
A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php

wash away the pollution and guilt of sin. And too often those who have the light of Christianity, seem to prefer to seek some fountain which may be discovered to them in their philosophy, in their humanitarianism, or in their works, in which they may wash and be healed, rather than come to Christ and the fountain opened in him. They are like the crowd of blind, halt, and withered, waiting in the portico of ancient Bethesda for the legendary angel to descend and trouble its waters. They know not that he whom all angels worship, and to whom all diseases render prompt and willing obedience, is among them. This miracle seems designed to present — but we discover it not, till we separate the false from the genuine in the text — the Saviour of the world in striking contrast with all those false deities, supports, and helps which sinful men are fain to search out in seeking after peace of conscience and hope towards God.

ARTICLE VI.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE APOSTLES.

BY S. R. ASBURY, RESIDENT LICENCIATE AT ANDOVER.

[Continued.]

The Discourse of Stephen.

Introduction.

Stephen may be recognized in his single speech as the immediate predecessor of Paul. We meet here with all those ideas which distinguish the doctrine of Paul from those already considered. It might be expected that the teaching of Jesus as to the profound antithesis between Law and Gospel would be apprehended and further developed by some believers prior to the conversion of Paul; and hence there is no reason to doubt the historical character of this discourse. A token of its genuineness has also been discovered in the circumstance that the expression "Son of

Man," used by Jesus himself, and still current in the infant church, occurs here for the last time in the New Testament.

The Fundamental Idea

of the discourse is the irreceptivity of the Jewish people in all periods towards the divine revelation. Their unbelief with respect to Christ is not isolated, but constantly repeated, and ends in their exclusion from the kingdom of God.

In Stephen's discourse, the imperfection of the Mosaic law and ritual is first expressly set forth, and the impending dissolution of the old covenant prophesied. While James, and Peter in the earlier period of his ministry, in accordance with their position towards the law and ritual, attributed to the believing Jews a certain preference over heathen converts, on account of their observance of the law, Stephen is the immediate predecessor of Paul in regarding this adherence to the legal point of view as only an imperfect stage of development, and in bringing into full consciousness the inadequacy of the Mosaic ritual. It was natural that this should be done first by a Hellenist, like Stephen; the Hellenists being naturally most inclined and adapted to apprehend and set forth the universal elements of Christianity.

The Doctrine of Paul.

Introduction.

The Sources. The discourses of Paul recorded in the Acts, though presenting less of his peculiar view of Christian truth than the Epistles, are not without importance. Had it been the intention of the author of the book of Acts, as alleged by some modern critics, to approximate the teaching of Paul as much as possible to that of Peter, there would have been some difficulty in discriminating between them, whereas the differences are palpable even in the forms of presentation. Nor are the speeches of Paul made up from his Epistles, since between these, also, there is evident distinction, together with essential agreement.

All the Epistles are not equally important as sources of doctrine. For this purpose, the Epistles to the Romans, Galatians, 1 and 2 Corinthians, Ephesians, Colossians, and with reference to the *parousia* 1 and 2 Thessalonians. The Epistle to the Philippians, being chiefly hortatory, is of less weight, and the pastoral Epistles are of still less, referring only to the idea of the church. The Epistle to Philemon may be excluded from the list of sources. The Epistle to the Romans is the most important. Though it does not contain the apostle's whole doctrinal system, it takes us at once into its centre. The other Epistles rank in importance in the order in which they are mentioned.

The genuineness of the Pauline Epistles has been so generally acknowledged that there is no need of discussing the question. Those on which doubt has been cast are, moreover, the least important for our purpose. The internal evidence is all in favor of their authenticity. Whatever differences of view exist may be be explained by the different occasions of the Epistles. The criticisms are of too indefinite and altogether negative a character to be worth consideration. The Epistles are also so connected and necessary to a full development of Pauline doctrine, that we must accept them entire.

The Apostle Paul's Historical Position in the Apostolic Church.

In devoting himself to missions to the heathen, and insisting on the recognition of heathen converts independently of the law, he may certainly be regarded as introducing a new stage of development, but not as acting in opposition to the previous apostles, or as originating a new idea; since Peter made the first step in this direction. The idea already existed; but it required an advocate of the profound and earnest nature of Paul to clothe it, as it were, in flesh and blood, and establish it as the doctrine of the church, as we find it in the age of John.

We should expect that the man for such a task would

be called from the circle of Stephen; but, as Neander remarks, it was not from the soft shell of Hellenistic culture, but from the hard kernel of Pharisaism, that the new spirit was to take its form. In order that he might contend successfully against the mingling of the Jewish legal and the free Christian spirit, it was necessary that he should know the former by experience, as well as the latter. The dialectic taste acquired by him in his education to be a learned expounder of the law and tradition, adapted him especially to develop the fundamental verities of the gospel in their living, organic connection.

The manner of his conversion, its suddenness, and the presence of the Redeemer himself, must have exercised great influence on the general character of his teaching. The death of Stephen seems, according to the Acts, only to have driven Paul further from the kingdom. The moderation of Gamaliel can hardly, as supposed by some, have contributed to his conversion. But that there was some preparation is implied in his vivid description of such a state of mind in Rom. vii., which could not have been so vividly described had it not been personally experienced.

His declarations in Gal. i. 12, 16 show that he was conscious of having received his knowledge of the gospel, not from the instructions of the older apostles, but directly from the Lord himself. This is confirmed by 1 Cor. ix. .1 and the account in Acts; the divergence of the latter being not such as to excite any suspicion of its authenticity. All the statements evidently refer to an objective fact, and not to an ecstatic vision, especially as the latter would have had no weight with others as a divine call to the apostolic office.

The complete separation of his old and new life by his conversion led Paul to regard redemption, not as the perfection of Old Testament revelation, but as a specifically new element in the revelation of God in Christ. As it was dark in his life, so it was dark in the whole period of history, before this revelation. But his life previously was under

the law; the principle of salvation is therefore presented by him as in opposition to the law. As the law was inadequate to produce the new life, the Jews, equally with the heathen, are in need of a Saviour. His apostleship to the Gentiles is thus closely connected with the manner of his conversion. Prior to this he *must* have persecuted the church, because he regarded Christ as the destroyer of the law and ritual. Those expressions of Christ which intimated the abrogation of the law made the deepest impression on his mind. When he accepted Jesus as the Messiah, he also adopted this view. The truth came to him not fragmentarily, yet as a whole it was capable of organic development.

Did he moderate his views in the latter portion of his life? He expressed them differently, according to the different occasions of the Epistles, but in his later Epistle to the Philippians the distinction between the Jewish and Christian points of view is drawn as sharply as in his letter to the Galatians.

But it was necessary not only to found a church independent of the law, but to preserve a living bond of union between the new church from the heathen and the original Jewish church. Paul was the author of tendencies which might have led to irreconcilable divisions. One of his great aims, therefore, is to bring about a community of feeling by inducing the Gentile converts to aid the poorer members of the Jewish churches, and to yield to the requirements of the law whenever this could be done without the infraction of principle (1 Cor. ix. 10).

There is no ground, either in the Acts or the Epistles, for the hypothesis that Paul and the other apostles were not on a good understanding with each other. The difference of his mode of presentation and type of doctrine from those of others is made no secret of; and yet he knows nothing of any opposition between them which would prevent their cordial co-operation. He is certainly at one with them in his secondary endeavor to show the connection of the old and new covenants, and the paedagogic character of the former.

Articulation of the Pauline System of Doctrine.

In the well-known work of Usteri on this subject,[1] it is presented under two main divisions, the period *before Christ*, and the period *after Christ*. But, as Schmid remarks, this division is altogether too indefinite, and fails to distinguish any common fundamental idea. Schmid's own division of the Pauline doctrine is into *The want of δικαιοσύνη in all men*, and *The production of δικαιοσύνη by faith in Jesus Christ*. This is essentially correct; but in his treatment of section first, he introduces the new element of the *divine action with respect to the want of righteousness*. Since the fundamental thought of the Pauline doctrine is that the righteousness which is striven for in vain on the legal point of view is freely bestowed in Christ, we have rather to present in our first section the doctrine that *the law cannot procure the righteousness which avails before God*, but in the second that man *obtains it by faith in Christ*. Thus a fundamental idea, the idea of δικαιοσύνη, is common to both sections. The object of endeavor is presented as the same under both dispensations; but the manner of attainment is different. All single doctrines adjust themselves naturally about this central point. In the first section, we have the anthropological elements, with a full development of the doctrine of sin; in the second, the Christological or soteriological.

The Fundamental Idea,

as given above, is not peculiar to Paul, but is found in the Gospels as presented by our Lord, and has its roots in the Old Testament. It is certainly most prominent in the Epistles to the Romans and Galatians, where Paul expresses it most explicitly. The greater prominence of the idea of life in some of the later Epistles is quite in accordance, as will be seen below, with the fundamental position of δικαιοσύνη.

[1] Entwickelung des Paulinischen Lehrbegriffes.

Since in the Old Testament, as Schmid remarks, the one fundamental relation of man is his relation to God, and every other is derived from this, δικαιοσύνη in the Old Testament designates righteousness, uprightness, integrity towards God. In so far as the will of God is expressed in the law, it designates that condition in which a man agrees to the requirements of the law, and in this it is involved that man is able to regard himself as righteous, and that he is acknowledged by God to be a righteous person. Δικαιοσύνη thus designates the state of highest moral perfection. As the divine will is the norm for the human will, the δίκαιος is he in whom the relation of dependence on the divine will is adequately realized. The immediate consequence of δικαιοσύνη, according to Paul, is ζωή, and as these two ideas are thus closely related, sometimes one, sometimes the other, is brought into the foreground in the Pauline Epistles. As the consequence of sin is condemnation, which is death, so the consequence of δικαιοσύνη is ζωή; and as the idea of death comprises at the same time moral and physical corruption, so the idea of life, according to the conception of Paul, comprises all salvation, both subjective and objective.

Paul distinguishes a twofold δικαιοσύνη, ἰδία δικ. (Rom. x. 3), and δικ. θεοῦ or ἐκ θεοῦ (Phil. iii. 9), or ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ and παρὰ τῷ θεῷ (Rom. ii. 13; iii. 20). The former being such as man may attain by his own efforts; the latter expressions designate such as is attributed to man by God. The law may conduct to the former, but not to the latter. That righteousness alone has any value which is acknowledged as such by God, and he can acknowledge that only which proceeds from him, which is ἐκ θεοῦ. There are two ways in which one may strive after δικαιοσύνη, one in which the divine acknowledgment is obtained as the reward of merit; the other in which he despairs of bringing any merits before God, and expects δικ. from the divine grace alone. The two methods exclude each other. Paul had tried them both, and his doctrine is thus closely connected with his experience.

SECTION FIRST. — By the Deeds of the Law no Man can be Justified before God.

The Universality of Sin in the Human Race.

The idea that all men are wanting in righteousness before God is found in the other apostolic doctrine, but is expressly developed only by Paul. He treats it in the Epistle to the Romans as a matter of experience, leaving it to the conscience of each to include himself in this experience. The Jews and Greeks being the representatives of the human race, the case of all must be that of either the one people or the other. He begins, in his demonstration, with the heathen, as the proof was easier in their case than in that of the Jews; their sin exhibiting itself generally in more striking forms.

In order to prove that this want of righteousness is a guilty one, the apostle refers back to a state in which even the heathen were in possession of a real knowledge of God. Heathenism is not a lower stage of religious development, but real perversion and extinction of the religious consciousness; and this presupposes an original possession of the truth (Rom. i. 18). All that might be known of God the heathen had known; their knowledge resting on God's own revelation of himself in his works and in the human conscience. From these the divine omnipotence and deity (*δύναμις* and *θειότης*) might be known, but not without an original God-consciousness. But the *καρδία*, the centre of spiritual life, being estranged from God, this higher knowledge, which the heathen once had, has been gradually suppressed, and their present condition is one of complete but guilty ignorance of the divine will, which must result in the prevalence of sin and idolatry. Paul does not mention the influence of evil spirits in producing this state of things, evidently because he would restrict himself to the realm of experience. If the word *δαιμόνια*, in 1 Cor. x. 20, 21, is to be understood, not in the Hellenistic, but the usual New Testament sense, of evil spirits, it would follow that Paul

shared the opinion of the Jews of idols, as evil spirits which could procure the worship of men. It would then be implied in 1 Cor. viii. 4; x. 19, that he denies reality to the idols only *as such*. Nothing, however, prevents us from understanding *δαιμόνια* in the usual Hellenistic sense; and since, as is clear from *δεισιδαιμονεστέρους* (Acts xvii. 22), he uses this word in this sense, and since the passages above cited most naturally lead to the view that he ascribed reality to the idols only in the conception of the heathen, we cannot regard it as certain that Paul shares the view designated.

The speeches of Paul in the Acts agree with Rom. i. as to the ability of the heathen to perform the task required of them (Acts xvii. 27), the original communion of man with God, and consequent sin of his ignorance, and that, notwithstanding their perversity, God has repeatedly manifested his goodness to the heathen (Acts xiv. 17. Compare Rom. ii. 4).

Paul does not hold that sin has destroyed all susceptibility of the divine among the heathen. He supposes such a susceptibility to exist, though slumbering, as he ascribes to the heathen the possibility of a relative fulfilment of the law (Rom. ii. 14, 26), and a striving after union with God as lying at the foundation of their worship of the one unknown Supreme (Acts xvii. 23), and finds some germs of truth even in the folly of heathen wisdom and poetry (Acts xvii. 28).

The Jews also have no righteousness before God. They also are the objects of his wrath. The possession of the law makes no difference in their relation to God, but increases their guilt, as it is not, like the law in the heart, exposed to the disturbing influences of sin. Sin being thus the reigning principle in all men, all differences vanish in view of the ideal of righteousness.

Sin as Bias. While James and Peter restrict their view to actual sins, Paul refers to the sinful state lying back of all sinful desires and actions. He comprises both *actual* and *habitual* sin under the word *ἁμαρτία*. Man finds this evil propensity within him on the first awaking of his moral

consciousness (Rom. vii. 9); it is this which radically determines his whole inner life, which opposes his fulfilling of the law, and frustrates all his higher resolutions.

The Seat of Sin is, according to Paul, the σάρξ. We must distinguish the physical and ethical ideas of σάρξ, explaining the latter by the former, and by the trichometrical division of human nature into σῶμα, ψυχή, and πνεῦμα, which is found in some passages of Paul's Epistles. Σάρξ, in the physical sense, designates primarily the matter of which the σῶμα, which is organized σάρξ, consists; but in a wider sense comprises both σῶμα and ψυχή, and is opposed to πνεῦμα (2 Cor. vii. 1). Since the idea of the sinful is closely connected with the idea of the earthly and perishable, σάρξ derives its ethical sense from its physical. According to Paul, sin has deeply penetrated into the present physical organism, so that motives to sin continually proceed from it, and σαρκικός may be regarded as equivalent to sinful.

It must not, however, be supposed that Paul attributes sin to the present *corporeity* of man. This would be inconsistent with Christ's assumption of a human body and the destination of the body to eternal glory. It might be ascribed to the unrestrained dominion of the sensuous over the spiritual part of man, which is charged against man as guilt, and for which he is subject to punishment. But the antithesis of σάρξ and πνεῦμα is not identical with this opposition of the sensuous and spiritual in man. Σάρξ has a more comprehensive reference than to the sins which spring from the bodily nature. Sin, in its highest forms, is found in spirits which have no bodies. There is a σοφία σαρκική. Paul even ascribes an ascetic tendency to the σάρξ (Col. ii. 18, 23), and regards the deepest root of evil as confidence in one's own strength, and in striving after ἰδία δικαοσύνη. He refers mainly to those sins which spring from the senses, because these are manifest even in a regenerate person, and because they were most prevalent in his day.

Death the Recompence of Sin.

All the evil which God has connected with sin is included in death. The idea is a comprehensive one, comprising spiritual, physical, and eternal death.

The first element is *spiritual deadness — spiritual misery*, which is inseparably connected with sin (Rom. vi. 16; vii. 10; viii. 8; 2 Cor. ii. 16; iii. 6). This is that condition in which the moral impulses in man are extinguished, and the higher life is suppressed by the lower. The idea does not necessarily include conscious unhappiness. It is capable of degrees. The extinction takes place gradually. During life there is a possibility of restoration; but if a man perseveres in sin to its close, the capacity for good becomes totally extinct, and the condition of eternal death is entered upon, to which Paul refers in 2 Cor. ii. 16, in the words *εἰς θάνατον*. This is the perfect form of the spiritual death already begun, and is the second element in Paul's conception.

The third element is physical death, the violent separation of soul and body. That Paul regarded this as the immediate consequence of sin may be seen from the reference of Rom. v. 12 to the representations of Genesis, and from 1 Cor. xv. 21, 22; Rom. viii. 10. It is the feeling of guilt which gives death its terror (2 Cor. v. 4), but it does not follow that Paul regarded only the peculiar manner of death as the consequence of sin. Man is not necessarily mortal, but the fact of death is due to sin. There may be translation without death (2 Cor. v. 4); there will be at the *parousia* (1 Cor. xv. 52).

Mortality as the consequence of sin is mirrored also in nature (Rom. viii. 19). *Κτίσις* alone cannot designate unredeemed humanity, nor can the apostle ascribe to this a longing from the beginning of the world for the consummation of God's kingdom; nor can he describe the fall as involuntary (v. 20), or the redemption of the heathen as taking place at the same time with the glorification of the

sons of God (v. 21), without mentioning the conditions. It is certainly the teaching of Paul that nature needs a purification, as well as man; for such a present condition of nature is alone suitable for sinful man as mirrors his own internal dissension.

The Origin of Sin and Death.

From the whole tenor of Rom. v. 12–21, compared with 1 Cor. xv. 21, it follows that Paul regards the universal dominion of death (and sin) as the consequence of the sin of the first man. The transgressions of individuals cannot be regarded as the primary cause of death in man; since death takes place in those whose moral consciousness has not been awakened. Paul traces not only actual sin, but the *habitus* from which sin proceeds, to the sin of Adam, and in Rom. vii. 7, he designates this predisposition as ἁμαρτία.

Paul does not expressly state the nature of the connection between the first man and his posterity; but it is evident that, as sin is predisposition, it could not have spread from the force of example, but from the natural increase of the human race. Is the sin of the first man, according to Paul, reckoned by God to all others as guilt? This would be the case, if all men took part in it. But the grammatical impossibility of that rendering of the words ἐφ᾽ ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον on which this view is founded follows from the fact that, even if it were possible to take ἐφ᾽ ᾧ for *in quo*, it must be referred to the nearest subject, θάνατος, and not to the remote, ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου. Moreover, if according to verse 13, the imputation of actual sins to the heathen must be restricted, because they were not in possession of the Mosaic law, certainly no imputation of a sinful bias derived from Adam can be spoken of as guilt.

According to Paul, then, the first original cause of the death of all men is the sin of Adam; the secondary cause, the sinning of the men themselves. All men having strengthened their sinful bias by the concurrence of their

will, they may account death as the punishment of their own transgressions.

Sin entered *humanity* only by the sin of the first man. It was already present in the universe; and there is a close connection between the sin of man and the sphere of evil lying above humanity. Though not in the first part of Romans, the apostle refers to this connection frequently elsewhere. He designates by an expression borrowed from Jewish theology all those relations which are not penetrated by the relation to God as *αἰὼν οὗτος*, concerning which all that is doubtful is whether this period extends to the second, or only the first, advent of Christ. As there are passages favoring both views, we may perhaps combine them. The *αἰὼν begins* to cease with the first advent, but does so entirely only with the second. It is dependent on a super-terrestrial kingdom of evil, all of which is also dependent on one higher spirit, who is the wicked one, *καὶ ἐξοχήν*. This kingdom of darkness is also called a kingdom *of the air* (Eph. ii. 2) and *in heaven* (vi. 12), which expressions are evidently not to be taken literally.

The Law and Sin.

When the apostle speaks of the inability of the law to produce a new life, he refers primarily to the positive Mosaic law, and to this in its whole circumference. For he makes no sharp distinction between the ritual and ethical parts of the law. He sometimes refers more particularly to one than the other; but it is not to be supposed that in denying a justifying efficacy to the law he means simply the ritual. He places by the side of the Mosaic law the moral law written in the heart, as essentially of the same import. It is owing to the obscuration of this that the Mosaic legislation confers so great an advantage on the Jews over the heathen.

In denying justifying efficacy to the works of the law, Paul understands, not those works which the law requires, but those which it is able to produce in man in his state of

sin. The gospel is not a new law, but a new power. The incapacity of the law to justify is due to the evil disposition of man. In Rom. vii. 7 sq. the apostle distinguishes two stages in the moral development of the unregenerate life — a state of comparative innocence, in which man, being ignorant of the higher moral norm, is not conscious of the slumbering evil within him; and the state in which the latent depravity is roused and strengthened by the application of the law.

The first object for which the law was given is the *knowledge of sin*, not in that degree in which the heathen possess it, but a deeper, more penetrating knowledge (ἐπίγνωσις, Rom. iii. 20). The second object is regarded by Paul as the multiplication of particular transgressions of the law. This is the actual result of its prohibitions, and is regarded, according to the teleological manner of the scriptures, as the object of the law. The disease of sin is more easily cured when brought to outward manifestation. The third object, *a reaction against sin*, appears to be in some contradiction to the second. It is, however, the rendering of the passage (Gal. vii. 19) best suited to the context. The law as a παιδαγωγός, by the terrors of divine punishment, hinders man somewhat from abusing his freedom. This limiting effect is seen in the superiority of the Jews over the heathen. But had this been its only effect, man might have been led into self-delusion as to his real condition, whereas, by producing outward transgressions, it brings to light his inward depravity, and shows its own inefficiency as a means of justification. The *provisory* character of the law clearly follows. Bringing men into bondage, it awakens in them a longing for deliverance, and prepares the way for a new economy (Gal. ii. 19).

The legal relation of man to God is not the original. The *promise* has the priority, and the possession of the promise is the greatest advantage which distinguishes the Jews from the heathen (Rom. iv.; Gal. iii.).

SECTION SECOND. — Man is Justified before God only by Faith in Christ.

The Fulness of Times. The Person of Christ.

The redemption of humanity by Christ is the goal of all previous history. The heathen were prepared for this event, though in a less effective manner than the Jews (Rom. ii. 4; Acts xiv. 17). The manner of this redemption, however, though intimated in prophecies, may yet be said to have remained hidden in the divine counsel till the appearance of Christ.

With regard to the *person* of Christ, we may distinguish between the doctrine of Paul's earlier and his later Epistles, not, however, so as to find any contradiction between them, as some have done. The Christology of the earlier Epistles is simply less developed than that of the later. In the former, the Deity of Christ is nowhere explicitly stated, but is frequently implied. He is distinguished clearly from other men, as having assumed only the *ὁμοίωμα* of the sinful *σάρξ* (Rom. viii. 3), and as being perfectly sinless (2 Cor. v. 21; Rom. v. 19), and from the first man as being *ἐξ οὐρανοῦ*, and being, instead of a *ψυχὴ ζῶσα*, a *πνεῦμα ζωοποιοῦν* (1 Cor. xv. 45–47). The essential equality of Christ with God is implied in the designation of Christ as *the Spirit* (2 Cor. iii. 17). The use of the word *ἐξαπέστειλεν* in Gal. iv. 4 is also significant, and the contrast of his conditions of poverty and riches (2 Cor. viii. 9). In 1 Cor. viii. 6, a participation in the creation of the world is ascribed to Christ, and in 1 Cor. x. 4, in the conduct of the Jewish people.

In the later Epistles to the Philippians and Colossians, the Christology is much more developed. In Phil. ii. 6, 7, Paul distinguishes the condition in which Christ was in perfect dependence on God from that in which he was in full possession of the divine power and glory, which, like his being rich (2 Cor. viii. 9), must have been before his incarnation, as expressed also in Col. ii. 9. As, according to the last passage, Christ was already equal to God, *εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ*

must refer to his recognition and adoration on the part of all creatures, and it will be preferable to render *οὐχ ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο* as Schmid does, *he did not regard the εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ as what he wished selfishly to retain for himself.* In the passage where Paul has most developed his doctrine of the person of Christ, he designates him as *εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἀοράτου* (Col. i. 15), which must be understood not of the historical Christ, but of his condition before his appearance in the flesh, as Paul does not speak of the former till verse 18. The conception is that God himself, being invisible, becomes manifest to the world in Christ. This is also the idea expressed in *σωματικῶς*, Col. ii. 9. The fulness of the Deity took upon it a definite form in the Son. By *πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως* also we are to understand, with Schmid, that this absolute image of the invisible God in an absolute manner opened the path of life for the whole creation. It does not indicate his relation to God as the first being created by him. It is further explained by *ἐν αὐτῷ ἐκτίσθη*, which denotes that he is the ideal ground of all existence. It is common to both the earlier and later Epistles that Christ is apprehended before his appearance in the flesh as *not* a creature. It would then be perfectly consistent for Paul to speak of Christ directly as God; and it is most probable, though not certain, that he does so in Rom. ix. 5. The only other passage to which we can appeal is Tit. ii. 13, on account of the absence of the article before *σωτῆρος* and the primary reference of *ἐπιφάνεια* to Christ, were not the designation of Christ as *ὁ μέγας θεός* evidently un-Pauline.

When Paul speaks of the incarnate Christ, he distinguishes the condition of *perfect dependence on God*, in which Christ renounces the possession (not merely the use) of the divine power and glory, and that in which he has returned to this possession (2 Cor. xiii. 4). The first reaches its acme in the death, the second begins with the resurrection, of Christ. He also refers to a third condition, — that before his incarnation. The state after his exaltation to the Father is dis-

tinguished from this, in that his human nature then takes part in his divine glory (Phil. iii. 21), and that he is then confessed and extolled as the Author of a new life (Phil. ii. 9–11). It is noteworthy that whenever Paul sets forth the human nature of Christ, he always intimates at the same time his *divine dignity*. So in Rom. i. 3, 4; viii. 3; Phil. ii. 7, 8.

The Work of Christ. His Death and Resurrection.

By Christ the δικαιοσύνη, which could not be effected by the law, is to become the actual possession of humanity. As man, being unable to fulfil the law, is exposed to the *wrath* of God and its consequence — death (Eph. ii. 3), the work of Christ is to *afford the propitiation demanded by the law*, and to *communicate a new life*. Both sides are set forth by Paul as the effect of the *death* of Christ, to which the resurrection is supplementary. The *prophetic office* of Christ is left quite in the background. It is, indeed, doubtful if Paul once mentions it, as Eph. ii. 17 may be referred to the preaching of the apostles.

Paul does not regard Christ's *perfect fulfilment of the law* as substitutionary. He always refers the forgiveness of sins to his death. The one act of righteousness (ἓν δικαίωμα), in Rom. v. 18, is evidently also his self-sacrifice. The view of the substitutionary character of Christ's *sufferings* is not peculiar to Paul, nor his view of his death as the *blood of the covenant* (1 Cor. v. 7; xi. 25). The first is found in Peter; the latter in the synoptic Gospels. But the idea of an expiatory sacrifice is peculiarly Pauline, though he only mentions it expressly in one passage (Eph. v. 2).

As death is the punishment of sin, the expiation of sin can be accomplished only by one in whom death is not the consequence of his own sin, freely submitting to it. In so far as Christ, the representative of entire humanity, bore this suffering, his suffering may be regarded by God as that of entire humanity. In so far as he suffered the punishment of sin did he offer the expiation demanded by the law. It

is, however, presupposed that men themselves appropriate the substitutionary sufferings of the Son of God, and break off from their whole past life of sin. In Rom. viii. 3, which contains essentially the same thought as Gal. iii. 13; 2 Cor. v. 21, sin is said to be *condemned*, i.e. destroyed, viz. by the forgiveness of sins, *in the flesh*, i.e. by the sufferings of Christ in his human nature. In Rom. iii. 25, which is the chief passage containing Paul's doctrine of the death of Christ, the idea is expressed most definitely that the sufferings borne by the Son of God at the same time manifested the divine holinesss (righteousness in the wider sense). In the period before Christ man's sins had not been fully punished; such a manifestation of holiness was therefore necessary. It is also shown how in the work of redemption his holiness was in harmony with his love.

The Atonement. While *ἀπολύτρωσις* in the narrower sense designates only the deliverance from the guilt of the old life, the idea of *καταλλαγή* includes also the inauguration of a new relation to God. God, not Christ, according to 2 Cor. v. 19, is he who reconciles humanity to himself. But *καταλλαγή* is further, as Schmid remarks, "an application of the objective occurrence to the believing subject." The man who appropriates the atonement has thus renounced his enmity towards God. According to Paul's teaching, this change in the relation of man to God presupposes a change in the relation of God to man; otherwise he can ascribe no objective reality to the *wrath* of God. The *love* of God was previously restrained by sin, now it can be freely communicated to man.

By the death of Christ *the law is abrogated*, both in its ritual and ethical parts; not, however, by being made void, but by being fulfilled (Rom. iii. 31). It is clear that with respect to the ethical part, the abrogation is of the form, not of the substance. Its fulfilment is now first become possible (Rom. viii. 4). The motive for this is no longer taken from the letter of the law. The expiation required having been made, the law can no longer exclude from communion with God.

The effect of Christ's death is regarded by Paul as not merely the *forgiveness of sin*, but the *destruction of its power* in man. The transition of man from his state of sin is due to the life-communion with Christ, which is the result of faith in his death and participation in his expiatory sufferings.

The prominence of the *resurrection* in Paul's doctrine may be ascribed to the deep impression made on him by the appearance of the risen Lord at his conversion. He regards it primarily as the divine confirmation of the atoning death of Christ — the guarantee that it is accepted (1 Cor. xv. 17; Rom. iv. 25). As Christ, moreover, always acts as the representative of humanity, believers, by virtue of their communion with him, will partake in his resurrection and in the blessedness and glory of which it forms the commencement. With Christ's resurrection is inseparably connected, in Paul's view, his exaltation to the Father; and with this his sending of the Spirit and bestowal of gifts (Eph. iv. 8). As the Head of the church his constant mediation is necessary; the appropriation of his atonement by mankind being also due to his intercession (Rom. viii. 34).

In tracing redemption to a divine *Trinity*, Paul is distinguished from Peter in that in his doctrine he proceeds from an *economic* to an *immanent* Trinity (2 Cor. xiii. 14; 1 Cor. xii. 4–6; Eph. iv. 4–6). As Neander remarks, it has essentially a practical and historical basis. It is in a practical religious way, through the mediation of redemption by Christ, that we obtain the idea; but it is not simply a trinity of revelation. Paul refers to the immanent relation of the Son to the Father, in Col. i. 13, 15, where he calls him the Son of his love, and his exact image. The Spirit is also spoken of in the same connection with the Father and the Son, and personality is ascribed to him, in 1 Cor. xii. 11, "as he *will*." In 1 Cor. ii. 11, also, the Spirit of God is distinguished from God himself.

Redemption and its Appropriation.

Paul speaks of redemption as both present and future.

Believers are now sons of God, and yet their sonship is a subject of hope. According to Gal. v. 5, this is the case even with the perfection of δικαιοσύνη. Present salvation consists in the forgiveness of sin and the communication of a new divine life.

The *appropriation* of redemption is represented by Paul as due to divine grace. The divine activity is so emphasized as apparently to exclude the human. Man's part is, however, necessarily inferred from the other teachings of the apostle. He sets forth the divine operations in order in Rom. viii. 29, 30. He further distinguishes sanctification from justification in 1 Cor. i. 30; vi. 11.

Election. Paul teaches with special emphasis that the redemption of Christ is for all men, without distinction. The final cause of the failure on the part of some to obtain it is to be found in the divine counsel. Some are eternally chosen and predestinated to salvation; but no decree of reprobation is mentioned, unless the hating of Esau, in Rom. ix. 13, be thus interpreted. Paul's doctrine of predestination, however, cannot be that man's sin is included in the divine decree; for this would contradict his entire teaching elsewhere as to God's judgment and punishment of sin. It is evident that Paul regards the election of believers as conditioned by a foreseen moral susceptibility, as he finds the final ground of the rejection of the Jews in their unbelief (Rom. xi. 20), and designates this unbelief as guilty (xi. 18–21). This statement is not refuted by the hardening of man being regarded as a divine act, and not mere permission of sin; for it always presupposes obstinate unbelief. Nor can an appeal be made to Rom. ix. 16, since, in accordance with Paul's teaching elsewhere, it refers only to that perverse behavior of man in claiming justification as the result of his own performances. It may also be questioned whether such a statement as that in Rom. xi. 32 can be reconciled with a doctrine of unconditional predestination.

Calling is the realization of the eternal counsel in time. It comprises the offering of salvation on the part of God,

and its actual acceptance on the part of man, which is also traced to divine influence. *Called*, in the Pauline sense, are those only who have really accepted the divine call in the preaching of the gospel.

Justification is the immediate consequence of such a believing acceptance of the gospel (Rom. viii. 30). The declaration of man as righteous in the juridical sense, and the production of righteousness by the Holy Spirit are two ideas so distinct that they cannot possibly, as Lipsius thinks,[1] be designated by Paul in the same words and at the same time. To take justification in the latter sense is to confound it with sanctification. That it is to be understood in the juridical sense is evident from its antithesis being condemnation (Rom. v. 18; viii. 33), from Paul himself explaining δικαοῦν by λογίζεσθαι εἰς δικαιοσύνην (Rom. iv. 3, 5, 6), and from the additions παρὰ τῷ θεῷ, ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ. In this sense, also, it is used in the Old Testament, in the discourses of our Lord, and by James. The Pauline idea of justification does not comprise the relation of sonship in believers, for this presupposes the operation of the Spirit of God in the heart, of which forgiveness of sin is the condition. It is true that faith is ascribed to the act of God; but this must be regarded as distinct from the progressive influence of sanctification.

Sanctification, as distinct from justification, is the communication of divine power for the production of a new life in man, which necessarily presupposes on the part of man the consciousness of his new relation to God. The act of justification is a single one; but, as sin is not wholly destroyed, it has to be continually appropriated anew, and so the communication of the Spirit is constantly renewed; every further communication, however, depending on the use made by man of the power already granted him. By the abuse of the means of grace he may lose the new life altogether. It is the Spirit who produces consciousness of forgiveness from which springs that grateful love towards

[1] Die Paulinische Rechtfertigung's Lehre. 1853.

God which is the soul of the whole Christian life. The Spirit is thus the sure confirmation of the expiation effected by the death of Christ — the seal and pledge, and, with reference to the perfection of God's kingdom, its *first fruits* (Rom. viii. 23).

Faith.

Paul presents a much profounder development of the idea of faith than the other apostles. When he distinguishes (Rom. iv.) the faith of Abraham from that of believers in Christ, it is only as differing in the object, not in subjective character. Faith is not perception by the senses, for it relates to the supersensuous; nor is it intellectual cognition. It is founded in the love towards God still lingering in sinful humanity, and has its seat in the heart. It is not historical credence, but such a trust in God as triumphs over outward appearances and inward doubts, and can therefore be ascribed to Abraham, although he was a sinner (*τὸν ἀσεβῆ*, Rom. iv. 5). In faith man opens himself to the reception of a new life, which is gradually but surely perfected. In anticipation of this future perfection, faith may then be accounted unto him for righteousness.

Faith, as peculiarly Christian, consists, according to Paul, in this — that man, overcoming the doubts of divine grace which spring from the consciousness of guilt, feels that his sin is expiated by the death of Christ, and, the wall of separation between himself and God being removed, he is received into the relation of sonship. It presupposes despair of rendering one's self acceptable to God by his own merits, which proceeds from a *change of mind*, and leads to a real possession of new life in communion with Christ.

When Paul makes justification depend on faith in opposition to works, he has primarily in view the works of the law. Faith which does not *work* by love has no value in the sight of God (Gal. v. 6). Still it is faith as apprehending the divine grace, not as the root of the new life, which is said to justify. Even the works of faith are imperfect, and therefore inadequate to satisfy the demands of the law.

According to the two objects of faith, the death and resurrection of Christ, two sides of the idea are to be distinguished. The former is the ground of justification; the latter of the living communion with the risen Saviour, which is represented in different forms, but always as internal and immediate. From Rom. viii. 10, 11 it is, however, plain that this vital communion with Christ is regarded as the same with the indwelling of the Holy Spirit.

As Christ is made to men not only righteousness, but wisdom (1 Cor. iv. 30), and as the treasures of wisdom and knowledge are hidden in him (Col. ii. 3), Paul mentions gnosis in distinction from faith. It is the product of the new life, and thus has its root in faith, but also exercises a purifying and animating influence over these (Col. i. 9, 10; Phil. i. 9). Faith constantly needs enlightening and purifying; so there is no period in the early life of believers when knowledge has become perfect.

In 1 Cor. xiii. 13, Paul speaks of love as greater than faith. By this we are not to understand that the former is the root of the latter, for, as love in its peculiar Christian sense is produced only by the love of God displayed in the atonement, the reverse is the case. The same relation is borne by faith to hope. These three comprise all the virtues of the Christian life (Col. iii. 14; Gal. v. 14; vi. 2; Rom. xiii. 9, 10). All increase of this life depends on the increase of faith (1 Thess. iii. 10; 2 Thess. i. 3, 11; 2 Cor. x. 15). As the power of sin is not altogether destroyed by the new creation, there is danger even of believers returning again into bondage (1 Cor. ix. 27; x. 12); but there is a state of perfect maturity to which they attain by continued purification of the new life (Eph. iv. 13, 14). Thus the δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ, which is at first only a pronouncing just, becomes at last complete deliverance from sin, and perfect dominion of the divine principle.

As, according to Paul, to live under sin and under the law are identical conceptions, with the destruction of sin the law also is abrogated; not, however, in its eternal ele-

ments. It is now, indeed, fulfilled; but, as the new life is not produced by it, this is spoken of as in opposition to life under the law, and its works, notwithstanding their imperfection, are regarded as *good* works.

The Kingdom of God. The Church.

While the church consists only of redeemed men, the kingdom of God, according to Paul, includes the higher world of spirits, and continues after the second coming of Christ. It is also invisible, while the church is visible. Paul distinguishes two invisible kingdoms — that of darkness and that of light. By his redemption man is brought out of connection with the former into connection with the latter. The spirit of Christ being a spirit of love, its possession brings believers into communion with each other, and forms them into the body of Christ. All members must possess this spirit, though not all in the same degree. Notwithstanding all individual differences, the church is but one. The apostle knows of but *one* temple of God, *one* body of Christ, *one* bride of the Lord. But this unity is purely internal (Eph. iv. 4–7). It is the basis of the church's development, but is also (vs. 13) designated as the object towards which it strives. The church is holy; but it does not therefore follow that it consists only of those who are perfect, but of those in whom dwells the Holy Spirit. In 1 Tim. iii. 15, the church is called the "pillar and ground of the truth" The infallibility here ascribed to it does not imply that of all its members, but the higher illumination of their minds. This holy church is also *universal*, comprising all, without distinction of age or condition. Those who are excluded from it are so by their own fault. The church is ever developing, and therefore in the present state never possesses the fulness of Christ's Spirit. There is further an incongruity between the empirical character of the church and its ideal, in that some are connected with it who have never received the spirit of the new life, or through unwatchfulness have lost it. And this incongruity Paul repre-

sents as unavoidable in the present conditions of the church's development (2 Tim. ii. 10, 12). Paul does not himself distinguish between an inner and outer circle in the church, though such a distinction seems to be required, probably because it was of less importance in the apostolic age than at present.

The gifts of grace are various in different members; but, all being the products of the same Spirit, they are in subordination to the unity of the church, and are thus promotive of the church's interests (1 Cor. xii. 4–7). As the Spirit is, according to Paul, the glorifying principle of humanity, these gifts are the natural endowments of each, but purified from sin and exalted by the new life.

The church is distinguished from the kingdom of God by its visible means of grace, viz. *baptism* and the *Lord's supper*. Paul does not expressly distinguish these from all others; but such a distinction seems to be justified by 1 Cor. x. 2, 3 (and perhaps xii. 13). *Baptism* is the means of regeneration through the reception of the forgiveness of sins. It is connected with the impartation of the Spirit (Tit. iii. 5); it introduces to communion with other members (1 Cor. xii. 13), and with Christ himself (Gal. iii. 27). As faith is elsewhere represented as the condition of this communion, and faith presupposes a change of mind, a change of mind, in Paul's view, is always presupposed in baptism. In the apostolic age, baptism itself was a crucial test of a man's faith; it was not therefore necessary to dwell particularly on its conditions. The *Lord's supper* is not mentioned so frequently by Paul as baptism. It is connected with the forgiveness of sins in 1 Cor. x. 16. It is a grateful remembrance of deliverance by the death of Christ from the bondage of sin (1 Cor. xi. 24, 25); but, not merely so, it is also the repeated appropriation of the forgiveness of sin. It, as well as baptism, has a special reference to the *communion of believers* through the death of Christ. It is altogether foreign to Paul's doctrinal conceptions that either the rite of baptism or the supper has

any unconditional efficacy. According to 1 Cor. xv. 50, flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God; it is the Spirit alone which gives life (Rom. viii. 11).

The Consummation.

Individual believers immediately after death enter into a fuller and closer communion with the Lord than is possible here; but the perfection of this communion is attained only when the kingdom of God is consummated. This will be the case at the second coming of Christ; this, then, forms the centre of Paul's eschatology. It is evident that when he wrote his earlier Epistles he still cherished the hope that he would be alive at the second coming (1 Thess. iv. 15; 1 Cor. xv. 52). In the later period of his life he became convinced that he would not survive the *parousia*, and therefore turned his attention more to the condition of believers intervening between their death and the final judgment. The importance which he ascribes to the second coming might lead us to suppose that he regarded the intermediate state as one of imperfect communion and entire incorporeity. In the Epistles to the Thessalonians he comforts those who were troubled about the condition of the dead by reference to the *parousia*, not to the glory on which they would enter immediately after death. In passages like Rom. viii. 10, 38; xiv. 9, it is, however, implied that the communion with Christ is uninterrupted by death. In Phil. i. 23; 2 Cor. v. 8, Paul expresses his own expectation of such a communion in a higher degree. It is, therefore, its perfection which he connects with Christ's second coming.

The same may be understood concerning the spiritual body. In 2 Cor. v. 1, it is implied that this body is possessed by believers on their resurrection, though not perfected till the *parousia*. In 1 Cor. xv. 35–54, Paul sets forth the unity of this body with the present, as well as its diversity from it. It is the *σῶμα*, not the *σάρξ* and *αἷμα*, which is glorified (vs. 50).

The second advent will be sudden and unexpected; there

is, however, preparation for it in the course of development of the kingdom of God. The conversion of the Jews is to precede it, and may be recognized as a sign of its nearness (Rom. xi. 15). The forces which are hostile to the kingdom will be conquered only by Christ himself at his coming (1 Cor. xv. 24). Previous to this these forces will make a last determined effort against the kingdom, under the leadership of a single personality who is designated Antichrist (2 Thess. ii. 3). Paul seems to have understood by this some power existing in his time, the full revelation of which was then hindered; but to what power he refers we have no means of determining.

As in 1 Cor. xv. 23 the *parousia* is only the initial point of Christ's activity in the consummation of his kingdom, there will be some time intervening between it and the end. In this period will take place the conquest of all his enemies and the final judgment. Does Paul regard the work of redemption as concluded when all without distinction have become partakers of eternal life? Or does he teach that a part of mankind, persistently rejecting the divine grace, will be thus finally excluded from the kingdom of God? The judgment presupposes the existence of both classes of men. But, in accordance with Paul's doctrine, a further development may take place subsequent to the judgment. In Rom. xi. 32, what is primarily said of nations appears to be extended to individuals. The object declared in Phil. ii. 10, 11 seems to be designated elsewhere as to be actually attained in the future (1 Cor. xv. 22; Rom. v. 19). The doctrine of the restoration of those who did not believe in Christ during their earthly life is certainly not distinctly and expressly taught, but only intimated, and it is not difficult to perceive the divine wisdom in not having granted us a fuller revelation on this subject. If it be objected that such a view of restitution must include wicked spirits, the passage Col. i. 20 may be referred to, where Paul apparently speaks of these as to be "reconciled," a term applied by him only to those who have been alienated by sin and guilt, not

to those who are simply imperfect. As Neander remarks: "A magnificent prospect is thus presented of the final triumph of the work of redemption, which was first opened to the mind of the great apostle in the last stage of his Christian development by means of that love which impelled him to sacrifice himself for the salvation of mankind." [1]

The seat of the consummated kingdom of God Paul regards as the glorified earth (Rom. viii. 19–22). As the body of man is not to be completely destroyed, but to be glorified, so with this terrestrial κόσμος. The relation of believers to God, as long as sin is not yet destroyed, is only through the mediation of Christ; but after they are glorified into his image, this mediation is no longer necessary, and Christ will give back to God the power which he received for the redemption of humanity and the establishment of the divine kingdom (1 Cor. xv. 28).

ARTICLE VII.

RECENT THEORIES ON THE ORIGIN OF LANGUAGE.

BY REV. JOHN O. MEANS, BOSTON HIGHLANDS.

How did man first come to speak? Was it instinctive and spontaneous, as soon as he was fairly afloat? Or was there a prolonged period when man was mute, or uttered inarticulate animal cries, from which he slowly learned to speak? If he learned, who taught him? Did he teach himself — invent speech by the natural exercise of his faculties working upon the materials around him? Or did some superior teach infant man at first, as subsequently some superior has taught every infant who has learned to to speak?

How he came by the marvellous possession of language is one of the most interesting and important, as it is one of the

[1] History of the Planting of Christianity, Vol. i. p. 531 (Bohn's ed.).