

# The Expository Times

<http://ext.sagepub.com/>

---

## **Pauline Anthropology and Christian Doctrine**

A.S. Laidlaw

*The Expository Times* 1901 12: 258

DOI: 10.1177/001452460101200604

The online version of this article can be found at:

<http://ext.sagepub.com/content/12/6/258.citation>

---

Published by:



<http://www.sagepublications.com>

**Additional services and information for *The Expository Times* can be found at:**

**Email Alerts:** <http://ext.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts>

**Subscriptions:** <http://ext.sagepub.com/subscriptions>

**Reprints:** <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav>

**Permissions:** <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav>

trine of the Resurrection. But above all he directs attention to 4 Maccabees, whose description of the immediate passage to heaven (5<sup>37</sup> 13<sup>17</sup> 18<sup>23</sup>) of the seven martyrs, their enjoyment of God's presence (9<sup>8</sup>), and especially the comparison between the lot of these martyrs and that of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob (16<sup>25</sup>, etc.), all bear a striking resemblance

to the teaching of Jesus. Our author claims, however, for Jesus absolute originality for the profound thought that this life with God is 'the Resurrection from the Dead,' a doctrine which Fries holds to have been afterwards displaced by a theory of the Resurrection which Jesus meant to combat.

*Maryculter, Aberdeen.*

J. A. SELBIE.

## Pauline Anthropology and Christian Doctrine.

BY THE REV. A. S. LAIDLAW, M.A., B.D., HUNTLY.

### I.

#### Christ and Adam.

"NOT as the trespass, so also is the free gift."—  
Rom. v. 15.

THE term Anthropology is not free from ambiguity. Theologians and scientific men use it in different senses. The former have been accustomed to employ it where the reference was purely psychological. Thus Lüdemann's *Anthropology of the Apostle Paul* is a treatise upon biblical psychology, wherein are discussed the terms, flesh, spirit, body, heart, mind, and so forth. In the hands of recent science, however, anthropology has become the 'doctrine of Man' in a much wider sense: it is the Science of Man.

It is easy to understand how anthropology came to be so narrowed theologically. Some of the most important and most fascinating problems of anthropology, such as cluster round the origin of man, have appeared to be closed questions to the theologian. The garden of Eden seemed to say all that required to be said about man's origin; and the names of Noah's sons to tell us nearly all there is to tell about the classification of races. Accordingly, what was left but some obscure questions of psychology? The phrase *Biblical Psychology* tends to suggest that the Bible, while no longer regarded as authoritative in such sciences as geology and astronomy, is still so regarded in psychology, and in the wider science of anthropology. But who is to say that science may be allowed to speak about the material universe, but must hold her peace when man is involved? Are we to suppose that there is one exception to be remembered when we liberally concede that the Bible

does not anticipate modern science? Must we hold that the Bible does anticipate one science, the science of anthropology?

Certainly this is 'different,' as some may be ready to object, but it is not really so within the limits which science must observe. The essential value of the Genesis narratives of the origin of man lies in the clearness with which they teach that man is a spiritual being, and has spiritual relations with God his Creator. Apart from that, man has a bodily existence, and has had a history. Into these science must investigate and report.

The Pauline anthropology properly understood is chiefly to be found in the Epistle to the Romans, in the discussion which occurs under the head of 'Adam and Christ.' The apostle's statements concerning Christ's redeeming work are there expressed in terms of the Pentateuchal narratives of the Fall and the Dispensation of the Mosaic Law. This bearing upon his doctrine of the Atonement intensifies the interest with which we inquire whether the growing competence and authority of the modern Science of Man do not necessitate reinterpretation or even restatement of St. Paul's doctrine of man, and whether it is possible adequately to present the Work of Christ in terms prescribed by Jewish anthropology. Types and shadows are useful before the event, but may be so used after the event as to obscure the truth. Types when 'fulfilled' ought to 'withdraw,' and allow the truth to shine in its own light. It is obvious why

the apostle argues as he does. A Jew himself, he was writing for Jews or for Gentiles who were, or would be, indoctrinated in Jewish ideas. Jewish anthropology finds its principles in Genesis. St. Paul built, as he must, on the foundation already laid. He explains Christ in terms of Adam. This was useful, but is perhaps not quite so useful in the twentieth century as it was in the first. Our science is not that of Genesis. In so far as they are different, is not revision of the Pauline argumentation indicated?

The grand consideration is that in formulating the most central and vital Christian doctrines, we ought to make Christ Himself our point of departure instead of obscure and doubtful analogies. It is obvious that Mosaic narratives colour the Pauline statement of the farthest reaching Christian doctrines. Accordingly, it is a needful and inviting task to disentangle these and see what the result promises to be. There is no cause for alarm. The Bible was not destroyed by the vindication of the Copernican astronomy. Should one interpose, 'Yes, but that was a small and remote consideration, whereas now you are touching the central doctrine of the Christian faith,' I reply, 'That is certainly a reason for proceeding reverently and humbly; but is not the call to go forward the louder and clearer precisely because what is most central is alleged to suffer obscuration by artificialities and unrealities?' There misconception is most fatal. Such hidden rocks have been largely responsible for heresy and schism in the history of the Church.

At this stage it will be advantageous temporarily to alter our point of view somewhat. The assumption which, it may be supposed, underlies my remarks hitherto is that there is the closest possible connexion between Pauline doctrine and the Adamic narratives, and that the latter is of the very essence of the former. The validity of this assumption is, however, an interesting previous question.

Does St. Paul then substantially build his doctrine of the Work of Christ on the Mosaic accounts of the first man, the appearance of sin, and the giving of the Law? Is it absolutely necessary in order to appreciate his doctrine of Christ to look at it in the light of these? Is the Adamic side of his equation as important as the Christian, indeed in a sense more important, because coming first it determines the issue? It delimits the ground. It sets the problem. It

prescribes the reference in which alone the Christian factor is to be considered. But this reference may be limited, temporary, accidental. A logical fallacy must be guarded against. The antecedent of a conditional proposition does not so limit the consequent. Granted that 'If A is, B is,' B is not dependent on A only. There may be other preconditions as valid as A. It does not follow that, 'If A is not, B is not.' I wish to suggest that the Christian side of St. Paul's equation may not be inseparably limited to the Adamic, but has an independent value, and may be dwarfed by the narrow issue presented to it.

I venture to think that the Adamic element is by no means an unquestionably essential factor in St. Paul's doctrine of Christ, being rather used for the purpose of illustration and, so far as it is an argument, applied *ad hominem*, with the implication that its force could only be local and temporary. If this can be shown, it is another welcome evidence that what is of eternal moment in the Word of God is not finally and inextricably bound up with elements of pre-scientific knowledge which were foredoomed to wax old and vanish away.

In order to examine this question as to the dependence of the Pauline doctrine, it is proper to take the strongest and most explicit statements of the apostle. The classical passage is Ro 5<sup>12,21</sup>. The first thing we notice is that sin is said to have entered the world as an act of transgression, the penal consequence of which was death. St. Paul says, 'Death passed unto all men, for that all sinned,' implying, I suppose, that Adam's descendants died either like Adam himself for their actual transgressions, or by reason of imputed guilt, or both together. The apostle remarks upon the fact that 'until the law, sin was in the world,' and immediately interjects an argument to which I attach importance for my present purpose. He adds: 'But sin is not imputed when there is no law. Nevertheless, death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the likeness of Adam's transgression.' Mark that 'nevertheless.' Clearly it is meant to bring into sharp contrast two statements apparently irreconcilable. If sin was not imputed 'until' Moses, we should have expected that death would not 'reign' between Adam and Moses. But it did: that is the point. Now, why is this *crux* introduced into the middle of the argument, which is even injured thereby? The

fact which the apostle wishes to emphasize is that sin and universal death entered through Adam, and yet he immediately makes the damaging admission that sin could not be imputed prior to the Law. Why is this thrown in? It seems to me that we have not here a serious logical argument at all. The well-known passage in Galatians about 'seed' and 'seeds' may be compared with it. It is rather a very loose piece of dialectic, the object of which is, not to ground Christ upon Adam, but using Adam as an offset and contrast, to make manifest the superiority of the Christian Dispensation to the Adamic. The ruling ideas are, 'Sin and universal death by Adam: forgiveness and life to all by Christ.' The key to the curious twist in the argument is to be found in the words, 'But not as the trespass, so also is the free gift.' The method of argument, if argument it can be called, is this: St. Paul welcomes the very worst that can be said about the Adamic Dispensation, in order, by contrast, to magnify the grace of Christ. He aggravates the case as much as he can. He points out how hardly the old *régime* bore upon men, more hardly even than seems reasonable, inasmuch as, although sin was not imputed prior to the Law, nevertheless death, the punishment of sin, fell. Why was this? Well, the apostle is not concerned about the justice of it. He confesses to not seeing the *rationale*. The fact was enough for him, and the more oppressive it was, the better for his purpose, which is to blacken the old Dispensation and make his readers glad to pass out from under it. So he parades the fact that men died although they had not sinned after the likeness of Adam's transgression, and even although sin was not imputed prior to the Law. This is quite in St. Paul's manner. He is piling up a case against the Covenant of Works, and leaves no stone unturned or unhurled. Hence the unction with which he says, 'But not as the trespass, so also the free gift.' White shows well against black. The darker the black, the fairer the white. Adam wrought death, which devastated even beyond the bounds which reason and justice seem to set. Christ came that all might have life, and have it abundantly. What is urged to the disparagement of the first Adam, redounds to the greater glory of the Second.

If this representation is just, if the Adamic references are illustrative matter rather than of the substance of St. Paul's Christian doctrine,

clearly there is the less of hazard in proceeding to consider the question with which we set out, and to which we now return, namely, how far our Christian doctrine, being Pauline, is intertwined with these Adamic representations, and stands in need of disentanglement. Take the doctrine of imputed sin and guilt by reason of Adam's transgression. There is a corresponding Christian doctrine of the imputation of Christ's righteousness, which is undoubtedly modelled upon it. Christ's Work is expounded in terms of Adam's. Now, in any case, is not this to commit the fault of explaining *obscurum per obscurius*? And if the representation now given of the slight connexion between Pauline doctrine and the Adamic and Legal matter is correct, this procedure is as unnecessary as it is perilous. It may lead us to be more Pauline than Paul. It is a remarkable fact that 'the apostle nowhere speaks of the righteousness of Christ being imputed, nor does he anywhere identify the righteousness of God given to faith with the righteousness of Christ.'<sup>1</sup> It has been pointed out that he even seems to avoid this way of speaking, when naturally he would use it if it expressed his thought. Thus: 'Not having a righteousness of mine own, even that which is of the law, but'—and here, where he might be expected to say, 'the righteousness of Christ,' what he actually says is, 'that which is through faith in Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith.' St. Paul's phrase is not 'the righteousness of Christ,' but 'the righteousness of God,' a righteousness which God gives to those who 'believe in Jesus.' Bruce avers that the Pauline idea of justification is best expressed 'as a judicial act whereby God regards as righteous those who trust His grace as manifested in the atoning death of Christ'; and he cites Weiss as maintaining that the idea of God imputing to men the righteousness of Christ does not belong to the Pauline system of thought. Professor Stevens appends the following note to his chapter on Justification in his recent *Theology of the New Testament*: 'That the old theological formula, "the imputation of Christ's righteousness to the believer," does not correctly render Paul's thought of justification is now so generally recognized by exegetes that I have not thought it necessary to refer to it in the text.'

This short discussion has been introduced in

<sup>1</sup> A. B. Bruce, *Expositor*, August 1893, p. 86; republished under the title of *St. Paul's Conception of Christianity*.

support of my general contention that St. Paul's statements of Christian doctrine are not really limited and conditioned by his illustrative references to Adam. These are rather dialectical expedients, embroideries which effectively set off a theme which is independent. The Christian side of the equation is separable from the Adamic, and its signification will be obscured unless it is read apart, as thus: 'The grace of God, and the gift by the grace of the one man, Jesus Christ (did), abound unto the many.'<sup>1</sup> 'They that receive the

<sup>1</sup> Ro 5<sup>15</sup>.

abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness (shall) reign in life through the one, even Jesus Christ,'<sup>2</sup> and so on. Danger enters when the 'How?' of this is sought by means of such expressions, as 'through the one man's disobedience the many were made sinners.' If these are made the starting-point, divers strange doctrines of imputation result. If the independence of the Christian side of the equation is recognized, a more spiritual reading of Christ's Work becomes possible.

<sup>2</sup> Ro 5<sup>17</sup>.

## At the Literary Table.

### THE BOOKS OF THE MONTH.

EVENING THOUGHTS. BY THE REV. PATON J. GLOAG, D.D., LL.D. (*T. & T. Clark*. Crown 8vo, pp. 294. 4s.)

Dr. Paton Gloag has been a preacher of the gospel for fifty years. He would have been a poor preacher indeed if at the end of that time he could not have found thirty sermons worth publishing. For most of us, perhaps, thirty is enough. Some men are inspired to new purpose and surpassing power every time they preach. Most men are inspired and powerful once a year. As for Dr. Paton Gloag we judge by these thirty, and this is what we find: He knew the gospel early, and he never swerved from it; he preached what he believed; and he kept learning right on till the end. So the clearest note in these thirty is conviction of the truth as it is in Jesus; but that note is presented out of the variety of a broad, sympathetic, spiritual mind.

TRUTH AND REALITY. BY JOHN SMYTH, M.A., D. PHIL. (*T. & T. Clark*. Crown 8vo, pp. 261. 4s.)

The title is not attractive. But the book is. There is something new in it. Professor Flint says it is not new to him, but it will be new to most of us. And it is true. Professor Flint himself says it is true, and deserves beyond most truths great emphasis to-day. And we see that it is true when we have caught it. What is it? That is another matter. What it is has taken Dr. Smyth two hundred and fifty pages to tell. We have read the book and re-read some of it (having

taken it, on Professor Flint's recommendation, for a railway journey, and found the book done before the journey), but we cannot put it into a sentence. It shows quite conclusively how incapable is every form of naturalism of explaining the things we see and know; it shows quite restfully how inevitable is the entrance of the spiritual and how universal its application.

ERAS OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH. THE REFORMATION. BY WILLISTON WALKER. (*T. & T. Clark*. Crown 8vo, pp. 488. 6s.)

With this volume the series of 'Eras' ends. It has been discovered by not a few, no doubt; but it may be suspected that the unfamiliar names (for most of the writers are Americans) have blinded some to the literary value of the series. One volume—Mr. Bartlet's *Apostolic Age*—by a most accomplished English scholar, was at once recognized as having passed all competitors on that much travelled road. But we are still too insular in our theology. And we are still too monarchical. A great name, if it is the name of an Englishman, is necessary to catch our eye even yet.

And so it may be that this stately, masterly history of the Reformation, in which the whole extent of the greatest period in the Christian centuries is described, may pass unnoticed by those by whom its blessing is most needed. It contains no offence. For history speaks and not the author. It is an almost faultless example of descriptive narrative.