CHRISTIANITY ACCORDING TO ST PAUL

LONDON
Cambridge University Press
FETTER LANE

NEW YORK · TORONTO
BOMBAY · CALCUTTA · MADRAS
Macmillan

TOKYO
Maruzen Company Ltd

CHRISTIANITY ACCORDING TO ST PAUL

BY

CHARLES A. ANDERSON SCOTT

D.D. CAMB., HON. D.D. ABER.

CAMBRIDGE
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS
MCMXXXII

First Edition 1927
Reprinted 1932

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN

To
the revered memory
of
my teachers

THOMAS ANDERSON

EDWARD THRING

ANDREW BRUCE DAVIDSON

PREFACE

It is a strange fate indeed which has befallen the Apostle Paul in the last quarter of a century. For four centuries at least he has been looked on as the champion of an Evangelical interpretation of Christianity, his writings as the sheet-anchor of Protestantism. Now there is an influential school of thought both at home and abroad which claims him as the author of 'sacramentarian' Christianity and the only begetter of Catholicism.

This book has been written with the issue thus raised in view, but with the conviction that the best way of dealing with it is to set forth as fully as may be within the necessary limitations of space what chiefly matters in St Paul's conception of Christianity. Some of the results, which have been slowly arrived at through many years study of the Apostle, are not likely to please partisans either of traditional Protestantism or of traditional Catholicism. It may be convenient to indicate a few of these conclusions.

1. The influence of Hellenistic thought upon St Paul's interpretation of Christianity was negligible. So far as the content of his teaching was not due to the fact of Christ its content and also its forms were derived almost exclusively from Judaism.

2. The conception of Salvation provides both a centre and a framework for all the religious and ethical ideas which have real importance in Christianity as St Paul understood it.

3. His doctrine of Redemption is mainly if not wholly explained in terms of emancipation from bondage to spiritual Forces, sin, death and possibly the Law being included among them.

4. Justification as a conception which moves wholly on the forensic plane and starts from a forensic view of sin is essentially subordinate to Reconciliation, which starts from a deeper view of sin and operates on the higher plane of personal relationship. The Protestant interpretation has been too largely governed by the form which Luther's experience assumed.

5. In his interpretation of the sacrifice of Christ the Apostle's debt to the Levitical system is negligible. The Old Testament analogue which he had before his mind in Romans iii. 25 is not any form of Jewish sacrifice but the Brazen Serpent. It is unnecessary to seek for a technical meaning for ἱλαστήριον (A.V. 'propitiation'). We need not go beyond the simple, etymological meaning, 'one who restores friendly relations.'

6. Faith, in the specific sense in which St Paul ascribes to it saving quality, is evoked by preaching, by the proclamation of Christ and of Him as crucified, and is for the Apostle the sufficient condition on man's side for the securing of Salvation. Any 'sacramentarian' theory accordingly becomes irrelevant.

7. Faith-union with Christ secures at once the experience of Salvation and the condition of ethical victory. The Sacraments 'seal' the experience which has already been apprehended by faith.

8. So far as St Paul's recorded teaching goes, the function of the Lord's Supper is to bring about an intensely vivid sense of Christ as present with His Church and a similarly vivid sense of the oneness of its members who participate. This recognised presence of Christ is enough to give judgment-value to the rite.

9. The interpenetration for St Paul of theory and practice, of religious experience and ethical duty and achievement, is everywhere manifest. In failing to do justice to this we have missed an important line of

apologetic. 'It is wholly necessary that the systems of Christian Dogmatics and Christian Ethics which are traditionally two, should be again fused into a single system.'

10. St Paul's Christology appears as the natural implication of his experience of Salvation together with the explanation of that experience which satisfied him. The forms in which he expresses his Christology have the Old Testament for their source.

As often happens, much confirmatory and illustrative material has come to hand while the book has been passing through the press. In particular, I should like to mention, on the ethical implications of primitive Christianity, Wendt's valuable study of the Epistles of St John, and, on the origins of the Eucharist, Lietzmann, *Messe und Herrenmahl.*

C. A. S.

Westminster College
December, 1926

THIS re-print has given me the opportunity of correcting some half-dozen *errata* which I have noticed. I should have been glad to make some addition, mainly in the form of quotation from authoritative sources, confirming some of the less familiar points made in the text. The important book on *The Mysticism of Paul*, by Albert Schweitzer, was published in German three years after this one, and it has given me satisfaction to find that I have the support of the great scholar and missionary in several of the views I have advanced. These include the treating of Justification as concomitant to Reconciliation, and the emphasis on the *unio mystica* as the necessary con-

sequence of Reconciliation and the condition of ethical power and progress. 'Paul grasped the fact that the essence of being a Christian lies in the experience of being in fellowship with Christ.' I hope to return to this important point elsewhere.

I have noted also, not without satisfaction, how Lietzmann in two passages in the third edition of his Commentary on Corinthians has so altered the text of his second edition as to show that he is no longer prepared to accept Reitzenstein's theory of the influence of the mystical cults on the sacramental teaching of St Paul.

C. A. S.

September, 1932

CONTENTS

Chapter III

Chapter IV

Chapter v

Chapter vi

Indices

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

DAC, *Dictionary of the Apostolic Church.*
DCG, *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels.*
EGT, *Expositor's Greek Testament.*
ERE, *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics.*
HDB, Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible.*
HTS, *Harvard Journal of Theological Studies.*
HBNT, *Handbuch zum Neuen Testament.*
I.C.C. International Critical Commentary.
OTT, *Old Testament Theology.*
RJ, Bousset's *Religion des Judentums.*
SH, Sanday and Headlam, *Romans.*
SNT, *Schriften des Neuen Testaments.*
TLZ, *Theologische Literaturzeitung.*
VNT, *Vocabulary of the New Testament.*
ZNTW, *Zeitschrift für Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft.*

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

ST PAUL was a Jew, who in circumstances well known to readers of the New Testament was led to recognise in Jesus of Nazareth who had been crucified, the Messiah of his race, now risen from the dead and glorified: who at once yielded himself to Him as the unseen Master of his soul: and for thirty years afterwards lived a life of religious fellowship with Him, and of consecrated devotion to His cause. He began at once to preach the truth which he had persecuted. Concerning his experiences, his activities and his preaching during the first fifteen years after his conversion we have practically no information. Then he suddenly becomes known to us, known to us as a man and known as a teacher with a fullness and an intimacy to which ancient history provides only one or two parallels. We know him through his letters, ten of them. They cover a period of some ten years. With one exception, which is addressed to an individual, they are written to communities of people who were already Christians. Most of them had heard the Gospel from Paul's lips. With one or possibly two exceptions these letters are prompted by his knowledge of particular problems of Christian thought and life which he knew to be perplexing these communities. To set forth Christianity as he would do to unconverted people, whether Jews or heathen, is definitely not his business in these letters; much that is fundamental in either theology or ethics he takes for granted or alludes to as already known. He writes not primarily as a theologian, not even as an evangelist, but as a friend and a pastor,

as one to whom the faithfulness of his converts and their progress 'in the Gospel' was a matter of life and death[1].

But St Paul writes also as a thinker, as one who is not satisfied to register or enforce merely isolated facts or truths: he must needs see them in their relation to one another, in their relation to earlier events and ideas, in their relation to 'the whole counsel of God.' He is not a 'theologian' in the technical or modern sense of the word: he was not enough of a philosopher to be that. Yet neither is he a dreamer, indifferent to history and to reason, satisfied with emotion, sentiment or ecstasy. He seeks to commend his Gospel to rational and reasoning men, and though probably the last thing that would occur to him would be that he had a system of thought which would one day be called 'Paulinism,' he had a conception of Christianity which he called 'my Gospel.'

St Paul's purpose in these letters is mainly to explain and commend the application of his Gospel, Christianity as he conceives it, in reference to specific problems which had arisen in the contact of Christian with non-Christian thought and practice, especially Jewish; to illustrate its place in the Divine plan for human salvation, and to show its application to life, individual and social. It is in doing so that he gives us the opportunity of discovering what Christianity means for him. But before examining this in detail there are certain general questions which call for consideration. (1) In view of the fact that Paul, presumably a man in early middle life when we first meet him, was more or less familiar with two worlds of thought, the Jewish and the Hellenistic, which of these supplied the dominating factor in his mind, and what was the proportion of its influence to that of the other? (2) What were the sources from which he drew material for thought and

[1] 1 Thess. iii. 8: 'now we live if ye stand fast in the Lord.'

illustration? (3) What was the most general and comprehensive aspect in which Christianity appealed to him?

St Paul was a Jew, but he was a Hellenistic Jew, that is to say, although he was born and brought up in a Jewish home, that home itself was outside the Holy Land. It was in Tarsus, in the midst of an atmosphere of Greek thought and culture. He spoke and wrote the Greek language: he was probably not unfamiliar with Greek literature; he was at home in Greek life. He was thus peculiarly fitted to be the mediator to the Greek world of a faith which had been cradled in Judaism. In studying his mind it is important to remember both factors in his intellectual history, even more important, if it were possible, to estimate in what proportion he was influenced by the one or the other.

The first impression produced by a perusal of his letters is clear and strong, namely, that it is the Jewish element which predominates, and that very greatly; that the Hellenistic element, so far as it is present at all, is not central but superficial. Those who come to his letters with a fair acquaintance with the Old Testament have no sense of passing from one intellectual atmosphere to another. The idiom of his thought is Hebrew. And this first impression is confirmed by an examination in detail. There are indeed traces of Greek culture or of what might be called Hellenistic consciousness in the letters: but they are singularly few. Paul is proud to be 'a Tarsian, citizen of a distinguished city' (Ac. xxi. 39); he appreciates the dignity and the privileges of his Roman citizenship; he quotes a phrase or two from Greek writers.

It is possible, however, to attach too much significance to Paul's early years in Tarsus[1]. The position of

[1] That Paul 'must have been affected' by contact with mystery-cults in Tarsus and elsewhere is often said, but by no means necessary. We have a case to the contrary in Origen. 'On verra qu'il est caractéristique

a Jewish family in such a city was not really analogous to that of a family of any other race. Probably the strongest thing in the consciousness of such a family would be the sense of difference, of separateness, of occupying a higher plane religiously and ethically than the Gentiles round about. All the outward expressions of family life, the common meals, the festivals, the study of the Law, the worship of the Synagogue, would tend to preserve and foster this separateness. Even under modern circumstances it is characteristic of many Jewish homes that they retain the Jewish atmosphere with little modification from without. And there is good reason to believe that Paul's home was one of this type. Only so can we account for his pride of race, his close familiarity with the Scriptures, his passionate love for Israel. And it must have been in fulfilment of the family ambition as well as in accordance with his own choice that he left Tarsus to go to Jerusalem, there to be trained in the school of Gamaliel[1], to become 'a Pharisee of the Pharisees.'

The evidence of the Epistles in general points in the same direction. References to features of Greek life are on the whole perfunctory: those to the characteristics of Judaism are enthusiastic. To the former belong allusions to the games, to processes of law, possibly some echoes of the vocabulary of the mystery-cults. Such references are not surprising in one who as the missionary of a new faith was singularly sensitive to what was in the minds of those to whom he wrote. Our

de notre théologien qu'il est fort peu préoccupé des religions syncrétistes, des mystères, des cultes orientaux. Nous y voyons l'une des grandes influences du temps. Origène les ignore' (de Faye, *Origène*, 1924, p. 13). And Origen, unlike Paul, was brought up in a Hellenistic atmosphere.

[1] No significance need be attached to the reported fact that in one branch of 'the school of Gamaliel' the pupils studied 'the wisdom of the Greeks.' If St Paul had taken 'the modern side' we should find much more evidence of the fact in his Epistles.

surprise is rather that he does not show himself more keenly alive to the tenets of popular philosophy and the character of the popular religion. Many of those to whom he wrote had of course been Gentiles, and yet, though he frequently stresses the difference between Gentile and Christian standards of conduct, he shows little or no interest in comparing Christian with Greek thought. In fact, the traces of Greek influence cannot be said even to approximate, either in number or in character, to the marks of Jewish tradition. There is no ground in general for the assertion that the Hellenistic factor had come to outweigh the Jewish in Paul's consciousness, or for tracing to the influence of that factor anything in his teaching which can be paralleled in Greek philosophy or in Greek popular religion. On the contrary, these general considerations leave the impression that Paul remained *au fond* a Jew, carrying into his new interpretations of life and of providence conceptions and principles which were peculiarly the property of Judaism, and definitely strange to Hellenism[1].

And this is confirmed when we come to consider these principles in detail.

(i) We note Paul's pride of race, so persistent and so strong as to be inconsistent with anything that could be called cosmopolitanism. No man in whom the Hellenistic element had got the upper hand could have written of himself as Paul does towards the end of his life. 'If any other man thinketh that he hath whereof he might trust in the flesh, I more: circumcised the eighth day, of the stock of Israel, of the tribe of Benjamin, an Hebrew of the Hebrews; as touching the law a Pharisee' (Phil. iii. 4–5: cp. 2 Cor. xi. 22; Ro. xi. 1). Moreover, this pride of race was rooted in his religious conscious-

[1] So Eduard Meyer, *Ursprung des Christentums*, III. 315: 'But if Paul thus...stood in relation to the culture of the world, nevertheless inwardly he remained through and through a Jew.'

ness, and connected with the ultimate goal of his religious hope. It was to Israel as the people of God that he belonged, to Israel privileged above all other peoples in that they had 'the Sonship, the Shekinah, the Covenants, the Divine Legislation, the Worship and the Promises' (Ro. ix. 4). For the sake of these his kinsmen according to the flesh Paul proclaimed himself willing even to be accursed from Christ (Ro. ix. 3). And it is very significant that the salvation which he anticipated for the Gentiles was not any salvation independent of the Jews. Indeed, the salvation of the Gentiles is expressed in terms of their ingrafting into 'the old olive tree.' The new tree into which both are to be grafted is the old Israel 'renewed.' By Paul even the salvation of the Gentiles is looked on as a means to an end—namely, that 'all Israel shall be saved' (Ro. xi. 26).

Take away St Paul's knowledge of Christ and his faith in Christ and what is left is not a cosmopolitan, or an eclectic, or a Hellenist of any kind, but a Jew of the noblest type, with a passionate devotion to all that was best and purest in the Jewish religion.

(ii) It is of great significance that St Paul was and remained to the end an uncompromising monotheist. This fact alone puts a gulf between him and the easy-going polytheism of the Hellenistic world. For him monotheism was not merely a theoretic proposition, but the universal postulate of his thinking. Even his devotion to, and adoration of, Jesus Christ did nothing to infringe or modify it, or to withdraw attention from the One God. The Epistles to the Thessalonians in particular bear copious evidence of what can best be described as the God-consciousness which conditioned all his thinking. It is God whose minister he is, the Gospel of God which he preaches, God who has called the brethren into his own kingdom and glory. And

when men are converted to Christianity they 'turn...to serve the living and true God.' This one God was for him the ultimate source of all Christian experience and His glory the final goal of the whole process of redemption.

It is in consistency with this uncompromising monotheism that Paul emphasises, as he does, the 'subordination' of the Son to the Father. Even the Lord Christ whom Paul exalted so high, 'belongs to God' in the same way as redeemed man 'belongs to Christ' (1 Cor. iii. 23); and as 'the head of every man is Christ,' so 'the head of Christ is God' (1 Cor. xi. 3), while the consummation of all things is to be the handing over of the Kingdom by Christ to 'his God and Father,' and His own subjection, 'that God may be all in all' (1 Cor. xv. 24, 28). Nothing could more vividly illustrate the convinced monotheism of the Apostle than the way in which he all but bestows on Christ the name of God and yet refrains from doing so[1]. Paul gave to Christ everything that men give to God alone, except the name; he becomes perhaps the first illustration of the truth that 'the reality of the Creeds lies in that surrender of the soul which precedes their articulate utterance.'[2]

(iii) But it was not only in his monotheism that Paul showed himself heir to Judaism and not to Greek thought; it was also in that he assumed God to be knowable, and to have character, and character which had been ascertained. And that character (apart from the further revelation of it which had come through Jesus Christ) was no other than that which had been made known through the prophetic schools of Israel. God was 'the Lord merciful and gracious, long-suffering, and abundant in goodness and truth, keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity and trans-

[1] See further, p. 273.

[2] W. Manson, *The Incarnate Glory*, 1925, p. 73.

gression and sin, and that will by no means clear the guilty' (Ex. xxxiv. 6, 7). Righteousness which was a synthesis of mercy and of holiness, that was the character of God.

Pupils in Greek or Oriental schools of thought had the choice between an Absolute Being whose Deity was bound up with His inscrutableness and unapproachableness, and the members of a syncretistic Pantheon, some of whom might represent types of single qualities but to none of whom was assigned 'character' like that of Jehovah. Learners in Paul's school, on the other hand, were introduced to a God all whose purposes and actions were in accordance with holiness, righteousness, mercy and truth. And the new world of thought with which Paul sought to make them familiar was one in which these principles might be seen at work. They found indeed their highest illustration in the salvation which he preached. Paul might have found it difficult, even as we do, to produce proof texts for his statement that 'the Gospel of God' had been promised 'of old by his prophets in the holy Scriptures' (Ro. i. 2). Yet he was justified in the conviction that the Christian message with which he was entrusted was the fulfilment of an age-long process the outline of which had been disclosed in the Old Testament; it was indeed ultimately the outcome of the character of God as it had been revealed to Paul's Jewish fore-fathers.

(iv) It is for this reason, that God for St Paul is the God who had been made known through the prophets, that the Old Testament provides his one quarry for illustration and religious vocabulary. And that not only when his argument is expressly directed to Jews. A critic of his methods, viewing the large Gentile element in his audience, and even making all due allowance for considerable acquaintance with the Jewish Scriptures on the part of those who were 'God-fearers,' might not

unjustly question the wisdom of this habitual reference to the Old Testament, and the absence of any serious or sustained attempt to relate the new message to the current thought of the Hellenic world. Had Paul's mind been captured by, or even seriously influenced by, that non-Jewish world of thought, neither his style nor his method of argument would be what it is. In his presentation of the Gospel he starts from Jewish postulates, assumes the validity of the Jewish Scriptures and operates with Jewish argument and illustration[1].

(v) The ideal which the Apostle set himself to realise was not a new cult, indeed it was not a cult at all, although it involved a cultus. It was a Society, a society of men in whom the age-long purpose of God was at last fulfilled, and was being fulfilled. It was a society of men, that is, who having been redeemed, reconciled, consecrated, found perfect self-expression and perfect satisfaction in doing the will of God. And even so it was not entirely a new society. It was felt by St Paul to be in continuity with the ancient society of God's People. Its very existence involved the disclosure of the 'mystery,' the secret purpose which had been at work behind all the history of Israel (Eph. iii. 9). The People in whose experience and through whose teachers God had made Himself known was still Paul's people, still God's People. They have not been repudiated by God (Ro. xi. 2). Their privileges have not been annulled (Ro. ix. 4). These privileges rather have been and are being turned to good account by a remnant, a section of that People, 'Israel according to faith,' those namely who found upon faith in Christ. It had been and was a mark of the hopeless state of the Gentiles that they were 'aliens from the commonwealth of Israel.' The wonder of their new opportunity is not that they form a new

[1] Cp. Edwyn Bevan, *The Hellenistic Age*, p. 104: 'Christianity has remained always essentially Hebraic.'

Society which they invite Israel to join, but that it is open to them to be incorporated in an existing Society, the spiritual Israel, as 'partakers of the same inheritance, members of the same body, sharers in the same status' (Eph. iii. 6). In spite of all the newness of the Christian facts, the Christian experience and the Christian hope, Paul was acutely conscious of the continuity between the 'Church in the Wilderness' and the 'Church of Christ.' Even the privileges and experiences of the new Age were most clearly expressed in terms of the experiences and promises of the old. The saving righteousness of God 'apart from the Law,' which was now being manifested, was that to which witness had been borne by the Law and the Prophets (Ro. iii. 21).

Now, these are the principles which define the field within which St Paul's mind works. The conception of God as One and of God as revealed character is central to his thinking; a primary place is occupied by the conception of the new message as prepared for by the old dispensation and issuing out of it, and also by the conception of Israel as the object and channel of God's favour to men, ideally embodied in the ideal Society. And these, which are central principles with him, are wholly absent from Hellenistic or Oriental thought. Compared with these the elements in his thinking to which parallels have been found in non-Jewish literature, in Greek religion or in pagan mysteries, are obviously secondary. They belong to the surface rather than to the core of his thought and teaching. It is highly probable that these elements themselves are to be accounted for without appeal to extra-Jewish influences; but even if it could be proved that they, or some of them, were derived from non-Jewish sources that would not alter the fact that the core and marrow of his teaching is continuous with, and finds its basis in, the teaching of the Old Testament.

THE POSSIBLE SOURCES OF PAULINE THOUGHT

The possible sources of the Apostle's religious ideas and terminology may be set out as follows:

(*a*) Jewish, as reflected in (1) canonical literature, (2) post-canonical literature, (3) contemporary thought;

(*b*) Christian, as found in (1) the facts concerning Christ, (2) the teaching of Christ so far as it had reached the Apostle through the earlier disciples, (3) the primitive interpretation of these facts;

(*c*) Hellenistic, as reflected in contemporary writers to whose works he may have had access.

It is not possible to deal here with the large subject of Jewish sources or expressly with the non-Jewish sources which may have been open to Paul. But something must be said concerning the Christian sources which were available.

(i) We cannot exclude the possibility that Saul of Tarsus had actually burnt into his memory a picture of Jesus of Nazareth as he had seen Him in the flesh. He may even have seen Him crucified; that at any rate would help to account for the manner of his references to 'the blood.' The Crucifixion stands between two points of time when we know that Saul was in Jerusalem, his going up to the school of Gamaliel and his presence at the martyrdom of Stephen. And while we do not know that the city had ceased to be his head-quarters in the interval, the position in which we find him at the end, a rising member of the Pharisaic party, and a member of the Sanhedrin, points rather to long residence in Jerusalem. If Harnack and others be right in assigning an interval of only twelve or eighteen months between the Crucifixion and the conversion of Saul, the probability is increased that Saul was in Jerusalem at the time of the Trial: and if so, it can only be described as likely that he would have sight of this Galilean

heretic in whom the Pharisees were so greatly interested and might even be present with the Sanhedrin at the Trial[1]. That Paul had at least seen Jesus, and that he remembered it, is at least one of the possible interpretations of 2 Corinthians v. 16: 'Therefore for the future we know no man simply as a man. Even if we have known Christ simply as a man, yet now we do so no longer.'[2]

(ii) We may not go further and suppose that Paul had heard the Master teach, but that he had considerable opportunity of learning the facts of His life and something of His teaching is beyond question. In the first place, he could hardly identify the objects of his persecution without some examination of them, in the course of which the persecutor would necessarily learn something concerning the things that Jesus had said and done[3]. Then, after his conversion, and during the twenty years or so between that and the writing of his Epistles he would have innumerable opportunities of learning from disciples who had seen and heard the Lord. The material out of which our Synoptic Gospels were composed was then passing from mouth to mouth together with much besides which was not destined to be recorded. And even though we give full weight to his words about knowing the historic Christ no longer, we need not suppose that he closed his ears to these reports.

(iii) That Paul made good use of these opportunities

[1] So J. Hope Moulton, *Expositor*, 1911, II. p. 18 ff.: 'Paul then was in Jerusalem during that central week of human history, and it was then that he became humanly acquainted with Christ.' So also Joh. Weiss, *Paul and Jesus*, p. 42 ff.; *Urchristentum*, p. 137; Bousset, *ad* 2 Cor. v. 16: 'unmöglich wäre es gerade nicht dass er den Herrn in seinen letzten Lebenszeiten in Jerusalem gesehen habe'; and Lietzmann in *HBNT* on the same passage. On the contrary, Feine, *NTT*, p. 259.

[2] So Weymouth.

[3] See Weiss, *Urchristentum*, p. 136.

is plain from his letters. It is true of course that his religious interest and experience centred in the Risen and Living Christ. But it is not true to say that he was either ignorant of, or indifferent to, the manifestation of Jesus 'in the days of his flesh.' 'It is one of the strangest theological blunders to assume that, among all the early preachers of Christianity, Paul alone refrained from the use of the means of presenting his message which lay in the rehearsal of narratives of the life of Jesus, that he either did not know, or did not wish to know, any thing about these.'[1] It is not only that the main facts of that life were evidently familiar to him, but that he attached to them the highest importance, to the fact that Jesus was born 'of a woman,' 'under the law,' 'of the seed of David': that He was 'a minister of the circumcision': that He died the death of the cross: that He was raised from the dead. It is on these facts that his whole Gospel is based. It is on the interpretation of them that he founds his explanation of Salvation. 'Christ died for our sins'; and it was as Jesus of Nazareth that He died; it was 'in the flesh' that He 'condemned sin,' 'in the body of the flesh' that God 'reconciled men to Himself.' The fact of our Lord's humanity is absolutely indispensable for the Apostle's theory of redemption. It provides the identification of the Redeemer with the race He would redeem, in all human experience save the consciousness of having sinned. It is therefore wholly a mistake to represent the emphasis which Paul puts upon the Risen Christ as excluding interest in, or knowledge of, the Historical Jesus; the 'heavenly man,' the 'life-giving Spirit' had no meaning for him except for His being the same as 'the man Christ Jesus.'[2]

[1] Weiss, *Urchristentum*, p. 167.

[2] For fuller detail see my article 'Christology' in the *Dict. of Apostolic Church.*

But Paul's knowledge went beyond these salient facts; it included much of the Master's teaching. Direct quotations may be few. But great importance is attached to them. In the matter of divorce the Apostle draws an express distinction between the authority of the Lord's words which he quotes and the authority he claims for his own. But far beyond the scope of direct quotation is that of the teaching of Jesus, the essence of which is reproduced though in widely different form in the teaching of the Apostle. The difference of form is so great as to preclude any suggestion of quotation, while the correspondence of thought is too close to allow of independence. As this is specially marked in connection with the ethical teaching of St Paul it will fall to be considered later[1]. But the possible explanation of the phenomenon calls for attention here. So long as Paul was understood to have written under direct and special inspiration, a kind of dictation by the Spirit, the question did not arise. But if that hypothesis be given up we are confronted by a harmony of ethical outlook which cannot be accidental and which calls for explanation. It is a harmony which appears not only in the details of ethical teaching, but in the principles, and in the balance and emphasis with which they are brought to bear upon conduct. The Christian man as he is delineated by St Paul is extraordinarily like the portrait of an ideal disciple as it may be constructed from the teaching of Jesus. And it will be found very difficult to suggest any explanation of this fact which does not include brooding by the Apostle on abundant information as to what Jesus had been and had taught. And by abundant information I mean information which covered much, possibly very much, that is not contained in our Synoptic Gospels. Paul himself would have ascribed much influence to the illumination of the Spirit. But

[1] See below, p. 215.

it was an illumination of knowledge previously acquired by natural means[1].

Confirmation of this suggestion is found in the fact that Paul shows unexpected knowledge of certain features in the impression made by Jesus on those who knew Him. He refers to His χάρις (grace); and the illustration which he gives does not exhaust the meaning of the word, but is the supreme illustration of a general characteristic (2 Cor. viii. 9)[2]. He registers the 'obedience' which was characteristic of Jesus[3]: His 'endurance' (2 Thess. iii. 5; cp. Heb. xii. 2): His 'disinterestedness' and 'purity' (ἁπλότης, ἁγνότης, 2 Cor. xi. 3): His 'deference' and 'considerateness' (πραΰτης, ἐπιεικεία, 2 Cor. x. 1), the fact that 'he pleased not himself' (Ro. xv. 2). It is of course possible that St Paul had been told that these were features which characterised the life and conduct of Jesus. But it seems much more probable that he was himself responsible for these deductions, and that he made them out of a copious store of reminiscences which had been transmitted to him by many who had companied more or less closely with Jesus. Many of our speculations as to what happened during these thirty years before our Gospels came to be written down are governed by our own attitude to their central subject. It is for most of us one among a thousand other interests. For Paul and those with whom he frequently consorted it was all and everything. And the 'Apostles' were far from being the only depositaries of information. We must allow for many contacts with those who had seen and heard the Master, for eager enquiry and eager communication, and then for the inspired intuition which enabled the

[1] Cp. Otto, *The Idea of the Holy*, p. 167: 'it taught him that infinitely profound understanding of the Christ made manifest which has led a critic like Wellhausen to confess that, when all is said, no man has understood Christ himself so deeply and so thoroughly as Paul.'

[2] Cp. my *Dominus Noster*, p. 21 ff.

[3] 2 Cor. ii. 5; see Hort, *ad* 1 Pet. i. 21.

Apostle to postulate these general qualities in the character of Jesus. And what was true of Paul's knowledge of His character would apply equally to his knowledge of His teaching. We meet it as it issues from the alembic of Paul's mind; but much of the material which has been fused there, must have reached him from first-hand sources.

PAUL'S CENTRAL AND INCLUSIVE IDEA: SALVATION

St Paul's conception of Christianity can best be studied under the aspect of Salvation (*σωτηρία*). For this there are several reasons.

(i) Negatively, it is well to avoid the more familiar term 'Paulinism.' For that inevitably suggests a system of thought, whether it be one elaborated by the Apostle himself, or whether it be one deduced from his writings by subsequent seekers for a system. And that makes for misunderstanding at the outset. It has been rightly said 'it is in fact the *πρῶτον ψεῦδος* if and when Paul is taken as in the first place a theologian and so understood.' But it is not only the primary fallacy, it is a misconception which has mischievously affected the whole treatment of the subject. There are quite modern works on the subject, which begin by laying out a scheme of religious dogmatics beginning with Anthropology and running on through Hamartiology and Soteriology to Eschatology, and then search the Pauline quarries for material out of which to erect the fabric of such a system. One of the first things we have to do therefore is to recognise that though St Paul was undoubtedly a thinker, he was very far from being a systematic theologian. His ideas on various topics are harmonious with one another. But they are not always absolutely consistent, neither are they stated in such a way as to fit exactly into one another and form a 'system.' Even the effort to make them fit starts by

ignoring what is characteristic of his teaching, namely, that with few exceptions it is delivered in immediate application to life, to some particular type of ignorance or uncertainty or moral perplexity. The form of his teaching is therefore conditioned, at least in part, by the known circumstances of those to whom it was given; it is art rather than science, life rather than logic, which provides the standards for his method.

A great teacher has defined education as 'the transmission of life to the living by the living,'[1] and the definition exactly seizes the characteristic of Paul's teaching and that which distinguishes it from what the title 'Paulinism' suggests. St Paul as he meets us in these Epistles is not primarily a theologian; he is not a lecturer on theology; he is not even a preacher. What moves him primarily is his 'care of all the Churches,' in a word, his pastoral consciousness. It is for their sakes that he seeks to interpret the life which was already theirs and his, to account for its origin, to describe its implications, its natural forms of expression, its spiritual sources of nourishment. The fact is that each of the great topics which he handles is not so much a section which articulates into a dogmatic whole as one aspect of the whole itself, of Christianity as 'the power of God unto salvation.' 'That arises from the fact that Paul was not a philosopher, not even in the first place a thinker, but an Apostle.'[2]

(ii) But positively also Christianity according to St Paul is best studied under the aspect of Salvation, inasmuch as 'Salvation' is really the most comprehensive term for what the Apostle found in Christ. It includes, as we shall see, all the chief factors in Christianity, whether in theory or in practice. It looks both behind and before. It covers the initial experience, the present status and the future consummation of those

[1] Edward Thring.

[2] Feine, *NTT*[2], p. 225.

who are Christians. In its backward reference it includes all from which men have been saved through Christ, in its forward reference all that is secured to men in Him. It embraces all the great topics with which we are familiar—Redemption, Justification, Reconciliation, Adoption, Sanctification. Negatively it covers deliverance from Servitude (δουλεία), from Unrightness and Condemnation (ἀδικία, κατάκριμα) and from Hostility (ἐχθρά). Positively it covers the experience of Freedom (ἐλευθερία), of Acquittal or Rightness with God (δικαιοσύνη) and of Reconciliation (καταλλάγη). It makes room for Christ in all the aspects of His saving activity, for the Holy Spirit as creating, sustaining and guiding the 'life' of those who are saved, and for the Church as the organ and end of the Divine purpose, the Body of those who by saving are being saved. It is in fact hardly too much to say that Christianity was of interest to St Paul only because it was a method of Salvation.

(iii) Moreover, it was in this aspect that St Paul's message or Gospel found a point of attachment to the religious needs both of the Jewish and of the pagan world. In the religious vocabulary of the Jews there was no word more familiar, no word so plastic responding to successive changes in the conception of the danger from which men needed to be delivered. Nothing could have a wider appeal than a message about 'salvation.' And no less beyond the limits of Judaism the same word was in common use to describe the need of men for a deliverance which could only be effected in a religious way. The question What must I do to be saved? came as naturally from the lips of the Philippian jailer as it might have done from those of a Jew familiar with the Old Testament. What they severally meant by it might be very different. But the point is that the proclamation of a 'message of salvation,'

of a Gospel which claimed to be 'a Divine Force unto salvation,' would be heard with interest and expectation alike by Jews and by Gentiles.

We may indeed find here as good an illustration as any of the general principle which should govern our investigation of the origin of Pauline language and ideas. St Paul neither invented the word nor was he the first to give it a central place in the vocabulary of religion. It was already in use throughout the Hellenistic world to describe what may be thought to be the deepest need of man, the highest gift of this or that god or goddess, the secure reward of participation in this or that mystery. We may accept Reitzenstein's statement as covering both the pre-Christian and the Christian period that, in regard to the mystery-cults, 'what men expect from them is naturally varied. Many, it is true, refer the σωτηρία which is prominent in all of them, to the outward life, deliverance from danger, success in their calling, protection from sickness; but even then, as Apuleius shows, there is bound up with the external help a promise of continued life in the Beyond. From an early period deeper natures seek in the Mystery new knowledge and the enhancing of the divinity of the Ego.'[1]

The fact is that σωτηρία, salvation or deliverance, was and is what is sought and offered in all religions of the higher form. The true differentia between them lies in that from which deliverance is sought and effected, and in the means, whether magical or moral, whereby it is accomplished[2].

[1] Reitzenstein, *Poimandres*, p. 17. The same varied application of this idea is noted in converts from heathenism to-day. See Campbell Moody, *The Mind of the Early Convert*, p. 45, etc.

[2] 'To speak of "a religion of redemption" is, one may say, to be guilty of redundancy, at any rate, if we are considering the more highly developed forms of religion. For every such religion, when once it has won its autonomy and freed itself from dependent reference to merely

The idea of 'salvation' therefore as a thing supremely to be desired was widely current, albeit with very varied connotations, in the world into which Paul was born; he could hardly be unaware of the fact. Certain forms of religion offered to secure or to bestow this salvation through the practice of certain rites or mysteries. The latest theory as to the origin of historical Christianity by interpreting the teaching of St Paul in the light of these facts reduces his connection with Jesus of Nazareth to a slender thread and makes him and not his Master the real author of Christianity.

The line of argument has been well summarised by Schweitzer. 'Paul's mind,' they say, 'was filled with Hellenistic ideas of "redemption"; in Tarsus he had become familiar with the mystery-cults which were at that time practised in Asia Minor, and he was equally acquainted with mystical ideas of religion which had grown on the soil of Zarathustra's religion. Later on he connected these Greco-Oriental redemption ideas with reflections concerning the person and the work of Jesus of Nazareth, whom he represented to be the Saviour dying for the redemption of man. Also, it was Paul who gave Christianity its sacramental character.'[1]

Had Paul been a Greek, or had he become completely Hellenised, or had he allowed Hellenistic ideas to expel fundamental Jewish conceptions from their place at the centre of his thinking, or had there been no other sources lying nearer to his hand, there might arise an *a priori* probability that he did interpret his own religious experience in terms of this σωτηρία of the mystery-religions.

worldly welfare (εὐδαιμονία) whether private or public, developes in itself unique and overabounding ideals of beatitude which may be designated by the general term of salvation.' Otto, *The Idea of the Holy*, p. 170.

[1] Schweitzer, *Christianity and the Religions of the World*, p. 20.

But, as we have seen, Paul was a Jew, was proud of being a Jew, wished to remain a Jew, and looked for the complete and final salvation of the world in terms of the salvation of Israel. He was a Jew in the attitude of his mind, in the habit of his thought, in the method of his logic. He drew nothing worth speaking of from the literature of Greece. He drew freely and copiously on the Old Testament for illustration, for argument, for vocabulary. And there in the Bible of the Greek-speaking Jews the word σωτηρία had long ago established itself as a synonym for the complete fulfilment of Israel's hope in God. The content put into the word at different periods and by different men varied of course among the Jews, as it varied elsewhere; it varied with the changing interpretations which were put upon man's highest good. It might mean no more than deliverance from impending danger to life or to liberty; it might mean no less than triumphant participation in the transcendent Kingdom of the Messiah. It might stand for something wholly corporate or national, or equally for something intensely personal and individual. But whatever the form of deliverance or the quality of privilege which it connoted, it was expected that God would vindicate His character ('show his righteousness') by sending 'salvation' to His people. The promises of the prophets, the prayers and aspirations of the psalmists alike had found in the word the highest expression of religious experience.

'The Lord Jehovah is become my salvation'; 'the ends of the earth shall see the salvation of our God'; 'say unto my soul I am thy salvation'; 'his salvation is nigh them that fear him.'[1] The word was part of the religious vocabulary of the Jews, the idea it suggested the most comprehensive and plastic conception of God's merciful dealing with His people. And if we take, as

[1] Is. xii. 2, lii. 10, Ps. xxxv. 3, lxxxv. 9.

we may, the canticles in the opening chapters of the first and third Gospels as giving a fair impression of the religious tone in the home of Paul's childhood, we find there the same emphasis on the same theme. 'My spirit doth rejoice in God my Saviour'; 'hath raised up a mighty salvation for us'; 'to give the knowledge of salvation to his people for the remission of their sins.'

In view of St Paul's origin, upbringing and predilections it seems gratuitous to seek or to presume any other than Jewish influences or sources for his interest in 'Salvation.' On the other hand, there is one consideration which seems conclusive against any identification of his conception of σωτηρία with that current in Greco-Oriental cults; and that is that whereas in the latter 'salvation' was exclusively and intensely individual, by St Paul it was contemplated as a corporate experience. It was no doubt apprehended by the individual as an individual, but it came within his reach only because God had dealt savingly with mankind. 'God was in Christ, reconciling the world (or, humanity) to himself.' Salvation had come, or was available, according to St Paul, because God 'for Christ's sake' had done something of tremendous import so as to place mankind, or a section of mankind ('whom He had chosen') potentially at least in a new relation to Himself. The salvation-experience of the individual was secured to him as part of the experience of the whole. This feature, which is specifically characteristic of St Paul's conception, marks it off very definitely from the Hellenistic conception of salvation, and shows its affiliation with the Jewish, and with the Jewish conceptions of the Kingdom of God.

It is not argued that St Paul was either unfamiliar with, or indifferent to, these Greco-Oriental ideas. He may even have seen in them points of attachment for the Christian message—though, if so, there is singu-

larly little to show it. But the stream of religious thought in which he was working was that which rises to our ken in the prophets of the eighth century and finds its purest expression in the mind and teaching of Jesus.

The implication and the *rationale* of 'salvation' as contemplated by St Paul will therefore best be studied in the light of Jewish thought on the subject; and it will be found that the connotation of the word follows a line of development parallel to that of several other key-words in the Jewish religion, which were similarly taken over by Christianity. But this word has, as has been said, a comprehensiveness such as belongs to none of the others. It alone describes the central Christian experience in the three aspects of past, present and future. The *Entweder-Oder* finds no legitimate place here. Men who were in living communion with God had had experience of His saving goodness in the past, were enjoying it in the present, and expected its consummation in the future. This is in accordance with the fact that all experience of God is at once real and satisfying and incomplete (cp. 1 Pet. ii. 2, 3). Paul therefore uses the word (and its cognates σώζειν and διασώζειν) with each of the three references to past, to present and to future.

Most commonly he uses it in reference to the future, with an eschatological significance. Thus: 1 Thess. v. 9, ἔθετο ἡμᾶς ὁ θεὸς εἰς περιποίησιν σωτηρίας. Ro. xiii. 11, νῦν γὰρ ἐγγύτερον ἡμῶν ἡ σωτηρία ἢ ὅτε ἐπιστεύσαμεν. Phil. ii. 12, μετὰ φόβου καὶ τρόμου τὴν ἑαυτῶν σωτηρίαν κατεργάζεσθε. Ro. v. 9, πολλῷ μᾶλλον... σωθησόμεθα δι' αὐτοῦ.

But he uses the same words also to describe an experience which has begun and is going on, a present process: 1 Cor. i. 18, τοῖς δὲ σωζομένοις (cp. Ac. ii. 47).

1 Cor. xv. 2, δι' οὗ καὶ σώζεσθε. 2 Cor. vi. 2, ἰδοὺ νῦν ἡμέρα σωτηρίας. And the verb at least is used by him to describe something that has happened in the past, resulting in an established status: Ro. viii. 24, τῇ γὰρ ἐλπίδι ἐσώθημεν. Eph. ii. 5, χάριτί ἐστε σεσωσμένοι.

And while the words from this root thus cover all the aspects in which the central Christian experience can be contemplated, the idea they convey is also capable of being analysed into the elements which go to make up that experience, and thus serves to correlate the ideas of redemption, justification, reconciliation and sanctification. It includes what men are saved *from*, what men are saved *to*, and also the means by which they are saved.

This is in fact the experience which Paul's Christian theology is intended to explain. What we call his 'theology' grows out of the attempt to answer the question, What must have happened in order to account for the fact that I and others are secure of, nay, find ourselves in enjoyment of, salvation? And the motive for putting the question and providing an answer to it is the passionate desire to clear the way for others, in order that they may enter into the same experience.

In making this analysis of the pre-suppositions and of the implications of salvation Paul found guidance in the Scriptures of the Old Testament, in the religious ideas which had accrued to Judaism especially in the centuries immediately preceding the Advent, and specially in what he had learnt concerning the life and the teaching of Jesus. And the explanation at which he arrived may be stated summarily thus: Salvation, the complete and final deliverance of the whole man, the first-fruits of which were already his, pre-supposed (*a*) *negatively*, (i) Redemption or Deliverance from Servitude in every form; (ii) Justification, or Deliverance

from Condemnation; (iii) Reconciliation, the removal of Alienation, Hostility to God: (*b*) *positively*, (i) Adoption, a new status of sonship; (ii) Consecration, a new status of saintship or belonging to God, and (iii) Life, life of a new quality, life in the Spirit, life that is 'life indeed.' Each of these main factors in salvation is causally connected by St Paul with the death and risen life of Jesus, the negative ones more emphatically with His death, the positive ones more emphatically with His life. The work of the Holy Spirit and the efficacy of the means of grace are connected particularly with the positive factors. If therefore we consider Salvation as a Fact of the Past, Salvation as an Experience of the Present and Salvation as a Hope of the Future, we shall take the best way of studying the Apostle's thought and teaching as a coherent and living whole.

CHAPTER II

SALVATION AS A FACT OF THE PAST

'BY grace ye are people who have been saved.' 'Unto this hope were we saved.' 'Through him we have obtained our access to this grace wherein we have our stand.' 'Who delivered us from the power of darkness, and brought us over into the kingdom of the Son of His love.' In all these various aspects the Christian experience is presented as something accomplished and even complete. For himself and for his fellow-believers St Paul looked back to a moment in their lives when the transforming experience had taken place. They had been 'laid hold of' by Christ Jesus (Phil. iii. 12). They had been 'called' by Him, and they had responded to His call. They had passed into a new sphere of life, and it was the sphere of salvation. The proof of it was in all cases that they had received the Spirit. Of these things St Paul was unalterably convinced, and so probably were those to whom he wrote. His doctrine or exposition of Salvation is really found in the answers which he gives or may be inferred to have given to the question, What must have happened in order to make this experience possible? In the first place, what barriers had been removed, barriers which were holding back Salvation? And the answer falls into three parts, according to the nature of the barrier as it presents itself to him under different aspects. Before these things could have happened men must have been 'redeemed' (emancipated from every form of servitude), 'justified' (exonerated, acquitted), and 'reconciled' to God. It is of the first importance to keep separate, in the first instance, what the Apostle has to say under each of these heads. Only when that has been carefully studied, can a synthesis be safely attempted.

I. REDEMPTION OR EMANCIPATION

Men had been saved, or could be saved. The first presupposition of that experience or possibility was that they had been 'redeemed,' delivered from each and all of various forms of bondage or servitude under which they had fallen. We have to examine first therefore what St Paul has to say about Redemption (ἀπολύτρωσις) together with its suggestive parallels ἐξαγοράζειν and ἐλευθεροῦν. The presupposition which underlies this language is that man has hitherto been in servitude, held in thrall by various powers external to himself. By faith in Christ he can now be *free*. Potentially he has been delivered, emancipated, from every other dominion than the direct dominion of God. His condition is now one of Freedom due to the work of Christ recognised as a work of Redemption.

The word is of course derived from λύτρον, ransom, but its history shows a clearly marked tendency to broaden the conception by lifting the emphasis off the idea of 'ransom' or price paid, and leaving the more generalised idea of deliverance or emancipation[1]. Illustrations of this use of the simple verb, whether in the active or the middle voice, are found in Psalm cvii. 2, 'Whom he hath redeemed from the hand of the enemy'; Luke xxiv. 21, 'We trusted that it had been he which should have redeemed Israel.' The compound substantive ἀπολύτρωσις occurs several times in the New Testament in passages where the idea of price paid would be very difficult to introduce. Thus, 'Lift up your heads, for your deliverance (A.V. redemption) draweth nigh' (Lk. xxi. 28); 'They were tortured, not accepting deliverance' (Heb. xi. 35). Reminiscence of the word's etymology may be found in Ephesians i. 7,

[1] For the history of these words see Abbott, *Ephesians*, in I.C.C. p. 11; also Westcott, *Hebrews*, p. 295.

1 Corinthians i. 30, 1 Peter i. 18; but for the most part the meaning is weakened to simple 'deliverance' (cp. also Ro. viii. 23; 1 Cor. i. 30; Eph. i. 14?)[1]. We may therefore accept the conclusion arrived at by Abbott, 'There are no doubt other passages in which it is easy to introduce the idea of payment of a price, but as the only ground for insisting on introducing it in every case is an erroneous view of the primary meaning of the word, further proof is required in each instance.' The same cannot of course be said of ἀγοράζειν (1 Cor. vi. 20, vii. 23) and ἐξαγοράζειν (Gal. iii. 13) which continue to connote the idea of price.

It was failure to recognise this stage in the history of the word ἀπολύτρωσις which led to speculation as to the person to whom the price had been paid and to the theory advanced by Origen and others that the ransom had been paid to the Devil. But Origen would not have made this guess unless he had been impressed by the much more important fact that the work of Christ must be regarded from one point of view as a work of deliverance from evil powers. Men had been delivered from the power of the Evil One. If the question was pressed, To whom had the ransom been paid? it was natural to reply, To the Evil One.

(i) REDEMPTION FROM SERVITUDE TO EVIL SPIRITS

The first form of servitude from which Paul believed that Christ had delivered men was servitude to spirit-forces of evil, demons, or the Evil One. This is partly concealed from us by the fact that he often uses unfamiliar terms to describe these spirit-forces of evil, such as 'the elements of this world,' 'the prince of this

[1] So Lietzmann, *ad* Ro. iii. 24 in *HNT* and Feine, *NTT*[2], p. 376 (with more reference to price in Ro. iii. 24).

world,' 'angels, thrones, principalities and powers,' 'the prince of the power of the air'—and partly by the fact that in only one passage does he refer to 'demons,' and in two only does he refer to 'the devil' by that name. It was in fact evil intelligences of a much higher order than 'demons' with which St Paul was concerned; and with cosmic spirit-forces of which Satan, Beliar, or the Devil was only the titular chief. Much of Satan's importance, on the other hand, was due to the idea that as 'prince of the demons,' 'prince of the powers of the air,' he exercised a paramountcy over 'the armies of demons that lurk' or were supposed to lurk, lying in wait to cause all manner of mischief to men. An individual man might be victim to, obsessed or tyrannised over by, a demon (or 'unclean spirit'); but it was far more serious that the race of men was understood to have fallen into subjection to higher powers of evil.

This belief was connected with that very vital change which had passed over Jewish religion between the Exile and the Advent, a change due partly to a new emphasis on the transcendence of God, partly to a new sense of human weakness and sinfulness and partly to a settled pessimism and despair of better things and better conditions at least within the horizon of this present life. The issue was a form of practical dualism. This was not philosophic in its origin or character, but religious. The very intensity of men's belief in God led them when faced by the phenomena of human suffering and wickedness to postulate for their present experience a source other than God.

The clearest expressions of this belief in the New Testament came not from St Paul but from St Stephen and St John. In Stephen's speech he marks the time when God 'turned and gave Israel up to serve the host of heaven' (Ac. vii. 42)[1]; John describes the whole of

[1] Compare Jer. xix. 13; Deut. xvii. 3, xxxii. 8 (LXX).

humanity as 'lying in the evil one,' *i.e.* in his grasp, under his dominion (1 Jo. v. 19). But in the light of these phrases the significance of Paul's language becomes clear, when he speaks of 'the god of this Age' (2 Cor. iv. 4; cp. Jo. xii. 31: 'now shall the prince of this world be cast out').

But St Paul is more immediately concerned with what may be described as the intermediate powers of evil, what he calls Principalities, Powers, Thrones and Dominions or Potentates. These he seems to have conceived as forming a hierarchy of evil spiritual Forces, subordinate to the Prince or Ruler of this Age, but greatly superior to demons in rank and importance.

It is unnecessary to look for the source of the terminology or for the reason of its adoption by St Paul in false teaching, 'Gnostic' or otherwise, which he was anxious to combat. Some theory of this kind had been present to the Jewish mind ever since the close contact of the people with Babylonia had made them familiar with the astral religion and the astrological theories of the Chaldaeans. A few quotations will remind us of the disposition and the power which the Apostle either himself ascribes to such spirit-forces or knew to be ascribed to them by others. At the close of Romans viii. they, 'angels, principalities and powers,' are referred to as capable of and apparently desirous of 'separating us from the love of God.' '*Our* conflict,' he writes to the Ephesians, 'is not with flesh and blood, but with Principalities and Powers, with World-rulers of the darkness, with spirit-forces of evil in the unseen.' And it is the same Forces on which he throws the responsibility for the death of Christ, 'the rulers of this world, who did not know the Divine wisdom,' otherwise 'they would not have crucified the Lord of the Shekinah' (1 Cor. ii. 6–8).

There is, however, one phrase of special interest in this connection. It appears four times in the Epistles of St Paul[1], and is represented in the Authorised Version by some combination of the word 'elements.' 'Even so we, when we were children, were in bondage under the elements of the world'; 'how turn ye again to the weak and beggarly elements whereunto ye desire again to be in bondage?' Guided by Bishop Lightfoot it has been the habit of English scholars to understand the Apostle as referring here to 'rudimentary teaching,' 'the A B C of Christianity,' with the possible alternative of a reference to the physical elements.

But neither rendering does justice to the significance which Paul evidently attaches to the phrase. The modern interpretation is much to be preferred, which sees in στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου primarily stellar bodies, the planets or the signs of the Zodiac, and derivatively Spirit-forces, angels or other supranatural beings which were understood to control them or through them to influence human life[2]. In other words, it is the same order of beings as are elsewhere described as Angels, Principalities and Powers, to which men had been in bondage, and to which, as Paul sorrowed to believe, the Galatians were in effect prepared again to submit themselves.

It was from bondage of this kind, servitude to Spirit-forces hostile to man and to God, from which Christ had delivered men and set them free. This introduces us to a form of religious experience (religious because it connects man with the unseen world) which, in form at least, is so far from anything recognised by the modern

[1] Gal. iv. 3, 9; Col. ii. 8, 20.

[2] Cp. Edwyn Bevan, *Hellenism and Christianity*, p. 77: 'The fear of these world-rulers, particularly the Sun, the Moon and the five planets lay heavy on the old world. The Mysterious Seven held humanity in the mechanism of iron necessity.'

civilised man that we may welcome any evidence which helps us to recognise its reality and its importance at a certain stage of intellectual development.

Such evidence is provided by the observation of trained observers in the Foreign Mission field, who find this servitude to unseen Spirit-forces and the dread of them one of the most common features of heathen life. In Warneck's admirable study of Christianity in its approach to animistic religion we find the following: 'The insurmountable wall which rises up between the heathen and God is not sin as among ourselves (not in the first place at least); it is the kingdom of darkness in which they are bound. That bondage shows itself in the fear that surrounds them, fear of souls, fear of spirits, fear of human enemies and magicians. The Gospel comes to unloose the ignoble bonds. It stands forth before their eyes, a delivering power, a redemption. They see Jesus certainly as the self-revelation of God, but they see Him chiefly and most clearly as the conqueror of demons and the Devil.'[1] Again, 'To the heathen the Devil is a master girdled with power, from whose despotism Jesus redeems them. They lay hold of Jesus Christ, not so much as a Saviour from the power of sin, but as a deliverer from the power of darkness. The Gospel truth which they first grasp is that Jesus has power over demons, and that He has come to make sons of God out of the slaves of sin and the Devil.'[2] Once more the same observer: 'The number of dangerous spirits to which human misery is traced back is legion. These spirits have no relation of dependence upon God. Belief in God or gods and belief in demons belong to entirely separate domains. The good-natured God has no power to restrain the mischief of the spirits and is never besought

[1] Warneck, *The Living Forces of the Gospel*, p. 232.
[2] *Ibid.* p. 234.

to do so. We have *an unsettled dualism of religious thought.*'[1]

For West Africa we have the evidence of Schweitzer: 'For the negro Christianity is the light which shines in the night of fear. It assures him that he is not in the power of Nature-Spirits and ancestral ghosts, but that in all that happens the will of God maintains its sovereignty. Thus he turns from terror to trust, from an un-ethical to an ethical world-view.'[2] It is probable that these observations of the situation to-day reflect with considerable accuracy the religious outlook of unintellectual people in the time of St Paul.

We cannot say to what extent, if any, Paul himself had been conscious of this bondage. No doubt it was an experience more vividly realised and more oppressive among the non-Jewish races. But it was not entirely absent from the Jewish mind. And it is probable that at periods of national stress and despair there would be a recrudescence of superstitious belief in the power of the stars, of evil Forces in the unseen, of that Fate which they were supposed to represent or to control. And Paul in Galatians iv. 3 distinctly ranges his fellow-countrymen and in some sense himself among those who when they were 'not yet of age' had been 'in thraldom under the spirit-forces of the world.' But those who believed in Christ were made free from that thraldom. Theirs was 'no slavish spirit that would make them relapse into fear' (Ro. viii. 15, M.). God had 'delivered them from the Powers of darkness,' and transferred them into the Kingdom of His Son (Col.

[1] *Ibid.* p. 68; cp. Campbell Moody, *The Heathen Heart*, p. 117: 'converts seek for protection from demons in Christ'; also *Mind of the Early Convert*, pp. 44, 105: 'when the Chinese becomes a convert, his zeal almost invariably expresses itself in hearty denunciation of idol-worship and exultation at his release from evil spirits.'

[2] Schweitzer, *The Primeval Forest*, p. 154.

i. 13). In a word the result of Christ's work as well as the purpose of it might be described as the deliverance of men from 'this present Age, evil as it is' (Gal. i. 4). Or, as the writer to the Hebrews puts it, the purpose of the Incarnation was that Christ might 'through death destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil; and deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage' (Heb. ii. 14, 15).

In what way did St Paul conceive that this had been accomplished? In one sense it has not yet been completely achieved. The 'rulers of this world' are not destroyed; they are 'being destroyed' (*καταργούμενοι*), or rather 'being put out of action,' just as Christians are being saved. The end will not be until Christ has finally destroyed these spirit-forces every 'Rule and Authority and Power' which is hostile to God and man. These are the 'enemies' which He must put under His feet (1 Cor. xv. 24), and the last of these hostile forces to be destroyed is Death. But Christ has already dealt the fatal blow. It is to this that Paul alludes in the perplexing passage in Colossians (ii. 15). 'He stripped off from himself the Principalities and the Powers and made them a contemptible exhibition, when by his cross he triumphed over them.'

The verb in the middle voice (*ἀπεκδυσάμενος*), which has caused so much difficulty to interpreters, really gives the clue to the meaning of the passage. What was it that Christ laid aside as a robe, when He died upon the Cross? According to Paul's thinking it was His 'flesh' (*σάρξ*) or physical constitution. This was perceived by some of the Latin Fathers, who boldly translated, 'having put off from Himself His body, He made a show of them.' Paul's doctrine of the *σάρξ* is fairly clear. The physical constitution of man was, like everything else that God made, originally 'good.' But historically, in consequence of the Fall, it

had become 'corrupt.' Henceforth it was that part of man through which the evil spirit-forces laid hold on him, enslaved him. It was in his 'members,' in his physical constitution, that Paul recognised a controlling force bringing him into captivity to the law of sin. And Christ had taken upon Him this σάρξ, the physical constitution of man; God had sent Him 'in the likeness of sin's flesh,' (ἐν ὁμοιώματι σαρκὸς ἁμαρτίας), *i.e.* in the likeness of flesh which has become the property of sin (Ro. viii. 3). And just as Christ, inasmuch as He was 'made under the law' came under the law's jurisdiction in order that He might deliver men from its curse and dominion, so being 'made of a woman,' or in Johannine phrase being 'made flesh,' He came into relation, hostile relation, with these spirit-forces of evil which held the world in fee. That He was 'without sin' was not because He did not feel the full force of their attack, but because He and He alone resisted it.

And in the act of dying He divested Himself of that flesh, the medium through which He had become involved in the human experience of the hostility of evil Potentates and Powers, the spirit-forces which had usurped authority over men. It was they who 'crucified the Lord of glory,' but in doing so they over-reached themselves. He escaped from their dominion, nay more, He broke it; God raised Him from the dead, and in His resurrection (the thought of which is never far from Paul's mind when he is speaking of the Cross) He asserted and proclaimed His victory over every hostile Force, death, demons and the Devil.

The cogency of such an explanation may be difficult for us to seize; but it is capable of further illustration. In the account of the Incarnation which Paul gives in the second chapter of the Epistle to the Philippians, the phrase, 'took the form of a servant' (slave or thrall) appears to be inadequately explained as a reference to

the humble condition of our Lord's life on earth. The context calls for something much more impressive. And it seems probable that Paul has here also the idea before his mind that the Incarnation involved so complete a participation in human experience that Jesus Himself accepted the position of a thrall, albeit an unconsenting one, to the spirit-forces by which men were enslaved. The same idea appears in Origen, when he speaks of Christ as 'passus dominationem tyranni.'

And the significance attached to His stripping off the flesh finds a parallel in the context of the passage before us. 'And ye were circumcised with a circumcision not made with hands, in the stripping off of the flesh-body, in the circumcision of Christ' (Col. ii. 11). It is clear that 'the circumcision not made with hands' is explained as 'the stripping off of the flesh,' and that this is further described as 'the circumcision of Christ,' *i.e.* the circumcision which Christ had undergone. But again the current explanations are far from adequate. The circumcision of Christ to which Paul here refers is that which He underwent when in the act of death He stripped off from Himself the flesh-body in which He was clothed[1]. Circumcision made with hands was a laying aside of the flesh which could only be partial and symbolic. In the case of Christ there took place a laying aside of the flesh which was real and complete and in those who 'died with' Him one which was ideally complete. Men were 'circumcised with the circumcision of Christ' in the same sense as they were 'crucified with' Him.

And there may possibly be another illustration of the same idea in the Epistle to the Ephesians (iv. 21), where the very difficult phrase, 'as truth is in Jesus' (καθώς ἐστιν ἀλήθεια ἐν Ἰησοῦ) ought perhaps to be connected with what follows: 'that, as was actually the

[1] Cp. Klöpper, *Der Brief an die Kolosser*, p. 402.

case with Jesus, ye put off the old man and put on the new.'[1]

Finally, the idea of our Lord having waged a victorious struggle with the enemy of mankind underlies the parabolic saying of Himself: 'when a strong man armed keepeth his palace, his goods are in peace. But when a stronger than he shall come upon him, and overcome him, he divideth his spoils' (Lk. xi. 21, 22). The strong man is Satan. Christ has come upon him and overcome him. There has been a struggle. Christ has been victorious. And the proof of it is that He is 'spoiling his goods' by casting out demons.

Confirmation of this interpretation of redemption as well as of its importance in the first three centuries is found in the literature of the early Church. In Ignatius (*Eph.* XIX. 3) we find allusion to the destruction of 'the old kingdom' as part of the result of the Incarnation, an allusion which becomes clearer in Justin Martyr (*Apol.* II. 6. i. 5)—'The Son of God became man in order to destroy the demons.' Elsewhere in Justin the triumph over the Devil is distinctly referred to His birth, or to His birth, death and resurrection taken together[2]. 'This victory over demons was accepted as a fact, just as the forgiveness of sins was accepted as a fact. At present the one fact was not used to explain the other.'[3] In Irenaeus we find, 'Through the second man God bound the strong and spoiled his vessels, and evacuated death by giving life to the man who has been subjected to death.'[4] So also in Tertullian, 'Et dominus quidem illum redemit ab angelis munditentibus (= that hold the power of this world) a spiritualibus nequitiae, a tenebris hujus aevi.'[5]

[1] For this use of ἀλήθεια cp. 2 Cor. vii. 14.

[2] Cp. *Dial. c. Tryph.* c. 78 and 85.

[3] Rashdall, *The Theory of Atonement*, p. 202.

[4] *Adv. Haer.* III. XXII. 2.

[5] *De Fuga*, 12, t. i. 484, *cit.* Rashdall, *ibid.* p. 251. The passage shows in what sense Tertullian understood Eph. vi. 12.

Many other illustrations might be given; but these are enough to show how much importance was attached in early Christian thought to the idea that Christ by His death had redeemed men from servitude to the spirit-forces of evil[1]. When we add the evidence from the Mission field to-day, we may conclude that the proclamation of Redemption from the dominion of these spirit-forces as accomplished through the death of Christ was one which would find a wide response in the first century from people who stood at a certain level of intelligence and of culture.

In two passages St Paul refers to a price as having been paid, by which men had been redeemed or purchased for freedom[2]. He gives no indication as to the nature of the price. But there can be no doubt that he saw it in the total self-offering of Christ, specially upon the Cross.

(ii) REDEMPTION FROM THE BONDAGE OF THE LAW

From his new standpoint as a Christian St Paul looked back on his experience as a Jew, and recognised that the Law, which from the Pharisaic point of view was the great glory of Israel and indeed the means to Israel's salvation, had been an intolerable yoke of bondage. 'Be not entangled again in that yoke of bondage,' he writes to such Jewish Christians as might hear his letter to the Galatians read (Gal. v. 1). And further, he recognised that the effect of the Law had

[1] For other quotations relevant to this subject see Hastings Rashdall, *The Theory of the Atonement*, pp. 279, 292, etc. Reference should also be made to F. C. Conybeare, *Jewish Quarterly Review*, VIII and IX; Joh. Weiss, *Dämonen*, in Hauck's *Realencyclopädie*, vol. IV; Harnack, *Expansion of Christianity*, I. 368; Weinel, *Geisteswirkungen*, pp. 24 ff., 113; Campbell Moody, *Mind of the Early Convert*, pp. 2, 105, 113; Rivière, *Dogme de la Redemption*, p. 90 f.

[2] 1 Cor. vi. 20, vii. 23; cp. 1 Pet. i. 18, 19; 2 Pet. ii. 1.

been to lay a curse at least on those who had had opportunity to observe it, and had obviously failed. For, in Deuteronomy (xxvii. 26) it was written, 'Cursed is every one that continueth not in all the things which are written in the book of the law to do them' (Gal. iii. 10). The Law actually involved a bondage and imposed a curse. But 'God sent forth his Son to deliver them who were in subjection to the Law' (Gal. iv. 4); and 'Christ has redeemed us from the curse of the Law.' This was the second form of servitude from which Christ had emancipated men.

Paul traced the experience of being freed from the Law as a bondage and from the curse which was involved in his failure to keep it, to the act of Christ. How had this been accomplished?

On this Paul has not much to say, but in the light of his explanation of the other forms of Redemption his meaning is sufficiently clear. 'Christ was made a curse for us.' The form of the quotation from Deuteronomy which follows might naturally have led the Apostle to write 'was cursed for us'; but probably he shrank from a statement of that kind, and introduced the rather ambiguous modification. In this case the key to the process, as he understood it, lies again in the Incarnation, and here in the special form of our Lord's Incarnation as a Jew. His self-identification with the Jewish race was so complete that it involved Him in subjection to this form of bondage also. As completely as He had been identified with men in their relation to the flesh, so completely had He become identified with the Jew in his relation to the Law[1]. As He had been 'made of a woman' with all the implication of that, so He was 'made under the Law' with all that that involved;

[1] Just as in accepting baptism He had identified Himself with those who awaited the Kingdom even to the point of appearing to share their 'repentance.'

in order that He 'might redeem them that were under the Law' (Gal. iv. 5). And as He suffered the extreme consequences of being 'made flesh,' so He suffered the extreme consequence of being under the Law, namely, the death *of the cross* which according to the Old Testament involved the victim in a curse. He was identified with His race as it lay under the judgment of a broken Law; and the form of His death proved the completeness of the identification. But once more His triumph over that death which spelled curse, meant triumph over the Law which imposed the curse and the deliverance of His people from its yoke.

The Apostle does not further expound the process of emancipation in this form. But we may infer with great probability the explanation he would have given. The clue is provided by Romans vii. 4 (cp. Gal. ii. 19) taken with the analogy of redemption from the spirit-forces. 'Ye died to the Law through, or by means of, the crucified body of Christ,' or, as Dr Moffatt renders it, 'The crucified body of Christ made you dead to the Law.' Neither the death nor the curse was the real end which it seemed to be. On the contrary, the end in Christ's case had proved to be life and exaltation to the right hand of God. He broke the power of the Law as a yoke of bondage by first realising in His own Person the utmost extremity of its authority, and then by breaking forth from its dominion in the newness of the resurrection life. Those who by faith participated in His death participated in this aspect of it also. Christ, therefore, was 'the end of the Law...to every one that believeth' (Ro. x. 4)[1]. He was the end of the Law as a system, a dispensation and a servitude.

[1] The passages in Eph. ii. 15 and Col. ii. 14 quoted by Sanday and Headlam *ad* Ro. x. 4 are not relevant here. They really refer to a different matter, the Law as the effective barrier between Jews and Gentiles.

Primarily and directly redemption in this form concerned Paul as a Jew and only as a Jew. It was the Jews alone who were under the Law, and on whom lay the curse of failure to observe it. But what was true of the Jew with his written code was capable of ready extension to the Gentile, in so far as the natural man is always prone to conceive his relation to God in terms of law, and to turn his obedience into a yoke of bondage.

(iii) PAUL AND THE LAW

It is, however, important to observe in what sense Paul understood that Christ was the end of the Law, and of law—in what sense it had ceased to function in the case of believers. It is mainly on a misapprehension of this that the charges of inconsistency rest which have been freely and frequently levelled at the Apostle[1]. On the surface, his language in different places appears to be inconsistent with itself, and again his practice appears to be inconsistent with his theory. On the one hand we have the Law described as a yoke of bondage, something from which men needed to be redeemed, from whose authority they had been discharged (Ro. vii. 6), of which Christ was 'the end.' On the other hand, we find Paul exalting the Law, ascribing to it Divine authority, and practising it, even in some of its most external ritual. 'The law is holy, and the commandment holy and just and good' (Ro. vii. 12). 'We know that the law is spiritual,' that is, belongs to the higher life (cp. 1 Cor. vii. 19; 1 Tim. i. 8). He caused Timothy to be circumcised (Ac. xvi. 3); he shaved his head in Cenchreae, 'for he had a vow' (Ac. xviii. 18). He joined with four other men in ritual purification according to the law, and that for the express purpose

[1] *E.g.* Schweitzer, *Paul*, p. 160: 'The peculiarly inconsistent attitude of the Apostle to the Law.'

'that all may know that thou thyself walkest orderly and keepest the law' (Ac. xxi. 18–26).

On such evidence it is not difficult to formulate a charge of inconsistency against which there seems to be no defence. But there is more than inconsistency. When we compare 'Christ is the end of the law' with 'Do we then through faith cancel the law? Not at all. We establish the law' (Ro. iii. 31), we find a flat contradiction. The two propositions could not be held by the same man unless he were putting different meanings upon the word 'law.' And it is only necessary, in order to meet the charge of inconsistency to apply steadily a distinction which was undoubtedly present to Paul's mind. That is the distinction between the Law as a *system* whereby men could secure, or thought they could secure, 'righteousness' by merit, and the *contents* of the Law, the Divine requirement as to the character and conduct of men. In the former sense the Law had come to an end. In the latter sense it remained valid for Jews and Christians, though not valid in quite the same sense for both.

Paul found himself in consequence of his faith-union with Christ emancipated from the Law as bondage. He was free therefore to proclaim the discovery which had been forcing itself upon him during his Jewish days, that the Law had failed. The Law held out a prospect of leading men to 'life'; 'the commandment was ordained unto life' (Ro. vii. 10); 'he that performs all these things shall live by them' (Gal. iii. 12, quoting Lev. xviii. 5). But the Law had proved itself in Israel's experience powerless to do this very thing, to 'make alive' (Gal. iii. 21), that is to create or quicken within men that life which is akin to the life of God. Even more than that it had proved itself experimentally a law that led to sin and death (Ro. viii. 2) or as Paul put it in 2 Corinthians (iii. 7) 'a form of administration

which issued in death.' Hence the recognition of its failure is expressed with a note of indignation. The Law had mocked men. It had offered itself not only as of Divine authority, but as a method of attaining the righteousness which God required. And just in proportion to the degree in which Paul had surrendered himself to its authority and set himself by its means to achieve righteousness was the indignation and sense of disillusionment with which he regarded its failure. There is something almost stinging in the phrase—'That which the Law could not do.'

From this Paul is led to an examination of the history of the Law, and to the discovery that its function as a system for regulating the relation between God and man has been only *relative* and *transitory*. It appears in the history of the Divine dealing with Israel as a parenthesis (παρεισῆλθεν, Ro. v. 20) interpolated between the periods during which grace on God's side and faith on man's were the conditions of happy relationship. Already four centuries before the Law was promulgated God had entered into a covenant with the founder of the Jewish race, a covenant which rested on the entirely different basis of gracious promise and trustful confidence. And now in Christ the promise is fulfilled and the like answering confidence of faith renders the Law as a system irrelevant (Gal. iii. 17).

In further proof of the inferiority of the Law as a system Paul adduces the circumstances of its promulgation as related in Jewish legend. The Law 'was ordained through angels, by the hand of a mediator' (Gal. iii. 19). It had reached man only at two removes from God. It was promulgated by angels; and they in communicating it to men had to make use of an intermediary or spokesman, Moses; whereas in giving the Promise God Himself had spoken to Abraham direct.

Moreover, from the day of its promulgation the Law

was marked as καταργούμενος, something that was passing away (2 Cor. iii. 13), a fact which was symbolised by Moses putting a veil over his face in order that the people might not see the fading of the glory[1].

This criticism of the Law on the ground of its failure and of its historical relativity justified the more fundamental repudiation of it as a permanent basis of the relation between God and man. The Law laid a snare for men in that it tempted them to make a mistake which Paul had discovered to be simply fatal. By setting before them a codified rule of life and by assuring them that by following this rule they could *earn* the favour of God, it made the relation between God and man one of contract, one as between Master and man. 'The wages of sin is death.' So long as a man insists on maintaining that form of relation, it is wages that he receives. His real Master is sin. And the wages which sin pays is death. But the relation can now be put on a new footing. It may become the relation of Father and son; and to those who enter this relation 'the gift of God is eternal life.' The attitude which the Law had fatally encouraged men to adopt towards God was that of making a claim upon Him, what Paul describes as 'boasting.' 'If Abraham were justified on the ground of performances, then he would have ground for making a claim' (Ro. iv. 3), 'Where then is there room for claim? It is excluded.' The Pharisee in the Parable is the classical illustration of those who make this claim, the Publican of those who do not. And when Jesus said that the Publican went down to his house 'justified rather than the other,' He taught the same truth which Paul expounded in his doctrine about the Law, and about 'faith and works.'

But all this did not alter the fact that the Law was from God (πνευματικός), that its precepts were holy

[1] So Bousset, *ad loc.* in *SNT.*

and just and good. Paul, as a Jew, had thought that men should keep the Law in order that they might be saved. As a Christian he saw that men must be saved in order that they might keep the Law. The requirements of the Law had not ceased to be binding—as regards the moral law, on all men; had not ceased, as regards the ceremonial law to provide legitimate religious expression for the Jew. It still remained part of the advantage which the Jew had over the Gentile that 'his were the Covenants, and the Legislation and the Cultus' (Ro. ix. 4), the Law which was 'the embodiment of knowledge and truth' (Ro. ii. 20, M.)[1].

Always provided it was understood that the keeping of the Law established no claim upon God, that it could be kept in any real sense only by those who had accepted salvation, Christ, as God's free gift of grace.

And the Law had its uses. It had been 'added on' (Gal. iii. 19) 'because of transgressions,' that is to say, in order to reveal sin in its true character, by exhibiting it as transgression of the defined will of God. From this point of view, 'the law entered that the offence might abound' (Ro. v. 20). Its function was to bring to light the real nature of the disease. 'I had not known sin except through the law' (Ro. vii. 7); 'through the law cometh the knowledge of sin' (Ro. iii. 20). The recognition of sin as sin, which was facilitated by marking it as 'transgression' was essential to the discovery of the true value of the gift of God in Jesus Christ. So that the Law had served as an actual guide to bring men to Christ (Gal. iii. 24). It had religious value therefore in that it quickened and deepened the sense of sin and of human powerlessness

[1] Cp. J. Weiss, *Urchristentum*, p. 169: 'Warmly as he protests against imposing Circumcision and the Law upon the Gentiles, he is equally unwilling to take away from the Jew what is to him most dear and holy.'

in the face of sin, and so quickened and deepened the craving for 'Life,' the 'Life' which when accepted through Jesus Christ secured the fulfilment of the contents of the Law under conditions of the Spirit. Paul's contending was with those who because they did not understand the change wrought by Christ sought to make the keeping of the whole Law *de fide* for all Christians, and to make it part of the *esse* of the relationship with God.

(iv) REDEMPTION FROM THE SERVITUDE OF SIN

The analogies of redemption from the Law and from the spirit-forces of Evil will be useful when we proceed to examine St Paul's view of Redemption in its third aspect, viz. Redemption from the servitude of Sin largely regarded as a personified force. This is Redemption in its most universal form, emancipation from a bondage which is not primarily racial like that of the Law, nor connected with one stage only of intellectual progress like fear of unseen forces, but experienced by man as man.

Paul's treatment of the subject of Sin is largely governed by his conception of it as something external and objective[1]. This comes out most clearly in the account he gives of his own moral history in Romans vii. 'Apart from the law sin is dead'; 'sin sprang to life and I died'; 'sin slew me'; 'sin entered into the world and death by sin'; 'the wages of sin (the wages paid by sin) is death.' To this personified external Force (which Paul seems almost to reckon among the spirit-forces of Evil) man has come to be in servitude. Paul himself had been 'sold under sin' (Ro. vii. 14), so as to become Sin's bondman. He charges both Jews and Greeks

[1] 'Die Sünde wird bei Paulus stets als fast persönliche Macht betrachtet.' Lietzmann, *ad* Ro. vi. 7. See also Dibelius, *Geisterwelt*, p. 119.

alike that 'they are all under sin' (Ro. iii. 9). Men were 'thralls of sin' (Ro. vi. 20, cp. vi. 6; Gal. iii. 22). Sin has indeed ruled as a king in the realm of death (Ro. v. 21). It exercised a dominion, a tyranny over men, from which, until Christ came, there was no escape[1].

It is not enough to say, as is commonly done, that in these and other passages Paul came near to *personifying* sin. He came near to personifying it because he conceived it as something which reached him and other men from without, something which had existence and showed activity prior to and independent of his consent to it. And conversely we do not find any indication of sin (in the singular) being conceived of as individual and personal. Paul does not speak, as we should do, of 'my sin,' meaning sinful condition. His word for that (ἀδικία) contains the further connotation of the Divine judgment on the condition. He does use the word ἁμαρτίαι in the plural with this meaning: 'Ye are yet in your sins' (1 Cor. xv. 17), as also for acts of sin. 'Sin' is not for him a synonym for a sinful status; it is a power invading, attacking, subjugating men from without, and using for this purpose the flesh or physical constitution as its instrument.

Paul has singularly little to say about sin as involving pollution, and nothing to say as to an initial cleansing of the sinner by Christ. He calls on Christians to cleanse themselves from the filthiness of the flesh (2 Cor. vii. 1), in a passage which is otherwise curiously un-Pauline. And he refers to Christ as having cleansed His church with the washing of water (Eph. v. 26). But a sentence like 'The blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth us from all sin' not only comes from a different Apostle; it has no true parallel in Paul. He conceives of men as being in servitude to Sin, or as having incurred loss of

[1] Cp. Feine, *NTT*[2], p. 316: 'Das Fleisch ist also Sitz, Organ und Werkzeug der Sünde.'

righteousness, or condemnation through their sins, as having been separated, alienated from God by Sin.

Universality of sin. For St Paul it was axiomatic that all men were thus 'under sin,' that is, under its dominion. The proof of it lay in the fact that 'all have sinned' (Ro. iii. 23, v. 12, xi. 32). And that was a fact of experience and observation. There was further proof, specially manifest in the case of the Gentiles, in their rapid descent into the worst forms of immorality (Ro. i. 21–32). It was because 'they worshipped and served the creature rather than the Creator' that God gave them up to their vile passions. It was common ground between Paul and Jewish readers of his Epistle to the Romans that all Gentiles were sinners. In seeking to bring them to recognise the fact that Jews also came under the same condemnation, his appeal is to conscience and the observed facts of life. It is a mistake to suppose that he relies upon Scripture for the proof that it is so. Here as elsewhere his quotation from the Old Testament (Ps. xiv.) is really by way of illustration of what is otherwise seen to be true rather than of demonstration of a new fact. The words of the Psalm are apposite to his proposition, at the most a confirmation of it, but not adduced as the proof. That all men 'sinned and came short of the glory of God' was an observed fact which did not need to be proved.

At the same time it is to be noted that Paul recognises a deeper meaning for 'sin' than just contravention of the Divine commands. Sin involves coming short of the Divine glory, descent to a lower plane than that for which man was destined; or, as he puts it elsewhere, it involves being 'cut off from the life of God' (Eph. iv. 18). But this belongs rather to his analysis of sin's consequences, not unconnected perhaps with the teaching of Jesus as to the effect of sin in disqualifying a man for communion with God (Mk. vii. 20). We see

the effect of the setting up of a new criterion ('doing the will of my Father') in the appearance of new factors in St Paul's catalogue of sins. Tested by the new standard, still more when tested by the degree in which he 'fell short of the glory,' even the 'righteous' Jew was 'concluded under sin'; and any limitation which Paul as a Pharisee might have been prepared to set upon the universality of sin was swept away.

The origin of Sin. Paul observed two universal facts. All men sinned, and all men died. And he saw a causal connection between them. He saw also a common source of both, in Adam. 'By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin' (Ro. v. 12). 'While the rest of mankind died through the trespass of one' (Ro. v. 15). 'As in Adam all die' (1 Cor. xv. 22). In view of the intimate connection which Paul sees between sin and death these passages all testify to the explanation he would give of universal sinfulness. It was due to the transgression of Adam, who as founder and head of the human race by that transgression entailed sin and death upon his descendants. Sin thenceforth became a constant and inescapable factor in human experience. And so did death, which followed sin as a consequence. And by death Paul means neither physical death alone nor 'spiritual death' alone but both; or rather he does not make the distinction. Death was due to the principle of decay introduced by sin into the flesh (cp. 2 Pet. i. 4), which from thenceforth became 'mortal' (θνητός, Ro. vi. 12; 2 Cor. iv. 11); at the same time it introduced moral as well as physical decay in man who was thus 'cut off from the life of God.'

Concerning this explanation of the origin of universal sinfulness, there are two things to be noted. The first is that St Paul is not the author of it. It was the line of explanation which had been commending itself to Jewish writers and teachers for some generations. It is

not found indeed in the Old Testament itself. 'The Old Testament teaches first that all individual men are sinners; second, that the sinfulness of the individual is not an isolated thing, but is an instance of the general fact that all mankind is sinful; and thirdly, the sin of man can only be taken away by the forgiveness of Jahveh. Probably the Old Testament does not give any rationale of the fact that each individual is sinful beyond connecting him with a sinful whole.... It is doubtful, however, whether the Old Testament gives anything beyond the historical fact that Adam fell and that we observe his descendants universally sinful.'[1]

It is in the post-canonical literature that we find speculation on the origin of human sinfulness settling down on Adam as not only the exemplar but actually the source and cause of sin in his descendants. The view becomes increasingly clear in Enoch, Baruch and 4 Ezra[2]. In the Apocalypse of Baruch (liv. 15) we find the same paradoxical co-ordination of hereditary sinfulness with personal responsibility which we find in Paul. 'Though Adam first sinned and brought death upon all, yet of those who were born from him each one of them has prepared his own torment to come.'[3]

In this matter, therefore, St Paul was probably reproducing the view of his Rabbinic teachers.

The second point is, that this question does not enter into the substance of his teaching on Salvation or Redemption. He uses the universality of sinfulness and death which is thus traced to Adam to illustrate the universality of the need of salvation (Ro. v. 12–17); the universality of death experienced by the race of which Adam was the head, to illustrate the universality of the

[1] A. B. Davidson, *Old Testament Theology*, p. 217.

[2] See the full and illuminating treatment of the whole subject in Dr Tennant's *Sources of the Doctrine of Original Sin*.

[3] See R. H. Charles, *Apocalypse of Baruch*, p. 91 ff., with an important note on the Pharisaic teaching on predestination and free-will.

gift of life to all members of the new Race which has Christ for its Head (1 Cor. xv. 22). But his account of Salvation, its necessity and its achievement, would be true for him, though only one man had sinned, and only one man had been redeemed and saved.

Sin then was conceived by Paul as one of the hostile Forces, originally external to man. Behind Sin stood Death, which indeed made use of Sin as a means of effecting a lodgment in the human race. 'The sting of Death is Sin' (1 Cor. xv. 56). He means that Death employed Sin to stab for itself an opening into human nature. So 'Sin came into the world and Death by Sin' (Ro. v. 12). And once Sin had effected an entrance it remained, 'sin that dwelleth in me' (Ro. vii. 17, *ἡ ἐνοικοῦσα ἐν ἐμοὶ ἁμαρτία*), subjugating to itself the flesh, bringing the members into captivity to its law, the whole body into 'the bondage of corruption.'

The relation of man to Sin which Paul conceived of as dealt with in the Redemption effected by Christ was the relation of a slave to a tyrant. It was an internal tyranny exercised by a Force which had successfully attacked the human personality from without.

As such it had corrupted the will, the intelligence and the imagination (Eph. iv. 17, 18; Ro. i. 21). And the working of these corrupted functions was manifested in those acts and habits of sin the true character of which was brought to light by the operation of the Law (*παραβάσεις* or *παραπτώματα*, also *ἁμαρτίαι*). The distinction is important for the understanding of Paul's account of salvation. For we shall find that he understood Christ to have dealt in one way with Sin as a subjugating power, and in another way with sins as the expression in thought and deed of a subjugated and corrupt personality. In one passage (Col. i. 14) he thinks of men's sins as themselves forming a bondage, and their 'remission' therefore as equivalent to redemp-

tion (ἀπολύτρωσις). But otherwise the redemption is from Servitude to an external force.

From this, the worst and the most universal form of servitude also Christ had redeemed men. His power to do so arose, according to St Paul, from the same fact as was operative in His power to redeem from other forms of Servitude. It depended on His Incarnation, the completeness of His self-identification with humanity. Born of a woman, found in fashion as a man, he came 'in the likeness of flesh which belonged to sin' (Ro. viii. 3). His experience of the power of sin, of the attack of sin, of the danger from sin, was a reality. It was so real, in fact, that Paul might say that God 'hath made him to be sin for us' (2 Cor. v. 21). The form of the sentence, like that in Galatians iii. 13, is probably due to Paul's shrinking from saying that God made Him a sinner. That would be false; He was 'without sin.' But in all else that belongs to man's relation to sin except consent to it, Christ was partaker through His Incarnation. In other words, Christ was 'made sin for us' when He was 'made flesh.' And He broke the dominion of Sin for Himself and for mankind because 'in that he died, he *died unto sin* once for all' (τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ ἀπέθανεν ἐφάπαξ, Ro. vi. 10). This does not mean that He died 'for sin.' Neither does it refer to a continuous relation to sin, something in Himself which never responded to the appeal of sin. He had that. Paul called it 'the spirit of holiness' (Ro. i. 4). It is again to the moment of Christ's death that Paul here refers. In that moment God 'condemned sin in the flesh' (Ro. viii. 3), that is to say *pronounced the doom of sin* as it had found lodgment in the physical constitution of men. Or, by a different figure, Christ at that moment divested Himself of the Flesh, and thereby died out from under the condition of Servitude in which He was involved by the Incarnation. He died from under the

dominion of Sin as He died from under the dominion of the spirit-forces and the Law. For again death was not the end, but life, under new conditions of freedom from every kind of Servitude. 'In that he liveth, he liveth unto God.' His triumph over death is a triumph over Sin together with all the other spirit-forces of Evil. He has broken that yoke of bondage also, redeemed a new Race from the dominion of Sin.

We find therefore the same line of explanation running through the Apostle's references to redemption in each of its main aspects. The primary condition of Christ's work in Redemption is the Incarnation, the taking by Christ of a true manhood, of human nature as it had come to be through inherited propensity and individual submission to Sin. And the Redemption was effected through the Death and Resurrection of Christ regarded as an indivisible moment in the Divine plan. The Redemption was something 'objective' in the sense that Christ had created a new situation which was there, prior to, and independent of, its being taken advantage of by any individual man. He had provided for man that absolute freedom which is 'security in God from the obligation of shifting slaveries.'[1] It remained for the individual to appropriate this gift to himself[2]. And the human energy or faculty by which it was appropriated was 'faith.'

II. JUSTIFICATION

(i) A CONCOMITANT OF RECONCILIATION

'God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, *not reckoning unto them their trespasses.*' Paul might have written with precisely the same meaning, 'justifying them freely by his grace.' This introduces

[1] Nairne, *Hebrews*, p. cv. [2] See later, pp. 98 ff.

us into a new aspect of that which must have happened before men obtained Salvation, and to a new group of ideas. These are the ideas represented by 'unrighteous' (ἄδικος), 'condemnation' (κατάκριμα), 'righteous' and 'righteousness' (δίκαιος, δικαιοσύνη). In the groups of ideas indicated by Redemption and Reconciliation the imagery is severally drawn from the experience of captivity and release and from intimate personal relations. In this group it is derived from legal procedure.

In the discussion of this subject there is one thing to be borne in mind. It is complicated for us by the fact that we have come to use the words 'guilt' and 'conviction' of sin in another and a deeper sense than Paul gives to them. For us they represent something which is predominantly subjective, something of which a man is conscious quite apart from the decision of any external authority. It is before the bar of conscience that a man to-day knows himself to be 'guilty'; it is the voice of conscience which produces 'conviction.' Paul was not without apprehension of that aspect of sin; but he expresses it in terms of alienation, and sees it dealt with by Reconciliation.

In handling the subject of Justification he looks on sin and the sinner much more from the Old Testament point of view. According to that a man knew himself to be a sinner not through what we call the voice of conscience but because he had contravened some positive law or regulation, or because he found himself suffering what he recognised as punishment. Thus an 'unrighteous' man was one who had lost his innocence in the sight of the law or of some paramount authority; he was under 'condemnation.' Similarly, he could be pronounced guiltless by some competent authority; and this involved 'remission of sins' (ἄφεσις τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν), which is not identical with 'forgiveness,' and resulted

in his being 'justified' or 'righteous' (δίκαιος). From this point of view therefore 'righteousness' (δικαιοσύνη) does not describe an ethical quality in a man's character, but a status which is conferred upon him; it denotes the way in which he is regarded by some competent authority[1].

Strictly speaking 'unrighteousness' is not the result of 'sin,' but of 'transgression,' into which sin is translated by the operation of law. The sin of Adam was transgression, because a law was laid upon him and he disobeyed it. Not so with his descendants, at least down to the time of Moses. For when there is no law, 'sin is not reckoned.' But Adam is a type of Him that was to come. For as he entailed death upon his posterity, even on the generations before Moses who had not sinned after his fashion, and so become unrighteous, in like manner Christ, of whom Adam was a type, entailed life on those who through Him were declared 'righteous.'[2] In Paul's teaching about Justification he deals with this aspect of sin, as in his teaching about Reconciliation he deals with it in the deeper aspect, under which it was recognised as present, law or no law, recognised and acknowledged by the conscience.

For this condition of 'unrighteousness' also had been altered for men who believed on Christ, who 'founded on faith in Him.' Men are 'justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus' (Ro. iii. 24). God was in Christ 'not reckoning unto men their trespasses.' God it is who 'justifies the ungodly' (Ro. iv. 5).

[1] See the full treatment of this group of words in Sanday and Headlam, *Romans*, p. 28 ff.: 'δικαιόω means properly to pronounce righteous. In so far as the person pronounced righteous is not really righteous, it has the sense of "amnesty," "forgiveness." But it cannot mean "to make righteous." There may be other means at work to make a person righteous, but they are not contained or even hinted at in the word δικαιοῦν.'

[2] Ro. v. 12 ff.

In all that he has to say on the subject St Paul is working with ideas which have their source, and find copious illustration, in the Old Testament. That men required to be 'justified,' declared righteous, and further that they could establish a claim to be declared righteous was a commonplace of Jewish teaching. The prophets pressed home the necessity; and the law indicated the means whereby it could be accomplished. 'It shall be our righteousness, if we observe to do all these commandments' (Deut. vi. 25); and (with reference to the fulfilment of a specific precept) 'it shall be righteousness unto thee before the Lord thy God' (Deut. xxiv. 13). The popular and also official doctrine is probably to be found in the speech of Elihu in Job (xxxiii. 26–28). But it must be remembered that down to the same period at least the proof of this righteousness would be generally expected and recognised in earthly prosperity, which was the manifestation of God's favour within the present life.

But when this interpretation of righteousness and its attestation could no longer be maintained in the face of experience, when attention began to be focused upon an Age to come for the fulfilment of religious hope, and upon a Divine intervention for the final discrimination between the wicked and the righteous, a new emphasis began to be placed upon God's share in justification or declaring righteous. The ground on which a favourable decision might be looked for, was not changed. It was still found in 'good works' or the full performance of the Law. What God-fearing men looked for was that public acknowledgment and vindication of their righteousness which was denied them in the circumstances of their time. It came therefore to be part of the expectation of the Messianic Age, part of the content of the promised 'salvation' that God would 'justify' those who deserved it, contradict the apparent witness of experience by declaring them righteous.

It is thus that we get the combination of 'righteousness' and 'salvation' in many passages of the Old Testament, to which attention has been called. God's righteousness would be seen in actions corresponding to His character, His own character would be vindicated through the vindication of the faithful ones among His people. 'In the Lord shall all the seed of Israel be justified' (Is. xlv. 25). 'I will bring near my righteousness; it shall not be far off, and my salvation shall not tarry' (Is. xlvi. 13). 'My righteousness is near; my salvation is gone forth' (Is. li. 5)[1].

Thus, several not entirely homogeneous ideas concerning righteousness and 'justification' are represented in the Old Testament—righteousness which might be secured by men's own effort, righteousness as a status conferred and declared by God, and righteousness as an attribute or quality of the Divine nature manifesting itself in the form of 'salvation.' So soon as 'salvation' itself should come to be conceived ethically or spiritually, the 'righteousness' of God was on the way to be recognised as something in which men might come to participate. It would be 'revealed' or 'displayed' when, through men being declared righteous, it came to form part of their experience of salvation.

Of these factors in the complex idea of 'justification' as it might be constituted from the Old Testament Paul definitely repudiated the first, the possibility of man establishing a claim to be declared righteous. If there are traces in his writings of the final stage in the development, when it is recognised that the Divine righteousness conferred by God has its intended and natural result in an internal ethical righteousness in the sense commonly given to the word by us, they appear under other terminology. This ethical culmination finds expression rather in connection with the developing

[1] See further illustrations in Sanday and Headlam, *Romans*, p. 34.

connotation of 'holy' and 'holiness.' It comes to precise expression in the First Epistle of Peter. 'As he which called you is holy, so be ye holy in all your manner of life' (1 Pet. i. 15). The other factors all find a place in St Paul's conception of justification.

The discovery which he made was that 'in Christ' that which had formed part of the anticipated future of God's faithful ones had moved forward to become, for those who founded on faith in Christ, a part of present experience. They had 'peace with God' (Ro. v. 1), from which it was for him a certain inference that they had been 'justified,' declared and treated as righteous by God in Christ. This only means that Justification shared with other factors of salvation and with 'salvation' itself in that process which explains so much of the thinking of the New Testament and which has been described as 'the transmutation of eschatology.'

This is illustrated in connection with the great cardinal ideas such as 'salvation,' 'eternal life,' 'the Kingdom of God.' We meet them, as first presented in the New Testament, on the plane of eschatology, which is still the plane of future history under conditions of space and time. The fact that they are to be realised only after the great interference by God which the Jews anticipated as the coming of the Messiah does not alter their essential character. They are all interpreted in terms of the life that now is. But ere we leave the New Testament, each of these cardinal ideas has undergone a most significant transformation. The Kingdom of Heaven is now seen to be independent of any outward conditions. It is righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost. 'Eternal life' is not merely the continuance or renewal of the life that now is, under the new conditions of a Messianic Age; it is 'to know God and Jesus Christ whom he has sent.' And 'justification' is not merely the anticipated acquittal at the Day of

Judgment; it is the realisation of peace with God here and now due to the acceptance of the fact that 'God was in Christ...not reckoning unto men their trespasses.'

It is no adequate description of this transformation to say that these ideas were 'spiritualised.' They were replaced and transcended. For them were substituted the spiritual realities to which they corresponded as what the writer to the Hebrews calls the patterns in the heavens correspond to the earthly shadows. And if it is in the mind of St John that we see more clearly the results of this process it is in the mind of St Paul that we see something of the process itself.

(ii) EXAMINATION OF ROMANS I–III

The subject of Justification in this forensic sense, where it is equivalent to 'treated as not guilty' is dealt with by St Paul almost exclusively in two of his Epistles, those to the Romans and to the Galatians. The exceptions are (*a*) I Corinthians, vi. 11: 'But ye were washed, but ye were consecrated, but ye were justified, in the name of the Lord Jesus and by the Spirit of our God.' Here the successive moments in the experience of Salvation, Justification, Consecration, Baptism, are combined, and connected with features peculiar to Baptism, the name of the Lord Jesus, and the gift of the Holy Spirit. It is not without significance that the Apostle here passes over certain essential factors, as in a phrase like 'justified in (or, by) his blood' he passes over others. (*b*) Philippians iii. 9, where he again repudiates the righteousness which is claimed on the ground of merit, and claims the righteousness which is from God on the ground of faith.

Within the Epistles to the Romans and the Galatians themselves the great majority of the passages which

refer to Justification refer to it in its connection with faith, *i.e.* to the means of its appropriation. One passage (Ro. iii. 24) connects it with the grace of God as its source, and with the 'redemption that is in Christ Jesus' as its ground. In two passages only does Paul appear to connect Justification in this forensic sense with the death of Christ[1]. These are the classical passages embedded in Romans iii. 21–26, and the phrase in Romans v. 9: 'Much more being justified by his blood, we shall be saved through him from the Wrath.' And inasmuch as all Paul's references not only to Justification but to the remission of sins and to the sacrifice of Christ are commonly interpreted in the light of the former of these passages it must be examined with some minuteness.

The traditional interpretation of the passage may be gathered from the current English Translations. In the Authorised Version we have, 'Being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus: whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God; to declare, I say, at this time his righteousness: that he might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus.'

The Revised Version puts a comma at 'faith' separating it from 'in his blood,' and continues 'to shew his righteousness, because of the passing over of the sins done aforetime, in the forbearance of God; for the showing, I say, of his righteousness at this present season: that he might himself be just, and the justifier of him that hath faith in Jesus'—a sentence in which

[1] What is said above concerning 'Justification' applies also to the word 'Righteousness' describing the status of those who have thus been justified. In some passages, such as Ro. xiv. 17; 1 Cor. i. 30; 2 Cor. v. 21; Eph. iv. 24, the meaning has passed over from that of forensic status to that of ethical quality.

lucidity of thought has been sacrificed to the desire for verbal accuracy.

In Dr Moffatt's translation the traditional interpretation is brought out with perfect clearness: 'whom God put forward as the means of propitiation through his blood, to be received by faith. This was to demonstrate the justice of God in view of the fact that sins previously committed during the time of God's forbearance, had been passed over; it was to demonstrate his justice at the present epoch, showing that God is just himself and that he justifies man on the score of faith in Jesus.'

This interpretation becomes yet clearer in the paraphrase given by Sanday and Headlam. 'The shedding of His blood was in fact a sacrifice which had the effect of making propitiation or atonement for sin, an effect which man must appropriate through faith. The object of the whole being to vindicate the righteousness of God. In previous ages the sins of men had been passed over without adequate punishment or atonement; but this long forbearance on the part of God had in view throughout that signal exhibition of His Righteousness which He proposed to enact when the hour should come as now it has come, so as to reveal Himself in His double character as at once righteous Himself and pronouncing righteous, or accepting as righteous the loyal follower of Jesus.'

It should be said at once that the conviction has slowly forced itself upon me that this interpretation is exegetically unsound, and does not represent the thought of the Apostle.

(1) It is necessary to study the paragraph iii. 21—26 as a whole, and also to study it in its context. The opening words, 'But now apart from law the righteousness of God has been manifested,' strike for the second time what is the key-note of the doctrinal part of the

Epistle. This has been struck already in i. 17, and is struck again in v. 1 and viii. 1. In i. 17 the thesis is laid down, 'For therein the righteousness of God (or, a Divine righteousness) is being revealed from faith to faith.' The next verse draws attention to a close analogy: 'For the wrath of God is being revealed against all manner of godlessness and iniquity.' For this second statement Paul adduces his proofs in *vv.* 24–32. Then, when we might expect him to return to his theme, he introduces two parentheses, a longer one in which he brings the Jew within the ambit of the same judgment as the Gentile (ii. 1–29) in spite of the protests which the former may make (iii. 1–8), and a shorter one in which he repeats his conclusion, buttressing it with a cento of quotations from the Old Testament. It is equally true of both branches of the human race that the attempt to arrive at righteousness by keeping law has been a failure. 'No person can be acquitted in God's sight on the score of obedience to law.' Then he resumes, 'But now apart from law a Divine righteousness has been manifested.'

(2) An examination of the context thus brings iii. 21–26 into close connection with i. 17, of which it is indeed an expansion. And we find already mentioned there three of the terms which form the chief factors of our problem, 'the righteousness of God,' 'is being revealed' and 'faith.'

(i) *δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ*. All of the many meanings which have been suggested for this phrase lie between two extremes, according as it is regarded as describing an attribute or quality of the Divine Being, equivalent to the fact that God is righteous, or a status or quality conferred on man, 'a righteousness of which God is the author and man the recipient.' As applied exclusively, the one interpretation contemplates a righteousness which is being shown, proved, demonstrated, the other

a righteousness which is being communicated. The true meaning probably combines both elements. It is not the abstract quality of righteousness in God to which Paul refers; neither is the ethical quality of righteousness conferred on man. It is the righteousness of God as the status to which men are admitted, but it is a righteousness which has the character of God for its source and its norm.

(ii) But there remains the question of emphasis. And this must be settled by the meaning of ἀποκαλύπτεται, 'is being revealed.' And in the choice between 'demonstrated' and 'conferred' or 'communicated' everything in the passage points to the latter. There is, in the first place, the parallelism with the 'revelation' of the wrath of God, referred to in the next verse. What is illustrated in the following verses is not so much the fact that God is angry against sin as that His wrath is taking effect in the experience of men. Each further plunge into wickedness which they take is the expression of that wrath. It is not a fact which is being revealed but an experience which is being gone through. Secondly, this interpretation alone gives a satisfactory explanation of the phrase, ἐκ πίστεως εἰς πίστιν[1]. If ἀποκαλύπτεται conveys the idea of being revealed so as to reach, then this phrase takes its natural meaning of 'on the ground of faith, to faith,' faith being at once the ground on which justification is conferred and the faculty which receives it. And thirdly, the quotation from Habakkuk would be quite irrelevant if ἀποκαλύπτεται meant 'is being demonstrated,' whereas it is an effective illustration of the fact that the Divine righteousness is being revealed so as to reach men as Justification, Salvation or Life.

[1] The explanation given by *SH* cannot be said to be satisfactory: 'The phrase means starting from a smaller quantity of faith to produce a larger quantity.'

We may conclude therefore that Paul's thesis in i. 17 means that a Divine righteousness, a righteousness which proceeds from God, is being conferred on men. God reveals His righteousness in saving His people. And it will be found that this is in harmony with the usage of the Old Testament. There, in many passages, and especially in II Isaiah 'the righteousness of God' is brought into suggestive parallelism with His 'salvation.'[1] 'There is no God else beside me; a just God and a Saviour' (Is. xlv. 21): 'I bring near my righteousness; it shall not be far off, and my salvation shall not tarry' (Is. xlvi. 13): 'My righteousness is near; my salvation is gone forth' (Is. li. 5; cp. Ps. xxiv. 5). 'These passages seem to give the key to this use of the word. It is not a Divine attribute. It is a Divine effect: it is something produced in the world by God, a condition of righteousness called His not only because He produces it, but also because when it is produced men and the world will be in attributes what He is.'[2] 'Hence He is righteous when He acts along the line of His redemptive will or in conformity to it; or in other words according to His redeeming purpose.' For St Paul as for those who went before him it was as Salvation that God's righteousness was to be manifested to His people, but for him it reached them primarily in the form of justification.

(3) The traditional exegesis of iii. 21–26 starts from the view that the righteousness of God here referred to is to be understood mainly if not exclusively as an attribute of the Divine Being, and one which had been somehow compromised or exposed to criticism in consequence of God's failure adequately to punish sin.

[1] See *SH, Romans*, p. 34; A. B. Davidson, *OTT*, pp. 143 ff., 398; J. Skinner, 'Righteousness in the O.T.' in *HDB*.

[2] See Davidson, *ut supra*. In Micah vi. 5 Dr Moffatt translates what in A.V. is represented by 'the righteousness of the Lord,' by 'the saving power of the Eternal.'

It is therefore inferred that the purpose and result of Christ's sacrificial death is to demonstrate the righteousness of God which has been impugned.

(*a*) It is, however, very difficult to find evidence for either of these presuppositions. If St Paul were even interested in the question of 'righteousness' as an abstract quality of the Divine nature he would stand alone among the writers of our Scriptures. For them that righteousness, though it is of course always something inherent in, and characteristic of, God, is at the same time always something which is moving forward to express itself in the experience of men. The form in which it is apprehended by men is commonly described as deliverance or salvation, with which, as we have seen, it is frequently set in significant parallelism[1].

(*b*) There is even less evidence for the presupposition that the Divine attribute of Righteousness had been impugned or challenged because God in the past had failed adequately to punish sin. The only Scriptural evidence which is offered in support of this view is the phrase in Acts xvii. 30: 'The times of this ignorance God winked at,' or 'Such ages of ignorance God overlooked' (M.). As has been pointed out by a recent commentator[2], 'it is not alleged either here or in Romans iii. 26 that God inflicted no punishment upon the heathen; Romans i. 18 is a decided proof to the contrary.' And even if the phrase were more far-reaching and less ambiguous than it is, it could not weigh against the testimony of Scripture as a whole, which is that according to the belief and experience of

[1] Cp. St John Thackeray, *St Paul and Contemporary Thought*, p. 89: 'We should probably therefore look not so much to contemporary Jewish theology for the ultimate source of St Paul's thought on the subject as to the older theology of the Psalms and the later portions of Isaiah, where the righteousness of God is spoken of as a power which goes forth and propagates itself among men.'

[2] R. J. Knowling in *EGT*, *ad loc.*

the Jewish race God did punish sin[1]. Indeed, the strength and depth of the conviction is shown by their age-long habit of inferring that sin had been committed when they saw or felt punishment or misfortune. Neither is there anywhere a hint that God did not punish sin 'adequately.' The conviction of Israel as a nation was expressed in the sentence, 'She hath received double for all her sins.' And though the prayer had often gone up from Israel that God would take vengeance on the oppressors of His People, the suggestion is never made that the Gentiles were immune from punishment for their sins. And, indeed, the immediate context of this passage furnishes proof to the contrary. The fact that the wrath of God is being revealed or manifested against all kinds of wickedness among the Gentiles has been definitely stated in Romans i. 18, and expounded with great force in the remaining verses of the same chapter. It is difficult to suppose that Paul could have written this passage if he had had vividly present to his mind the idea that God's failure to deal adequately with sin had created a problem with regard to His righteousness.

If, however, there is little or no evidence for the alleged fact that God had failed to punish sin, there is even less for the inference that this had led to 'a charge that God does not care for sin.'[2] On this point no evidence appears to be offered. It is conceivable that appeal might be made to certain utterances in the Psalms and the Prophets which express a passionate longing that God will manifest His Righteousness. But that appeal is not due to any sense that the abstract quality of Divine Righteousness has been challenged or impugned. It is an appeal that God will manifest

[1] Cp. Heb. ii. 2: 'every transgression and disobedience received a just recompense of reward.'

[2] So Denney, in *EGT, ad loc.*: 'Paul does not say in so many words what it is in Christ crucified which constitutes Him a propitiation, and so clears God's character of the charge that He does not care for sin.'

His Righteousness by vindicating, delivering, saving His people.

There is no ground therefore for the view which really gives the clue to the traditional interpretation of this passage, namely, that the sacrificial death of Christ was necessary 'because of the passing-over of by-gone sins,' in which appears to be understood, though not exclusively, the sins of former generations. It was 'with a view to the passing over of former sins,'[1] the former sins of Paul and his contemporaries; and 'through the forbearance of God' refers not to the reason for overlooking the sins of former times, but to that in God which leads Him now 'not to reckon unto men their trespasses.' English scholarship (largely under the influence of the discussion in Trench's *Synonyms*) has almost universally attached great importance to the distinction between the rare word πάρεσις, translated 'passing over,' and the word ἄφεσις, which is commonly used for the 'remission' of sins, and so has found in it a reference to the alleged 'passing over' of sin by God in former generations. But in spite of Trench's arguments it is more than doubtful whether this distinction can be pressed[2]. And, however that may be, the forward-looking-meaning of the preposition, the possibility of which is admitted, removes the emphasis from the sins of past generations to those of men in Paul's own time—with which he was chiefly if not wholly concerned.

(*c*) There appears therefore to be no sufficient ground either in this passage itself or elsewhere in Scripture for the presupposition on which the current exegesis is

[1] Adopting 'the somewhat unusual but not impossible sense of the preposition' (*SH, ad loc.*), a sense in which it is used in the second clause of Ro. iv. 26.

[2] See Lietzmann in *HNT, ad loc.*: 'the distinction between ἄφεσις and πάρεσις, possible in itself, is nowhere demonstrable, and is not here required.'

based, viz. that there was necessity and recognised necessity for the vindication or demonstration of the abstract Righteousness of God. It remains to examine, apart from this presupposition the two main questions of interpretation. These are (1) What is the meaning of ἱλαστήριον (A.V. 'a propitiation')? and (2) in what sense did Paul understand that God had 'displayed' this righteousness?

The word ἱλαστήριον is most probably neither a substantive, nor a neuter adjective calling for some substantive like θῦμα or ἐπίθεμα to be supplied, but an adjective in the masculine agreeing with ὅν[1]. Its meaning then would be provisionally 'as one exercising propitiatory power.' The construction may be taken to be fairly certain. But it still remains to ascertain the precise significance of the word itself. A study of this and cognate words (ἱλασμός and ἱλάσκεσθαι), especially as they occur in the Septuagint, and of the Hebrew words to which they correspond, brings out an important distinction between the usage in Biblical and in classical Greek. In the latter the verb 'propitiate' is common, but it is construed regularly with the accusative of the deity (or person) propitiated. This construction is found very rarely in the LXX (of men propitiating men). 'This difference of construction marks a difference between pagan and Biblical ideas; for although propitiating God may be indirectly involved in phrases used in the Old Testament, it is not direct and prominent as in non-Biblical writers. The restoration of God's favour and the forgiveness of the worshipper are generally the aim of the propitiatory sacrifice (cf. Lev. iv. 20); but the idea of directly appeasing one who is angry with a personal resentment against the offender, which is

[1] See *SH, ad loc.*, and also Denney in *EGT*. The predicative force of the adjective is well illustrated in Philemon 15: ἵνα αἰώνιον αὐτὸν ἀπέχῃς.

implied when the deity is the direct object of the verb, is foreign to biblical usage.'[1] The idea of appeasing God in the heathen sense by offering Him an inducement to alter His disposition towards the worshipper is absent from the Old Testament, 'nor is it ever implied that the offerer of such a sacrifice is outside the dispensation of God's grace, or the object of His wrath.'[2] This confirms the conclusion arrived at by Bishop Westcott[3]: 'The scriptural conception of ἱλάσκεσθαι is not that of appeasing one who is angry, with a personal feeling against the offender, but of altering the character of that which from without occasions a necessary alienation, and interposes an inevitable obstacle to fellowship.... This being so, the ἱλασμός when it is applied to the sinner, so to speak, neutralises the sin.'

In so far, therefore, as the word 'propitiate' connotes in our common speech the placating of one who is hostile or angry, it is not a suitable rendering for ἱλαστήριον. It describes a thing to which, or a person to whom, power is assigned to establish or re-establish fellowship, and that particularly by removing or neutralising the barrier or obstacle. And in the case before us it *might* predicate of Christ crucified the power to remove that in man or that between man and God which hindered the coming of the Divine righteousness, and so the power to reconcile man to God.

Now if it be open to us to adopt that interpretation, there is one strong reason in its favour. That is found in the words which follow. It is now generally agreed that these words (διὰ πίστεως) are not to be connected with ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι. The clause describes the circumstances in which either Christ acts with propitiatory power, or God 'sets Him forth.' The Revised

[1] F. Platt in *DAC*, II. 281.
[2] Driver in *HDB*, IV. 131.
[3] Westcott, *The Epistles of St John*, p. 85.

Version puts a comma between the two clauses. But it is not so commonly recognised that this raises a further difficulty for the traditional interpretation of the passage. For it emphasises the fact that the words 'through faith' must be taken to qualify ἱλαστήριον. In other words, whatever is the effect of the setting forth of Christ which is conveyed in that word, it is something which is conditioned by faith. The proposition which is found here by most commentators and theologians is one held to be 'objectively' valid, one which became effective quite independently of, and prior to, any human response. It is something of which humanity is to take advantage, but to whose validity humanity contributed nothing. It would of course be admitted that the *purpose* of the transaction would remain unfulfilled unless it were accepted by human faith; but it would be too much to read into the phrase, 'a propitiation which is at once complete and valid apart from human response, and incomplete without it.' It would appear therefore that Christ on the Cross is here represented as exercising reconciling power not on God but on man; He exercises it 'through faith,' *i.e.* through the faith which His sacrificial death evokes. The sentence would then describe the means taken by God to bring about the reconciliation of men. It would belong not to a class of its own but to the same class as, 'God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing to men their trespasses.'

(*d*) Εἰς ἔνδειξιν τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ. This with the parallel phrase in the next verse provides the strongest support for the traditional interpretation. The word ἔνδειξις naturally means 'display,' and is used elsewhere in the Epistles of the manifestation in fact of an internal quality or condition (2 Cor. viii. 24; Phil. i. 28). And if we could accept the view that Paul was interested in the demonstration that God is

righteous, the twice-repeated phrase would be naturally referred to such a demonstration. If however there is no reason to suppose that he was concerned as to the abstract righteousness of God, and if what he was concerned about was the arrival of that righteousness in the experience of men, and if all else in the paragraph bears upon that question, it is natural to enquire whether 'display' in the sense of 'objectively demonstrate' is the only meaning of which the word is capable. It is only a slight extension of the primary meaning that is required: 'display so as to reach'; and if there is no instance of this somewhat rare substantive being used in this sense, there are some very suggestive analogies. In 2 Timothy iv. 14 the corresponding verb is used in this sense; in 1 Corinthians xii. 7 the synonym φανέρωσις does not mean a merely objective display of the Spirit, but such a display as enters into experience: and there is a similar use of ἀπόδειξις in 1 Corinthians ii. 4. Nor are the analogies in other languages wanting or unimportant. In later Latin 'exhibere' is used for 'confer'[1]; and in English, medical and academic, both the verb and the corresponding substantive appear with the definite significance of 'convey.'

Paul has already said of the righteousness of God that 'it is being revealed,' that it 'has been manifested'; and we have found reason to suppose that the idea underlying these words is not that of demonstration, but that of communication. It is still the same subject that he is dealing with: it is difficult to resist the conclusion that this phrase also expresses the same idea, 'with a view to the communication of a Divine righteousness.'

(*e*) This is plainly the meaning of *v.* 22 also, where we have in effect a repetition of i. 17, only so phrased as to bring out more clearly the meaning of ἀποκα-

[1] Augustine, *Serm.* 4.

λύπτεται. It describes how the righteousness of God has reached those who believe.

(*f*) Lastly, it is by this interpretation alone that we can do justice to the emphasis in the opening words of the paragraph. 'But now, *apart from law*, a Divine righteousness has been revealed.' There is now a new era, one in which something has happened independently of law which in former times might have been looked for, indeed had been looked for, through the instrumentality of law. And what that was admits of no doubt. It was what the law 'could not do' that was now done through Christ. And that was the obtaining or achieving of righteousness by men. Now as things are, a Divine righteousness has been revealed so as to reach men apart from law. That and nothing else is the subject of the paragraph.

If these objections to the traditional interpretation be valid, and if these indications of the Apostle's true meaning be accepted, that meaning would be conveyed by the following translation: 'Whom God publicly set forth dying a bloody death as one exercising reconciling power through men's faith in Him, with a view to conferring a righteousness of His own, through the overlooking of past sins by the forbearance of God, with a view, I say, to conferring His righteousness at this very moment, and to His being righteous and at the same time declaring righteous him who founds on faith in Jesus.'

For, this seems to be Paul's line of thought, he who has faith in Jesus is one who has read the meaning of that sacrifice, has responded to the love of God which is therein 'commended,' and is one whom a Holy God, being already ready to forgive, may, if one may say so, forgive with safety, without fear that thereby His righteous will and holy character will be called in question, nor yet His hatred of sin.

It does not follow that, if this interpretation be correct, the death of Christ is not regarded by Paul as a sacrifice, or as a sacrifice which in some sense was offered to God, although in another and equally important sense it was a sacrifice offered by God. To that we must return later. But it would follow that the value or efficacy of the sacrifice would not be explained on any analogy from the sacrifices of the Levitical system.

We should find ourselves in agreement with Paul Feine, when he says[1], 'The Epistle to the Romans does not move like the Epistle to the Hebrews among the representations of Levitical symbolism.' The root of St Paul's teaching here would be found in the prophetic teaching of the Old Testament. God had shown Himself to be in Christ at once 'a Just God and a Saviour' (Is. xlv. 21). For Isaiah's 'Look unto me, and be ye saved,' was substituted the summons to look on Christ 'publicly set forth,' 'placarded,' 'lifted up' upon the Cross, and to see there such an expression of Divine love and mercy towards men who were 'yet sinners' as would change their hearts and 'bring them to God.'

Thus interpreted the passage does not explain how it was made possible through satisfaction offered to His Justice for God to forgive sin, but how through the sacrifice of Christ men might become forgivable. Paul does not here explain that the sacrifices of the Law are now unnecessary because another and a better sacrifice of the same kind has taken their place. If he had expiatory sacrifices in his mind at all, his thought was that what the expiatory sacrifices were understood to effect had been brought about in another and a better way, by a sacrifice which had power to bring the sinner into a relation of reconciliation to God; with the result that the righteousness of God could now reach the sinner, and God could acknowledge him guiltless

[1] Feine, *NTT*, p. 309.

without impinging on his own righteousness. 'We have been reconciled to God through the death of his Son' (Ro. v. 10); and God who was in Christ reconciling us, from that moment treated us as righteous, not imputing to men their trespasses. Paul does not say that men were forgiven (or 'justified') because of the death of Christ, as though the death were the efficient cause of the forgiveness. The cause or ground of forgiveness was God's holy love, that is love which by its nature could not reach an unrepentant sinner. The sacrificial death of Christ secured forgiveness because it rendered forgivable those who had faith in Him.

(iii) JUSTIFICATION AND FORGIVENESS

It is sometimes said that Justification is simply Forgiveness, Free Forgiveness[1], and the statement is a welcome approximation to the truth. Nevertheless, it cannot be accepted as wholly satisfactory. The equivalent of Justification is 'remission of sins,' 'not reckoning to them their trespasses.' But the forgiveness which is offered by God in Christ includes more than that, even as the human conscience instructed by Christ demands more than that. It is possible that for a Jew nothing more was required than the assurance that his sins were 'remitted,' 'blotted out'; he might thereafter feel himself automatically restored to the relation of favour on God's part and confidence on his own, which was the hereditary prerogative of his people. But it was different with those who could claim no such prerogative, and with those Jews who had become uneasy as to the grounds of such a relation and their validity, in a word, with any who had been led by conscience to

[1] *E.g.* Sanday and Headlam, *Romans*, p. 37: 'When the process of Justification is thus reduced to its simplest elements, we see that there is after all nothing very strange about it. Justification is simply Forgiveness, Free Forgiveness.'

take a deeper view of the consequences of sin. So long as these were found mainly in punishment, suffering, judgment, so long 'remission of sins,' letting off the consequences, might suffice. But when it was recognised that sin had a far more serious consequence in alienation from God, the severing of the fellowship between God and His children, Justification (in the forensic sense) ceased to be sufficient. 'Forgiveness' took on a deeper meaning; it connoted the restoration of the fellowship, the establishment or re-establishment of a relation which could be described on the one side as fatherly, on the other as filial. In so far as this element is absent from the idea of Justification, it is misleading to equate it with free Forgiveness. Certain schools of theology have been led into confusion of thought by failing to observe this distinction. It was quite plain to St Paul, and accounts for the distinction between Justification and Reconciliation.

III. RECONCILIATION, AN ANTECEDENT TO SALVATION

Another postulate of the Salvation in which Paul and his fellow-believers rejoiced was Reconciliation. Redemption was neither all that was necessary, nor all that was experienced. For behind these hostile spirit-forces from which Christ had redeemed men, was God. And Servitude in any of its forms sprang out of, and continuously accentuated, the alienation of the human spirit from God. Humanity was 'cut off from the life of God.' Men were 'alienated and enemies in their mind through wicked works' (Col. i. 21). The hostile forces had made only too good use of their opportunity. The Law had 'multiplied transgression.' Sin had brought forth 'fruit unto death.' The breach had steadily widened. Man, who was made for harmony with God, and to find in

that harmony his true blessedness, was actually at issue with God, imbued with suspicion, hostility, even moral antipathy, towards God and goodness. There was something here which was not dealt with by Redemption, something which was not covered even by remission of sins or Justification. It was something which called for Reconciliation.

Paul here reaches a conception of sin and of its consequences which is deeper and truer because more spiritual and ethical than had yet been emphasised. And not unnaturally he proceeds from it to the deepest apprehension of what God had done for men in Christ. 'God was in Christ reconciling mankind unto himself.' He reaches also a deeper conception of Forgiveness. What was required and involved was more than 'remission of sins'; it was Reconciliation, or restoration of fellowship.

The words which St Paul uses to describe this new relation to God and its establishment are καταλλαγή and καταλλάσσειν. The substantive καταλλαγή occurs only once in the New Testament (Ro. v. 11), and is there translated 'atonement' in A.V., but 'reconciliation' in R.V. The alteration serves as a warning that we must not without careful and cautious investigation transfer what we learn about the *rationale* of 'atonement' in the Old Testament to the explanation of 'reconciliation' in the New.

The important questions which arise in this connection are the following:

(1) Does Paul regard the object of reconciliation as double or single? Is God reconciled to man, and man to God, or is it only man that is reconciled?

(2) Does Paul assign an objective sense to the Reconciliation as well as a subjective, as though it took place, primarily at least, anterior to any appropriating response on the part of man?

(3) In what way has Reconciliation been effected through the death of Christ?

To the first question no answer is provided by the word καταλλαγή itself. It signifies the transformation of a relation of hostility into one of peace and friendship. The hostility to be removed may be felt on both sides, though perhaps more on one than on the other; or the hostility may exist solely in the one, and the movement towards reconciliation may proceed spontaneously from the other unhampered by any such feeling. In seeking to discover whether St Paul regarded the relation between God and man as mutually hostile or as one of hostility on man's side only, attention has been drawn to his use of the word 'enemy' (ἐχθρός). There are three passages in which he uses the word in a way relevant to the question. 'If, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God' (Ro. v. 10); 'you, that were sometime alienated and enemies in your mind by wicked works' (Col. i. 21); 'in the light of the Gospel they are enemies for your sakes, but in the light of election they are beloved for the fathers' sake' (Ro. xi. 28).

In the two former of these passages there can be no doubt that the word is used in the sense of 'enemies to God.' But even those who have recognised this have felt that the case is different in the third passage. The passive form 'beloved,' they say, demands a passive meaning, 'hated,' to balance it[1]. But is this not to attach too much weight to grammatical symmetry? The governing consideration throughout the context is, 'Thus all Israel shall be saved' (*v.* 26). A temporary and partial hardening has fallen upon them. This may give the impression that God is hostile to them, that they are treated as enemies though in truth they are beloved for the fathers' sakes. Beyond that Paul's

[1] Lietzmann, *HNT*, *ad* Ro. xi. 28; Sanday and Headlam, *ibid.*

language does not carry us. But does it even go so far in suggesting that God was hostile to His people? Both phrases describe the same people at the same point of time. Can they be at the same time 'hated' and 'beloved'? And the other interpretation is entirely in harmony with Pauline thought. 'Seen in the light of the Gospel, still hostile to God for your sakes: but in the light of election still beloved for the fathers' sakes.' When we were hostile, 'we were reconciled,' for 'while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us.' Hostile and yet beloved—that exactly describes Paul's conviction on the whole situation.

The view that God is described as hostile to men is thought to be confirmed by references which Paul makes to 'the wrath of God.' Thus, 'there is frequent mention of the Anger of God as directed against sinners, not merely at the end of all things but at the present time. When that anger ceases to be so directed, there is surely a change (or what we should be compelled to call a change) on the part of God as well as man.'[1] But is it the case that there is 'frequent mention (in the New Testament) of the wrath of God against sinners'? Directly or indirectly St Paul connects God with the idea of anger or wrath some ten or eleven times. In six of these cases (Ro. iii. 5, v. 9, ii. 5; Eph. v. 6; Col. iii. 6; 1 Thess. i. 10; cf. Ro. xii. 19) the reference is clearly to the Wrath in the eschatological sense of the Day of Judgment; Romans ix. 22 refers to the postponement of the Wrath 'in the great long-suffering' of God. In three cases the same reference is less clearly expressed (Ro. iv. 15; Eph. ii. 3; 1 Thess. v. 9); two remain. 'The wrath of God is being revealed against all godlessness and wickedness' (Ro. i. 18); 'the wrath has come upon them to the uttermost' (1 Thess. ii. 16); and both of these may well fall under the general principle that

[1] Sanday and Headlam, *Romans*, p. 129.

the contents of the eschatological expectation are already entering the experience of men.

So far as Paul is concerned (and the New Testament as a whole gives little further support) these passages seem to provide only a slender foundation for the view that God is represented as hostile and requiring to be reconciled.

On the other hand, the usage of the word 'reconcile' (καταλλάσσειν) points very clearly to the answer that it is man and man only who is reconciled. There is indeed no case in which any uncertainty can arise. 'It is all the doing of God, who reconciled us to himself through Christ. God was in Christ reconciling mankind unto himself' (2 Cor. v. 18, 19); 'we were reconciled to God by the death of Christ' (Ro. v. 10); 'we pray you in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God' (2 Cor. v. 20). There can be no doubt that Bishop Westcott was right in his dictum; 'such phrases as "propitiating God" or "God being reconciled" are foreign to the language of the New Testament.'[1] And no one has recognised this more unequivocally than Dr Denney[2]. 'When reconciliation is spoken of in St Paul, the subject is always God, and the object always man. The work of reconciling is one in which the initiative is taken by God, and the cost borne by Him; men are reconciled in the passive or allow themselves to be reconciled. We never read that God has been reconciled. He was engaged in Christ in reconciling the world unto Himself.'

If this be the correct answer to the first question, it carries with it the answer to the second. It does not seem possible to conceive any sense in which St Paul could think of the Reconciliation as 'objective' if that means something which was established prior to and

[1] Westcott, *Epistles of St John*, p. 85.
[2] Denney, *Death of Christ*, p. 143.

independent of human consent to be reconciled. Whatever Reconciliation implies in the attitude of God was already there when he 'spared not His Own Son, but freely gave him up for us all.' St Paul does not suggest that any ground or motive for this reconciling of man to Himself by God was either required or provided. It was wholly and sufficiently accounted for by the nature and character of God, which anticipated the sacrifice of Christ, indeed, it provided it. It anticipated any repentance or obedience on the part of man. It was the spontaneous expression of the Divine nature.

At this point the thought of St Paul presents both correspondence and contrast with the purest thought of Pharisaic Judaism on the subject of forgiveness. According to that system the sufficient ground for God's forgiveness was man's repentance, and the moving cause of it was the love, mercy or loving-kindness of God. Repentance, however, was something the presence and reality of which were not easy to ascertain with certainty. And it was natural to call for some external proof that the repentance was genuine. Such proof might be provided in the offering of a sacrifice; but there was an increasing tendency to find it also in the doing of 'good works.' Not less natural was it that, by a process which has happened more than once in the history of religion, 'good works' came to be substituted in practice for that of which they were the symbol. But the theory remained the same. Forgiveness was offered to men on the ground of repentance alone[1].

This is but the continuation of one stream of teaching in the Old Testament itself. 'Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts; and let him return unto the Lord, and he will have mercy upon

[1] See Kohler, *Jewish Theology*, 1918, p. 246 f.: 'Neither priesthood nor the sacrifice is necessary to secure the divine grace. Man need only find his way to God by his own efforts.'

him; and to our God, and he will abundantly pardon.' 'To the Lord our God belong mercies and forgivenesses, though we have rebelled against him.' 'He hath not dealt with us after our sins, neither rewarded us according to our iniquities.' 'Return ye backsliding children, and I will heal your backsliding.' Whatever significance or importance the priestly school of thought in Israel may have attached to the sacrificial system, it would be a serious mistake to see in the sacrifices the only or the universally necessary ground for forgiveness: or to assume that the consciousness of having been forgiven would lay on the Apostle the logical necessity to find an expiatory sacrifice in the death of Christ.

Texts like these which have been quoted abound in the Prophets and the Psalms, testifying to a profound confidence in the readiness of God to forgive on the single ground of sincere repentance. And the Rabbinic Judaism in which Paul had been brought up definitely attached itself to that conviction. It 'rested its confidence in the Divine forgiveness on God's justice—based on his knowledge of human nature, and on his mercy—based on his love.'[1]

But the growingly enlightened consciousness of sin reacted on this confidence. So also did the increasingly ethical conception of God's holiness. Was it possible that a Being of this character could continue to 'show mercy' to beings such as men were? For St Paul in whom the Law had wrought despair, the difficulty would be not to believe that love forgave on the simple condition of sincere repentance, but to believe that the Divine love could persist against the hostility and wickedness of men.

Herein Paul found in great part the meaning of the Cross. The Cross in which God 'pronounced the doom

[1] See Israel Abrahams, 'God's Forgiveness,' in *Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels*, 1917, I. 139 ff.

of sin,' at the same time revealed in the most startling yet persuasive way the love of God, even a holy God, to sinful men. Such was the price which God was willing to pay in order to reconcile men to Himself. 'He spared not his own Son'; 'whom he displayed a bleeding victim, or, suffering unto blood (*προέθετο...ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι*) as one having propitiatory power' (Ro. iii. 25)[1]. Or, as we find it in the First Epistle of Peter (iii. 18), 'he suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God.'

It is clear that the Apostle laid great stress on the Crucifixion of Christ both as a spectacle and as a symbol of vast significance. He reminds the Galatians (iii. 1) how Christ had been 'placarded' before their eyes as One who had been crucified. This can only refer to the vivid presentation by the Apostle in his mission preaching of the scene on Calvary. And though in his reminder to the Corinthians (1 Cor. ii. 2) he claims to have made 'Christ' the great subject of his preaching, he indicates that he puts emphasis on that aspect of Christ which presented Him as One who had been crucified.

There seems good reason to think that the Old Testament analogue to the Crucifixion was found by St Paul not in the Levitical sacrifices but in the Brazen Serpent. The parallelism is clear at several points. As the story is recorded in Numbers xxi. 6 ff., Moses made a figure in the likeness of the serpent which has attacked the people. So Christ was 'made in the likeness of sin's flesh,' 'made sin.' The serpent is lifted up upon a pole. So Christ was 'lifted up' upon the Cross. Those who gaze on the serpent are healed. So men are called to behold Christ crucified, and find in Him their Healer. As Godet says[2], 'it is the plague

[1] See *supra* p. 68.

[2] Godet, *Comm. on St John's Gospel*, i. 314.

itself which, represented as vanquished by its exposure on the pole, becomes the means of its own defeat. This exposure takes place not in a real serpent, but in a typical model, which has the property of representing the whole species. This intervention works only through a moral act, the gaze of the wounded.' This was indeed the Old Testament type to which the words of Christ Himself, recorded in the Fourth Gospel, draw attention, and in which He invited men to see a foreshadowing of His Crucifixion. 'As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up' (Jo. iii. 14); 'I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto me' (Jo. xii. 32; cp. viii. 28)[1].

Thus, the answer to the third question, how Paul understood that this reconciliation was effected by Christ, is clear. What was necessary was to remove either the hostility of man or his hopeless conviction that he had forfeited for ever the love of a holy God. Both the hostility and the hopelessness had their ground in ignorance of God, of His character and His attitude to men. Men were 'enemies' largely because they thought that God could not but be their enemy. They despaired of forgiveness because they were ignorant of the nature and power of love. But God had 'confirmed and commended his love toward us in that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us.' The message of the Cross was a message of free and unconditional forgiveness. Unconditional on God's side, although on man's side it could only be accepted on condition of repentance. 'God was in Christ reconciling the world

[1] Significant references to the Brazen Serpent are found in *Wisdom* xvi. 7: 'He that turned toward it was not saved because of that which was beheld, but because of thee, the Saviour of all'; and in the *Epistle of Barnabas* xii. 5: 'Again, Moses makes a presentation of Jesus, showing that he must suffer, and shall himself give life.' Cp. also Philo, *de Agricultura*, ed. Pfeiffer, p. 46 f.; *Agric.* 95, p. 315; and Tertullian, *De Idol.* 5 (Oehler, 1. 72).

unto himself.' Not only in the Cross but in the total self-manifestation of Christ there was a revelation of the character of God, of His attitude to men, the attitude of a Father. And, in order to bring this home to men, 'He spared not his own Son.' This also was set forth supremely in the Cross, where the suffering and the sacrifice were not of the Son alone. The relation of the Father to the Son was such that they were manifested also in the action of the Father who 'gave him up for us all' (Ro. viii. 32).

The effect of this Paul expected to be, as indeed he had seen it to be, the flooding of human hearts with the love of God, the disappearance of hostility, the joyful acceptance of forgiveness, in a word the Reconciliation.

This is not all that Paul has to say about the 'Atonement,' but it is the heart of it. In so far as it has been, or is, felt to be inadequate, that is largely due to our failure to recognise the quality and the power of love, and the sufficient demonstration of it which is contained in and conveyed by the Cross.

'In the last resort, nothing reconciles but love, and what the soul needs, which has been alienated from God by sin and is suffering under the divine reaction against it, is the manifestation of a love which can assure it that neither the sin itself nor the soul's condemnation of it, nor even the divine reaction against it culminating in death is the last reality in the universe. The last reality is rather love itself, making our sin its own in all its reality, submitting as one with us to all the divine reactions against it, and loving us to the end through it, and in spite of it. Reconciliation is achieved when such a love is manifested, and when, in spite of guilt, distrust and fear, it wins the confidence of the sinful.'[1]

[1] Denney, *The Christian Doctrine of Reconciliation*, p. 218.

THE DEATH OF CHRIST AS A SACRIFICE

It would be a serious mistake to conclude that if the 'propitiation' passage in Romans iii. proves to have to do with Reconciliation rather than with propitiation in the sense we commonly give to the word, Paul did not therefore look upon the death of Christ as a sacrifice. We have now to consider the evidence that he did so regard it, and to ascertain if possible the character which he assigned to that sacrifice.

We may take as a starting point some sentences from Johannes Weiss[1]: 'According to many of St Paul's utterances salvation is so deeply anchored in the nature and the love of God that one must at least raise the question, on what grounds then was the work of Christ still necessary? The answer cannot possibly be to the effect that the necessity proceeded from God, or was founded on His nature. There is only one single passage in Paul (Ro. iii. 25 f.) in which the idea is to be found, unexpressed, it may be, yet underlying, that for His righteousness' sake God could not waive an expiatory sacrifice. But even this idea is so passing and so indirectly expressed that it cannot have played any great part.'

There are, however, not a few other passages in which, although that particular idea is not present, different factors in Salvation appear in close connection with 'the blood of Christ,' and still others where His death is connected with the idea of sacrifice. And it is natural that the exegesis which found an expiatory sacrifice postulated in Romans iii. should find in all these other passages allusion to a sacrifice of the same kind. The outstanding passages of this type are: 'In whom we have redemption through his blood' (Eph. i. 7); 'being justified in his blood' (Ro. v. 9); 'we have

[1] Weiss, *Urchristentum*, p. 364.

been reconciled to God through the death of his Son' (Ro. v. 10); 'through him to reconcile all things to himself, having made peace through the blood of the cross' (Col. i. 20); 'but now hath he reconciled through his flesh-body, through his death' (Col. i. 22); 'but now have been brought near in his blood' (Eph. ii. 13).

It is by no means easy to say what is the significance to be attached to this language when we cease to read it in the light of the 'propitiation passage' as traditionally interpreted. On the one hand, we have the language itself, and the interpretation which it is natural to put upon it—the blood as the instrument whereby, or the medium wherein, justification is secured, or redemption effected, or peace established. There is further the efficacy which is assigned to the blood of the sacrifices in Leviticus (xvii. 11); 'the life of the flesh is in the blood; and I have given it you upon the altar to make atonement for your souls; for it is the blood that maketh atonement by reason of the life.' And again, there is the fact that other writers in the New Testament do seem to have found their explanation of the efficacy of Christ's death in the analogy of Levitical sacrifice[1]. The language they use does at any rate draw illustration of the effect of Christ's death from the sacrifices of the Old Testament, and suggests that what was understood to be secured by them was effected perfectly by it.

These are weighty considerations. Yet there are others.

(1) The very variety of the functions which in these passages are ascribed to the 'blood' robs the language of much of its impressiveness. By it or by the death men obtain justification, redemption, reconciliation; by it they are brought near, and peace is made; and at the same time reconciliation is traced to 'his flesh-body through death.' This variety of expression suggests that

[1] *E.g.* Jo. i. 29; 1 Jo. i. 7, iv. 10; Heb. ix. 22 ff.; 1 Pet. i. 24.

we are in presence not of a technical, but of a general idea. The efficacy which is thus assigned to the 'blood' goes far beyond the scope claimed for it in Leviticus, where its effect is only negative, the 'covering' or neutralising of that which forbids safe or acceptable worship of God. These varied and positive effects which Paul ascribes to the 'blood of Christ,' though they may find a faint analogy in the Levitical sacrifices, point to a much wider meaning for the phrase. It stands for the death of Christ in its completeness and in all the horror of its circumstances. That death was for Paul a necessary link in the process whereby God wrought the Salvation of men in all its forms and implications.

(2) Continuity with the Levitical theory of sacrifice is further weakened to a thin analogy by the wide difference in regard to the character of the sins which sacrifice was understood to deal with. Under the Levitical system only sins of ignorance were capable of being atoned for by sacrifice. 'The class of offences said to be done with a high hand were capital, and followed by exclusion from the community. The sins of error and ignorance could be removed by sacrifice and offering. The Old Testament sacrificial system was a system of atonement only for the so-called sins of inadvertence.' As to the class of sins done with a high hand, which the sacrifices did not touch, 'upon the whole they were the sins forbidden by the moral law.'[1] But it was with these sins against the moral law and with sin in a still deeper sense that Paul was concerned. It was with these that he believed that Christ had dealt. Whether it were due to the teaching of the Master Himself (cp. Mk. vii. 14–23), or to other influences, Paul had learnt what it is that really defiles a man, *i.e.* disqualifies him for communion with God. It was sin in

[1] A. B. Davidson, *OTT*, p. 316.

that sense, sin of that kind, in connection with which he believed that Christ had died and for which Christ had procured forgiveness. The difference in the scope which is thus claimed for the sacrifice of Christ is so great that it is difficult to believe that Paul saw in it only an extended application of the principle underlying the Levitical sacrifices, or that he could have failed in that case to draw attention to the difference.

(3) And there is a more general consideration which points in the same direction, namely, the improbability that the Levitical theory of sacrifice, or indeed the sacrifices themselves, bulked largely in the religious life and thinking of one brought up in Paul's circumstances. The contrary opinion has weighed heavily in the discussion of our problem; nevertheless, it is probably erroneous. The reasons cannot be more than indicated here. For Jews of the Diaspora, as even for those who lived in Galilee, the sacrificial ceremonial of the Temple could have only a distant and an indirect bearing on personal religion. For two or three centuries at least the Synagogue and the Law had supplied and secured for the great majority of the Jewish race the religious privileges which were otherwise provided by the Temple and the sacrifices. Moreover, the theory of sacrifice which found expiatory and 'atoning' value in the blood belongs entirely to the latest stratum in the Pentateuchal legislation[1]. It finds no support or recognition in the prophets. By many of them indeed the whole sacrificial system had been sharply criticised. Jesus Himself had said: 'Go ye and learn what this meaneth, I will have mercy and not sacrifice.' The sentence in Hebrews (ix. 22), even if it refers to sins, which is doubtful, does not represent the universal or even the general view

[1] Cp. G. A. Smith, *Deuteronomy*, 1918, p. 172: 'Note, however, that D. unlike P. sets no atoning value on the shedding of blood or life'; A. B. Davidson, *OTT*, p. 330.

of Judaism on the subject. The prophetic criticism of sacrifices in general, the inferior prestige of the second Temple, involving in some quarters doubt as to the validity of its ceremonial, and the wide acceptance of a theory of forgiveness grounded on human repentance and Divine mercy, and quite independent of sacrifice—all these considerations make it highly improbable that St Paul would feel it necessary to explain the efficacy of Christ's death in terms of the 'priestly' theory of atonement.

It would appear therefore that some other explanation must be found for Paul's emphasis on 'the blood,' and for the effects attributed to it in the passages quoted above. This has been so strongly felt by some modern scholars that attempts have been made to find a mystical or spiritual meaning for the language. It has been described as 'a vivid way of realising the Living One who is also the Crucified, and with whom Paul lives in mystic, spiritual fellowship of blood.'[1] Or, it has been connected with 'the blood-fellowship with the exalted Lord continually renewed through the Eucharist.'[2] But this is to give an illegitimate extension to the idea of mystical union, and that by pressing the language further than it will bear. No doubt Paul when speaking of 'the blood of Christ' referred to His outpoured life, but it was His life outpoured upon the Cross. And he used the phrase as a concentrated expression of all that was involved in and exhibited in the sacrificial death of Christ, in which he saw the mediating cause of Redemption, Justification and Reconciliation.

There can be no doubt that Paul set the death of Christ at the very centre of his thinking and teaching on the subject of Salvation. He did not, however, isolate it, but held it always in the closest connection

[1] Deissmann, *The Religion of Jesus*, 1923, p. 179.
[2] Schettler, *Die Paulinische Formel 'Durch Christus,'* 1907, p. 5.

with the Incarnation on the one hand, and the Resurrection on the other. Bearing this in mind, we return to the question, In what sense did he regard the death of Christ as a sacrifice?

That he did so regard it is again beyond doubt. It was a voluntary self-offering, a voluntary acceptance of pain, shame and death, made on behalf of men, in connection with their sins, and in furtherance of the saving purpose of God. This is the case in spite of the fact that the Apostle never (unless it were in Romans iii. 25) states it definitely and unmistakably. Apart from Romans iii. 25 there are two passages in which he connects the death of Christ with sacrificial language, Ephesians v. 2 and 1 Corinthians v. 7. But it will be found on careful examination that neither of these throws light on the character of the sacrifice. The former passage runs: 'Christ loved you and gave himself for us an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet-smelling savour.' The force of this, the only passage in which Paul describes Christ as a sacrifice (*θυσία*), is considerably weakened by the facts (1) that the phrase is a combination of reminiscences from the Psalms. As Dr Armitage Robinson says, *προσφορὰν καὶ θυσίαν* is probably borrowed half-unconsciously from Psalm xl., and the second phrase *εἰς ὀσμὴν εὐωδίας* is certainly so; (2) Paul himself elsewhere uses both phrases, with no apparent difference of meaning, to describe human acts of devotion and self-surrender. In Romans xii. 1 he uses both 'sacrifice' and 'offering' of the act and life of self-surrender apart from any deeper connotation of sacrifice; and in Romans xv. 16 'offering' with the same meaning. 'For a sweet-smelling savour' appears once in connection with the preaching of the Gospel (2 Cor. ii. 14) and once in connection with the gifts sent by the Philippians to himself (Phil. iv. 18), a fact, says Dr Robinson, 'which should warn us against pressing it

too strongly to a doctrinal use' in the passage in Ephesians. Due consideration given to their history and to the context in which they stand these phrases in Ephesians appear rather to describe our Lord's surrender and submission of Himself as complete and acceptable, than to ascribe any definite character to His sacrifice.

The second instance of definitely sacrificial language connected with the death of Christ is in 1 Corinthians v. 7: 'for our passover has been sacrificed, even Christ.' While this confirms the conclusion that Paul regards the death of Christ as a sacrifice, it does not afford the light we might expect upon the character of the sacrifice. Read with its context the phrase is seen to be introduced in order to support an appeal for purity. Like the leaven at the passover-time moral impurity is to be swept out of the Christian community. For in a very real sense it is passover-time with them. Have they not their own Paschal lamb, even Christ? Their life is to be a continuous feast of remembrance, a feast also at which Christ forms the spiritual nourishment. It behoves them therefore to exclude finally all manner of corrupting elements in the moral life. It must be remembered also that the Passover rite had gone through many changes in the course of its history, changes both of form and of significance; and it is impossible to say to which stage of its history Paul's thought attached itself. If it should seem probable that the rite would have for him its contemporary rather than any antiquarian significance, then the sacrificial idea would be attenuated almost to the point of disappearing. The lamb was slain, but the ritual use of the blood had fallen into the background, indeed into abeyance[1]. It was now the eating, the common sacred meal, that was emphasised. The passover, as Benzinger

[1] On the many changes in the significance of the passover see *Encycl. Bibl.* col. 3599.

says, 'is now divested of its sacrificial character; it is a domestic feast.'

As we have seen, the context in which we find this allusion seems to indicate this as the significance of the rite which had appealed to Paul. In any case, the passage cannot be used to throw light on the character of Christ's sacrifice. This is clearly stated by Dr Denney. 'It is implied that there is an entire incongruity between a life of sin and a life determined by a relation to the sacrificial death of Christ. But we could not from this passage make out what according to St Paul was the ground of this incongruity. It would be wrong in a passage with this simply allusive reference to urge the significance of the lamb in Exodus xii. and xiii., and to apply this to the sacrifice of Christ.'[1]

Thus, apart from the presupposition created by the traditional exegesis of Romans iii. 25 there does not appear in Paul's language connected with sacrifice anything to show what precise character he assigned to the sacrifice of Christ.

We have to search therefore for more general indications. From these we learn that

(1) It was a sacrifice ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, 'on our behalf,' 'for our benefit.' 'He loved me,' says Paul, with a rare touch of individualism, 'He loved me, and gave himself for me' (Gal. ii. 20). 'Christ died ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν (Ro. v. 8)[2].

(2) It was a sacrifice 'on account of (ὑπέρ) our sins' (1 Cor. xv. 3), 'in connection with (περί) sin' (Ro. viii. 3; cp. Gal. i. 4): and those for whom He died were ἀσεβεῖς 'ungodly,' ἁμαρτωλοί 'sinners' (Ro. v. 6, 8).

(3) It was a sacrifice the purpose and result of which was to restore or to establish a relation of amity, love, sonship between men and God; it achieved that by 'commending to them his love,' by drawing men to

[1] Denney, *Death of Christ*, p. 138.

[2] Cp. for the sense of ὑπέρ, 1 Jo. iii. 16.

Christ (cp. Jo. xii. 32) and so to God (cp. 1 Pet. iii. 18); it was the means or instrument of Reconciliation.

(4) It was a necessary sacrifice because without it men could not have secured emancipation from the evil forces which held them down, or the restoration of a right relation to God, or been moved to believe in and accept the forgiving love of a Holy God, and so to find that Life which vanquishes death in all its forms. Without it Salvation would not have been accomplished.

(5) It was a sacrifice in accordance with the mind and will of God; it gave effect to His purpose. The Justification of which it was the mediating cause had had 'witness borne to it by the law and the prophets' (Ro. iii. 21); that is to say, in modern speech, it was in accordance with, and in fulfilment of, the whole trend of the revelation of God contained in the Old Testament. Therefore it was that God 'spared not his own Son, but freely gave him up for us all.' It was God who 'set forth' His Son upon the cross as one with reconciling power.

(6) It was a sacrifice in which Christ appeared and acted as a Representative, and that in a two-fold aspect. He represented God to man. 'God was in Christ' pronouncing the doom of sin, breaking its dominion over man as well as that of all the other forces of evil, waiving the legal demands of a broken law, drawing men, reconciling the world, unto Himself. But Christ also represented man to God. And that not in any merely official or statutory sense, but in a capacity of representation which was inherent in Him as the Head of a New Humanity. We are here once more confronted by the idea of solidarity, and somewhat baffled by it; for it has almost disappeared before our modern individualism. It was universal in the ancient world. A father and his family, a chieftain and his clan, a king and his people, in each case the head was necessarily

and inherently the representative of the body. What he did they did. His default was their default, his achievement their achievement. The Old Testament is full of incidents and utterances which find their only explanation in this principle[1].

St Paul saw in Christ the Founder and Head of a new humanity, a second Adam[2]. As such He summed up in Himself the Race which was to be, the Race of those who through faith in Him came into filial relation with God. He was their Representative. His achievement was their achievement, His obedience their obedience.

(7) The feature in the sacrifice of Christ to which Paul does give prominence and significance is His obedience. In 2 Corinthians x. 5 he singles out that quality as specially characteristic of Christ, so that He was therein an example to His followers. In Philippians ii. 8 he points to the Cross as the supreme illustration of that obedience. And in Romans v. 13–18 he expounds the result of that obedience upon the relation between man and God. That relation had been disturbed as a mutual one, destroyed by sin, in the first instance by the disobedience of Adam. Adam, as the head of the race and its representative, had involved his posterity in the wrong relation which resulted; and each individual man had endorsed that wrong relation by

[1] See especially Feine, *NTT*, p. 304: 'It is not possible to understand Paul's theory of the significance of Christ's death unless we keep before us the possibility of the pre-supposition of the possible transfer to mankind of what happened to Christ—a pre-supposition self-evident to Paul but not immediately to be apprehended by us. What clearly transpires here is the antique notion of the oneness of the race or the people and of the Head of the people as the representative of the whole. What happens to the Head happens to all the members of his people; and again the Head acts in a binding and legal manner for the whole. In us moderns this sense of solidarity is not so vital as in the people of antiquity, though we may find clear traces of it in national consciousness, in class or professional consciousness, and in the sense of social duties and obligations.'

[2] See further, *infra*, p. 154.

acts of sin. This was the situation with which Christ had dealt in His life, but supremely in His death, of obedience. Thus Paul writes: 'So then as one transgression issued in condemnation falling upon all men, in the same way one act of righteousness has issued in righteousness that leads to life for all men. For as through the disobedience of an individual man the rest of men passed into the status of sinners, so through the obedience of one man the rest of men received the status of righteous.'

As we have already seen, Paul was not the originator of this theory according to which Adam had entailed guilt and sin upon his posterity. He appeals to it as a commonly accepted opinion. The argument he draws from it depends upon two assertions, the one that Christ was, no less than Adam, a Representative man, the other that He had performed an act of obedience of such a character as to cancel for all who belong to Him by faith the act of disobedience on the part of Adam together with its consequences for his race. The Apostle's argument in Romans v. 15–17 is complicated and slightly obscured by his desire to show not only that the effect of Christ's death in entailing consequences on others is similar to that of the disobedience of Adam, but that it is vastly greater; the difference being due to the superiority in the scale of being of the second Adam to the first. But all obscurity disappears at *v.* 18. Each sentence is carefully balanced, and in particular the meaning of δικαίωμα is given by the parallelism with παράπτωμα, act of transgression, and confirmed by the following verse in which ὑπακοή, obedience, clearly corresponds to παρακοή, disobedience. So that in spite of the fact that δικαίωμα in *v.* 16 has meant 'sentence of acquittal,' it means here 'act of right, or righteousness.' Christ's act of righteousness was His obedience, the sacrificial death upon the Cross in accordance with the will of God.

And there is probably a closer relation than appears upon the surface between the idea of obedience and that of sacrifice. The condition of receiving the Divine forgiveness being true repentance, not merely sorrow for sin but a change of mind or attitude towards God and possibly towards men, an obvious difficulty presented itself; and that was the difficulty of making sure that the repentance was sincere. Hence arose the demand for acts of penitence, such as fasting, almsgiving, 'works meet for repentance.' And alongside of these sacrifice also had an important function in guaranteeing that the sinner was truly repentant. Just as almsgiving came to be identified with 'righteousness,' so a close relation might be observed between 'obedience' or an indefeasible act of obedience and sacrifice. The death of Christ was a sacrifice inasmuch as it was a supreme act of submission to the will of God.

And what was in Him obedience was for those whose Representative He was the equivalent of a guarantee of their obedience, an obedience which in their case required and implied repentance. Seeing that this guarantee was completely and sufficiently provided in the sacrificial death of Christ, it is possible to understand how Paul could see in the αἷμα, the out-poured life of Christ, the instrument whereby Salvation in any of its forms had been secured. The shedding of the blood is the consummation of the obedience, its irrefragable demonstration. And as the obedience of one, the Head and Representative, was the indispensable condition of justification for those whom He represented, it would be natural for the Apostle to use such language as 'justified by his blood.'[1]

[1] There is thus nothing in Paul's teaching that conflicts with the conclusion arrived at by R. C. Moberly: 'Whether God forgives a man or not depends wholly and only on whether he is or is not forgivable. He who can be forgiven by Love and Truth, is forgiven by Love and Truth, instantly, absolutely, without failure or doubt.'

The righteousness which is the content of justification is, according to Paul, neither imputed nor imparted; it is a status conferred, not as had previously been believed, on the ground of merit, but on the ground of faith; and that faith was faith in God particularly as He was revealed in the sacrifice of Christ.

CHAPTER III

SALVATION
ITS APPROPRIATION, FAITH

THESE things had happened. Christ had felt, fought, and overcome the dominion of evil spirit-forces, of the Law and of Sin. He had given such a demonstration of the love of God that only the response of men was required to complete the Reconciliation. He had provided a means whereby those most conscious of guilt could know themselves restored to a status of Rightness before God. How was all this to become effective in the experience of men? How were they to be made aware of it, and induced to respond to it, so that Salvation might be theirs? In other words, how came Salvation to be appropriated?

Our answer, if it is to do full justice to the thinking of St Paul must take account of two moments in the experience of Salvation, moments which are logically and chronologically distinguishable, although in St Paul's judgment equally essential to the full experience of being saved. The first is essentially individual, the appropriating response of each individual to the mercy of God revealed and offered in Christ. Paul calls that 'faith.' By it men are saved. But this faith is of such a character that it is inevitably followed by the second moment which is found in the incorporation of the individual in the community, the sacred Society. The two moments are logically distinguishable, inasmuch as the first involves a new relation to God through Christ and specially through Christ crucified; the second involves a new and continuous relation to God through the corporate Christ, the sacred Society of those who 'call upon his name.' They are chrono-

logically distinct because in any case the second is an inference from the first, and in normal cases the vivid apprehension of the second moment is connected with a rite, the rite of Baptism, which is not immediately coincident with the act of faith. Nevertheless, the two moments are for St Paul parts of one whole. The faith which saves is a faith which unites. How is this faith evoked?

I. THE WORD OF THE LORD

Paul's answer to this question is clear. Faith was evoked as a response to the message of the Gospel. 'Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by a message (or the message) about Christ' (Ro. x. 17). It was 'by the foolishness of preaching' that God chose to 'save them that believe' (1 Cor. i. 21). It was when men had heard the message of truth, the gospel of their salvation, and when in response to it they had 'believed,' that they were sealed by the Holy Spirit (Eph. i. 13). It is hearing that produces faith. 'How shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard? And how shall they hear without a preacher?' (Ro. x. 14).

Paul evidently looked to the proclamation of the 'word of the Lord,' the message about Christ, the Gospel, as able in itself and by itself to evoke faith. Thus the Gospel was itself 'a Divine Force unto salvation' (Ro. i. 16). The Galatians had received the Spirit 'on the ground of hearing which led to faith.' So Paul reminds them in iii. 2, and in the fifth verse of the same chapter he seems expressly to exclude as the ground of the same experience any external rite or ceremony whatever. All this appears to preclude any suggestion that it was through the rite of Baptism that men entered upon the experience of Salvation in any of its forms. One of the features which have been most stressed as common to St Paul and the mystery-cults in

the description of Salvation is the statement of it in terms of 'the new birth' or 'the new creature.' But Paul himself quite definitely relates the experience in this form not to any rite, but to the preaching of the Gospel. 'In Christ Jesus I begat you through the gospel' (1 Cor. iv. 15; cp. Philem. 10). So it was to 'the preaching of the word of God' that Barnabas and Saul were called by the Holy Ghost, to which they were ordained with the laying on of hands (Ac. xiii. 2–5). And so it was that the central thing in Paul's consciousness of his ministry is expressed in the saying, 'Christ sent me not to baptise, but to preach the gospel.'

As to the contents of this message we know them only in broad outline. The letters of St Paul were written to people to whom these contents were already familiar. To Jews and to the considerable body of 'god-fearers' who as adherents of the Synagogue were acquainted with the Old Testament Paul would doubtless lead arguments to show that Jesus was the Messiah[1]. To others, so far as he addressed himself to them, he would use the criticism of polytheism which was already fully developed in the Jewish propaganda. The purpose and effect of this preaching would be to induce men to 'turn from idols to serve the living God' (1 Thess. i. 9). To all he would proclaim 'Christ and him crucified,' that is to say, Christ in glory and Christ upon the Cross, with the Resurrection as the connecting link. He set forth Christ, risen from the dead, 'declared to be the Son of God with power through the Resurrection,' victorious over every enemy of man, 'delivering us from the Wrath that is coming,' living as a Spirit-being with a life which was the life of God; for He was one whom God had highly exalted, and given to Him the name that is above every name, the name of 'Lord,' that every

[1] Cp. Ac. ix. 20, 22.

tongue might acknowledge Him to be such to the glory of God the Father.

And in order that men might understand how such an one might stand in any relation to themselves Paul proclaimed Christ as 'one who had been crucified.' To do that he would require to give at least an outline of His life, to describe Him as Jesus, 'made of a woman,' 'in the likeness of sin's flesh, yet without sin,' manifesting many of the rarest and finest qualities of human nature, and manifesting them in a perfectness which had never been approached. He had been obedient 'even to the death of the cross,' and it was 'in connection with our sins' that He died. And all this was in fulfilment of the redeeming purpose of God, testified to by the Scriptures of the Old Testament. In fact, this was nothing less than God's own Son, whom God Himself set forth upon the Cross, in and through whose death God confirmed and commended His love to us, 'in that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us.' The ultimate issue of such preaching was the discovery of God as He had been made known in Christ and specially in His death.

What other factors entered into Paul's 'mission' preaching it is impossible to say. There may be hints in such phrases as 'the goodness of God leadeth thee to repentance' (Ro. ii. 4), 'who gave himself on account of our sins that he might deliver us from this present evil world' (Gal. i. 4), and 'to await his Son from heaven' (1 Thess. i. 10). Certainly, there are indications scattered through the Epistles that Paul lost no time before giving further instruction to those who accepted the heart of his message, that he instructed them in matters pertaining to Christian duty and Christian privilege. And it seems probable that he would then communicate to them what more he knew concerning the historic life of Jesus. Only the interest which was

felt in such information was the interest of people who had already believed on Him as risen, glorified and living.

What we may be certain of is that in the preaching of Christ, Christ living and Christ crucified, Christ who 'died for our sins' Paul saw, because he had found by experience, the means to evoke faith, the faith which becomes operative through love. His consciousness as one of the commissioned 'ministers of God' is best summed up in the words: 'We are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us; we pray you in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God' (2 Cor. v. 20).

II. THE RESPONSE OF FAITH

The condition of salvation which is necessary on the side of man is thus, according to St Paul, 'faith.' It is in fact the only one on which he insists when he looks on salvation as the initial stage of Christian experience. The curious fact that he makes little or no allusion to repentance is probably accidental, except in so far as it is accounted for by the fact that his letters are addressed to those for whom initial repentance was already in the past. Other things lay in the future, obedience, conformity to the ethical ideal of Christ, holiness. The development of these was in the Apostle's judgment the explication of salvation as a present experience. They were no part of the condition of appropriating salvation at the outset. As that was wholly 'of grace' on God's side, so it was wholly 'by faith' on man's. 'By grace ye are saved through faith.' 'Grace' is the attitude and activity of God towards man displayed in giving, freely and unconditionally. 'Faith' is the corresponding attitude and activity of man towards God displayed in accepting unconditionally all that God gives in Christ.

The cardinal position which St Paul thus assigns to

faith in relation to salvation calls for careful discrimination of the various meanings which the word bears, not only in the New Testament, but in the writings of the Apostle himself. Starting from a root which implies reliance, confidence, these meanings branch off at once into two streams, according as they express confidence that is felt, or that which deserves or claims confidence. Thus we get, along one line, *trust*, *confidence*, *belief* in a person or of a fact, *conviction*; along the other, *faithfulness*, *good faith*, *ascertained truth*[1]. Obviously, the meaning of 'faith' as the human condition of securing salvation is to be sought in the first group. The crucial question in regard to Paul's conception of salvation and indeed of Christianity is, what does he mean by the faith which saves?

Those who answer the question, How did St Paul understand that men entered into the experience of salvation, with his own words, 'through faith,' are by no means agreed on the significance to be given to the word.

1. There is the view which is perhaps most widely held, having found official expression through many authorities both in the Roman and the Reformed communions[2]. According to this view, salvation or redemption was primarily a transaction between the Father and the Son, the effect of which was on the one hand to vindicate the violated righteousness of God, and on the other to make it possible for God to forgive guilty sinners on condition of repentance and faith. And by 'faith' is understood belief, intellectual assent

[1] See the full analysis of the usage and meaning of πίστις in Sanday and Headlam, *Romans*, p. 31; in Lietzmann, *HBNT*, *ad* Ro. iv. 25, and Joh. Weiss, *Urchristentum*, p. 322.

[2] As a modern instance we may take the dictum of Mr Hilaire Belloc (cited by Dean Inge in his Hulsean Lectures), 'Faith is the acceptance of a truth, and the refusal to entertain the opposite of that truth, though proof be absent.'

to the reality and validity of the transaction. Directly or indirectly, the familiar verse in Genesis quoted by Paul has had much influence in support of this theory—'Abraham believed God and it was counted unto him for righteousness' (Ro. iv. 3). In the theological formula of the Reformers—Righteousness is imputed to those who believe the Gospel and specifically that part of the Gospel which has reference to the redeeming work of Christ. By an extension of the same principle we get such phrases as 'believing in the blood,' 'trust in His redeeming blood,' 'believing in the sacrificial death of Christ,' as descriptions of the condition for appropriating salvation[1].

Explanations of this type are all open to several serious objections. In the first place by limiting the meaning of 'faith' to intellectual assent, they deny or at least overlook that quality in faith which is specifically characteristic of St Paul's conception of it. And in so far as salvation or justification is attached to faith not by any genetic connection but as a kind of reward appointed to faith by the will of God it goes far to bring faith within the ambit of what Paul meant by 'works.' Thirdly, it leaves an obvious and fatal hiatus between justification and sanctification, between the attaining of a right status with God and the achievement of ethical likeness to God. This hiatus is so real that on this theory it is even possible for a man to believe that he is justified or saved on the ground of his belief in the fact or scheme of salvation, and stopping there to remain indifferent to the claims of Christ's ethical ideal. The charge of Antinomianism which was laid

[1] Cp. Loisy, *Mystères*, p. 231: 'Le principe du salut est la foi à une rédemption, à un mythe de sacrifice, à l'efficacité perpétuelle d'une mort divine, et à la participation à l'esprit même du divin rédempteur.' It is difficult to attach much importance to speculations on the origin of 'Paulinism' which rest on so complete a misunderstanding of what Paul means by 'faith' as 'the principle of salvation.'

against Paul's Gospel in his life-time, and has been brought against it from time to time ever since has no foundation except through this equating of 'faith' in St Paul with intellectual assent. The fallacy was accurately diagnosed by St James when he wrote, 'The devils also believe and tremble' (ii. 19).

A further objection is that this explanation is incomplete. It explains how one who believes is saved *from* the judgment of God, from condemnation or from death, but throws no light upon the connection between 'salvation' and the new life of sonship and ethical achievement. It moves wholly in the region of forensic imagery. When all is done, it leaves the believer 'justified' but isolated, the subject of a sterile acquittal. It gives an interpretation of Paul's thought so incomplete as to be untrue. All that he has to say about union with Christ, life that is hid with Christ in God, life in the Spirit, life on a new ethical plane, is either ignored or is brought in as a subsequent and subordinate factor in the experience of salvation. For the Apostle the two movements, the religious and the ethical, were one and indivisible; and 'faith,' the faith which saves, was something which secured the promise of both.

2. 'A divine righteousness is being revealed (*i.e.* communicated) to faith on the ground of faith' (Ro. i. 17). 'But now the righteousness of God has been manifested (*i.e.* conferred)...even the righteousness of God which is by faith in Jesus Christ' (Ro. iii. 21, 22). 'That he might be the justifier of him who founds on faith in Jesus' (Ro. iii. 26; cp. Gal. ii. 16). 'For ye are all children of God by faith in Christ Jesus' (Gal. iii. 26). 'Not having mine own righteousness, the kind that rests on law, but the kind that rests on faith in Christ Jesus, the righteousness that comes from God on the ground of faith' (Phil. iii. 9). 'By grace ye are saved through faith' (Eph. ii. 8). Passages such as these suggest that

there is for the Apostle not an adventitious or mechanical connection between faith and salvation, but a vital one. There is something in the nature of this faith which makes it the appropriate condition for securing salvation.

This faith is directed towards persons not propositions. It is 'believing on him that justifieth the ungodly' (Ro. iv. 5), 'on him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead' (Ro. iv. 24). 'We have believed in Jesus Christ, that we might be justified by faith in Christ' (Gal. ii. 16). 'To you it is given...to believe on him' (Phil. i. 29). It is faith in this sense, 'believing on' a person, whether God or Christ, to which St Paul ascribes the possibility of appropriating salvation. It involves much more than intellectual assent, and the 'more' is of vital importance. And this gives the *differentia* between Paul's explanation of the appropriation of salvation and the purely forensic or narrowly Protestant explanation. For him the faith that saves always involves a union of will and life between the believer and the Saviour, between God and His child, a union which issues in progressive ethical insight and ethical achievement, or, to put it theologically, in sanctification.

St Augustine's re-discovery of Paul and 'Paulinism' was closely connected with his recognition of the specific character and function which the Apostle assigned to faith. 'Even Paul himself,' he says, 'did not refer to just any kind of faith, whereby a man believes in God, but to that saving and wholly evangelic faith whose works proceed from love.'[1] The Apostle would have found no difficulty in agreeing with St James that 'faith without works is dead.' He himself pronounces valueless a faith which could even 'move mountains,' if it were not associated with love (1 Cor. xiii. 2). And in Galatians (v. 6) he gives his own definition of the

[1] Aug. *De fid. et op.* § 21.

faith which saves; it is 'faith which becomes operative through love.'

The idea expressed in these words has not uncommonly been taken to be that faith in this specific sense displays its quality in (subsequent) works or deeds of love and charity. But it really involves something prior to this, and even more important. The faith that saves is something which along with other characteristics has this which is of vital import, namely, that it attaches the subject of it to its object; it attaches one moral personality to another, in the bond which is called love. In a word, it sets up what is called a 'mystical union' between the believer and Christ. Thus it provides the channel along which the current of love can flow in both directions, from the believing man to God in Christ, and from God in Christ to each believing man.

Now faith in this sense, with this quality and exercising this function, is not really other than the faith which Jesus had sought to evoke, and had evoked in His disciples. He was well aware of the other kind of faith, and recognised its insufficiency. 'Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven.' And the faith for which He looked, in the absence of which He was 'not able' to perform mighty works, was a faith which involved a real though it might be a very uninstructed attachment to His person. It involved such an attitude to Himself as prepared the believer to accept Him as well as the immediate boon of healing or whatever it might be. It was a faith which gave as well as craved, gave trust, confidence, affection, and so established a lasting bond between the Giver and the receiver of the boon[1]. It

[1] Compare A. Sabatier, *Religions of Authority*, etc., p. 397: 'In the evangelical sense and in the discourses of Jesus Christ faith always implies a moral relation between person and person. It is an act of confidence in God, in His justice and His love, the gift of the entire heart, the consecration of the will.'

even established a confidence of a humbler kind. At any rate, our Lord on one occasion traced the want of that confidence in ordinary intercourse to inadequacy of 'faith' (Mt. xvi. 8) or to 'hardness of heart' (Mk. viii. 17).

It is in this union of heart, mind and will established through the faith which 'becomes operative through love' that we are to find the clue to St Paul's explanation of salvation, of the way in which individual men enter into experience of redemption, reconciliation, and justification, and also start on the process of ethical development which culminates in sanctification.

III. FAITH-UNION WITH CHRIST

This union of will and purpose which saving faith establishes between the believer and Christ has often been described as a 'mystical union'; and an instinctive dislike to the phrase has militated against acceptance of the truth which underlies it. To many minds it suggests something vague, nebulous and even unreal, something quite unequal to the weight which Paul builds on this foundation. The objection, however, arises out of the associations which have gathered round the word 'mystical' rather than out of the experience which it describes. The mystery of mystic experience of which this mystical union is the expansion and the consummation, really begins with any contact between one personality and another. It is not universally true, it is not even generally true that 'we mortal millions live *alone*.' In the fact that it need not be true lies one of the highest prerogatives of our nature. Contact, which is not merely physical, not merely contact through the senses, contact which can only be described as spiritual, contact of personalities, is indeed a fact of daily and hourly experience. All such contacts involve re-action of some kind, however faint, either of repulsion or of

attraction. And where the re-action of spiritual contact is one of attraction, it may and often does issue in a relation which becomes continuous, even permanent. Such continuous and permanent contact raised to the highest power because approximately independent of all physical or sensuous assistance is what is described as 'mystical union.' 'It is expedient for you that I go away; for if I go not away the Comforter will not come to you.'

Paul of Samosata may seem a strange authority to whom to turn for light upon this subject. But no one has vindicated more clearly than he the reality and validity of such union. 'As Nature reveals that there is an underlying unity and identity of essence, so the fixed habit of love effects in diversity a unity and identity of will, revealed by a unity and identity in objects of desire.' Indeed, 'different natures and persons have only one means of union, namely concurrence of will from which springs a oneness of activity between those who are thus brought into contact'; for 'what are controlled by the condition of their nature have in them nothing praiseworthy; what are controlled by the fixed habit of affection are highly to be praised; for they are controlled by a unity and identity of purpose confirmed through unity and identity of activity, and their impulse towards further increase never ceases.'[1]

Now the moral energy of man which going forth to meet the 'grace' of God in Jesus Christ establishes a mystical union in this sense is 'faith.' In this sense it describes, as Jülicher says, 'an activity of conscience. It is in fact for Paul an abbreviation for "to be united to Christ, to have become a new man through the possession of the Spirit."'[2] It may seem that Jülicher

[1] Paulus Samos, *Doctrina de Verbi Incarnatione*, cit. Raven, *Apollinarianism*, pp. 52, 53.

[2] Jülicher, *Paulus und Jesus*, p. 20.

is in a hurry to ascribe to faith what really belongs to the contents of the salvation which faith apprehends. And the same may be said of the description which Joh. Weiss gives of 'faith,' analysing it in the light of St Paul's consciousness at his conversion. 'Much indeed is included in it. Renunciation of all desire to earn salvation by merit, sorrow over the past, the confidence that God will really forgive sin, child-like trust, with which he gives himself over to God, thankfulness toward Him who "gave himself for me," love which seeks no longer anything for itself but all for Him, obedience in all that He may henceforth demand, the resolve to live newly in the service of God and of His Son.'[1]

There can be no doubt that all these factors are included in the conception of faith in the specific Pauline sense. But if we ask what it was Paul felt to be present in the consciousness of the believer at the moment of believing it would be best expressed as an utter and entire committal of himself to God in Christ, following an over-mastering impulse of the will to respond with love to the love of God which had been manifested in Christ.

The content of this initial act of faith, this projection of the self to lay hold on God offering Himself in Christ, revealed its different elements in relation to the different forms in which the offer expressed itself. Directed towards God Himself coming to meet men in Christ it involved thankful acceptance of reconciliation, on the ground of God's love as 'commended' by the death of Christ. Directed towards the offer of justification, forgiveness or re-instatement as right with God it involved joyful acceptance of this as a free gift, the final waiving of all attempts to establish one's own righteousness by merit. Directed towards Christ in His

[1] J. Weiss, *Urchristentum*, p. 142; cf. p. 325.

victory over evil, sin and death, it involved a union with Him, a union of will and moral experience so complete that His death and the new life which followed it became part of the believer's experience. Like Christ he died to sin, was made dead to the law, died from under the authority of evil spirit-forces. Sin need no longer have dominion over him. He was free with the freedom wherewith Christ was free. He was 'circumcised with the circumcision of Christ,' in so far as he too had put off the flesh. So complete was his participation in the victorious death of Christ that he could be described as having been crucified with Christ; and in the new life of Christ, the spirit-life, that he could be described as 'alive unto God,' or as 'spiritual.' 'In like manner do you also reckon yourselves to be dead unto sin but alive unto God through Jesus Christ' (Ro. vi. 11).

This transformation of religious relationships, and of ethical outlook, was in all its parts ideally complete at the moment when faith, saving faith, had shot forth a hand to accept and to grasp. Practically, of course, the subsequent experience was a double one. Even those who were truly 'in Christ' were still 'in the flesh.' The old man was not destroyed. Christians though really 'spiritual' might still show many tokens of being 'unspiritual' (1 Cor. iii. 1–3). But in essence the religious and ethical situation had been completely changed. A new status had been acquired, a process had begun, the stages and conditions of which we have to examine later. But it was a process the end of which was guaranteed, provided only the faith was real (Phil. i. 6); and it was a process concerning whose issue the believer need feel no doubt, because he was already in possession of the Spirit, the 'first-fruits' of his full inheritance.

Paul nowhere states the fact of this union more clearly than in 1 Corinthians vi. 17: 'He that is joined

unto the Lord is one spirit.' Had he been asked how a man was thus joined, he would have answered, 'by faith.' And the same experience which is here described in terms of union, is elsewhere described in terms of reciprocal indwelling, Christ in the believer (Ro. viii. 10; Gal. ii. 20; Col. i. 27), the believer in Christ (Phil. iii. 9; 2 Cor. ii. 17; Ro. xvi. 7). As Baur recognised, 'This is indeed the key-note which we may hear sounding through all the Apostle's letters, in which he is constantly depicting his relation to the Cross of Christ. It is never a relation of mere objective theory, but always and at the same time the relation of the subjective union of the inmost feelings with the Crucified, a mystic communion with the death on the Cross and with the life of Christ risen.'[1]

These words draw attention to the primary application of the principle of faith-union with Christ, namely to the effect of the union in producing an ethical participation in the death and in the resurrection of Christ conceived as conditioning His relation to Life that is life indeed. Paul, as we have seen, saw in the death of Christ a stripping off by Him of that 'flesh' or physical constitution through assuming which He had become subject to spirit-forces of evil (Phil. ii. 7—δοῦλος) and exposed to the assault of sin. This was the 'circumcision of Christ' (Col. ii. 11), and those who were in Him had been circumcised with the same 'circumcision not made with hands.' They had 'stripped off the old man with his deeds' (Col. iii. 8), or, by another metaphor, had 'crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts' (Gal. v. 24). What Christ had done in dying,

[1] Baur, *Paulinism*, i. 17. Compare J. O. Dykes in *Exp. Times*, xvii. 58: 'The heart of human deliverance must lie neither in the moral force of an ethical example (where, if anywhere, Antioch put it) nor (as the Latin Church came more and more to put it) in forensic or in ritual arrangements; but in a divine dynamic introduced into human nature at its centre, by the vital union of God with us in Christ.'

they did by their faith-union with Him. They died (2 Cor. v. 14), died as He did to sin, to the law, to fear[1]. And thenceforward they 'bore about in their body the dying of the Lord Jesus' (2 Cor. iv. 10). That which was ideally complete at the moment of believing was continuously wrought out in the subsequent life of faith. They had shared in Christ's death in every aspect of it except the physical. And 'he that is dead is free from sin' (Ro. vi. 7).

But the death of Jesus had not been the end. He had been raised from the dead by the right hand of God, He was living, living under new conditions of life, with a life which was life of and in the Spirit. And Paul held that those who 'believed on' Him, through the same faith-union whereby they participated in His death, participated also in His new life; 'in like manner do ye also reckon yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God' (Ro. vi. 11; cp. Gal. ii. 19). As in the case of Christ so with those who believed on Him, it was God Himself who 'made them alive together with Him' (*συνεζωοποίησε*). Life in this sense is salvation as experienced in the present, and its implications will come up for later consideration.

There have been many theologians and interpreters of St Paul who have recognised the importance of this factor in his thought; but the tendency has been in almost all cases to find in it the explanation of what follows after a man has been 'saved,' an explanation of the process of sanctification. This truer conception of a union with Christ established through the initial act of faith accounts for, and is necessary to account for, Paul's interpretation of salvation in all its stages, in its

[1] See Bousset, *ad loc.* in *SNT*: 'As soon as anyone entered into the circle of the new humanity founded by Christ, for him death has already taken place after the fashion of Christ's death; he has become quit and free from his old self.'

initial one as well as in those that follow. It avoids the necessity of giving two distinct meanings to 'faith,' even 'the faith that saves'; and removes the very dangerous hiatus, a hiatus of which no one would be more acutely conscious than St Paul, which would otherwise exist between faith in the sense of intellectual assent and that faith which being made operative by love establishes an ethical union of will and purpose between the Saviour and the saved. Thus it is because he 'founds on faith in Jesus Christ' that the sinner is restored to the status of righteousness; it is by faith that he has 'access' to the sphere of grace wherein he is set (Ro. v. 2); it is through faith that Christ takes up His abode in his heart (Eph. iii. 17).

And this is the faith which the Apostle believed to 'come by hearing.' It was 'through the gospel,' the proclamation of glad news, that men came to be partakers of new life (1 Cor. iv. 15). Paul believed and his experience gave him reason to believe that this 'message of God,' this proclamation of Christ as both Victim and Victor with the interpretation which made the whole story a revelation of the mind of God, could break through the barriers which men had allowed to grow between themselves and God, so that their hearts were 'flooded with the love of God' (Ro. v. 5). And the response from the side of men is that 'faith' which at one and the same time receives the gift and lays hold on the Giver.

IV. THE SEAL UPON FAITH: BAPTISM

St Paul saw in Baptism the normal but not necessary, the helpful but not indispensable sign and seal put upon the act of faith appropriating the gift of God in Christ.

Baptism as a rite administered by a religious teacher which signifies both moral cleansing and initiation into

a new community was probably practised for the first time by John the Baptist. This would account for the special emphasis in the name by which he was known, 'John the Baptizer' (Mk. i. 4), and also for the form of our Lord's question about John and his authority, 'The baptism of John, was it from heaven?' (Mk. xi. 30). The 'baptism' of proselytes to the Jewish faith, which is commonly pointed to as an antecedent and an analogy, was essentially different in character. It was merely a bath of cleansing taken by the proselyte, in the presence of witnesses; it was not administered by any religious teacher, and did not in itself confer initiation[1]. Christian baptism was probably a continuation of John's baptism, a symbolic cleansing following upon repentance, in view of the coming Kingdom. But as we find it practised by the early Church it had an added feature of great significance which was wanting in the baptism of John. The convert to Christianity was baptised 'in' or 'into' or 'upon' the name of Christ. There is no ground here for appealing to crude superstition in order to account for the use of 'the name' as though it operated like a magical charm. The true significance of the word is too well established in the Old Testament, and not without illustration in the New. For we find it employed quite commonly to denote everything by which an individual is known or distinguished from other individuals. To 'know God's name' or to 'declare His name' is to know or declare His revealed character, all that is known of Him[2]. To 'call upon His name' is to worship Him as He is revealed. Similarly, the 'name of Christ' means Christ as He is known, Christ and all that He stands for, Christ in His total relation to men. And to baptise into His name means, over and above

[1] See Israel Abrahams, *Pharisaism and the Gospels*, I. 36 ff.; also Lake and Jackson, *Beginnings of Christianity*, I. 332, 333.

[2] See G. B. Gray in *HDB*, III. 478. F. H. Chase, *JTS*, vi. 481.

the symbolism of cleansing, to bring formally under His authority, formally to recognise the relation in which the believer stands to the known Person of Christ, and to place the seal of divine confirmation on that relation.

Much may be learnt from the passage at the beginning of 1 Corinthians x., in which we find described what may be called *involuntary* baptism. 'I would not have you ignorant how that *all* our fathers were under the cloud, and *all* passed through the sea; and were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea.' That is to say, they had come under the authority or jurisdiction of Moses. They had become Moses' people. And the obligation was imposed upon them not in consequence of any ceremonial but because they had all participated in the supernatural deliverance. And they 'did *all* eat the same heavenly meat (the manna); and did *all* drink the same heavenly drink' (the water from the rock). Paul does not draw the inference; but it is clear that he felt that the original obligation was confirmed by the fact that they all participated in the Divine provision of food and water. But they failed to recognise or act up to the obligation which they had thus incurred; and the punishments that fell upon them 'happened unto them for ensamples.' The experience of that generation was an illustration of the peril of ignoring the obligation incurred by participating in the mercies of God. And the contemporary analogy which Paul has in mind is the obligation imposed on those, whether actually baptised or not, who have claimed and accepted the Divine deliverance, and the Divine provision for the nourishment and refreshment of the soul, 'the bread of life and the water of life.' They too had been practically, even if not technically, baptised unto Christ.

Apart from this passage which bears only indirectly on Christian baptism there are five passages in which

St Paul makes allusion to Baptism. One of these (Eph. iv. 5) throws no light upon the meaning which he attached to the rite. The others are 1 Corinthians i. 13–17; Romans vi. 3–4 and Colossians ii. 12; Galatians iii. 27. In these passages the subject is looked at from three different angles. In the Corinthian passage the dominant idea is that of baptism 'in the name' as expressing and sealing the relation of the baptised person to another, and the danger lest, even though the name used was that of Christ, the person or the agent who administered baptism might obscure Him in Whose name he acted. 'Were ye baptized in the name of Paul'—so that ye belong to Paul? The very possibility of such a misunderstanding causes the Apostle to thank God that he 'baptized none of you save Crispus and Gaius.' 'Christ sent me not to baptize,' says the Apostle, 'but to preach the Gospel.' What really mattered was what could be accomplished by preaching. Baptism 'in the name of Christ' placed a seal upon the fact that the person baptised belonged to Christ; he belonged to Him by faith.

Baptism in the early Church was normally baptism of adults, the exceptions being cases where a whole family or household including children were baptised on the ground of the faith of the head of the family. It was normally baptism by immersion, in a stream or pool. And in two of these passages (Ro. vi. 3–4; Col. ii. 12) Paul presses home the obvious but striking symbolism of such a ceremony. The person to be baptised has by faith become united to Christ in a way and to a degree which involves his having 'died with Christ' and been raised with Christ in 'newness of life.' He was told to reckon himself to be dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God through Jesus Christ. He had been 'crucified with Christ,' circumcised with the same circumcision 'not made with hands' in the stripping off

of the flesh-body. Language was strained to breaking-point in order to exhibit the completeness of the inward breach with the past, with the world and with sin, which resulted from true faith-union. Being crucified with Christ was a metaphor; stripping off the flesh was a metaphor; so was dying and living again. But they illustrated what was a spiritual and ethical experience regarding the reality of which Paul had no doubt. And in the rite of baptism he found a striking picture, seal, and confirmation of that experience, one too which could be reproduced in action. In the plunging below the water he saw a representation of the death and burial of 'the old man with his affections and lusts'; in the emergence from the stream the representation of the rising again to life with God. Thus Baptism was a 'likeness' or representation of Christ's death, and 'through our baptism we were buried with him into his death.' Baptism was again a sign and seal of that which had already taken place in the moment of faith-union with Christ.

Yet a third idea connected with Baptism finds expression in Galatians iii. 27: 'As many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ.' With this must be compared: 'that ye put on the new man (= the new humanity) which after God is created in righteousness and holiness of truth' (Eph. iv. 24; cf. Col. iii. 10), and 'put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ' (Ro. xiii. 14), addressed to those who are already Christians. The idea underlying these passages is that of the corporate Christ, who finds His representation in the redeemed humanity of which He is the head. In Him, that is, in the corporate Community which represents Him, the baptised are ensphered. This conception of far-reaching importance must be fully dealt with at a later stage[1].

[1] See below, p. 154.

The significance of Baptism which these passages emphasise is therefore threefold. It is in all cases a symbol and seal of something which has already taken place, a sign of having passed under the authority and jurisdiction of Christ, of having died with Him to sin and been raised again to a life in the Spirit, and of being incorporated in the redeemed humanity which is His Body.

The curious absence in these passages of any reference to the cleansing significance of Baptism is partly compensated in two passages where Paul alludes to Baptism without using the word. 'Christ also loved the church, and gave himself up for her, that he might consecrate her after cleansing in the water-bath [of baptism] together with the Formula' (Eph. v. 25, 26). By the Formula Paul probably means the public acknowledgment by the persons to be baptised of Jesus as Lord. 'If thou shalt confess with thy mouth Jesus as Lord, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved' (Ro. x. 9). 'No man can say that Jesus is Lord but by the Holy Ghost' (1 Cor. xii. 3). The utterance of this confession would be a natural antecedent to the rite of baptism. Paul here gathers under one head all the individual cases of baptism. Behind them as a whole stood Christ sealing and confirming the cleansing power of His Spirit to those who had confessed Him as Lord. The essential thing here described is that the Church is a cleansed Body; the individuals of whom it was composed had received in baptism the sign and seal of cleansing, granted to them on the ground of their confession of Jesus as Lord; and behind it all was the fact that Christ loved the Church and gave Himself up for it.

Another indirect allusion to Baptism is found in 1 Corinthians vi. 11: 'but ye were washed, but ye were consecrated, but ye were justified in the name of the

Lord Jesus Christ and in the Spirit of our God.' This has commonly been interpreted to mean that baptism had for its concomitants or for its consequences consecration and justification. This is an interpretation very difficult to reconcile with Paul's teaching elsewhere on the subjects of consecration and justification. And it is quite unnecessary. He is not describing the implications of Baptism, or the results which follow it. He is describing the stages of Christian experience and recalling them in the reverse order. 'Ye were baptized, and behind that lay your consecration by the Spirit; ye were consecrated, and behind that lay your justification which took place the moment when you "called on the name of the Lord" and were saved.'

Paul valued Baptism. But he did not overvalue it. He thanked God that he had baptised so few of the Corinthians. Possibly some of his converts valued it more than he did. Possibly some of them had begun to misunderstand it and even to misapply it. There appears to be an indication of that in 1 Corinthians xv. 29[1]. There we read of some at Corinth who allowed themselves to be 'baptized for the dead.' St Paul mentions the fact without indicating either approval or disapproval, in order to point out the absurdity of such people denying the resurrection. There is considerable probability in the suggestion which has recently been made that the persons on whose behalf this ceremony was performed were not persons who had died without faith in Christ, but such as had believed but had died before being baptised; and also that the motive may have been to 'make up the number of the elect.'[2] But even so we have an indication of what is otherwise probable, that quite early in the Christian movement there developed a tendency towards the materialising of

[1] See below, p. 132.

[2] See Preisker, in *ZNTW*, 1924, p. 300 ff.

the sacraments, and particularly of Baptism. Faith, especially the faith of uninstructed converts, is apt to look anxiously round for some 'solid' foundation or justification of what is really a spiritual experience. And there is an inevitable tendency to transfer to the rite the efficacy which belongs to the faith which it expresses and confirms[1]. The fourth Gospel is not without indications of a tacit protest against such a development[2]; and that St Paul makes no express protest, though his teaching is consistently in the other direction, may be taken to indicate that he was not yet conscious of 'sacramentalism' as a serious danger.

The Baptism of John had been 'a repentance-baptism for the remission of sins,' that is to say, it was a sign and guarantee of that inward change of mind to which forgiveness was granted. By the time of Paul the ceremony had been enriched and the scope of its meaning considerably enlarged. Putting together what the Apostle says on the subject and bearing in mind the function he assigns to the proclamation of the Gospel and to the faith which it can evoke, his conception of Baptism included the following elements. On the part of the believer it was a sign of his public acknowledgment of Jesus as Lord, of his acceptance of the salvation offered to him in the name of Christ, and of the submissive penitence and obedience which that acceptance involved. On the side of the person who baptised and of Christ who stood behind him, it conveyed an assurance of the reality of the experience of dying with Christ to sin and rising with Him to life on a new plane; an assurance of that forgiveness of which the cleansing rite was so eloquent a testimony; and an assurance of belonging to Christ (cf. 2 Tim. ii. 19; Jo. xv. 16) and of being incorporated in His sacred

[1] Cp. Campbell Moody, *Mind of the Early Convert*, pp. 146, 196.
[2] *E.g.* Jo. iii. 5, iv. 2, vi. 47–63, xiii. 1–14.

Body the Church. It was an outward and visible sign that the grace of God manifested in Christ Jesus had quickened faith, and that faith had laid hold on God in Christ.

V. ST PAUL AND THE MYSTERY-RELIGIONS

If the foregoing account of St Paul's thinking and teaching on the subject of salvation be true to the evidence of his letters, the question of his relation to the mystery-religions is one of secondary importance. The relation, if there was one, has not been such as to affect the exposition of his theory. Salvation, which was the goal for himself and for others, was secured and could be secured without the employment of any rites corresponding to those of the mysteries. He attached real value to the two rites of Baptism and the Eucharist; but the nature of their value was to express, confirm and maintain a relation which was already established by faith, not to establish or nourish that relation *ex opere ope ato.*

But this conclusion is capable of being supported on quite other grounds. And in view of the widespread inclination to assume as proven that under the hand of St Paul Christianity became a 'mystery-religion,' it may be well briefly to set out these other grounds.

It is important to make clear the precise nature of the problem. It may be granted that at some point of time, and in some quarters earlier than in others, Christianity, the Christianity of the Great Church, did become a sacramental cult in the sense that it began to offer salvation through the sacraments when validly administered, the condition of 'faith,' when required at all, being fulfilled by a general assent to the authority of the Church. The one question which concerns us here is, at what point of time did this take place? Did

it occur subsequent to Paul, or was it the result of his influence and the expression of his thinking? The question is important not merely for its bearing upon our estimation of St Paul and his place in the development of Christianity. It is even more important because according to the answer we either have or have not, within the New Testament, an exposition of the Gospel as a way of salvation which can be regarded as essentially consistent with its original proclamation by Jesus and a valuation of His Person which draws both its analogies and its vocabulary from sources which are represented in our Scriptures. It is the denial of this which gives all its significance to the assertion of Loisy that Paul appears to have been the principal agent or at least the principal theoretic expounder of the transformation of the Gospel into a mystery[1].

The question then is, did this transformation take place in the mind and through the influence of Paul?[2] Before dealing with it in detail there are certain general considerations which it seems legitimate to emphasise. They have to do with the character of the evidence, and the way in which it is handled.

1. It is relevant to recall that for a very large number of those who profess Christianity to-day it is a 'sacramental religion.' They know it, from within at least, only in that form. And it is only natural that those who know it, those who believe in it, as such, should find confirmation of what is their own theory in certain words and phrases in the New Testament and even in St Paul. One for whom religion is primarily and essentially sacramental is inevitably attracted by phrases like 'buried with him in baptism,' 'the laver of regeneration,' 'is it not the communion of his body?' and without investigating their context and their history is

[1] See Loisy, *Mystères*, p. 229.
[2] K. Lake, *HTS*, 1922, p. 107.

satisfied that he has found indubitable links with the mystery-religions, and good ground for maintaining that Paul explained salvation as proceeding from the sacraments, *ex opere operato*.

The same life-long familiarity with 'sacramental religion' betrays its influence in another way, in the exposition that is given of the mystery-religions themselves. It is almost inevitable that those who approach the investigation of the mysteries, their ritual and their significance, with their minds full of 'sacramental' teaching should too hastily interpret actions and language in terms of what is familiar to themselves. Indeed some of the writers on the subject cannot be exonerated of a certain recklessness, in ignoring the dating of documents, in hastily equating things which profoundly differ, and in shutting their eyes to other sources for Christian practices and ideas.

It is further important to bear in mind how meagre after all is our information regarding the mystery-cults and especially the significance which was attached to them, and how much of it dates from the second, third and fourth centuries after Christ. 'All our knowledge has to be gained from fragmentary statements by writers of late period and little critical power.'[1] This warning by Professor Gardner confirms the statement of Dr Kirsopp Lake, 'Our knowledge of the actual ceremonies and liturgies is very small, as almost all documentary evidence has been destroyed.'[2] The so-called Liturgy of Mithras which is frequently cited is probably *not earlier than the middle of the second century*; while its connection with the religion of Mithras is very uncertain and indeed is rejected by Cumont. And the work of Apuleius, which is also much relied on, in like manner belongs to the second century after Christ. It

[1] P. Gardner in Hastings' *ERE*, IX. 77.
[2] K. Lake, *The Stewardship of Faith*, p. 71.

is argued that a document like this 'almost certainly reflects the spirit of the Mysteries of an earlier period.' But appeal is made to Apuleius for something much more definite than 'the spirit of the Mysteries'; and after the lapse of a century it is as easy to believe that ideas reflected in these documents may betray the influence of Christian thought as that the thought of St Paul has been moulded by them.

There are many important questions no answer to which seems to be forthcoming. To what extent was the Hellenistic world actually covered by the mystery-cults? Were they represented in every city? What proportion of the population adhered to them? To what classes did they specially appeal? Did the initiates present themselves to be spectators of the religious drama, or to partake of the flesh of the 'god' more often than once in a life-time, or once a year? Was there any true analogy between the highly elaborated *mise en scène*, the sensuous representation of the fate of the god in a kind of miracle-play and the ceremony which Paul describes in 1 Corinthians xi., not to speak of the common meal in which it was set, and the breaking of bread from house to house?

Further, there is to be considered the silence, almost complete, of the Christian writers to the end of the second century. The exceptions are the *Didaché*, Ignatius and Justin Martyr. The *Didaché* lends no support to the theory, Ignatius has one rather cryptic phrase[1]; Justin opens the way to an interpretation of the words of Institution other than a figurative one, and shows himself aware of the fact that the followers of Mithras have a similar rite in which they use bread and water.

[1] With Ignatius' description of the Loaf as *φάρμακον ἀθανασίας* should be compared Rabbinic language about the Law; *e.g.* 'He who occupies himself with the Torah for its own sake, for him it is a balsam (or, medicine) of life.' See Lietzmann, *HBNT*, *ad* 2 Cor. ii. 16.

Against these scanty allusions we must set the silence of Clement, of Hermas, of the *Epistle to Diognetus* and of the Apologists in a body. The case of the *Epistle to Diognetus* is particularly striking. For the writer sets out to instruct his friend who is 'anxious to understand the religion of the Christians'; and yet throughout his letter there is no trace of sacramental ideas, no most distant allusion to mysteries. Had Christianity by the middle of the first century become a sacramental religion, the evidence of its character from the second century would surely have been more copious and more clear.

The scantiness of our information as to the mystery-cults and the teaching which lay behind them makes very difficult any comparison between them and Christianity. But it may safely be said that it is only at a few points that they even seem to come into contact. Wanting in the mystery-religions, for example, are the conception of God, 'the living and true God' and of His 'glory' as the goal of human history and human effort; the conception of mankind as the object of God's love; the conception of a redeemed Society knit together by common faith in God and common love between its members; 'that most essential thing in Christianity, that which constitutes it a *cause*'[1]; and that ethical emphasis and analysis which sought to translate religious experience and emotion into a richly diversified moral life of energy, endurance and service. In the absence of so much that is markedly characteristic of primitive Christianity, any apparent correspondence with Hellenistic thought or practice cannot be allowed to have affected its essential character.

[1] Edwyn Bevan, *The Hellenistic Age*, p. 105: 'In the Hellenistic mystery religions the man who received initiation was simply lifted out of the lower sphere individually into the higher sphere; there was so far as we know no common purpose which the society was set to achieve in the real world.'

From these general considerations we pass to the case of St Paul in particular. The view that he was influenced in his interpretation of salvation and especially of the manner of its appropriation by ideas underlying the mystery-cults is supported in the first place by his use of words and phrases which were technical terms in connection with the mysteries. Of these the most important are *σωτηρία, μυστήριον, τέλειος, σοφία, γνῶσις.*

It has been already pointed out that St Paul in offering 'salvation' through faith in the Lord Jesus was using language as familiar to the Greeks as it was to the Jews, and offering something which was as much the goal of Hellenistic religious aspiration as of Jewish. The difference lay in the content of the salvation offered through Christ. That included possibly all that was offered through the mystery-cults but also something which went much deeper into human need and especially reconciliation to God and a fellowship with God which implied likeness of purpose and progressive assimilation of character.

The word 'mystery' is used by Paul some twenty times, but never with reference to any religious rite whether Christian or pagan. In all cases where the context throws light upon the meaning he gives to the word, it describes a truth which has long been hidden but is now revealed. A good illustration is in Ephesians (iii. 3–6), 'he made known unto me the mystery...that the Gentiles are co-heirs[1], companions and co-partners in the Promise.' In fact, a careful examination of the Apostle's use of the word rather raises the question whether he would have used it so freely in a non-technical sense if he had had any consciousness of a relation between Christian rites and what were speci-

[1] Compare also Ro. xi. 25; 1 Cor. xv. 51; Eph. i. 9; Col. i. 26; and see H. A. A. Kennedy, *St Paul and the Mystery Religions*, pp. 124–30.

fically described as 'mysteries,' or indeed if the technical sense of the word were in such universal use as is commonly supposed. And the doubt is confirmed, by the almost innocent way in which he uses μεμύημαι, 'I have been initiated' (Phil. iv. 12).

As to τέλειος (A.V. 'perfect') it has been too hastily assumed that it is a technical term for one who has been initiated into a mystery-cult. It has been shown by Joh. Weiss[1] following W. Bauer that there is no certain instance of the word in this sense, indeed in one passage of Plato it is contrasted with 'initiated.' Paul himself clearly uses it in contrast with 'children under age,' *i.e.* in the sense of 'mature,' such as were qualified to understand.

Neither is there good ground for the suggestion that σοφία (wisdom) and γνῶσις (knowledge) are used to describe 'esoteric teaching' given only to those who had been initiated. Or rather such language suggests the wrong atmosphere. The distinction which Paul draws (*e.g.* 1 Cor. ii. 2–8) is the distinction between the preaching of Christ and Him as crucified to those who were not converted, and the expounding to those who were Christians, and specially within the Christian assemblies, of the 'mysteries' of God, the secret purposes which had now found illumination and fulfilment in Christ, and the further purposes which were still to be fulfilled. In regard to 'knowledge' there is an important distinction to be noted. In the mystery-cults, according to Reitzenstein, 'knowledge' 'brought about salvation, and consisted in the fact that God showed Himself wholly to the man, and through this vision made him to be God.'[2] For St Paul, on the one hand, though knowledge was equally a grace-gift of God, it

[1] J. Weiss, *ad* 1 Cor. iii. 3. Weiss, however, thinks that in this passage it denotes not the 'mature' but the spiritually 'initiated.'

[2] Reitzenstein, *Hellenistische Mysterienreligionen*, p. 114.

followed on the experience of salvation. It did not precede Salvation; still less was it its efficient cause. Neither is there any suggestion in St Paul that the effect of Salvation was that men 'became gods.'

It is possible that in some words employed by Paul we catch echoes of terms which were in technical use in connection with the mystery-cults[1]. And he may even have been distinctly conscious of the contrast between what was offered through Christ and what was offered in these cults. But more than that is neither required nor justified by his vocabulary.

2. On the other hand, there are certain considerations which seem positively to preclude the suggestion that St Paul in his interpretation of Salvation assimilated Christianity to the mystery-cults.

To suppose that Paul believed or taught that by merely submitting to Baptism a man was 'born again' or became 'a new creature,' or was 'saved' is to make him contradict himself in his fundamental conviction that salvation is by 'faith' and not by 'works.' For it would be hard to find a better illustration of what he understood by ἔργον than a rite of any kind which was effective *ex opere operato*. And there can be no doubt that he would have passed on Baptism so understood the same judgment which he passed on its Old Testament analogue, circumcision. If, as he wrote 'neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision,' then on the same principle, neither baptism nor the want of baptism can be of any avail.

3. A careful examination of Romans iv. 9–12 puts this beyond doubt. The whole point of his argument there is that Abraham was 'justified' prior to, and independently of his accepting the sign of circumcision. Abraham 'only got circumcision as a sign, the seal of a righteousness which belonged to his faith while yet

[1] *E.g.* 2 Cor. iii. 18; cp. Ro. viii. 29.

uncircumcised.' There can be no doubt that Paul would have said exactly the same about baptism—that a man received it as a sign or seal of the righteousness which was already his through faith in Christ, and not as a means of obtaining that righteousness or appropriating salvation. This seems to me decisive.

The same point of view is emphatically expressed in the question in Galatians (iii. 5), 'He that ministereth to you the Spirit...doeth he it by the works of the law or by the hearing of faith,' *i.e.* that leads to faith? It is clear that among 'the works of the law' the one which was most prominently before the Apostle's mind was circumcision. And the contrast which he here draws with 'the hearing that leads to faith' is one which he would draw with equal emphasis in the case of any rite whatever which was represented as efficacious in itself for the securing of Salvation.

4. If Paul *had* been guided in this matter by his familiarity with the mystery-religions, he would not have seen in baptism the means of securing a new birth. There is no evidence that the lustrations which were introductory to the heathen mysteries were understood to have this effect, 'If the idea of new birth was associated with the mysteries themselves it was probably regarded as the result of the whole process of initiation.'[1]

It was not because a man had been baptised that Paul regarded him as 'justified' and 'a new creature,' but because he founded on faith in Christ, because he was 'in Christ Jesus': of these things baptism was the seal.

[1] Cp. V. H. Stanton, *The Gospels as Historical Documents*, III. 201: 'The bath and sprinkling are according to Apuleius followed (not preceded) by a ten days' fast, and it is only after this that the priest takes Apuleius by the hand to lead him into the "penetralia." There is nothing in Apuleius' account to justify the statement of Reitzenstein that after the bath "als Wiedergeborener wird dann der Täufling der Göttin vorgestellt."'

5. The whole weight and emphasis which Paul lays upon preaching points in the same direction, especially when taken in connection with his deprecation of baptism as a function of his ministry. It is not credible that, had any 'magical' or quasi-magical result been understood to be guaranteed by the sacrament, Paul would have thanked God that he had baptised so few. The instrument of the new birth was not baptism, but preaching (1 Cor. iv. 15).

6. Those who would see in the Eucharist a close analogy to certain further stages in the mystery-cults, in which there was an elaborate dramatisation of the fate of the god, and possibly some symbolic representation of communion with the god, through eating and drinking his 'flesh and blood,' seem to be thinking of the developed ritual and theory of the Catholic Church, and not of the rite as it meets us in the writings of St Paul. It must be admitted that the Apostle's language, especially in 1 Corinthians x. 16, has readily lent itself to misunderstanding. Its true meaning will be discussed at a later stage[1]. Meanwhile it must suffice to note that the symbolism of the Loaf in x. 16 does not go beyond the representation of the Body of Christ in the sense of His living spiritual Body, the Church, while the symbolism of the Cup stops at the representation of the Blood whereby the new Covenant had been sealed and the new People constituted. There is in this passage no reference to partaking of either. The second passage in the same Epistle, which is probably of later date than the first, goes further, but not beyond the symbolism of Bread and Wine representing Christ as the only and sufficient source of spiritual nourishment for the People, 'the bread that came down from heaven.'

On the other hand, in these passages where it would have been natural on the theory we are discussing for

[1] See below, p. 182 f.

Paul to show consciousness of analogies with the teaching underlying the mystery-cults, he draws illustrations from Judaism and from paganism but not from the mystery-cults specifically. 'Behold Israel after the flesh, have not they which eat the sacrifices communion with the altar?' And similarly partaking of the feast in the idol temple (not any mystery-rite) is treated as an act of communion[1].

There is one passage in St Paul, however, from which an allusion to 'magical-sacramental' ideas and practices cannot be excluded. That is the reference in 1 Corinthians xv. 29 to 'those who are baptised for the dead.' This can only mean that there were some Christians at Corinth who (possibly under the influence of association with mystery-cults) had perverted Christian Baptism to superstitious and magical practices. But even this passage does not commit the Apostle to either holding the idea or approving the practice. At most it can be said that he is aware of it, and cites it as an extreme case of the unreasonableness of denying the resurrection. In any case, this admittedly ambiguous language cannot be allowed to overturn the quite unambiguous principle laid down in Romans iv. 11; for that was fundamental to Paul's Gospel.

There is further one passage which is commonly understood to suggest that justification as well as sanctification follows on baptism. In A.V. it runs, 'But ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus' (1 Cor. vi. 11). But it is, as we have seen, by no means necessary to take these words as representing successive stages in Christian experience, so making them contradict what we know otherwise to have been the thought of the Apostle. It is equally open to us to see in them the same stages contemplated regressively: ye had yourselves washed,

[1] See V. H. Stanton, *l.c.* III. 200.

i.e. baptised; before that ye were consecrated, dedicated by the Spirit; before that ye were justified.

Other aspects of this problem will present themselves later, but this is the crucial one. The recognition of Jesus as Lord might be facilitated among the Greeks by the fact that the same title was commonly given to the central figure in a mystery-cult. The ideas of a new birth, of immortality, and of conformity to the image of God might fall on ground which had similarly been prepared to receive them. But the whole character of Christianity, the Christianity of Paul, would be falsified if the salvation which he proclaimed were a salvation to be obtained in the same way as salvation through the mysteries, through the valid celebration of a rite and not through that joyful self-committal of the whole personality to God in Christ, which is 'faith.' And it is difficult to resist the conclusion that some scholars have allowed themselves to be persuaded that this change took place in the mind of Paul on evidence which in any other connection they would have pronounced to be insufficient.

We shall prefer to agree with Bousset: 'The new ideas cannot originate from Paul. They make their appearance in his case only by passing allusion. He himself attaches no great importance to them. For him also the personal-spiritual remains in spite of all outside influence the principal thing in religion.'[1]

[1] Bousset, *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments*, II. 120.

CHAPTER IV

SALVATION AS A PROGRESSIVE EXPERIENCE

SALVATION was thus regarded by St Paul as something which had already been achieved. The conditions by which it was made possible had been supplied by God. The condition which made it actual was supplied by those who had faith in Jesus Christ. To all such Paul said, 'Ye are saved people' (Eph. ii. 5). They had attained a new status, a standing on the plane of grace (Ro. v. 2). They had been delivered from the Power of Darkness and transferred into the Kingdom of the Son of God's love (Col. i. 13). They were already 'justified' and had 'peace with God' (Ro. v. 1), and 'access by one Spirit to the Father' (Eph. ii. 18).

But in spite of all the emphasis upon this fundamental experience as accomplished and complete, Paul is equally clear in asserting what looks like a paradox, that what has happened is yet only the beginning, that Salvation is a process, and that the issue of it depends on religious faithfulness and ethical effort. The Gospel which he preached is that 'wherein ye have your standing,' but it is also the Gospel 'by which ye are being saved, if ye keep in memory what I preached unto you, unless ye have believed in vain' (1 Cor. xv. 1, 2). 'We are unto God a fragrance of Christ to them that are being saved' (2 Cor. ii. 15; cp. Ac. ii. 47). 'For if when we were enemies we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more shall we be saved by his life' (Ro. v. 10).

This introduces a new aspect of Salvation, a positive aspect revealing that whereunto men are saved and the

principles and method whereby the end is secured and attained. For this positive aspect of Salvation St Paul has a synonym of great significance and great comprehensiveness. That is Life, life as it was now experienced, life as it could be lived, by those who believed on Christ.

I. THE CHRISTIAN CONCEPTION OF 'LIFE'

Like many other words in the New Testament the word 'Life' appears there and not least prominently in St Paul with quite a new connotation which has to be carefully distinguished from the ordinary signification of the word[1]. Of course, the word is in constant use, in both the Old and the New Testament, with its usual signification. It denotes the life which men share with the rest of animal creation, the life which appears to be extinguished by physical death. But the Hebrew learnt to give a new and deeper meaning to the word. This was due to what must be recognised as one of the greatest discoveries in the field of religion, the discovery that life which is worth living, life in the highest sense, is life lived in a happy relation with God. 'Man doth not live by bread alone, but by every thing that proceedeth out of the mouth of the Lord doth man live' (Deut. viii. 3). Whatever be the meaning of this sentence in its original context, the use made of it by our Lord (Mt. iv. 4) and the form which He gave it make His meaning clear. He quotes the text in the form in which we find it in the LXX, where for 'every word' we read 'every thing'; and He uses it to teach that man has, or has open to him, life of another and a higher kind than that which is nourished by bread, and that that life is nourished by the total self-communication of God.

[1] See H. A. A. Kennedy, *St Paul's Conception of the Last Things*, p. 102 ff.; E. F. Scott, 'Life' in *DCG*; Bousset, *RJ*3, p. 270 ff.; Volz, *JE*, p. 306; Inge, *Outspoken Essays*, II. 41.

The conception in that form is one to which many passages in the Old Testament show approximation. 'A righteous man by his faithfulness shall *live*' (Hab. ii. 4). 'When the wicked man turneth from his wickedness and doeth that which is lawful and right, he shall live thereby' (Ezek. xxxiii. 19). 'There the Lord commanded the blessing, even *life* for evermore' (Ps. cxxxiii. 3). 'Whoso findeth me, findeth life' (Prov. viii. 35). In these and in similar passages the word has 'the pregnant sense of life in the divine favour.'[1]

In the literature of the Interval where the expectation of the Divine intervention is postponed till the arrival of a New Age, 'life' comes to be treated as one of the blessings of that New Age, indeed as its supreme and characteristic blessing. What the righteous may look forward to is Life in the coming Age, Life of the Age to come, ζωὴ αἰώνιος, or, as it is rendered in English, 'eternal life.' So it comes about that 'to live' or 'life' is used as equivalent for 'to be saved' or 'salvation.' The most general but at the same time the most pregnant word for participation in salvation is 'life.' We find *vivere* as the equivalent of 'to be saved' in 4 Ezra vii. 21, viii. 6; Psalms of Solomon xiv. 3, xv. 13; and *vivificari* in the sense of *salvari* in 4 Ezra vii. 137; Baruch lxxxv. 15.

The Synoptic Gospels preserve evidence of the conception at this stage in its development. 'Strait is the gate...that leadeth unto life.' 'It is better to enter maimed into life.' 'What must I do that I may inherit eternal life?' which is practically synonymous with the jailor's, 'What must I do to be saved?' But at this stage the conception is subject to an important qualification. 'According to the Jewish sources "eternal life" commences always in the future, and is identical with the New Age to come. The conception, even when it is

[1] Briggs, Brown and Driver, *Hebrew Lexicon*, *sub voc.*, cit. Kennedy.

not further defined, has everywhere an eschatological form, and nowhere signifies the Johannine (and Pauline) conception of an inward, timeless, but at the same time already realised quality. The transition from the eschatologically to the ethically conditioned takes place in the New Testament.'[1]

Life—Life worthy to be called life, because lived in the presence and favour of God—Life in this sense as the supreme characteristic of the Coming Age—Life in this sense realised now; it was through these stages that the conception passed. The final stage was no doubt achieved in the consciousness of Jesus, though for most of the evidence we have to look to the Fourth Gospel. 'Man doth not live by bread alone'—but by the total self-communication of God. That Life in the higher sense was His. 'My meat is to do the will of him that sent me.' 'I have meat to eat that ye know not of.' 'The words I speak unto you are life.' 'Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life,' that is to say, life in this sense is quickened and nourished by the self-manifestation of Jesus. 'This is the bread that came down from heaven.'

Whether or not St Paul was guided to this discovery by knowledge of the life and utterances of Jesus, he also had made the transition to this final stage. 'Life' was for him synonymous with salvation in its *positive* aspect.

This was the primary and all comprehensive result of his conversion viewed subjectively. Life with all the riches of its content, Life in God and to God, had moved forward from the far horizon which it has occupied for Jewish hope—moved forward and enveloped him as an atmosphere, penetrated him as the fabric of a new personality. All that he had been taught to expect as the contents of a distant salvation was already his—peace with God, freedom from the dominion of sin,

[1] Volz, *Jüdische Eschatologie*, p. 328.

the gift of the Spirit—'righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost.' Of this Paul could have no doubt. It was witnessed by every day's experience. Neither could he doubt that he owed it to the mediation of Jesus, the Crucified but Risen Messiah; for that he had the ineradicable witness of the vision on the way to Damascus. God had revealed His Son to him, and in him; to Christ he had yielded himself in full surrender; and this was the result—Life.

'It is out of the realisation of this new life that the letters of the Apostle are written. There speaks in them a man who knows himself to have been renewed up to the inmost essence of his being. Not only his thought, his feeling, his aims have become different; he himself in the depth of his nature is no longer the same. It is on that account that he can no longer think as he thought, no longer feel as he felt, no longer will as he willed. Another lives in him, Christ.'[1]

But though this transition from the eschatological to the ethical was made first by Paul as a matter of experience, it had been already foreshadowed by Jesus as the result of sovereign insight. 'At this point, the correspondence of the Pauline line of thought with the preaching of Jesus comes plainly to light. As Jesus had spoken of the Kingdom of God with all the good it involved as a present reality, so Paul knows as a present possession the introduction of the Christian into Life and all its good in consequence of the antecedent quickening (*Auferweckung*). And in like manner as Jesus conceived this possession as wholly ethical in character, expecting it to develope in a righteousness, that is in a religious-ethical attitude answering to the Kingdom of God, so the same energy of religious-ethical valuation and determination shows itself in His Apostle.'[2]

[1] Otto Schmitz, *Das Lebensgefühl des Paulus*, 1922, p. 41.
[2] Titius, *Paulinismus*, p. 264.

If St Paul had been asked for a satisfying example and illustration of 'life lived in the favour of God,' he would probably have pointed to the historical Jesus. His writings are not so devoid of record concerning the conduct and bearing of the Lord as not to provide the firm outlines of a portrait. He refers to the 'obedience shown by Christ'[1]; His submission to the Father (2 Cor. x. 6); His 'consideration' and 'courtesy' (2 Cor. x. 1); His 'endurance' (2 Thess. iii. 5); and His 'grace' (2 Cor. viii. 9), that quality of radiant self-bestowal which is illustrated in the Synoptic Gospels and emphasised in John i. 14, 16, 17.

If, however, he had been asked for an example and illustration of Life in the highest sense he would probably have found it in the life of the risen and living Saviour. That was a spirit-life, life on the spiritual plane, life which raised all the qualities of personality to an immeasurably higher power. But as experienced by the believer in Christ life in this sense was limited by two important considerations. It could not be wholly or entirely his under the conditions of earthly existence. He had it now, but in the future he would have it 'more abundantly.' He was 'alive by the Spirit' now (Gal. v. 25), and yet Life in its fullness was part of his hope of the future. His life was 'hid with Christ in God,' 'I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly' (Jo. x. 10).

And what obviously set a stern limitation on this experience was 'the earthly body,' the body of flesh which was weak through corruption introduced by sin. Not until that had been 'redeemed,' and replaced by the 'spiritual body' would Life be experienced in its fullness. For this life was no mere addition to or development of the natural life of man, but the bestowal or emergence of life of a higher order, which transformed

[1] So Hort, *ad* 1 Pet. i. 21, referring to 2 Cor. x. 5.

or eventually would transform the whole personality. And inasmuch as 'body' or 'frame' is essential to the idea of distinguishable personality, the 'frame' also must be raised to the plane of Spirit, participating in the quickening due to 'life indeed.'

It is incorrect to speak of Life in this sense as 'eschatological.' The point is that what had been eschatological, in fact the great hope of the future, had now become experimental, a hope which had been realised. The primary proof that it was so was found probably in the possession of the Spirit. That had been anticipated as the most striking feature of the Messianic period (Joel ii. 28). The experience of the Spirit's presence and power was the observed result of the Apostolic preaching and the response to it. 'My preaching was with the manifestation of the Spirit and of power' (1 Cor. ii. 4). And this would bring in its train the other factors included in the eschatological hope, and among them the conviction of having Life. Nor was confirmation lacking in the new ethical mastery and the development of new ethical standards, ethical life springing from and expressing the newness of spiritual Life which was claimed.

St Paul saw the Author of Life in this sense in God, God's agent in bringing it to birth in himself and others who were called to preach the Gospel, and the means whereby the result was achieved in the preaching of that Gospel of the grace of God. It is of God that he says, He 'hath made us alive together with Christ' (Eph. ii. 5; cp. Col. ii. 13); of Christ that He has been made (since the resurrection) 'a life-giving Spirit' (1 Cor. xv. 45); of the Holy Spirit that 'we are alive by the Spirit' (Gal. v. 25). If anyone is in Christ Jesus 'there is a new creation'; there is a new Race the Race of humanity redeemed, 'renewed after the image of him that created it' (Col. iii. 10). The initiative lay with God, but a human agent was necessary. And the new

Life in his converts was so real to Paul that he conceived of himself as standing to them in the relation of father: 'Onesimus whom I have begotten in my prison' (Philem. 10; cp. 1 Cor. iv. 15)[1].

It seems probable that it was through the experience of Life as the contents of Salvation ethically interpreted that St Paul was led to the discovery that Salvation had already come. In other words, the positive aspect of Salvation would be the first to be realised; the recognition of the negative aspects would follow as the result of intellectual process. We have examined the factors of Salvation in its negative aspect; what is common to all three factors of Salvation in that aspect, Redemption, Justification, Reconciliation, is that each of them depends on something accomplished by the death of Christ. What is common to the factors of Salvation in its positive aspect is that they are intimately connected with His life, the life of one who 'has been crucified,' but is 'alive for evermore.' 'Much more shall we be saved by his life.'

II. THE PRINCIPLE OF LIFE: THE SPIRIT

St Paul saw the principle of the Life which was the synonym for Salvation on its positive side in the Spirit, the Spirit of God or the Holy Spirit. The roots of this conception are to be found of course in the Old Testament and in pre-Pauline Judaism. But Paul gave to it a development and an application which appear to have been original with him[2]. He assigned to the Spirit

[1] The metaphor is not original with Paul, neither is it derived from the mystery-religions. 'It already appears frequently before Paul'—Weiss, *ad* 1 Cor. iv. 15. *E.g.* Num. xi. 12. In the Talmud, 'If one instructs the son of one's neighbour in Torah, the Scripture reckons it as though he had begotten him.'

[2] E. F. Scott, *The Spirit in the New Testament*, p. 47: 'It cannot be proved that the conception of the Spirit, as it meets us in the New Testament, was modified in any essential respect by alien modes of thought.'

character, initiative, purposive action, ethical qualities which together represent what we mean by personality. And while in so doing he took a momentous step beyond any point which had been reached by Judaism, there is no suggestion that he owed anything in this matter to contemporary Hellenistic religion. And in the application of this conception he found the key not only to the explanation of the Christian experience but to the interpretation of the Person of Christ.

It should be said at once that there is no part of his vocabulary which the Apostle uses with less scientific precision than the terms which reflect his psychology. It is easy to see that he uses 'flesh' and 'spirit' to denote the extremes; 'flesh' stands for the lower or animal nature, 'spirit' for the highest element in man. But the meaning of 'spirit' is different according as the person who has it is thought of as a 'natural' or unspiritual man, or as a redeemed and 'spiritual' man. The 'natural' man has a spirit, and he has 'flesh' and 'mind'; and Paul occasionally uses the word in this sense. This is clearly seen in 2 Corinthians ii. 13, 'I had no rest in my spirit, because I found not Titus my brother,' compared with vii. 5 (referring to the same circumstances), 'Our flesh had no rest.'[1]

But far more commonly Paul means by the 'spirit' the highest element in the redeemed man, something which did not belong to him as 'natural' man, something which had been bestowed upon him by God in answer to his faith in Jesus Christ (1 Thess. iv. 8). This is indeed nothing less than the Holy Spirit, the Spirit of God; and as handled and applied by the Apostle the interpretation of Christian experience in terms of the Spirit becomes one of the most central and significant factors in his thought. 'Whenever Paul speaks of the Spirit we can feel the quick power of his own religion.'

[1] Cp. 1 Thess. v. 23.

Paul when he became a Christian became a member of a community which traced back to a monumental experience of the Spirit its own birth as a community as well as its conviction that God had made Jesus 'both Lord and Christ.' The primitive community saw in this experience the fulfilment of an ancient prophecy, and its conception of the Holy Spirit was at first not different from that found in pre-Christian Judaism. It was a Force, a mighty Influence belonging to God and proceeding from God, parallel in character and to some extent in operation to the Word of God and the Wisdom of God. According to the narrative at the beginning of *Genesis* the action of the Spirit was specially seen in the creation of life. Otherwise, it was recognised chiefly in the quickening of human power, *e.g.* for ruling, for craftsmanship, for insight, and in the manifestation of prophetic fervour. In all probability it was the last of these which is predicted by the prophet Joel as a feature of the 'last days' or the times of the Messiah. 'On my servants and on my handmaidens I will pour out in those days of my Spirit; and they shall prophesy.' The most striking phenomenon of Pentecost, the ecstatic utterance described as 'speaking with tongues' was explained by St Peter as the fulfilment of the prediction, 'He hath shed forth this' (ἐξέχεε τοῦτο, Ac. ii. 33).

The difference between this conception of the Holy Spirit and that which meets us in St Paul can hardly be exaggerated. The earlier conception is in harmony with the thought of the Old Testament, to which that form of existence which we describe as 'spiritual' was practically unknown[1]. In contrast to this St Paul conceived

[1] 'Der philosophische Begriff des Geistlichen findet sich nicht in A. T.lichem Gottesbegriffe'—Schultz, p. 467. 'Gott selbst, die Engel, die Seelen Abgeschiedener, im Judentum auch die himmlische Welt werden irgendwie stofflich vorgestellt'—Gunkel, *Wirkungen des Geistes*, p. 50.

of a Being, immaterial, universally extended, immanent in human experience and characterised by those qualities of self-consciousness, purpose, and self-direction which we sum up as constituting personality. The difference is graphically expressed by the transition from Peter's τοῦτο (this thing) to ἐκεῖνος (that one) in the Fourth Gospel (xvi. 13); and Paul stands indubitably with the latter. 'Grieve not the holy Spirit of God' (Eph. iv. 30). This Being has character, and character which is known. It is in fact the character of Jesus of Nazareth. Whatever is known as to the purpose of His life, the relation into which He entered with men, the direction which His influence took may equally be predicated of the Holy Spirit. In fact, as St John afterwards averred that Jesus had 'declared the Father,' so St Paul in effect assumes that He had revealed the Spirit[1].

This equating of the Spirit with Christ, of Christ with the Spirit, appears to have been original with Paul. And probably no other intellectual step taken by him was so pregnant of consequences for his own thought and that of those who followed him. Other cardinal conceptions, the Messiahship of Jesus, His death 'for our sins,' the Lordship of Christ, he took over from others; but this discovery was his own.

The ultimate result of this discovery was the discovery of the spiritual world, a world in which spiritual values have unchallenged currency, spiritual realities undisputed recognition. It was the world 'of spirit,' or 'of the Spirit.' It might present itself to the imagination as a plane or platform to which humanity could be raised; as an atmosphere which men might come to breathe; as 'the new sphere of Life' (Ro. vi. 4, M.). It represented the final step in the transcendentalising of

[1] This result has been described in a portentous yet significant German phrase as *die Christificierung des Geistes*. It is the complement of the *Vergeistigung* of Christ.

the conception of the Kingdom of God. It was in effect the discovery of heaven.

But the discovery had other important consequences prior to this. Its effect on the Apostle's Christology, his explanation of the Person of Christ, will fall to be discussed later. But the primary function of the Spirit in the experience of the Christian was recognised in the creation of Life. 'If,' says St Paul to the Galatians, 'we are alive by the Spirit, by the Spirit let us walk.' Christ had become, at and after the Resurrection, a 'life-giving Spirit' (1 Cor. xv. 45); 'the Spirit maketh alive' (2 Cor. iii. 6). We serve 'in the new sphere of spirit, not in the old sphere of a written code' (Ro. vii. 6). It is true of course that the Apostle traces the experience of the new Life not only to the action of the Spirit, but also to the action of God (Col. ii. 13; cp. Eph. ii. 5), and identifies the principle of it with Christ as well as with the Spirit; 'when Christ who is our Life appears' (Col. iii. 4; cp. Gal. ii. 20). But this arises from the general principle that while for Paul the risen Christ and the Spirit are practically interchangeable in respect of their operations in the experience of men, the ultimate source of all human experience is God. Life by the Spirit, Life in the Spirit, Life according to the Spirit, 'the Spirit dwelleth in you'—this is the language which is of primary significance, and explains and illuminates other phrases such as 'in Christ,' 'Christ in you.'

The origin of this conception, so potent in Paul's thinking, is probably to be found in the Pentecostal experience and in corresponding experiences which followed on acceptance of the Gospel. In the narrative of Pentecost we find the power and presence of the Spirit manifested in certain phenomena largely of a psycho-physical kind. Subsequent experience, including that of those who received the Spirit on confession of

Jesus as Lord, a confession normally sealed by Baptism, led to the recognition of Spirit-gifts of a different order. These were 'gifts' of a religious and ethical character, coinciding with such gifts as speaking with tongues, but in course of time replacing these as the most valued manifestations of the Spirit's power. This evaluation of the manifold gifts of the Spirit was largely the work of the Apostle. We see its results specially in 1 Corinthians xii.–xiv., where without unduly depreciating the physical manifestations he urges that Christians should 'set their ambition on the higher gifts,' and among the higher gifts of faith and hope and love singles out love as the greatest of all. Now inasmuch as the comprehensive description of these gifts in their totality was Life, and as the creation of life was traditionally recognised as one great function of the Spirit, the conception of the Spirit as the Giver of Life was for St Paul really implicit in the experience of Pentecost.

III. THE NEWNESS OF 'LIFE'

The experience which was thus mediated by the Spirit was one which came naturally to be expressed in several simple metaphors, and in particular in terms of 'a new creation.' There is no need to look outside the confines of Jewish thought to find the material which Paul moulded and minted into these phrases. 'Born again' is not part of his vocabulary. But, if he had used it, it would have been no more than the crystallising of thoughts which start from the conception of Life, and proceed through his experience in leading men by 'the hearing of faith' to become partakers of that Life. He knew how the Psalmist had called on God (repeatedly in the 119th Psalm) to 'quicken him,' that is, to make him live. 'Quicken thou me according to thy word' (Ps. cxix. 25). As the meaning of 'life' changed and

deepened, so deepened the meaning of the prayer. And as the Apostle felt that the prayer in its deepest sense had been answered for all who had believed on Christ (cp. Eph. ii. 5) so he would speak of them as 'a new creation' or 'new creatures.' And in so far as Paul himself through the preaching of the message of Christ was the agent in bringing about this experience, he could speak of himself in terms of fatherhood. We find the metaphor in its simplest form in Philemon 10, 'I beseech thee for my son Onesimus, whom I have begotten in my prison.' It appears with some expansion in 1 Corinthians (iv. 15), 'Though ye have ten thousand instructers in Christ, yet have ye not many fathers; for in Christ Jesus I have begotten you through the Gospel.' And in the confused metaphor of Galatians iv. 19 the same thought is struggling to find expression along with the complementary one that Christ is formed within the believer.

For all such life is transformed. 'The old things have passed away; behold, they have become new.' The conditions under which they live are 'new conditions, conditions of Life' (cp. Ro. vi. 4), 'conditions of Spirit' (Ro. vii. 6). Something has happened corresponding to what happened to Christ at the Resurrection, and the Life which they now live is of the same quality as His risen Life. They are to 'reckon themselves dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God in Christ Jesus' (Ro. vi. 11).

Two things are to be noted in connection with this interpretation of the Christian experience. The first meets us again and again in St Paul, namely, the paradoxical assertion of an experience which is complete and yet in process, certain and yet conditioned, present and yet an object of aspiration and hope. This may be sufficiently illustrated for the present by his use of the word 'spiritual' (πνευματικός). It describes one who has received the Spirit, has been placed on the

plane of spirit, and is ensphered in the Spirit. It describes, in part, what Paul understood by a Christian in the full sense of the word. All Christians who had a just claim to the name were πνευματικοί. And yet, writing to the Christians in Corinth, he felt himself at one moment unable to address them so. He must needs address them as 'of fleshly nature (σάρκινοι), as babes in Christ' (1 Cor. iii. 1). The second clause reveals the character of the paradox. The new condition might be looked at as something achieved, obtained, in all its features at the moment of believing, confessing, and receiving the Spirit. It might equally be regarded as a process, corresponding to the process of physical growth, which began at that moment. The Spirit and the possession of the Spirit were then not the totality of the Christian experience, but its 'first-fruits' (Ro. viii. 23) and the 'earnest' or guarantee of its completion (2 Cor. i. 22; Eph. i. 14). 'Of this I am confident that he who has begun the good work in you will go on completing it until the day of Jesus Christ.'

The fact is, of course, that Paul saw clearly that although the principle of Life, the higher spiritual nature, was implanted in the believer on Christ, the lower nature was not destroyed. He remained ἐν σαρκί even though he was ἐν Χριστῷ (Philemon 16; cp. Ro. viii. 10). The believer's personality had become the field of a struggle between the passion of the flesh and the passion of the Spirit (cp. Gal. v. 17, M.). Nevertheless there was a guarantee (on the condition of faithfulness) that the flesh would be subdued, the body redeemed, and the Spirit triumphant.

The second thing to be noticed is the close and constant connection between the experience of 'newness of Life' and ethical demand and achievement. St Paul had no use for a religious experience which did not

translate itself into conduct. It is indeed one of the most striking general characteristics of his thought that the statement of truth is uniformly followed by the demand for action or disposition to correspond[1].

A good example relative to the subject of newness of Life is found in Colossians iii. 1 ff.: 'Since then you have been raised with Christ, seek the things that are above. ...For ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God....Slay therefore...sexual vice, impurity, evil desire and that insatiableness which is idolatry.' Only the false conception of what Paul understood by the faith that saves can account for the strange belief that he was indifferent to 'works.' Only the strange confusion between the 'works' themselves and the imagined power of 'works' to secure salvation can account for the idea that he preached 'faith without works.' Saving faith for him is 'faith which becomes operative through love.'

There are other antitheses besides this of life and death which the Apostle employs to denote the sharpness of the contrast between past and present for the Christian. Darkness and light, thraldom and freedom, servitude and sonship—he presses them all into service. And there is something significant in the number and variety of the metaphors. As in the case of the many figures he employs to describe identification with Christ in His death, so here; the plasticity of his language suggests that he is not attempting to explain Christian experience in harmony with any existing terminology, but using a variety of natural metaphors in the attempt to express the central fact of a complete change of attitude to God and to man.

[1] Or conversely, the ethical demand is frequently buttressed by an appeal to truth or doctrine, *e.g.* Phil. ii. 5; 1 Cor. xi. 17–29.

IV. THE SPHERE OF LIFE

According to one of the ways in which St Paul most commonly contemplates the new life which is Life indeed, it is lived in a new sphere. He gives a new definiteness to the conception of God as One 'in whom we live and move and have our being.' The consciousness of this fact which is first stated as true of human nature in general, is sharpened and defined by the recognition of the contrast with another sphere, the sphere of the flesh, or the World, or the Age that now is, a contrast of which the believer in Christ becomes vividly aware. All men live and move and have their being in God (Ac. xvii. 28). But not all men know it. When they come to know it through faith in Christ they look back on their ignorance, they look in on their imperfect apprehension of its truth, as an entanglement in a lower Order, a dwelling in a lower Sphere. The new Sphere into which they have consciously entered is variously described by the Apostle.

(i) 'IN THE SPIRIT'

'Ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit' (Ro. viii. 9). The preposition no doubt connotes control by the flesh on the one hand and by the Spirit on the other. But we cannot eliminate the local significance which is indeed primary. The Spirit which dwells in men is also conceived as the Spirit within which men dwell. The Power by which they are now dominated is both within them and outside them, an atmosphere in which they 'live and move.' We meet with the same double way of conceiving the experience when we examine the other form in which St Paul expresses it; and that is what may be described as the phrase of his choice—'in Christ.'

(ii) 'IN CHRIST'

It may not be very difficult for us to understand the Apostle's meaning when he speaks of 'spirit' or 'the Spirit' as a sphere within which men may live and move, or as a Power which can dwell in men. But it is different when he employs, as he so constantly does, the corresponding phrase 'in Christ.' And the difficulty is all the greater inasmuch as for the ordinary Christian 'Christ' presents Himself to imagination primarily as 'the man Jesus' translated to heaven. That is very far from the conception which predominated in the mind of St Paul. And a serious effort has to be made to comprehend the possibility of his giving a reasonable meaning to the phrase 'in Christ.'

'"When any one is one with Christ (lit. in Christ)—there is new creation." He that wishes to understand Paul must strive to reach a realisation and a sympathetic apprehension of this vital principle which permeates his whole personality.'[1]

These words of Johannes Weiss are not too strong, though they represent a notable change of method in the interpretation of St Paul. The new emphasis on the 'mystical' or 'fellowship' element in Paul's teaching dates from the publication in 1892 of Deissmann's pamphlet on the Pauline Formula 'in Christ.' Attention had already been directed to the phrase by Schleiermacher and others, but Deissmann was the first to subject the usage of it in the New Testament to exhaustive analysis, and to enforce the necessity of doing justice to the peculiar significance with which Paul employs it in many passages. The statistical situation is noteworthy. Reckoning along with the formula 'in Christ' the by-forms such as 'in the Lord,' 'in Him,' we find that the formula is absent from the Synoptic

[1] Joh. Weiss, *Urchristentum*, p. 341.

Gospels, from James, 2 Peter, Jude and Hebrews; that it appears suddenly in the Pauline writings and then no fewer than 164 times, to re-appear with greatly diminished frequency in Acts, 1 Peter and the Johannine books. In Paul's Epistles it occurs with more or less frequency in all, but specially in the Epistles of the Imprisonment where the occurrences are from three to four times as frequent as in the earlier Epistles. The problem therefore is to discover the exact meaning to be given to the preposition ἐν, and then the sense or senses in which the Apostle employs the phrase.

An interesting contrast with the Synoptic Gospels arises from the fact that another preposition (μετά) is there used to describe the companionship of the disciples with Jesus, a preposition which is never employed by St Paul for that purpose.

The conclusions to which Deissmann comes are that the formula was an original creation of the Apostle, that in some sense or other the preposition must receive a local meaning, that the personal name connected with it must be that of a living person, and that the possibility for the Apostle of employing the phrase in this pregnant religious sense was provided by his equating the risen Christ with the Holy Spirit.

No doubt Deissmann, as is common with other discoverers, was carried too far by the enthusiasm of his discovery, and showed an inclination to find this special ('mystical') significance of the formula in nearly all the instances where it occurs. A more careful analysis would lead to the classifying of many of these instances under a different heading[1]. But when these groups have been eliminated there remains quite a sufficient number

[1] Weiss, *loc. cit.* p. 360, distinguishes groups in which the preposition indicates Christ as (*a*) the medium through whom something reaches men; *e.g.* Rom. iii. 24, viii. 39. (*b*) as in some way representing men; *e.g.* 1 Cor. xv. 22; cp. 1 Cor. vii. 14. (*c*) as the object of verbal action; *e.g.* Phil. iii. 3; cp. Ro. v. 11; Phil. ii. 19, 24, iii. 1.

of instances to establish a special significance for the phrase. Of such are the following: 'This is the God to whom ye owe your being in Christ Jesus' (1 Cor. i. 30, M.); 'there is now therefore no condemnation to those who are in Christ Jesus' (Ro. viii. 1); 'thus stand fast in the Lord' (Phil. iv. 1); 'the Church of the Thessalonians in God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ' (1 Thess. i. 1); 'both in the flesh and in the Lord' (Philem. 16).

The 'local' significance seems to be the only legitimate one in these cases. And though there are passages, such as the one in Philemon, where we might put 'Christian' as an equivalent ('both as a man and as a Christian'), that only proves how central and sufficient a characteristic of the Christian was the relation described by the phrase. If we give, as it seems we must, a local sense to the preposition, at least in a number of instances, then Christ is conceived of as in some sense the habitation or dwelling-place of the Christian. Like the Spirit He is conceived of as a Sphere or Atmosphere within which men may live and move.

In seeking for an explanation of a conception which to many appears so strange we may find it partly at least where Deissmann finds it, in the equating of Christ with the Spirit. The proof of this lies not so much in the categorical statement of 2 Corinthians iii. 17, 'The Lord is the Spirit.' The interpretation of that sentence is far from certain. It would probably be wrong to say that Paul 'identifies' Christ and the Spirit. 'Paul distinguishes the Spirit and Christ, and probably it never occurred to him that they could be thought of as identical.' 'His aim on the contrary is to keep them distinct, and his very phrase "the Spirit of Christ" which brings them so closely together implies an effort to distinguish.'[1] But the practical equating of Christ and

[1] E. F. Scott, *The Spirit in the New Testament*, pp. 182, 183.

the Spirit in Paul's interpretation of Christian experience finds frequent illustration in the way in which he assigns the same functions now to the one and now to the other in relation to that experience. This is seen very clearly in Romans viii. 9–11. In the experience of Salvation on its positive side Christ and the Spirit are here treated as interchangeable[1]. To this equating of the Spirit with the exalted Christ we must return when we examine Paul's Christology. In the meanwhile it is sufficient to point out how the idea of being 'in Christ' was facilitated by the fact that Paul thought of the Exalted Christ not as of the man Jesus exalted to the right hand of God but in terms of the Spirit which was immaterial and omnipresent.

But there is a consideration of at least equal importance as throwing light upon the phrase and the meaning Paul gave to it; and that is the bold way in which he equated Christ with the Church, the Fellowship of Redeemed Men. In 1 Corinthians xii. 12 he writes, 'As the human body is one and has many members, all the members of the body forming one body in spite of their number—so also is *Christ*'; though the conclusion which anyone familiar with Paul's use of the metaphor of the Body and closely following his thought in this context might naturally anticipate would be 'so also is the *Church*.' Calvin makes indeed this terse comment on the passage, 'he calls Christ the Church.'

It is the same conception we find underlying and necessary to explain a rather obscure argument in the third chapter of the Galatians 'The promises were made to Abraham "and to his stock." It does not say "stocks" as though referring to a number, but "stock" as though referring to one person, namely Christ' (iii. 16). If we

[1] Other illustrations are found on comparing Gal. iii. 26; 1 Cor. xii. 9: 2 Cor. v. 21; Ro. xiv. 17: Gal. ii. 17; 1 Cor. vi. 11: Phil. iv. 1, i. 27.

take 'Christ' here as referring to an individual person Jesus Christ, we cannot defend the Apostle against the charges of 'Rabbinic exegesis' and hair-splitting which have been so often laid against him here. But when we come to *v.* 22 we find that the promise is to be given to those who have faith; that is to say believers in Christ are in fact the stock who were contemplated in the promise to Abraham. So in *v.* 16 Paul wrote 'Christ' not of the individual, but of the corporate personality of which He was the Head. 'He is the head of the body, the Church' (Col. i. 18; cp. Eph. v. 23), not, or not only, in the sense in which English monarchs have been proclaimed 'head of the Church'; Christ is for Paul the head of the Church as being part of it. And it is part of Him. He is Head of the New Race, Founder of the new People of God, occupying the same relation to the New Race as Adam occupied to the old. And that relation was not merely an official one, or a genetic one, or one established by a Divine decree. It was a relation inherent and inevitable arising out of the natural oneness (as it was understood) between the Head and Founder and the People of which He was the Head.

This is all connected with that conception of solidarity which is so marked a feature of ancient thought, but in modern thinking has given way before a shattering individualism[1]. It finds abundant illustration in the Old Testament. There, as Hort says, 'the prophet, the people to whom he speaks, and the dimly seen Head and King of the people all pass insensibly into one another in the language of prophecy.'[2] In some of the Psalms 'the distinction between the king and his people

[1] Cp. S. A. Cook, in *Cambridge Ancient History*, III. 437 *sqq.*, 'The Solidarity of the Group and its God'; *ibid.* p. 493, 'Hebrew thought refers with equal facility to a representative individual and to a group he represents.'

[2] Hort, *ad* 1 Pet. i. 11.

seems often a vanishing one.'[1] It will probably remain always uncertain whether 'the figure of the Suffering Servant in the fifty-third of Isaiah is intended by the writer as an individual or as a personification of the righteous and suffering remnant of Israel.' And in particular the designation 'Christ' or 'Anointed' was applied almost without distinction to the people or to the individual who represented them. Thus in Habakkuk (iii. 13), 'thou wentest forth for the salvation of thy people, to save thy Christ.'[2]

In view of this habit of Hebrew thought it came naturally to St Paul to identify Christ with the Society of redeemed men of which He was the Head[3]. For that Society also was regarded by him as a corporate personality. This conception of a New Humanity, ideally one and perfect, though actually in process of being united and made perfect presents itself frequently in his Epistles. According to 1 Corinthians xv. 45, 47 Christ is the source and Head of the new humanity, the second race of men which is 'from heaven.' In Galatians (iii. 28) the Apostle's meaning (which is obscured in A.V., 'ye are all one in Christ'), is 'ye are all one being in Christ.' And, as we see from Ephesians iv. 13, this 'being' is 'the new man,' that second race which is through the varied ministry provided by God to grow until it reaches 'the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ.' For Paul has no thought there of any individual Christian or Christians attaining that majesty. It is not 'till we each come,' but 'till we as a whole come' to the 'perfect man,' that is, to present a new humanity perfect and complete in Him.

It is here that we find the true explanation of the

[1] Witton Davis, *ad* Ps. lxxxix. 50; cp. H. Wheeler Robinson in *The People and the Book*, p. 375 f.

[2] Compare Ps. ii. 2, xvii. 51, xix. 7, xxviii. 8, cv. 15.

[3] Cf. Nairne, *Hebrews* in *CGT*, p. cv: 'There was no Christ apart from his people.'

difficult phrase in Ephesians i. 22, 23: 'gave him to be head over all things to the church which is his body, the fulness of him that filleth all in all' (A.V.). The word translated 'filleth' is really passive[1]. And what Paul means is 'who is finding his completion utter and entire.' As the Church is not complete without Christ so Christ is not complete without the Church. The Church in fact is His body in the sense that in and through it He is continuously realising Himself. It is a complementary part of the total Christ, in which He 'finds his completion.'

The same thought appears when Paul reminds the Ephesians (Eph. iv. 21) that they have been 'taught in Christ'; he reminds them of occasions when assembled together in His name, they have realised their oneness in Him and with Him, and have learnt in the Fellowship of His people things that otherwise would have been undiscovered. Another idea which otherwise is strange and difficult, is illuminated by this conception. It is the idea of 'putting on Christ.' 'As many of you as have been baptised into Christ, have put on Christ.' When we see how St Paul equated the community and its Head, we can see how being 'in Christ,' 'baptised into Christ' and 'putting on Christ' were intelligible forms of expressing the deepest meaning of incorporation into the *community*.

Now if Paul thus equated Christ with the Church, the Fellowship, the Society of men and women who were brought together into one Body and dwelt in by the Spirit of Christ, the significance which he attaches to the conception of being 'in Christ' loses much of its mysteriousness and any unreality which may have seemed to attach to it. Being 'in Christ' was mediated through being in the Fellowship. The meaning of being 'baptised into Christ' was at once illustrated when the

[1] See Armitage Robinson, *ad* Eph. i. 23.

believer was received into that sacred Fellowship. It was not that the two were identical, the Society and the Saviour. But the Society represented the Saviour in such a way and to such a degree that the faith-union with Christ which was the key to salvation found perpetual expression and illustration in the fellowship of the Church.

Neither is this great conception absolutely novel in St Paul. It is really the elaboration of the thought contained in our Lord's words, 'where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them.' Here, again, by 'name' we are to understand 'personality as known.' To be gathered in His name is to be united in a common attitude to Himself, to Him as known through His life, death and resurrection. Within the group so united He is as part of it. Paul says, Yes, and the group is He, an inseparable part of Him, His Body. And any man who is truly member of that Body is in Him. And 'if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature.'

(iii) 'THE FELLOWSHIP OR CHURCH'

St Paul, as we have seen, discovered that the new life was lived in a sphere which could be described as 'Christ' or 'the Spirit.' But there was a third way in which he conceived of the environment of the new Life; he saw it in the Community of those who having believed in Christ and received the Spirit are *ipso facto* united into a sacred Society. The three phrases 'in Christ,' 'in the Spirit,' 'in the Fellowship, Body or Church,' represent not three disparate or successive elements of experience, but an identical experience under different aspects. And so they mutually interpret one another. Just as the meaning of the phrase 'to be in Christ' is to a large extent explained by the practically synonymous phrase 'to be in the Spirit,' so it is further

illuminated by this conception of the sacred Society within which believers dwell. Much of what Paul describes as taking place 'in Christ' is so described by him because he saw it taking place in the Fellowship. The Spirit-filled community, which is 'the Body of Christ' and has Christ for its 'head,' is the sphere within which believers live and move. It is from this point of view that Paul's conception of the Church must be studied.

We ask the wrong question if we ask when or by whom the Church was 'founded.' For the word suggests an 'institution'; and there was a Church in the true sense of the word before there was an institution. There was a Church from the first day when 'two or three' gathered together in Christ's name, and round His Person. But if the new community came into being when first two or three were brought into faith-fellowship with Jesus of Nazareth and so into love-fellowship with one another, it was at and after the day of Pentecost that it came to consciousness of itself; and it did so not in the first place as an institution but as a Fellowship.

We may trace the character of that self-consciousness and note its development through the names by which the community was known, (1) the Fellowship or the Unity, (2) the Body, (3) the *Ecclesia* or Church.

(1) The name of 'The Fellowship' ('Fellowship of Christ,' 'Fellowship of the Spirit') though frequently employed by St Paul did not originate with him. It appears in what is probably one of Luke's sources in Acts ii. 42, where we learn that those who were baptised attached themselves 'to the instructions of the Apostles and to the Fellowship, to the breaking of bread and the prayers.' And there is strong probability that the name had an even earlier application to the followers of Christ. For its equivalent in Aramaic

(Chabūra) was in current use to describe a group of companions or partners, sharers in a common life (*e.g.* students at a college). And in particular the word was used to describe the group of friends who might unite to celebrate the Passover Feast in common[1]. It may be also not without significance that among the many names given to itself by the community of 'Damascus-dissenters' whose acquaintance we make in the 'Zadokite Document' of Schechter one was 'the Chabūra of the new covenant.' If, as seems probable, the group of followers whom Jesus gathered most closely round Himself, took or had given to it some distinguishing name, that name would naturally be 'the *Chabūra* of Jesus'; and the name κοινωνία or Fellowship under which it first presents itself in the Acts is simply the Greek for *Chabūra*. The Fellowship would then be something the origin, the consciousness, and even the name, of which went back to the days when the Master was still on earth.

But St Paul, if he were not the first to use the name, laid hold of it as he laid hold of other terms current in the primitive community and elaborated its meaning and its value. In the first place, he defined it as 'the Fellowship of Christ' (1 Cor. i. 9) in the sense that it was Christ who had called it into being and it belonged to Him[2]. He defined it equally as 'the Fellowship of the Spirit' in the same sense. The Spirit of life had called it into being. 'If Christ has any appeal, if love carries any sanction, *if the Spirit has really created a Fellowship*, if affection and tenderness are really its atmosphere, show it in word and deed' (Phil. ii. 1). So in 2 Corinthians xiii. 13 it may be true that 'no

[1] See Israel Abrahams, *Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels*, II. 210.

[2] Cp. Findlay in *EGT*, *ad loc.* 'not into a communion *with* Jesus Christ (nowhere else has the name an objective genitive of the person) but into a communion belonging to and named after Him.'

exegetical skill can give us certainty as to the meaning of the Apostolic Benediction,' but there is strong probability that it means 'may the grace that shone in our Lord Jesus Christ, the love that is characteristic of God and the fellowship that has been created by the Spirit be with you all.'[1]

Further, Paul saw this Fellowship as based on faith, the common faith of those who form it, since the faith by which men are united to Christ *ipso facto* unites them to one another. To Philemon he describes it as 'your faith-fellowship' (6). He spoke of it also as 'the Unity,' and under that name also traced its origin to the Spirit ('preserve the Unity of the Spirit,' Eph. iv. 3), and found its basis again in 'faith and the knowledge of the Son of God' (Eph. iv. 13)[2].

It is hardly necessary to emphasise the fact that primarily and essentially this corporate Unity is conceived by Paul as a spiritual one. It is held together by spiritual bonds, by a common relation to Christ, faith, by a common experience of the Spirit and by a common outlook on the world. For the Fellowship was not merely a fellowship of believers *inter se*, nor yet a fellowship of believers individually with the Spirit, but a complex experience which included both. It was in relationship with one another that men continuously realised their relation to Christ and to God through Him. Indeed, they found in this reciprocal fellowship the convincing proof of their own salvation: 'we know that we have passed from death unto life because we love the brethren' (1 Jo. iii. 14). The Fellowship was, in fact, the sphere within which this complex experience was realised, the reciprocal interaction of moral and

[1] Cp. Bousset in *SNT, ad loc.* 'der heilige Geist der Träger des Christlichen Gemeindelebens wirkt die lebendige Gemeinschaft.'

[2] According to some MSS this name occurs also in Col. iii. 14: 'love which is what holds the Unity together.' The two phrases are brought together in an interesting way in the Liturgy of St James.

spiritual forces, divine and human. And this *Koinonia*, called into being by the Holy Spirit, was prior to the organisation of a 'Church'; it was related to it as the organism to the organisation[1].

(2) But if this spiritual Fellowship was to survive, grow and function in the world that now is, it must necessarily develop an organisation. The earliest stage of the process is reflected not in the emergence of officials or in the fixing of their authority and grading of their powers, but in that conception of the Fellowship as the Body of Christ which becomes such a favourite figure with St Paul. It is a description or title which is commonly spoken of as 'a metaphor' and is apt to be dismissed somewhat cursorily as 'one of Paul's metaphors.' But this conception also was not one which originated with him. It had already been freely used in classical literature in phrases corresponding to our 'body politic.'[2] It is quite true of course that in applying the word to the Christian community the Apostle is using it metaphorically. But in his hands it is more than a metaphor. We find here a case of the kind pointed out by Dr Gilbert Murray: 'Sometimes the word of revelation comes by metaphor. The speaker signals in the direction of the truth.'[3] And in this case, as in others, the important thing is to note at how many points the symbol corresponds to the thing symbolised. The metaphor of the Body is by St Paul so analysed and applied that it is seen to correspond at many points with that which it illustrates. It represents, so far as a concrete and visible thing can represent an abstract and invisible, the relations and the functions of the community alike within itself and in relation to its

[1] See *The Spirit*, ed. Canon Streeter, p. 69 ff.

[2] Illustrations in Lietzmann, *HBNT, ad* 1 Cor. xii. 12; cp. Feine, *NTT*[2], p. 449.

[3] Gilbert Murray, *Essays*, p. 134.

invisible Head. The diversity of 'gifts' involving diversity of function, the concentration of all the gifts upon one object, the welfare of the whole and the glory of the Head, the reciprocal contribution of the members, the kind of control exercised by the Head, the phenomena of growth, 'through every point of contact and supply according to the proportionate working of each several part' (Eph. iv. 16)—in all these features Paul found correspondence between the human body and the social organism in which believers in Christ were bound together. So we get: 'We have all been baptised to form one body' (1 Cor. xii. 13); 'The Church which is his body' (Eph. i. 23); 'Ye are the body of Christ' (1 Cor. xii. 27); 'Thus we, many individuals though we are, are one body in Christ' (Ro. xii. 5). And even more striking is the use of the name absolutely, indicating how familiar it had become in this sense: 'He is the saviour of the Body' (Eph. v. 23); 'He is the head of the Body, the Church' (Col. i. 18); 'eats and drinks without a proper sense of the Body' (1 Cor. xi. 29).

It is when we apprehend the measure of literalness with which St Paul used this language that we appreciate the sacred character of the Church in his eyes, the seriousness with which he regarded any injury done to its purity, its peace or its unity. The upbuilding (A.V. 'edification') of this Body was to be the ceaseless ambition of those who formed its members, the criterion of that which was 'becoming' in a Christian—'Let all things be done with a view to upbuilding' (1 Cor. xiv. 26; cp. Ro. xiv. 19; 2 Cor. xii. 19). Part of the purpose for which God had given divers kinds of ministry was with a view to 'the upbuilding of the Body of Christ' (Eph. iv. 12). That some things which were 'lawful' for the individual did not tend to the upbuilding of the Body was sufficient reason for abstaining from them

(1 Cor. x. 23). The growth, unity and well-being of this Body was something on which Paul's heart was set not less than on the religious and ethical progress of those individuals of whom it was composed (Eph. iv. 16). It was indeed in the task of building up the Body that men were conscious of being fellow-labourers with God—'Ye are God's building.'

There were other metaphors which St Paul employed to illustrate his conception of the Christian Society, metaphors which though less plastic illustrated other characteristics. It was a Shrine or Temple, it was a Household of God. 'Know ye not that ye (corporately) are the temple of God?' (1 Cor. iii. 16; cp. 2 Cor. vi. 16); 'Ye are being built up as a dwelling place of God in the Spirit' (Eph. ii. 22). Elsewhere (1 Cor. vi. 19) the same figure is used of the individual believer; 'know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Spirit within you?' But here, as in 1 Peter ii. 5, it is used of the corporate society to illustrate both the way in which the several members ('living stones') are articulated in the whole, and the sacred function of the community to be the dwelling-place of God and the centre of His presence among men. The Messianic hope of Judaism included the expectation of a new Temple exceeding even the first one in splendour[1]. This feature also in the Jewish hope had found fulfilment in the Christian community, a Temple of God in which Christ was the Shechinah. And God was the Builder of it (1 Cor. iii. 9).

The consciousness of intimate relationship between the members of the Community is indicated in two phrases τοὺς οἰκείους τῆς πίστεως (Gal. vi. 10), whether it means 'the household of faith' or 'our kinsfolk in the faith' and οἰκεῖοι τοῦ Θεοῦ (Eph. ii. 19), 'of the

[1] *Tobit*, xiv. 5; *Enoch*, xc. 28; *Sib. Oracles*, iii. 657. See Bousset, *Religion des Judentums*, p. 226.

household or family of God.'[1] This conception goes back to the teaching of Jesus: 'Whosoever doeth the will of God, the same is my brother and sister and mother' (Mk. iii. 35). The new community is the family of God.

(3) The Fellowship, the Body of Christ, the Family of God; to these descriptions in which we see the expression of the self-consciousness of the new Society we must add the *Ecclesia* or Church. This is the title which in later time has replaced all the others. But wide and various as its connotation has since become, its main significance at the outset lay in the evidence it gives of a continuity of self-consciousness with the former 'Church,' 'the Church in the wilderness,' the *Ecclesia* of the Old Testament. What this name primarily conveyed was the conviction that it was the believers in Christ who formed the true Israel, a new People of God.

There probably never was a time when the Christian community thought of itself in any other way than as belonging to the People of God. 'The Christians adopted in speaking of themselves the title of *Ecclesia*, which to Hellenistic ears must have inevitably taken with it the claim that they were the chosen people, the true Israel. For ἐκκλησία was used in the Septuagint (except in Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus and Numbers) to mean the People of the Lord assembled together for common action, and it is this use of the word in the Septuagint which is really important, rather than any considerations derived from Greek etymology.'[2]

When at the first Jews became 'believers' or 'disciples' they were not understood to cease being con-

[1] Compare also 1 Tim. iii. 15, 'the house of God,' not the place of assembly, or the institution, but the family or household. So Dibelius, *ad loc. HBNT.*

[2] Lake and Jackson, *Beginnings of Christianity*, II. 188.

nected with the earlier *Ecclesia*. Neither did they as Christians at first deny the title of *Ecclesia* to the community of Israel. A phrase in Galatians, 'the *Ecclesiae* of Judaea which are in Christ Jesus' (i. 22), appears to indicate that even when this Epistle was written Paul was prepared to recognise that there were other *Ecclesiae* in Judaea besides the 'Christian' ones. What happened subsequently was that the Christian Society was first led to doubt, and then to deny, that the Jews who persecuted believers in Jesus as Messiah could belong to the true people of God. For them the consciousness of belonging to that People came to rest on different grounds. It was no longer an Israel 'according to the flesh' in which they were incorporated but a spiritual Israel, 'Children of Abraham' by faith. We see the argument taking shape under Paul's hands in Romans iv. The promise of an inheritance to Abraham and his descendants was made on the condition of faith. That threw open the inheritance in all its aspects (*e.g.* righteousness, salvation, the Kingdom) to Gentiles as well as Jews provided they displayed the faith of Abraham (Gal. iii. 7). But the same principle acts also in excluding from the true Israel those Jews who remain in unbelief. 'Not all who belong to Israel are Israel' indeed (Ro. ix. 6). But there is an Israel according to faith, *a New People*, a new *Ecclesia*[1].

With this name the Christian Community took over the spiritual inheritance of the ancient Israel, and the results were important and far-reaching. As Harnack has pointed out, 'This conviction that they were a *people*, involving the transference of all the prerogatives and claims of the Jewish people to the new community, at once furnished the adherents of the new faith with a *political* and *historical* self-consciousness. Nothing

[1] See further Hamilton, *The People of God*, p. 24 ff. and compare also Ro. ii. 28, xv. 10; 2 Cor. vi. 16–18; Heb. iv. 6–11.

more comprehensive or complete or impressive than this consciousness can be conceived. This estimate of themselves rendered Christians impregnable against all attacks and movements of polemical criticism, while it further enabled them to advance in every direction for a war of conquest.'[1]

The results which followed from this continuity of self-consciousness were many and important. The young community felt itself from the first rooted in history. It had not forfeited the prestige which belonged to Israel as the object of God's favour and the agent of His purpose, called to bring blessing to mankind. They were 'the seed of Abraham,' in whom all the nations of the earth were to be blessed. They shared also in the prestige which even outside the circle of Judaism was beginning to be attached to the Hebrew Scriptures. They carried over from Judaism all that was best in the ancient faith and all that was finest in its ethical standards. They were heirs also of the great tradition of steadfastness in the faith; of courage and tenacity manifested by the first martyrs in history, heirs not only of the promises and oracles of God, but of the splendid heroism of many who 'called upon His Name.' This consciousness of being a veritable *Ecclesia* of God in the sense made familiar by the Septuagint, and therefore the true Israel, lasted just long enough for these precious things to become the permanent possession of the new Society[2].

In this matter also of the continuity of consciousness with the People of God under the former dispensation the mind of the new community may not have been so independent of the influence of Jesus as has been

[1] Harnack, *Expansion of Christianity*, I. 300.

[2] It is not without significance that the 'Damascus Dissenters' among other names for their community used this one, 'the new congregation'; cp. 'The Zadokite Document' in Charles' *Corpus*, II. 802.

supposed. The words used by Him at the Last Supper, 'This is my blood of the new covenant,' if they were understood by His followers at all, could only be understood in the light of teaching given by Himself to the effect that His blood when shed would be the ratification of a new covenant, of the new covenant promised by Jeremiah. But the covenant of Sinai had been the occasion and the symbol of the constitution of the original People of God; and so this new covenant implied a similar constitution of a new People, according to the promise, 'I will be their God and they shall be my people' (Jer. xxxi. 33). A new People which was at the same time continuous with the old was involved in the idea of the new covenant.

And there may be further allusion to the same line of thought in the words, 'on this rock I will build my church' (Mt. xvi. 18). It only requires an emphasis upon the possessive pronoun—*my* Church—which the Greek at any rate invites, in order to bring out an allusion to the older 'Church' in the reference to the new one, an allusion which would be entirely in harmony with what is suggested by 'my blood of the new covenant.' In fact, the whole attitude, what has been felt to be the paradoxical attitude, of Jesus to the older dispensation would be interpreted if we saw here also an application of the principle, 'I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil.' The group of believing followers whom He left on earth was the nucleus of a new People of God, a new *Ecclesia*, a new Church.

The Fellowship, The Body of Christ, The Household of God, The *Ecclesia* or Gathered People of God—it is necessary to keep all these descriptions in view in order to do justice to Paul's conception of what we call the Church. But our survey would not be complete if we did not include a further conception according to which St Paul viewed the Church as the nucleus of a New

Humanity. There may be an allusion to this in 2 Corinthians (v. 17), should the words be rendered, 'if anyone is in Christ Jesus, there is a new creation.' But in the Epistle to the Ephesians the thought finds clear expression, with special emphasis upon the fact that in order to bring this new Humanity into being Christ had broken down the barrier between Jew and Gentile, had become their peace—in order that in Himself He might unite the two in one new creation, the 'new man' or, as we should say, a new Humanity (ii. 13–16). Thus the Church could be addressed as 'one being in Christ' (Gal. iii. 28); and the goal to which Christian hope was directed was the attainment not by individual Christians but by this new Humanity, the Body of Christ, of 'the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ' (Eph. iv. 13).

The functions of the Church which could be so variously conceived and described, and the inferences of an ethical kind to which the Apostle was led must be reserved for later consideration.

V. THE IMPLICATIONS OF 'LIFE'

Salvation as a present experience was understood by Paul to be secured by the response of faith to all that was offered by God in and through Christ, and especially to His forgiving love. It was a response which involved the acceptance of all that was offered. And the experience proved on analysis to include certain elements of great significance for the religious and the moral life, such as Freedom, Sonship, having the Spirit. The first of these was *Freedom*. 'In freedom Christ has made us free' (Gal. v. 1). This describes an experience the depth and happiness of which could only be estimated by those who have known the horrors of mental or moral servitude. Men, especially those of the Jewish

faith, were now free 'from the law that leads to sin and death' (Ro. viii. 2), free from sin as a servitude (Ro. vi. 18, 22), free from an uneasy conscience, free from the fear of death, free from 'the spirit of bondage' (Ro. viii. 15), a comprehensive term for that dread of the unseen and the unknown which for those who experience it does more than anything else to embitter life. 'Fear hath torment' (1 Jo. iv. 18). In the fourth Gospel which so often crystallises the thought of St Paul we find the whole experience summed up in the saying, 'If the Son shall make you free, then shall ye be free indeed' (Jo. viii. 36).

Along with this went the experience of *Sonship*. The Spirit which the Christians had received was a 'Spirit of adoption,' that is to say, one which creates an overwhelming sense of Sonship. It became natural for them to call on God as Father (Ro. viii. 18; cp. 1 Pet. i. 17), and to think of themselves as the children or sons of God (Gal. iii. 26, iv. 5–7; cp. 1 Jo. iii. 1). Here again the fourth Gospel gives an emphasis of its own to this profound experience; 'as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God' (Jo. i. 12).

It was thus that in all probability the deepest thing in the new experience was described. Sonship involved a radical readjustment of the relation of men to God. That relation had been at the worst one of cringing obedience, at the best one of contract as between employer and employed. And for St Paul there was little to distinguish the one from the other in respect of ethical value. The ambition to secure favour of God by works of the law, that is by merit, was in his eyes on no higher level than obedience prompted by ignorant fear. In either case the relation to God was on a wrong footing, and could not lead to peace, righteousness or salvation. Now there was open to men through faith-union with Christ an entirely different relation with

God, one of mutual confidence, and reciprocal love, one in which God gives and man receives, making spontaneous returns in loyalty and obedience and service, in a word, the relation of Sonship.

Paul is not afraid of stating and even emphasising the fact that the new relationship involves 'service' no less than the old. 'Being set free from sin you are become servants or thralls of righteousness' (Ro. vi. 18). But he betrays the consciousness that by putting it so strongly he is exposing himself to a retort, what then becomes of our freedom? and adds, 'I use this human analogy to bring the truth home to your weak nature' (vi. 19 ff.). They had been servants of sin, and were on the way to receive the wages of sin, which was death. They had now become the servants of God, from whom they had received eternal life as a free gift.

Thus the freedom which they enjoyed was freedom to serve, but to serve not in the slave or hireling spirit but in the spirit of sons, to serve under new conditions of Spirit not on the old terms of a written code (Ro. vii. 6). Serving as slaves they could never be anything else than unprofitable (Lk. xvii. 10). For it is one of the marks of the slave that his master may expect from him everything, to the last moment of his time, the last ounce of his strength. He can never contribute anything beyond what is required of him. In that sense he can never be 'profitable.' But serving as sons they served under conditions when every moment and every act of service was 'profitable'; for it gave joy to the Father whom they served. The scope and character of this service will have to be examined later. But here it may be noted that St Paul's criticism of the Law as a system did not withhold him from making the keeping of the commandments of God part at least of the service to be rendered by Christians (1 Cor. vii. 19). The requirements of the Divine Will still found expression

in the moral standards revealed in the Old Testament. The whole difference lay in the new spirit, the spirit of Sonship, in which they were to be carried out. The motive was no longer either fear of a taskmaster or the hope of earning merit, but happy acquiescence in the will of a Father[1].

The ethical possibilities contained in this relationship have been displayed in connection with the problems of modern China. 'There is much of value in the ancient Chinese loyalties and sense of mutual responsibility. What is more fitted to conserve these values, and at the same time deepen and widen them, than the Christian ideal of sonship to the great Father? Within this relationship marriage or family loyalty is seen, not merely as a duty, but as an opportunity under the eyes of the great Father for individual and social good in mutual service and good will. Reverence for personality is reinforced by the consciousness of its divine origin and meaning. In a word, it gives perspective, and an all-inclusive bond for life's relationships which nothing else can give.'[2]

The third great implicate of Salvation as experienced in the present was *the possession of the Spirit.* The Christian not only was 'in the Spirit'; he had the Spirit; the Spirit was in him. And this was true of all who had entered into faith-union with Christ. This is clear from Galatians iii. 2, and 1 Corinthians xii. 13, 'we have all been imbued with the same Spirit'; 'If any one have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his' (Ro. viii. 9). This was so far from representing a further stage of Christian experience, or a higher level to be achieved only by a section of the community, that

[1] Another profound correspondence with the thought of Jesus, 'Jesus fordert den innern Gehorsam des Freien'—Herrmann, *Die sittlichen Weisungen Jesu.*

[2] Alex. Baxter in *The Congregational Quarterly*, II. 444.

the possession of the Spirit was itself the first fruits and guarantee of the experiences which should follow.

But Paul does not only look back to the moment of believing as the occasion of receiving the Spirit: he thinks of it as being continuously bestowed by God (Gal. iii. 5; 1 Thess. iv. 8). It is a continuously vitalising and energising force, to which the Apostle assigns the attributes of personality because the effects of its presence correspond so widely and so closely to what was known of the self-consciousness and self-direction of Christ. The place which Christ had occupied in the daily experience of His disciples was for those who had not seen Him 'and yet had believed' occupied by the Holy Spirit, who was at once the Spirit of God and the Spirit of Christ.

Manifold indeed are the functions which the Apostle ascribes to the Spirit in the new Life which has been opened to the believer. It is the Spirit who bears continuous testimony to his sonship, who searches the deep things in a man and 'makes intercession with sighs which find no language,' who is the source and spring of ethical effort and achievement, who guides the will, illumines the understanding, inspires and sanctifies the whole personality of the believer[1].

VI. GROWTH AND PROGRESS IN SALVATION-LIFE

Paul clearly recognised and anticipated growth and development not only of the Christian Community but of the individual Christian. He recognised that some were less developed than others. There were those who were *νήπιοι* (Eph. iv. 14), babes in Christ, others who were *τέλειοι*, mature (1 Cor. iii. 1). Even of himself he says, 'Not as though I had already attained

[1] On the relation between Christ and the Spirit see p. 257, and on the ethical fruit of the Spirit, p. 141 ff.

or were already mature; but I follow on, if that I may apprehend that for which also I was apprehended of Christ Jesus' (Phil. iii. 12). He, and others, had 'died with Christ,' and yet there was a sense in which he 'died daily,' 'bearing about in the body the dying (*νέκρωσις*) of the Lord Jesus' (2 Cor. iv. 10). There was a sense in which even for those who had passed through baptism participation in Christ's resurrection life was still in the future (Ro. vi. 5), and a sense in which even for those who had been justified 'righteousness' was a hope of the future; 'we through the Spirit wait for the righteousness we expect by faith' (Gal. v. 5). If any man was in Christ, there was already a new creation; nevertheless, one of the things which Christians were 'taught in Christ' was that they should put off the old man and put on the new (Eph. iv. 22, 24). There is indeed a continual process of decay of the outward man combined with renewal of 'the inward man' (2 Cor. iv. 16), a progressive discovery of 'all the good things that are ours in Christ,' and approximation to complete likeness to Christ.

Concerning the situation thus displayed two things may be said. First, the apparent paradox is one which as Bousset says, runs through the whole of primitive Christianity. It is simply due to the contrast between the ideal and the actual, the ideal suffering the abatement due to the fact that even the 'spiritual' man is still in the flesh; the old man, the outer man, the unspiritual man can only by degrees be forced to acknowledge his defeat. And yet defeated he has been, first, and that with final completeness, by Christ, then really yet not completely in the experience of those who have believed on Christ.

The other fact to be noted is that this involved a community of the kind which has been described as 'a mixed Church.' The 'pure Church' which some have dreamed of and longed for in every generation

did not exist even at the first. Within the one community would be included all gradations from 'babes in Christ' to 'mature,' and many varieties of ethical qualification or disqualification. For many of those who had been drawn from heathenism ethical education must have commenced when they became Christians. They had much to learn, some of them must have had everything to learn concerning the application of the Christian ideal to life. It is highly significant that in a general letter to the Asian Churches Paul takes cognisance of pilfering, of lying, and of corrupting conversation as though teaching on these subjects was far from unnecessary (Eph. iv. 25–28), and in writing to the Corinthians he envisages the possibility that even one who bears the name of Christian and is a member of the community might be found to be immoral or covetous, or an idolater or a slanderer or a drunkard (1 Cor. v. 11). With such, when they were discovered, it was a duty to break table-fellowship. They had fallen from the level or plateau of grace. But short of such flagrant ethical shortcomings there must have been weaknesses, ignorances, attempted compromises, delinquencies of a kind which are only too well known to our missionaries dealing with converts from heathenism to-day. Many of these people had a long way to travel before reaching a stable ethical standing, but it is clear that they are still regarded as members of the community. The theory is that they are 'alive by the Spirit'; and there is strong confidence that if they walk by the Spirit, that is, if they allow the Spirit which gives them Life to control their character and conduct, they will ultimately form part of that body of the redeemed who together come 'to the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ.' To a mixed congregation of this type Paul writes: 'Ye are all children of light, children of the day' (1 Thess. v. 5).

The growth which was expected and provided for was growth in 'knowledge' and in 'holiness,' that is, in spiritual apprehension and in ethical achievement. The knowledge was partly knowledge of the contents of salvation, partly knowledge of the will of God. It is knowledge of the good things that are ours in Christ (Philem. 6; 1 Cor. iii. 12), of the hope to which we are called, knowledge of the love of Christ (Eph. iii. 19), of the riches of our inheritance, and the greatness of God's power (Eph. i. 18, 19), of 'the mystery of God, even Christ in whom are laid up all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge' (Col. ii. 2, 3), in a word knowledge of those things which God hath prepared for them that love Him[1]. There was to be continuous progress also in the knowledge of God's will, God's ideal for human life and conduct. For there was to be a continuous renewing of the mind and the result was to be expected in the recognition or discovery of that will, namely, what is good and well-pleasing and perfect (Ro. xii. 2; Eph. v. 10).

The sources from which this growth is provided for and the means by which it is secured are manifold. But behind them all is God. 'It is God who worketh in you both the willing and the doing in fulfilment of his pleasure' (Phil. ii. 13). 'If in any thing ye think differently, God will reveal this also unto you' (Phil. iii. 15). 'Ye are taught of God to love one another' (1 Thess. iv. 9).

Christ is presented chiefly as the sphere within which this growth takes place, the life which permeates and energises the community and the individual. 'Christ in you, the hope of glory' (Col. i. 27); 'I can

[1] Such is evidently the contents of the higher wisdom, and not as Weiss somewhat strangely interprets it (*ad* 1 Cor. ii. 9): 'the plans which God has for the elect at the end, the salvation of the Kingdom, the glorifying of the comrades of the Messiah.' For Paul these conceptions had undergone an ethical transformation.

do all things through Christ who strengtheneth me' (Phil. iv. 13).

To the Spirit St Paul assigns certain important functions at this stage of the Salvation-experience. By Him believers are led on, impelled as by a supernatural force to which they have committed themselves (Ro. viii. 14; Gal. v. 18). He co-operates with the believer in his weakness, particularly in his inability to use rightly the power of prayer, not knowing rightly what he should pray for. Inasmuch as 'the sighings which are beyond speech' are both prompted by the Spirit and as it were presented by Him in prayer, He is said to intercede on behalf of God's people on the lines of the Divine purpose (Ro. viii. 26, 27). It is the Spirit who strengthens the believer 'in the inner man' (Eph. iii. 16), and is the organ of the increasing knowledge of the things which have been bestowed upon us by God (1 Cor. ii. 12). The influence of the Spirit is specially realised in connection with the speech of those who proclaim the Gospel (1 Cor. ii. 13) or are called to edify the congregation (1 Cor. xii. 8), and it is He who is at work among the hearers producing in them 'consecration' or 'sanctification' (Ro. xv. 16).

As to the means recognised by Paul as effective in producing this growth in knowledge and in character we may distinguish the Word, the Fellowship, and probably the Eucharist or Lord's Supper.

The Word on which he relied predominantly may be described as the living Word, the Word inspired by God or His Spirit and communicated either in speech or by writing either by individual messengers of God or by the community as a whole. He does occasionally quote as sufficient authority some phrase from the Old Testament, and occasionally he relies on a saying of Jesus which had been treasured in the memory of His followers (1 Cor. vii. 10, ix. 14; 1 Thess. iv. 15), where

it is to be noted that he does not make appeal to any written word. In the two passages in First Corinthians he draws attention to the presence or absence of direct authority from the Lord. But it would be a mistake to infer that he assigns any markedly inferior authority to the teaching for which he can claim no such warrant. For he and his comrades had 'the mind of Christ' (1 Cor. ii. 16; cf. vii. 40), where the substitution of Χριστοῦ for Κυρίου which stands in the quotation may be intended to give the reader to understand how it had become possible, that the eternal and transcendent 'mind of the Lord' could enter into the men of a particular circle at a definite time[1].

On the ground of this consciousness it may be said that all the Apostle had to communicate of teaching, whether the interpretation of Christian experience, or the application to life of the Christian ideals falls under the description of 'the Word'; it is the living word, the word of the life-giving Spirit, of which he believes himself to be the organ.

It would be a mistake however to infer that Paul claimed what is called infallibility for his teaching, or expected it to be accepted as such by those to whom he wrote. For they also were *ex hypothesi* men who were possessed by and possessed the Holy Spirit. And one of the gifts bestowed by the Spirit was 'the discerning of spirits'; and 'he that is spiritual judgeth all things' (1 Cor. ii. 15). Full persuasive authority lies in the convergence of three factors, the external judgment, in this case that of Paul, the corporate judgment, that of the 'Church,' and the judgment or conscience of the individual. The ultimate responsibility for the recognition of truth or duty lies with the individual. 'To his own Master he stands or falls' (Ro. xiv. 4). Nevertheless, it is at his peril that he ignores or under-values

[1] See J. Weiss, *ad loc.*

either the living Word or the corporate judgment of the community.

The community itself also has opportunity and responsibility for promoting growth in knowledge and in character. It is within that community that the 'word of Christ' is to dwell 'richly,' and through it Christians are to teach and admonish one another (Col. iii. 16); they are to 'comfort one another' with certain teaching, and to build each other up (1 Thess. iv. 18, v. 11). To the community also is committed a power of discipline and indeed responsibility for exercising it, whereby members who showed themselves wholly and hopelessly unworthy might be removed from the Fellowship (1 Cor. v. 5).

But apart from this direct duty and opportunity of communicating instruction the Fellowship had an even greater function. It was itself an organ of insight. 'Ye have not so learnt Christ...if so be ye have been taught in him' (Eph. iv. 20, 21). In Christ, that is, in the Fellowship, that is, in the gathering which was conscious of itself as called into being by Christ, filled with His Spirit, guided by His mind, men found a new sensitiveness in themselves, a sensitiveness to the truth as it is in Jesus. In the words of the fourth Gospel He 'manifested Himself to them as He did not unto the world.' Thus their faith-fellowship, their fellowship founded upon faith had its appointed result in 'the recognition of every good thing that is ours in Christ.' It is 'in company with all God's people' that men are to come to know the love of God in all its dimensions (Eph. iii. 18). It is the Love which is experienced in its highest intensity within the Fellowship, which can 'abound more and more *in insight and all manner of perception*' (Phil. i. 9). The Fellowship formed the focus in which the spirit of the individual, the spirit of the community and the Spirit of Christ met, where the

spiritual perceptions of the individual were quickened by the contact. The results that might be looked for are indicated in Ephesians (iv. 22 ff.) where it is assumed that the community thus gathered together has 'heard Christ' (that is the message about Christ), has been 'taught in him,' has discovered the necessity and the possibility of 'putting off the old man and putting on the new,' and also the ethical implications of that experience involved in the newness of life and the new relations to other men.

Thus the Fellowship for whatever purpose it was constituted was found to be a most potent means for promoting the development of spiritual insight and of character. But it seems probable that this function was discovered to operate with special effectiveness in connection with the Lord's Supper or Eucharist. St Paul gives no direct teaching on the subject, but it seems to be involved in the symbolism of the feast that it was intended and calculated to provide spiritual nourishment and to stimulate spiritual growth. It was 'the table of the Lord' and if it had judgment power as 'a savour of death unto death,' it was also a savour of life unto life.

In that case the Eucharist must be reckoned along with the Word (the 'testimony about God,' 'Christ' in the sense of the message about Christ or the teaching of men who had the Spirit) and the Fellowship as among the means which Paul looked to for the deepening of spiritual perception and the perfecting of ethical ideals and character. These all were 'means of grace,' that is to say, they were instruments employed by the Holy Spirit in order to bring about new experience of Christ, new insight, new knowledge, and so to produce and foster those qualities which together formed 'the harvest of the Spirit.'

VII. THE LORD'S SUPPER OR EUCHARIST

The earliest literary reference to a ceremonial partaking of food by the Christian Community is probably to be found in the source or sources employed by St Luke in the opening chapters of the Acts. There we learn (ii. 42) that the new converts 'attached themselves... to the breaking of bread,' literally, the breaking of the Loaf. Concerning the whole body of these disciples we learn in the same context that 'they, continuing in the temple, and breaking bread from house to house, did eat their meat with gladness and singleness of heart.' More than twenty years later we hear of the disciples at Troas coming together on the first day of the week to 'break bread' (Ac. xx. 7). And in the *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles* the section concerning the Eucharist is headed περὶ τοῦ κλάσματος, 'Concerning the Breaking' or 'the thing for breaking.'

It will not be suggested that there was ever a period in the history of the primitive Community when the rite so described failed to include the drinking of Wine as well as the common partaking of a Loaf. But the evidence does seem to point to a period when the emphasis in the interpretation of the rite was placed upon the Loaf, when not so much significance was attached to the Wine. The rite took its earliest name from the Loaf as *a parte potiori*.

As to the Loaf, we may recognise two factors in its symbolism. In the first place there was the Loaf itself, in which, as we may deduce from the prayer in the *Didaché*, was seen a symbol of the Unity into which the individual members of the Fellowship had been gathered and kneaded. Even as the materials of that Loaf had once been scattered on the hills, but were now compacted into one, so these members once so divided, had been compacted together in Christ. The Loaf

itself was thus a valued symbol of the common Life, the higher Life shared in common by the members of the Fellowship, and inasmuch as that Life was identified with Christ Himself, a symbol of Him as the abiding nourishment of spiritual life, the Bread from heaven.

But, secondly, this Loaf was broken, and broken in order that it might be distributed. And it seems clear that the act of breaking recalled to those who had been personal followers of Jesus occasions, probably many occasions, when they had seen Him perform the action in a solemn and significant way. The two disciples at Emmaus recognised Him when they saw Him repeat that action although they had not themselves been present at the Last Supper. It is only a surmise, but it appears a probable one, that on some of the occasions, when He broke the Loaf at a common meal, He had used words which have not indeed come down to us but which gave to the Loaf and its breaking the significance which was afterwards attached to them by His followers. And there certainly had been one occasion of peculiar solemnity when holding the Loaf in His hand He had said, 'This signifies my Body.'

We find what may be called a second stage in the interpretation of the Lord's Supper reflected in 1 Corinthians x. 16. And the first thing that strikes us is that here a definite significance is attached to the Cup as well as to the Loaf. It is not necessarily the same significance. And indeed one of the points at which recent investigation of the origin of the Eucharist has advanced lies just here, in the recognition that the Loaf and the Cup, the Bread and the Wine, as we commonly describe them, did not, at the outset, represent (possibly in different aspects or in different parts) the same object, namely, Christ; or that, as is probably the commonest

explanation, taken together they represented the whole Christ[1].

Literally rendered, St Paul's words in this passage run, 'The cup of blessing which we bless is it not (=does it not represent) a partnership of the blood of Christ? The Loaf which we break, is it not (=does it not represent) a partnership of the body of Christ?' The questions to be answered are, what is meant here by κοινωνία or 'partnership'? and what is the meaning to be given to the genitive in each case?

The interpretation of the verse has suffered seriously from being sought in disregard of the context in the midst of which it stands. For us who have a special interest in it as offering light upon the problem of the Eucharist, it is apt to stand either alone, or as the central statement which what goes before or follows after is put there to illustrate. For St Paul on the other hand it is itself an illustration, and only one of several, though doubtless the most important, which he collects to throw light on a principle to which he attaches great importance. The principle is this, that by participating with or partaking of what Otto would have us call 'numinous' objects men are brought into a group or comradeship or partnership or fellowship which involves a permanent relation to the numinous object or to the person who may be thought to be represented by it. Among such objects he alludes in this short section of the Epistle to the manna, the water from the rock, the rock itself, the Cup and the Loaf of the Eucharist, the Altar in the Jewish temple and the Table of demons, the sacrificial feast of the idol-temple. In all these cases the moral or spiritual effect of participation which Paul

[1] See art. on 'Lord's Supper' in *DCG* by Sir Robert Falconer ('both parts do not convey the same truth'); Joh. Weiss, *Urchristentum*, p. 84, 'the breaking of bread is not in the beginning a celebration of the death of Jesus,' and *Comm.* on 1 Cor. xi. 29.

registers is similar if not identical. Participation in the numinous object brings about or confirms incorporation in a group which stands in a common religious or ethical relation to the being or the thing whose significance is suggested by the numinous object.

At the beginning of the chapter the illustrations are taken from the early history of Israel. The being or person here is Moses. All the fathers of that generation went through certain experiences of a tremendous, awe-inspiring character, under the cloud and in the sea, experiences issuing in deliverance the source or agent of which was Moses. The result was that they were 'baptized unto Moses,' that is, they were severally and corporately committed unto him, brought under his authority, pledged to yield him allegiance. This initial experience was further confirmed when they all partook of the heavenly food, the Manna, and of the heavenly drink, the water from the rock. The supernatural provision for their need pledged them yet more deeply to Moses as their leader and teacher. Still more, if the Jewish legend were true (and it was at least a child-like way of accounting for an indubitable fact of high significance, namely, that during all the years of the wanderings provision was made by God for the physical needs of the people), if the legend were true, then the rock which accompanied them on their journeyings 'was Christ.' That is to say, Paul would have them see in the rock, or in the providential care of which it was the symbol, an expression of that Divine care and delivering purpose which found its summation and climax in the Messianic hope, and in some quarters in the figure of a Messiah. The men of that generation were then under the obligation of a double experience to reckon themselves as belonging to Moses to accept and obey his authority. But they rejected that obligation, and in more ways than one repudiated his authority. And the

judgments which befell them happened and were recorded not merely as the punishment of their sin, but τύποι ἡμῶν, so as to present a type of general experience. They had paid the penalty not only of actual sin, but of having 'eaten of the table of the Lord and [then] of the table of demons.'

The recital of their fate is followed by a digression of a kind characteristic of the Apostle, deducing general precepts from the particular instance. Then in *v.* 14 he firmly strikes again the key-note of the whole context; 'therefore, flee from idolatry.' Because idolatry in the form which he is contemplating, the conscious participation in idol-feasts, is something more decisive than 'bowing in the house of Rimmon.' It involves a partnership with evil powers, an incorporation among the comrades of the demons. And what he has to say here about the Lord's Supper actually appears as his next illustration of the consequence of participating in such sacred objects as the Cup and the Loaf to which a special religious significance has been given; and when he proceeds to adduce yet further illustrations, the first is taken from the Altar in the Jewish Temple. Those who eat of the sacrifices do thereby become Partners, Comrades, of the Altar. Obviously, this does not mean that they partake of the Altar nor yet of the sacrifices on the Altar; it is indeed the partaking of the sacrifices that leads to the partnership with the Altar. What is meant here can only be that they enter into such close contact and connection with the Altar that its holiness to a certain extent passes over to them[1]. To complete the thought Paul might have added a sentence corresponding to what appears below, 'Men cannot partake of what is on the Altar of God and also of what is on the table of demons.'

In the following verses Paul comes to the thesis, the

[1] So Weiss, *ad* 1 Cor. x. 18.

principle applying to the matter of meats offered to idols, which the foregoing analogies are intended to establish. What was true of the heavenly food in the desert, what is true of the Loaf and Wine in the Eucharist, and of the sacrifices on the Altar of the Jews is equally true of these idol-sacrifices. One does not need to raise the question whether there is any reality behind the idol, whether the gods of the heathen have any real existence. The fact is that those who offer these sacrifices believe themselves to be offering to demons, and those who partake of them enter into a partnership or fellowship with demons. And for those who have already partaken at the Table of the Lord, that is logically and spiritually unthinkable.

If now we return to *v.* 16 and look at it in the light of the whole context we see that it must predicate, as the result of the use made of the Loaf and of the Wine, a partnership or fellowship which has its character defined by the Body and by the Blood of Christ. It is not that men partake of the Body and the Blood, any more than they partake of the Altar or of the demons. It is more than doubtful whether the word *κοινωνία* can bear that meaning, and the parallel use of *κοινωνοί* in *vv.* 18 and 20 clearly points in another direction. What they partake of is the Loaf and the Cup, and the effect is to bring them into a certain relation with one another[1], and so to constitute a Sacred Society of Fellowship, or alternatively to confirm the self-consciousness of such a Society.

But this is further described as a *κοινωνία*, a Partnership or Fellowship, 'of the blood of Christ,' 'of the Body of Christ'; and it is by no means easy to be sure as to the precise significance of the genitive. Two

[1] So Lietzmann, *ad loc.* '*κοινωνία ἐστίν* is a pregnant expression for "is a means for the obtaining of fellowship."' Also J. Weiss, *ad loc.* 'it amounts to this, When we bless the Cup, we enter into the Fellowship.'

alternatives appear to be open. It may mean 'fellowship with the blood of Christ' in the sense of fellowship with Christ in his death; 'fellowship with the (living) Body of Christ' in the sense of fellowship with the Christ in the new life, through His living Body, the Church. It is in favour of this interpretation that it would assign to the Lord's Supper the same significance which we have found Paul attaching to Baptism, as a pictorial setting forth of that which has taken place through faith, the dying with Christ to the world and to sin, and the living again to God and to righteousness. If salvation as a personal experience arises from a faith-union with Christ which has these for its consequences, then a rite which was understood to depict and confirm fellowship with Christ in His death and in His life, would be of the highest value in the eyes of the Apostle.

But there is an alternative explanation, namely, that the κοινωνία or Fellowship is one which has been sealed by, and so owes its origin to, the blood or death of Christ, and further, one which is realised as a κοινωνία or Fellowship of the living Body of Christ. It is not a serious objection to this that it requires us to give slightly different force to the genitives in the two clauses. And the interpretation has this in its favour, that while the second clause ('Does not the Loaf represent the Fellowship of Christ's Body?') expresses the symbolism of the Loaf, the explanation of the first clause is in harmony with the words our Lord is reported to have used, 'This Cup is the new covenant in my blood.' These words really point to the establishment of a new People of God bound to Him and to one another by a covenant which was sealed by His death. And they are words which are found in the second passage of the same Epistle in which Paul refers to the Lord's Supper. It is possible that the passage in 1 Corinthians x. belongs to an earlier letter to Corinth; and that would go far to

account for the different treatment which the subject receives. But it may also be accounted for by the fact that the reference to the rite is introduced in the two passages for very different purposes. In the first it appears as part of the ground for an appeal to have nothing to do with idolatry and idolatrous feasts. In the second it is introduced as the ground, the sole ground, for an appeal to abandon the unbrotherly temper and the unbrotherly conduct which are destroying the true character of the Sacrament.

The interpretation of this second passage also has been seriously misled by its being studied without due regard to the context, and without any attempt to discover its bearing upon the ethical problem in hand. The verses in question (1 Cor. xi. 23–25) are embedded in a section (*vv.* 17–34) where the thought is as closely knit as anywhere in Paul. This will be seen in the first place if we recognise how certain ideas in the earlier verses find echo in the later. These people were gathering together for worship not to their advantage, but to their disadvantage (*v.* 17). And the disadvantage is described in *v.* 30 in terms of physical consequences of a serious kind. The question in *v.* 22, 'Have ye not houses for your eating and drinking?' finds an echo in *v.* 34, 'If anyone is hungry, let him eat at home.' And the suggestion that the people whose conduct is criticised do actually 'despise the Church of God' reappears in *v.* 29 where the same attitude or temper is described as 'not having a proper sense of the Body,' *i.e.* of the Church.

In the heart of this closely articulated passage describing the unhappy conditions and the still more unhappy consequences which had manifested themselves at Corinth, Paul sets what he obviously intends to be the effective ground for bringing about a change of temper and attitude. Whatever further interpreta-

tion he may have attached to the Lord's Supper the interpretation with which he is here concerned is clearly of a kind which should make such conduct impossible; and this must be firmly kept in view in every attempt to explain *vv.* 23–29.

These verses fall into three groups. In the first group (*vv.* 23–25) Paul recalls to the memory of the Corinthians the significant actions and words of the Lord, 'On the night in which He was betrayed He took a loaf, and after giving thanks He broke it, saying, "This means[1] my body broken for you; do this in memory of me." In the same way He took the Cup after supper, saying, "This Cup means the new covenant ratified by my blood; as often as ye drink it, do it in memory of me."'

In the second group (*vv.* 26, 27) Paul draws the inference which is to give to the rite the ethical application or sanction for the sake of which he introduces the narrative; and in the third group he draws the practical conclusion (*vv.* 28, 29), that before approaching this common meal a man should examine himself, and that in view of the danger lest in eating and drinking he may bring judgment upon himself, or in the words of *v.* 17 eat not to his advantage but to his loss.

Taking these three groups in the reverse order, the phrase *μὴ διακρίνων τὸ σῶμα* ('without a proper sense of the Body') in *v.* 29 indicates the principal matter concerning which a man is to examine himself. It is if he fails to discern the Body, if he eats without a proper sense of the Body that he incurs judgment. And by the Body is meant Christ's living Body, the Church. It is that failure to discern the Body which leads to his despising the Church (*v.* 22), and his want of respect

[1] Moffatt's translation of the Words of Institution. That the verb *can* stand for 'means,' 'represents' is clear from Gal. iv. 24, as well as from several passages in the Gospels. As Lietzmann says, 'It ought never to have been disputed.' That it *does* stand for 'means' is clear from the circumstances in which the words were first used.

for the Church is what is shown in his selfish and unbrotherly conduct. It follows that he is to examine himself to find whether he is in the right temper, whether he takes the right attitude towards his fellow-members in Christ. Only so can he safely partake of the Eucharist.

The line of the Apostle's thought finds striking illustration in the Parable of the man without a wedding garment (Mt. xxii. 11–13). That man was found to be without the wedding robe not because he did not possess one, possibly was too poor to have one, but because he refused to accept one. In common with his fellow-guests he had probably had the offer of a wedding robe as he passed through the vestibule of the banqueting hall. But he had refused, in an insolent and defiant way. He had some fancied grievance against his host, some sense of superiority to his fellow-guests, some temper which put him out of harmony with the occasion, and showed it by his sulky or insolent refusal to be robed like the others. His fate, to be cast into outer darkness, was just the outward expression of his inward condition; he was excluded because he had by his wilfulness excluded himself. He had shown that he had no sense of the Fellowship of which he was invited to form part.

'Let a man therefore examine himself,' and make sure that he realises the character of the Fellowship and responds to its claims upon him, and 'so let him eat.'

In the second group of verses Paul gives the only indication which the passage contains of the function he assigns to the Eucharist. That is not to say that he did not assign other functions to it; but it is here that we are to find his reason for introducing the narrative of the Institution. What follows serves to emphasise the very serious consequences of failure to do and to do rightly what is here set forth as the purpose of the rite.

In other words, the clause 'ye proclaim the Lord's death till he come' has to bear the entire weight of the ethical appeal.

For that reason it seems certainly necessary to give to the clause some meaning other and deeper than just a public testimony to the fact that Christ had died. That indeed has often been felt to be a curiously limited and inadequate significance to be the only one which Paul here attaches to the rite. And the more we reflect on the context in which he places it, the judgment quality which he finds in the rite, which he stresses and elaborates, and the ethical demand for which he finds here a sanction, the more clear does it become that something more is intended here than the mere proclamation or attestation of the historical fact that Christ died.

The clue to the further and deeper meaning of the clause is found in the closing words of the first group—'do this εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν,' and in the word ἀναξίως in the following verse. As to the former phrase, the commentators, considering its importance, have very little to say. The rendering in A.V. 'in remembrance of Me' seems, to say the least, inadequate. The Greek word which it would be natural to use in order to render our phrase 'in memory of' is not ἀνάμνησις but μνήμη. It is so used, *e.g.* by Epicurus: εἰς τὴν Μητροδώρου μνήμην—and writers such as Plato and Aristotle expressly distinguish μνήμη, 'memory,' from ἀνάμνησις, 'recollection,' or the act of recollection. The force of the phrase is therefore not 'with a view to preserving my memory' or even 'celebrating my memory' but 'with a view to recalling me.' That really was the primary purpose and function of the rite. It recalled Christ so vividly to memory that He was felt to be actually present. And it was this which gave numinous significance to the Loaf and the Wine by means of

which His followers re-constituted the scene which had been so familiar in the days of His flesh.

These words Paul has reported as having been used by the Lord Himself. In *v.* 26 he draws an inference of his own; the clue to its meaning lies in the word *ἀναξίως* in *v.* 27. It was possible to celebrate this rite either *ἀξίως* or *ἀναξίως*. And if as seems clear what Paul meant by celebrating it *ἀναξίως* was celebrating it in a temper alien from its meaning and purpose, then its true purpose could only be expressed by celebrating it in a temper harmonious with its meaning, an attitude of heart towards the other members of the Fellowship which would make it impossible to use the feast for mere self-gratification. To celebrate it so was to celebrate it *ἀξίως*, in a spirit worthy of its origin and its meaning. And when men celebrated it so, they 'proclaimed the Lord's death,' not merely as a fact of history, but with the meaning and force which they had found in it. They showed that one result of that death had been to establish a Society of which they were loyal members, manifesting consideration for others, unselfishness and a brotherly spirit. In view of the meaning and purpose thus inhering in the rite conduct such as that which St Paul was criticising would be impossible. You could not behave as you do if you remembered that the very purpose of the rite is to proclaim the death of One who by dying sealed a covenant relation of love between men as well as one of faith and love between God and man. It is here therefore that St Paul found the ethical sanction which his remonstrance required.

And that leads back to the first section of the central passage, the narrative of the original institution of the Supper in *vv.* 23–26, and specially to the words connected with the Cup. 'This cup means the new covenant ratified by my blood' (M.). As one of the implications of the old Covenant at Sinai had been found in

the constitution of a People, the People of God, so the new covenant carried with it the constitution of a new People, the People of God in Christ. And this People was represented by any group or society of believers met to recall Christ, to proclaim to one another and to the world outside the death of the Lord as the foundation of their Fellowship and the secret of their mutual love. The reality of their experience both past and present was attested by their attitude to one another as members of the same sacred Body. The blood of Christ, of which the Cup was the symbol, brought back to mind that necessary condition for the establishment of this Fellowship, His sacrificial death, that death wherein 'God commended his love to men.' No one could look on it without realising the utter inconsistency between partaking of that Cup and cherishing a selfish or unbrotherly attitude towards those 'for whom Christ died.'[1]

This is as far as St Paul's application of the rite to a particular moral situation carries us in seeking for the interpretation which he put upon it. It is obvious, however, that further implications were involved in the report which he gives of its institution. The Loaf itself, as we saw when examining x. 16, set forth in symbol that living Fellowship which the Master had established, a Fellowship of which He Himself formed a part, no less than His disciples who by responding to His self-manifestation had been united to Him and to one another[2]. He broke the Loaf. It was a poignant symbol of the impending breach in their fellowship, as well as of the breaking of His body on the cross. Yet the Loaf

[1] It is relevant to compare the ethical interpretation which Ignatius put upon the 'flesh' and 'blood'; *e.g.* 'Be renewed in faith which is the flesh of the Lord and in love which is the blood of Jesus Christ'—*Trall.* VIII. 1; cp. *Rom.* vii. 3.

[2] Compare a remark of Lütgert: 'the congregation is the circle of those who stand in fellowship with God and share that fellowship with one another as their highest gift.'

in its broken state was 'for you' (τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν)[1]. He 'loved me, and gave himself for me.' The very breaking made it available, was necessary to make it available, for all. It was by being broken that the Bread from heaven could become the nourishment of each and every one. St Paul does not give any expression to this idea of spiritual nourishment through the sacrament, the feeding upon Christ by faith, the quickening and strengthening of Life through renewed and vividly realised fellowship with Him. But it is difficult to believe that it could be absent from his thought.

Neither do we find in the Apostle's references to the Eucharist any suggestion that he assigned to it any sacrificial character. There are, however, two passages, which, read in the light of certain post-apostolic references, may reflect the sacrificial idea in a special form. It is becoming clear that according to sub-primitive conceptions the Lord's Supper was regarded as giving the opportunity to offer a symbolic sacrifice. For therein the Church offered itself to God. And inasmuch as it believed itself to be 'the Body of Christ,' the sacrifice could be regarded as a sacrifice of His body. It seems indeed probable that we are to find in this conception the true explanation of all the language which down to the end of the second century connects the idea of sacrifice with the Eucharist. Such a connection would be greatly facilitated if the bread and wine which were set apart for use in the sacramental rite had originally formed part of a general contribution, the greater part of which went to provide a common meal. Members of the community would see in the

[1] It is not possible to decide whether St Paul wrote the word 'broken' as part of the Words of Institution. The probability is that he did not. But the word was very early supplied, the idea being indeed involved in the action. It had, however, the effect of narrowing or concentrating the significance upon the crucified body of Christ, to the exclusion of that living personality which is the 'Bread from heaven.'

Loaf and in the Wine what they themselves had given, a natural symbol of themselves. And they as a whole were the Body of Christ. The primary symbolism of the Loaf was probably the oneness of the members with one another and with their Divine Head[1]. The breaking of the Loaf would then symbolise the sacrifice or offering of Christ's living Body, the Church. This conception persists at least as far as Augustine. 'This,' he says, 'is the Christian sacrifice, the many become one body in Christ. And it is this that the Church celebrates by means of the sacrifice of the altar, familiar to the faithful, when it is shown to her that in what she offers she herself is offered.'[2]

There are two passages in St Paul which at least leave room for this conception of sacrifice in connection with the Lord's Supper. In Romans xii. 1 he calls on Christians to present their bodies as a living sacrifice, and describes that as their 'immaterial Service.' In Romans xv. 16 he recalls the grace bestowed upon him by God whereby he is a priest of Christ Jesus to the Gentiles (the wonder of it!), ministering as a priest (no material sacrifice, but) the Gospel of God, in order that the offering up (not of any symbolic sacrifice, but) of the Gentiles might be acceptable, having been consecrated by the Holy Spirit. No doubt the triumphant consciousness which here finds expression, would come to its ultimate realisation in the ethical working out of self-surrender to God on the part of the Gentiles. But this priestly consciousness in Christ's Minister would

[1] Cp. *Didaché*, ix. 4; Cyprian, *Ep.* 62, par. 14: 'in which very sacrament our people are shown to be made one; so that in like manner as many grains collected and ground and mixed together in one mass make one bread, so in Christ who is the heavenly bread, we may know that there is one body with which our number is joined and united.'

[2] See Bp. Gore, *The Body of Christ*, p. 203 ff. (with further quotations from St Augustine); F. C. Burkitt in *The Interpreter*, 1921, p. 179 ff.; also Swete, *JTS*, iii. 164.

find its most natural explanation if (in view of the later evidence) we referred it to occasions when St Paul, presiding at the Lord's Table, acted as the mouthpiece of the Body of Christ when, having been cleansed by the word, consecrated by the Spirit, it solemnly offered itself in sacrifice to God.

But if we confine ourselves to what St Paul expressly says upon the subject it would appear that in the Corinthian Epistles we catch Christian thought about the Lord's Supper at a very early stage in its development, when it focused on one central idea as yet unanalysed. It was what has since been described as the Real Presence. The use of the Loaf and of the Wine according to the example and instruction of the Lord brought Him so vividly into consciousness that His continual presence, which was a matter of faith, became a fact of experience; brought Him as He was known, 'Christ and in Him One who has been crucified,' within the field of consciousness. He was really present with His Church, and nothing that He had ever done for His disciples while upon earth was excluded from the possibilities of such an experience.

How profound and even overwhelming Paul felt this experience to be is shown by his belief that a definite 'holiness' in the Old Testament sense of the word came to be attached to the rite. A man incurred real danger, danger to health and even to life, by participating in it rashly or wrongly. He made himself responsible for, or to, 'the body and blood of Christ'; He sinned against 'Christ and him crucified.' The Lord's Supper had the same judgment-force as the Word or the Gospel. And for the same reason. Each of them was calculated to convey so penetrating a sense of the unmerited and redeeming love of God that it acted to the dividing asunder of them that were being saved and them that were being lost. And it would appear that Paul believed

that illustrations of physical consequences corresponding to such a judgment had fallen within his observation, or at least come to his knowledge. From this it was only a step, and a natural one, though it was one which Paul did not himself take, to transfer to the symbols themselves the qualities of that which they symbolised.

On the other hand, right use of the Eucharist, the use of it in a spirit consonant with its origin and its purpose, both expressed and confirmed the experience of Fellowship, of Oneness in and with Christ, of mutual articulation as members of the living Body, a Body which had Christ for its head.

The important thing is that the criterion of right or wrong in the use of the sacrament was the character of the ethical reaction to the significance of Christ and Him crucified.

VIII. THE EXPRESSION OF LIFE IN CHARACTER AND CONDUCT

It may be possible to construct a system of Christian ethics, and to such a system the writings of St Paul would no doubt make a considerable and important contribution. But it would be a mistake to assume or suggest that he sets forth such a system, or indeed betrays any consciousness that a system is necessary. And this is the more noteworthy seeing that if he had any acquaintance with contemporary Greek thought he must have been aware of more than one systematic treatment of the science of ethics. Yet he neither alludes to any system nor tries to produce one of his own. He betrays no interest in the much debated question of the supreme good. He offers no discussion of virtue, nor any classification of virtues. He could hardly fail to be familiar with the accepted list of 'cardinal virtues,' fortitude, temperance, prudence and justice, which

later Christian writers adopted as the framework of their system. And if he makes allusion to only one of these, ignoring the others, if he attempts no corresponding analysis, it is because he approaches the whole subject in a different way. His way is not speculative but practical. He registers the results in conduct and character of the Life which issue from faith-union with Christ; or he throws into the form of advice and precept what he sees to be the necessary because natural expression of that Life in character and conduct.

Paul was thus true to his own principle: 'the written code killeth.' The code which in the form of the Jewish Law had proved 'a law that leads to sin and death' was something from which Christ's disciples had been emancipated. Paul had no intention that another written code should take its place. What had taken its place for the Christian was the 'governing principle of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus' (Ro. viii. 2). The Spirit who had created the new Life in Christ Jesus continued to be the normative influence in its growth and ethical expression. Ideally at least the character and conduct of a Christian were the spontaneous outcome of the Life. It was by no mere metaphor that they were described as the fruit or harvest of the Spirit, or 'the harvest of righteousness which is by Christ Jesus' (Phil. i. 11).

In thus recognising and insisting upon the closest connection between religion and morality Paul was entirely true to the Jewish tradition in which he had been brought up. Whatever tendency there may have been in the priestly school at Jerusalem to exaggerate the importance and the value of ritual, there could be no doubt as to the bearing of the prophetic teaching. Throughout that was heard the sustained demand for character and conduct corresponding to the revealed character of God. To do justly, to love mercy and to

walk humbly with his God, the combination of religious fellowship with a high ethical standard, described the supreme duty of man. In Judaism at its best religion was looked to to produce 'the fruits of righteousness.'

It was not so in the Hellenic world. There religion and ethics were distinct and separate. The gods of Greek mythology were not themselves examples of morality. There could be no connection between human goodness and beings notoriously capable of caprice, duplicity and unfaithfulness. The Oriental mystery-cults on the other hand did make a certain ethical demand upon their worshippers, though it is by no means easy to ascertain how large an area of conduct it covered, or how far it extended beyond ritual qualification for admission to the mysteries. But here again there was no relation between the demand and the character of the god or gods. It cannot indeed be said that any particular character attached to the god or the hero of a mystery-cult. He was simply the hero of a story. He had passed through certain tragic and triumphant experiences. Neither his character nor his conduct were of any concern to his worshippers. Thus 'the ethical interest of the mysteries was but slight.'[1]

On the other hand, there was in the first century a widespread desire for moral reformation. And the lines and implications of such a reformation were provided through the revival of the Stoic and Cynic philosophies. 'The sublime intuitions of Plato had been found too vague and unsubstantial, and the subtle analyses of Aristotle too hard and cold to satisfy the natural craving of man for some guidance which should teach him how to live and die.'[2] Yet Stoicism itself was not a pure product of Greek thought. In it we have probably a result of the contact between the religious consciousness

[1] Kirsopp Lake.

[2] Lightfoot, *Comm. on Philippians*, p. 272.

of the East and the intellectual culture of the West. In the appeal to conscience, the summons to take life seriously, and the high moral ideals of the school we may perhaps see some heritage of Hebrew prophecy disseminated through channels which are now beyond discovery.

In this field also St Paul shows his affiliation to Jewish rather than to Hellenic thought, and in particular to the teaching of the great prophets who found in the nature and character of God at once the summons to ethical effort and its norm. 'In the face of Christ' God had illuminated men's hearts to give them the knowledge of His glory (2 Cor. iv. 6), where the meaning of 'glory' is passing or has passed from external splendour to ethical perfection. And the fuller and deeper knowledge carried the old imperative into deeper levels of character. The principle embodied in the Old Testament saying, 'Ye shall be holy, for I am holy' had been applied at first in a predominantly external and ritual sense. It was now applied to the development of character in essential harmony with the character of God. In practice, of course, it was not the character of God but the character or example of Christ which was presented as the norm. The goal set before the Christian Community was to 'come to the measure of the fulness of Christ.' The goal set before the individuals of whom the Community was composed, was to be 'conformed to the image of Christ.'

The interlocking or interpenetration of the religious and the ethical is one of the most characteristic features in St Paul's writings. A conspicuous illustration of it is seen in Philippians ii., where the fullest exposition of the Incarnation which he gives is introduced to support a sustained appeal for conformity to an ethical ideal. The act of Christ in humbling Himself to be found in fashion as a man is presented not as a proposition in

theology but as a reason why His followers should look not on their own things but on the things of others. Similarly, the narrative of the Institution of the Eucharist might never have been written had not the Apostle seen in the meaning of the rite a great and sufficient motive for brotherly conduct within the community. Even the elaborate exposition of the resurrection and the celebration of coming victory over death does not close with the triumphant note, 'O death, where is thy sting?' but with what sometimes strikes our ear as an anti-climax: 'Wherefore, be steadfast, unmoveable, always abounding in the work of the Lord.' In Ephesians iv. the doctrinal summons to put off the old man and put on the new finds an immediate interpretation (*vv.* 25 ff.) in a series of ethical precepts, some of them of a quite elementary character.

In view of these passages and others of similar import it is not too much to say that this interpenetration of the religious and the ethical, this valuation of truth for the sake of its practical efficiency, is characteristic of Pauline thought. But we can go further, and recognise that it has its natural source in the Apostle's fundamental interpretation of Christianity. As we have seen, the condition on man's side which is essential for the appropriation of salvation is faith, and the faith to which St Paul assigns this function is 'faith which finds expression in love.' In that single phrase we have the assertion of the inherent relation between faith as a human energy directed towards God and love as a human energy directed towards God and towards human individuals and human society[1]. The root-principle of Paul's religion is thus indissolubly united to his root-principle of morality. The love which serves is a function of the faith which saves.

[1] Compare the combination of the two words in 1 Thess. iii. 5; Philem. 5; Eph. vi. 23.

(i) THE SOURCE OR SANCTION OF ETHICAL ASPIRATION

So far at least as ethics is concerned with relationships St Paul found in Agapé the chief source and the sanction both of the standard which he set up and of the separate precepts which he lays down. The word Agapé therefore is of equal importance in his thinking with the word πίστις, and is deserving of equally careful study[1]. The Greek language has no fewer than three words (ἔρως, φιλία and ἀγάπη) all of which can be and generally are represented by the single English word 'love.' And the Greeks drew a clear and sharp distinction between ἔρως on the one hand and φιλία or ἀγάπη on the other. For they recognised the distinction which is obscured in our language and usually overlooked in our thought, the distinction between love which seeks to possess and love which seeks to give. They consistently reserved the word ἐρᾶσθαι therefore to describe the love that seeks, craves and in its baser manifestations lusts; φιλεῖν and ἀγαπᾶν they kept for the other aspect of love, φιλεῖν for the friendship which involves mutual consideration and affection, ἀγαπᾶν for the intenser form which finds its truest satisfaction in giving and in the sacrifice of self.

The word Agapé, the substantive, is not found in classical Greek, but only in the Septuagint, the New Testament and subsequent Christian literature. It is said to be (not the source of the verb, but) 'a back formation from the verb, originating, doubtless, in a restricted dialectic area.'[2] That dialectic area may well have been the one in which the LXX version of the Old Testament was produced. In that version it appears

[1] See Sanday and Headlam, p. 374; Lütgert, *Die Liebe im N.T.*; Eduard Meyer, *Ursprung*, III. 437.

[2] Moulton and Milligan, *VNT*, *sub voc.*

with special frequency in the Song of Solomon. And it is not difficult to see how exactly in translating that book this word would commend itself to the translators. The Song owed its place in the Hebrew Canon to the belief that the love which is there depicted and celebrated is not carnal but spiritual. To have used the word ἔρως would have been fatal to this interpretation. So that, although it might be too much to suggest that the translators of the Song coined the word, it is not difficult to see why they adopted it and used it exclusively. It occurs twice also in the *Book of Wisdom*, once in a passage where might be traced an anticipation of the thought of St Paul, ἀγάπη δὲ τήρησις νόμων αὐτῆς (*scil.*, of wisdom). Found only twice in the Synoptic Gospels, and not at all in the Acts, it appears with marked frequency in all the Epistles (with the exception of the Epistle of James), and frequently in the writings ascribed to St John. On the other hand, the word ἔρως is not found either in the LXX or in the New Testament, and φιλία only once (Jas. iv. 4), though the verb (φιλεῖν) is not infrequent. The word for 'love' in the Christian sense is Agapé, and it connotes something radically different from, even antithetical to, ἔρως.

The best corrective to the confusion of thought and even misunderstanding which often arise from the failure of our language to distinguish two such diverse conceptions is to bear in mind the conclusion arrived at by an authoritative teacher of philosophy.

'The result of the whole investigation would seem to come to this, that it is by love only that we can enter into that harmony with others which alone constitutes our own reality and the reality of the universe.'

'Our conclusion then is extravagant enough. Love is not only the highest thing in the universe, but the only thing. Nothing else has true reality: everything

which has partial reality has it only as an imperfect form of the one perfection.'[1]

St Paul understood that this emotional force known as Agapé was released in men in response to the same force issuing from the heart of God. The centre of the Christian experience was interpreted as due to the forthcoming of this Divine Force. The death of Christ had for its purpose to accredit the reality of love in God, to bring it home to men, to persuade them to believe and accept it (Ro. v. 8; cp. 1 Jo. iv. 9). It was due to God's 'great love towards us' that those who had been dead in trespasses and sins were now alive together with Christ (Eph. ii. 4). And it was by the alchemy of the same love, which had flooded their hearts, that the tribulations of life were surely transmuted into hope which brings no disappointment (Ro. v. 3). And the same great quality radiated from Christ, and specially from Christ as crucified. In one of his rare touches of individualism St Paul acclaims the fact that the life he now lives is lived 'by the faith of the Son of God who *loved me* and gave himself for me' (Gal. ii. 20). But it was the same love of Christ which embraced the corporate whole; 'Christ *loved the Church* and gave himself for it' (Eph. v. 25). The whole of Christian experience had its origin in a movement of the divine heart towards men which is described as ἀγάπη. 'Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us' (1 Jo. iv. 10).

It was no mere sentiment therefore, no mere emotion, disposition or feeling to which Paul appealed when he set Agapé at the centre of his ethical system. It was the same compelling and controlling force which had moved God to give His Son. It could be trusted to move men to all needed subordination and sacrifice of self.

[1] See J. E. McTaggart, *Studies in Hegelian Cosmology*, c. 9.

Paul is not only clear, he is emphatic, as to the function of Agapé in the moral life of relationships. It is both central and all-comprehensive. 'All the law is fulfilled in one word, even in this, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself' (Gal. v. 14). 'He that loveth another has fulfilled the law' (Ro. xiii. 8). 'Above all these things put on Agapé which gives cohesion to the perfect life' (Col. iii. 14)[1].

As to the source or origin of this Agapé the Apostle puts his thought in various forms. It is the natural self-expression of faith, the faith which saves. It is part of the 'harvest of the Spirit,' the innermost result of the Spirit's working in the heart, the 'love of the Spirit' (Ro. xv. 30). It follows on the direct operation of God: 'Ye are taught of God (*θεοδίδακτοί ἐστε*) to love one another' (1 Thess. iv. 9). The direction which it takes is first of all towards God and Christ. Paul nowhere urges this, unless there be an exception in 2 Thess. iii. 5. He assumes it as characteristic of Christians. They are 'those that love God' (Ro. viii. 28; cp. 1 Cor. viii. 3), 'those that love our Lord Jesus in sincerity' (Eph. vi. 24). And conversely, the absence of this love is fatal to any claim to be a Christian: 'A ban be on him that loves not the Lord' (1 Cor. xvi. 22)—a sentence the bearing of which on Paul's teaching in general is too often overlooked.

Concerning any practical applications of this love to God and Christ, Paul has little or nothing to say. It is the practical application of Agapé as affecting the Christian's relations to his fellow-men that is so variously exhibited in his letters, and because of its bearing on these relations that he rejoices perpetually to recognise its presence and its activity among those to whom he writes—among the Thessalonians (1 i. 3),

[1] Or, according to the reading of some MSS, 'which gives cohesion to the Unity.'

the Corinthians (2 viii. 7), the Ephesians (i. 25), the Colossians (i. 4) and in Philemon (5). He urges upon the Romans (xiii. 8), the Galatians (v. 13) and the Philippians (i. 9) that they should 'abound' in this quality. For the sacred Society is 'rooted and grounded in love.' Love is the basis on which it rests, the soil from which it draws its nourishment.

It is this centrality and comprehensiveness of Agapé in the development of the ideal character which accounts for the supremacy among the Christian *χαρίσματα* or grace-gifts which Paul claims for it in 1 Corinthians xiii. In view of the popular estimate which was evidently put upon these gifts by the members of the Christian Church it was not a little audacious to declare that Prophesying would be superseded, that Tongues should cease, that Gnosis or higher knowledge should lose its importance, and that Love alone would remain. For it was evidently in these quasi-ecstatic phenomena that the community recognised the charter of its Divine character and many individual Christians the proof that they had the Spirit. With these gifts the very existence of the community seemed to be bound up. And Paul's definite subordination of tongues, of prophecy, even of faith, to love, while it must have been startling indeed to his readers, testifies eloquently to the importance he attached to the moral life and character of which Agapé was the spring. The description he gives of it in *vv.* 4–7 goes far to explain how he expected it to function in moralising the relations of life. 'Love is long-tempered; love does kind things, is free from envy. Love makes no parade, gives itself no airs, never misbehaves; does not pursue its own interests, is not irritable, does not keep a reckoning of wrongs, does not take pleasure in others' evil, but shares in the joy of goodness. Love is always slow to expose, quick to believe, always hoping, always patient.' That Paul believed this to be a just

characterisation of the quality which moved the heart of God towards men, which might and did move the hearts of believing men towards one another, explains the supremacy he assigns to Agapé and the saving function he claims for 'the faith that finds expression in love.'

(ii) THE GUIDING PRINCIPLE OF CONSISTENCY APPLIED IN PERSONAL MORALITY

Before examining the applications of this emotional force to details of conduct, it will be well to consider a principle of a different order to which Paul appeals, particularly as a sanction for personal morality. It is not easy to describe, but for the moment we may speak of it as the principle of consistency, or conversely the irrationality of conduct which contradicts the Christian experience. 'If (as is the case) we are alive by the Spirit, by the Spirit let us walk.' 'If (as is the case) ye be risen with Christ, seek the things that are above.' 'If Christ be in you, the body is dead because of sin.' If you are πνευματικοί, definitely raised to the plane of spirit, you cannot without self-contradiction do the deeds of the flesh. If you have been partakers of the table of the Lord, that closes to you the table of demons. If your whole personality belongs to Christ, you cannot give even your body to immorality.

This principle, of which these are only a few illustrations among many, is similar to the one expressed in the familiar lines:

> I have seen higher, holier things than these;
> And therefore must to these refuse my heart.

Its application is found in Paul's handling of questions of personal morality, and specially in connection with 'sins of the flesh.' But it provides also the sanction for his positive appeals for a high standard of personal life.

The will of God which the renewed mind is able to ascertain includes all that is noble, pleasing to Him and ideal (Ro. xii. 2). The things that are true, honourable, just, pure, worthy of love and praise, these are the things which Christians are to keep in mind (Phil. iv. 8). 'Ye once were darkness, but now are light in the Lord.... The fruit of light is all manner of goodness and righteousness and truth' (Eph. v. 8, 9).

The passage in Colossians (iii. 1–8) from which one of these quotations is made is probably as illuminating as any: 'If ye be risen with Christ, seek the higher things, think the higher things.... Slay, therefore those members that belong to earth, immorality, impurity, base passion, evil desire and grasping greed. Strip off all these things, anger, rage, malice, abusive speech, foul talk.'

This passage brings out three points of importance.

It illustrates the principle of consistency. If the experience of salvation is real, it will be only natural to care for things which belong to the higher life, to avoid those which belong to the lower.

It is clear that the word μέλη, 'members,' is used not literally, of the members or limbs of the body but metaphorically. As our Lord in the Sermon on the Mount said, 'If thine eye be evil,' referring to the evil disposition which employs the eye as its instrument, so Paul says, 'Slay your members which belong to the earth,' using the word to signify those dispositions or inclinations of the mind or will which use the body as instruments of the personality. This is important in the interpretation of the passage in 1 Corinthians (vi. 12–18), in which St Paul gives a fuller exposition than elsewhere of the grounds for reprobating sexual immorality. There also he is thinking of μέλη and of σῶμα not so much in their physical connotation as in their function of giving

expression to the personality[1]. This sin of fornication differs from every other kind of sin in that it involves a man's whole personality. The coming together of man and woman is not merely a physical union, but a psychological blending. And a transient union implies the disintegration of personality. For the Christian it also involves an impossible contradiction; for he is joined to the Lord, and therefore 'one spirit with him.'

The third point on which the Colossian passage throws light is the number and variety of the forms of conduct and disposition which involved self-contradiction for the Christian. Along with it we may take the catalogue of the 'works of the flesh' in Galatians v. 19–21, so far as they refer to breaches of personal morality. Of 'sins of the flesh' as we commonly understand the phrase, the Galatian list adds 'drunkenness' and 'drunken revelries' to the 'fornication' and 'impurity' common to both lists.

To include these four in the list of things to be reprobated and shunned by the Christian meant little less than a revolution in the ethical outlook of the world outside of Judaism. What lay behind these prohibitions was really the discovered dignity of the Christian personality. For him who knew that the body was for the Lord and the Lord was for the body *μέθαι* and *κῶμοι* were impossible; still more clearly so *πορνεία* and *ἀκαθαρσία*. But neither form of self-indulgence had been condemned or even criticised by the ethical teachers of Greece. At the best they counselled 'moderation' in such self-indulgence, and at the worst they

[1] Joh. Weiss, *ad loc.*, after a careful examination concludes that *σῶμα* here 'almost means personality'; also *Urchristentum*, p. 453, 'The "body," as he understands it, is not only the material body, the dwelling-place of the soul destined to decay, but the imperishable form of the personality.'

tolerated even graver forms of sexual vice, such as those St Paul refers to in Romans ii.[1]

The private life of citizens of the Hellenic world reflected the absence of any conscience or authoritative teaching on these matters. 'The Virtue of Chastity was confined to narrow limits, such as loyalty to the husband on the part of the wife. Men were under no obligations, except that of avoiding adultery or dishonour to a neighbour's family. It is hard to find passages in pre-Christian Greek literature where loose intercourse is looked upon as in itself a moral offence. Sexual indulgence stood upon exactly the same moral level as eating and drinking. Philosophy made no attempt to alter this moral attitude. Even the Stoics, with their relatively ascetic morality, made no effort to combat the sensuality of the time.'[2]

To the same effect is the picture given by Dobschütz: 'The worst feature was morality in the strict sense. There were, no doubt, many houses where honourable family life was maintained. At the same time it cannot be denied that unparalleled shamelessness had spread over wide circles. Unutterable things were done without any secrecy. Divorces were of daily occurrence, adultery common, and unchastity considered no sin. Human life was little valued. Not a few were sacrificed to magical rites. Poison removed the inconvenient. The philosophy of a Seneca reveals the moral bankruptcy even of the best.'[3]

When Paul, in a situation which can be so described, issued the command, φεύγετε τὴν πορνείαν (1 Cor. vi. 18), it meant nothing less than a revolution in ethical ideas as well as in ethical practice. And it was

[1] See J. W. Hunkin, *JTS*, XXVII. 282: 'it is not sufficiently realised that fornication is not only made light of in the comedies, but is condoned, with very few exceptions, even by the serious thinkers of the period.'

[2] See W. H. S. Jones, *Greek Morality*, pp. 118, 119.

[3] Dobschütz, *Christian Life in the Primitive Church*, p. 367.

a revolution directed against practices which were sanctioned by the whole estimate of women in the ancient world, entrenched in the selfishness of men, and not open to control except by the conscience of the individual. At the back of the prohibition lay a new respect for the individual personality, and a profound conviction as to the level to which it had been raised by the fact of Christ. The grounds on which Paul urges it are, 'Your body is a temple of the Holy Spirit within you'; 'Ye are not your own, ye have been bought with a price'; 'Glorify God with your body.'

The possibility must not be ignored that a similar if not identical standard of morals had already found some recognition in the Hellenic world through the influence of the Jewish synagogues. 'The Jewish synagogue had already drawn up a catechism for proselytes and made morality the condition of religion; it had already given a training for religion. Christianity took this up, deepened it, and freed it from all externalism.'[1] That catechism, so far as it can be recovered from the *Didaché*, goes to show that alike in regard to the standard of moral life, and to its detailed application, St Paul was not without example and support in Judaism[2].

And the Christian community as a whole accepted the new standard, and strove to live up to it. As Harnack says, 'Above all, the conflict undertaken by Christianity was one against the sins of the flesh, such as fornication, adultery and unnatural vices. In the Christian communities monogamy was absolutely held to be the one permissible union of the sexes.' Towards the end of the primitive Christian era Aristides, describing the life of the Christians to the Emperor, can say: 'The Christians...do not commit adultery nor

[1] Harnack, *Expansion of Christianity*, I. 488.

[2] Cp. *Did.* II. 2, *οὐ μοιχεύσεις, οὐ παιδοφορήσεις, οὐ πορνεύσεις, οὐ φονεύσεις τέκνον ἐν φθορᾷ.*

fornication, they do not bear false witness, they do not deny a deposit, nor covet what is not theirs. Their wives, O King, are pure as virgins, and their daughters modest; their men abstain from all unlawful wedlock and from all impurity.' Even admitting that Aristides is generalising and overlooking the exceptions, it is clear that the new standard was definitely accepted as the Christian ideal, and conformed to by a large proportion of Christians.

The dignifying of the personality carried with it the dignifying of the body as the organ of its physical activities. Christians looked forward to its 'redemption' as necessary to the completion of their 'adoption' (Ro. viii. 23), and saw in it the basis for the glorious body that was to be (Phil. iii. 21). Hence Paul deprecated any mishandling of the body (Col. ii. 23), excluding both the practice and the theory of asceticism. 'Why submit to rules and regulations like "Hands off this," "Taste not that," "Touch not this," referring to things that perish by being used?'[1] Life lived under such precepts was in contradiction to Christian freedom, a freedom which knew only one limitation, that freedom should be used not as 'an opening for the flesh' (Gal. v. 13), but always for the general good (1 Cor. vi. 12).

(iii) THE INCOMPATIBILITY OF THE SPIRITUAL AND THE CARNAL

St Paul finds yet another base for ethical precepts in the principle laid down by him in Romans viii. 6, inadequately rendered in the Authorised Version, 'To be carnally minded is death; to be spiritually minded is life and peace': *τὸ φρόνημα τῆς σαρκὸς θάνατος, τὸ δὲ φρόνημα τοῦ πνεύματος ζωὴ καὶ εἰρήνη*, of which the true English equivalent is 'the material point of view is death, but the spiritual point of view is life and peace.'

[1] So Moffatt.

It would be difficult to state more emphatically the supremacy of the spiritual side of life, the recognition of which so revolutionises human standards and conduct. The ethical inferences to be drawn from this principle are equally numerous and penetrating. It definitely makes the value of the individual to consist in personality, not in wealth or rank or power. It defines the legitimate sphere of ambition. It changes the character of human relationships. 'From henceforth know we no man as merely human.' Each has also a spiritual side, an eternal value, for his neighbour. The thought of the Apostle is here in closest harmony with that of his Master, however different may be the forms of expression. The absolute incommensurability of the spiritual side of life is what Jesus sought to set forth in many a saying and parable.

Of this principle St Paul makes a special application which is of great importance. It is contained in his diagnosis of what he calls πλεονεξία and the concrete forms it takes[1]. The English renderings of the word which are commonly given, 'covetousness' or 'greed' or 'avarice,' are unsatisfactory, since they all tend to limit its meaning to greed for money or property. The word actually denotes colossal selfishness, that insatiableness which marks one who neither fears God nor regards man. And it is an indication of fine ethical insight in the Apostle that he sets πλεονεξία in such close connection as he does with immorality on the one hand and idolatry on the other. For sexual immorality is to be repudiated not merely because it brings pollution on body and spirit (2 Cor. vii. 1), but because it is the expression of callous indifference to the rights and dignity of another personality. It even seems sometimes to gain an added zest from this defiant assertion of self. And the connection between πλεονεξία

[1] See Trench's *Synonyms*, 1. 94; Lightfoot, on Col. iii. 5.

and 'idolatry' (Col. iii. 5; cp. Eph. v. 5) shows that the meaning of idolatry for St Paul was far from being exhausted in 'bowing down to stocks and stones.' It went much deeper to include that satisfaction with, and absorption in, the material things of life, which amounts to worship. πλεονεξία is the internal disposition, εἰδωλολατρεία the external conduct which has its root in 'a material point of view.' It is the direct antithesis of that Agapé which Jesus had called for as the all-essential moral energy or quality. 'Ye cannot serve God and Mammon.'

(iv) STANDARDS OF ETHICAL DUTY

So far as the standard or norm of Christian conduct is concerned, St Paul relies very largely upon the power inherent in the Christian to discover what is for him the will of God; 'be transformed by the renewing of your mind that you may discover what is the will of God, the Good, the Pleasing and the Ideal' (Ro. xii. 2)[1]. But even the renewed mind was not left without guidance. There were certain ideals already defined as consistent with the Divine Will or illustrated by examples. The will of the Christian being directed towards these would escape all danger of misusing its liberty.

St Paul assumes throughout the continued validity of the Jewish moral law, the prohibition of idolatry, murder, theft, adultery, covetousness. The Jews, as he said, possessed 'the embodiment of knowledge and truth' in their law (Ro. ii. 20). But in spite of several illustrations which he draws from the Old Testament, especially from the Book of Proverbs, and two specific

[1] 'The new life is not the copy of any model, not the dead fulfilling of any law, but springs out of the fellowship of God and Christ, an ever new, original and individual product of the Spirit, a free creation of religious inwardness (Innerlichkeit) which derives its law out of itself'—Weiss, *Urchristentum*, p. 433.

commandments quoted from Exodus and from Deuteronomy (Eph. vi. 2; 1 Cor. ix. 9) there is a rather marked absence of direct appeal to the Old Testament in support of ethical precept.

He is ready to appeal wherever possible to a remembered saying of Jesus, and evidently attaches to it an absolute authority (1 Cor. vii. 10, ix. 14; cp. 1 Thess. iv. 15). In a neighbouring passage there is a distinct note of regret at the absence of any corresponding word of Jesus. 'I have no commandment from the Lord, but I give my opinion.'

Apart from direct quotations there are many echoes of the Master's ethical teaching. It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that much in the twelfth chapter of the Romans is inspired by reminiscences of that teaching. But even more remarkable are the passages where the thought is the same though the language is quite different. 'Why do you not rather put up with injury? Why do you not rather accept loss?' (1 Cor. vi. 7) summarises in a striking way familiar teaching in the Sermon on the Mount. 'He that eateth and drinketh unworthily eateth and drinketh condemnation to himself,' that is, he that partakes in a spirit unworthy of the occasion, provides a pregnant interpretation of the Parable of the Wedding Garment. Such sayings as 'That we may not shock them' (Mt. xvii. 27) and possibly 'Thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness' (Mt. iii. 15) find frequent illustrations in what Mr Montefiore has called 'the principle of not giving needless offence which is used with great power and insight by St Paul.' And the Apostle might have found authority for his fundamental principle of the inherent relation between faith and conduct in Matthew vii. 21–23, 'Depart from me ye workers of iniquity.' 'They that do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God.'

Besides precept St Paul sets example as a norm of Christian conduct. In one passage (Eph. v. 1) he boldly calls on Christians to be 'imitators of God as his beloved children'; though the context appears to limit the precept to a certain field wherein the imitation is to be practised—'forgiving one another as God for Christ's sake forgave you,' and 'walk in love.'

The example of Christ Himself is more freely appealed to (Ro. xv. 7; Eph. v. 2, 25, 29; Col. iii. 13; 1 Thess. i. 6). And alongside the formula ἐν Χριστῷ we find the significant phrase κατὰ Χριστόν as a norm of Christian conduct: 'May God grant you to be in harmony with one another in Christ's way' (Ro. xv. 5; cp. Col. ii. 8). And St Paul reproaches himself that in his 'boasting' he has been speaking as a fool and 'not according to Christ,' that is, not following the example of the Lord's humility (2 Cor. xi. 17). 'Receive one another as Christ also received you' contains a further reminiscence of our Lord's bearing towards men. The question has been raised whether in such passages St Paul is not referring to the glorified Christ. But the character of the imitation which is called for seems to put it beyond doubt that it is the example of the historical Jesus that he had in view. And it follows that St Paul could assume in those to whom he wrote some adequate acquaintance with the character and teaching of the Master.

The Apostle further calls on his converts to take himself for an example, or chronicles the fact that they did so (1 Thess. i. 6; 1 Cor. xi. 1). In 1 Corinthians xiv. 16 he seems to suggest that he is sending Timothy for this purpose, that he may remind his converts of Paul's 'ways in Christ' with a view to their being followed; and in 2 Thess. iii. 7–9 he invites specific imitation of his own industry and toil.

Standards of a different kind are suggested by

references to 'that which is fitting' or not fitting (Ro. i. 28), or 'becoming' (Col. iii. 18; Eph. v. 4), or 'decorous,' in good taste (Ro. xiii. 13; 1 Cor. vii. 35; 1 Thess. iv. 12). 'Let not vice or impurity or rapaciousness be so much as named among you, as becomes God's people, nor yet indecent, frivolous or flippant talk, things that are unbecoming.' That is to say, Paul counts on an instinctive standard of propriety which will lead Christians to refrain from what is undesirable, unsuitable, even when it is not expressly forbidden, to do what is 'good' even when it is not expressly enjoined. What he sought from Philemon, for example, was not anything that was covered by express commandment. It was something that was 'befitting.' And Paul's method was to make clear to Philemon the moral and spiritual conditions, and then leave him to deduce for himself the conduct that would become a Christian. Thus, as Dr Tennant has said, 'The Christian ideal of perfection in character and conduct is unique. It is the "good" rather than the "right." This ideal contains emotional as well as volitional elements; includes the ethically beautiful as well as the morally meritorious, or the admirable as well as the imperative.'

It must be remembered that Paul saw in the assemblies of the Christians and especially in their assemblies for worship the appointed and successful means for clarifying and strengthening this ideal. In Ephesians iv. 22–32 we may observe some of the results in the recognition of duties, some of which appear to us very elementary, a recognition which was traced to the fact that men had been 'taught in Christ,' that is, that within the Fellowship of which He was the Head, and His Spirit the inspiring power, they had obtained insight into what was required of them.

Closely related to that which is fitting as a standard of conduct is that which is 'advantageous' (*τὸ σύμφορον*),

ministering to the true welfare of the individual or of the community[1]. If the one is appealed to as a standard of conduct the other is offered as an ideal which is to attract. It was confidence in the power of this ideal which is the ultimate justification of that freedom from codified law which Paul so triumphantly proclaimed. 'Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty.' It was the controlling principle of this Spirit leading to life which set men free from the Law that leads to sin and death. 'All things are lawful for me.' That freedom could be safely claimed or admitted in the case of those for whom τὸ σύμφορον, the higher good of the individual or the community, had become a controlling ideal of conduct. Freedom claimed, but waived in the name of a corporate ideal, gives the clue to much of St Paul's ethical teaching. And the ideal is frequently expressed in terms of 'upbuilding,' 'the upbuilding of the Body of Christ,' by which is meant the deepening and strengthening of the Life and Unity that were already present, and the further extension of the Body in the world. This was one of the purposes for which God had given the diversified Ministry (Eph. iv. 12), part of the object of public worship (1 Cor. xiv. 5, etc.), one of the governing motives alike of the Apostle himself (2 Cor. xii. 19) and of the members of the community itself (1 Thess. v. 11).

Yet another criterion of right conduct is offered in the suggestion that it is 'pleasing,' that is, pleasing to God. 'Wherefore we also cease not to pray for you and to entreat that you may be filled with the knowledge of his will in all wisdom and Spirit-wrought understanding, so as to live worthily of the Lord unto all pleasing' (Col. i. 9, 10). 'For it is God who produces in you both the willing and the acting according to what pleases

[1] Cp. Mt. v. 29, συμφέρει σοι ἵνα ἀπόληται ἓν τῶν μελῶν σου; Jo. xvi. 7, συμφέρει ὑμῖν ἵνα ἐγὼ ἀπέλθω.

him' (Phil. ii. 13; cp. 2 Tim. ii. 4). 'We make it our ambition... to be pleasing to him' (2 Cor. v. 9). There is thus introduced into Christian ethics a simple and far-reaching principle, one moreover which postulates and rests upon a personal relation to God as well as the power to discover what is pleasing to Him. The significance of this appears in Romans xii. 2. 'It is exceedingly important that according to this passage the renewing of the mind, which naturally takes place through the Spirit, expresses itself precisely in this way that the Christian has a sure perception of that which is the Will of God, The Good, the Pleasing and the Ideal is not straightway indicated for all and for every case in a written law or in words of the Lord. The moral judgment (this is what is meant by δοκιμάζειν; cp. also Phil. i. 10) must decide in each individual case what the will of God is, and this is only possible if the moral sense which has hitherto been held in the slavery of the flesh has been fundamentally renewed and changed.'[1]

'The real standard of Greek morals was τὸ ἀγαθόν, that which was morally noble, impressive, admirable.' And although it is true that the ethical teaching of St Paul in many of its details corresponds closely with that of the Greek moralists, it makes all the difference that for him the standard is τὸ ἄρεσκον or τὸ σύμφορον. The element of self-consciousness or of solitary self-sufficiency which is inseparable from τὸ ἀγαθόν disappears from Paul's standard, in whichever way it be described. The man who of set purpose follows τὸ ἄρεσκον has always before his mind the One whom it is his hope and his joy to please; or, if it be τὸ σύμφορον that guides him, he gives himself with equal subordination of self to promote the ideals of the community to which he belongs.

[1] Joh. Weiss, *Urchristentum*, p. 433.

A consideration of these standards suggests that St Paul conceived of the Christian as having in ethical matters a free judgment which moved within certain wide frontiers defined by the revealed will of God and at the same time was continuously inspired by high examples and guided by a delicate perception of what was 'worthy of the Lord,' what was becoming in His followers, what was for the good of the Church and what was seemly in the eyes of men. These things were elements in that will of God for which the 'spiritual' man had an instinctive perception, but an even clearer and surer perception when he was in fellowship with God's people (σὺν τοῖς ἁγίοις).

Christian character and conduct are thus by St Paul indissolubly connected with the experience of Salvation, inasmuch as that experience demands as its condition on the human side faith which finds expression in love. They are similarly connected with that experience viewed as Life, of which they are the spontaneous outcome, or as the possession of the Spirit, of which they are the natural fruit. In the familiar analysis of that 'fruit' or 'harvest' of the Spirit which Paul gives in Galatians v. 22 ff. he appears to distinguish three groups of qualities or of kinds of conduct corresponding to the inmost, the inner, and the outer forms of the personality. At the heart of this experience of the Spirit's power he finds a loving disposition, a glad heart and a quiet mind. These can be known only to the subject. Nearer to the surface are good-temper, good-feeling, good-will; and on the surface of conduct are good-faith or honour, deference to others and self-control.

Assuming such motives and postulating these general standards and results, Paul proceeds not to build an ethical system of precepts and prohibitions, but to deal with problems of conduct as they arise. In so doing he

starts from the same presuppositions as Jesus. He is instructing men whose hearts have been flooded with the love of God, who in response to that love do themselves care for God and for their fellow-men, especially for 'those of the household of faith' (Gal. vi. 10).

(v) SOCIAL RELATIONS

In examining the applications which St Paul makes of these general principles to particular relations we may distinguish the problems arising out of ordinary human relations and those which arise from relations within the sacred Society. Under the first head will fall what he has to say on the relation of husband and wife and the position of woman generally; of parents and children; and of master and servant. And the first thing to observe is that in no case within these relations is the fact that a man is or becomes a Christian to alter the social relation in which he stands to another. A wife is not to separate from her husband, and a husband must not put away his wife, even in cases where the partner remains an unbeliever. That is the more noteworthy if, as we are told, it runs counter to the Jewish rule in the case of proselytes. 'Such questions had long been matters of rabbinical discussion, and the fundamental principle laid down was that the change to Judaism did away with all former relations. The proselyte, male or female, was under no obligation to his or her heathen spouse, and was strictly bound to enter into a new marriage with a Jew.'[1] Paul recognised no such rule. All he required was that a Christian widow, if she remarried, should marry a Christian (1 Cor. vii. 39). He believed in the power of one believing partner to 'consecrate' the other, that is, to hold him or her in some sense and in some degree dedicated to God and so in closer touch than otherwise with the Divine Grace.

[1] Dobschütz, *Christian Life in the Primitive Church*, p. 31.

The same principle applied to children. A parent who was or became a believer was not thereby separated religiously from his or her young children. He brought them over with him into a certain relation to God, consistently with which they could be described as no longer 'unclean' but 'holy,' in the sense, the almost exclusive sense, of the word in the New Testament, of 'belonging to God.' It is here of course that the practice of infant baptism found its origin and its justification. It would probably never occur to a convert of the first century that he himself could enter into a relation with God in Christ and not carry his young children with him into that relation. This sense of solidarity was so strong that the baptism of whole families would follow naturally on the conversion and baptism of the head.

Writing to the Corinthians St Paul lays down with great emphasis the general principle that every man is to remain in that condition of life in which he was when the call of God reached him (1 Cor. vii. 21, 24). And he gives pointed application of the principle to the case of slaves: 'were you a slave when you were called? Do not let that disturb you. But even if you can become free, rather accept it,' *i.e.* the condition of slave[1]. Taken along with the anxious insistence upon the necessity of subordination specially on the part of women this emphasis on the duty of each man remaining in the condition in which God found him supports the view that Paul recognised what he felt to be a real danger in the Christian movement running off into a movement for social emancipation. Such a movement might only too easily find its justification in his own teaching as to the disappearance 'in Christ' of the distinctions of sex, race and status. Yet the premature and reckless appli-

[1] This interpretation, which goes back to Chrysostom, is supported by Bousset (*SNT*), Lietzmann (*HNT*) and Weiss in their respective commentaries with arguments which carry conviction.

cation of these principles on a large scale might readily have brought disaster. 'Christianity would have sunk beyond hope of recovery along with such revolutionary attempts; it might have brought on a new slave-rising, and been crushed along with it. The time was not ripe for the solution of such difficult questions.'[1]

Members of the Christian community were to remain with these social relations externally unaltered. Internally, however, they were profoundly changed by the fact that they were now 'in the Lord.' Their individual ambitions and propensities were sublimated in a higher loyalty. It is a profound ethical principle which St Paul, unconsciously perhaps, here lays hold of. 'No natural tie even is purified and exalted except by subjection to a greater spiritual fellowship.'[2] To be 'in the Lord' involved at once spiritual subjection to Christ and membership in the sacred Society. And the Society, which, as we have seen, provided a visible expression of that relation to Christ, provided also the sphere within which the spiritual side of these relationships found continual expression. In the atmosphere which was to be found there they were to be progressively moralised or spiritualised. Thus Paul expressly refrains from asking Philemon to alter the slave-status of Onesimus. He is content to ask that he may be received as 'a brother beloved, both as a man and as a Christian,' in full confidence that whether the external relation be changed or not, its internal character will be transformed. 'Henceforth,' says Paul, 'we know no man after the flesh,' that is, merely as a man. For his fellow-Christian has passed through a change corresponding to that which had passed over Christ, who was Himself no longer 'in the flesh.' And just as the Christian now stood in a relation closer, more intimate,

[1] Bousset, *SNT*, II. 101.

[2] J. Oman, *The War and its Issues*, p. 25.

to the spiritual Christ than he could have done 'in the days of his flesh,' so he was to recognise in his fellow-Christians 'spiritual' persons, new beings, for whom old things had passed away. He was to show his trust in Christ by trusting His work in others.

(vi) WOMEN AND MARRIAGE

The Apostle's attitude to the question of marriage and his dealing with the relations within the married state are largely bound up with the current estimate of women which to a large extent he shared. He had not accomplished the transition from the estimate which was common to the ancient world to that of the Christian. It was the accepted view of antiquity that woman is naturally the inferior of man. It was generally accepted in the Hellenic world where, though the practice in many cases rose above the theory, yet the theory was that which had found expression in Aristotle, 'the woman may be said to be an inferior being.'[1] In the world of Judaism practice was doubtless even more commonly superior to theory. Still the theory was explicit. The woman was inferior. She could be divorced, dismissed from her home, on the most trifling excuse. Religiously, women ranked with the bond-servants as exempt from the obligations of the Law.

Perhaps the most humiliating thing was the way in which by many Rabbinic authorities the woman was looked on as 'a constant moral danger.'[2] By some authorities it was forbidden even to greet a woman, and much conversation even with one's own wife was reprobated as sure to bring mischief[3].

[1] Aristotle, *Poetics*, xv. 1; compare also A. W. Verrall, *Euripides*, p. 111, note: 'of all the ancient moralists Euripides is alone, alone with Plato, in showing an *adequate* notion of that radical disease, an imperfect ideal of woman, of which, more than of anything else, ancient civilisation perished.'

[2] Bousset, *SNT*, 1. 106. [3] See Bauer, *HBNT*, *ad* Jo. iv. 27.

Paul had not escaped from this traditional estimate of woman as inferior to man. It is true that he nowhere requires the wife to 'obey' her husband as he calls on children to obey their parents. But he postulates for her a subordination to the man corresponding to the man's subordination to Christ and to Christ's subordination to God (1 Cor. xi. 3; Eph. v. 23). Wives are to defer to their husbands 'as to the Lord,' though this demand addressed to them is only a special case of the rule laid down for all Christians, 'Defer to one another in the fear of Christ.'

On the other hand, Paul lays down certain propositions which have had their inevitable consequences in the modern estimate of women. Within that sphere of the higher Life which he identified with Christ, of which he saw a concrete expression in the sacred Society, there was 'no room for male and female' (Gal. iii. 28, M.); the distinction was transcended; if both are 'one in Christ,' they represent personalities of equal worth. The same thought underlies the passage in first Corinthians (xi. 11, 12), 'Of course, in the Lord, woman does not exist apart from man, any more than men apart from women; for as woman was made from man, so man is now made from woman, while both, like all things, come from God.' And the saying is the more significant, if, as seems probable, it is a conscious rectification of *v.* 9. And the general precept laid down in Ephesians v. 25 ('Husbands love your wives even as Christ loved the Church') provides just the practical conclusion which issues naturally from such considerations.

As to marriage in general St Paul's attitude was that of one who might be described as naturally celibate. Probably his complete absorption in his work left no room for the claims of family life to make themselves felt. He was one of those who have become celibates

'for the sake of the Kingdom' (Mt. xix. 12). That would account for the somewhat detached attitude he adopts to the question of marriage, while it did not prevent him from approving it for other people. On this question also he seems to speak with two voices. On the whole he seems more eager to dissuade men from marriage. It is important, however, to observe that the reasons he adduces are not theoretical. They differ entirely from the reasons by which the celibate ideal was afterwards supported and enforced. Paul's reasons are practical. 'I would have you free from excessive care' (1 Cor. vii. 32), free from the cares of the home in order that you may serve the Lord assiduously without distraction. 'I wish to spare you' (1 Cor. vii. 28). The pressure of the present time is such, and the expectation of even harder times so well-founded that it is only prudent to avoid giving hostages to fortune.

On the other hand, Paul recommends marriage, one may say, for most men. If he does this grudgingly (1 Cor. vii. 1), he heartily accepts the marriage state as the normal one, and is at pains in several of his Epistles to suggest the ideals by which it should be governed. And in Ephesians (v. 29) he does not shrink from finding a standard for a man's love towards his wife in the love of Christ for the Church. In v. 32 he goes even further and points to the marriage relationship and its indissoluble character as typical of the union between Christ and the Church. In this analogy he might have found opportunity for developing a view of marriage as spiritual, ideal and chivalrous as has ever been conceived. But the fact remains that, in the married relation as apparently in the worship of the Church, Paul definitely assigns to the woman a subordinate position and supports his teaching by arguments which he may have learnt in the rabbinical schools.

(vii) WOMEN IN THE CHURCH

In reference to the function of women in public worship St Paul has probably been misunderstood, not, it must be admitted, without reason. In two closely adjacent passages he expresses opinions on the subject which are practically if not directly contradictory of one another. In 1 Corinthians xiv. 34, 35 he says: 'Women must keep quiet in the gatherings of the Church. They are not allowed to speak; they must take a subordinate place as the Law enjoins. If they want any information let them ask their husbands at home; it is disgraceful for women to speak in Church.'[1] To this there is a close parallel in 1 Timothy ii. 11, 12. But in 1 Corinthians xi. 5 we find: 'Every woman praying or prophesying with her head unveiled dishonoureth her head,' where the reference is undoubtedly to women taking part in public worship. And so far from disapproving of their so doing the Apostle seeks only to regulate the practice in a minor matter of costume. The essential contradiction between the two passages cannot be overlooked, and in view of the doubtfully Pauline authorship of much in the Pastoral Epistles the former of the two passages stands practically alone. And there are, moreover, good critical grounds for believing that it does not come from Paul at all. In several good authorities for the text these verses are found not after *v.* 33 but after *v.* 40, which is in itself a strong indication of interpolation. They break the close connection between *vv.* 33 and 36. They appear to reproduce the teaching of 1 Timothy i. 11[2]. Moreover the definite appeal to 'the Law' strikes a note which rings strangely from St Paul. It appears highly probable therefore that these verses representing the opinion of a later age have passed from

[1] Moffatt's translation.

[2] Summarised from Bousset, *SNT*, *ad loc.*; cp. also Weiss, *Urchristentum*, p. 456.

the margin of some copy of the Epistle into the text. For the other evidence from the primitive community points rather to such recognition being granted to women as would include their participating in public worship. In the Acts we find full justice done to the influence exercised by women and to the service they rendered to the Gospel. The daughters of Philip the Evangelist are described as 'prophetesses' (Acts xxi. 9), and from 1 Timothy iii. 11 it may be gathered that they were eligible as deacons. And the many salutations which St Paul sends to women, expressing high respect and affection, are in harmony with this picture, and not with the estimate underlying 1 Corinthians xiv. 35. 'It is plain that at the outset of the Christian movement as in all periods of religious exaltation women played a special part. Later came a reaction. It was felt to be dangerous that women should take too active a part in the life of the community, and vigorous attempts were made to check it.' It is probably the witness to such attempts that we find in these passages in which women are prohibited from speaking in Church.

(viii) PARENTS AND CHILDREN

Children are enjoined by the Apostle to 'obey their parents in the Lord' (Eph. vi. 1; cp. Col. iii. 20), where 'in the Lord' is a reminder of the sacred character of the Christian family and indirectly involves a limitation upon the kind of commandment to which the parents may expect obedience. On the other hand, fathers are to avoid irritating their children, 'lest they should lose heart' (Col. iii. 21; cp. Eph. vi. 4). Here the Apostle appears to open a new chapter in ethics. A good commentary on the precept is in the *Life of Sir Thomas Browne*: 'To his sons at a very tender age we find him writing as to valued friends, studiously careful not to offend their susceptibilities.'[1]

[1] Edmund Gosse, *Life of Sir Thomas Browne*, p. 140.

(ix) MASTER AND SLAVE

The relation between Master and Slave was similarly allowed to remain externally unaltered. But internally it was transformed by the fact that both were 'in the Lord.' It was, indeed, no novelty that slaves should be admitted as members of a social confraternity, within which they were recognised as equals with freemen. And this points to the possibility that the condition of slavery, at least of the common domestic type, was largely free, at that time, from the horrors which have marked other forms in other ages[1]. In particular, it was the custom to allow slaves the full observance of their inherited religion, so far as it did not interfere with the cult which the house followed.

This helps to account for the fact that the Apostle leaves the institution of slavery uncriticised. He betrays no suspicion that it was wrong for Christians to hold slaves. He does not hesitate to apply to the slave the general principle that a man ought not to abandon the calling in which he had received the call of Christ. For 'the slave who has received his call in the Lord is really a freeman of the Lord'; just as the freeman who has been called becomes the slave of Christ (1 Cor. vii. 21, 22). The freedom 'wherewith Christ has made us free' is so potent as to draw the sting from slavery. The bondage wherein He obliges men 'by love to serve one another' is so effectual as to rob masterhood of its tyranny.

Masters are to treat their servants 'justly and fairly,' knowing that they also have a Master in heaven. Servants are to obey their masters at every point, 'not simply when their eye is on you, like those who court human favour, but serving them with a single heart out of reverence for your Lord and Master.'[2]

[1] See Dobschütz, *Christian Life in the Primitive Church*, p. 33.

[2] Col. iii. 22–iv. 1; cp. Eph. vi. 5–8; 1 Tim. vi. 1; Titus ii. 9.

(x) RELATIONS WITHIN THE COMMUNITY

It is not necessary to emphasise the closeness of these relations as they were conceived by St Paul. Of that he gives frequent illustration in connection with his metaphor of the Body. 'Ye are members one of another.' The individual Christians who together formed the Body were as closely articulated into one another as the various parts of the human frame, 'The whole body fitted and compacted together through every point of contact and supply and through the proportioned activity of every part grows and builds itself up in love' (Eph. iv. 16).

It is necessary however to emphasise the fact that for St Paul the formation of these relations with other Christians and with the Christian Community follows automatically on the formation of the faith-union with Christ. It is not by any subsequent step, or by any further act of will, that the believer in Christ becomes a member of the Fellowship. The same Baptism which is a seal upon faith-union with Christ is at the same time a seal upon love-union with other believers. 'We all in one Spirit were baptised into (*i.e.* so as to form) one Body' (1 Cor. xii. 13). Logically it may be necessary for us to think of the gift of the Spirit as bestowed on each believer in turn; but for St Paul there was no measurable interval between the reception of the Spirit and incorporation in the Body, the Church[1].

It is to this sense of common membership in the sacred Society, of common interest in its members and care for their welfare, that Paul appeals in much of his ethical teaching. Its bearing upon the action of individuals to one another is well illustrated in Ephesians iv. 25–32: 'Putting away falsehood, speak truth every

[1] Cp. F. D. Maurice, *Life*, 1. 209: 'The Spirit dwells in the Body, and in each of its members *as such*, and not in individuals; the Spirit in an individual is a fearful contradiction.'

man with his neighbour; *for we are members one of another.*' 'Let the pilferer cease pilfering, and rather do honest work toiling with his own hands, that *he may have to give to him that is needy.*' 'Let no corrupting speech come from your lips, but only what is good *for others' upbuilding.*' Any bitterness, anger or abusive speech is to be suppressed, for these are things which hurt the common life. All such conduct 'grieves the Holy Spirit.' It is treachery to the Fellowship. And it is the same interest in the life of the community which leads the Apostle to include among 'the works of the flesh' such unexpected features as 'enmity, strife, party-spirit, and divisions.' Such things are condemned along with murder and impurity because they menace the common life even as the others menace the individual. And God has taken the life of the Society under His protection even as He has taken the life of the individual. 'He that ruins the temple of God, by God shall he be ruined' (1 Cor. iii. 17).

The individual Christian is expected therefore to accept as an end which he pursues with an earnestness equal to that which he gives to his own interests the 'upbuilding' of the Society, to avoid with equal care what injures its true interests and what injures his own. At the same time, the Society is not an end in itself but a potent means to the religious welfare and development of the individual. It is within its fellowship that he 'hears Christ' and is taught 'in Him,' that he receives warning and encouragement and comfort in distress (1 Thess. iv. 18, v. 14). If, as Professor Pringle Pattison has said, 'personality is the capacity for fellowship,' and if 'the individual can only achieve completeness as a moral personality if his ethic be developed under the guidance of the ideal of the ultimate community,' St Paul showed a deep psychological insight when he recognised in the Fellowship or Church an essential factor in the Divine provision for salvation.

(xi) LIMITATIONS

It should be obvious, yet it has not always been attended to, that Paul's ethical teaching is subject to certain quite definite limitations. In the first place, so far as direct teaching at least is concerned, there are certain important aspects of duty which Paul ignores. His ethical teaching is confined to the duty of the individual towards himself in view of the fact that he is a Christian, and the duty of the individual towards those to whom he is related whether by social or by spiritual ties. As to his duty in relation to the world outside he has little to say, and what he does say does not go very deep. In 1 Corinthians v. 9–12 Paul has to correct a misapprehension which had arisen from some language used by him in a former letter. He had warned the Corinthians not to have intercourse with immoral persons. And when they apparently took that to mean immoral persons either within or outside the Church, Paul explains that he was referring to any member of the Church who was proved unworthy; 'otherwise,' he adds, 'you would have to come out from the world.' That is to say, he treats as absurd the suggestion that Christians should withdraw from contact and intercourse with non-Christians. He accepts as fundamental the position of believers as described in the fourth Gospel, 'in the world, but not of the world.'

It is consistent with this that he claims entire liberty of conscience for each believer in things indifferent, a liberty which is none the less real because its exercise may be limited by consideration for others (Ro. xiv; Col. ii. 16–18).

The only direct reference to a Christian's duty to society outside the Church is in the passage (Ro. xiii. 1–7) where Paul seeks to regulate the relations between

Christians and the Civil Authority. They are to submit themselves to the Civil Government on the ground that its authority comes from God, by whom indeed it has been constituted. 'The magistrate is God's servant for your benefit.' They are also to pay taxes, to give to all 'their respective dues, tribute to one, taxes to another, respect to this man, honour to that.' The injunctions are clear and detailed. They correspond to that respect for order, that deep distaste for any kind of unchecked licence which is a marked characteristic of the Apostle[1]. At the same time, the passage does not give the impression that Paul had found reason to think out the problem. It had not yet become a matter of conscience. It was at the hands of the Jews that Christians met with hostility and persecution. And the State, in its capacity of the upholder of order, was still felt only as their protector against lawless rabbling and ill-treatment. If Paul had any particular class of opinions in mind which he desired to repress, it may have been the outcome of revolutionary ideas in Palestine extending from Jewish-Christian to heathen-Christian communities and taking practical shape in the refusal to pay taxes as something unbecoming the saints of the Kingdom. Just as Jesus (Mk. xii. 17) declined to give approval to this disposition, and as in Matthew xvii. 24–27 He recognised indeed His own right to claim exemption from tribute, yet gave instructions that the demand should be complied with, 'that we may not shock them,' so Paul says, entirely in the same sense as Jesus, 'Give to every man what is due to him,' 'Owe no man anything,' as though these obligations were obvious and belonging to natural human ethics, such as Christians ought not to evade. Paul 'shares to a certain extent the thankful attitude of the Provinces which recognised in the Empire the guardian of peace, the principle

[1] See Weiss, *Urchristentum*, pp. 442, 461.

of order versus chaos, the bulwark of order and justice.'[1]

The scope of Paul's direct ethical teaching is thus limited to the field of general principles or to those particular problems to which his attention was called. At the same time the limitation is not absolute. It is qualified by two considerations. In the first place, though Paul did not follow out the application of Christian principle beyond the limits of the Family and the Church, he opened the way for such application. As Prof. Alexander has said, 'Already in the family the scheme of such a principle is found in the care of a man for wife and child, prompted not by compulsion but by affection and rendered freely as his part of the domestic life. Morality is an extension of this free service.'

The second qualification is that, as we have seen, Paul claimed for the Christian that power to discover the will of God through which he or the Community or the two reacting on one another could ascertain what was Christian duty in new circumstances or in reference to new problems. Paul's teaching in fact holds in solution what is crystallised in the language of the fourth Gospel, the Spirit 'shall lead you into all truth.' The exercise and results of such power find illustration in the Christian ban upon polygamy and slavery.

The second limitation on the ethical teaching of the Apostle lies in the fact that it is to be understood as working effectively only within the circle of those who are 'in Christ.' Just as we have seen his theology to be interlocked with his ethics, so his ethics is indissolubly bound up with his theology. As the first is fruitless without the second, so the second is helpless without the first. In other words, he is not contemplating in this teaching the world outside the Church. He would have

[1] Weiss, *Urchristentum*, p. 461.

been the last to claim any authority for it except in respect of those who had first submitted themselves to God in Christ. No doubt many of his ethical principles and precepts have commended themselves to thoughtful minds outside the Church. But the seventh chapter of the Romans contains St Paul's own description of the hopelessness, as he believed it, of the attempt to obey a moral law prior to or apart from faith-union with Christ.

CHAPTER V

SALVATION
ITS CONSUMMATION IN THE FUTURE

THE Salvation which had been achieved through the death of Christ had been appropriated in the act of faith, and might be looked on as complete when faith had laid hold on the gift of God. But the same act of faith initiated a process through which Salvation was progressively realised. The process was inherent in the nature of faith as that which finds expression through love and therefore establishes relations with God and with other believers in Him through Christ. These relations provide the condition alike of spiritual development and of ethical advance and victory. And St Paul both records and expects great development and advance within the limits of this life. But even so the contents of Salvation are not exhausted. There remains a consummation, a final perfecting of the process in which the act of God would be specially manifest. This consummation is commonly connected with a point of time whether it be the transition from life on earth to life in glory or 'the appearance of Christ' or 'the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ with all his saints.'

'Now is our salvation nearer than when we believed' (Ro. xiii. 11); 'when Christ who is our life shall appear, then shall ye also appear with him in glory' (Col. iii. 4); 'much more being reconciled we shall be saved by his life' (Ro. v. 10). The Salvation which began as an act of God and an accomplished fact only to resolve itself into a process in which man's strenuous co-operation was enlisted awaits its final consummation in a new act of God, the revelation of His Son in glory.

It is noteworthy that when the apostle contemplates the future consummation of Salvation he borrows largely from the expectations and the language of Jewish eschatology. This is specially marked in the Thessalonian Epistles (1 Thess. iv. 13 ff.; 2 Thess. ii. 1–12). But the really important feature in these passages is not to be found in the eschatological conventions which the apostle takes over from the past but in the modifications he introduces into traditional material. In this we may see confirmation of the suggestion that much in St Paul's religious thinking is to be explained as 'transmuted eschatology.' The promises and predictions of the prophets clothed to a large extent in the imagery of the Apocalyptists had formed the furnishing of his mind. These promises, connected as they were with the salvation or deliverance of God's people Paul had discovered to be fulfilled, transcendentally fulfilled, in Christ. The Reign of God had come. Salvation was already a fact of experience. Hopes fulfilled could be stated in terms of present spiritual realities. But as for what still lay in the future, expectations which could not in the nature of things be submitted to the transmuting power of Christian experience, these Paul reproduced as they had been handed down to him. No doubt he had his own interpretation for certain of the details. His picture of the future included a great apostasy, the manifestation of 'the man of sin' or 'Anti-Christ' (for the time being held down by some restraining power) and at the last the coming of Christ in glory. He knew nothing to invalidate these expectations. Nevertheless, he had conceived an idea of the future which was destined when developed to render these Apocalyptic details irrevelant; 'so shall we be ever with the Lord' (1 Thess. iv. 17). Here and buried in details drawn from Jewish depictions of the end we find an entirely new ideal, St Paul's original contribution to the subject.

The Old Testament saint could look forward contentedly to 'dwelling in the house of the Lord for ever'; The Christian might look forward to nothing less than endless and unhindered fellowship with his Saviour, finding in that his perfect consummation and bliss (cp. Phil. i. 23).

Coming to details, we observe that of the three factors in salvation as accomplished by Christ two are definitely regarded by St Paul as still waiting to be completed. The redemption is incomplete. The purchase price has been paid. Man has received the Holy Spirit as the first-fruit and pledge of perfect liberty from the dominion of evil. He belongs to God, yet not wholly (Eph. i. 14). By his flesh or body, his physical organisation, he is still attached and attracted to the things that are seen and temporal. He is waiting even for the fullness of adoption, for he is waiting for 'the redemption of the body' (Ro. viii. 23), that is to say, for the redemption of the whole man.

The thought here is specially characteristic of St Paul. The body that is to be redeemed is not the fleshly body (1 Cor. xv. 50). It stands for the frame or form which gives recognisable individuality to the person. For St Paul who rejected all suggestion of a man becoming a disembodied spirit (2 Cor. v. 3) it was essential for the completeness of the personality that it should continue to have such a frame. Redemption therefore would be complete only when that which had been sown a natural body was raised a spiritual body.

So with justification. It may be only an illustration of the plasticity of St Paul's language, but it is not without significance that in writing to the Galatians (Gal. v. 5) he speaks of expecting 'the righteousness we hope for.'[1] Justification, the righteousness of God, was the portion of him who founded on faith in Christ; nevertheless, righteousness was still an object of hope,

[1] For the significance of the genitive compare Gal. iii. 14.

part of the expected consummation of the future. Probably we catch the word here as it moves from describing status and begins to describe character, and the righteousness for which Paul waits approximates to the modern significance of the word.

With regard to Reconciliation, on the other hand, there is no indication of advance or development being either needed or experienced. Even if in Romans v. 1 we read the subjunctive, ἔχωμεν, it is not a summons to seek peace with God, but, as was pointed out by J. H. Moulton, the verb keeps its durative force and means 'let us continue to have peace with God.' The reconciliation of which the death of Christ was the mediating cause was complete and final. It could only be altered by the wilful breaking away of him who had been reconciled.

St Paul does not refer definitely to death as the presupposition of the consummation in these forms. What he does definitely anticipate as lying in the future is resurrection or for those 'who are alive at His coming' transformation, the final destruction of the spiritual enemies of man and the handing over of the Kingdom by Christ to God, that He may be 'all in all.'

'If we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection' (Ro. vi. 5). 'He that raiseth up Jesus from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you' (Ro. viii. 11; cp. 1 Cor. vi. 11); 'who [the Lord Jesus Christ] shall change our body of humiliation that it may be fashioned like unto his body of glory' (Phil. iii. 21). St Paul conceived of the resurrection of believers as due to an act of God or an act of Jesus Christ, but also as the consummation of that Life which had its beginning in faith-union with Christ. 'The gift of God is eternal life.' And this is not the same thing as 'immortality,' the immortality

which was understood to be conferred by a participation in the mystery-cults. That immortality was something which a man might believe he had, yet must wait till he had passed through death in order to experience it. Eternal life was different, it was something which a man knew he had 'by his Spirit that dwelleth in you.' Its endless duration was only a corollary of its quality. It was life on a plane beyond the reach of death (cp. Jo. xi. 26), therefore it was life which runs on into the age to come. The life beyond death was recognised by St Paul as a continuation under new conditions of that eternal Life which had already begun here; and its chief characteristic was perfect and unhindered fellowship with Christ.

That is the essential thing concerning Paul's expectation of the future. In two passages he deals with certain of the new conditions, the *form* in which the personality which survives death is to be embodied. In the opening of the first of these (1 Cor. xv. 35) he betrays a certain impatience with the imagined question he proceeds to answer. It is so clear to him that the body or frame which shall be is not the same as the body which is. He appears quite unconscious of the fact that he is propounding a new conception equally far removed from Judaistic and from Hellenistic speculation. The Greek when he did adopt the belief in immortality was content to posit the immortality of the soul, neither raising nor answering any question as to the form which the soul might be supposed to have or take. The Jew, on the other hand, when he adopted the belief in a life to come following on a resurrection, thought of the whole man, body as well as soul, as brought back to life. Even though the elements of which his body was composed had been scattered in decay, they would be reassembled at the last day. The vision of Ezekiel (xxxvii. 1–14) suggests the concrete

form which was given to the expectation; and though in the intervening centuries some may have moved to a more spiritual way of thinking concerning the future, it was entirely natural that the question should be raised at Corinth, 'with what body do they come?'

St Paul, while he is clear that 'we shall not be found naked,' that is without form or frame of some kind (2 Cor. v. 3), is equally clear that the form in which we are to be clothed is not made up of those elements which compose the earthly body, nor indeed of elements of the same kind at all. 'Flesh and blood shall not inherit the kingdom of God.' He appeals to the analogy of the familiar process of nature wherein the seed when cast into the ground rots and dies but only to reappear in a new form. 'Body,' frame or form, he believes there must be and will be. Otherwise, the individual spirit would be merged in an indistinguishable cloud of spiritual existences. And there is a spiritual body, frame, or tenement, as there is a 'natural body'—not in the sense of a body composed of spirit but meaning a body belonging to the spirit's sphere, even as the other body belongs to the material sphere[1].

The other passage (2 Cor. v. 1–5) elaborates more fully the figure of the body as a dwelling-place or a garment and emphasises the idea that God has prepared such a housing 'not made with hands eternal in the heavens.' Evidently, Paul refused to contemplate as part of God's plan continued existence as a disembodied spirit. In his teaching about the resurrection life he asserts the continued existence of distinct and distinguishable personalities.

Moreover, seeing that eternal life of which immortality was a corollary, connoted both ethical achievement and religious experience, the expected consummation

[1] Compare the use of the same adjective in Ro. vii. 14 to describe the Law; the nearest equivalent in English would be 'heavenly.'

included both of these. The body that now is is a body of humiliation, because through it man has become subject to various shifting servitudes. The body that is to be is a body 'of glory' and of Christ's glory, because like His body it is to be the expression and the instrument of moral perfectness, a glory 'full of grace and truth' (Jo. i. 14). Thus the destiny of those who love God is to be 'conformed to the image of his Son' (Ro. viii. 29; cp. 1 Jo. iii. 2), and so to be presented 'holy and unblameable and unreproveable in his sight' (Col. i. 22; cp. 1 Cor. i. 8, xv. 49). St Paul thus conceived of the ultimate destiny of the individual Christian and also of the corporate Society in terms of the perfect consummation of character (Eph. v. 27; 2 Cor. xi. 2).

So also with the religious content of eternal life. 'So shall we be ever with the Lord' (1 Thess. iv. 17). 'We are...willing rather to be absent from the body and present with the Lord' (2 Cor. v. 8). 'Our Lord Jesus Christ who died for us that whether we wake or sleep (that is, whether we live or die) we should live together with him' (1 Thess. v. 9, 10). 'To be with Christ, which is far better' (Phil. i. 23). It is in this way that St Paul describes the consummation of the religious factor in eternal life. And here two points call for attention. The first is that the consummation of Salvation on its religious side finds expression in terms of a personal relation. It is not in any kind of gratification, material or individual, nor yet in any depersonalised absorption in the divine that the Apostle finds the ultimate bliss, but in a personal relation between the saved and the saviour. Paul refers to it always as a personal relation not with God but with Christ. That he would exclude such a relation with God who 'was in Christ reconciling the world to himself' is highly improbable. That he does not refer to it is partly accidental and partly due to the fact that in his treatment of

Salvation as a present experience he lays so much emphasis on the relation to Christ. It is the continuation and the perfecting of this relation in which he sees the ultimate issue of faith.

Christianity according to St Paul differs profoundly from other religions in that it conceives of a destiny open to man as the permanent existence of a self-conscious personality in unbroken personal relation and ethical harmony with God as revealed in Christ; and finding in that its perfect self-realisation and happiness; and further in that it offers to the acceptance of faith alone a Salvation by which these things are secured, maintained and perfected. At the same time the faith by which this is secured is never alone; for there is that involved in its very nature whereby is guaranteed a continuous approximation to the character of Christ.

CHAPTER VI

SALVATION
ITS AUTHOR AND PERFECTER, CHRIST

IN every aspect of this Salvation, and in every stage of its progress, the necessary organ of its accomplishment and means of its conveyance to men was Christ. And the measure of the greatness of the boon, the 'unspeakable gift,' gave the measure of the greatness of Him through whom it was placed within reach of men. 'Salvation' represented not for Paul only but for great numbers of men and women his contemporaries, whether Jews or Gentiles, man's *summum bonum*, the banishment of his darkest fears, the fulfilment of his highest hopes.

It is small wonder therefore if St Paul found almost no category too exalted to assign to Him who is the mediator of such Salvation to men. We should have failed in our attempt to show the greatness, the scope and the richness of this Salvation as Paul conceived it, if the position we find him assigning to Christ in the scale of being should appear anything else than natural, one might say, inevitable. Deliverance from fear, from spiritual bondage, from the status of condemnation, from alienation from God; admission to sonship, to free access to God unmediated by any functionary or any rite, to the unlimited stores of moral and spiritual power which were involved in the gift of the Holy Spirit; certainty that good as was the present, the future was to be only and in every respect better—in a word, all that Salvation had ever meant for a Jew, to whom it meant more than for any other race, all that and much more had now become available in and through Christ.

The Christology of the Apostle is sometimes treated as though in his interpretation of Christ he was continually being pushed on by the desire to bring Him up to the level of the hero of some mystery-cult, to claim for him anything that had ever been claimed by rival systems for their 'god.' When, however, we realise the magnitude of that which Paul understood Christ to have done, nothing less than fulfilling and indeed transcending the hope of Judaism, the situation seems to be that (unless he did attach the predicate θεός to Christ) the titles and descriptions which he assigned to Him were open to criticism on the ground rather of inadequacy than of exaggeration.

Historically, moreover, the bringing of Salvation to Israel had been regarded as the function of none other than the Highest. With all the changing meanings given to the idea itself in the Old Testament there is the unchanging conviction that it is God who is to bring or bestow Salvation. 'The salvation of the future, like that of the past, can be brought about only by an act of God himself. However many the instruments of his Salvation, God himself is the really efficient cause of deliverance; and what he has been in the past, he will be in the future.'[1] That the meaning now given to Salvation was infinitely deeper and more spiritual did not alter the conviction that the author of it was God, while it opened the way for the idea that He who was the Agent and Mediator of the Deliverance stood in a relation to God indefinitely closer, more personal and more permanent than those who had been His instruments of old.

Thus the discovery of Salvation as a present experience in all its reality and with all its variety of forms, with its great implications as to what had been done and its guarantees of what was yet to come, involved

[1] Schultz, *OTT*, II. 354.

the discovery of the nature, rank and dignity of Him to whom men owed its arrival. And we have now to consider the forms under which this discovery found expression in the writings of St Paul.

(i) JESUS THE MESSIAH

In the first place, Paul regarded Christ as the Messiah of Jewish expectation. We are told in the Acts of the Apostles (ix. 22; cp. xviii. 28) that in Damascus he 'put the Jews to confusion by his proof that this was the Messiah,' that 'in their synagogues he preached Jesus that he is the Son of God' (ix. 20). The variation in the form of the statement does not cover any change of meaning. As in the second Gospel and elsewhere the title 'Son of God' here imports no more than Messiah, being used in that official sense which finds classical illustration in Psalm ii. 7. And this is probably still the meaning of the Apostle when he proclaimed (Ro. i. 3) that through the resurrection Christ had been installed as Son of God with power. The resurrection had reversed the verdict of the cross. The Messiah who had died there in weakness and in shame was now publicly acknowledged and proclaimed as the Messiah 'with power.' At the same time, the antithesis between this and the preceding clause, 'of the seed of David according to his human constitution,' suggests that the transition from the purely Messianic significance of the phrase is already taking place. And the same double reference may be more clearly felt in 2 Corinthians i. 19, where it is 'Christ the Son of God' whom Paul has preached among the Corinthians. In some of the rare cases where St Paul prefixes the article to Χριστός the Messianic connotation may also have been present (*e.g.* Ro. ix. 5; 1 Cor. x. 4).

But the recognition of Christ as Messiah leads to the assigning to Him of certain functions which form part of the Jewish expectation. As Messiah pre-existence is

predicated of Him[1]. He was King and had brought the Kingdom with Him. For where the King is there is the Kingdom. And the Kingdom is the Kingdom of Christ as well as of God (Eph. v. 5). At the same time, He is subordinate to the Father to whom at the end He is to hand over the Kingdom, when 'all enemies have been put under his feet' (1 Cor. xv. 25). In accordance with Jewish predictions He is to 'destroy his enemies with the breath of his mouth' (2 Thess. ii. 8; cp. Is. xi. 4, LXX). He is also the Judge before whose judgment seat all men are to appear (2 Cor. v. 10; cp. Ro. ii. 16; Acts xvii. 31). He who had previously been thought of as the bearer of the Spirit was now understood to bestow it.

It may be difficult for us to understand how St Paul reconciled a conception of Christ endowed with these traditional Messianic prerogatives with a firm belief in his full humanity. Probably he held both without making any attempt to reconcile them. There are, however, certain further references to the Kingdom which bear trace of the transition which was in process from the eschatological conception of the Kingdom to the ethical, and so from the Messianic to the Spiritual conception of the relation between the Father and the Son. In Colossians i. 13 the kingdom of the Son of His love into which God has translated believers is opposed to the kingdom of darkness, and the antithesis is ultimately an ethical one; and in Romans xiv. 17 the ethical aspect of the Kingdom is clearly asserted; it is declared to be connected not with eating and drinking, *i.e.* with questions of ritual diet, but with righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost. Here we find a conception of the Kingdom which is closely parallel to that lying behind the words of Jesus in Mark xii. 34, where nearness to the Kingdom is represented as conditioned by ethical attitude.

[1] See Bricka, *Le Fondement Christologique*, p. 17.

(ii) HIS FULL HUMANITY

The recognition of Jesus as Messiah did nothing to modify St Paul's conviction that He was man in the full sense of the word, full partaker of the nature common to man. Indeed, His complete identity with mankind except for consent to sin was indispensable for the Apostle's explanation of Salvation. It was indispensable in order that in what He did in a death of obedience God might see the act of the new race; and in what He did in dying to sin men might see the act of man. Thus he was 'born of a woman,' a member of the human race; 'made under the Law,' a member of the Jewish race, partaking alike in its privileges and in its responsibilities (Gal. iv. 4); born 'of the lineage of David,' a scion of the royal house and fulfilling in that respect the expectation concerning the Messiah (Ro. i. 3)[1]. If Paul in Philippians ii. 7, 8 says that He 'came to be in the likeness of men' and 'was found in fashion as a man,' he is far from suggesting any unreality in the human nature of Christ; He is registering the fact that in all that fell under the observation of other men Jesus was a man like themselves. In two other phrases of similar form he penetrates deeper. That Christ was sent 'in the likeness of sin's flesh' (Ro. viii. 3) means that He was so truly man that the flesh He bore was human flesh as it had historically come to be, an appanage of sin, the open field of sin's activity. And that He 'took the form of a servant,' or thrall (Phil. ii. 7) means that He was so truly man that He entered into, in the sense of experiencing though not submitting to, the servitude from which He was to set men free.

Indeed, His identification with the human race was

[1] There is as little ground for finding in the phrase 'born of a woman' any reference to the Virgin Birth, as there is for finding any denial of it in Ro. i. 3.

so complete that He could be said to have been 'made sin for us.' That is to say, though He 'knew no sin,' in the sense that He never consented to it, was never guilty of it, in every other relation to sin He was one with His brethren of mankind. It was the same in His identification with the Jewish race, which was so complete that He could be said to be 'made a curse for us'; that is to say, He was so absolutely one with His brethren the Jews that He shared with them in the curse and hostility of an outraged law.

(iii) THE LORD—'KYRIOS'

An even more significant conception of the risen Christ which was adopted by St Paul and further developed by him was expressed in the title Kyrios, 'the Lord.' That he was not the first so to apply this title but took it over from the primitive community is at least highly probable. The record of the earliest days contained in the Acts attests the acknowledgment by St Peter that 'God has made this same Jesus both Lord and Christ' (Ac. ii. 36)[1]. By this title it became the habit of the disciples both to speak of and to address their risen Master. It is this which comes to the lips of Stephen in the hour of his martyrdom; and if it is by this title that the convicted Saul addresses the Figure which appears to him on the Damascus Road it was probably because he had heard it often from the lips of believers on Christ whom he had 'examined.' The fact that in writing to Corinth he can use this title in its Aramaic form (*Maran*, 1 Cor. xvi. 22; cp. *Didaché*, x. 6) shows how familiar it had become in Christian speech.

It represented indeed a summary of Christian preaching; 'we preach Christ Jesus as Lord' (2 Cor. iv. 5); 'for he is Lord of all, rich towards all those who

[1] See Weiss, *Urchristentum*, p. 23: 'a form of belief in Christ which is extremely primitive, and at least pre-Pauline.'

call upon him' (Ro. x. 12). Moreover, the acknowledgment that 'Jesus is Lord' is the one audible profession of faith which Paul requires of a would-be Christian, the only and the sufficient external condition of participating in Salvation[1]. It was the outward expression of that faith in Christ which is the human factor in Salvation. And the significance of the acknowledgment is such that when it is made it is understood to be due to the working of the Holy Spirit (1 Cor. xii. 3; cp. Mt. xvi. 17). 'No one is able to say that Jesus is Lord except by the Holy Spirit.'

The name as well as the dignity and authority denoted by the title belong to Christ as exalted to the right hand of God. This indeed was the issue of what He had undergone in the flesh; 'to this end he died and rose again that he might be Lord both of the living and the dead' (Ro. xiv. 9). 'God hath highly exalted him, and given him the name that is above every name, that at the name of Jesus every knee shall bow...and every tongue confess that Jesus is Lord' (Phil. ii. 9–11). Passages such as these leave little doubt that St Paul was fully conscious of what he was doing in claiming this rank and title for Jesus Christ. It involved a claim to universal dominion over 'things in the Heavens, things on the earth and things under the earth.'

In the Epistles of St Paul the transference of this title to Christ is almost complete. That is to say, there are only a few instances, and these for the most part quotations, in which it is used with reference to God, and a few more where the reference is uncertain[2].

The Greek world knew 'lords many' as it knew 'gods many.' The Jewish world and the Greek 'god-fearers'

[1] Ro. x. 9; cp. Eph. v. 26 where *ῥῆμα* probably refers to this formula, as in Ro. x. 8, *τὸ ῥῆμα τῆς πίστεως* may be 'the formula which expresses faith.'

[2] See Kattenbusch, *Das apostolische Symbol*, II. 5, 22: 'It is almost amazing how seldom God is described as Kyrios.'

who frequented the Synagogues knew but one 'Lord,' and looked on all others for whom the title was claimed as nonentities. In the Greek Bible which they read it occurred hundreds of times; and it stood there as the Greek rendering of the word which the scrupulous Jew when reading the Hebrew text substituted for the name of God, too sacred to be pronounced. From which field of thought did St Paul or the primitive Church derive the title? Was the effect of its bestowal to equate Christ with the heroes or demi-gods of Hellenism or the mystery-cults, or to present Christ as sharing the prerogatives of Jehovah? In spite of all that has been urged to the contrary it remains most probable that it is from the Old Testament that the title was ultimately derived, the transference being partly mediated through the Apocalypses and the Psalms of Solomon.

The habit of thus describing the risen Christ as ὁ Κύριος, 'the Lord,' has of late years been traced by some good authorities to a quite different source. It is maintained that the absence of the phrase, whether as title or description, from the Gospel of Mark and the rarity of its appearance in other Synoptic Gospels are incompatible with an origin in Judaism and within the Palestinian community. Further, it has been urged that in Aramaic usage the simple *Mara* without any suffix is not employed, but only the forms *Mari*, My Lord, and *Maran*, Our Lord[1]. On the other hand, the title is found in connection with many Oriental cults where it is ascribed to the hero-god or goddess, *e.g.* Isis, Osiris, Mithras, a fact of which St Paul appears to take notice in 1 Corinthians viii. 5[2]. It is even argued by Bousset that the LXX translators were themselves similarly influenced in their choice of the phrase which had its 'proper home' in Syria and Egypt. The conclusion

[1] Bousset, *KC*, pp. 98, 99.
[2] *Ibid.* p. 114 ff.; Lietzmann, *HNT*, *ad* Ro. x. 9.

which Bousset draws is that 'in this atmosphere the Christianity of Antioch and the other originally Hellenistic churches came into being and grew. In such a field the young Christian religion took shape as a Christ-cult, and out of these surroundings was taken over the comprehensive formula Kyrios to describe the dominating position of Jesus in the worship.'

The facts to which Bousset has drawn attention (though many of them are derived from the post-Apostolic period) may account somewhat for the ready and wide acceptance given to the title in churches outside Palestine[1]. But that the title was first ascribed to Christ at Antioch or anywhere else outside the Jerusalem community is far from being proved or even probable. The rarity of the title in the Synoptic Gospels, and its use there rather as a term of respect than an expression of religious relationship, so far from discrediting a Palestinian origin for the phrase, point rather to the accuracy with which these Gospels reflect the situation during our Lord's lifetime. And even if it be true that 'Mar' was not a current form in Aramaic it is admitted that Maran was; and that is the form in which St Paul uses it[2].

But the question immediately before us is, from what source did St Paul derive the phrase? And here the significant thing is that he transfers to Christ not only the title Kyrios but some of the most striking attributes which had been associated with it in the Old Testament. Thus, the phrase 'to call upon the name of the Lord' appears frequently in the Old Testament as practically an equivalent for 'to be a worshipper of Jehovah.' The Israelites were *οἱ ἐπικαλούμενοι τὸν*

[1] Lake, *The Stewardship of the Faith*, p. 94.

[2] See F. C. Burkitt, *Christian Beginnings*, p. 49 ff.: 'It is not the theory of Bousset which I suppose is now dominant in critical circles'; 'I venture to think the old-fashioned tradition is in this case more probable than the new theory.'

κύριον or τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ κυρίου. It is now the followers of Christ who are so described; 'together with all those who call upon the name of our Lord Jesus Christ' (1 Cor. i. 2). Similarly the phrase which in Joel (ii. 32) is predicated of Jehovah is transferred to Christ; 'whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved' (Ro. x. 13). In the same context (Ro. x. 11) we find the language which Isaiah uses of Jehovah, 'everyone that believeth on him shall not be put to shame' (Is. xxviii. 16), applied by St Paul to 'the Lord Jesus.' Moreover, 'the day of the Lord' which in the Old Testament had meant 'the day of Jehovah' (Am. v. 18; Joel ii. 1) is now used by St Paul to signify 'the day of Christ' (1 Thess. v. 2; cp. 1 Cor. v. 5; Phil. i. 6, 10, etc.) and in 2 Thessalonians i. 9 the traditional imagery of the Day of the Jehovah is used to describe the Day of Christ.

Even more significant perhaps are the cases where the language is not technical and where the transference is not to be accounted for by a simple substitution of the Messiah for Jehovah. For example, we may compare 'who hath known the mind of the Lord' (Is. xl. 13) with 'we have the mind of Christ' (1 Cor. ii. 16); and again 'when it shall turn to the Lord, the veil is taken away' (adapted from Exodus xxxiv. 34)[1].

When we bear in mind the evidence from the early chapters of Acts with the admittedly primitive character of their Christology together with the evidence that for St Paul Kyrios was no mere title but a title with attributes, and these drawn from the Old Testament, it appears to be both unnecessary and mistaken to assume that the title was derived by him from any source

[1] Cp. 1 Pet. iii. 15: 'Sanctify in your hearts Christ as Lord,' adapted from Is. viii. 13: 'Sanctify the Lord of Hosts Himself.' 'One may observe here with special clearness how Christian exegesis simply transferred to Christ Old Testament language concerning Jehovah'—Windisch, *HNT, ad loc.*

external to Judaism. It is possible, however, that within pre-Christian Judaism[1] the way had been prepared for the transference of the title to the Messiah, and that the resurrection illuminated for the primitive community and for St Paul a relation between God and the Messiah which was already present to their minds.

Whatever was the source from which the title was derived there is no doubt that St Paul found in it and gave to it great and deep significance. It meant that Christ was the Messiah of the Jews and more, much more. It gave to Him a religious significance hardly to be distinguished from that which men assigned to God. 'To make clear the religious import of this name one would have to cite the whole of the New Testament. For in the expression "Our Lord Jesus Christ" the whole primitive religion is contained. Dutiful obedience, reverence, and sacred fear lest he should be offended, the feeling of complete dependence in all things, thankfulness and love and trust—in short, everything a man can feel towards God comes in this name to utterance. That which is expected of God, the Lord (Jesus) can also impart.'[2]

As to the dogmatic implications underlying the title Kyrios (prior to any development in the hands of Paul) it is very difficult to speak. A heavenly Being in whom the traditional Messianic functions were fulfilled but also transcended, so that his relation to God was conspicuously more personal and more inherent, his relation to men greatly more religious and more spiritual. 'It is extremely probable that if a Jew had been asked whether this infringed on monotheism he would have said "no" after a little hesitation; while, if a Greek had been asked

[1] Cp. *Pss. Sol.* xvii. 28: πάντες ἅγιοι καὶ βασιλεὺς αὐτῶν Χριστὸς Κύριος; also Mk. xii. 35 ff. (Ps. cx. 1).

[2] Joh. Weiss, *Christ, the Beginning of Dogma*, p. 46.

whether it conceded the divinity of Jesus, he would have said "yes," also after a little hesitation.'[1] But there is no reason to suppose that such questions were yet raised.

(iv) THE SON

The complete manhood of Christ, His Messiahship and the recognition of Him as 'Lord,' these factors in the total conception of Christ were taken over by St Paul from the primitive community. There are two of them to which he gave important developments. One of these is found in that element of sonship which from one point of view is included in the Messiah. The form of Messianic expectation which looked forward to an ideal King had laid stress upon the Divine calling and appointment of the Messiah and had expressed it in terms of adoption. It is to such a one that the words are addressed, 'Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee' (Ps. ii. 7). The relation was one which began at a definite point in the lifetime of him who was appointed. It was formal and official. Nevertheless, it led to the Messiah being thought of and described as the Son of God and in this sense it was applied to Jesus[2].

Into the form thus provided St Paul put entirely new contents. He employs the description 'Son' and occasionally the full phrase 'Son of God' in such a way as to show that he conceives of the relationship as personal, ethical and inherent. Thus he speaks of Christ as 'the Son' (1 Cor. xv. 28), or 'his Son' (Ro. i. 3, 9, v. 10; 1 Cor. i. 9; Gal. iv. 6). And the significance of this usage is shown by the passages in which the description is expanded, as in Romans viii. 3, *τὸν ἑαυτοῦ*

[1] Lake, *supra*, p. 94.

[2] *E.g.* Mk. i. 11; Mt. iv. 6; and compare Mt. xxvii. 40 wtih Lk. xxiii. 35.

υἱὸν πέμψας; viii. 31, τοῦ ἰδίου υἱοῦ οὐκ ἐφείσατο; and Colossians i. 13, τοῦ υἱοῦ τῆς ἀγάπης αὐτοῦ. Here the conception of Christ's sonship has passed over into a conception other and deeper than the official Messianic one. The language postulates a relationship which is independent of any historical experience, one which is pre-eminently ethical in character, and seems to involve 'a community of nature between the Father and the Son'; and this significance is confirmed by the freedom and emphasis with which God is described as his Father (*e.g.* 2 Cor. i. 3, xi. 31; Eph. i. 3; Col. i. 3).

In what way the Apostle was led to the conviction which is reflected in this usage may be possible to surmise though it cannot be proved. The closeness of the relation between God and Christ was for him a necessary postulate for his explanation of Salvation. It was indispensable to that explanation that Christ should be in a sense free from all qualification, representative of God, in order that in what He did in dying to sin and for sin men might see the act of God, the revelation of His attitude to sin, the proof that the power of sin was broken. God was behind, one might say that He was within, the sacrifice of Christ, alike in its purpose, in its achievement and in its result. He was 'in Christ reconciling mankind unto himself.' Any merely official relation was wholly inadequate to fulfil the conditions of the work that Christ had performed.

The ethical character of the relationship was also a necessary postulate for St Paul, inasmuch as the sending and the sacrifice of Christ were prompted by the love of God, the effect of that sacrifice was to 'commend the love of God,' and one result of it was that the hearts of men were flooded by the same love; while, at the same time, it was the like motive, love to men which prompted Christ to offer the sacrifice (Gal. ii. 20; Eph. ii. 4, v. 2, 25). If God and Christ were one alike in the central

energy of character and in the direction which it took, undeterred by unworthiness in the object, then the relation between them could best be discerned and described as one which was pre-eminently ethical in character[1].

There is every probability that His own relation to God had been similarly conceived by Jesus, and similarly expressed by Him in terms of sonship. It is indeed the conception of that relation which answers to what was deepest in His self-consciousness. The same conception may have been reached by St Paul either as the result of spiritual intuition or as part of the tradition passed on to him by others. In the former case it would seem necessary to postulate for him a wider and more intimate acquaintance with the character, conduct and teaching of Jesus than he is usually credited with. In the latter case this factor in our Lord's self-presentation to men must have gone deep into their thinking about Him. Indeed, it would be natural to presume that He had said more upon the subject than has been preserved in our record.

(v) THE RELATION BETWEEN CHRIST AND THE SPIRIT

There were two other aspects in which St Paul deepened the conception of the Messiah-Jesus to the extent of transforming it. He who by the resurrection had been publicly installed and proclaimed as the Messianic Son *with power*, had at and through the same resurrection become on the one hand 'a life-giving spirit' (or 'the life-giving spirit') and on the other hand the new Adam, spiritual progenitor and Head of a new race.

[1] Cp. Denney, *Studies in Theology*, p. 33 ff.: 'It [the Sonship] may involve metaphysical presuppositions, but these alone do not constitute it. We miss the mark altogether if we do not see that it is constituted out of love, confidence, obedience, fellowship in a work for man.'

The Synoptic Gospels represent Jesus as specially qualified for His Messianic work by His possession of the Holy Spirit. At His baptism the spirit came upon Him in all the fullness of its power. And the influence of the same spirit by which He was led up into the wilderness of Temptation is understood to have been part of His constant experience. It was indeed part of His Messianic prerogative to be endowed with the spirit of wisdom and revelation by which the prophets had been guided. Down to the time of Pentecost the Spirit was conceived of as a divine power manifesting itself in selected men and coming to the fullness of its expression in the life and teaching of Jesus. At the same time allusions to the Spirit by Jesus Himself are surprisingly few. It has been suggested that 'the subject was not entirely congenial to his own mind. His sense of God was immediate and personal. He may have felt that an idea like that of the Spirit removed God to a distance, or put an abstract power in place of Him. His silence on the Spirit would result unconsciously from the effort to think of God directly as the Father who was ever near to his children.'[1] If this be so, it indicates an important distinction between Jesus and the Evangelists; to them it was natural to trace what seemed strange and supernatural in Him to the operation of the Spirit.

In the Acts there is only one passage bearing on the subject (xvi. 7), where a similar hindering to that traced to the Holy Spirit in *v.* 6 is ascribed to 'the spirit of Jesus.'

But it was St Paul who brought the Spiritual Christ and the Spirit of God into the very closest relation, yet a relation not so much of identity as of equivalence. Direct indications of this are few, and their interpretation is not certain. In Romans i. 3, 4 κατὰ πνεῦμα

[1] E. F. Scott, *The Spirit in the New Testament*, p. 79.

ἁγιωσύνης is balanced with κατὰ σάρκα in such a way as to suggest a personal holiness in Jesus which was complementary to his physical constitution[1]. On the other hand, good authorities interpret the phrase to mean that Jesus was identified with the Holy Spirit in the same way as he was with the human stock of David, and so was raised to be the Son of God 'with power.' A more direct statement is found in 1 Corinthians xv. 45, though the authorities are here again divided; 'the first Adam became an animate being, the last Adam a life-giving spirit.' The second clause is commonly taken to refer to Christ prior to His incarnation, and to do no more than emphasise the distinction between Him and a 'psychic' or animate being. But apart from other reasons to be given later[2] this is to ignore the force of ζωοποιοῦν, 'life-giving,' and the special association of the Holy Spirit with the function of creating life. The probability is that St Paul means here that Christ after the resurrection became One who exercised the same function and so came into the closest relation with the Holy Spirit.

The third passage (2 Cor. iii. 17) is not lacking in clearness, and appears to state the relation in terms which do not stop short of identification. 'The Lord is the Spirit.' Moreover, this statement is followed in the next verse by a phrase which seems to repeat the thought: 'as from the Lord the Spirit.' There are, however, other renderings of this phrase which are grammatically possible and remove the support which it would otherwise give to the clear statement in the first. And even the first phrase is not so free from ambiguity as it seems. We have already observed that the verb (ἐστί) may convey not identity but representation[3]. And a careful study of the contents makes

[1] So Feine, *NTT*, p. 260, 'nach seinem Heiligkeitsgeist.'
[2] See below, p. 262. [3] See above, p. 189.

it probable that the phrase means, 'now "the Lord" signifies the spirit.' In turning to the Lord men turn from the letter to the spirit[1].

In any case, none of these passages gives a sufficiently sure foundation on which alone to build a doctrine of the relation of Christ to the Spirit as conceived by St Paul. We must look to the indirect evidence. What that points to is not so much a personal identity as an equivalence of function. In all that concerns the present experience of the Christian, moral or spiritual, St Paul treats the heavenly Christ and the Holy Spirit as practically interchangeable. The Spirit and the exalted Christ alike make themselves felt as δύναμις, a divine Force of personality working on the personality of the Christian[2]. And the character and direction of their influence are identical. That 'Life' which was a comprehensive description of the Christian experience was at once the Life of Jesus 'manifested in our mortal bodies' (2 Cor. iv. 10, 11), in a sense, Christ Himself (Col. iii. 4) and the direct result of the Spirit's influence (Gal. v. 25; 2 Cor. iii. 6). And the same general equivalence appears in many details. In Romans viii. 9–11 the 'Spirit of God,' the 'Spirit of Christ' and 'Christ' are used indifferently to describe the indwelling power of God. The universal presence of Christ in the church and in each believer as well as his presence 'at the right hand of God' found a necessary explanation in this collocation with the universal Spirit of God; while at the same time the varied forms of ethical influence which were now assigned to the Spirit were seen to be identical with the ethical ideals and influence of Jesus. In fact, this equivalence which St Paul gave to the heavenly Christ and to the Spirit

[1] E. F. Scott, *ut cit.* p. 181.

[2] Cp. 1 Cor. ii. 4 (hendiadys); 1 Thess. i. 5 with 2 Cor. xii. 9 and Phil. iv. 13.

bore not less effectively on his conception of the Spirit than on his Christology. It led to a transference to the Spirit of the character, qualities and purposes which had been seen in Jesus. And so it led to a conception of the Spirit which can only be described in terms of personality.

The fact which St Paul emphasises is that to the Christian consciousness the influence of the personal risen Christ is equivalent as regards its moral and religious effect to the energy of the Divine Spirit; and that it is through our faith in Him, our union with Him, that we experience that specific working of God's Spirit which was exemplified supremely in His life. The personal pre-eminence of Christ and the intimacy of the relation in which He stands to God are involved in this conviction that He acts on men's souls with the power of God's Spirit and that His influence conveys to them what is proper to the very life of God[1].

(vi) THE SECOND ADAM

As by deepening the conception of Sonship and by emphasising the equivalence in the work of Salvation between the Son and the Spirit St Paul threw new light on the relation of Christ to God, so he illuminated His relation to mankind by presenting Him as the new Adam of a new Race.

In the first place, he conceived of a new Humanity, a corporate unity of redeemed men, as having been brought into being through Christ. There had in fact been 'a new creation' (2 Cor. v. 17; Gal. vi. 15). The 'new man' had been created as the first man had been 'after the image of God,' but in righteousness and holiness which rest on truth (Eph. iv. 24). And when St Paul calls on men to ensphere themselves in this

[1] See Somerville, *St Paul's Conception of Christ*, p. 120.

new Humanity (Col. iii. 10; Eph. iii. 23), it is as when he calls on them to be ensphered in Christ. And he foresees as the destiny of this corporate Society of Christ's people that it is to develop extensively and intensively, in magnitude and in likeness to Christ until it actually represents Christ to the world (Eph. iv. 13).

In the second place, as the earlier Humanity had in Adam its origin, its head and its representative, so the new Race had the same in Christ. Thus the first Adam was 'a type' of Him that was to come (Ro. v. 14), and Christ can be recognised as the last Adam, who, summing up humanity in Himself, re-presents it to God. If it were reasonable to believe that the first Adam had entailed upon his descendants according to the flesh condemnation and death, how much more reasonable was it that the second Adam, the Son of God, should be able to secure for those who belonged to Him by faith the reversal of condemnation and the gift of life.

The first man, Adam, had at his entrance into the visible world, been made 'a living soul.' The last Adam had at His entrance into the world unseen been made 'a life-giving spirit.' And as the first man belonged to earth, being earthy, so the second Man belongs to heaven, being heavenly[1].

That this is the meaning of this much disputed passage appears from a careful study of the context in which we find it. The question in hand is, With what body do they come? The body of the first Adam had been a body 'of humiliation,' and as composed of 'flesh and blood' could not inherit the Kingdom of God. The body to be borne by the new man after the resur-

[1] See H. R. Mackintosh, *The Person of Christ*, p. 69: 'the passage is concerned throughout not with the pre-existent but with the exalted Christ. It was only in virtue of the Resurrection that He became head and archetype of the new race'; Windisch, *TLZ*, xxxiv. 602: 'the heavenly man as known to us from Philo has no existence at all for Pauline Christology.'

rection was a 'spiritual' or heavenly body. Until the Resurrection of Christ the highest thing that could be said of man was that he was 'a living soul,' and even that was qualified by the fact that he was 'of the earth, earthy.' Now, the Head of the new Race, Himself become 'a life-giving spirit,' had a body 'of glory,' belonged to heaven and the spiritual world, and provided for those who through Him were joined to the new Humanity, a guarantee that a like heavenly 'body' would be theirs. As they had borne the image of the earthly, so they would bear the image of the heavenly.

(vii) SIDE-LIGHTS ON ST PAUL'S CHRISTOLOGY

There remain still certain ideas which St Paul brings into relation with Christ, which contribute something, and it may be something important, to our understanding of his Christology. They are represented by the words σοφία, δόξα and λίθος (Wisdom, Glory and Stone).

The Wisdom. Here it is well to begin with the evidence that the Church in post-Apostolic times equated Christ with the Divine Wisdom. This evidence comes down as late as the Calendar printed in the Book of Common Prayer. The words *O Sapientia* against the date December 16 are the opening words of the first of the seven ancient Advent antiphons, all of which are addressed to Christ; and the words which follow contain echoes of the description of Wisdom in *Ecclesiasticus* and *The Wisdom of Solomon.* In the *Dialogue of Athanasius and Zacchaeus*[1] we find the doctrine that Christ is the Wisdom of God stated and illustrated from the Old Testament. In the collection of *Testimonies* which forms part of Cyprian's works this identification appears as one of the topics; and Justin Martyr is the authority

[1] Ed. F. C. Conybeare, 1898; see Rendel Harris, *Testimonies*, II. 19 and 99.

for the statement, 'in the Books of the Prophets Christ is addressed as the Wisdom.'[1]

At what point did this identification begin? It is a moot question whether it was made by Jesus himself. There is considerable reason to think that it was. A comparison between the Great Invitation (Mt. xi. 28–30) and *Sirach* li. 23–27 suggests not only that He was familiar with the passage, but that He was consciously putting Himself in the place of Wisdom. And the utterance in Luke xi. 49 would be clear of ambiguity if by 'the wisdom of God' Jesus meant Himself, as indeed Matthew understood Him to do (Mt. xxiii. 34)[2].

Whether the idea reached St Paul from the Master or not, he appears to allude to it, and still more clearly to apply it in a striking way. In 1 Corinthians (i. 24) he proclaims Christ as a Force of God and as the Wisdom of God; and in i. 30 he declares that Christ has proved to be for us Wisdom coming from God. That Wisdom here is not the 'wisdom' which in the same context is contrasted with 'foolishness' is suggested by the form of the sentence itself, and confirmed by the analysis of it which immediately follows. 'Righteousness' and 'Sanctification' and 'Redemption' are not natural factors in the wisdom which is sought by the Greeks; they are cognate rather to Wisdom as it is depicted in the Old Testament.

But it is in the Colossian Epistle that we find the clearest indication that St Paul associated Christ with the divine Wisdom. There we have (i. 15–17) a detailed description of what has sometimes been called the Cosmic Christ; 'he is the likeness of the unseen God, born first before all created being;...all things have been created by him and for him; he is antecedent

[1] Justin Martyr, *Dial. c. Tryph.* 100; cp. Tertullian, *De Orat.* 2: 'Quam eleganter divina Sapientia ordinem orationis instruxit.'

[2] Rendel Harris, *Testimonies*, II. 97.

to all things and in him all things subsist.' It has been held by many good authorities that St Paul here exalts Christ to a position as pre-existent Creator and present Upholder of the Universe which goes far beyond the implications of his teaching elsewhere. But there are two things to bear in mind; the first, that already in the earlier Epistles we find the germ of the ideas here developed. 'All things have in him their Source, their Sustainer and their Goal' (Ro. xi. 36; cp. 1 Cor. viii. 6). And further, the development which we find in these verses of Colossians is almost wholly in terms of language derived from Jewish sources in which the divine Wisdom is described. The familiar description of Wisdom in Proverbs viii. 22 ff. ('The Lord possessed me in the beginning of his ways, Before his works of old. I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning, Or ever the earth was') implies what the Jews understood by pre-existence and goes on ('When he marked out the foundations of the earth, Then was I by him, as a master-workman') to suggest at least co-operation between God and the Wisdom in the work of creation. In *Sirach*, xxiv. 3 ff. we find the same ideas further developed; both pre-existence and eternal existence are there predicated of Wisdom; Wisdom is the instrument of God's creative power (xlii. 21), and makes claims which find their parallel only in the words of Jesus: 'Come unto me, ye that are desirous of me'; 'He that obeyeth me shall not be ashamed' (xxiv. 19, 22). In *Enoch* (xxx. 8) we read, 'I commanded my Wisdom to make men,' an evident interpretation of Genesis i. 26; and so in Philo Wisdom appears both as pre-existent and as the creator of the world[1].

The impression made by the study of the context from which these quotations are taken is even stronger

[1] See Bousset, *RJ*3, p. 343 ff.; and specially Windisch, *Festschrift für Heinrici*, p. 220 ff.

than that left by the most striking single sentences. Wisdom in this section of Jewish literature is presented almost as an independent Mediator alike in the work of Creation and in the bringing of spiritual blessings to men. Thus, when the work of the Messiah was apprehended in terms of spiritual blessing and his relations to God in terms of personal sonship, it became natural to transfer to him much of the detailed description and many of the functions which had previously centred round the Wisdom of God. 'The pre-existent Christ of the New Testament, especially of Paul, is the divine wisdom of the Jews.'[1]

At the same time, it is quite probable that there were special circumstances at Colossae which led the Apostle to give particular emphasis to the work of Christ whom he thus equated with Wisdom. That speculative theosophy to which we give the general name of Gnosticism was claiming for various Aeons or personified forces believed to have emanated from God the like powers and functions in the creation and upholding of the world. St Paul recognises the challenge and replies by claiming for Christ that he was prior to all such Forces, and inasmuch as He was the Creator of all, the Aeons themselves, if such there were, had been created by Him.

The same challenge from the side of 'Gnostic' theosophy probably accounts for the phrase which St Paul uses in the same context; 'in him the divine Fullness chose to dwell.'[2] The word Pleroma was probably employed by the Colossian syncretists, and suggested what it afterwards came to denote in developed Gnosticism, the totality of the divine emanation, 'the spirit forces of the world,' under whose government

[1] Windisch, *ut sup.* p. 232.

[2] Col. i. 19; cp. ii. 9: 'In Him dwells the whole fullness of the Godhead bodily.'

men were supposed to live. What St Paul asserts is that the true Pleroma, the Pleroma of the Godhead, the totality of divine agencies, is found in Christ[1]. Among these he would reckon the Wisdom, the Word, the Spirit, and the Glory, of God[2]. Moreover, Christ the true Pleroma had overcome the false one, when he stripped off from Himself the 'principalities and powers' and 'triumphed over them openly.' The clue to the passage lies in the fact that St Paul puts Christ on the one hand in the place of the Divine Wisdom of the Old Testament, and on the other hand in the place of the Pleroma, the totality of 'spirit-forces of the world' whose servitude the theosophists were seeking to rivet upon the Colossians. Whatever the false teachers promised as the result of accepting their teaching could be more wholly and more surely secured through Christ. In Him men might reach complete fullness (Col. ii. 10), a thought which leads the Apostle in the following verses to an exposition of the contents of that fullness and the stages by which it is arrived at.

This passage in Colossians therefore does not represent any addition to St Paul's conception of Christ. He elaborates in view of theosophic speculation convictions which he has already expressed[3].

The Glory. 'The history of the word Glory (δόξα) in the Bible has still to be written.' When it is written it will probably be found that, like many other Scriptural expressions, it starts from a conception which is physical or material, something which appeals to the senses, and

[1] Cp. *Dial. of Athanasius and Zacchaeus*, p. 31: ἐδιδάχθης ἀπὸ τῶν προφητῶν ὅτι δύναμις καὶ λόγος καὶ σοφία καὶ βραχίων καὶ παίδιον καὶ ἄνθρωπος λέγεται.

[2] See Lightfoot, *Colossians*, p. 260; and especially Somerville, *St Paul's Conception of Christ*, p. 158.

[3] Dibelius, *HNT*, *ad* Col. i. 15: 'We must not over-estimate the significance of these thoughts for Paul's belief about Christ; for they are not formed *ad hoc*, but *ad hoc* developed as fully as they are.'

ends as a conception which is predominantly ethical in character. 'We beheld his glory, full of grace and truth' (Jo. i. 14). The word owes its significance in many passages of the New Testament to the fact that (probably along with σκηνή) it stands for the Jewish conception of the Shekinah, the splendour or brilliance which is an effluence from the Deity, which can be seen though He Himself is not visible, and which marks the place of His dwelling. In the Targums this word Shekinah is commonly employed as a substitute for 'God' in the Hebrew text[1]. In *Enoch* also (xiv. 20) we find, 'And the great Glory sat thereon'; (cii. 3) 'the angels will seek to hide themselves from the great Glory'; and in *Sirach* (xvii. 13), 'their eyes beheld the majesty of the Glory.'

In the New Testament we find allusions to the Shekinah of the Temple in Hebrews ix. 5 and in Romans ix. 4 where St Paul mentions it among the privileges enjoyed by Israel. But the word (δόξα) appears also to be used of Christ, and that with the meaning developed in inter-canonical literature. Thus in 1 Corinthians ii. 8 we find him described as 'the Lord of the Glory'; and in Ephesians i. 17 God is spoken of as 'the Father of the Glory.' If along with these passages we take James ii. 1 ('Our Lord Jesus Christ, who is the Glory.' M.) and 1 Peter iv. 14 ('The Spirit of the Glory and of God'), it is difficult to resist the conclusion that for St Paul also the Glory was an equivalent for Christ[2].

[1] See Bousset, *RJ*3, p. 346; *HDB*, iv. 487 ff. Examples are Ex. xxxiii. 14, 'My Shekinah shall go with thee'; xxxiii. 20, 'Thou canst not see the face of my Shekinah.'

[2] See J. B. Mayor on Jas. ii. 1; Hort on the same passage; Burney, *Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel*, p. 36. Commenting on Ps. ii., Simeon ben Jochai speaks of 'The Lord of the serving Angels, the son of the Highest, yea, the Shekinah.' There is an interesting passage in Justin Martyr (*c. Tryph.* 61): 'God begat from Himself a certain immaterial Dynamis, which is called the Glory of the Lord, and sometimes the Son, and sometimes the Wisdom.'

The Stone or Rock. Here again Cyprian in his *Testimonies* (II. 16) gives special significance to the passages in the Epistles which connect Christ with the Stone, Corner Stone or Stone of Stumbling referred to in the Old Testament[1]. For one of his headings is, 'Quod idem lapis dictus est'; and Justin Martyr had already made frequent use of the idea in his dialogue[2]. St Paul appears to have made the same identification when he described Christ as the foundation, the only foundation which can be laid (1 Cor. iii. 10; Gal. ii. 9), the corner-stone (Eph. ii. 20), and again as the Stone of Stumbling (Ro. ix. 32, 33). The parallel passage in 1 Peter (ii. 6–8) so far from having been borrowed by St Peter from St Paul, as has been thought, may well point to the common use by both Apostles of a Book of Testimonies in which this identification is made[3].

The identification with the Stone may not lead to such important inferences as the identification with the Divine Wisdom and the Divine Glory. But it combines with the others to show very clearly what was the field in which St Paul's mind was working. Each of these ideas represents a root (it may be a secondary one) of his Christology. And each of them is let down into the soil of the Old Testament.

(viii) PRE-EXISTENCE OF CHRIST

The question of the pre-existence of Christ is comparatively unimportant if what is meant is merely, Did St Paul conceive of Christ as having existed prior to His Incarnation? Concerning that there can be no doubt. 'He who was rich, for our sakes became poor'

[1] Ps. cxviii. 22; Is. viii. 14, xxviii. 16.

[2] See Rendel Harris, *ut cit.* I. 19, 29 ff.; Justin Martyr, *c. Tryph.* cc. 34, 70, 76, 86.

[3] Rendel Harris, *ut cit.* p. 30. Cp. *Dialogue of Athanasius and Zacchaeus*, p. 54. The possibility cannot be excluded that this identification also goes back to Jesus. 'On this rock' (πέτρα) = Himself.

(2 Cor. viii. 9). At the same time this would not serve for one brought up in Jewish thought to place Christ in a unique position. For it was an established habit of the Jewish mind to assert pre-existence of objects and of men who were specially representative of God. It was asserted in this way of Moses, of the Temple, the Tabernacle, the heavenly Jerusalem, the Law and the Sabbath[1]. It simply meant that 'the notion of quality was transformed into the notion of priority.' In Psalm cxxxix. 15, 16 we find the same thing predicated of the human personality[2]. It was all the more natural to postulate pre-existence for such Divine energies as the Word or the Wisdom, and for such a Divine representative as the Messiah. And when St Paul recognised in Christ both the Wisdom and the Messiah the conception of his pre-existence followed as a matter of course[3]. What is of importance for our enquiry is to ascertain, if it be possible, in what form Paul conceived of Christ as pre-existing, and in what relation to God.

(ix) CHRIST AND GOD

In seeking light upon St Paul's conception of the relation between God and Christ in His pre-existent state it is natural to turn first to the Christological passage in the Epistle to the Philippians (ii. 6–11).

Starting from what appears to be fairly certain, we note that it is the pre-existent Christ of whom St Paul is speaking (*ὑπάρχων*); and he uses a word which at least does not exclude the idea that for Christ there was no beginning; He was originally 'in the form of God,' but came through the Incarnation to be 'in the form

[1] See P. W. Schmiedel, *ad* 1 Cor. xv. 45, in the *Handcommentar*.

[2] See some interesting illustrations given by Windisch, *Festschrift für Heinrici*, p. 225.

[3] See Bricka, *Le Fondement Christologique de la Morale Paulinienne*, p. 14 ff.

of a thrall'; the change involved an emptying of Himself, and was followed by a further manifestation of humility, a proof of His determination not to 'look on his own things,' in that as a man He was obedient, and that up to the point of accepting the death of the cross. And in consequence God has highly exalted Him, not only restoring to Him that whereof He had emptied Himself, but giving Him the title and position of Lord, in accordance with which He is to receive the worship of all created being.

As to the rest, concerning which opinions and authorities are divided, the clue seems to lie in the indubitable contrast between 'in the form of God' and 'in the form of a thrall'; and in the recognition that the latter phrase is not adequately explained as a reference to the lowly condition of the Saviour's life on earth. It refers to the fact, as it was for St Paul, that in the completeness of His identification with humanity He entered into the thraldom or servitude to which in various forms mankind was subjected. Paul does not say, however, that He was a thrall (δοῦλος)[1], but that He was in the form of a thrall. In every recognisable aspect of His personality He was a thrall; but there was that in Him which steadfastly refused to submit to the thraldom. Thus, though 'under sin' He was 'without sin.' And this throws light on the meaning of 'in the form of God.' Paul refrains, we cannot help feeling refrains deliberately, from saying θεὸς ὑπάρχων, 'being originally God,' but suggests that in every recognisable aspect of His personality He was from the beginning Divine; He shared in the Divine nature, possibly St Paul would have said, shared along with other Divine existences such as the Wisdom and the Spirit. But there was a further privilege which was

[1] Even as he shrinks or refrains from saying that He was 'accursed' (Gal. iii. 13) or a 'sinner' (2 Cor. v. 21).

within his reach, namely, to be 'equal with God.' He could have grasped it by the assertion of Himself, by insistence on His own interests[1]. But He refused, nay, more than that, He abdicated the privileges which were His as being 'in the form of God' and became man in all the circumstances of his servitude.

That God when 'He highly exalted him' gave Him the name and authority of Kyrios, the Lord, appears to indicate that Christ was after His resurrection admitted to higher glory than He had before, and so confirms the interpretation we have given of 'to be equal with God.'

It may be claimed for this exegesis of the passage that it explains and justifies its place in the context and St Paul's purpose in writing it. It exhibits Christ as the supreme illustration of his own utterance, 'he that humbleth himself shall be exalted,' and His example as the supreme sanction for the precept, 'Look not every man on his own things.'

Apart from this passage in Philippians we have to rely mainly on St Paul's references to Christ as 'Son' and to God as His 'Father,' supplemented and illustrated by the parallel conceptions of The Wisdom and The Glory. All three assume the pre-existence of Christ, but while the Sonship emphasises particularly the personal and ethical relations, the others emphasise its inherent character. Conceivably at least there might have been a time when the Son was not (though this is by no means suggested by St Paul). But to think of God without His Glory and His Wisdom was not possible. They were co-eternal with Himself. At the same time it is probable that St Paul thought of Christ

[1] Taking ἁρπαγμόν in the sense of *res rapienda*. Should it mean rather *res rapta*, the equality with God would be something which He had, but surrendered. In deciding between these two the language of the passage gives no assistance. But the former seems preferable in view of the thought in *vv.* 9–11.

as having realised the relation of Sonship with added fullness after the Resurrection. Henceforth He was instated as the Son 'with power,' as 'the life-giving spirit,' as 'the Lord,' and as 'the first-born of a great brotherhood.'[1] His self-offering in fulfilment of the Father's will was at once the expression and the proof of spiritual and ethical oneness, which, combined with the idea of subordination never lost sight of by St Paul, is most accurately indicated in the relation of Sonship. The 'Son' always implies the 'Father'; and, as Bousset says, 'the object of Paul's faith was in a strange way a double one. Faith was for him in the same sense and in the same extent faith in Christ Jesus and in God.'

Nevertheless, St Paul did not call Jesus Christ God. That is the conclusion to which we should in all probability come after a careful examination of the three passages in which many have found evidence to the contrary. In Romans ix. 5, where the question is one of punctuation, both A.V. and R.V. adopt the form which makes the Apostle describe Christ as 'God blessed for evermore.' But Westcott and Hort, putting a colon after the word *σάρκα*, support the view that the closing words of the verse do not refer to Christ but contain an ascription of praise to Almighty God (cp. Ro. i. 25; 2 Cor. xi. 31)[2]. The introduction of 'Amen' as a solemn close to the sentence is decidedly in favour of regarding it as a doxology[3]. In 2 Thessalonians i. 12 (*κατὰ τὴν χάριν τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*), A.V. and R.V. divide the clauses, rightly recognising that a second article is not required before

[1] Cp. Denney, *ad* Ro. viii. 29: 'It is implied in *πρωτότοκον* that he also is regarded as having attained the fulness of his Sonship through the Resurrection'; and Pfleiderer, *Paulinism*, i. 131.

[2] So Lietzmann in *HNT*, Jülicher in *SNT*, Denney in *EGT*. *Aliter SH*, and apparently Westcott in Appendix, vol. ii. p. 110.

[3] See F. C. Burkitt, *JTS*, v. p. 451, who also makes an interesting suggestion regarding *ὁ ὤν*.

κυρίου, and that it is in keeping with the general Pauline usage to distinguish between the Father as θεός and Jesus Christ as κύριος[1]. The third case, in Titus ii. 13, is more ambiguous. Here the A.V. ('the glory of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ') has been altered in R.V. into 'the glory of our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ,' making the sentence speak of Christ as God. Between these two renderings it is hardly possible to decide. But a more probable rendering than either of these is that suggested by Dr Hort, 'the appearing of Him who is the Glory of our great God and Saviour, even Jesus Christ[2].' The balance of judgment is probably in favour of a rendering which would not present Paul as speaking of Christ as God. But even if it were otherwise, there would still remain the uncertainty as to the Pauline authorship of this Epistle. And though it were held (as seems probable) that in the Pastoral Epistles we have a combination of Pauline and non-Pauline elements, this phrase appears in a section which is conspicuous for the number of non-Pauline features. It would therefore be taking very precarious ground if we relied on this passage as the only evidence that St Paul spoke of Christ as 'God.'

Should the examination of these passages leave any uncertainty as to whether St Paul did or did not in one or other of them refer to Christ as 'God,' that uncertainty must give way before the very great improbability that one in whom the monotheistic faith of

[1] See Milligan, *Thessalonians, ad loc.*

[2] The fullest discussion of the passage is in Esra Abbott, *Critical Essays*, pp. 439–487, concluding that the phrases should be separated. See a valuable note in W. Lock, I.C.C. *ad loc.*; see also Hort, *The Epistle of St James*, p. 47; Burney, *Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel*, p. 36. Koehler in *SNT* (commentary) leaves the question undecided; Dibelius in *HNT* translates 'unseres Gottheilands'; Moffatt separates the phrases, 'the appearance of the Glory of the great God and of our Saviour Jesus Christ.'

Judaism was so deeply ingrained could have taken this momentous step. Moreover, if the Apostle had taken this step for himself, it would on the one hand have called for exposition and defence, on the other hand, it would inevitably have involved him in controversy and the fiercest criticism. And of neither of these is there any trace. He tells us that the message of the cross was 'to the Jews a stumbling-block.' But to have proclaimed Christ as δεύτερος θεός, a second God, would have been to put a far more hopeless barrier between the Jew and the Gospel. What we do in fact seem to see is the Apostle being pressed by his experience and urged by his convictions up to the verge of acknowledging Christ as God, but finally precluded from making such acknowledgment by his hereditary monotheism[1].

It follows that any attempt to find in St Paul's teaching about Christ another instance of that 'deification' of heroes and Emperors which was common in his time is quite beside the mark. In such cases we find the title indeed conferred, but nothing corresponding to St Paul's religious and ethical attitude to Christ. In his case we find a deliberate refraining from giving the title, but a consistent attitude of the whole personality, mind, will and heart, such as men take up towards the living God alone.

It was only after the lapse of three or more centuries and with the aid of a philosophy to which St Paul was a stranger that the Church was able to arrive at a formula in which it proclaimed the Godhead of the Son consistently with the unity of the Godhead.

How near the Apostle came to giving this name to Christ may be seen not only in his habit of transferring to Him many of the attributes and prerogatives which

[1] Cp. Feine, *NTT*, p. 256, 'Er hat Christus nie Gott genannt'; Jülicher, *SNT*, ii. 223; Weiss, *Urchristentum*, pp. 363, 375.

in the Old Testament were reserved for God, but in descriptions in which any distinction almost fades away. Christ is 'the image of God' (Col. i. 15), all that God could be in human flesh. God has 'shined in our hearts to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ' (2 Cor. iv. 6), that is, in the recognisable personality of Jesus. Again, Paul never loses sight of the fact that the world is to be judged by God, judgment being indeed one of His special prerogatives (Ro. iii. 6); but Christ also is to be the judge at the great assize, whether He is presented as the representative of God, 'through whom God shall judge the secrets of men' (Ro. ii. 16), or whether He appears independently as the One who occupies the judgment seat (2 Cor. v. 10). It is, however, in 1 Corinthians ii. 8 that the Apostle comes nearer perhaps than in any other to identifying Christ with God. He there speaks of Him as 'the Lord of the Glory' (*τὸν κύριον τῆς δόξης*). It may not be possible to decide the precise relation which is indicated by the genitive; but the significant thing is that in the Book of Enoch this description is one which is commonly applied to the Almighty. 'Then blessed I the Lord of Glory, the eternal King.'[1] And as it was in the days of His flesh that the world-rulers had failed to recognise the Lord of glory, the phrase seems to carry back Paul's highest conception of Christ to the days before the Resurrection.

Still Paul refrained from giving the title *θεός* to Christ. And to this an illuminating parallel may possibly be found in connection with his use and non-use of the word 'Saviour.' He does use it on two occasions with reference to Christ. He is 'the Saviour of the Body' (Eph. v. 23), *i.e.* it is He who saves the Body, the Church. 'Whence also we await a Saviour (one who saves), even the Lord Jesus Christ' (Phil. iii.

[1] *Enoch* xxv. 7; see Weiss *ad* 1 Cor. ii. 8.

20). In both these cases the word appears rather as a description of His activity than as a title. The distinction becomes clearly marked when we turn to the Pastoral Epistles and find the word freely used there as a title and not as a description of activity or function[1]. Had St Paul been consciously or even half-consciously setting forth Christ as the Divine hero of a new mystery-cult he could hardly have failed to claim for Him the title which such heroes commonly bore. And indeed in view of the supreme significance which he attached to Salvation, and the way in which he traced it in all its aspects to Christ his refraining from speaking of Christ as ὁ σωτήρ has all the appearance of being deliberate. Should we seek for a motive, it might well be found in an instinctive disinclination to bring Christ to the level of the mystery-heroes, a disinclination similar in character to that which withheld him from speaking of Christ as God.

(x) CONCLUSION

St Paul nowhere speaks of Christ as God. Yet 'God was in Christ'; the Church (of the Thessalonians) was 'in God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ'; Paul prays that 'our God and Father and the Lord Jesus Christ' may direct his way, and uses a verb in the singular after the double subject; he 'besought the Lord' that he might be delivered from the thorn in his flesh, and he means Christ. What formula can be found to express this paradox, a reluctance to identify coupled with a blending in experience?

To say that for St Paul Christ had the value of God may seem an inadequate thing to say. Nevertheless it must be the starting point for any positive statement upon the subject. And further progress must be along

[1] See W. Foerster, *Herr ist Jesus*, 1924, p. 124; and compare Hort, *The Christian Ecclesia*, 1900, p. 124 (on ἐπίσκοπος).

the line of discovering what that 'value' was. The phrase itself, in our common use of it, is apt to be thinned to express little more than an intellectual estimate. As such it would be utterly inadequate to express the Apostle's thought and attitude. For he brought into his conception of God's 'value' the whole moral, emotional and intellectual content of his religious heritage, the whole hope of mankind. All that God had been expected, or could be expected, to do for men in the field of man's spiritual or moral experience had been done by Christ. It is only when we realise the greatness and the wonder in the Apostle's eyes of what Christ had done in reconciling men to God, the fulfilment by Him in a transcended form of the age-long purpose of God, that we are prepared to appreciate what is meant by 'the value.' What God alone could do, according to the prophets, Christ had done, or God 'in Him.' St Paul, along with spiritually minded Jews in many generations, had long looked forward to the day when God would 'redeem Israel from all his iniquities.' It had now been done, by Christ. He had long seen all his religious hope embodied in a Kingdom which God was pledged to bring in. Christ had brought it, and as to its meaning for men the half had not been told. Paul had lifted his heart to a day when God would 'pour forth of his Spirit upon all flesh'; Christ had sent that Spirit to dwell in the hearts of men; and lo! the Spirit had the character of Jesus.

And as he had received from or through Christ all that he and his race had been taught to expect of God, so he offered to Christ all that he felt due from man to God, utter confidence, the child-like dependence which expresses itself in prayer, obedience, love, worship. If because of his monotheism he was withheld from describing Christ as 'God,' and we are withheld from saying more than that for St Paul Christ had the

value of God, we must remember what value God had for St Paul. The Apostle was not acquainted with the fourth Gospel, but he would have subscribed with all his heart to the saying, 'He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father.'

Christianity according to St Paul was something in which experience, theory and conduct were inextricably intertwined. It was a Life, which springs up in men in response to the approach of God in Christ. It was life to God and in God, a life of freedom, of sonship and of ethical aspiration and achievement, life on a plane beyond the reach of death. And Paul's 'theology' was an exposition of what God had done in Christ which made such life possible, of what man must do in order to realise it, and of what God was doing through Christ to nourish and to foster it. His Christology was a recognition of that status in the world of being which men could not fail to give to One through Whom and in Whom they had experience of the saving power of God.

INDICES

I

INDEX OF SUBJECTS

II

INDEX OF AUTHORS

INDEX OF PRINCIPAL PASSAGES

CAMBRIDGE: PRINTED BY W. LEWIS, M.A., AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS