

idea of morality was not in it ; and not good, there was no sense of sanctity attaching to it. He was—the word is not easily found, we ought to have coined or adapted it long ago. Mr. WILLIAMS suggests 'vindicated,' but that refers rather to the act of the Law—the judgment—than to the state of the man. Whatever word is chosen the meaning is clear. The man stands qualified for whatever honour men can bestow and whatever glory God has to give.

Why did St. Paul give up the idea that a man is so qualified by the Law? Simply because he found that he was not so qualified. The Law was not able to do it. The word did not change its meaning: St. Paul changed his opinion of the Law. What the Law could not do Christ did. And any man could 'by faith in Christ make his own what Christ did. Christ having executed judgment on all his oppressors, he could hold up his head before God and man.

The Person of Jesus Christ.

BY THE REV. DAVID S. CAIRNS, M.A., D.D., PROFESSOR OF APOLOGETICS AND DOGMATICS
IN THE UNITED FREE CHURCH COLLEGE, ABERDEEN.

IN attempting, at the request of the Editor, a preliminary notice of the new work by Professor H. R. Mackintosh, on the doctrine of the Person of Christ, I must disclaim all idea of adequately estimating the book. It is far too rich in suggestion, and too thorough in its handling of a great and arduous theme, to make any adequate judgment of it possible without much fuller opportunity of examining and weighing it. I shall therefore confine myself mainly to giving some brief account of its plan and execution, and shall only touch upon its actual contribution to the discussion, and upon some of the thoughts which it suggests.

One may say at once that the book is of exceptional quality and richness, and more than fulfils all the expectations which the earlier writings of the author had led one to expect. There are very few recent theological volumes on the same plane of all-round distinction, for knowledge, for constructive power, and, not least, for admirable lucidity and arrangement. It is nothing less than masterly as a piece of exposition, a quality which comes out alike in the architectonic of the argument and the charm of the style.

It consists of three sections, following the usual modern schema of Exegesis, History, and Reconstruction.

The first of these deals with a survey of the Evangelic and Apostolic Christology. Little need be said here of this or of the following section. Both are throughout excellent. Especially note-

worthy in this first section is the candour with which the writer admits the 'subordinationist' elements in the Apostolic teaching, recognizing in the clearest way that while the highest view of our Lord's Personality is a structural part of New Testament thought, there is another strand of thinking intimately interwoven with it which, to superficial observation, seems to be radically at variance with that higher view. Surely scholarship has, finally, to all intents determined what the New Testament data actually are, and the real controversy has shifted to their historical antecedents, their constructive interpretation, and their religious value.

The second section is equally good. The author's knowledge of the whole vast field is wide and deep. Whether he is dealing with the ancient or the modern field, we get the same sense of adequate knowledge and precision of statement which mark the scholar in theology as in other regions.

The more recent developments as represented by the Ritschlian and post-Ritschlian Schools receive special attention, not only in this, but in the two last sections of the book. I know of no Christological treatise where these are so fully discussed. I should say that the writer's own positions have been determined mainly in view of these later developments. He feels strongly, and I believe rightly, that these latter theories, if carried consistently through, would mean the destruction or

at least the fatal impoverishment of the Christian message, the loss of what gives Christian propaganda its optimism and *élan*. It is the fervour of this conviction that makes the book so interesting.

Admirable as are these two opening sections of the volume, the real interest lies in the latter half, where the writer leaves the harbour and adventures out into the deep. He is, of course, far more open to criticism from this point onwards. We begin annotating this statement and that with marginalia and points of interrogation. That is too strongly put, we say; this is an untenable position, and so on. But when it is all over and we look back, we say this is good thinking and good fighting; this is a book with some blood in it—a book to return to, not only for reference, but for inspiration and wholesome provocation!

The plan here is as excellent as in the earlier part. First come certain preliminary questions; then a second part dealing with the vital spiritual convictions and interests which in the writer's view demand a Christology; and, finally, a section on the transcendent implicates of faith, which contains the author's rationale of the Person. We shall look at each of these in turn. In the first of these three last subdivisions Professor Mackintosh vindicates the need for a reasoned Christology. Here he takes ground against three antagonists—the humanitarian, who says there is no need for any Christology, since Christ is simply one man among others; the traditionalist, who thinks that the Church has already settled the matter by her councils and creeds; and the Ritschlian, who disbelieves wholly in the application of metaphysical theories to spiritual facts. The author's real opponent is the first, the main stress of the later argument is directed against him; but he takes ground decisively against the other two.

His position with reference to the Councils is defined in the sentence: 'Nicea is a position won once for all; Chalcedon, on the other hand, betrays a certain tendency not merely to define but to theorise.' He objects strongly to the two-nature theory of Chalcedon, on the double ground that it depicts a Christ who is not the Christ of the Gospels, and that it rests on an impossible view of personality. The reasoning here seems to me conclusive. May we not add to it that the two-nature theory destroys the whole revelation value

of Christ? The two natures, Divine and Human, are supposed to lie, as it were, like two strata or, to vary the figure, like the outer court of the temple and the inner shrine. We learn to know the human nature, but behind it there is the nature we really want to know, but which by hypothesis is different from the other. We can never assert more of this than that it is like the human, as well as different. But how can we assert even this? We can only say 'this is like that,' when we have an independent knowledge of both, and so can compare them. But, clearly, this is not to use the Human Nature as a medium of Revelation. This was assuredly less by far than Christ meant when He said, 'He that hath seen me hath seen the Father.' The impossible metaphysics of linking up the two natures in one Person does not really satisfy the problem.

By parting thus decisively with the Ecclesiastical tradition at this point, Professor Mackintosh leaves the convenient shelter of Church authority. But he refuses with equal boldness to take refuge in the Ritschlian shelter. He will not hear of any impassable barrier between Religion and Metaphysics. If we are sure of a thing through faith and revelation, and here at least he is a true Ritschlian, then we are bound to take the responsibility of interpreting all things in the light of that certainty, of thinking things out and thinking them through. The passage in which he asserts this duty of the reason is one of the most impressive in the book.

The next two chapters in this subdivision lay down the bases of modern Christology. These are found in the Jesus of History and in Christian experience. The Christ with whom Christology has to deal must be great enough to account for His sinlessness, for His work as Redeemer, as Indweller, and as final Revealer of God.

We now come to the heart of the argument. The results reached in these two closing sections are in the main conservative, and will, no doubt, meet with a good deal of criticism. He has chosen to leave the shelter of authority, and to take the risks of theological construction, and the only way out for him now is to fight his way through. The spirit of the polemic is admirable, earnest, courteous, and trenchant.

He does not always carry conviction to my mind, and I shall note later some points which seem to me to need reconsideration. But the

problems are fairly raised and faced, and he has always something to say that is well worth saying on every one of them, and not a little that is illuminating. The whole discussion is so relevant and so well informed that it is impossible to follow it closely without having one's own mind cleared up on the whole theme, whether the result is for or against the writer. One idiosyncrasy of the author needs to be referred to at this point, if the reader is to do justice to the argument. I have repeatedly entered a caveat against some statement as too emphatic; and gone on with some protest in my own mind to find that protest removed at a later stage by the equally emphatic statement of the counterbalancing truth. It is part of the writer's peculiar expository gift, which leads him to isolate and emphasize. But the book needs to be read as a whole before we get his full meaning. It would be easy to misrepresent his actual thought by isolated quotations.

The crucial section of the book is that on the *Werthurtheile* of Christianity, which are here called 'the Immediate Utterances of Faith.' The first of these is that Christ is not only the Subject but the Object of Faith; that, explain it how we will, we cannot attain to the standard of faith in the God whom Jesus revealed without faith in Jesus Himself; and that, as is the measure of the one, so is the measure of the other. This is really the basal fact of Christology to-day, as real as is any of the great human experiences, as real as the principle that love seeks love, and that the soul lives by prayer. It is the simple truth that to-day confidence in the Father whom Jesus revealed can be maintained only through confidence in Jesus. The endeavour to rule out this elemental religious fact by *a priori* theories of the necessary relativity of Jesus, as a personality in the flux of history, is met by showing that Modernism is here inconsistent with its own scheme. It believes in prayer and in forgiveness, both of which are inconsistent with its own theory of relativism. To these we may surely add Freedom.

From this starting point the author goes on to the new position that Christian faith is in the Risen Christ. That Christ rose from the dead is to him part of the very substance of the Revelation. Here, of course, he is in sharp antagonism with Modernism, and even with many who think it unwise to stake Christianity on what they deem a purely external event, rather than on the revela-

tion of the Divine Character in the inner life of the Son alone. I cannot share this latter view. There can surely now be no doubt that the entire structure of Apostolic thought grew out of the Resurrection. It is indeed an endeavour to see all things *sub specie Resurrectionis*, and the optimism and vital force of the whole ethos and outlook depend upon this fact. 'Say your worst about the world, yet it is a world in which Jesus rose from the dead.' Such is the faith of the first Christians, and it is this conviction which makes them put Hope among the great virtues instead of among the fortunate gifts of temperament as we put it to-day.

From the Resurrection and Exaltation the argument moves on to the next religious idea, the perfect Manhood of Christ. The author is certainly right in putting this among the great *religious* verities of faith. This is the distinctively modern discovery, or rather rediscovery, the point in which the traditional Catholic Christology is weak, and which has to be reasserted if Christianity is ever to come to its own again. To many the whole modernist controversy is a mere lapse from the faith. It is surely nothing of the kind; it is fundamentally a recovery of an obscured truth. No truth is ever rediscovered without convulsions and extreme positions; and so it is to-day. But we shall never do full justice to Modernism until we realize that it is the one-sided reassertion of a great and neglected religious verity of central importance, the true Humanity of Jesus. It is just as needful that this truth should come to its full rights as that the most venerable ancient creeds should be conserved. Our author is in this regard a true modern. 'Were it conceivable indeed,' he says, 'that we were forced to choose—as we are not—between the conviction that Jesus possessed true manhood in all its parts, and the assurance that He was the Son of God come in flesh for our salvation, our plain duty would be 'to affirm His Humanity and renounce His deity.' With this I fully agree. But we could never have reached this position, with the richer content of Christian truth which, I believe, it implies, without the long modern conflict with Humanitarianism. I believe we must keep this in mind in all the phases of that controversy which may remain, and ask ourselves, 'What is, what may be, the truth which these continued protests contain?' It is not enough to show inconsistencies and impoverish-

ments of vital truth in Humanitarian writers, we must ask what is the possible religious truth for which they are still standing, and which, it may be, our own syntheses are as yet ignoring. Have we as yet found the final 'balance of truth'? Have we any right to assume that the controversy is as yet concluded, or that there may not be in the minds of those of us who hold with conviction to the positive position, residues of the past that the future will not justify? Over the rest of this chapter time forbids me to dwell. There is a very fine passage on the balance of qualities in Jesus, and a very interesting discussion of whether we can predicate human individuality as well as personality of our Lord, but we must pass on to the next chapter where the argument reaches its climax in the discussion of the Divinity of Christ.

In this chapter the author sums up the preceding argument. He recalls first the facts about Christ which he has established from the Gospel History. 'The primal and creative source of belief concerning Jesus is recorded fact. . . . The final court of appeal, therefore, is Jesus' witness to Himself as echoed and apprehended by the believing mind. . . . We are obliged to call Jesus what He called Himself, and what the new life He inspires proves Him to have been.' This last clause is expanded later. 'The moral authority of Jesus presents itself in the Christian conscience as invested with absolute supremacy, as infinite with the infinitude of God, also a fact which insists on doctrinal interpretation. It means that the voice of Jesus finds us at depths of our being accessible to God only. Again we have an intuition of Divine suffering in the Cross. Involuntarily, we are made aware, in presence of Christ's passion, that it is God Himself who bears our sin and carries our sorrow . . . that the judgment upon evil uttered upon Calvary is manifested through suffering veritably Divine, and that Christ chooses the Divine life He thus pours out for sinners. Again, Christ abides within His people, His life pervading theirs with a creative, undefined power; but this capacity to inhabit the inner man, kindling life by an originating impulse, is clearly something not predicable of a simply human personality. If He be the giver of a Divine Spiritual Energy, how escape the assurance that He is Himself Divine? Or if He reveals the Father perfectly, must He not participate by right of nature in that which He reveals? Finally, we arrive at the clear position that

specifically Christian faith in God the Father is linked indissociably to faith in Christ the Son. Without any duplication of the object grasped by faith—which would be polytheism—believers cast themselves down into the depths of Christ's compassion, and in Him find rest for their souls. Yet nothing can be more certain, than that in this sense Christians can believe in God only.'

'How shall we describe this wondrous Person, in whom those attributes of power and supremacy are found, this Jesus who transmits a life no one else had transmitted to Him? He is highest in the highest realm we know; through Him, as first cause, our race has received the creative inflow of the unseen pouring from fountains of the great deep. Which is the right predicate? How name the presence that constitutes Him our Redeemer? Surely it is only God Himself.'

After this the author selects three aspects of Christ's Humanity, which are intelligible only if they are based upon His true Godhead. These are His sinlessness, His special Sonship, and His transcendent risen life. He then discusses Haering's view, that the term Godhead is none the less inappropriate, as applied to Christ by scientific theology, though it is justifiable as the expression of intense religious feeling.

Finally, we get at the real heart and motive of the author's Christology in a striking passage, in which he urges that we 'can conceive a far more glorious Gospel' than that of the Humanitarian Christ. 'We can conceive the thought that God Himself should be present to heal and save. And we judge that the most glorious thought of God is always the truest.'

Of the power and truth and beauty of very much in this chapter it is unnecessary for me to speak. The last sentence quoted, indeed, seems to me to go to the heart of the matter. Nevertheless we confess to some questioning, if here we have as yet an account of the whole that is satisfying. I would briefly note two points at which the construction seems to me inadequate, with a view to suggesting discussion, and perhaps of leading the author to state his views more fully at some future time. When all is said, the centre of faith in the New Testament is placed in God, and in the Gospels this is quite clearly God the Father. The central motive of Jesus is not, as Seeley said, His enthusiasm of Humanity, but His enthusiasm of God, and His *ultimate* aim is not to awaken

faith in Himself but in His Father. I entirely agree with the author's position as to Christ Himself being the object of faith, and as to His seeking and approving this faith in His disciples. But the primary and ultimate aim is, that through Him they may find the Father. This, moreover, seems to me the dominant type of Apostolic religion. Christians are those 'who through Jesus believe in God,' and this is not 'Godhead' but 'the Father.' Moreover, we have the considerable number of subordinationist passages in the New Testament to consider in this connexion. Either we must regard these as 'vestigial survivals' or use them as vital utterances of faith. The author gives abundant evidence that he is familiar with this point of view. Indeed, the knowledge of all types of religious experience shown in the book is extraordinary. But here it hardly seems to have entered deeply enough into the fundamental construction. In the endeavour to avoid Tritheism we seem sometimes in danger of Modalism. It appears to me that we must start with Jesus as the Revelation of the Father. As we endeavour to enter into this we find that we become more, instead of less, dependent upon the Son. This is the vital experience which leads us to the conviction of His Divine place. 'He fills the whole sphere of God,' but He fills it as a transparent glory through which we look to the Father.

The other point relates to the implicates of the sinlessness of Jesus. Does that sinlessness imply necessarily, as the argument of the book maintains, that Jesus must be Divine? I cannot see that it does, on the author's basis. It is a leap beyond the data. 'When we ask why He uniformly triumphed over sin, whereas we fail, the answer, as we shall see, must lie in that element of His being, in virtue of which He is one with God' (p. 404). 'The sinless preface to a sinless adult life is in itself suggestive of a vital and inherent identity with the Divine' (p. 414). But possibly I misunderstand his basis, for later we have a pregnant saying, which if it were worked out would, I believe, greatly strengthen the whole argument of the chapter: 'His original oneness with God stands here solely for the potentiality and basis of sinless manhood' (p. 414). Were these two lines of thought wrought out more fully, the essentially filial character of Christ's Eternal Personality, and the essential kinship of that Eternal Personality with essential Humanity,

we should, I believe, have a fuller and more satisfying account of the whole matter.

It is in this section which deals with the *Werthurtheile* of Christianity that the core of the book lies. These are the verities, the author would say, of which we are sure. They are matters of faith, and of a certainty which we cannot predicate of further doctrinal constructions and interpretations. But none the less we are bound to go on to this further task. You have to face these problems in effect, he says, if these faiths are true. Here in what follows is the best solution I can give, and I give it for what it is worth.

The limits of time and space prevent me from dealing as it deserves with the singularly fresh and suggestive closing section of the book. It is a bold and comprehensive endeavour to deal with the problems of thought which arise as soon as we try to explain this Christ of Faith, to unify our impressions of Him, and to set them in the full light of our knowledge of God and the world and the soul. The mere enumeration of the leading topics discussed will show the range of this argument. The Incarnation and Divine Immanence, Pre-existence, Kenosis, Incarnation, and the Sub-conscious Life, Progressive Incarnation, the Virgin Birth, the Economic and the Immanent Trinity, are the leading themes. The whole discussion has a range and courage of thought which is eminently refreshing. The ancient problems are set in the full light of modern knowledge, and the solution is pursued with unflagging energy. Specially interesting are the chapters on Immanence and on Pre-existence.

As regards the method of the Incarnation the author accepts in its essence Dorner's view of a gradual union of the Divine and the Human in Jesus, as the Human Jesus grew in the spiritual life, and hazards the bold analogy of the growing union of the Christian with His Lord. I shall quote but one characteristic passage out of many to indicate the spirit of the whole. Dealing with the charge of elaborateness and inconceivability, he says: 'Yet even here, the main ideas of which these chapters have been so faltering and imperfect an exposition may perhaps challenge comparison, as regards mere capability of being thought, with the constructions of recent speculative philosophy, be it Hegelian, Bergsonian, or Materialistic. The conception of Godhead, self-renounced and self-fulfilled in Christ, is surely child's play in contrast

to the marvels of the absolute dialectic, of the intuitive method, or of naturalistic evolution as interpreted in terms of matter. Whereas the Christologian has at least this advantage, that the mystery he reports is a mystery of grace. Holy love is his last criterion of reality. The greatness, the mercy, the glorious power of Jesus Christ, who ransomed us with His blood, and who, after all creatures have received of Him, is still as endless as in the beginning—these are facts which have conveyed to the human mind a totally new impression of what God is, and of the lengths His love

will go to redeem the world. He who has stood by this ocean of Divine mercy, as it stretches from his feet to incomprehensible distances, will not too much complain that our estimate of Christ should thus bring us, ere we are aware, to the verge of silence.'

These words may well complete the imperfect notice of a noble book which, whether we agree or differ with it, and the reviewer does both, really advances the discussion of the great theme with which it is concerned, and will doubtless leave its deep mark on its future course.

In the Study.

New Commentaries.

WHATEVER the reason of it, there is no part of the Bible upon which we are better served with commentaries than on the Epistles of St. John. The volume in the 'International Critical Commentary' is the latest addition to the literature. Its title is *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Johannine Epistles* (T. & T. Clark; 10s. 6d.). The author is the Rev. A. E. Brooke, B.D., Fellow, Dean, and Divinity Lecturer, King's College, Cambridge.

One of the most interesting things about the literature on these Epistles, is that it takes so long to grow old. Books on the Gospels, including the Johannine Fourth, are antiquated speedily; books on the Pauline Epistles stay a little longer; but books on the Johannine Apocalypse scarcely survive their author. On the Johannine Epistles only, so far as we can see, do the commentaries live. In his list of the literature on these Epistles Mr. Brooke names Lücke (1820-1856), Huther (1855-1880), Maurice (1857), Ebrard (1859), Haupt (1869), and Rothe (1878) as all worth studying still. What is the reason of it?

On Rothe, by the way, Mr. Brooke makes a remark, and on Rothe only. He says, 'A most valuable Commentary.' But he has forgotten that Rothe is accessible in English. To the earliest volumes of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES a translation of Rothe's *First Epistle of John* was contributed. It has not been reprinted, and has no doubt made these early volumes to be the more sought after.

With Mr. Brooke himself we are greatly charmed.

How good it is that the preacher—not only the special student but the practical preacher—is accustomed to turn first of all to the volumes of the 'International Critical Commentary.' We want reliable scholarship. We can do the rest ourselves. Every preacher will turn to Mr. Brooke's Johannine Epistles. And it is very rarely that he will require to turn to any one else.

In the Rev. Cyril W. Emmet's commentary on *St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians* (Robert Scott; 3s. 6d. net), the argument in favour of the South Galatian locality is stated shortly and clearly; the argument in favour of an early date for the Epistle, a date *preceding* the Apostolic Council of Acts xv., is given in fulness and with astonishing force of conviction. For that great argument alone the book is worth buying.

But it is also a commentary, of independence and ripe scholarship. Mr. Emmet is becoming recognized as one of the most reliable theological writers of our day.

Professor Allan Menzies of St. Andrews, who published an edition of St. Mark's Gospel on a new plan, has not repented of his temerity. The new method of exposition has proved a true method and very useful. Now he has issued on similar lines an edition of *The Second Epistle of the Apostle Paul to the Corinthians* (Macmillan; 6s. net).

What is the method? The Greek is given on one page and Dr. Menzies' own translation on the page opposite. Then, the commentary is an exposition, not of the writer's words but of his