

*THE MODERN OVERESTIMATE OF PAUL'S
RELATION TO CHRISTIANITY.*

OF late years there has been a decided inclination in certain quarters to overestimate the place and influence of Paul in the origination and early diffusion of Christianity. In some cases this has been done almost to the extent of putting Christ aside altogether, and making Paul the real founder of the Christian faith and Church. This course has been followed more especially by anti-supernaturalist critics, but even authors of the more positive and Catholic side have sometimes manifested the same tendency.

In general we may say that this overestimate of the part played by Paul in the founding of Christianity has been a characteristic of the more immediate school of Baur. This fact is frankly acknowledged by Professor Pfeiderer himself. He says:—"In the case of the earlier theologians of the so-called Tübingen School there was perceptible a certain inclination, in dwelling on the theological originality of the Apostle Paul, to put into the background his religious dependence on Jesus in such a way that it might seem as if Christianity had proceeded really not from Jesus, but from Paul. That was, indeed, never Baur's opinion; but in his pupil Schwegler's account of primitive Christianity an inference of this kind might undoubtedly seem to be implied. The inference has been subsequently made by others, and most distinctly by the philosopher Edouard von Hartmann, in his work on the *Entwicklung des religiösen Bewusstseins der Menschheit*. According to Von Hartmann, Paul, as 'the inventor of heathen (Gentile) Christianity and the dogma of Salvation,' is alone entitled to be considered the

author of the Christian religion of Salvation.”¹ And Pfeiderer himself admits that, “It is true that the Messianic movement would not have become the universal religion of Christianity without the work of Paul.”² Again, he elsewhere says, “It was Paul who rescued the life-work of Jesus from sticking fast, and perishing under the ban of Jewish traditionalism, inasmuch as he freed the Christian faith from the religion of the law, and thereby first made it an independent religion, and a religion for humanity.”³ As a very high authority says, “For this writer Paulinism is Christianity.”

As a pronounced example of the same tendency in our own country we may adduce *The Natural History of Christianity* by Dr. William Mackintosh. In this volume the author would fain persuade us to believe that Paul is practically the founder of Christianity as commonly understood. He draws a sharp “distinction between the religion of Jesus and the Pauline or Christian religion,” that is, the prevalent Christianity from Christ downwards. He speaks of the passage from the one to the other as “a fall,” and says, “This fall consisted in the conversion of the simple doctrine of Jesus into the complex dogma of St. Paul, by which the whole subsequent development of Christian theology has been determined.”⁴ And again he says, “It is just possible that the religion of Jesus, in its simple, calm, and somewhat jejune form, could not of itself have maintained its place in the world, nor have supplied the generating principle of a renovated society. But St. Paul, by retaining in connexion with it some of the inherited forms of religious thought, and by casting it in the historico-dogmatic form in association with the life and person of Jesus, was enabled to procure for it entrance into men’s minds.”⁵ In view of the above, and

¹ Pfeiderer, *Hibbert Lectures*, 1885, pp. 8 f. (3rd edition).

² *Ibid.*, p. 10.

³ *Urchristenthum*, pp. 27 f.

⁴ *The Natural History of the Christian Religion*, pp. 402 ff.

⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 338 f.

much more to the same effect, Professor Bruce has good ground for his assertion that "On the Tübingen theory, Christianity would have been a failure but for Paul," and for his protest against "the widespread tendency to make him the author of Christianity."¹

There must, of course, be some ground to give a semblance of truth to the view that Paul is the originator and founder of Christianity, and the apparent ground is not difficult to find. It lies mainly in the fact that he is the greatest *enunciator* of Christian truth, and people do not always distinguish between the enunciator and the originator. Christ Himself *is* Christianity, and it was not so much His work to formulate it as to *be* Christianity and to *make* it. But Paul as an apostle enunciated, and, as a man of logical mind and training, naturally worked out in somewhat systematic form, the truth existing and incarnate in Christ, and no doubt gave the shaping of the doctrines a flavour of his own idiosyncrasy. Nevertheless he is only the enunciator, the expositor of what is in Christ, and he did not originate the doctrines any more than does the theologian of the present day, when he enunciates and expounds them in his system of theology.

Furthermore, when the death of Christ took place, a new factor of prime importance was introduced, a new point of departure was reached in the development of Christian doctrine. The Crucifixion called for an explanation of its meaning, and this led the way to a full statement and enunciation of the doctrine of the Atonement, of which Christ in His teaching had naturally only given the germ, His death not yet being an accomplished fact. This exposition of the atoning significance of Christ's death it fell to Paul as well as to Peter and John to make, but this by no means proves that he was the originator of the doctrine. It already existed as an *historical fact* in the Crucifixion,

¹ *Apologetics*, pp. 413, 416.

and he only gave expression to it. Moreover, the *development of doctrine* resulting from Christ's promise of the Spirit to guide the apostles into all truth (John xiv. 26, xv. 13) led to a fuller statement of doctrine all along the line. In this development, Paul, like the other apostles, had his share, otherwise there would have been no great reason for his existence as a revealer of Christian truth. But because of this further development of the truth beyond the mere teaching of Jesus Himself, we must not be misled to regard the Apostle as the founder or inventor of Christianity, or even of any special truth which he may have enunciated. Not only is all the developed doctrine to be found in germ in Christ's own teaching; it fully exists in the personal Christ, and Paul merely gives us an enunciation of it.

In passing from the substance of Christianity to the evidence for it, we find without doubt that the evidence furnished by Paul and his experience is of the very highest importance. The facts of his Pharisaic upbringing and belief, his position as a contemporary and a persecutor who knew all about Christianity as looked at from the side of its deadly enemies, the suddenness and sincerity of his conversion, his complete surrender of all for Christ, his manifold persecutions and his final martyrdom, all enthusiastically borne, form a proof of the weightiest kind. Furthermore, this proof is greatly intensified by the fact that his first four epistles are acknowledged by all fair and competent critics to be unquestionably genuine, and written before A.D. 60, so that we have an accepted foundation on which to rest the proof. Altogether the proof from Paul has the great advantage of being very definite, capable of being expressed in brief form and of being easily grasped, so that it is one of the most useful working apologetic arguments. But any such overestimate as would make it the only reliable, or even the supreme proof of Christianity is a mistake, and can be productive only of evil. Such a

view is not only an aberration from historical fact, but it introduces confusion, if we may so say, into the curve of Christianity by making what should be a perfect circle, with Christ for its centre, into an ellipse with Paul and Christ for its two foci. Moreover, it ultimately tends to weaken the proof by leading inquirers to look to Paul for the supreme evidence for Christ, instead of looking directly to Christ Himself; in other words, to look to the moon for the evidence of the existence of the sun, rather than to the sun itself. Our object is to show that the general view stated above is exaggerated, if not altogether untrue.

For one thing, Christianity and the Christian Church existed before the conversion of Paul, and even in spite of all his bitter persecution. He refers once and again, in his four unquestionable Epistles, to his furious persecutions of the Church: "I am the least of the apostles, that am not worthy to be called an apostle, because I persecuted the Church of God" (1 Cor. xv. 9); and again: "Beyond measure I persecuted the Church of God and made havock of it" (Gal. i. 13). Furthermore, Christianity and the Church not only existed before his conversion, but were widely spread and still spreading. He speaks of "the Churches in Judæa which were in Christ" before his conversion (Gal. i. 22); and when he was arrested by Christ on his way to Damascus, he was on an errand of persecution, which shows that the Church had already gained a settlement in that distant city. From all this it appears most clearly that Christianity and the Church not only existed, but had obtained a wide hold before his conversion, and that even in spite of his fanatical persecution; and how, then, can it be said with any reason that Paul was the founder of Christianity and the Christian Church, which he did his very utmost to annihilate?

We would draw attention to the important fact that, though Paul was the Apostle of the Gentiles, he was

plainly not the first to preach the gospel to them and admit them into the Christian Church. Before his apostolic work began, Philip the Evangelist had already admitted the Ethiopian eunuch; Peter had baptized Cornelius and his circle; and we read that they "that were scattered upon the tribulation that arose about Stephen travelled as far as Phœnicia and Cyprus and Antioch, speaking the word to none save only to the Jews. But there were some of them, men of Cyprus and Cyrene, who, when they were come to Antioch, spake unto the Greeks also, preaching the Lord Jesus. And the hand of the Lord was with them; and a great number that believed turned unto the Lord" (Acts xi. 19-21, R.V.). The statement of Weizsäcker—"There can be no doubt that the marvellous extension of the faith beyond the limits of Judaism, in other words, Gentile Christianity, was due to Saul, soon now to be called Paul, and to no other"¹—goes quite beyond the New Testament record.

If we turn our attention to the great mother-churches of the first Christian age, those Churches which were the centres of Christian life, influence, and conquest, we shall find, singularly enough, that only one of them owed its origin to Paul, and that one of the less important. The first of these mother-churches is that of Jerusalem; but with the founding of this one, of course, Paul had nothing to do. All that he did with regard to it was to persecute it to the uttermost. The next mother-church is that of Antioch; but the Apostle had just as little to do with the planting of this Church as of that at Jerusalem. It had been founded some years before Barnabas brought him upon the scene, and it was only the splendid success with which the Gospel met at Antioch that led Barnabas to seek and fetch Saul from Tarsus to be a fellow-helper (Acts xi. 19-26). With Ephesus it is somewhat different. Paul

¹ *Apostolic Age*, vol. i. p. 93 (Williams and Norgate).

was the founder of the Ephesian Church (Acts xix.); but that Church can scarcely be regarded as of the first rank among the original mother-churches. As Weizsäcker frankly admits, "All that we know of the termination of Paul's long residence there discloses not only a gloomy result, but absolutely a destruction of all his work,"¹ and in any case, at a comparatively early date, the candlestick of Ephesus was removed out of its place. The next great mother-church we naturally mention is that of Alexandria; but with it also Paul had absolutely nothing to do. And last, and in some respects the most important of all, is the Church at Rome. But of this, again, we know for certain that the Apostle was not the founder. Several years before he ever saw Rome, in the year 58, when he wrote his Epistle to the Romans, the Church in that city must have been of many years' standing. It was already influential and well known throughout infant Christendom: "Your faith is spoken of throughout the whole world" (Rom. i. 8); "Your obedience is come abroad unto all men" (Rom. xvi. 19). Even making due allowance for the Church at Ephesus, we may confidently say that the great evangelizing centres of the first Christian age owed their origin to other workers than Paul. The Churches which he founded in Asia, Macedonia, and Greece never attained to any such importance and influence as those of Jerusalem and Antioch, Alexandria and Rome. To quote from Renan: "His Churches were either not very solid or they disowned him. The Churches of Macedonia and Galatia, which are indeed his own proper work, have little importance in the second and third centuries. The Churches of Corinth and Ephesus, which do not belong to him by a title so exclusive, pass over to his enemies, or do not feel themselves to be founded canonically enough if they have been founded only by him."²

¹ *Apostolic Age*, vol. ii. pp. 162, 165.

² *Saint Paul*, pp. 563 f.

It might, however, have been possible on other grounds to make out a case for the high position claimed for Paul. He might have been the recorder of facts in our Lord's life and work of such fundamental importance that without them Christianity and the Christian Church could not have survived. But this, we need scarcely say, is not the case. The facts with regard to our Lord's history recorded by Paul, and not explicitly mentioned by the Evangelists, are few and unimportant. They are such as His appearances after the resurrection to the five hundred brethren, and to James (1 Cor. xv. 6, 7). Beyond all question, it is not on Paul's Epistles, but on the record of the four Gospels, that the Church has always lived, and upon them it has always depended for that powerful picture of the life and character of Christ which has in all ages captivated and held in thrall the minds, the hearts, and the imaginations of men. As their very place at the beginning of the New Testament implies, it is the Gospels and not the Epistles of Paul that form the foundations of Christianity and the Church. Without these Gospels Paul's Epistles themselves would want their proper foundation; they would be left hanging in mid-air, and could not even be understood. "To people who had never heard the principal Gospel narratives, his Epistles would present insoluble enigmas at every line."¹

It might, however, be supposable that the doctrines of Christianity revealed by Paul, and by him alone, are of such importance as to be absolutely essential to its existence in the world. But this is equally untenable. All the fundamental doctrines which he reveals are already to be found in Jesus and the teaching of Jesus in the four Gospels. It is Christ, and not Paul, that is the originator of them. This will be seen at once by a rapid review of what are regarded as the leading characteristic doctrines of the Apostle. He teaches the doctrine of universal sinfulness (Rom. iii. 23);

¹ Sabatier, *The Apostle Paul*, p. 83.

but so does Christ: "If ye, *being evil*, know how to give good gifts unto your children" (Matt. vii. 11); "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God" (John iii. 3). Paul teaches explicitly the divinity of our Lord (Rom. ix. 5, etc.); but so does Christ Himself when He says, "I and My Father are one" (John x. 30 with 33), and when He declares it to be the Divine purpose "that all men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father" (John v. 23). Paul teaches the doctrine of the Atonement; but so does Christ before him: "The Son of Man came to give His life a ransom for many" (Matt. xx. 28; Mark x. 45). Paul teaches justification, or salvation by faith in Christ; but so does the Master: "He that believeth on Me is not condemned" (John iii. 18); and again, in the Parable of the Pharisee and the Publican, He says of the latter, "This man went down to his house justified rather than the other" (Luke xviii. 14). Paul teaches the doctrine of regeneration—"the washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Ghost" (Titus iii. 5); but so emphatically does Christ: "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God" (John iii. 5). Paul teaches the federal headship of Christ; he calls Him "the last Adam" (1 Cor. xv. 45); but so also does Christ: He speaks of Himself as "the Son of Man," and of His blood as "the blood of the new covenant" (Matt. xxvi. 28), in which latter expression we have to think of Him as our covenant or federal Head. Again, if the Apostle dwells on Christ's headship over the angelic world and His cosmical relationship (Eph. i. 20, 21; Phil. ii. 9-11, etc.), is not the germ of this teaching already to be found in Christ's own utterance: "All power [authority] is given unto Me in heaven and in earth" (Matt. xxviii. 18)? One of the characteristic doctrines of Paul is said to be the contrast between "the flesh and the spirit," but we find the

germ of this also in Christ's own teaching: "That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit" (John iii. 6; cf. also Matt. xxvi. 41). Paul teaches the universal destination of Christianity: "There is neither Jew nor Greek, circumcision nor uncircumcision, Barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free" (Col. iii. 11); but we have the same universalism already in Christ, and in the noblest key: "God so loved the world, that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life" (John iii. 16); "This gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness to all nations" (Matt. xxiv. 14). Paul teaches the sovereignty of God in election; but Christ says, "All that the Father giveth Me shall come unto Me" (John vi. 37). Once more, Paul teaches the resurrection, the last judgment, the future perdition of the wicked, and the blessedness of believers, but so does Christ before him: "The hour is coming, in the which all that are in their tombs shall hear His voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of judgment" (John v. 28, 29). We need only to recall to mind the well-known passage in the twenty-fifth chapter of Matthew (*vv.* 31-46), closing with the solemn words, "And these shall go away into eternal punishment; but the righteous into eternal life." Nothing can be more certain with regard to the doctrines that Paul teaches than that it is Christ who is the original, and not Paul, though at times the specific form may be his. Indeed, Paul himself, in one of his unquestioned Epistles, declares this in the most emphatic language: "I make known to you, brethren, as touching the gospel which was preached by me, that it is not after man. For neither did I receive it from man, nor was I taught it, but it came to me through revelation of Jesus Christ" (Gal. i. 11, 12). "I know not," says Godet, "of what part of the teaching

or work of Paul one would not find the principle already laid down in the life and words of the Lord. Jesus has, if I may say so, drawn the apex of the angle, of which Paul has only prolonged the sides.”¹

In like manner it would be easy to show that there is no essential doctrine of Christianity taught by Paul which has not been explicitly taught by some one of the other New Testament writers; but to prove this in detail is quite unnecessary to our purpose. It is certain that if all Paul's Epistles had been lost, our creed would in no material way be different from what it is, although the technical statement of some of the doctrines might be slightly different. This is settled most briefly and conclusively by Paul's own emphatic declaration in Galatians ii. He tells us there that, when at Jerusalem, he compared his gospel with that of the three “pillars, James, Cephas, and John,” and he explicitly states, “They imparted nothing unto me, and gave to me and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship” (Gal. ii. 6, 9). Indeed, the whole passage shows most clearly that his teaching coincided with theirs.

And what we have shown to be true with regard to the doctrines is equally true with regard to the organization and ordinances of the Church. They are all pre-Pauline. The government of the New Testament Church was very simple. It embraced two, or at the most three, classes of ordinary office-bearers, and all these existed before Paul entered on his apostolic work. This is true of the Deaconship. We read of its institution by the other apostles, when Paul was still Saul the persecutor (Acts vi.). The office of Elder also already existed before his conversion—was indeed older than Christianity itself. In any case, we read of its existence at Jerusalem when Paul visited that city at the close of his first period of work at Antioch (Acts xi. 30), and it is certain that he did not institute it there. And if we regard

¹ *Introduction to the Epistles of St. Paul*, pp. 619 f.

the Evangelist as a separate office, we find "Philip, the Evangelist" at his work (Acts viii.) before the conversion of the Apostle. In like manner, when we contemplate the Sacraments of the Church, we find them both in full practice before his memorable journey to Damascus. We gather this not merely from the Gospels and the record of his baptism in Acts ix. 18, but from his own unquestioned Epistles. He refers to the fact of his own baptism when he says, "As many of *us* as were baptized into Christ were baptized into His death" (Rom. vi. 3, 4), so that Christian baptism must already have been in practice in the Church. The same is true of the Lord's Supper. He speaks of his receiving the form of institution from Christ, and he declares expressly that it was instituted by Christ Himself (1 Cor. xi. 23-29). In other words, nothing new or important in the radical organization of the Church is due originally to Paul.

With the preceding line of argument the fact agrees that the use of Paul's Epistles among the earliest writers of the Church was by no means predominant, and is far from suggesting that he was the founder of Christianity. Indeed, the very opposite is the case. It is true that we find explicit mention of the Apostle and his First Epistle to the Corinthians in the Epistle of Clement of Rome; but that is very naturally accounted for by the fact that Clement is writing to the Corinthian Church. Certainly, unless we accept Hebrews as an Epistle of Paul, Clement's Epistle bears almost as much the impress of Peter as of Paul. The influence of his Epistles on the Epistle of Barnabas and on the Didaché is small in the extreme, indeed, is scarcely traceable at all. In the Epistles of Ignatius (shorter recension) we have only six or seven very brief quotations or reminiscences. We do find a number of Pauline references in the Epistle of Polycarp, perhaps partly accounted for by the fact that the author

is writing to the Philippians, one of Paul's Churches. In any case, taking the references as given in Lightfoot's *Apostolic Fathers*, we find twenty-six from the Apostle Paul and nine from Peter, which shows a much higher proportion from the latter. When we come to Justin Martyr, we find that, with numerous references to the Gospels, there are only a few dim reminiscences and phrases traceable to Paul's writings, and not a single explicit quotation. Of course, in the great writers towards the close of the second century, such as Irenæus, Tertullian, and Clement of Alexandria, we find numerous quotations from the writings of the Apostle, but in no way disproportionate to their quotations from the rest of the New Testament. To quote again from Renan: "After Paul's disappearance from the scene of his apostolic contests we shall see him almost forgotten. The second century scarcely speaks of him, and seems systematically to seek to efface his memory. His Epistles then are little read, and are of authority only for a very reduced group of Churches."¹ Harnack is equally emphatic: "Marcion was the first, and for a long time the only Gentile Christian who took his stand on Paul."² Surely this does not look as if Paul were the founder of Christianity.

But it may be said that the argument from the number of references in the earliest writers is a very superficial one. It may be that while the references are comparatively few, the type of doctrine that prevailed in the ancient Christian Church and literature is of the distinctive Pauline form. But this is not the case. Rather Paulinism so-called was at a decided discount during the earliest Christian ages, only shooting up now and then into prominence in the case of isolated men like Augustine. Indeed, the centuries before the Reformation may not unfairly be

¹ *St. Paul*, p. 564.

² *History of Dogma*, vol. i. p. 284.

described as the non-Pauline age of the Church. It was only at the Reformation that the Apostle practically was discovered, and that the Pauline age began.

Here we naturally turn first of all to the early and Catholic *Creeeds* of the Church, and a brief glance is sufficient to show that in them the specialities of so-called Paulinism are conspicuous by their absence. In the Apostles' Creed there is no certain trace of Paul, and it might have obviously been the same if he had never lived and written. Almost as much may be said with regard both to the Nicene and Constantinopolitan Creeds. If there be expressions in them that remind us of Paul, they do not go very far. Indeed, the only doctrinal expression contained in the latter which reminds us of Paul is "The Holy Spirit, the Lord, and the Giver of life" (cf. 2 Cor. iii. 18, 6), although the latter expression may just as likely be derived from our Lord's utterance in John vi. 63. Evidently, if we are to accept the witness of the Creeds, their testimony is decidedly against regarding Paul as the founder or even predominant power in moulding the doctrine of the early Church.

We must come to very much the same conclusion when we contemplate the type of doctrine found in the early Christian authors. Clement of Rome, in his *Epistle to the Corinthians*, shows a certain understanding of Paul's mode of putting justification by faith, and that he belongs in a general way to his school, but he shows almost as much the special influence of Peter. In *Barnabas* we have a prevalent type of style and thought quite unlike that of Paul, and a form of doctrine with scarcely a tincture of specific Paulinism. In the *Didaché* there is nothing of the distinctive Pauline form. The same thing may be said to be true to a large extent with regard to the *Ignatian Epistles*; and while *Polycarp* contains relatively many references to Paul, yet he is so intensely practical that it is difficult to

say whether his type of doctrine is more Petrine, or Johannine, or Pauline. The writings of Justin are much more Johannine than Pauline, as is seen from the fact that the Logos forms the centre of his theological system; he has indeed scarcely any of the special traces of Paulinism at all. The same may be said of Theophilus of Antioch; and if it be not quite warrantable to describe Hermas as anti-Pauline, we may at least classify him as quite non-Pauline. Of the great authors at the close of the second century, there is not one that can be characterised as pronouncedly Pauline in anything like the Reformation or modern sense. Irenæus, as might perhaps be expected, is more Johannine than Pauline; he has at the most only traces of "Pauline thoughts," and certainly his strongly legal conception of Christianity is very different from the spirit and form of Paul's representation. Clement of Alexandria, like Irenæus, is also more Johannine than Pauline, as may be seen in a general way from the prominence he gives to the idea of the Logos. The same may be said of Origen, and certainly both of these great Alexandrians present a striking contrast to Paul in their philosophising methods. As for Tertullian, his theology, like Paul's, moved around the two centres of sin and grace, and he may have been the first step in the stairway that led up to Augustine, yet his system, with its doctrine of merit, its Montanistic aberrations and extreme asceticism, and its pronounced Chiliasm, can only in a modified sense be called Pauline. Indeed, the only author of the second century who shows decided devotion to Paul is the heretic Marcion, but he again differs widely from the Apostle in his fantastic Gnosticism, and in any case his movement soon died out. We do not need to come further down the stream of Christian literature than the close of the second century, for by this date the Christian doctrine and Church are both established, and down to this date the type of doctrine is

not such as to prove that Paul was the founder of Christianity, or even the most important factor in shaping the doctrine of the ancient Church. Even Weizsäcker confesses: "When we review the development of Christian theology in the period subsequent to Paul, we are astonished to find that only a part of his work was taken up and carried out."¹ As Harnack puts it: "The later development of the Church cannot be explained from Paulinism"; and again, "The attempts at deducing the genesis of the Christian doctrinal system from the theology of Paul will always miscarry."²

The most powerful argument, however, yet remains. Nothing can prove so effectively that Christ was at once the Founder and the very substance of Christianity as Paul's own unquestioned epistles themselves. The Apostle, indeed, would have been utterly horrified at the bare thought that he, and not Christ, should be regarded as the founder of Christianity, and would have met it with a characteristic "God forbid." From the unquestioned epistles we learn that, instead of Paul being the originator of our religion and the rehabilitator of Christ, it is Christ Himself who is the very sum and substance of Paul's teaching: "I determined not to know anything among you, save Jesus Christ, and Him crucified" (1 Cor. ii. 2). He represents Christ as his very life: "I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me" (Gal. ii. 20). He speaks of Christ as being his supreme glory: "God forbid that I should glory save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ" (Gal. vi. 14). To him, "Christ is all and in all" (Col. iii. 11). But, indeed, there is no use in quoting individual passages, for the whole texture of the Epistles is of the same tenour. In view of this, surely nothing can prove more overwhelmingly than the Apostle's own Epistles that Christ and not Paul was the originator, that it was not

¹ *Apostolic Age*, vol. i. p. 173.

² *History of Dogma*, vol. i. p. 148 and p. 149, note.

Paul that made Christ, but Christ that made Paul what he was. We conclude, therefore, that Christianity, instead of becoming extinct if Paul had not appeared upon the scene, would have been very much the same in substance as it is, and would have had very much the same triumphant career.

We need scarcely remark in closing that our contention in no way lessens the value of the apologetic argument derived from the conversion, life, and writings of the Apostle. The argument, indeed, remains exactly as it was before. Our line of thought only gives increased force and prominence to the evidence for Christianity that existed *before* Paul. It emphasises the fact that *before* and *aback* of Paul, and quite independent of him, there was evidence existing for Christianity so powerful as to conquer the bigoted Pharisee and persecutor, who had the means of attaining to full and first-hand knowledge of all the details. This evidence is nothing less than *Christ Himself*, who is at once the supreme evidence as well as the substance of Christianity. Our argument really removes Paul from standing in front of Christ and so far obscuring Him, and tends to bring Christ Himself directly and supremely into view, as the One who virtually speaks to us in Paul.

ALEXANDER MAIR.

THE SAYINGS OF JESUS.

To those who are interested in the early history of Christianity there probably has never been published a better sixpenny-worth than the little tract in which Messrs. Grenfell and Hunt introduce us to the newly-discovered leaf of *The Sayings of Jesus*. The reproduction of the original papyrus, the introduction, the text, the translation and notes, and the general remarks are all excellent. We