

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Expository Times* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[Issue]_[1st page of article].pdf

light spread over the East and the West. On that day was born the Image of Love and the Great Child. He spent His days calling people to the Truth and guiding them to the right path. He was a good shepherd who sheltered His sheep and defended them against the wolves. . . . The greatness of Cæsar has passed away, the Nero's page in history is a dark one ; but time has failed to efface the greatness of the Apostle of Love, and His page in history remains white, with no spots on it.' On the other hand a great deal of the anti-Christian material produced in the West is being eagerly assimilated and skilfully used to attack the work of the Christian missionaries in the East.

The problem before the Christian Church is to turn this Renaissance into a Reformation. The situation in Moslem lands to-day presents an interesting parallel to the fifteenth century in Western Europe. The moulds which had contained and shaped the life of the Middle Ages were all broken up as new worlds swam into view. But only in those nations where the new spirit was directed into religious channels were the deepest springs of national life rejuvenated. The nations which rejected or crushed the religious movement, like Italy, Spain, and Portugal, were spiritually and morally, and soon, also, politically crippled. The wonderful flower of their springtime did not yield fruit because it lacked the spiritual vitality of the Protestant Reformation. So the Moslem world to-day needs to be vitalized by the Gospel if its awakening is to herald the coming of a better day. The old Mohammedanism is passing away,

and many of its devotees, shaken out of that ancient stronghold, are taking the road of secularism. The issue is not Mohammed or Christ. It is Christ or decay and death. Here as in the case of the ethnic religions it is becoming apparent that upon the Christian faith there will ultimately fall the whole burden of keeping alive religion in the earth.

What forces are available for the winning of the Moslem world? The Churches of the East are, locally, in the front trenches, but they are so dispirited, darkened, and hardened by long oppression that little is meantime to be hoped from them. 'The really central question is: Has a missionary Protestantism vital power and spiritual energy enough to flood the spiritual deserts of modern Islam with the rising tide of a spiritual revival which will lead to a religious reformation and transformation?' The hour calls for a great Crusade. The Christianity of the West must approach the Moslem world with fullest sympathy and in the spirit of brotherhood, bearing in her hand a full Gospel in the assurance that it will meet the Moslem need. The workers already in the field have been confirmed in this assurance. 'The most searching experience and possibly the most creative hour in each of the conferences was the consideration of the topic, "What has Christ to bring to Moslems which they cannot under any circumstances obtain from their own religion or from any other source?" The corporate thinking and intercession of those memorable hours confirmed the faith of every one as to the absolute uniqueness, supremacy, and sufficiency of Jesus Christ the Living Lord.'

Recent Thought on the Doctrine of the Atonement.

BY THE REVEREND ROBERT MACKINTOSH, D.D., LECTURER IN THE UNIVERSITY OF MANCHESTER.

I PROPOSE to confine this report to literature in our own language. Before we attempt any historical statement, let us briefly consider the nature of the problem as a *locus* in systematic or dogmatic thought.

I. Two great doctrines have, in a sense, competed for attention from orthodox minds, alike in past ages and in our own day: the Incarnation and the Atonement. Mr. J. K. Mozley has remarked upon the comparative waning of what we may call the

Westcott and *Lux Mundi* tradition, which explicitly defined Christianity as 'the religion of the Incarnation,' and upon the continuous stream of recent books, Anglican and other, which deal with that other doctrine termed in his own volume of collected pieces 'the Heart of the Gospel.' Of course we must not exaggerate the divergence here implied. Orthodoxy proclaims the truth of both doctrines. The difference between the rival schools or tendencies is concerned with nothing beyond comparative emphasis. Unless, subconsciously, more is at stake? The Western world inherited Nicene and post-Nicene Christology as a simple presupposition, when it began to deal with its own more ethically conceived problems. A pre-Christian dogmatic postulate, that Messiah must be the Son of David, had safeguarded in the East the assertion of Christ's humanity; which else, perhaps, might have been volatilized away. Only in strangely indirect fashion ('what is not assumed is not healed') did the humanity of Christ reveal its religious significance to the Greek Fathers. Latin thought, from very early days, struck a different note (*In quantum homo*,¹ mediator). It is not certain that what is inherited as a simple presupposition will permanently maintain itself as the best way of formulating the religious interests at stake; and we cannot omit from our survey in this article efforts to argue back from 'modern' views of the Atonement to a modern and non-Orthodox Christology. I may be permitted to quote my own remark,² that Ernest Troeltsch dismisses to limbo both versions of orthodoxy. In whatever sense that powerful mind continued Christian, neither Atonement nor Incarnation meant anything to him.

We may define doctrinal Christianity as the assertion that Christ is *necessary* and that Christ is *all-sufficient*. He comes doubtless not in His own name but in His Father's; nevertheless, our thesis, reasonably understood, is nothing less than what we have termed it—the central utterance of Christian belief. The doctrine of the Atonement proclaims, in addition, the necessity of the *death* of Christ and the all-sufficiency, if not of the death as such, yet of the completed Work. Not truly of the

¹ Dr. Franks points out that Lutheranism felt it necessary to modify this position, though taken directly from 1 Ti 2⁵. According to the Lutheran system, Christ is Mediator in both His natures—human and divine.

² 'Troeltsch and his English Interpreters,' in *Congregational Quarterly*, July 1924.

death apart from resurrection; nor yet of death apart from that life, full of grace and truth, which such a death and such a rising from the dead worthily or inevitably crowned; but none the less our doctrine proclaims the all-sufficiency of one sacrifice for sins offered for ever. Something came to pass in Christ's death, apart from which God had not been duly glorified nor man redeemed. There may be erratic Christians, like Ritschl and even Herrmann, who find Christ necessary as revelation—'we by Him do believe in God'—*i.e.* as the *sole* saving revelation,³ but who have nothing helpful to tell us regarding the death of our Lord. Yet 'placarded' before us stands, and must stand for ever, the challenging Fact. And if with perverse ingenuity, some one asks, What, then, if His enemies had *not* crucified Him?—it is enough for us to reply that by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God He had been given into their hands. Something came to pass—something 'objective,' as Mr. Mozley once more expresses it. For my own part, I seek rather a truth which blends the objective and the subjective. What Kant has taught us in pure philosophy may surely prove to be the part of wisdom in Christian theology as well. A dear friend of my own was grievously wounded, when a glib young pupil said to him, 'But God, sir, is *my attitude*.' What may be said offensively has also been said, I take it, with the deepest impressiveness: 'To know God, you must love Him.' If Christ is not 'my Lord,' what is all the objective truth about Him worth to me? And on the other hand, if Christ is not more than a helpful human influence, what have I, what has any man, to rely upon? Because He is necessary, Christ can never be for us anything that does not include the richest subjective meaning. And, because He is all-sufficient, Christ is the supreme objective reality, and we are built upon eternal foundations in the Rock of Ages. The average barely subjective theory may reduce the grace of God to a fragment of psychological process. We have not so learned Christ.

II. A few years back, a noticeable group of theological books appeared, dealing with the history of the doctrine of the Atonement. Earliest in time came the two-volume *History of the Doctrine of the Work of Christ*, by Principal Franks of Western College, Bristol. Massive in learning and masterly in power, this study never fails to handle

³ Troeltsch's Christian confession is infinitely more precarious.

its great theme broadly, so as to bring out the bearing of the doctrines of the Atonement upon the whole structure of theological systems. And, while sympathetic towards what is good in all types of doctrine, Dr. Franks is definitely Protestant and evangelical. Yet he is reticent regarding the details of his personal belief; and the four 'syntheses' in which he sums up the movement of Christian thought are not easy reading. Perhaps we may take it that he views Ritschl as the high-water mark in the progress of doctrine—a view not specially easy to justify when the doctrine of the Atonement is being made central. Dean Rashdall's posthumously published Bampton Lectures are equally learned and decidedly more outspoken. But, when he has said all, how little do we find in our possession! Like the father of Deism,¹ he believes that 'we should repent of our sins,' and that if we do 'God will forgive us.' Neither Gethsemane nor Calvary seems to add one single touch to this correct yet meagre piece of insight. Is 53 when scientifically expounded is no Messianic prediction, and therefore—according to Rashdall—its spiritual relevance to the death of Christ is *nil*. This kind of theology is Abelardism run to seed, and moral 'influence' theory at about its feeblest.

Mr. J. K. Mozley's *Doctrine of the Atonement*, one of the strongest of Messrs. Duckworth's 'Studies in Theology,' is mainly historical, though it sums up cautiously in favour of objective and almost (though not quite) penal readings of the doctrine. Two other volumes owed their simultaneous appearance to the choice of a 'special doctrine' for historical study during several years by the Manchester University Theological Faculty. One book was by Mr. Grensted, recently Principal of Egerton Hall in Manchester, now returned to the University of Oxford; the other was by myself. Mr. Grensted's supply of material is excellently useful; he quotes original texts, and appends an English translation. His own expressed attachment is to R. C. Moberly's version of the doctrine of Vicarious Penitence in Christ; I have thought that I could detect something too much of an attempt to impose not precisely that doctrine but generally the feelings and beliefs of a cultured modern Anglican upon the great figures of the past—Could they not mean a little less than they now seemed to say? And here again, perhaps, a little

¹ According to Dr. Franks, this was a Christian touch in Lord Herbert.

more? My own less learned review of *Historic Theories* of the doctrine² may be open to the criticism that I sharpen unduly the utterances which others soften. Yet I venture to hope that any one who gives fair consideration to the review of the great theories, and to the lessons which that review suggests, will find himself helped in appraising past history, and even—it may be—in undertaking the real task of the present; to state a theology which is truly ethical and unflinching Christian. In a brief closing chapter of attempted construction, my book directed attention mainly to Christ's work, in living and in dying, as the Redeemer of human character—a doctrine more familiar (even from Dr. Porcher du Bose) in the bizarre form of what has been termed Redemption by Sample, according to which Christ took into His person our sin-stained human nature and washed it clean.

Earlier than this group of historical efforts, we had the work of at least two notable systematic thinkers, both of whom started from within the orthodox and even the penal tradition—Dr. Forsyth and Dr. Denney. One had thought that Dr. Denney, at least, was absolutely identified with a penal interpretation of the sufferings of Christ; but midway in his career he disclaimed the thought of transferred punishment; and, in his posthumous Cunningham Lectures on the *Christian Doctrine of Reconciliation*, he reveals to us a finely ripened and sympathetic mind. Forsyth's case was not dissimilar. Unfortunately the precise doctrine commended to us by either remained more than a little obscure. On the other side, as representing distinctive Abelardism, nothing of equal weight, I should suppose, was given to us in recent years; or nothing before Dr. Rashdall's lectures.

III. Within a period that may be reckoned rather by months than by years, books on our subject have continued to pour forth—some larger, some smaller, most of them Abelardian. It has been the present writer's duty to notice in one or other theological organ six recent studies—Anglican (Canon Storr's *Problem of the Cross* and Dr. Maynard Smith's *Atonement*), Congregationalist (Professor

² In a perfectly friendly notice of my book, Mr. Mozley described me as a 'free lance'—hardly to my contentment. Evangelical Christians hate legalism, yet seek always to be 'not without law to God, but under law to Christ.' Still, that does not exactly imply that we are under law to the Ecumenical Councils; and the kindest of Anglo-Catholics may find the distinction subtle.

C. J. Cadoux's *Message about the Cross* and his brother Dr. A. T. Cadoux's *The Gospel that Jesus Preached*, Wesleyan (Dr. Maldwyn Hughes' *What is the Atonement?*), and Presbyterian (Dr. G. H. Morrison's *Significance of the Cross*—a rather unusually printed reproduction, in outline, of some powerful sermons). To these I should wish to add Mr. Mozley's *Heart of the Gospel*, already mentioned, but now requiring fuller reference.

All six volumes illustrate the continued tendency to dwell more upon Atonement as such than (at least *eo nomine*) upon Incarnation. Again, we may search all the six without finding any clear reference to the impressive theory of Vicarious Repentance, whether as developed on the lines of church, sacrament, and penitential sorrow by Dr. R. C. Moberly, or as propounded a generation earlier, with an even nobler earnestness joined to radiant serenity of spirit, by John M'Leod Campbell. So, too, we miss any attempt to find the significance of the atoning work of Jesus Christ in its subjective effects¹ not on human emotion merely, but on the character and the conscience—with or without the bizarrerie of Redemption by Sample. Any who have tried to expound the mystery of the Atonement as the necessary means for the renewal of man's soul must admit to themselves that, so far as the contemporary mind is concerned, we have pleaded in vain.

Concentrating our attention now upon the four volumes that were named at the head of our list—that modern evangelical, Dr. Storr, is at least far less objective in his recent utterance than Mr. Mozley had judged his earlier writings to be; while Dr. Maynard, with all his Anglo-Catholic extremeness, has been described to me by an expert belonging to his own communion as having formulated nothing beyond Moral Influence, and yet having credited himself with reproducing fully the traditional more objective faith of the Church. The remaining three studies—those of the two Doctors Cadoux, and of Dr. Maldwyn Hughes—stand, with differences in detail, for a combination of Moral Influence with the modern theory of Divine Suffering or the Eternal Cross. The former element in this credo received its noblest statement from Abelard, but is found in full power wherever evangelism is

really alive, and goes back through Augustine to St. Paul, '*God commendeth his love towards us* in that Christ died for us.' A precious, a sacred, a heart-moving element in the truth of God, but (as all defenders of the objective doctrine must maintain) incomplete in itself, and owing its strange power to our apprehension of that greatest among objective facts, that 'when we were yet sinners, *Christ died for us*.' The other thought, so far as I am aware, first emerged from the fertile mind of Horace Bushnell. We may gladly join with Bushnell and his disciples in getting rid of the prejudice intruded upon Christian thought by Greek philosophy—that the deity as such must be 'impassible.' But can we seriously hold that, on the balance, the blessed God is reduced to habitual unhappiness by man's sin? or that, if that lamentable belief were correct, God's unhappiness could redeem man? There is no real objectivity here; only the sentimental 'influence' of a foolish fancy.

Dr. A. T. Cadoux travels on from the special doctrine of Atonement into wider regions of Christian theology. He is resolutely anti-miraculous, and his Christology is narrowly humanitarian. Both of these startling positions are presented to us as distinct religious improvements, loyal to the inner spirit of Christianity. One has sometimes suspected that Harnack's views on Christology are not dissimilar. Harnack definitely stands by Athanasius as against Arius; for he finds it necessary to assure himself that we are in touch, not with any high-placed Being subordinate to the true God, but with the Father of mercies Himself. Yet, perhaps, in Christ *the man* Harnack discovers that full access to the heart of God which Luther preached with such melting tenderness, and which Arius's Creature-Logos would have made eternally impossible. It appears therefore that, upon the outskirts of subjective theories regarding Atonement, more formidable problems still are beginning to loom into view.

If we pass now to the other side of the debate, we find in Dr. Morrison confessedly a champion of Denney's views, and in Mr. Mozley, largely, a prophet of Dr. Forsyth's. There is a certain amount of overlapping in the several papers which make up Mr. Mozley's recent volume; and the present writer must confess that, on a first reading, he thought the papers unequal in value and the volume as a whole slight. A re-perusal, undertaken for the purpose of this article, has proved much

¹ The *Dogmatic* of the German theologian Haering is worth consulting on this point—namely, on the objectivity truly implied in the subjective working of the grace of Christ—and also for its statement in modified form of the theory of Vicarious Penitence.

more impressive. If one may say so, Mr. Mozley worthily represents in our own generation a name already so distinguished. And it is a picturesque circumstance that one, whose interests and associations are now so largely Anglo-Catholic, should dedicate his collected papers partly to the memory of Dr. Forsyth, if partly to a living friend, Mr. Studdert-Kennedy. Both in speaking for himself and in summarizing Forsyth, Mr. Mozley pushes his way back from Atonement to Incarnation—to the veritable full literal truth of Ph 2⁵⁻¹¹. Forsyth's assertion, that in the death of Christ God 'judges sin,' may be almost verbally Pauline, but it is very hard to put a definite meaning upon it; and, when Mr. Mozley seeks to explain it, he seems to pass out of the region of logic into that of rhetoric—rhetoric which, however fine in spirit and however worthy in form, is not what one was seeking. Even stranger is Forsyth's decision, sympathetically conveyed to us by the younger man: It was necessary that Christ Jesus, however tempted, should be impeccable; it was necessary that Christ Jesus, under conditions of Kenosis, should not know that He was impeccable! One must have strange confidence, both in one's moral intuitions and in one's powers of ratiocination, to speak thus. I will say no more regarding Christology; but I must admit, with full emphasis, the value of sacraments to Mr. Mozley's faith. Need that value be a thing confined to Catholic High Churchmen? Every time we break the bread and share the cup, it is as though God Himself were saying to us—Christ is more needful to you than food, or light, or air; Christ is utterly sufficient to cleanse and to bless you; Christ who is all this, waits upon you now. . . . Sacramental doctrine, even in the form he gives to it, does not hinder but gloriously helps Mr. Mozley's faith. But was there ever an Anglo-Catholic like him? Or will there ever be such another? Or is there anything in Anglo-Catholic doctrine itself to prevent the superstitious from regarding the Eucharist as magic, or to prevent the self-righteous from regarding it as one more good work which will extort the favour of God?

So, too, Dr. Morrison, when he writes 'Christ is more than a man; He is Man,' is exploiting the old Greek dogma—of the An- or Enhypostasy of Christ's human nature—in a new interest. The Eastern mind affirmed it in order to safeguard, if possible, the unity of the theanthropic person; Dr. Morrison repeats it in order to make reasonable and

credible—if it might serve so great an end—our faith that this one man is the Saviour and hope of all the ends of the earth. Happy are they who can carry the burden of old forms lightly, or even find their yoke a help towards true spiritual freedom. But not all are so fortunate as that. And, for us who are non-'Catholic' (in the sense in which Catholicism is a sectarian badge), there is always theoretical possibility of a better restatement of the creeds. And what is abstractly possible may one day reveal itself as practicable and so forthwith become a duty. Not for us are the hindrances, nor yet the helps, found in these ancient trammels by Christians who accept them as eternal truth.

IV. We do not fully estimate the currents of contemporary thought until we have asked not only what is published, but also how it is received. Let me quote a single sentence from what has been said of Mr. Mozley's *Heart of the Gospel* over the initials of a well-known theological Professor in the University of Cambridge: 'Any one who is satisfied to regard "the course of the world's history"¹ in the pessimistic or world-denying manner that has been common in the Church in the past, or the gospel as "a gospel for a perishing world" [p. 163], may be more than content with Mr. Mozley's championship of the position. Others, of whom I am one, would not admit the main premiss.'² Mr. Mozley wrote 'perishing,' he did not say 'a lost world.' In vain! His moderation does not save him. His critic's meaning is made more articulate in the closing words of an article in the *Modern Churchman*:³ 'Jesus Himself may be far less regarded to-day as the Saviour of mankind, because none of the doctrines of the Fall of Man and Atonement and Heaven and Hell, which are generally known as Christian, are credible to-day. But His ideas and ideals as to the relations that ought to exist between man and man as a condition of human society are becoming socially effective as they never were while those doctrines reigned and the world was regarded as a perishing world disfigured by man rather than as God's world, potentially and progressively, but only through man's free co-operation, His perfect organ: the end to be as much Man's achievement as God's.'

¹ These words are taken from the introductory page contributed to Mr. Mozley's volume by Dr. T. B. Strong, then Bishop of Ripon, now of Oxford.

² *Journal of Theological Studies*, July 1925, p. 435.

³ September 1925.

Fittingly does this author spell 'Man' as well as 'God' with the capital initial.

V. Still further ; if we are to estimate rightly the present theological situation, we must study it, not only in its constructions and criticisms, but in its *obiter dicta* while busy with other themes. For the mind of man is one ; and all our thoughts and strivings go to enrich—or to degrade—our thought of God and of His salvation.

There is the Pacifist outlook, represented in theories of Atonement by Professor C. J. Cadoux and others, but independently represented with immense zeal and self-confidence in general discussion and debate. According to this, the sufferings of the crucified Lord, eked out by the sufferings of saints, martyrs, and conscientious objectors, are ultimately to redeem an—as yet—unredeemed world.

There is the Christian Socialist outlook, which declares that love, mercy, generosity, is the whole of goodness ; that Justice is infra-Christian, and 'rights' inevitably 'selfish' ; and, in brief, that Christ came into the world to found the Labour Party. It is true that the clients of the Christian Socialists insist upon 'rights' and loudly demand what they call 'justice' ; but the pure theory of Christian Socialism seems to be what I have stated.

There is the Neo-Marcionism which despises the Old Testament because of its solemn emphasis upon justice and relatively lesser emphasis upon love. Dear, glorious, fascinating book, where everything is in the making and the faults that truly exist are faults of immaturity and not of decrepitude—how is it libelled to-day !

There is the doctrine that punishment is purely a reformatory process, and that, if it is ever inflicted in retribution for wrongs committed, such justice is nothing better than revenge. So distinguished a writer as Dr. Farnell, in his Gifford Lectures on

The Attributes of God, does not seem to envisage the possibility of any other motive for retributive punishment than malice and spite. So too the Birmingham 'Copec' Conference—an assemblage of warm young hearts and hot young heads—heard three brief speeches, all upon one side, and then voted down Capital Punishment. That most terrible of punishments is the most distinctively and characteristically penal ; hence the condemnation.

All these streams of tendency have one origin and one influence. Right for right's sake is despised and denied ; justice, as a distinguishable element in the moral ideal, is blotted out ; and God's love is degraded into an unethical softness. Not merely is faith uprooted ; its presuppositions are destroyed. The very soil in which it grew, and in which it might again have taken root, is washed away. This is the master error of our day, and the form in which the contemporary mind becomes guilty of apostasy from God. For, while justice is not the highest thing in the moral ideal or in the character of God, you never can think worthily of love or of grace if you deny justice. And, while the Atonement of Jesus Christ cannot be vindicated as a transferred punishment, if you do not believe in punishment you will never understand the Christian salvation. It is impossible here to argue in support of these positions. They can only be stated as theses which concern the life or the death of our Christian hope.

Nevertheless the foundation of God standeth sure ; and, although the Christian mind may suffer bewilderment, the Christian heart will respond in humble penitence and thankfulness to the great utterances of the New Testament in all their solemn fullness of meaning—utterances such as this : 'Where sin abounded, grace did much more abound : that, like as sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace reign, through righteousness, unto eternal life, by Jesus Christ our Lord.'

Literature.

SACRIFICE.

OF recent years the attention of Old Testament scholarship has been very largely concentrated upon the prophet : it is but fair that the priest

should have his turn. And it is a piece of peculiar good fortune that the problems connected with him and his functions should have been investigated by the man who, while he lived, was probably our greatest Semitic scholar, distinguished alike for