

THE THOUGHT OF PAUL.

V. THE HELLENISM OF PAUL.

JUST a few words more with regard to the Hellenism of Paul in response to Principal Garvie's courteous and friendly paper! ¹ The character of the great Apostle was far too complex to be conceived and expressed in exactly the same way by two students who approach him on independent and different lines. Principal Garvie and I will doubtless continue to study, and to differ in certain matters from one another, and, as I believe, each to respect the other's opinion.

There are just two points on which we might perhaps approximate without much difficulty to a common view through clearer conception of the meaning of Paul's own words.

(1) Principal Garvie quotes the Apostle's account, as given in Acts xxii. 3, of his training, "brought up in Jerusalem at the feet of Gamaliel"; and says that, while "the exact age at which Paul came to Jerusalem" is uncertain, "yet surely it must have been as a boy of twelve or thirteen at the very latest, if the words are not to be emptied of all meaning."

As to this I am compelled to differ. This estimate of age would suit Acts xxii. 3 quite well; but would it suit Acts xxvi. 4 where Paul defines "my manner of life from my youth up, . . . among mine own nation and at Jerusalem" ? ² what meaning are we to gather out of the words

¹ EXPOSITOR, November 1911, p. 470 f.

² I need not here go into the question of reading. The true text which certainly has "and at Jerusalem" (τε), only makes clearer the fact that Paul did not come to Jerusalem and Gamaliel until he could be called a *réos*.

“from my youth up” ? I see nothing in xxii. 3 to prove that Paul came to Jerusalem at thirteen years of age or earlier. I see everything in xxvi. 4 to prove that he came later than thirteen. One who had come to Jerusalem as a young boy under thirteen would not have said “from my youth up,” but rather “from my childhood up.” A *Neos* was a grown man, not a child of thirteen.¹ Paul was a *Neos* when he came to Jerusalem to study, or even before he came.

So far as concerns his studying in the rhetorical schools at Tarsus (which may for want of a more exact term be called the “University” of Tarsus), we have no reason to think that an able boy might not attend these schools at an early age. We have no exact statistics on the subject, and no knowledge. In such matters the age of entering on higher study varies widely. My wife’s father was fully ready for the University of Glasgow at eleven years of age, and was kept at home for a year until he was more mature physically. Two of the best classical scholars I have come in contact with entered the University of Aberdeen at fourteen ; and I have known several who would have done much better to come a year or two earlier than they did. Yet sixteen or seventeen has been the most common age in my experience, although the average was raised by a certain number of much older students. In such matters averages are quite valueless as a standard to apply to an individual case.

Moreover, it always remains an open question, how much Paul learned from the educated atmosphere in which he was brought up as a boy, how much from formal instruction in public classes, and how much from training by individual teachers in his own home. There is a general tendency, of

¹ Even though, as I think, *neos* in Anatolian usage encroached on and displaced *ἐφηβος*, still a boy of thirteen would hardly be even an *ephebos*.

which I find numberless examples in my own circle of acquaintance, to set down to the credit of schooling much which is due simply to the natural growth of the intellectual and physical powers of the boy or girl. One attributes to the influence of the school a good deal which would have been learned apart from school. I do not intend or wish to depreciate school training: unless the school is very poorly managed, its influence is powerful and beneficent. Especially in cases where custom or carelessness entrusts the education of a child mainly to school-teachers and frees the parents largely from the onerous duty of training the child, the importance of the school and the school teachers is incalculable. Yet, even taking all this into account, I have nothing to retract from the above sentences.

This extra-scholastic training Paul received in abundance and in impressive and judicious form, as I should be inclined to gather from Philippians iii. 5. Such training has always been characteristic of Jewish home life, and its central point and main force lay in the family festival of the Passover with its religious and historical lessons.

Probably Principal Garvie has built more than I should be ready to accept upon the single word "brought up" (*ἀναεθραμμένος*), as if it necessarily implied the rearing of a child. This, however, is too much to infer. The simple and the compound verb are not used solely of children, a point on which we need not here enter. The two passages, Acts xxvi. 4 and xxii. 3, taken together, seem to me to be perfectly satisfied by the interpretation that Paul, when he became old enough to choose for himself—an age which varies greatly in different persons—deliberately selected and devoted himself to the Divine service in his own land among his own people at the Holy City, and went up to Jerusalem to learn at the feet of Gamaliel. Other passages in his letters, especially Philippians iii. 15 and the *Apologia pro*

vita sua in 1 Corinthians vii. 25 f.,¹ seem to me to require the interpretation that Paul was brought up to a certain stage at Tarsus in the fashion needed for a Jewish boy who was born in the local aristocracy as a Roman citizen and a burgess of Tarsus, and that with full knowledge and conscious choice he selected, like Moses, the life of serving God and his people through training in the Law at Jerusalem.

That Paul spoke the "Hebrew" language fluently seems in no way inconsistent with the upbringing in a Pharisaic household of Jews who were Roman citizens. In modern times I have known Jews who learned Hebrew early in life, though living in western European lands, far removed from many of the influences which were acting on a strict Jewish household in Tarsus, such as the visits to Jerusalem for the feasts and the easy free connexion with the Holy City. That a household of Graeco-Roman citizens should at once remain strictly Jewish and yet be learned in all the wisdom of the Roman Imperial world of the East seems to me quite natural and in perfect accordance with previous and subsequent Hebrew history.

(2) Principal Garvie says that: "Paul's familiarity with Greek and Roman life as shown in his metaphors, the last argument which Sir William Ramsay offers, seems to me adequately accounted for by what I have freely conceded of Gentile influence on Paul in his early years, in his travels, in his visits to his native city." As to Paul's "early years," that is the point in discussion; and the Principal seems to concede at one time what he refuses at another. According to his own expression on p. 472, "Jewish exclusiveness would have prevented what" he here concedes. If it was allowed that Paul should mix so freely in childhood with the Greeks as to speak with such sympathetic insight regarding the intensity of effort in sports (which were abhorred

¹ EXPOSITOR, Oct., 1900, p. 288 f.

by the strict Palestinian Jews) and to compare this intensity of effort with the spirit needed for living the truly religious life, why should he be debarred from coming into any relation with the Greek education, which was absolutely necessary to enable his father to play his part as a Roman citizen and a Greek burgess? As a boy under fourteen he was, on that theory, allowed to come during his most impressionable age into a position of complete familiarity with the spirit of Greek athletic and municipal life, so that words and ideas taken from it suggest themselves to him in the mood when he is most inspired with the beauty and character of the true life. When he rises to the most sublime utterance regarding the magnificence and perfection and glory of the Saviour's victory on the Cross, he expresses his glowing thought in metaphor from a Roman triumph, which of course he could never have seen and about which he could have learned only in the course of a Roman education in the duties and dignity of Roman citizenship.

All this implies, so far as I can judge, a deep and hearty comprehension of Graeco-Roman life, and remains wholly inexplicable without that comprehension. Who can comprehend without sympathy? The idea is unthinkable.

Nor does later Gentile influence on Paul "in his travels and in his visits to his native city," seem to me to furnish any adequate explanation. Either the visits took place during the years when he was still young and impressionable—the very point under discussion—or they were too late to meet the facts of the case. I do not think that he went to Jerusalem to study there during some months of each year, and returned to Tarsus to spend his holidays at home, like a modern University undergraduate. He went to Jerusalem to devote his life to his people and his God and the Law of God. The experiences of his travels, after he became a Christian, when he was over thirty or over

forty, do not mould the inmost spirit in such a way that metaphors from those experiences rise to the mind in moments of deep feeling, as is the case with a number of the athletic metaphors used by Paul to express the ideas that he thought most holy and divine. My friend is, as I think, confusing the attitude of the Tarsian-Roman Paul with the feelings of a narrow Palestinian Jew.

There is not the shadow of a trace of evidence that either Paul or the Hellenistic Jews considered Greek philosophy to be in itself "a corrupting influence." Nor does Principal Garvie adduce any evidence to that effect : he only speaks on p. 472 of Greek philosophy as a thing which Paul "must have regarded as a corrupting influence." Certainly Paul was in the last degree unlikely to spend any time after he became a Christian in studying philosophy. So far every one will agree with the Principal. Paul had already gone through it and come out on the other side (as some one said about Jowett and Hegelianism). It was not necessary for a mind like Paul's to spend long years in studying Greek philosophy, as the ordinary modern undergraduate does. He caught up its ideas and traversed the philosophy of his time as a great mathematician sweeps over a new treatise in his subject, making himself master of it all in the time that an ordinary person would spend in misunderstanding the first few pages, because he recognises much that is already half consciously outlined in his own mind.

From the legislation of Moses (if, for the sake of illustration, and without any disrespect to some great modern scholars who deny that an individual corresponding to the name Moses ever existed, we may assume for the moment the reality of his life and work) one might argue that he was a highly educated man, familiar with all the wisdom of his time. Any one who argued in this way would be met with the reply that Moses was too characteristic and patriotic

a Jew to have deeply studied extraneous literature, were it not for the recorded fact that Moses was educated mainly in that non-Jewish wisdom and hardly participated except at brief intervals and almost by stealth in the tradition of his own people.

So it was and must be with Paul. It was the wideness of his early experiences and training that made him the one Apostle able to appreciate fully, to lay special emphasis on, and to make clear to the world, the spirit of freedom and the universalism in the teaching and life and death of Jesus.¹ My friend replies that it was not Paul's previous education, but his present experience of Christ as Saviour and Lord, which so vitalised for him features of the teaching of Jesus which others had failed to appreciate." But this "present experience of Christ as Saviour" was as vividly and vitally present to the other Apostles as to Paul; and the question is, why they "failed to appreciate" the side which Paul appreciated. It was the individuality, the nature, the character of Paul which, after he had been laid hold of by Jesus, "vitalised for him features . . . which others had failed to appreciate"; and Paul, in his whole nature, had been made by his entire education and previous experience. The rest did not catch this feature as Paul did; but as soon as Paul caught it and stated it clearly, the other Apostles as a body appreciated it, and accepted Paul's position. The only Christian who seemed to be on the point of catching the Pauline view before Paul was Stephen, the great Hellenist Jew.

The experience of a higher teacher is always the same. Let him state his view as clearly as he can to a class, and he

¹ It is in my view necessary to hold closely together in thought the three: the teaching was of small value without the life and the death. So Paul held, and such is the fact. That is the one answer to those who maintain that the historical truth of the life and the death of Jesus is unimportant, and that what is really important for the world is His teaching.

is fortunate if even one catches immediately the spirit, and what the teacher deems the fundamental truth of the teaching. The rest, however devoted and in a sense appreciative, are Wagners to this Faustus.

Principal Garvie and I are so far agreed that we regard the Jewish inheritance and home training and nature as the fundamental and dominant factor in the thought and life of Paul. First of all, at all times, in all situations, we feel in him the Jew. But I incline to lay more emphasis on the fact that in Paul we feel always the educated Jew, trained to life as a Roman citizen in the most aristocratic position among the population of the great Hellenised, yet more than half Asiatic, city of Tarsus. Principal Garvie would lay less stress on this side of Paul's complex individuality. I can understand the philosophic position of Paul only on the theory that his expression was influenced by Greek philosophy, whereas the Principal (if I rightly apprehend him), thinks that it was not so influenced. The difference is, in a sense, slight; yet it implies considerable difference in our estimate of Paul's cast of thought and his early training. In the following sections I shall attempt to put my own conception from my own point of view.

Only in regard to one sentence of Principal Garvie's last article (which will evidently not appear in his book, and which seems to be a rather hurried expression) must I wholly and absolutely disagree. He says on p. 471, "to me it seems more probable that Paul was more affected by the Tarsian environment on his visit after his conversion than during his early years." On the contrary the influence which I seem to see in Paul is one that lies too deep to belong to his mature life, and one that depends on circumstances too inharmonious with Paul's mental attitude after he became a Christian to be assigned to that period. Only in childhood and the earliest youth is such an influence possible.

That Paul during his long residence in Cilicia and Syria, after he fled from Jerusalem, was still engaged in thinking out the philosophic basis of his religious position I would fully concede, though I think that the most important part of that work was done in the Arabian solitude ; but nothing seems to be more unlikely than that during this process he should be studying Greek philosophy or Hellenic manners and customs. In recasting his religious and philosophical position, his whole previous education served to mould the definition of his new thought, as it gradually took clear form in his mind.

VI. HAD PAUL A PHILOSOPHY ?

We proceed now to the task of describing in its stages of growth the way in which Paul looked at the world around him and above him. The different influences which helped to mould his mind will probably become most readily clear, if we try to conceive his thought in its origin and development. My aim is to state an unprofessional opinion in the common terms of the present day, neither philosophical nor theological, but such terms as one who is neither a philosopher nor a theologian can use. I try to express the thoughts which gradually took shape in my mind as I traversed year after year the paths which Paul trod in Asia Minor. The scenery exercises a strong influence on those who become familiar with it ; and one who is always thinking about Paul has (or thinks that he has) his mind insensibly tuned into harmony with Paul's, as he goes along the same road.

The modern traveller in a railway train has no such experience, and never learns what the influence of scenery is. He has no time to see it, while he is hurried past it to gaze for a moment on a new scene, which in its turn rapidly fades away to the rear. Very different is it when one travels for three successive days straight towards one of those lofty

peaks, which watch like beacons and guides over the great plain of South Galatia, and at last sees the details of the beautiful mountain grow distinct and take separate form as one comes within a few miles of the city over which it keeps guard. One thinks of the feelings in Paul's mind, as he came from Cilicia, and saw far in front the great mountain which stands high above Derbe and marked the nearest his Churches, and the bounds of Galatic Lycaonia and the Roman Empire in which his work lay. It is not of picturesque or aesthetic charm that one thinks in such a scene. There is a vague consciousness of this ; but the thought that fills one's mind is the memory of history and human life. The mountain now stands sentinel over two or three tiny and dying Turkish villages, and one very small village of refugees from Roumelia ; yet it is life, not death, that is suggested to one's mind ; but the life and the thought thus suggested lie in the past and the future, not in the present. One understands then why the mountain is still called the Pilgrim Father (Hadji Baba) : it is the divinely appointed landmark to guide the traveller and the pilgrim ; it was the direct gift of God, and is in every age regarded as one of the seats of the Divine power that guards the land.

Paul did not talk sentimentally about the beauty of the mountain or the scenery. One dare not talk after such patronising fashion in such a scene : to do so would seem sacrilegious. One is thankful and grateful for the awe and the guidance. But just as, according to the older and only good tradition, when Paul, travelling by the Way of the Sea, reached the slight ridge of Kaukab and saw for the first time Damascus open before him, and contemplated the scene of his self-chosen work, an emotional storm affected him in which his mind was raised above its ordinary level to contemplate the Divine truth, so in some minor degree was it when the same man, hurrying towards the Galatian cities

after his letter to reclaim the lost, came within sight of the mountains that showed where Derbe lay, and watched them hour after hour and day after day, as he went onwards to his work among them.

We are all asking the same great questions, and have been doing so through the centuries. Paul is one of those who, in answering these questions, have gripped the heart of mankind. He has been hated by many, and believed in by countless thousands, and his influence grows with the progress of time. No apology, therefore, is needed for the attempt to state what Paul means to one who has been nurtured amid the European Universities of the nineteenth century, and then has wandered for many years along the Pauline roads with Paul in his hands. Every great poet and prophet and religious teacher, while he speaks first of all to the men of his own age, has a message for all time. His message is never antiquated, because he has penetrated beneath the surface to the great principles of life and the great forces that sweep through history, and make the world's life. This message, however, has to be re-interpreted by each age for itself in terms of its own life ; and, as I might almost say, it has to be re-interpreted by every man for his own self in terms of his own life.

Paul has left to us no formal statement of his religious-philosophical position, such as would satisfy the modern undergraduate candidate for a degree with Highest Honours in the University. We have nothing from his hand remotely approaching the character of a "Students' Manual of the Religion of Paul." The Apostle was far too much immersed in affairs, even had the requirements and curiosity of moderns been within his range of vision. The urgent calls of the moment were always pressing upon him, and he could never satisfy himself that he was sufficiently responding to the calls : "we were afflicted on every side :

without were fightings, within were fears":¹ and again "beside those things that are without, there is that which presseth upon me daily, anxiety for all the churches: who is weak, and I am not weak? who is made to stumble, and I burn not?"²

Hence he wrote only occasional letters on special difficulties that occurred among his friends and converts. All his epistles were real letters from a man to his friends, discussing and advising about the affairs of the moment. The letter to the Romans comes nearest to the character of a formal exposition, because among the Roman Church he had only a few personal friends,³ and little special knowledge of the condition and questions in that congregation appears in the Epistle. Even that letter however is not a complete formal treatise explaining his own opinions. It is rather a generalisation of his experience among his other Gentile Churches, the expression in a more systematic fashion of the advice and teaching which he had found most urgently required among them,—rather homiletic than philosophic.

Yet every statement which he makes in any of his letters expresses the judgment of a man who had thought out for himself a certain system of philosophy and religion,—who had not merely accepted a doctrine taught him by others, but had, while accepting this doctrine, brought it into relation with his own mind and experience and made it part of his own independent and original thought. He had found in that doctrine what completed and perfected his own life; and he had meditated on it until his whole

¹ 2 Cor. vii. 5.

² 2 Cor. xi. 28.

³ That the last chapter of Romans is a misplaced fragment of a letter to the Ephesians (as a common modern theory regards it) is an idea which distorts one's view of the situation in the Imperial world and in the Church generally at that time. It has, however, no bearing on the teaching of Paul.

past history and the whole history of his own race and of the world became a unity. Hence he judged every question that was submitted to him by his followers, and solved every difficulty which they had to meet, on the general principles into which he had thought himself and by which he lived.

In attempting to understand the way in which this system of thought and these principles of judgment had gradually developed themselves within Paul's mind in such a way as entirely to recreate and mould his personality—"it is no longer I, but Christ liveth in me"¹—we cannot depend for aid on recognising any stages of development within the range of Paul's own letters. His system was already complete before he was finally called to go forth unto the Gentiles: there had been earlier intimations given to him of his future work, but not [intimations such that he clearly understood them and obeyed them.² The very fact that at last he understood the true nature of the call showed that he was now at last fully prepared to answer it. The recognition of the right way to put the question of career leads one on to answer the question. The answer is already implicit in rightly formulating the question. That is the truth of science, as well as of life. To know how to put the right question marks the creative man in science as in life. The beginner can neither put the right question nor set rightly about the solution of the complicated general problem.

No development, therefore, in the religious position of Paul can be traced in the letters. His religious thought is as

¹ Galatians ii. 20.

² The final intimation, which led to immediate action, took place on his second visit to Jerusalem (Gal. ii. 10), and is described by himself in Acts xxii. 17-21. This seems to be the right and necessary placing of that vision.

complete in the first as in the last. The apparent differences between them in regard to the expression of his teaching are due to two causes.

(1) He had to adapt his teaching both to the special needs and to the varying power of comprehension among his pupils. He had to solve the pressing difficulties of the moment, and he had to speak to them in language that they could understand. It was necessary to raise those pagans to a higher moral platform before they could even comprehend many of the requirements of morality as Paul understood it. Their judgment had been distorted, and needed to be straightened. The Jews around him started on a far higher moral standard, and could feel needs and be conscious of sin as the pagans could not. You must talk of mathematical principles in very different ways to an untaught and to a moderately well trained learner; and so it is with moral principles, as any intelligent missionary among a rude or a savage race can bear witness.

Paul had to create the consciousness of the sin and the need, before he could guide rightly the ignorant gropings after "Salvation,"¹ which were everywhere manifest in the pagan world. Hence he came among the ignorant Corinthians "not with verbal or philosophic skill, setting forth the mystery [i.e. the deeper and more complicated explanation of the nature] of God." He used no "persuasive words of wisdom." He blazoned before them in simple description "the [Divine] Spirit and the power" thereof. It was only "among the mature that he used philosophico-religious language."² He would not, in modern parlance, have talked to an ordinary audience of "the teleology of

¹ All men in the Aegean lands were seeking for "Salvation," and making prayers and vows for it, but wherein it lay they knew not. Such votive stelæ are remarkably common *ὕπὲρ σωτηρίας*.

² 1 Corinthians ii. 1-6.

the finite consciousness." A deep truth underlies those words, but that way of expressing them must be reserved for an audience in a University, highly trained in philosophic terminology: it conveys no meaning to the uneducated man. Hence the letters to the Ephesians or Colossians, who had already been trained and practised in Christian thought, are more philosophic and mystic in language than the Corinthian letter. Yet in all the same philosophy, the same religion, and the same mysticism lie below the surface.

Again to Timothy, a Christian of long standing and experience, yet himself a simple nature without higher philosophic training or innate power, a special mode of presenting the advanced and practical teaching was appropriate.

(2) Paul learned much about the best way of approaching the pagan world. In method of presentation of his message, and in the line of attack on the Roman world (as a stage in the attack on the entire world of man), there is a distinct development, which is however probably already fully completed in the Corinthian letters.

Still, with all the difficulties of the task clearly in mind, we essay it simply because we must. Paul insistently presses on the minds of men, and we cannot get clear of him.

VII. THE BASIS OF PAUL'S THOUGHT—(1) GOD IS.

Probably no one will hesitate as to what this basis was. His whole mind was built on the foundation: *God is*. It was impossible for a true and patriotic Jew to doubt about this fundamental truth.

The whole glory of the Jewish race lay in this belief. It had taken many generations and many centuries to work this truth into the fabric of the Jewish mind. Only after

many errors, many lapses, many a slipping back into polytheism, did this fundamental principle at last establish itself. The books of Moses, the reiteration of the ten commandments, the family teaching and the Passover, could only by slow degrees eradicate any possibility of an alternative from the mind of the Jews. The age of the great Prophets and the teaching of history, as the race lived through it, at last fixed this deep in the Jewish heart.

To the Jew the whole glory of his race was concentrated in this belief. This distinguished his people from every other nation. This one people held firmly the truth, to which here and there amid other races a great philosopher or a great poet attained by a rather halting and uncertain course. So Aeschylus had attained it: "Zeus, whatever He is and by whatever title it is right to call him, I address Him by this name."¹ How great a statement this is! How much it contains of Greek history and of Greek thought. Yet how poor it seems in comparison with the simple and majestic principle of the Jews: *God is—the living and real God.*

Every great man in the Jewish race had been great in virtue of his firm hold on this truth; and his greatness had been proportionate to the firmness of his grasp. To doubt the existence of the One Living God was to destroy the basis on which the nation's greatness rested. The fool might say in his heart "there is no God"; but Paul does not speak to the fools and cannot be understood by them. He assumes this principle always. He addresses only those who believe it in however wavering and insufficient fashion, whether they do so by nature or through the compelling and convincing power of experience in life. Paul presumes a certain element of wisdom and insight among those whom he addresses. The absence of this

¹ *Agamemnon*, 152.

elementary power of rightly judging he regarded as a proof of moral degeneration, i.e. of sin.

He does not attempt to prove to his hearers that *God is*. They must see it for themselves. God has not left Himself without witness, in that He did good and gave them from heaven rains and fruitful seasons.¹ These are the free gifts of God. Men recognise this, and know that it is He who is filling their hearts with food and gladness. To the present day in Paul's own Asia Minor a bounteous spring flowing from the rock or the earth and turning the ground through which it flows from a dry desert into a fruitful garden, is called by those who enjoy its benefits, Huda-verdi, "God-has-given."

To such men, who had understood this elementary fact of the world, Paul addressed himself.² To the rest, a few philosophers, he did not speak. This address opened the pagan world of Greece and Rome to him, for almost all accepted this principle. The Divine power, which they worshipped without recognising its real nature, he set forth to them. He pointed out all that followed from this initial and fundamental truth.

To Paul and to every Jew this living God was a real power, external to man ; He was not the creation of human thought, but independent thereof, not a phantom of the mind, but an absolute and self-existent reality. Further, as man has been made in the image of God, this self-existent primal reality is a person. He lives.

From this axiom that there is one personal God, the single self-existent and all-powerful reality, Paul's thought began. To him it was the starting-point of all thinking and the guarantee of man's power to think rightly : it was driven

¹ Paul and Barnabas in Acts xiv. 17.

² Acts xvii. 23.

home into his nature by the generations that lay behind him, self-evident and final, an ultimate and direct perception, not demonstrable by reasoning or argument, but recognised intuitively. In the perception of one's own existence there is involved the recognition or the assumption of the existence of God. You cannot get behind that. Thought moves onward from that.

Such, then, is Paul's position. You must have that or nothing. In God alone is confidence. Without Him life is a rudderless drifting on a troubled sea. With Him the world becomes intelligible and real as the envisagement or the work of God.

This direct perception Paul would call the first expression of Faith. By Faith we know this primal truth. "Faith is the giving substance to things hoped for, the test of things not seen. . . .¹ By Faith we understand that the universe has been framed by the word of God." Faith is the guide and the moving force in every right act of human life. Without this power of Faith we cannot make even one sure step.

To the loose and vague thinker this seems a big assumption—but that is only because he thinks loosely and vaguely.

W. M. RAMSAY.

¹ Hebrews xi. 1 may be quoted as indirectly attesting the ideas of Paul, being (as the writer believes) composed in communication with him, by an intimate friend who expresses from an independent point of view and in non-Pauline words the fundamental idea of Paulinism.