Thus does Dr. ORCHARD preach his sermon. We wonder sometimes if it is a sermon or a song. But as soon as we come to the 'heads'—the inevitable three—we do not doubt that the song is a true sermon. What are the three heads of it?

The first is that love to Jesus must be love to a real historical person. It is the Christ of our own experience that we love? Yes, but the Christ of our own experience is the Christ of Calvary. Can you bring a case where it is not? And when it goes back to Calvary, it finds a Christ who demanded love, love before everything else, love and nothing else.

The second head is that our love to Jesus goes back to Jesus' love for us. The question 'Lovest thou me?' (Jn 21¹⁷), which is Dr. ORCHARD's text, presupposes 'as I have loved thee.' It is meaningless without that. It is impertinent. 'We love because he first loved us.' Here again Dr. ORCHARD thinks there is material for the psychologist. And for the theologian. For 'He loved

me and gave himself for me'—that the follower of Jesus can say that, never having seen Jesus in the flesh, and find a response to that in the passion of his own heart's love for Jesus, is surely both psychology and theology the most profound.

The third head is that it takes us back to God. 'God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son'—it takes us back to that. For without that we cannot explain the love of Jesus. And without the love of Jesus to us, we cannot explain our love to Jesus, as we have already seen. It takes us back to the love of God, where the psychologist is at fault, and even the theologian is in deep perplexity. But of the fact there is no doubt whatever. It is a chain. We know that God loves us because we love Jesus. His disciples might have loved Him because they found Him as a man well worthy of their love. But we who have not seen Him in the flesh could not love Him so. We could not love Him if He were not the Son of God. We could not love Him if it were not true that God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son.

The Theology of Paul and the Teaching of Jesus Christ.

BY REV. J. G. JAMES, M.A.; D.LITT., NEW BARNET.

WE are frequently being told that the theology of St. Paul as propounded in his Epistles is a hindrance rather than a help to those who would take the gospel of Jesus our Lord in all its directness and simplicity to their hearts. In one form or another this objection has been urged since the cry, 'The Return to Christ' was raised, and long before the Tübingen School came into being. The later developments in theology have brought it once more to the front, and we are continually hearing echoes of the same cry, that Paul corrupted the simplicity of the truth as it is in Jesus. Renan has thus stated the charge. 'The writings of Paul have been a stumbling-block and a peril; they have caused the chief defects in Christian

theology. Paul is the father of the subtle Augustine, the arid Aquinas, the sombre Calvinist, the sour Jansenist, and the ferocious theology which predestinates to damnation. Jesus is the father of those who seek repose for their souls in the dreams of the ideal world.'

It is really worth our while to look at this contention fairly and to consider what degree of truth there is in it. In so doing we may be enabled to bring out the distinctive value of Paul's testimony and the contribution he has made to religious truth. English writers do not as a rule seem to have taken a prominent place in this vital discussion, which has been going on now for some years, but it is a subject upon which every careful

and intelligent reader of the N.T. may come to a definite conclusion for himself.

Let us start with Arnold Meyer's statement of the case. He represents our Lord in the whole of His life and teaching as being perfectly simple and consistent, propounding the deepest truths as if no one could possibly doubt or question them. He appeals to nature and to human life; He judges by the instincts of His own good life and expects others to do the same. He has no system, no definite theology, no dogma of human depravity, no plan of salvation. God is near to every one who says to Him, 'Our Father.' With joy He promises in God's name the forgiveness of sins to all who repent and He never makes the additional demand of faith in the propitiatory sacrifice of His death. The only propitiation He knows is repentance and conversion. Our Lord can feel all confidence in the simple religious soul, even in the sinner who in penitence seeks after God.

Paul's doctrines form a striking contrast to all this. He is said to have had an entirely different conception of God. Like an Oriental ruler God displays the qualities of despotism and caprice. He can approach men only through His Son. If He would love His enemies and reach out His hand to them, He requires the propitiatory shedding of blood. Christ has died and risen again in order to bring men to God, and all that He has suffered and all that He has done had been planned beforehand for the redemption of men. This is Meyer's statement of the soteriology of Paul, and he calls it a theological drama, in which Christ plays the assigned part, and thus lost and helpless souls pass on to receive the foreordained doom of condemnation or grace.

Let me further quote from Wrede. In Jesus everything aims at the personal character of the individual. In Paul the central point is a divine act, in history, but transcending history, or a complex of such acts, which imparts to mankind a ready-made salvation. Whoever believes in these divine acts—the incarnation, the death and resurrection of a celestial being—receives salvation. This to Paul, says Wrede, is the sum of religion.

These are typical statements of a certain school of thought which I imagine most of us would condemn as being, to say the least, extreme. But whilst we should shrink from endorsing such sentiments as these, there are many amongst us who question whether Paul's theology has not made it

more difficult than otherwise for simple souls to accept the gospel, and who think it would be a distinct gain if men were content to leave Paul's theories severely alone, or at any rate hand them over to theologians to deal with, whilst adhering closely to the teachings of Jesus and especially to accept the revelation given by our Lord to men of God as their Father, with all that the doctrine of the Fatherhood involves. There has been a determined effort of late years to dissociate Jesus from Christianity as a system or a cult, and to lay upon Paul the responsibility of encumbering the religion of Jesus with an incubus of dogma which all succeeding ages have been engaged in unravelling and attempting to explain.

In the first place it is perhaps desirable to indicate in brief the point of contact between Paul and our Lord and to show how far the Apostle was influenced directly or indirectly by the teachings, the life, and the death and resurrection of his Master.

The question with some critics is not how much of Christ's teaching is to be discovered in Paul's Epistles and how far he was influenced by the materials that we find in the Synoptics, or in Q and Ur-Mark, but whether the Synoptics themselves were not influenced by Paulinism, inasmuch as they may have been produced later than the Epistles. On the surface of it this hypothesis looks absurd or as begging the whole question. The answer to this position seems to me to be that if the Gospels were under the influence of Paulinism at all they would have been much more so than they obviously are. This extreme position may, I think, be safely ignored in this paper.

A careful comparison of the Epistles of Paul with the Synoptics will yield probably far more striking evidences of Paul's knowledge of his Master than one might have suspected. And it is permissible to suppose that Paul passed over many of the details of our Lord's life and ministry in order to give the full significance of His death and resurrection and to explain the far-reaching and universal import of these facts for humanity and in the redemption of the race. It was surely not necessary for him to tell all that he knew about Jesus at a time when these facts would be known and accepted by all. At any rate he gave ample evidence that at least he knew that Jesus was 'a man' born of a woman, of the family of David, as wholly submissive to the Father's will, as worthy of the imita-

tion of all in that He pleased not Himself, that He instituted the last supper, that He was betrayed to death, and that on the third day He was raised from the dead and thereby declared to be the Son of God with power. This outline of facts seems to have been perfectly familiar to the apostle together with several of our Lord's specific teachings.

Nor are we to suppose that Paul claims to have received all his knowledge of Christ by direct revelation, without any kind of communication from the rest of the disciples. The facts connected with human redemption were a matter of common knowledge although the message of the gospel both for his own heart and for deliverance to the nations was doubtless received directly from the Lord Himself. None of the events connected with Jesus differed in any substantial manner from what we find recorded in the Synoptics, and we may well suppose that he received them through the ordinary channels of information.

May I be permitted to say in passing that I am not at all sure, in spite of the opinion of many eminent authorities, that Paul did not know Jesus personally in His earthly ministry? One is inclined to ask where Paul was during the course of the great tragedy which took place at Jerusalem. He was on the spot shortly afterwards and he may have witnessed and heard more than we give him credit for. I am inclined to agree with Johannes Weiss in regarding the passage in 2 Co 5¹⁶ as a practical admission that Paul did know Jesus after the flesh, but that he was not disposed to lay any stress upon the fact. It was rather that Christ knew *him*—knew him to be a true disciple and a new creature that really mattered. At one time he had been an enemy of Christ, but now he could claim to be an apostle equally with any of them.

Whether this position be accepted or not we may confidently affirm that Paul had every right to speak of himself as an apostle of our Lord, that he believed in Jesus Christ as the Son of God his Saviour, and that he deliberately set himself to carry out his Master's intentions, preaching the gospel of the grace of God in Christ's own spirit and with his Lord's approval. Feine very properly shows that Paul was familiar with the words and thoughts of the historic Christ, and in eschatology, the doctrine of redemption, in ethics, in his attitude towards the Law, his conception of baptism and in the Lord's Supper, he only carries to a further point of development what was already

embraced or implied within the teaching of our Lord Himself. Paul would not regard himself in any other light than as a servant of Christ, as His apostle, and his one effort was to know and proclaim his Lord. Paul had grasped the full meaning of Christ's ministry, and Christ was henceforth the aim and meaning of his whole being.

Whilst Feine and many others have so clearly expressed this as being the aim and intention of the Apostle, what are we to think of the apparently well-marked differences in the theology of Paul as compared with the gospel of Jesus? May he not have been unconsciously and unwittingly under other influences, and so have been the cause of divergences of which he himself was not aware? With the best possible intentions, may he not have started trains of thought and doctrine which were not in complete harmony with the simple teaching of his Lord?

It is so often asserted that Paul was under the influence of the Rabbinical Schools of thought that it is unnecessary for me to enter into the discussion of this point with any extended reference. He declares that he was advanced in the Jews' religion beyond many of his own age among his countrymen, that he was more exceedingly zealous for the traditions of his fathers, as touching the law a Pharisee, and that he was a Hebrew of the Hebrews. His frequent references to the words of the O.T., his quotations from the Book of Wisdom, his habit of referring to the sacred text, and his mode of reasoning are all suggestive of the Jewish Rabbi. As such he was well acquainted with the eschatological, the Messianic, and the apocalyptic ideas of his time, and was quite familiar with the doctrines that centred in the conception of the 'heavenly man.' The whole of his polemical and apologetic methods were those of the cultured and up-to-date Rabbi. This has been very largely the ground of the objection and even of reproach brought against Paul, that he has introduced far too much of the ideas and the methods of the Rabbinical Schools into the theology of the Christian religion.

Let me say what I fear will lay me open to somewhat severe criticism. I believe that Paul was far more largely under Hellenistic influences than has been generally allowed, and that he cannot be fully understood unless we give full consideration to this matter.

The very fact that Paul felt compelled on several

occasions to make such strong and emphatic declarations of his Hebrew origin and Rabbinical connexions suggests that for very good reasons he felt it necessary to do so, because in the eyes of many persons it must have seemed otherwise. It is true that he was on each occasion indicating what he had given up for Christ, but surely the Tarsian convert would have been suspect in the eyes of the stricter Pharisaical Schools, and it was necessary in consequence to state his standing in relation to the Law.

When we say that Paul was under the influence of Hellenism, what do we mean? Hellenism stood for the fusion of races, the unity of language, the union of cities and other political entities into one great harmony, and, above all, it stood for religious toleration. That Paul had every opportunity of coming under these influences and that he had some sympathy with these movements is undeniable. Paul was brought up at the feet of Gamaliel, a teacher whose breadth of vision is well known, as also the fact that he advised his pupils to study Greek literature. Tarsus, his birthplace, was the seat of the most thoroughgoing Greek culture of that day, and it affords the one example in history in which a state was ruled by the successive principals of its university. Sir W. M. Ramsay affirms that 'it was the one city which was suited by its equipoise between the Asiatic and the Western spirit to mould the character of the great Hellenistic Jew; and that it nourished in him a strong sense of loyalty and patriotism as the "citizen of no mean city"' (*The Cities of St. Paul*, p. 235).

There are abundant linguistic evidences that Paul was thoroughly conversant with the Greek literature of his day. He quotes Menander in 1 Co 15³³, 'Evil company doth corrupt good manners'; Aratus, or more probably Cleanthes, in Ac 17²⁸, 'We are also his offspring'; and Epimenides in Tit 1¹², 'Cretans are alway liars, evil beasts, idle gluttons.' His metaphors are Greek in regard to the mysteries (Col 1²⁶, Ph 4¹²), the life of the citizen—'commonwealth, fellow-citizens' (Eph 2¹⁹⁻¹⁹), and education—'tutor' or 'schoolmaster' (Gal 3²⁴). Paul's frequent use of the term 'conscience,' which is found so seldom elsewhere in the N.T., is quite a Stoic conception. His moral teaching takes up the best thoughts of Greek philosophy. In 1 Co 4⁸ he uses the Stoic phrases, and in Col 1 it is said by Weiss that the expressions in which Paul clothes his ideas (with regard to 'the image of the invisible

God,' 'the first-born of every creature,' etc.) are entirely Greek and were borrowed from the Stoic School. The Stoics laid great stress upon the law of nature; Paul employs the term quite in harmony with their usage. He uses delicate distinctions as *μορφή* and *σχῆμα* in referring to the Person of Christ (Ph 2^{6.7.8}), and his terms for spirit, soul, nature, etc., are thoroughly psychological. The great lyric in 1 Co 13, which has been termed the 'love-song of the Church,' has been adduced by Dr. Andrews as an instance of the strong vein of poetry which is to be found in Paul's nature. On the other hand, Canon Hicks says that it irresistibly reminds him of Aristotle's Nicomachean Ethics! Perhaps we may reconcile these two authorities by saying that the highest flights of philosophy are indistinguishable from poetry, and all true poetry is philosophy. Several passages in Paul remind one of the Nicomachean Ethics. The beautiful passage in 2 Co 5⁴ referring to the process of being clothed upon of immortality has an almost exact parallel in Aristotle (*N.E.* x. vii. 1177b, 33).

Several modern writers, particularly Schweitzer, will not allow that there is much in this contention, asserting that Paul had no first-hand acquaintance with the classic authors, but that his Hellenism came to him through the Alexandrine influences. But to me it seems highly important. We know that Jesus employed figures and parables that were decidedly Oriental and Syrian, but Paul found himself within, and had to deal with, an almost entirely different world, a world later in time and, as Asia Minor was, saturated with Greek thought. The gospel came in Jewish garb, or perhaps we should say in Oriental garb, but it had to pass through the thought-forms and the language of the Greeks, the most suitable medium, as the colloquial Greek was, for the people of that day with whom Paul had to deal. Indeed, I am inclined to go so far as to think that Paul's mystical sayings bear a far richer significance if we are permitted to read them in the thought-forms of the Platonic Idealism, with which I cannot think that Paul was wholly unacquainted. Mr. Claude G. Montefiore in his book on *Judaism and St. Paul* says that the Apostle was no Rabbinical Jew and that he did not really understand the Law, excepting in its fetters. Sir William M. Ramsay has stated the case very strongly when he asserts that it is 'unintelligible how so many distinguished

scholars in modern times can read his letters and continue to maintain that he was a narrow Jew, ignorant of Hellenic thought and training' (*The Cities of St. Paul*, p. 434).

However this may be, we may be sure that Paul owed nothing either to Hellenic thought or Rabbinical tradition for the gospel which he preached. His message was received direct from his Lord. Nevertheless he owed a great deal to both for his modes of expression and as the medium for conveying the truths of the redeeming love of God in Christ—truths that are of equal importance for Jew and Greek, barbarian and free.

At the present time a great deal is being written with the purpose of showing that early Christianity owes much of its teachings and all the principal events of our Lord's life and ministry, His death and resurrection to the influence of the cults of that age and especially to the Mystery Religions, and that Paul derived all his ideas with regard to the sacraments from these sources. There can, I think, be little doubt that the Apostle manifests a full acquaintance with these mysteries and that many of his conceptions were framed with these cults in view. So far as we know what the mystery religions actually taught, it seems that they were so crude and almost revolting, and devoid of moral force and dignity, that one wonders how they could have been compared with the gospel story or the teachings of Paul. We can understand that Paul referred implicitly to these esoteric teachings to point the contrast between them and the supreme mystery of godliness. Nor have I any sympathy with Weinel's view that we have in Paul two forms of religion, the one sacramental and the other spiritual, standing side by side, without any attempt at co-ordination. He asserts that the sacramental element was derived from the mystery religions and has become through the ages the basis and the justification for all the distinctive Catholic doctrines. If these two irreconcilable elements really exist in St. Paul's teachings, which I very much doubt, either of the two would have destroyed the other in the experience of a mind so logical and well balanced as that of the Apostle.

Now we come to what is specifically the main point of this paper. In what respects does Paulinism differ from the essential gospel truths as taught by Jesus Christ, and what do these differences involve?

Let us observe that whilst Paul received his gospel from Christ Himself and would admit no possibility of there being another Gospel, his work and mission were entirely different from those of his Master. Paul's distinctive work was to present the gospel to the nations and the Gentiles, and to show that they had the same claim to the benefits of Christ's redemptive work as the Jews. The ministry of Jesus was especially and almost exclusively confined to the chosen people. He was not sent but to the lost sheep of the House of Israel. These were to have the first chance in the offer of salvation through God's mercy and grace. But in order to do this our Lord has to take the Law, which was their especial gift and sacred deposit from God, and unfold its true and full meaning extensively and intensively. By enforcing its true inwardness and its spiritual significance He was demonstrating the fact that He had not come to destroy but to fulfil the Law and the Prophets. This was precisely what the Hebrew people, especially the scribes and the Pharisees, could not or would not apprehend, hence their rejection of a Teacher so penetrative and so searching. He came to fulfil the Law and the Prophets, and never said a word about abrogating or setting aside the Mosaic code. What their own Law, revered and almost worshipped by them, really meant was precisely that which the Hebrew nation required to know.

Paul took up the same attitude as his Master with respect to the moral claims of the Law. To him love was the fulfilling of the Law. He almost repeated the very words of Christ when he said that He had fulfilled the Law for us, and that Christ is the end of the Law for righteousness to every one that believes. But what about 'the lesser breeds without the Law?' His mission, unlike that of his Master, was especially to them. The standing before God of both Jew and Gentile was by faith and not by the works of the Law. It was faith which led to obedience that was the sole ground of justification before God for the Jew no less than for the Gentile. The Jew was not saved simply because his race was included within the scope of the covenant or because he possessed the Law. It was because, as a truly spiritual child of Abraham, he exercised faith in the God of the covenant. Christ, he argued, had fulfilled and satisfied the Law for all, and therefore the Gentiles were put in precisely the same

position before God as the Jews. In Christ Jesus all are one, neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision, but a new creation. Neither Jew nor Greek could keep the Law in its entirety. All alike were condemned and included under sin in order that all might alike share in the covenant of grace. Weinel has well expressed the matter. 'The two roads to salvation are therefore descent from Abraham and justification. . . . The experience of his life showed him that the road of righteousness was an impossible one. No one can acquire so much righteousness of his own as to be quite sure of God's acquittal. Rather all men are sinners, Gentiles as well as Jews, and both are condemned by the law itself, the former by the law which is written in their own hearts, the latter by the detailed laws of Moses. All are sinners, and all therefore have come short of the heavenly glory of God. There is no righteous man; no, not one. Neither amongst the Gentiles, nor among the children of Abraham. All alike deserve to go to hell.'

All this reasoning, which appears to so many people to be unnecessarily intricate and which is regarded as a corruption of the simplicity of the gospel, was designed to make it perfectly clear for those who were outside the borders of the chosen race that they equally with the Jews could claim the benefits of Christ's redemptive work. Paul was but applying to the people of his day the scope of the profound utterance of our Lord, 'God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have eternal life.' As an answer to those who sought to re-impose the Mosaic ritual upon Gentile Christians this reasoning was most effective and conclusive. Paul was not, in his elaborate arguments in the Epistles to the Romans and the Galatians, encumbering the gospel with speculations of his own, still less was he importing Rabbinical conceptions and limiting ideas into his message. On the contrary, he was endeavouring to demonstrate the liberty of the gospel and freedom from the Law. He was universalizing the religion of Jesus, and was indicating the basis upon which that universality rested. In giving the true universal significance to the gospel message he was merely setting forth and developing his Master's own teaching and applying it altogether in harmony with his Master's intention. He thus

not only attempted to free the Christian religion from the limitations of the Jewish faith, but actually succeeded in doing so. Jesus had pronounced Woes against the lawyers of His time because they shut up the kingdom of God against men, Paul in the Galatians attacked the lawyers and also the Law because it set up a barrier between Jews and Gentiles. It is passing strange that Jesus, as He said, came to fulfil the Law, but made it so spiritual in its connotation that He was condemned for doing violence to it; on the other hand, Paul, who demonstrated that the Law was rendered of none effect, has through the centuries been accused of being a legalist!

It was the Rabbinical element in Paul that led him to narrow the scope of salvation, to oppose Jesus Christ, and to persecute the Church. When Christ had set him free from the Law, what a freedom was that! He was released for all those glorious activities which gave full play to what was best in Hellenistic aspirations, a kingdom of God with world-wide intention, that would break down the partition between the nations as well as give full religious and spiritual freedom.

Nor must it be forgotten that in all his teaching Paul was speaking directly out of his own experience to those who needed special help, the very help which Paul was commissioned to give. Dr. Andrews in his invaluable little book, *The Value of the Theology of St. Paul for Modern Thought*, has made this fact perfectly clear, and he rightly maintains that no one can understand Paul, the theologian and apostle, who does not study Paul, the man. Paul had found that his own mystic union with Christ, his Saviour and Lord, had brought to his soul the satisfaction and peace which the most punctilious observance of the Law had never afforded. And it was when he was brought face to face with the problems which arose out of the conflict with Judaizing teachers and all that was opposed to his universalistic schemes and the wideness of God's mercy that he elaborated his theological system which we find unfolded in the Epistles to the Romans and the Galatians.

Let us pass to the consideration on broad lines of the relations of morality and religion as set forth by Paul, as compared with those of Jesus Christ. It is here where many people conceive the greatest divergence to lie, but where, as it seems to me, the greatest harmony exists. The

contrast is often presented as that of the ethical teaching of Jesus with the speculative thought of Paul. But where is really the meeting-place of ethics and religion? Is it not in pure and holy love, love to God and man based upon the experience of God's forgiving love to us in Christ? In this respect the Apostle and his Master are absolutely at one. On the two commandments of love, said the Master, hang all the Law and the Prophets. Paul ever maintained that love is the fulfilling of the Law. The parables of our Lord emphasized the importance of love in its practical expression, and yet Paul was applying the same principle of love in quite another set of circumstances to actual cases, when he insisted that a newly found Christian liberty was not to be used in such a way as to cause a brother to stumble or to be made weak. It may be urged that Paul laid more stress upon faith in the finished work of Christ than he did upon love, whilst Jesus made love the ground of approach. Still, it must not be forgotten that Jesus always insisted upon the full acceptance of Himself in faith and His words by obedience as the necessary conditions of any spiritual blessing. Paul's great Ode to Love, in which faith and hope are subordinated to love, to say nothing of other great spiritual gifts, could never have been written by one who was hide-bound with Rabbinical lore or theological pre-occupations. Love was for him the life-blood of all morality and religion, it overleaped all the barriers of time and place and circumstance, it was 'the more excellent way.' This teaching was the transcript and reflex of his own life and character; one has only to think of what he suffered in the interests of others and for his Master's sake to realize the truth of this statement. As Weiss has pointed out, the emphasis laid upon love indicates that in this respect Paul understood Jesus 'inwardly, deeply, and correctly.' Those who speak of the ethical teaching of Jesus so as to imply that Paul had no ethical teaching must surely have forgotten Ro 14, in which the Sermon on the Mount is brought to bear upon the specific needs of the Romans of Paul's day. The ethic of Paul, as Weiss has so fully and admirably shown, is an invaluable contribution to the totality of Christian morality. Men are taught that they must not retaliate; it is better to suffer wrong than to inflict it. The non-resistance of one who loves God and

his fellows is inspired by a divine and fine contempt for the powers of evil. Men are to bear the misfortunes of life in a brave and cheerful spirit, anxious for nothing but to do the will of God, and committing all else to the ordering of the Heavenly Father's wisdom and love. They are to please not themselves, but their brother for his good to edification. All this is in complete harmony with the Master's own spirit. Where minor points of difference occur it will be noticed that Paul was dealing with a different set of conditions; and it must ever be borne in mind that Paul had the task of organizing Christian communities, whilst his Master was dealing with individuals and was inaugurating the kingdom.

I can quite believe that some of my readers may ask why I have not dealt with two of the distinctive doctrines of Paul, viz. original sin and predestination. It must be said in reply that either one of these would take more than the whole of the space that I have at my disposal for this paper. With regard to the former, one need hardly do more than point out that, whatever view of the subject we adopt, original sin takes its place in Paul's great argument that the whole race needs redemption as a race, and that none can stand before God on the ground of merit. As therefore the race needs to be redeemed, Christ is a perfect Saviour by offering a cosmic sacrifice and propitiation by His death. Likewise with regard to predestination, assuming that it is true that God's people are the chosen and elected, yet, as Paul argues, that very election is grounded in the mercy and the free grace of God. So that for all the nations, the Gentiles as well as the Hebrews, the gift of salvation is freely bestowed, and the new covenant of grace may include all. It should not be forgotten that the germs of both these doctrines are found in the teaching of the Master Himself.

There is, of course, one essential difference between Paul and Jesus, and that was precisely the difference which we should expect to find between the disciple and his Master, the sinner and his Saviour. That is the spirit of reverence, dependence, and faith in Christ which runs through the whole of Paul's life and teaching. With all his fulness of utterance and with all the grateful adoration of the Apostle for his Lord, we cannot but feel that the underlying thought is too deep for expression, feelings that broke through language

and escaped, when he sought to convey to others all that Christ meant for him.

It is here, as it seems to me, that the thought-forms of the Platonic philosophy came to his help, although Paul was expressing what far transcended the Platonic or any other philosophy. More than all that Plato meant in his doctrine of ideals we have in Philippians, where Paul sets His Lord before him as the prize, the mark, and the goal of the whole of his vital activity. Christ was to him the reality of the personal Ideal, to whose form and likeness he had to approximate more and more. Christ was to him his highest good, the purpose and aim as well as the significance of his whole being. He longed to be found in Him, not having his own righteousness, but the righteousness which is of God through faith. His life was hid with Christ in God, and yet he could say, 'I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me.' Paul felt that his vital interest, his true being, was not in himself, the actual sinful Paul, but in his Ideal, his Lord. In this mystic union of Paul with Christ there was no Pantheistic tendency, no blending or confusion of the centres of personal entity, but it was a conception of the Christ as the Ideal, who, whilst being the end and the fulfilment of his soul's aspiration and the object of his faith, was being formed in him, and who was shaping and moulding his life and character, and upon whose personality, death and resurrection, his whole life was being formed and modelled. Thus could he say that his life was to be found in Christ and Christ in him. This is not the *unio mystica* of the mystery religions, but an ethical union, as Professor Pringle Pattison has said, constituted by love and mediated through faith. Whilst the form may have been Platonic, the content was the living Gospel of his Lord, nay, the very Christ Himself. Whilst the revelation came to his soul through the immediacy of faith he acknowledged that he owed the whole of his message to Jesus the crucified, who was still living in all His resurrection power as his Saviour and his Lord.

The theology of Paul, therefore, was intended for distinctly practical purposes in regulating, instructing, and organizing the Churches which he had formed or in which he was specially interested.

It was not an attempt to formulate in precise terms the dogmas of the Christian Church, and yet it has been the basis of all theological thought in the ages since. Moreover the theology of Paul has always been associated with every great movement of the Church in Evangelical fervour and enthusiasm. One has only to claim for Paul a deeper study of his doctrines in the light of his own personal experience to discern that he was in spirit nearer to his Lord than one might have thought. 'He who would understand Paul aright,' one has said, 'should seek to find him at the height of his ideal, and then he would discover that he is not far distant from Jesus.' He enlarged upon and sought to explain the redemptive work of Christ, its far-reaching scope and its universality. He indicated its bearing upon the needs of humanity, man's sinfulness and his capacity for knowing and serving God in Christ and finding life eternal. But in all this he was expanding and interpreting our Lord's own declaration that He came to give His life a ransom for many, and all the doctrines of redemption centred in that supreme act of self-sacrifice which in reality had a larger content of truth than all the doctrines and dogmas could elucidate. This was Paul's theme, and to the exposition of it he devoted his whole life until the time came for him to lay that life down for the Master's sake and to go to be with his Lord, and receive the crown of righteousness.

The leading characteristic of Paul's teaching was that he owed all that he was to Christ, his Lord. Christ in His perfect holiness, Paul through Christ's redemptive work, Christ in His eternal Sonship, Paul through the grace of God, Christ as the manifestation of the infinitely holy love of the Father, Paul by means of that unspeakable love that chose and singled him out, Christ as the Saviour and Lord, Paul the Apostle, were infinitely removed the one from the other, and yet at the same time were in vital relation and perfect union. Meyer has splendidly expressed it when he said, "Back to Jesus from Paul," does not express what is required of us, but our motto should be, "Back through Paul to Jesus and God," and our conclusion, "Paul just one who points the way to Jesus and God."