(2) the identification of the visits of Galatians ii. and Acts xi., (3) the placing of Galatians before the "Council," (4) the "Western" version of the Decree. Of these the fourth stands on a somewhat different footing to the rest. The first three are not the desperate resort of "harmonisers," twisting or ignoring facts in order to force an agreement which is not there. They are the *prima facie* natural interpretation of the facts; the *onus probandi* surely lies on those who reject them. Accept them, and each piece of the puzzle falls into its place easily and satisfactorily. The resultant picture does no discredit either to the Apostle or to the historian of Acts.

CYRIL W. EMMET.

ST. PAUL'S BELIEFS: SOME RECONCILIATIONS.

WE are familiar with comments on differences, sometimes amounting to oppositions, between the views of St. Paul and those of other teachers. St. Paul's championship of faith—to quote the primary example of such criticisms—has been contrasted with St. James's championship of works. But I wonder that it has not been thought simpler to exhibit St. Paul as contradicting himself.

When a serious teacher is found making assertions which verbally contradict each other, we are warned to look for some conviction which may perhaps express itself naturally, according to circumstances, in both the contradictory statements. It is a not uncommon habit of those who think most deeply to speak paradoxically, and to express themselves in judgments or precepts which need to be interpreted and applied with respectful intelligence. This is eminently true of our Lord's words; and similar thoughtful treatment is demanded by the writings of St. Paul. I propose to consider in this spirit the Apostle's doctrine

concerning (1) Faith and Works, (2) the Law, and (3) the Goodness of non-Christians; and (4) then to compare the teaching of St. Paul with that of his Master.

We can best understand St. Paul by assuring ourselves what his deepest faith must have been. His nature, it is evident, was an extraordinarily tender and sensitive one. In Renan's phrase, he had a great *retractile* soul. How he could shrink and be hurt, by what emotions of pain and of joy he could be carried away, is best seen in the second Epistle to the Corinthians. In his pre-Christian days, as an ardent disciple of Rabbinical Judaism, he was indignant at the monstrous disloyalty of the people who were holding that Jesus, who had been put to death as a ridiculous pretender to royalty, was the heavenly King whom the Jews were expecting to appear. The behaviour and the words of Stephen at his martyrdom must have affected him most unpleasantly. His Jewish zeal carried him on, and he had occasion to see other instances of the dignity and joyfulness with which the believers in Jesus could suffer, and he learned nothing of their lives but what was good and winning. He perceived that they steadily beheld the crucified Jesus at the right hand of God. But how was it possible that a man treated as Jesus had been could be the heavenly King? The question lodged itself in him, and gave him no peace. And then it occurred to his keenly inquiring intelligence that a King reigning at the right hand of God could not be the Christ of the Jews only, but must be Lord of the world. The thought of this Jesus reigning in heaven over all the Gentiles made the belief of his provoking adherents still more preposterous. But they did believe, and their belief made their lives and their deaths beautiful. They urged that what was so strange in the history of Jesus as the Christ proved to them the infinite and amazing compassion of their God; that nothing else imaginable could

have brought home to their hearts the sympathy with which God was caring for His human children as the crucifixion of Jesus did. And they could certainly appeal to mysterious voices of the Hebrew prophets which associated the manifestation of the Messiah with suffering and humiliation preceding His glory. Such questionings must have agitated the soul of St. Paul whilst he was forcing himself to persecute the Christians, until the inward tumult was quelled by the momentous vision in which the crucified Jesus finally conquered him and made him His slave.

(1) I recall this experience of his in order to lay stress on the nature of the Apostle's faith. He had been brought to believe that Jesus the Crucified was actually the Son of God, and that both God and men and the relation of men to God were to be known through Him. From the time of his conversion he was continually learning more and more of God, more and more of men, by studying the Man who was reigning over Jews and Gentiles. What did he learn about human life? He saw that men, declared to be children of such a Father as was revealed in Christ, were intended to live as God's children. The filial life towards God could only be a life of the profoundest admiration and gratitude. The description of the Christian calling in Ephesians i., ii., iii., is both in spirit and in form eucharistic. A human son of the heavenly Father was evidently bound to give himself up in thankful trust to God, and to desire that the will of his Father would move and rule and use all his energies. Whilst he was seeing this in Christ, St. Paul was aware of men who regarded themselves as believers in the true God holding themselves apart, as it were at arm's length, from God, and setting themselves to negotiate with Him. They admitted that God had claims upon them, and they were ready to do certain things which they hoped would satisfy Him and make them safe with Him. The

most scrupulous of them busied themselves with observing precepts handed down to them in a Divine Law, and they regarded it as meritorious to push the precepts to extremes, beyond what was necessarily implied in them. This way of thinking and acting St. Paul described as seeking to be justified by works. It assumed that a man was an independent being who might deal with God and satisfy God's reasonable demands. But what a false notion this was in the eyes of one who saw God and men in Christ, and how it was stultified by experience! Man could *not* stand by himself and satisfy God; he was not made for such independence, and it was disastrous that he should claim it. Against this mistaken reliance on works St. Paul set the joyful submission of faith. To one who knew God through Christ, the only action for a man was to surrender himself with thankful reverence to the grace and will of God, so that he might be what God would have him be and do what God would have him do. It was a matter of course that such an aim would issue in right conduct. A man's conduct would show how far he had faith; how far—though at the best it would be most imperfectly—he was yielding himself to the Divine impulse and forbearing to claim independence and merit for himself. He could only be justified by faith; that is to say, to fulfil his appointed righteousness he had to accept the relation of son to God, and in a spirit of dependence and self-surrender to seek and do the will of God. In thus resolving he was right and would act rightly, and might count on being accepted and approved by the heavenly Father, and receiving suitable rewards. And the way to cherish such filial submission was to look on Jesus Christ, crucified, risen, exalted; to see God in Him, and man in Him. So the revelation which St. Paul had received exhibited "works" to him under two aspects: as the plausible payment to a Divine Lawgiver which was to secure a man in

self-righteous independence, and as the conduct of one who threw self over, and made it his aim to obey and to please his heavenly Father. And in what he teaches concerning faith and works, St. Paul is quite consistent with himself and with St. James.

(2) It is sometimes assumed that St. Paul was converted from Judaism to Christianity, and that he says hard things of the Judaism that he had abandoned, giving it the name of "the Law." Many hard things he does certainly say of the Law; but, on the other hand, we find him doing honour to the Law, as when he pronounces it to be "holy and just and good." The contradiction is explained by the Apostle's use of the word "Law," without the article. He says to his fellow-believers, "Ye are not under law, but under grace." It was one thing to know God only as a Lawgiver, another to know Him as the Father revealed in Jesus Christ. To be under law was to live under the sound of commands, "Thou shalt do this, Thou shalt not do that"; and of the threat, "If thou disobeyest a command, thou shalt be condignly punished." St. Paul had known in his own experience what it was to be thus under law, and he had found the condition to be an unhappy one. He could not keep the law as he knew it ought to be kept; and he became aware of a perverse tendency in human nature which was provoked by a peremptory and threatening command into disobedience. Law had as its representative to him and his fellow-countrymen the traditional Jewish Law. When God was known in Christ, He was seen to be a Father offering forgiveness to weak and erring children, drawing them into a life of filial trust, and giving them a spirit which would help their weakness. To accept these Divine offers and gifts was to be under grace. And St. Paul had no patience with teachers who, whilst they professed to believe in Jesus as the Christ, ignored what was revealed

of God in Jesus Christ, and assumed that the Christians were still under law. Law thus *substituted for grace* had a killing power on the anxious soul, and a true bearer of the Gospel had to treat the Law as an enemy. But as an instruction in the will of God the law was to be honoured and valued. Children of God, rejoicing in forgiveness and reconciliation, were still bound to observe the law. The Jewish generations which had handed down the law of Moses had not been necessarily "under law," as St. Paul understood the phrase. Their God Jehovah had from the first been a God of promise, encouraging, helping, delivering, forgiving, as well as commanding and threatening and punishing. The godly sons of Abraham had not crouched before a Being whom they only knew as a God to be feared, nor had they attempted to walk in self-righteous independence; but they were men of faith, looking up to a righteous God in Whom they hoped, on Whom they depended, to whom they could appeal for pardon, whose Law they loved because they so gratefully reverenced Him who gave it for their guidance. And under the Gospel the Father of Jesus Christ still gives commands, is still to be feared; but His children can always flee out of hopeless fear into the home-atmosphere for which their Maker designs them.

(3) Again, St. Paul seems to make acceptance with God, and really good and acceptable conduct, depend on faith in Jesus Christ. It is often, if not generally, assumed that this is his doctrine; that he holds that it is only by believing in the Son of God who died and was raised again that a man can be justified; that is, that he can be right with God and do righteous deeds. But how, then, does he regard the good men who have not heard of Jesus Christ, or have not believed in Him when they have heard of Him? This question may be answered out of the same doctrinal Letter

in which he most dogmatically affirms and expounds justification by faith. He tells his readers in the second chapter of the Epistle to the Romans that all men are justified by their works, the Gentiles as well as the Jews; that there is no respect of the person—that is, of the nominal religion—with God, and that God is not the God of the Jews only, but of the Gentiles also. "When Gentiles which have no law do by nature the things of the law," he says, "these, having no law, are a law unto themselves, in that they show the work of the law written in their hearts." To St. Paul, to be justified by works might mean the same thing as to be justified by faith; the two phrases had the same meaning when the works sprang from a living faith, and the faith was a filial life towards God. Evidently St. Paul saw faith in all good Gentiles, whatever they professed in the way of religion; and the faith was essentially the same as that of those who "believed in Him who raised Jesus our Lord from the dead." What was the virtue of believing in Jesus? It lay in the believer being drawn to the God revealed in Jesus. So far as a man was drawn without Jesus to Him whom Jesus manifested, he had faith, and was justified by it. And the true living God was not one who could only be known by a name written in letters; He was light, He was love, He was the source of all the order, spiritual and material, of the universe. St. Paul saw in every good man a submission of himself to a Righteousness and a Love which were above him. It must have been difficult to see this in the typical Stoic, who looks so supremely self-righteous. St. Paul would have held, so I cannot but think, that in the case of his being fundamentally self-righteous, a Stoic was not a good man; but that it was one of the spiritual paradoxes which we are constrained to accept as true, that a man might think himself to be self-righteous when he was really looking up with reverence to a Righteousness which

had authority over him and to which he was surrendering himself. St. Paul gives us the impression that he held justification by faith to its furthest extreme, but that he rejoiced to see goodness and would fearlessly acknowledge it in a man of any religion or of no religion, being sure that there was for all goodness some root of essential faith.

(4) I conclude with contending that there is not the least want of harmony between the teaching of St. Paul and that of our Lord. To give an instance of what is sometimes alleged as to such disagreement, I may mention an observation once made to me by a friend who was warmly interested in religious questions. There was an excellent religion, he said, promulgated by Jesus of Nazareth, which had a good chance of spreading over the world; but then came Paul with his bastard Platonism, and spoiled the good promise. No doubt St. Paul drew what may be called doctrinal inferences from what he held to have been revealed to him; but I repeat that his essential faith was in Jesus the crucified, reigning at the right hand of God, and in what could be seen in Him of the nature and purposes of God. All his theology was what he held to be strictly deducible from his vision of Jesus Christ. He saw God as a living Father, offering forgiveness to erring and wayward children, and inviting them to live with Him as His reconciled and trustful children. Jesus was to him the way to the Father, and that was what our Lord Himself said He was. He spoke thus in the hearing of those whom He was sending forth: "O righteous Father, the world knew Thee not, but I knew Thee; and these knew that Thou didst send me; and I made known unto them Thy name, and will make it known." When we look at what is preserved of His teaching in the Gospels, we find Him continually naming the Father and the Kingdom. The coming Kingdom, He never tired of explaining, was a spiritual one; it was the Kingdom of the heavenly

Father, who sees in secret. He bade His disciples pray to their Father in heaven that His Kingdom might come. As regards conduct of all kinds, His persistent lesson was that men were to allow themselves to be drawn into the presence of the heavenly Father, and were to seek to please Him. His theology was identical with that of St. Paul; "He that beholdeth me beholdeth Him that sent me"; and His morality was, like St. Paul's, deduced from His theology. It was a special view of St. Paul's, entirely in harmony with the teaching of Him who prescribed "Walk in light," that men were to learn in detail how they ought to walk by looking and seeing and *trying*, and that it was often through experience and the discerning faculty cultivated by experience that they would come to know what the will of their Lord was. For the world was God's world, to be understood by the light proceeding from Jesus the Son of God; and God was teaching men how to walk in His world by what they could see in it under that light as to His ways and purposes. A singularly high value is thus given to the observation of consequences and to the principle of progress. The Lord Jesus was indignant with those whom He trained for apostleship when they let their intelligence sleep and judged by appearance. His teaching and that of St. Paul equally left room in the practical life of the world for much accommodation. The spiritual perfection of the child of God looking up to the Father through Christ was never to lose its supremacy or to be left out of sight; but there was a sphere for such practical law as should recognise "the hardness of men's hearts," and there were things of Caesar to be rendered to Caesar, and the ruler did not bear the sword in vain. The Christians of the first days were taught by the Lord and His Apostles to see in the governing work of the Romans a ministry of God, and to deal respectfully for Christ's sake with customs—like

slavery, for example—which the Light of Christ was in time to convict and to abolish. And both by the words and by the actions of those to whom our deepest reverence is due, we are warned that the faith which justifies is in greater danger from religion and ecclesiastical rule than from the common righteousness of the world.

J. LLEWELYN DAVIES.

SIN AS A PROBLEM OF TO-DAY.

III. SIN AND THE DIVINE HOLINESS—THE MORAL END.

HOLINESS, as Christianity understands it, is a name for the undimmed lustre of God's ethical Perfection. God is "the Holy One"—the alone "Good" in the absolute sense,[1]—and it is only when sin is lifted up into the light of this moral glory of God's character that its full enormity and hatefulness are disclosed. The divine Holiness is a postulate of the Christian doctrine of sin.

1. It is not necessary to spend time on philological discussions as to the *primitive meaning* of the word "holy,"[2] or as to the *stages* of the growth of the idea in the Old and New Testaments. It is more important to deal with the essential elements in the idea, as these come out in the result. On the former point—the origin and growth of the idea—many questionable things are often said. "To us," Dr. W. R. Smith observes truly, "holiness is an ethical

[1] Mark x. 18.

[2] In Old Testament, קֹדֶשׁ, holiness; קָדוֹשׁ, holy. In New Testament, ἅγιος. The root-meaning of the Old Testament word is obscure. Some (Gesenius, Dillmann, etc.), find the root-idea in "pure," "clear," "bright," or similar notion; others (Baudissin, etc.) find the idea in "separation." The latter is the view at present more generally favoured. Dr. Robertson Smith apparently begins with holy places and things (*Rel. of Semites*, Lects. iii.–iv.), but in Israel, at least, it was not so. "The probability is," as Dr. A. B. Davidson says, "that the application of the term 'holy' to *things* is secondary" (*Theol. of Old Testament*), p. 152; cf. p. 145).