

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

constitutes the greatest problem with which the educationists, and the individual himself, have to deal. A large part of what theologians call 'Original Sin' is really the result of this. Europe inherited from St. Augustine a diagnosis of this maladjustment which attributed to human nature an original depravity. And Calvin gave to the Augustinian doctrine both a more clear-cut form and an extended lease of popularity. Against this diagnosis of man's disease the theory of the 'noble savage,' with its implication of an original perfection of human nature, was an extreme reaction.

Educational theories and practice in Europe and America have been largely influenced by one or the other of these two false diagnoses of the human problem. Traditional education was largely based on the former. The newer education leans heavily to the latter. There are some modern theories of education which would only be justified if we were entitled to accept the theory of the 'noble savage.' But no educational theory can be psychologically sound which minimizes the extent of the maladjustment which the normal child and adolescent must overcome before he can become a tolerable member of civilized society. Moral personality must be acquired; and it cannot be acquired without cost.

One other point in Dr. STREETER's striking essay must be briefly referred to. He has been impressed by the close resemblance of Freud's view of morality to that of St. Paul before his conversion. Freud regards morality as a set of rules imposed by society upon a recalcitrant individual, beginning in early life. These rules have a certain quality of

awe attached to them, since they have been imposed by the authority of some one, like the father, who to the child is a majestic personage. Nevertheless, the awe with which they are regarded is balanced by a resentment which necessarily brings with it internal conflict.

This conception is substantially identical with the view of morality under the law which St. Paul entertained before he became a Christian. The Law was regarded by him as something majestic in its claim to obedience. The commandment is 'holy and righteous and good.' Yet, by the mere fact that it made that claim, it stimulated in him an instinct of resentment and rebellion. 'I had not known sin except through the law; for I had not known coveting, except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet.'

Accordingly the change from being an orthodox Jew to being a Christian was conceived by St. Paul primarily as a *liberation*. The Christian was no longer 'under the law.' To him right conduct had become a form of *self-expression*. But it was right not because it was *self-expression*, but because the self-expressed had been transformed. Through Christ, Paul had entered into a new relation to God. He was not a servant but a joyful son. Christ was born within him. There are circles to-day in which what is called 'self-expression' seems the first and great commandment. But self-expression will be a good thing or a bad thing according to the inner quality of the self which is expressed. To St. Paul Christianity is self-expression; but it results inevitably in moral acts because it is the expression of a self recreated by the spirit of Christ.

Things most certainly Believed.

BY THE REVEREND A. E. GARVIE, M.A., D.D., D.Th., LONDON.

I. IN writing the first of the series of articles which the editors, wisely in my judgment, are providing on this subject in the pages of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, I may be allowed to offer a few introductory

comments. (1) There can be no doubt about the importance of the subject. If there be any belief in God at all, that belief must be the supreme belief, to which all other beliefs must be sub-

ordinate, and by which all other beliefs must be determined. As a man thinks of God, so will he think of world and self. (2) No less opportune does the subject appear. What has gone wrong with the world in its present difficulties, despondencies, and distresses is that it has forgotten God, that it has not made Him the predominant partner in all its planning and performing, but has followed its own ways, and trusted its own devices. Hence the *crisis* which is on deeper scrutiny, a *krisis*, or judgment on men forsaking God. Recovery can come only as men return to God, and seek counsel of Him. The Christian way is the only way of deliverance and safety, prosperity and progress. 'Be not deceived; God is not mocked: for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap' (Gal 6⁷). (3) As in Jesus the Christ our Lord, God has disclosed His mind, heart, and will, the holy love, which saves through sacrifice, and realizes the Kingdom of God on earth, never had the Christian faith a fuller opportunity and a greater obligation of world-conquest, bringing the kingdoms of this world into obedience to God and His Christ. (4) There is a turning towards religion; but it is not always towards Christ. There are rival claimants, naturalism and humanism, and even a Christless theism; and it is necessary to show that Christ alone has the words of the eternal life, and that the world will err if it depart to any other Master (Jn 6^{67t}). (5) While I am convinced as a result of many years of study that the Christian Church can offer an adequate argument to the human reason and an authoritative appeal to the human conscience, yet more persuasive than any such argument or appeal is the evidence of personal experience, individual and corporate, to the sufficiency of Divine grace through human faith, the watchword of the Reformation, *sola gratia sola fide* as the remedy for human ills. Hence such individual testimonies as will be given here are of value in the corporate influence of the Christian Church upon the world. (6) We are not concerned here with *what ought to be believed* on authority, oecumenical creeds, or denominational confessions, but with *what is believed* on personal conviction, individual faith. (7) What in belief as in practice must, however, be avoided is *individualism*, self-isolation from or self-assertion against the Christian community. It can be confidently said that the more a man penetrates into the sanctuary of the Divine revelation and the human redemption in Christ, the more certainly will he not find himself solitary, but in the company of the sages, seers, and saints, the 'great cloud of witnesses,' all 'looking

unto Jesus, the author and finisher of our faith' (Heb 12²). (8) As one who abandoned with much pain Scottish Presbyterianism on account of conscientious scruples about creed-subscription, and who for more than forty years has been a minister of Congregationalism, which imposes no creed, I desire to state my own conviction that it is not a lawless freedom which leads a man to truth, but an independent loyalty to what is the common faith of the Christian Church.

II. (1) Brought up in Scottish Presbyterianism, in religious circles where a confident and aggressive evangelical type of piety prevailed, the Cross of Christ—His atonement for sin—was the central conviction, and to this through all doubts I clung, despite difficulties about the prevalent doctrine of the Atonement. Although I have in my theological pilgrimage travelled far from the theory of *penal substitution*, yet that Cross stands unmoved as the focus of my thought and life. Some years ago, when asked to write a sermon for a volume, entitled 'If I had Only One Sermon to Preach,' or some such words, I chose as my text Paul's confession: 'Far be it from me to glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, through which the world hath been crucified unto me, and I unto the world' (Gal 6¹⁴ R.V.). To this may be conjoined the practical sequel to such a faith: 'The love of Christ constraineth us; because we thus judge, that one died for all, therefore all died: and he died for all, that they which live should no longer live unto themselves, but unto him who for their sakes died and rose again' (2 Co 5^{14t} R.V.). Hence, it is quite impossible for me to return to the Reformation doctrine of *justification by faith* as an adequate summary of Christian truth, unless its forensic interpretation is abandoned, and a spiritual and ethical takes its place, unless it be held to mean *reckoning righteous* in order to *make righteous*, and even then the word *righteous* is too narrow to cover the relation of God and man in Christ. I myself must advance from Ro 1-5, the argument of the Jewish Rabbi against Pharisaic Judaism, to Ro 6-8, the confession of the Christian Apostle of what Christ had been in him, and had done for him. My vital experience I find expressed ideally, if not altogether and always actually, in Paul's words: 'I have been crucified with Christ; yet I live; and yet no longer I, but Christ liveth in me' (Gal 2²⁰ R.V.). As a theologian, if I may claim that title, I am compelled to form a theory of the objective significance as well as the subjective value of the Cross, and to relate the latter to the former. It is because the Cross makes manifest the holiness of

God as righteous judgment as well as loving forgiveness of the sin of the world, that it constrains the penitence for sin and the faith in forgiveness as the motive of holiness which are exercised in this experience of personal union with Christ. But any and every theory must be subordinate to the experience, and men may possess the experience who never framed the theory. It is not belief in the theory which brings the experience; but the experience which leads men, as reasoning beings, to form the theory. It is the Living Christ Himself who saves and becomes the Lord of the saved, and not any doctrine about Him. What I most surely believe is that He has saved, is still saving, and will ever save me. 'I know him whom I have believed, and I am persuaded that he is able to guard that which I have committed unto him against that day' (2 Ti 1¹² R.V.).

(2) Central as the Cross remains, and essential as is this evangelical type of faith for me, yet from that centre there has been a widening circumference of Christian thought and life. From the *work* of Christ I must needs pass to the *person*, from the gospel of Paul to the Gospels concerning Jesus. I increasingly realized that the character of the death was determined by the content of the life. It was what He the Crucified was that made the Cross what it was. The critical literary and historical questions about the Gospels, although I recognized their crucial importance, have always been of subordinate interest for me; the inner life of Jesus for more than twenty years engaged my study and meditations and vitally affected my experience and, I dare to believe, my character. To companion with Him as I tried to do has not been in vain; something of His life has passed into mine. Much less boldly than Paul, and in all humility and sincerity, I have known something, if far less than I might had faith as fully claimed what grace freely offered, of the inward change: 'we all, with unveiled face reflecting [R.V.m. *beholding*] as a mirror the glory of the Lord, are transformed into the same image from glory to glory, even as from the Lord the Spirit' (2 Co 3¹⁸ R.V.). The doctrine of the Incarnation thus claimed attention, as an intelligible explanation of the impression and the influence upon me of the Living Person, who, as it were, stepped out of the distant past of the records into the immediate present of the experience, for the Christ who had died and rose again as Saviour and Lord was now filled with the content of the Jesus of history, and meant and was worth so much the more for me. Never sharing the to me too materializing views of *sacramentarianism*, the In-

carnation became *sacramental*, the historical personality became the expression and the conveyance of the Divine reality; and hence the *sacraments*, especially the Lord's Supper, became not mere signs, but truly symbols, conveying to faith the Divine grace which they signified, but always as signs and seals of the gospel, and subordinate to it. Thus I found myself less alien, more akin to the *sacramental* type of piety, not as a substitute for, but an extension of the *evangelical* type.

(3) This absorption, for so I can call it for many years, with the Gospels, led me further in two directions—the theological and the ethical. As I believed Jesus to be Divine, my faith in Him may be said to have been directed towards God, but God as God was in the background, till the Son, revealing the Father whom He alone knew and could reveal as such (Mt 11²⁷) became the true and living way to the Father (Jn 14⁶). There is a type of piety which stops short at Jesus, His human attraction, and is not led by Him to the Father whom He came to reveal, and so loses much of the fulness of His revelation. His historical personality is not an end in itself, but is the *sacrament* of the eternal reality of God, and it is in this alone that the full satisfaction of man's whole personality can be found, for the whole temporal process of Nature and history finds its full meaning and worth in the eternal reality: and the life of Jesus Himself has not its full content unless on this universal background. He interprets not only this temporal process, but this its eternal setting. God as revealed in Christ, not Jesus apart from God, or God apart from Him, but God in Him in inseparable unity is the object of my Christian faith. As He, and not the whole Bible, is the *formal* principle of my theology, so God's Fatherhood is the *material* principle, to recall the distinction made by the Reformation. This is no depreciation of the Bible as the literature of the preparatory, progressive, and historically interpretative revelation, of which He is the focus, and which only in Him can be clearly and fully understood. I cannot believe anything about God inconsistent with His revelation of the Father; I can believe anything that can be deduced from that revelation. His revelation includes the ethical monotheism of the prophets; the perfect Father is righteous as well as good, judges as well as forgives sin, disciplines His children through suffering that He may develop them in His likeness. The tenderness, gentleness, and kindness of Jesus must not be detached from His moral integrity and severity, as disclosing the secret of God's Fatherhood. Not only the Holy Scriptures must be brought into

relation to our understanding of God's Fatherhood, but also what Nature and history disclose as to the moral order, in which God rules as Judge as well as Saviour. But with all these cautions I accept God's Fatherhood in Christ as the eternal God who is my refuge, and whose everlasting arms are underneath not me alone, not mankind alone, but the whole world. Challenged by the problem of evil, pain, and sin, that conviction remains unshaken, for only in God's reconciling and redemptive purpose can any solution of the problem become credible. As Paul in the benediction passes from the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ to the love of God (cf. 1 Co 16²³ and 2 Co 13¹⁴), so have I found through the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ the love of God.

(4) Passing now from the theological to the ethical content of the revelation in Christ, we may base the one upon the other. God is moral perfection, the holy Father; and men as His children must also be holy. Christian morality is the conduct of the children of God, whom He is making like Himself. The following of the example of Jesus is the imitation of God; and neither is an outward conformity, but an inward transformation, as has already been suggested. It is not because the phrase the Kingdom of God suggests a society, for the meaning is much more *rule* than *realm*, that Christian ethics is social, but because discipleship meant companionship with Jesus in a company, and the Christian Church from the beginning was the community of the Spirit. The supreme law of absolute love to God and equal love for self and neighbour would have no content except in a society. Christian service half a century ago in the slums of Glasgow filled me with a passionate indignation against the wrongs, and an intense compassion for the miseries of men, women, and children, due to a false and bad social order, or rather disorder. Hence for me the Christian ethics includes not only individual and domestic morality, to which it has too often been confined, but also economic, civic, national, and international righteousness and goodness. What has been called the *social* gospel is not another gospel, but the gospel in its widest and most consistent practical application. Jesus' startling declaration: 'If ye forgive not men their trespasses, neither will your Father forgive your trespasses' (Mt 6¹⁵), so inseparably combines man's relation to God and man's relation to his fellows—religion and morality—that it is no gospel which is not social. In my judgment much of the insufficiency and inefficiency of the Christian churches is due to their having disproportionately cultivated piety instead of promoting righteous

dealings among men in all relations. Crucial as was the issue for Paul of the controversy about circumcision, yet he reaches beyond it to something more essential: 'In Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision; but faith working through love' (Gal 5⁶ R.V.). A holy human society, and not only holy human individuals, is the purpose for mankind of the Holy Father—God *all things in all men* (1 Co 15²⁸).

(5) Not only on account of the teaching of Jesus regarding the Holy Spirit and of the records in Acts regarding the presence and the power of the Holy Spirit in the Primitive Church, but from my personal experience of the dependence of my own inner life on God's sovereignty of grace (in no exclusive sense as in Calvinism), from the manifestations of Divine activity in religious revivals, and from the conviction of the need of the Church for constant Divine guidance for the fulfilment of its tasks in the world, have I been led in increasing measure to emphasize the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. Although the dogma of the Spirit was formulated in the Church from no inner compulsion, but from the outward of heresy, and though the formula was framed in logical parallelism to that of the person of Christ, the doctrine is not to be regarded as useless theological baggage, which the Church may discard on its theological journey; it is an essential interpretation of a vital element in the experience of believers, and an element which needs to be insisted on to-day, since the Church is in constant danger of seeking the safeguards of its unity and continuity in creed and code, ritual and polity instead of the constant and universal sovereign activity of God through the Spirit as the Life-Giver. The God who is 'in all, and through all, and over all,' who in relation to mankind is the universal Father, has revealed Himself, and redeemed man in Jesus as Christ and Lord, and Son of His love, and is continuing and diffusing that revelation and redemption in the inner activities of the Holy Spirit as enlightening, cleansing, hallowing, and renewing all who by faith receive and respond to His grace. This for me is no theological creed merely, it is a religious experience. It is the one God who in all this fulness is fulfilling His purpose of love in and for me, in and for all who are willing to receive His 'unspeakable gift.' The dogmatic formulæ of two natures in one person, or three persons in one substance, do not express what God is to me, for not only are the terms, *nature*, *person*, *substance* ambiguous in their meaning, and not only do the phrases inadequately express the unity of Christ's person, and the unity of the reality of God, but the formulæ

are cold abstractions in comparison with the glowing concreteness of the experience.

(6) For me, accordingly, as religion is nothing else and nothing more than my personal relation of dependent faith, or rather God's personal relation of sovereign grace, for His, not mine, is the constant initiative, so theology is for me only the doctrine of the one God as Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. I have lightened the ship to save it from shipwreck in the storms of theological difficulty and doubt of much of the old cargo, such as Biblical cosmology, anthropology, psychology, and eschatology, and left on board only what could be deduced from, or be found consistent with, this doctrine of God in the Bible's teaching about world, man, sin, salvation, duty, and destiny. Such doctrines as verbal inspiration, particular election, original sin, total depravity, eternal punishment, penal substitution, have for me gone into a sea, which I hope, despite some contemporary reactionary tendencies, is not going to give up its dead. The affinity of nature as the possibility of the community of life between God and man, the reality of sin, the necessity of salvation, the insufficiency of man to save himself, the sufficiency and the sovereignty of Divine grace in saving, the joy and the peace of forgiveness, the purifying and perfecting of man by the Spirit of God, the final blessedness of the saints, even 'the larger hope'—the Kingdom of God as the objective, the eternal life as the subjective aspect of the Divine purpose of redemption and reconciliation—that is my theology, based on the revelation of God in Christ as interpreted by the Spirit, and verified in experience—these are for me 'the things most certainly believed.' If all Christians shared this experience fully, if the Church proclaimed this theology fully, not only as an inheritance from the past, but as a possession in the present, ever vivified and vitalized for thought and life by God's own Spirit, could it not meet the challenge of the age in its doubt or denial, the need of the world for counsel and power? And would not the gospel of the love of God, revealed in the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and realized in the 'common possession' of the Holy Spirit be once more the power and the wisdom of God unto salvation? The Church has hitherto tended to believe

too many things, most of them circumferential and not central; it cannot believe *too much* with intense and enthusiastic conviction in the few things that are *central* which I have tried so inadequately to state.

(7) This statement, to fulfil its purpose, has necessarily been personal; but I have tried not to allow it to be egotistic; for I would laud and magnify only the God who saved, and not make prominent the man saved. I am convinced that the churches must make quite clear that, while they share the faith of the past generations, they are not bound by their creeds. In Germany and other Continental countries there is said to be a return to the Reformation; there is a Neo-Calvinism and a Neo-Lutheranism, and so the movement suffers from division. When at a recent meeting some British and Continental theologians avowed themselves either stiff-necked Lutherans or stiff-necked Calvinists, I was tempted to paraphrase the words of Paul: 'Is Christ divided? Was *Luther* crucified for you? or were ye baptized into the name of *Calvin*?' (1 Co 1¹³). I was much relieved when one at last avowed himself 'a stiff-necked Christian'; he knew the mischief which theological division can do, for he came from a land where the Church's witness and work are hindered by sectarianism. To return to Christ, and Him alone, as in my early manhood I was forced to do, is not merely a *backward* movement in history, it is an *upward* movement to reality in God, for in Him eternity broke into time, which 'like a dome of many-coloured glass stains the white radiance of eternity,' and shed its white radiance over the many colours of time. 'The Word which was in the beginning with God and was God, became flesh, and tabernacled among us [and we beheld his glory, glory as of the only-begotten from the Father] full of grace and truth' (Jn 1¹⁻¹⁴). I so beheld His glory, and that glory has ever since been the light of all my seeing. Will the churches ever be persuaded to cease hugging the shores of their old creeds, and to launch out on the deep of a frank and fearless quest of Christ Himself, not Athanasius or Augustine, not Luther or Calvin, not Wesley or Newman, and so make a good voyage to the safe harbour: *sola gratia sola fide in Christo Jesu?*

