

## Unto Romans: XV. and XVI.

WILLIAM BENJAMIN SMITH.

TULANE UNIVERSITY.

IN a former paper we have considered the textual facts concerning the address and destination of the chief of Pauline epistles, in so far as these lay before us in the opening chapter and in the general situation as commonly understood. The conclusions recommended by that study were found to be distinctly at variance with those ordinarily accepted. In the following pages we shall try to forget our earlier study and to yield ourselves without recalcitrance to the natural guidance of an entirely different body of facts presenting themselves in the last two chapters. These are incomparably more numerous and complicated than those already treated; indeed, they yield in these respects to no others that meet us in New Testament study. But they are not far to seek; they are in large measure exactly ascertainable, and even already ascertained; and so great is their significance, both direct and indirect, as to justify the most painstaking investigation.

Our final judgment must rest upon two entirely separate bases of support, the internal and the external evidence, and it is perhaps a matter of indifference which we study first; but since a choice must be made, we shall begin with the former and let our mind play freely upon it, unaffected, so far as possible, by the latter.

### I.

Almost any attentive English reader, in passing from the 14th to the 15th chapter of Romans, must become conscious of something strange or peculiar, though he may be unable to say what it is. Certainly it is not a change of subject. The general theme of the 14th chapter is forbearance, consideration of one for another. This has been elaborated at great length through 23 verses, and presented from almost every point of view, even at the expense of no little repetition of thought in slightly varying words. Compare vv.<sup>4, 10, 13, 15, 20, 13b, 21</sup>, etc. Apparently the discussion, so fragmentary and continually returning

upon itself, has been closed with the apophthegm, "Whatsoever is not of faith is sin." At the very best, then, one is surprised to find precisely the same subject resumed in 15<sup>1</sup>: "Now we that are strong ought to bear the infirmities of the weak, and not to please ourselves." Verse<sup>2</sup> then brings us back exactly to the previous verse<sup>19</sup>, to the notion of edifying one another. Our surprise increases to find that the subject thus formally introduced is immediately dismissed, this time finally. The verses that follow are connected merely mechanically by certain words. Verse<sup>3</sup> adduces the example of Christ as supposedly referred to in a *Scripture*; v.<sup>4</sup> shows that all *Scriptures* are written for our *comfort*; v.<sup>5f.</sup> prays the God of *comfort* to make them a unit in mind, accord, and mouth unto the *glory* of God; v.<sup>7</sup> exhorts them to receive one another unto this same *glory*, while the following verses, <sup>8-13</sup>, would show that, while the Jews who believe on Christ are saved by right, to maintain the truth of God and fulfil his promises to the fathers, the Gentiles are saved by mercy, for which they *glorify* God. Apparently this latter idea is the one aimed at in the whole paragraph and finally reached by the steps indicated in italics. It can hardly be that any of these intermediate notions are presented for their own sake, else why are they dismissed so instantly? We can liken them to nothing else so well as to switches on a railroad track. Each serves to turn off the thought into an entirely different path without wrecking the whole train, until suddenly we find ourselves moving at right angles to the course on which we started.

This seems to be a most puzzling procedure for any one writing freely at first hand: v.<sup>1</sup> reopens a discussion already closed with great formality, but straightway drops it and turns off by a highly artificial path to something wholly diverse. The feeling of bewilderment which overtakes the English reader at this point, and which we have tried to analyze, is much intensified on reading the Greek. The δέ is more closely continuative than "Now," and we are puzzled by the sudden apparition of two classes, the Able and the Unable (οἱ δυνατοί and οἱ ἀδύνατοι): "and we ought, we the Able, to bear the infirmities of the Unable." These are spoken of as two classes perfectly familiar to the readers; yet no mention has been made of either hitherto. "He that is weak in the faith" (τὸν δὲ ἀσθενούντα τῇ πίστει) seems to be another; at least, the terms used are not the same. Of these Able and Unable we hear nothing more, nor can we ascertain who they were. That there should have been two such well-marked orders from the beginning of the Roman congregation,

that Paul should have known about them so accurately as to rank himself at once undisputedly with the one, and assume a tone of condescension toward the other,—all this seems strange and very hard to understand. Everything considered, we are here in the presence of a riddle, which no art of Hermes has yet availed to unravel. If we were dealing with anything but a Pauline epistle, the suspicion would certainly arise that this paragraph was a later addendum, that its author intended to attach it as closely as possible to the foregoing chapter, and for that reason resumed the subject in vv.<sup>1-2</sup>, only to pass swiftly away from it by the curved track of vv.<sup>3-4, 5, 6, 7</sup>, to what was really in his mind, the relation of Jew and Gentile, set forth in vv.<sup>8-12</sup>, while the whole closes with the benediction of v.<sup>13</sup>. Would Professor Charles entertain any doubt on this point, if the writing were the Book of Enoch?

Let us now consider this main thought of v.<sup>8</sup>: "For I say that Christ has become a Minister of Circumcision, for the sake of God's truth, in order to confirm the promises of the fathers, but that the Gentiles glorified God on account of mercy." It seems impossible to mistake the meaning of these words, as Judaic and ultra-Judaic. Christ is declared to be "Minister of Circumcision," which must signify one who promotes or represents circumcision, and the mildest meaning this can have is the champion of the Jewish people. That so much at least is signified, follows necessarily from the object of this ministry as stated: "To establish [make good] the promises of the fathers," *i.e.* the promises made to the Jewish patriarchs. We do not see how it is possible to form a more strictly Judaic conception of the office of the Messiah. In order, however, to leave nothing unsaid, to distinguish as sharply as possible between Jew and Gentile, the writer continues: "But [I say] that the Gentiles praised God for mercy." In other words, salvation and glorification had been promised to the fathers for their posterity, the Jews. In order to fulfil (*βεβαιῶσαι*) these promises, and so maintain the truth (or fidelity) of God (*ὑπὲρ ἀληθείας θεοῦ*), Christ became "Minister of Circumcision," whatever that may be. Thus, salvation belongs to the Jews of *right*, it is an obligation on the part of God, who must fulfil his promises and maintain his truth; but with Gentiles, it is quite another matter: to them God has made *no* promises, is under no pledge; their salvation is purely of grace; it is for his *mercy* that they praise God. We do not dwell on the Scriptures alleged in proof of this doctrine, which have plainly no semblance of pertinency, but we ask concerning the unmistakable doctrine itself: Is it

Paulinism? Is it the teaching of *Galatians* or of *Romans*? Does it consist with "There is no distinction," 3<sup>22</sup>? with 3<sup>30</sup>? with 10<sup>12</sup> ("for there is no distinction both of Jew and of Greek")? Can we conceive of the author of this verse as writing the Epistle to the Galatians? And if such be his final dictum, why did he write this long argument for Romans? Why did he through a dozen chapters so laboriously produce a certain impression, which at the end he obliterates by one stroke of the pen? The doctrine of this verse is very plain and even plausible; if Paul has meant this all the time, why did he not say so frankly and clearly at the outset? Can we think of the apostle as a woman in love, who reserves the whole secret of her heart for a postscript? To our mind this is nothing less than incredible.

It is futile to attempt to shelter this un-Pauline passage behind another equally un-Pauline, as 11<sup>15</sup><sup>xxx</sup>. Undoubtedly there are found more than once precisely such contradictions in the Chief Letters, in *Romans* itself. But these constitute the true problems of New Testament exegesis, which imperiously demand solution and by no means solve one another. In them lies the secret of Christianity. The homoeopathic treatment, adopted even by Lipsius, has long been a favorite with commentators, and a stone of stumbling in the way of true criticism. Propound them a riddle in *Galatians*, and at once they answer by another in *Ephesians*; conundrums in *Mark* they resolve readily by enigmas in *John*. But we maintain firmly that two negatives in different chapters do not make an affirmative; neither, for the understanding of the New Testament, is there any help in Hahnemann. We hold that the deliverances of the apostle must be judged by the same logical law as the deliverances of any other intelligence: if he taught, as in *Galatians* and elsewhere in this epistle, the most ultra-anti-Judaism, then he could not teach the ultra-Judaism of these verses and remain an honest man. Nay, he would have been foolish as well as dishonest, to contradict so flatly in a postscript without explanation the tedious elaborations of the foregoing chapters. And when Lipsius says in defence, "Die scharfe Unterscheidung zwischen Juden und Heiden findet sich mindestens ebenso bestimmt 11<sup>16-24</sup>," it is enough to answer: "So much the worse for the Paulinity of 11<sup>16-24</sup>." Who has ever suggested even a plausible reason for supposing that Paul really wrote or inspired those verses?

We pause but a moment on v.<sup>12</sup>, though it contains much food for reflection. How inflated this benediction! How strangely placed

in the midst of the epistle! How uncertain the text! Shall we read πληρώσαι, or πληροφορήσαι (with BFG)? Is not the un-Pauline ἐν τῷ πιστεῖν (not found in DFGdefgm Arm.) with εἰς τὸ περισσεῖν (not found in B 57) a plain conflation? It would seem hard to imagine a conclusion rhyming better with the notion that this paragraph<sup>1-13</sup> is a later addendum.

The most obvious remark concerning the next passage, vv.<sup>14-22</sup>, is that it has no immediate connection with the foregoing. "But I am persuaded, my brethren, even I myself, concerning you, that also you yourselves are full of goodness, having been filled with all the knowledge [*gnosis*], able also to admonish one another." It is vain to say this connects immediately with the foregoing exhortation (Lipsius); formally, yes; but not really; it might as well be attached anywhere else. The next observation is that the emphasis is extremely labored and overstrained, and the style plethoric. But these considerations are slight, by the side of those that meet us in vv.<sup>15-19</sup>. The writer seems to be apologizing for writing "too boldly in part" (τολμηρότερον[-ως] ἀπὸ μέρους = *kühner (als erforderlich), stellenweise*), but in these nine verses ideas are not expressed, they are merely dimly shadowed forth: we see only men as trees walking; and it seems to be the purpose of the writer to avoid committing himself to anything beyond intimations, though the uncertainty of the text makes even this uncertain. So much, however, we may say with all confidence: that *the ground-note of this section is apologetic, and that in so far it is entirely discordant with the Introduction, 1<sup>8-10</sup>*. There the writer's spirit was as far as possible from apology for *visiting* the Romans, much less for *writing* to them; on the contrary, he excuses himself for *not* coming to them, on the ground that he had indeed often planned a visit, but his plans had miscarried; and he cannot find a single expression quite strong enough to voice adequately his yearning, and prayer, and purpose to visit them, but he piles up intensives one upon another. There is no possibility of mistake here. The tenor can not be misunderstood. If the writer be honest, he had long been planning a visit to Rome, in the hope of strengthening them, of preaching the gospel, and of winning converts for the gospel; and whatever were the causes that thwarted these plans, they lay outside himself, in the circumstances of his situation; they did *not* lie within him; there all was perfect readiness to preach gospel to "you that are in Rome" just as well as to any other people, either Jew or Gentile. Here, however, the case is precisely reversed. The writer apologizes, in a vague and almost

unintelligible way, it is true, yet indubitably he apologizes for even writing to these Roman readers; he is modest to a degree: he will not call himself an apostle, but only a "Minister of Christ Jesus"; he protests that he has never preached and will never preach gospel where Christ has been named, lest he build on another's foundation; and finally he disclaims in a marvellously awkward fashion all intention of preaching or staying in Rome (?) and assures them he intends only to stop over *in transitu* on his way to Spain! We affirm that these two passages (1<sup>8-15</sup> and 15<sup>14-24</sup>) contradict each other absolutely and at every point; not indeed grammatically and outwardly, but, what is far more important, inwardly and psychologically. When we represent to ourselves the moods, the tempers, which the two passages necessarily imply, we find them as utterly opposed as can be, nor is there any possibility of uniting them in the same person. The language here used may sound strong, but it does not nearly render our sense of the fundamental antagonism between these two paragraphs, an antagonism as deep as the soul of man; nor can we believe that any unbiassed intelligence can read and re-read the passages and vividly realize the affections they imply, without a like lively feeling of the discord between them.

On minuter examination we shall find this general impression deepened and strengthened. As already observed, this section is certainly apologetic, but for what it is not so easy to determine. Apparently for writing "more boldly in part" (than was proper or necessary), though what part is referred to, no man can say; but to make out any satisfactory connection between vv.<sup>14</sup> and <sup>15</sup> seems a hopeless undertaking. Stripped of all verbiage these stand thus: "I know you are good and wise, but [ $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$  = *doch*, Lipsius] I wrote you more boldly in part [than was necessary]." It is this adversative "but [nevertheless]" that is so hard to understand in connection with the "more boldly." If it stood, "I know you are babes in the faith, and need careful instruction, nevertheless I may have written too boldly at times," etc., the thought would seem natural; as it is, it seems awkward and inverted. Let this pass, however; now and then even Homer nods. We now inquire what was the object of the writing — a most important question, over which generations of critics have cudgelled their brains to no purpose. It is answered in three words only: "To remind you": (*ὡς ἐπιαναμνήσκων ὑμᾶς*). But he who reminds must remind of something; of what then is the writer's reminder? The text furnishes no answer whatever! The following clause tells *why* he reminded, "because of the grace," etc. but does

not even hint of what he reminds. Now this *why* is not the question that would naturally interest either us or the original readers ; it is the *what* that we want to know about, and here we are left in utter darkness. On looking closely at this *why*, we find that it is apparently an authorization of this reminder, of this letter : " I wrote to remind you, because of the grace that was given me from God, for me to be a priest of Christ Jesus to the Gentiles, ministering sacrificially the gospel of God that the oblation of the Gentiles may become acceptable, having been sanctified in Holy Spirit." Herein, then, lay his right to address them such a letter. Here, then, is the real thought : a defence of the author's right to address such an epistle to such readers, — he was priest of Christ Jesus unto the Gentiles. This reason may be good in itself, but what possible fitness has it on the lips of him who has already proclaimed himself, " Paul, servant of Christ Jesus, elect Apostle, . . . through whom we received grace and Apostleship unto obedience among all the Gentiles for his name's sake, among whom are ye " ; who has already professed his year-long prayer and purpose, nay, his inviolable obligation, to visit them and evangelize among them, his complete readiness to preach gospel to all alike everywhere? What has occurred to transform the sublimely daring apostle into a fawning, cringing priest? And what a remarkable conception is this of Paul, as " the official of Christ Jesus, ministering in sacrifice the gospel of God, that the oblation of the Gentiles may become well-pleasing." The imagery is ungainly and repulsive, and, what is more, it is thoroughly hieratic, while the thought and the tendence are ultra-Judaic. Moreover, there is a whole group of unfamiliar terms, *λειτουργός, προσφορά, ιερουργούντα*, the last not elsewhere in the New Testament. If the *Autor ad Galatas* or *ad Romanos* wrote such words as these to these same Romans, then nothing is impossible ; Coke may have written Hamlet, we may believe anything of anybody.

The next, v.<sup>17</sup>, " I have therefore the glorying in Christ Jesus as to things pertaining to God," connects, if at all, only loosely with vv.<sup>16</sup> and <sup>18</sup>. The following verses, <sup>18-22</sup>, contain a vindication of the writer's preaching to the Gentiles, but in the strange form of a disclaimer of all glorying, save in what Christ had wrought through him most marvellously. Hereby uncalled-for modesty is combined with extraordinary pretensions : from Jerusalem, and in a circle as far as Illyricum, he has fulfilled the gospel of the Christ. Further on he declares he " has no more room in these regions," and hence hastens to lift aloft the standard of the cross, above the western wave, in farthest Hispa-

nia. The very best that can be said of these statements is that they are gross rhetorical exaggerations ; the latter is indeed absurd. Had the writer said that he would now move upon the great capital city, having evangelized in some measure the Orient, we might have accepted it as the plan of a masterly spirit ; but to say that there was no more field for his activity in the immense and densely populated and highly civilized East, not a tithe of which had heard of the gospel, and that he must therefore pass over, not to Rome or even to Italy, but to the remote and semi-barbarous Spain, to find scope for his powers, is simply preposterous. For our part, we refuse to ascribe such fustian to the Apostle Paul.

. It would be hard to imagine a more thorough undoing of this notion, that Paul went or intended to go to Spain because he had "no more room" in the East, than is furnished by Lightfoot himself in his "Chronology of St. Paul's Life and Epistles" (*Biblical Essays*, p. 223). He places the apostle's arrival at Rome 61 A.D. ; his release from prison 63 A.D. What then does Paul do? Hasten on to Spain? By no means ! He makes a "first journey eastward, revisits Macedonia," Philippi the fourth time, then "revisits Asia and Phrygia," also visits Colossae, and "founds the church of Crete." All this extensive and continued activity in the "parts" where five years before he had no room ! Now at last, thinks Lightfoot, he "visits Spain, Gaul, Dalmatia." Where is the evidence? Why, in 2 Tim. 4<sup>10</sup> we read : "For Demas hath forsaken me, having loved this present world, and is departed unto Thessalonica, Crescens to Galatia, Titus unto Dalmatia" !! But even Lightfoot cannot pretend that Paul stayed any considerable time in Spain. For there follows in his scheme a "second journey eastward," in which the apostle is made to "revisit Asia and Phrygia, Ephesus, Macedonia, Philippi, Achaia, Crete, Asia, Miletus, Troas, Corinth," and on his way to Nicopolis he is arrested and carried away to Rome to martyrdom 68 A.D. To be sure, all this "globe-trotting" is on paper only, but it shows indisputably that the great bishop did not himself for a moment believe that there was no more room in Asia, much less in Greece, and Italy, and Africa, for the apostle, and that he did not take the Spanish journey at all seriously.

Not less suspicious is v.<sup>20</sup> : "And so being [or am I] ambitious to evangelize not where Christ was named, lest I build on another's foundation." This sounds like a redoubled and exaggerated echo of some very indistinct words in 2 Cor. 10<sup>14</sup><sup>17</sup>. Moreover, it seems pitiful and thoroughly pusillanimous. That Paul should studiously

avoid preaching where any one else had preached, where Christ had even been named, appears ridiculous and unbelievable, and finds no semblance of warrant either in Corinthians or in the Book of Acts. Is it possible that such base jealousies guided the counsels of the early preachers of Christ? We cannot believe it.

Moreover, it sharply contradicts the Introduction, 1<sup>8-15</sup>, where the writer declares it had long been his purpose to preach to them (in Rome) and reiterates his readiness, and eagerness, and sacred duty to preach alike to all men everywhere. It is useless to expatiate on this point. He who does not perceive the contradiction as well as the unlikelihood here would hardly perceive them anywhere.

These verses, 23-25, present an extraordinary hiatus in structure as well as remarkable textual uncertainty. To us it appears incredible that the Apostle Paul, writing to Roman strangers in straightforward, honest fashion, about a matter of business, should express himself in such a lumbering, confused, unmeaning manner as the following: "Wherefore also I was hindered these many times from coming unto you, but now having no longer room in these regions, and having yearning to come unto you for many years, as perchance I may fare into Spain — for I hope as I fare through to behold you and to be sent on thither by you, if first in part I be sated of [seeing] you — but now I fare unto Jerusalem, ministering to the saints. For they pleased, Macedonia and Achaia, to make a certain communion unto the poor of the saints, those in Jerusalem. For they pleased, and their debtors they are. For if the Gentiles communed in their spiritual things, they are in debt also to minister to them in the carnal things." It would be hard for a schoolboy to write more wretched English, but the Greek is no better. What is the author really trying to say? Apparently he is trying to avoid saying anything positively, but will merely hint vaguely that he has no thought of preaching or staying in Rome. As already observed more than once, such a frame of mind is the diametrical opposite of that displayed in the Introduction. Along with this timorous deprecation there goes what a *captatio benevolentiae*! He has been hindered so many times from visiting them, has had yearning to visit them for many years, and now, though he will not dare make them the longed-for visit, yet he will venture upon a passing call, on his way to Spain, only to behold them (*θεάσασθαι* = view with wonder, or as a mere gratification of the sight), and to be sent on by them when he has partly fed his eyes full of them (*ἐὰν ὑμῶν πρῶτον ἀπὸ μέρους ἐμπλησθῶ*)! What Oriental courtier ever indited more unctuous flattery? Is this

Paul, the apostle, who declared not long before: "Do I seek to please men? Were it men I still pleased, Christ's servant I should not be"? We do not see how any one can ascribe these verses to the apostle, and yet retain any reverence for the apostle himself.

On closer inspection, perhaps the most obvious peculiarity of our passage is the hiatus that yawns after "Spain": all is protasis up to this point, but no apodosis follows; the sentence begun is never completed. In rapid impassioned declamation, or in high-wrought lyrical composition, this might be forgiven; but what must we think of it in the most leisurely narrative of a most deliberate writer, who, as the greatest critics assure us, watches over his tenses and his particles with the most scrupulous care? Observe also the frequent repetitions and tautophones: τοῦ ἔλθειν πρὸς ὑμᾶς . . . τοῦ ἔλθειν πρὸς ὑμᾶς; νυνὶ δὲ . . . νυνὶ δὲ; ἠὲ δόκησαν γὰρ . . . ἠὲ δόκησαν γάρ; πορεύομαι . . . διαπορευόμενος . . . πορεύομαι; κοινωνίαν . . . ἐκοινωνήσαν; καὶ ὀφείλεται . . . ὀφείλουσιν καί. Note also how the author has quilted his verses from scraps of earlier writings: compare ἐνεκοπτόμην τὰ πολλὰ τοῦ ἔλθειν πρὸς ὑμᾶς with πολλάκις προεθέμην ἔλθειν πρὸς ὑμᾶς καὶ ἐκωλύθη (1<sup>13</sup>); ἐπιποθίαν δὲ ἔχων τοῦ ἔλθειν πρὸς ὑμᾶς with ἐπιποθῶ γὰρ ἰδεῖν ὑμᾶς; ἐλπίζω γὰρ διαπορευόμενος θεάσασθαι ὑμᾶς with οὐ θέλω γὰρ ὑμᾶς ἄρτι ἐν παρόδῳ ἰδεῖν (1 Cor. 16<sup>7</sup>), where the variations ἐλπίζω for οὐ θέλω and θεάσασθαι for ἰδεῖν are subtle and intentional, — observe also ἐλπίζω γάρ in the same verse; ὑφ' ὑμῶν προπεμφθῆναι with ὑμεῖς με προπέμψητε (1 Cor. 16<sup>8</sup>); ὡς ἂν πορεύομαι with οὐ ἂν πορεύομαι; Μακεδονία καὶ Ἀχαΐα with Μακεδονίαν καὶ Ἀχαΐαν (Acts 19<sup>21</sup>); πορεύομαι εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ with πορεύεσθαι εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα (Acts 19<sup>21</sup>).

This collection is not called λογία, as in 1 Cor. 16<sup>1</sup>, but more sanctimoniously κοινωνία, as in the later 2 Cor. 8<sup>4</sup> 9<sup>13</sup>; hence λειτουργῆσαι (2 Cor. 9<sup>12</sup>); hence also the διακονῶν τοῖς ἁγίοις (2 Cor. 8<sup>4</sup> 9<sup>1</sup>), while τοὺς πτωχοὺς comes from Gal. 2<sup>10</sup>. The explicitness of "unto the poor of the saints, those in Jerusalem" seems to be the mark of a compiler. Thus, all the ideas and nearly all the phrases of these verses appear to be culled from elsewhere; the author's only addition is "unto Spain," and it is precisely this same that turns the whole to nonsense: for this abandonment of the East, in favor of the West, is a mere romantic conceit, without any sanction either in Corinthians or in Acts, where the goal of Paul is not Spain but Rome (19<sup>21</sup>), or in common sense. This inability to add any fresh and inherently probable detail to his authorities is the sure mark of a late reviser.

This want of originality shows itself, unless we err, very strikingly

in v.<sup>28</sup>. What shall we say of the expression "Having sealed them this fruit"? What mind working freely would of itself elaborate such an image? It is in vain that acute conjecturers have lashed their wits over *σφραγισάμενος*; their best guesses do not really mend matters. But we think we can divine the mind of the writer. He is bound fast to scriptural words and idioms, he will vary hardly a hair's breadth. Now in 1<sup>13</sup> there was talk of "some fruit" (*τινὰ καρπὸν*), and in 2 Cor. 1<sup>22</sup> is found "He who also sealed us" (*ὁ καὶ σφραγισάμενος ἡμᾶς*), and in 1 Cor. 9<sup>2</sup> the Corinthians are called "The seal of my Apostolate" (*ἡ γὰρ σφραγίς, κ.τ.λ.*). This was enough for such a compositor, who produced therefrom the monstrous hybrid *σφραγισάμενος αὐτοῖς τὸν καρπὸν τοῦτον*, — where "fruit" means not converts but collection!

Among so many rocks of offence it is not easy to say what is the chief, but the notion that the Gentiles should share their carnal goods with the Jews *because* the Jews had shared their spiritual goods with the Gentiles, is as un-Pauline as can be imagined, besides being bizarre and ridiculous. To suppose that the author of *Galatians* and *Romans* seriously entertained any such grotesque, ultra-Judaic idea is to dissolve his whole personality in contradictions.

The concern of the writer to persuade the Romans that they need have no fear, that he will not stay, but will merely pass on by, is really amusing; thus again in v.<sup>28</sup>: "I shall go away, passing by you into Spain." And right on the heels of this pleading for a night's lodging, with promise to leave early in the morning, comes this boast: "But I know that coming unto you I shall come in fulness of blessing of Christ." To our mind there is no literary judgment more inevitable than this: it is not the apostle but his impersonator that here speaks.

In the presence of such facts it is almost dumbfounding to read in Lightfoot's first Essay (p. 313): "It never once occurs to him [Paul] that he is intruding on the province of others." Now here are fifteen verses that are either apologetic or nothing at all, wholly unmeaning. Lightfoot himself admits that the apostle "apologizes for speaking to the Romans with overboldness"; but that is in v.<sup>15</sup>, and in the thirteen that follow and form the bulk and the essence of the apology, there is no hint of any overboldness, except in writing and going to the Romans. There is no point at all in the pompous description of his ministry to the Gentiles, unless it be an implied vindication of his mission unto them; there is no point whatever in this emphasis of his maxim about not preaching where Christ was

already named, unless he is forestalling some accusation of intrusion ; there is not the least meaning in his repeated insistence that he will not stay in Rome, but will merely gaze upon them in transit and pass away into Spain, unless he would acknowledge Rome as forbidden ground, through which he may indeed seek a right of way, but nothing more. This general purport of this cautiously-veiled pericope is unmistakable, not only *in spite of* but precisely *because of* the veiling. Surely no one can maintain that everything in these verses is plain, artless, straightforward ; even a thoughtful child, on reading them, must perceive that more is meant than meets the ear. And what possible significance can this "more" have other than we have given it? Has any apologist ever suggested? Will any ever suggest? We pause for a reply.

If the immense learning of the British bishop has not saved him from purblindness, neither has the matchless erudition of the German professor delivered him from self-contradiction. Zahn cannot deny that this section represents Rome as practically tabu to the apostle, whom he fancies as confining himself to "*Grundlegen*," as starting the Christian work here, there, everywhere, and then leaving it for others, as soon as started — a mere idle fancy, whose only recommendation is that Zahn needs it, contradicted sharply by the Antiochian, Ephesian, Macedonian, and Corinthian life of the apostle ; he admits repeatedly that Rome was only a *Durchgangspunkt* (p. 260) ; that merely writing to the Romans was not *εὐαγγελίζεσθαι*, and hence only was excusable (p. 293) ; that Paul did not think to effect much in Rome (*er doch in Rom nicht viel auszurichten gedenkt*) ; and so on *passim*. Nevertheless, Prisca and Aquila, consecrated to the *Missionspläne* of the apostle, along with Epænetus, had gone to Rome as soon as Paul left Ephesus, to prepare the ground for him there, as they had already done in Ephesus (*um auch dort, wie ehemals in Ephesus, dem Apostel das Quartier zu bereiten*, p. 274) ; he hopes to evangelize successfully the unconverted population of Rome (*er hofft auch der ihrer Masse nach unbekehrten Bevölkerung Roms mit Erfolg Ev. zu predigen*, p. 253) ; he names only this missionary preaching as the object of his coming (*nennt er als Zweck seines Kommens nur die Missionspredigt*, p. 253) ; and by 1<sup>13</sup> can be meant only a successful missionary activity among the population of Rome (*nur eine erfolgreiche Missionswirksamkeit unter der Bevölkerung Roms*, p. 263). If these be not glaring contradictions, then we do not know contradictions when we see them. But of such is the kingdom of apology. Zahn and his confrères constitute their works

of makeshifts and *Nothbehelfe* and all manner of antinomies. Whatever quack remedy offers a moment's alleviation they seize with eagerness, unmindful of the agony they are preparing for the morrow. For them sufficient unto the page is the evil thereof.

In further illustration we may take Godet, who imagines a colony of Pauline converts sent on ahead by Paul to look over the ground and prepare that all-important field for his sowing, and this in the face of the fact that Paul protested his intention merely to view the Romans on his way to Spain! So, too, Sanday and Headlam think this elaborate treatise was addressed to scattered groups of wanderers in Rome, some from Ephesus (sent by Paul), some from Tarsus, more from Antioch, forming "not exactly an organized Church, but such a fortuitous assemblage of Christians as was only waiting for the advent of an Apostle to constitute one"; and again they speak of it as "only a small community, which had grown up chiefly as composed of settlers from other places"; again, it consists of little groups scattered over the great city "without any complete and centralized organization." Yet to these few scattering Christians, not yet a church, is addressed the most elaborate document of early Christianity; they are in peculiar danger of false doctrines that will assail them as a shining mark (16<sup>17-19</sup>); they are so important that Paul dares not intrude upon them; they occupy the mighty metropolis so that he cannot stay there but must hurry on to Spain; they receive the salutations of all Christendom; and Sanday and Headlam themselves, in their paraphrase, speak of "the world-wide fame which as a *united Church* you bear for your earnest Christianity"! These expositors think his "imagination had been fired at the prospect of winning a foothold for Christ and the Gospel in the seat of Empire itself"; and yet, in stating his plans he is careful to guard against the idea that he intends to stay any time in Rome, but promises twice to look and pass!

We may not dismiss this section without noticing a favorite argument for the genuineness of this pericope, derived from this very project of a visit to Spain. It is said that it was perfectly natural for Paul to disclose such a purpose in advance, in ignorance that it would never be fulfilled; but for his impersonator, years after his death, in full knowledge that such purpose would be frustrated, to put it into the mouth of the apostle, would be highly improbable if not impossible. This argument, so confidently advanced, limps painfully in both feet. In the first place, it is not known that Paul did not go to Spain. Two passages, one in the Muratorian Fragment, the other in

the First Epistle (so-called) of Clement to the Corinthians, seem to attest, if not the fact, at least a tradition, or rumor, or surmise that the apostle actually visited Hispania. Nothing certain can be made out of these passages, and it is useless to dwell on them; but the indisputable fact that with the last verse of the "We-account" Paul the apostle vanishes from history, cripples this vaunted argument hopelessly. However, we do not deny that the Spanish mission seems to us very improbable, and we are quite willing to concede, for argument's sake, that it never took place; yea, we think it most unlikely that the idea was ever entertained. But all this could not weigh a feather with the impersonator. There is no semblance of reason to suppose this latter wrote before the end of the second century, at least four generations after the death of Paul. By that time the life of the apostle was naught but a gigantic shadow thrown upon the present from a dim-remembered past. Neither the impersonator nor any one else knew anything whatever concerning the last days of the great missionary. Even in this day of printing and careful biography, what can the average presiding elder tell you accurately about the last days of John Wesley? The second or third century impersonator, in all likelihood, knew little if anything more about Paul than we do, his sources of information were but little purer, and he used them with perhaps no critical care or concern. Where no one knew, each might fancy what he pleased. If the idea that Paul preached gospel even unto the Pillars of Hercules seemed edifying, the impersonator would unhesitatingly adopt it, and there was none to say him nay.

But even if there had been a directly counter tradition, it would have made no difference. The notion is entirely false that the second-century writers were bound down to any definite historical form in their redactions. That the gospels are discrepant in nearly every chapter, that Acts and the Epistles are irreconcilable, is a commonplace of criticism. To exhibit the genesis of these antagonisms is a fundamental problem of New Testament theory. The *Vorgeschichte* of Luke contradicts that of Matthew at nearly every point; the Fourth Gospel jars with the Synoptics from beginning to end. Even if we should concede that harmonistic may patch up some artificial concord in every instance, — a wholly impossible concession, — the case would not be altered; the apparent discord is all we have to consider, and that would remain as harsh as ever. As soon as we turn to the choir of extra-canonical early Christian writers, our ears are assailed by a veritable babel. There is not one early

author that does not clash defiance to the New Testament Scriptures. Thus, Irenaeus contends that Jesus reached his fiftieth year, and where did Ignatius get his notion of the nativity (Eph. 19)? That the impersonator of Paul should send him to Spain has in no case a single feature of improbability.

The same remarks apply with full force to the further objection that a second-century author would not have put into Paul's mouth a futile prayer for escape from the unbelievers in Jerusalem. But the prayer need *not* appear futile, for he *was* delivered (according to Acts). Is it replied, Yes, but he came as a prisoner, and not "in joy" nor "in fulness of Christ's blessing," to Rome? We answer that Acts knows of no hindrance put on Paul's activity in Rome; he preached "with all boldness, none forbidding him." His imprisonment, if it had any reality at all, was merely nominal. There was nothing in it to prevent "joy" and "blessing." Besides, there is most excellent reason to believe that the whole story of the trouble at Jerusalem, and the imprisonment, is misplaced, and that Paul went to Rome *a freeman*.

At this point we must ask indulgence for a digression. It would seem rather late in the day to enter a formal refutation of Paley's arguments in his *Horae Paulinae*, pp. 1-65, nor would there be any reason for doing so, had they not received recently such unqualified endorsement in such authoritative circles. Jowett has pronounced them decisive, and he is echoed by Lightfoot and Hort, who in turn are echoed by Sanday and Headlam. What then are these reasonings so hale and hearty, though hoary with a hundred years? Time is rarely so merciful to the syllogisms even of a Paley.

They are all based on certain supposed "undesigned coincidences" between the epistles and Acts, or between different epistles, or different parts of the same epistle. In the case of *Romans*, they number eight, of which first and chief is the coincidence between Rom. 15<sup>25, 26</sup> and Acts 20<sup>2, 3</sup> and 24<sup>17-19</sup>, 1 Cor. 16<sup>1-4</sup>, 2 Cor. 8<sup>1-4</sup> 9<sup>2</sup>. In *Romans* we have data agreeing with those in three other writings, and Paley thinks such "conformity beyond the possibility of random writing to produce," and "in the highest degree improbable" as "the effect of contrivance and design." For the forger, he thinks, could have had no other purpose than that of "giving color to his forgery by the appearance of conformity with other writings which were then extant"; and such a purpose he thinks unreasonable, since "coincidences so circuitous as this answer not the ends of forgery." He who reads this essay attentively need hardly be told that Paley has

mistaken the character of the passage entirely. The aim of the impersonator is by no means to mask a forgery. He is trying through the whole pericope (<sup>14-23</sup>) to break, as gently as possible, the force of the bold Introduction, 1<sup>8-15</sup>; so he represents the apostle as apologizing for writing, and as reiterating that he would not pay them a visit, but would merely look in upon them and pass by on to Spain. The whole situation is a transparent device of this impersonator, who, as we have seen, has taken nearly all his phrases from preëxistent sources, and has added only one circumstance of his own invention, namely, "To Spain," thereby, however, reducing the whole to absurdity; for we repeat, and the repetition cannot be made too emphatic, that the notion of Paul's abandoning Asia and Africa, Greece and Italy, with all their infinite, unexplored possibilities, for the rugged regions of Spain, is chimerical and without any historical warrant of any kind whatever. The apparent strength of the Paleian argument lies entirely in its naïveté and superficiality. Of course, the textual and other deeper difficulties of the passage have quite escaped the English critic.

No. II. "consists of coincidences depending upon date," such as Rom. 16<sup>1-23</sup>, with Acts 20<sup>4</sup>, whence it appears that three — Sosipater, Gaius, Timotheus — of the seven mentioned as saluting the Romans were actually with Paul at the supposed time and place of writing. This coincidence, thinks Paley, is not too exact, but just exact enough. "As much as could be expected from reality, though less than would have been produced by design." He is clearly eminently complacent; had the coincidences been two, four, five, six, or even seven, his satisfaction would hardly have been less complete. Such reasons are as plentiful as blackberries, in support of any proposition. Again, recent critics are surprised to find Priscilla and Aquila returned to Rome, but Paley finds here a striking coincidence; for they might possibly have returned to Rome between 1 Cor. 16<sup>19</sup> and Rom. 16<sup>3</sup>, whereas had the date been any other, either before or after, they could not have been in Rome! This argument is fearfully and wonderfully made. It amounts to saying that an historical situation which was not impossible was very probably actual! There is not the remotest hint in Acts of any such return of the couple to Rome.

Paley also thinks that the encomium of Priscilla and Aquila in v.<sup>4</sup> is strangely accordant with history, but Acts is profoundly silent in the matter. It contains no suggestion of such devotion on their part, no hint of any very special relation existing between Paul and them.

To our mind the commendation sounds overwrought, and the construction of the verse seems suspicious.

Another congruity, this time of place, is detected in the mention of Erastus as "chamberlain of the city," since the phrase in 2 Tim. 4<sup>20</sup>, "Erastus abode at Corinth," renders it "a fair subject of presumption" that Erastus dwelt in Corinth or "had some connection with Corinth." This coincidence is not worth contesting; Paley admits it "is not so precise as some others." Nor could we have any motive in contesting it, for it is part of our notion of these "epistles" that they are revisions of revisions in which genuine historic data and literary fragments of various kinds have been taken up and elaborated.

Similar remarks apply to the second congruity of place, in the mention of Phoebe as "Servant of the church which is at Cenchreae." Since this town was the eastern port of Corinth, there is nothing peculiar or noticeable in Paul's having been there, nor anything requiring explanation in the circumstance that the Cenchrean Phoebe should be commended in a letter apparently written from Corinth. Paley does not bring out his argument at all clearly on this point; it is in fact too tenuous to bear clear statement, but the commendation of Phoebe may be an authentic fragment.

No. III. rests on a comparison of Rom. 1<sup>13</sup> 15<sup>23, 24</sup> and Acts 19<sup>21</sup>. The English theologian thinks the conformity between the history and the epistle is perfect. The transparent superficiality of this contention must now be long since established, if our study has not been wholly misdirected. He asks with amusing naïveté, "If the passage in the epistle was taken from that in Acts, why was Spain put in?" The reader has no need to be informed. Paley has missed the *raison d'être* of the passage entirely.

No. IV. is a "geographical coincidence" strongly emphasized by Lardner, between Rom. 15<sup>19</sup> and Acts 20<sup>2</sup>. These critics admit that Paul did not go near Illyricum in his first journey through Macedonia; but they think the clause "when he had gone over these parts" leads us to suppose "he went so far west on his second journey." But this is the airiest fancy; for the following clause, "and had given them much exhortation (*παρακαλέσας*)", shows clearly that this second journey was through those parts already visited, and for the purpose of strengthening and comforting the congregations already founded. The word *παρακαλέσας* cannot be used except of communities already Christianized. In the light of the foregoing discussion, we need not pause longer on this coincidence; another such, and the Paleian argument is undone.

No. V. is deduced from a comparison of Rom. 15<sup>30</sup> and Acts 20<sup>22-23</sup>. Paley thinks that the frames of mind correspond as they should in history; the greater despondency in Acts he thinks natural. We may concede all this and ask, What of it? that the impersonator, in view of Acts, should write as is written in *Romans* seems as natural and probable as can be. Paley himself cannot, or at least does not, give his own argument on this point any distinct statement.

No. VI. is "another strong remark, arising from the same passage"; namely, that the prayer for "delivery" could not have been made *ex eventu*, since he "was not delivered from the unbelieving Jews." This argument, a great favorite, has already been amply answered. The historical fact, as found in Acts, is that he *was* delivered.

No. VII. is founded on "the conformity between the arguments of this Epistle and the history of its reputed author." Paley argues that *Romans* "places the Gentile convert upon a parity of situation with the Jewish," and so did the historic Paul; therefore Paul wrote *Romans*. This argument would hardly be taken seriously in this day and seems quite too flimsy for consideration. Even if the case were exactly as stated in the premises, the utmost allowable inference would be that the writing was Pauline, not that it was Paul's. However, the case is *not* stated correctly, nor nearly adequately, but so inexactly and erroneously as to furnish no basis for real discussion. We cannot waste time on such crudities.

No. VIII. is "supplemental to the former," No. VII., and is equally vague and intangible. It is contended in the first place that the "same point" in *Galatians* is "put in great manner upon authority," but in *Romans* entirely upon argument; and properly, for Paul had converted the former, but not the latter. A certain acumen is shown in this observation, but plainly the situation as disclosed is too indefinite to allow any inference. Besides, the remark bears upon the body of the "Epistle" and not at all upon the chapters now under consideration. Treatment of this argument, such as it is, does not fall within the scope of this paper.

A similar reflection applies to the second and final consideration advanced by Paley, that the tenderness shown for the Jews throughout *Romans* accords with the fact that the "Jews were very numerous at Rome, and probably formed a principal part amongst the new converts." This observation is also acute, but also lies beyond our present horizon, inasmuch as it applies to the bulk of the "Epistle." We merely remark in passing, that one of the very strongest arguments against the Pauline authorship, the Roman destination, and the epis-

tolarly character of this document, may be derived from a minute study of the whole with reference to the very point here raised by Paley. This critic has indeed laid his finger upon an important nerve in the dissection of *Romans*, but his further examination is altogether hasty, careless, and incautious. The representation that he gives of the apostle as, at every stage of the discussion, drawing just conclusions at war with Jewish ideas, and then immediately withdrawing, or softening, or blunting them, in deference to these same ideas, is highly injurious to the reputation of the apostle himself. Such a procedure might beseem an unprincipled, time-serving, office-seeking politician, but not the chosen vessel of the Almighty. If Paul really carried water thus on both shoulders, then the charge of "dealing craftily with the word of God" (*δολοῦντες τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ*, 2 Cor. 4<sup>2</sup>) was not levelled at him without good aim.

We have now scrutinized these "undesigned coincidences" closely, with the result that they fail to sustain the weight of inference thrown upon them. Singly they are without any strength, and collectively they are no stronger, being all given in the same shallow and uncritical study of the text, and being all alike resolved by the same deeper analysis. Paley's was a virile, logical intelligence that played nimbly over the surface of things; measured by the standard of his century, his work ranks high; it is only the applause of his latter-day admirers that makes us wonder.

The 16th chapter opens with a commendation of Phoebe, deaconess of the church at Cenchreae. There seems to be nothing impossible in the supposition that Phoebe was going from Corinth to Rome, though it can hardly count as probable, and Paul may have sent a letter by her, though this again does not recommend itself strongly. But let it pass.

The long list of salutations has called forth much discussion. We do not flatter ourselves that we are able to add much of importance. That Paul should have so many acquaintances among the Christians at Rome seems improbable, but not impossible. Neither can we prove that Prisca and Aquila may not have returned to Rome, and Epænetus have accompanied them; though we cannot suppose that they went to prepare the way for the apostle, if he did not mean to stay some time, but merely to pass through the city. There are many other points of difficulty, such as: "Salute Prisca and Aquila, who for my life laid down their own necks;" possibly, but probably? Very strange, too, is v.<sup>6</sup>: "Salute Mary, who bestowed much labor on you" — a queer piece of information for the Romans. Equally

strange is v.<sup>7</sup>: "Renowned among the Apostles" and "in Christ before me" are odd characterizations of Andronicus and Junias, and of what force in addressing the Romans, who, perhaps, knew the twain much better than their sponsor? In v.<sup>13</sup>, "His mother and mine" sounds overstrained in Paul the aged. Verse <sup>16</sup> appears to overleap all bounds with its "all the Churches of Christ salute you."

While no single feature here may be decisive, it is certainly true that many must give us pause. The more we read this list, the more puzzling it becomes. Why should Paul call upon a congregation of strangers to salute his own friends among them? Why should he be at such pains to characterize his acquaintance in a way often bewildering, sometimes trivial? Each single difficulty may, perhaps, be met by the ingenuity of commentators, but the unfavorable impression produced by them all, is hard or impossible to remove.

We do not think there is any gain in regarding this list as the fragment of a letter to the Ephesians. Hereby the main perplexities remain unresolved.

Again, nothing seems to be proved, either one way or another, by the researches of Lightfoot, which aim to show that many of the names were those of historical Christians at Rome. Very possibly; but the names were too common to warrant any inference; John Smiths and Tom Browns abound everywhere. If there be any reference, as seems likely, to persons historically or traditionally connected with the Roman Church, then, in our judgment, this fact would by no means make for the genuine Paulinity of the list; on the contrary, it would rather point to an impersonator who sought to give local color and vraisemblance to his invention, by the use of the names of these real or imaginary Roman worthies. For the air of strangeness and unreality remains about the passage and grows distincter with every reading.

With respect to vv.<sup>17-20</sup>, something more definite may be said. It is the refuge of conservatives that the apostle is not warning against factionists actively at work among the Romans, but against some that he foresaw might invade them, namely, against Judaizers. However, there is no warrant herefor in the text. The Revised Version renders the present participial *τοὺς ποιοῦντας* correctly: "Them which are causing." Nor can we believe that Paul means to say: "I beseech you, brethren, you that are in Rome, to mark the Judaizers in Corinth and turn away from them." That would be very unnatural, and would be crossing the bridge too long before reaching it. Besides, the description given of these factionists (v.<sup>18</sup>) does in no way fit the

Judaists ; quite the contrary. These might be charged with narrowness, and legalism, and the like, but not with serving the belly ; they were rather ascetic. The mark of these sectaries is their "Chrestology and eulogy." The only plausible or probable reference of these words is to the Gnostics. It is hard for us, at least, not to suspect in the former a double meaning, a mere variant for *Chrestology*, since *Chrestus* and *Christus* were interchangeable forms. Was it possible for a Christian to use the word *χρηστολογία* and not think of *χριστολογία*? Be this as it may, this section must strike the unbiassed mind as marvellously out of place — such an all-important matter suddenly jammed in after such a long list of salutations. It is idle to say with Hort (*Romans and Ephesians*, pp. 53-55) that Paul has been warning his readers throughout indirectly against these heretics and now finally gives one direct warning ! The eye that can see anywhere in the foregoing chapters the vaguest hint of the situation presupposed in this paragraph, can see anything anywhere. Even Sanday and Headlam admit that "commentators have felt that there was something unusual in a vehement outburst like this, coming at the end of an Epistle so completely destitute of direct controversy" ; but,

Only to show with how small pain  
The sores of faith are cured again,

they accept straightway the bare dictum of Hort that "it is not unnatural." How inane to say "St. Paul has been building up his hearers against errors such as these, by laying down broad principles of life and conduct" ! With far greater propriety could one defend such a passage at the close of the *Nicomachean Ethics*, or even the *Elements of Euclid* ; for has not the Geometer, by laying down broad principles of scientific truth, and building up his hearers against the fallacies and intellectual errors so prevalent in antiquity, been warning them indirectly against the smooth and fair speech of sophistical argument, which in every age has beguiled the hearts of the unwary to all manner of false doctrine and pernicious? It seems thus, on sober second thought, to be strange indeed that some such passage is not found near the close of Aristotle's *Logic*. The omission can be explained, perhaps, only by the want of moral earnestness in the Hellenic nature !

It is hardly worth while to dwell on other details of this paragraph. Every unbiassed mind must perceive the vagueness of reference, the looseness of structure, the halting, stumbling thought, the far-fetched antithesis (wise unto the good, simple unto the evil), the allusion to

the approaching Parousy, the implication (in *are causing*, etc., and the *God of Peace*) of prevalent dissensions and heresies, the flattering unction in v.<sup>19</sup>, and the utter ineptness of the whole to the Romans and to the foregoing "Epistle."

The following verses, <sup>21-24</sup>, seem chiefly notable for v.<sup>22</sup>: "I greet you, I Tertius, who wrote (ὁ γράψας) the Epistle in the Lord." The first person singular is supposed elsewhere to refer exclusively to Paul; this use of it to refer to Tertius is surprising and confusing. Laurent's suggestion that the verse (<sup>22</sup>) was at first a marginal observation, appears at first sight very happy. But it seems strange that an amanuensis should make such a note on the side of Paul's letter. The case is most probably not so simple. Conjecture, however, seems vain. The verse must stand or fall with the rest of the chapter. The position of the verses is bewildering mainly because of the evident misplacement of vv.<sup>17-20</sup>.

We now come to the fourth and final conclusion of this "Epistle." Three have already met us: 15<sup>13</sup> 15<sup>33</sup> 16<sup>30(24)</sup>. That these are at least apparent conclusions is manifest, despite the denials of Lightfoot and his followers. It will not avail with Hort to coin a fine phrase and call them "pauses of adoration." There is no adoration about them, no ascription of praise, nothing at all but benediction, parting blessing. Their place is at the end of a communication, oral or written, there and nowhere else. The instances accumulated by Lightfoot prove nothing against this contention. In every case the benediction is either practically at the end of the whole, or else it marks the end of a part that had originally no connection with what follows. It is comparatively easy to find both ends and beginnings in the middle of a compilation.

It must be observed that benedictions and doxologies do by no means stand on the same footing. The latter may be suggested and appropriate in almost any place in a homily or epistle, but the former are entirely unnatural save at the end. Now it is three benedictions, not doxologies, that have thus far met us, but it is a doxology that we find at the close, vv.<sup>25-27</sup>. Here then is a most singular phenomenon. This "Epistle" has apparently four ends. There is no parallel to this state of the case in any human composition that has proceeded as a unit from one single hand on one single occasion. The indication of gradual composition, of compilation, seems so unmistakable that the burden of proof must lie on the defenders of the unity. We declare a universal negative: no composition with four apparent ends is an original unit; they declare a particular affirmative: this

one compilation with four apparent ends is an original unit. Can there be any doubt as to where lies the *onus probandi*? Yet not one defender of the integrity seems in the least conscious of his logical responsibility. All quietly assume that this integrity has an overwhelming presumption in its favor, whereas the presumption is wholly against it; no one troubles himself in the least to produce positive proof of original unity, whereas the need of such proof is crying. How entirely different is the procedure of critics in dealing with all other compositions, profane or apocryphal! Would Charles, or Gunkel, or Blass hesitate to pronounce against the unity of *Enoch*, or *Esdra*s, or *Sibyllina* in the presence of four such apparent endings? Would Lightfoot, or Hort, or Sanday, or Headlam invent specious reasons and cling to bare possibilities, were they considering some profane or post-Apostolic document? Assuredly not! To ask these questions is to answer them. Their only excuse for reversing all the familiar canons of criticism, is that we are dealing with a supposed Epistle of the New Testament!

If the 15th and 16th chapters were plainly and incontestably Pauline, if they proceeded unmistakably from the same hand that wrought the foregoing fourteen, then we should have to take refuge in some theory of recension by Paul himself, like Renan's or Lightfoot's. But how does the case stand? It is precisely the opposite. The contents of these chapters are distinctly marked, not as Pauline but as un-Pauline. They must and do surprise even the most steadfast conservative, pledged to find nothing ungenue within the lids of the New Testament. Such exegetes do indeed harmonize all discrepancies, but the strenuous effort put forth cannot be disguised. Hence the natural inference from the presence of the four apparent endings remains unshaken.

Thus far we have raised no question touching the matter or manner of this closing doxology. The same has been the subject of frequent investigation, and nearly all has been said that seems worth saying. Fortunately we are in position to dispense with a minute examination. The main facts lie close to the surface. Some of these are:

(a) There is no parallel to this doxology in any other indubitably Pauline Epistle.

(b) It is not in the style of any other Pauline writing, especially not in the style of any part of this "Epistle."

(c) It is so excessively overladen and inflated that it is hard to believe that any one could have composed it originally as it is.

(d) It is grammatically incomplete: the construction begun in v.<sup>28</sup> is dropped, apparently forgotten, and never resumed.

(e) It has no manifest fitness in its present place, no relevance, but the most strained and far-fetched, to the contents foregoing.

(f) It is astonishing that Paul, writing so modestly to strangers, to whom he had never preached gospel, whose faith had apparently no Pauline base, should speak thus of God's establishing them "according to my Gospel."

(g) The awful phrase, "according to revelation of mystery for times eternal kept in silence," has not the slightest justification in the body of the Epistle, but suggests a wholly foreign realm of Gnostic or semi-Gnostic speculation, where the figure of Silence (ΣΙΓΗ) is particularly imposing.

(h) As much may be said of v.<sup>28</sup>, which bewilders in almost every phrase, the *τε* after *δὲ* being especially puzzling. (Zahn speaks of the *τε*-clause as *sehr auffällig*, p. 286; he can find no better reference for it than 15<sup>4.9-12</sup>, and for "the preaching of Jesus" he must refer to 15<sup>2.8</sup>!)

(i) For any parallel or suggestion of this doxology, we must go to Jude<sup>24.28</sup>, to which the resemblance seems too close to be accidental; and if it comes to a question of priority and intelligibility, the form in Jude seems every way to deserve the preference.

(j) The whole atmosphere of the passage seems late, ecclesiastic, hieratic, like the peroration of some patriarch of Constantinople.

It is of great weight to our argument that Bishop Lightfoot admits the difficulty presented by this doxology, especially that it resembles not the proto- but the deutero-Paulines, and concludes thus: "These facts seem to show that though written by the apostle, it was not written at the same time as the letter itself." Dean Alford also saw the impossibility of supposing that Paul would write the Epistle in one manner of thought and speech and close with a doxology in such a startlingly different manner, and he conjectures accordingly that this latter was appended to the Epistle "in later times by the apostle himself, as a thankful effusion of his fervent mind." Lightfoot, of course, perceives the inadequacy of Alford's view, just as clearly as Hort discerns the insufficiency of Lightfoot's; nevertheless, Hort is quite unable to explain the facts, only partially recognized by the dean and the bishop, which drove them to their subterfuges. His defence can do nothing but make one smile and wonder; Lightfoot rightly finds it worthless. It is profoundly significant that two such authorities as Lightfoot and Alford find this doxology impossible as

an original part of this Epistle, and that such a master as Hort can make no reply that is an answer.

But when both dean and bishop seek to satisfy their critical conscience and their traditional faith at the same time, by assuring us that Paul appended this doxology at a later date, say five or six years after, we must interpose "*Quo imperante?*" By what authority do ye these things? If it be once conceded, as it must be, that this doxology is unintelligible as a part of this Epistle, then there remains no reason for referring it to Paul, the supposed author of the Epistle. Hort and Zahn have recognized this fact, hence they defend the doxology at all hazards as part of the original letter.

The notion that Paul in two or three years of captivity changed his diction completely, that he passed into a new sphere of ideas and left his ancient orbit as only a faded memory behind him, that he developed a new syntax, a new use of particles, new uses of prepositions, new mannerisms and constructions, new devices of rhetoric, at the same time rejecting his old favorites, almost without exception, — this notion, so complacently assumed by Lightfoot, is wholly without warrant. We hold such a transformation to be psychologically impossible, nor can conservative critics produce a scintilla of evidence of its actuality.

That the contrast between this so-called later and the earlier Pauline style is not exaggerated but rather extenuated in the foregoing, must be apparent to any one who will study two articles in the *Unitarian Review* of January and February, 1889, on "Curves of Pauline and of Pseudo-Pauline Style": wherein it is shown that in almost every conceivable peculiarity of inner structure the group Galatians, Corinthians, Romans, contrasts sharply with Philippians, and still more with Ephesians and Colossians. Had the comparison been made with the Pastorals, the contrast might have appeared even sharper still. It would be hard to find two compositions more widely separated in every quality of matter and manner than *Romans* or *Galatians* and *Ephesians*.<sup>1</sup> That the author of the one should also be the author of the other is far less credible than that Alexander Hamilton of the Federalist should have written the Resolutions of 1798.

It is curious to imagine what might have been, had Paul lived a

<sup>1</sup> Speaking of Eph. 1<sup>3-14</sup>, a great master of Pauline rhetoric, Johannes Weiss, says: "it is almost a blasphemy of the lively and vigorous author, Paul, to ascribe to him such a phraseologic conglomerate of ideas." *Theol. Litztg.*, 29th Sept., 1900.

few years longer. If, according to Lightfoot, the apostle wrote Thessalonians 52-53 A.D., and Galatians 57-58, and Ephesians 62 A.D., and the Pastorals in 67, and if such profound transformations in thought took place every five years, then what might have happened had he escaped martyrdom ten years longer? We see not the slightest reason why he might not have written *Hebrews* and the *Apocalypse*, the *Shepherd of Hermas* and the *Epistle of Barnabas*, and with another lustrum added to his life, why might he not have composed the *Teaching of the Apostles* and the *Christian Sibyllina*? The Paul that could write 1 Thessalonians 52 A.D., and 2 Thessalonians the year after, that could be ultra-anti-Judaic in *Galatians* at the close of the year 57, and equally ultra-Judaic in *Romans* in the spring of 58, is a Paul that strides from realm to realm, not in seven-league boots, but at pace of Poseidon:

τρίς μὲν ὀρέζατ' ἰών, τὸ δὲ τέτατον ἴκετο τέκμων,

and we can no more understand him than we can understand the legerdemain of Hermann. Fortunately, however, for our comprehension of the New Testament and early Christianity, this many-minded apostle, unstable as water, is entirely unhistorical. He is a fiction of conservative imagination, as unreal as the classic Proteus.

Inasmuch then as Hort and Zahn have done nothing to invalidate the internal evidences of this doxology, and inasmuch as Alford and Lightfoot can give us nothing but their mere word to attest the marvellous change which they find it necessary to imagine in Paul's style and conceptions, and inasmuch as the strivings of these two warring wings of apology annul each other, we must consider the case, in the court of internal evidence, as closed against the doxology.

We have now examined both these chapters with minuteness sufficient for the purposes of our argument, and we seem to state the result in the mildest form when we declare that there is not to be found in them a single feature worth mentioning, either of matter or of manner, of thought or of diction, of history or of dogma, that so much as suggests Paul the apostle writing to Romans. Unquestionably the chapters, or most of them, are written *as if* by him, but the veil of impersonation is everywhere transparent. There is not a single sentiment, not a form of expression, not a statement of fact, that is not readily intelligible as the work of one or more impersonators. While we cannot always choose with confidence among several special possible motives, yet the general tendency is hardly anywhere in doubt, even when most guardedly discovered. Thus, it is clear

that the first section, 15<sup>1-13</sup>, is conciliatory and Judaistic. It was almost certainly written after the struggle against Marcion, and is part and parcel of the Judaism triumphant, which even to this day declares that "Salvation is of the Jews," and indignantly disclaims Paganism in Christianity, even where it is most incontestable. The author of this pericope would seem closely related by his mannerism "I say" to the author of 10<sup>18, 19</sup> 11<sup>1, 11</sup>, though he may be merely imitating this latter; and also by his method of profuse and irrelevant quotation, illustrated again in 2 Cor. 6<sup>14-7<sup>1</sup></sup>, a late interpolation.

The section 15<sup>14-33</sup> seems to proceed from another emender of still later date. He seems to be a member of the Roman church, very jealous of the glory and perhaps of the Petrine origin of that church. His contribution is intelligible only as a corrective of the Introduction, 1<sup>9-15</sup>. He is not quite pleased with the general tone of authority and superior wisdom that is assumed by this stranger (Paul) in addressing the great Roman church, hence he makes Paul ascribe every virtue to his readers and confess his own overboldness. He makes the apostle explain why he thus wrote to Rome, and intentionally lowers his apostleship into a priesthood. This seems to indicate that he belonged to that Jewish wing that would extend Paul the right hand of fellowship, but would never admit him as quite coequal with the Twelve. He was also probably in sympathy with the notion (not yet a tradition) that some apostle proper (as Peter) founded the church at Rome; hence he is most careful to make it appear that Paul had no share either in founding or in extending it, that Paul never intended to do more than pay the Romans a passing call.

He is very jealous of the Judaic origin of Christianity; hence he makes the collection for the saints an occasion to assert it in its most extreme form. He venerates the church at Jerusalem, designating them repeatedly as "the saints." His authorities are the scriptures of the New Testament; from these he has compounded his whole work, coloring and adapting to suit his purposes, now and then adding a phrase, with that singular mixture of freedom and servility that marks the writers of his era. Left to himself he becomes florid, unctuous, and pompous. The task that he set himself was not an easy one, and he has executed it with only very partial success, though with considerable skill. His chief artifice is vagueness, half expressing, half repressing what is in his heart. By such means he hopes to make Paul tone down and attenuate and finally turn into its opposite his own Introduction, without directly contradicting him-

self at any time in word and letter. His attempt is not ingenious enough to deceive critics that are not under some over-ruling prepossession.

Concerning the commendation and the salutations we are not prepared to speak confidently, but we incline to regard them as addenda, designed to give color and verisimilitude to the tradition concerning the Roman destination of the "Letter"; the author of the list seems to be speaking *pro domo*.

In vv.<sup>17-20</sup> we hear a still later voice, raised in defence of Old Catholicism, now established as the true faith and fighting heresy of every description. The Roman church now stands conspicuous as the model and pattern of Orthodox Faith.

Concerning vv.<sup>21-23</sup> it is needless to hazard conjecture.

The present position of the doxology by no means implies that it was the latest of these addenda. As we shall see, there is good reason to regard its place at the end of chap. 14 as the earlier. In our judgment it was the work of one of the first revisers or compilers. It seems to be semi-Gnostic in character and apparently belongs to the second half of the second century, when the old Catholic church was taking definite form, and was making, as the price of its existence, concessions in every direction, fusing together Paulinism (my Gospel) with Judaism (the preaching of Jesus Christ), and welding the doctrine of the divine authority of the prophets with Gnostic speculations concerning silence and everlasting aeons. It was, perhaps, written shortly after the doxology in Jude, on which it seems to be moulded; not, however, itself as an original unit. Its incomplete structure and the notable text-uncertainty seem to mark it as a gradual product.

We affirm then that these chapters are at least intelligible in every detail on the broad general basis of a later and composite origin; that such an origin is suggested and openly hinted by almost every distinct feature, both of form and of substance; and that the margin of indetermination in our theory, the playroom of uncertainty demanded, is not larger than the circumstances will justly allow.

On the other hand, we have seen that the hypothesis of Paulinity and original unity confronts us at every turn with obstacles, all of them serious and some of them insuperable; that every device for the relief of one merely aggravates the others; and that the defences put up by the most consummate masters of the art apologetic not only destroy each other, but are suicidal in their self-contradictions.

The only opposing arguments we can think of are: (1) That such

compilation and redaction as we assume are unknown in the New Testament and well-nigh unthinkable; (2) That the documentary evidence and the textual conditions negative our theory decisively and imply unequivocally a primitive unity.

To the first argument we answer that he who advances it seriously has not yet learned the ABC of New Testament criticism, and is beyond the pale of this discussion; the second calls for careful consideration, and such we propose to give it.