

HARPER'S LIBRARY *of* LIVING THOUGHT





PAUL
AND
JESUS



BY
JOHANNES
WEISS



H
&
B



HARPER &
BROTHERS
LONDON & NEWYORK



H
&
B

PAUL AND JESUS

BY

JOHANNES WEISS

PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY IN
THE UNIVERSITY OF HEIDELBERG

TRANSLATED BY

REV. H. J. CHAYTOR, M.A.

HEADMASTER OF PLYMOUTH COLLEGE

LONDON AND NEW YORK
HARPER & BROTHERS
45 ALBEMARLE STREET, W.

1909

PAUL AND JESUS

THE subject before us is by no means new, though its religious interest is ever fresh and has been revived recently and vigorously by the publication of Wrede's "Paulus."* In opposition to this book a series of publications have appeared within the last few years; of these I need mention for consideration only the works of Kölbing, Kaftan, and Jülicher.† In all of these we may trace more or less clearly the profound emotion which must have been aroused in every sensitive reader by Wrede's radical and uncompromising statements. Whether we are inclined or not to accept his fundamental ideas, the effect produced by his mode of exposition can only be described as staggering. We must, at any rate, submit to this impression, and attempt at least conditionally to adopt Wrede's standpoint, if we wish to appreciate the serious nature of the problem. In order to

* *Religionsgeschichtliche Volksbücher*, I, 5, 6. Tübingen, 1905.

† P. Kölbing, "The Spiritual Influence of the Man Jesus upon Paul." Göttingen, 1906. J. Kaftan, "Jesus and Paul": a friendly polemic directed against the volumes by D. Bousset and D. Wrede in the *Religionsgeschichtliche Volksbücher*. Tübingen, 1906. A. Jülicher, "Paul and Jesus," *Religionsgeschichtliche Volksbücher*, I, 14. Tübingen, 1907.

PAUL AND JESUS

attain this mental attitude in the interest of the arguments we shall propose, we must now recall some of his main principles.

Wrede's object is to overthrow the view predominant in modern theology, that Paul loyally and consistently expounded and developed the theology of Jesus.

“ Unless these two figures are to be deprived of all historical reality, it is obvious that the title ‘ Jesus’ disciple ’ is hardly applicable to Paul, if it is intended to express his historical relationship to Jesus. He is essentially, in comparison with Jesus, *a new phenomenon, as new as is possible, in view of the wide standpoint common to both.* He is far more widely removed from Jesus than Jesus Himself is removed from the noblest forms of Jewish piety. Nor is any advantage gained by the assertion that Paul’s teaching could not exactly coincide with that of Jesus, seeing that he could look back upon the life and personality of Jesus. We need not further labour the point that *the picture of Jesus’ life and work did not determine the character of the Pauline theology.* . . . Undoubtedly Paul regarded himself as a disciple and apostle of Jesus, and was proud of the fact : he was not himself conscious that he was an innovator. But in view of the facts, his personal opinion is no proof that he merely continued Jesus’ work and ‘ understood ’ Jesus ; indeed, it was not the historical Jesus Whose disciple and servant he professed

WREDE'S THEORY

to be, but Another (namely, the heavenly Christ).”

Wrede compares the teaching of Paul and Christ as follows : “ The teaching of Jesus is directed entirely to the individual personality. Man is to submit his soul to God and to God’s will wholly and without reserve. Hence his preaching is for the most part imperative in character, if not in form.

“ The central point for Paul is a divine and supernatural action manifested as a historical fact, or a complex of divine actions which open to mankind a salvation prepared for man. He who believes these divine acts—the incarnation, death, and resurrection of a divine being—can obtain salvation.

“ This view is the essential point of Paul’s religion, and is the solid framework without which his belief would collapse incontinently ; was it a continuation or a further development of Jesus’ gospel ? Where, in this theory, can we find the ‘ gospel ’ which Paul is said to have ‘ understood.’ The point which was everything to Paul was nothing to Jesus.”

1. The three publications above mentioned proceed upon individual lines in their attempts to confute Wrede : they are, however, akin, in so far as they attempt to weaken his arguments by representing them as one-sided and exaggerated. They are particularly concerned to show that the preaching of Jesus and that of His apostle were

PAUL AND JESUS

far more closely related and have much more in common than Wrede will admit ; while naturally recognising that a considerable difference exists, they assert that unanimity upon the central point is paramount. These efforts to secure a compromise have emphasised many valuable points, but I am inclined to doubt their power to efface the wide and deep impression made by Wrede's treatise. The idea probably persists in many quarters, that while Wrede has been defeated upon matters of detail, his main position remains unshaken. This failure is partly due to the fact that the wide range and the serious nature of Wrede's fundamental idea have been inadequately appreciated : if that idea is not always clearly stated in his argument, its presence may be invariably felt.

It must be admitted that upon one point at least Paul's faith differed fundamentally from the religion of Jesus : to Paul Jesus is an object not only of belief, but also of *religious veneration*. A man who asks for "grace and peace," not only "from God our Father," but also "from our Lord Jesus Christ," must regard Christ as co-equal with God : however carefully the formulæ distinguishing His unique nature from that of God may be worded, the practical faith of Paul and his congregations expects no less from Christ than from God—guidance, help, and blessing. Their prayers as well as their praises are offered

PAULINE CHRISTOLOGY

to Him. As compared with the preaching of Jesus, this practice is a complete innovation. I cannot understand how Kaftan can assert that there is a direct line of connection between the gospel proclaimed by Jesus and the early Christian teaching. Granted that Jesus was conscious of His mission as the Messiah, and I should be the last to dispute the fact, granted that He was firmly convinced of His resurrection and elevation to Messianic supremacy, which again I do not deny, the only conclusion to be drawn is that the same ideas are to be found in the preaching of Jesus and of Paul. But can it truly be said that Jesus expected to become the object of divine *veneration* and prayer and of formal worship, even in respect of His future Messianic position? Did He feel that He was not merely the leader of men to salvation, but Himself a part of that salvation? Did He feel that He was not so much the head and the guide of His followers as the future sharer of the throne of God with no less divine a claim to honour and adoration? Is the Christology of Paul a direct continuation of Christ's "consciousness of His Messianic mission"? Here there appears to my mind a discrepancy which no theological device can bridge. I observe in particular a change of front which implies a decisive divergence. In the synoptic Gospels, and to some extent in St. John, I observe the countenance of Jesus ever uplifted to the Father,

PAUL AND JESUS

offering prayer and leading His disciples to Him. Even when Jesus speaks of the Father to men, in full consciousness of the Godhead, He speaks only because He has gained assurance in prayer of His commission and His power ; when He has given testimony before men, He bows again before His Father in order to gain new strength and assurance. Paul also knows the "first-born of many brethren," Who stands at the head of His congregation, makes intercession on their behalf, and secures access to God for them. Preponderant, however, is the sense of complete religious dependence upon the exalted Christ, as expressed in the formula "the servant of Christ," and in the consciousness that the will of the Lord is decisive in every step of personal life. The sacramental union with an exalted Master, the "life in Christ," are forms of a religious belief which regards Christ not as the prophetic revealer of God or the bringer of salvation to men, but as the Godhead Himself. This view seems to me entirely novel, in comparison with the preaching and religion of Jesus Himself.

Kaftan certainly fails to lay sufficient stress upon this discrepancy when he says (p. 58): "Thus the gospel of Jesus and the preaching of Paul are essentially connected, and proceed upon the same fundamental lines of thought. The difference between them arises from the fact that they are separated by the death and resurrection

PAULINE CHRISTOLOGY

of Jesus ; it is the difference between Master and disciple."

Both Kaftan and Jülicher oppose Wrede with the argument that the belief in the divine "Master" was not an innovation introduced by Paul, but had existed in the primitive Christian community before Paul's time. Wrede could hardly dispute the point, and would probably reply that this new development, this fundamental change in the character of the Christian religion, had occurred before Paul's period, and that he was simply the thinker who developed the new religion with the greatest energy and clarity. Here, indeed, we touch the centre of this disturbing question. Primitive Christianity is, in part at least, a religion of Christ ; in other words, its central point is close dependence by faith upon the exalted Christ. For centuries this form of religion has been regarded as Christianity proper, and numberless Christians at the present day neither know nor desire any other form of faith. They live in closest spiritual communion with the "Master," in prayer to Him and in longing to meet Him face to face. Another religious tendency, which proceeds simultaneously, is unable to rest content with dependency upon the exalted Christ, and finds its full satisfaction in progress from Jesus of Nazareth to the Father. These two forms of religious life exist side by side in our churches, and it is very desirable that they should coexist

PAUL AND JESUS

in mutual toleration, and that the preaching of the gospel should do no violence to either of them. I freely admit that I myself, with the majority of modern theologians, prefer the second form, and I hope that it may gradually become predominant in our Church. But as a historian, I feel bound to assert that it is a conception widely removed from the early Christian or the Pauline view. On the other hand, I feel no less bound to assert that the Jesus of history, so far as we know Him, regarded Himself as sent to draw His followers into immediate experience of the life of sonship, without requiring any place for Himself in their religious aspirations.

2. Thus upon all essential points, Wrede's assertions regarding the Pauline doctrine of redemption remain unshaken. Attempts will always be made to show that Jesus also represented salvation and the remission of sins as dependent upon His own death; the words of the institution of the Lord's Supper as given by St. Mark and the words regarding the ransom in St. Mark x. 45 seem to support this view. But the question then arises, how far St. Mark's narrative was influenced upon this and other points by the Pauline doctrine of salvation. The effects of such influence would naturally be expected to appear in a gospel written in the course of mission work among the heathen after the death of Paul. That in this gospel the evangelist

DOCTRINE OF REDEMPTION

did in fact conceive the figure of Jesus from Paul's point of view, has, I think, been adequately demonstrated in my work, "the oldest Gospel." As regards the statements of Jesus now under discussion, the attention of theologians must be constantly directed to the very remarkable circumstance, that the words upon "ransom" are omitted in the third Gospel, ostensibly composed by St. Luke, the pupil of Paul. It is little to the point to argue that the omission was made for the reason that St. Luke omits the whole story of the ambition of the sons of Zebedee. Why should he have rejected this passage which illuminates almost more clearly than any other the special nature of Jesus' gospel, as understood by St. Luke? The omission can hardly have been made in order to spare the feelings of the sons of Zebedee, as such consideration is not obvious in St. Luke ix. 54 f. Yet, in the passage where St. Luke gives the words concerning "service" (xxii. 24) he omits those concerning "ransom." Again, the institution-words of the Lord's Supper are given by St. Luke (according to the shorter and original text, xxii. 15-19 a; see my explanation in the *Schriften des Neuen Testaments*, I, 509 f.) not according to St. Mark—without referring the bread and wine to the Body and Blood of Christ. How is this to be explained? No satisfactory answer to the question has yet been given. In any case, it can no longer be asserted that St.

PAUL AND JESUS

Mark x. 45 and xiv. 22, contain the oldest and the most reliable and most definite tradition regarding Jesus' attitude with reference to His death. Even if these passages in St. Mark contained the authentic utterances of Jesus Himself, they do not contain the words "for you," which are characteristic of Paul. The words "for many" imply a different meaning. Whether in the shorter and weaker form as recently given by Harnack in his reconstruction of the original sayings, or in their full content as given by the synoptic Gospels, the words of Jesus give not the remotest indication that only by the Blood of Christ were the doors of God's kingdom to be opened to the disciples, the "poor," the "souls as of little children," the "elect," and the "sons of peace." No; "fear not, little flock, for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom" (St. Luke XII. 42)—to give it without further mediation, upon your repentance and your earnest desire as little children. The Father takes to His arms without demur the son returning home, and to the palsied forgiveness of sins is granted unconditionally, for Jesus knows His Father in heaven as one who causes His sun to shine upon the just and upon the unjust. "Redemption," indeed, in its fulness is not forthcoming until the supremacy of God is complete, but those whom Jesus has gathered and led to repentance, may be certain that redemption even then is theirs.

DOCTRINE OF REDEMPTION

Thus, if Jesus, as I assume, regarded His death as a link in the chain of the divine dispensation which was to end in the supremacy of God's kingdom, He did not regard it as a supplementary expiation on behalf of His disciples, but at most as a necessary sacrifice on behalf of the sinful and hardened people, and perhaps only as the completion of His work in the form of a typical martyrdom (St. Luke XII. 49; cp. St. Mark X. 39, VIII. 34 ff). Hence Paul's view can only be regarded as an innovation, when he founds his own prospect of salvation and that of the disciples before him upon the self-sacrifice of the Incarnate and the Crucified One. Jülicher expresses a similar view in a vigorous passage as follows (pp. 27 f.):

“ But even though we may silently reject some of Wrede's exaggerations, the ‘ mythological Christ ’ of Paul can only be regarded as ruthlessly violent treatment of the picture of Jesus in its noble simplicity, as drawn for us by the Gospels. Jesus Himself never spoke of His existence before His earthly life. He never referred to His obligation to bear the form of a servant, or to the mediatorial work of His death and sacrifice. He promises forgiveness of sins from time to time, and shows not the least sympathy with the idea that before His coming no man could be justified or sure of salvation. Thus not a single element in this extraordinary system of Pauline Christology can be derived from the words of Jesus.

PAUL AND JESUS

It was a system which undoubtedly originated in the mind of Paul himself."

At the same time, Jülicher attempts to show (pp. 34 f.) that the fully developed Pauline Christology was not necessarily regarded by the primitive congregation as a complete and alien innovation. "The gulf dividing Paul from the primitive congregation had been filled to an extraordinary extent. . . . Paul follows new paths which diverge widely from the Gospel of Jesus, in developing his doctrines concerning justification, redemption, and the nature of Christ ; but he has the primitive congregation on his side ; he merely represents the new and deep interests of the community believing in Christ, against those who disputed the redemptive nature of Christ's death and the fact of His resurrection. The death of Jesus had raised new problems which could only be solved by new methods ; for his attack upon the religion of the opposition, Paul had selected as his principal weapon the fact which others were painfully defending against the scorn of Judaism, and his choice proved that he was equal to the situation. He had in fact devised the only means by which the situation could be saved ; the death of the Messiah was exalted with illuminating arguments, as marking the supreme point of the history of salvation, and was represented as claiming the gratitude of all co-religionists from that time onward." Here we have another attempt to

DOCTRINE OF REDEMPTION

minimise the importance of the difference between the belief of Paul and the religion of Jesus, immediately after this difference has been emphasised: the dividing gulf is partly filled; the belief of the early congregation is said to have been already directed to the course which Paul pursued with consistent and characteristic tenacity. This argument may be correct, though the views of the primitive congregation upon the significance of Jesus' death with regard to salvation must always remain extremely doubtful, in spite of 1 Corinthians xv. 3. The gulf may be half filled, but no greater degree of approximation is thereby gained between the life of sonship as lived by Jesus and Paul's doctrine of adoption on the basis of redemption by the blood of Christ; the view above characterised as "ruthlessly violent treatment of the picture of Christ in the Gospels" is not materially changed by this attempt to remove difficulties. The difference remains between the voluntary and immediate apprehension of God's love in child-like confidence, and the belief that man may venture to approach God, because God Himself has offered the necessary sacrifice upon the Cross of Christ.

I am therefore unable to admit that Paul's Christology and his doctrine of reconciliation are nothing more than developments of Jesus' teaching, and speaking from the historian's point of view, I regard the strong exaggerations of Wrede

PAUL AND JESUS

as more correct than the pacificatory arguments of his opponents.

3. I can, however, support their opposition to Wrede, if we can agree to the view that the Christology and reconciliation-doctrine of Paul and of the primitive congregation is merely the theological expression, in terms necessitated by the age, of a religious attitude directly derived from the teaching of Jesus. I trust that I do not misrepresent Kaftan or Kölbing if I assume them to consider that these elements of belief merely expressed the invincible conviction of the primitive congregation ; that for this congregation the time of waiting and of uncertainty was past and salvation had become an immediate reality instead of a future possibility ; that, again, this certain conviction was the gift which they had received directly from Jesus. Let us pursue these ideas somewhat further.

The history of religion, as developed in modern times, teaches us that the various soteriological, Christological, sacramental, and eschatological ideas and concepts, which we find side by side in the New Testament were pre-existent in Jewish or Hellenic thought or in the syncretism of Oriental religions ; it is no great exaggeration to assert that hardly a form of expression is to be found in the New Testament, which has not at some previous time been formulated. We can construct not only an eschatology, but also a Christology antecedent

EARLY CHRISTIAN HOPES

to Christ in time. The new religion, desiring to explain its experience to its own satisfaction, or to proclaim and defend it before the world at large, adopted the conceptions and lines of argument already current, ready to hand and generally intelligible ; so much the history of religion teaches us, and the clearer the fact becomes as research advances, the greater must be our respect for the nature of this experience which stirred a mass of old ideas to fresh energy, rearranged them and became a nucleus around which they crystallised afresh. Ideas of redemption and hopes of a redeemer were in the air ; but they could never have begun of themselves the centripetal movement which we observe. It was essential that somewhere a new force should arise capable of attracting, regrouping, and remodelling the scattered elements. Abandoning metaphor, the fact is that somewhere the certainty must have arisen that the fulness of time was come and that salvation was at hand. The most important religious fact that could possibly be stated is, that among the first disciples, immediately after the heaviest of all possible reverses, the death of their Master, this certainty arose with invincible power, like "the impulse of a compressed spring" (Wellhausen) and never again was depressed. The cause of this fact was stated by the disciples to be the resurrection of Jesus. But even the adherents of the old belief will be forced

PAUL AND JESUS

to admit that this miracle could never have produced such an effect upon them unless their previous intercourse with Jesus had given them the certainty that the hour had come when the supreme power of God was to be manifested, and that Jesus was He that should come. Those who adopt the modern point of view are forced to admit that the disciples could not have experienced the phenomena of the resurrection unless they had possessed the inward conviction, in spite of their despondency, that Jesus was the Messiah. How then is this their conviction to be explained? Only on the supposition that the strength of Jesus' personality, His free and joyous confidence in God's love and God's presence, in short, His belief had influenced the belief of His disciples. So far, the belief of the congregation in Christ and the conviction that the death of Jesus must, in some way or other, help to secure their own salvation is ultimately the effect of the triumphant conviction of Jesus Himself, which was uninterrupted even by death. In this sense we may say that the religion of Jesus continues its influence in the ideas of the primitive community, notwithstanding their fundamental difference.

What then is Paul's position in this respect? Can it be said that his faith in Christ and his doctrine of reconciliation are ultimately in continuity with the belief of Jesus Himself? Here, in my opinion, we touch the real problem, con-

PAUL'S KNOWLEDGE OF JESUS

cerning which the arguments on either side have been most critically developed by Wrede and Kölbing respectively. The question is whether we can admit the "spiritual influence of Jesus upon Paul," to use Kölbing's phrase. Wrede most energetically denies that we can.

4. "The character of Jesus and of His life and work did not determine the nature of Paul's theology. This fact remains indisputable, however much Paul may have known of Jesus, however deeply stories of Jesus may have touched his heart, whatever he may have heard of Jesus by chance in the course of his missionary work." This sentence of Wrede's contains an assertion which if bold is also self-contradictory. To admit the possibility that Paul may have known much of Jesus and to assert that the personality of Jesus cannot have made any decisive impression upon him, is to underestimate the importance of this possibility. Wrede, however, does not take his admission very seriously; he has not investigated the question, how much Paul really knew of Jesus; his opponents have also failed to appreciate its importance. In the time of Baur, Holsten, and Pfeiderer the concession was far too readily made, that Paul knew but little of the historical Jesus, and the question at issue has been unnecessarily obscured in consequence. We must now attempt to review the prevailing opinion.

Mission work among the heathen could have had

PAUL AND JESUS

no vitality unless it had been based upon definite narratives of Jesus' life, as I have already attempted to show (see *Das älteste Evangelium*, pp. 33-9). The epistles of Paul which have been preserved to us contain but few references to this narrative material, for the reason that they deal chiefly with the problems of Christian life with which new converts were confronted. At the same time such references as occur suffice to show that Paul had a *clear idea* of certain main features in the life and work of Jesus. When upon occasion he appeals to the words of Jesus as a final authority, e.g. in I Corinthians VII. 10, he has in his mind no mere abstract *logion*, but the figure of Jesus as a teacher whose authority over the congregation is unconditional. When he supports his exhortation by an appeal to the meekness and gentleness of Christ (2 Cor. x. 1) he is thinking not merely of Jesus' condescension in taking the form of man, but has before his mind the whole of Jesus' life. "The life of Jesus upon earth is to Paul no less indispensable an element in the history of salvation than His life in glory; the *obedience* of the Son of God, which comprehends the whole of His earthly life (Phil. II. 8; obedience unto death) is arbitrarily limited by Wrede to the acts of incarnation and self-sacrifice upon the cross, two widely separated acts. If the parallel between the first and the second Adam (Rom. v. 12 ff.) is not a mere verbal juggle, Paul recognised that "the man

PAUL'S KNOWLEDGE OF JESUS

Jesus " was free as to time and occasion to decide for good or for evil, for " falling or for justification," even as Adam was free ; within the limits stated in Romans v. 15, 18-19 Paul leaves room for the whole content of the Gospel history " (Jülicher, pp. 30 f.). Paul makes the crucifixion the central point of his teaching, and regards it not merely as a special act on the part of Christ, but is also profoundly moved by the act of personal love performed by Him " Who gave Himself for me " (Gal. II. 20). His idea of the death of Christ was rather conceptual than intuitive, as may be inferred from the fact that he so often speaks of the " Blood of Christ," though the shedding of blood was not a prominent incident in the manner of Jesus' death. But the element here derived rather by inference than by direct perception is fully counterbalanced by the stress laid upon the equally important object, " the Cross of Christ." This phrase evoked in Paul's mind, not only the concrete picture of the Crucified, but a number of secondary circumstances which must have been known to him. Crucifixion was the Roman form of capital punishment ; Paul must therefore have known that the Roman authorities and the governor were concerned in its infliction. On the other hand, he must undoubtedly have regarded the Jews as responsible for Jesus' death (there is no direct reference ; Gal. II. 19, 20 seems to regard " the law " as responsible) ; he must have had an

PAUL AND JESUS

idea of the general course of the trial. In fact the picture of the Crucified must have stood before his mind in more than mere outline : colour, features, and expression must have been manifest to him, or he could never have " evidently set it forth before the eyes " of the Galatians (Gal. III. 1). This expression indisputably presupposes a vivid, sympathetic, and realistic description of the event and not merely an impressive proclamation of the fact. Paul also knew special details of the Passion, as is entirely proved not only by the stress which he lays upon " the sufferings of Christ," but especially by 1 Corinthians XI. 23 ff. The words of institution in the Lord's Supper, which even then had become a fixed form, presuppose a detailed picture of the Supper. The words, " In the night, when the Lord Jesus was betrayed " surely contain *in nuce* a large part of the history of the Passion. The reference to " the night " implies a chronological knowledge of the events in question; the words " the betrayal " imply knowledge of the traitor and of the arrest. If we try to realise the mental attitude of the man who wrote these words, we cannot doubt that Paul not only knew in detail the narratives of Jesus' death and passion, but that he had himself lived through these events in thought with heartfelt sympathy and emotion. He certainly made constant use of them in his preaching. The idea that Paul had no knowledge of the life of Jesus and also no interest in it col-

PAUL'S KNOWLEDGE OF JESUS

lapses hopelessly as soon as we consider the conditions under which the first written Gospel arose. If St. Mark's Gospel was composed in Rome, as the old and unprejudiced tradition relates, and if it appeared shortly after the death of the apostles Peter and Paul, as the majority of critics assume, it represents in literary form the knowledge of Jesus' life current in the Roman congregation at the end of Paul's life and regarded as important for mission work. If the source of the discourses (Q) is, as seems to me indisputable, older than St. Mark and was current among the Greek congregations, it again provided a rich store of material whence knowledge of Jesus' person and teaching could be derived. We need not assent to the exaggerated theory of Resch, who considers that Paul borrowed from Q at every turn, and we may therefore regard as justified the fundamental idea that what we know of Jesus from His words (and in narrative form) was also, for the main part, known to Paul's congregations. Attempts have been made to show that Paul's epistles contain reminiscences of a considerable number of *logia*, by Titius (*Die neut. Lehre von der Seligkeit*, II, 12 ff.) and others with entire success in many points (e.g. Rom. XII. 14, 17). But apart from such detailed evidence the existence of the early congregations is inconceivable, if they did not possess a considerable knowledge of the Lord's words, deeds, and sufferings. Can Paul possibly have

PAUL AND JESUS

regarded this subject with indifference? Can he have consciously and deliberately confined himself to his spiritual relation with the glorified Christ and have excluded from his religious life any concrete ideas concerning the personality of Jesus which the traditions of the congregation might bring to him? The theory need only be stated to show its unpsychological and irrational nature. Thus Jülicher expresses his judgment (p. 55); "an apostle of Jesus Christ, who declined to learn anything of the earthly life of the Messiah, who rejected as 'weakness of the flesh' all that was known of the Son of God in the form of a servant, and who thus acted in order to support his own dogmatic theory, is the outcome of the modern mania for logical consistency, but is certainly not the Paul of history. The friendly co-operation of Paul with other evangelists, such as Barnabas and Mark, who certainly did not favour this extraordinary process of selection, excludes all possibility that the Gospel history, or the material points of it, can have been unknown to Paul."

5. At the same time, a somewhat different problem rises before us at this point and its importance must not be underrated. It cannot be denied that Paul's Christology is inclined, upon one side, to abandon the firm lines laid down by concrete ideas of a definite personality. Paul identifies the Lord not only with the "Spirit" (2 Cor. III. 17), but also, and I think no other

PAUL'S KNOWLEDGE OF JESUS

interpretation possible, with the Logos or world-soul of the Stoics (I Cor. VIII. 6 ; Col. I. 15-17 ; on this point see my article, *Christologie des Urchristentums* in Schiele's *Religion und Geschichte*) ; to explain the closest communion with Christ, his strongest expression is "Christ in us" and "we in Christ" ; this union with Christ or interpenetration by Him and these identifications with impersonal powers of universal influence are conceptions hardly possible, unless we regard the idea of the Lord in heaven as "deprived of personality," if we may use the phrase. These expressions present Christ, not as a personality with definite outlines, but as conceptual or of changing substance, and they are the strongest arguments in favour of the view that the human and historical person of Jesus played no part whatever in the religious life of Paul. It is, in fact, difficult to conceive how Paul came to use expressions so widely divergent in reference to his Master, Christ ; we must assume that the idea of personality which implies for us an obvious, definite, and indelible element, did not as yet exist in that sense for Paul. The fact must be referred to a certain fluidity of thought which was then habitual ; abstract ideas could be personified as easily as personalities could become abstractions. Cases in point are Philo, who regarded the Old Testament heroes as types of special virtues, or the Stoic allegorical view of the gods, which identified

PAUL AND JESUS

Hermes with the Logos. Conversely we note that personification is a process of no difficulty to Paul; sin and death are examples (Rom. vii.; 1 Cor. xv. 26). The history of Hellenistic religious thought will provide many other examples.

But the sublimation and dissolution of personality is a feature by no means invariably characteristic of the apostle's religion. It belongs rather to an upper stratum of speculation, and does not reach the sphere of true religious feeling, of daily work and prayer. In this latter department the personality of the Divine Master is undoubtedly the all-paramount idea for Paul. He feels himself to be the servant or bond slave of Christ and the apostle of his master; he is conscious that he is at peace with God and has confidence against the judgment (Rom. v. 1, 11) "through our Lord Jesus Christ"; he wishes his readers "grace and peace from our Lord Jesus Christ"; the statements of his plans and resolves are accompanied by a humble "if the Lord will"; he thrice cries to the Lord that the angel of Satan may depart from him. In these cases, his abstract speculations are blown away like smoke and his soul stands before that which we call a "personality." But this heavenly personality is said—and this is Wrede's thesis—to have nothing in common with the Jesus Who lived on earth: "Moreover, He Whose disciple and servant Paul would be, was by no means the historical man Jesus, but

PAUL'S KNOWLEDGE OF JESUS

Another, namely, the 'divine man,' the eternal 'Son of God.' "

At this point it is necessary not only to attack Wrede's view as utterly unpsychological, but also to criticise his opponents for their failure to examine with adequate attention one extremely important side of the question.

6. It is generally admitted that the relationship of the apostle to his Christ was unusually warm and heartfelt: it is indeed that which we call a "personal relationship." Is this form of connection conceivable, if Paul clung upon all material points to the idea of Christ as the heavenly Messiah, an idea with which his past training in Jewish thought had made him familiar? Is the sense of gratitude and love in any way possible when the object of it is merely the "heavenly man" of apocalyptic literature? Are not the titles "Lord" and "Son of God" nothing more, in the last resort, than empty categories as regards personal feeling and incapable of arousing any deep religious sense? One feature at least Paul borrowed from the picture of the man Jesus for transference to his Jewish Christ, the grace and love which had sacrificed themselves for him. Read Galatians II. 20, "Nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me"; this sentence is unintelligible unless we assume some reminiscence of the historical Jesus, but Paul continues, "The life which I now live in the flesh, I

PAUL AND JESUS

live by the faith of the Son of God, *Who loved me and gave Himself for me.*" Here it is surely obvious that Paul cannot even conceive the glorified Christ, Who is the object of his most heartfelt and grateful faith, apart from the love which the Christ manifested during His earthly life. Paul may conceive the whole course of this life as concentrated in the critical acts of incarnation and death, or in death alone; but the pathos of his feeling is derived from the fact that the glorified Christ was the Christ Who felt and manifested such love for Paul personally.

This consideration brings us to the vital point of the question. The conception of the heavenly Messiah, which Paul possessed during his youth in Judaism, acquired colour and life, and aroused affection and confidence after his conversion. But wherefore were these new features added? Paul learned by experience that the heavenly Son of God *was identical* with the Jesus Who had offered Himself for mankind upon the cross in humility, obedience, and love. How distorted, therefore, is the statement, that Paul, while making the heavenly Messiah his own, regarded the man Jesus with intentional indifference! Precisely the contrary statement is true. The Messiah of Judaism, remote and exalted, never touched Paul's heart until he suddenly perceived in that picture the features of the crucified Christ.

Here it is necessary to say a word upon the

THE HEAVENLY MESSIAH

nature and significance of Paul's conversion. Inquirers are usually content with the statement that the heavenly Christ appeared to Paul upon the road to Damascus. But it is impossible to understand how this event should have sufficed to produce a complete change of life. Paul as a Jew believed in the heavenly Messiah ; to him it was already an article of faith that the Son of God was in heaven "in divine form," and was thereafter to "reveal" Himself (1 Cor. I. 7). When, therefore, this "heavenly man" appeared to Paul, the zealous pupil of the law, the revelation might certainly imply a considerable strengthening of his faith : the Messiah was there, He had revealed Himself ; Paul must continue to fight and struggle ; perhaps it might be possible to bring the Messiah down from heaven, if true righteousness could be restored (Rom. x. 6). But it is not clear how this manifestation could turn Paul from his former paths and bring him to faith in Christ. In dispute with his opponents, he had never denied that the Messiah was in heaven, but that the Messiah was the crucified Jesus, Who had gone up to heaven. And he can only have been won over by the fact that the One Who appeared to him bore not only the signs of the heavenly Messiah, the Son of God, but was also recognised by Paul as the crucified Jesus.

The first disciples preached "our Jesus is the Messiah" ; Paul's belief and message hence-

PAUL AND JESUS

forward proclaimed, "Yea, it is the truth : your Jesus is the Messiah." But to explain this change one antecedent condition is necessary, that Paul should believe that his vision had been a revelation of the heavenly Messiah and the crucified Jesus in one person.

7. I now propose to raise another question, in spite of the fact that Jülicher has characterised it as childish, because I think it may lead us a step further : by what tokens did Paul recognise not "Christ," as Jülicher states the question, but *Jesus*? The question can only be regarded as childish by one who regards Paul's belief as the result of a miraculous and supernatural event. Readers who consider the event on the road to Damascus simply as a divine miracle, will find no difficulty in the question. If God displayed the heavenly Christ in all His glory to His persecutor, and if the influence of antecedent psychological conditions was inappreciable, then it was naturally but a small matter for God to arouse in Paul by some means or other the conviction that this Christ was no other than the crucified Jesus. Even if Paul had previously never heard of the Nazarenes and their Master, it would naturally have been perfectly easy for God by miraculous means to give Paul all necessary information concerning Jesus and His cross at the time when the apparition appeared. But modern criticism regards the matter from another standpoint and

PAUL'S VISION OF JESUS

considers that the experience on the way to Damascus was simply a vision or hallucination. Paul may have regarded it as an experience sent by God, and so, ultimately, may we regard it; but the characteristic point of the modern view is that the divine action turned to account certain psychological conditions which occurred in strictly regular sequence. What Paul saw was not the effect of an impression produced by an object external to his observation; the picture formed upon his retina was evoked by mental excitement, and the several features of the picture were the expression of ideas which had long been harboured by the observer; the consequence of a great mental upheaval was to bring these ideas into a new combination, so that they formed plastic and realistic material for a convincing picture. In the words of Th. Zahn (*Einleitung in den Neuen Testament*): "The pictures seen in ecstatic visions, as in ordinary dreams, are formed of materials already existing within the mental range of the seer or dreamer when awake." Any one who regards the experience of Damascus from this point of view will perceive that the question as stated above cannot be answered off-hand. It is quite conceivable that the figure of the Messiah whose coming from heaven was the object of such deep desires and prayers, might appear to the apostle; he was profoundly moved by these longings, and had been influenced by

PAUL AND JESUS

contact with the adherents of a false earthly Messiah, while the struggle within him had then reached its critical point. The vision can only have presented in visible form that object which had long busied the imagination, a lofty supernatural figure in divine glory. But, to repeat our question, by what signs did Paul recognise the figure as Jesus? In the case of Peter, the question would be otiose. He naturally sees even in a vision only the beloved features which he had constantly seen in the flesh and constantly re-pictured in loving imagination. But what are we to say of Paul, who, according to Wrede and others, had not only never known Jesus personally, but had never received any strong or clear impression of His person? What psychological explanation is there of the fact that Paul firmly believed this visionary appearance to be Jesus? There is a solution of the difficulty: the glorified Jesus may have appeared bearing the marks of crucifixion or the cross itself: the personal features and the "countenance" of Jesus may not have produced the effect, but rather some other distinguishing marks of His personality. But this solution is a last and desperate resource.

Let us then consider the matter quite simply, avoiding all presuppositions. Paul is convinced by his vision that the crucified Jesus has appeared to him as the glorified Messiah. Were we not prejudiced by theological tradition we should

PAUL'S VISION OF JESUS

simply say that before the event on the road to Damascus Paul possessed (1) an idea of the heavenly Messiah, (2) a picture of Jesus derived either from description or from personal knowledge. His vision showed a union of these two: the features of Jesus which he knew appeared in the splendour of heavenly glory.

The result of our considerations is as follows: Paul's vision and conversion are psychologically inconceivable except upon the supposition that he had been actually and vividly impressed by the human personality of Jesus.*

8. But another line of argument will also lead us to the same result. The appearances of the risen Lord to the first disciples have been regarded as "visions": if this theory be accepted, the ultimate and adequate reason for these experiences must be sought in the deep and permanent impression which the man Jesus made upon his disciples during His lifetime. The sight of the risen Lord certainly brought a new element within their consciousness, upon which their belief in the Messiah was based. But, as we have already observed, the true psychological sequence of events must have been the opposite;

* Such is also the opinion of Kölbinger (p. 110): "If no 'spiritual contact' took place between Paul and the man Jesus, the appearance on the road to Damascus could have been nothing but a picture of the heavenly Being presented in some way to the senses, but in no way connected with the man Jesus."

PAUL AND JESUS

because the disciples had been deeply and permanently attached to Jesus by their experiences with Him; because they were already most profoundly convinced that He was the Messiah; because they could not and would not abandon this deep and perhaps unconscious faith: for these reasons they were predisposed to receive such experiences as the visions in question. It was not the miracle of the Resurrection which produced their faith; they experienced that miracle, because their faith was already profound. Any one who thus regards the experiences of the first disciples cannot interpret Paul's conversion upon different lines of argument. Hence throughout the history of criticism, from Baur to Kölbling and Jülicher, we find a series of attempts to reconstruct the psychological history which culminated in Paul's vision. Kölbling gives a fully detailed account of these various attempts at reconstruction, and offers the following solution (p. III): "The stronger his yearning grew, the fiercer became his hate of the disciples of Jesus, who regarded the enemy of Pharisaic piety as the Messiah and therefore, he was convinced, merely blocked the path to salvation which lay open to the Jewish nation. In clear and definite outline he saw before him the picture of the Man, who was rightly accused of attempts to destroy the worship of the Jews and to change the customs which Moses had delivered to the Jewish people (Acts vi. 14). The

PAUL'S VISION OF JESUS

Galilæan prophet had violently opposed the piety of the Pharisees, had opened the kingdom of God to sinners regardless of the claims of the law, had proclaimed woe to the upholders of the law, and had cut the pupils of Gamaliel to the heart. Paul was resolved that the adherents of this false Messiah must be rooted out, in order to secure the salvation of himself and of his nation. At times, indeed, a voice spoke loudly within him, recalling his grief at the fact that the increasing lawlessness of the people and his own incapacity prevented the due fulfilment of the moral commands of the law, especially of that requiring purity of heart, which Jesus with startling vigour had opposed to the zeal for outward cleanliness. Doubtless timid questionings then arose within him: might not the Friend of publicans and sinners have proclaimed the truth after all? Might not God have actually raised Him from the dead, to be the Messiah bringing the Kingdom of God, as His disciples boldly preached in defiance of all persecutors? These doubts and questionings were fostered by two influences. The first was his ardent longing for the fulfilment of all promises in the kingdom of God (2 Cor. I. 20). His heart yearned for the coming Messiah. If the prophet of Nazareth, whose words were mighty and who performed miracles, had really come in divine power, the kingdom of God had also come and his longings were satisfied. Jesus would not yield a single

PAUL AND JESUS

step to those who denied that sinners could inherit the kingdom ; He wished to open where His adversaries wished to close ; for this reason He had undergone the death which His enemies had prepared for Him. He had known their intentions and yet He had come to the holy city, when it was filled with countless pilgrims arriving for the feast. Nowhere and at no other time was His prophetic work in public so likely to arouse the anger of the Pharisees. How could a man so act, if God were not with him ? Could it be that Jesus had died for love of him, His bitter enemy, for love of Paul and of all who brought Him to the cross, to bring God's forgiveness of sins and a share in the glory of His kingdom ? But whenever such thoughts came over Paul, he rejected them. The despiser of God's law could never be the Messiah. God himself Had condemned Him to the accursed tree. Therefore it was his task to display the greater zeal in exterminating the blasphemous adherents of the Nazarene. . . . And then, when his zeal was at its height, God's hour struck. The companion of publicans and sinners was too strong for him. Jesus stood suddenly before his soul as the bringer of the kingdom of God in God's almighty power, and brought peace with God to him, God's enemy. . . ."

The noteworthy point in this description is the fact that its author assumes Paul to have possessed a very close and clear knowledge of the

PAUL'S VISION OF JESUS

person and work of Jesus; it would almost appear that Paul before his conversion had read that Gospel of Mark from which Kölbing takes the essential features of his picture of Jesus. At any rate the main idea is undoubtedly correct; Paul's vision and conversion presuppose the fact that he had been strongly impressed by the personality of Jesus. He must already have been half-persuaded and have plunged into the task of persecution with forced zeal and an uneasy conscience. Of similar character, though marked by greater brevity and reserve, is the description of Jülicher (p. 53): "It is unlikely that he could have learned much of the words of Jesus, of His redemptive work and of the majesty of His person during the period of his work as a persecutor; but, as this hatred was a matter of principle with him and as he was then filled with zeal for God (Rom. x. 2) and with hunger after righteousness, it is even less likely that he refused to hear any detailed account of the object of his hatred. He secured the information which would enable him to justify his anger to his own conscience. The heroism of the disciples of Jesus under persecution must first have shaken his conviction, ready as he was to judge men by their fruits; certain scriptures, to which he was referred because they prophesied the sufferings and death of the Messiah, perplexed him. If these doubts were but of momentary duration, they became a thorn in his side,

PAUL AND JESUS

from which he could not escape. In hours of solitude he was tormented by the question, suppose He were the Messiah! Certain proud words of the Crucified resounded in his ear; if the Speaker of them had been the Messiah, were not these words worthy to be called the words of God? He prayed God to free him from these doubts. And then Christ suddenly appeared to him."

This reconstruction of events is also convincing, especially because it represents the bravery of the disciples of the Crucified as an important influence upon Paul. The bond which connects Jesus with heathendom through the primitive church and through Paul is, indeed, ultimately traversed as if by an electric current with the consciousness of victory, the sense that fruitless longing has been left behind and secure possession has been attained. This sense is the ultimate ground of the strength and joyfulness which enabled the congregations to rise superior to their environment. Hence it is certainly correct to assume that the faith of the first disciples also influenced Paul. At first he was repelled by it; then his attention was attracted, doubts were aroused in him, and his position was undermined, until eventually the barriers which excluded the flame were broken down. Thus the "narratives" of the first disciples which were delivered in the enthusiasm of faith and their written testimony may have influenced

PAUL'S VISION OF JESUS

Paul more strongly than he cared to admit to himself.

We may therefore adhere to the opinion that the "spirit of Jesus," working through His disciples, eventually conquered Paul; the figure of Jesus was so convincingly apparent through the lives and characters of His adherents, that Paul's powers of resistance eventually grew wearied and mentally he was more prepared for the ultimate change than he himself realised. But in the vision it seems that a picture of Jesus appeared which was known to him not by direct observation, but "by tradition." The question now arises whether this transmitted conception of Jesus and this indirect contact with Him can have been adequate to produce a spiritual upheaval of sufficient extent to make the vision intelligible.

Paul, then, is said to be the first of that infinite series of believers, whose hearts have burned with love of Jesus or of Christ, "whom having not seen they love" (1 Peter i. 8); he is of the company of St. Francis and Zinzendorf, of Luther and Schleiermacher, whose minds were overpowered by the figure of Jesus, though their knowledge was derived only "from tradition." But we must not forget that the tradition which existed in their days was not that which Paul could use. They lived, above all things in the report of the Gospel, in the atmosphere of those realistic and powerful narratives which they had heard not once, but a

PAUL AND JESUS

thousand times, which were written on their hearts from their youth, arousing and filling their imaginations. They also had before them the whole range of ecclesiastical tradition in preaching and instruction, which provided commentaries upon those narratives and explanations of them, emphasising and expounding particular features; these influences provided a fruitful soil whereon the imagination might be busied with the personality of Jesus. That visions of Christ should occur in such an environment is perfectly explicable. The materials for realistic presentation in form and outline were abundantly at hand; nothing was needed but the stimulus of strong excitement to set those elements in motion. If, again, the forms imagined from the Gospels were deficient in colour, precision of outline, features or expression, ecclesiastical art could complete them fully and clearly. We are all influenced by a typical picture of Christ produced by ecclesiastical art, though individual presentations of it may differ in detail. The influence of this support to the religious imagination must not be underestimated; we cannot erase it from our lives, however sublime the height upon which we may wish to place Jesus.

Let us now return to Paul. We will, in the first place, confine ourselves strictly to the prevailing opinion that Paul had never seen Jesus and had only heard of Him. We may believe that the

PAUL'S VISION OF JESUS

information which Paul received was most abundant and lay aside for the moment the passage in Galatians (I. 22) which states that Paul was not personally known to the Judaic congregations (!); but we must also remember that the inspiring imagery of our Gospels was not at his disposal for daily reading, that he did not enjoy our long ecclesiastical education in the life of Jesus, and that there were no pictures of Jesus for him to contemplate: on the other hand we must conceive Paul as opposed to this Jesus in every fibre of his being. Can we then imagine that the descriptions given to him of Christ were strong enough to produce in his mind a picture of Jesus of such reality and convincing power as to break down his passionate fanaticism and eventually to evoke a vision of splendour and personal colouring which determined the whole of his future career?

9. For myself I feel bound to say, whether others support my views or not, that this mode of treating the problem seems entirely unsatisfactory and unconvincing. I lay no stress upon the historical difficulty, that the struggle with the Nazarene churches can hardly have left Paul with time or inclination to gather detailed knowledge of Jesus' life or with leisure to assimilate it (Gal. I. 22). There is a more important point to consider. I must adhere to the statement that the vision on the road to Damascus is only in-

PAUL AND JESUS

telligible on the supposition that Paul recognised Jesus in the heavenly vision. He may have heard a personal description of Jesus from the first disciples or from casual observers ; but could such a description have enabled him to *recognise* Jesus ? If we seriously consider the meaning of this vision, we are forced to conclude that the features of the earthly Jesus must have been known to him, seeing that the vision showed him the glorified Jesus. And I cannot but wonder how the whole school of modern theology has been able so readily to reject the best and most natural explanation of these difficulties, namely the assumption that Paul had seen Jesus personally, and that the sight had made an indelible impression upon him, perhaps unconsciously or even against his will. "We need not consider the possibility that Paul the Pharisee may have known the Galilæan prophet in person. The possibility naturally exists, but that it was ever realised there is no certain evidence in our sources of information." Thus Kölbing (p. 109). *One* indication, at least, we have in the considerations above detailed, which show that a literal interpretation of the vision presupposes Paul's personal knowledge of Jesus. But the problem may be more directly attacked by an opposite line of argument. Where is there a single syllable to show that Paul had *not* seen Jesus in person ? The words of the exalted One, "I am Jesus, Whom

PAUL'S KNOWLEDGE OF JESUS

thou persecutest," given in the three accounts of the conversion to be found in the Acts (ix. 5, xxi. 7, xxvi. 14) are no proof that Paul then saw Jesus for the first time ; they were spoken because Paul saw no figure, but only heard the voice. It would have been an obvious course, both for the author of the Acts and for Paul, to declare the very surprising fact that Paul had never seen face to face the Lord, Whom he so zealously served. Yet we find no trace of any remark to this effect.

The *argumentum e silentio*, which asserts that Paul would certainly have referred to his personal knowledge of Jesus in 2 Corinthians xi. 22, is not conclusive ; he had no reason to feel proud of a meeting with Jesus, as he was at that time bitterly hostile to Him. The passage in 1 Corinthians ix. 1 (οὐχὶ Ἰησοῦν τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν ἑώρακα) is very probably to be referred to his vision of the glorified One, notwithstanding the name Ἰησοῦς ; naturally, it does not exclude the possibility that he had already seen Jesus at an earlier date. Indeed this passage is also remarkable for the fact that he here names the subject of his vision, Jesus, which again suggests that he had seen Jesus in the splendour of His glory on the road to Damascus, or had rather "recognised" than seen Him.

However, the arbitrary assumption of theologians that Paul had not seen Jesus in the flesh, is definitely contradicted by the express statement of the apostle himself in 2 Corinthians v. 16. Kölbing

PAUL AND JESUS

excludes this passage from his argument, saying that it is "capable of different interpretations." Kaftan and Jülicher also decline discussion of it. It would be little to the credit of Paul as a writer or to our methods of exegesis, if the meaning of so important a statement could not be ascertained with certainty. We therefore proceed to discuss the meaning of this passage :

ὥστε ἡμεῖς ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν οὐδένα οἶδαμεν κατὰ σάρκα·
εἰ καὶ ἐγνώκαμεν κατὰ σάρκα Χριστόν — ἀλλὰ νῦν οὐκέτι
γιγνώσκομεν.

The connection of the sentence with the preceding argument is as follows. It is stated as a consequence (ὥστε) resulting from preceding statements. The writer applies to himself the content of verse 15, which has been stated in the third person. Verses 14, 15 state that Paul is held in bonds by the love of Christ, i.e. is preserved from selfishness and idle vainglory : "We have judged, have realised and learned to estimate our own lives upon this principle, that if one died for all, then were all dead. He indeed died for all, in order that (and therefore, so that) they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto Him which died for them and rose again." The whole connection clearly shows that Paul uses this principle not to pass judgment upon others, but upon himself. Hence it follows that when he changes to the first person with ἡμεῖς in verse 16, he proposes

2 CORINTHIANS V. 16

to say something of his personal life* and not merely to say in what light others may appear to him. Thus the general statement that the "living," i.e. those who have died with Christ and risen again with Him, live not to themselves, but to their exalted Lord, is now applied to himself, as he includes himself in the series of the ζῶντες. As one who "lives no more to himself," he says, "Henceforth know we no man after the flesh."

How are the words κατὰ σάρκα to be construed? We must notice the order of the words, which is equivalent in the two halves of the sentence. In either case κατὰ σάρκα comes immediately after οἶδαμεν and ἐγνώκαμεν to denote a close connection between them. Paul might have said οὐδένα κατὰ σάρκα οἶδαμεν—ἐγνώκαμεν Χριστὸν κατὰ σάρκα (this is the reading of Dcop aeth) but it would then have been possible to take κατὰ σάρκα with οὐδένα and Χριστὸν as defining them more precisely, and this is exactly what Paul wished to avoid, although most of the commentators so construe the passage. Κατὰ σάρκα is in either case intended to define the verb more precisely, and this interpretation is in accordance with Paul's custom, e.g. I. 17, κατὰ σάρκα βουλεύομαι; X. 2 ff., κατὰ σάρκα περιπατεῖν, στρατεύεσθαι;

* The word ἡμεῖς which, for instance, in verse 11 changes irregularly to the singular, can here undoubtedly be taken as the plural of authorship: cp. the purposeless change in VII. 14.

PAUL AND JESUS

XI. 18, *καυχᾶσθαι κατὰ σάρκα*. There is, therefore, no reason whatever to follow the usual explanation of *κατὰ σάρκα* as a limitation upon the personal object: "no one according to his external human characteristics," "Christ in His human earthly nature." It is much rather a special kind of knowledge that is under consideration.

To understand the meaning of the words *εἶδέναι, ἐγνώκειν κατὰ σάρκα* we must first ask: *What sense is the word "know" intended here to convey?* The question is unusual and bears a delicate distinction of meaning, as is obvious from the fact that logically it is impossible after a certain point of time "no more to know" that which one has already known. The object known cannot be obliterated from the memory; hence the meaning can only be, "I will have nothing more to do with," either because no value is attached to the object or because there is a final rupture with former connections. In this sense we have the expression in e.g. 1 Cor. II. 2, *οὐ γὰρ ἔκρινα εἶδέναι τι ἐν ὑμῖν*, "I resolved to know nothing among you." Obviously Paul had known a great deal and knew it at the time of writing these words; but he wishes to appear to the Corinthians as one who knew and cared for nothing but Christ crucified. Here it is plain that the specific use of *γινώσκειν* indicates an act of will; not self-separation from knowledge, but renunciation of the

2 CORINTHIANS V. 16

fame or advantage which might follow from such knowledge. We find the use with a slightly different shade of meaning in Matt. vii. 23, "I never knew you." That this statement is not in literal correspondence with facts is clear from what precedes: the point, again, is the desire for no further acquaintanceship. Returning to 2 Corinthians v. 16 the point of the ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν οὐδένα and οὐκέτι γινώσκωμεν consists in the fact that Paul attached no further importance to the "knowledge" he previously possessed.

What, then, is the meaning of the phrase "knowing after the flesh"? Undoubtedly, to know as men know one another, to stand to others in the natural human relations possible between man and man. As in Romans ix. 3 Paul speaks of his brethren as τῶν συγγενῶν μου κατὰ σάρκα, so he can also say of former friends, relations, and compatriots that he "knew" them formerly, that he was in personal relations with them "after the flesh." And the words ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν οὐδένα οἶδαμεν κατὰ σάρκα had a terrible and tragical significance with regard to his own life. His conversion severed the ties that had united him with parents, brothers, and compatriots. He had broken away from the natural ties of life, and his home, family and brethren now existed only ἐν πνεύματι or ἐν Χριστῷ, even as those "who have left house or brethren or sisters or father or lands for My sake," to whom the promise

PAUL AND JESUS

is given (Mark x. 29 f.) that "they shall receive an hundredfold now in this time, houses and brethren and sisters and mothers and children and lands, with persecutions." A striking parallel to the passage under discussion is Mark III. 33, the scene in which the earthly relations of Jesus appear, where Jesus asks, "Who is My mother and My brethren?" He no longer knows them. In a similar position is the man who "no longer lives to himself," but to the exalted Lord. Here again, we can see how distorted is the exposition which would represent Paul as saying, "I attach no further value to knowledge of them after their outward human form"; this is not the point at issue; the point is that Paul's outward relations with men as men ceased to exist when his life was centred in the exalted Lord, when he began to live ἐν πνεύματι and ἐν Χριστῷ.

In what sense does Paul say that he knew Christ, κατά σάρκα? It will, I assume, be admitted that the words εἰ ἐγνώκαμεν are not to be understood as referring to a supposed case; this would be wholly unintelligible to the reader, for it would imply that the writer and his first readers alike admitted that Paul had not known Christ κατά σάρκα. In that case, again, Paul would have doubtless written ἔγνωμεν (the reading of 17 Or). I must also decline to accede to the view that Χριστόν either here or in verses 17-20 represents not the personal name, but the conception of the Messiah; as

2 CORINTHIANS V. 16

though Paul meant that before his conversion he had "known the Messiah" only as conceived by the materialist political thought of Judaism. No reader could have observed this change in the meaning of *Χριστόν*, and Paul would have been forced to use a different expression. Again, the view that Paul is referring to an earlier period of his life as a Christian, when he "thought" of Christ from a more Judaistic standpoint, or the view that he is speaking of his life before conversion when he hated and persecuted Christ, are alike impossible for the reason that this "thinking of Christ" or this "view of Christ" cannot be spoken of as *ἐγνωκέναι κατὰ σάρκα*. The words *οὐδένα οἶδαμεν κατὰ σάρκα* can by no natural means be interpreted as a "judgment passed upon men," and it is equally impossible that this word *ἐγνωκέναι* should denote a particular manner of estimating or judging others; the former phrase is concerned with those personal human relations which were dissolved by Paul's conversion, and similarly here, the meaning must be that Paul had known Christ, as men know one another, that is, had seen Him with his eyes.* Indeed, the expression implies more than this; it signifies the impression made not only by outward appearance, but by personality,

* The objection, that in this case Paul would have written not *Χριστόν* but *Ἰησοῦν* is not valid as argument: e.g. 1 Cor. xv. 3 f. we read *Χριστός ἀπέθανε καὶ ἐτάφη*. *Χριστός* here, as often, is used as a proper name.

PAUL AND JESUS

the impression received by direct personal acquaintance. The nature and value of this "knowledge" in Paul's judgment is sufficiently explained by the words *κατὰ σάρκα*. From his point of view when writing, this "knowledge" is inadequate and of little worth, like all else connected with the *σάρξ*: in comparison with the *γινώσκειν κατὰ πνεῦμα*, as acquired by him after his conversion, he considers that it scarcely deserves the name of "knowledge." Before conversion he did not possess the enlightenment of the *πνεῦμα*, and therefore knew Christ only so far as was possible with the powers of the *σάρξ*, with the knowledge pertaining to flesh and blood (Matt. xvi. 17). Paul doubtless meant by this that he had perceived in Christ only the *ὁμοίωμα ἀνθρώπων*, the *σχῆμα ὡς ἀνθρώπου* (Phil. ii. 7); indeed, before his conversion, he had regarded Christ as a sinner, judging wholly *κατὰ σάρκα* and *κατὰ ἄνθρωπον* (2 Cor. v. 21) and considered His person as a *ὁμοίωμα σαρκὸς ἁμαρτίας* (Rom. viii. 3). His powers of conception, confined as they were to the *σάρξ*, had been able to see only *σάρξ* in Christ: such is the true meaning contained in the syntactically incorrect collocation *Χριστὸς κατὰ σάρκα*; these powers did not enable him to recognise the Son of God in the *ὁμοίωμα ἀνθρώπων*, which only became plain when God *revealed* it to him (Gal. i. 16). The expression thus implies two facts, that Paul had seen and known Jesus, and that he

2 CORINTHIANS V. 16

had not then arrived at real "knowledge" of Him. Hence the fact that he had known Jesus was now valueless to him, and he therefore treats it as non-existent, because "now we know Him no longer," i.e. *κατὰ σάρκα*, but have acquired knowledge of Him in a manner entirely new.

But the most difficult question which is raised by our text has not yet been solved. *What reason induced Paul to refer in any way to this "knowing no man" and in particular to his former knowledge of Christ?* It must be admitted that the transition to this subject is abrupt. A very possible conjecture is that verse 16 in our Bible is a later remark of the apostle's inserted in the text after the epistle was finished. In the first copy verse 17 followed verse 15 immediately. As a matter of fact verse 17, *ὥστε εἰ τις ἐν Χριστῷ, καινὴ κτισίς· τὰ ἀρχαία παρῆλθεν, ἰδοῦ γέγονεν καινά* is an admirable continuation of verse 15 because it retains the form of general hortatory explanation and abandons that of personal application which verse 16 introduces. The impression produced by verse 16 is that of an aside,* both short and obscure in meaning. Paul must have had some special motive for thus expressing himself—allusions are to be discerned in his words, which can only be interpreted by accurate knowledge of his position with reference to his opponents. We will first see

* *ὥστε* in verse 16 is not parallel to the *ὥστε* in verse 17: the latter is not consequent upon verse 16, but upon verse 15.

PAUL AND JESUS

whether the language betrays his intentions in any respect. The point of the expression is obviously directed against those *ἐν προσώπῳ καυχώμενοι καὶ μὴ ἐν καρδίᾳ* (v. 12). Paul does not wish to boast or to advertise the fact that since his conversion he has entirely broken with his former self. He will know nothing of that which was in any way creditable to himself, for his life has received a new content and shifted to a new centre of gravity. If in this instance he seems to go out of his way to emphasise the fact that he attaches no further value to the former personal relationships and acquaintances which were dissolved by his conversion, it seems likely that the statement was made for controversial purposes. The motive of it would become excellently clear, if Paul's opponents had boasted of their personal acquaintance perhaps with Peter or James and had thus attempted to justify their own proceedings. Paul would then indicate in this passage, by way of reply, that he also had known these men, but that these personal relations were now long past and lay in the sphere of purely material life, from which he had definitely escaped. If this be so, a similar thought with a slightly different shade of meaning is to be found in Galatians II. 6; *ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν "δοκούντων" εἶναί τι, ὁποῖοί ποτε ἦσαν, οὐδὲν μοι διαφέρει· πρόσωπον ὃ θεὸς ἀνθρώπου οὐ λαμβάνει.* Upon this assumption the first half of verse 16 would certainly produce an impressive

2 CORINTHIANS V. 16

effect. I give the theory for what it is worth ; it is also possible that the statement is entirely general in character and has no special reference to the first apostles.

But it is impossible to explain the second half of the sentence, unless we assume that a polemical purpose dictated the expression. Let us consider the logical connection of the two ideas. In verse 16 (a) we have a negation οὐδένα οἶδαμεν. Then verse 16 (b) begins with εἰ καί, as introducing an exception which Paul here concedes : "Henceforth *know* we no man after the flesh : yea, though we *have* known Christ after the flesh, yet now henceforth *know* we Him no more (after the flesh)." Surely it is remarkable that the exception to "*know* we no man," should be expressed, "though we *have known*." We should expect the present tense to be used. The remarkable transition to the past is only intelligible on the assumption that the writer considered his past knowledge as capable, in this particular case, of extending also to the present. Paul can have been induced to consider this possibility only by some special circumstances. It may therefore be assumed with every probability that Paul was moved to refer to this point only because his opponents had prided themselves on the fact that they had seen or known Jesus in person. In opposition to them, Paul points out that he also had known Jesus, but that he no longer regarded the fact as of importance,

PAUL AND JESUS

because his knowledge had been only *κατὰ σάρκα*. The brevity of his reference to this point is intelligible enough ; his past relations to Jesus were not a matter on which he could pride himself. But his reason for touching the question in any way is only comprehensible under one condition, that the opponents with whom he had to deal might be regarded, from his point of view, as standing in much the same relation to Jesus as he himself stood. Had they been intelligent and enthusiastic disciples, in whose presence Paul would not have cared to refer to his former lack of knowledge, he would not have raised the question upon this occasion. The antithesis is obscure unless Paul's phrase *κατὰ σάρκα* was intended not only to depreciate the value of his own former knowledge, but also to present the position of his opponents in a less favourable light. They boasted of the fact that "they had known," but this was merely knowledge *κατὰ σάρκα*; they could produce no evidence in support of their claims except the fact that they had seen Jesus, but they had never advanced to the true knowledge *κατὰ πνεῦμα*. We can imagine them as quoting various outward details and circumstances concerning the life of Jesus, His home and family, His outward appearance and the like, in order to show that their acquaintance with Jesus was complete ; but Paul regarded all these matters as falling within the sphere of the *σάρξ*. They doubtless emphasised

2 CORINTHIANS V. 16

the Jewish characteristics of Jesus, His descent from David, His fidelity to the law, and so forth; this was reason enough for Paul to summarise them as men who "know Him only *κατὰ σάρκα*." Paul also knew similar details (Rom. I. 3, *γενομένου ἐκ σπέρματος Δαυεὶδ κατὰ σάρκα*; IX. 5, *ἐξ ὧν ὁ Χριστὸς τὸ κατὰ σάρκα*; Gal. IV. 4, *γενόμενον ἐκ γυναικός, γενόμενον ὑπὸ νόμον*); he had known Jesus as a Jewish teacher and as claiming to be the Messiah, and could relate his experiences, but this knowledge, which his opponents regarded as important, is inadequate in his view, for he had learned to know Jesus *κατὰ πνεῦμα*, as the Divine Son of God. So utterly different is this knowledge, that he reproaches his opponents in another place with preaching a different Jesus from his own (XI. 4).

We have thus attempted to expound the motive which prompted these obscure words. If our explanation does not seem convincing, we can at least plead that the text is abrupt and difficult and that our knowledge of the conditions under which it was written is insufficient. But upon one point we must insist: the words as they stand admit no other interpretation than one, as already proposed, in the sense that Paul had seen and known Jesus in person, and that he himself regarded this knowledge as being *κατὰ σάρκα* and therefore worthless because it had been superseded by a better knowledge *κατὰ πνεῦμα*. Paul only refers to the point,

PAUL AND JESUS

because his opponents boasted of such knowledge on their own part.

If we now attempt to conceive the manner in which Paul gained this personal knowledge of Jesus, the simplest and most natural assumption is that he had seen Jesus during His last visit to Jerusalem and perhaps had heard Him speak ; he may have been a witness of Jesus' Passion and Crucifixion, a supposition likely enough in the case of a passionately enthusiastic pupil of the Pharisees. It is no less easy and natural to suppose that he was impressed and attracted by the strong excitement concerning the false prophet which naturally prevailed among his fellow scholars and associates, and that he learned many details concerning Jesus' person and teaching in the course of the lively discussions concerning Him, which took place among the people and the scribes. There is thus no obstacle to the supposition that Paul had actually "known" Jesus and had been impressed by His human personality and His teaching, though Paul afterwards regarded this impression as external, superficial, and "carnal."

We have thus assumed, and without this assumption any psychological explanation of Paul's vision is impossible, that his meeting with Jesus and what he saw or heard of Jesus had made a strong impression upon him, stronger, indeed, than he himself had realised or was afterwards willing to admit. No one will deny that it is

INFLUENCE OF JESUS ON PAUL

psychologically possible for an impression to persist below the threshold of consciousness, and imperceptibly to penetrate and modify the whole of a man's inward life. We should be depreciating both the personality of Jesus and the receptivity of Paul, if we refused to admit that the form and the words of the long-suffering One, His intellectual supremacy and constancy, His confidence and truth, His sympathy and earnestness were unable to produce that indelible impression even upon the hostile and refractory mind of the Pharisee.

If our assumption is correct, we have an explanation of Paul's entirely enigmatical behaviour *after* his conversion. It is contrary to all historical and psychological experience that Paul should have retired to Damascus and solitude, instead of seeking information concerning Jesus, if he had possessed no knowledge of Jesus before his conversion. This behaviour is only intelligible if we suppose that he was not in immediate want of further information concerning the outward personality of Jesus ; he already knew with Whom he had to do. The one question before him was the nature of his future relations to Jesus and the manner in which his knowledge of the man Jesus could be reconciled to the heavenly vision and his Jewish doctrine of the Messiah. On this point he could expect no enlightenment from Peter and he already knew all that Peter could tell him. He therefore

PAUL AND JESUS

left the task of constructing his gospel message to the "Spirit," which had already revealed to him the true nature of the crucified Jesus of Nazareth.

Whatever view may be taken of my exposition of 2 Corinthians v. 16, it will be admitted, in view of the preceding arguments, that Paul's conversion is only to be understood upon the supposition that he had been strongly impressed by the personality of Jesus, whatever the psychological means by which the impression may have been transmitted. For Paul was not won over to the side of the gospel because he was convinced from Jesus' preaching that His gospel was true; it was the personality of Jesus which convinced Paul of his Messiahship. "Belief in Christ" is, in the last resort, not merely the admission that the Messiah has appeared, but the conviction that Jesus is the man of whom it can be said without blasphemy that He is the Son of God, the Messiah. This belief to Paul was not a theoretical, but a "moral" conviction; it presupposes not merely a train of argument carried to a successful conclusion, but a subjugation of the moral nature. And this, again, is only conceivable as based upon a living knowledge of Christ's being, in its main features.

10. Let us now address ourselves to the task of comparing Paul's teaching and religious personality with our knowledge of the preaching of Jesus and His character as a religious force. We may

POINTS FOR COMPARISON

ask what is the interest or purpose of this comparison ?

We have no intention to reduce the teaching of Jesus and of His apostle to a common denominator and to obliterate the character peculiar to their respective messages; in order to harmonise the doctrinal statements to be found in the Bible. It is, on the contrary, important that we should see the two types in the fulness of their difference. I might almost say, of their incommensurability, without any attempt to smooth over or suppress divergencies. We must realise the difference between these personalities as produced by their respective positions, the conditions in which they lived, their religious temperaments, education, modes of thought and expression, conduct of life and receptivity ; only then have we laid the proper foundation for an answer to the question, How did they solve the problem of life ? Are they in fundamental harmony upon this point, notwithstanding their very different methods of formulating their ideas ? Are they of one spirit, one will, one faith ? Is Paul truly to be called " a disciple of Jesus " if his opinions and his aims are regarded as a whole ? The answer to these questions raises another problem : supposing a fundamental harmony to exist, is it derived from the spiritual influence of Jesus upon Paul, or, as Wrede asserts, is it simply the common basis of Jewish thought, derived from the Old Testament, which has brought these two

PAUL AND JESUS

utterly different characters to adopt similar views of life ?

We will attempt to answer these questions without reserve but with every regard for truth, without mechanical or artificial methods of comparison, while avoiding the no less mechanical and unjustifiable comparison of features which in no way lend themselves to the process.

If we question a witness, who, if not wholly unprejudiced, is at any rate important, namely, Paul himself, we are told that he believed his gospel to be the gospel of Christ, that he regards himself as an "ambassador of Christ" and as continuing Christ's work. But, it is objected, his own testimony in this matter is invalid. He was not himself in a position to perceive how infinitely far his own preaching and philosophy of life were removed from those of Jesus. His self-deception concerning his spiritual relationship to Jesus was inevitable; for, as the person most immediately concerned, he was unable to appreciate the influences which made him the child of another spirit. Not until our own time, when the course of history lies open to the observer, has this fact become apparent.

Let us then follow this precept and attempt, first of all, to realise the unusual difference between the respective positions of these two personalities; a difference which necessarily produced divergency in their views of life and its meaning.

PAUL'S HELLENISM

II. To begin with a circumstance which may seem somewhat non-essential, my opinion is that previous comparisons have not sufficiently appreciated that which may be stated in one word as Paul's Hellenism. We are bound to admit that Hellenic culture was not entirely wanting even in the environment of Jesus. The movements of the outer world were brought before Him by the strong infusion of foreign elements in the population of Galilee, the great commercial route by the Sea of Gennesareth, the Hellenistic towns of Decapolis, Cæsarea Philippi, and Tiberias, Herod's theatre and amphitheatre in Jerusalem and the games instituted by that king (cp. Schürer, I, 387-95). The number of Greek Jews in Jerusalem (cp. Acts vi) and the fact that intercourse with Roman administrative officials was unavoidable may be sufficient reason for supposing Jesus to have possessed a knowledge of Greek. On the other hand, a difference of high importance is implied in the fact that Jesus was born of country-folk in Galilee, while Paul grew up in an important Hellenistic city, and when he reached maturity was subject to the strong influence of the pervading Roman civilisation. His metaphors and similes are drawn from other sources than those of Jesus (he is especially fond of military metaphors) and even this fact is symptomatic of a profound underlying divergence. His full command of the Greek language would be a non-essential

PAUL AND JESUS

point, if he had used it only to express ideas common to the Jewish people, even as the message of Jesus has reached us only in Greek dress. But his vocabulary contains a large number of ideas entirely Greek and only explicable as the product of Greek culture, which are never used by Jesus. Here is a reason for assuming a profound difference of ethical and religious thought. The thought and expression of Jesus are concrete, popular and plastic as compared with the abstract terms constantly used by Paul; these, as being the products of a completed system of thought, themselves influenced the thought of the speaker who used them. Such terms as *πνευματικός*, *ψυχικός*, *σαρκικός* point to profound anthropological and psychological thought: a theory of religious perception is presupposed by the phrase *νοούμενα καθορᾶται*, Romans I. 20. The use of *νοῦς*, Romans VII. 23, 25, and in particular of the concept *συνείδησις* presupposes accurate consideration of psychological questions. In I Corinthians XI. 14 Paul appeals to *φύσις*; in I Corinthians VII. 35 he uses the word *ἀπερισπάστως* (Epict. I, 29, 59; II, 21, 22; III, 22, 63); he speaks of *θειότης* and *θεότης*, and makes *ἀφθαρσία*, *αἶδιον* and *ἀόρατον* the characteristic signs of the idea of God; he uses such delicate distinctions as *μορφή* and *σχῆμα*, *μεταμορφοῦσθαι* and *μετασχηματίζεσθαι*, *μόρφωσις*, and a man who could do this possessed a mind of very different character from

PAUL'S HELLENISM

that of the Galilæan prophet and speaker in parables. In Paul we have constant echoes of the thought of the Stoa, however popular in form ; we cannot expect that the gospel of Jesus should retain its original form in passing through the mind of His apostle.

12. Paul's "Hellenism" however, is something more than merely linguistic or merely an element in his culture. A man whose environment had been the great cities of the Roman Empire was bound, not only to think in a different manner, but to use other standards of comparison and adopt other points of view than those habitual to a member of a family in Nazareth. It is true that Paul did not pass through the streets of Corinth with the cultured and enthusiastic self-complacency of a Greek brought up in an æsthetic atmosphere, but shut his eyes to much with which he met. All such splendour merely aroused in him the judgment that "the things of this world pass away." His view of the world was certainly far more pessimistic than that of Jesus ; Jesus praises the beauty of the flowers of the field and the care of God for the ravens, while the Apostle hears only the "groaning of the creature." And yet, notwithstanding the strength of his feeling that "the God of this world" is the devil and that Christ is "crucified to the world and the world to Him," he can recognise special virtues in the civilisation of the Roman Empire of

PAUL AND JESUS

which we hear nothing in the worlds of Jesus. The difference is due to the special positions of the two characters. By his Roman citizenship Paul was far more closely connected with "the things of this world" than was the Galilæan carpenter's son, whose home was wherever God's sun shone, and of whose family was any one who would know and do the will of God. Paul was proud of his citizenship, and derived many advantages from it. At Ephesus he was doubtless in touch with the *Conventus* of Roman citizens who had settled in the town ; or he must in some other way have secured the good offices of the official representatives of Roman civilisation, the "Asiarchs" (Acts xix. 38 : cp. my article "Asia Minor" in R. E. III, x. 537 ff.). The statement in the Acts of the Apostles upon this point has not hitherto been appreciated at its full worth. It shows, on the one hand, that there was no idea at that time of forcing Christians to accept emperor-worship, and on the other hand, that Paul did not regard the attitude of these people towards the State-religion as any obstacle to his friendly intercourse with them. This fact is strikingly consistent with the astonishingly high esteem in which the native Jew held the Roman constitution. It is true that Paul's attitude may have been influenced by the favourable nature of his own experiences. Any one who, like Paul, had repeatedly travelled on foot from Antioch to the west coasts of Asia Minor, often

PAUL'S IDEA OF THE STATE

“in perils of waters, in perils of robbers . . . in cold and nakedness,” would be ready enough to appreciate the governing power which made and guarded roads, preserved the peace and crushed wrong-doers. Any one who, like Paul, had repeatedly enjoyed the protection of the officials against the mob, would naturally regard the supporters of law and order as allies rather than as hostile to his work. But these facts are hardly enough to explain the high idealism apparent in Romans XIII. 7 ff. The State is there regarded as *κατέχων*, as averting the entrance of corruption and decay; this view may be regarded as the outcome of personal experience; but the powers that be are also regarded as the servants of *God for good*, and such a statement is only possible for a writer who not only shuts his eyes to many disagreeable facts, but also finds some divine element for reverence within the State. In Paul's case this attitude is to be explained as due to more than tradition (Wisdom VI. 4, where kings are called *ὑπηρέται τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ*); it is the outcome of the true Græco-Roman spirit which remained with Paul in spite of his renunciation of the world and his preaching of repentance. Revolution or antagonism to the State Paul regarded as sin against God, just as tumult, uproar, and disorder are hateful. God is not a God of *ἀκαταστασία* but a God of peace; everything is to proceed *εἰσχημόνως καὶ κατὰ τάξιν*

PAUL AND JESUS

(I Cor. XIV. 33, 40). This characteristic expression is the outcome of the Roman desire for discipline and drill. With this point of view we may compare the few words which explain the attitude of Jesus towards governmental authorities. It is not surprising that Jesus should have shown but little religious and patriotic favour towards the prince who governed his own country; but the fact that He regards rulers in general as oppressors and tyrants (Mark X. 44) shows that He did not regard the State, as such, as a moral force worthy of respect. Cæsar is to be paid his penny, if he insists upon it, but that any deeper emotion springing from religious motives is due to him "for the sake of God," does not in any way appear from Mark XII. 17 (cp. my explanation in the *Schriften des Neuen Test.*, I, 184 f.). Jesus certainly showed no desire to encourage the revolutionary intrigues of the zealots; but His disinclination was not the outcome of innate conservatism and love of order, but of the conviction that attempts to secure the sovereignty of God by force of arms were impious (see op. cit. ad Matt. XI. 12). His words can only be construed as implying complete indifference to that which is honoured with the title of βασιλεία in this age. Jesus does not need to break His connection with His native land, for the glory of the palace of Tiberias has paled when the first rays of God's sovereignty appeared above the horizon. Paul has long before broken with

PAUL'S UNIVERSALISM

the world, and yet can recognise high moral value in the institutions of the world.

Whether Jesus turned His gaze upon the inhabited world as a whole, and how closely He observed it, we do not know; but the gospel tradition, which represents Him as silent upon the subject, no doubt reflects His characteristic attitude. His heart is preoccupied with the people immediately about Him; to win their souls, to save them from judgment, to proclaim the approach of the judgment and the kingdom of God to the towns and villages of Galilee and to those who gathered in Jerusalem for the feasts, was His first task. Very significant is the fact, that in three different parables (Mark iv.) He compares His work with that of the sower; it is not merely a question of religious subordination of self, the issue of His work lying solely in God's hands; a certain limitation of space is also implied: the sower works in a small field bounded by visible limits. St. Matthew's explanation that the field is the world (xiii. 38) is only to be understood as a reference to the work of the great missionary church. Jesus is not an apostle: He also fulfils His task in solitude, when He wrestles in prayer for the coming of the kingdom and confirms the minds of His faithful few in their belief and constancy. To Paul the most important point is that the Word should "not be bound," but that it should "run" (2 Thess. iii. 1; 2 Tim. ii. 9).

PAUL AND JESUS

He describes His work by the metaphors of a triumphal campaign of God through the land (2 Cor. II. 14), of a campaign of conquest (2 Cor. X. 4), and the reconciliation of "the world" is his object (2 Cor. V. 19; Rom. XI. 15). Jesus confines Himself to the "little flock," to the "few" who are "chosen." Paul with his Greek culture and Roman citizenship cannot rest content with gathering believers upon a small spot of earth and proclaiming true righteousness in their midst. So soon as he has decided for Christ, plans for world-wide missionary enterprise come before his mind. For Paul, the unit is the country or nation, not the individual. Jew and heathen, Greek and barbarian, the *κλίματα* of the East (Rom. XV. 23) with the provinces of Galatia, Asia, Macedonia, Achaia, and also the West with "Spania," and doubtless Gallia and Germania in the background—such was the area within which his extensive labours fell. Jesus also desires to win "men" and not simply Jews, but only because the soul of man is His immediate care; His thought follows Jewish lines; when, as is foretold by the prophets, the heathen shall hereafter flock to the kingdom, they will sit down with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob (Matt. VIII. 4). Yet the Father in heaven is the God of the fathers (Mark XII. 26). In Paul's philosophy, however, the conception of "humanity" plays a definite part, though the term is lacking in his vocabulary. His universalism

PAUL'S UNIVERSALISM

is most obvious in the question asked in Romans III. 29, which has not received the attention it deserves. "Is he the God of the Jews only? Is he not also of the Gentiles?" That Paul should have been able to conceive this idea, perhaps the most mature result of his missionary labours, is not so remarkable as the fact that he expected as a matter of course an affirmative answer, not only from the Christians, but also from the Jews of the dispersion, to whom he had explained his views from chap. II. II onwards. This idea is one of the antecedent suppositions necessary to justify his work. In this passage we catch sight of that cosmopolitanism, if we may use the term, on which the philosophy of this Hellenistic Jew was based; the East and the West alike are God's. Paul has the world-wide outlook of Hellenistic culture; he is a born missionary, and, had he never known Christ, would perhaps have become a preacher of the one true God among the nations. Upon the whole, the personality of Jesus impresses us as less Jewish than that of Paul; but Paul's outlook upon the world is from the outset far more universal in its general outlines.

13. With this fact is connected—at any rate to some extent—the speculative element in Paul's thought, which is practically absent from the words of Jesus. The preaching of Jesus is couched in a few profound and winning sentences concerning the Father in heaven and all that He requires

PAUL AND JESUS

of His children. Paul's doctrine is propounded in accordance with a system of metaphysics and a philosophy of history. As a missionary, the world as a whole was ever before his eyes, and, similarly, as a thinker he holds in connection the general course of the world's history from the moment when the nature of the "invisible God" was hypostasised in its "image, the firstborn of every creature," to the end when God is to take "all" back to Himself, so that God is "all in all" (Col. I. 15; I Cor. xv., 28). The expressions in which Paul clothes these ideas are entirely Greek and were borrowed from the Stoic school; this philosophical dress is entirely unmistakable; it is especially obvious in Paul's Christology and in his doctrine of the Spirit, which are unintelligible apart from the influence of the Stoic Logos doctrine. (See my essay, "Christus—Die Anfänge des Dogmas," *Religionsgesch. Volksbücher*, I, 18-19. 1909).

Here, however, we are not so much concerned with the content of Paul's philosophy, as with the fact that he, in contradistinction to Jesus, felt the need of speculative inquiry and could not avoid casting his thoughts in systematic form. In his case the fact is not merely the outcome of his Hellenistic culture; the trained scribe is also visible. Here, then, we have a further difference of profound import in the fact that Paul belonged to the Rabbinical school and Jesus did not.

PAUL'S PHILOSOPHY

This, at least, is the prevailing view, and is supported by the famous judgment of the people in St. Mark i. 22 and by the general tone of the discourses. The assumption, however, requires some limitation. Religious knowledge and work at the time of Jesus could not be entirely dissociated from the influence of the scribes. To translate the Scriptures into the vernacular and to expound them in the synagogue demanded some measure of scribe-learning. Tradition informs us, and lays considerable stress upon the fact, that Jesus was superior to His opponents in the field of Rabbinical dialectic. For instance, the argument and proof in the discussion with the Sadducees (Mark XII. 26 f.) is thoroughly Rabbinical—in this case I am inclined to doubt the attribution to Jesus—as also is the argument upon the Son of David (Mark XII. 35 ff.), the question of divorce (Mark x. 5-8), and many other instances. Unless all these instances are to be explained as discussions of the church with Judaism, these scanty remnants of theological activity force us to admit that Jesus was able to use the weapons of Rabbinical repartee.

It is, however, equally certain that this part of the tradition does not represent what was especially characteristic in Jesus. The great discourse against the scribes in Matthew XXIII. contains only a short passage (*vv.* 16-22, the words concerning oaths which are wanting in Luke) of

PAUL AND JESUS

dialectical argument in the style of the scribes ; entirely preponderant are the vigorous and sweeping expressions of indignation at the foolishness and hypocrisy of this class. We may compare with this chapter such a passage as Galatians III., in order to observe how the scribes are controverted, in the one case by the scribe, in the other by the prophet. In the other discourses of Jesus we are constantly surprised by the numerous appeals to the common sense of mankind, and this is a feature which is eminently of a popular nature and without appeal to scholars. Wisdom and experience of life, not scholarship and criticism, are the leading principles. Those scriptural proofs which would best betoken a course of theological reflexion are infinitesimal in comparison. The utterances are often strongly reminiscent of Scripture, but this fact is a proof that the speaker was fully penetrated by the word of God. The special characteristics of Jesus are particularly obvious in cases where strong religious feeling has evoked utterances flowing, inspiring, and therefore marked by artistic power. Their force and vigour is then original and striking ; instances are the words concerning anxiety or the imperative call to renounce the claim for legal rights and for revenge. Overwhelming earnestness, frowning abruptness, a fire of ready passion, and the heights of enthusiasm as apparent in the quadruple description of the love of enemies in St. Luke,

RABBINICAL INFLUENCES

in the rejoicing over the wonderful love of God for the young, in the beatitudes, in the words concerning children, in the paradoxes upon the greatest and the least, upon ruling and serving—these are the heart's outpourings of His true nature. If we ask whence these originated, the answer is, from His certain faith in God and His trust in Him. The case cannot be stated better than in the Old Testament phrase, God was with Him (Acts x. 38), or in that of St. Mark (i. 22), He spoke as one with authority. Precisely for this reason He was not as the scribes who relied upon authority, tradition, and evidence in support of argument.

We turn to consider Paul. To represent him as nothing more than a Rabbi converted to Christianity would be to take a very one-sided view. No trace of the scribe's attitude is to be found in Romans XII. or in 1 Corinthians XIII. We are constantly amazed at this *παράκλησις* (Rom. XII.); we wonder at the stream of thought which flows from the preacher when he reveals the command of love in fresh lights, at the wealth of feeling reflected in the most varied forms of expression. The height of artistic expression maintained throughout 1 Corinthians XIII. is not the result of painful hair splitting; a master is playing upon his instrument, and the wonderful melody which he produces is due to the fact that in this hour his heart is full of his deepest experiences and hopes. It is impossible to avoid the impression that a pro-

PAUL AND JESUS

foundly religious nature is here outpouring itself without restraint. It would be futile to enumerate the passages in which this impression is repeated. These, however, are moments of exaltation and of extreme enthusiasm, and enable us to gain some idea of Paul as an inspired apostle. In the business of life and in meetings of the congregations he may often have spoken thus, when carried away by his enthusiasm. But in his writing another element is also strongly apparent. Even when matters of faith and creed are in question, he is often not satisfied to explain his conviction ἐν παρρησίᾳ. Jesus gives no reason for His proclamation that the kingdom of heaven is at hand. He feels the approach of the storm instinctively, and His conviction is uttered with such force that He is believed. In this respect He is typical of the prophet in the true sense of the word. Paul also speaks as a prophet upon occasion, for instance, in the eighth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans. But though his certainty that salvation was possible was undoubtedly immediate, he none the less feels himself obliged to support his statement by arguments; he appeals in the first place to experience. As God did not spare His own Son, He has surely intended to give us all in giving us His Son. It is noteworthy, however, that even this practical religious argument is introduced as a logical conclusion *a majore ad minus* (cp. Rom. v. 8-11), a form of fundamental importance in Rabbinical

RABBINICAL INFLUENCES

dialectic. But the exalted testimony of the prophet is also interspersed with logical deductions in compressed form: "if children, then also heirs" (*v. 17 a*); the *εἶπερ* (*v. 17 b*); the argument based upon the groaning of the creature (*γάρ, v. 19*); the little discussion concerning the nature of *ἔλπις* (*v. 19*); the climax (*vv. 29 f.*). To our feeling these digressions seem somewhat out of key with the general tone of the passage. But to Paul they have a religious significance, and they clearly show that his faith grew up in closest conjunction with his theology. His conviction is certainly based upon facts, upon the love of God which the Spirit has poured into his heart; but he also feels obliged to bring home the truth of this fact by appeals to reason. An excellent instance is Romans v. In the first half of the chapter (*vv. 1-11*) Paul has expounded his conviction with attractive fervour in the form of a confession of faith or testimony, showing that, together with justification, salvation is also given, and that the *δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ* is really a *δύναμις εἰς σωτηρίαν*. This, however, is not enough for him: from verse 12 onwards he introduces the section concerning Christ and Adam, which will always strike us as being a descent to the level of an appeal to reason or of abstract thought. But the certainty of salvation is not definitely secured in his opinion until he has proved it by philosophical argument. Thus he falls back upon the apocalyptic dogma

PAUL AND JESUS

which he regarded as irrefragable, that the work and influence of the Messiah correspond logically, by way of diametrical opposition, to the fall of Adam and its consequences, and that therefore as Adam brought death to many, so Christ is to bring life to many. Similarly the certainty of the Resurrection naturally rests in the first instance upon the fact of Christ's Resurrection (I Cor. xv. 1-11); but after adducing this proof Paul adds the purely logical deductive proof which he regarded as entirely conclusive (vv. 12-19), and also a proof from apocalyptic sources (vv. 21 f.): as by Adam came death, so life must come by Christ, and in a definite order as established by apocalyptic prophecy (vv. 23-28). In the following passage we also meet with logical arguments, the proof from the analogy of nature (v. 37), and in particular the idea, which is very surprising to us, that if there is a natural body there is also a spiritual body (v. 44), with the scriptural proof in the style of the *midrash* following the statement (v. 45). And these deductions appear in the middle of a section (vv. 42-44, and 49-57) which is filled with an increasing measure of prophetic enthusiasm.

The appeal to apocalyptic dogma is simply a special form of the theological method apparent in the citation of scriptural proofs. The very considerable part which the method plays in Paul's writings, and the manner of its application which seems to us entirely haphazard, are special

RABBINICAL INFLUENCES

signs of Rabbinical culture. The constant readiness to adduce scriptural proofs and the forcing of words to bear a desired meaning are survivals of that painful and unprofitable species of scholarship which the scribes maintained, and which never dared to rely upon individual thought or experience, but remained in every detail dependent upon tradition. Symptomatic also of Paul's leanings to a speculative system of thought is his tendency to show that the truths of the moment can be proved to have existed as the original and primordial thoughts of God. The tendency is due not only to a certain mistrust of anything new or unduly modern—an essential characteristic of later Judaism—but also to an axiom which is influential even in modern theology, that the older truth is, the more true it is ; even the certainty of salvation seems to be more firmly established when the appeal can be referred to God's counsels for salvation established before the ages (Rom. VIII. 29 f.) ; in this respect also the last age must be connected with the first age. The promise is stronger than the law, and contains the true expression of God's will, because it is four hundred and thirty years older (Gal. III. 17). By chance, or perhaps of set purpose, Jesus is found expressing this idea in the discourse upon divorce, "from the beginning it was not so." (Matt. XIX. 8). In their criticisms of the law, Jesus refers to the original revelation, Paul to the prophecy to Abraham; and here again the difference

PAUL AND JESUS

may be material and not merely accidental. We shall return to this point later. Here we observe another motive, Paul's *polemical and apologetic* purposes, which also actuated his efforts to bring his doctrine into harmony with Scripture. It was also a matter of constant personal interest to Paul to prove to his own conscience and to his churches that his gospel was the direct continuation of God's first revelation, that Christians were the true "congregation of God," and "Israel after the Spirit," and that he himself was therefore not an apostate, but the only consistent Jew. Moreover, as the founder and organiser of the worldwide mission, Paul was also bound to be the first theologian of the church.

Paul's missionary work comes into connection with the propaganda of the Jews of the dispersion; the latter and others employed a rational polemical system to controvert heathen idolatry and strove to spread belief in the *one* true and living God by appeals to reason; similarly Paul found a rational basis for his monotheistic preaching in the popular philosophy of Stoicism; proofs of the fact are the speech on Mars' Hill (the Areopagus), which is elaborate in style, and especially Romans i. 20 *τὰ γὰρ ἀόρατα αὐτοῦ . . . τοῖς ποιήμασιν νοούμενα καθορᾶται*, where Paul derives ideas not only from the Wisdom of Solomon, but from Hellenistic thought in general. But he also attempted upon a much larger scale to make the theory of salvation,

PAUL AND JUDAISM

which was peculiar to Christianity, intelligible upon a rational system; definite instances are 1 Corinthians VIII. 6 and Colossians I. 15 ff., where Paul brought the terms *Christus* and *Logos* into complete combination.* He thus became the founder of the *Logos Christology* and therefore of ecclesiastical dogma. It is unnecessary to say that no analogy to this achievement can be found in the work of Jesus. Hence it is correspondingly important to compare with the preaching of Jesus that part of the Pauline theology, in which the apostle explains his attitude towards Judaism.

14. For this purpose it was necessary to show that Jesus was the Messiah, that His death had from the outset been predestined as part of God's plan of salvation—these doctrines are generally presupposed in the epistles—and in particular that the law and circumcision cannot bring salvation, but that even from the days of Abraham faith was predestined as the only means whereby men could be saved. This anti-Jewish demonstration conducted by a Jew was the necessary consequence of the separation of Christianity from Judaism, and the inevitable accompaniment of the rise of a new religion standing midway between Judaism and the heathen religions.

Jesus had no special reason for propounding a theological system to His followers. His work was purposely confined to Israel; He wished to pre-

* Cp. my essay, "Christus—Die Anfänge des Dogmas."

PAUL AND JESUS

serve national continuity as regarded the general features of His theory of life, the belief in the final Messianic redemption and even the great fundamental principles of the love of God and of one's neighbour. He was led to combat the prevailing pietism by observing that the scribes abrogated in favour of the ordinances of men the divine law which was perfectly well known to them ; He saw that they were formalists, untrue, inconsistent, and making no attempt to fulfil the will of God. His opposition to official Judaism was not theoretical, but practical. Thus, in view of the approach of God's kingdom He preached repentance, greater seriousness and true inward religion, brought the nature of life with God before men's eyes and hearts and gathered together such as could be saved. The prayer of His holy church to which He looked forward was simply a summary of current Jewish petitions, and its life was simply that of the strictly pious and thoughtful Jew, awaiting the kingdom of God with full certainty and awe ; the church was therefore in need of no new theology and needed it the less, as Jesus had brought the ancient God of Israel to earth with incomparable realism and vividness.

Jesus and His earliest congregations were thus unconcerned with systematic theology ; the fact is of high importance to us, because for this reason the picture of Jesus exerts an immediate attraction upon men of the most varied education or culture.

PAUL AND JUDAISM

Had His preaching been amalgamated with a theology open to disputation, access to His person would have been greatly impeded. The fact that He thus declined to promulgate a theology of His own did indeed produce one historical consequence of serious import. The Palestinian adherents of Jesus, by retaining their Jewish nationality, lost their power of historical development. The new world-wide religion stood in need of a theology such as Paul possessed. The life of Jesus created the type of a child of God freed from formalism and from servitude to law; Paul explained the theoretical principles upon which this type was based.

Indications, however, may be found, even in the life of Jesus, of attempts to secure an explanation with Judaism upon points of principle. But his critical observations upon the validity of the law (Mark II. 27; VII. 15; X. 5 ff.) were not dictated by any systematic theological plan, but were attacks inspired by momentary occasions and were not pursued. They are distinguished from Paul's criticisms of the law by the fact that the quondam Rabbi pupil attempts to secure an agreement with his opponents by finding some common standpoint as a basis for argument. This basis is "Abraham's faith," and from this starting-point he can attempt to show the transitory nature and the secondary importance of the law; thus, though denying the law, he retains his footing in Judaism. Jesus

PAUL AND JESUS

adopted a far more radical method. Reverting from Moses to the revelation of Paradise, He adopted a general humanitarian standpoint and stepped beyond the limits of Judaism. The ideas that the Sabbath was made for man and that inward not outward purity was the vital point (Mark II. 27) implied a general disruption of the official Jewish system, if they were carried to their logical consequences. For the theory that the law was paramount rested upon the invincible belief that Moses was a paramount authority, that "purity of hands" was of essential importance to religion, that man existed simply for the sake of the law, and that nothing was of greater importance than the fulfilling of the law. When Jesus unceremoniously denied the fundamental postulates of the whole system—perhaps without fully realising the radical consequences of His action—all possibility of agreement disappeared. Views implying so fundamental an upheaval destroyed all hope for a "reform" of Judaism, even if Jesus had projected any movement of the kind, and this, in my opinion, was certainly not the case. In this point also, notwithstanding his anti-Judaism, Paul displayed a more positive interest in his nation as a whole.

Any project of general reform must have lain outside the purview of Jesus, for the reason that, as we may learn from the discourses, He regarded the critical moment as imminent. He was obliged

PAUL AND JUDAISM

to content Himself with announcing the approach of the judgment at least to all towns and villages. We therefore gain the impression that His efforts were concentrated upon the task of saving the few elect from their dangerous environment ; the un-shepherded people in general and the shepherds in particular appear in the Gospels as a helpless *massa perditionis*. Too strong is the tone of resignation to be heard in the, "many are called, but few chosen" and elsewhere. Jesus is obviously well aware that He is asking too much of the many, that He would not be understood and that His hearers could not become His followers even if they were so minded. Thus He is ultimately led to the stern judgment that the "sons of the Kingdom" will be cast out.

Paul, as we know, was unable to reconcile himself to so absolute a rejection, and believed that Israel would ultimately be converted. His judgments upon the Jews who "are against all men" are often couched in strong terms ; but the whole of his theology, so far as it is an attempt to secure an understanding with Judaism, appears as a magnificent and touching effort, to convince the Jews and to prove to himself that he was not an apostate. Probably his theology enabled many a Jew to become or to remain a Christian with an easy conscience. And while he rejected the law, his art undoubtedly contributed in large measure to the fact that the religious treasures of the Old

PAUL AND JESUS

Testament were preserved for the congregations. However the "Judaic Christianity" of the Church may be criticised, there is no doubt that the preservation of the Old Testament was for Christianity both a historical necessity and a piece of good fortune. If the Church was to survive the competition of the sacramental religions which had no history, and especially the competition of the primæval Jewish religion, it required a book for purposes of edification, an abundance of religious material, a specialised ethical system as provided by the proverbial books and "examples of the good." In Clement's first epistle we see how readily the author drew upon these resources. Though this process took place, yet Christianity was not overgrown by a second outcrop of Rabbinical interpretation, and the fact is due to Paul, and especially to his training in the Rabbinical schools.

15. He was, indeed, so deeply involved in Pharisaism, and his personal experience of it was so profound, that he was able to recognise the fundamental error of the school with complete perspicacity; consequently he was able to strike at the central point of the Jewish attack on Christianity and to disperse the storm with a success which no one else could have attained. We may, perhaps, say that he saw more deeply into the nature of Pharisaism and rejected it more absolutely than even Jesus Himself. Jesus con-

PAUL AND JUDAISM

stantly referred to the inconsistency between outward behaviour and inward motive ; the formalism and unreality of this pietism aroused His anger. Paul, on the basis of his personal experience and by means of his entirely religious nature, realised that Judaism was distorted as a system and that its attitude towards religion was from the outset perverted ; he regarded as chimerical the theory that by means of works men could force God to deal out reward and salvation in fulfilment of a contractual obligation ; moreover, this attitude towards God, which seemed to regard Him as a contracting party with rights and claims not superior to those of man, was recognised by Paul as impious and as a blasphemous misrepresentation of the position of man, in view of his entire dependence upon God. The irreligious aberrations of Pharisaism consisted in this "boasting before God," as Paul calls it, or as we may paraphrase it, "in self-glorification upon the ground of past achievement, in making demands of God" ; this mad "going up to heaven" to bring salvation down from thence, and this unseemly "reckoning" with God which is entirely characteristic of all Jewish thought, are the by-products of a pietism which, like heathenism, professed to exert compulsion upon God ; heathen magic, sacrifice and prayer, was here replaced by the practice of righteousness to which God was unable to refuse reward. Paul himself had shared this passionate

PAUL AND JESUS

zeal for the law, this painful ἐργάζεσθαι, and the attempts to take heaven by storm and bring salvation down to earth; he had realised profoundly the hopeless nature of this labour, of the "pursuit after righteousness," wherein the fair object was seen only as a *fata morgana*, unattainable, attractive and yet mocking all attempts (Rom. ix. 31, διώκων . . . οὐκ ἔφθασεν); it was this experience which enabled Paul not merely to conquer certain outposts of Judaism, but to show that the system must be rejected as absolutely incompatible with the gospel.

But Paul's discoveries were also of a positive nature; he was enabled to realise the essential nature of the religious life; by contrast with Judaism and its pursuit of righteousness the fact became clear that man's position to God must always be that of the recipient, and this position Paul denotes as "Faith."

All the knowledge that Paul thus acquired by bitter experience was obviously self-evident to Jesus from the outset. Jesus was never in such close connection with the spirit of Pharisaism, nor stood so nearly beneath the lash of the law; hence He never felt the fundamental aberrations of the scribe religion so deeply as Paul nor was He obliged to overcome any perverted tendency to strive on behalf of the law. It was granted to His nature to rely in confidence and devotion, with purity and inward love, upon the infinite goodness

PAUL AND JUDAISM

of the heavenly Father. Thus Paul's great question, works or faith, finds no place in the preaching of Jesus.

In another direction, however, Jesus both felt and expressed the same opposition to the sentiment of Pharisaism. When He said that a man must receive the kingdom of God "as a child" and that the kingdom belongs to child-like minds (cp. *Schriften des Neuen Testaments* on Mark x. 4 and Matt. xviii. 3), He spoke in opposition to the Pharisees no less than when He uttered the cry of joy for the divine preference shown to "babes" (cp. *ibid.* on Matt. xi. 25 f.). Jesus must have felt that the self-conscious and introspective spirit of Pharisaism, ever watching itself and balancing accounts with God, was the greatest obstacle in the way of access to God; for the true guests at the heavenly Father's table were the "poor" who hungered only for divine blessings, the "babes" who knew nothing of theology and religious rights and cared less, and the "children" who were ever ready to receive divine gifts. *In these ideas of Jesus we have the true parallel to Paul's great thesis, "faith, not the works of the law."*

Here, again, we see the difference between Paul and Jesus; the beatitudes, the cry of joy, and the words regarding children are original conceptions expressing in different ways the division which separated Jesus from the prevailing pietism; but though varied in tone and wealth of expression,

PAUL AND JESUS

they are characterised by uniformity of sentiment. Paul, on the other hand, gives us a sharply-defined formula, probably not evolved by himself, but the product of long disputation concerning faith and works, a formula also which very imperfectly represents his real meaning. New religious experience did not, in this case, create its own forms of expression, but adapted itself to formulæ already existing.

Paul maintained the argumentative standpoint with reference to Jewish Pharisaism which Jesus had adopted but had not pursued (Matt. v. 20); under what conditions and on the ground (ἐκ) of what achievements is man justified by God? The legal formula and also the extraordinary paradoxical refinement of Paul, to the effect that "God recognises the sinner as justified" in form admit the existence of that which is, and are therefore analytical judgments, to use the language of Kant and Ritschl. The formal logician would say that this mode of expression simply evokes the idea that there must be in the justified sinner something which God can recognise as righteousness; hence the conclusion is but too obvious that "faith" is also a "work" which outweighs the deficiency of other works in the eyes of God. This was not the interpretation intended by Paul, who regards "faith" as the contrary of "works," as is clear not only from Romans iv. 5, but also from his general attitude; he undoubtedly intended to

PAUL AND JUDAISM

represent faith as the organ of receptivity for grace. Hence though his formula is divergent and not entirely happy, *his religious theory coincides with that of Jesus in its essential points*. Jesus was able to retain the Jewish theory of reward without prejudice to His entirely independent idea of sonship; similarly Paul's theory and its entire antagonism to Pharisaism is perfectly clear, notwithstanding the Jewish formulæ under which it is propounded.

Thus the Pharisee, trained to think in legal terms and regarding the inviolable character of the divine justice which governed the world as supremely important, completely changed his attitude and preached that the grace of God was superior to the claims of legal right. We may ask how this change was produced. It is quite conceivable that Paul might have founded a school of Christian Pharisaism, not only in matters of formal expression, but also in reality of life: "It is true that the Messiah exists and demands faith in Himself; but it is therefore the more necessary at this moment for men to become worthy of the Messiah by adherence to the law, and so to maintain the perfect righteousness: only faith and works in conjunction will secure salvation." For what reason, then, did Paul utterly reject the law and look to grace alone as the only hope? Why did he give prominence so exclusively to faith, regarding it as complete renunciation of personal merit and as simple readiness to receive grace?

PAUL AND JESUS

Inquirers appeal to Paul's experience; the law had bound him fast in the depths of sin, and could therefore serve no longer as a means to salvation. But on the other hand, there is his idea (Rom. vii. 12 f.) that the flesh, not the law, is the cause of this failure. Why should not the law be at least a subordinate means to salvation?

Appeal is also made to Paul's directness of statement, to his habit of pursuing argument to its logical consequence; alternative or subordinate possibilities have no place in his dialectical methods. But this logical directness or resolution of will must have arisen from his experience of life.

Paul himself states another reason to account for his complete rejection of the law (Gal. ii. 21): how can man "frustrate the grace of God," i.e. treat it as non-existent, scorn and despise it? To regard the law as necessary to salvation is to act as if God had given no overwhelming proof of His grace: "for if righteousness comes by the law, then Christ is dead in vain," the sacrifice has been offered unnecessarily and without result. To preach that righteousness came by the law as a doctrine for the congregations would be an act of unpardonable ingratitude and an impious revolt against God's clearly revealed will. Paul's profound and immediate consciousness of the love

* Cp. Luke x. 16, 1 Sam. ii, 17: ὅτι ἠθέτησαν τὴν θυσίαν τοῦ κυρίου; Is. ii. 1, υἱοὶ . . . με ἠθέτησαν.

PAUL'S SOTERIOLOGY

manifested in Christ's act, and his reverential fear of diminishing the gratitude due to Christ, is shown in such passages as I Corinthians VIII. 12 : he who wounds the conscience of the brother for whom Christ died, commits a sin against Christ ; and I Corinthians XI. 27 : he who partakes unworthily of the Lord's Supper "is guilty of the body and blood of the Lord." The force of the passage is weakened, if we consider it as referring only to the profanation of the sacred elements. The idea is, that such a man is guilty of the death of the Lord. Thus the propitiation (*ἱλαστήριον*) which God has openly set up (*προέθετο*) stands ever before his eyes with imperative eloquence. Before this manifestation of the righteousness of God man can but bow and receive its benefits ; he cannot hope to supplement it. The adherents of the legal system, overwhelmed by this new and unexampled fact, must surrender what they formerly held dear and must reconstruct their philosophy of life upon a new basis.

16. The prevailing view represents this conversion from the *νόμος ἔργων* to the *νόμος πίστεως* as the result of a dialectical process. When Paul was convinced that the crucified One was the Messiah, a complete reversal of opinion followed ; it was clear that God, instead of placing His Son forthwith upon the throne of the world, had first surrendered Him to death in expiation of sin and as satisfaction to righteousness. He had resolved

PAUL AND JESUS

upon this sacrifice, in order that grace might abound unrestrained. Hence grace and not retaliatory justice was the compelling motive and that which marked the ultimate purpose. Hence, again, it was necessary to receive God's grace in faith. Thus a new philosophy of life may be seen to have arisen from a series of inferences returning upon the facts. Christ's death upon the cross can be shown to have occurred for the purpose of manifesting the grace of God : "God commendeth His love toward us, in that Christ died for us" (Rom. v. 8) ; "God is for us, for He spared not His own Son, but delivered Him up for us all" (Rom. VIII. 32) ; "justified freely by His grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus" (Rom. III. 24). In all these passages Christ appears, so to speak, only as the dumb victim, the purely passive instrument in God's hand. If this were all, there would be some justification for the view that Paul's soteriology was based upon a theological inference from a historical fact ; he required no personal connection whatever with the immediate author of salvation, for he was merely the object by means of which God proclaimed His purposes of salvation.

But these passages are selected upon very one-sided principles, and the account of the "logical conversion," as above detailed, is a caricature which even Wrede might have rejected. I have brought out its one-sided character as far as

PAUL'S SOTERIOLOGY

possible, in order to show the fallacy which it conceals. One point is especially clear, that the dialectical process was only intended to produce a theoretical and apologetic foundation for that conviction which Paul had already gained from other sources. If we inquire into the cause of the peace of mind which he had gained, of the confidence and joyous sense of reconciliation to which he testifies with such overwhelming force, he replies, "The love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us" (Rom. v. 5); our sonship to God is sealed by the spirit in our hearts crying Abba (Gal. iv. 6). Translated into our language these phrases mean that Paul has been overcome by the sense of triumphant exaltation which was a vital force in the church before his time; "the joy of the Holy Ghost" (1 Thess. i. 6) has passed into his heart; he is directly conscious of the proximity and the peace of God. And thus far, his consciousness that he is at peace with God is ultimately a consequence of the religious exaltation which the influence of Jesus produced among His followers.

But Paul refers this consciousness of his even more directly to the influence of Jesus. The opinion of those who attempt to depict Paul as a formal dogmatic theologian and consider that he deduced his doctrine from the death of Christ regarded as a purely material event, gives an unnecessarily distorted view of the case. Paul

PAUL AND JESUS

emphasised as strongly as possible the voluntary nature of Christ's act, not only in His incarnation (Phil. II. 7 f. ; 2 Cor. VIII. 9), but also in his obedient devotion even to death. In Romans v. 15, in speaking of "the grace of God and the gift by grace, which is by one man, Jesus Christ," Paul clearly shows the complete unity of Christ and God in willing the gift of grace to men. An important passage in this connection is Galatians II. 20, "I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me and gave Himself for me." Paul feels that his life is overshadowed by the grace of Christ (2 Cor. XII. 9) ; his "love of Christ constrains him" and holds him firmly within the limits of his career, so that he cannot swerve aside (2 Cor. v. 14) : he feels that he has peace with God through "our Lord Jesus Christ" (Rom. v. 1) ; he is confident that Christ at all times makes intercession with God for him (Rom. VIII. 34) ; he is conqueror of all sorrows through Him that loved us (Rom. VIII. 37) ; in Him he is strong and Christ's strength is powerful in his weakness (Phil. IV. 13 ; 2 Cor. XII. 9) ; in a word, Paul lives not only in the theoretical idea, but in immediate consciousness of the fact that the will of Christ has been from the outset and will ever be directed to secure the salvation of His followers. Love is His nature, grace and favour emanate from Him, strength and help are to be gained from Him at every moment ; hence the formula of blessing,

PAUL'S KNOWLEDGE OF JESUS

“ the grace of the Lord be with you all ” ; hence the repeated salutation, “ Grace and peace from God the Father and from the Lord Jesus Christ. ” Thus, even from the theoretical standpoint, Christ is more to him than the “ victim ” offered by God ; He is the personal exponent of God's loving will, which He has made entirely His own ; the love of God has taken manifest form “ in Christ. ”

We now ask whence Paul gained this picture of Christ. Not from Jewish tradition, for nowhere in the apocalyptic literature is it asserted that the “ King Messiah, ” the “ Son of Man, ” the “ Judge ” was also the incarnation of God's love and grace. The theory that when Paul came to believe in the Messianic nature of Jesus, he simply transferred to Jesus the attributes of the apocalyptic Messiah, here breaks down. Paul could not have derived from Judaism this important feature in his picture of Christ : *past experience* had developed and transformed the figure of the Jewish Messiah most decisively. Paul must have been convinced by the narratives of the first disciples or by personal impression that Jesus was entirely devoted to the task not merely of preaching the love of God, but of acting as its incarnation in His every deed and word and of preaching it so attractively that sinners were able to take courage in view of that love. He must have known something of Jesus' efforts to win the souls of men, of His deeds of mercy to the suffering, and of His consoling

PAUL AND JESUS

and strengthening intercourse with the lost. From His lips Paul had received the message with which he goes throughout the world, "Make your peace with God!" In particular, he must in some way, perhaps from the words of institution of the Lord's Supper, which he knew, have gained the conviction that Jesus did not dumbly endure His sufferings and death, but took them upon Himself with full consciousness and voluntary self-sacrifice, as an essential part of His task, in obedience to His Father.* This general impression of the person of Jesus as proclaiming and also as fulfilling and performing the divine intentions of love corrected Paul's picture of the apocalyptic Messiah in most important details, and here we cannot but observe the profound and decisive influence of Jesus upon Paul.

It is a very distinctive fact that Paul's change of feeling does not seem to have been caused primarily by the words or doctrine of Jesus. Paul's doctrine of grace is nowhere expounded in sentences which in any way re-echo the words of Jesus concerning His heavenly Father or His parables of the prodigal son and the Pharisee and the publican. It is from the great fact of Jesus' life that Paul deduces the love of Jesus and the grace of God. It is, in any case, an instructive task to

* I may repeat (pp. 10 f.) that neither the text of Mark x. 45 nor that of the words at the Last Supper are guaranteed as authentic.

THE FATHERHOOD OF GOD

compare the main ideas of Jesus concerning the sonship of man under the fatherhood of God with the corresponding ideas as found in Paul's writings.

17. It is not surprising that the Abba cry of the Lord's prayer should be re-echoed in Paul's epistles (Gal. iv. 6; Rom. viii. 15), and that the term "father" should be applied to God as a proper name; not "our father," but simply "Father." It is not Paul the theologian, but Paul the member of the church who thus speaks, standing midway in the stream of spiritual life which has been outpoured from the apostolic age to the present day. Jesus was by no means the first to speak of God as "Father," but in prayer with His disciples He inspired them with His own faith and gave them courage to speak of God "as dear children speak of their father," and taught them to "fear God, to love and trust Him above all things." This spirit of devotion also came upon Paul. The idea of the fatherhood of God and the sonship of man was naturally possible also to Paul the Jew, as may be seen from Wisdom II. 13, 16-18, where one of the characteristics of the righteous is that "he profeseth to have the knowledge of God, and called himself the child of the Lord." Wrede has with good reason cited this passage, to which many others from Jewish literature might be added, as proof that the name of Father as applied to God was not peculiar to Jesus and His disciples. But of all explanations

PAUL AND JESUS

of Paul's use of the name, the most improbable is to state that after years of membership in the Christian community, he was led to speak of God as Father rather by Jewish tradition than by the influence of Jesus' preaching (Wrede, p. 96). Here we have a clear instance of the mechanical nature of the method employed by Wrede and others. If the point at issue were merely the "occurrence" of the title "Father" in Paul's writings, Jewish habits of mind would be just as good an explanation as Christian tradition. But the point is not the fact or amount of "occurrence," but the obvious warmth and feeling with which the title is pronounced by Paul and the fact that a restless seeker after righteousness, and a worshipper of rare enthusiasm should have found such peace with God that he can say, "We stand in the grace of God," "We rejoice in the hope of the glory of God" (Rom. v. 1 f.): he feels "the love of God" immediately present "in his heart" (v. 5); he is "convinced" that nothing can separate him from the love of God. This attitude of Paul's is the material point, and this he adopted not under the influence of Judaism, but only when the spirit of Christian brotherhood first came over him; then and then only did he realise that God was his Father and that he was a child of God.

It must also be remembered that the title of Father often expresses relationship not to the

THE FATHERHOOD OF GOD

faithful, but to Christ: Paul speaks of God, somewhat inconsistently with the rest of his Christology, as "the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ." This is more than a merely dogmatic statement; from tradition Paul apparently derived a picture or a notion of the extent to which Jesus felt Himself dependent upon "His God and Father," and rested in His love. We may recall the climax ever pregnant with meaning of 1 Corinthians III. 23, "ye are Christ's and Christ is God's." Even if these words refer to the exalted Christ, none the less they show traces of the fact that Paul had realised the subjection of Jesus to His Father (Phil. II. 8: *ὑπακοή*).

But Paul's exposition of this particular doctrine, the Fatherhood of God, contains points of difference which show that on this question he did not simply adopt "the doctrine" of Jesus. When Jesus speaks of His Father in Heaven, who cares for His children on earth and lets His sun shine upon the just and upon the unjust, whether worthy or unworthy, whether recognising His goodness or not, Whose heart is turned to the wandering sinner if he will but repent and avail himself of this love, we do not receive the impression that Jesus was consciously preaching a new and unprecedented doctrine: on the contrary, He assumes the readiness of all His hearers to admit that such is indeed the nature of God and to ask themselves why that nature is continually

PAUL AND JESUS

forgotten and why we do not grasp the hand which He extends to us with unwearied patience. Jesus is distinguished from the thinkers of His age simply by the fact that He was immediately conscious of the power and nearness of the love and compassion of His God, and this consciousness is so strong, so deep, and so clear that He cannot but testify to it and communicate His own blissful peace to others. There is no trace whatever of an idea that then only, in the last times, had God at length revealed Himself as the Father ; on the contrary, He had been always as He then was, and only the foolishness of man had failed to recognise His true goodness. No less alien to the teaching of Jesus is the idea that He in some way had been the first to touch His Father's heart and to open the channels of His grace. Jesus has simply received the divine grace and has thus been permitted in moments of blessedness to behold the fulness of the divine love.

Very different is the attitude of Paul. When he speaks from the pre-Christian standpoint, as in Romans I and II, he does not refer to the love of God as the Father, holding mankind in His embrace from time immemorial, but of His "eternal power and Godhead" manifest in the works of creation and demanding prayer, gratitude, and reverence ; he speaks of the judge, who judges men by their deeds and gives to each his due reward and who therefore must destroy the whole

THE FATHERHOOD OF GOD

world for its sinfulness.* God indeed passed over the previous sins of mankind without judgment ; He remained " true " because He had reserved the revelation of His righteousness for the fulness of time (Rom. III. 25). But not until that time did He reveal His love. Making the distinction somewhat finer, we may say that God did not eventually determine the redemption because He had been the " Father " from time immemorial, but that only in the fulness of time did He adopt the position of Father—at any rate to a portion of mankind. The " Abba " of Christians is not treated by Paul as the primitive cry of humanity which all men might utter, if they could find the courage ; he regards it rather as a title of honour which Christ gained permission for the elect to use by His death. Jesus preached that sonship was the eternal possession of mankind, if they would but avail themselves of it. Paul considers that sonship was conferred upon believers by a special legal act of adoption. Jesus speaks of God's grace and love as existing like the sunshine from the beginning of all things : Paul regards them as part of the secret counsels of God, existing indeed from eternity, but revealed only in " these last days."

Paul thus considers the fact of adoption and the revelation of the Fatherhood of God as belonging

* In this connection there is no place for such ideas as those expressed in Wisdom II. 13, 16-18.

PAUL AND JESUS

to the great acts of God in the last days ; thus we observe that even upon these vital points of his religious experience his thoughts and mode of expression are entirely confined to apocalyptic form. He might have so formulated his idea as to say that he, the prodigal, had at length grasped his Father's outstretched hand, which had been so long extended ; he is content to say that not until these last times did God raise a portion of humanity from a state of slavery to that of sonship. Thus Paul's consciousness of sonship to God gains a dramatic note which is absent from the preaching of Jesus. There is a difference of tone, not only on this one point, but throughout Paul's teaching.

18. Paul, as contrasted with Jesus, is a typical Christian by conversion. Conversion divided his life into two entirely distinct parts. There is no connection or transition between them, at any rate in Paul's opinion. There was no psychological development by way of preparation, nothing, in short, which betokened the change : " behold, a new thing has come to pass, the old has passed away." Former values have lost their proportion : life's centre of gravity has shifted ; " I no longer live but Christ lives in me." No man can describe a breach with his own past in stronger terms than those used by Paul. Hence his religious thought is concerned entirely with contrasts between the present and the past, between life and death or

THE TYPE OF CONVERSION

light and darkness, while through it all shines the light of the one great experience, the importance of which to Paul is not exaggerated by his comparison of it with the moment when God said, "Let there be light" (2 Cor. iv. 6). The new creation which was expected in the last days began with himself at Damascus.

It is clear that nothing of this kind is to be found in the case of Jesus. There is no sign of passionate inward struggles, of any turning point in life, of any lurid light upon the past. Although we know nothing of the religious development of Jesus, we may say that if He had followed a course of progress in any way analogous to that pursued by Paul, some echoes of it would have been perceptible. Even if we were to assume that Jesus received baptism from John, in order to "do penance" in His own way, we can only imagine the act as an effort to pursue with greater and more uncompromising energy a course upon which He had already entered. The only kind of "breach with the past" that we can observe in the life of Jesus is the fact that He broke away from the ties of family and friends, that He cast aside the hammer and chisel and left His home for a wandering life. Yet we have a feeling, though we can say nothing more definite, that in this matter He was but directly following an original and primordial impulse of His nature.

With Paul it was not so : throughout his life he

PAUL AND JESUS

was harassed by the thought that he had followed a hard, sinful, and wandering path, from which it had been necessary for Christ to recall him perforce. For years he had lived under a sky so overcast that the sun could not be seen, until at length the clouds parted and the heavenly glory streamed down upon him in splendour sudden and blinding, but healing to his soul. Thus for Paul the term "grace" had special associations; it implied the mercy which condescends to help the sinner in the hour of his greatest need.

Paul speaks the language of a convert, and for that reason he was the suitable apostle for those who were passing from a religion of error and a life of sin to a new religion of holiness and grace. His accents made their way to the hearts of the newly converted heathen, because he had himself been plunged in error and in grievous sin against Christ. Hence the moving pathos of his peace of mind and his devotion to his Master; he feels that it is his duty to make amends for past failures by redoubled loyalty.

Of decisive importance, we may venture to say, to the fate of our own church has been the fact that Paul, the type of the sinner saved from deepest ruin, became the model by which dogmatic and hortatory theology has constantly demonstrated that form of progress to Christianity regarded as normal; the first instance, followed by many others, was the author of 1 Timothy i. 15 f.

THE TYPE OF CONVERSION

Yet in Titus II. 11 f. the same author bore in mind the conditions of Christianity as a church, when he speaks of "the grace of God that bringeth salvation to all men," referring to it, not in Paul's dramatic way, as a means of salvation at the last hour, but as a force surrounding, guiding, urging, and "teaching" man throughout his life. In this altered connotation of the term *χάρις*, we see reflected the change from missionary to ecclesiastical Christianity; the type of the "convert" is replaced by the type of the normal Christian, who needs not to be brought over from heathenism to Christianity or from complete perdition to salvation, but is born within the church community, grows up in the sunlight of grace surrounding him from his childhood, and is to become ever more profoundly conscious of the importance of his position as a means to blessedness. In a sense this change is a reversal to the type of religion preached by Jesus, and in this sense we can to some extent justify the words "away from Paul and back to Jesus," if their meaning is prudently and carefully considered. In its purely religious sense the saying contains the germ of the ideas to be found in A. Ritschl's much criticised and little understood "Theory of the Congregation."

19. Paul, as the first missionary and converted Christian, is also the type of a Christianity of redemption. Here again we may observe the influence of the traditional apocalyptic methods. At

PAUL AND JESUS

the outset Paul is in full accordance with Jesus : they agree upon the common standpoint that salvation is secured by the special interposition of God, by a miraculous overthrow of Satan's power, by the foundation of the kingdom, by the sending of the Spirit, and by the new birth and the enlightenment of the elect. Jesus, however, regards this universal change as belonging to the future, together with the *καινή κτίσις* and the outpouring of the Spirit, the enthronement of the Messiah and the destruction of death and of the devil, though the forces of the coming age are considered to be operative in His own time, during which the power of Satan is being shaken. Paul, and the whole of primitive Christianity with him, adopts a different view of history. The finger of time has moved rapidly forward. The definite foundation of God's supremacy is not yet complete : men must still watch and pray, "Thy kingdom come." But a decisive beginning has been made : by the death of Christ the sins and the laws of the temporal world have been judged ; by the resurrection the temporal rulers and the "powers" have been stripped of their power and led captive in triumph ; Christ has been seated upon His throne of glory, and the deciding conflict in which success is certain has been begun in the spiritual world. The Spirit of God has entered into the souls of the elect, and has given them assurance of salvation and power to conquer the flesh and sin, while beginning the

APOCALYPTIC ESCHATOLOGY

work of re-creation and enlightenment. Thus salvation (*σωτηρία*), redemption (*ἀπολύτρωσις*), and the glory of the children of God (*δόξα*) have not yet been made manifest, but are assured by irrefutable facts. Paul looks back upon these facts and finds in them a metaphysical and theoretical basis which enables him to account for his immediate consciousness that his state is one of blessedness. Jesus, on the other hand, looks forward to the final decision, but His own spiritual confidence is the sole guarantee that this decision is to take place soon and certainly. From that communion with God in which He rests He derives His certainty that the triumph of God is at hand. From His immediate consciousness of the nearness, the greatness, and the truth of God He derives the conviction that these characteristics will be outwardly manifested in glory and triumph. His own victories over the unseen world confirm Him in this belief, but His conviction as such is based upon His personal religious experience.

20. This is the point at which we meet with the loudest outcries against Paul : he is said to have reduced Christianity to a dogmatic system and to have burdened us for ever with a system of apocalyptic eschatology, with the incomprehensible doctrine of Christ's expiatory death and with the intellectualist conception of faith. "Of central importance to Paul is a divine act which, though historical, transcends history, or a complex of

PAUL AND JESUS

divine acts bringing immediate salvation to the whole of mankind. Salvation is assured to the man who believes in these acts, the incarnation, death, and resurrection of a divine being " (Wrede, p. 93 f.).

From the historical point of view this statement is only too correct, and no one would attempt to depreciate the weight of the dogmatic burden under which we labour at the present day.

But it is not a full statement of the case : in particular it would be entirely erroneous to contrast the preaching of Jesus with that of Paul at this special point, as if His preaching were un-influenced by apocalyptic methods. Jesus was indeed untroubled by the paralysing sense of the remoteness of God and by fruitless yearning for the revelation of God, which was expected in the last days : He could see these influences operative about Him, but for Himself they were without consequence, because to Him had been vouchsafed an immediate consciousness of the reality and triumphant power of God. Using traditional theological terms, we might say that to Him, in His inward life, the kingdom of God had already come. At the same time we must remember that He also looked forward to a final, world-wide, and miraculous manifestation and establishment of God's supremacy, and this in a dramatic manner obvious to the world at large. Thus far Jesus admitted the claims of Jewish metaphysics, which

APOCALYPTIC SPECULATION

demanded that some tangible confirmation of faith should ultimately be forthcoming. It may be that in His own mind this desire to see the future justification of the divine power was overcome by His own immediate faith in God ; but the fact remains that His preaching retained the apocalyptic form and thereby propounded a difficult problem for our consideration. Even at the present day many theologians are unable to accommodate their ideas to the fact that in the words of Jesus the last and final decision concerning human salvation is transferred to a near future which has never come to pass. It is also clear that another train of thought of purely religious nature and undisturbed by apocalyptic speculation (the idea of sonship) existed concurrently. But it is impossible to reduce these two sides of Jesus' thought to complete harmony.

The fact of this inconsistency remained unperceived by theology and by the faith of the churches, and no serious harm occurred in consequence ; this result was due solely to the work of Paul. By antedating the eschatological events known as justification, redemption, and elevation to the position of sonship, he blunted the edge of the eschatological system. The "complex of divine acts" upon which he based his faith is ultimately nothing more than the theoretical foundation of his conviction that salvation was already at hand and could be grasped by faith. This direct sense

PAUL AND JESUS

of salvation, to the effect that we "are justified," that "God is for us," that "the love of God which is poured into our hearts" continually bears us and lifts us up, is a sense which, if considered in the light of religious psychology, is simply the immediate consciousness of God possessed by Jesus. Jesus was able to express this new belief in God the Father with entire simplicity and untrammelled by theological apocalyptic formulæ, and for this our gratitude should be unbounded. Paul then expressed the same conviction in the dramatic and legal form of apocalyptic speculation, but modern theologians are not thereby obliged to concentrate their attention upon the mere form, to criticise it as useless and so to widen the gulf dividing Jesus from His apostle. On the contrary, our duty as students of religious history is to recognise and to explain the religious impulses and modes of thought concealed beneath these formulæ and so to make Paul's true religious life available for practical purposes. Moreover, expositors of true religious feeling have never doubted whether these religious confessions or the doctrine of redemption were the central point of Paul's personal belief. Luther and Paul Gerhard would never have been able to create their wonderful reconstructions of Paul's growth in faith had the actual condition of things been as obscure to them as the sentence above quoted shows that it apparently is to Wrede.

THE TERM "FAITH"

The definition there given of "faith" as a theoretical acceptance of the "facts of salvation" seems to me especially unjust. It is obvious to any one that this interpretation will hold good of a number of passages. Certain expressions might even lead us to suppose that "faith" included a *sacrificium intellectus*. But it is none the less certain that the concept, as is natural in the case of concepts not original, but adopted, appears in colourings very different from this (cp. Lietzmann, *Handbuch zum Neuen Testament* on Rom. iv. 25). Any one who examines Paul's doctrine and religion as a whole must admit that his heartfelt and ultimate intention, when using the term "faith," was to denote that pure faculty of receptivity, which abandons the guidance of self and simply receives the proffered salvation, accepting justification "as a gift" (δωρεάν); thence follows the further idea that faith is the confidence in the possession of righteousness and secure reliance upon the σωτηρία to follow in the future. Those who inquire what "faith" meant to Paul will perhaps gain less from the passages where πίστις occurs, than from such a passage as Rom. viii. 31-39, where the term is not used, but is replaced by the stronger πέπεισμαι. We can most certainly affirm that this confidence in his salvation which Paul possessed was directly related to the religion of Jesus. That it was entirely unaffected by the impetus of a new religious life proceeding from

PAUL AND JESUS

Jesus is an assertion which a later generation of theologians will perhaps not have the courage to maintain.

21. The type of Christianity represented by Paul is one of conversion and redemption ; the ethical system connected with it is accordingly one supernaturally inspired. In this respect again there is an obvious difference between Paul and Jesus.

The moral transformation of which Jesus speaks is an antecedent condition to the kingdom of God, while the *καινότης ζωῆς* demanded by Paul is an effect of the initial series of divine acts and especially of the imparting of the Spirit. Thus repentance and conversion, the new righteousness of the Sermon on the Mount, proceed from an act of will ; whereas the moral reformation of the Pauline epistles is the fruit of the Spirit. Hence Jesus speaks in the imperative, while Paul praises liberation from the legal compulsion of sin and death as an act of God's grace. Here we touch the point which perhaps marks the profoundest difference between the two natures and religious types : Jesus propounds as simple imperatives the greatest and most superhuman demands upon man's powers of self-discipline, renunciation, and self-sacrifice, as though it were immediately obvious that any one who heard them would do them, and this without uttering a word concerning the help of God or the support of the Spirit : here we observe the

PAUL'S ETHICAL SYSTEM

loftiness of this ethical nature, to which the supreme good is as self-evident as breathing and as necessary as food and drink. For this reason Jesus is ready to place some confidence in the nature of others. Pronouncements concerning the weakness of the flesh and the readiness of the spirit which sound to us specifically Pauline, are exceptional among the words of Jesus ; He believes that there are also " good trees " in God's garden. This is not inconsistent with the statement that in comparison with God all men appear " base," and that no one can be called " good " except God alone. It is the more necessary to grow in the likeness of God, to become a true child of God, and to imitate His incomprehensible goodness, at least in showing love towards our enemies.

Paul's experiences of the weakness and inconsistency of human nature had been so bitter that he could place no reliance upon its goodness ; he is unable to see that anything but lust and sin were evoked by the good and holy commands of the law : the desire for good is utterly weak and paralysed. Worst of all, the best of desires has involved him in the worst of sins. He has been saved by a miracle and daily he feels himself uplifted by a mysterious power which does not proceed from himself. When he is weak, then is he strong ; when death is gnawing at his vitals and his nerves refuse their office, miraculous power flows in upon him : as the outward man is

PAUL AND JESUS

worn away, the inner man grows stronger and more glorious. The Spirit impels him towards the good, lifts him above fear and trembling, irresolution and weakness of will; the Spirit puts the words of triumph in his mouth and opposes his mockers with tokens of spiritual power. "Joy in the Holy Ghost" amid fear and tribulation, "love, joy, peace, longsuffering, goodness, nobleness, faith, gentleness, meekness," such is the fruit which has arisen from the once stony ground, and this truly is "a work of God" and is truly "a new creation."

These evidences of an ethical system based upon supernaturalism can never be harmonised with the commands given in the Sermon on the Mount; the differences of melody and rhythm are too pronounced. The more remarkable is the fact that amid the strongest assertions of reliance on the redemption, the ethical imperative constantly reappears suddenly and without introduction. We are crucified and buried with Christ, the body of sin is destroyed, so that we are no longer the servants of sin: "Reckon ye yourselves therefore to be dead to sin, let sin no longer reign over you, yield yourselves to the service of God" (Rom. vi.). The power of the Spirit of life has freed you from the compulsion of sin and death; "we, therefore, are pledged henceforward to live no more in the flesh according to the desires of the flesh." To be impelled by the Spirit, is the gift

PAUL'S ETHICAL SYSTEM

of grace to the children of God : " through the Spirit to mortify the deeds of the body " is your duty. Thus Romans VIII. 13 f. brings these two sides together ; the passive and the active, the impelling force and the discipline of self cannot be more closely conjoined than in Paul's idea that the divine power of the Spirit may be used (*πνεύματι*) to mortify the flesh (*θανατοτοῦν*).

Thus the ethical sense of responsibility, the energy for struggle and the discipline of will was not paralysed or absorbed in Paul's case by his consciousness of redemption and his profound spiritual experiences ; the fact does not merely prove that his strong-willed nature possessed a disposition eminently ethical ; at this point, we may assert, though strict proof may not be possible, that the moral impulse is at work which proceeded from Jesus and was received by His church ; this impulse was carried yet further by Paul. Regarded from the widest point of view afforded by the history of religion, this indissoluble union between religion and ethics which exists in Paul's doctrine, and this constant counterpoise of the sense of salvation and the sense of responsibility form a decisive proof that the personal influence of Christ was strongly operative. Paul's Messianic theory had abandoned all selfish individualism, and all dreams of material and temporal power. The sense that his salvation was secure aroused in him the desire to win the " many " to his faith and to

PAUL AND JESUS

give them a share in his blessedness ; his election did but spur him to pursue salvation, and the Christian church was to be distinguished by its dealings and to develop the power of winning new members ; these facts are only explicable as the results of mighty ethical impulses.

We shall now attempt to show the connection of Paul's ethical system with that of Jesus and its divergence from it in certain respects ; we shall show how he was influenced by Jesus and how he developed his system independently.

When we consider how few of Jesus' words were directly appropriated by Paul, an important inference becomes possible. Apart from the appeal to eschatological statement (I Thess. IV. 15) we find direct quotations in I Corinthians VII. 10 on the question of divorce, I Corinthians IX. 14 regarding the livelihood of the preacher of the gospel, i.e. in matters where primitive Christian rights may be seen in process of formation. Paul's appeal to the authority of Jesus in such connections is noteworthy ; it is analogical to the method employed by the scribes when justifying questions of legal right by reference to doctrinal authority. These passages are not so characteristic of the Christian moralist as of the quondam rabbi.

In passages dealing with questions essentially ethical, such as Romans XII. 13, I Corinthians XIII. or Colossians III., we find reminiscences of the words of Jesus, but no attempt at literal quota-

PAUL'S ETHICAL SYSTEM

tion: an ethical command is emphasised, not because Jesus promulgated it, but because the apostle knows himself to be acting entirely in the spirit of Jesus. In this connection I may refer to 1 Corinthians II. 16, "We have the mind of Christ," which does not merely mean, we "think" as Christ thinks, but "Christ thinks in us"; the mental processes of the Christian are under the immediate inspiration of the spirit of Christ; He it is who enables His followers to develop, to apply, and to interpret the will of God. This explanation will throw light upon the two following passages, 1 Corinthians. IV 17, τὰς ὁδοὺς μου ἐν Χριστῷ . . . καθὼς διδάσκω, and Romans XIV. 14, οἶδα καὶ πέπεισμαι ἐν κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ. Here the words ἐν Χριστῷ certainly have their well-known mystical sense, but with a special shade of meaning, implying the conviction that the "way" and the "doctrine" are at Paul's command in virtue of his inward communion with Christ. It would, however, be unjustifiable to interpret this as meaning that Paul mechanically deduced the certainty of his personal judgment from the impersonal and mystical substratum of his new life. The natural assumption is that at moments when he conceived judgments ἐν Χριστῷ, the personality of Jesus was before his mind and directed his course. Moreover, a searching analysis of the relationship implied by the words ἐν Χριστῷ will show, that though the formula is "mystical"

PAUL AND JESUS

and "pantheistic," yet there is nothing essentially mystical about the psychological process. For instance, the phrase "Christ lives in me" (Gal. II. 20) is immediately converted into "I live in the faith of Him that loved me." Here the two individual points of view are contrasted and not amalgamated in the usual manner of mysticism; similarly with the words ἐν Χριστῷ in their ethical connection. The formula here rather expresses Paul's conviction that he is acting in the spirit of Jesus' teaching, when he says in Romans XIV. 14 οὐδὲν κοινὸν δι' ἑαυτοῦ (cp. Mark VII. 15). Thus the Corinthian church is expected to recognise and take to heart all that Paul writes in I Corinthians XIV. ὅτι κυρίου ἐστίν (v. 40 DG), not as if he had quoted one ἐντολή or several ἐντολαί of his Master (as B and KL baldly explain), but as intending to say, all this is the will of the Lord. So, too, Paul's ὁδοί ἐν Χριστῷ are the fundamental principles of his doctrine and his dealings, to which he clings as one ἐν Χριστῷ ὢν; they are the ὁδοί which Jesus Himself would follow and teach. In this connection, when Paul is speaking of his "ways in Christ," we also meet with the command μιμηταί μου γίνεσθε (I Cor. IV. 16). It is self-evident that he is not setting up his own character as a model, but himself only as a teacher of the ὁδοί ἐν Χριστῷ, which fact is fully proved by I Corinthians XI. 1, μιμηταί μου γίνεσθε, καθὼς κατὰ Χριστοῦ. Sufficient attention has not been paid

PAUL'S ETHICAL SYSTEM

to this passage ; we know that to the Greeks *μιμητής* meant not only a pupil in philosophy who followed his teachers' doctrine and mode of life (*ἀγωγή*), but also one who "followed" the gods (*ἔπεισθαι τοῖς θεοῖς*) and attempted to become like them (Eph. v. 1; Matt. v. 48);* hence it follows that in this passage Paul represents himself as a follower of Christ, who strives to become like Him in the whole conduct of his life. It is unnecessary to point out that Paul could never have laid down this principle, if he had not possessed a clear picture of the moral character of Jesus.

Now it is a most remarkable fact that Paul invariably appeals to the example of Christ, when he is dealing with commands to unselfishness of life, to renunciation of self-advantage and the like. Thus 1 Corinthians xi. 1 immediately follows 1 Corinthians x. 24, "Let no man seek his own, but every man another's welfare"; and x. 33, "I seek not mine own profit, but the profit of many that they may be saved." So again 1 Corinthians iv. 16 f. follows the passage which blames the Corinthians for their pride and want of consideration. Romans xv. 3 points out the

* Xen. Mem. I. vi. 3: *οἱ διδάσκαλοι τοὺς μαθητὰς μιμητὰς ἑαυτῶν ἀποδεικνύουσιν.* Plut. Mor. 550 DE (*de sera numinis vindicta*, cp. 5): *κατὰ Πλάτωνα πάντων καλῶν ὁ θεὸς ἑαυτὸν ἐν μέσῳ παράδειγμα θέμενος, τὴν ἀνθρωπίνην ἀρετὴν, ἐξομοίωσιν οὖσαν ἀμωσγέπως πρὸς αὐτὸν, ἐνδίδωσι (makes possible) τοῖς ἔπεισθαι θεῷ δυναμένοις . . . οὐ γὰρ ἔστιν ὅ τι μείζον ἀνθρώπου ἀπολαύειν θεοῦ πέφυκεν ἢ τὸ μιμῆσαι καὶ διώξει τῶν ἐν ἐκείνῳ καλῶν καὶ ἀγαθῶν εἰς ἀρετὴν καθίστασθαι;* cp. also p. 332 AB.

PAUL AND JESUS

fact that Christ pleased not Himself, as worthy of imitation, while Philippians II. 5 ff. gives as an example the self-abasement of Christ in support of the command *μη̄ τὰ ἑαυτῶν ἕκαστοι σκοποῦντες, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ ἑτέρων ἕκαστοι*. From these passages we can observe the main features in that picture of Christ which hovered before Paul's mind, self-denial, renunciation, abandonment of His own honour for the sake of others. Once again, to assume that Paul deduced these fundamental characteristics of the Messiah from the supra-historical fact of the incarnation, or to deny that the character of Jesus was not actually known to Paul as manifest in His life, is to produce a wholly arbitrary distortion of these ideas. The very words of the passage in the Epistle to the Philippians contradict such a theory: "Being found in fashion as a man, He humbled Himself and became obedient unto death" (or better, was obedient throughout the long road of suffering unto death).

This self-renouncing love was not characteristic of the Jewish Messianic ideal, but was something entirely new, surprising, and unexampled before the appearance of Jesus. It is the achievement peculiar to the life of Jesus and the central point of His preaching. Hence special prominence is given to it as forming the content of the "law" of Christ. "Bear ye one another's burdens and so fulfil the law of Christ," says Galatians VI. 2, and it is certainly more than coincidence that Paul

PAUL'S ETHICAL SYSTEM

should speak of himself as *ἐννομος Χριστοῦ* (I Cor. IX. 21) when he is explaining from his own case how it is necessary in the interests of others to renounce rights, liberties, and even the assertion of conviction. It is again more than mere coincidence that the conception of a *νόμος Χριστοῦ* should appear in this connection, for in Galatians v. 13, the saying *διὰ τῆς ἀγάπης δουλεύετε ἀλλήλοις* evokes the further idea, that the law is fulfilled in the one command of love.

In itself it is conceivable that Paul might have adopted the idea that the command of love was of central importance, from the influences of his Jewish past; in Romans XIII. 8-10, at any rate, the conclusion *πλήρωμα οὖν νόμου ἡ ἀγάπη* is only valid, if we assume the existence in thought of the "golden rule," that men fulfil the law by care to avoid inflicting upon their neighbours that which they would not wish to suffer themselves.

Though it is possible that Paul may have been familiar even before his conversion with this stress laid upon love and the connection between the love of God and the love of neighbours (both pass easily and naturally into one another in I Corinthians VIII. 1-3), yet we cannot thus explain the enthusiasm with which Paul grasped the ideal of love and made it the central point of life. Statisticians of vocabulary may be able to estimate the "occurrence" of the word "love" and of this ideal even before the time of Jesus, but the fact

PAUL AND JESUS

that Paul "need not write concerning brotherly love" because in this matter his church "has been taught" by God shows that the brotherly love of the early churches was marked by a spontaneous vigour and a practical fruitfulness which is unexampled in Judaism. The new element in Christianity was not only doctrinal and intellectual, but was also obvious in the Christian certainty of faith and heroism in overcoming the world; similarly, upon the ethical side the remarkable point is not so much the formulation of ideals as the vigour and enthusiasm with which they were adopted and carried into practice.

Paul, the apostle of the spirit, opposed all the energy of his nature to avert the danger that the church might be swept away by enthusiasm and subordinated all other considerations to the task of edifying the church. Liberty and knowledge, his rights as an apostle, and his special Jewish convictions were not so important to him that he would not renounce them for the sake of others; he refused all value to the highest revelations, even of the Spirit, unless these were joined with love; in all this he was actuated not so much by a theoretical idea as by an ethical force, which cannot be explained simply as an outcome of his Jewish past, nor of stoicism, nor yet of his personal predisposition. Is our assertion too bold if we say that in these respects we see the influence upon Paul, not merely of Jesus as an

PAUL'S ETHICAL SYSTEM

ideal, but also of the impulse which His personality communicates to its environment and even to the man "whose point of spiritual contact with it is somewhat remote"? Never is Paul's language richer, warmer, or more enthusiastic than when he speaks of love, of renunciation and unselfishness, of serving and of bearing. It seems by no means an over-statement to say that in such passages as Romans XII., where Paul depicts love in all its forms, or in I Corinthians XIII., where he rises to lyric power in his praise, we have not only echoes of the words of Jesus (v. 14), but can see the reflection of His personality. I have in mind such passages as *χαίρειν μετὰ χαιρόντων, κλαίειν μετὰ κλαιόντων*, or the echo of the words, "they have their reward," in, "though I bestow all my goods to feed the poor and have not love . . . it profiteth me nothing." However, the coincidences between special turns of phrasing are not the points at issue, but rather the fact that the characteristic which moved the apostle most profoundly, and for which he found a form of expression "classical" and unrivalled, is precisely that which is most clearly and convincingly prominent in the picture of Jesus. In this respect Paul "understood" Jesus inwardly, deeply, and correctly.

The same may be said concerning the philosophy and personality of Jesus from another point of view. One great paradox runs through his work and preaching and can be reduced to the brief

PAUL AND JESUS

formula "that which is highly esteemed among men is abomination in the sight of God" (Luke vi. 15): surely this thought is re-echoed by the gospel of Paul.

We must remember that Paul from the outset by no means stood aloof from the "wisdom" of the world, but used it, even when he was a Christian, for apologetic purposes; thus his judgment, as expressed in Corinthians i. 1 (cp. also iii. 19: "the wisdom of this world is foolishness with God") stands out in sharp contrast to this background. Experience showed him that God has chosen the unwise to put the wise to shame (1 Cor. i. 27), and this is precisely what Jesus praises as the special grace of God (Matt. xi. 25; cp. on this point Titius, *Paulinismus*, p. 16).

The standards of wisdom, of philosophy, and of Pharisaism had utterly failed when measured against the "foolishness" and the "stumbling block" of the cross of Christ; of what advantage to attempt to persuade a Pharisee that the Messiah *ἔσταυρώθη ἐξ ἀσθενείας* (2 Cor. xiii. 4)! But Paul had fully realised the principle not only as concerned the Messiah, but also with regard to the Christian life, that the way to glory lay through suffering. Apart from fugitive reminiscences of the Jewish belief in retaliation (1 Cor. xi. 30), he had broken with the view that suffering is a sign of abandonment by God; on the contrary, the tie of faith uniting the com-

PAUL'S ETHICAL SYSTEM

panions of the Messiah was a tie of blood implying suffering and death with Him. Is it likely that Paul reached this view of life merely by reflecting upon the fact of the Messiah's death? He must have known that this view of suffering was a fundamental principle in the character of Jesus, that He required His followers to undergo suffering in imitation of Himself, and lived in the belief that life was only to be gained by the sacrifice of it. It is impossible that the opinions of Jesus and Paul should have coincided merely by chance in the matter of this new appreciation of the value of life, which was alien both to Jewish and Greek thought. Rather it was because Jesus had lived in this opinion that it became a self-evident and the only tenable view in the eyes of His churches and of Paul. Paul's conversion did not merely consist in the fact that he had come to recognise the theoretical possibility of a suffering Messiah; the voluntary and enthusiastic self-sacrifice of Jesus had made so great an impression upon him that on this account alone he had been ready to accept Jesus as the real Messiah.

From his connection with the Stoic ethical system, Paul had learned to attach extraordinary value to personal freedom and independence: "be not the servants of men: am not I free? Why is my liberty judged of another man's conscience?" These are the watchwords of the ethical system, which prides itself upon its freedom and to which

PAUL AND JESUS

Paul, even as a Christian, is ready to subscribe.* But in full consciousness of this freedom he has made himself "servant unto all" (1 Cor. ix. 19). Here it is impossible not to perceive an echo of St. Luke xxii. 26 f.; St. Mark x. 45; but we must recognise not only a memory of the Master's words, but also the reappearance in the Apostle's person of an essential feature in the character of Jesus; it is particularly clear in Galatians v. 13 with its surprising antithesis; *μόνον μὴ τὴν ἐλευθερίαν εἰς ἀφορμὴν τῆ σαρκί, ἀλλὰ—διὰ τῆς ἀγάπης δουλεύετε ἀλλήλοις.*

Many similar points might be mentioned in which Paul's ethical system adopts and develops impulses which, as we know, were originated by Jesus. I content myself with a brief reference to two passages in which Paul summarises the new life: Romans xiv. 17, "righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost," and especially Galatians v. 22, "but the fruit of the spirit is

love, joy, peace,
longsuffering, gentleness, goodness,
faith, meekness, temperance."

Surely the joyousness of these bright ideals, which stand out so clearly against the darker background of Paul's life as a whole, represent a strain in his nature which he owed neither to himself

* Cp. my essay: "Christian Freedom according to the Preaching of Paul." Göttingen, 1902.

PAUL'S ETHICAL SYSTEM

nor to his Jewish past. Surely in these cases we can hear Jesus speaking by the mouth of Paul.

It seems worth while to mention, in addition to these coincidences of ethical principle, certain tendencies of tone and method which cannot be neglected without detriment both to our theory and our practice.

A general line of difference resulted from the respective positions and tasks of Jesus and Paul. The organisation and education of churches obliges the missionary to undertake a very detailed investigation of particular questions affecting morality. The special treatment of the marriage question given in 1 Corinthians VII. is as intelligible in the case of Paul as it would be incomprehensible in the case of Jesus. To the decision of these casuistical points Paul brings the method and formulæ which he had learned in the rabbinical and Stoic schools, but with which Jesus had no concern. Jesus speaks upon the question of divorce only incidentally, and then in such strict and general terms that His high ideal of marriage as indissoluble is perfectly plain, though it is difficult to see how the ideal is to be realised in practice. Jesus casts aside without scruple the Pharisaic precepts upon purification; His general view of true "purity" would overthrow the whole Jewish system if carried out in detail, and compromise upon individual points is therefore impossible. Paul shares this view, but he also has the delicate

PAUL AND JESUS

faculty of adopting the psychological standpoint of the "weak," and his attitude towards practical questions is therefore a compromise between the ideal and the real. But he can also display extreme stringency: members of the Church are not even to eat with a man in mortal sin. Jesus shows more liberality upon this point. He even seeks the company of actual sinners, because He is not obliged, like Paul, to consider the necessities of an exclusive community placed in such an environment that strict purity must be maintained. Thus Paul is limited by the necessity of translating ethical principles into practice, whereas Jesus is concerned only to propound His great ideals; the prophet and the teacher are obliged to employ different methods.

I may refer to one point upon which readers have been too ready to interpret Jesus in terms of Paul. The command of the Sermon on the Mount, to resist not evil, but to turn the other cheek to the smiter, etc., is undoubtedly repeated, though very freely reproduced, in Romans XII. 14, 19-21. But the command to heap coals of fire upon an enemy's head and to overcome evil with good is wanting in the Sermon on the Mount. It has been usual to carry the thought expressed by Paul to the Sermon on the Mount, and to regard the object of the extreme meekness there required as the putting of the enemy to shame. This, however, is to introduce an alien motive into the command

PAUL'S ETHICAL SYSTEM

given by Jesus, which requires extreme self-discipline and command of passion for the good of the sufferer and not for that of his oppressor. What advantage could the latter derive from the power to inflict a second blow? Nor is there any mention of putting him to shame. The changed interpretation which is customary appears even in St. Luke's Gospel. These extreme commands were subordinated to that which orders the love of enemies and were thus understood to mean that such meekness was intended to benefit the opponent. Such is, indeed, Paul's meaning. The metaphor of the "coals of fire" from the Proverbs adds a touch which clouds the purity of the motive expressed by Jesus. However the metaphor may be interpreted, the intention is that the enemy shall feel pain and therefore change his attitude in consequence of a benefit conferred upon him. This truly Eastern idea is followed by a Greek thought; "evil" is to be overcome by "good": the use of *νικᾶν* reminds us of Stoic phraseology, especially in its passive form; be not "overcome" by evil. The word is never thus used in the synoptic gospels, but is characteristic of Paul's vocabulary, as in Romans VIII. 37, *ἐν τούτοις πᾶσιν ὑπερνικῶμεν*, and is repeated with full intensity in the Johannine writings. Parallel passages are *ἤδη μὲν οὖν ὅλως ἡττημα ὑμῖν ἐστίν, ὅτι κρίματα ἔχετε μετ' ἀλλήλων* (I Cor. VI. 7), and *πάντα μοι ἔξεστιν, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐγὼ ἐξουσιασθήσομαι ὑπό τινος*

PAUL AND JESUS

(I Cor. vi. 12); these are ethical ideas which originated rather in the Stoic school than in the preaching of Jesus.

Thus we come to the Greek element in Paul's system of ethics, which must be regarded as of considerable importance. To this extensive subject only a few words can be devoted. I can but mention the word *ουνείδησις* and assume general knowledge of the fact that no corresponding conception is to be found in the words of Jesus. I may here refer to Paul's characteristic manner in stating motives for ethical commands in the Greek fashion, which might be called æsthetic; the term *εὐάρεστον* appears conjoined with *ἀγαθόν* and *τέλειον* (Rom. XII. 2); *εὐσχημοσύνη* (Rom. XIII. 13; I Thess. IV. 12; I Cor. VII. 35, XIV. 40) is as important to Paul as *ἀσχημοσύνη* is contemptible; in cases of immorality *παρὰ φύσιν* it is the shame to the body (*ἀτιμάζεσθαι*) which horrifies Paul; conversely, in the case of marriage he demands for the woman not only *ἀγιασμός*, but also *τιμή* (I Tim. IV. 4); the speech of Christians is to be always with grace, seasoned with salt (Col. IV. 6); not only *ὅσα ἔστιν ἀληθῆ, ὅσα σεμνά, ὅσα δίκαια, ὅσα ἅγια*, but also *ὅσα προσφιλή, ὅσα εὐφήμα, εἴ τις ἀρετὴ καὶ εἴ τις ἔπαινος* are to be objects of ethical consideration among Christians. The very Greek character of these cases will be obvious, even though we do not give in full the Greek parallel passages which might be quoted. We here observe the Hellenist

PAUL'S ETHICAL SYSTEM

expressing himself in the terms of the Greek culture by which he had been certainly impressed.

Finally, I proceed to compare the passages in which Paul and Jesus speak of their "freedom from the world." We may compare the verses of the Sermon on the Mount concerning anxiety with the words of Phil. iv. 11, 12, "I have learned, in whatsoever state I am, therewith to be content :

" I know both how to be abased
I know how to abound ;
Everywhere and in all things I am instructed
Both to be full and to be hungry,
Both to abound and to suffer need."

On the one hand is the childlike optimism, relying upon the Father in Heaven, Who will not allow His children to perish, seeing that He cares so abundantly for the birds and flowers. On the other hand we have the proud self-consciousness of a free will practised in self-denial and self-discipline, a character *αὐτάρκης*, to use the Stoic catchword. Closely connected as were the two personalities in their practical attitude towards life, the underlying motives were thus very different.

But now let us notice how Paul transforms this sense of independence, due to strength of character, when he utters the words : " I can do all things through Christ which strengtheneth me." Hardly any other quotation from Paul's writings would show so clearly the extent to which Stoic ethics and

PAUL AND JESUS

the "sense of religious independence" are amalgamated in his case. But there is a noteworthy difference in his mode of expressing the fact as compared with the words of Jesus. There is no mention of the "Heavenly Father," Who will care for His children, but there is the consciousness that his strength to overcome the world proceeds from his Master in Heaven, with Whom he is united for life and death by the closest ties.

Here we return to our starting-point. There is one fundamental difference between the religion of Paul and the type of religious life which Jesus originally created: to the apostle Jesus is not merely a mediator, guide, and example, but He is also the object of religious veneration. Paul certainly utters the cry of Abba together with Jesus; but he also calls upon the name of Christ. He trusts God's love and grace, but the strength which is mighty in his weakness is the life of Christ in his mortal frame. With Jesus he looks to a glorious future, when he will see God face to face; but he also longs to see Christ "manifested" and to "be ever with Christ."

Hence the faith in Christ as held by the primitive churches and by Paul was something new in comparison with the preaching of Jesus; it was a new type of religion. Here we touch the real problem for the Church, the "question of destiny": can the Church for all time maintain this form of

CONCLUSION

Christianity? In comparison with this question, other points of difference in doctrine, in religious attitude, and in character are of small account and are likely rather to enrich our religious vitality than to raise any problem in our path.

The theory, however, that Paul's faith was not connected by any living tie with the historical figure of Jesus, and that the coincidence of the methods employed by Paul and Jesus for the solution in practice of the problem of life was merely fortuitous, is henceforward little likely to disturb theology.

PRINTED BY
WILLIAM BRENDON AND SON LTD
PLYMOUTH