 19). He asserts it again in Romans i. 3, "*τοῦ γενομένου ἐκ σπέρματος Δαυεὶδ κατὰ σάρκα*"; also in Romans ix. 5, "*Ἰσραηλεῖται . . . ἐξ ὧν ὁ Χριστὸς τὸ κατὰ σάρκα.*" This fact forms so fundamental a part of his conception of Christ that it is in the forefront both of his missionary preaching, and also of the most carefully reasoned and systematized of all his Epistles. Sabatier has pointed out how few writers on St. Paul realize that he was first a missionary and afterwards a theologian. "To people," he adds, "who had never heard the principal gospel narratives, his Epistles would present insoluble enigmas in every line." The very essence of his teaching to both Jews and Gentiles, who had never heard of Jesus, must have been the sinless course of His life on earth, His death on the Cross and His elevation into glory. St. Paul would, we believe, unhesitatingly assert the real nIcarnation of the Son of God as Son of David "*κατὰ σάρκα.*" His

[1] 2 Mac. xv. 13 ff. Cf. St. Matt. xvi. 14; St. John i. 21, vi. 14, vii. 40. [2] מָשִׁיחַ.

[3] *The Psalms of the Pharisees*, Profs. Ryle and James. Introduction.

earthly life was not merely Docetic, the facts of His earthly life were valued and formed part of missionary teaching. We can see from the universalistic ideas of the Prophets,[1] held together with a belief in the Davidic descent of Messiah, how it was possible for the Apostle of the Gentiles to acknowledge and to teach that the Lord Himself was born as the prophets had foretold and as the Jewish race believed, of the stock of David, the son of Jesse.

The following reasons seem to the present writer to point conclusively to St. Paul's knowledge and deep appreciation of the value of the earthly life of Jesus.[2]

(i) To preach "Christ crucified" implied a reference to the chief facts of the earthly life. Much has been written about the words of the Apostle in 2 Cor. v. 16,[3] "Wherefore as for us, we know no man henceforth after the flesh; even though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now we know Him so no more." [*Ὥστε ἡμεῖς ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν οὐδένα οἴδαμεν κατὰ σάρκα· εἰ καὶ ἐγνώκαμεν κατὰ σάρκα Χριστόν ἀλλὰ νῦν οὐκέτι γινώσκομεν.*]

[1] The narrower national notions commonly attributed to all Jews were peculiar to the Zealots.

[2] Prof. Weinel (*Jesus or Christ?* p. 30) writes, "The question of the Law was precisely what Jesus left incomplete. . . . From the content of our Gospels it thus becomes clear why, precisely in the great struggle of his life, Paul was unable to quote Jesus." The struggle about the Law took place probably before the words of Jesus had a supreme importance in his life (see chap. ii. p. 21, 22). In any case it is at least arguable that St. Paul came to the same point of view about the Law as his Master.

In the same volume (*Jesus or Christ?*) we are reminded by Prof. Bacon (p. 213) that "Mark is a thoroughly Pauline Gospel." He is so struck with the subordinating of the precepts of Jesus to His Person and Work that he regards that Gospel as a "drastic Pauline recast of the primitive Petrine tradition." For St. Paul's use of "Q" see p. 216 ff. of *Jesus or Christ?* and p. 41[23] of this book. So Wendling regards the "final redactor" of St. Mark as influenced by the Pauline doctrines of the Atonement, and of the Church. *Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem*, p. 398 ff.

[3] Some (e.g. J. Weiss) regard this text as justifying the inference that St. Paul had seen Jesus during His earthly life.

What does knowing a Christ *κατὰ σάρκα* mean? It is evidently a knowledge which he has come to disregard, a view of the Christ which has been cast to one side. He had known before his conversion a fleshly Messiah, a national Deliverer, the object of material hopes, the warrior king of an earthly Zion. His conversion had changed all that. "Now henceforth we know Him so no more." Now he knew a Christ Whose love for him constrained him (*v.* 14), Who died for all that all might live to Him. It does not in the slightest degree imply that he despised the earthly life of the Lord and had rejected it as unworthy of Him Who was the image of the invisible God.[1]

(ii) Shortly after he wrote 2 Cor. St. Paul wrote to the Romans that Christ was "of the seed of David," and shortly before that He was "made of a woman, born under the law."[2]

(iii) Is there not really a stronger underlying agreement between Epistles and Gospels than we are sometimes led to expect and more reference to the earthly life of Jesus than superficial readers discern?[3]

[1] As Weizsäcker strongly holds. See *The Apostolic Age*, vol. i. p. 142. Sir J. C. Hawkins has lately pointed out the intense interest the stories of the Passion and Crucifixion must have had for St. Paul and his followers (*Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem*, p. 92).

[2] Gal. iv. 4. Cf. Rom. i. 3 and Rom. ix. 5 where the birth and life of Jesus are referred to. In Rom. i. 3 the reference is to "the Son," in Rom. ix. 5 to "ὁ Χριστός," i.e., S. Paul's change in view was rather of "the Messiah" than of Jesus.

[3] See *The Testimony of St. Paul to Christ*, Dr. Knowling, pp. 179–350. So close is the correspondence between the teaching and words of St. Paul and Jesus that it has been affirmed (by Resch) that St. Paul used some document which St. Mark also used. "It is probable that much more of the common teaching and even phraseology of the early Church than we are accustomed to imagine goes back to the teaching of Jesus" (Sanday and Headlam, *Romans*, p. 382. See also Dr. Knowling's *Messianic Interpretation*, p. 85). Dr. Sanday points out that in two passages at least St. Paul appears to show detailed knowledge of the Gospel story; the Lord's Supper (1 Cor. xi. 23–34), and the Appearances of the Risen Saviour

(iv) This matter was no subject of dispute between St. Paul and the Apostles of the Circumcision.

(v) Jesus Himself, Who had lived His life on earth, was the teacher of St. Paul. Can we fail to believe that the magnificent conception of the Incarnation set forth in Philippians ii. 5–11 came from this Source? Jesus Himself tells us that certain events of His life will stand for ever, such as that He is the Revelation of God the Father.

The moral sacrifice and negation expressed in 2 Cor. viii. 9, "Though He was rich, yet He became poor,"[1] the entreaty—in 2 Cor. x. 1[2]—"by the meekness" and "sweet reasonableness" of Christ can refer to nothing else than this earthly walk amongst men. Then, too, there was the "sinlessness of Christ."[3] "Him Who knew no sin

(1 Cor. xv. 3–8). Could he not have described *other* passages of the Lord's life also with equal accuracy? Cf., too, the "words of the Lord," 1 Cor. vii. 10; ix. 14; expressions similar to Gospel phrases Rom. xii. 14; 1 Cor. iv. 12, 13; vi. 3; xii. 2, 3; the character of Jesus in St. Matt. xi. 29 with that of 2 Cor. x. 1; Phil. ii. 5–11; the "Love" of the Gospels with that of 1 Cor. xiii. Did he use "Q"? See (*Dict. of C. and G.*, Art. "Paul").

[1] ἐπτώχευσεν πλούσιος ὤν. It deals with the motive not the method of the Incarnation. [2] διὰ τῆς πραύτητος καὶ ἐπιεικείας.

[3] τὸν μὴ γνόντα ἁμαρτίαν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἁμαρτίαν ἐποίησεν. Amongst other attacks upon the sinless character of Jesus is that of Prof. Schmiedel (*Jesus or Christ?* p. 67 ff.), who writes, "Jesus would not have had the feeling that His mission was withdrawn from Him unless sin had kept Him for some length of time removed from the face of His Father." The Rev. R. J. Campbell writes, in the same volume (p. 191), "To speak of Him as morally perfect is absurd; to call Him sinless is worse, for it introduces an entirely false emphasis into the relations of God and man." He later defines "Christhood" as "manhood at its highest power." This surely is moral perfection, which, in so far as it means "being sinless," and is for the individual, he yet denies is the great end of spiritual endeavour.

The term "sinlessness of Jesus" (made familiar by Ullmann's book of that name) is sometimes objected to as implying a merely negative conception, the absence of evil. As Mr. Martin (*Dict. of C. and G.*, Art. "Divinity of Christ") points out: His moral self-witness is in the highest degree positive. The term indicates the

He made to be sin on our behalf" (2 Cor. v. 21). In St. Paul's eyes the whole value to the Father of the death of Christ lay in that it was the death of a sinless being, Who, though He had taken upon Him our flesh and endured the temptations that throng our life, yet had never fallen from the loftiest conceivable ideal of man.

(vi) Were the theory we are discussing true, we should expect to find St. Paul gnostic and docetic in his views. His very assertion that Christ was "of the seed of David," "made of a woman, born under the law" is a negation of Docetism."[1] Matter is rather that in which evil has its home, the agent through which it acts. Christ became ("ἐγενήθη") man. He was "this (man)."[2] Yet He was the Creator and Sustainer of the Universe, Who in His great love came to earth, and assumed our flesh, in itself good; and, despite His outward temptations, He conquered by the grace of the Holy Spirit.

(vii) The keynote of St. Paul's preaching—the suffering Messiah—precludes any belittlement of the value of Christ's earthly life. Christ was a minister of circumcision that the promises might be confirmed (Rom. xv. 8).

(viii) The Pauline School, in which we may, perhaps, include St. John and the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, are clearly and definitely against such view. They were continuing his teaching not revolutionizing it.

4. Christ the Suffering Messiah.

4. Christ as the suffering Messiah. To recognize in Jesus the Messiah of their hopes, after the terrible mental anguish and bodily suffering during His earthly life, and especially during His last week on earth, meant a recognition of suffering as an integral factor in the Messiah's appearing. It was indeed the main object of the Apostolic teaching to

stainless purity of Christ. To give the conception accurate expression is, perhaps, impossible.

[1] Cf., too, 1 Tim. iii. 16. [2] διὰ τούτου. Acts xiii. 38.

show how the Christ Who was to come should suffer, contrary to popular expectation, but completely in agreement with the Old Testament Scriptures. Who was this Messiah, this Jesus, Whom they were preaching? A crucified Messiah? St. Paul knew what a stumbling-block (*σκάνδαλον*) that was to the Jews, as well as foolishness (*μωρίαν*) to the Gentiles.[1] Accordingly he made it his first aim to prove that "it behoved the Christ to suffer" (Acts xvii. 3) and then proceeded to show that "this Jesus . . . is the Christ." Once the fact of the sufferings of Jesus was seen to be foreshadowed in the Old Testament,[2] the proof was clear to him. So prominent did the thought of the sufferings of the Christ in His earthly life become in St. Paul's Christology that he recognizes in his own life the same kind of sufferings which abounded in that of His Master (2 Cor. i. 5). Nay more, he filled up on his part "that which is lacking ("*τὰ ὑστερήματα*") of the afflictions of Christ" in his flesh for His body's sake which is the Church (Col. i. 24).

Without the conception of a suffering Christ, of glory reached through suffering, the life of Christ and the death of the Cross would have been alike inexplicable. The whole of the early Church must have fought their way to this position. St. Peter, representative of the best of Christian Judaism, had done so, when he wrote, "searching what time or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ Which was in them (the prophets) pointed unto, when It testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ and the glories that should follow them" (1 Pet. i. 11); and, "Christ also suffered for sins once, the righteous for the unrighteous, that He might bring us to God" (1 Pet. iii. 18); and "Forasmuch, then, as Christ suffered in the flesh, arm ye yourselves with the same mind (*ἔννοιαν*)" (1 Pet. iv. 1).[3] In

[1] 1 Cor. i. 23.
[2] Particularly in Isa. liii.
[3] I.e. as Jesus. Cf. i. Pet. iv. 2 and Rom. vi. 7.

the fiery trial ("τῇ ἐν ὑμῖν πυρώσει") his readers of the Dispersion are to rejoice because "they partake of Christ's sufferings" (1 Pet. iv. 12, 13). Once the fact was there in the life of Jesus, and the proof from the Old Testament was forthcoming and convincing, the missionary to Palestine and the Dispersion had a clear, logical message for the Jew. To preach Christ crucified at all to a Jewish audience was a "stumbling-block"; to attempt to preach Him without showing His relation to the Old Testament Scripture would be foolishness, too.

5. Jesus Christ as the Rock, the Deliverer and the Lord of Peace.

5. In the imagery of the Old Testament, the Rock and Deliverance are frequently and intimately connected. The hot, dusty desert, and the mighty rock for shadow and protection; the devastating hosts of enemies, and the rocks and caves for a defence and hiding place; the attacking armies and the fortress built upon the rock for a stronghold and refuge are familiar conceptions in Hebrew poetry. The Lord God was their Rock. The title implies the "strength, faithfulness and unchangeableness of Jehovah."[1]

Moreover, the Rock had been to their nation one of the chosen instruments of the Revelation of His lifegiving power and guarding love, for it was the rock in the wilderness that enabled the fainting people to quench their thirst;[2] "He clave the rocks in the wilderness and gave them drink as out of the great depths."[3] Round this incident many traditions gathered.[4] It is with St. Paul's reference to it[5] that we are primarily concerned. He writes, in

[1] Cf. Psa. xviii. 2. Kirkpatrick (Camb. Bible) *ad loc.*

[2] Exod. xvii. 6. [3] Psa. lxxviii. 15.

[4] Amongst them a Rabbinical legend related that as the multitude of Israel moved on its march a stream of water followed from the rock throughout their wanderings. It has accordingly been asserted that St. Paul is here taking this rabbinical legend and applying it to Christ. [5] 1 Cor. x. 4.

1 Cor. x. 4, "For they drank of a spiritual rock that followed them, and the rock was Christ." [1]

How far St. Paul had contemporary Rabbinical legends in mind it is hard to say, but there seem to be at least two interesting ideas in the reference:—

i. It undoubtedly teaches the Pre-existence of Christ.[2] The Targum on Isaiah xvi. 1, "Afferent dona Messiae Israelitarum, qui robustus erit, propterea quod in deserto fuit Rupes Ecclesia Zionis, expresses" this.

Wisdom x. 15 ff. relates that the wisdom of God (*σοφία Θεοῦ*) was with Moses and led the Israelites through the wilderness. It was a common belief that the Messiah, the Angel of the Covenant, was present with the chosen people. At all events, Christ is regarded here as existing before His Incarnation, not as an Idea but as a Person, and as watching over and sustaining His people in days of danger. Dr. Inge writes that it reminds him of Clement's language about the Son as "the Light which broods over all history." [3]

ii. The Jews had frequently been led, by their sense of the importance and office of the Rock, to designate even Jehovah Himself by that title, cf. e.g., Psalm lxxviii. 35, "And they remembered that God was their Rock, and God Most High their Redeemer." Cf. Psalm xviii. 2; 2 Samuel xxii. 2, etc. St. Paul must have been conscious of this when he wrote. Yet he applies to Christ a name which is used in the particular personal sense of the Old Testament application of it to Jehovah. By this is implied not merely the pre-existence of Jesus as the Angel of the Covenant, but as One in Whom Israel trusted as in a Rock. He sustained them spiritually, as the waters out of the living

[1] *ἔπινον γὰρ ἐκ πνευματικῆς ἀκολουθούσης πέτρας, ἡ πέτρα δὲ ἦν ὁ Χριστός.*

[2] See hereon below in chapter *Christ as Eternal*, p, 103 ff.

[3] *Christian Mysticism*, Dr. Inge, p. 66.

rock had refreshed them physically.[1] Both these ideas of Messiah, Pre-existent and Divine, were present in tentative, speculative, forms in certain contemporary schools of thought.

The Deliverer.

Another Old Testament conception taken up by St. Paul has reference rather to the Work than to the Person of Messiah. Deliverance was the first step in the establishment of the Messianic Kingdom. So Messiah was not only Protector, He was the active Saviour (ὁ ῥυόμενος), the Rescuer, He Who frees (פלט) captives. In this sense there was frequent combination of the word with the Rock. "The Lord is my Rock in Whom I take refuge, my Deliverer" (Ps. xviii. 2; cf. 2 Sam. xxii. 2; Ps. xl. 7; lxx. 5.) It is unlikely that the views of Castelli (advanced in *Il Messia secondo gli Ebrei*, p. 164), and Dalman (*Worte Jesu*, p. 242) are correct. They assert that, according to the original conception, the Messiah is never the deliverer.[2] God delivers, and then Messiah reigns. Psalm ii., however, as Professor Stanton shows, strongly militates against that view; though, as he points out, the actual relation of the Messiah to the establishment of the Messianic Kingdom cannot be precisely determined.[3] Nevertheless in Rom. xi. 26,[4] St. Paul quotes Isa. lix. 20, "Out of Sion [5] shall come ὁ ῥυόμενος." [6] Jesus was indeed the Redeemer, the Goel. The Rabbis interpreted the passage Messianically, and so St. Paul applies it. To Christ pertained the active work of redeeming Israel and humanity, as well as of sus-

[1] Cf. Isa. lv. 1; Ps. xxxvi. 9; St. John iv. 14; Rev. xxii. 1, 17. also see St. John ix. 7 and vii. 37 f., with Westcott's note thereon.

[2] "Messiah," Art. *H. D. B.*, Prof. V. H. Stanton.

[3] The Jews did not presume to dictate to God about the future as so many think.

[4] Cf. also 1 Thess. i. 10.

[5] In original "וּבָא לְצִיּוֹן."

[6] In original גּוֹאֵל.

taining and protecting them. The whole idea is, of course, raised into the spiritual realm in the New Testament.[1]

The Lord of Peace.

After the work of deliverance is done, under the protection of the Rock, there is Peace. The Messiah is accordingly "Prince of Peace" (Isa. ix. 6).[2] His kingdom shall be filled with harmony and happiness.[3] Discord shall be no more. Even the "red tooth of nature" will cease to draw blood (Isa. xi.). "This man shall be the Peace," after delivering Israel from the hand of the Assyrians (Mic. v. 5, 6). The coming Messiah was to be the bringer of peace. Though this peace was as a rule material and the vision was of a country free from war, fertile and flourishing, and of a people living on the fat of the land, it was not entirely so. For the wicked there could be no peace (Isa. xlviii. 22; lvii. 21). Peace is coupled with truth as a revelation (Jer. xxxiii. 6). It is to the faithful remnant that peace will come. In the New Testament, Jesus Himself is the Peace-maker, Who, reconciling to God him that is near and him that is afar off, has become our Peace (Isa. lvii. 19; Eph. ii. 14; cf. Mic. v. 5). He is the Prince of Peace, "The Lord of Peace give you peace at all times" (2 Thess. iii. 16). "Peace be unto you from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ" (Rom. i. 7 *et passim*). But we discern here a fuller and deeper spiritual meaning. It is no longer so much a future blessedness as a present possession of the individual Christian.[4] "The mind of the Spirit

[1] By this phrase it is not implied that the Christian had the monopoly of spiritual things, but that, for St. Paul, the image stood for a purely spiritual office in that land of eternal reality "beyond the show of a passing world"—the home land of the Spirit. For expectation of a Deliverer among the Gentiles, see p. 34, n. [2]

[2] Possibly Solomon, son of David, is referred to in the first instance (so Philo).

[3] See also Isa. lii. 7, liii. 5, lvii. 19, Hag. ii. 9, Zech. ix. 10.

[4] Though in Rom. ii. 10 it is referred to with "glory and honour" as the reward of the good man at the παρουσία. Cf. St. John xiv. 27.

is life and peace" (Rom. viii. 6). "We have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ" (Rom. v. 1).[1] It comes from the redeemed soul abiding in Christ. We are at peace with God. So we get the technical meaning of Thayer,[2] as "the tranquil state of the soul assured of its salvation through Christ, and so fearing nothing from God and content with its earthly lot, of whatever sort that is." Of such a Peace was the Risen Saviour Lord and Prince. To His coming had the prophecies of old pointed in their deeper meaning, and even as St. Paul's experience of a Peace that passed understanding transcended the idea of the Old Testament, so must the Being in Whom that Peace was to be found have transcended in spirituality and in power the foreshadowed Messiah of the Jews.

To sum up the foregoing remarks we may say generally that Jesus was the Messiah. We have seen that He was the Son of David, that in His ministry to the circumcision, in His condemnation, death and resurrection, He was fulfilling the promises of the Father. As He was the Holy One and the Righteous One, so He suffered according to the Scriptures. As Messiah He brought Deliverance, Protection, Sustenance and Peace. In fact, every spiritual ideal and aspiration was fulfilled in Him. Whether St. Paul could have had such high ideas of the Jewish Messiah without attributing something of the divine nature to His Being is a question we shall be in a better position to answer later. At present we are forced to postulate for the Christ a nature, in its humiliation and suffering human, in its sinlessness divine, a life that was truly lived, and a resurrection which proved God's especial favour.

But we have further to consider three points of St. Paul's Christology, on which there has been shed much light by the recent study of contemporary documents.

[1] Reading ἔχομεν for ἔσχωμεν on the authority of Cremer, though the latter reading is better attested.

[2] *Lexicon of the New Testament*, 4th edition, p. 182.

6. Jesus Christ as "the Son of God." The Title in the Old Testament.

6. Jesus Christ as "the Son of God." The conception of God as Father is first prominent in history in the intimate relationship between God and the whole of His chosen people. Israel is His son and firstborn (Ex. iv. 22. Cf. Hos. xi. 1). The term then acquires a more individual application to the theocratic king as representing the nation. So in Nathan's vision David's cry to God would be, "Thou art my Father" (Ps. lxxxix. 27). Of David's seed God said, "He shall build an house for my name . . . I will be his Father, and he shall be my Son" (2 Sam. vii. 13, 14; cf. Heb. i. 5, where it is Messianically interpreted). It is in the Psalms that this relationship between God and the whole people, and the theocratic king and his line as representative of them, is beginning to be withdrawn and is more and more applied to that dim figure yet to come, even now in a vision "projected, as it were, upon the clouds," and "invested with all the attributes of a person,"[1] the Messiah. Such seems to be the reference in Psalm ii. 7. Whilst there is probably an historical foundation for this Psalm, there are three instances[2] of a Messianic interpretation, and St. Paul quotes v. 7 as fulfilled in the Resurrection of Jesus Christ (Acts xiii. 33). The Resurrection is the declaration (*ὁρισθέντος*) of Sonship (Rom. i. 4), but His Sonship is concerned with the whole of His earthly life. It is "the Son" Who was born of a woman; i.e., took upon Himself our human nature (*γενόμενον ἐκ γυναικός*, Gal. iv. 4), lived an earthly life in the likeness of sinful flesh (*ἐν ὁμοιώματι σαρκὸς ἁμαρτίας*, Rom. viii. 3), died upon the Cross as an offering for sin (*περὶ ἁμαρτίας*), thus condemning sin in the flesh, and finally was declared to be Son of God in the Resurrection (Rom. i. 4).

[1] Art. "Son of God," Prof. Sanday, *H. D. B.*

[2] See Dalman, quoted by Prof. Sanday in above article.

What, then, would the phrase "Son of God" mean for St. Paul? We are forced to inquire for answer into the current use of the phrase in his time.[1] It had long had amongst the Jews a distinctly Messianic connotation. The Messiah was "ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ," the supreme representative of God to Israel, and of Israel to God. He was endued with divine powers by the Holy Spirit, beyond any of the sons of men[2] (Enoch cv. 2). But writings contemporary with St. Paul's day, apart from the Gospels and Epistles, give us little information. It is therefore to the latter that we turn for guidance as to the meaning of the phrase.

The meaning of the Title to Jesus and St. Paul and their Contemporaries.

It is clear that such an inquiry must first of all take into account the different classes of persons who used the term. Prof. Sanday has done this so admirably in his article on "The Son of God,"[3] that we cannot forbear quoting extensively from it.

a. Contemporaries, Jewish and Non-Jewish.

1. The Populace. The confessions of the demoniacs Mark iii. 11; v. 7, he writes, "looked at psychologically," could not mean more than that they believed themselves to be in the presence of the Messiah. If we read into the words a higher meaning we assume a providential extraordinary action (which could, however, readily be felt by a will that was dormant).

2. The Centurion (Luke xxiii. 47). Because of conflicting parallels, doubt has been expressed as to whether the words

[1] It is not likely that the cult of the Roman Emperors suggested either word or idea. The Emperor was called "god" because his father after his death had been ranked among the gods. (*Messianic Interpretation*, Prof. Knowling, p. 58.)

[2] See Grimm-Thayer Lexicon, note on υἱός.

[3] In *H. D. B.* See also his book *Christologies Ancient and Modern*, p. 180.

were really used. If we grant their genuineness, yet the sense in which they were used would depend partly on the nationality of the centurion, a point as to which we are uncertain.

3. The Ruling Classes. The chief evidence is the question of the High Priest, "Art thou the Christ, the Son of the Blessed?"[1] The reply contained two assertions, (i) the admission of the charge, which was evidently regarded by the Jewish audience as blasphemy. "Still it would not follow that this was taken as an assertion of full Divinity. It was probably taken as a claim to be the Messiah," superhuman indeed, but not strictly Divine. (ii) There was the prophecy of the second Coming of Christ as a Judge.

4. The Disciples. St. Peter's confession,[2,3]. "The Son" (as distinguished from all others who may be called "sons") "of the Living God" (Matt. xvi. 16) is as much as to say "the Son of Jehovah Himself" (the God of Revelation and Redemption). "We are on the way," writes Dr. Sanday, "to the ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης καὶ χαρακτὴρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως of Heb. i. 3.

β. To Jesus Himself. At the very least the title means the expected Messiah.[4] It was the claim which the popular mind understood Him to make. But for Jesus it meant something far more. As He took up the conception of the

[1] St. Mark xiv. 61. Cf. Parallels St. Matt. xxvi. 63 ("Son of God"), St. Luke xxii. 70 ("They all said, 'Art thou then the Son of God?'")

[2] Cf. Parallels.

[3] Prof. H. Jones (*Jesus or Christ?* p: 101 ff.) insists upon the sonship of all by denying the uniqueness of the Sonship of Jesus. "The claims of Jesus are rendered meaningless, reduced into mere playthings of the superstitious imagination, by being thus made exclusive." As has been pointed out by the Rev. C. A. Scott (*J. T. S.* xi. p. 302) it is through Christ historically that humanity is convinced that it and the divine are "on one side." Prof. Schmiedel refuses to use phrases such as "Son of God," which would make Jesus unique or the Mediator (*Jesus or Christ?* p. 76).

[4] See Heb. i. 1.

Son of Man, applied it to Himself, and filled it with living meaning, so He took the title "Son of God" as the one which covered "the relationship of the perfect man to God —the perfection of Sonship in relation to God." [1]

So with St. Paul. "Paul does not call Jesus the Son of God because he has found in Him the Messiah. . . . Jesus is the Son of God because, being the Spirit of Holiness, He proceeds in His essence from the Divine nature." [2] It was to prove that Jesus was "the Son of God" that St. Paul laboured at Damascus.[3] This meant both proving that He was the Messiah, and further, setting forth a new conception of Messiah.[4]

7. Jesus Christ as Judge.

7. We pass now to St. Paul's conception of Jesus Christ as Judge.

Contemporary ideas on this subject are very important. In the Similitudes of Enoch (*c.* 1st century B.C.) Messiah sits on the throne of His glory beside the Head of Days, judging both men and angels (xl. 1; lxii. 2, 3, 5; lxix. 27, 29).

Imagery from Daniel is most certainly employed, though in Daniel it is God who is judge, "the one like unto a Son of Man" only then appearing to take the kingdom. The idea of Messiah coming in the clouds of Heaven seems to have been combined with the idea of His judgeship in 2 (4) Esdras xiii. 3, etc., which is possibly pre-Christian. In any case the Similitudes would probably be known to Jewish scholars, and the conception therein of the august, superhuman Being, seated on the throne of the Almighty, and

[1] Cf. *The Christology of Jesus*, Dr. Stalker.

[2] *The Apostle Paul*, Eng. trans. A. Sabatier, p. 334.

[3] Acts ix. 20.

[4] Though Christ is not called "'Son of God' in 2 Thess. ii., He is regarded as the opponent of Anti-Christ and so is the consubstantial representative of God." Cf. Col. i. 12–15; Heb. i. 2–8; iii. 3. (*Dict. of C. and G.*, Art. "Divinity of Christ," Rev. A. S. Martin.)

judging all men would have been fairly familiar to St. Paul's mind. We "wait for His Son from heaven whom He raised from the dead, even Jesus which delivereth us." [1] He is to come "with all His Saints." [2] He is to be "revealed from Heaven with the angels of His power in flaming fire, rendering vengeance to those that know not God." [3] When the Lord comes, He will bring to light the hidden things of darkness and make manifest the counsels of the heart.[4] It is before the judgment seat of Christ that we shall all be made manifest.[5] It may thus well be that the idea of Christ returning to judge the world shows a point of contact with the Jewish conceptions of Messiah, and that St. Paul was led by his Lord to see herein a true and abiding idea, which, if purified and vivified, must take its place in Christian eschatology.[6]

8. Jesus Christ as "The Beloved."

8. "The Beloved," (*ὁ ἠγαπημένος*) is an Old Testament title for Israel. So it might easily come to be employed of the Messiah (cf. "The Servant," "The Elect," "The Holy One"). Moreover, we note that the titles, "The Beloved," "The Elect," "Christ," were interchangeable at this time.[7] Further, in the Ascension of Isaiah *ὁ ἀγαπητός* of the Messiah, and in early Christian literature *ὁ Ἠγαπημένος* of our Lord, are frequently used.

We therefore conclude that the term was commonly applied

[1] 1 Thess. i. 10. Cf. the expectation that Messiah would abide for ever as king over an earthly kingdom.

[2] 1 Thess. iii. 13. Cf. Dan. vii. 13.

[3] 2 Thess. i. 7. [4] 1 Cor. iv. 5. [5] 2 Cor. v. 10.

[6] For the recent emphasis on the eschatological side of the beliefs of the early Church see below, p. 212 ff. Prof. K. Lake thinks that the Sacraments were the centre of Christianity for the Gentile Christian and the expectation of the Parousia for the Jewish Christian.—*Earlier Epistles of St. Paul*, p. 437.

[7] Cf. Isa. xlii. i. in Heb. and LXX; and see Eph. i. 6 where *ἐν τῷ Ἠγαπημένῳ* refers to Christ.

to the Messiah at the time of St. Paul. Its probable meaning cannot be disconnected from the Gospel phrase *ὁ υἱός μου, ὁ ἀγαπητός*," which means " My Son, the beloved," that is " beloved " is a separate title.[1] He it is Who is especially the object of God's love (אַהֲבָה). So the title is adopted by St. Paul (Eph. i. 6), who sees in it a fitting expression for the perfect relation of love between the Father and His only Son.[2]

Summary and Conclusion.

Looking back upon this chapter, containing many points of contact with Jewish Messianic hopes, we are struck especially with one characteristic. It was, generally speaking, the case that Jewish ideas of the Messiah started from the human side. Their speculation proceeded *κάτωθεν*, in contradistinction to that of Greek thinkers who, starting from the Divine, may be said to have proceeded *ἄνωθεν*. So it is rather on the human side that we find Jesus Christ fulfilling the highest conceptions of the Messiah that Jewish prophecy or Apocalypse had expressed. It is His historical mission that is pointed to: " The wonderful birth, the wonderful works, the crucifixion, the resurrection, and the ascension may be viewed as aspects of the work of the Son of Man and of the Son of God—they are aspects of the work of salvation, and of the coming forth from, and return to, the Father; but as enacted in time and space, they might be more appropriately described as belonging to the manifestation of the Messiah." [3] We can thus see that, however else St. Paul thought of Christ, He was in his eyes truly human, His life was really lived on this earth. He had established for His people a kingdom of Peace. Yet he was convinced that Jewish scriptures and speculations carried us further. He was the Holy and Righteous One. He was the pre-existent

[1] See *Ephesians*, Dr. A. Robinson, p. 229.
[2] Cf. The Doctrine of the Trinity.
[3] Art. " The Son of God," *H. D. B.*, Prof. Sanday.

Rock, the Son of God, the Coming Judge, the Beloved. The Jews had vaguely conceived of one, who though human was something more. In Him were to dwell attributes that were Divine. St. Paul, even without the vision and conversion, must have thought of the Messiah as God-sent and God-strengthened. With the central experience of his life behind him, every conception of his early days which was seen to be fulfilled in Christ was purified and filled with the loftiest and fullest meaning; for his vision of Christ was a vision of God. At the lowest estimate this conception of Jesus Christ was as high as the highest estimate of the Messiah among his people. At its true estimate, it implied that God's eternal purpose was established through Christ, and that the guiding hand of God in the history of the Jews was recognized for the past and assured for the future. He realized at last what Israel's mission to the world was, when he flung aside the fetters of a narrow Judaism and went forth to proclaim to mankind the Gospel of God and His Anointed.

CHAPTER IV

Jesus Christ as the Second Adam

General Remarks on the Source of the Doctrine.

ST. PAUL'S lofty conception of the Messiah as Incarnate in Jesus Christ has impressed itself on most students of his theology. It has, however, been regarded by many of those who have been equally impressed by the very exalted Messianic dogma of contemporary Judaism as merely a development from that. The early Christians, believing Jesus to be Messiah, attributed to Him the ideas then current, and so created a superhuman person. Jesus is great and heroic and divinely controlled.[1] Further it has been held that views so lofty cannot be developed from, or supported by, those which the Old Testament Scriptures reveal. Wernle takes this view. "The Pauline gnosis claimed to be a revealed exegesis of the Old Testament. But this Christology cannot possibly have been obtained by exegesis of the Old Testament, seeing it had been wrongly inserted into every text." We cannot agree that such was the relationship of St. Paul's doctrine either to current Messianic thought or to the Old Testament writings. The one fails to perceive the lofty spirituality of St. Paul, the other the depth and meaning of the inspiration of the Old Testament. Surely an accurate analysis of St. Paul's doctrine of the Messiah must take account of both. There is no doubt that Rabbinism and traditional influences affected St. Paul's mind especially in the phraseology and thought-forms

[1] So Bousset in his book *Jesus*.

of his Christology.[1] There was a Jewish background to his conceptions, a background in which the Old Testament was prominent ; his habits of thought were in no small degree Jewish ; and he dealt with existing contemporary thought in a way that transformed it without destroying it, and extracted all that was best, impressing upon it the stamp of his own individuality as he saw in it something to which the teaching of Christ led him. But he was by no means a slave to Jewish tradition, nor is it possible to explain his conceptions merely as the adoption of contemporary Jewish thought.

May we, then, not discover another source outside, which, alone or in combination with Jewish sources, would account for St. Paul's spiritual conception of the Person and office of the Christ. Prof. Pfleiderer thinks so. In the 1890 edition of his book on Paulinism he states that St. Paul derives one part of his theology from the Jewish synagogue, another from Alexandria, another from Hellenistic sources such as the Book of Wisdom.[2] Again, in his later book, *Early Christian Conceptions of Christ*, he seems to reduce the Christ of the earliest disciples to a kind of demon god, whom he calls an " animistic personification." [3] Now such a line

[1] As the Talmud says " A convert is a palimpsest."

[2] The labelling of separate sources in this way is apt to be misleading. There was a considerable intercourse between Egypt and Palestine and Greece. E.g. under Ptolemy II, Jews were in important commands in the Egyptian army and the court of this king afforded an excellent meeting ground for Jewish and Greek ideas. In Philo we have a Jewish Platonist. " The Egyptian " (Acts xxi. 38) could obtain a following in Palestine as a prophet.

[3] Prof. Pfleiderer strikes a truer note in his " conclusions " when he thus describes the value of parallels :—" The religious interpretation of those spiritual experiences . . . was the expression of the same eternal law, whose sacred truth had impressed itself upon mankind from the beginning—the law that the corn of wheat must die in order to bring forth fruit, and that the Son of Man must suffer that He may enter into His own glory " (*Early Christian Conceptions of Christ*, p. 164).

of thought, however interesting and valuable, may be invested with a quite mistaken value. Prof. Bruce, in his clear and valuable work on St. Paul, sees the "dull pedantry" into which this extreme tendency carries the critic. "It is a mistake," he says, "to be constantly on the look-out for sources of Pauline thought in previous or contemporary literature"; and again (quoting Günkel), "The theology of the great apostle is the expression of his experience, not of his reading, a remark which applies both to the Old Testament, the Apocrypha, Philo and the Scribes." So Dr. Kennedy avers that he has no sympathy "with those who reduce great factors in the spiritual or intellectual history of the race to mere bundles of influences which can be discovered and classified by minute analysis."

It is with the conviction that we cannot thus satisfactorily analyse St. Paul's conceptions, nor indeed understand them at all, except in view of that experience by which all the different converging lines of thought were at last united in the single portrait of the Christ, that we turn to a consideration of the characteristic Pauline expression of the work and person of Christ as "the Second Adam." It is not without connexion with the last chapter, but the phrase has a history, a value and a teaching of its own.

Contemporary Jewish Ideas on the Subject.

The general idea of the Second Adam was by no means unknown in contemporary Jewish literature. We first turn to Philo. In his system the highest and most generic of all was God as pure being. Then came His Logos, the real unifying principle of all below. "It was by virtue of His Reason that God was both ruler and good, or in other words creation and providence were both expressions of reason." [1] So, a *νοητὸς κόσμος* must have existed in the mind of God before the world came into being. The Logos is the *ἰδέα*

[1] *Philo*, Prof. Drummond.

τῶν ἰδεῶν, the supreme, archetypal idea. He is image of God, and archetype of man. In his interpretation of Genesis, moreover, Philo distinguishes between the Adam of Genesis i. 27 and the Adam of ii. 7, finding in the first the ideal man after God's image, remaining with God as a heavenly pattern. The second is the earthly man.

Turning to the Talmud, we find passages[1] to the effect that Adam's sin is his own, not the sin of the race. Yet the death sentence went forth on the race as a result of that sin; and, moreover, the tendency to evil lying dormant in the flesh was aroused and fostered. We must, of course, remember that the Talmud did not come into being as a connected and definite whole till about 200 A.D.,[2] when there had been room for development in Jewish theology; and it is for experts to determine how far St. Paul borrowed or adapted the Talmudic ideas of his time. The "Last Adam" seems, however, to have been a familiar title for the Messiah in his day. Contemporary thought, following Philo, distinguished the first and second Adam in creation, but it is significant that it went further and identified the "last Adam" with the Messiah. Schöttgen quotes (*inter alia*), "quemadmodum homo primus fuit primus in peccato, sic Messias erit ultimus ad auferendum peccatum penitus" and "Adamus postremus est Messias" from "Neve Shalom" (ix. 9). Thus in Alexandrian speculation there was the idea of an archetypal man existing before the imperfect, earthly representation should come into being, and in Palestinian Rabbinism there was a distinct approximation to the Apostle's idea of Christ as the Second Adam and Messiah.

In describing St. Paul's use of this phrase, two passages will come particularly before our notice. The first gives prominence more especially to the work of the Second Adam, the second lays the emphasis rather on His Person.

[1] Quoted by Weber.

[2] Though most of the material is much older.

(i) The term is used in that section of the Epistle to the Romans in which St. Paul proves that justification can never come by the Law.[1] His argument is a fourfold one. First of all, he appeals to universal experience. It is a matter of common observation that sin is widely, or, as the Apostle certainly believes, universally prevalent. He then proceeds to show how the Law brings a knowledge of sin, "For by the law is the knowledge of sin." A further stage in the proof is reached in the passage where Christ is spoken of as the Second Adam; and by giving his argument a personal turn the final step in the demonstration of the inherent sinfulness of humanity is reached as he sets forth his own experiences and struggles to show how sin works even now in man.

The "Adam-Christ" section of "Romans." A Parallel and a Contrast.

It is of the "Adam-Christ" Section alone that we can treat here. Wherein does that proof consist? It starts from the fundamental assumption that death is the result of sin. Death is universal and therefore all have sinned. In what sense are they sinners?[2] The answer lies in the truth that in mankind there is a moral unity and solidarity. We know from his other arguments that St. Paul recognized that the law and, before the law, conscience roused the immediate knowledge of sin into being; but here the thought is the physical, organic connexion of generation with generation. One man, Adam, sinned, and so death passed upon all,

[1] Rom. iii. 20. "Therefore by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified."

[2] Prof. Gardner (*op. cit.* pp. 163, 164) suggests that St. Paul took two views in regard to sin, one "quasi-historic," concerned with the idea of the Second Adam; and one "anthropologic or mystic," that man is by nature prone to sin. The Church by the doctrine of original sin endeavours to reconcile the two.

[3] Rom. v. 12 . . . . ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον. The Vulgate renders

even upon "them that had not sinned after the likeness of Adam's transgression,"[1] and thus including children dying in infancy.[2] But, in all this, Adam was only a figure of Him Who was to come (τύπος τοῦ μέλλοντος). St. Paul is thus brought to the idea of the Second Adam, Whom he saw in Jesus Christ. This conception implied a likeness and a distinction, a parallel and a contrast between the First and Second Adam. They were parallel in the scope of their influence. The work of each was to influence the whole human race. They are contrasted and directly opposed in the nature of that influence. "How superior the work of Christ! (i) How different in quality; the one act all sin, the other act all bounty or grace! (v. 15). (ii) How different in quantity or mode of working; one act tainting the whole race with sin, and a multitude of sins collected together in one only to be forgiven! (v. 16). (iii) How different and surpassing in its whole character and consequences: a reign of Death and a reign of Life! (v. 17). Summarising: Adam's Fall brought sin: Law increased it: but the Work of Grace has cancelled, and more than cancelled, the effect of Law."[3]

A Consideration of 1 Cor. xv. 45, 47.

(ii) We are thus naturally led to the thought of 1 Cor. xv. 45, 47. There it is shown that it is only in the spiritual life, in vital relation to Christ alone, that this grace is obtained, just as our vital relation to Adam physically made us what we are. The first Adam indeed became living soul

it "in quo peccaverunt," i.e., "in whom.". . . But ἐφ' ᾧ means "because." Nevertheless the Vulgate is right in idea; ἥμαρτον is Aorist indicating a single act at a definite time. We may perhaps take the difficult phrase, with Drs. Sanday and Headlam (p. 134) on "Romans," as meaning "If they sinned their sin was due in part to tendencies inherited from Adam."

[1] Rom. v. 14.

[2] Following Professor Bruce we would take "death" throughout this passage as physical.

[3] *Ep. to Romans*, Drs. Sanday and Headlam, p. 138.

(ψυχή) when God breathed into him that breath of life, which was psychical rather than spiritual (1 Cor. xv. 45). He was "of the earth, earthy" (ἐκ γῆς, χοϊκός). He was in a "natural," sensuous, undeveloped condition. This was his nature as distinguished from his work. It is not that he was therefore mortal. Death was the wages of sin. He was capable of immortality as well as death. It is that "he was man as nature presents him to our experience."[1] But the last Adam[2] was constituted a life-giving spirit.[3] He was the Second Man from Heaven.[4]

On these words many theories of St. Paul's view of Christ have been built. They may conveniently be classed under four heads :—

First, the Pre-existent Man Theory.

The theory of the Pre-existent Man is upheld by Baur, Holtzmann, Schmiedel, and many others. Interpreting these two verses in the light of the Philonian and Rabbinical quotations mentioned above, they see in them a reference to Jesus Christ as the Archetype of humanity, the ideal Heavenly Man, the divinely-constituted Lord of the human race. As such He was Pre-existent. In his essential being He was man, and no more. As "Pneumatic man" He existed in a celestial body to be in due time manifested on earth as the Pattern Man, "ὁ μέλλων" (Rom. v. 14). Ritschl too inclines to this view. He holds that the "μορφὴν δούλου" of Phil. ii. 7, would have been "μορφὴν ἀνθρώπου" if Christ was man on earth only.[5]

[1] Art. "Adam," *H. D. B.*, Dr. Denney.
[2] ὁ ἔσχατος Ἀδάμ.
[3] ἐγένετο . . . εἰς πνεῦμα ζωοποιοῦν 1 Cor. xv. 45.
[4] ὁ δεύτερος ἄνθρωπος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ 1 Cor. xv. 47.
[5] But, surely, the use of "μορφὴν δούλου" is amply explained by the context as meaning His Humanity.

Some Objections to this View.

This theory as a whole has justly met with strong opposition. Haupt on Phil. ii. 5–11 says he cannot discover the Pre-existent Man-Christ in St. Paul's writings. Both Klöpper and Schmidt also oppose it. Weizsäcker denies that any trace of the idea is to be found. Numerous arguments occur to us which seem to raise too great a barrier to its acceptance. Such are :—

1. It is in disagreement with other passages which teach pre-existence and which will be dealt with later, e.g. Col. i. 15, 16, where Christ is the instrument of creation. The ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ of Phil. ii. 6 seems to be impossible for One Who was merely a created model.

2. Prayer to a *creature* would be impossible to St. Paul. It would be equally impossible to worship any one not essentially God. His whole training, based as it was on uncompromising monotheism (which neither Jesus nor St. Paul gave up [1]) forbade it. Moreover it was one great sin of the Gentile world to worship and serve the creature " to the neglect of " (παρὰ) [2] the Creator. St. Paul takes up his polemic against those who, professing themselves to be wise, became fools and changed the glory of the uncorruptible God unto an image made like to corruptible man. What the experience of his Jewish youth had taught him, his words as a Christian Apostle show is still, and for ever would be, true for him. God is " all in all," and to Him alone was due worship, honour and praise from the creature. We are reminded of the weighty words of Sabatier, " There is in every human personality a negative element, a residuum which our admiration sets aside. This limitation separates the adherence of the disciple from the faith of the believer. It distinguishes enthusiasm from adoration."

[1] Cf. The שְׁמַע of Deut. vi. 4 with St. Mark xii. 29 (and Parallels), " Ἄκουε, Ἰσραήλ, Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν Κύριος εἷς ἐστιν," and with 1 Cor. viii. 4 " οὐδεὶς Θεὸς ἕτερος εἰ μὴ εἷς."

[2] So Drs. Sanday and Headlam hereon, p. 46.

3. By the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ the law of Redemption was made clear to St. Paul. This law could hardly be universal if Christ was merely the "Heavenly Man" in the sense we are considering. Christ is the agent in the creation of the universe, "the vital principle upholding and pervading all that exists." "The Son is the image of the invisible God, the first born of all creation, for in Him (ἐν αὐτῷ) were *all* things created in the Heavens and upon the Earth. . . . All things were created through Him (δι' αὐτοῦ), and unto Him (εἰς αὐτὸν). And He is before all things (πρὸ πάντων) and in Him (ἐν αὐτῷ) all things cohere (συνέστηκε)" (Col. i. 16 and 17). All things are summed up in Christ (Eph. i. 10). "Christ is all, and in all" (Col. iii. 11). Lastly, in the same passage from which the phrase under consideration is taken, occur the verses (1 Cor. xv. 24–28) where the reign of Christ is regarded as co-extensive with all history, and with the universe, not only with mankind and the earth.[1] So in the Redemption wrought by Christ, the earnest expectation of the creature, even the brute and unintelligent creation, waiting with eager straining longing for the manifestation of the sons of God, will be answered. The dumb and the unintelligent, creation (κτίσις) as well as the "sons of God," creation in its imperfection and mystic beauty, its kindness and its cruelty, its perpetual decay and renovation, shall share in the blessings of Redemption. The old shall be transformed. "New heavens and new earth," a new abode shall be prepared[2] for the new man in Christ Jesus. Redemption is a movement that is "truly cosmic." "The sons of God are not selected for their own sakes alone, but their redemption means the redemption of a world of being besides themselves."[3] Such a cosmic view of the

[1] The writer is indebted to Dr. Inge (*Christian Mysticism*, pp. 55, 56) for much of this note. [2] μονή. Cf. St. John xiv. 2–23.
[3] Sanday and Headlam, *Ep. to Romans*, p. 212.

relation between Christ and creation, and between creation and redemption in Christ, is incompatible with the theory of the pre-existent man. The universe is created, living through, and sustained by, the eternal word ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ. It is the Universe redeemed that demands an incarnate Saviour presenting the paradox of the Universal and Absolute manifested in space and time, a human life and death, of a union between the finite human and the infinite Divine. The redemption of material things, the restoration of nature is a corollary from the Christian doctrine of the Resurrection of the body. "In the consummation of man lies also the consummation of all created things." [1] The Redemption, if it is an act of utmost love, is not only the Incarnation of a Being, previously human; it is rather a voluntary humbling and emptying, and a taking of humanity to Himself, as never before, by a union of two natures. If such a union did not take place at the Incarnation, this loses its moral appeal as well as its efficacy, and the Church's reading of the Scriptures, and interpretation of Christian teaching have been, throughout the ages, mistaken.

It is commonly asserted that the natural meaning of "the Second Man from Heaven" is "One Who was pre-existent as man." This however is by no means admitted. We shall discuss the probable meaning below.

4. According to Philo, whose speculations the supporters of this theory say that St. Paul adopted, the Ideal Man is first in order of time.[2] Afterwards comes the carnal, psychic, imperfect man. But St. Paul's order is the reverse, as has been frequently pointed out. "That is not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural." It would rather seem that St. Paul is here directly attacking Philonism, and con-

[1] Westcott, *Gospel of Life*, p. 237 ff.

[2] Philo was aiming at reconciling the Old Testament with the Platonists. The Philonic doctrine was of man as we know him; St. Paul's of man looked at in the light of his own experience in Christ.

tradicting its tenets. For these reasons, then, we are to reject the theory of the Pre-existent Man as quite inadequate to meet the facts.

SECONDLY, THE IDEAL PRE-EXISTENCE.

A second theory regards St. Paul as teaching that Christ in His pre-existent state was Head and Archetype "in posse" only, not "in esse." The "Idea" alone pre-existed in the mind of God. Jesus Christ is the temporal manifestation of the Eternal Idea of the Sonship of man to God. In the same way, in the passage in Rom. v. 12–21, Adam as an historical person is not compared with the historical Jesus. It is the sinner compared with the Ideal Man. St. Paul is there, as in 1 Cor. xv. 46, speaking of ideas not facts.[1] So Weizsäcker, in dealing with Rom. v. 12–21, writes, "The last Adam had been from the beginning, yet He was not merely last in earthly history, but His essential nature, hitherto latent, only became active from and after His resurrection." Weizsäcker also prefers to look for this conception rather in contemporary Palestinian theology than in Philo. There is found in the Talmud and in the Targums the idea that God was preparing the Messiah in Heaven, reserving Him till the time of Revelation, and in that sense He was pre-existent and "from Heaven."[2] In Rabbinic literature there was the notion of One born of David's line caught up from earth and kept in Heaven or Paradise till the time for His advent. This conception seems to have been before the authors of the Jewish apocalyptic literature. For instance, in 2 (4) Esdras the Son of Man is regarded as a man coming from the sea flying with the clouds of Heaven. After avenging the enemies of God He is to reign for a long time in peace

[1] So Wernle, *Beginnings of Christianity*, vol. i. p. 249.

[2] When the Jews wished to speak of anything as divine, they endowed it with some definite attribute of God; e.g., the Law was said to have pre-existed. So of Messiah the idea of a man, sinless though tempted, and consistently inspired, was expressed in this way.

and prosperity, and then He and all flesh will die. Then comes the general resurrection, the judgment by the Most High, and a new world.[1] St. Paul was familiar with these speculations, and they point to his real meaning when he uses the phrase "The Man from Heaven."

The Raison d'être of this View.

The comparison on the whole, however, tells against this interpretation. In fact, the whole justification of this position lies in the belief of its supporters that it preserves "the religious interest in a form more consonant to the modern consciousness." The modern consciousness, however, cannot claim to be the interpreter as well as the test of St. Paul's ideas, and to read its supposed conclusions into them is bound to lead to misunderstanding. The highest tendencies of the "modern consciousness" will find their truest satisfaction in wise and sober scholarship and exegesis far more surely than in the theories of any biblical Procrustes, however ingenious or brilliant he may be.

Objections to this View.

The majority of modern scholars, including Beyschlag, have now abandoned this view. Beyschlag affirms that such statements are "an imperfect mode of setting forth the truth that the temporal appearance of Christ must be traced back to an eternal basis." Amongst the many reasons that have been suggested, or suggest themselves, for a rejection of this theory, we note the following: (i) The fact that it does not accord with the rest of St. Paul's writings. This is admitted by all, and, in answer to it, the plea of the "modern consciousness" is advanced. We can immediately perceive upon what a wide sea of difficulty and doubt we are cast loose by a refusal to attribute even that value which historical criticism, sober exegesis, and personal experience lead us to assign to our sacred writings. More-

[1] Art. "Messiah," *H. D. B.*, Prof. V. H. Stanton.

over, to reject one portion of the undoubted writings of an author in the explanation of another portion thereof seems arbitrary and unreasonable in the extreme. In the interpretation of this passage we are concerned rather with what St. Paul really meant than with what certain interpreters of the "modern consciousness" believe he ought to have meant.

(ii) When one thinks of St. Paul as a mystic and remembers his wonderful "life in Christ," it seems impossible that the object of his faith was an "Idea" however elevated, however sublime. Christ was not merely for him an example, a pattern of how earthly life should be lived; otherwise the parallelism between the first and second Adam would fail at the crucial point. Our nature is Adam's nature and derived from him. Jesus Christ was a Person in whom the Apostle found the consummation of his own being, Whose riches of wisdom and power were unsearchable, Whose grace could make the weak and trusting more than conquerors in the strife. If Christ may be seen and perceived by the soul, if the Divine light is already shining within us, if the heart is pure and there are love and faith to guide us on the path that leads to Him, it is impossible, as a matter of simple experience, that the object of our hope should be merely an Idea. Only in a Personality can our personalities find their ultimate source and perfection.[1] To regard Christ as a mere embodiment or illustration of a living Idea, and then to assert that "I live, yet not I, but Christ liveth in me"[2] would be the hallucination of a madman or a fool. Even Schleiermacher, though he thought that it is not essential for a Christian to believe in the literal Resurrection, emphasized the fact that His Person is pre-eminent over all, and that He is the Creator of a new and spiritual race. So

[1] See Moberly, *Atonement and Personality*, Illingworth, *Personality, Human and Divine* c. ii., Von Hügel, *Mystical Element in Religion*.

[2] Gal. ii. 20. See Moberly, *op cit.* pp. 254, 255. See also below, p. 217 ff.

Somerville clearly and forcibly writes of "Christ as Eternal." "The mind seems to demand that He should be in His own Person distinctive, should be more and greater than they who are to benefit by their connection with Him, and the Scripture representation of Him as eternally pre-existent, descending into a connexion with us from a higher life, best meets that postulate." [1]

(iii) The Incarnation is itself a revelation of God's love. So St. Paul believes (Phil. ii. 1–11, also 2 Cor. v. 19 . . . Θεὸς ἦν ἐν Χριστῷ κόσμον καταλλάσσων ἑαυτῷ; and 2 Cor. viii. 9). The Christian revelation that God is love postulates One eternally begotten from the Father before all worlds, the object—the Son—of the Father's love.[2] The Incarnation is robbed of its meaning if Christ was but the illustration or incarnation of an Idea.

(iv) It is inconceivable that the Word of God, the Logos, ever *became* a Person. He was either a Person from all eternity, or remained for ever an Idea.

Thirdly, The Pre-existent God-Man.

Dr. Edwards' clearly-written and suggestive Davies lectures on "The God-Man," state the theory next to be considered. In his excellent summaries, he thus defines his position. He is considering the relationship of the Son in the Trinity.

(i) The Son, as God, is co-eternal with the Father; as God the Son, originated from the Father.

(ii) The Son, as God, is co-equal with the Father; as God the Son, subordinate to the Father. The Son as co-eternal and co-equal with the Father is God, as originated from and subordinate to the Father He is in idea Man. So, in the

[1] *St. Paul's Conception of Christ*, Dr. Somerville, p. 198. See particularly Illingworth, *Personality Human and Divine*, Lect. I. p. 22; Lect. II. p. 26 ff. (Macmillan & Co., 6*d.* edition).

[2] See Illingworth, *Divine Immanence*, and Gore, *Creed of a Christian* (Dialogue on the Holy Trinity).

Trinity, the Son is Archetypal Man. The Incarnation is the birth of the Son of God as actual man in ethical obedience to His Father. The immanence of God in Man alone makes this possible for "finitum capax infiniti"; just as man, if he is to know God at all, must be a partaker of the Divine nature.[1] Thus Christ pre-existed not as God alone, nor as man alone, but as God and man in essential union. So Christ was from all eternity God-Man, eternally in God, yet the ideal Man, the archetype of humanity.[2] In the image of Him our race was made. The Incarnation is thus only a change of state—an assumption not of our *nature* but of our flesh. In the main this is the view held by many English thinkers, including such of exceptional brilliance as Professor F. D. Maurice and Dr. Dale. The ground principle which supports this theory is really an attempt to account for the kinship between God and Man, to explain the immanence of God in Man and Man in God, the essential correspondence between the Human and the Divine.[3] In support of this idea Dr. Edwards cites 1 Corinthians xv. 45–47, the passage now under consideration. He refuses to accept the view[4] that Christ acquires a glorified body in heaven *after* the Resurrection and comes therein at the "παρουσία."

For his own interpretation he gives the following reasons, on which we will comment in turn:—

(i) ἐκ γῆς when used of Adam refers to his *original* state, and therefore "ἄνθρωπος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ" refers to the pre-incarnate state of Christ. We do not, however, grant the hypothesis. Are not "ἐκ γῆς" and "ἐξ οὐρανοῦ" descriptions not of a state, but of nature or origin? Adam was typical of, and the head of, a race, of psychic, carnal origin. He was "χοϊκός." Christ was "heavenly" in

[1] Cf. Illingworth, *Personality Human and Divine*, Lect. V.
[2] So Professor F. D. Maurice and Dr. Dale.
[3] See John i. 18.
[4] Of Meyer, Weiss, Pfleiderer, etc.

His origin and nature. He was "ἐπουράνιος." He was pre-existent indeed but not necessarily pre-existent as man. All that the words tell us is that He, Who, in the fullness of time, took upon Him our flesh, and so became the Second Adam, and the Head of a race of spiritual men, was in His origin and nature divine (ἐξ οὐρανοῦ).

(ii) St. Athanasius says that "ἐξ οὐρανοῦ" means ἐπουράνιος, and is used of the Logos coming from Heaven. We have already implied that this may be so, but we still fail to see how the phrase "The Heavenly Man" would necessarily imply more than a Person who, though he became Man, yet was in origin Heavenly.[1] The Person of Christ, perfect God, perfect man, was "ἐπουράνιος," Heavenly, and it is perfectly natural and justifiable to speak of Him as the "Man from Heaven" (ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ) without postulating a pre-existence as God and man. Moreover, St. Athanasius is not the only early Father who mentions the text. A reading by no means uncommon which became inserted into the Textus Receptus (occurring in Origen, Chrysostom and Theodoret) is "ὁ Κύριος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ." The phrase was evidently not understood in later time to refer to Christ's pre-incarnate existence as archetypal man. It was the "Lord from Heaven" who was the Second Man. He, Who now is exalted, Lord of Lords and King of Kings, sitting on His Father's right hand in Heaven is at the same time Head of the new race of mankind.

(iii) In the last place "from Heaven" cannot, it is said, refer to the Incarnation, for St. Paul says that "Christ was made of a woman, born under the law." It must refer then to Christ in the pre-existent state as man. It is pointed out that the idea of the passage is change. The words cannot imply that Christ's body was actually from Heaven. St. Paul must therefore mean that He is the Ideal

[1] We remember that "Children and the fruit of the womb are an heritage from Jehovah."

and Archetypal Man. We venture to doubt whether the phrase "ἐξ οὐρανοῦ" as interpreted of the Incarnation is necessarily in conflict with the other statements which St. Paul made concerning the Incarnation of Christ. If he believed that the Eternal Son of God became man, and was born of a human mother, it would not present a contradiction to him to call Him both "from heaven" and "born of a woman, born under the law."

A Further Objection to this Theory.

There is one other objection which suggests itself. The theory is built upon the belief that Christ was pre-existent as God as well as man. It is agreed that there were not two Persons in Christ. That is inconceivable; but on this theory it seems an unavoidable conclusion, unless there is no difference between being perfectly human and perfectly divine, that is, unless "Perfect man" and "Perfect God" are merely descriptions of the same *nature* from different points of view.[1] His nature is twofold not single. He is both perfect God and perfect man. Existing before the Incarnation [2] He emptied Himself, taking the "μορφὴν δούλου," being made [3] in the likeness of men, and, being found in outward resemblance as a man, He humbled Himself [4] (Phil. ii. 7). These words and the view we are at present considering, seem to be irreconcileable. If we hold that "μορφή" has reference not to accidents but to "essence," the teaching of this passage seems clearly to be that Jesus Christ, in essence before the Incarnation God, by a process of self-emptying,[5] took [6] the essential being of a servant, and so humbled Himself, being further obedient even to

[1] We are conscious that a great deal of the vague thinking about the subject is influenced by the philosophical and poetical pantheism of many teachers and poets popular to-day. E.g., Swinburne writes in Hertha, speaking as in the person of God—

"Man, equal and one with me . . . man that is I."

[2] ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ.

[3] γενόμενος. [4] ἐταπείνωσεν ἑαυτὸν. [5] ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν. [6] λαβών.

the death of the Cross. Not a word or hint is here given that, before the "Kenosis," Christ was existing essentially as man as well as "ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ."

We therefore hold that little or no support will be found in St. Paul's writings for this theory; and that Weizsäcker was right when he says, "There is no trace in Early Jewish Christianity of a theology in which Jesus was held to have existed as a heavenly man."[1] God pre-existed *ab aevo* and God was in Jesus.

The Real Meaning of the Passage.

It seems best then to take the words "from Heaven" as indicating merely "origin" and "nature." This as we have seen may, perhaps, indirectly imply the pre-existence[2] of the *Person* spoken of as the "second man," but not the pre-existence *as Man.* Of the particular form of His Pre-existence, the passage tells us nothing. We are left to gather that from other passages and accordingly conclude that it was "ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ," not "ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπου." The whole passage (1 Cor. xv. 45–47) might refer to the Exalted Christ,[3] a view which the context appears to support. The Second Man would then be the Risen, not the Pre-incarnate, Christ. He is the "Son from heaven" for Whom we wait (1 Thess. i. 10). As such, He is clothed with His spiritual body, the "house from heaven." Indeed the use of the phrase "from heaven" in this and other passages ought to make us cautious how far we apply it to the idea of pre-existence. For if we say that the "Second Man from heaven" implies "Pre-exist-

[1] See *The Apostolic Age.* Weizsäcker, vol. i. bk. ii. c. ii. § xi. ("The Nature of Christ"). On this quotation there are two remarks to be made; (1) The statement applies to St. Paul whether included in "Early Jewish Christianity" or not in the intention of its author. (2) When Weizsäcker adds "or Divine Being" we should join issue with him. [2] See below p. 103 ff. [3] Amongst those who take this view is Holtzmann, who nevertheless, strange to say, upholds the idea that Christ was essentially man and no more.

ent Man " must we not say that the body which is " from heaven " likewise implies a " pre-existent body " ?[1] Of a pre-existent body we cannot conceive without soul and personality. So that by applying a like exegesis to the phrase " body from heaven " we arrive at the theory that we are incarnations of pre-existent personalities. It is, however, the fleeting fashion of the body of our humiliation that is fashioned *anew*.[2]

We are inclined to think that here, as so often, too much has been read into a simple phrase, and great theories have been constructed on a basis far too slender to uphold them.

The Bearing of this Doctrine on St. Paul's Christology.

We come then to consider positively how far we are helped in our understanding of St. Paul's Christology by his doctrine of the Second Adam.

(i) In the first place we learn to look on the Second Adam as the " life-giving Spirit." Christ is the Head of a New Humanity. Each member of Him is filled with and lives His life. He alone is the source of all spiritual life. The believer is baptized into His death, is buried with Him, and rises in Him to newness of life.[3] In him Christ is formed until he attain to the fullness of His stature.[4]

[1] So in St. John iii. 13. " ὁ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβάς " " he that descended out of heaven (even the Son of Man) does not mean that the Son of Man as such pre-existed in heaven. It is an assertion of the directness of His knowledge by nature, and " immediate vision." The expression ' He who being Incarnate is the Son of Man ' " preserves the continuity of the Lord's personality, and yet does not confound His natures " (see Westcott, *ad loc.*).

[2] And though this house is " eternal," " in the heavens," it is not reached until this body of humiliation is transformed and fixed in the permanent form of His own body—that of His risen glory. St. Paul leaves no trace of a doctrine of existence in a body before life on earth, and such an interpretation as the one we are refuting would lead us to speculations rather Buddhist than Christian.

[3] See Rom. vi. 1–14.

[4] See below on " Christ as Immanent," p. 130.

(ii) As has been pointed out above, and as follows from the fact that the Second Adam is the life-giving Spirit, Christ is regarded not merely as an example; otherwise the parallel between Him and the first Adam would break down just where the argument demands it. If Christ has entered as deeply into our nature as Adam does, we shall attain in Him to the new spiritual manhood of which He is the Archetype.

(iii) We may gather from the whole conception that no one less than a Being essentially God could, in St. Paul's eyes, have accomplished the work which the Second Adam did. St. Paul is here approaching Christ on the human side. Christ as Man was the Head of a new Humanity, a spiritual race. He was indeed truly Man, but St. Paul's very conception of Him as Man postulates a Person who was far more. "It sets Him," says Somerville, "on a platform where he stands apart, superior, supreme. We are forced back on the recognition of a nature in Him that is an absolutely new fact, and is identified in a special way with the life of God." [1] We would go further and say that only by first realizing the absolute Divinity of Jesus Christ can one understand and appreciate the Pauline doctrine of the Second Adam. Such an exalted view of Christ as Man could only emanate from an intense conviction that Christ was actually and in essence God.

[1] *St. Paul's Conception of Christ*, p. 69.

CHAPTER V

Christ the Redeemer

THE RELATION BETWEEN ST. PAUL'S VIEWS OF THE REDEEMING WORK AND THE PERSON OF CHRIST.

THE deeper the personal experience of our redemption in Christ Jesus, and the wider the significance we assign to it, the more we shall be impressed and awed by that central miracle and mystery of our faith—the personality of the Redeemer. It was so in the Primitive Church. As long as Jewish Christians looked for an external material deliverance, as long as they failed to perceive the deep, spiritual significance of Christ's life and death, so long did their views of His Person remain crude, materialistic and national,[1] so long would they see in Him merely a wonder-worker, approved indeed of God, but, it may be, not intimately concerned with events on the earth until the day when He should be revealed in all His power to deliver His people. The primitive Church as a whole had, we may well believe, got far past this stage. There was naturally among Jewish Christians a clinging to ancient forms of belief, to old ideas and undeveloped conceptions; but, as the force and beauty and spiritual demands of the Christian life were felt by them, these influences must have tempered or destroyed all their cruder notions by the new light they shed upon life. When we come, indeed, to study

[1] The Jewish Christians from the Dispersion had, however, a more spiritual view to begin with. They could not go up to the Temple, and there was also the constant influence of Greek thought.

St. John and St. Paul, we can see how that process had reached its consummation in them. Though imagery from Jewish eschatology had been largely adopted in the Early Church, the letters of St. Paul bear evidence that Christianity and legalism had entered upon a death struggle. In spite of all the points of contact with Judaism, the Christians were living a new life. "It was a life of forgiven sin, of filial trust, of brotherly service, of present communion with Christ. . . . The sanctification, without which no man shall see the Lord (Heb. xii. 14) was not only the ideal, but to a large extent a characteristic of their daily living. Thus the life experiences of the Early Christians, even as revealed in such books as the Acts, are truer to the teaching of the Master than a superficial study of the use of such theological terms as "Salvation" and "Kingdom" would seem to indicate. Much more shall we find this the case, when we pass to the more developed conceptions of St. Paul and St. John." [1]

Preparation for the full Christian Doctrine of Redemption.

It is our business first of all to obtain as clear a conception of St. Paul's idea of Redemption as his writings permit. We can then estimate more accurately the Christology which that idea presupposes. As we consider the history of God's chosen people, we see how the New Testament idea of Redemption is the consummation and crown of the ideas of Salvation and Redemption to which the Old Testament gives expression.[2] As a Jew, St. Paul would

[1] Art. "Salvation, Saviour," *H. D. B.*, Prof. W. Adams Brown.

[2] It is true that the Greek pagan and mystic Societies had as their deity a θεὸς σωτήρ, "and the Society sought through fellowship with him to reach a state of σωτηρία, safety or salvation" (*Religious Experience of St. Paul*, Prof. Gardner, p. 82; *Earlier Epistles of St. Paul*, Prof. Kirsopp Lake, p. 45). The real root of St. Paul's doctrine lay, however, in the Old Testament, as the following detailed examination attempts to show.

inherit the grateful love of his race to Jehovah for deliverance past, and their steadfast hope of salvation for the future. He had read, in early days, the account of the deliverance of Israel from Egypt, how Jehovah redeemed (גאל) them with a mighty hand and with a stretched-out arm (Exod. xv. 13). He had followed the story of their salvation from danger and distress, from defeat in battle when "Jehovah of hosts"[1] (of the armies of Israel) raised up "saviours" in the days of the Judges. The Psalms had sung their impassioned music to his soul, now plaintive like the cry of a bird with a broken wing, now tender with compassion for the poor and the sad, now charged with the burden of a conscience-stricken heart, now glad with hymns of deliverance, now glowing with visions of material splendour for the Remnant of Israel. Thus the awful universal need of Redemption must have pressed its mystery upon him as a problem without answer. He felt the "world's sad heart" beating, and caught the "still sad music of humanity" sighing through the immortal strains and pilgrim lives of the poets and ancestors of his people.

In Jeremiah and Ezekiel individualism is developed.[2] In many of the later Psalms the Messiah is the Saviour of the poor and needy,[3] of the upright,[4] and of the contrite.[5] These Psalms are written by writers who speak from the very depths of their hearts, from their intense experiences of the love and tenderness of God for the individual soul. To them had been brought home the meaning of repentance. For with the lifting up of the cry for deliverance from the punishment for sin goes the prayer for help to repent from the sin itself. "Create in me a clean heart, O God, and renew a right[6] spirit within me." So salvation is regarded

[1] Jehovah Elōhē Sabbāōth.
[2] Cf. Jer. xxxi. 29, 30; Ez. xviii. [3] E.g. Ps. cix. 31.
[4] E.g. Ps. xxxvii. 39, 40. [5] E.g. Ps. xxxiv. 18.
[6] Ps. li. 10 ff. "right" is in original "נָכוֹן" i.e. "steadfast."

by men who voiced the aspiration of earnest souls of their time, as not only national, but individual; not only material, but spiritual. The forgiveness of sins is the chief blessing of the age to come. The prophet's cry is "repent," for only for those in Jacob that turn from transgression shall the Redeemer come to Zion.[1] It is the broken and contrite heart that God requires.[2] After the close of the Old Testament canon, individualism was still more emphasized, and the idea also became more transcendent. In the Apocalyptic literature the material and the spiritual are blended in startling and unexpected combinations.[3] The growth in transcendent individualism is seen in the doctrine of the Resurrection, which became universal among the Pharisees.[4] Therewith grew up the doctrine of rewards and punishments, of Paradise on the one hand, and of Gehenna on the other, instead of Sheol with its "aspect of colourless monotony."

"Summing up the conceptions of salvation which we have met thus far, we find that they are four: (1) Salvation in this life, in the sense of deliverance from present danger or trouble . . . (2) The salvation of the Messianic Kingdom, to be enjoyed by all the righteous who may be alive at the time, as well as by the risen saints; (3) Salvation after death, in the sense of a preliminary foretaste, by the righteous, of the enjoyment of the age to come; (4) The final salvation of the heavenly world, when the present earth has been destroyed . . . Into such a world of thought, confused, changeful, yet rich with germs of fruitful and inspiring life, Jesus came with His Gospel of salvation."[5]

[1] Isa. lix. 20. [2] Ps. li. 17 and 19.

[3] Art. "Salvation" and "Saviour," *H. D. B.*, by Prof. W. Adams Brown. He gives a number of quotations in illustration.

[4] It was developed especially through the persecutions and martyrdoms under Antiochus. It is clear from the mysteries that the hope of immortality was wide-spread in the pagan world.

[5] Prof. W. Adams Brown's summary of these conceptions in the article cited.

The Meaning deepened by Jesus.

The name "Jesus" is the Greek form of יְהוֹשֻׁעַ.[1] He deepened and vitalized and set in their true bearing the current ideas of the time in both their transcendent and their individualistic tendencies. In the first place His idea of the Kingdom of God was of a kingdom not only future and heavenly, but present and on earth. Salvation is a present experience, and whosoever is living the Christian life of faith and love is "safe," "He that hath the Son hath life."[2] In the second place Jesus lived to teach and died to prove how infinitely precious in the sight of God is a single human soul.

It is not to the righteous man expecting salvation as a result of perfect conformity to the ceremonial law that redemption comes. It is for the poor and outcast,[3] for all who in lowliness and contrition seek the Divine forgiveness. Moreover it was purchased by the Redeemer Himself through suffering and death. So what was at first deemed the failure of His mission, was in reality the only possible fulfilment of it.

St. Paul's Doctrine.

As we turn to St. Paul we find these truths unhesitatingly emphasized. "Salvation" is a term with a purely moral and spiritual content. It differed from the "salvation" of the pagan mysteries in that its effect and test was a life lived on the highest plane. It is deliverance from sin. The flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and is the "body of this death." It is not, as in the Orphic Mysteries, the source of evil, but through it sin works, and the deeds of the flesh are set over against the fruit of the Spirit (Gal. v. 19–24). Redemption is the crucifixion of the flesh—the conquest of

[1] Later abbreviated to יֵשׁוּעַ (Joshua or Jeshua), and meaning "Whose help is Jehovah," or "The Lord (Jehovah) is Salvation." It is probably derived from the Hiphil of "ישע."

[2] 1 John v. 12. [3] Cf. St. Matt. v. 3, St. Luke vi. 20.

the power of sin through and in the body. In this connexion the significance of Christ's death is insisted on, and a strong eschatological element prevails.[1] Yet here, as in every case, St. Paul's doctrine is by no means a simple adoption of current notions from Judaism. The form may be Jewish indeed, but he had experienced already the blessedness of this fuller salvation,[2] for him the chains of slavery to sin had already fallen off,[3] for him life had become new because he dwelt in Christ,[4] for him there was already redemption and sanctification.[5] Whatever the formulation of these truths, it was the expression of vivid religious experience. He could now see in the death of Jesus on the Cross, and in the suffering of His life on earth, the workings of the Divine Purpose, and that

> "Through the Shadow of an Agony
> Cometh Redemption."

Once grasped, it was no more a cause of stumbling [6] to him, but an experience through which each would-be disciple must pass, if there was to be participation in the blessings which Christ brought. Mystically united with Him, the believer dies (Rom. vi. 2), is buried (Rom. vi. 4), rises (Rom. vi. 5, 6), with Him. He must share the sufferings of his Master (Col. i. 24; 2 Cor. i. 5). Nothing can separate us from the love of Christ, nor things present, nor things to come, because He is God. For St. Paul the death of Christ has acquired the greatest value. His whole aim is "to point out the significance for faith of an unique experience befalling One believed to be personally sinless, Who could not therefore be conceived of as in His passion suffering for His own sin." [7] As repre-

[1] *St. Paul's Conception of the Last Things*, by Dr. Kennedy, deals fully with the subject. Prof. Gardner (*op. cit.* p. 89) asserts that it was "really the influence of his preaching which finally turned the eyes of Christians from the hope of a millennial reign of the saints towards a spiritual heaven above the sky."

[2] Rom. viii. 2, 23; vi. 2; xiv. 17. [3] Rom. vi. 2.

[4] 2 Cor. v. 17. [5] 1 Cor. i. 30. [6] σκάνδαλον.

[7] *St. Paul's Conception of Christianity*, Dr. A. B. Bruce, p. 166.

sentative of humanity he died a death of saving efficacy to all the race, and even (St. Paul believed) to the whole universe.[1]

Three Prominent Thoughts Therein.

In the death of Christ the Apostle saw three things prominently brought before him.

(1) There was the revelation of the wrath of God against sin. God was reconciling the world through Christ.[2] By the death of Jesus, God is really showing what He thinks of sin. His wrath is revealed from Heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men.[3]

(2) But there was another and more prominent aspect of His death. It was a revelation of the Love of God. It was not of course the creation of it; but in the death of Christ providing us with the way of escape, St. Paul saw a manifestation of an eternal and abiding love. "God commendeth His own love towards us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us" (Rom. v. 8).

(3) Thirdly, on the part of Christ he saw an accomplishment of forgiveness for sin, of justification, of sanctification, of moral renewal, of a world reconciled to God through the Son. That precious death and its wondrous benefits were proclaimed and kept in remembrance, till He should come again, by the Lord's Supper (1 Cor. xi. 24–26).

Why was the Death of Christ Efficacious for this? Dean Everett's Theory.

It is when we ask wherein the death of Christ was efficacious that we find difficulty. Why should the death of Jesus suffice, or be required at all, for the working out of God's purpose of reconciliation? To this there have been many replies. A recent one is Dean Everett's *The Gospel of Paul.*

[1] Rom. viii. 21. [2] 2 Cor. v. 19. [3] Rom. i. 18,

His is quite a new reading of St. Paul's doctrine, based on an interpretation of Galatians ii. 19–20 and iii. 13. Christ did not come to redeem man from sin by enduring its penalty. This doctrine has no support either from heathen or Levitical sacrifices or from the New Testament. The immediate effect of His death was not the removal of the penalty of sin, but the abrogation of the Law; and then followed the remission of sin as a result. This is the gist of his explanation. Christ died by crucifixion, and was therefore accursed, or ceremonially unclean. We are crucified with Him and therefore also ceremonially unclean. We are thus outlawed, excommunicated from the Law. Christ was accursed because crucified, not crucified because accursed. So by the Law's own act every man crucified with Christ is free from legal claims.

Objections to Dean Everett's Theory.

The following objections to this theory are urged:—

(1) Even were it admitted that Dean Everett's interpretation of Galatians iii. 13 is permissible, we cannot accept that of Galatians ii. 19, 20. What is true of St. Paul ("I am crucified with Christ") is true of all Christians. But the excommunication of Christ by the Law which might be implied in the former text cannot mean that therefore ceremonial uncleanness is a necessary result of faith in Christ. A glance at the history of the Church will show how untenable Dean Everett's view is. The early disciples generally could not have held it. Peter and John went up to the Temple daily to pray. It is true that St. Paul kept his vow in the Temple (Acts xviii. 18) and joined in ceremonial observances of purification (Acts xxi. 26). But this was not because he believed he was ceremonially unclean in Christ. His view of the Law was not that Christ and those united with Him were unclean in the eyes of the Law, but that they had outgrown the need of such a

παιδαγωγός,[1] and that the old Law was fulfilled, its aim was accomplished, now that they had been led to Christ.

(2) Christ redeemed men from the law by *coming under the law* (Gal. iv. 4), not by being excommunicated by the law.

We do not mean to imply that we can speak of Christ redeeming us by His life on earth, though He came not to destroy but to fulfil the Law; not to be excommunicated by it but to accomplish its demands. But we must remember that the life during which He was under the Law, His death and resurrection had all their place in the work of Redemption. For a very long time attention was concentrated entirely on the redemption of humanity by the death of Jesus Christ. Under the influence of Bishop Westcott's teaching, has come, like a fresh revelation, the marvellous meaning of the Incarnation with its vast issues for all human aspiration and thought. Thus, there is perhaps a danger lest the Pauline and Biblical doctrine of the redemptive efficacy of the death of Christ should be obscured. We believe that a redistribution of the emphasis and a recovery of balance in our system of doctrine is a pressing and an immediate need, for we shall err greatly if we attempt to separate the birth and life of Christ from His death and resurrection. The explanation of the efficacy of His death lies in the manger cradle at Bethlehem, the meaning of Christmas is hidden till Easter and Ascensiontide and Whitsuntide add their message. Whilst all are necessary, all are one, indivisibly one, even as He is one Person through them all.[2] Yet all centre upon and illuminate that great redemptive sacrifice on the Cross. We are redeemed by the blood of the Son of God shed for us.[3]

Dean Everett's theory neglects the fact that St. Paul's

[1] Gal. iii. 24 ff. [2] Cf. St. John vi. 46, 62.

[3] Cf. Church of England Prayer Book; e.g. the Consecration Prayer (Holy Communion) and the "Salvator Mundi" (Office for Visitation of the Sick).

conception of Redemption goes far further back than the Jewish law to the birth of the human race, and that he saw upon the Cross not One Who abrogated the law by being an outlaw from it, but One Whose death was efficacious for the Jew because He perfectly fulfilled the law by living under it, and for the Universe because He paid the universal penalty of sin by death. Its result for the Gentiles was that upon them might come the blessing of Abraham in Christ Jesus ; and for both Gentile and Jew that they might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith.[1]

(3) Dean Everett regards the persecution of Paul before conversion as due to the Christians being excommunicated " because of the pollution that came from the Cross resting also upon them." But if so persecuted for this reason, would not the Early Church have recognized this ? We find no trace of such a motive animating the violence of their accusers. These latter would hardly comprehend the meaning of spiritual union with Christ.

Nor is it likely that they persecuted the Apostles simply because these followed One Who was crucified and therefore unclean. The Jews had known what it was to build up the tombs of the prophets they had murdered. It was because the active preaching of the Apostles was manifestly destructive of the precious tenets of the hierarchy, such as the denial of the doctrine of the resurrection ; and finally because the Christian came to see not that he was ceremonially unclean, but a free man in Christ Jesus.

(4) Why were Christians freed from Law ? Not because they were ceremonially unclean in the eyes of the law, for a few sacrifices could have remedied that ; but because of the reign of Grace.[2]

(5) The Crucifixion of Christians was a *moral* one. Would this have brought down the condemnation of the Law ?

[1] Gal. ii. 16, iii. 2.

[2] Cf. Romans, especially chap. viii.

THREE ASPECTS OF ST. PAUL'S DOCTRINE OF CHRIST'S DEATH.

(*a*) HE REGARDED IT AS VICARIOUS.

The above reasons are in the main adduced by Dr. A. B. Bruce[1] and seem to the present writer conclusive against Dean Everett's theory. If we look carefully at St. Paul's view of the death of Christ we find three aspects which seem to suggest tentatively and in different directions some reasons which might explain his view of the efficacy of the death of Christ in the sight of God.

a. It was regarded as vicarious. So Jesus Christ distinctly taught. He is the good shepherd who lays down His life for (*ὑπέρ*) the sheep.[2] He fulfils the whole conception of vicarious sacrifice found in Isaiah liii. He is the Man of Pains familiar with sickness. He is pierced for crimes that were ours. By His stripes we are healed.[3] It is the will of God that through His soul making a guilt-offering (an atonement for sin), because in His innocence He "gives His life as satisfaction to the Divine law for the guilt of His people,"[4] so shall He see a seed. In His own words, He gives His life a ransom for many (*λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν*).[5] As a Pharisee, St. Paul was acquainted with the Jewish doctrine of the availing merit of the Patriarchs and of the Saints of God. But its fundamental truth had never gripped him before, and he awoke in the new life to find in the death of his Master what Jesus Himself knew was necessary for its efficacy, as well as its significance and value—vicarious suffering for sins.

This is the meaning of St. Paul's words in Galatians iii.

[1] *St. Paul's Conception of Christianity*, p. 184.

[2] St. John x. 11.

[3] Isa. liii. (see G. A. Smith, *Isaiah*, vol. ii. chap. xx.); St. Matt. viii. 17.

[4] *Isaiah*, G. A. Smith, vol. ii. p. 364.

[5] St. Matt. xx. 28; cf. St. Mark x. 45 and 1 Tim. ii. 6. Also Gwatkin's *Knowledge of God*, vol. i. p. 217, and Hope Moulton, *Prolegomena*, p. 105.

13, "Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us (ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν)," and of those in 2 Cor. v. 21, "Him who knew no sin He made to be sin for us (ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν)."

It is not, however, universally admitted that St. Paul teaches the vicarious death of Christ. For instance, Somerville[1] denies that he does, and it will not be unfruitful to consider his reasons carefully. For five reasons he refuses to find any vicarious meaning in Gal. iii. 13 :—

Somerville's Position Criticized.

(i) It refers to the Jewish law for Jews. It is a Rabbinical argument. How then can we give it universal scope? The hanging on the tree is not a sentence of death as a universal fact, but a sentence of death threatened under special laws of the Jews. In reply, we would observe:

(*a*) An obvious criticism to be made upon this first reason is that it does not show in any way why we should deny the vicarious teaching concerning the death. Because we may not personally be able to regard that death so, is no reason why the conception should be denied to St. Paul. We are concerned with what St. Paul thought, not with what in the opinion of some interpreters is vital in his thought for us to-day.

(*β*) This view is denied to St. Paul not even because it is unscriptural or does not fit in with modern ways of thought. It is because St. Paul has clothed his argument in Rabbinical dress. On the same principle we should reject almost the whole of St. Paul's conceptions. "The denial rests on dogmatic rather than on exegetical grounds."[2]

(ii) How did Christ's bearing the curse result in its removal? Whilst we are deeply and humbly conscious of the mystery, does not the only line of explanation seem to

[1] So also Schmidt.

[2] Art. "Sacrifice," *H. D. B.*, Prof. W. P. Paterson.

lie in the vicarious suffering of the Saviour for the sin of the world?

(iii) Was it a substitutionary infliction of punishment or a moral equivalent for it? Most probably it was the former, but the question is too complex to be discussed here, and whichever answer were given, the main issue of the question under discussion would not be affected.

(iv) If it was to the Law as a personified power that this homage was paid, what relation does that power bear to God? St. Paul elsewhere discusses the whole relation of the Law to God and Israel, and of its place in the economy of God's dealing with mankind. It is improbable that the Law was regarded by him as a personified power.

(v) How did His Son becoming a curse (Gal. iii. 13) affect God? In this and other questions, difficulties are raised which are rather objections of modern thought than deduced from a study of Pauline conceptions. St. Paul was not unaware of the paradox of God's Justice and His Love, nor of the difficulty which human thought encountered in trying to fathom its meaning. But still he insists that "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself."[1] The effect of that reconciliation, in Christ, of His becoming a curse and being made sin, was a restoration of Fatherhood to God and of Sonship to man.[2]

We venture thus to remove the bar which Somerville would place upon our progress towards the perception of St. Paul's views. We admit the difficulties, fully and humbly. We deny their cogency to the point at issue. We do not think that we must solve their mysteries, as Somerville urges, before we can use Gal. iii. 13 to support a dogmatic conclusion. Taking this text in conjunction with 2 Cor. v. 21, "Him who knew no sin He made to be sin on our behalf, that we might become the righteousness of God in Him," we gather that Christ

[1] 2 Cor. v. 19. [2] 2 Cor. vi. 18.

endured in death the doom of sin, the curse of the law. He thus met the utmost claims of the law as setting forth God's Holy will. Somerville indeed says that the effect of Christ being made sin is the same as "obedience." Jesus was not made a sinner, but placed in the position of a sinner. Why this redeems is not stated, though St. Paul writes to the Romans that "through the obedience of the one shall the many be made righteous" (Rom. v. 19). Yet we cannot forget the other side of His redemptive sacrifice. Christ died to sin (Rom. vi. 10). Sin ceased to have any claim over Him. He had become sin for our sake, and the power of this sin culminated in His death, when it came to an end for ever. So it was "for us," ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, "on our behalf; and though ἀντὶ ἡμῶν is never used by St. Paul, there is an unmistakable exchange between Christ and man. The death of Christ is the penalty of our sins, not of His. Our righteousness is obtained by faith in Him. It was by vicarious suffering that Christ became the expiation and propitiation of our sins, and that idea underlies his use of sacrificial language. Though it does not exhaust the whole or even the greater part of the conception of sacrifice, yet the vicarious aspect of the latter was once and for all revealed in Isaiah liii.[1] "The great mystery of the idea of Sacrifice itself . . . is founded on the secret truth of benevolent energy which all men who have tried to gain

[1] See especially vv. 4–6.

"Surely our ailments He bore,
And our pains did He take for His burden. . . .
Yet He—He was pierced for crimes that were ours,
He was crushed for guilt that was ours,
The chastisement of our peace was upon him,
By his stripes healing is ours.
Of us all like to sheep went astray.
Every man to his way we did turn,
And Jehovah made light upon him
The guilt of us all."

(Prof. G. A. Smith's translation.)

it have learned—that you cannot save men from death but by facing it for them, nor from sin but by resisting it for them."[1]

(β) And as a Propitiatory Sacrifice.

(β) His death was a propitiatory Sacrifice. Through His death believers have forgiveness of sins. So we are brought to the much discussed passage (Rom. iii. 25), "Jesus Christ . . . whom God sent forth to be a propitiation" (ὃν προέθετο ὁ Θεὸς ἱλαστήριον[2]). Ἱλαστήριον may be taken in three ways:—

i. The "mercy seat," after the usage of the LXX, which so translates כַּפֹּרֶת from כפר (in Piel) "to cover," "expiate for sin." In the same sense we might supply ἐπίθεμα as the LXX of Exodus xxv. 17 does.

ii. Supplying θῦμα or ἀνάθημα we should translate "a propitiatory offering."[3]

iii. Taking ἱλαστήριον as a verbal adjective with Somerville, Sanday and Headlam, Bruce[4] and most recent commentators, it would mean "that which serves the purpose of" propitiation. There was therein some vicarious endurance, which made propitiation for, and expiated, our sins.

Somerville asserts that St. Paul does not teach that Christ's death was a sacrifice in the sense of an offering for sin. "We have nothing of sacrifice in the Bible. If

[1] Ruskin's *Slade Lecture*, p. 14 (also quoted by Drs. Sanday and Headlam on *Romans*, p. 93).

[2] Rom. iii. 25. [3] Also see von Adolf Deissmann hereon.

[4] Prof. Gardner (*op. cit.* p. 194 *n.*) translates the word "a way of reconcilement," a "person who reconciles." He also supports the interpretation of ἀπολύτρωσις which makes it equivalent to deliverance merely, with no notion of a price paid. Sanday and Headlam, however, conclude against this (*Romans*, p. 86). There is not of necessity any reference to the person to whom the ransom is paid, but "the whole emphasis is on the *cost* of man's redemption," that is on the death of Christ. Cf. *Light from the Ancient East*, von Adolf Deissmann, p. 331 ff.

we had, it would be unwarrantable to apply it to Christ. The sacrifice of Christ was the offering of Himself to God." On the contrary, we venture to think that both St. Paul's language and ideas are sacrificial as Somerville half admits in another place—" being the very truth they (the legal precepts) dimly shadowed forth " . . . " being the spiritual reality prefigured by the ceremonial cultus." The propitiatory death is frequently and clearly set forth by St. Paul.[1] Yet though we accept its truth, we are driven with him to cry that we cannot fathom the unsearchable riches of Christ. The idea of Propitiation is too deep for us. " We speak of something in this great sacrifice which we call 'Propitiation.' We believe that the Holy Spirit spoke through these writers, and that it was His Will that we should use this word. But it is a word which we must leave to Him to interpret . . . The awful processes of the Divine mind we cannot fathom. Sufficient for us to know that through the virtue of the One Sacrifice, our sacrifices are accepted, that the barrier which Sin places between us and God is removed." [2]

(γ) AND AS REPRESENTATIVE—THE PRINCIPLE OF SOLIDARITY.

(γ) The death of Christ was representative. Somerville finds herein the explanation of all St. Paul's language, the true centre of his doctrine of the Redeemer. There is no doubt of its prominent place in St. Paul's thought. The death of Christ was the death of the race. It is the same principle of solidarity which we discussed under the head of the Second Adam.[3] The death of Christ was an act of perfect obedience to the Father's will, and it has the efficacy of a moral act. " So we in Him have obeyed to the uttermost and are established, saved, and redeemed in a new relation of life." Thus it is as Representative of our race

[1] E.g. 1 Cor. xv. 3; 2 Cor. v. 21; Eph. i. 7.

[2] *Epistle to the Romans*, Drs. Sanday and Headlam, p. 94.

[3] See Rom. v. and p. 57 ff. *supra*.

that His death has efficacy for us. Christ our Passover was sacrificed for us (1 Cor. v. 7). In Him we all die. In Him we all rise to newness of life.

The Connection between the Life of Jesus on Earth and Redemption.

But there is one aspect of Christ the Redeemer which has come more and more to the front of late years. Bishop Westcott, influenced by the whole trend of his theological thought,[1] found the centre of the conception of sacrifice not so much in the death of the victim as in the offering of its life. And so St. Paul lays no little stress on the value and the nature of the earthly life of Jesus.[2] Not only must he have done so for purposes of missionary preaching, but also in forming his conception of Redemption through Christ. "God sent forth His Son" in the fullness of time "made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law."[3] The life of Christ—His whole state of humiliation (so runs the argument of those who follow Bishop Westcott herein), was "the ransom" ("λύτρον") which redeemed us and brought us Redemption ("ἀπολύτρωσις"). The truth in it is well expressed by Bruce. "The principle is that at whatever point Christ touched men in His state of humiliation, His touch had redemptive effect."[4] He was made under the Law by circumcision. We are redeemed from subjection to the Law. He was made a curse and so are we redeemed from the curse of the Law. He was made sin that we might become a righteousness of God in Him. He suffered the penalty which sin entails and so forgiveness is held out to us. All this again is true.

But surely it is on the Cross that redemption from the Law is

[1] See above, p. 85. Cf. *The Gospel of Creation*. See also his additional notes on 1 John i. 7 and on Heb. ix. 12.

[2] See Christ as Messiah (above), p. 40.

[3] Gal. iv. 4.

[4] *St. Paul's Conception of Christianity*, Dr A. B. Bruce, p. 186, *n*.

effected. The bond of the requirements of the Law of Moses, against us by its decrees ("τὸ καθ' ἡμῶν χειρόγραφον τοῖς δόγμασι," Col. ii. 14), has been taken out of the way and cancelled, because Christ nailed it to His Cross. It was upon the Cross that He was made a curse for us (Gal. iii. 13). He was made sin in that last dread hour, when His cry, "that last, lone cry of innocence," rent the air, "My God, My God, why hast thou forsaken Me?" He suffered by His death the penalty which sin entails, "The soul that sinneth, it shall die"; [1] and only then did He cry "It is finished," and the great Redemption was complete.

An example of the error into which a mistaken emphasis upon the life of Jesus (as distinguished from His death) may lead us, is to be found in Dr. Bruce's interpretation of Romans viii. 3, "God, sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin condemned sin in the flesh" [2] (Rom. viii. 3). The ordinary interpretation of this is that the condemnation took place in the death of Christ "περὶ ἁμαρτίας" being a sin-offering. From the context, however, Dr. Bruce judges that it refers rather to Christ's life. The Apostle is speaking of the need of help to conquer the law of sin ruling in the members. Dr. Bruce holds that St. Paul conceives it to be in the sinless holy life of Christ that this is rather found. He had successfully resisted the bondage to the flesh. God sent His Son into the world "with reference to sin" (περὶ ἁμαρτίας). Every part of His earthly experience was a contribution towards the destruction of sin. So men may be "πνευματικοί," may fight and prevail through Him Who loved us, even though temptations thick assail us through the σάρξ. This is Redemption.

Such a lamentable misunderstanding of St. Paul's meaning destroys the appeal of the Gospel, as it fails to recognize

[1] Ez. xviii. 4. Cf. Rom. vi. 23.

[2] ὁ Θεὸς τὸν ἑαυτοῦ Υἱὸν πέμψας ἐν ὁμοιώματι σαρκὸς ἁμαρτίας καὶ περὶ ἁμαρτίας κατέκρινε τὴν ἁμαρτίαν ἐν τῇ σαρκί.

the source of its power. St. Paul did not and could not teach this. We may with confidence translate "περὶ ἁμαρτίας" as "sin-offering," for which it is used constantly in the Old Testament, "more than fifty times in the Book of Leviticus alone."[1] Such was the Sacrifice of Christ, making atonement for the sins of the world. It was only on the Cross that St. Paul regarded Christ as condemning sin in the flesh (Rom. vi. 7, 10. Cf. Col. i. 13, 14). That the power by which we conquer sin in the flesh comes from the holy example of the sinless life of Jesus is not a Pauline doctrine. His stainless life is our example, and it is that which makes His death efficacious for the washing away of sin (2 Cor. v. 21).[2] But it is not therefrom that we derive the power that makes our weakness strength. Hero-worship is not the motive force of the Christian life. It is the "power of Christ" (2 Cor. xii. 9), the love which Christ has towards us, which constrains us (2 Cor. v. 14). That love was shown not only in His taking our nature upon Him, but pre-eminently in His death on the Cross, where Christ gave Himself for (ὑπέρ) us (Gal. ii. 20)[3] an offering and a sacrifice προσφορὰν καὶ θυσίαν) to God (Eph. v. 2). It becomes a power in the life through the Holy Spirit's presence whereby Christ Crucified and Risen dwells in us, and the deeds of the body are mortified (Gal. iv. 8; v. 16). Through the Holy Spirit, we are organically united with Christ. We are buried with Him by Baptism into death. His Resurrection and the power of it[4] (Phil. iii. 10) is ours by personal experience.

[1] Sanday and Headlam, *Romans, ad loc.*

[2] Cf. Heb. vii. 26–27. [3] Cf. St. John xv. 13.

[4] Prof. K. Lake points out that Jewish Christians would regard the Resurrection "either merely as the proof that the Christian view of Jesus was correct, and the Divine confirmation of His message, or as the means whereby He had attained (or, possibly, resumed) the heavenly nature of the "man" who was to appear at the coming of the Kingdom as the divinely appointed King." Gentile Christians saw more, and this more easily. There was a special significance and unique efficacy in the atoning death and

Its source is from (ἐκ) God, Who raised up Jesus from the dead (2 Cor. xiii. 4) and glorified Him (Phil. ii. 9).[1] So was Christ "designated"[2] by the Father to be the Son of God with power (Rom. i. 4). Our power is Christ's power, and His power is God's power, even as we are Christ's, and Christ is God's. Thus that constraining love which first drew us unto His Cross, and from which only the human will can separate us (Rom. viii. 35) awakens the response of that love wherein we shall be holy and blameless before Him (Eph. i. 4), and forms that atmosphere of divine appeal and human answer in which the body of Christ's Church is being built up (Eph. iii. 14–19). It is when we draw our spiritual strength in such a way that we have the power of Christ working in us through the Holy Spirit (Rom. i. 4). By such an indwelling of Christ, as well as a dwelling in Christ is the reign of sin ended (Rom. vi. 12) and the body of sin destroyed. Then only do we walk in newness of life, and live "in Christ."

The Physical Death of the Redeemer and the Moral Death of the Redeemed.

One objection rises readily to the mind in this connexion. The death of Christ on the Cross was physical. Our death to sin is moral. How then can the one result from the other? If our crucifixion is ethical, must not His have been ethical also? So Somerville writes: "He was heir in His own Person to the weakness of the flesh and its temptations. Christ found the dying to it an essential element of holiness, and, in so far as His death on the Cross

resurrection of Christ. The analogies of the mysteries accustomed a Greek convert to continue "to think along the lines already familiar to him" even if he did not "borrow" from those doctrines. See *Earlier Epistles of St. Paul*, pp. 408–411.

[1] Cf. Eph. i. 20; Col. iii. 1; Rom. viii. 11.

[2] Not "proved" or "instituted." See Sanday and Headlam *ad loc.*

was the final triumph of His holiness over all the desires of the flesh that furnish to men unregenerate the motive power of life, it possesses a moral efficacy that constitutes Him leader of all His brethren." [1] So we bear about in the body the dying of the Lord Jesus, that the life also of Jesus might be made manifest in our body.[2] In other words, "Whosoever would save his life shall lose it; and whosoever would lose his life for My sake shall find it." [3]

Was the Death of Christ Moral as well as Physical?

The death of Christ is thus from this point of view moral, as well as physical. He died to sin in the flesh, and it is this death that we share. He certainly regarded the death of the believer as primarily moral. "The reason for dying in the one case is a transcendent theological one, in the other moral. On this account the dying to live, to which the Christian is summoned, loses the impetus arising from its being presented as the ideal and universal law of all true life, and is based on the weaker though not lower grounds of a believer's sense of congruity and honour." [4] For St. Paul, however, did not the secret of his vivid religious life, his intense fervour and energy of faith lie in the absolute devotion of the heart and life to God, in his entering into mystic union with Him Who was the Representative and Brother not only of the spiritual race of men, but of the whole of mankind and the universe? In other words, was it not to Him both the universal law of life and God's appeal to the conscience, the heart and the will. Not only is salvation a death unto sin (Rom. vi. 2) and a new birth unto righteousness, for it is the law of life that it is reached through death (Rom. vi. 7), but also it is clearly

[1] *St. Paul's Conception of Christ*, Dr. Somerville, p. 100. See also Prof. Green's book, *Witness of God*, works, vol. iii. p. 230.

[2] 2 Cor. iv. 10. [3] St. Matt. xvi. 25.

[4] *St. Paul's Conception of Christianity*, Dr. A. B. Bruce, p. 180.

only in union with Christ, in the answer of the will guiding the heart and mind, that life is gained (Rom. viii. 2). We cannot, and I believe that St. Paul did not, distinguish thus the physical from the moral death of Christ. Indeed, we may say that where sin had never reigned, there was no death to sin. The death of the believer is not only moral and spiritual, but it rises into the perfect newness of life when the body, too, is redeemed and transformed (Rom. viii. 23; Phil. iii. 21). The cry for complete union with Christ is not fully answered till then. Even then, though the death of Christ and the death of the Redeemer were placed by him in different categories of thought, his faith was such that he could lay hold on Christ, die and rise with Him, so that he became partaker of his Lord's exalted life. It was Christ crucified in the flesh on the Cross (Gal. ii. 20, cf. iii. 13), and Christ risen from the grave (Col. iii. 1), as in the vision on the Damascus road, with Whom he was united. Salvation for St. Paul meant, essentially, union and present union with the living Head—a union consummated by a life not only ethical and spiritual but also physical, for his body had become the Temple of the Holy Ghost (1 Cor. vi. 19).

The view of the Person of Christ postulated by St. Paul's Doctrine of Redemption.

We are now in a position to estimate what view of Christ this conception of Him as Redeemer involved.

We have seen that for St. Paul no merely forensic conception of the death of Christ is adequate. As Redeemer indeed Christ submitted to death and thereby redeemed us from the curse of the law. Christ was thus the Head of mankind as an ideal unity. In objective identity with Him, our sin passes to the Sinless One, His righteousness to us. There was more. Between the Redeemer and the Redeemed there was a subjective identity. An inward life

was lived in Him. He was one with men, they were one in Him. This other aspect of St. Paul's religious life is ever present. "As Christ in love made His own every detail in our unredeemed state, so faith in the exercise of its native clinging power makes its own every critical stage in Christ's redeeming experience, His death, burial, resurrection and ascension, and compels the redeemed man to re-enact these crises in his own spiritual history." [1]

It was, moreover, Christ as Sinless, Perfect, Man absolutely obedient to his Father's Will, Who, by His humiliation and perfect walk in the likeness of sinful flesh, and by His suffering life offered up in His death on the Cross, has procured for us redemption by His blood, entrance into the mystical life with Him, and the sure hope of the Resurrection. So it is only as Perfect, Sinless, Obedient, Man that His death was efficacious for this.[2] St. Paul has grasped the truth which his Master taught, the truth of "Life through Death." As life "in Christ" brought ever new light upon the mystery, St. Paul could see in the Person of his Lord the working out of the eternal principle. "The Death and Resurrection of Jesus were the visible embodiment of the law of all spiritual being that death is the true road to the higher life." [3] Yet more than that comes with the Redemption in Christ Jesus. The power to live the new life is given as the eyes are opened to see the vision of its beauty. The Christian is enabled in the strength of his Redeemer to follow in the footsteps of that stainless patient life, and to live his years like those his Master passed beneath "the Syrian blue." He knows the power of His Lord's Resurrection,[4] the soul is justified,[5] sin is conquered,

[1] *St. Paul's Conception of Christianity*, Dr. A. B. Bruce, p. 179.

[2] That the character of Christ was St. Paul's ideal for himself as for all is seen in such passages as Col. iii. 12, Phil. ii. 5, 1 Cor. xi. 1.

[3] Art. "Jesus Christ," *H. D. B.*, Prof. W. Sanday.

[4] Phil. iii. 10. See Lightfoot, *ad loc.* [5] Rom. iv. 24, 25.

immortality is sure. No ordinary man ever did this; no teacher before or since, however closely to his maxims he might live, ever accomplished this. He was indeed Man, and as such He was the Head and Representative of a new and spiritual Humanity. He was Perfect Man, and His manhood was lived in complete obedience to God's will. By such a life offered on the Cross for our redemption, a vicarious, propitiatory sacrifice was made to God in perfect obedience to His counsels, a ransom for the whole world. He who died this death must have been Man truly and completely, representing and containing in His nature the very essence of our manhood; so alone the race of which He was representative might hope to be lifted up in their Head till they should attain the stature of the Perfect Man. But the Redeemer must have been more than this. That love beyond death which wrought so great a salvation for the universe is something we can recognize though not comprehend. Its constraining power lifts us beyond any Unitarian or Pantheistic explanation of His Person, as it carried St. Paul far from the narrow limits of popular Messianic opinion and kept him from the errors of Cerinthus and his Ebionite followers. Christ is more than man. He is a "pre-existent Divine being, coming into the world from a higher realm, and imparting to those who are subjected to the law of sin and death, the new spiritual vitality without which deliverance is hopeless."[1] St. Paul in this soteriological conception of the Redeemer draws very near to the doctrine of the Logos as expressed by St. John. In this Heavenly Man, in this Redeemer Who brought deliverance from the bondage of the world, the flesh and the devil, he saw not only the Perfect Man but the life-giving Spirit.[2] In One Whose saving grace went out to still the groaning and travailing of the whole creation he must have recognized

[1] Art, "Salvation, Saviour," *H. D. B.*, Prof. W. Adams Brown
[2] 1 Cor. xv. 45.

a Person transcendent as well as immanent, Divine as well as Human, God as well as man; for through Him was worked out God's eternal purpose "to reconcile all things unto Himself whether things upon the earth or things in the heavens."[1]

Brief Summary of the First Section, Christ from the standpoint of His Perfect Manhood.

Up to the present we have regarded St. Paul's Christology rather from the human standpoint than the Divine. By that is meant that we have briefly tried to bring together and examine some of those aspects of the Person of Christ which are particularly prominent in his thought and which refer to Christ primarily as Perfect Man. In Christ as the Messiah we have seen One Who took unto Himself many of the current and forgotten Messianic hopes and aspirations of the Jewish race, illuminating and transforming them by the process. Behind these was the fundamental expectation that the Messiah would be really and completely Man. This basis Jewish speculation never left, though the Messiah was sometimes prefigured as a Man with many Divine functions and attributes. This basis, moreover, St. Paul never forsook, however different it looked in the new light. For him Jesus was the Messiah, Holy, Righteous, Sinless Man. He came to earth as the "last Adam," the "Second Man from Heaven" to found and perfect a redeemed Humanity, to be the firstborn of many brethren. As the Second Adam, too, we have seen Christ primarily as truly man, One who could never have performed the office which the Man from heaven came to fulfil had He not taken upon Him our nature and lived out His life on earth amongst mankind, and died for our Redemption. Yet He is more to us. There is postulated a nature Divine in Him Who fills these Messianic conceptions with the fullest and loftiest

[1] Col. i. 20.

meaning, in Him Who interprets this our life for us in wonderful and unique terms, and as our Head, makes it possible for us also to pass through our earthly span of years freed from the bondage of sin. The whole of our future lies in Him. It is the pledge of our continual growth in grace that He should have infinitely great possibilities in store for us. As we ever advance, and grow more and more like Him in His infinite beauty and holiness, we shall find new graces to be acquired, new depths to be sounded, new heights of life revealed for aspiration and attainment. His Redemption and our life in Him convince us of far more than His Perfect Manhood. They demand from us the worship, the reverence, the love, the surrender which we can only give to One in Whom our restless hearts have peace because they have at last found God. We have arrived at a point whence we may tread, though still with cautious and hesitating footsteps (for the ground is very sacred and not smooth for sin-blinded men), the path which leads us ever higher to the sublime truths, which God through His Apostle proclaimed to His Church, truths which may be summed up in the words of the Nicene Creed, "I believe in *God* the Son, Redeemer of the World."

CHAPTER VI

Christ as Eternal

WE have now come to consider Christ as an Eternal Person. On this subject the minds of Christian thinkers have been especially engaged throughout the history of the Christian Church. On our view of the eternal Being of the Immanent and Transcendent Christ, must ultimately depend our conception of His Person. It is the check by which speculation with regard to the nature of Christ is guided and restrained. So Arius, when, after arguing from the subordination of Son to Father, he arrives at the conclusion "ἦν ποτε ὅτε οὐκ ἦν" ("there was once when He [the Son] was not") was seen to be teaching a Christ not consonant with the Christian Faith. Speculation, directed by experience, finds here a subject on which it legitimately may exercise itself, but finds at the same time limits beyond which it may not pass.

St. Paul's Conception of Christ as Pre-existent. The Three Alternatives.

The subject resolves itself, in the main, into an inquiry into St. Paul's conception of the pre-existent Christ. Many have asserted that this doctrine forms no part of the Christology of the Church for all time, and they explain it as "the intellectual clothing of faith in the moral and spiritual supremacy of Christ."

But what did *St. Paul* believe? Can we say that for St. Paul Christ is eternal? Or are we to believe with Dr. Ander-

son, that "Paul's Christ began to be"? Or, for this is the third alternative, holding that love must always seem to us "invisible, insoluble, superior to all analysis," do we therefore conclude that St. Paul was "indifferent alike to questions that related to His human birth and His eternal pre-incarnate nature?"[1] The last of these opinions has a considerable following among the advanced thinkers of the day. New schools of thought have arisen, standing for new and illuminating conceptions. But is there not the danger in every period of transition such as this, lest men, dazzled by the sudden glare, should lose their hold on truths which have stood the test of time, lest, tempted by the opening up of other realms of thought, they should be easily led to abandon ancient strongholds of the Faith which have lived through battle and storm? Is it not wise to be conservative in these matters and to make sure that the ground in front is firm before the old position is left? We must advance, but true advance is slow. The creeds are a heritage to be valued and not despised, and we believe that, if rightly understood, they will still prove to the majority of Christians the greatest help in their spiritual lives.

The Doctrine of the Pre-existent Christ and 1. Palestinian Ideas.

The doctrine of the Pre-existent Christ has been regarded as merely a combination of ideas from two sources:—

(i) From Palestinian theology, e.g. Harnack asserts that the Jews "were in the habit of supposing that every important person or thing, which has successively appeared, or is to appear, on the earth, has first existed in heaven; and that such a heavenly pre-existence was assumed in the case of Messiah in accordance with this mode of thought."[2]

[1] So Somerville, *St. Paul's Conception of Christ*, p. 214.

[2] Art. "Messiah," *H. D. B.* (Prof. Stanton), where this passage is quoted.

But, as Prof. Stanton points out, Dalman, the chief expert we have in Jewish literature, does not allow that the instances given of heavenly prototypes of the Holy City and Temple establish this principle. He emphatically denies its prevalence among Jewish, or, at all events, Palestinian circles. "The older Rabbinism," concludes Prof. Stanton, "seems to have contented itself with the idea of the pre-existence of the *name* of Messiah" (Ps. lxxii. 17).[1] In later days there developed the idea of One Who had been born on the earth previously of the seed of David and had been caught up to Heaven, and Who was waiting till His manifestation to Israel as their Messiah. So then the traces of a definite doctrine at the time among the Jews are but doubtful.[2]

II. Heathen Ideas.

(ii) From heathen beliefs. As pointed out above, the prevailing aspect of the Deity for Eastern and Egyptian thinkers was that of transcendence. The Creature and the Creator needed some intermediary to bring them together. This postulated the "Logos," or "Word" of God, which, for Plato, comprehended all the inferior gods of heathenism. The influence of the idea was seen in Palestine in the Targums in the doctrine of the "Memra" (Verbum—λόγος προφορικός), and of the "glory" where the thought was that of "verbum." In Alexandria Philo stands for the combination. He was more of a Platonist than a Jew, and terms God "τὸ ὄν" instead of the "ὁ ὤν" of the Alexandrian translators. The attributes which Plato assigns to his "Logos" are assigned by Philo to the "Word of God," "Wisdom," and "Spirit," in the Old Testament, and these latter become hypostatized. So, too, there came to be attached to faith in Jesus Christ, a belief in His existence before Incarnation,

[1] Art. "Messiah," *H. D. B.*, Prof. Stanton, p. 356.
[2] See *The Jewish and the Christian Messiah*, Prof. Stanton, p. 130.

possessed of such Divine attributes as St. Paul in his later Epistles especially seems to ascribe to Him. Thus a synthetical, speculative, doctrine of Christ's Pre-existence was produced, unimportant, because only of that age, and not for all time, with no religious value, because a mere metaphysical speculation.

But this explanation does not satisfy us. "The Christian consciousness has acquiesced in this doctrine as not only consonant with its convictions of the Divine greatness of its Master, but as required by those convictions to justify them to itself."[1] Our Faith necessitates the Pre-existent Christ; for One Whose Person and Work are so unique, must have existed before He came to earth. This conclusion is strengthened by an examination of St. Paul's teaching, to which we now proceed.

St. Paul's Teaching, the "Logos" in his Epistles, and in St. John's Writings.

The subject of the Pre-existent Christ is intimately connected with that of His cosmic work. Dr. Lightfoot pointed out the lamentable result which has attended the neglect by Christian teachers in the past of the wealth of cosmic teaching in St. Paul's epistles.[2] As modern theology realizes afresh the greatness of its inheritance, the idea of Christ as the centre and goal of all History, as the perfect manifestation of the Logos, the eternal Reason, finds no small place in the deeper and richer truths that issue from the obscurity with which Latin influences,[3] it may be, have surrounded them.

[1] So Somerville in *St. Paul's Conception of Christ*, p. 197.

[2] The Apologists of the second and third centuries allowed cosmology to displace soteriology from the foremost place. St. Paul emphasized both in their balance and mutual helpfulness in building up a scheme of thought. (See *Christologies Ancient and Modern*, Dr. Sanday. So Loofs and Harnack there referred to, pp. 16, 17.)

[3] See *The Christ of English Poetry*, Hulsean Lectures by Dr. Stubbs, p. 170 ff.

It is proposed to consider, first, Christ as "Logos," and then to pass briefly in review texts definitely bearing on the doctrine under consideration, dwelling especially on the "Gospel of the Incarnation" contained in Phil. ii. 5–11.

(i) Christ as Logos does not come before us in St. Paul as a doctrine so definitely and clearly taught as in the Prologue to St. John's Gospel. The references which might imply that the ideas of the Logos current at the time supplied a phraseology in which to express certain truths about Christ are rather incidental than direct. Consequently it has been stated that St. Paul does not go quite as far as St. John —there is "a step to take" from the highest point reached in the Pauline conception to the Johannine elevation.[1] It is asserted that we do not find St. John's universalistic teaching in St. Paul. "Christ was the sustainer of the Jewish nation (the Rock) and the centre and root of the social unity of the Christian Church . . ., but I can see no trace that he had learned to extend the same truth to the whole world of heathen humanity, that he had grasped the fullness of St. John's teaching."[2] Is it not, however, more accurate to say that St. John and St. Paul were expressing the same thoughts, the only difference being that St. John has used expressions of them which St. Paul, writing under very different circumstances, has not adopted? Let us take for a moment the "Logos" conception in St. John. As it presents itself it seems to be a development of the Palestinian "Logos" doctrine. But it contains new elements: (*a*) The Logos is at once essentially Divine and an eternal Person; (*b*) the Logos became incarnate; (*c*) the Logos is identified with the Messiah. (3) The Messiah of the Old Testament is identified with the historical Jesus of Nazareth. We think that these ideas are found in all their fullness in the conceptions of St. Paul, and, generally speaking, the corre-

[1] So Sabatier in *St. Paul the Apostle*, p. 262.
[2] Mr. Hutton in *Essays*.

spondence of idea throughout is so striking that Dr. Salmon could account for it only on the supposition that "St. John read and valued St. Paul's writings."

Particular Coincidences in Idea.

This coincidence in idea may, moreover, be traced out in numerous details. Dr. Bacon has recently done great service in his book on *The Story of St. Paul* by pointing out more fully and clearly the great part which the Logos played in St. Paul's conception of Christ. The Logos was the Wisdom Spirit from God, and the unifying principle of the Universe. For St. Paul this Spirit is the Spirit of Christ. In Christ, by Christ, for Christ, the universe is harmonised. He is the bond of all things. In Him all things cohere and are summed up. It was the purpose of God, *ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι τὰ πάντα ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ* (Eph. i. 10).[1] He is the Creator as well as the Goal of creation, the *A* and the *Ω*. "Just as a Stoic might say: 'The Logos is the rational element of creation, accounting for it as a cosmos; therefore the creation must achieve its ideal by this Logos element pervading and dominating all its parts, as man achieves his ideal when the Logos element in him fully dominates,' so St. Paul too conceives of the universe as an organism, but the Logos-Christ is the unifying, vitalizing element, corresponding to the blood or Spirit."[2]

Coincidence of Terminology.

Turning to the Epistles[3] we are struck by the remarkable coincidences in terminology with the Wisdom and Logos literature. Christ is the "image of the invisible God": "the firstborn in respect to all creation (*πρωτότοκος πάσης*

[1] The doctrine of "recapitulatio," "the summing up of all things in Christ," as expounded by early Apologists, e.g. Justin Martyr and Irenaeus, goes back to St. Paul's phrase and thought.

[2] See *The Story of St. Paul*, pp. 323, 324, Dr. Bacon.

[3] Especially those to the Colossians and Ephesians.

κτισεως), "For in Him all things were created, in the heavens and upon the earth, things visible and things invisible." [1] The life of Christ pervades the universe.[2] "All individual existence will be subjected to that. . . . This intermediate Being demanded by philosophy as the agent and medium of creation, revelation, and redemption, is nothing else than the Spirit that was in Christ, called 'Wisdom' in the Jewish literature, called 'Logos' by Philo and the Greeks." [3] It is the "Wisdom of God in a mystery" that we speak,[4] a mystery which is the revelation of God's purpose in creating the Universe, hitherto from all ages hidden in God, Who created all things.[5]

So it is especially with regard to creation that St. Paul regards Christ as "Logos."

It is then perhaps especially with regard to creation that St. Paul looks at Jesus as Logos. He is the Creator of the world, and Himself the firstborn of all creation. He is the pervading Logos principle in Whom the universe finds harmony and co-ordination, He is the Goal to which the whole creation moves. He is, moreover, both the Word living in the closest relationship to God (the λόγος ἐνδιάθετος), Wisdom dwelling with God,[6] in Whom are hidden all the treasures of Wisdom; [7] and He is also the Word manifested, λόγος προφορικός, for Jesus Christ Himself had spoken in the Old Testament, and Jesus Christ was the revelation of God on earth. In Him dwelt all the fullness

[1] Col. i. 15. See Wisdom vii. 26.

[2] Cf. Wisdom i. 7. "The Spirit of the Lord filleth the world, and that which upholdeth all things together hath knowledge of the voice." Also Wisdom vii. 24. "Wisdom passeth and goeth through all things by reason of her pureness."

[3] *Story of St. Paul*, p. 332, Dr. Bacon.

[4] 1 Cor. ii. 7.

[5] Eph. iii. 9. It is noticeable, as Dr. Bacon points out, that where St. John's Gospel and the Epistle to the Hebrews use "Logos," St. Paul uses the Palestinian term "Wisdom," p. 331 n. 2 of *The Story of St. Paul*.

[6] 1 Cor. i. 24.

[7] Col. ii. 3.

of the Godhead bodily. In Him hath God made known the counsels hidden from the foundation of the world. We can speak with "the mind of Christ." [1] Hence we can speak "God's wisdom in a mystery." All the problems of the "Logos" doctrine and of cosmogony are solved in Christ. The keynote to his solution is the word "Love." [2] We cannot enter into mystic union with the Logos-Wisdom-Spirit by an intellectual process. It is "love," "the will of God," not γνῶσις, "enlightenment," by which we come to know Him. "Therefore," concludes Dr. Bacon, "the pre-existent Christ-Spirit is indeed to be identified with the Wisdom of God and the Power of God, but above all and beyond all with the Love of God." Moreover, we must remember that the pre-existent Christ existed before the Creation in a state of the closest intimacy with the Father (for He was Son as well as Word). He is no longer the impersonal semi-divine Logos of Philo. He is identified with the Messiah, He is identified with Jesus Christ, He is a person and absolutely Divine. Such, until further study brings new light on this conception, are the ideas expressed in St. Paul's Epistles in the highly technical language of the Wisdom literature. They lead us to conclude that he adopted that language to formulate in the dress most familiar to himself and his readers the truths which Christ Himself had taught him in the days of retirement and preparation in the deserts of Arabia.

Col. i. 15–20 and its Teaching about Christ as Pre-existent.

We now turn to consider some of the texts bearing on Christ as Pre-existent. The "Locus classicus" is of course Col. i. 15–20.[3] The first three verses, 15, 16 and 17,

[1] 1 Cor. ii. 1–16.

[2] So Dr. Bacon, *The Story of St. Paul*, p. 350.

[3] ὅς ἐστιν εἰκὼν τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ· ἀοράτου . . . ἀποκαταλλάξαι τὰ πάντα εἰς αὐτόν.

describe the relation of Christ to God and the world. We note here especially the following phrases. (i) The image of the Invisible God (*εἰκὼν τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ἀοράτου*"). In the word image *εἰκών* there are the three ideas of Representation, Manifestation and Likeness.[1] Dr. Lightfoot's remark is just, that "the idea of perfection does not lie in the word itself, but must be sought from the context, e.g. 'all the fullness' (*πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα* v. 19)." Nor does 1 Cor. xi. 7 allow us to see in the word alone what Christian antiquity has ever regarded the expression "image of God" as denoting, that is "the eternal Son's perfect equality with the Father in respect of His substance, nature and eternity."[2] Philo often used this word of the "Logos." Still there is no doubt that the new meaning of the Logos-doctrine to Christians filled the Logos-phraseology with far deeper significance, and we may understand the phrase when interpreted by the context, as implying *perfect* Likeness, *perfect* Representation, and *perfect* Manifestation of the Invisible God.

2 "Firstborn of all Creation (*πρωτότοκος πάσης κτισεως*).[3] The word "firstborn" *πρωτότοκος* (like *εἰκών*, a Messianic expression and applied even to God by R. Bechai) conveys the ideas of (*α*) Priority "in respect of all creation," (*β*) Distinction from "the genus *κτίσις*,"[4] and perhaps therefore implies the meaning "Heir and Sovereign." At all events Christ's absolute pre-existence is here clearly taught.

(iii) "Who is the beginning" (*ὅς ἐστιν ἀρχή*), i.e. "in that He is *ἀρχή*." The ideas underlying this word are (*α*) Priority in time, (*β*) the source of life. "The term is here applied to the Incarnate Christ in relation to the

[1] *Colossians*, Dr. Lightfoot, pp. 142 ff.

[2] So Dr. Ellicott, *Colossians*, p. 123. See *Ephesians and Colossians*, Dr. T. K. Abbott, p. 210.

[3] Dr. Lightfoot's note hereon (p. 144 ff.) is excellent. He is in the main followed by Dr. Abbott.

[4] *Ephesians and Colossians*, Dr. Abbott, p. 212.

Church, because it is applicable to the Eternal Word in relation to the Universe.[1] In each of these three words (εἰκών, πρωτότοκος, ἀρχή), and indeed throughout the passage, the idea of pre-existence is prominent.

Other Passages.

Some other passages in St. Paul's writings ought to be mentioned, and it is noteworthy in referring to them that as Beyschlag remarks, "especially in the earlier Epistles," St. Paul "presupposes (the doctrine of the Pre-existence) as familiar to his readers and disputed by no one," e.g. we find such texts as "God *sent forth* His Son"[2]; "God sending His own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh and as an offering for sin, condemned sin in the flesh";[3] "Though He was rich, yet for your sakes He became poor"[4]; "For they drank of a spiritual rock that followed them, and the rock was Christ."[5] So too we may see a deeper meaning than is sometimes found in the words "and One Lord Jesus Christ through Whom are all things and we through Him" (δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα καὶ ἡμεῖς δι' αὐτοῦ).[6] Weizsäcker translates the phrase "The mediator of all things, Who is also our mediator." It seems, writes Somerville, to point to a wider activity, "to base Christ's present mediatorship in regard to men on a prior one in regard to creation." He is now the Lord and mediator of the Human Race. This relationship existed long before in regard to "all things."

The meaning of Phil. ii. 3–10.

But St. Paul's views seem to centre especially round the interpretation of Phil. ii. 3–10. Concerning this famous passage a long and bitter controversy has raged. Most of the combatants have, however, been silenced

[1] Lightfoot, *ad loc.*
[2] Gal. iv. 4. [3] Rom. viii. 3. [4] 2 Cor. viii. 9.
[5] 1 Cor. x. 4 (1 Cor. xv. 47 probably refers to the exalted Christ). [6] 1 Cor. viii. 6.

through a masterly exposition by Dr. Gifford, who seems to leave little else to be said thereon.[1] He deals, one by one, with the points which the passage raises. A brief abstract of his treatment will afford the best idea of the problems and their soundest solution. From the context it is clear that the aim of the passage is to give an example of humility and self-sacrifice," "Have this mind in you" (*τοῦτο φρονεῖτε ἐν ὑμῖν*). The question at once arises and is important for the whole interpretation of the passage, does "Who being in the form of God" (*ὃς ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ ὑπάρχων*) refer to the pre-existent, pre-human Christ alone, or, as the Lutherans hold to-day, to Christ Incarnate and wonder-working? Dr. Gifford says, "neither exclusively." It rather applies to both. That this can be so

[1] A more recent interpretation of the passage is indicated by two articles in the *J. T. S.* The first, by the Rev. J. Ross (vol. x. p. 573), deals with *ἁρπαγμός*. He points out that it is admitted that *ἁρπαγμός* usually means "the action of plundering"; but sometimes is equivalent to *ἅρπαγμα*, "plunder, booty." Now *ἁρπαγμός* is not used elsewhere in LXX or New Testament, but *ἅρπαγμα* is used 17 times and always in the sense of "plunder." Probably, therefore, St. Paul meant "the action of plundering" or he would have used *ἅρπαγμα*. It is likely that the Philippians understood it in the active sense. They did not imagine that St. Paul spoke of robbing God, but rather that the Messiah, Jesus Christ, did not think that to be on an equality with God was the "plundering" or "rapacity," a wrong with which they were familiar through the Roman tax-gatherers and praetors. On the contrary He gave all away. Unlike an earthly king, He was among them as "He that serveth." So the Philippians were to let this mind be in them. The *ἁρπαγμός* was just that to which He was tempted in the wilderness.

It is further pointed out that *ἅρπαγμα* could not equal *ἁρπαγμός* because the former does not mean a thing to be grasped in the future, but something grasped and carried off already. It may have been aimed at the Judaising Church who boasted in the glory and dominion which they would enjoy when Messiah came. How could the Apostle help the Philippian Church? By setting forth the Lord as voluntarily and gladly rejecting the earthly ideal for the spiritual, and thus winning the name above every name. (Also see *Expos. Times*, vol. xix. p. 33, where Mr. F. B. Badhara connects

he shows by a discussion of the nature of the imperfect tense, its use in the New Testament (as e.g. in John xi. 49 and 2 Cor. viii. 17), and its use in early Christian writers (e.g. the letter of the Church of Lyons and Vienne to Asia). So he concludes that Christ did not cease to be ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ when He "emptied Himself."

The meaning of ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ.

Next comes a discussion of the meaning of "ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ." Meyer, Alford, Hofmann, Bruce, Thomasius, refer it to "the Divine appearance before Incarnation, the glory visible at the throne of God." This rests on the assumption that (*i*) the "μορφή Θεοῦ" is separable from the "οὐσία" or "φύσις," the "essence" or "nature" of God; or that (*ii*) either (*a*) the "μορφή Θεοῦ" is equivalent to "τὸ εἶναι ἴσα Θεῷ," or (*b*) "μορφή" equals the "form of appearance," and "ἴσα Θεῷ" the internal nature of the divine habitus.[1] But he shows that these assumptions are both false.

the idea of the passage with the Pauline contrast between the First and Second Adam and makes ἁρπαγμόν a reference to the apple.)

The second article is by the Rev. W. Warren (vol. xii. p. 461), who asserts that the one weak spot in Dr. Gifford's study is the assumption that ἁρπαγμός is the same as ἅρπαγμα, contrary to St. Paul's usual accuracy. In the words ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν there are two ideas (1) abnegation of selfish impulses, the opposite of ambition, (2) self-devotion and self-sacrifice, the opposite of plundering others. It is the same thought that we find in "Who, being rich, became poor," or in the story of the poor widow woman who withheld nothing. Dr. Gifford assumes that ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν requires a genitive of contents, i.e. that "Equality with God" was the only thing of which Christ could have emptied Himself. But we may translate "He poured out *Himself*, emptying His fullness into *us*," not He emptied Himself of anything. This would remove the text from the sphere of the Kenotic Controversy, and we now interpret the passage, "He considered His equality with God not as an opportunity of self-aggrandisement, but effaced all thought of self and poured out His fulness to enrich others."

[1] So Meyer makes "habitus" equal the whole idea of divinity though it is the Latin translation of "σχῆμα."

"*Μορφή*" is properly the nature or essence, not in the abstract, but as actually *subsisting in the individual,* and retained as long as the individual exists. This is a sense that would be familiar to St. Paul.[1] So "*μορφή*" cannot exist in Christ without *φύσις* and "*οὐσία,*" nor these without that, any more than abstract can exist without concrete, universal without individual. "*Μορφή τοῦ Θεοῦ,*" then, (*i*) includes the whole nature of the Deity and is inseparable from it, (*ii*) is not itself inclusive of anything "accidental" or separate, (*iii*) could not be put off by the Son of God at the Incarnation, without His thereby ceasing to be God. Nor was the form of God laid aside to take the "form of a slave."

THE MEANING OF *τὸ εἶναι ἴσα Θεῷ*" AND "*ἁρπαγμόν.*"

The next phrase of the passage, "*τὸ εἶναι ἴσα Θεῷ,*" according to Meyer, does not mean "being equal to God," but "the God-equal existence," that is, existence in the way of equality with God. Dr. Gifford shows that "*εἶναι*" here is substantive and the phrase equals "*τὸ αὐτὸς εἶναι ἴσα Θεῷ.*" Moreover, it is grammatically wrong to place an attributive (*ἴσα Θεῷ*) *after* the article and substantive. Thus it is the mode of existence that is changed, not the nature. "He divested himself of the glories, the prerogatives, of dignity, not of the essence." Christ, then, emptied Himself of what He did not consider as "*ἁρπαγμόν,*" that is "*τὸ εἶναι ἴσα Θεῷ.*" De Wette and Thomasius deny that He ever possessed this, and "*ἁρπαγμόν*" may certainly have either of two meanings, the passive meaning, "Who *though* He pre-existed in the form of God, *yet* did not regard it a thing to be greedily clutched, *but,*" as distinct from the active meaning, "Who because he was subsisting did not regard it as an act of plunder." Of these two meanings the context decides us in favour of the former. The phrases "Taking the form

[1] Lightfoot quotes Plutarch and Philo-Judaeus.

of a servant," "being made in the likeness of men," and "being found in fashion as a man," "He emptied Himself," "He humbled Himself," [1] do not necessarily either imply or exclude the reality of the nature assumed by Christ. The "Kenosis" and the "Humiliation" are both voluntary. "He emptied *Himself*," "He humbled *Himself*." "The self-consciousness of Christ voluntarily remained that of the Son of God developing Himself humanly. As to the manner in which these two natures are united in one person, as to the degree in which the Deity was limited and the Humanity exalted during His earthly life, the Apostle has said nothing whatever."

The bearing of the Passage on Doctrine of the Pre-existence of Christ.

This passage has always been regarded as having an intimate bearing on the Pre-existence of Christ. If Dr. Gifford's interpretation is correct, (and there is no serious refutation,) either Christ must have been regarded by St. Paul as Eternally God, or the passage must be explained away in some such manner as Schleiermacher attempts to do, when he says that the statements therein contained are merely "ascetic" and "rhetorical" in character and were "not intended to be didactically fixed." Hilgenfeld regarded the "Pauline Christ as heavenly man but not a Divine Being." Through His self-humiliation He attained to equality with God. But this is manifestly not a Pauline view. Ritschl in his opposition to metaphysics (a point of view which Somerville to some degree shares) is obliged to postulate an ideal pre-existence simply in the thought of God. The term "Divinity" is nothing but the absolute confidence of believers in the redemptive power of Jesus.

[1] "μορφὴν δούλου λαβών," "ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος· καὶ σχήματι εὑρεθεὶς ὡς ἄνθρωπος," "ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν," "ἐταπείνωσεν ἑαυτὸν."

" We must not seek a doctrine of the Divinity of Jesus Christ in the New Testament, but simply the expression of religious believers in contact with His Person." We may ask what the difference is between the two? The expression of the conviction of religious believers in contact with the Person of Jesus is a doctrine of His Divinity. It is Christ in history to whom St. Paul refers here. " In the letters addressed to that Church there are not wanting indications how he would have dealt with the subjective impressionism to which they would reduce his historical Christology. . . . It is not Christ's sufferings, or even His death, but His very existence in humanity, which constitutes for Paul the final proof of His self-renunciation." [1] Harnack states that the doctrine of the divine Pre-existence is a mere reflection in St. Paul's mind of the glorified Humanity in which he first beheld Christ. The flesh was inadequate and hostile, and therefore a humiliation. Godet is inconsistent in his translations of the passage; Pfleiderer comes to it with a preconceived idea of Christ as the Pre-existent Heavenly Man.[2] " As Paul understood it, this was not an Incarnation in the strict doctrinal sense, as the Son of God was really celestial head of the race before. He did not need therefore to take human nature, but simply exchanged the form of celestial existence or godlike body of light for the body of flesh." Dorner takes more or less the same view of Christ as " an embodied Ideal of religious and divine humanity " as Pfleiderer. He says that the " ἐγώ " of our personality is formed in the image of His. " In virtue of this abasement He was able to enter into a human development completely similar to ours." Somerville holds with Hingelfeld

[1] *The Christ of History and of Experience*, Dr. Forrest. We cannot altogether endorse Dr. Forrest's last sentence—as we believe that St. Paul found the " final proof " in the death of Christ rather than in His life on earth. But both were necessary and we cannot accurately speak of either as " final " without the other.

[2] See " The Hibbert Lectures," 1885.

that that Lordship over all, referred to in the words "τὸ εἶναι ἴσα Θεῷ," was conferred on Christ at His Resurrection and not possessed in a pre-incarnate state. "Christ," he says, "was *highly* exalted" (ὑπερύψωσε). We are to picture to ourselves a situation in which the Pre-incarnate one had "presented to Him the career by which He was to realize the possibilities that lay wrapt up in His being in the form of God." The higher glory won was that of being "loved, honoured and adored by all on the ground of service rendered to them." We cannot, however, believe that that ground is sufficient to constitute a new and higher nature in Jesus Christ Himself. Would that make Him ἴσα Θεῷ? Surely it is impossible to think that any but One in essence God could so be described. The majesty of equality in attribute with God can never be "attained." It is no part of St. Paul's teaching that Christ became God as a result of His work on earth and of winning the gratitude of his fellow-creatures.

The Axiom of Interpretation. Three Classes of Opinion.

All these theories are but attempts to read into the plain meaning of the text notions which are supplied by the mind of the exegete himself. To us who desire to find out St. Paul's own view of Christ they cannot commend themselves. Whatever conclusion we come to, there is one axiom which must be at its base, that is, there is one and the same Being in every stage of the existence of Jesus Christ. "There is . . . one Lord Jesus Christ." [1] But even if this be granted, there is considerable variety of view as to the nature of this Being.[2] Opinions fall as a rule into one of three classes:—

(*i*) Christ was in His essential nature Man and no more.

[1] 1 Cor. viii. 6.

[2] Kenotic theories in general arose from a conviction that real human experience and nature were certainly to be postulated in any Christology.

He pre-existed as heavenly Spiritual Man, to be revealed in due time as the Pattern Man. This view has been dealt with under the head of the Second Adam (*ii*) Secondly, there is the orthodox view of the Nature of Christ. Somerville admits that it does full justice to the Divine factor in the Person of Our Lord, and to those passages which assign cosmological functions to the Pre-incarnate One. It also finds a reason in the original constitution of His Person for His present supremacy over all. He asserts that its weakness consists in its sacrificing the humanity of the historic Christ, and, with that, His moral and religious significance for the life of men, to what is conceived to be the interest of His essential and metaphysical Divinity. But is this true? Does the Catholic dogma of Perfect God and Perfect Man "sacrifice" the humanity of the historic Christ? None would assert more emphatically than orthodox theologians the real human nature taken by Our Lord,[1] and none see more of His moral and religious significance for the life of man than those who regard Him as pre-existing in essence as God, as emptying Himself, taking unto Himself the nature of humanity, and thereby working redemption for mankind and setting before them a life of perfect obedience to God's will.[2] So Bishop Gore says, "There is indeed no evidence of a Divine Providence, watching over the fortunes of the Church, more marked than that which is to be found in the decisive and reiterated refusal to admit any opinion to be Christian which explained away the reality or the natural and spiritual completeness of our Lord's manhood." [3]

[1] "The resistance of Antioch to Alexandria saved, or went as far as seemed possible to save, the integrity and reality of the human nature in Christ." Dr. Sanday, *Christologies Ancient and Modern*, p. 54.

[2] We admit that the Greek Church after Nicaea and Chalcedon had made Christ "a philosophical abstraction, and forgotten that He was a living man" and thus gave rise to the Iconoclastic controversy. See Gwatkin, *Knowledge of God*, vol. ii. p. 118.

[3] *Dissertations*, Dr. Gore, p. 138.

A difficult objection for Catholic theologians to answer is, however, raised by Somerville. "If there is," he says, "all the difference between what Christ in His transcendent nature is and what we are, that there is between One who is possessed of the Infinite attributes of Divinity and those that are finite and exist under the limitations of creature-hood, then it is hard to see how there can be any real union between the Human and the Divine in His Historical Personality or how He could be in any true sense *a*[1] man." And again, "The only question is whether His original Godhead is to be conceived of under those attributes of infinity that are incommunicable to human nature, or as having affinities with and relations to what is human that explain the Divinity of man as "made in the image of God." Here we are face to face with the paradox that meets us on the threshold of any inquiry into the nature of the Person of Christ. He is both universal and local, absolute and manifested in time, omnipotent and subject to a human mother, omniscient and growing in wisdom, omnipresent yet with a human body. We may gain illumination with increasing knowledge of the laws of personality which will enable us in some measure to understand such a union of the Human and the Divine,[2] but we may hardly hope to explain it entirely. The orthodox theologian insists that both are true in Christ, but the explanation still remains a deep mystery. (*iii*) Yet it is this difficulty that has led to the third view also treated of above, i.e. that in the Pre-existent Christ there was an essential union of both God and Man, a view of

[1] Rather "Man"—not a separate Person from Christ as God. In Him as Man the Incarnation had universal significance. He summed up and represented humanity before God. Christians, as members of the human race, die with Him and rise again to newness of life.

[2] So Dr. Sanday has made a bold and striking essay in his book *Christologies Ancient and Modern*, offering a new line of thought suggested by recent psychological research. See infra, p 220.

which the objections stated before seem to afford an adequate refutation.[1]

The Question of the Moral Consciousness of our Lord in His Earthly Life.

In the meantime there rises another difficulty which we approach humbly, realizing that we are entering again those mysterious realms of Christian paradox, where only the single eye of a simple faith and a pure heart can clearly see. It is the question of the moral consciousness of Our Lord in His human life.[2] It is not a question, as Dr. Gore points out, which ought to harass the ordinary life of faith, but it rightly presents its problem, and demands our thought. "We shall bow in awful reverence before the deep things of God, but we shall, none the less, seek to go as far as we can."[3] The two Pauline passages bearing on the subject are the one we have just been considering, i.e. Phil. ii. 5–11, the self-emptying, and 2 Cor. viii. 9, the self-beggary. These undoubtedly teach a self-limitation, a teaching which the Gospels as unmistakably exhibit. Christ is regarded as laying aside the "mode of divine existence" ("τὸ εἶναι ἴσα Θεῷ"). There was a "real entrance of the Eternal Son of God into our manhood, and into the limited conditions of consciousness necessary to a really human state. Yet, on the other hand, He is the Word, the Eternal Logos of God, the Creator, Sustainer, and Goal of all things. He is the principle of cohesion in the universe. He impresses upon creation that unity and solidarity which makes it a cosmos instead of a chaos."[4] Were then these functions suspended in the Incarnation? To

[1] See *Jesus Christ as the Second Adam*, p. 57 ff.

[2] See Dr. Weston's book *The One Christ*; also for the theory of a "double consciousness," see infra, p. 223.

[3] *Dissertations*, Dr. Gore, p. 73.

[4] *Philippians*, Dr. Lightfoot on the passage (ii. 5–11).

what extent did He empty Himself? These are the questions that confront the thinker. The answers given by theologians may broadly be divided into four classes.[1]

Four Classes of Answer.

(1) The Theory of a "Dual Consciousness."

(1) First there is the theory of a "dual consciousness." Of this view by far the most capable account we have seen is given in Dr. Gore's dissertations.[2] During Our Lord's human life He had as it were a double life and consciousness. Within His humanity He withdrew from operation His power, His majesty and His omniscience. Yet it was the Eternal Word Himself Who lived under human conditions of limitation. "And this seems to postulate that the personal life of the Word should have been lived, as it were, from more than one centre, that He Who knows and does all things in the Father and in the universe should (reverently be it said) have begun to live from a new centre when He assumed Manhood, and under new and restricted conditions of power and knowledge." [3] There was no interruption of His cosmic functions; from the one centre He lives as the Eternal Logos, from the other centre He was the earthly Christ, the Jewish Messiah, the Christian Redeemer.

Dr. Gore goes on to urge reasons why such a dual consciousness is not inconceivable.

His considerations are helpful but not altogether convincing. Somerville objects to this view in the following words: "I do not see, however, on this view, how we can believe in a Divine Personality as the principle of the Personal life

[1] Dr. Forrest regards the Kenotic theories as far more satisfactory than the "too abstract" and "exaggeratedly antithetic" formula of Chalcedon. (*The Christ of History and the Christ of Experience*, p. 194.)

[2] This view also urged by Bishop Martensen and R. H. Hutton.

[3] *Dissertations*, Dr. Gore, p. 215.

of Jesus Christ, since it is only outside of the latter and as extra-mundane that this Divine Person is conceived as existing as He really is ; or that we can affirm more of Christ, if this theory be true, than that He possessed in an extraordinary measure that Spirit of God that is the principle of every true human personality. And in that case the union of the Divine and Human in His Person is no more than the supreme instance of the union that is normal of every true Christian." [1] We venture to think, however, that this objection somewhat misses the point and is scarcely valid against the orthodox doctrine of the Christian Church. It is not *outside* the personal life of Jesus Christ or as *extra-mundane* that this Divine Person is conceived of as existing as He really is. In some way which we cannot fathom, Jesus Christ during His life on earth was the Divine Person. It was He Himself Who was incarnate. " It is no doubt true," says Dr. Gore, " that as God He possessed potentially at every moment the divine as well as the human consciousness and nature." [2] If He was exercising the functions of the Word in one sphere, yet it was also He, and not merely a man animated by His Spirit, that underwent the real " Kenosis " within the sphere of humanity. This view comes to us with no small weight of orthodox authority, as Dr. Gore shows, extending from Irenaeus to Dr. Westcott ; and as such it will commend itself strongly to all Christian thinkers.

(2) The " Absolute Kenotic " Theory.

(2) Secondly and going to the other extreme, there is the " absolute kenotic " theory advocated by Godet, and in the main by Gess, and the Lutheran theologians generally. " How is such a self-deprivation on the part of a divine Being conceivable ? " Godet asks [3] ; and answers thus : " It

[1] *St. Paul's Conception of Christ*, pp. 207, 208.
[2] *Dissertations*, Dr. Gore, p. 97.
[3] *Commentary on St. John* i. 14. See p. 362 and p. 396 ff.

was necessary, first of all, that He should consent to lose for a time His self-consciousness *as a divine subject.*" He ceases to live the life of the Godhead altogether. He gives up to the Father His cosmic functions. The Logos could only become man if He ceased to act except in the human nature which He took upon Himself.

It is the absolute abandonment that is the difficulty of this view to the present writer. It does not appear to be Scriptural and requires assumptions "so tremendous that nothing short of a positive apostolic statement could drive one to contemplate it."

(3) The Union of the Natures by a Moral Process.

(3) A third view is that advocated by Dorner.[1] The union of the natures is a moral process. The incarnation is a gradual one. Dorner postulated at first a dual personality, a perfect, personal, humanity within the life of the Divine personality. There was a gradual communication of the Personal Logos to the human person until entire unity resulted. This repeats the error attributed to Nestorius and, as Dr. Gore shows,[2] even though later modified[3] by making the Logos a "principle" rather than a separate personality, it is still Nestorian at the bottom.

(4) The "Partial Kenotic Theory."

(4) Fourthly there is what Dr. Gore terms the "Partial Kenotic" theory. It was maintained in Germany by Thomasius and Delitzsch. Dr. Fairbairn in his book, *Christ in Modern Theology*, has clearly explained it. The one thing which is essential, that is the real continuity of a conscious personal life is safeguarded to a far greater extent than the theory of absolute "Kenosis" demands. "The

[1] *Doctrine of the Person of Christ*, Div. ii. vol. iii. pp. 250–254. Cf., too, the error of Paul of Samosata who taught that Christ progressed towards divinity (ἐκ προκοπῆς τεθεοποιῆσθαι).

[2] *Dissertations*, Dr. Gore, p. 195. [3] As Rothe and Dorner do.

external attributes of God are omnipotence, omniscience, omnipresence ; but the internal are truth and love. . . . The external alone might constitute a Creator, but not a Deity ; the internal would make out of a Deity the Creator. Whatever, then, could be surrendered, the ethical attributes and qualities could not ; but God may only seem the more God-like if, in obedience to the ethical, He limit or restrain or veil the physical." [1] Thus the physical attributes were abandoned. "So," says Dr. Gore, Dr. Fairbairn as much as M. Godet, "postulates that Christ did absolutely abandon His relation of equality with God and His functions in the universe." [2] But does not Dr. Gore here confuse the being in the form of God ("ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ") with "τὸ εἶναι ἴσα Θεῷ"? If he means to assert that His "relation of equality with God" ("τὸ εἶναι ἴσα Θεῷ") was not abandoned he seems to forget Phil. ii. 7–10, or at all events to be inconsistent with his interpretation thereof in other places. What Christ retained was, as shown above, the "ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ"; and what He emptied Himself of was "τὸ εἶναι ἴσα Θεῷ," whatever meaning we attach to those phrases.

Indeed, no theory of the consciousness of our Lord during His lifetime appears to be free from objections. It seems to the present writer that any theory ought to take account of those points which we have raised in the present discussion. We must make our idea of the Self-Emptying and Self-Beggary of our Lord's human life consistent with our idea of the pre-existent Christ. The difficulties of doing this are great, as has been pointed out ; so great indeed that many have given up the task as impossible for the human mind. "The failure of all theologians to interpret intellectually the Person of Christ in the light of the special religious truth that in each case gives interest to their

[1] *Christ in Modern Theology*, Dr. Fairbairn, pp. 354, 476.
[2] *Dissertations*, Dr. Gore, p. 192

speculations, illustrates the inability of the human mind to deal with the metaphysics of the subject."[1] So the whole bearing of the passage in Philippians is considered by Somerville and Haupt to be "entirely foreign" to any question of metaphysical theories of the "Kenosis." It speaks not of a surrender of metaphysical attributes but of a moral act of self-abnegation. He won the Headship not by "grasping," but by "humble" obedience. But of what, on this view, did the Humiliation consist? Surely the passage tells us that Christ came from glory to the limitations of earthly life for us. If so, metaphysical problems are bound to arise, and they are not answered by denying their existence.

A tentative View of the Pre-existent Christ.

However unsatisfying, then, the solution may be, it is our task to try to form some conception of the bearing of these questions on the Eternal Nature of Christ. It seems to the present writer that in the Pre-incarnate Son, and arising from the very fact that He was the Son of the Father, there was not only His Eternal Nature as God, but there were also potentialities which enabled Him in course of time to take upon Himself our nature. In the Old Testament times[2] He may have appeared as an angel in human form. For instance, He was probably personally present with His people in the wilderness as the "Angel of the Covenant." If so, then these potentialities had already become to a certain degree active. At all events, their existence seems to be postulated by His Incarnation of the

[1] *St. Paul's Conception of Christ*, and so in the whole chapter on the "Eternal Nature of Christ."

[2] It is held by some that the man "made" in the image of God of Gen. i. 27 is none other than our Lord Himself.

"His Divine Person, if it is allowable so to speak, included an essential capacity for the Incarnation" (St. John x. 36, Westcott, a passage seen after the compilation of this essay).

Virgin Mary, and all He has afterwards become for mankind. During His earthly life, He was God as well as Man, One Person and the same as the Pre-existent Son. His Self-Emptying consisted in the restrictions and limitations without which His life as Son of Man on earth would have been impossible. Whether this self-limitation can be defined as Dr. Fairbairn has above defined it, as referring to His physical attributes, is a question which ought rather to be answered in the negative than the affirmative. In any case God in Christ shines through and permeates every action of His on earth. This so impressed the Jews that He was accused of "making Himself God." [1] He, the Eternal, the Omnipotent, the Omniscient, is incarnate with the fullness of the powers of God dwelling in and exercised by Him, except in so far as the limitations of His earthly life made that impossible. It was a voluntary humiliation, because He came down from heaven and a position of infinite glory to win, through humble obedience yet voluntary emptying and beggary, the salvation of mankind. Yet the potentiality for a return to Divine Majesty was at all times present with Him. It was as if one were to become a leper to work amongst and save lepers, yet retained the power at any time to shake off the leprosy and return to his fellows. Christ the sinless became sin for us, "Him who knew no sin He made to be sin for us." [2] This St. Paul saw in the self-emptying. But to the difficult question of the cosmic relations of Christ during His earthly life, St. Paul does not seem to supply any answer. Ultimately He regards Christ as the Logos, the Word, the Creator of the World, and its Sustainer. He is moreover the Giver of the Holy Ghost. Can we say that God the Father assumes these functions during the earthly life of His Son? We have indications from our Lord's own words

[1] St. John. x. 33. See *Expositor*, viith ser., p. 446.
[2] 2 Cor. v. 21.

of the deep, personal and loving care that the Father was exercising over all creation. It is the Father in Heaven Who numbers the very hairs of our heads and knows when the sparrow falls to the ground. It is the Father Who sends rain on the just and on the unjust. It is the Father Who knows when the "day of the Lord" shall be. There was yet after the Incarnation unbroken communion between the Son and the Father. "The Father was personally present with the Son." [1] In work, in counsel, in Godhead they were one (ἕν). But we can hardly go farther than to suggest that so far as Christ by the necessities of His life on earth was obliged to limit the exercise of His cosmical functions, so far did God the Father directly and mediately take them upon Himself. It would require years of study and thought before any true estimate of this limitation could be formed, and it may be that in our present state of knowledge and insight it is impossible to reconcile these truths, though the reconciliation, we believe, will one day be found in Him "who sums up all things" in His Person.

Summary.

Our survey of St. Paul's view of Christ as eternal has been very limited. There are other words of his than those dealt with in this chapter which imply His Eternal nature. The use of the name "The Son of God" will be considered later, and the expression "the Image of the Invisible God" has already been commented on. We have seen Christ as the Eternal Logos, the Word of God, without Whom God cannot be conceived of as existing, and Who is unthinkable without God. We have discussed the cosmical functions of the Logos, his office as Creator, as the Upholder, and Unifying Principle of the Universe. The difficulties of the great Philippian passage have been pointed out. We

[1] Cf. St. John viii. 29 and see Westcott, *ad loc.*

have seen that He was one and the same Person in His pre-incarnate life and in His humiliation. "The supposition of an act of self-emptying on the part of the second Person of the Trinity, that means the divesting Himself of those qualities that constitute His divine nature, is one that just views of God do not allow us to entertain."[1] There is a continuity of Divine life and the Divine Person in Him Whom we know as Jesus Christ. He it is, moreover, as we have shown elsewhere, Who is Exalted and Glorified and Who is even now in Heaven, till the great day of His appearing. Then shall come the end of all things, and the Son shall deliver up the Kingdom to the Father. But in that consummation He will not cease to be, nor will He be absorbed in Him who is all in all; but He will live on as "the first among many brethren," yet at the same time co-equal and co-eternal with God the Father, and God the Holy Spirit.

[1] So A. B. Bruce writes in his criticism of the theory advocated by Gess.

CHAPTER VII

Christ as Immanent

St. Paul the Mystic.

ST. JOHN has been often regarded as the most mystical of New Testament writers, and many commentators have seen in his Gospel and Epistles an Alexandrian type of mystical speculation. The mystical element in his writings and faith has, however, been unduly emphasised. On the other hand, that of St. Paul, who is really as mystical, to say the least, as St. John, has certainly been underestimated. St. Paul, with his unique experience behind him, felt that he owed his religious life to the appearance of the Christ, Who was revealed to him, and Who revealed to him the knowledge required for his future work. Hence his contempt for philosophy.[1] A man's religion must be that of the heart, revelation must be internal, it is the spiritual mind alone that can comprehend the things of the Spirit. The mysteries of Christianity are only for those who are cleansed " from all defilement of flesh and spirit." [2] Then in the inner life the light begins to shine, growing stronger and clearer and purer, bringing to the believer a proportionate increase of knowledge, grace and love. " He exalts the inner light into an absolute criterion of right and wrong." [3]

[1] 1 Cor. i. and ii. [2] 2 Cor. vii. 1.

[3] *Christian Mysticism*, Dr. Inge, p. 62. Of what does religious experience consist ? Prof. K. Lake thinks that religious contro-

Christology and Pneumatology.

We have already dwelt on the ever present conception in St. Paul's writings that the individual Christian experiences in his own life the redemptive process of Christ who set forth for us in His life, death, and resurrection the law of redemption. How does this come about? It is by faith (διὰ πίστεως), as the means though not the source,[1] that we are justified (Gal. ii. 16). Faith is necessary for the entrance upon Christian life testified to in the rite of Baptism, "For ye are all sons of God, through faith, in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as were baptized into Christ did put on Christ" (Gal. iii. 26, 27). It is in faith (ἐν πίστει) that St. Paul lives (Gal. ii. 20), through faith in Christ (διὰ τῆς πίστεως αὐτοῦ) we are brought near to God (Eph. iii. 12; Rom. v. 2). As those who eat the sacrifices offered to idols enter into fellowship with demons, so those who partake of the sacrifices from the altar at Jerusalem are sharers of the life of Jehovah, and so those who partake of the Supper of the Lord worthily, that is, without disorder and in faith, enter into fellowship with Him (1 Cor. x. 15–21). Faith is more than conviction or orthodoxy. It is always "living" and "saving." It is "an energy of the whole nature, an active transference of the whole being into another life"[2] (εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐπιστεύσαμεν; Gal. ii. 16). It is loving trust (fiducia).[3] It is the means of

versy of the near future will centre round the opposing propositions (1) That religion is the communion of man, in the sphere of subliminal consciousness, with some other being higher than himself. (2) That it is communion of man with his own subliminal consciousness which he does not recognize as his own, but hypostatizes as some one exterior to himself (*Earlier Epistles of St. Paul*, p. 252).

[1] But cf. ἐκ πίστεως in same passage and Lightfoot *ad loc.* Our Article xi. is "per fidem" not "propter fidem."

[2] Westcott, *St. John*, Introd. p. xxxix.

[3] "Faith . . . leaves us outside Christ, trusting to Him; but this crowning act of faith (eating the flesh of Christ and drinking

sonship (Gal. iii. 26),[1] of peace with God (Rom. v. 1); of life (Gal. ii. 20),[2] of unity (Eph. iv. 5; iv. 13; 2 Cor. iv. 13), of protection (Eph. vi. 16), of power (Gal. v. 6),[3] of illumination (2 Cor. v. 7).[4] But it is by the Holy Spirit that faith itself is born (Gal. v. 22). "The work of the Spirit may not be displaced by the activity of the human spirit," [5] and it is by His personal Agency that Christ is formed within us. Thus it is the Holy Spirit that works in our hearts, and makes entreaty for us with sighs "too deep for words" (*ὑπερεντυγχάνει στεναγμοῖς ἀλαλήτοις*).[6] "Where the Spirit dwells and works, God dwells and works (1 Cor. iii. 16; vi. 19; 2 Cor. iii. 17); it is by the Spirit that God is immanent in men." [7] We propose, then, to consider briefly the relation between St. Paul's doctrine of the Spirit and the Christ in Whom we live by the Spirit; for we shall find that, for St. Paul—as for ourselves—Christology and Pneumatology are inseparable both from each other and from the Christian life. So intimate is this relationship that to attempt to set forth the one without reference to the other would result in an extremely inadequate and probably misleading presentation.

Aspects of St. Paul's Doctrine of the Holy Spirit.

(1) *χάρις* and *χαρίσματα*.

As we study St. Paul's views, three leading conceptions of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit become prominent:—

(i) First St. Paul distinguishes between the miraculous gifts (*χαρίσματα*) and Grace (*χάρις*), the normal exercise of the Christian life in love, humility and joy. He does

His blood) incorporates us in Christ" (Westcott, *Revelation of the Father*, p. 40).

[1] Cf. St. John i. 12.
[2] St. John xi. 25.
[3] St. John xiv. 12.
[4] Cf. St. John xii. 36, 46.
[5] Kuyper, *The Work of the Holy Spirit*, Introd. p. xiv.
[6] Rom. viii. 26, cf. viii. 16.
[7] Art. *H.D.B.*, "The Holy Spirit," Prof. H. B. Swete.

not indeed neglect the former, for he lived, as Professor Swete points out, in an age of physical manifestations. In fact, in one place he treats of them at length (1 Cor. xii.). But he knows that in the Spirit's work there lies a deeper, more abiding office. "The permanent results of the Spirit's coming are faith, hope and love." He works in the human body but still more in the human spirit; for, by His presence and working, a life of sonship to God is the possession of the believer,[1] a life corresponding to the Risen life of Christ.[2] This life the Spirit seals,[3] being moreover the earnest (ἀρραβών) of a yet greater work of the Spirit in the Resurrection of the body and the "immeasurable life of progress" lying beyond. Such is, in brief, the work which St. Paul in his earlier Epistles attributes to the Holy Spirit.

We are not to suppose that the Early Church in Palestine deliberately regarded the Holy Ghost as excluded from this sphere; but for them the outward χαρίσματα were the more remarkable, and therefore were chiefly assigned to the Spirit as His work.

St. Paul, however, had seen men arise who could prophesy in the name of his Master, and do many wonderful works, yet whose lives he knew were lived in sin.[4] Hence he would be led to a deeper insight of the Spirit's function than was prevalent among those Christians whose experience of the Spirit's working was confined to the Charismata and outward manifestations. The Holy Spirit was the Sanctifier and builder up of the life in Christ. For St. Paul the "moral miracle"[5] of a sinful man made holy came to be the greatest miracle of all. The steady, not the intermittent, action of the Spirit alone brought growth in grace. The Holy Spirit dwelt in man as a Temple,[6] which must never be allowed to

[1] Rom. viii. 14, 15, 16; Gal. iv. 4–6.
[2] Rom. viii. 2. [3] 2 Cor. i. 22; v. 5. [4] 1 Cor. xiii. 2.
[5] *St. Paul's Conception of Christianity*, Dr. A. B. Bruce, p. 249.
[6] 1 Cor. iii. 16.

become defiled by sin. He is immanent, dwelling in our hearts. But Christ also dwells in our hearts by faith. We cannot in our experience separate these two indwellings. Therefore ὁ δὲ Κύριος τὸ Πνεῦμά ἐστιν.[1] "The Spirit is the 'alter ego' of the Lord."

(2) The Identification of the Spirit of God and the Spirit of Christ.

Next we observe the identification of the Spirit of God and the Spirit of Christ. He is the Spirit of Him Who raised up Christ from the dead (Rom. viii. 11), i.e. the Father. He is the Spirit of Christ Himself as the Anointed One and as Son of God (Gal. iv. 6). Somerville[2] sees in this fact an advance in the primitive doctrine, for, "while it was the original belief that the Divine Spirit is given to men through Christ, it does not seem to have been held till Paul taught it that this Divine Gift is itself the Spirit of Christ—the active principle of His Personality." As the Person of Christ became more and more associated with the work of His Spirit in the heart, so it would be seen how those noble qualities, which found their highest perfection in Him, were produced and nourished by His Spirit. It would thus become increasingly apparent what the higher work of the Holy Spirit really was. Moreover we can see with Somerville how, by drawing close the Gift and the Person and identifying the Spirit of God with the energy of the personal life of Jesus, Paul furnished a test for phenomena to discriminate between those proceeding from the Divine Spirit and those proceeding from an alien source.

(3) The Identification of the Spirit of God and the Spirit of Christ with the Person of Christ.

There seems to have been an identification of both the Spirit of God and the Spirit of Christ with the Person of

[1] 2 Cor. iii. 17. So Dr. Plummer thereon.
[2] *St. Paul's Conception of Christ*, p. 117.

Christ. This we find in two texts particularly; 1 Corinthians xv. 45, "The last Adam (became) a life-giving Spirit" (ὁ ἔσχατος Ἀδὰμ . . . (ἐγένετο) εἰς πνεῦμα ζωοποιοῦν), and 1 Corinthians vi. 17, "But he that is joined unto the Lord is one spirit" (ὁ δὲ κολλώμενος τῷ Κυρίῳ ἓν πνεῦμα).

Yet there was a True Distinction between the Lord and the Holy Spirit.

These texts, however, by no means lead us to conclude that St. Paul is here setting up any theory of the Person of Christ. He does not set himself to construct "a philosophy of religion in which the relation of the Holy Spirit to God, to the Church, and to the human soul, receives scientific treatment."[1] His whole conception of the Spirit arises from his own religious experience. The Spirit had been at work in his own inner life and he knew Christ as the source, the only source, of the growth in holiness and grace which constituted the deepest experience that life contained. So, as we pointed out above, he could identify the Holy Spirit and his risen Lord. But he also distinguished them very markedly, and here we must join issue with Wernle, who writes in one place, "The Spirit and Christ must be identical, as indeed we should infer from the very expression 'Spirit of Christ,' which connects the two conceptions."[2] Again, he says, "It is the Christianization of the Spirit, who is thereby transformed from an impersonal force of nature into the historical influence of the person of Jesus."[3] And again, "Jesus made children of God of His disciples without uttering one word about Salvation. . . . The Spirit is nothing but the influence of the personality of Jesus in history."[4] This view of St. Paul's conception of the Spirit we hope to show to be inadequate by referring to St. Paul's own writings. First we have the three Persons named as

[1] Art. "The Holy Spirit," *H. D. B.*, Prof. H. B. Swete.
[2] *Beginnings of Christianity*, Wernle, vol. i. p. 265.
[3] Wernle (*op. cit.*), vol. i. p. 265. [4] Wernle (*op. cit.*), vol. i. p. 288.

distinct hypostases [1] in " The Grace " (2 Cor. xiii. 14). Then the whole passage, Romans viii. 12–30, especially verses 16 and 27 (" The Spirit Himself beareth witness . . . that we are . . . joint heirs with Christ . . . He that searcheth the hearts knoweth what is the mind of the Spirit, because He maketh intercession for the saints according to (the will of) God ") points to the distinct personality of the Spirit. So also do such passages as 1 Corinthians ii. 11 (" Even so the things of God none knoweth save the Spirit of God ") ; and 1 Corinthians xii. 4 (" Now there are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit. And there are diversities of ministrations, and the same Lord. And there are diversities of workings, but the same God, who worketh all things in all "). This language is far from being applicable to an " impersonal force of nature or the influence of the personality of Jesus in history." The Spirit of God is a Person Who is from St. Paul's point of view " uncreated and divine, for It is internal to the Essence of God." [2]

THE BEARING OF 2 CORINTHIANS III. 17–18 ON THE DOCTRINE.

Two of the most difficult texts are to be found in 2 Corinthians iii. 17–18.

(1) *ὁ δὲ Κύριος τὸ Πνεῦμά ἐστιν*, which was translated by Chrysostom, " The Spirit is the Lord," and was taken by him to afford evidence of the Divinity of the Holy Spirit. It is better to translate, " The Lord is the Spirit," and to understand it as meaning " in effect " : " to receive Christ is to receive His Spirit."

(2) " *οὗ δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα Κυρίου, ἐλευθερία . . . καθάπερ ἀπὸ Κυρίου Πνεύματος.*" Dr. Hort conjectured a reading "*κύριον*" in the first instance[3] and making the word merely an adjective.

[1] Using the word in the later technical sense of *μία οὐσία τρεῖς ὑποστάσεις*," which, through the influence of the Cappadocian fathers, became the universal formula for East and West.

[2] Art. " The Holy Spirit," *H. D. B.*, Prof. H. B. Swete.

[3] Appendix, *New Testament in Greek*, Westcott and Hort, p. 119.

Dr. Plummer conjectures "κύριος" and paraphrases it thus: "The Lord Jesus is the Source of the life-giving Spirit, as opposed to the condemning, death-giving letter: indeed the Lord *is* the life-giving Spirit. But such an identification reveals the sovereign power of that Spirit, and where, as in the realm of the Gospel, the Spirit (not the letter) is sovereign, there there is freedom."[1]

The second phrase will bear many interpretations. Some are (i) Even as by the Spirit of the Lord. (ii) Even as by the Lord of the Spirit, that is, Christ (Tertullian reads "πνευμάτων" for he quotes as "domino spirituum"). (iii) Even as from the Lord the Spirit. (iv) Even as from the Spirit which is the Lord (R.V. marg.). (v) Even as from a Spirit exercising Lordship (Hort), or a Spirit which is Lord. This takes "κυρίου" as an adjective, and is probably the best yet suggested.

A Consideration of some Phrases Indicating the Mystical Union. (1) "In the Lord" and "In Christ."

Having thus seen how St. Paul could say he was living in the Spirit, and yet could look to Christ as the Source and Sustainer of his spiritual life, we are better able to appreciate the meaning of one or two phrases which St. Paul used with reference to the mystical union with Christ.

(i) "In the Lord" and "In Christ" ("ἐν κυρίῳ" and "ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ"). It is only by the identification of the indwelling of the Spirit and of Christ that St. Paul can use these words.[2] First we notice that "ἐν τῷ Ἰησοῦ" is

[1] 2 *Corinthians, ad loc.*, Dr. A. Plummer, to whom I owe this note.

[2] For a consideration of the possibility of union between person and person see Prof. Sanday's *Christologies Ancient and Modern*, p. 151 ff.; see also Dr. Moberly, *Atonement and Personality*; Dr. Inge, *Christian Mysticism* and *Personal Idealism and Mysticism*; Dr. Du Bose, *The Gospel in the Gospels, The Gospel according to St. Paul, High Priesthood and Sacrifice*; Dr. R. M. Jones, *Studies*

never used in this connexion,[1] and this fact is significant. It is Jesus as Christ, the one Anointed, and filled with the Spirit in whom St. Paul lived. "The term Christ conjoined with Jesus in the Epistles always points to the religious significance Jesus has for believers."[2] Next, we see that the exact meaning of the preposition "ἐν" is important for the understanding of the phrase. Deissmann has a monograph on the words "ἐν Χριστῷ" wherein he shows how, while "μέτα" is used in the Synoptics, "ἐν" is used in the Epistles. In the phrase "ἐν Χριστῷ" the "ἐν" has a local sense—the element in which the believer lives, as birds in air. So Christians live in the pneumatic being of Christ. This becomes in St. John an "abiding in"—"μείνατε ἐν ἐμοί."[3] Karl, however, in his treatment of the phrase regards the preposition as meaning "possession by," "within the sphere of influence of" (e.g., ἐν βεελζεβούλ). Further, he says that "ἐν" conveying the idea of limitation, often describes the sphere within which the action takes place," as in Romans xvi. 3, 9; Colossians iv. 7; 1 Thessalonians iii. 2. We note, moreover, that in the LXX "ἐν" is used of "possession by" God.

It implies "Atmosphere" and "Identity."

The interpretation of Deissmann, however, seems preferable on the whole. There is the idea of "life in Christ" so strongly brought forward—a life lived in an atmosphere consisting of Christ, Who is the environment of our spiritual life as the air we breathe forms that of our natural life. If the conditions of continuous life are perfect and permanent correspondence with environment, so is it with life "in

in Mystical Religion; Baron von Hügel, *The Mystical Element in Religion*, all mentioned by Prof. Sanday.

[1] But cf. Eph. iv. 21 "καθώς ἐστιν ἀλήθεια ἐν τῷ Ἰησοῦ," though cf. reading ἀληθείᾳ, W. H. margin, and Dean Robinson's note, *ad loc.*

[2] So Somerville, *St. Paul's Conception of Christ*, p. 121.

[3] E.g., St. John xv. 3.

Christ." But there is more than that in these words. They bring irresistibly to our minds the thought of unity, even of absolute identity with Him. "I have been crucified with Christ, yet I live; and yet no longer I, but Christ liveth in me." [1] There was a new moral and religious consciousness. "Christ became the self of the Apostle and what he lost in individuality by the substitution of Christ, the living principle of love, for the self-limited and particular, he gained in personality; for, passing out of his old self into Christ, he found his real self and realized his true life in God." [2] So he could say, "The love of Christ constraineth (*συνέχει*) us" (2 Cor. v. 14), "I long after you all in the tender mercies (*ἐν σπλάγχνοις*) of Jesus Christ" (Phil. i. 8), "As the truth of Christ is in me" (2 Cor. xi. 10), "I can do all things through Him that strengtheneth me" (*ἐν τῷ ἐνδυναμοῦντί με*, Phil. iv. 13), "But we have the mind of Christ" (*νοῦν Χριστοῦ*, 1 Cor. ii. 16), "Bearing about the dying of the Lord Jesus that the life also of Jesus may be manifested in our body" (2 Cor. iv. 10. Cf. Col. i. 24). Christ would one day be formed in his spiritual children, as yet feeble in the faith (*τέκνα*, Gal. iv. 19). Thus the lives of believers are not separate. They are all breathing the one atmosphere, living in union with one and the same Saviour. There is one principle of life in them all. It is in this connexion that we get a glimpse of the place which the Sacraments [3] held in the religious life of St. Paul. The one Baptism indicates faith in the one Lord (Eph. iv. 5). All who are baptized [4] into Christ put on Christ and become one with Him and each other (Gal. iii. 26–27). In the Lord's Supper there is "one loaf" and "one cup" shared to indi-

[1] Gal. ii. 20.

[2] *St. Paul's Conception of Christ*, Dr. Somerville, p. 123.

[3] See Prof. K. Lake, *The Earlier Epistles of St. Paul*, p. 45. He states that "the Sacraments became the real centre of Christianity."

[4] It was mostly adult Baptism in the time of St. Paul.

cate the " one body," and the fellowship therein of all who truly partake (1 Cor. x. 16, 17); so we dwell in Him, and He in us.

It is the same conception but expressed in yet more tender and striking imagery that crowns the sublimest thought of the later " Christological Epistles," and describes under the analogy of " the Head and the members of the one body " the mystical relation and living union which Jesus perceived to exist between Himself and those who trusted in Him, a union so close that He Himself expressed it in the allegory " I am the Vine, ye are the branches." [1]

(2) " The Image of the Invisible God."

We find another mystical idea in the phrase " the Image of the Invisible God " (" *ὅς ἐστιν εἰκὼν τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ἀοράτου* ") (Col. i. 15). It is in this and similar phrases [2] that St. Paul indicates the ground upon which we may firmly hold that mystical union with Christ is both a possibility and a reality. The verse comes in a magnificent passage describing the cosmic work of Christ and His relation to creation and the Church. He is, as we have seen, the universal source and centre of life. In Him were all things created, in the heavens and upon the earth; all things have been created through Him (*δι' αὐτοῦ*) and unto Him (*εἰς αὐτὸν*). All things are summed up in Him. With regard to creation He is the firstborn (*πρωτότοκος*). His relation to God the Father is that He is " the Son of His love," and the " image of the Invisible God." His relation to His Church is the mystical relationship of union of the Head and the Body. He is the firstborn from the dead. It is precisely because all men are images of God (Gen. i. 27; 1 Cor. xi. 7), and He is the image of God, because all men are the " glory " of God (1 Cor. xi. 7), and He too is the " Lord of glory " (1

[1] St. John xv. 5.

[2] E.g., " Son of God " and sons of God.

Cor. ii. 8), and the hope of glory (Col. i. 27); and, finally, because we are sons (Gal. iv. 6) and God sent forth His Son, that mystic union with Him is possible, and we are able to accept His assurance that, in union with Him, we may attain to the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ. Such is the meaning with which these phrases were filled by the Apostle. The Logos had indeed been called by Philo "the image of the invisible God" as the principle of self-manifestation and self-communication in the Godhead. But it was just one of those philosophical terms used by the Apostle to teach a religious truth. It does not represent the "advance" and the "new terminology" which Somerville sees in the conceptions of the "Christological Epistles."[1] The same phrase had been used in 2 Corinthians iv. 4, and the conception must soon have been prominent in St. Paul's thought about Christ. It may indeed be an equivalent phrase to "the Son of God" of the earlier Epistles, and if so, it implies not only Pre-existence but Divinity. Its bearing on the subject before us is at all events seen in the fact that, though we are all "sons," "images of God," "imitators of God," the "fullness of God," "fellow workers with Him," it is always *through Christ* and in *organic* connexion with Him that these privileges are ours.[2] Further, it is as a body we are thus termed. Of no one individual man could it be, nor was it, said by St. Paul that he is, or was, the Image, or the Fullness, or the Glory, or the Son of God in the sense in which these may be ascribed to Christ.[3] Each of the three

[1] *St. Paul's Conception of Christ*, Dr. Somerville, p. 155.

[2] We are transformed into the εἰκὼν τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ. "The holy and blessed state of mind which Christ possesses" (Grimm-Thayer on εἰκών).

We notice how St. Paul's thought completes that of St. John. Christ is the light of the world (St. John viii. 12), God is light (1 John i. 5), Christians shine as luminaries (ὡς φωστῆρες) in the world (Phil. ii. 15).

[3] In 1 Cor. xi. 7, man is called "εἰκὼν θεοῦ" because the thought is of his God-like power of command. So in the same passage δόξα

ideas latent in the word "Image," that is, likeness, representation, and manifestation were transcendently present in Christ. "He that hath seen Me, hath seen the Father," [1] and life in Him enables us in a lesser and imperfect degree to reflect that Image. "It is," as Somerville grandly says, "as successive generations of men are simply the unfolding of the natural life contained in the First Man, so that not until the race is exhausted can we form any proper conception of the power and faculty that lay in him at the first in germ, so of Christ, the Second Adam, no adequate representation can be furnished of the possibilities of spiritual manhood and likeness to God . . . till Humanity [may we not say the Universe?] as a whole has been brought into living union with Him."

(3) Christ as Head (*a*) of Man, (*β*) of the Church and Redeemed Humanity, (*γ*) of all Principalities and Powers.

Christ as Head is regarded by St. Paul from three different points of view: (*a*) as Head in relation to Man. "The head of every man is Christ" (1 Cor. xi. 3). Christ is the Saviour of the race, its Head, its Guide, its Representative. He is all that He meant when He spoke of Himself as the "Son of Man." (*β*) As Head in relation to the Church and redeemed humanity. It is especially this idea which is brought before us in the "Christological Epistles." "And He is the Head of the body, the Church" (Col. i. 18); "But speaking the truth in love may grow up unto Him in all things, who is the Head even Christ" (Eph. iv. 15, and Eph. v. 23). St. Paul refers to Christ as Head of His Church, and of a New Humanity, in two different ways. (i) As

is used of man because his "function of government reflects the majesty of the divine ruler" (Grimm-Thayer). In reference to Christ these phrases refer to His unique pre-eminence and relation to God.

[1] St. John xiv. 9.

Head, He is immanent in the Church. The idea of immanence, though not dominant, is certainly there. The idea of the Indwelling Spirit seems to have been replaced to some extent by the conception of Christ as Head in the later Epistles. We find it, however, side by side with the former in the *earlier* Epistles (though Somerville does not appear to think so), cf. 1 Corinthians xii. 12, "As the body is one and hath many members. . . ." "Your bodies are members of Christ" (1 Cor. vi. 15). "Ye are the body of Christ" (1 Cor. xii. 27). It is scarcely a step in advance of this to set forth Christ as the Head of that body whereof we are members. As belonging to one body, the same life flows through all. As Head, He dwells inseparably in His members as His members live in Him.

(ii) As Head, moreover, He is transcendent. This is perhaps the dominating idea of the expression, and will be dealt with in the next chapter, p. 151.

(γ) Christ is Head in relation to all principalities and powers. Here again the idea is rather one of transcendence, and will be considered below, p. 167 ff.

The Source of St. Paul's Doctrine of the Indwelling Christ. (i) Is it Jewish?

Meanwhile we have still to answer the question, What was the source of St. Paul's doctrine of the Indwelling Christ? Is it to be traced to Jewish conceptions of the time, or to the Greek mysteries, or was it a conviction borne in upon him by his own vital experiences? These points we shall now take in order.

(i) In the Jewish books Baruch, Sirach and Wisdom, Wisdom is conceived of as personal and with a distinct hypostasis (Prov. viii. 22 ff.). As a Pre-existent spirit, Wisdom is the means of creation in the past and of redemption in the future, whilst a new spiritual and eternal state of things is established. In these books, especially in the

Wisdom of Solomon, we get "a presentation of Stoic ideas in Pharisaic dress." St. Paul, it is said, therefore conceives of Christ as the "Soul" animating the universe, who has implanted that divine spark of life in our breasts which makes us part of and sharers in His life.

If he has taken this speculation, he has spiritualized and transformed it beyond recognition. The Power of God, the Wisdom of God, the Spirit of God all work within. No subtle philosophy produces that experience. It was the foolish things of the world that shamed the wise, and the weak things that brought to nought the mighty.

(ii) Or does it come from Current Mystical Ideas in Greece, Egypt and India?

(ii) Or did St. Paul obtain his doctrine by adopting the mystical ideas current at the time? The Eleusinian, Orphic, Bacchic, Greek and Oriental mysteries, with their extraordinary parallels to the Story of Christ and the religious lives of the redeemed, offered union, mystical and real, with the "Θεὸς σωτήρ."[1] Indeed, Professor Bacon asserts that all the mysteries, both Greek and Oriental, have as their common theme the Indian doctrine of Avatar. He quotes the following passage from Barth, *Religions of India*.[2] The

[1] Prof. Gardner (*op cit.* p. 72) mentions three words used by St. Paul which have a special technical sense in the language of the mysteries. (1) τέλειος meant "one fully initiated." We must, however, remember that in some cases (as, e.g., 1 Cor. ii. 6) it is contrasted with νηπίοις ("babes" 1 Cor. iii. 1) and so has rather the sense of "full-grown" (Matt. v. 48). Also, in an absolute sense, God is τέλειος. (2) μυεῖσθαι, means in classical Greek "to be initiated into the mysteries." In Phil. iv. 12, however, it has a wider application, "to every condition and environment I have become accustomed," or "in everything and all things I have learnt the secret" (Grimm and Thayer). (3) Φωτίζειν may be used in quite a general sense. Prof. Gardner also suggests that the "ἄρρητα ῥήματα" mean "words which it was not lawful for him to repeat" (2 Cor. xii. 4) and take us "into the atmosphere of the mysteries."

[2] p. 170.

Avatar doctrine is " the presence, at once mystical and real, of the Supreme Being in the human individual, Who is at one and the same time true God and true man ; and this intimate union of the two natures is represented as continuing after the death of the individual in whom it took place." [1] Among the ceremonies which introduced the worshipper into mystical union with the Θεὸς σωτήρ were such as the covering of himself with a mask representing the divinity, or with blood representing the life, of the god. He ate and drank that which represented the god's flesh and blood, if by any means he might thereby live in his god and so attain to immortality.[2] Certainly these ideas were very prevalent and the ritual was widely spread when St. Paul preached the Gospel of the Redeemer, and they represented real religious experience.

Their Influence was felt in the Terminology which St. Paul Adopted.

It is probable that at the least they had no small influence on the terminology he used, and the forms under which he presented this doctrine. There is nothing inherently improbable or repugnant in such a view. There is the " mystery of Christ," God as the " Θεὸς σωτήρ," Christ as the " New Man." With Christ we are united through baptism in His death, putting off the old man, as we are united with Him in His resurrection, in putting on the " new man." As Bacon says, " It was not possible to preach the Gospel on such soil and not employ this phraseology and these ideas. If it had been possible, it would have been a foolish neglect of germs of truth which God had in His own

[1] *Story of St. Paul*, Dr. Bacon, p. 307. See also *Expos.* viith Ser. No. 7, *The Dependence of Early Christianity upon Non-Jewish Religions*, Prof. Carl Clemen ; and Prof. K. Lake, *Earlier Epistles of St. Paul.*

[2] Cf. Gwatkin, *Knowledge of God*, vol. ii. pp. 146, 147; Bigg, *The Church's Task under the Empire.*

way sown in millions of hearts that were groping after Him in heathen darkness, longing for a deliverance from the dominion of sin and death." But the mysteries did not influence the *doctrine* of St. Paul.

(iii) The Real Source was his Personal Experience.

There is a vast difference between the teaching of the mysteries and the doctrines of the Christian Faith.[1] The latter resulted from personal experience under revelation from Christ. But, when he came to preach and teach and formulate his religious experiences, St. Paul would naturally adopt current modes of expression, he would dress them in such guise as his hearers and readers could recognize, he would show how the world's preparation for the Gospel had not been lost, and how every ancient working of the Logos in mankind was but making ready the soul for the Gospel-sowing. As he adopted Rabbinical language and mode of argument in preaching to the Jews, so we may well believe he took Gentile phraseology to express his meaning to the Gentiles. We are, as Professor Stewart says, waiting for more material from inscriptions. "In the meantime it cannot be called illegitimate, as it certainly is an enrichment of New Testament language, to surround such words as μυστήριον, τέλειος, ἐπόπτης, with associations derived from so important an element of contemporary Greek life as the mysteries."[2]

He was a "Practical" and so a True Mystic.

So the true Christian mystic will find in St. Paul one who experienced in his own religious life the marvellous joy that

[1] Gwatkin, *Knowledge of God*, vol. ii. p. 149.

[2] Cf. Art. "Mysteries," *H.D.B.*, Prof. H. Stewart. See also *The Religious Experience of St. Paul*, by Prof. Gardner, chapter iv. especially. He lays great stress on the parallelism, but not so great as formerly. He hesitates to assert that St. Paul plagiarized from the mysteries and he admits that he spoke of them "in terms of the greatest dislike and contempt" (p. 80).

a life hidden in Christ, and a soul illuminated by the shining light of His Presence, alone can know. As our own lives are drawn more closely to His, as we learn more and more deeply of the unsearchable riches of His love we shall more and more appreciate the wonderful combination of active devotion, deep meditation and undimmed happiness throughout his life of toil and suffering which is set forth in every writing of the Apostle to the Gentiles. In him we shall find an example of what a true mystic ought to be. He was no "unpractical dreamer," so engrossed with flights into the worlds beyond that he took no interest in the affairs of this.[1] Full of energy and missionary zeal, his advice and exhortation were always practical and to the point. It was indeed his spiritual insight, and experience, that enabled him to reach so deeply down under the superficialities of life, and to disclose the realities which alone can afford us sure guidance and certain foothold. To his mysticism he owed in no small degree his power as a missionary, and as a mystic he speaks to Christians of every century and race through his writings, ever holding forth the lamp of Life to give light and leading to those souls which are advancing from glory to glory, as the Spirit, which is Sovereign, transforms them into the image of the glory of the Lord.

[1] "As a matter of fact," says Dr. Inge, "all the great mystics have been energetic and influential and their business capacity is specially noted in a curiously large number of cases. For instance, Plotinus was often in request as a guardian and trustee; St. Bernard showed great gifts as an organizer; St. Terese, as a founder of convents and administrator, gave evidence of extraordinary practical ability; even St. Juan of the Cross displayed the same qualities; John Smith was an excellent bursar of his college; Fénelon ruled his diocese extremely well and Madame Guyon surprised those who had dealings with her by her aptitude for affairs. Henry More was offered posts of high responsibility but declined them. The mystic is not as a rule ambitious, but I do not think he often shows incapacity for practical life if he consents to mingle in it" (*Christian Mysticism*, p. xi. Preface).

The Necessity of a Check in the Mystical Life met by realizing (1) the Transcendence of Christ, (2) by a True Appreciation of His Earthly Life.

St. Paul's experience of the Indwelling Christ was not by any means exhaustive of his relationship to Christ. However vivid that experience, Christ was also the pattern of manhood, an external type to be imitated, "an objective and historical model whom every believer keeps before his eyes, 1 Cor. xi. 1, Phil. ii. 5."[1] But there was another aspect on which he lays the greatest stress. Christ was not only Immanent, He was Transcendent. While we hope to deal in more detail with this latter aspect in the next chapter, it seems well to point out here how great a safeguard his conviction of the transcendence of Christ must have been against those many dangers that beset the mystic in his advance in the Christian life. It has indeed been true of many mystics that they have been led astray, not by centring all their religious life in the Indwelling Christ, but by excluding every other aspect of Him, as insignificant and uninteresting. We are reminded in this connexion of the late Dr. Dale, and the doctrine of the "Living Christ" associated with his name and received by many eminent English theologians. This view is typical of the modern sacrifice of the "Christ of History" to the "Christ of Experience."[2] It makes Him, as Somerville points out, "little more than an intellectual conception or a theological fact—a category of thought without power to touch the heart; or, if conceived by us as a Person, He would be to our souls what the spiritual Christ is to a certain class of mystics—the object of an intercourse in which impressions are referred to Him that really come from their own hearts, and that have no connexion with the historical manifestation of the Son of

[1] Sabatier, *The Apostle Paul*, Eng. trans., p. 84.
[2] See infra, ch. x.

Man," or, we may add, with the exalted and transcendent Lord. St. Paul's Christ was a "blending of history and faith." Indeed in the words of Gloag,[1] "Paul is far removed from an enthusiastic subjectionism which consoles itself with personal experience, but loses out of sight the historical foundations of the faith."

It was in communion with the Spiritual Christ, the source of Life, Risen and Exalted, that St. Paul found his Christian life possible. It was not merely a fellowship with the Jesus of History Whose sayings and example exercised an illuminating influence over his mind. "A school might have been formed, a hero worship might have been instituted had that been all, but a Religion could only arise, because the Ancient Church was conscious that God had revealed Himself in the Resurrection and Exaltation of Jesus."[2] It is true that St. Paul valued the earthly life of Christ and worshipped the Christ of History. It is also true that he did not undervalue organization and a life of regular devotional worship and constant discipline of body and soul. It is further true that St. Paul was a mystic.[3] But all these facts are parallel, and not contradictory. Indeed no Church or individual can ever long remain either purely mystical or entirely disciplinarian, "for even Rome has never ventured to stamp out entirely the mystic element; and not even a sect is purely mystic, for the Quakers themselves were not long in discovering that scandals and disorders might come from an unregulated following of the inner light."[4]

[1] Transl. Bruce, *St. Paul's Conception of Christianity*, p. 258.

[2] *Die Nachfolge Christi*, J. Weiss, p. 83, transl. Somerville, *St. Paul's Conception of Christ*, p. 251.

[3] "There can be no personal religion in any age without a touch of mysticism" (Gwatkin, *Knowledge of God*, vol. ii. p. 200 *n.* and p. 327).

[4] *The Knowledge of God*, vol. ii., Prof. Gwatkin, p. 58.

The Historical Manifestation of Jesus Christ and the Christ of Mysticism.

So for St. Paul there was no antagonism, nor had Jesus of Nazareth sunk out of sight. It is the same Lord Whose patient feet trod this earth, Who lives exalted and glorified. It is the same Lord Who has taken real human flesh and blood upon Him, and Who lives by His Holy Spirit enshrined in the hearts of believers.

So Jesus the Divine calls out the Divine in us. In the innermost depths of our personality dwells a spark of the divine light. Only when that shines, and lights our whole being, is knowledge of God possible. "What we are, that we behold; what we behold, that we are."[1] How near to God must be One Who can kindle this faint flame of God's light till its beams become the sunshine of our lives. How near to us must be One with Whom it is possible to enter into so close a mystical union that we dwell in Him and He dwells in us. By the working of His Holy Spirit Christ is formed in our hearts. For every faithful soul the means of grace bring strength and refreshment by communion with the Divine. Thus for the individual as for the race the Person of Christ has a saving significance. This must imply the intimacy of His relation with God as well as His Personal pre-eminence over mankind. "If you have found in Christ the supreme and ultimate authority over your moral and spiritual life, you have found God in Him."[2]

[1] Ruysbroek, quoted by Dr. Inge, *Christian Mysticism*, p. 7.
[2] *Christian Doctrine*, Dr. Dale, pp. 120, 121.

CHAPTER VIII

Christ as Transcendent

The Idea of Transcendence in Oriental Philosophy and in Jewish Theology.

WE have seen in the last chapter the absolute possession which Jesus Christ takes of the soul of the believer. It is proposed herein to point out one or two lines of thought whereby we may gather something of the transcendence which St. Paul assigned to Christ both in the spiritual and physical worlds. The complementary ideas of the Immanence and Transcendence of Christ are beautifully and tersely expressed in the Pauline phrases "in Christ" and its converse "Christ in me."[1]

As the relationship between Christianity and its rival religions becomes clearer, we can see how the former has taken into itself every element of truth in the latter, purifying it of all unworthy accretions. It was so in the case of the doctrine of Divine Immanence considered in the last chapter. A favourite idea in Greek Philosophy, and the basis of all the Stoic doctrines (themselves an attempt to combine Hellenic and Oriental thought), was the unity of the world as Nature or God. There is one Divine Being, ruling and sustaining all, the All-Father, everywhere present. It was grasped in crude and imperfect form in the popular religion of the mysteries, and St. Paul, as we have seen, recognized to the full the truth the Stoics taught. So whilst

[1] Cf. "Manemus in illo cum sumus membra ejus; manet autem ipse in nobis cum sumus templum ejus" (Aug. *in Joh.*, xxvii. 6).

it is not specifically Christian in the narrower sense of that word, for it depends upon the Light that lighteth every man that cometh into the world, yet the true communion of man with God is a great and precious truth of which the deepest meaning is found only in the Indwelling Christ.

In Oriental Philosophy, however, the dominant idea was rather the transcendence of the Deity. Matter was inherently evil, or, at least, passive to good. Consequently, God dwells far above all His creatures on earth, and could only come into contact with them by acting through a series of emanations. Herein again is concealed a truth which the revelation of Christ placed in its true position. It is, however, in the writings of the Hebrew prophets that this doctrine is most definitely and accurately foreshadowed. In the dawn of history, God had drawn very near to man, and man to God. He walked with man in the Garden ; He entered into covenant relation as man with man. "He spake unto Moses face to face, as a man speaketh unto his friend." [1] But as time drew on, the directness of communication seemed to pass away. There was no frequent vision.[2] The idea of God gradually lost any anthropomorphic associations. Whether or not, in its simplest form and most primitive stage, the popular view of Him was that as kith and kin, as one of the tribe, and God was only its champion against foes, and participator in its meals,[3] the gulf between the worshipper and the Deity was now immeasurably widened. His attributes acquired a moral meaning. The power of sin was deeply felt and sin-offering came to be made. So the development proceeded to the sublime conceptions of Isaiah. "The Holy One of Israel," [4] far removed in His sanctity and holiness from sinful humanity, in Whose pure

[1] Exod. xxxiii. 11. [2] 1 Sam. iii. 1.
[3] See Whitworth, *Hulsean Lectures*, 1903, p. 5.
[4] קְדוֹשׁ יִשְׂרָאֵל.

presence the lips of even the good man must be cleansed with refining fire, enters the Heaven of Heavens in awful majesty. His voice is the thunder, and His glance the lightning flash. He is the Lord of Hosts,[1] the Lord of the armies of men and angels, the Lord of the sun, moon and stars. Though side by side with this development was brought back, too, spiritualized and deepened, the truth of God's nearness to His people, for He may be personally known to them; and in the coming days the New Covenant should be established when the Lord Himself should personally teach His people and inscribe the knowledge of Himself on every heart,[2] yet the awful Holiness of Jehovah, His universal Rule, His omnipotence and omniscience were truths even more strongly emphasised by the keenest-sighted, and most spiritually minded, of the Old Testament prophets as they were more deeply impressed on his soul. There is no better introduction to the understanding of St. Paul's conception of Jesus as transcendent than the study of the development of these Jewish conceptions, undoubtedly familiar to him, concerning the sovereignty and transcendence of Jehovah. That St. Paul had felt the majesty and beauty of the Old Testament revelation is beyond doubt. That he was acquainted with the popularizations of Oriental philosophy we do not hesitate to admit. But it was no mere "amalgamation" of the two, no mere eclectic synthesis of Hellenism and Judaism which he effected. It was rather "the conquest of both for Jesus" that makes his doctrine a spiritual power, and that "assigns Paul his high place in the world's history."

ST. PAUL'S VIEW OF THE TRANSCENDENCE OF CHRIST INCLUDED IN HIS CONCEPTIONS OF CHRIST (*a*) AS LORD, AND (*β*) AS HEAD.

In dealing with what he teaches it is proposed to treat of

[1] יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת. [2] Jer. xxxi. 33, 34, etc.

it mainly in two sections: *α*. Jesus as Lord; *β*. Jesus as Head.

α. *Jesus as Lord.* The title *κύριος* in the Epistles usually refers to Christ.[1] In the Old Testament there are three classes of words which our English version translates by "Lord": (i) There is the Tetragrammaton יהוה, LORD, the sacred Proper Name of the God of the Jews. When St. Paul quotes Old Testament passages where the LORD is speaking, he writes *Κύριος*. To Jews, *Κύριος* must have represented all those peculiar and sacred relationships which they concealed behind the letters יהוה. So sacred was יהוה that (by the "hedge to the Law" of Lev. xxiv. 16) the penalty for using it was made death; and so אֲדֹנָי (and in the case of אֱלֹהִים, יְהוָה אֲדֹנָי) supplied the vowel points for יהוה after the vowel points were invented. It was thus pronounced אֲדֹנָי, or אֱלֹהִים as the case might be. (ii) There is the word אֲדֹנָי Lord, when used as a name for the Divine Being. אֲדֹנָי is probably either a plural "of majesty" or the "intensive" plural, and not a relic of polytheism. Thus it may express the idea of greatness of person or of "indefinite expansion" of time or space (as in שָׁמַיִם). *Κύριος* may, however, be used for אָדוֹן in the singular if referring to the Divine Person, or for מָרֵא in the same instance.[2] (iii) There was a class of words meaning "master" some ten in number, translated "lord" in the Old Testament. Of these the chief is אָדוֹן. In the New Testament whenever *Κύριος* refers to God or Christ it is translated "Lord." The Old Testament lettering "LORD" for a reference to Jehovah is dropped, and thus the Old Testament distinction between the proper and the ordinary Name for God is taken away. This distinction is also

[1] There are exceptions, of course, in such passages as Eph. vi. 5, 9 (once); Col. iv. 1. In such cases as 1 Cor. vii. 25; 2 Cor. viii. 21; 1 Thess. iv. 6; 2 Thess. iii. 1–5, 16; 1 Cor. iii. 20, the interpretation is doubtful.

[2] Only Dan. ii. 47; v. 23.

lost in the LXX where *κύριος* is used for the Divine Being whether אֲדֹנָי or יְהוָה.

St. Matthew xxii. 44 and Psalm cx. 1. St. Paul's Use of the Title.

The result is seen in the confusion that results from the exegesis of such a text as "The Lord (Jehovah) said to my Lord (Messiah)" (*Εἶπεν Κύριος τῷ Κυρίῳ μου κ.τ.λ.*),[1] in the original נְאֻם יְהוָה לַאדֹנָי, where a correct understanding of the relationship between the LXX and Hebrew is necessary. Amongst the Jews at the time of Our Lord *Κύριος* was applied to the Messiah (Mark xii. 35, 36, 37; and xi. 3; Psalms of Solomon xvii. 36 (*βασιλεὺς αὐτῶν Χριστὸς κύριος*). This did not, however, necessarily imply that Messiah was God, for "they expressly distinguished between the Messiah and the Memra or 'Word' of Jehovah."[2] As a title it was applied by the disciples to Jesus. "Ye call me Master (*ὁ Διδάσκαλος*) and Lord (*ὁ Κύριος*)."[3] After His death and resurrection the Apostles made it the expression of their central belief. "The word 'Lord,'" writes Wernle, "is introduced as the equivalent for Messiah into the official formula used at Baptism: Jesus the Lord, no longer Jesus the Christ."[4] The confession "Jesus is the Lord," was probably the germ from which the later Baptismal Creeds developed. It certainly appears in St. Paul's Epistles as a confession which Christians were bound to make. "No man speaking by the spirit of God saith *Ἀνάθεμα Ἰησοῦς*, and no man can say *Κύριος Ἰησοῦς* but by the Holy Spirit."[5] "Wherefore God also hath highly exalted Him—that every tongue should confess

[1] St. Matt. xxii. 44, quoting Ps. cx. 1.

[2] Sanday and Headlam on Rom. i. 4, referring to Weber, *Altsyn. Theol.*, p. 341.

[3] St. John xiii. 13.

[4] *Beginnings of Christianity*, P. Wernle, vol. i. p. 247.

[5] 1 Cor. xii. 3.

that Jesus Christ is Lord (ὅτι Κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς) to the glory of God the Father." [1] If thou shalt confess with thy mouth ὅτι Κύριος Ἰησοῦς, thou shalt be saved (Rom. x. 9). In this confession is included those developments to which the exigencies of later times gave rise. At the very least the word Κύριος for St. Paul must have meant the Messiah. It really meant very much more. As we trace his use of the word as applied to Jesus Christ certain relationships which it expresses become more and more prominent.[2]

I. Christ as Exalted.

(1) It is the title given to Christ as Exalted. It is indeed a Divine acknowledgment of the value of His earthly life, "For to this end Christ both died and lived (again) that He might be Lord of both the dead and the living." [3] Christ Jesus "took upon Him the μορφὴν δούλου . . . and became obedient unto death, even the death of the Cross; wherefore also God highly exalted Him and gave unto Him the Name which is above every name . . . that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord." [4] So the Lordship of Christ as exalted is intimately connected with the Redemption He wrought upon earth. It is noteworthy that the title "the Lord Jesus" occurs so frequently. The Name which belonged to Him in its fullest sense after His self-emptying and perfect obedience on the

[1] Phil. ii. 11.

[2] von Adolf Deissmann (*Light from the Ancient East*, p. 353–364 ff.) has suggested the emphasis laid by St. Paul on ὁ Κύριος is a tacit protest against the common application of the term to the Caesars of this time. Resch has traced the development of meaning from "master" or "rabbi" to that of the Pauline epistles which he regards as influenced by the use of the word for Roman Emperors, and the divine honours paid to them (*Dict. of C. and G.*, Art. "Divinity of Christ," Rev. A. S. Martin).

[3] Rom. xiv. 9.

[4] Phil. ii. 7–11. See also *Messianic Interpretation*, Prof. Knowling, pp. 5, 93.

Cross was transcendent compared with every other name, and was united with that name which especially referred to the earthly life of Christ. In this name, "Jesus" confessed as "Lord" (ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι) every knee should bow of things in heaven and things on earth and things under the earth.[1] Universal reverence and prayer, the worship of all nations, are ascribed to Him, Who is Lord. It is "the name of Jesus"[2] that forms the ground in which (ἐν) prayer grows and bears its precious fruit, acceptable to God, and which (to extend the metaphor) forms the atmosphere in which (ἐν) prayer lives.

St. Paul's Eschatology. 1 Cor. xv. 24–28.

It is in this connexion that we are brought to consider St. Paul's eschatology. Christ now sits as Exalted Lord at the right hand of His Father, accomplishing a work for Him. But the end will come "when He shall deliver up the Kingdom to God, even the Father; when He shall have abolished all rule and all authority and power. For He must reign till He hath put all enemies under His feet." After the destruction of the last enemy, i.e. death, there will come the subjection of the Son also "to Him that did subject all things unto Him, that God may be all in all."[3]

[1] Cf. Dr. Plummer's notes on the occurrence of the phrase in St. Matthew. See *Commentary*, pp. 325, 330, 434. Referring to Baptism in the last passage Dr. Plummer writes: "Whereas in Acts we have 'baptized into the name of the Lord Jesus' or 'baptized in the Name of Jesus Christ,' St. Paul says simply 'baptized into Christ,' omitting all mention of the Name." But yet as the passages quoted show, the Name was nevertheless indicative of character and representation, it was "a synonym for the Divine Nature, for God Himself." We venture to hold that St. Paul taught and practised prayer to Christ despite Prof. Gardner's assertion that "he regards worship and prayer as due to God alone. Prayer to Christ is nowhere advocated by St. Paul" (*Rel. Exp. of St. Paul*, p. 204.

[2] Phil. ii. 9 (ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ). Quite possibly "the Name" is Κύριος. In any case it refers to His dignity and nature as Κύριος. Cf. Rom. xiv. 11.

[3] 1 Cor xv. 24–28.

A twofold question is then presented to us. Is the Lordship of Christ Eternal? and how can such eschatology be reconciled with the doctrine of the Trinity? Many explanations have been given; St. Chrysostom regards the passage as merely referring to the "full agreement with the Father," St. Augustine as "the Son guiding the elect to the contemplation of the Father," Beza as "the presentation of the elect to the Father," Theodoret as "the full manifestation of the Father to the World," St. Ambrose holds that the Son here is the same as the Church—the body of Christ; many early commentators apply it to the Human nature of Our Lord only. The Son, "ὁ υἱός," must, however, include the whole of His Being. It is used absolutely. Luther, Melanchthon, Bengel, Olshausen and others apply it to the cessation of the mediatorial office between God and man—the reign of Grace administered now by the Son will be succeeded by a state of glory. Against this view Godet urges the objection that a Kingdom is to be delivered up, not a mediatorial office. Meyer, Hoffmann, Heinrici, and others apply the term to the sovereignty exercised by Christ over the hostile powers. "He ceases to have in the view of the world that mediate position between the world and God, in consequence of which the world saw in Him a ruler different from God, possessing a sovereignty belonging to Him as His own. This rule within the world ceases because it has reached its end." Against this view it is urged that the submission is voluntary. Once more, there is the view of Schmidt, who held that "Either the characteristic of absolute existence is not essential to the notion of God, which no one will allow, or it must be confessed that the Apostolic conception here stated is incompatible with the Divine Nature of Christ."[1] Consequently he concludes that the idea of the subjection of the Son here taught is contradictory not only to the dogma of the Trinity, but also to the expres-

[1] *Die Paulinische Christologie*, quoted by Godet on 1 Cor. *ad loc.*

sions of St. Paul which imply Christ's divinity and pre-existence. But this is attributing to St. Paul a contradiction which it seems impossible to attribute to his logical mind. Godet points out that the idea of subordination as well as of His Divine Pre-existence forms part of St. Paul's Christological conceptions.

THE TRUE INTERPRETATION OF THE PASSAGE.

The view we are led to adopt here is the following:—The word "Son" implies (i) possibility of subjection and (ii) equality of nature. After the voluntary submission then, Christ is an elder brother with brethren. We are joint heirs with Him. He still of course remains "What we can never be—*ὁμοούσιος τῷ πατρί.*" He is not absorbed in the Deity, nor does He lose His personality—that is still distinct. Neither does He descend; but we, His subjects and followers, rise to Him in the fullness of time, when the Messianic sovereignty shall be yielded up, when, that is, we shall have reached the perfect stature of Christ. It is only to perfect humanity that God can directly reveal Himself, that He can be "*πάντα ἐν πᾶσίν,*" when human wills of His creation fully and freely yield to Him.[1] Thus too the Salvation shall be universal, of the universe as well as humanity, of devils as well as angels. For St. Paul possibly regarded the universe as governed by semi-personal, "actually existent and intelligent forces,"[2]—"Elemental Beings" (*τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου*"). There are, he says, half scornfully using terms familiar to Jewish speculation, "thrones and dominions and principalities and authorities" (Col. i. 16). But in comparison with Christ they are "no

[1] So Lotze writes, "The goal of history is the formation of a society of intelligent and free beings, brought by Christ into perfect communion with God."

[2] Gal. iv. 3; Eph. i. 21. Dr. A. Robinson *ad loc.*; also *Earlier Epistles of St. Paul*, Dr. K. Lake. The latter deals with the parallel between the angels of Jewish theology and the beneficent daemons of the mysteries, see pp. 192 ff., 213.

gods," for over all conceivable rivals, real or imaginary, good or evil, in this world or the next, Christ is made supreme, the Absolute Lord. All things are "unto Him"—the Head of redeemed humanity, the firstborn of all Creation. Such is the Lordship of Christ. It implicitly condemns Pantheism, for Pantheism requires the annihilation of the individual existence. It moreover excludes the Deistic view that man is good without God. It assures us that one day the relationships of "Κύριος" and "δοῦλος" will have passed away, and we shall live at last the perfect life.

Christ will still be its source and pledge. He will no longer rule, for the Kingdom will have been presented to the Father, and we shall see God as He is. As our Elder Brother, perfect in His humanity too, He will be subordinate to the Father. The relationships of time will fade from the timeless realms of immortality; though, whilst memory still brings back the past and grateful love fills the soul,[1] the songs of praise to the Redeemer cannot cease. The old relationship will be restored. Man will walk with God in His Paradise, he will not need to hide in the cleft of the Rock when the Glory passes by. But God will be more fully known through humanity's experiences of sin and suffering and struggle, and through the earnest expectation of the creature being met by a deeper Revelation of Himself. He will be a God Whose deathless love has been revealed in the Trinity, three Persons yet one God, co-equal and co-eternal;[2] Whose

[1] Love abides (1 Cor. xiii. 13).

[2] Cf. *Lux Mundi*, p. 72. "So far from the doctrine of the Trinity being, in Mr. Gladstone's unfortunate phrase, 'the scaffolding of a purer theism,' non-Christian monotheism was the 'scaffolding' through which already the outlines of the future building might be seen. For the modern world, the Christian doctrine of God remains as the only safeguard in reason for a permanent theistic belief." The phrase referred to occurs in Mr. Gladstone's *Proem to Genesis*. "It may be that we shall find Christianity a sort of scaffolding and that the final building is pure theism, when . . . God shall be all in all."

unfathomable love has brought a universe back to Himself. This God shall be all in all.

Of that perfect life we can speak but hesitatingly, for so deep a mystery belongs to a region which we can yet see through a glass but very darkly. Yet the dim, uncertain outlines, as they shape themselves through the gloom, assure us of the realities that shall one day be revealed.

Other Functions of the Lordship of Christ.

(2) The Lordship of Christ secures for His people protection from evil. His is the victory over sin and death, and in the strength of His invisible might we are more than conquerors. "For I am persuaded that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor things present, nor things to come, nor powers, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus Our Lord." [1]

(3) As He is Our Lord, we are His "δοῦλοι," "bond-servants," subject to the law of Christ, yet free with the liberty wherewith He has made us free. He has redeemed us and henceforth He is our new Master.[2]

(4) As Lord, He sanctifies and strengthens His servants. "And the Lord make you to increase and abound in love one toward another." "But the Lord is faithful, who shall stablish you and guard you from the evil one." [3]

(5) With "The Lord" St. Paul enters into mystic union. He is "ἐν κυρίῳ," "Whether we live, we live unto the Lord" ("τῷ κυρίῳ").[4] We please the Lord by walking worthily of Him.[5] "Let Him that glorieth glory in the Lord 'ἐν κυρίῳ.'" [6] "Are ye not my work in the Lord?" (ἐν κυρίῳ).[7] It is the "glory" of the Lord we reflect.[8]

(6) As Lord, He is Judge. The day of the Lord is at hand

[1] Rom. viii. 38. [2] Rom. i. 1; Col. iv. 12, etc.
[3] 1 Thess. iii. 12; 2 Thess. iii. 3. Cf. the work of the Holy Spirit. [4] Rom. xiv. 8. [5] Col. i. 10.
[6] 1 Cor. i. 31. [7] 1 Cor. ix. 1. [8] 2 Cor. iii. 18.

"when He shall come to be glorified in His saints"[1] and we shall be for ever with the Lord.[2] Here we are in close touch again with current Jewish conceptions. We have already dwelt, in the chapter on "Christ as Messiah," on the points of contact between Jewish eschatology and the Pauline conception of the last day. The subject of the speedy return of the Christ is brought forward especially in the first and second Epistles to the Thessalonians. As we have pointed out above, the day of the Lord conceived of by the prophets was a descent of God in battle to destroy the enemies of His people. Gradually there grew up the idea of a judgment by which the oppressors should be punished, and with it developed the idea of a resurrection for the saints who died in times of distress. For Nature too there should be "a new heaven and a new earth." With the growth of the idea of a personal Messiah, moreover, as in the Psalms of Solomon, the Sibylline oracles, Enoch and the Apocalypse of Baruch, the Messiah is conceived of as King *after* the judgment, an office handed to Him by God. In St. Paul's writings, the Parousia is the day of the Lord, the day of Christ. On that day, living and dead shall assemble before Him for judgment "each shall receive the things done in the body, whether good or bad."[3] Christ awards life eternal to those who have sown unto the Spirit, corruption to those who have sown to the flesh.[4] There is thus a difference in the two conceptions. The Jewish idea of Messiah in Heaven does not include the belief that whilst He is in Heaven, before He appears, there is any vital relationship with His people, "nor does He exercise any of those offices towards and on behalf of them the thought of which is so prominent in the Christian faith."[5] In fact Professor Stanton, in his dis-

[1] 1 Thess. i. 10; 2 Thess. i. 10. [2] 1 Thess. iv. 17.
[3] 2 Cor. v. 10. [4] Gal. vi. 7–10.
[5] *The Jewish and Christian Messiah*, by Prof. V. H. Stanton, p. 153.

cussion of the Enochic book of the Three Parables, says that if he is right as to the traces of Christian influences therein, "the Christ is nowhere on Jewish ground regarded as the future judge of quick and dead." Harnack, moreover, regards the hope of Christ's speedy coming as "the most important Article in the Christology."[1] The belief in the Second Advent became, he says, "the specific Christian belief." The truth would appear to be that there was no idea that Messiah would come twice. It was his *Second Advent* that was peculiar to Christianity, though even that idea was in a very faint way present in the conception of One of the seed of David snatched up to the clouds and kept there waiting till his manifestation in glory.[2] Be that as it may, it is an undoubted function of the Risen and Exalted Lord to judge the world.

The Earlier and Later Epistles hereon.

It would be interesting to turn aside to inquire whether the conception expressed in 1 and 2 Thess. developed in the later Epistles or disappeared from them. It must suffice to say here what becomes evident in a study of them all, that the same essential characteristics of the doctrine appear in every group of the Epistles; and that, however modified the view might have been, the variation nowhere amounts to inconsistency.[3] It would be further interesting in this connexion to inquire whether St. Paul believed in a doctrine of *universal* restoration. Was the redeeming effect of Christ's life and death to result in the bringing of all the sinful to a state of blessedness? Though a detailed discussion would be irrelevant in this essay, we are led, by a study of the material, to conclude that this is not so. But in any

[1] *History of Dogma*, Dr. A. Harnack, vol. i. p. 82. See infra, p. 212, for recent emphasis on the eschatological side of Christian doctrine.

[2] Art. "Messiah," *H. D. B.*, Prof. H. V. Stanton.

[3] So Dr. Salmond.

case the work of Christ was of cosmic significance. It does not end with man. It includes all created things. It was His intention and accomplishment " to bring all things back to their pristine condition of harmony, through Christ as the centre of unity and bond of reconciliation." [1]

Three prominent Features of the Judgeship of Christ.

So in this conception of Christ as Judge it is sufficient for our purpose to note three things: (i) The day of the Lord Jehovah becomes the day of the Lord Jesus. The function of judging in the Old Testament attributed to the Lord becomes, in the New, the office of the Redeemer. (ii) The Divine attributes of omniscience and omnipotence are implied for the Judge. The rewards and punishments, which He distributes, evidence His infinite power. His searching the innermost and deepest secrets of the heart of every man implies a knowledge which could only belong to God Himself. (iii) There is postulated the absolute transcendence of One who could so judge Humanity, One so far above men that, though their Head, He was capable of pronouncing sentences of eternal import on those whose nature He had taken into His own.

The Lordship of Christ and God the Father.

(7) We note the relation which Jesus as Lord has towards God the Father. We have dwelt on one aspect of this above, namely, the subjection of the Son to the Father. There is another, however, quite as prominent. It is the equality, the oneness in heart and mind and will of Jesus Christ and the Father. It is shown by considering the Epistles in the light of two facts:—

(i) What the Father does the Son does also. There is in St. Paul's writings a kind of " communicatio idiomatum " between the *Persons* of the Godhead. It is the " judgment of

[1] Art. " Eschatology," *H. D. B.*, Prof. G. G. Findlay.

God " that we know is true against evil doers,[1] is inevitable,[2] and righteous and kindly.[3] Before the judgment seat of God all must stand.[4] Yet it is before the judgment seat of Christ that we must all be made manifest.[5] The true key to the apparent inconsistency is possibly to be found in Rom. ii. 16. " In the day when God shall judge the secrets of men, according to My gospel, by Jesus Christ " (*διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*). Again God is the distributor of blessing, and it is He Who hath called us into the fellowship of His Son Jesus Christ Our Lord.[6] Yet it is Christ the Lord Who strengthens and stablishes our hearts unblamable in holiness.[7] Grace comes from God through Jesus Christ.[8] Moreover, the death of Christ is the working of God's purpose and the manifestation of His love as well as of that of the Saviour. " But God commendeth His own love towards us in that, whilst we were yet sinners, Christ died for us." [9] Christ is also our peace, " Who made both one . . . that He might reconcile them both in one body unto God." [10] Yet it is God Who reconciles. " But all things are of God Who reconciled us to Himself through Christ." [11] Yet more noticeable than all is the identification of Jesus with the Lord of the Old Testament in the many passages where " the Lord " speaks and acts. All these instances lead us to conclude that St. Paul's use of the word *Κύριος* for the Saviour implied far more than that He was the Jewish Messiah. He saw in Him One Whose work and essence could be identified with the work and essence of God Himself. Could such a One have been less than Divine ? And, if Divine, was there any escape for a Jewish monotheist from the conviction that He was God, co-equal with, and of the same essence as, the Father ? Wernle, indeed, says, " As both ' Lord ' and ' Saviour '

[1] Rom. ii. 2. [2] Rom. ii. 3. [3] Rom. ii. 5. [4] Rom. xiv. 10.
[5] 2 Cor. v. 10. [6] 1 Cor. i. 9 ; vii. 17 ; 1 Thess. ii. 12.
[7] 1 Thess. iii. 13. [8] Rom. xvi. 20. Cf. 1 Cor. i. 4.
[9] Rom. v. 8. [10] Eph. ii. 16, 17. [11] 2 Cor. v. 18.

were attributes universally applied to gods and kings, both these titles came to be means, contrary to his (St. Paul's) intention, of separating Jesus altogether from the Messianic picture, and bringing Him nearer to the dignity of the Godhead"; but is it not rather true to say, as we have shown, that the many lines of that portrait of the Messiah drawn by divers portions, and in divers manners by the prophets upon the canvas of the shifting future, had at last met, not to be destroyed, but to be harmonized and blended in that single figure whom St. Paul preached to the world as his Lord?

The title "Lord" certainly implied for the Apostle a nearer relationship to God the Father than would be gathered from the "Messianic Picture"; but it was not because "gods and kings" were universally so called that he came to this faith.[1] It was the living experience of his life that lifted him high above the national narrowness of his countrymen. He stood upon heights which made the transcendence of Jesus only more manifest and awful, and yet which filled him with our common hope and yearning that, some day, as we rise from one stage of glory to another,[2] we shall attain to the fullness of the stature of the Perfect man; of Him, Whose dwelling in our hearts is the seal of our attainment to the Heaven of Heavens, to the glories behind the veil, where Christ exalted sitteth on the right hand of God.

(ii) To us, moreover, He is God's vicegerent. As such we may address our petitions to Him.[3] "The authority of God is indistinguishable from that of Christ, for it is an authority of righteousness and love." It is the Father Who is the

[1] See "The Trial of our Faith" (*Christianity and Paganism*), Dr. Hodgkin.

[2] 2 Cor. iii. 18. Cf. Bengel who comments thus: "a gloria Domini ad gloriam in nobis."

[3] Cf. The hymns, petitions, and prayers offered to the Son by the Christian Church of all time, e.g., Collect for 3rd Sunday in Advent, 4th S. in Advent (in Sacramentary of Gregory), 1st Sunday in Lent, St. Stephen's Day in Church of England Prayer Book. Cf. Eph. i. 21; Phil. ii. 10.

source, through the Son Who is the instrument. "In turning in faith and prayer to Christ, he (St. Paul) was conscious he was drawing near to God in the surest way, and that in calling on God he was calling on Christ in Whom alone God is accessible to men." [1] Only as God manifested in human form, could He have inspired the highest religious worship, and only by being Divine could He have been a worthy object of it.

(β) Jesus Christ as Head.

β. Jesus Christ as Head. We considered in the last chapter the conception of Christ as Head, and therefore Immanent, and mentioned there that the predominant idea in Headship was transcendence. It is a term of wider application than "Lord." It contains the ideas of authority and union combined. First, then, Christ is not only the life of believers, He is their Controller collectively, and, as such, as the Head, the "Firstborn from the dead." [2] The Church is the Body of which He is the Head, that among all (or, in all things, ἐν πᾶσιν) He might have the pre-eminence. "For the husband is the head of the wife, as Christ also is the head of the Church." [3] So the Church is conceived of as the Body saved by the deep counsels and unsparing devotion of the Head, who requires absolute obedience. He it is Who provides for the safety of the members of the Body. That is the function of Christ as Head of the Body. Further, He is the Head of individual members of the Body. "The head of every man is Christ, and the head of the woman is the man, and the head of Christ is God." [4] "There exist," says Godet, referring to this passage, and especially to κεφαλὴ δὲ Χριστοῦ ὁ Θεός, "three relations which together form a kind of hierarchy." Lowest in the scale comes the purely human relation between man and woman, higher is the Divine-

[1] So Somerville, to whom I am indebted for many of the previous remarks, *St. Paul's Conception of Christ*, pp. 134–147.
[2] Col. i. 18. [3] Eph. v. 23. [4] 1 Cor. xi. 3.

human relation between Christ and man, and highest is the purely Divine relation between God and Christ. He sees in the conception two ideas :—

(*a*) Community of life.

(*β*) Inequality within this communion—one being active and directing, the other receptive and directed.

Many [1] think that the words apply only to Christ incarnate. But there could be no idea of community of life present in that case. The same division exists with regard to the interpretation of another passage, "All are yours; and ye are Christ's; and Christ is God's." [2] Some [3] maintain that the words, "and Christ is God's" refer to Christ as man only. It is better, however, to refer them (with most of the Fathers, and with Meyer, Klung and Godet) to Christ as a Divine Being. The words refer to Christ Glorified and Head of the Church. So that even within the Trinity would follow the subordination of the Son to the Father—a subordination to some extent implied in the words "Son," "Logos." "As to His one and invisible Person as Son of God and Son of Man, Jesus receives all from the Father and is consequently His." So in the text especially, for the moment, before us (1 Cor. xi. 3), the reference is probably to the Divine Person of Christ, and we must not shrink too much from the difficult idea of the subordination of the Son within a co-equal Trinity.

Lastly, Christ is Head in relation to "all principalities and powers." "And gave Him to be Head over all things to the Church, which is His body." [4] "And in Him ye are made full, Who is the Head of all principality and power." [5] "And not holding fast the Head from Whom all the body, being supplied and knit together through the joints and bands, increaseth with the increase of God." [6] These texts

[1] E.g. Edwards, Heinrici. [2] 1 Cor. iii. 23.
[3] E.g. Augustine, Calvin, Olshausen, de Wette.
[4] Eph. i. 22. [5] Col. ii. 10. [6] Col. ii. 19.

bring out clearly the transcendence of Christ as Head, the idea of authority over all things. The same principalities and powers which God, having put off from Himself, made a show of openly, and triumphed over, were subject to Christ as their Head. The idea is not purely speculative. Christ is the Supreme Universal Ruler. We may compare with this the sublimest conceptions which the Old Testament produces of the universality of Jehovah's rule. None are more sublime or far-reaching than this. To Christ is attributed, not only as the Second Adam the government of man, not only as Head of the Church authority over the Redeemed Humanity, but the Headship over all things, including the angels. However St. Paul regarded the angels (and they were undoubtedly held to have great religious influence and authority [1]), not even they could separate him from the love of Christ. He, the Head, transcends them all. We may well ask, how, then, could St. Paul have conceived of Christ living in His Exalted State, but as a Person in the Godhead Itself.

THE MEANING OF COL. II. 15–18. RULER OVER ANGELS.

Another passage (Col. ii. 15–18) remains for consideration, "ἀπεκδυσάμενος τὰς ἀρχὰς καὶ τὰς ἐξουσίας, ἐδειγμάτισεν ἐν παρρησίᾳ, θριαμβεύσας αὐτοὺς ἐν αὐτῷ. "Putting off from Himself principalities and powers, He made a show of them openly, triumphing over them in it" (the Cross). St. Paul regarded the law as ordained through angels, διαταγεὶς δι' ἀγγέλων.[2] This would appear to have been a common belief of the Jews.[3] He might consequently have meant by these words, that promulgation of theirs,

[1] The angels of Jewish theology almost exactly corresponded to the Spirits or daemons (πνεύματα or δαιμόνες) of Gentile religion. (*Earlier Epistles of St. Paul*, Prof. K. Lake, p. 192 ff.)

[2] Gal. iii. 19.

[3] Cf. also Heb. ii. 2; Acts vii. 53; Jos. *Antiq.* xv. 5, 3: "And as for ourselves, we have learned from God the most excellent of our doctrines, and the most holy part of our law by angels, or ambassadors" (Whiston's trans.).

" that writing, that investiture,"[1] so to speak, of God was first wiped out, soiled and rendered worthless and then nailed to the cross, abrogated, and cancelled there. There is no doubt that the errors of false teachers at Colosse had associated the worship of angels with Jewish observances, and there is no doubt that St. Paul had this in mind as he wrote. But may not his words have had a far wider application? Formerly, God had appeared to men under the vesture of created intelligences. They saw in the workings of God in nature and the world the interposition of angelic beings. On the Cross, God stripped Himself of that vesture in the death of Him Who was the Head of all principalities and powers. Now the revelation of Him Who was supreme in the angelic realms was complete, God was reconciling the world in Him, and both victory over sin and death and the fulfilment of Man's destiny to be sovereign over all things become at last a possible consummation. All powers, evil and good, were in subjection to Him.

And over Nature.

St. Paul's teaching hereon was teaching for his own time, but it has its importance to-day. For us indeed the problem has shifted further back, but it is not changed. The question, " Does Christ rule over nature? " finds here a clear answer. Where the ancients saw angels, we see law. There seems to be a great gulf fixed still between God and His world. There is the cruel struggle for existence, the survival only of the fittest, the tooth of nature red with her children's blood. How many has this state of paradox and contradiction, of saddening difficulty and perplexity, led into the dualistic way of thinking, which either works out an ascetic Ideal or results in the licence of the libertine! How many, again, have fallen into the danger of becoming slaves to an ideal of conduct, shutting out of thought and life all but

[1] So Dean Alford, *ad loc.*

natural law where nothing is moral, and all is merely strength and selfishness? The answer to these problems is found, to-day as then, in Christ. With Him as our Head, we are victorious in the battle of life. His rule is co-extensive with the universe as with humanity. For Him we must claim the world and all its interests. In Him alone we may hope to reach, slowly and painfully, it may be, a real understanding of the underlying unity despite the superficial contradictions of the workings of God in the world. Only by holding up and preaching this Christ to men can we hope to bring our many brethren who feel keenly the buffetings of the restless sea of doubt to the haven of the peace that passeth all understanding. In Him we see that love is not merely good nature, but the perfect revelation and fulfilment of the highest law—that love is sacrifice to the uttermost.[1]

The Ideas of Immanence and Transcendence combined.

But the consideration of Christ as Head leads us on to another, and still wider, conception in St. Paul's writings. To a certain extent the ideas of immanence and transcendence are both present in the word "Lord" as well as in the word "Head," though in each the dominant idea is that of "transcendence." St. Paul passes very readily from the conception of Christ as Head to the loftiest conception of all, a conception which contains in the highest development both these truths. In three passages particularly is this combination shown :—

(i) In the passage already mentioned above (Eph. v. 23–33), after speaking of "the husband as the head of the wife, as Christ also is of the Church,"[2] St. Paul passes from the metaphor of headship to that of identity. As the husband and wife become "one flesh," the ideal marriage state from the beginning, so also is Christ and the Church. "This mystery is a mighty one; but I speak (it) with reference to

[1] Prof. Gwatkin, *Knowledge of God*, vol. i. p. 85. [2] Eph. v. 23.

Christ and the Church."[1] Here there is absolute unity between the Head and the Body. Indwelling and transcendence are combined in that sacred identity which is the fruit of holy Love.[2]

(ii) Long before St. Paul wrote to the Ephesians he had already assigned to Christ a position of the highest dignity and closest relationship with believers. A remarkable passage in 1 Cor. reads, "For as the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of the body, being many, are one body; so also is Christ."[3] Of this passage there have been nearly as many interpretations as interpreters. Grotius, de Wette, Heinrici, regard "Christ" as meaning "the Church itself." Reichbert thinks that it refers to "the ideal Christ." Others regard it as referring to the Glorified Christ, including His Church. So Chrysostom and Meyer refer it to Christ as the Head filling His Church. Hofmann and Edwards regard it as teaching that Christ is the "personal ego" of the organism. Holsten, as he often does, regards Christ here as the same as the Spirit. Godet explains it as "the whole spiritual economy of which He is the principle." This last is nearer the most satisfactory interpretation which is given by Dr. J. A. Robinson.[4] "He is no part, but rather the whole, of which the various members are parts." He was not thinking so much there of Christ as the Head, as of Christ including the Head, and all the members. It is exactly parallel to the Johannine passage, "I am the Vine, ye are the branches."[5]

(iii) So we are brought into a position to understand the difficult phrase which crowns St. Paul's thought on the sub-

[1] This idea clearly springs not from heathen rites, but from the beautiful and touching imagery of the Old Testament especially adopted in the story of Amos and Gomer.

[2] Eph. v. 32. Cf. Gen. ii. 24; St. Matt. xix. 5; also see Dr. J. Armitage Robinson hereon, *Ephesians*, p. 42.

[3] 1 Cor. xii. 12. [4] *Ephesians, ad loc.* [5] St. John xv. 5.

ject, " And Him hath He given to be Head over all things to the Church, which is His body, the fullness of Him Who all in all is being fulfilled " (*τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν πληρουμένου*).[1] Dr. J. A. Robinson has dealt so clearly and admirably with the meaning of this last phrase, that we cannot do better than follow his guidance.[2]

First, then, it seems clear that in the sense in which the body is the fullness (*τὸ πλήρωμα*), or completion, of the Head, in the sense in which the Head is incomplete without the body, Christ needs the Church for His fullness, and without It He is, in that sense, incomplete. " Through the Church, which St. Paul refuses to think of as something separate from Him, He still lives and moves among men." The whole Head and Body is thus Christ. As the Church grows more complete so does Christ. He is " the Christ that is to be." So that in one sense Christ is not all that He shall be. " He is being fulfilled." He hath put all things under His feet and He hath given Him to be head over all things to the Church, which is His body, the fullness of Him Who all in all is being fulfilled. " All conceivable fullness, a completeness which sums up the Universe, is predicated of Christ, as the issue of the Divine purpose." So St. Paul can say elsewhere, " In Him were created all things, in the heavens and upon the earth, things visible and things invisible, whether thrones or dominions or principalities or powers, all things have been created through Him, and unto Him; and He is before all things, and in Him all things consist." [3]

Summary of the Present Chapter and its relation to St. Paul's Christology.

What do these conceptions of St. Paul concerning Christ teach us as to His Person? We have seen that the term " *Κύριος* " was applied by him to Our Lord. The sense in

[1] Eph. i. 23. Dr. Robinson hereon.
[2] *Ephesians*, p. 42 ff. [3] Col. i. 16.

which the disciples in the early days of their discipleship addressed Him as "*Κύριος*" (i.e. as a Jewish Rabbi) is inadequate. The word became filled with the deepest meaning. "Jesus is the Lord" was a confession implying belief in a Lord Risen and Exalted. For St. Paul, familiar with the LXX and the Old Testament in Hebrew, and most careful in his uses of current expressions in a Christian sense, the word "Lord" conveyed the idea of Godhead. Quotations relating to יְהוָה or אֲדֹנָי are applied to Christ. As Lord He is Sovereign over the Church, and over the Universe. "This Lordship is so wide and lofty as to be inconceivable in one less than God." He is moreover the Head, the controlling, saving Ruler of the body, the Church. He is the Head of all creation. All things move to their goal in Him. "To believe in Him, to accept Him as our Ideal, and find our life's end in doing His will is to be true to a relation that lies in Creation itself, and that expresses the eternal law of our being." [1] We have dwelt briefly, too, on the fact that Christ is addressed in prayer, and is the object of worship, a thing impossible for St. Paul with his abhorrence of creature worship, if Jesus Christ were not God Himself. Yet, in a sense, there is a "Christ that is to be," still incomplete, imperfect, a Christ consisting of the Head as well as the Body, "which is the *πλήρωμα* of Him who all in all is being fulfilled." Christ in the end performs the office of Judge at the Parousia, an office which demands for its fulfilment attributes belonging only to God Himself.[2] Then at the end "the Kingdom is delivered up to the Father, in obedience to Him, when the work of the redemption of the Universe is perfected, a surrender which does not imply inequality of nature, but "is essential to the Divine Unity."[3]

[1] *St. Paul's Conception of Christ*, Dr. Somerville, pp. 192, 193.

[2] It is true that in some final sense, God the Father is Judge and the Son intercedes before Him. Cf. St. Matt. x. 32.

[3] Art. "Paul the Apostle," *H. D. B.*, Prof. G. G. Findlay.

"There is nothing really surprising," concludes Prof. Findlay, "if, as seems most probable in both instances, Paul has actually in Rom. ix. 5[1] and Tit. ii. 13 given to Christ the predicate 'God.'"

[1] See *infra*, p. 180.

CHAPTER IX

Christ as Perfect God and Perfect Man

Was Christ, for St. Paul, Perfect God?

WE have seen in the foregoing pages that the external attributes (e.g. omniscience, omnipresence, omnipotence) and the internal attributes (e.g. truth and love)[1] essential to the Deity are predicated by St. Paul of Jesus Christ. No one can really grasp the view of Christ which St. Paul's convictions concerning Christ as Immanent, as Transcendent and as Eternal, postulate, without perceiving that, for him, Christ was indeed God. We are aware that this conclusion is by no means always attained. Sabatier writes, "St. Paul's Christology, on the contrary, was framed from a human standpoint. It has an anthropological origin, and retains something of this essentially human character even in its metaphysical form. This is doubtless the reason why the Christ of Paul never comes to be simply and absolutely God."[2]

Baur thought St. Paul's view of Christ's Person was much lower. He holds that "It cannot possibly be allowed that he regarded Him as God. He calls Him *a* man."[3] "So Dean Everett in "The Gospel of Paul" writes, "Christ was indeed to him never God. The Church in the deification of Christ has followed the momentum derived from St. Paul;

[1] To adopt Dr. Fairbairn's division, see p. 125 supra. Cf. πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα, "All the Divine powers and attibutesi," Col. i. 19.

[2] *The Apostle Paul*, Sabatier, p. 262. [3] *Paulinsm*, vol. ii. p. 239 ff.

but has been carried by it far beyond the point which he himself reached. Still Paul invested Him with superhuman and pre-existent glory by which He stood under God alone."

Three Questions suggest themselves for Answer.

It would seem that three points especially ought to be dealt with, if we would arrive at a satisfactory answer to the question, "Was Christ, for St. Paul, perfect God?" These are (i) What view of the Person of Christ is implied by the place He occupied in St. Paul's religious life, and by the Apostle's conception of the work Christ came to do for the world? (2) Does St. Paul in his writings ever call Christ God? (3) What evidence is there that the "momentum derived from St. Paul" was carried by the Church in its deification of Christ far beyond the point which he himself reached? In other words, "What is the relation between the Christ of St. Paul and the Christ of dogma?" The first of these has already been dealt with at sufficient length, and we now propose to discuss the question, "Did St. Paul actually call Christ God?"

Evidence of St. Paul's Sermons and Writings.
(*a*) The Title "Son of God."

The answer depends on our examination of St. Paul's writings,[1] a process to which we now again proceed with this question in view. Here we find certain phrases, which to the mind of the present writer clearly indicate that for St. Paul Christ was God; (1) There is his use of the title

[1] The texts in the New Testament suggested in this connexion by the Rev. A. S. Martin (*Dict. of C. and G.*, Art. "Divinity of Christ") are John i. 1, xx. 28, 1 John v. 20, Heb. i. 8 ff., Rom. ix. 5, Titus ii. 13, Acts xx. 28, 1 Tim. iii. 16, Phil. ii. 6, 2 Pet. i. 1, Col. ii. 9, The strongest in St. Paul's writings are regarded as Phil. ii. 6–8 and Col. ii. 9. Other texts not regarded by that writer as important, but sometimes quoted, are Col. ii. 2, Eph. v. 5, 2 Thess. i. 12.

" Son of God." We have already dealt with the use of this phrase from a Messianic point of view. We have seen that it meant at least that Jesus was the Messiah. But to the Apostle it meant much more. In Rom. i. 1–14 it stands in juxtaposition with, and contrast to, the fact that Christ satisfied all the conditions of Messiahship in His descent from David as a description of what He is in His higher nature, and as proved by the Resurrection according to the Spirit of Holiness (κατὰ πνεῦμα ἁγιωσύνης). If Dr. Sanday is right, though in the Old Testament the term " Son of God " did not imply Divinity, yet by this time it was established as " the standing formula to express what we mean by the Divinity of Christ." [1]

Dr. Sanday thus defines the term : " It is the picture of a mind lying open without flaw or impediment to the stream of Divine love pouring in upon it, and responding to that love at once with exquisite sensitiveness and with entire completeness. It is indeed the very perfection of what we mean by religion and the religious attitude of the soul to God." [2] It is an expression freely used by the apostles to " bring out their belief in the Divine side of the nature of Christ." [3]

For St. Paul, then, to use this phrase is to confess his belief in the divinity of Christ, and to identify the Son of God with the Eternal Word, the Transcendent and Exalted Christ, and the Indwelling Saviour, is in every respect to regard Him as God. But did the term imply for St. Paul all that the Fathers of the fourth century saw in it ? Was the Son of God necessarily identical in essence with God, and therefore actually God ?

There is no doubt that in the Gospels the title is used in

[1] Art. " Son of God," *H. D. B.*, p. 573, Prof. W. Sanday.

[2] *H. D. B.*, p. 576.

[3] *H. D. B.*, p. 577. See note on the origin of the Christian use of the title " Son of God."

the main of the Incarnate, and not of the Pre-existent, Christ. But in the Epistles there is more ambiguity. In two passages especially, as Dr. Sanday points out, Christ as pre-existent is called "Son," i.e. in the opening passage of the Epistle to the Hebrews, where it is as "Son" He made the worlds; and in Col. i. 13–15 "The Son of His love . . . Who is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of all creation." Moreover, Rom. viii. 32, "God spared not His own Son," and Rom. viii. 3, "God, sending His own Son" certainly imply that Christ was the Son of God before His Incarnation. Nor can we refrain from concluding that one, who, like St. Paul, saw so great a transcendence in the Sonship of Jesus over the sonship of His followers, and identified in his thought this same Son of God with the Person Who stood in the closest possible relationship to God as the Son of His love and to man as Universal Ruler and Saviour, would probably have seen in the words an absolute identity of essence and an essential equality with the Father.[1]

(β) Colossians i. 19, Colossians ii. 9, and Philippians ii. 7–11.

(β) The passages Col. i. 19 and ii. 9 strengthen the conclusion that for St. Paul Christ was actually God. In the former passage he says, "It was (God's) good pleasure that in Him all the plenitude should have its permanent abode" (*πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα κατοικῆσαι*"), i.e. in Christ there was no mere temporary indwelling of a portion of "the Divine powers and attributes,"[2] but their totality resided permanently in Him. This statement seems to the present

[1] The only contemporary attempt known to Dr. Sanday to distinguish radically between *υἱὸς Θεοῦ* and *Θεός* is in Clem. Hom. xvi. 15, 16 (cf. x. 10). "It is," he says, "characteristic of the teaching of that curiously isolated production."

[2] *Colossians*, Dr. Lightfoot, p. 157.

writer a declaration as strong, in all but name, as if its author had said "*Θεὸς ἦν ὁ χριστός.*" Is it conceivable that One Who was not *ὁμοούσιος τῷ πατρί* should be capable of exercising to the fullest degree all the totality of the attributes of the Divine nature? "All that is His own right," moreover, "is His Father's pleasure, and is ever referred to that pleasure by Himself."[1] So that the objection of Meyer and Eadie that the Divine essence dwelt in Christ necessarily, and not of the Father's good pleasure, falls to the ground.

The second passage runs thus. "In Christ all the plenitude of the Godhead has its permanent fixed abode bodily." ("*ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ κατοικεῖ πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς Θεότητος σωματικῶς*"). Of the word "*σωματικῶς*" many interpretations have been given. *Inter alia* it is understood as meaning "really," or "wholly," or (understanding "*πλήρωμα*" as used of the Church) "as this body." The best and most appropriate meaning is "bodily wise, corporeally,"[2] and thus the whole phrase refers to the Incarnate Christ. "The indwelling of the Pleroma refers to the Eternal Word and not to the Incarnate Christ, but '*σωματικῶς*' is added to show that the Word, in whom the Pleroma thus had its abode from all eternity, crowned His work by the Incarnation."

We have already dwelt at length on the meaning of the words in Phil. ii. 7–11, "Who being in the form of God" ("*ὃς ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ ὑπάρχων*"), and we have seen that, almost beyond doubt, St. Paul there views Christ as being in essence God, not merely as pre-existent with regard to His self-emptying, but eternally; and we should be quite ready to find that he really does in unmistakable terms call Christ God.

(γ) Romans ix. 5.

(γ) It is possible that he has done so in a fourth passage

[1] *New Testament in Greek*, Dean Alford, *ad loc.*

[2] So Dr. Lightfoot (p. 180) and Dr. Abbott (pp. 154, 253) on "Colossians."

which we will now proceed to consider, i.e. Rom. ix. 5. The verse reads thus in the R.V., "Whose are the Fathers, and of whom is Christ as concerning the flesh, Who is over all, God blessed for ever" (*ὧν οἱ πατέρες καὶ ἐξ ὧν ὁ Χριστὸς τὸ κατὰ σάρκα· ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων Θεὸς εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας*).[1] This text was the subject of an interesting controversy some years ago between Dr. Kennedy and Dr. Gifford, two theologians whose scholarship and ability made the incident doubly interesting. Dr. Kennedy preached a sermon in 1883,[2] and, when it was published, discussed the text thoroughly in the appendix. After a statement of preliminary facts he goes on to consider first the context of the words. St. Paul's object, he says, was to win the ear of the Jews. He sums up their most glorious privileges, "Whose is the adoption . . ." Is it likely he would say, "Of whom as concerning the flesh Christ *came*, Who is over all, God blessed for ever?"[3] That would imply that Messiah was

[1] Professor Gardner (*op. cit.* p. 202) is quite ready to admit that Θεός does apply to the Exalted Christ. He asserts that this word was much more loosely used in the time of Paul. Paul himself seems not to be very strict in 2 Cor. iv. 4, where the "god (*ὁ θεός*) of this age" (not world) is mentioned. In the latter passage indeed some have taken ὁ Θεός as referring to God and not to Satan (so Irenaeus, and, taking *τῶν ἀπίστων* before *τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου*, Origen and many early writers). This is an improbable interpretation. But we may easily see how *θεός* in this connexion was used as equivalent to *ἀρχών*. Its use may be quite general. "He whom this age has elevated to the position of their God." In any case Θεός is in each case qualified by the words which accompany it. "Who is over all, God blessed for ever," if we allow that it refers to Christ, can only mean that Christ is the Supreme and Eternal God. Principal Carpenter (*Jesus or Christ?* p. 241 *n.*) gives a summary of recent critical opinion on the text. He agrees with Lietzmann that its interpretation is a "matter of feeling." For an interesting and widely accepted suggested emendation (reading *ὧν* ὁ instead of ὁ *ὤν*) see *J.T.S.* vol. xi., 1909–1910, Art. Philo (p. 36) (Mr. J. H. A. Hart).

[2] A sermon before the University of Cambridge on Christmas Day.

[3] So A.V.

come, to which the Jews would not listen. Nor is the translation, "of whom as concerning the flesh is Christ Which is over all, God blessed for ever" happier, for, he says, it is the Father Who is "ἐπὶ πάντων."[1] It was really the ascription of a final doxology of confidence in the great monotheistic doctrine of the Jews. The Jews did not expect the coming Messiah to be the Lord Jehovah incarnate. Moreover, doxologies are elsewhere addressed to the Father, except one in 2 Tim. iv. 18 which is addressed to "ὁ Κύριος," and 2 Pet. iii. 18, where the glory both now and unto the day of eternity is ascribed to Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. The former, however, seemed to Dr. Kennedy to be ambiguous, though he admitted that the latter refers to Christ. So the words of Rom. ix. 5 should, in his opinion, be punctuated with a colon after "τὸ κατὰ σάρκα," and the next words should he translated as a doxology to the Father.

Dr. Gifford in his reply dealt with these points fully and adequately. First, then, *did* St. Paul refrain from predicating "Θεός" of Jesus Christ? Dr. Kennedy admitted that he predicated its equivalents. In 1 Cor. viii. 6 he recites a kind of creed ". . . and in One Lord Jesus Christ . . ." which for St. Paul must have meant that Jesus Christ was in some way the Lord Jehovah. Meyer, Abbott, and others have not established their contention that "Θεός" is far higher than "Κύριος." Moreover, if we consider the context, we find that the words are not addressed so much to Jewish unbelievers as to *all* the believers at Rome. He is detailing the privileges of the Jewish nation; there is no word of sudden change or revulsion of feeling from anguish to exultation, nor any reason why there should be a digression. From a grammatical point of view it should be noted (i) that "ὁ χριστός" is "the Messiah" rather than a proper

[1] Ought it not, however, to be remembered that there is an interchange of office and title between Father and Son?

name. (ii) That there ought to be an antithesis to "*τὸ κατὰ σάρκα.*" (iii) "*ὁ ὤν*" is not used in its "sacred" sense of "absolute being" ("I am"). So "*ὤν*" is either (*a*) the copula, i.e. "*ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων Θεὸς*" is subject, and "*εὐλογητός*" predicate. In this case Dr. Kennedy's construction is possible—or (*b*) "*ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων*" may be subject and "*Θεός*" predicate. It is not probable, though possible, that there is an ellipse of "*ἐστι.*" (iv) "*εὐλογητός*" in a doxology always *precedes* its subject. Dr. Gifford concisely states the matter thus:—

"The Apostle applies in all other passages '*εὐλογητός*' to God. Granted. Therefore in Rom. ix. 5 also to God. Granted also. Therefore he does not apply it here to Christ. *Non sequitur*—unless, of course, we start with the presupposition that he does not intend to call Christ God here as (so it is said) he does not elsewhere. But surely this *a priori* consideration falls before the weight of internal evidence of the passage itself."

So Dr. Gifford concludes that here, at all events, St. Paul does actually call Christ "God."

After a careful consideration of all the evidence, Doctors Sanday and Headlam come to the conclusion that there is no argument which they have felt to be quite conclusive. The grammar and argument of the passage, however, lead them to say, "In these circumstances, with some slight, but only slight, hesitation we adopt the first alternative and translate 'Of whom is the Christ as concerning the flesh, Who is over all, God blessed for ever, Amen.'"[1] There has, however, since appeared an ingenious theory advanced by Prof. Burkitt.[2] He points out that the question still remains whether any doxology at all occurs in the context. The "Amen" points to the words being not a description but an ascription. "The obvious difficulty in referring the

[1] *Commentary on Romans*, p. 238.
[2] *J. T. S.*, vol. v. p. 451.

words to our Lord is not that the Christology . . . is too 'high' for St. Paul, but that the words are used in a parenthetical way." After a discussion of the use of εὐλογητός by St. Paul, Professor Burkitt concludes that, as in Rom. i. 25 and 2 Cor. xi. 31, he adds here at the end of the enumeration of Israel's privileges, his solenm invocation of the God of Israel. He accordingly translates it "I lie not, . . . the Eternal (Blessed is His Name!) *I* call Him to witness." The occurrence of the word "εὐλογητός" is enough to show that the Holy Name has been explicitly or implicitly pronounced. "It is the mention of the Tetragrammaton that calls forth the benediction expressed in 'εὐλογητός,' for the Name of the Holy One (Blessed is He!) should not be uttered without a benediction."[1] This is exceedingly ingenious; but, until further proof is forthcoming that it rests on less tentative grounds, the conclusion reached by Dr. Gifford, or, at all events, the more cautious one of Drs. Sanday and Headlam, commends itself to the present writer.

(δ) Acts xx. 28.

(δ) There are other texts where the ascription of Θεός to our Lord is, to say the least, doubtful; e.g. St. Paul's speech to the Elders at Miletus contains the much-discussed passage, "Take heed unto yourselves, and to all the flock, in the which the Holy Ghost hath made you Bishops, to feed the Church of God, which He purchased with His own blood" (Acts xx. 28) (προσέχετε ἑαυτοῖς καὶ παντὶ τῷ ποιμνίῳ, ἐν ᾧ ὑμᾶς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον ἔθετο ἐπισκόπους, ποιμαίνειν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἣν περιεποιήσατο διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ ἰδίου). On this verse the MSS. are divided between "Θεοῦ" and "Κυρίου," but "Κυρίου" has, on the whole, the greatest

[1] So Professor Burkitt suggests that in St. Mark xiv. 61 ff. "Υἱὸς τοῦ Εὐλογητοῦ" indicates the use of the Tetragrammaton itself or of one of its recognized substitutes.

weight of MSS. authority.[1] On the other hand, transcriptional evidence would incline us to read "*Θεοῦ*." We are aware that even if we read "*Θεοῦ*," there are alternative interpretations, as e.g. "the Church of the Father (*Θεοῦ*) which He purchased through the blood that was His own" (i.e. of Jesus).[2] But we must not exclude the possibility, at least, that St. Paul, if correctly reported, has here actually called Christ "God."

(ε) Romans xvi. 27, Romans xi. 34–36.

(ε) Again in Rom. xvi. 27, "To the only wise God [to whom] be the glory through Jesus Christ for ever . . . Amen." (*μόνῳ σοφῷ Θεῷ, διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ* [*ᾧ*] *ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. ἀμήν*) Dr. Liddon believed that the doxology refers to Christ, but it may be that it is better to omit "*ᾧ*" and take it as referring to God the Father. In Rom. xi. 34–36, "For who hath known the mind of the Lord . . . for of Him, and through Him and unto Him are all things. To Him be the glory for ever. Amen" ("*τίς γὰρ ἔγνω νοῦν Κυρίου*; . . . *ὅτι ἐξ αὐτοῦ καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν τὰ πάντα. αὐτῷ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. ἀμήν*") the ascription is to "the Lord." Does St. Paul mean Christ? In the Old Testament question "Who hath known the mind of the Lord?", the "Lord" is Jehovah, but it would be quite in keeping with St. Paul's use of "*Κύριος*" if in this quotation the Lord were Christ. Some regard the passage, on the other hand, as an ascription to the Trinity, "*ἐξ αὐτοῦ, καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν.*" At least an ascription to Christ is possible.

[1] For Θεοῦ ℵB Vulg. Syr. For *κυρίου* ACDE Copt. Arm. For *κυρίου καὶ* Θεοῦ H.L.P.

[2] So Mr. T. E. Page on the passage, *Acts of the Apostles*, p. 217. Westcott and Hort suggest a primitive error—"ΥΙΟΥ" may have dropped out after "ΤΟΥΙΔΙΟΥ."

(ζ) Colossians ii. 2.[1]

Col. ii. 2 affords us further evidence of a cumulative character, especially the phrase "that they may know the mystery of God, even Christ" (εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν τοῦ μυστηρίου τοῦ Θεοῦ, Χριστοῦ). We fully admit the weight of various readings, but yet there is the possibility, however the readings for "Χριστοῦ" (B. Hil.) vary ("καὶ Πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὅ ἐστιν Χριστὸς"),[2] and however ambiguous the meaning, that Christ is here called God.

Summary of the Position thus Reached.

We hold, therefore, that it is impossible to assert unreservedly that St. Paul has not called Christ God, and on the other hand, we conclude that though we cannot absolutely affirm that St. Paul has called Christ God, our hesitation in doing so is of the slightest. He has attributed to Him such functions and station as carry with them of necessity that belief, he has applied to Him such terms as could only be given to One Who was identical in essence with the Father. If he does not in his epistles lay great stress upon the miraculous in the life of Christ, such as the Virgin Birth and His mighty works, yet he portrays Him as One perfectly obedient to the Will of God, and for St. Paul that was Divinity. Such an accumulation of evidence must bring with it the expectation of, or at all events the preparation for, finding "Θεός" used of Christ in his writings.

St. John clearly believing and teaching the Deity of Christ, as is so widely admitted, only predicates Θεός of Christ once (John i. 1), though the reference and reading there is undoubted. Even if St. Paul did not give to Jesus Christ the predicate "God" in his epistles, in the same unmistakable way, there remains no other conclusion to adopt as regards St. Paul's belief of the Person of Christ than that he saw in Him Perfect God.

[1] But see *supra*, p. 177 *n*.

[2] Cf. Col. i. 27.

Christ the Perfect Man.

So far we have dealt entirely with the Deity of Christ. But as we have shown above, no one who was not really man could have played the part in St. Paul's religious life that Christ did. It was the reality of Christ's earthly life, the reality of His sufferings,[1] the reality of His victory over sin, and of His saving power for the human race that transformed the Apostle's zeal, kindled his love and inspired such amazing power and patience in the winning and shepherding of souls. Always before St. Paul's eyes was this life to be seen, wherein was set forth in the flesh the perfect ideal relationship of man to man, of man to God. This was no shadowy phantasm, passing through the ranks of men, unreal amongst the terribly real things of life. It was no apparition fleeting like a shadow on the screen from one side of the picture of His generation to the other. In Him St. Paul saw God become Man for our redemption, the Eternal Word Incarnate, the sublimest example of self-sacrifice and humiliation. His Lord had left the state and majesty of His throne on high, He had beggared Himself and by His lowly, patient, stainless life, given up in death on the Cross and consummated by the Resurrection from the grave, there had been brought to mankind, nay, even to the universe, a hope new born, a freedom new granted, a joy and a peace which the world could neither give nor take away. That His life was really lived, we believe, is an implication underlying all St. Paul's convictions. We have tried to show that the earthly life of Jesus had some value for St. Paul. That he believed in the Virgin Birth we may not be able to affirm positively, though we remember how weak and dangerous is the argument from silence as a rule.

[1] That the reality of His temptations was also emphasized strongly in St. Paul's teaching is made very probable by the stress laid upon it in word and argument by the Pauline School, e.g., the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Epistles and Gospel of St. John.

We have, moreover, indications that he might have taught it, e.g. "Born of a woman," [1] "Born of the seed of David according to the flesh," [2] whilst Bishop Gore thinks that the conception of the Second Adam postulates it.[3] However that may be, docetic theories can find no place in St. Paul. A wilful delusion on the part of his sinless Lord was impossible. Nor was Christ merely a man endued with the Divine Spirit, at birth, or, perhaps, at baptism. The Spirit was His Spirit, and wrought in the believer the image of His Lord. Nor did He progress ("ἐκ προκοπῆς") towards Divinity. The sinlessness and spotlessness of His life from birth to death forbid the idea. His being One Person (always ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ ὑπάρχων," though not always "ἴσα Θεῷ") throughout, both in Pre-existence and during His Incarnation, make it impossible. His Person was Divine. In it were united the Divine nature, which was His from eternity, and the human nature, which was only potential before His Incarnation, but realized and perfect after it. Nor was his Christ the Christ of Apollinaris, as Harnack seems to assert. "In Apollinaris, speculation has returned to its first beginning, for this Christ is really the Christ of Paul, the heavenly Spirit-being Who assumed the flesh." Apollinaris taught that in the God-man, Jesus Christ, the Logos took the place of the Human Soul (ψυχή). He had a "σῶμα," and an irrational soul, and instead of the human "πνεῦμα" there was the Logos.[4] The conception was certainly a loftier one than that of Arius who substituted a half divine (though personal)

[1] Gal. iv. 4. [2] Rom. i. 3.

[3] He was the head of a new race, a new starting point for humanity. "Now considering how strongly St. Paul expresses the idea of the solidarity of man by natural descent and the consequent implication of the whole human race in Adam's fall, his belief in the sinless Second Adam seems to me to postulate the fact of His Virgin Birth, the fact, that is, that He was born in such a way that His birth was a new creative act of God." *Dissertations*, Dr. Gore, p. 10.

[4] Cf. The Platonic threefold division of man.

Word for the human soul; but it labours under difficulties as grave. Christ, so it was said, could not even feel infirmity or temptation.[1] "We confess that there is one nature of God the Word Which was incarnate" summed up his teaching. His Christ was thus not really man at all. Such a Christ, it is clear, could not have been a real Redeemer. "That which was not taken was not healed."[2] If we have estimated rightly, on the one hand, St. Paul's power of formulating theological thought and his wealth of religious experience; and, on the other, his conception of redemption in Christ Jesus, we cannot for a moment attribute to him a Christology so inconsistent. Christ must have had a perfectly human soul as well as a real human body.[3]

We have seen how the really human nature of Christ is demanded by the conception which St. Paul formed of Him as Messiah, as Second Adam, and as Redeemer. As the Saviour of the House of David, He was born of a human mother. As the Head of a New Humanity, of a Redeemed Race, He was the Perfect Man, the Second Adam, in Whom, as the Author of their salvation and the Strength and Stay of their lives, the new creation lived. He was the explanation of the past, the solution of the mysteries of life, the reconciliation of the apparent paradoxes of experience. Could the figure of the Man of Sorrows, crowned in His life by the Cross, in His death by the Resurrection, have been blotted out from the world-worn Apostle's vision as he filled up that which was lacking of the sufferings of Christ? "Ecce Homo!" we cry, as we see the veil lifting, and Christ,

[1] Cf. against this idea St. John xii. 27; St. Matt. xxvi. 38.

[2] "τὸ γὰρ ἀπρόσληπτον ἀθεράπευτον," Gregory of Nazianzus. Ep. chap. i.

[3] We must not forget that St. Paul and St. John were very considerably superior to their immediate successors in spiritual insight and attainment. Cf. St. Paul's epistles and the Epistle of Clement, or the Epistle to the Hebrews with that of Barnabas.

as St. Paul knew Him, outlined, though yet but faintly, to our view. "Ecce Deus" are the words that rise to our lips as we kneel in lowly worship before the transcendent Lord of Glory, exalted, seated on the right hand of the Father. Yet He is no "tertium quid" [1] with the human and divine commingled. He is One Lord Jesus Christ. That is why in Him we find the pledge of our hope, the earnest of what we shall be. As Christ is formed in us so more and more we shall become that for which we exist, until we attain to the stature of the fullness of Christ, and perfectly fulfil our destiny. In His divine essence, Christ remains still immeasurably above us. By His assumption of human nature we obtain the inspiration, the hope of an eternal progress, we find the ground of the optimism of the Christian faith.[2]

[1] Tertullian, Adv. Prax. 27.

[2] We should remember that, as the Editor of the *Interpreter* (vol. vi. p. 225) has pointed out, the word "Person" is differently used in Theology and in ordinary language. "One personality of Christ" does not mean a mixture of human and divine in a third hybrid nature which blends both. In the ordinary sense "person" means "a separate spiritual individual, a separate mind, will, and energy." In Christ one Personality, One Person, has two minds, two wills, two energies, human and divine. This "duality" has been the subject of much recent criticism. It had been emphasized by the Reformed theology which insisted upon the reality of both natures in Christ. So Prof. Kilpatrick (*Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels*, Art. "Incarnation"), writes that questions such as the relation of His divinity to His humanity "evidently proceed from the point of view of dualism, according to which one nature is contrasted with another; whereas St. Paul's views of God and of man, and of the God-man are all synthetic. Personal unity, not logical dualism, is the key to the thought of St. Paul. Between God and man, there is the unity of moral likeness; between the Father and the Son, the unity of being and fellowship, . . . between the pre-incarnate and the incarnate periods of Christ's experience and action, the unity of one continuous life . . ." He asserts that before reconstruction of theological definition is possible, this "dualism" must be abandoned. Principal Garvie, however, is with us when he states (*Encycl. of Rel. and Eth.*, Art. "Christianity") that "it cannot be claimed that a satisfactory re-statement which is likely to win general acceptance has been reached."

THE CHRIST OF ST. PAUL AND THE CHRIST OF DOGMA.

So, as both Dr. Lightfoot and Dr. Gifford assert, St. Paul's doctrine of the Person of Christ is not adequately represented by any conception short of the perfect deity and perfect humanity of Christ.[1] Had he lived through the times of controversy, when the doubts and speculation of the fourth century forced the Church to define her faith, St. Paul would indubitably have been among the staunchest supporters of those dogmas, which are now sometimes supposed to be in opposition to his teaching. Is there that opposition between the Christ of St. Paul and the Christ of dogma which some theologians perceive? Christ for St. Paul was indeed the Christ of experience, but is not the Christ of dogma also the Christ of experience? It is surely experience which makes the soul cling immovably to the conviction that Christ was both Perfect God and Perfect Man. To have a religion without dogma of some kind is impossible.[2] But we must be careful to take the right

[1] We do not admit that, as a recent writer has attempted to show (*Jesus or Christ?* p. 255, by Rev. James Collier), it is in consequence of the "genesis and development, the ascendancy and preponderance" of the Holy Communion (becoming later the Mass) that Christ has Himself "become God, and the Supreme God." Nor do we admit, though this is the order of treatment in this essay, that, as Dr. Martineau has advocated (*Seat of Authority in Religion*, p. 361), Jesus was construed successively by the personal attendants of Jesus as Messiah, by St. Paul as the Second Adam or the Ideal of Humanity, and by the school from which the Fourth Gospel came as a Divine Incarnation. In the first place this theory of development does violence to the facts, and in the second place the Synoptists know Jesus as the Ideal Man and the Son of God, and St. Paul and St. John know a Jesus Who is also Messiah (see *Dict. of C. and G.*, Art. "Divinity of Christ," Rev. A. S. Martin). Their emphasis is different, but not exclusive. The Person is the same.

[2] I would borrow Dr. Sanday's definition of the much misused word "orthodoxy." It ought to be used to express "a deep centrality and balance of thought, undisturbed by extraneous influences of any kind, and resting on a basis of genuine religion" (*Christologies, Ancient and Modern*, p. 22).

view of the dogmas of the Christian Church. Why were the definitions of the fourth and fifth centuries drawn up, and what office did they serve? When the Church began to embrace within its fold those who brought with them inheritances of Greek philosophy and Oriental training, it soon commenced to feel the effect in its spiritual life. Speculation became rife, the doctrine of the Person of Christ became emptied of its essential value, and, had the Church not made a bold stand at Nicaea, it must "either have sunk back into an effete paganism, or shaped itself on despotic ideals of the Muslim sort." [1] All that the Christian wished to preserve was the innermost, deepest-rooted, conviction of his soul that Christ was "as divine as the Father, and as human as ourselves." There was no idea of being logically consistent. There was no attempt to explicate the method of the Incarnation, but its reality was clearly asserted.[2] Moreover in the decision at Nicaea, all future orthodox decisions were involved. The same speculative interests which forced the Church to that decision compelled her to put forth definition after definition until she crowned all with that of Chalcedon, wherein the two truths are emphatically stated. There is no attempt to explain how Christ became incarnate or what the self-limitation therein implied involved. To do that the kenotic theories of to-day have sprung into existence. Whatever view therefore we take of the "Kenosis," we can at least join with those who formulated the Creeds of the General Councils of the fourth and fifth centuries, and give our unhesitating adherence to the unchangeable doctrines of the Perfect Godhead and Perfect Manhood of Jesus Christ which they set forth. That they advance beyond St. Paul in the expression and formulation of belief is evident. That St. Paul taught as

[1] *The Knowledge of God*, Prof. Gwatkin, vol. ii. p. 112.

[2] See *The Christ of History and the Christ of Experience*, Dr. Forrest, p. 193.

truly as they do the real, perfect, sinless, Manhood of his Lord, and, at the same time, His absolute equality and essential identity of essence with the Father is the firm conviction of the present writer.

Experience and Dogma.

The Church's interests have never been merely speculative or metaphysical. They were not so then.[1] She has always in the main stream of her thought held that experience is the basis and the test of the Christian life. The person of Christ is "a mystery that may be practically known by any one, theoretically comprehended by none."[2] "The Church's formulae," says Dr. Forrest, "were negative rather than positive." No one, we are convinced, can study the history of those times, and read the works of the Fathers, without becoming convinced of the justice of Prof. Sanday's remark about the definitions of our faith that "Every word in them represents a battle, or succession of battles, in which the combatants were, many of them, giants."[3] To these positions, hard won by our spiritual ancestors in Christ, we firmly hold. In our faith in God's leading, we dare not disparage their witness.[4] But it does not therefore follow that we cannot have passionate convictions, whole-hearted zeal, intense experiences. It does not shut us out from the

[1] The Trinitarian formula was drawn up by the Church "non ut illud diceretur, sed ne taceretur" (Tert., *De Trin.*, v. 9, 10). Prof. Sanday writes: "There may well have been a self-determination of the Godhead, such as issued in the Incarnation, as far back as thought can go. I add that as perhaps a tenable modern paraphrase of the primary element in the doctrine of the Trinity. This doctrine, in its essence as in its origin, turns upon the recognition of the Incarnation of the Son" (*Christologies, Ancient and Modern*, p. 168).

[2] *The Knowledge of God*, Prof. Gwatkin, vol. ii. p 76.

[3] Art. "Jesus Christ," *H. D. B.*, Prof. W. Sanday, p. 650.

[4] Cf. the recent Ritschlian School in its disparagement of the metaphysical,

wonderful working of the Holy Spirit as He fashions us into the likeness of Christ. It rather means that we supplement these by quiet hours of patient thought about the Redeemer, by welcoming all evidence, of whatever kind, that our faith may be strengthened and its contents become clearer to our minds, by recognizing the guiding hand of God as we see Him leading His people through storms of controversies, speculations and doubts, and by bringing vividly home to ourselves the glorious heritage of the Church of to-day from the Church of all time. It seems to be unworthy of the Christian conception of the working of God in the world to reject all or any of this, and only by making it our own, as well as by a resolute determination to leave that heritage not only untarnished but enriched by saintly life, will our religious experience have true balance. There have indeed been accumulated in the past needless accretions to, and harmful perversions of, the doctrines of primitive times, but we venture to think, that to any candid student of history, certain fundamental doctrines stand out, clear and unmistakable, as the continuous Faith of the Church. These fundamentals we believe to be contained in her Creeds.

Conclusion.

We conclude that St. Paul's faith was as true, if not quite as rigidly defined, as that of the great army of Christian saints who have placed unshaken trust in the Perfection of the Deity and the Manhood of our Lord united in One Person. His experiences were deeper, his powers of insight keener, than those of any of his contemporaries except perhaps St. John, and certainly than those of any of the leaders of Christian thought since. Even to-day, despite the accumulated wealth of Christian tradition and centuries of patient seeking after light, we still turn to him with the cry, " Master, show us the Christ," and for answer he has

placarded before us the Messiah as the Man of Sorrows, bearing on the Cross the sins of the world. He has pointed us to a Christ whose cosmic and soteriological functions concern the universe. He has proclaimed the gospel of the solution of the ultimate problems of life. He has made known to us the heavenly vision which he obeyed, a vision which, he has affirmed, must dawn on every Christian soul, and shine more and more unto the perfect day. As that vision becomes clearer to us, we shall find its light illuminating many of the darker places of our lives ; we shall realize the truth of Browning's words :

> " The acknowledgment of God in Christ,
> Accepted by the reason, solves for thee
> All questions on the earth, and out of it,
> And has so far advanced thee to be wise."

CHAPTER X

Recent Christological Thought

WE live in an age of specialization. In no department of the world's activities is this more manifest than in the sphere of theological thought. Dr. Schweitzer has indicated the type of progress of which he himself is a conspicuous example. " Progress always consists in taking one or other of two alternatives, in abandoning the attempt to combine them." [1] This is the progress of the specialist, and it is apt to be very one-sided. The truer progress is by the Hegelian method of thesis, antithesis and synthesis ; and, though in this way advance is not so great along any one particular line of specialization, it is so much the more truly balanced and therefore sounder in the main.

Behind much of this activity lies a great revolt from the Pharisaic attitude of the man who, having a formula, imagines that he has the right thing and is safe. It carries with it, for the moment, a discrediting of Pauline theology. " For eighteen centuries," writes Dr. Bacon, " Christianity has been interpreted by its theologians from the Pauline view ' sub specie æternitatis.' But the Matthæo-Petrine basis has never been eliminated. . . . The dominance of the Pauline-Greek interpretation is coming to an end." [2] A twofold task has been before theologians ; first, to find the " Historic Jesus " from the Gospel records ; secondly,

[1] *Quest of the Historical Jesus*, p. 237.
[2] *Jesus or Christ ?* p. 219.

to set forth the true relationship between this Jesus and the Christ of the Creeds.[1] With each ebb and flow of opinion, the same questions are asked again: "How shall we speak of Him? What is Christianity?"

An idea of the varied movements at work in thought and life may be gained from a consideration of some of their recent developments, all of them bearing on the elucidation or influencing the estimation of Pauline theology.

(i) The application of scientific methods of historical criticism and investigation into the literature of the New Testament and its background, has continued with unabated vigour.[2] It is with the latter especially that recent works on St. Paul have dealt. Professor Knowling, in his book, *Messianic Interpretation*,[3] has brought out very clearly the most recent information concerning the Jewish background to the Christian conception of the Messiah. He deals there [4] with the view of the most recent Jewish commentator that the usual Christian idea of Jewish conceptions is in reality the creation of the Christian theologians, "half caricature, half truth," and concludes that, in this case, it is not the Christian but the Jew who has falsified the picture of his own Messiah.[5] Among the most interesting of recent discoveries in this respect is that of the Odes of Solomon. Harnack regards them as being Jewish in origin with Christian interpolations. They bear witness, as Professor Knowling points out, to a universalism as wide as St. Paul's and a mysticism not unlike that of St. John's. For them the Messiah has come.

The Gentile background to the Epistles has been treated of in two recent and important books, *The Religious Experience of St. Paul*, by Professor Gardner,[6] and *The Earlier*

[1] *Jesus or Christ?* p. 9.
[2] See above, p. 1 ff.
[3] See also *The Background of the Gospels*, Dr. W. Fairweather.
[4] p. 19 ff.
[5] See also Mr. J. H. A. Hart's book, *The Hope of Catholic Judaism*.
[6] Crown Theol. Series.

Epistles of St. Paul, by Professor Kirsopp Lake.[1] Both emphasize strongly, and perhaps unduly, the effect of the language and ideas of the mysteries upon the Pauline presentment of the Gospel. Professor Gardner, after dealing with the origin and essential features and development of the Greek mysteries proceeds to point out the parallelism with Pauline doctrine in detail (chap. iv.). The use of the word " mystery," the contrast between flesh and spirit, the idea of salvation, the universalism of the Gospel,[2] the Christian Sacraments, all find close parallels in the mysteries. It is not quite clear how far Professor Gardner would have us regard St. Paul as dependent upon the latter for his theology. St. Paul began " the mysticizing of Christian enthusiasm." It was the next age that carried it much further, and introduced " new elements " not " so valuable or so innocent " as those introduced by him. He would not " consciously copy the pagan ritual " or ideas, yet he " fused together " by the fire of his enthusiasm the doctrine of the Exalted Christ (regarded by the Professor as of Jewish origin, and closely connected with apocalyptic belief) and the doctrine of the Mystic Christ (which is " derived from, or at all events, parallel to, the beliefs of the Hellenistic mysteries ").[3]

Professor K. Lake's most valuable book deals with the Epistles to the Thessalonians, Corinthians, Galatians and Romans. He sets out the Gentile hope of a coming Deliverer,[4] the idea of a Redeemer-God and its connexion with the growing importance of the Sacraments.[5] He dwells on the eschatological interest of the Thessalonian belief and the relation of the mysteries' view of life after death to the Jewish doctrine of a Resurrection which was adopted by St. Paul.[6] The last two chapters are particularly important. There Professor Lake regards the Jewish Christian

[1] Pub. Rivington, 1911. [2] Cf. the Odes of Solomon above, p. 197.
[3] P. 200. [4] P. 43 ff. [5] P. 45. [6] P. 92.

generally as seeing in the Crucifixion of Jesus not an atoning death, unique in the history of the world, but "merely one of a long list of crimes against the messengers of God." The unique significance of the death of Jesus was assigned to it by St. Paul in Gentile circles, not necessarily "borrowed" from the mysteries, but, as such conceptions were in the air, Jews and Greeks each construed the same spiritual experience in the language familiar to themselves. The last chapter touches upon eschatology, and is referred to below.

Both of these lines of inquiry are valuable. If it were possible to discover exactly what were the Messianic hopes, and the ideas of Gentile religion current in the time of St. Paul, and if we could further find out accurately where St. Paul stood both before and after his conversion with regard to them, the meaning of his message, his doctrine, and his experience would be so much more clear. We welcome the light thrown upon both these necessary preliminary studies to an adequate conception of his Christology. The study of Christian origins is yet in its cradle; but as it grows we believe that the synthesis of its different lines of inquiry will confirm the conclusions reached above.

(ii) In Liberal thought there has been a very considerable departure from the traditional statements of Christianity. It represents a breaking free from convention in religion, a shrinking from the repetition of shibboleths, and a discrediting of orthodox dogmatic statement. For instance, the Rev. W. Morgan, in his able article "Back to Christ,"[1] asserts that the "Absolute Substance" of the Councils (a term and an idea borrowed from Hellenistic Philosophy), "has nothing in common with the holy personal Will of the Prophets, or with the gracious Father of our Lord Jesus Christ." In their definitions, if the ethical was recognized, it occupied only a subordinate place in comparison with the metaphysical. The "vital religious

[1] *Dict. of C. and G.*

interests" which the Church imagined she was preserving [1] were really only "a metaphysical, or more strictly a physical, conception of God."

(iii) The influence of personality in history is recognized as it never has been before. This has been attributed by the writer just mentioned to the influence of such teachers as Goethe, Emerson and Carlyle. We may add also such names as Moberly, Illingworth, and James.[2] The rise of new speculative philosophies has greatly aided the movement to make personality the central and dominant principle in history. In the study of the psychology of Christian experience seems to lie one of the most fruitful fields of research. It is a return to St. Paul, or rather a further unfolding of the Pauline Gospel "Christ in me."

(iv) Side by side with these movements has been the growth of popular socialistic ideas, a new and powerful realization of what we call (for want of a better word) "Solidarity." [3] No principle has been more potent in the vast labour disputes of the day. It is essentially a social doctrine, but in so far as it has a religious basis, it finds its parallel, if not its inspiration, in St. Paul. It throws a growing light on the influence of action upon others, and so helps us to understand "As in Adam all die, so also in Christ shall all be made alive." Yet only half the truth is grasped, and that not wholly—"No man liveth unto himself." So there is poured out a wealth of devotion, of sacrifice, of zeal, of labour, all traits of the Pauline type of character. But the other half is not yet apparent—"No true man liveth

[1] See p. 190 ff. above.

[2] Bishop Westcott distrusted and "was dissatisfied with personal influence, he was inclined to overlook it, and to expect from organization on true principles that effectiveness which mainly depends on the man behind it." He gave a higher place to the power of ideas. See *Life*, vol. ii. pp. 362, 363.

[3] Prof. Gardner suggests "incorporation." See *Rel. Exp. of St. Paul*, p. 197.

for himself," and "though I give my body to be burned, and have not love, it profiteth nothing."

(v) Most encouraging of all has been the wonderful outpouring of missionary enthusiasm, resulting in the drawing together of different schools of thought for the common aim under the one Lord. It is a return to St. Paul in the best sense. Here are lives of single purpose, of unsparing devotion and unrelaxing zeal, fired by the noblest ideals and the grandest aims. Their message is the same as that of the first preachers of the Gospel. It is proof that the inspiration of St. Paul is a force to be reckoned with in the religious world to-day.[1]

It is always most difficult to review the trend of movements of the day. The horizon is so vast, and we overlook so much or falsely estimate the importance of what we see. But yet we believe, with the optimism of the Christian faith, that these seemingly parallel or divergent lines of advance will, one day, be seen to converge in a more wondrous portrait of the Christ; and that, to vary the metaphor, the seemingly discordant notes that sound so inharmonious to our ears now—

> "May make one music as before
> But vaster."

We may, however, for this purpose, take these different movements as centring round two subjects: (i) The recovery and estimation of the Christ of History; (ii) the explanation of the personality of the Christ of History.

I. The Recovery of the Christ of History.

(i) The strong movement to recover the Christ of history may be seen on every hand. It emanates from a belief that the Christ of theological speculation has replaced the Christ of History, that it is "increasingly difficult to find the Nicene Christology in the New Testament and the ante-Nicene Church," [2] that popular language is exceedingly inaccurate,

[1] See Allen's *Missionary Methods*; *St. Paul or Ours?* in the Library of Historic Theology. [2] Father Tyrrell, *Jesus or Christ?* p. 8.

the orthodox theological Christianity tending towards Nestorianism, and the popular non-theological Christology being monophysite.[1] So Pfleiderer writes in the beginning of his book, *The Early Christian Conceptions of St. Paul*: "It is to the great and abiding credit of the scientific theology of the nineteenth century that it has learned to distinguish between the Christ of faith and the Man Jesus of history." Theology is seen no longer as a result but as a process, its terms modified or even transformed by outside influences.[2] It has a growth, and its expression varies with, or even more than, Christian experience. So it is held that the figure of the historic Jesus is merged into, and swallowed up by, that of the pre-existent Logos as a drop of vinegar in the ocean (to use the famous Eutychian phrase). We have been too much concerned with operations within the Trinity.[3] Many have taken up the old attitude that all healthy progress means the transition from Trinitarian Christianity to Unitarianism.[4] We have regarded Christ as the transcendent Lord, the Saviour of the world, the Creator and Support of life, and have not found the historic Person, Whose moral personality and the acts of Whose historic life form the true basis of real religious faith to-day.

In thus going back to the historic Christ, one of the most considerable barriers seems to many scholars to be St. Paul.[5] The teaching of the Apostles, the position of the Early Church, the experience and belief of the Church of Christ throughout the centuries are discredited and must be swept aside. The contrast must be drawn between the Adam-

[1] Father Tyrrell, *Jesus or Christ?* p. 10.

[2] It is interesting to compare Newman's position with Harnack's. See *Dict. of C. and G.*, Art. "Divinity of Christ," Rev. A. S. Martin.

[3] Dr. Schweitzer attributes the bringing together of the "supramundane Christ" and the historical Jesus to Gnosticism and the Logos Christology (see *Quest of the Historical Jesus*, p. 3).

[4] Cf. Delitzsch, referred to by Prof. Knowling, *Messianic Interpretation*.

[5] See *Dict. of C. and G.*, Art. "Paul," Prof. Sanday.

Christ section of Romans and the Gospel of Jesus of Galilee.[1] Some even go behind the "pillar" passages of Schmiedel, and the question can be seriously asked, "Did Jesus really live?"[2] Some find in the Jesus discovered by this process a Jesus Who is their ultimate authority in religion. Others find in Him not a message about Himself, but a message about God the Father. Fatherhood and Brotherhood are His Gospel, not salvation from sin through a dying Saviour; others see in the acts and moral personality of the historic Jesus the Gospel of the Redeemer. Others find in Him a mistaken eschatological dreamer Whose School was very much more powerful than Himself, Whose Church was built upon a falsehood and Whose followers found their spiritual life in believing a delusion or fabricating a myth. To others it has seemed that, after all, the historical Jesus, the details of His life on earth, the facts of His ministry, the searchings of textual scholars, the tomes of apologists, the rejecters or supporters of the miracles are all vanity. Jesus came to bring an Idea and an Ideal whereby we reach "the native land of the Spirit" and know Christ no longer after the flesh. Others influenced only by the great democratic movements of the day find in Him (when He is properly "reduced") only a humanitarian Jesus whose ethic contained the principles of social reform.[3]

Principal Garvie, in his article "The Living Christ,"[4] has given a clear account of the way in which the Jesus of History has been sought. First, He has been stripped of all miracles, then the metaphysical has been excluded, then Jesus has been "reduced" to an Apocalyptic dreamer. Some of these aspects were brought into prominence in popular English thought through the medium of an article

[1] See Loisy, "The Christian Mystery," *H. J.*, Oct. 1911.
[2] Prof. Clemen.
[3] See *Jesus Christ and the Social Question*, Prof. Peabody.
[4] *Expos. Times*, vol. xxii.

in the *Hibbert Journal* entitled, "Jesus or Christ?"[1] A number of writers not very representative[2] were invited to write their views on the alternative. "Jesus" was taken to mean the historical Jesus of the Gospels; "Christ" the second person of the Trinity, Who became man. We are bidden by some writers to choose between the two. Whilst it is admitted that as far as the Christian Church is concerned the paradox is true that it is "built upon a hyphen,"[3] and even Professor Schmiedel is constrained to admit that "it is a very serious question whether we to-day should possess Christianity at all if Jesus had not been interpreted as a divine being,"[4] the general result of the volume is that though most writers accept both the titles, they do not admit that the same person is truly both. Jesus is historical, Christ is the Ideal, Who was never on the earth; and it is necessary to recover the Former from the dualism of the Christ of dogma, and the transcendence of the Christ of St. Paul and Experience.

(i) The Rationalist School ranges from those who deny that Jesus ever lived, to those who, in varying degree, merely object to the traditional presentation of the Person of Christ. Some resolve it into a myth and others attack the portrait as we have it, and deny its perfection. Of the forerunners of the extreme Rationalist School, Strauss (1808–1874)[5] is one of the most prominent. His method of dealing with fact and narrative has been compared to "a ploughshare passing through a field of daisies."[6] He reduced the Christian story to myth, which is the creation of fact out of an idea. Another writer (Drews) has since

[1] By the Rev. R. Roberts.

[2] It was pointed out by the editor of the *Interpreter* that the Unitarian writers were twice as many as the rest.

[3] Prof. Gardner, *Jesus or Christ?* p. 50.

[4] *Jesus or Christ?* p. 65.

[5] For Paulus see *The Quest of the Historical Jesus*, Dr. Schweitzer, p. 48 ff.

[6] *Dict. of. C. and G.*, vol. ii., Art. "Christ in Modern Thought."

explained the Gospel story entirely from the "Christ-myth of West Africa," asserting that we know nothing of the historical personality we call Jesus. Kalthoff certainly allowed that "among the thousands of the crucified in the time of the Gospel, there must have been some Jesus who in the spirit of prophetic piety closed his poor martyr-life." "But," he added, "this cross had no meaning." According to him, Christianity was in its essence a widespread social movement, which was begun by a class of oppressed men struggling into power. This was later combined with the philosophical and mystical views current at the time into a religion. Jensen's view was that Christianity arose from Babylonian legend. Pfleiderer finds the beginning of Christianity in myth, not in history, and even likens the conception of Christ to those conceptions found in legends of other faiths.[1]

If these writers are correct, St. Paul was either the victim of a great delusion, or he was responsible for the propagation of a gigantic fraud. We believe these theories will not bear examination. The only sources of information that we have give no support to the theory that Christianity rose from a social movement, and the plausibility of that theory depends upon the "transferring to a distant age of economic views and social hopes" of to-day.[2] That Christianity presents parallels with early myths is undoubtedly true. But it does not follow therefrom that it is itself a myth. "If the Christian God really made the human race, would not the human race tend to rumours and perversions of the Christian God?"[3] The study of anthropology and of comparative religion is illuminating whilst it is humbling, but it only sets in greater relief the firm historic basis of our faith, as well

[1] *Early Christian Conceptions of Christ*, p. 9.

[2] *Encyc. of Rel. and Eth.*, Art. "Christianity," Princ. Garvie.

[3] Mr. G. K. Chesterton, *Religious Doubts of Democracy*, p. 18; see also *Dict. of C. and G.*, Art. "Divinity of Christ."

as its purity and loftiness amid so much that was crudely primitive and degrading. "If the doctrine of the Person of Christ," wrote Dr. Fairbairn, "were explicable on the mere mythical apotheosis of Jesus of Nazareth, it would become the most insolent and fateful anomaly in history." St. Paul's cry for a real Christ is our own—

> "my flesh, that I seek
> In the Godhead! I seek and I find it . . .
> . . . a Man like to me,
> Thou shalt love and be loved by, for ever!
> . . . . a Hand like this hand
> Shall throw open the gates of new life to thee! See the Christ Stand!"[1]

Another class of writers, however, accept the fact of the earthly life of Jesus, but either reduce our knowledge of Him to the narrowest limits or deny that the portrait presented is great enough to justify the claim that Jesus is perfect Man, perfect God. In a recent article[2] some of the charges of defects in the life and character of Jesus have been enumerated. Professor Schmiedel, accepting the position that Jesus was man, asks: "Can a man be sinless?" To pin our faith to an affirmative answer is "hazardous in the extreme."[3] The Rev. R. Roberts has attacked the apparent "limits" of the historical Jesus as portrayed in the Gospels. Professor Gardner writes, "Any community, save one purely parasitic, which acted upon (the precepts of the Sermon on the Mount) would starve."[4] Many are asking whether the whole of Christian morality is not out of date. The "sinlessness" of Jesus is denied. The Rev. R. J. Campbell writes: "To speak of Him as morally perfect is absurd, to call Him sinless worse, for it introduces an entirely false emphasis into the relation of God and man."[5] So the

[1] R. Browning, "Saul."

[2] Rev. A. S. Martin, Art. "Christianity," *Dict. of C. and G.*, see pp. 472, 473 ff.

[3] *Jesus or Christ?* p. 68 ff.

[4] *Rel. Exp. of St. Paul*, pp. 242, 243.

[5] *Jesus or Christ?* p. 191.

first rationalists have been content to allow that Jesus was a man not only tempted like as we are, but also found with sin. For Rénan, Jesus during His last days on earth fell from His ideal of the "sweet theology of love," adopted Jewish eschatology, became a wonder-worker who stooped even to "arranging" miracles, and at last, outwardly brave, inwardly in despair, died upon the Cross, the conqueror of Death. The eschatologists and even the modernists,[1] have followed in the same groove of thought.

It is needless to insist upon the difference between this position and that of St. Paul. For him, redemption could only be through a perfect, sinless life offered up once for all. Mr. Roberts was effectively answered, in the "Jesus or Christ?" controversy, by at least three writers, Mr. G. K. Chesterton and Professors Hope Moulton and Weinel. Professor Schmiedel's canon of criticism, by which we are to accept only such parts of the Gospel story as are beyond possibility of invention, because they contradict the characteristic view of Him which believers held, ultimately simply begs the question.[2] He seems to hold what is a contradiction in terms. "It is impossible to hold communion with Jesus as a man in the past," yet "no one feels reluctance in addressing prayers to Jesus."

It is possible to answer objections to the character of Jesus in detail, and one by one, but we must be content here to bring them into relation to the Pauline Christology, and to observe that it is remarkable how eagerly St. Paul is claimed as a witness that the birth-stories of our Lord belong to the realm of myth because he does not appear to have referred to them, and "therefore did not know them," yet his view of the Person of Christ, and his witness to the early Christology of the Church is rejected as unhistorical and speculative. Christ is perfect, or He could not be our Ideal, for, in so far as He is imperfect, He would fall short of being our moral

[1] See infra, p. 215.

[2] See *Jesus or Christ?* p. 177.

example.[1] He is the Perfect Man to whom we shall one day come. That is the aim of the Gospel message (Col. i. 28). But it is not as an Example that He is His Gospel. It is in the giving of power to reach that goal that Christ is the Saviour (Rom. i. 16).

(ii) More important, however, than the rationalizing critics are the views of what has been called the "Christocentric" School,[2] of whom a typical English representative is Dr. Fairbairn.[3] Their aim is to get behind the scholastic, the speculative, the Pauline Christ, to the historic Jesus, and having discovered Him to make His self-consciousness, not the Church, or the Bible, or St. Paul, the absolute guide and authority. This school knows a Christ Who is transcendent and superhuman, a Risen Lord declared by the Resurrection to be the Son of God with power, but they will not use of Him the terms that describe Him as the Second Person of the Trinity. The Gospel is the interpretation of fact; not the Person and Work of Jesus, but a doctrine about them.[4] St. Paul translated "the religion of Jesus," which was personal, into the religion of Christ, which was universal.[5]

Concerning this position it may be observed that all our knowledge of the historic Christ comes to us from and through the Apostles. Historically the Epistles have as

[1] Prof. Hy. Jones (*Jesus or Christ? The Idealism of Jesus*) endeavours to preserve the real humanity of Jesus by diminishing the distance between Him and ourselves. Yet Bishop Lightfoot has rather expressed the heart of the Gospel. "It is the infinity of the price paid for our redemption, which is its essential characteristic. It is the fact that God gave not a life like our lives . . . but His Eternal Word to become flesh . . . for our sakes" (*University Sermons*, p. 290).

[2] *Dict. of C. and G.*, Art. "Back to Christ," Rev. W. Morgan.

[3] See *The Place of Christ in Modern Theology* and *Studies in Religion and Theology*.

[4] "Christianity is given only when speculatively construed." Dr. Fairbairn, *Philosophy of the Christian Religion*, p. 306. (Quoted in above article.)

[5] *Studies in Rel. and Theol.*, p. 475.

much weight as the Synoptists, and their portrait of the Christ is earlier. In the deepest sense, St. Paul's thought is "Christocentric." The "Christocentric" thinker is right when he wishes to see the Jesus also of the Synoptists, and to make that one Christ the supreme authority of his life. That was the way of St. Paul. But he is wrong if he shuts out from his interpretation of that self-consciousness of Jesus the experience of Christians of the past. God speaks of and guides us to the Christ through the Bible, as well as through the Church. The lives of His saints also daily interpret the living Christ. It is the truth Browning has expressed—

> "Oh, I must feel your brain prompt mine,
> Your heart anticipate my heart,
> You must be just before, in fine,
> See and make me see, for your part,
> New depths of the divine!"
>
> (*By the Fireside.*)

They seem to be also wrong in so far as they allow any doctrine of Christ to take the central place of His Person. But if that danger be guarded against, and the true synthesis be made of their own spiritual experience of the personal presence of Christ with the experience of the Body of the Redeemed, this school of thinkers will find itself very near the heart of Pauline theology.

(iii) The Liberal Protestant School of Theology is widely supported, especially by German thinkers. They are filled with the Reformation spirit of liberty of thought, and find themselves carried by it behind the Reformation standpoint, which they regard as a return to St. Paul rather than to the historical Jesus.[1] In the words of Lessing, "The Christian religion has been tried for eighteen centuries, the religion of Christ remains yet to be tried." The "religion of Christ" is not, in their view, the religion of miracle and dogma which treats of Jesus Christ as God (*θεολογεῖ τὸν*

[1] See Art. "Back to Christ" above referred to.

Χριστόν). It is a religion with no Christology, with no developed doctrine of Redemption. It was held and taught by Jesus yet it concerned not Himself but the Father. His central doctrines were the Fatherhood of God, and the Brotherhood of Men. Not the Son, but the Father only, belongs to the Gospel, as Jesus declares it.[1] So the doctrine of the Trinity was called forth by liturgical necessities and customs (the number "three" being widely regarded as sacred).[2] All metaphysical theology is rejected, and the miraculous in the Gospel story is denied. Jesus is unique indeed, but He is no longer an object of faith. His office is described in the words of Bousset: "Thou art our leader, to Whom there is none like, the leader in the highest things, the leader of our souls to God, the Way, the Truth, the Life."[3] To Harnack, Jesus is the coming Judge.[4] So Professor Weinel finds the heart of Christianity to be not in the Person of Jesus, but in what He taught. Professor Henry Jones wishes to keep the position of "son of God" for all, in the same sense that Jesus was "Son of God."[5]

It is impossible to bring such teaching into line with the Christology of St. Paul, for it is reached only by ignoring the latter. The heart of the Pauline theology is not the Revelation of the Fatherhood of God.[6] When once the

[1] *What is Christianity?* A. Harnack, p. 144 ff.

[2] See Drs. Krüger and Harnack. The latter in his book *Verfassung und Recht der Alten Kirche* finds that the expression "Son of God" took by degrees the place of the usual expression "The Messiah," and the formula "Father, Son, and Holy Ghost" replaced "God, Christ, and Holy Spirit" as a result of Judaistic controversy (see *Messianic Interpretation*, pp. 81–84).

[3] *Das Wesen der Religion*, p. 267 (also quoted in Art. "Back to Christ").

[4] *Das Wesen der Christentums*, p. 91.

[5] Art. in *Jesus or Christ?* "The Idealism of Jesus."

[6] As the writers of the Pauline section of Art. on "Communion with God" (*Encyc. of Rel. and Eth.*) seem to think, see vol. iii. p. 754.

uniqueness of Jesus is admitted, it is difficult to stop there. Harnack is constrained to admit that in some sense He is the centre of His Gospel, "He was its personal realization and strength,"[1] and even Professor Henry Jones allows that "revelation had come to Him with a fullness and power with which it came to no other." But the main criticism of the position from the point of view of St. Paul lies in the fact that Jesus is not made His own Gospel. He is for St. Paul, Himself Christianity.[2] Nor did St. Paul regard Christ only as a God-like man. As Father Tyrrell has reminded us again.[3] "God-like" is still removed by an infinite distance from God. A God-like man may command our admiration, our love; but "man owes no adoration, no unqualified self-surrender even to the most God-like of men—only to the absolutely Divine." In their denial of the miraculous, and their opposition to the metaphysical[4] these thinkers find themselves differing from the Pauline view of Christ and of nature; of Christ, because, though we can never fathom the mystery of His Incarnation, or fully understand the psychology of His soul,[5] yet we must try to reach an adequate conception of His relationship to God and man; and of nature, because to St. Paul God was greater than nature, and the Christ who shone upon him on the Damascus road also gave to some power to work miracles and gifts of healings. It is

[1] *What is Christianity?* p. 145 ff.

[2] Harnack and many others have declared that this is not so. "It is a perverse proceeding to make Christology the fundamental substance of the Gospel, (as) is shown by Christ's teaching which is everywhere directed to the all-important point, and summarily confronts every man with his God" (*What is Christianity?* p. 184).

[3] *Jesus or Christ?* p. 15.

[4] See *Encyc. of Rel. and Eth.*, Art. "Christianity," Princ. Garvie.

[5] "No one could fathom this mystery who had not had a parallel experience" (*What is Christianity?* p. 129). Yet a man's philosophy and thought have a vital bearing on his conduct. "What a man thinks that he is."

true that Christ revealed the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of men, but He revealed the Fatherhood because He revealed Himself, and Brotherhood because He showed that the whole race of the Redeemed were one in Him.

(iv) The Ritschlian School which was mentioned above represents a return from the Christ of the Epistles to the historic Jesus of the Gospel records. This Christ is the sum of Christianity. Doctrine is not the Revelation, for that is but the formulation of the faith of another. "It is not by appropriating St. Paul's thoughts about Christ . . . that we become Christians, but only by trusting Christ as St. Paul trusted Him." Only then have his thoughts meaning to us.[1] The great thing is to live the life, and know the experience, not to assent to a formula, or to learn a creed.[2] If, then, we ask "what is the *worth* of Christ?" we find by experience that He has the worth of God. That experience comes alone through faith. There is, however, no value in the miraculous, or in traditional theology, in themselves.

On the question as to belief in the Virgin Birth, the mighty works, the bodily Resurrection, the Ritschlians are divided. Some accept them as historical, but most believe that the living Christ is not declared to be the Son of God with power by the bodily Resurrection, but by the impression His Person makes upon us. In that sense it is true that He could not be holden of death.

In many ways this is, perhaps, the most powerful of modern schools, and is a return not only to Christ but to the standpoint of St. Paul. It makes the Person of Christ the centre of its faith. It saves the Exalted Christ of experience from the charge of being merely visionary by filling up its conception of Him from the details of Christ's historic

[1] See *Dict. of C. and G.*, Art. "Back to Christ."
[2] Thus following Schleiermacher and Rothe.

life on earth; finding in the activities of that earthly life that Redemption was won and God was revealed.[1]

In this scheme of thought the idea of the Kingdom of God assumed considerable importance, and rightly so. The supremacy of experience is also truly insisted upon, and the centrality of Christology for the faith. But it has what seem to be weaknesses, with all its truth and strength, and the criticism ventured above [2] still seems to be just and needed in an estimation of it.

(v) The Eschatological School has of late been revived mainly through the issue of Professor Schweitzer's book, *The Quest of the Historical Jesus*. This work most ably traces the course of German thought about the life of Christ and endorses with considerable emphasis and argument the purely eschatological view of the teaching of Jesus. "The Jesus of Nazareth who came forward publicly as the Messiah, who preached the ethic of the Kingdom of God, who founded the Kingdom of Heaven upon earth, and died to give His work its final consecration, never had any existence. He is a figure designed by rationalism, endowed with life by liberalism, and clothed by modern theology in an historical garb." [3]

Dr. Schweitzer considers that the attitude of thinkers to the eschatological position is the great dividing line between them. He would force upon us the choice between the eschatological and the rationalist position, between "thorough-going scepticism and thorough-going eschatology." [4] Reimarus, Rénan, Weiss (J.), Ritschl had all more or less insisted on the importance of the eschatological interpretation of Jesus.[5] Its importance, as Professor Sanday has

[1] See *Dict. of C. and G.*, vol. ii., Art. "Christ in Modern Thought."

[2] See *supra*, p. 6 ff.

[3] See p. 396. For the eschatological teaching of J. Weiss, see pp. 237–240.

[4] Chap. xix.

[5] So the Rev. J. M. Thompson in a recent book, *Jesus according*

pointed out,[1] is that it is a check upon the extreme rationalizing School, it postulates a real manifestation of God on the earth, not merely of an eminent teacher, and it refers to an element really in the Gospels and certainly true. It is a protest against an entirely ethical presentation of the teaching of Jesus. Yet eschatological teaching is not necessarily unethical. If half the first message was eschatological, "The Kingdom of Heaven is at hand," the other half is ethical, "Repent ye."[2] The ethical side of the Gospel is so prominent that it has been most evident to those who have tried to estimate Christianity from the outside,[3] for the Apocalyptic hope was clearly unrealized and as yet in the future. Even the charge of Nietzsche and his school that Christianity in its tenderness towards the weak and sinful, its introspection, its view of sorrow and sin, as "a worship of failure and decay" is unexpected testimony to the prominence of the ethical in the Christian Gospel. The rise of ethical societies in Christian countries is another witness to the same fact. It is clear that no satisfactory position can be arrived at without a due balancing of both ethical and eschatological. The New Testament view of the Kingdom is that of a Kingdom both present and future, both ethical and eschatological, both visible and invisible. Dr. Schweitzer following Weiss sees only the future and the eschatological, and of this Jesus is only the forerunner. He does not establish it.

Many scholars[4] will not allow the primary importance of the eschatological element. Though such prominence is given in the early epistles of St. Paul to the speedy Second

to St. Mark, writes: "He thought the present world was coming to an end in a few years."

[1] *H. J.*, Oct., 1911.

[2] *Earlier Epistles of St. Paul*, Prof. K. Lake, p. 443.

[3] E.g. Lecky, *Hist. Eur. Mor.* ii. 8 f.

[4] Such as Wellhausen, Wrede, Kölbing, Peabody, von Dobschütz.

Coming, it nowhere forms the pith of the Christian message, nor is it regarded as indispensable for the effectiveness of that message. The dominating influence in Jewish theology was Pharisaic, though, as Dr. Sanday shows,[1] that did not exclude the Apocalyptic. But the Gospel of Paul was neither. It was a definite experience of salvation from sin, a growth in holiness, a firm conviction of the presence of the Indwelling Saviour, and a strong hope in His Return. Eschatology is a part and an important part of his preaching,[2] but it is not all. For St. Paul the Kingdom of Heaven is certainly present as well as future, "The Kingdom of Heaven is . . . righteousness and peace and joy . . ."[3] Nothing is further from St. Paul than to make his Lord a mere visionary, an Apocalyptic dreamer, either consciously wrong, or with only a message from God about the future, a hope the conditions of whose realization were faith in God the Father, and the forgiveness of sins.[4] There are many indications in the Gospels that the eschatological is secondary.[5] In St. Paul it is subordinate to the main Gospel of pardon for sin and peace through the blood of Christ, though we recognize his insistence on the paradox that the present Christ is yet an absent Christ Who is to come. Professor Sanday has recently shown how the ethical and apocalyptic movements in Judaism were parallel and separate. He points out that

[1] *H. J.*, Oct., 1911.

[2] Probably, as Princ. Garvie points out (*Encyc. of Rel. and Eth.*, Art. "Christianity"), we have not sufficiently realized that Jesus stood in the prophetic succession and used prophetic speech.

[3] Rom. xiv. 17. See also 1 Cor. vi. 20; Col. i. 13, 14. For the kingdom as future see Gal. v. 21; 2 Cor. iv. 9 ff.; Eph. v. 5; 1 Thess. ii. 12.

[4] So Loisy in his book *Jesus*.

[5] Cf. The Parables of the growth of the Kingdom; the emphasis laid on our duty towards our neighbour; Matt. xxiv. 36; Mark xiii. 32 ("Of that hour no man knoweth"). The coming of the Son of Man may be "at even, or at midnight, or at cock-crowing, or in the morning" (St. Mark xiii. 35). "The Kingdom of God is within you" (ἐντὸς ὑμῶν. St. Luke xvii. 21).

Dr. Schweitzer has made the mistake of ignoring St. Paul,[1] who is an excellent example of the refutation of the accusation that the Lord's teaching is an "Interimethik." The theory would make the disciples greater than their Lord, for it assumes that the opinions of Jesus must not be allowed to be in advance of his age, though those of the disciples must have transcended them. St. Paul, at least, had no suspicion that he was doing so. For him in Christ were all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge hidden (Col. ii. 3). The "reduced" historical Jesus of Schweitzer would make the impression produced by Him an incredible miracle.[2]

(vi) The Roman Catholic modernist eschatologists represent an attempt to make Roman Catholicism agree with the results of modern thought. Their position is a protest against the Rationalist School, and denies that the essence of the Gospel is to be found in the Revelation of the Fatherhood of God.[3] So Father Tyrrell writes: "He seemed to call men less to His teaching than to Himself." The original message of Jesus was contained in the announcement of the Coming Kingdom of God. The sonship of Jesus was only in regard to that Kingdom about to be established. "The Gospel of Jesus is not a religion . . . yet a religion had issued from the Gospel." It was "not due to the will or direct action of Christ."[4] We cannot expect in Christ "truth in its strict sense," but only value for the spiritual life. Jesus cherished a hope which was doomed to disappointment, yet He planted the seed which afterwards grew, and still grows, as the Roman Catholic Church. It is in the Church that this fallible Jesus, possessed by the Apocalyptic ideas of the time, still lives on. There was no

[1] For his account of Pauline Eschatology see *Quest of Historical Jesus*, p. 364 ff.

[2] For an able and minute criticism of the eschatological position, see *The Eschatological Question in the Gospels*, by the Rev. C. W. Emmet.

[3] See Loisy, *L'Évangile et l'Église*, p. 86 ff.

[4] Loisy, *H. J.*, Oct., 1911.

Revelation once for all given to mankind, but the Church finds gradually, and with continually deeper meaning, through the impulse from the Apocalyptic message of Christ, the ever-growing content of the Christian Gospel.[1] This "new apologetic" for the Roman Catholic Church, an appeal to the future, not to the past, is open to the twofold criticism of, first of all, placing the Church before Christ, and making that the real source of Christianity; and secondly, of making the Christ a mistaken visionary who announced only a hope for the future, and the coming end of this age. It is "only by a 'tour de force' intellectual and moral that the creed, code, and worship of the Church can be represented as no more than the Evolution under God's providence of the religious impulse given by Jesus in proclaiming the Coming Kingdom." [2] For St. Paul, Christology, not Eschatology, gives the central impulse to his Christianity. "Christianity," as de Pressensé wrote, "is Christ." For St. Paul, too, the Kingdom has come—the Christian has eternal life. He knows the power of the Resurrection, and he already has the peace that passeth all understanding.

(vii) The speculative school of philosophy which has followed in the steps of Hegel has exercised, and still continues to exercise, considerable influence. Hegel (1770–1831) held that the way of all progress lay through three distinct stages; thesis, antithesis and synthesis. We recognize a truth, and we state it as though it were a whole truth. As experience grows, we discover it is only a half-truth and that the apparent opposite is equally true. Later comes the higher synthesis in which the two are united. So in religion, by means of the historical facts we attain the realm of the spiritual, and then the facts matter no more. It is the

[1] So the reply of Italian modernists to the Papal Encyclical of Condemnation. See Father Tyrrell's *Christianity at the Cross Roads*, and *Mediaevalism*; also see *L'Évangile et l'Église*. Also, Art. "Christianity" (*Encyc. of Rel. and Eth.*).

[2] *Expository Times*, Art. "The Living Christ," Princ. Garvie.

process of which St. Paul writes, "Wherefore we henceforth know no man after the flesh: even though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now we know Him so no more." [1] So Bishop Phillips Brooks writes: "It is the Idea of Jesus which is the illumination and inspiration of existence." [2] So Edward Caird beautifully translates Hegel: "And, as on the summit of a mountain, removed from all hard distinctions of detail, we calmly overlook the limitations of the landscape and the world, so by religion we are lifted above all the obstructions of finitude. In religion, therefore, man beholds his own existence in a transfigured reflection, in which all the divisions, all the crude lights and shadows of the world are softened into eternal peace under the beams of a spiritual sun. It is in this native land of the spirit that the waters of oblivion flow, from which it is given to Psyche to drink and forget all her sorrows; for here the darkness of life becomes a transparent dream-image, through which the light of eternity shines in upon us." [3]

We have been recently reminded what an influence the Hegelian type of thought still has. The Rev. R. J. Campbell writes: "So far as we can judge from Gospel evidence the Christ of the Apostle Paul bore little or no relation to the Jesus of Galilee." [4] Professor Gardner asserts that St. Paul "scarcely thought of the death of Christ as a fact in history," and "to make much of the outward surroundings of the suffering would be to dwell on Christ after the flesh"; and again, History is "a mere reflection on earth of a heavenly drama." "The phases of his Master's existence . . . are in his mind rather connected in essence than in time." [5] Dr. Anderson writes: "As religion has its being in eternal idea or ideals, it may

[1] 2 Cor. v. 16. [2] Bohlen Lectures, 1879.
[3] *Evolution of Religion*, vol. i. p. 82 f.
[4] *Jesus or Christ?* p. 189.
[5] *Rel. Exp. of St. Paul*, pp. 32, 189, 190.

be entirely indifferent to historical facts. The living Christ remains only the symbol of the Divine life in man, but has no connexion with the historical Jesus, whose existence is to be regarded as of no significance or value for religion." [1] So not only the Jesus of history but all historical Christianity must sink into unimportance.

For this position the support of St. Paul is claimed. When he reached "the native land of the Spirit" the hard distinctions of events in time and space were obliterated by the dream light of eternity. But the meaning of 2 Cor. v. 16 [2] is not that here assigned to it. St. Paul is really the great opponent of such evaporation of fact. For him, above all, the facts of sin and death were real; for the Hegelian School they are unfelt. Redemption also must be real [3]; "myths and legends" cannot really save from real evil. St. Paul's writings bear witness of an entire spiritual and moral change. Only if Christ was an historical reality is there a sufficient cause for this change. For us, as for St. Paul, the temporal reveals the eternal; we know that the way of Divine and human progress lies through the facts of history, that we cannot detach the Ideal from the Historic,[4] and that, like all the Apostles, we look for a God and a Saviour Who *acts*. It is, as Professor Scott Holland has said, "His reality as Jesus in the flesh, which is the measure of His capacity to be the Christ." [5] We would seek a Christ supreme in the spiritual realm, but a purely ideal Christ is impossible. "Against the empty abstractions of the Divine Spirit" which mark this School, "and its anæmic conception of Christ's

[1] Cf. *The Larger Faith*," p. 229 ff. [2] See above, p. 40 ff.

[3] See *Encyc. of Rel. and Eth.*, Art. "Christianity," Princ. Garvie; see also Art. in *Jesus or Christ?* by same writer. See also Hermann, *Why does our faith need historical facts?* (there mentioned).

[4] So Prof. Weinel in *Jesus or Christ?* Mr. G. K. Chesterton cleverly says that if we so separate Jesus from Christ we make the one an obscure Rabbi, and the other a myth.

[5] *Jesus or Christ?* p. 135.

Person, the experience-theology is a passionate protest." [1].

Christianity has what Professor Sanday has called " truth to type," [2] and its type is that of a religion which finds its basis in faith in an historic Person. It is not the contemplation or the appropriation either of an ideal or an idea. It must consist, as Coleridge has reminded us, of both fact and idea.

(viii) The great social movements of the day are not without their view of Christianity and of Christ. It is the Humanitarian Christ who mainly appeals to them. They hold that all theology must be given up. The practical duties of brotherhood and philanthropy constitute the Gospel. The rise of ethical schools and societies [3] indicates the number of those who place the full emphasis upon the attenuated gospel of the moral precepts and what the Unitarian terms the " pure humanity of Jesus." The Socialist leaders, while appealing to Jesus, are frankly puzzled by much that they find in the Gospels.[4] Both Socialist and Ethical Societies move apart from St. Paul. Their religion contains nothing of the supernatural in their faith. The Risen and Exalted Christ is unknown to them. The Christ of St. Paul has not shone upon their path or into their hearts.

II. The Explanation of the Person of the Christ of History.

One development of Christological thought, mainly amongst the orthodox supporters of the perfect Manhood and perfect Godhead of Christ, has taken place recently in the realm of psychology. Two questions have been repeatedly asked [5]: (i) What is the relationship of the Divine

[1] *Dict. of C. and G.*, vol. ii., " Christ in Modern Thought," Rev. A. S. Martin.

[2] *Christologies, Ancient and Modern*, Chapter ix. on " Symbolism," Prof. Sanday.

[3] Due to Matthew Arnold amongst others.

[4] See Prof. Peabody, *Jesus Christ and the Social Question.*

[5] As e.g. by Dr. Inge, *J. T. S.*, vol. xi. p. 584.

and the Human in the Person of our Lord? (ii) How can a Christ who is more than the "reduced" Christ of the Ritschlians be brought into our own lives? Professor Sanday in his book, *Christologies Ancient and Modern*, propounded a fresh and interesting theory, which we may give in his own words: "The first proposition is, that the proper seat or 'locus' of all divine indwelling or divine action upon the human soul, is the subliminal consciousness. And the other proposition . . . is, that the same, or the corresponding subliminal consciousness is the proper seat or 'locus' of the Deity of the incarnate Christ." [1]

That psychology has a most important part to play in the interpretation of religious experience is becoming increasingly certain. Professor Sanday's position has, however, been somewhat severely criticized. It remains for us here to point out how far his theory will harmonize with the Pauline Christology.

In the first place it is quite possible [2] that St. Paul had no thought of the Kenosis at all. It is further certain that, if he had, he was only concerned with the fact, and not the method of it. But he has very clear and definite indications in his epistles as to how he would test for acceptance or rejection any theory of the relationship between the Divine and the Human in our Lord's Person. Most prominently we note that his religious life was entirely in the conscious sphere. His conscious life was the dial of the pressure of not only a hidden life, but also of a life which he knew, which was reached by conscious self-surrender of will to his Lord. In that inner sphere of union with Christ, nothing was so essential as "the conscious and active faith" [3] that unites the soul to Him. Professor Sanday suggests that that union takes place in the subconscious sphere. The

[1] P. 159. [2] See above, pp. 113, 114.

[3] See *Expos. Times*, Art. "Christologies Ancient and Modern," Sept. 1910. Prof. Mackintosh.

subconscious, as has been frequently pointed out,[1] has no moral character of itself. From it come the diabolical and frivolous, as well as the noble and the good. It is true that realm is mysterious, but we ought not therefore to assume that it comes from some higher spiritual source.[2] We ought not to trust its promptings simply because they are out of the reach of reason. "That way madness lies." It is true that many of our noblest ideas come unexpectedly and unbidden,[3] and rise from that subliminal realm where our powers have no conscious play. Yet we cannot identify that sphere with the Divine.[4] But the value of such "uprushes" from the subliminal self is determined not by what they are in themselves, but by the conscious use we make of them. It is in the sphere of knowledge and reason and will, and through these, that they assume their importance. Nor is the subliminal the only channel through which the Divine speaks to us. Sometimes God speaks directly, and most clearly so. Dr. Inge thinks that the unconscious part of man preserves "stores of racial rather than individual experience, world-old instincts [5] and mechanical habits, indispensable for the existence and perpetuation of the race." [6] But the supraliminal thoughts are just as inspired and important.

So, for St. Paul, his religious experiences were, above all, conscious. God spoke to him directly. It is true he saw visions, but the vision was to the whole man's personality, and he was conscious of them. So on the Damascus road he saw and heard. When he was lifted up to the third heaven and saw visions and revelations of the Lord,[7]

[1] Ibid.; also see *H. J.*, Oct., 1910, Rev. J. M. Thompson.

[2] Dr. Inge, *J. T. S.*, vol. xi. p. 584.

[3] So *H. J.*, Oct., 1910, Rev. J. M. Thompson (above).

[4] Dr. Sanday does not do so. He regards the subliminal as the sphere for the operation of the Divine.

[5] So Prof. Mackintosh, Art. "Christologies Ancient and Modern," *Expository Times*, Sept. 1910.

[6] *J. T. S.* (above). [7] 2 Cor. xii. 1–4.

though the consciousness of the body faded away, yet he knew, he heard, he remembered. His life "in Christ" was a conscious growth unto the perfect man. The inspiration of the Holy Spirit was a very living and constant experience. Faith was the active going forth and resting on and in Christ. So of love. Love must be conscious. It cannot be transferred to the realm of the unconscious, and love is for St. Paul "the greatest thing in the world." [1] Hope must be conscious, though it rises often unbidden and unexplained, yet it is the fruit of the Spirit's working, and has its anchor far within the veil —not that which separates the conscious from the unconscious self, but which lies between this conscious state and the next. That veil is pierced by a new and living way, and, though we know now only in part, and see that future as through a glass darkly, then we shall know as we are known. Dr. Sanday's theory seems to force us back towards an agnostic conception of God.[2]

So for St. Paul the conscious, not the unconscious, is the essential in religion. Love, holiness, wisdom are all conscious states. The intellect plays an important part in the religious life. The will and heart are summoned to yield their acceptable service. He spoke, it is true, not in words of man's wisdom, but only because every thought was brought into captivity to Christ. Religion was not out of his control. "We are fellow-labourers with God." The Holy Spirit does not think for us, does not will for us, does not love for us, does not work for us. But He works with us, and in that conscious co-partnership we learn to find our true selves because we find ourselves in Him.

How, then, would this theory concern St. Paul's Christology? His psychology is not ours, but nevertheless

[1] See Prof. Drummond's beautiful booklet, *The Greatest Thing in the World*.

[2] So Prof. Mackintosh (above).

we can well believe that a theory which seemed to place the sinlessness of the historic Jesus out of His power, which seemed to do away with the reality of His temptation, and left no room for the play of His human will, or the exercise of His human intellect, would not have been adopted by St. Paul. Jesus Christ would not then have been tempted in all points like as we are, though He might have been without sin. It is not easy to see what the "limitations essential to humanity" are, though we cannot get very much further than that phrase.[1] Yet if the subconscious is human in us, it is human, too, in Christ, and the theory becomes, as Mr. Thompson has said, but another illuminating description of His humanity.

The influence of Psychology has worked in another way, and instead of the two natures of the Creeds there has grown up the theory of a double consciousness. When the Son of God became man He lived in two universes, "the macrocosm of creation and the microcosm of human life."[2] There seems to Dr. Inge to be a more pressing danger at the moment of duplicating His personality than of denying His two natures.[3] The theory of the double consciousness seems to postulate three kinds of wisdom in Christ. (i) An unlimited Divine wisdom; (ii) a limited Divine wisdom; (iii) a human wisdom,[4] and we are in danger of dividing the Persons and in another sense of separating the Jesus of History and the Christ who made and sustains the Universe. This would divest the Incarnation and so the Redemption of its reality. For St. Paul undoubtedly the two are one.

[1] See above, p. 227.

[2] *Dict. of C. and G.*, Art. "Incarnation," Rev. T. B. Kilpatrick.

[3] *J. T. S.*, vol. xi. p. 584. See Baldensperger, *The Self-Consciousness of Jesus*. Schweitzer, *Quest of the Historical Jesus*, p. 365 *n.* and pp. 233–237.

[4] *Dict. of C. and G.*, Art. "Wisdom of Christ," Dr. C. Harris. For the Liberal Protestant view of the consciousness of Jesus see Harnack's *What is Christianity?* p. 128.

There is one mediator, one Lord Jesus Christ. Jesus Christ is born of a woman, and in Him dwells all the fullness of the Godhead bodily. In so far as the Kenotic theories demand a double centre of activity, " a centre of self-abandonment, and a centre of His divine-human or human activities after the self-abandonment has taken place," we postulate a dual consciousness ; and in so far as we assume a full consciousness of Godhead during His Incarnation, broken only by His allowing human limitations sometimes to rule Him, we make His manhood, as Dr. Weston has pointed out, unique not only in the degree of its perfection, but also in its kind.[1]

We must with St. Paul insist upon the single human consciousness of Christ. So our dilemma is not between thorough-going eschatology and thorough-going scepticism, but between St. Paul and so many modern writers. Who are right ? Those who explain the developments in later times as due to accretions gathered, consciously or unconsciously, from Greek mystery or Oriental myth, and seek the true Jesus by " reducing " Him to the " limits " [2] of the synoptic gospels, or those who, with St. Paul, hold that in essence the Christian gospel was from the first a complete and spiritual message of salvation, proclaiming Him Who had lived and died among men to be Lord and Saviour of all.[3] Did St. Paul interpret his Master rightly, or do the moderns ?

If we have the " wings of faith " of which Professor Gardner speaks, may we—must we—not cross " the abyss between

[1] See Dr. Weston, *The One Christ*, p. 158 ff.

[2] Why the Synoptists, which are later than Saint Paul's Epistles ? Mr. G. K. Chesterton in his reply to Mr. Roberts (*Jesus or Christ ?*) refers somewhat scathingly to the alleged " limitations " of the Jesus of the Synoptists.

[3] Prof. Gardner has put the distinction between the " Synoptic " and the " Pauline " Gospel as that between " doing the will of God " and the new element in the disciples' experience—" sharing the life of Christ " (*Rel. Exp. of St. Paul*, p. 246).

the transcendent Son of God and Jesus of Nazareth? Rather, there is no abyss. They are inseparably One to faith. We see the Christ of the Synoptists, and the Christ of St. Paul, and find the same Person demanding our reverence, and the instinctive worship of our lips, "My Lord and my God."

We are glad to find this conviction strengthened by Prof. C. A. Scott's words in the Cambridge Biblical Essays. He acknowledges the difference between the historical and the Pauline Jesus, but denies that it amounts to a contradiction. It is "quantitative not qualitative." It is the variety of life. Between Jesus and the Pauline Epistles stand the death and resurrection of the Saviour, the experience of Paul and of the primitive Church. Because the picture is different there is no need to deny the identity of the Person portrayed. "We fail to find any critical necessity for querying the genuineness of any feature in the teaching of Jesus simply on the ground that it re-appears in the teaching of Paul."[1] St. Paul confirms the total impression of the Gospels.[2] He, with them, assigns to Christ the most absolute place among men.

For the disciples the Christ of History and the Christ of experience were inseparable. For the Christian Church of all generations to the present there has been no doubt of this identity. As Professor Scott Holland has stated so forcibly, "The very same people who hold the Christological faith, put together and accept the record that we have in our hands of the historical Jesus."[3] Though St. Luke, to take one instance, "must have drunk in the entire Christology of his great patient," yet his Gospel has no hint of more than a simple historical record, no hint of conflict or contrast between the Christ of St. Paul and the Christ of the

[1] See p. 352 for the difference and correspondence between the Pauline Christ and the Christ of the Synoptic Gospels.

[2] See p. 375.

[3] *Jesus or Christ?* p. 125.

Synoptists, or of the struggle with the Law or with Hellenism. For him, the interest in the earthly life of Jesus was deepened by the doctrine which he had learnt from the Apostle of the Gentiles.[1] So, Professor Scott Holland asserts, "Christianity began as Christology."[2]

So it is that amongst members of almost all, except the most extreme, of the schools above described, we find those who are willing at least to give to Jesus the supreme place in the Revelation of God to the world, and even to attribute to Him the worth of God for the soul. For Father Tyrrell, Christ seemed to point to Himself as "the embodiment of the life and truth He taught, He made personal love and devotion to Himself His equivalent to salvation and the righteousness it involves. This was implicitly to take God's place in relation to the soul—the place which Jesus has actually taken for Christians."[3]

So Professor Schmiedel writes: "It is a very serious question whether we to-day should possess Christianity at all if Jesus had not been interpreted as a divine being."[4]

So Bousset, in his book *Jesus*, finds that Jesus bound His disciples to His Person as never again one man has bound men. He is the Master of the inner life. "He may not be divine, but He is not to be denied worship."

This brings us to the position we have taken up throughout. The central impulse, the central study, the central experience of Christianity is its Christology. It is the personality of its Founder which proclaims its supreme importance for mankind. It is no uniqueness of doctrine, but of Person which makes Christianity the religion of the world.[5]

[1] Contrast the statements of Rev. R. J. Campbell, *Jesus or Christ?* p. 189. "For Paul, the earthly ministry of Jesus does not exist." The Christ of St. Paul is "an official, a potentate, a majestic 'summum bonum'; but not a living teacher in homespun."

[2] P. 124.

[3] *Jesus or Christ?* p. 9.

[4] *Jesus or Christ?* p. 65.

[5] It is difficult, if not impossible, to select any special article of

It is not merely what He said or did, not merely the example He left of how life ought to be lived. Religion is not ethics as Kant held. It is a living faith in a Person—Jesus of Galilee, the Risen Lord of Glory. St. Paul did not place his theology on the one hand as cold and barren and dead, and his devotion to his living Lord on the other as that which was energizing and vitalizing. He was as we all are. Every one with religious life and even the simplest faith must, whether he consciously realize it or not, have a theology of some kind. The Christ of the Synoptists, the Christ of experience, the Christ of St. Paul are but one Christ, known through experience, interpreted in His manifold action and infinite love in History, portrayed by the inspired words of our New Testament in that earthly life which gives content to our faith.

All healthy thought refuses to accept traditional phrases without testing, searching, and proving. It shrinks from the conventional and traditional as such, and puts away the shibboleth—sometimes, it is true, with no little admixture of the gnostic pride of superior knowledge. Through many stages and along different lines, the incessant work of examination, analysis and construction proceeds. Are they parallel lines? Do they diverge, or do they converge? The landscape is too wide for those engaged on some small portion of it to take it all in at a glance, or for any such to judge of the whole work of their day or generation. But we work on, believing that the paths meet somewhere in the future out of our ken, and in the hope that some day a prophet will arise from among us who will show us that not only at the end of our own path, but of all paths, stands the One Christ Jesus the Lord. Even now, it may be, as to

religious faith which is in its general aspect a doctrine peculiar to Christianity. Its uniqueness lies in the Person of the Founder (Wallace, *Gifford Lectures*, iii.) quoted *Dict. of C. and G.*, Art. "Divinity of Christ" (Rev. A. S. Martin).

Moses of old, a vision of the promised land shines swiftly through the parted mists as we tread the higher lands up which we toil. In that "native land of the Spirit" the hard distinctions of history do not fade away into unimportance or nothingness; they are seen to compose the landscape, though now transfigured by the revelation—through them—of the love of God.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

GENERAL WORKS

"The Story of St. Paul"	Dr. Bacon
"Paulinism"	Prof. F. C. Baur
"New Testament Theology"	Prof. W. Beyschlag
"The Church's Task under the Empire"	Dr. Bigg
"The Messiah of the Apostles" . . .	Prof. C. A. Briggs
"St. Paul's Conception of Christianity"	Prof. A. B. Bruce
"Romans ix. 5" (*J. T. S.*, vol. v. p. 451)	Prof. Burkitt
"Evolution of Religion".	Prof. Caird
"Cambridge Biblical Essays"	
"Cambridge Theological Essays"	
"St. Paul's Attitude towards Greek Philosophy" (*Expositor*, 5th ser., vol. ix)	Rev. A. Carr
"Book of Enoch"	Dr. Charles
"Paulus in Athen" (*Studia Biblia*) . .	Prof. E. Curtius
"The Living Christ and the Four Gospels"	Dr. Dale
"Light from the Ancient East" . .	von. Adolf Deissmann
"Studies in Theology"	Dr. Denney
"Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels" (cited as *Dict. of C. and G.*)	
"Dictionary of Religion and Ethics" (cited as *Dict. of Rel. and Eth.*)	
"Doctrine of the Person of Christ" . .	Prof. D. J. A. Dorner
"The God-Man"	Principal Edwards
"The Gospel of Paul"	Dean Everett
"The Expositor" (as cited)	
"Studies in Religion and Theology" .	Dr. A. M. Fairbairn
"Christ in Modern Theology" . . .	Dr. A. M. Fairbairn
"The Background of the Gospels" . .	Dr. W. Fairweather
"The Christ of History and the Christ of Experience"	Dr. Forrest
"The Authority of Christ"	Dr. Forrest
"The Religious Experience of St. Paul"	Prof. Gardner
"Lux Mundi" (edited by)	Dr. Gore
"Dissertations on the Incarnation". .	Dr. Gore

" The Knowledge of God "	Prof. Gwatkin
" Expansion of Christianity " . . .	Dr. Adolf Harnack
" History of Dogma "	Dr. Adolf Harnack
" What is Christianity ? "	Dr. Adolf Harnack
" Hibbert Journal " (cited as *H. J.*)	
" St. Paul and Hellenism " (*Studia Biblia*)	Dr. Hicks
" The Mystical Element in Religion " .	Baron von Hügel
" Divine Immanence "	Dr. Illingworth
" Personality, Human and Divine ". .	Dr. Illingworth
" Christian Mysticism "	Dr. Inge
" Jesus or Christ ? " (*Hibbert Symposium*)	
" Journal of Theological Studies " (cited as *J. T. S.*)	
" St. Paul's Conception of the Last Things "	Dr. Kennedy
" The Testimony of St. Paul to Christ "	Dr. Knowling
" Messianic Interpretation "	Dr. Knowling
" The Earlier Epistles of St. Paul ". .	Prof. Kirsopp Lake
" The Divinity of Our Lord " (*Bampton Lectures*)	Rev. H. P. Liddon
" L'Évangile et l'Église "	Abbé Loisy
" Lectures on the ' Kenosis ' " . . .	Prof. A. J. Mason
" The Spiritual Development of St. Paul "	Dr. Matheson
" Christianity in the Apostolic Age " .	Prof. A. C. McGiffert
" St. Paul's View of the Divinity of Our Lord " (*Essays for the Times*)	Dr. Alan Menzies
" Prolegomena "	Prof. Hope Moulton
" Jesus Christ and the Social Question "	Prof. F. G. Peabody
" Paulinism " (*Hibbert Lectures*, 1888) .	Prof. O. Pfleiderer
" Early Christian Conceptions of Christ "	Prof. O. Pfleiderer
" St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen "	Sir W. M. Ramsay
" Life of Jesus "	Prof. E. Rénan
" St. Paul "	Prof. E. Rénan
" Justification and Reconciliation " . .	Dr. Albrecht Ritschl
" Psalms of the Pharisees "	Prof. Ryle and Dr. James
" St. Paul "	Prof. Auguste Sabatier
" What the First Christians thought about Christ "	Prof. Sanday
" Christologies, Ancient and Modern " .	Prof. Sanday
" History of the Jewish People ". . .	Dr. Emil Schürer
" The Quest of the Historical Jesus " (*von Reimarus zu Wrede*)	Prof. Schweitzer
" St. Paul's Conception of Christ " . .	Rev. D. Somerville

"The Jewish and Christian Messiah" .	Prof. V. H. Stanton
"The Christology of Jesus"	Dr. J. Stalker
"The Pauline Theology"	Dr. G. B. Stevens
"The Theology of the New Testament"	Dr. G. B. Stevens
"The Apostles' Creed"	Prof. Swete
"The Relation of St. Paul to Contemporary Jewish Thought"	Rev. H. St. John Thackeray
"New Testament Synonyms" . . .	Archbishop Trench
"St. Paul the Man and his Work" . .	Prof. H. Weinel (trans. by the Rev. G. A. Bienemann)
"Paul and Jesus"	J. Weiss
"History of the Apostolic Age". . .	Prof. Carl von Weizsäcker
"The Beginnings of Christianity" . .	Prof. Paul Wernle
Dr. Westcott's Works	
"The One Christ"	Dr. Weston
"Hulsean Lectures" (1903)	Dr. Whitworth

COMMENTARIES

"Ephesians and Colossians" . . .	Dr. T. K. Abbott
"The New Testament in Greek" . .	Dean Alford
"The Expositor's Bible"	
"Commentary"	Dr. Ellicott
"Romans"	Dr. Gifford
"Exposition of Philippians ii. 5–11" .	Dr. Gifford
"Sermon on Romans ix. 5"	Dr. Kennedy
"Old and New Testament Studies". .	Dr. F. Godet (edited by Canon Lyttleton)
"1 Corinthians"	Principal Goudge
"Answer to Sermon by Dr. Kennedy"	Dr. Gifford
"Galatians"	Dr. Lightfoot
"Colossians"	Dr. Lightfoot
"Philippians and Philemon" . . .	Dr. Lightfoot
"The Acts of the Apostles"	Rev. T. E. Page
"2 Corinthians"	Dr. A. Plummer
"Ephesians"	Dr. A. Robinson
"Romans"	Prof. Sanday and Principal Headlam
"Appendices"	Drs. Westcott and Hort
"Philippians and Philemon" . . .	Prof. M. R. Vincent

HASTINGS' BIBLE DICTIONARY (referred to herein as "*H.D.B.*"), Articles:—

"Salvation. Saviour"	Prof. W. Adams Brown

"Second Adam" . . . . . Prof. Denney
"Philo" . . . . . Prof. J. Drummond (additional volume)
"Paul the Apostle" . . . . . Prof. G. G. Findlay
"Eschatology" . . . . . Prof. G. G. Findlay
"Sacrifice" . . . . . Prof. W. P. Paterson
"Outlines of the Life of Christ" . . . Prof. W. Sanday
"The Son of God" . . . . . Prof. W. Sanday
"Messiah" . . . . . Prof. V. H. Stanton
"Mysteries" . . . . . Prof. H. Stewart
"The Holy Spirit" . . . . . Prof. H. B. Swete
Also many shorter Articles as quoted in the text.

INDEX

INDEX OF TEXTS

OLD TESTAMENT

NEW TESTAMENT

APOCRYPHAL AND OTHER BOOKS

Printed by BUTLER & TANNER, *Frome and London.*