

THE PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

VOLUME V

JULY 1907

NUMBER 3

AUGUSTINE'S DOCTRINE OF KNOWLEDGE AND AUTHORITY.

Augustine marks almost as great an epoch in the history of philosophy as in the history of theology. It was with him that the immediate assurance of consciousness first took its place as the source and warrant of truth. No doubt there had been a long preparation for the revolution which was wrought by his announcement of the principle of "self-assured subjectivity", as Windelband calls it, and his establishment of it in "the controlling central position of philosophic thought". But the whole preceding development will not account for the act of genius by which he actually shifted the basis of philosophy, and in so doing became "the true teacher of the middle ages", no doubt, but above and beyond that "one of the founders of modern thought".¹ He may himself be said to have come out of Plato, or Plotinus; but in even a truer sense out of him came Descartes and his successors.² When he urged men to cease seeking truth without them, and to turn within, since the home of truth

¹ Windelband, *A History of Philosophy*, E. T., pp. 276, 264, 270.

² Leder, *Augustins Erkenntnistheorie*, p. 76: "If we must see in Plotinus the father of Augustine's Platonism, we may yet recognize it as an especially original service of the Church-Father, that he established over against all scepticism the first point of all certitude in self-consciousness. He found in Plotinus no guidance for this: rather by an act of genius he anticipated in it the line of thought which Descartes (1640) made in his *Meditationes* the starting point of his expositions."

WAS PAUL THE FOUNDER OF CHRISTIANITY?

The centre of interest in New Testament criticism has shifted for the moment from the Gospels to the Epistles—from Jesus to Paul. An influential school of younger writers in Germany has confidently asserted that Paul and not Jesus Himself was the real founder of Christianity, meaning the Christianity of the churches and the creeds. To the ordinary Bible reader this statement will appear so paradoxical as scarcely to merit serious attention, while to the student more or less acquainted with the course of New Testament criticism the attempt to prove an antithesis between the teaching of Paul and that of the Twelve will seem like a wilful, if heroic, attempt to reoccupy an untenable position. The new view, however, is set forth in no tentative fashion. Its leading advocates, men like Wernle, Weinel and Wrede,* are scholars of repute and writers of unusual literary skill, and their strategic method in taking the case out of the hands of the theologians and appealing to the judgment of the intelligent laity has placed the advocates of traditional opinion rather on the defensive. The fight is now on in dead earnest, we are told, and if the cause is lost it will be due to its inherent weakness, and not to lack of ability in its leaders. An examination of the recent efforts at historical construction will at least bring us into contact with several bold and original thinkers, and cannot be without positive gains in shedding light upon the life and work of Paul and the history of the early church.

The following quotations from recent writers, who, though differing widely in other respects, yet agree in their opposition to Pauline Christianity, will serve to show the essence of the new contention :

* This was already in type before we learned with regret of the death, on Nov. 23, 1906, of the brilliant scholar and critic Dr. W. Wrede, professor in the University of Breslau. The article has been left unchanged.

But for Paul, said Nietzsche (*Morgenröte*, 1892), "Christianity would not exist; we should hardly have heard of a small Jewish sect whose teacher died on the cross". Paul was "the first Christian, the inventor of Christianity. Before him there were only a few Jewish sectaries."

"The introduction of Christianity into the history of the world", says Wernle (*Beginnings of Christianity*, 1903, Vol. I. p. 159), "is entirely the work of Paul. He is not the founder of the new religion, and he did not wish to be accounted such. . . . But it was he who brought Christianity out of Palestine and transplanted it among the Greeks. . . . It was bound to undergo a radical transformation. . . . The new start is one of such importance that we must distinguish the pre-Pauline from the post-Pauline Christianity; or, what amounts to the same thing, the Palestinian sect and the world religion."

Weinel (*St. Paul, the Man and His Work*, 1906, pp. 5, 11) in answer to the question, "Who has the greater claim to be called the founder of the world-religion, Jesus or Paul?" says, "'Paul', if by Christianity we understand belief in dogmas as to the person of Christ and his propitiatory death." He asks "Is the Christianity which Paul preached, and which still lives to-day in Church and dogma, another religion than the gospel which Jesus preached?" Paul is repeatedly called "the founder of the Church".

The conclusion of Wrede's monograph, *Paulus* (in *Religionsgeschichtliche Volksbücher*, 1905), is that "Paul must be regarded as the second founder of Christianity." Not through the gospel of Jesus but through Paul and his companions can we account for the great teachers, "Tertullian, Origen, Athanasius, Augustin, Anselm of Canterbury, Luther, Calvin, Zinzendorf." "This second founder of the Christian religion has without doubt as compared with the first exerted on the whole the stronger—not the better—influence."

Dr. Kohler, in the *Jewish Encyclopedia* (art. "Saul of Tarsus") speaks of Paul as "the actual founder of the Christian Church as opposed to Judaism."

All the writers above quoted agree that Paul was the founder of Christianity as a universal religion. To him belongs the credit, or discredit, of founding the Christian

Church, which with its creeds and institutions has lived on through the centuries till to-day.

To say that Paul was the founder of the world-religion is obviously to deny that Jesus was its founder. However pure and exalted the type of religion which He exemplified and taught, He did not teach His religion as the only supply for a universal need; He did not form any definite plans for world-conquest, or organize a church with a universal mission. The conception of a religion which should meet the needs of all men, and lay upon its adherents the obligation of a continual propaganda, and break down all barriers of race, caste and nationality, has been called the greatest thought which ever entered the human mind. If such a conception belonged not to Jesus but to Paul, it is to Paul that we must accord the crown of intellectual supremacy. Both Wernle and Weinel, it is true, concede a universal element in the teaching of Jesus. Referring to the passage, "Many shall come from the east and the west, etc.," Wernle says (I. p. 70), "How this admission of the Gentiles shall be brought about Jesus leaves to His God. He just gives the promise without giving His disciples any command to go forth as missionaries." And Weinel remarks: "Jesus would of course have raised no objection to the reception of the heathen. . . . He too, perhaps, once believed and said, that many would come from the east and from the west. . . . But words such as these were only occasional utterances, which bore witness to a heart free from all prejudice and full of love. They were not intended as indications for a definite organized work" (p. 221). Paul again goes beyond Jesus in clearly seeing and teaching that Christianity was independent of Judaism. Weinel says that "the consequences of His position in relation to the law remained completely concealed from Jesus" although He was opposed to ceremonial holiness (p. 219). Wernle believes that the statement in the Sermon on the Mount: "I am not come to destroy but to fulfil", belongs in its present form to the age after St. Paul. It cannot be ascribed to Jesus, for "its form betrays a theologian for

whom the question 'destruction or fulfilment of the law' implied a problem to be solved. For Jesus there was no such question, no question at all regarding the law in the strict sense of the word, for He was a layman and was in any case but moderately acquainted with the law—had perchance never studied it at all" (I. p. 88). Emerson has said that the human mind stands in perplexity, "demanding intellect, demanding sanctity, impatient equally with each without the other". To form the plan of a universal religion and to think out its true relation to Judaism, there was needed the mental grasp, learning and foresight of a Paul.

If Paul was the founder of universal Christianity, the popular estimate of his place in religious history must, it appears, be revised in two respects: First, he affected the religion of Jesus profoundly for the worse; and second, he saved it from oblivion and made it one of the great religions of the world. The name of Jesus, says Wernle, stands, it is true, in the centre of Paul's preaching, but he asks, "Is it not another Jesus?" (I. p. 167). Paul united the gospel of Jesus with a cosmology and a theology which "was bound to be welcomed by the decaying ancient world on account of its pessimism, its new myths, its ideal, its doctrine of hope" (I. p. 289). "Paul fought for the universalism of Christianity and the substitution of the religion of love for that of legalism: what he really attained was the establishment of the Christian Church with the new legalism of faith and the creed, with the return of all the Jewish sins of narrowness, fanaticism and the restricted conception of God" (I. p. 309). In similar vein Weinel says that "Paul was the first to intellectualize and thereby to narrow the original gospel" (p. 99). "The orthodox theories of the atonement can rightly appeal to St. Paul as their authority. . . . But we reject all such theories as to the death of Jesus . . . above all because they contain an unchristian, a less than Christian, conception of God and His relation to man" (pp. 311f.). Wrede is even bolder than Wernle in applying the expres-

sion "myth" to the Pauline conception of the incarnation, death and resurrection of Jesus (p. 103).

On the other hand, Paul's place in religious history as the founder of the world-religion becomes more important than ever, and his services to the cause of true religion are freely recognized. In his power of impressing his thought and his type of personal piety upon succeeding times he stands almost without a rival. Wernle says that by means of his experience Paul "was able to look into the depths of religion as no previous thinker had done. In so far as his propositions merely reproduce this experience, they are the foundation stones of every theory of religion" (I. pp. 301f). "Few men in all antiquity had a profounder knowledge of human nature", says Weinel (p. 364). His letter to the Philippians "contains the pattern of the perfect Christian gentleman" (p. 373). His teaching, says Wrede, "has given to millions of hearts the best that they possess". Without it, "a Luther, Paul Gerhard and John Sebastian Bach could not have been what they were", and it still fills with joy thousands and tens of thousands of good and earnest men (pp. 103f.). Even so pronounced an opponent of Pauline doctrine as the writer in the *Jewish Encyclopedia* is constrained to say that though both philosophers and Jews will differ from him, "both will admit that he is a mighty battler for truth, and that his view of life, of man, and of God is a profoundly serious one. The entire conception of religion has certainly been deepened by him" (Art. "Saul of Tarsus," p. 80).

This curious intermingling of praise and blame, often met with in the same paragraph or even sentence, is a necessary result, as becomes increasingly apparent, of the fundamental assumption of the later critics, namely, that Paul in propagating the gospel of Christ essentially modified its original content. Their volumes thus have to bear the singular aspect of being at the same time a eulogy of Paul and an anti-Pauline polemic.¹ The Apostle as they describe

¹Wrede is the most outspoken in his criticisms, while with Wernle praise and blame are about evenly balanced. Weinel's sympathetic esti-

him was at once the leading exponent and missionary of Christianity and yet by implication its arch-heretic. His influence as a religious teacher has been so salutary and far reaching that it is due to him that any of us are Christians to-day, and yet he has so corrupted the message of the Master that the cry "Back to Jesus" means "Away from Paul and his doctrines". He "has impressed forever a whole series of fundamental ideas . . . upon the thought of the Western world" (Weinel, p. 8), and before his greatness as a thinker "one stands in silent amazement" (Wernle, I. p. 340), yet he was profoundly mistaken about the central point in his thinking, his relation to Jesus and His gospel. He combined in himself in short the greatest knowledge of human nature and the greatest self-deception and his work was both the greatest service and the greatest disservice that has ever been done to Christianity.

The most obvious criticism that can be made on this theory is that it is lacking in inner harmony. One must either love Paul or hate him, it has been said;² but this new theory requires of its advocates an unstable equilibrium between love and hate, between admiration and reprobation. The Paul described unites in himself qualities so diverse that, though he is offered in the place of Jesus as the explanation of world-wide Christianity, yet he himself becomes if not the miracle at least the riddle of history. It may be interesting to follow the new criticism as it seeks to explain Paul and to account for his conversion, his consciousness of apostleship, his mission to the Gentiles and his message. We may then ask what is after all the fundamental question: Was the gospel which Paul preached really new?

The reader who, attracted by the title of Wernle's volumes, seeks in them an adequate account of the beginnings of Christianity will be disappointed at not finding any description or discussion of Paul's conversion. We are left in doubt as to whether at Damascus Paul really saw the

mate of Paul's character will be welcomed as a real contribution to our appreciation of the Apostle.

² J. Kaftan, *Jesus und Paulus*, 1906.

risen Christ or not. The possibility of the resurrection is indeed admitted. "Our judgment as to these appearances depends on the credibility which we attach to St. Paul and his informant", that is, Peter. "Purely scientific considerations cannot decide" (I. p. 115). The whole course of the discussion, however, seems to assume that the Christ whom Paul saw, or thought he saw, was not identical with the historic Jesus. This is distinctly stated in the first edition: "By means of his vision St. Paul became the creator of the new Christology, which drew its inspiration, not from history, but from something above it—a mythical being, and which won over the heathen for this very reason" (E. T. Vol. I. p. 250). In the second (German) edition, this passage is omitted, and instead Wernle explains why, in consequence of his vision of the risen Lord, the resurrection must have had for Paul "fundamental significance" and how it inevitably became for him the "basis of Christianity" (*Die Anfänge unserer Religion*,² p. 166).³ The vision at Damascus is constantly used as the key to Paul's subsequent life, thought and activity. Without the apostolic consciousness, which there had its origin, "it is incredible that Paul would have accomplished a tithe of what he did" (I. p. 165). The key to the conquests of Christianity is Paul, the key to Paul's work is the vision at Damascus, but in Wernle's *Beginnings* there is no explanation of the vision itself. It had tremendous consequences, deeply affecting the course of history, but no cause for its occurrence either objective or subjective is suggested.

Both Weinel and Wrede have explanations to offer. The conversion, according to Wrede, was a sudden change of view as to the Messiahship of Jesus without moral or con-

³ The two editions of *Die Anfänge unserer Religion* appeared respectively in 1901 and 1904. Vol. I. of the English translation was made from the first, and Vol. II. from the second German edition. The main difference between the two volumes in English is that in Vol. I. the conception of the sacraments is derived from Paul, while Vol. II. presupposes their existence in the early Christian Church. The quotations in the present article, except as specially noted, are from the English translation where it agrees with the second German edition.

scious psychological preparation, mediated in some way by a pathological cause. From 2 Cor. xii. we see that there was something in Paul's religion, mystical, abnormal, inseparable from self-deception, and all this throws a very special light upon the first vision at Damascus (p. 17). What really occurred? "This much is certain. Jesus could not have stood in bodily form before His enemy. . . . Paul knows no resurrection of the flesh. . . . It could therefore have been no usual 'fleshly', no actual (*wirkliches*) 'seeing'" (p. 9). It is immediately added, however, "probably Paul never doubted that he actually (*wirklich*) had seen Jesus. . . . The vision worked upon him with the full power of an objective fact." The vision must have had a cause, we are told, although we may not be able to indicate it. "An actual view of the processes we can never obtain." The only explanation suggested is the following: "Fanatical opposition can assert itself on the surface, and in the still depths, without a man's understanding it himself, doubt can gnaw and foment and gather revolution around itself, and a new being fight its way out" (p. 10).

Weinel thinks that Paul's conversion was a moral experience, culminating in a hysterical attack which caused him to see a vision. Referring Rom. vii. to the struggle preceding conversion, he says "heavier and heavier did the curse of the law become" (p. 75). The voice which said "Why persecutest thou me?" was the voice of Paul's uneasy conscience" (p. 82). The psychical commotion disorganized his eye-sight, which explains his blindness. He had a vision, he saw, but how? "The answer", Weinell frankly says, "will vary according to a man's conception of the universe . . . meaning nothing about faith or religion. The question has no existence for faith. Faith knows that what happened, happened in any case because God chose to work it then—whether Paul beheld Jesus in the light, or whether it was merely a visionary sight. It is a question of our conception of the universe, in so far as it brings us face to face with the problem: Do we admit the possibility of ap-

pearances of persons from another world to the sensual vision?" (p. 80). Weinel assumes that the question is to be decided in accordance with a ready-made conception of the universe, but the question, if it could be answered on purely historical grounds, is just one of those which might reasonably affect our conception of the universe. It seems to be admitted that, apart from philosophical views, the evidence is sufficient to support the reality of an objective appearance. But the question, says Weinel, has no existence for faith. For Paul, of course, it would have existence, affecting vitally his claims to apostleship, and as part of the general question of the resurrection it would have existence for every believer. Even for Weinel himself we find that it does exist for faith, for he says that Paul's failure to perceive that the vision was purely subjective has had dangerous consequences for religion. It led Paul to regard "faith" as no longer "simply the heartfelt trust in God's mercy, but something besides, the fervent acceptance of a fact—the Resurrection. . . . Hereby some of that 'belief in facts' has crept into Christianity which so easily destroys the true, the inmost conception of faith. The outward occurrence and the inner psychological process were identical for Paul. His failure to distinguish the two has forever burdened Christianity with the danger of this twofold conception of faith" (pp. 99f.).

If Paul were merely a private Christian his experience at conversion would be relatively of little importance. But his conversion cannot be treated out of connection with his work as the apostle of Christ to the Gentiles,—or more than that, as the founder of world-wide Christianity. Why did Paul when converted become a missionary to the heathen? This is a difficult question for the newer criticism. To refer his mission to a personal command from the risen Christ is excluded by hypothesis. If his own explanation of the origin and success of his work is adopted—"God revealed His Son in me that I might preach Him among the Gentiles. Christ wrought through me for the obedience of the Gen-

tiles"—then Paul has indeed the high honor in his mission and his message of being the apostle of Jesus Christ to the Gentiles, but he originated neither the universality nor the content of his gospel. On the other hand, to refer the mission directly to the vision at Damascus, considered as a purely subjective event, is to make that event still more wonderful. Through it Paul was converted not simply to the faith of which he was making havoc, but, it is implied, to a religion quite different from this, and through it he received a commission, so he thought, which he spent the remainder of his life in fulfilling. The heavier the explanatory task imposed upon the conversion, the more inexplicable does this as a merely natural event become.

"Whence", asks Wernle, "came the certainty of the apostolic calling? By far the most beautiful answer is to be found in First Corinthians: 'Necessity is laid upon me; yea, woe is me if I preach not the gospel.' The calling to go forth as missionary is an inner compulsion which Paul cannot at all withstand" (I. p. 165). But why this compulsion? "St. Paul gives us a clear account. He became at once Christian and apostle—such is his answer to the question—through the vision on the road to Damascus." But why was Paul an apostle to the Gentiles? While other considerations are mentioned, which, it is said, contributed to his decision, yet "the really decisive cause was the clearly felt impulse that urged him to go forth from the very moment of his call. He was under a necessity—he had to go to the Gentiles" (I. p. 174). It is said that Paul "draws no distinction between the general calling of an apostle and the special calling of a missionary to the heathen, but shows himself prepared to receive both at God's hands" (I. p. 161). Wernle, it will be seen, has no other account to give of the origin of Paul's mission to the Gentiles than that it was in obedience to an impulse—not a command—felt from the moment of his conversion.

While Weinel, at least nominally, connects the conversion and the missionary call, he finds it difficult to explain the

connection. He asks, "Why does Damascus mean a new vocation to Paul?" and seeks another explanation than the obvious one of a supernatural call. It is natural that out of the fulness of the heart the mouth should speak, yet, he says, "it is difficult to understand just why he became apostle to the Gentiles". Weinel's own explanation, stated with some diffidence, is based upon an interpretation of two passages, Gal. v. 11 and 2 Cor. v. 16. "In these passages we can trace the idea that Paul had once known and preached Christ after the flesh—that is, he had, when he was still Saul, recognized and proclaimed an earthly Jewish Messiah, and that he had already been a teacher, possibly also a missionary. In this case it may have been a pre-existent calling, or at least perhaps an incipient though hidden desire which awoke within in full force in that supreme moment" (p. 154). To add to the difficulty of this exegesis as suggesting a "pre-existent calling" is the fact that Weinel in two other places says that Paul believed that the Messiah was a heavenly being. "Even as a Jew, Saul believed the Messiah to be already in existence. . . . He is living in heaven with God, whence God will send Him forth when the time is fulfilled" (p. 45). So again in explaining the origin of Paul's Christology: "He now knew, from his own experience, that that heavenly being, in whom his people believed, existed as an actual matter of fact. He was identical with Jesus" (p. 314). The reader is obliged to choose between the pre-existent calling as explaining the mission, and the pre-existent Messiah as explaining the Christology.

Wrede, equally with Weinel, is somewhat at a loss to account for Paul's mission to the heathen. Paul himself, he admits, referring to Gal. i. 16 and Rom. xv. 15f., declares that "the moment of the conversion itself had destined him to be not only apostle in general, but apostle to the heathen" (p. 14). Yet it is added that there seems to be a little self-deception here; this sudden call is "psychologically hard to understand. In memory the perspective is easily shortened.

. . . At any rate the recognition of his life's task was an effect of the appearance of Christ; on the other hand, that he had 'seen' Jesus just as those apostles with whom He had lived constituted—for himself as for others—the title to apostolic dignity. The thought that Christ had Himself called him at that time lay not far away" (p. 15). Elsewhere Wrede says that the Jewish propaganda of the Diaspora may have co-operated in making Paul a missionary, but adds, "we are not in a position to trace his development clearly" (p. 42). Significant is the admission: "As to how Paul became a missionary to the heathen we are left with no trustworthy account, as soon as we refuse to place the beginning of the mission in the very hour of his conversion" (p. 29). It may be observed that no one of our authors has succeeded in breaking the organic connection between Paul's conversion and his sense of a divine call to preach the gospel to the Gentiles.

Paul's theology, equally with his call, is referred back to his conversion. The question of its source is doubly important because Paul is regarded as the founder of Christian theology not only without but within the New Testament. The Apocalypse, Wernle thinks, is in its theology a development of the gospel which Paul preached to the Gentiles. Its Christology shows "the unchanging outline of the Pauline Christology. It cannot possibly have originated twice over in different persons, unless indeed there were two appearances on the road to Damascus" (I. p. 386). The commission to evangelize the world is of course antedated when put into the mouth of the risen Christ. Wernle, as we have seen, traces Paulinism even into the imperial utterances of the Sermon on the Mount, and Wrede remarks that the Synoptic Gospels were composed in part under Paul's influence (p. 89). The John of the Gospel and Epistles cannot be appealed to as an independent theologian, for "there is no Johnine theology by the side of and independent of the Pauline. . . . John and Paul are not two theological factors, but one."

(Wernle, II. pp. 274f.). "The significance of the Fourth Gospel consists in the fact that it refers the teaching of St. Paul back to Jesus Himself. This constitutes its value and its worthlessness, its force and its fatality" (II. p. 276). "When the Johannine Christ speaks of how He was with the Father before He became flesh, it is Paul himself that is speaking to us" (Wrede, p. 99). First Peter is "an altogether Pauline letter" (Wernle, II. p. 293). Paul is even said to have been, unintentionally, "the father of the New Testament", since he made the distinction between natural and revealed knowledge (II. p. 245). "Paul is everywhere the starting-point. It is his gospel that now speaks to us out of the words of Jesus and the original apostles" (II. p. 294).⁴

At the base then of the great structure of Christian theology stands the thought of Paul. Paul himself traces his theology to three sources: revelation—in part inseparable from his Christian experience—, Christian tradition and the Old Testament. "God revealed His Son in me." "God shined in our hearts." "I delivered that which I received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures." Both revelation in the usual sense and Christian tradition are with our critics excluded as sources by the assumption that Paul's gospel was so largely his own creation, but the prime source is found in the new opinions and experiences that date in some way from Damascus. The hour of his conversion, Wrede says, gave him the germ of which his theology is but the development (p. 48). In Wienel's treatment the connection between his theology and his con-

⁴ While the influence of Paul is thus magnified, the extent of his direct authorship is limited. Wernle indeed draws from all the epistles except the Pastorals, but Wienel only uses the six most commonly acknowledged, Romans 1 and 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Philippians and 1 Thessalonians. To these Wrede adds Colossians and Philemon. The extremes of a twofold process of addition and subtraction are found in the *Jewish Encyclopedia* (art. "Saul of Tarsus"), where Paul is called "the actual founder of the Christian Church as opposed to Judaism," and yet even of his main epistles Romans is said to be largely "interpollated" and Galatians to be "spurious".

version is even closer, while Wernle says that "the decisive factor in the genesis of St. Paul's theology was his personal experience, his conversion on the road to Damascus" (I. p. 224). The explanatory burden laid upon this event is thus made heavier but without further explanation of the event itself.

What then were the novel elements in Paul's theology? Wrede gives three particulars: the universalism of his gospel, his Christology through which Christ became in origin and nature a heavenly being, and a new valuation of the death (and resurrection) of Christ (p. 96). The assumption is that the Jesus of Nazareth whom he was persecuting was for the early Christians only the Jewish Messiah. How He became for Paul in the hour of conversion the world's Saviour is left unexplained. There seems to be no very plausible reason for Paul's universalism either in thought or activity, except that he had received from the risen Lord "grace and apostleship unto obedience of faith among all the nations"; but if we accept Paul's own account then his gospel is not new either in its Christology or its universal destination.

Paul was original, Wrede and Weinel hold, in seeing in Jesus a pre-existent heavenly being. If the source of this new conception was an actual revelation of the glorified Lord to the eyes and mind of Paul, his change of view is not hard to account for. "For one who with Paul himself sees in Jesus a supramundane divine being, there is here indeed no problem" (Wrede, p. 84). Wrede, however, seeing in Jesus "what he was, an historical-human personality", must seek some other explanation, and finds it in the idea of a heavenly Messiah held by Paul previously to his conversion and identified through that event with the Jesus whom he was persecuting. "In the moment of his conversion as Jesus stood before him in the bright glory of His resurrection being, then he identified Him with his Christ", and transferred to Him the predicates of pre-existence and creatorship. But why did not the earlier disciples who

equally with Paul might have known the Messiah of the Jewish apocalypses, and had, at least equally with him, seen the glory of the risen Lord, make this identification? The answer is clear: "Intimate disciples could not so easily believe that the man who sat with them at the table at Capernaum or journeyed over the Sea of Galilee, could be the Creator of the world" (p. 86). Wrede does not ask what view of Christ was held by James, distinguished by Paul as "the Lord's brother", and said by him to have seen the Risen Lord. Upon this question Wrede, and with him Wernle and Weinel, are silent. It might further, perhaps, be asked whether Jesus, believing Himself to be the Messiah, was conscious of being the heavenly Being with whom Paul identified Him. The question here would be out of place, for Wrede apparently does not think that Jesus looked upon Himself as the Messiah (see p. 94).⁵

Weinel accepts with Wrede Paul's identification of the pre-existent Messiah foreshadowed in some Jewish apocalypses with the Jesus he was persecuting (p. 313). He does this as we have seen, however, in apparent forgetfulness of his previous suggestion that Paul had, "while still Saul, recognized and proclaimed an earthly Jewish Messiah" (p. 184). In one respect Weinel is a partial antidote to Wrede. Although Paul surrounded the person of Jesus with a heavenly aureole beneath which "His simple and yet all-powerful features threatened to disappear", still, we must not suppose that Paul knew nothing of Jesus. "According to his own words, he became acquainted with the outlines of the life of Jesus from the disciples themselves; and though his religion is everywhere in touch with the risen, living Lord, yet we find clear traces everywhere of his acquaintance with those memoirs of Jesus which afterward assumed a definite shape in our Gospels" (p. 317).⁶ Wernle

⁵ In his earlier works, *Das Messiasgeheimnis in den Evangelien* (1901), Wrede renews the attempt of Bruno Bauer to eliminate the Messianic element altogether from the life of Jesus. See Schweitzer's *Von Reimarus zu Wrede*, 1906, p. 10.

⁶ In Canon Knowling's *Witness of the Epistles*, 1892, and *The Testi-*

thinks that though the Jewish theory was simply that the name of Messiah was hidden with God, yet that "from very early times", much earlier than the composition of our section with Jesus. "The same goal was reached as soon as Jesus' words about His being sent by God were taken literally" (I. p. 147). The idea of pre-existence was not therefore a discovery of Paul's. Wernle contends that it is labor lost to try to trace Paul's ideas before his conversion. "In fact, we are completely ignorant as to what ideas he had exactly at that time. . . . The apostle had one theology and only one, and that is a Christian one. Each single word of his epistles flows from his Christian consciousness" (I. p. 225). Since Paul had no knowledge of the living Jesus, only of the heavenly Christ, he could form his Christology, Wernle says, only by extracting from the current titles of Christ, such as Messiah, Son of God, Son of Man, what these seemed to contain. "The knowledge of the titles and of their values compensates for the lack of personal knowledge. How could it be otherwise? If one knows Jesus oneself all titles are inadequate" (I. p. 246).

Paul's theory of the death of Christ, Wernle holds, had its roots in the "Christophany". But the Christophany, he adds, will not account fully for the theory, since all that Paul could properly infer from it was that he individually was a sinner and that the Crucified and Risen one had died for his sins. It was in an apologetic interest, that is in defense of Christianity as a universal religion, that Paul made the theoretical extension of his experience and constructed the dogmas,—All men are sinners: Christ died for the sins of all men. Herein Paul went beyond the idea of the early Church that Christ as Messiah died for the sins of the Jewish nation, and still further beyond the thought of Jesus Himself that "some good end must surely be intended by His death. It must be fraught with blessing for many among the people who as yet believed not in Him" (I. p. 111). How or why,

mony of St. Paul to Christ, 1905, the witness of Paul to the facts of the Gospel history is fully discussed.

in virtue of the Christophany, the passage was first made from the personal or the national to the universal does not appear. Wrede leaves it doubtful whether the early Christians brought the death of Christ into connection with sin at all, remarking that Paul's reception from tradition of the fact that He "died for our sins", 1 Cor. xv. 3, "is only demanded by a very literal construction of his words" (p. 112). It should be observed in general that the Christophany at Damascus is treated by implication as if it were not in any real sense an appearance of the risen Christ, yet it is made the primary source of the theology which permeates the New Testament and has for centuries dominated Christian thought.

It remains to speak of Paul's doctrine of justification. With this Weinel, at least, has the warmest sympathy. It was by Paul's antagonism to legalism that he became "the saviour of Christianity" (p. 101). He sees that the doctrine is the formulated expression of a deep religious experience, and calls his theology at this point "the defense of his holiest, his most cherished possession" (p. 101). The doctrine of justification by faith was "the core and centre of his theology" (p. 289). Wernle sees in it the result of a profound experience dating from Damascus, but thinks that Paul's apologetic interests have here, to an unusual extent "injured the expression of his thoughts" (I. p. 302). According to Wrede the doctrine of justification sprang neither from Paul's experience nor from Jewish presuppositions, but solely from the "needs of his heathen mission" (p. 84). It was a controversial weapon (*Kampfeslehre*), forged in order to keep the heathen converts from the yoke of Jewish custom and to assure the superiority of Christianity. Paul did not preach it at first and, we are led to infer, would never have preached it but for the Jews and Judaizers. The result of the controversy was that Christianity was made to appear as something entirely new, as a religion with a distinctive principle. We are left in doubt as to the content of his earliest preaching. Unless, it

may be remarked, he had seen in Christianity an opposition in principle to Judaism, he would not before his conversion have persecuted the new faith, nor have himself been persecuted as soon as he became its preacher. Weinel's insight is here truer than Wrede's. The doctrine of justification by faith was indeed a controversial weapon and was effective, as Wrede says, in emancipating Christianity from Judaism. But it was wielded by Paul so effectively because he had something to contend for, the reality of his own experience of salvation. It was a powerful weapon in the hands both of Paul and of Luther because in both cases it was forged in the heat of their own religious experience.

Could Paul, it is proper to ask, have become the man that he was apart from his theology—his views of sin, of justification, of faith, and of Jesus as the Crucified Saviour and glorified Son of God? It is not hinted by any one of our writers that this would have been possible. "His theology is his religion", Wrede admits (p. 48), and intimates that his theological writings have fed the religious life of Christian leaders from John to Luther. Wernle again scarcely believes that Paul could have been led to sainthood by any other than the theological road. The simple scheme of earlier Christianity, "Do God's will as Jesus taught it, and attach yourself to those who expect Jesus as their Lord", was, he says, for Paul "entirely inadequate". "Christianity was entirely a religion of redemption for him. He knew what that meant—to wish to do God's will and not be able to do it" (I. p. 76). The older form of religion would not, it is likewise intimated, have been adequate for the majority of Paul's hearers or been able to make headway among them. These, "belonging as they did to the classes that were morally degraded, were only too ready to accept the atoning death of Jesus which promised them remission of their punishment" (I. p. 188). But is the religion whose watchword is "Jesus as lawgiver", not "Jesus as redeemer", adequate to meet the religious needs of to-day? Into the answer to this question personal experience will largely enter. Such

a religion will not be adequate for those who, with the Apostle, know what it is to wish to do God's will and not be able to do it, nor for those who have found peace of conscience, moral strength and "joy in the Holy Ghost" in believing in the Christ whom Paul preached. Paul's theology and Paul's religion go together. His doctrines of grace will not be felt as a burden by those who share his experience of redemption, and with Paul call upon the name of the Lord Jesus Christ—his Lord and theirs.

But the religion of Jesus Himself, it is insisted, was something very different. He knew nothing of Paul's struggle and his antithesis of grace and the law. "That which Paul only learnt through the shipwreck of his old life, Jesus possessed from the very first as an original endowment" (I. p. 302). Why the absence of this antithesis in the case of Jesus? A sentence from Weinel, as we reflect upon it, may suggest the answer. "As a man increases in moral strength of character, so his conscience becomes more sensitive; he realizes more keenly the distance that separates him from the ideal, and hence the weight of the feeling of guiltiness oppresses him ever more heavily" (p. 92). We are not told why the best and holiest of men was an exception to this rule? The favorite text of the new criticism—"Why callest thou me good?"—is said to prove that Jesus places Himself entirely on the side of humanity. Yet our critics, while slow in dogmatic assertions of sinlessness, are equally so in suggesting any flaw in the character of Jesus. Weinel even says that Paul's dogmatic assertion that Jesus knew no sin, rests "indubitably upon the impression which the person of Jesus made upon the disciples" (p. 318). But the words of Jesus in the passage referred to imply that goodness is an attribute of Deity alone. The text may prove a double-edged sword in the hands of those who would exalt the character, but deny the divinity of Christ.⁷

⁷ Prof. N. Schmidt in "*The Prophet of Nazareth*", 1905, thus comments upon the passage in question: "When he humbly deprecates the title 'Good Master!' on the ground that none is good but one, namely, God, a majesty invests his figure such as no self-assertion could have

The apostle Paul as he is described in the Acts and Epistles is a wonderful man. About his figure lingers something of the mysterious glory which shone round him at Damascus. He was converted in a way which he himself regarded as without analogy in Christian experience. The choice of himself to be the herald of the good tidings to the Gentiles was something which excited his own wonder. Nobody could have imagined that the "chosen vessel" would be, not one of the Twelve who were disciples and followers of Jesus, but one who was His active and bitter enemy. Stranger even than the New Testament account of Paul is that which requires us to believe that he made havoc of the faith both before and after his conversion. He was the foremost champion of Christianity but in a sense its evil genius. He conquered heathenism, but only by preaching a new myth to the myth-loving Greeks. He freed Christianity from Judaism, but bound it fast with the fetters of dogma. Except for his work none of us would be Christians to-day, but our religion would now be better and purer if emancipated from his influence. He was the founder of the Church, but the Church must now, in sorrow or in anger, turn away from its creator.⁸

Are we then compelled by the facts to believe in this union of opposites? Was the Gospel which conquered the Roman world essentially new as compared with that of Jesus Himself and the original apostles? The evidence is to be found beside the Epistles only in the Gospels and the Acts. In the case of both of these we are at a disadvantage in using lent it" (p. 380). Why "a majesty", the reader may ask, unless He could rightly claim the title, and if so, what then?

⁸The new criticism is not friendly to the Pauline doctrine of the Fall, but it sees in Paul's doctrinal teaching something similar to this, a falling away from the purity of the primitive gospel which for centuries has to that extent corrupted the whole Church. The late Pastor Kalthoff, who knew no Christ after the flesh, denying His historical existence, criticized the new views from this standpoint, remarking that modern theology, in assuming "an immediate perversion and falling away from a pure original principle" has placed itself "outside the method of general historical science". (See Schweitzer: *Von Reimarus zu Wrede*, p. 312.)

the evidence, because of the alleged strong Pauline influence in both. If it is shown that the words of Jesus about Himself in the Gospels and the utterances of the apostles in the Acts are in harmony with the teaching of Paul, we are told that it is really Paul who is speaking to us out of the words of Jesus and His apostles. The evidence of Paul's own writings is, however, sufficient to show that there was no essential difference between the faith which Paul persecuted and that which he afterward preached. "Whether it be I or they", he said, about a point vitally affecting his Christology and his doctrine—that Christ died and rose again for our sins,—“so we preach, and so ye believed” (1 Cor. xv. 11). His written gospel in Galatians is said to be the same as was his oral gospel, and this, by implication, in the view of the churches of Judea which were in Christ, to have been the same as the faith of which he once made havoc (Gal. i.). The matter of discussion between himself and the other apostles was in relation to the Jewish law, and, however personal relations may at times have been strained, it is agreed both in Acts and the Epistles that here Paul's orthodoxy was completely recognized. In Paul's bitter contest with the Judaizers, neither party charged the other with different views of the person of Christ. The Jews persecuted equally Paul and “the churches of God which are in Judea in Christ Jesus” (1 Thes. ii.). Writing to the church at Rome where he had never been and claimed as yet no direct “fruit”, Paul describes his religion in words (“Christ in you, etc.”) which Weinel says are in accordance with the experience of all Christians of that time (p. 95). For some years he worked with Barnabas, a leader in the early church, and there is no trace of any difference of opinion except about John Mark, and the question of circumcision. Later his companion was Silas, a delegate from the Jerusalem Church. Why is it that upon the essential questions, “Who was Jesus?” “Did He die for our sins?” and “Did He rise again from the dead?” there is no trace in the New Testament of any disagreement between Paul and the earlier

apostles? It is significant that this question is not discussed by any of our authors. The only hint that we have observed toward an explanation of this singular agreement of the New Testament records is found in a single sentence of Wernle's second German edition (p. 177). It is said that while Paul makes of Jesus "an almost new creation", he yet uses the same titles as the apostles. This is a virtual confession that the difference in Christology so emphasized by the modern historian was not noticed by Paul himself or by the Jerusalem leaders. Even in the case of James, with whom according to the new theory the difference was most irreconcilable, the records give proof of essential agreement. This is shown by the title which Paul employs, "the Lord's brother," and by the fact, witnessed by both Acts and Epistles, of his laborious collection of alms for the Jerusalem Church.

When, further, we examine the contrast between the Christ of Paul and the Jesus of the Synoptics we find that it is not so sharp as is sometimes assumed. It is weakened, first, by admitted elements in the Gospels which may be harmonized with Paul, or were even introduced under Pauline influence, and, second, by the alleged fact that the Gospel miracles have almost hopelessly obscured the true portrait of Jesus. "Certain expressions and verses in St. Mark which were intended in anything rather than a Pauline sense suggested to it [a later age] quite naturally Pauline thoughts of the Son of God, of the atoning death of Jesus, of universal salvation, of the necessity of faith. Before the Gospel of John was written the Synoptists were read in a Johannine, that is, a Pauline sense." (Wernle II, pp. 251f.). Again it is said that "even in St. Mark the stories of the miracles, inserted because of apologetic interests, have produced a bizarre and fantastical picture" (II, p. 256). Wrede thinks that there are in Mark only remnants of a true view of the actual life of Jesus. This is overlaid by a superhistorical faith-construction and "the Gospel of Mark belongs in this sense to

the history of dogma" (quoted in Schweitzer, p. 336). From Mark then may be derived a Pauline Jesus, who equally with the Jesus of the Epistles is to be rejected, or else a Jesus discerned in shadowy outline underneath the Paulinism and the miracle. In the dilemma which Wrede proposes, "Jesus or Paul," the disjunction is hardly complete, for if we reject Paul and his teaching the Jesus of all four of our Gospels must really be rejected also. We must give up too, according to Wernle, much of the teaching of Jesus which still remains when the Pauline and miraculous elements have been removed. We must give up not only His own "fantastic and erroneous conception of His return" (I, p. 150) but even the Messianic idea which though accepted by Jesus (controlling according to the Gospels His whole thought) was yet foreign to Him, and accepted only under compulsion (I, p. 52). The contrast, we perceive, is not between the Christianity of Paul and the Christianity of the Gospels but between the Jesus of Paul and a Jesus in whose portrait, it may reasonably be claimed, essential features are lacking.

When finally we look in the Acts for traces of doctrinal disagreement between Paul and the other apostles, we are again disappointed. This is because both Paul and the other apostles are here (unconsciously, it is said) described not as they were but as a later age thought they should have been. It should be noticed that all our records fail us when we try to discover any radical difference between Paul and original Christianity. With Wernle's remark that in the account of the apostles in Acts, we "are concerned with dogma rather than with historical recollections" (II, p. 291) should be compared the conclusions of Harnack's recent monograph, *Lukas der Arzt*, (Leipzig, 1906). As the result of a patient investigation of the style of Acts and the verbal usage he comes to the conclusion that on the question of authorship "the critique is wrong and tradition right." With special reference to two English writers, Hobart and Hawkins, he examines anew the traces of medical phrase-

ology, and the stylistic agreement between the "we" passages and the rest of Acts and the Third Gospel, and is forced to the conclusion that both books in their entirety are the work of Paul's intimate companion, "Luke the beloved physician." Harnack does not believe that everything that Acts contains is true, but he contends that in Acts we are dealing with an author most advantageously situated to find out the facts, and not with conceptions of a later age. Harnack says: "If Luke and not some later and unknown compiler is the author of the great historical work, then the psychological and historical problem which is given us is extraordinarily great" (p. iv). Increasingly difficult does the rejection of Acts become, when it is tested not by a preconceived theory but with Ramsay, for instance, by the results of archaeological investigation. The picture of Paul's preaching in the Acts is moreover in perfect harmony with that derived from the Epistles. At Damascus he preaches Jesus as the Son of God, and at Antioch tells of a justification by faith not to be obtained through the law of Moses. The Acts ascribes to Paul just what the Epistles give us, not a new but a more developed theology.

An important result of the admitted Lucan authorship of the Third Gospel is that the Synoptic picture of Jesus, though portrayed here by a close friend of Paul, remains in its contents practically uninfluenced by Pauline thought. For example, Luke's story of the infancy is not, it is asserted, known to Paul, while the miracles which Luke narrates so freely in common with Matthew-Mark are not mentioned in the Epistles. Harnack indeed finds, in support of the conclusion that Luke wrote the Third Gospel, that Luke has more Pauline words than Matthew or Mark. Matthew has 29 words used by Paul but not found in the other Gospels, Mark has 20 such words in common with Paul, John 17 words, and Luke (Gospel) 84 words, 49 of which are verbs (p. 14). But these words, as will be found on examination of Harnack's list, are not theological terms. The technical terms of Paul's theology, such as "the righteousness of

God," "the righteousness of faith," "promise" (except in xxiv. 49), "grace" as opposed to works, "hope" and "sin" (in the singular) are lacking in the Third Gospel. As Dr. Fairbairn has said in a recent lecture in this country, "the words of Jesus as presented in the Gospels remain unaffected by Pauline writings." The Lucan authorship of the Gospel and Acts being established, we have a guarantee, first, that the evangelical tradition not only was not but could not be altered by the strongest Pauline influence, and, second, that in the opinion of one of the Synoptic writers, himself a companion of Paul, there was no essential novelty in Paul's Christianity. If the Lucan authorship of the Gospel and Acts be admitted, the theory that Paul was the founder of universal Christianity or of the Christian Church falls to the ground.

Socrates and Plato, says Emerson, form a double star which the most powerful telescope will not entirely separate. Jesus and His great apostle can be separated only by imagining another Jesus than the Jesus of the Gospels, and another Paul than the Paul of the Epistles or the Acts. The resulting construction, however brilliantly presented, is necessarily logically unstable and so improbable historically that the reader cannot but feel, in examining it, that he is dealing with "dogma" of a modern kind rather than with history: Herein perhaps, to borrow a phrase from Wernle, lies "its value and its worthlessness, its force and its fatality."

Lincoln University, Pa. WILLIAM HALLOCK JOHNSON.