

he hinges too much on the "thorn in the flesh" in Paul's spiritual development, though it is natural that a great preacher who was in early manhood stricken with blindness, should lay much stress on progress though suffering, especially as he supposes the Apostle to have been distressed with ophthalmia, an affliction somewhat kindred to his own.

This whole question of development of doctrine, and of religious grasp of the truth in accordance with the conditions of outward life is interesting; and we cannot deny it in the case of Paul any more than in that of any other Christian. A comparison of Ephesians with Galatians will make this plain. A certain school of critics who make a great fuss about psychological consistency, have overlooked the first principles of human nature, when they accept four or five of the main Epistles of Paul as genuine, and reject others because in them there is a new phase of teaching. They admit that the later Epistles are expansions of the same outlines of doctrine—that they came from the Pauline school though not directly from the Apostle's hand. But surely greater maturity on the part of the writer, and different wants and temperaments on the part of the readers, will be an adequate explanation of the new phases of doctrine even "psychologically."

On the other hand, the development hypothesis must be kept within bounds. The interval between Paul's conversion in 35 and the first letter to the Thessalonians say in 55, is much greater than that between 55 and the Pastorals in 67. Now, was the development all in the second half? Is it proper to take the Thessalonians as his earliest position and assign his great expansiveness in thought to the next 12 years? Allowing that his views of God, Christ, and the Universe broadened and deepened as time went on, yet we are not at liberty to judge from the silence in Thessalonians on these themes and on others that occur in his later Epistles, that in the main his principles were not the same in 55 as in 67, though not so rich and full. The condition of his churches, their struggles, their spiritual necessities decided his choice of subject and its treatment. I find the position of Pfeiderer, (*Paulinismus*) more tenable. Paul had been a Pharisee well versed in the law. He knew the implications of Messianic hopes, and the appearance of Christ revealed as the Son of God with power by His Resurrection, (Rom. I., 4,) not only