

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

may be a better place. Of course in this service each nation has its own share and contributes its own treasure, as Greece the love of beauty, Rome order and law, Israel the reality of God. And men may find in serving their nation a real service of the world.

But this brings us near the end of our pilgrimage. We begin to see the great Plan which includes all nations and all lives. Vocation is now seen to be

a call which comes to a man out of the heart of the Reality in which he finds himself, which is the will of the Infinite personal Life. There is an ultimate Reality which authenticates the summons of the ideal in conscience. There is a goal to which Creation is moving, and behind all a Purpose which is realizing itself. And when we see our place in this we can say, 'I have found Thee, who hast ever been seeking me; Thou hast revealed Thyself to me, who have ever been seeking Thee.'

Recent Thought on the Doctrine of the Person of Christ.

BY THE REVEREND SYDNEY CAVE, M.A., D.D., CAMBRIDGE.

It is peculiarly difficult to describe the thought of the age in which we live. As Goethe said, 'It is their outcome which gives to deeds their title,' and it is too soon to decide whether new tendencies mean advance or retrogression. Only when a conflict is passed, can its real issues be determined.

I.

It will be convenient to begin our study with a brief description of the position in Christology at the opening of the twentieth century.¹

In Germany Ritschlianism still dominated theology. Ritschl, indeed, was dead, but his influence remained. His reconstruction of theology had rendered the Church an inestimable service. By its concentration on the indubitable fact of Christ, and His value to us as God, it had helped to destroy the excessive intellectualism both of orthodoxy and of 'liberalism'; it had led men back from the worship of the vain idol of the Absolute to the God whom Christ revealed; and had shown that the essential element in Christianity is neither the speculations of orthodoxy, nor the 'idea of Christ' into which left-wing Hegelianism had re-

solved the meaning of His person, but the concrete work and mission of Jesus Christ, the founder of the Kingdom of God, the perfect revealer of God, the perfect redeemer of man.

Ritschl was a ponderous and often repellent writer, unduly controversial, and allowing at times his scorn for sentimentality to conceal his genuine Christian enthusiasm. His views found a more attractive presentation in Herrmann's book *The Communion of the Christian with God*, which, in our country especially, has had, we imagine, an influence greater than any of Ritschl's works. With a prophetic ardour alien from Ritschl's temperament, Herrmann sought to bring men back to what he held to be the certain fact of Christian experience, the communion of the Christian with God through our knowledge of the historic Jesus. No modern writer has described in more moving terms our indebtedness to the words and deeds and inner experience of the Jesus of whom the Gospels speak. For Herrmann, it was not enough to say that we come to God through Christ. 'It is truer to say that we find in God Himself nothing but Christ.' God makes Himself known to us through the fact of Christ, 'on the strength of which we are able to believe in Him.' 'The existence of this Jesus in this world of ours is the fact in which God so touches us as to come into a communion with us that can endure.' Yet the implicates of this faith, Herrmann

¹ For a fuller description of the modern period, I would venture to refer to the chapter on 'Ritschl and the Modern Period,' and for the standpoint here adopted, the chapter on 'Our Present Problem' in my recent book on *The Doctrine of the Person of Christ*.

refused to explore. We can be sure, indeed, that Christ knows about us, although in this life we can have no personal communion with Him, but from the problem of His pre-existence, Herrmann bade men turn 'with hearts cold as ice.'

Like all great theologies, Ritschlianism shows unmistakably upon it the marks of the Time Spirit. Rightly had it emphasized that we must begin with the known, and not the unknown, with the historically given, not with the speculatively preconceived. But reason has its rights, and it was impossible that the *caveat* of their great master should permanently prevent the members of this school either working out the implicates of the Christian facts, and so passing to a confession of Christ's Godhead which involves a more explicit recognition of His exalted and pre-existent life, or receding to a lesser view of Him which makes of Him no more than the supreme religious hero of the race. And, at the beginning of this century, both tendencies were already at work.

Of the first, we may take as illustrations the Christologies of Julius Kaftan and of Haering. To Kaftan,¹ Christianity means the life hid with Christ in God. It is not an ethical religion only, but an ethical religion of redemption, liberating not from sin alone, but from bondage to the seen and the temporal, for Christians are meant to live already as in the eternal, an eternal whose content and meaning are given us in the exalted Christ. As faith has to do with present realities, Christian faith has, as its first concern, the exalted Christ, but this exalted Christ we know through the life-picture of Him given in the Gospels. And the pre-existence of Christ which Ritschl and Herrmann had been unwilling even to discuss, is here explicitly asserted as the necessary consequence of Christian faith. 'Our faith in Christ lacks adequate experience, unless we affirm the eternal God in the historic Saviour, so that He who stands before us there, is He who from eternity is in God.'

We find a similar confession in Haering's suggestive book *The Christian Faith*, which happily has been translated into English.² Christ, he

¹ The 1st ed. of Kaftan's *Dogmatik* was published in 1897. Our account of it is based on the 6th ed. of 1909. An important supplement to it is his *Zur Dogmatik* (1904). It is unfortunate that the only book of his translated into English is his early book on *The Truth of Christianity*, a technical work, and marked by much of the narrowness of the older Ritschlianism.

² Eng. tr., 1915, from second German ed. of 1912.

teaches us, does not belong to the past alone. His activity is still perceived by faith, yet this activity is not different from that which He showed in His historical revelation. 'The work of the exalted Christ is this, that He makes operative for us His historical work on earth.' From such immediate utterances of Christian faith, Haering passes to its 'presuppositions or inferences,' which 'rise in the last resort to a height which seems to point beyond themselves.' It is in this way that we reach the doctrine of Christ's pre-existence. It is a 'boundary thought,' transcending what we know or understand and yet the sure consequence of faith.

With these right-wing Ritschlians, we thus begin, not with pagan views of God and man to which we have somehow to relate the doctrine of Christ, but with Christ as known in history and by Christian faith, and then pass from the immediate utterances of Christian faith to the tentative exploration of its ultimate implicates: Christ's pre-existence and His relation to the eternal God.

If some Ritschlians thus passed from the fact of Christ to the exploration of the implicates of His place and person, others, more numerous and more influential, sought to remove the necessity for such exploration by reducing the content of the giver. Ritschl himself had condemned the attempt to write the life of Jesus, for such an attempt 'implies the surrender of the conviction that Jesus belonged to a higher order than all other men,' but it was from this group especially that there came those attractive presentations of the life and teaching of Jesus which seemed to place Him in immediate accord with an age which, though distrustful of the supernatural, was ready to admire the supposed 'Jesus of the Gospels,' who leads us to God as no one else can do, but was not Himself part of the gospel He proclaimed. We think of such famous books as Harnack's *What is Christianity?* or Wendt's *Teaching of Jesus*, or Bousset's *Jesus*. No books praised Jesus more happily than they, but, for all their veneration of His character, their praise was something different from classic Christian faith. They did for Jesus what the one-eyed Wotan did for Brunnhilde, 'They kissed the Godhead away.'

In Great Britain, German theology had far less influence than German scholarship. The Kenotic theory, which has been in abeyance in Germany

during this period,¹ was represented in influential books, both of High Anglicans like Dr. Gore² and Dr. Ottley,³ and of Free Churchmen like Dr. Fairbairn⁴ and Dr. Forrest,⁵ whilst Christian Hegelianism, which was already moribund in Germany, still lived in England, largely through its very attractive presentation in the writings of T. H. Green and Edward Caird. Of German books, Herrmann's *Communion of the Christian with God* had great influence, though many, who owed Herrmann much, refused to rest content with his negations. If, in theology, German thought had only a restricted influence, in scholarship, the dependence was often servile, especially with those who, in their ignorance of German, believed that the brilliant books of German 'liberals,' published in English by a great Unitarian firm, represented the last results of German scholarship, and the unsettlement which such books produced was reflected in the fierce controversies aroused in 1907 by the Rev. R. J. Campbell's *New Theology*, and by Mr. Robert's article, 'Jesus or Christ?' in *The Hibbert Journal* of 1909. Of the first book, it would be ungenerous to speak, as its author has since retracted his views, but it is indicative of much that a revival of the Hegelian interpretation of Christianity could, in all sincerity, be called a new theology. To Mr. Robert's article, *The Hibbert Journal* erected the massive mausoleum of a special supplement, 'Jesus or Christ?'; a book which remains as an interesting memorial of the confusion of that time.

To these controversies we owe two books of permanent value, Dr. Denney's *Jesus and the Gospel* and Dr. Forsyth's *The Person and Place of Christ*. Dr. Denney was concerned to prove that Christianity is 'justified in the mind of Christ,' and with all his old incisiveness, but with a new sympathy and tolerance, showed that the faith of the New Testament is the faith, not in a supreme religious hero, but in a Divine Lord. Dr. Forsyth vigorously attacked the genial 'liberalism' which denies to Christ a final place, and himself, rejecting the Greek philosophy of substance, expounds the meaning of Christ's person in terms of a meta-

¹ Its last important presentation in German was written by a Swedish theologian, Bensusan (*Die Lehre von der Kenose*, 1903).

² *The Incarnation of the Son of God*, 1891.

³ *The Doctrine of the Incarnation*,³ 1902.

⁴ *The Place of Christ in Modern Theology*, 1893.

⁵ Especially in his book *The Authority of Christ*, 1907.

physics which is ethical and personal, and, recognizing that the Incarnation meant not only a 'kenosis' but a 'plerosis,' sought to unite with the 'kenotic' view, the theory of Christ's person, propounded by Dorner and by Kähler, which recognizes the gradual development of the incarnation, so that the reception by the human of the Divine was completed, not in the cradle, but on the Cross.

Mention must here be made of Dr. Sanday's new interpretation of the Person of Christ in his *Christologies Ancient and Modern*, first published in 1910, in which the subliminal consciousness was called in to explain the Divine in Jesus, whilst, at the same time, affirming that 'the human consciousness of the Lord' was 'entirely human.' In this way, Dr. Sanday claimed that we could take 'the humanity of our Lord in real earnest,' and yet assert that 'this human life, was, in its deepest roots, directly continuous with the life of God Himself.' Such an interpretation, coming from one so justly venerated, naturally aroused at the time much interest; but this new explanation of Christ's person seems to create more difficulties than it solves, and of it we hear little to-day.

Of far greater importance was the publication in 1912 of Dr. Mackintosh's book on *The Person of Jesus Christ*, which seems to many of us the most suggestive and valuable on its subject of modern times. This book not only gives a full and discriminating account of the Biblical and ecclesiastical material, but an elaborate constructive statement. With the right-wing Ritschlians, Dr. Mackintosh distinguishes between the 'immediate utterances of faith' that Christ is the exalted Lord, perfectly human and perfectly Divine, and the 'Transcendent Implicates' of Christian faith, the idea of the Incarnation, the pre-existence of Christ, His self-limitation and self-realization, His relation to the Divine Trinity. We have here a metaphysical Christology, but it is a Christology which has learnt to distinguish the Christian facts, as known to Christian experience, from their intellectual interpretation, an interpretation made in categories obtained not from an alien philosophy, but from a metaphysics which is itself derived from the inherent necessities of Christian faith.

II.

In Germany, even before the war, there were signs of reaction against the developments we

have described. Of significance here was the Modern-Positive School¹ which complained of the undue isolation of the Ritschlian construction, and which sought, while retaining the full view of Christ which the 'liberals' of the Ritschlian school had helped to menace, to express that view in terms of a world-view intelligible to modern thought. Still more significant was the interest aroused just before the war in Schaefer's vigorous protest against the whole development of theology from Schleiermacher on.² Theology, he argued, should be theocentric; instead, since Schleiermacher's time it had been, for the most part, anthropocentric, concerned less with God than man. 'Little man has cast on God his shadow.' It is not our experience which is primary, but the revelation of God in Christ, and, strictly speaking, God, and God alone, is the one object of Christian faith, and the one subject-matter of Christian Theology, so that our faith in Christ is not faith in the Jesus of history, but in the risen and exalted Lord, who belongs to the God whom alone we worship.

Students of theology, in the narrower sense of the word, are always few, and far more interest was aroused by the sharp reaction in Germany against the 'liberal' picture of Jesus' life and mission which had been so confidently proclaimed as the supreme achievement of modern scholarship.³

So early as 1901, Wrede had complained that the modern reconstruction of the life of Jesus, based on St. Mark's Gospel, was a piece of psychological guesswork, and had himself sought to show that it was only after the Resurrection that the disciples thought of Jesus as the Messiah.⁴ Arbitrary as was his own reconstruction, it was only the same sort of arbitrariness as many of the 'liberal' scholars

had shown in their modernization of Mark's Gospel, and the book led many to discover that the modern 'Jesus of the Gospels' was not the Jesus of history; and, when Drews in 1909 revived the fantastic theory that Jesus never lived, the fierceness with which he was assailed by 'liberal' scholars seemed to show that they had begun to be uncertain of their reconstruction of the life of Jesus.

More damaging still to the 'liberal' view of Jesus has been the 'eschatological' interpretation of Him. The view found its first and most pointed expression in a little book by Johannes Weiss, published as long ago as 1892, and entitled *The Preaching of Jesus on the Kingdom of God*. It is difficult to imagine any presentation of our Lord's teaching in more violent contrast to the genial and modernized Jesus of much current 'liberalism' than this picture of Jesus as the stern prophet of the world's immediate and predestined end, proclaiming a kingdom which would come by God's sole and catastrophic act. In the second edition of this book, published eight years later, Johannes Weiss admitted that his first sketch was one-sided, and explained that it had been the outcome of an intense personal conflict. Brought up in Ritschlianism, he was convinced that Ritschlianism provided the form of Christianity most suited to modern men, and yet, when he turned to the Gospels, he discovered to his regret that the Ritschlian idea of the Kingdom of God was alien from the teaching of Christ. It owed its origin rather to Kant and the Illumination. In this second and greatly enlarged edition Johannes Weiss conceded that there were times in Jesus' ministry when the deep shadows cast by the impending judgment vanished, and men and things appeared in a friendlier light. The innate joy in nature and the world of men took again its proper place. The thought of the downfall of the world receded, and Jesus gave Himself to the things of this world, rejoiced with the glad, mourned with those that wept. No longer, then, was He the stern and gloomy prophet, but a Man among men, a Child of God among the children of men. From such a mood came those words and parables which are of imperishable freshness, and in which there is little trace of world-weariness and asceticism, of the end of the world and the impending judgment, and moral commands whose inner beauty secure their permanent worth for men of every age.

There is no such concession in Schweitzer's

¹ The programme of this school is best studied in Grützner, *Studien zur systematischen Theologie*, ii. and iii., 1905 and 1909. So far as I know, the only book of this school which has been translated is R. Seeberg's *The Fundamental Truths of the Christian Religion*, 1908. Seeberg's view has now found fuller expression in his *Dogmatik*, i. 1924.

² In his *Theozentrische Theologie*, i.², 1916, ii., 1914.

³ The word 'liberal' is used throughout this study, not in the vague English sense, as opposed to 'traditional'—in that sense all of us who are trying to interpret the gospel to modern men are liberals—but in the German sense as opposed to 'positive,' i.e. as denying that in Christ there has come a revelation, which, however incomplete our understanding of it is, is final and normative.

⁴ *Das Messiasgeheimnis in der Evangelien*.

famous book *From Reimarus to Wrede*, published in 1906 and translated into English in 1910 under the title *The Quest of the Historical Jesus*. The book is too well known to need description. With bitter scorn Schweitzer denounces the modern reconstruction of the life of Jesus. Its Jesus of Nazareth is 'a figure designed by rationalism, endowed with life by liberalism, and clothed by modern theology in a historical garb.' The true Jesus of history is a 'stranger and an enigma.' He belongs to His own age and cannot be transported into ours.

By bringing into prominence aspects of the Gospels which had been ignored or eliminated, the 'eschatologists' have made it impossible for us to modernize Jesus in the way that many 'liberals' did. But the view, in its extreme form, seems destructive not only of 'liberalism,' but of any such estimate of Jesus as would make necessary a special doctrine of His person. It would be hard to see, in the mistaken fanatic whom Schweitzer depicts, one who is, in any sense, the perfect revealer of God and the saviour of men. To some of us it seems that Schweitzer's picture of Jesus is at least as distorted as the 'liberal' view it was intended to displace. We may not ignore the paradox of Christ's self-consciousness. Apocalyptic forms He used. He was the Son of Man, the glorious figure of apocalyptic hopes, and yet He accomplished His work in a way undreamed of in these apocalyptic dreams. He was the suffering Servant of the Lord who came, not to destroy all save the elect, but to give His life a ransom for the many.

The other great controversy of recent times is concerned with the influence, not of Jewish, but of pagan thought.

Ritschl had unduly isolated Christianity from non-Christian religions. Many of his followers are among those who press to an extreme the interaction of other religions on primitive Christianity. This religio-historical school has produced one great systematic thinker, Troeltsch, whose works are likely to have increasing influence in our own country.¹ To him, Jesus is the symbol of what is for us in Europe the highest expression of religion that we know—the life-world of early Christianity. But truth is 'polymorphous,' and we cannot speak

¹ His position is well described in two recent English books—Bouquet, *Is Christianity the Final Religion?* 1921; and Sleight, *The Sufficiency of Christianity*, 1923.

of the absolute validity of Christianity. From this standpoint, too, there can be no special doctrine of Christ's person, for Christology is a meaningless term unless it be, in some sense, a confession of Christ's Godhead. From the brilliant scholars of this school has come the attempt to explain the ascription by the early Church to Christ of Lordship by the influence of the paganism of the age, and especially of the mystery-cults of gods who die and rise again, which, it is asserted, though not yet proved, were already prevalent in the Roman Empire at the time when Christianity first entered the Gentile world. The researches of men like Reitzenstein² and Bousset³ have rendered New Testament scholarship an immeasurable service, and have helped to make more vivid to us the Græco-Oriental syncretism of Apostolic times.⁴ But, like the extreme eschatologists, they too sacrifice facts to theory, and tend unduly to identify form with content. And when scholars have done here their work, the problem will still remain one, not of scholarship, but of faith. The ultimate question is not 'in what forms did men first present the Christian message of the Son of God who died and rose again?' but 'is its content true?' and our answer to that question must depend on our whole estimate of Jesus, on whether we share the Church's faith in Him.

III.

It is too soon as yet to assess the influence of the Great War on the development of Christology.

In England and America the War has led many to turn their faces from the future to the past, and to try to find security in Fundamentalism, or in a revived 'Medievalism' which, though it insists on creedal orthodoxy, yet gives to Christ less importance than He has in the classic faith of the New Testament, for His place in the believer's life is shared in part by the Virgin and the Saints.

² *Poimandres*, 1904; *Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen*,³ 1920.

³ *Kyrios Christos*,² 1921, and *Jesus der Herr*, 1916, an answer to Wernle's vigorous attack on *Kyrios Christos* (*Jesus und Paulus Antithesen zu Boussets Kyrios Christos*, 1915).

⁴ To this school we owe Lietzmann's *Handbuch*, with its admirable commentaries on the New Testament. The views of this school are represented in English by Lake, *The Earlier Epistles of St. Paul*, 1919, and in a modified form by Morgan, *The Religion and Theology of Paul*, 1917. For criticism, see Kennedy, *St. Paul and the Mystery Religions*, 1913; and Machen, *The Origin of Paul's Religion*, 1923.

In Germany the War has led to a notable reaction, not only against the 'Jesusism' of some 'liberal' scholars, but against every modern attempt to exhaust the meaning of Christ by rational and ethical interpretations of Him.

This reaction has taken an extreme form in the 'Theology of Crisis' of which Barth's *Commentary on Romans*¹ is perhaps the most important expression. It is an amazing book—five hundred pages of violent paradox. Barth delights in emphasizing the irrationality of Paul's thought. He has more than Dr. Forsyth's contempt for the 'lust for lucidity.' The desire for simplicity, he tells us, is simply the longing felt by most theologians for a truth which should be direct and not paradoxical, and so not to be received by faith alone. The only light we have comes from the light which is given us in Christ's death. Religion is for Barth no source of comfort. It is the opponent of man, though disguised as his truest friend; it is the crisis of culture and of ignorance. It is the most dangerous opponent, apart from God Himself, which man has on this side of death. Religion can only serve to reveal our Godlessness, for it is a human possession and work—it is the highest achievement of men, but not the overcoming nor the renewal of the human. It is 'flesh,' even though it dresses itself out as the history of salvation, and 'all flesh' is 'grass.' So our one hope lies not in human piety, nor in human devotion, but in the sole act of God. God sent His own Son because of our sin. That is the liberating word. It is to be described only in strong negations, to be preached only as a paradox, to be grasped only as the *absurdum*, which, as such, is the *credibile*, because it is the Divine reaction against sin. The offence, the vexation, which it gives us, is a reflexion of the offence, the vexation, which we are to God.

The book, for all its violence, is one of the most moving and impressive works in modern theology. But, if Barth be right, there can be no theology, no successful attempt to understand the mystery of Christ's person. All that is possible for us is the awed expression of the awful, yet gracious, act of God in sending Christ to die for men, revealing thus His mercy in His judgment, His grace in His unapproachable and awful holiness. And this

¹ *Der Römerbrief*, 1st ed., 1918, 2nd imp. of 2nd ed., 1923. Dr. Karl Barth is Professor of Reformed Theology in the University of Göttingen.

Barth admits, 'Do we speak of the redeeming message of Christ, the Word of God as teaching, or of theology as science? We hear Kierkegaard's words, "Professors in this, that Christ was crucified," or Overbeck's "Theologians are the fools of human society."' It says much for the violence of the reaction against pre-war theology that such a teacher should have so great an influence on the younger men in the German Church to-day.

Less extreme, and in our country, at any rate, far more influential, is Otto's book on *The Holy*.²

For Otto, the distinctive category of religion as the Holy Religion is concerned with the Numinous, which produces in us awe—the response on our side of the *mysterium tremendum* of the Divine. Otto recognizes the special task of Protestantism to bring into prominence the ethical and rational elements of Christianity, but these alone do not constitute it a religion. The disciples at the first did not follow Jesus because they understood Him. Their faith in Him was not in the first place rational, but spontaneous and unreasoned, and we too, like them, can, by a genuine 'divination,' a religious intuition, be sure of the presence in Him of the Divine. So Jesus was more than a 'divination.' A prophet is that. He is the object of divination. He was thus more than a prophet. He is the Son, for He Himself in His person and work has become the object of the 'divination' of the Holy.

Otto has had himself to protest against the way his emphasis on the non-rational elements in religion has been abused. In the preface to the recently issued third impression of the English translation, he writes: 'I do not want to promote in any way the tendency of our time towards an extravagant and fantastic "irrationalism." The "irrational" is to-day a favourite theme of all who are too lazy to think, or too ready to evade the arduous duty of clarifying their ideas, and grounding their convictions on a basis of coherent thought.' His book is wrongly used if it leads men to seek, not the revealed, but the occult. But it may do us an inestimable service if it restores to us the sense of amazed wonder at God's grace in Christ. We know Christ through what He has done for us.

² *Das Heilige*, first published in 1916. The book was described by the present writer in an article, 'The Paradox of Religion: A Study of Otto's *The Holy*,' in the *Expositor*, Feb. 1923. There is now an admirable translation by Harvey, *The Idea of the Holy*, of which a third impression has recently appeared.

But we may not treat Him as a means and not an end, nor, in our concentration on human needs, fail to think of Him with awe and adoration.

IV.

It cannot, then, be claimed that 'recent thought on the Doctrine of Christ' has reached as yet any final conclusion. In our own country, Dr. Gore would have us abandon any attempt to reinterpret the Doctrine of Christ in modern terms, and, instead, reinstate not only the content but the terminology of the Creeds.¹ Dr. Relton² bids us find the clue to Christology in the doctrine of the *enhypostasia*, first taught by Leontius of Byzantium, a doctrine unintelligible save to those familiar with the subtle speculations which preceded and followed the Council of Chalcedon. Bishop Temple³ would have us reinterpret the ancient conciliar decisions in the light of a Christian Platonism, which, he claims, would enable us to assert that real humanity of the incarnate Christ which the Greek Christology tended to obscure.

To others of us it seems better to abandon altogether the attempt to interpret Christ to our age in the categories of a philosophy which is not only obsolete, but incongruous with Christian values. The ancient formulæ, as Schleiermacher pointed out long ago, are self-contradictory. In the doctrine of the Trinity as we have it in St. Augustine, the 'Athanasian' creed and St. Thomas Aquinas, the unity of the Godhead is so strongly emphasized as to make meaningless the dominant Christology in which Christ is regarded as the incarnate Son of God. If Christianity be, as we believe, a religion not of 'deification' but of communion, then no philosophy of 'substance' can be adequate for its expression. We need, instead, a philosophy of personality, and it is one of the encouraging signs of the times that there have appeared in recent years books⁴ in which we

have already the beginning of a philosophy of personality which will be congruous with Christian values, and in which, as we hope, the doctrine of Christ's person may one day find a more congenial expression.

Meanwhile the Church has a still more urgent task. Rightly do the classic formulæ assert that Christ was truly God and truly man, but the assertion has little worth or meaning unless we give to God and man their Christian value. Little as we know of Christ, we know more of Him than we do of God. We have to begin with what we know of Christ, and try to understand the God whom He revealed. It is here that we have the prime failure of the ancient orthodoxy. It assumed that Christ was the unknown quantity which had to be resolved into terms of God and man as if the meaning of God and man were already clear. It failed to see that the God of Jesus Christ was different altogether from the God of pagan philosophy, the ultimate abstraction of thought, impassible and to be known only by negations. Our problem to-day is less to define the relation of the Divine and the human in the Incarnate Person than it is, beginning with the revelation of God in Christ as known and received by the Church's corporate faith, to advance to an exploration, not only of Christ's place and person, but of the character of God and of the destiny of man.⁵ So conceived, the doctrine of Christ's person is no longer a recondite theory or a problem in Patristics. It is the practical concern of all believing men, for the confession of His Godhead becomes the inevitable expression of our certainty in the revelation of God in Him, and of the absolute validity of the values which His life and death reveal, values which must be normative for us in every sphere of public and of private life.

Personality; and Matthews, *Studies in Christian Philosophy*.

⁵ It is a pleasure to refer to Dr. Garvie's recent book *The Christian Doctrine of the Godhead*—a book which better than any other meets this modern need—where theology is based, not on the presuppositions of an alien philosophy, but on the revelation of God in Christ, so that we pass from the study of the Grace of Christ to the realization of the Love of God and the Community of the Holy Spirit.

¹ See his criticism of Dr. Mackintosh in *The Holy Spirit and the Church*, 1924, pp. 228-243.

² *A Study in Christology*, 1922.

³ *Christus Veritas*, 1924, pp. 106-133.

⁴ E.g. Pringle-Pattison, *The Idea of God*; Sorley, *Moral Values and the Idea of God*; Webb, *God and*