

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

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

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

THE
CHURCHMAN

OCTOBER, 1902.

ART. I.—RECENT LITERATURE IN RELATION TO
THE WITNESS AND WORK OF ST. PAUL—I.

IF this lecture takes the form of a criticism of various books and writers I must ask your indulgence—

1. Because there seems at the present time abundant material and need for such criticism.

2. Because in a single lecture I have been obliged to put a restraint upon myself, and to exclude some points which may seem to my hearers of more value than those which I have selected.

Behind the witness and the work of St. Paul there stands one great historical fact upon which both witness and work depend—his conversion. No recent criticism has availed to explain away its significance or the New Testament references to it. The remarks of Professor Ramsay are not a whit too strong: "The slight variation in the three accounts of Paul's conversion do not seem to be of any consequence; the spirit and tone and the essential facts are the same" ("St. Paul," p. 379). And in dealing with the narratives in Acts no one has helped more than Dr. Blass in his famous Commentary, or the Frenchman Sabatier in the third chapter of his "L'Apôtre Paul," to explain their relative fitness and essential agreement.

So far as St. Paul's own references to his conversion are concerned, we are met with the same phenomenon which is so

¹ This paper is printed in the form in which it was delivered in the early part of the year to the London Branch of the Society for Sacred Study. No notice therefore is taken of Dr. Chase's Hulsean Lectures, or of Dr. P. Ewald's article, "Lukas der Evangelist," in the new edition of Herzog, or of more recent articles in English Encyclopædias. Reference may also be made to a notice by Mr. Gayford in the July number of the *Journal of Theological Studies* on Professor Weber's theory as to the date of the Epistle to the Galatians.

characteristic of many recent attacks upon the historical facts of Early Christianity—viz., that the same objections against them are brought forward again and again as if they had never been answered.

Thus the American writer, Dr. Orello Cone, in his "Paul: the Man, the Missionary, and the Teacher" (1898), p. 59, quotes 1 Cor. ix. 1, "Am I not an Apostle? have I not seen Jesus our Lord?" and says that there is no cogent reason for applying this passage to the conversion. The Apostle may have "seen" the Lord in one of the visions mentioned in 2 Cor. xii. 1: "I must needs glory, though it is not expedient, but I will come to visions and revelations of the Lord."

But, as a matter of fact, the passage in 2 Cor. helps us to draw a hard-and-fast line of demarcation between the heavenly visions and revelations vouchsafed to the Apostle from time to time, and the "seeing" the Lord to which he refers in 1 Cor. ix. 1 and xv. 8.

The opening words of 2 Cor. xii. show us the Apostle speaking with evident reluctance and reserve, and as he proceeds, it is not too much to say that his reluctance becomes a positive aversion, that not even the insolence of his adversaries shall tear away the veil which hides the depths of his spiritual life; no longer will he boast or parade himself, lest his relation of equality with his converts should be at an end. But if the Apostle was thus so reserved in disclosing the experiences of his inner life, if he was in danger of becoming "foolish" in doing so, how can we account for the different tone of 1 Cor. ix. 1 and xv. 8? If the "seeing" of the Lord there referred to differed in no respect from the "visions and revelations" mentioned in 2 Cor. xii. 1, there remains a strange paradox in the fact that St. Paul should have made it his loudest boast, that he should have regarded it as the basis of his claim to the Apostolic office, and that he should have placed it in the foreground of his preaching. "Am I not an Apostle? have I not seen Jesus Christ our Lord?" (see Paret, "Paulus und Jesus," and Sabatier, *ut supra*, p. 45). Or if, again, this "seeing" was of the same nature and kind as the later spiritual and apocalyptic visions of Christ, then it is difficult to understand what intelligible force or meaning can be attached to the Apostle's affirmation "last of all He was seen of me also" (1 Cor. xv. 8). The sole justification for the words is surely to be found in the belief that he draws a hard-and-fast line between those appearances of which the series was closed, and all subsequent visions and revelations such as those referred to in 2 Cor. xii.

It is quite true that Dr. Cone does not hesitate to identify

Paul's "thorn in the flesh" with epilepsy, and to affirm that his "visions and revelations" were the result of abnormal physical conditions. So, too, Jülicher does not hesitate to inform us that the Apostle became an epileptic.

There is no doubt a plausibility about such statements, and at all events their repetition is easy; but amongst his many services we owe to Professor Ramsay the following remarks in his recent Commentary on the Galatians (427):

"The theory that Paul's disease was epilepsy deserves a word. Appearances are at first sight in its favour—the example of Julius Cæsar, Napoleon, Cromwell, all epileptics—the fact that the nervous system when working at its highest pressure is nearest to breaking down. "But," he continues, "if we take epilepsy as St. Paul's trial, then we must accept the medical inferences from it. It follows inexorably that his visions were epileptic symptoms, no more real than the dreams of epileptic insanity." "The theory is seductive," he admits; "but," he adds, "are we prepared to accept the consequences? Paul's visions have revolutionized the world. Has the modern world with all that is best and truest in it been built upon the dreams of epileptic insanity? Is reason the result of unreason, truth of falsehood?"

On this passage Professor Schmiedel calmly remarks that this is the judgment not of an historian but of a theologian. But why should not a theologian be an historian? Has Dr. Schmiedel forgotten amongst his own countrymen the honoured name of Neander, to take one instance only of such a combination? And if Neander's famous words are true, "It is the heart which makes the theologian," the historian no less than the theologian has often cause to remember that there are facts which appeal for discernment not merely to the critical faculty, but to the moral and spiritual side of human nature.

Professor Schmiedel's name has been brought into what some of us may venture to call very undue prominence in England, but there is no reason to suppose that he, or those whom he represents, are the sole or most honoured representatives of German thought. Apropos of this particular subject with which we are dealing, it is at least significant that Dr. B. Weiss, the Nestor of German theologians, to whom we owe one of the most able and erudite of the many modern Lives of Jesus, has added this remark to the latest edition of his "Introduction to the New Testament"—viz., that Paul places the appearance of Christ vouchsafed to him, and to which he appeals as the ground of his apostolate, not on a level with the visions and revelations of which he unwillingly boasts in 2 Cor. xii., but he considers it as the last in the

series of the appearances vouchsafed to the older disciples of the Risen One.

Nor is it without interest to turn to the article "Jesus Christus" in the edition of Herzog's "Encyclopædia," now in course of publication, where we find Professor Zöckler insisting that in 1 Cor. xv. the dominant thought of the passage is not of an appearance or a vision of Christ, but of His rising from the dead, a fact which the Apostle emphasizes by the stress which he lays upon the actual burial of the Lord.

Space forbids us to linger longer over a tempting theme, but amongst recent writers we may well be thankful to Dr. Findlay, who has dealt so fully with the various theories which seek to minimize the historical fact of St. Paul's conversion in vol. iii. of Hastings's Bible Dictionary, whilst it will always repay us to turn to the articles of Dr. Beyschlag in the "Studien und Kritiken" for 1864, 1870, and to his "Leben Jesu," vol. i., 1887.

Dr. Beyschlag's name has become well known in England, and his recent death is a grievous loss to us no less than to his own countrymen; but his articles referred to anticipate many current objections, and not only anticipate, but also answer them.

But the whole trend of recent literature is marked by a more positive and indisputable gain when we pass to a consideration of the "witness" contained at length in St. Paul's own Epistles.

And here, perhaps, we may best notice the valuable contribution made by Dr. Deissmann, now Professor of New Testament Exegesis in Heidelberg, to the better understanding of St. Paul's language, by illustrations from the papyri extending over several centuries B.C. to the third century A.D. No contribution to New Testament literature has been marked by greater freshness, and in this case our gratitude may fortunately anticipate favours to come, as in addition to his article on "Epistolary Literature" in the "Encyclopædia Biblica," vol. ii., the third volume is to contain an article from his pen on the papyri and their value.

Take, *e.g.*, the striking parallels between the magic formulæ inscribed on the Egyptian papyri, and the phraseology used in Acts xix. of the Jewish exorcists and of Ephesian superstition, or the use of the familiar word *pléthos* for the Christian Church in Antioch (Acts xv. 30), a word which, as the papyri show, was technically employed to designate the totality of the members of a religious association, or the use of the legal term *apologia*, Phil. i. 7, a word which may help in this forensic sense to throw light upon the date of the Epistle, united as it is with another legal term "in the confirmation

and defence of the Gospel," *bebaiósis*. Or, again, the use of the term for adoption, so familiar in Romans and Galatians, so frequent in the pre-Christian inscriptions of the Islands of the Ægean, always in the formula, A son of B, but by adoption son of C; with which we may compare the somewhat similar formula which occurs several times in the inscriptions with reference to the adoption of daughters. Fortunately, these two volumes on "Bible Studies" are now placed within the reach of English readers.

We realize more and more in these volumes the simplicity, the naturalness, the charm of St. Paul's language, and the truth of the famous saying that, although he was a Paul, he was also a man. But it is not only the naturalness of the Apostle's language which has received illustration from recent literature, but also its relation, or, I will say, its contrast, to contemporary Jewish ideas. And for this we have to thank not only Dr. Sanday and Mr. Headlam in their "Romans," but also Mr. H. St. John Thackeray in his "Relation of St. Paul to Contemporary Jewish Thought."

Mr. Thackeray's book is probably only of a preliminary character, but no one can doubt that it is upon right lines, and that further research must prove of inestimable value.

In Germany, of course, the great work of Dr. Dalman, of Leipzig, now in process of publication, the first volume of which has dealt with the words of Jesus, has already given fresh interest to and material for the study.

It is easy, indeed, to mark the hits, but it is not always so congenial to record the misses; it is easy enough for Pfeleiderer and others to assure us how much there is in Rabbinic phraseology, which is akin to that of St. Paul—it could hardly be otherwise, considering the nationality and the schooling of the Apostle; but it is often forgotten that with all this apparent nearness St. Paul and the Rabbis are poles asunder, and that the Apostle's theology, whilst "so Jewish in its foundations," is "so anti-Jewish in its results."

But this subject demands our attention from a somewhat different point of view. A learned and distinguished Jew of our own day, Mr. C. J. Montefiore, has recently blamed, in the *Jewish Quarterly Review* of January last year, one or two English writers, or, rather, St. Paul himself, for an utter misunderstanding of the power and spirituality of the Jewish religion in the days of Christ.

He contends that it is most unfair to derive our views of the Jewish religion solely from our own New Testament, and to concentrate our attention upon some specimens of Rabbinical literature to the entire exclusion of others.

I fully admit that passages of Rabbinical literature should

be used with the greatest caution, because they are so often given to us without any attempt to assign a definite date to them.

But there seems to me a strange omission in Mr. Montefiore's article. There is not a single reference in it to any of those Apocalyptic and pseudepigraphical books, with which we have recently become so familiar in England, chiefly through the continuous labours of Dr. Charles, of Dublin. I take three of these books, all written by Jews—all, it is not unfair to say, contemporary with our Lord and His Apostles, or, at least, with the writings of the latter.

"The Assumption of Moses," probably dating soon after A.D. 6—the date assigned to it not only by Dr. Charles, but by Mr. Burkitt in *Hastings's Dictionary*—is written by a Pharisaic Quietist. He has to protest—it is, in fact, the very object of his writing—against the secularization of the Messianic idea, and the growing political corruption of the Pharisaic party, against the notion so common, at all events, in the middle of the century, that works were the means of salvation.

"The Apocalypse of Baruch," the work of several authors, Pharisaic Jews, dating from 50-100 A.D., and containing portions to be assigned to a date before the destruction of Jerusalem, again shows us the prevalence of a carnal and sensuous view of the Messianic kingdom, and, in its dependence for salvation upon works, the need of the preaching of a St. Paul.

If we take the passages bearing upon works and justification, it is not too much to say of them that: "With every position here maintained Christianity is at variance, and Rabbinic teaching in full accord."

"The Book of Jubilees," dating, according to Dr. Ederheim, about 50 A.D., and according to Mr. Headlam in *Hastings's Dictionary* probably 50-60 A.D., but according to Dr. Charles as early as before 10 A.D., is an attempt of a pious Jew, and evidently a popular and widely-read attempt, to describe the creation and the successive events in the history of Israel from the standpoint of the writer's own time.

In doing this the writer severely condemns the laxity of his countrymen with regard to the keeping of the Sabbath, but at the same time he shows us how rigid were the requirements of an orthodox Jew, and, quite apart from the Gospels and St. Paul, what a fatal danger the spirit of Rabbinism might become.

Whoever drew water or lifted a burden on the Sabbath was to die; whoever did any business, made a journey, attended to his cattle, kindled a fire, rode any beast, travelled

by ship; whoever fasted or whoever made war on the Sabbath, was to die (chap. 1.).

As we read such regulations, can we wonder that people turned from a religion which might become so mechanical and so devoid of spirituality to the teaching of Jesus? or that St. Paul saw in such a spirit a burden too grievous to be borne, and in the law and liberty of Christ a more excellent way?

But, further, there is much in recent literature which may help us to appreciate not only the language, not only the thought of St. Paul, but also his doctrine, his distinctively Christian doctrine—*e.g.*, in relation to the Divine Person of our Lord. In this connection a remarkable testimony comes to us from a somewhat unexpected quarter.

Professor Jülicher, in his article "Colossians" ("Encyclopædia Biblica," vol. i., p. 864), after speaking of the alleged development in the Colossian Epistle of the dignity of Christ in the direction of the Alexandrian-Logos doctrine, answers that it can hardly be denied that the Epistle in question does exhibit a new development of Pauline Christology.

But, he asks, why should not Paul himself have carried it on to this development in view of new errors which demanded new statements of truth?

The fact is, he continues, that in some cases, probably, St. Paul has simply appropriated and applied to Christ formulæ which the false teachers had employed with reference to their mediatory being; and he concludes that none of the Gnostic systems of the second century known to us can be shown to be present in Colossians, whilst the false teachers with whom the epistle makes us acquainted could have made their appearance within the Christian Church in the year 60 A.D. as easily as in 120.

In France the same truth is insisted upon no less strongly by Sabatier, who points out that the word *logos*, although not actually used by St. Paul in Colossians, seems almost to rise to his lips.

In our own country we are not likely to forget the striking passage in his famous article, "Jesus Christ" (Hastings's Bible Dictionary, vol. ii.), in which Dr. Sanday supposes for a moment that a thick curtain falls over the Church after the Ascension.

The curtain is lifted, and what do we find? St. Paul and his companions give solemn greeting, in 1 Thess. i. 1, "To the Church of the Thessalonians, which is in God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ."

"An elaborate process of reflection, almost a system of theology," adds Dr. Sanday, "lies behind those familiar terms."

In Germany the corresponding article, as we may call it, "Jesus Christ" in the new edition of Herzog, by Professor Zöckler, draws special attention to the fact that while on the one hand St. Paul's Epistles emphasize the Davidic origin of Christ according to the flesh, they contain, on the other hand, testimonies to the divine Sonship and eternal pre-existence of Christ which are quite like echoes of the statements of St. John. And he instances such passages as 1 Cor. viii. 6; 2 Cor. iv. 4; Col. i. 15-18; Phil. ii. 5. You will observe that all these passages are taken from epistles which we may now claim beyond all reasonable doubt as the work of St. Paul: 1 Thess., Phil., Col., no less than 1 and 2 Cor.

Quite apart from any other argument, the admission of the exquisite little note of St. Paul to Philemon carries with it an acknowledgement of the authentic nature of the Epistle to the Colossians, "and if," says Dr. Harnack, "we are convinced of the authenticity of Colossians, and this conviction," he adds, "gains rightly more and more adherents, then a considerable portion of the doubts raised against Ephesians at once falls to the ground."

It is a significant fact that Dr. Deissmann in his article, "Epistolary Literature" ("Encyclopædia Biblica," vol. ii.), frankly admits as genuine all the letters which bear the name of St. Paul, with the exception of the Pastorals, in which, however, he thinks that parts of genuine letters of the Apostle may be found.

I am quite aware that some objections have been made of late years even against the four Epistles, which we have been so accustomed to regard as undisputed—Rom., 1 and 2 Cor., Gal.—and these objections have become popularized in England in the *Expository Times* by the Dutch theologian Van Manen, who is their chief supporter.

It might be sufficient to observe that not only are these attacks practically ignored as worthless by great "conservative" critics like Dr. Weiss and Dr. Zahn, but that they are dismissed contemptuously or ably refuted by advanced critics like Dr. Holtzmann and Dr. Clemen.

It is satisfactory, however, to be able to cite one more defender on this occasion on the "conservative" side. In his article "Galatians" ("Encyclopædia Biblica," vol. ii.) Schmiedel insists that from the point of view of *internal* evidence the four Epistles, while they stand and fall together, as is admitted on all hands, are full of such strong individuality, and are so personal, that we are really entitled to draw the conclusion, so often, as he thinks, illegitimate, that they could not have been invented, and that their genuineness,

moreover, is sufficiently attested by the *external* evidence; the Epistle of Clement of Rome alone would be proof enough (probably 93-96); the Epistle (47) cites 1 Cor. by name as a writing of Paul, and transcribes, without giving a name, Rom. i. 29 and even Heb. i. 1. It is surely of interest to note that this same passage from St. Clement of Rome to the Corinthians is cited by Paley, "*Horæ Paulinæ*," as a proof that our 1 Cor. was not only extant at Corinth, but was known and read at Rome within some forty years of the date which we claim for it.

It is a long way from Paley to Dr. Schmiedel, but the closely similar use of the same passage from St. Clement by both writers may help to remind us that even the most modern attacks are very often old ones in a new guise, and that they may often be defeated by an employment of the same weapons.

R. J. KNOWLING.

(To be continued.)



ART. II.—THE UNITY OF THE SPIRIT.

A MEDITATION FOR A CHRISTIAN CONGRESS.

"I, therefore, the prisoner of the Lord, beseech you that ye walk worthy of the vocation wherewith ye are called, with all lowliness and meekness, with long-suffering, forbearing one another in love, endeavouring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace."—EPHES. iv. 1.

IN these verses St. Paul passes to explain the practical working of the great truths which he had been declaring in previous chapters of the Epistle to the Ephesians. The account of the tumult at Ephesus, in the nineteenth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, affords a vivid illustration of the strange religious contrasts which were presented by that city in the Apostle's time. The city was known, as the town clerk reminded the people, as specially devoted to the great goddess Diana and to the image which fell down from Jupiter. But it contained a society of Jews, who were the worshippers of the one God of heaven and earth; while St. Paul had founded in it a Christian Church, which aroused equal opposition from both Jews and Pagans. His preaching at length produced a violent explosion, in which the adherents of those two faiths appear as much in antagonism to one another as to the Christians. The moment a Jew came forward to