revelation, says the science of Comparative Religion, is not peculiar to the Bible. All the sacred books have their prophets, and all the prophets lay claim to immediate inspiration from the Most High.

But here science corrects itself. A narrower attention to details discovers an essential difference. The religion of Israel is found not to be a direct descendant of an Arabian tribal faith. It starts with new elements whose origin science cannot detect. Its history is unique. All the things were arrayed against the religion of Israel which swept over and obliterated the religions of Babylonia and Egypt. Yet, when the fulness of time came, Israel was able to produce 'the greatest religious genius of the world.' Its present position also is unique.

But the Christian minister has an assurance which natural science can neither give nor take away. 'It is beyond the power of man to lift himself: he can only prevent himself from sinking.' Who says that? Dr. James Martineau. And he says it even while he is arguing that man has by searching found out God. The minister of the twentieth century will be content with that.

St. Paul the Hebrew, the Greek, and the Roman.[1]

By the Rev. John Kelman, Jun., M.A., Edinburgh.

I.

St. Paul the Hebrew.

The first century of the Christian era was notably a time when various streams of thought and life met. It has been pointed out by a famous historian that all the high-water marks of history are reached at moments of the confluence of different streams of idea. Certainly, never was there so high a water mark as then; and certainly never did three such large streams fall into one as the Hebrew, Greek, and Roman elements that united in these days for the formation of the coming ages.

At such times most men drift helplessly along the currents of their time—children of circumstance rather than masters of the situation. At any time it requires a large personality to rise above personal prejudices and local interests, and take a statesmanlike view of current movements and tendencies; to see the drift and meaning of the past, and to forecast the future with something like accuracy. At such a time as the first century, he who could do that must have been a man of gigantic intellectual and spiritual stature. In Paul we unquestionably find such a man. I do not know of any contemporary Greek or Roman man—certainly not any contemporary Hebrew—who had anything like so wide an outlook or so accurate a sense of the world's life then as his. The great Emperor Augustus himself, with all his cosmopolitanism, had not a more imperial soul. These articles aim at showing this—only indeed in the merest outline—in relation to the three great streams that have been mentioned. The present is a study of St. Paul as Hebrew; the second as Greek; the third as Roman.

[1] These sketches make little or no claim to originality. Much of the thought, and in some cases the language also, is gathered from the books of Professors Ramsay and Butcher, the well-known Lives and Commentaries, and other literature. This has been done without the constant citation of references, which would break up the continuity. The treatment is fragmentary, and the writer's only endeavour has been by selection and emphasis to suggest an interesting point of view.

Few characters in history have been more unjustly and inadequately conceived. Everything seems to have conspired to belittle him. First of all—and truly he would willingly have consented to this—the incomparable figure of Christ has eclipsed him. None can stand comparison with that figure, and all such comparison is unfair.

That there has been such is due largely to the unwise though well-meant exaggeration of a theology which has too often confined itself to Paul's Epistles, and has not drawn with anything like sufficient fulness from the Gospels. Again, parts of his teaching which were meant particularly for local and temporary situations—his words about women, about marriage, and other teachings of his—have been forced into prominence, and made to apply to totally different times and circumstances from those for which they were intended. This also has been against his memory.

But besides all this, there are elements in his own biography which have been too much remembered and thrust into undue prominence. From first to last he was a fighting man. And not only the unwelcome doctrines, but the aggressive and vehement way in which he advocated them, brought upon him not a little hatred and contempt from many quarters. Professor Bruce has contrasted him with the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews (who is 'contemplative, leisurely') as 'impetuous, passionate, vehement.' His greatness is often lost sight of in detail as we see him disputing with lesser men; now with apostles, now with his own converts, now with Jewish proselytizers, now with the heathen mob. His worst enemies and least faithful friends spoke of him as low, selfish, unreliable. Nothing in the Bible is sadder reading, more painful and humiliating, than Paul's many defences of himself against these. Reading such passages one feels ashamed of these small adversaries with their impertinent ignorance, who did not see that here was one born to judge and criticise, not to be criticised; one born to put the world on its defence, not to stand on his defence before the world.

And, finally, there is a great mass of painful detail which has the same effect. His cloak and parchments left at Troas, his frequent sicknesses and bodily weakness, his many tears—these are all distracting; and we find ourselves pitying this man, who has so much better reason to pity us. And also there was a mysterious trouble that he had—a thorn in the flesh, that no one has been able to explain. It seems to have been connected with his person in some way. His bodily presence was counted weak, we are told, and his speech contemptible. Anything of this sort is peculiarly trying to a sensitive nature like his. All readers of the New Testament must have noted that 'wailing, pleading, appealing tone' which is so often discernible,—the tone of one self-conscious and somehow wounded.

It was the habit of some of his contemporaries to account him inferior and subordinate to the eleven apostles. These critics judged from his position and were biassed by such trifles as we have mentioned. They were not competent to judge by the size of his manhood, to take his measure and to gauge the magnitude of his ideas and his plans. Of the whole eleven only John is worthy to be mentioned alongside of him, and John's greatness is the onesided greatness of the student, thinker, and man of feeling. Peter, with all his winsomeness, was a man of no very unusual type. In any age Christ might have had such a man for a disciple. The rest, so far as we know, were men of very average—some of them of quite commonplace—value. Paul finds his match only now and then in the whole history of the world.

He himself, probably, never knew how great he was, though he often enough feels and protests that he is greater than he is being taken for. Time has shed light upon him and his work, and to-day we understand it better than it has been understood before. But even in his own time there were unmistakable signs of it. Think, *e.g.*, of the strength and the diplomacy he showed in facing situations which he suddenly found himself confronting. Think of his presence of mind and mastery of circumstances. Whether it were in the theatre when the mob howled at him, in the prison when the earthquake melted the jailer's heart with fear, or in the shipwreck where he, the landsman, alone was competent to take command; whether it was confronting devils or sorcerers or priests or Roman governors,—he was ever ready with word and deed. Again and again we read of him 'fixing his eyes' on so and so—and to this day we are thankful that we had not to face these eyes. We seem to know what that must have meant. Again, that splendid inconsistency of his—that vivid impressionist way of seeing in a flash of strong light, now this side, now its opposite—that was the characteristic of no small soul. Ay, and even that 'melancholy through which his enthusiasm burned its way—that deep despondency which sounds so often like an undertone below his writing and his speech'—that, too, is part of the same greatness. Ask your Carlyle, your

Goethe, your Milton, Dante, Aeschylus what it means. It is only such men that can tell.

These personal traits, however, are not the direction in which we shall look for the greatness of this apostle. They are only preliminary hints of it. It is in his work—the thing he set himself to do and actually did—that that appears. There is only one word that seems to suit him—*Titanism*. There are some few men to whom this word applies—not many. They are men who seek tasks on a larger scale than the ordinary human tasks occupying men around them. They go back, as it were, to the older days when the Titans sought to storm the heavens. Many of them fail and end in bitterness. Some few succeed. In the Autobiography of William Bell Scott he tells us how he always felt impelled to choose ambitious poetic subjects, such as 'The Year of the World,' a mystic poem of the life of humanity. He reminds us how his brother, David Scott, the famous painter, would only paint in the same fashion—life-size, and with large proud stretch. This Titanism is indeed present in all really great minds. You may have much popularity upon small work, but not permanence.

This is what Paul was—Titanic. Literally, and not by poetic exaggeration. He found the world, in all three sides of it, out-worn, weary, and decaying. He undertook (and he carried out his undertaking) to take it up in his great hands and remake it, and give it new life—Hebrew, Greek, and Roman, and set it on to the end of time working out Jesus Christ's gospel along the lines of his great conceptions. His inspiration he owed to Christ, and to the inspiring Spirit whom Christ promised. But that Spirit found in him such a mind as is rare among men. When Paul fell to the earth near Damascus, one of the mighty fell; when he rose, it was the rising of a mightier still.

Let us now look at what this means for Paul as a Hebrew. For a Hebrew he was, and continued to the end. The old pictures and descriptions of him are unreliable enough, but they concur in giving him strongly Jewish features—aquiline nose, meeting eyebrows, and so on. It is true that his city Tarsus was one where Greek and Roman elements must have been at work upon the nature of the Hebrew boy. It is true also that Gamaliel, his teacher in Jerusalem, was one of those few Rabbis who were broad-minded enough to recognize the good that there was in heathen civilization and culture. Yet the fact is certain that this pupil at least took on little of it. In his early years there is trace neither of the large Roman tolerance and good-natured permission of liberty of thought; nor yet of the broad and sunny smile of Greece, that happy acceptance of the world and appreciation of it which makes the memory of Greece so sweet. On the contrary, you have him persecuting every un-Jewish thing he could persecute, with a narrow obstinacy, an ignorant wilfulness, that shows the worst side of Hebrew thought and feeling. And instead of the Greek smile and sympathy with nature, you find him entirely unobservant of her beauties; silent absolutely as to her trees and flowers, her winds and sea and sky. He was more familiar with crowds and assemblies, more easily delighted with cities and bazaars, than with any of the sights or sounds of Nature. So you find him in early days, and even to the end, an Hebrew of the Hebrews; using the Hebrew calendar, speaking and writing a foreign style of Greek, choosing Hebrew metaphors, and even arguing in the style of the Rabbinical schools with ease and naturalness, as in the argument about Hagar.

But while characteristic traits of Hebraism thus clung to him from first to last, as a Christian he shook himself free from Hebrew narrowness, seized upon the essential features of his nation's life, and gave Hebraism a new meaning. In fact, he remade Hebraism, and so conserved it. Hebrew religion was indeed a tremendous weapon, a veritable sword of the Spirit, for the conquering of the nations. But he found it lying resting—too heavy for any living hand to wield. He took it up and wielded it to purpose. This was one of the Titanic things Paul did. It was his Titanic handling of his own nation which set it on a level where it could see and tell upon the world.

To illustrate this we shall take the three great facts of the Hebrew heritage of Paul. They were (1) a race, (2) a law, (3) a crime. Here was the man who more than any other perpetuated the race, established the law, and atoned for the crime.

1. *The Race—the Hebrew Nationality.*—The two notes of Hebrew national thought were the descent from Abraham and the sense of being the elect of God. It would be impossible to exagger-

ate the influence that those two ideas had exercised for good on the nation. By their descent they were bound into a brotherhood the most tenacious that the world has known, and to-day the Jews of Sydney, of Berlin, of Rome, of London are still the aloof and peculiar people. Yet singular and persistent as this national solidarity is, if it had been the only outcome of the descent from Abraham it would have been but a survival. In early days this intense sense of brotherhood kept Israel in existence, and gave her the chance of being the religious factor in the world that she was. Long before Christ this had ceased to have more than a commercial or a purely historical value.

Paul rescued it by the boldest sort of stroke. He told them plainly that this nationality was not a matter of descent, nor even of circumcision. 'They are not all Israel that are of Israel.' It was a matter of spirit, and every one who is of the true spirit of Abraham, he is in the only permanent sense a descendant of Abraham.—The children by faith are the real children, not the children by blood. It was this supremely daring doctrine—how daring we cannot now realize—that saved the Jewish heritage and sent the Jewish religion forth as a gospel to the ends of the earth.

Again, the doctrine of election had become the most selfish and barbarous of egotisms. Elect for their own sake, as a token of God's arbitrary favouritism, the Jews of Paul's day stood safe, as they thought, on this rock, and watched all round them with compassionless indifference, the heathen perishing. This kind of doctrine was the accepted religious principle of Pharisaism, by which you kept your privileges to yourself. Paul fiercely opposed this; and the whole of that sorely misunderstood teaching about election in the Romans amounts in brief to this: That election is not primarily for the sake of the elect, but for the sake of the others. A nation is elected to religious knowledge and privilege for this very end, that it may be the salt of the earth, the light of the world—a light to them that sit in darkness. If it take its election selfishly, it will soon find that some other nation is elected to do the work it has neglected, while itself is cast away.

Here, surely, was great work. The Jews in every city where he founded a church dogged his steps and did all they could to oppose him. They thought he was the enemy of their nation, the denier of their election. Really it was *for*, not *against*, his nation that he fought. He saw that for them at least such doctrine as theirs—the idea of each nation sitting alone keeping and enjoying its own peculiar gains—meant utter and irretrievable failure. He took these two central aspects of nationality, and by giving them a generous and a spiritual meaning sent them abroad in the world, to be to the end of time the guides of all patriotism. It was the greatness of statemanship.

2. *The Law.*—The conspicuous fact in his national inheritance to the eyes of every Jew was the Law. His imagination still heard rolling the thunder of Sinai, still saw towering above every other monument of time the great stone tables of the Law, held in the hands of a colossal figure of Moses. To remove the Law was to destroy the nation and blaspheme against its past. This was what the Judaizers thought Paul was doing. And there was something to be said for that view. Did he not speak of the Law as 'weak and beggarly elements'? did he not deny that circumcision and the keeping of Jewish ordinances were any longer binding? Yes, and he did that in the interests of the Law itself. Here again we see his Titanism facing a superhuman task. To attack Hebraism here, at its very centre, was a work of the direst danger. Once shake men's abject reverence for the moral law, and what barrier is there between them and utter lawlessness and licence? To tamper with popular convictions here was a risk that needed supreme management. It was what Paul did.

The current way of regarding the Law was to take it as God's final word to man as to Salvation. The Jewish Christians took it so. To its last letter it must be obeyed or there was no hope. To neglect circumcision was to put oneself outside the pale of grace. And Christ might indeed be accepted as a later revelation of God, but yet must be accepted on the basis that after all Salvation lay in rigid and detailed obedience to the old system.

Paul saw that if that were so, then the world was lost. He saw that that complicated Hebrew legislation was no more fit to be the universal salvation of the world than the heathen sacrifices were. As a vitalizing force, the Law was as dead as Moses was, and no Pharisaic zeal could galvanize it into life. But looked at in another way the Law was not dead but terribly alive.

Taken spiritually, as an account of the true way to live, it was alive with a vengeance. To the end of time he who read that old Law seriously would find one thing—despair—as he came upon the part of it that struck home to him. For Paul that part was 'Thou shalt not covet!' He could keep the Law, and be blameless, as a Pharisee. He could outwardly conform to its precepts with the best of them. But when he seriously took home to himself that God's demand from him was that he should not merely refrain from doing evil things but refrain from coveting—from *wanting* to do them—then, he says, 'sin revived, and I died.' It flashed like a great light upon him that this was just what the Law was there for. It was to kill him—to strike dead his self-satisfaction, his mere respectability, his hope or salvation through being a consistent Pharisee—it was to do that that the Law existed. That was the very meaning and end of the Law. And when, in his despair, he looked around the world and saw Christ, full of grace and hope and forgiveness—then he thanked God for the cruel Law that had driven him to that kind Saviour. The Law was but a slave, he said, the slave (schoolmaster) that dragged reluctant children to school. The Law, rough, cruel, harsh, not amenable to reason, had dragged this great school child along till it left him at the feet of Christ.

You can see how tremendous a change of view this was to bring to his nation, and how Titanic was the soul that did it. It was the great conscience of Paul that did it. His conscience was of the sort we have seen later in Luther and in the Puritan divines. To the Pharisees the Law was a great machine, to Paul it was a great condemnation. It was the only way in which the Law could last. As a complicated machine for grinding out righteousness its day was done; but to the end of time it was God's hammer for smiting on man's conscience and breaking man's heart, and so showing him the value of Christ. Truly might Paul say in his defence, 'Do we then make void the Law? Yea, we establish the Law?'

3. *The Crime.*—The third part of the Jewish heritage Paul dealt with was its crime. For of late years every Jew born was heir to a tremendous crime—the crucifixion of Christ. It is quite impossible for us to imagine how fearful to a Jew was the idea that by any chance Messiah had come and had been crucified. Nothing that could by any possibility happen to any nation now can give an idea of it. To every patriotic Jew the future meant one thing, the coming of Messiah; and all the past history of the land took its meaning from the same thing. Their law, their prophets, and their psalms had breathed expectation of Him. Their kings had in all their glory only held a temporary and interim throne, ready to vacate it on a moment's notice when He came. Their defeats had been borne solely in the strength of a faith that all would be put right when He came.

Now there were great and increasing bands of men and women proclaiming in every market place, sending the news by every ship, discussing it by every fireside, that Messiah had come unawares, had been insulted, spat upon, bound, scourged, howled at, crucified. The nation that had waited and prayed for Him all these centuries had sought out carefully all that was cruellest and shamefullest to do to Him when they had Him. It was no wonder if Jews, and Paul among them, were bitter against the early Christians. If these Christians were right, then it meant all this—and in truth it could not have meant worse. Either the Cross of Christ was the just punishment of an unspeakably blasphemous man, or it was the blackest shame and most ruinously wicked mistake that ever befell a people.

Here was the awful dilemma which this Hebrew of the Hebrews had to face. Either he must go on persecuting Christianity, or he must accept this hideous fact of his nation's shame and crime. Once more the Titanic man finds a greater thing to do than either. He confesses the shame and feels it to the very innermost heart of him. But having confessed it—his nation's and his own disgrace,—having been driven to despair by it deeper than any to which the Law could drive him,—he takes that Cross and sets it in the very forefront of his faith and memory. Wherever he goes he will know nothing among them but Jesus Christ and Him crucified. He sees in it not only shame deep as hell, but also love high as heaven. The love had been there before,—God's love to the world which that Cross revealed as it never had been dreamed of before,—but it is to Paul more than to any other man that we owe the understanding of that love. It was he who faced his nation's shame and transformed it into the world's hope and light. In this way St. Paul set the Cross before the eyes of all coming centuries—

the point where shame was deepest and where love was mightiest—the point at which man finds at once his lowest station and his highest truth—the meeting point of the sin of the world and the Love of God.

Such was Paul the Hebrew, and this is the effect of him upon his nation. He found them cowering over the dying fires of ancient Race, nursing a dead Law, shuddering at and yet vehemently refusing to confess to a patent Crime. He left them sending on the true racial glory of Israel to all faithful souls, retaining the Law as the quickener of conscience to the end of time, glorying in that shame wherein he had discovered for them the eternal Love.

Recent Foreign Theology.

Winckler's 'History of Israel.'[1]

THE motto of this book should be 'Thorough.' Its secondary title, 'Die Legende,' warns us what we are to expect, and the expectation is not belied. The Biblical narratives, from Abraham to Solomon inclusive, are treated in the same manner as Mücke and Stucken follow with ancient history in general. As a matter of fact, Winckler holds that most of these Hebrew stories come from the same source as Harmodius and Aristogeiton, Romulus and Remus, and the fictions concerning Alexander the Great. They are myths, derived ultimately from cosmical phenomena. In like manner as men believed that they could read the future in the stars, so, when they would fain fill up the blanks in their knowledge, they read the past there. There is no sufficient reason for believing that such men as the patriarchs of Israel were real, living persons: the incidents related of them are legends which, in the first instance, had been told of one or other of the gods. Abraham is the moon-hero, heading the list of the forefathers of the race, as the moon (*Bab.* Sin) is the first of the gods. 'In Abraham, as in so many mythical characters, two figures have been blended, and we can clearly distinguish between two parts which have been assigned to him. In the one case, where he is mentioned along with his brother Dioscurus, Lot, he is one of the two Dioscuri. His other part . . . is that of brother and husband to his sister and wife, Sarah or Sarai, whose nature is clearly defined; she is the Istar of the Babylonian mythology. In this rôle Abraham is her brother and spouse, Tammuz-Adonis. Their father is the moon-god Sin. . . . The deity, therefore, whom Abraham represents is, substantially, the moon-god.'[2] Hence he is closely connected with Kirjath-Arba and Beer-Sheba, the city of the Four and the well of the god Seven, the four phases of the moon and the seven days of the week. Isaac is simply a redúplication of him. Jacob, as beginning a series, is also the representative of the moon-god. He 'is the father of twelve sons, the twelve months. And to prevent any misunderstanding as to his nature, the legend not only has the division of the year into twelve months, but also that into seventy-two units of five days each, of which evidence is found in Mesopotamian sources from Asia Minor dating earlier than 1000 B.C. It is also to be seen in the legend of the translation of the Septuagint by five translators in seventy-two days. The number of Jacob's descendants by five wives—Joseph's included, she being the mother of two sons—is seventy-two (Gn 46). The year consists of 5×72 days.'[3] Moses stands for Tammuz. When he dies his eyes are not dim, whereas Jacob, the moon-hero, is blind in his old age. The Israelites mourned for Moses thirty days, the days of mourning for Tammuz, whereas Jacob, the moon-hero, is bewailed seven days. The twelve judges correspond to the signs of the Zodiac. When we reach the period of the Kingdom we come into contact with historic personages. Saul and David and Solomon are names that refer to actual human beings. But the little residuum of fact has been enlarged and distorted almost beyond recognition. The three kings have been tricked out with all kinds of mythological embellishments. Much of what we read about Saul points to a moon-hero, for the very

[1] *Geschichte Israels in Einzeldarstellungen.* Von Hugo Winckler. Teil ii., Die Legende. Leipzig: Eduard Pfeiffer, 1900.

[2] P. 22.

[3] P. 57.