

the first appearing in the foreground, the second in the background of the vision ; while Mary, taking the present in its usual sense, may have hastily denied that such was, or could be at present, the case with her.

J. B. MAYOR.

STUDIES IN THE PAULINE THEOLOGY.

II. THE DOCTRINE OF CHRIST.

(1) PAUL'S knowledge of Jesus began with the sight of the Risen Lord on the way to Damascus. This appearance he regards as of the same kind as those to the other witnesses of the resurrection (1 Cor. xv. 8). One of his claims to apostleship is that he has seen Jesus (ix. 1). The attempt to treat this appearance as of the same kind as "the visions and revelations of the Lord" in an ecstatic state, of which Paul elsewhere speaks, is futile (2 Cor. xii. 1). The conditions for a subjective vision were absent in Saul the persecutor; the striking and sudden change wrought in him by the sight of Jesus is a proof of its objectivity. The emphasis Paul lays on the burial of Jesus indicates that for him the body of Jesus was included in the resurrection. A continuance of the spirit after death would not have been described in the words, "He hath been raised on the third day." The description Paul gives of the general resurrection is evidently applicable to Christ as "the firstfruits of them that are asleep" (1 Cor. xv. 20). If the body buried was *natural*, the body raised was *spiritual* (ver. 44). The possibility of the transformation of the one into the other is assumed regarding those who may survive until the general resurrection: "We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye" (verses 51 and 52). It is probable that Paul considered

the body of Jesus as having undergone a similar transformation. It is as risen that Christ is "the second man from heaven," whose heavenly image those who are raised from the dead in Him will bear (46-49). It is as risen also that He is the "life-giving spirit" in contrast with Adam: "the living soul." This contrast is not between Adam as he originally was, and Christ in His pre-existence; it is as subject to mortality, the mortality he brought on himself and mankind (Rom. v. 12), that Adam is contrasted with Christ, as by His own resurrection the victor over death, and the giver of immortality to all who are His. Any reference to the pre-existence of Christ as a heavenly man antecedent to the Incarnation would have been quite irrelevant to the argument in this passage; and it is quite a mistake to suppose that Paul is here borrowing this notion from Jewish speculation. It is certain, however, that the Risen Lord is for him endowed with *corporeality*. "In Him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily" (*σωματικῶς*, Col. ii. 9). The body of humiliation of believers is to be fashioned anew into conformity to "the body of His glory" (*σῶμα τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ*, Phil. iii. 21). Glory is perfection outwardly manifested. "We all with unveiled face reflecting as a mirror the glory of the Lord are transformed into the same image from glory to glory, even as from the Lord the Spirit" (2 Cor. iii. 18). It is in virtue of this glory that Christ is "the image of the invisible God," *εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἀοράτου* (Col. i. 15). This glory is evidently thought of as light of a dazzling brightness, so dazzling that Paul when he beheld it was blinded by it (Acts xxii. 11). Although our present experience may afford us no data in confirmation of Paul's statements regarding the corporeality of the Risen Christ, or the transformation of the natural into the spiritual body, it would be rash to base a denial on our ignorance.

(2). The Risen Lord with His body of glory is *life-giving spirit* (*πνεῦμα ζωοποιούν*). If we are to understand Paul's doctrine of Christ we must rid ourselves of the current conception of spirit as abstract consciousness, detached from and even opposed to body. In accordance with the Old Testament conception spirit is the divine energy, which not only gives knowledge, skill, wisdom, but is the source even of physical life. To say that it is substance rather than subject is to import into Paul's thought later distinctions of which he was not aware. The conception does not exclude the mental, but is wider. Divine life is in the spirit imparted to man, and as the divine life is marked by moral perfection, the spirit is holy. But the moral transformation wrought by the spirit is not distinguished from, or opposed to, the invigoration of the entire personality of man, including even his physical organism. For Paul the Risen Lord was such divine energy, for he had himself experienced a complete inward renovation. While, as in the apostolic benediction, the Lord Jesus Christ is distinguished on the one hand from the Father, and on the other from the Spirit, yet the Lord is also identified with the Spirit: "Now the Lord is the Spirit," "the Lord the Spirit" (2 Cor. iii. 17, 18). The power to produce a new creation, a sinless and immortal humanity, is what Paul on the basis of his own experience ascribes to Christ. Christ is the power of God as well as the wisdom of God (1 Cor. i. 24). Paul can do all things, Christ strengthening him (Phil. iv. 13), for Christ's strength is perfected in weakness (2 Cor. xii. 9). It is the omnipotence of God Himself which manifested in the Resurrection of Christ is mediated by Christ. "What the exceeding greatness of His power to us-ward who believe according to the working of the strength of His might which He wrought in Christ, when He raised Him from the dead, and made Him to sit at His right hand in the heavenly places" (Eph.

i. 19-20). Christ wields this power because He, by His resurrection, is invested with divine authority.

(3) For Paul the resurrection was of utmost significance for Christ Himself. It raised Him to a position, invested Him with an authority, and furnished Him with a power which had not during His earthly ministry been His. It was an exaltation after humiliation; and an exaltation which appears to have been conceived as not merely a restoration of prerogatives and privileges laid aside in the humiliation, for the exaltation was a reward for the humiliation. We must return to Paul's teaching about the pre-existence of Christ in the famous Christological passage in Philippians ii. 5-11; but at this stage of the discussion we must note that it teaches that God bestowed on the Risen Lord what He had not before possessed. "Wherefore also God highly exalted Him, and gave unto Him the name which is above every name; that in the name of Jesus every knee should bow of things in heaven, and things on earth, and things under the earth, and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God the Father" (vers. 9 to 11). What the confession of Jesus as Lord implies will immediately engage our attention. But we must first of all notice another passage which teaches this same truth regarding the resurrection of Jesus. In the opening verses of the Epistle to the Romans Paul defines the Gospel of God as "concerning His Son, who was born of the seed of David according to the flesh, who was declared to be the Son of God with power according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection of the dead" (i. 3, 4). The word *ὁρισθέντος* is inadequately rendered by the R.V. "declared," as the verb *ὀρίξειν* means to set a boundary (*ὄρος*). Hence Christ was marked off, set apart by the Resurrection as the Son of God with power. There was not merely a proclamation, but an investiture,

ordination, enthronement. I may be allowed to quote the note on this word in my commentary on Romans (p. 83). "The Greek word means either 'designated' or 'ordained' (Acts x. 42; xvii. 31); but Paul's meaning cannot be decided by the sense of one term. As Paul taught the pre-existence of Christ as Divine (2 Cor. iv. 4, viii. 9; Col. i. 15-19) he cannot mean that Christ became Son of God at His resurrection; yet, as he regarded the Incarnation itself as an act of self-humiliation by Christ, so he represented the Resurrection as an exaltation of Christ by God (Phil. ii. 5-11). We must take the word rather in the second sense, but must understand, not an assumption of Divine nature at the Resurrection, but the entrance by Christ into the full possession and free exercise of the dignity and authority not merely which belonged to Him as pre-existent 'in the form of God,' but which was conferred on Him as Son of God as the reward of His obedience unto death. We empty Paul's argument in the Epistle to the Philippians of its distinctive significance, as well as this passage here of its more probable meaning, if we assume that Christ's exaltation at His resurrection was merely a return to His pre-existent state."

(4) "The earliest creed of Christendom," says Stevens (*The Theology of the New Testament*, p. 389), "consisted of two words, *κύριος Ἰησοῦς*—Jesus is Lord" (1 Cor. xii. 3; Rom. x. 9). When Christ appeared on the way to Damascus, Paul asked, "Who art thou, Lord?" (Acts ix. 5) and, "What shall I do, Lord?" (xxii. 10). As the apostle of Christ he preached not himself, but "Christ Jesus the Lord" (2 Cor. iv. 5) as a saving message for all men. "There is no distinction between Jew and Greek; for the same Lord is Lord of all, and is rich unto all that call upon Him. For whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved" (Rom. x. 12, 13). This quotation from Joel ii. 32

illustrates Paul's practice of referring to Christ passages in the Old Testament which refer to Jehovah. (Compare 1 Cor. x. 22: "Do we provoke the Lord to jealousy?" from Deut. xxxii. 21). Paul prayed to Christ as Lord. "Concerning this thing I besought the Lord thrice, that it might depart from me" (2 Cor. xii. 8). He assumes this as a general practice among believers, describing them as "all that call upon the name of our Lord Jesus Christ" (1 Cor. i. 2). This title *Lord* is evidently "the name above every name" (Phil. ii. 9). God has subjected all things to Christ (1 Cor. xv. 27). In opposition to polytheism and idolatry Paul confesses his monotheism in the words: "To us there is one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we unto Him; and one Lord, Jesus Christ, through whom are all things, and we through Him" (1 Cor. viii. 6). How can the Lordship of Christ be reconciled with the unity of the Godhead? We are not warranted in assuming that Paul ignored that problem; for Judaism represented with ardent conviction the creed of monotheism in antagonism to the prevalent polytheism. The passage just quoted indicates the subordination of the Lord Jesus Christ to God the Father. The Father is the ultimate source (*ἐξ οὗ*) and the final purpose (*εἰς αὐτόν*); Christ is the mediating agency (*δι' οὗ* and *δι' αὐτοῦ*). It is by the free will of the Father (*εὐδόκησεν*) that the fulness of the Godhead dwells in Him (Col. i. 19). The name above every other name is His by the gift of the Father (*ἐχαρίσατο*, Phil. ii. 9). His Resurrection is ascribed to God's act of power, "God both raised the Lord, and will raise up us through His power" (1 Cor. vi. 14). The subordination of Christ to God is compared to the subordination of man to Christ. "Ye are Christ's, and Christ is God's" (1 Cor. iii. 23). When all has been subjected to Christ, then He Himself will be subjected, that "God may be all in all" (1 Cor.

xv. 28). The interpretation of Romans ix. 5 is much disputed. Even if the construction favours the ascription to Christ Himself of the clause, "Who is over all, God blessed for ever," rather than the rendering as a doxology, "He who is God over all be blessed for ever" (R.V. margin), yet the utterance of passionate emotion cannot be regarded as qualifying the distinctly expressed doctrine of the subordination of the Son to the Father. This must be kept in mind in reviewing the passages in which divine prerogatives and functions are ascribed to Christ.

(5) One of the most significant passages is in Colossians i. 13-17, in which Christ is described by three epithets: (1) "The Son of His love"; (2) "The image of the invisible God"; and (3) "The firstborn of all creation." As the false teachers against whom this Epistle is directed assigned dignity and authority to angels, the term Son is intended here to assert Christ's absolute superiority to the angels, as in the opening argument of the Epistle to the Hebrews (i. 1-ii. 8). In this connexion it is especially appropriate as the whole clause "Son of His love" defines Christ as both the object and the medium of the love, which is the essence of the Father. As absolutely possessing the nature of God, Christ perfectly reveals it. This is asserted in the second epithet, "the image of the invisible God." As this manifestation of the nature of God is the final purpose of the Universe, He in whom it is made is prior to as well as supreme in the universe; for the clause "the firstborn of all creation" does not include Christ among the created. The phrases "the firstborn from the dead" (i. 18) and "the firstborn among many brethren" are not strictly parallel, as the reference in them is to the state of humanity after the Resurrection, of which Christ's victory over death was both pledge and pattern. Further in the immediate context Christ is described as the Divine Agent in creation.

“ In Him were all things created, in the heavens, and upon the earth . . . all things have been created through Him and unto Him ; and He is before all things ; and in Him all things consist ” Col. i. 16, 17). While the passage does not allow us to think of Christ as a creature, yet the relation of the Son of God to the creation is not exhaustively or adequately stated, when His priority and superiority are simply insisted on. Both as the Son of God’s love and as the image of the invisible God He is the firstborn in the Creation in a sense not altogether dissimilar to that in which He is the firstborn in the Resurrection. He is as Son of God eternally, the reality of self-expression and self-communication in which is rooted the possibility of the Creation. In the Son is the eternal pledge and pattern of the truth and grace of God expressed and communicated temporally in nature and history. Our judgment of the *truth* of Paul’s statements regarding the *cosmic* significance of Christ will depend on our sense of the *worth* of the salvation in Him. If man’s relation to God is the supreme interest of the Universe, we can accept this view.

(6) Still more deeply does Paul cast the plummet of his thought into the abysmal depths of the personality of Christ in the classic passage on the *Kenosis* in Philippians ii. 6-8. This passage brings before us the Incarnation of the Son of God as a voluntary act of self-emptying. It has been in every phrase and almost every word the battle-ground of scholars, as though Paul were here giving definitions with the precision of dogmatics, and not in impassioned language presenting a sublime moral example for human imitation. “ Have this mind in you, which was also in Christ Jesus ” (ver. 5) might have warned the scholastic theologian off the ground. The questions which must be briefly discussed are : (1) the meaning of the phrase *ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ*. Does it mean essence or accident ? (2) The reference of the

phrase τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ either backward to the "existing in the form of God," or forward to "the name above every name." (3) The action implied in the word ἀρπαγμόν. (4) The consequent content of the *Kenosis*, or self-emptying, the divine nature itself, or the state of equality with God. As regards the first point it may be admitted that Paul did think of Christ as essentially divine, as possessing the divine nature, and not merely as exercising divine functions or enjoying divine privileges. As regards the second point it seems to the writer more probably true that the equality with God is not identical with the form of God, but means position rather than essence. Nature is not that which can be held fast, or snatched at, but dignity or authority is. But this granted, the further question arises : Is this equality with God the position already held by the Son of God as the agent of God in Creation, or the position attained by the exaltation to lordship at the Resurrection ? The answer to this question depends on how we deal with the third point. Is the prize already possessed and to be held fast, or is it as yet unattained, and to be snatched at ? The word itself does not decide the matter. We must consider the passage as a whole. The mind of Christ does appear more significant as an example to be imitated, if the prize was something yet to be attained, and in the attaining of which two courses of action seemed open to the Son of God ; He might have claimed the position as of right ; but He preferred to receive it by free gift of His Father as a reward for His humiliation unto sacrifice. The lordship is the prize ; this is the equality with God. The *Kenosis*, to pass to the fourth point, does not mean the surrender of divine essence, but the surrender of divine functions and privileges in order that the sacrifice to be thus rewarded might become possible. So far we may go in the exposition of Paul's thought.

Can we form a distinct conception of the process here described? It is obvious that here Paul has left the solid ground of experience, and that he has essayed a bold flight of speculation into a sublime region that lies beyond our ken. It is the Risen Lord whom he projects into the pre-existent state. This he conceives as similar, if not identical with, the exaltation after the Resurrection. Between the two lies the earthly life, which in comparison with the one or the other must be regarded as a humiliation. The descent into it is described metaphysically as a self-emptying. A sober exegesis can find in this *Kenosis* no more than is involved in the contrast between the outward conditions conformable to the essential divinity and the outward conditions involved in the Incarnation of Christ. But it is not a metaphysical process which concerns Paul; it is a moral motive. The glory of the Risen Lord has not been grasped by ambition, but earned as a reward of humility. The metaphysical process here described involves insoluble problems for our thought. In the first place the *historical individuality* of Christ is transferred to the pre-existent Son of God; and thus the unity of the Godhead is made incomprehensible, for the Son cannot be conceived as a distinct personality from the Father. We must candidly admit that here Paul is exercising his imagination rather than his intellect; that, before we can appropriate his thought and fit it into a credible conception, we must translate his *Vorstellung* into a *Begriff*. It was the divine *mode* or *principle* (it is difficult to find an appropriate term since the word "person" has acquired so different a connotation from that it had when first used in the creeds) of the Son in the Godhead that became a concrete individuality, a distinct personality only through the process of Incarnation. In the *second place* to the Son of God, thus conceived, is ascribed a single temporal act of *self-emptying*. Expositors

have made much of the aorist *ἐκένωσεν*: but it is doubtful wisdom to emphasize the niceties of Greek grammar in regard to a pre-temporal act. It seems to the writer much more intelligible that the Incarnation should be the consummation of a process of divine self-expression and self-communication in human history, and that this process should involve as the ground of its possibility an eternal act of self-emptying in the Godhead. The Son Himself is this *Kenosis* of the Deity, this self-emptying for self-expression and self-communication. For a concrete individuality and a temporal action we must substitute an eternal act in the Godhead, which we call Word or Son, which is the necessary condition of not only the Incarnation, but of the whole process of divine immanence in the Universe of which the Incarnation is the consummation. In the *third place* it is the moral significance of the Incarnation as self-sacrifice about which Paul is primarily concerned here, as in 2 Corinthians viii. 9. "For ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that, though He was rich, yet for your sakes He became poor, that ye through His poverty might become rich." The different metaphysics, which our thinking leads us to, does not at all lessen the worth of the Incarnation in this respect. "The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ" we conceive even more distinctly than Paul does in this passage as the historical manifestation and communication of the eternal nature of God as love.

Doubtless Paul was affected in some degree by the current Jewish belief in the pre-existence of whatever has value, as the temple, the Messiah, etc. But this Jewish belief does not adequately account for his doctrine of the pre-existence of Christ as the Son of God, taught in this passage, as also in those passages in which the coming of Christ into the world is described as His being sent by the Father (Gal. iv. 4; Rom. viii. 3). It was the absolute value of Christ to Paul

in his experience that compelled him to regard Christ as essentially divine. Christ had done for him, and was to him, all that God could be, and what God alone could be. This confession of divinity involved the belief in pre-existence ; as the divine eternally is, and does not come into being in time. That Paul thought of the Son of God as eternally existing in the concrete individuality of the Risen Lord was inevitable ; it did not require any external suggestion. He knew the Risen Lord, and thought of Him as eternally the same. The modification which we have suggested as necessary in Paul's doctrine does not make the pre-existence of the Son of God *ideal* ; for there is eternally in God as the reality of His nature as love this *Kenosis*, which we call Word and Son, and which became incarnate in the Lord Jesus Christ.

ALFRED E. GARVIE.

CHRISTUS ÆDIFICATOR :

A COMPARISON BETWEEN ST. JOHN II. 19 AND
ZECHARIAH VI. 13.

THERE are three separate reports of our Lord's saying about the rebuilding of the temple. Two of these occur in the evidence given by the false witnesses in the trial of Jesus before the Sanhedrin. And, although the witnesses were false, it by no means follows that the testimony itself was false throughout. It is possible, and indeed probable, that the misleading character of the evidence consisted in the interpretation of the words rather than in the report itself.

Each of the three separate reports differs from the other two, and each contains distinctive points of great interest and importance.