

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

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

IN his able book, *Church and State*, Professor RELTON has a very interesting chapter on 'A Philosophy of Sacramentalism.' He begins by pointing out that the same problem confronts philosophy, theology, psychology, christology, and eucharistic doctrine—the relation of the divine element to the human, or the spiritual element to the material. The same errors and the same extremes occur in all of them, and the same difficulty in finding a balanced truth. Further, the four christological errors (Arianism, Apollinarianism, Nestorianism, and Monophysitism) are reproduced in sacramental theories. What we have to do is to find a sacramental theory corresponding to the true, catholic, chalcedonian definition of the Person of Christ. Is this to be found along the following lines?

First, that Christ is present in, through, and by means of the Sacrament is a fact of spiritual experience, ultimately independent of any particular explanation of the manner of that Presence. Secondly, there have been four main theories of the mode of the Presence; none of them satisfactory; all of them containing a partial truth; each of them right in what it affirms, wrong in what, by implication, it denies. Transubstantiation mutilates the sign. Zwinglianism denies the objective presence of the Thing signified. Virtualism separates the sign and the Thing signified, failing to secure a true union between them. Consubstantiation confounds the two, so that neither retains its full reality.

The Anglican doctrine of the Real Presence is an attempt to avoid all these four errors. A good analogy is that of ourselves as persons, possessing body and soul. We are ourselves sacraments. We have an outward and visible sign, the body, of an inward and spiritual reality, the soul, or mind, or spirit. Body and soul are indissolubly united, and in that union the difference between the two is preserved. We know that we are *in* our bodies. We know that Christ is present *in* the Sacrament. But we do not mean locally present at a place in space at a moment in time. The presence of the mind in the body is not a materialistic and local but a spiritual presence.

We know the body as extension in time, we know the mind as boundless. The mind cannot be conceived of as spatially located in any particular part of the body, and yet in some sense where the body is, there am I. So in the Sacrament Christ is not locally present. His presence is spiritual, and yet where the Sacrament is, there in some sense is He. He could not be defined as 'present' in this sense by any chemical or scientific tests, any more than our presence in our bodies could be revealed by a microscopic examination of the brain or a chemical analysis of the various parts of our bodies. Yet He is present in the same sense of 'presence' in the Sacrament as we are in our bodies.

Could we then agree in eucharistic doctrine on the basis of the following Formula of Concord:

There is a real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist which, though it eludes definition and baffles analysis, is not material? Let us take, in illustration of this, two incidents from the Gospels which help to illuminate the kind of attitude it is possible to adopt towards this difficult problem of the nature of the Real Presence of Christ. The first is the Emmaus story. Here is Canon Streeter's comment on it.

'We must try to get back into our ritual and, therefore, first of all into our thoughts, the atmosphere of the Emmaus story—the first Eucharist, be it noted, after our Lord had risen from the dead. Here, surely, we have a glimpse of what a Communion service should be. They talk together of the things that had happened; their thoughts are full of Jesus of Nazareth, His might in word and deed, how He was crucified, and how it had been told them that He was now alive. So natural, so human, is their intercourse with one another and the unseen stranger—then suddenly, at the simple friendly meal, their eyes are opened, and they know that what they have been doing is to hold converse with their Lord.'

Note these points in this story. (1) Remembrance, commemoration of the wonderful Person and His work, followed by (2) a sudden full realization of a Presence which none the less *had been there all the time*. (3) That consciousness of the reality of the Presence synchronizes with a particular act at a particular moment of time. He made Himself known to them in the Breaking of the Bread. And finally (4) He vanished from their sight. For (5) work remains for them to do as the result of the experience. They must forthwith go and tell the good news to others. (6) The Presence is vouchsafed in this context, *i.e.* it is an experience intimately bound up with commemoration of Himself and His Passion. Moreover, (7) He Himself is the Unseen Celebrant, and it is His act which brings about, or is instrumental in effecting, so blessed a realization in them of His Presence.

The second episode is the appearance to the assembled company in the Upper Room. Here we

have again the marks of time and place intimately associated with the appearance of the Risen Lord, or the realization in the experience of His followers of the Real Presence of the Risen Lord. There is a moment or interval of time when in some sense He is not *in* the room followed by another moment when He is. The doors are shut. There is a passage through matter without any visible disturbance or alteration of its particles, and then He is in the midst of them making visible the marks of His Passion.

In the light of these incidents let us amplify the Formula of Concord suggested, as follows. There is a Real Objective Presence of Christ in the Sacrament, which, though it eludes definition and escapes analysis, is not material. We 'must, however, remember Canon Quick's warning against the danger of confusing 'objectivity' with 'externality,' as spatially conceived. We may say with Newman: 'We do not know *how*. We can only say that He is present, not according to the natural manner of bodies, but sacramentally.' Transubstantiation involves a belief in a physical change in the elements and a *localized* Presence. But the truth may be expressed, as Canon Quick does, by saying: if by 'local presence' you mean that our Lord is present in the consecrated Sacrament in a distinctive way, the phrase is true; but, if by 'local presence' you mean the natural presence of a body in dimensions of space, the phrase is untrue.

Dr. Rufus JONES is recognized as a protagonist in the things of the spirit. We might fitly say of him what Socrates said of himself, that he had done nothing but go about persuading all, both old and young, not to take account chiefly of their bodies or of their property, but first of all to care for the improvement of the soul, how that can be at its best.

He has now published *The Testimony of the Soul* (Macmillan; 8s. 6d. net), which contains the Ayer Lectures for 1936. It is a weighty argument in exposition and defence of the thesis that the spirit

of man is akin to the spirit of God, may be immediately conscious of it and live in happy fellowship with it.

It is vital that this thesis should be firmly maintained, for the negations of our day have gone very deep. In the controversies of the past one type of religion was pitted against another. Both sides held in some form a spiritual view of life. But to-day 'the religious attitude itself is challenged. The religious view of life as such is questioned. The validity of a spiritual outlook of any kind is put in jeopardy. The alternative to religious faith to-day is the acceptance of a naturalistic universe, a biologized man, a secularized society. Meantime the issues between the Conservatives and the Liberals, between the Fundamentalists and the Modernists, between the High Church and the Broad Church wings seem like petty controversies, when the whole house in which the contestants are living is on fire and in deadly peril.'

This negative attitude towards the whole realm of the spiritual is not due to any profound thinking about the deeper issues of life. It is not based on any closely reasoned system. It is rather of the nature of a blind revolt, a confused drift like that which carries the sand of the desert over the vegetation of border countries. 'It is not a position which has been arrived at by intelligent processes of thought and which can consequently be answered by the reasoning mind.' It can be met only by a fresh and impressive presentation of spiritual vitality in human lives.

The Christian Church itself, influenced by the prevailing temper of the age, has in large measure lost its pristine radiance and power. 'Too many of us are so busy thinking and speculating and arguing that we find little time to restore our souls, as the beloved Psalmist knew how to do, and to get the deep-lying springs of life set free within us. The most effective Christian method is not that of argument and debate as the forums suppose. The greatest things in the world are not reached by arguing. You can never argue anybody into loving you! The great experiences of life come like a

vernal equinox or like a luminous beam of light, and then there is no longer any need of arguing, you find yourself securely in the presence of an immutable fact of life.'

If religion, then, is to be brought back into vital dominion over men's lives in the world to-day it will not be done by any of our clever arguments, but by manifestations of spiritual power. 'The old infallibilities are dead and they must be replaced, not by new infallibilities, but by fresh discoveries of God and by the living testimony of the awakened soul.'

This implies a first-hand religious experience of a mystic sort. Dr. JONES is deeply concerned to defend and commend mysticism, not the mysticism of mere ecstasy, for that may lead nowhere, nor the mysticism which acts as an opiate dulling all moral activity, for 'almost no major mystics have ever approved of quietism.' The mysticism he is interested in is 'a mysticism which brings life to its full, rich goal of complete living, with radiance and joy and creative power.' In an interesting chapter on 'that much-abused word mysticism' he proceeds to 'pass the word mysticism through its bath of purification, and to indicate how, after a careful study of mystical movements, he thinks it ought to be used in the sphere of religion.'

Mystic ought not to be regarded as a synonym for mysterious. There is, indeed, a veil of mystery cast over all the realities of the universe, but it is a veil which overspreads the realm of science as well as the realm of religion. It has no special religious significance and we do not need another word to express mystery.

Again, mysticism ought not to be treated as synonymous with the occult, the esoteric, or anything in the nature of 'borderland phenomena.' Many seem to regard it as 'a kind of truth that squeaks and gibbers in hidden corners and out-of-the-way places. Automatic writing or automatic speaking may have, and certainly often does have, a significance for psychology, but I am tired of having it forthwith treated as though it were a

sure evidence of a mystical communication from God. These experiences are psychical phenomena, but they are not in any proper sense mystical phenomena.'

Nor, again, ought the word to be taken to mean contemplation of God or union with Him by way of abstraction and ecstasy. This is the experience which has been called the *via negativa*. It consists in emptying the mind of all content so that the naked soul may wing its way to the naked Godhead, the alone to the Alone, and perceive eternal reality in a 'super-luminous gloom of silence.' This doubtless represents a classical type of mysticism, but it ought not to be regarded as the only, still less the highest, type of mysticism. It leads in the direction of pantheism rather than of Christianity, and the ecstasy after which it strives is a highly abnormal experience.

Surely there is a better way of approach to God and of communion with Him. The Infinite is not to be conceived as simply abstract and characterless. An absolute perfect which lies beyond all distinctions is a mere negation, 'a divine dark.' It is possible to conceive a concrete Infinite, an Infinite revealed in and through the temporal and the finite. 'St. John's Vine with many branches already suggested in a figure this better way. In that figure we have the suggestion of an Infinite that goes out into multitudinous manifestations and that finds itself in and through its interrelated and finite branches. Perfection is not through isolation and withdrawal, but through self-surrender and sacrificial limitation. If that is a true conception we shall look for God—our God of the Christ revelation—not above the dome of the world, not beyond the tinge and colour of life, but in the current of it, a current that never runs smooth, in the love and in the tragedy of this our life, immersed as it is in the finite. If that is so, then ecstasy is not our surest way to God, and we must profoundly reinterpret the mystic way, though in doing so we must not forget that these old mystics of the past, with their hampering metaphysics, did actually in experience arrive and did touch eternal reality.'

The *essentia* of mysticism ought to be thought of simply as the experience of direct communion of the soul with God, and this is possible because, deeper than all our faculties, ideas, volitions, there is a subsoil root of our being, a core of personality, which is indissolubly connected with a higher world of reality. The peculiar way of arrival at the goal is not so important as is the actual fact of having arrived. There is a profound strain of mysticism in the writings of St. Paul, but it is obviously not of the classical type. 'It does not easily conform to the mystic way of the great tradition. Fifty-four times in his letters to his churches, St. Paul speaks of the way in which human life is *raised to a new power* when the Divine Spirit or, what for him means the same thing, when Christ is "in us," or when we are "in Him." The experience of rising with Christ into "newness of life" is beyond question a central feature of St. Paul's Christianity, but it is not ecstatic, nor is it reached by a process of abstraction. . . . So far as I can see, he never assesses the increase of power through mystical experience in terms of rare physical phenomena, or in terms of emotional thrills, or in terms of any mere private satisfactions. The great achievement which marks the state of "being in Christ," or of "having Christ in you," is the conquest of sin, the creation of a new man, the attainment of "the mind of Christ," the acquisition of power in this difficult world to be more than a conqueror, ability to render "reasonable service," and, above all, to become an organ of the greatest thing in the world, love and grace. This Ægean Christianity of St. Paul seems to me to be the very heart and essence of mystical religion.'

A writer on the Religious Consciousness, Professor J. B. PRATT, in complaining that we make so much nowadays of the social aspect of things as to be in danger of discounting the contributions of the individual, particularly in art and religion, has enforced the complaint in these words: 'Poetry is in one sense a social product; yet if Chaucer, Shakespeare, and Milton had died in their cradles, English literature would be much less worth the

reading. And while religion is a social phenomenon, its actual historical course would be very considerably modified if we could go back and take out of it simply these five men: Zarathustra, Buddha, Amos, Jesus, and Muhammad.'

Whatever we may think of this collocation of names, let it serve to remind us that in Amos of Israel we have a great and arresting figure in the history of religion; and let us also be reminded of the significance for the religion of Israel of Amos and his successors among the prophets.

Amos was the first of a new order of prophecy in Israel. The prophets that were before him were professional prophets, members of prophetic schools or guilds, with whose witness for the nation's God ecstasies of worship were associated, and who depended for their livelihood upon charitable gifts. From this order of prophets Amos was separate. For he had no sympathy with the emotionalism of ecstatic worship, and it was in no professional spirit that he had assumed the rôle of prophecy.

Amos stands at the head of a glorious succession, which includes a Hosea, an Isaiah, and a Jeremiah, of men who were called of God out of the midst of their ordinary business or employment in life that in His name—God of Israel, but God also of all the earth—they might speak to their day and generation. 'No prophet I, nor prophet's son,' says Amos, thus dissociating himself from the prophetic schools and guilds, and seeking even to repudiate the very name of prophet, 'but a herdsman, and a dresser of sycamores, and the Lord took me from behind the flock, and the Lord said unto me, Go, prophesy unto my people Israel.'

These words of Amos recall the sole instance in which the life of this prophet comes into the full light of day. The episode to which the words belong forms a classic episode in the annals of the Hebrew people, and is surely one of the great episodes in the religious history of mankind.

Just picture this man whom the Lord took from behind the flock, this shepherd and dresser of sycamores from the Judæan hills, keen and snell as the desert air he breathed, harsh and austere as the desert scenes that daily fed his eye, confronting the corrupt religion of his time in its chief sanctuary and on one of its high days, and in all the strength of stern conviction lifting up his voice against king and priests and people, that he might declare the oracles of judgment and righteousness he had received from the Lord's mouth, and from none other.

Amos at Bethel has been well compared to Savonarola at Florence, or Luther at the Council of Worms. As George Adam Smith says, it is the same scene, though the actors and the ages are changed.

Modern studies in Amos and the other prophets have banished the notion from our minds that these men of Israel who give their names to so many of the books of the Old Testament were mere impersonal agents or instruments of God, mere mouth-pieces of God's rebukes, warnings, and promises. They were men of flesh and blood, living men with a living message to their fellows that burned in their hearts and leapt in words of fire to their lips; men with the outlook of statesmen and the insight of philosophers and whose hearts were open to the inspirations of heaven; men who read so closely the signs of their times and mused on them so deeply that over their souls the light from heaven flashed, and after the light came the voice, and they knew that they were called and destined to be the interpreters of the Most High, the messengers to their people of God's character and will.

That is why the message they delivered came with all the passion and force of personality behind it. It did not flow through them as through some equable channel of revelation, but displayed the sweep and the rush, and mayhap somewhat of the turgidity too, of the mighty streams that break down from the mountain-side in the time of the melting snows.

thirty years. He often recalled how much he owed to those who were his teachers there—most of all to Marcus Dods, to whose memory he inscribed his great book on *The Doctrine of the Person of Jesus Christ*. He gladly acknowledged, too, the lifelong influence of Wilhelm Hermann, under whom he studied at Marburg, whose work, especially *The Communion of the Christian with God*, he constantly recommended to his own students. With further honours gained in the Divinity classroom he passed into the ministry, first in Tayport, Fife, and later in Beechgrove Church, Aberdeen. One of his colleagues—Dr. A. C. Welch—has recently claimed that experience of the actual work of the Christian ministry, no less than time devoted to study, is part of the true equipment of a teacher of theology. With such a judgment Mackintosh would have agreed, comparatively brief as his ministries were. He recalled more than once the work of open-air preaching in which he had taken a full share during his Aberdeen ministry and the special exhilaration of forming a new congregation and raising a building for their worship. He could speak out of his own experience of how ‘amid the rough vicissitudes of time, God’s people have to learn the mighty meaning of faith and patience, the nothingness of man, and the sovereignty of the Father. . . .’¹

Recollections of his work as a minister appeared constantly in his teaching. When some of us were concerned about the meaning and possibility of effective prayer for others he told us how he himself remembered looking round from his pulpit and saying of one and another in his church, ‘These people have been praying for me. . . .’ ‘I hope that experience will be yours when you stand before your congregations—and then you will know the power of prayer to strengthen and uphold.’ He laid stress upon the need for keeping theology always in contact with vital Christian experience and in touch with the Church’s life. ‘Religious difficulties,’ he would say, ‘are not to be argued about—the only cure is conversion.’ ‘There is no hidden and terrible region in God in which Christ does not avail. Such an idea is a mere relic of paganism, and the one way of escape from it is to turn, as a worshipper, and see the love of God in the face of the Redeemer.’ Speaking of the death of Christ, he emphasized always the Christian’s experience in sacramental worship. As he put it in *The Christian Experience of Forgiveness*, ‘The interpreter of atonement needs most of all, I think, to recapture that attitude of penitent trust and grateful adoration in which, if God will, we find

¹ At the opening of the General Assembly of 1933.

ourselves at the Lord’s Table. . . . It is vain to choose a doctrine of atonement which in the main overlooks the greatest things that come home to us as we take in our hands the bread and wine’ (p. 197).

In all this his own practice was in line with his teaching. He was called to the Chair of Systematic Theology in New College in 1904, at an age which enabled him to give his full strength to the study and teaching of his subject. He did not, however, lose touch with the life and work of the Church. He was a loyal member and elder in the Barclay congregation, Edinburgh, and for almost thirty years he rejoiced to preach, as he put it, on forty-eight Sundays out of the fifty-two. The published volumes of his sermons—*Life on God’s Plan* and *The Highway of God*—show the quality of preaching which was eagerly listened to throughout the length and breadth of Scotland and beyond. It was a memorable day in many a country parish, and in city churches as well, when Mackintosh came to help one of his former students at a Communion season or to conduct anniversary services. Quietly, but irresistibly, the worshipper was brought nearer and nearer to the very heart of things, impressed not so much by the preacher’s scholarship as by the consciousness that here was one sure of the gospel’s sufficiency for every need, and anxious that others should see Jesus only and yield themselves to Him.

It was the same with lectures like those which he delivered at a school for missionaries on furlough in 1921 (published as *The Divine Initiative*), showing how ‘all that Christians are they owe to the spontaneous love of God,’ or the course given in Union Theological Seminary in 1928, ‘to a general rather than to a specially theological audience,’ on *The Christian Apprehension of God*. Characteristically he chose to speak to the General Assembly of 1932 on *The Gospel and its Communication in the Modern World*, and to the Student Christian Movement Conference a year later on *How is God Known?* On topics like these, too, he talked with the missionaries of his own Church gathered from the remote districts of the Highlands and the Western Isles—a service which he loved to render and from the very midst of which God in His wisdom called him to Himself. His aim always was to make it clear that the forgiving love of God in Jesus Christ is the only clue, alike to the greatest problems of theology and to the everyday questions of ordinary life. ‘We are here,’ he said at a Church Congress in Glasgow in 1931, ‘to enable men and women who, as so often with ourselves, are wrong with God to get right with Him. . . . We are here to

tell them, with all the convincingness of disinterested and affectionate kindness, that our sins are pardoned for Jesus' name's sake. Unless the Church does this for men, she does nothing.'

III.

Two special ways in which Mackintosh served his Church gave further proof of his loyalty and wisdom. The General Assembly of 1930 took up the question of whether the newly reunited Church should not, for the sake of its own members and young people, and for those outside its membership whom it was seeking to win, make an honest and sincere effort to set forth, in as simple terms as possible, the main articles of Christian belief. It was decided that such a statement of the Church's faith should be drawn up, and, unhesitatingly, the Assembly chose Mackintosh as Convener of the Committee entrusted with the task. He had already experience of how delicate and difficult this duty was, for he had had a large share in the preparation of a similar statement in the United Free Church ten years previously, but for more than four years he gave of his best to the fulfilment of the Assembly's instruction. *The Short Statement of the Church's Faith*, published in 1935, bears its own evidence of his width of sympathy, his insight, and his gift of clear expression, as well as his constant loyalty to the gospel message. If it be true, as the writer of a recent article commending the document to 'the close attention of thoughtful men in England' has declared, that 'the Church of Scotland has shown that the Christian faith can be expressed in intelligible terms in a form that has the substantial agreement of the whole communion,'¹ it is largely due to Mackintosh's guidance—to his wide knowledge and catholicity of outlook and to the care with which he scrutinized each paragraph and sentence of the *Statement*.

The other task laid upon him brought with it the highest honour that the Church of Scotland can give to any of its ministers—the Moderatorship of the General Assembly, to which he was elected in 1932. He greatly valued such a token of the Church's confidence, yet, like the academic distinctions conferred upon him by his own University and by the Universities of Oxford and Marburg, it left his modesty unchanged. He thought much less of himself than of the work to which he had been called. 'The only important question,' he said, 'about any duty cast upon us by the Church is not whether we are worthy, but

¹ *The British Weekly*, June 4, 1936.

whether we can reckon on a faithful Redeemer, by whose power we may discharge the task.' The strain told heavily on his strength, for manifold demands were made upon him, yet he avoided no duty and kept every engagement, travelling far and wide not only in Britain, but on the Continent, as the ambassador of his Church. He spared himself no trouble, preparing carefully and conscientiously fitting words for each occasion and bringing always to the audiences that gathered to hear him a message of encouragement and call to fuller fellowship and simpler trust in the Church's King and Head. 'No one can open the New Testament,' he said on one occasion, 'without being aware of the extraordinary religious importance which it ascribes to the Church, as the fellowship of believing men and women. The New Testament shows not the faintest interest in unattached Christians. It takes for granted that Christ's followers will hold together.' With such words of counsel and guidance he moved among the churches, leaving always an abiding impression, and recalling ministers and people alike to the deep realities of their Christian faith. His were no merely formal or 'official' visits, so many of which had to be performed as a matter of routine. He came always as one who was in personal sympathy with the needs of those to whom he spoke and who would share as a friend their fellowship of faith in One 'in whom God Himself has become our neighbour, offering His friendship to every man, woman, and child in the world—His Son Jesus Christ.'

IV.

All his own experience of the gospel and its power in men's lives went to enrich the teaching which was the main concern of his life. We are thinking now of a narrower circle—of his influence over the students who passed through his classroom—yet how widespread that influence was! Throughout the whole of Scotland and into the far regions of the mission field men carried what they had learned from him, and students from many lands in ever-increasing numbers came to hear him and returned, as one of them put it, 'not only knowing more, but better Christians.'

The General Assembly which appointed him was assured that he would show 'distinguished scholarship and theological acumen' and 'open-heartedness and sympathy with men and generosity in dealing with them.' How true these words proved could be testified by many. Not only did he concern himself in all the life and work of his students in

their college days, welcoming them as he and his wife so kindly did to their home, and seeking to help them in all their difficulties, but he followed their after-career with constant mindfulness and solicitude. Many a man was surprised and encouraged by Mackintosh's offering to preach for him, and in manses throughout Scotland he was ever a welcome guest, interested in the home circle—in the children and their affairs—as well as in the congregation which he was visiting and its life. He was found one day with a little boy of three seated on his knee—pretending not to know how beads were strung in order that the child might have the joy of showing him how to do it. He loved to hear and to pass on a good story: he was a keen golfer, and enjoyed nothing better than a well-fought Rugby match. 'Come ten minutes earlier,' he wrote at the foot of an invitation to a meeting on the evening of an International at Murrayfield, 'and we can discuss the game before we begin.' None of his students who in later years sought guidance or advice found him too busy to attend to them or indifferent to their needs. He did not always offer an easy way out, but always he gave of his best, and men who had come perhaps hesitating lest they intrude on one preoccupied with more important matters, left him convinced of his genuine kindness and his readiness to help them in every way.

His general lectures dealt in broad outline with the main aspects of Christian doctrine, while in special or post-graduate classes he would discuss in detail a certain period or a given problem in theology. In the treatment of each doctrine he began by considering its Biblical basis and surveying its historical evolution, before giving a reconstructive statement in which the gospel on the one hand, and the testimony of the believing mind on the other, were the guiding principles. Always he sought to be scrupulously fair, alike to his students and to those whose views he was seeking to put before them. Sometimes, indeed, we felt that he might have made his own position clearer than he did, so anxious was he to avoid even the appearance of making us accept an argument simply because we knew it to be in line with his own thought. It was his desire, however, that, given the data clearly and impartially and as fully as was possible, men should form their own conclusions. He never concealed his belief that faith is full of mystery and brings us face to face with much that we cannot explain. 'In all this realm,' he would say of God's sovereignty and man's freedom, 'it cannot be "either . . . or," it must be "both . . . and,"

however incomprehensible it may seem.' 'The working of divine grace is a paradox in theory yet a commonplace in religious experience.' No wonder that some who yearned for merely logical explanations or sought clear-cut distinctions felt that he sometimes brought 'No' into too close proximity to 'Yes.' Yet, like Schweitzer's catechumens in Strasbourg, we were grateful to him afterwards for teaching us that 'religion is not a formula for explaining everything'—that, since 'Logic is simply baffled by the fact of sin,' there is no escape from paradox in truly Christian faith.

His wide sympathy led him to seek for the truth which, he was convinced, could be found, however distorted, behind even the strangest theories—to discover what men were seeking to state, however inadequate their expression of it might be. At the same time, he was ever alert to note features in a system otherwise valuable which seemed out of harmony with Scripture or untrue to the testimony of the believing mind. He would point out, for example, how much modern theology owed to Ritschl as the first to claim again a dominating place in men's minds for the love of God, while holding himself free to criticise features of the Ritschlian teaching to which he owed so much. Thus, too, he could welcome the influences of Otto's *Das Heilige* and later of the Barthian movement and of Karl Heim without committing himself to full approval of any one school. Something of each had been in his own teaching, yet even where he was most sympathetic—as, for example, in his recognition of the value of Brunner's *The Mediator*, with its 'reverent believing insight into the being and work of our Lord, as the Person in whom God is revealed, finally and decisively'—he indicated clearly that he differed from the author's views 'at certain important points.'¹

To his students this characteristic attitude was shown most of all in the study of the Westminster Confession of Faith, the subordinate standard of doctrine in the Church of Scotland, which he carried on, as he told the Assembly in 1930, in conversational classes for twenty-five years, and which left upon himself and upon his students 'a deep impression at once of the depth and grandeur of the Confession as a historic document and of its distance and strangeness for the modern Christian mind.' It was impossible, he maintained, to exaggerate the power of the experimental Christianity enshrined in many of its chapters—on Holy Scripture, Saving Faith, Repentance unto Life, or Baptism and the Lord's Supper. None the less

¹ Foreword to the English translation, 10.

his evangelical outlook led him to see clearly how far removed were certain features of the traditional Scottish Calvinism, based upon it, from the gospel message, and he was unhesitating in his condemnation of them. Thus, while emphasizing the need for belief in 'effectual calling' with its assurance that 'since the love which meets us in Jesus is sovereign and unbeginning, all misgiving about our future is removed by the conviction that we have an omnipotent Ally, who will see us through and make us more than conquerors,' he constantly emphasized the danger of the idea of reprobation so often linked with the doctrine of election. It brought, he maintained, an intolerable duplicity into the Christian's thought of God and, instead of strengthening the discouraged, it sapped a man's trust by its sheer uncertainty; it went, inevitably, with a limited theory of Atonement and, above all, it could not be preached as part of the gospel of God's forgiving love. 'It is when the two-edged doctrine of election and reprobation is at a height that Christian missions are least active.' So, to take another example, he set aside the Confession's teaching on total depravity and the idea of the divine being wholly lost in man. 'It would,' he said, 'allow neither the missionary nor the preacher to do his work—there would be no power in man of appreciating divine revelation.'

This test was, in Mackintosh's view, of supreme importance. True doctrine, just because it was based upon the Bible and in harmony with Christian experience, must be evangelical. Students of theology were not simply following a certain academic course, but were preparing themselves for the ministry of the Christian Church. Deliberately he chose for the subject of the first essay in his class 'The Bearing of Preaching and Dogmatics upon One Another,' in order that men might feel from the outset that what they were studying in his classroom was directly related to the life-work that lay before them. For the same reason he included in his lectures not only references to his own wide reading and the most recent movements in theology, but indications of the practical bearing of what he taught. 'The message you have to preach is not that men are God's hired servants, retained for their good behaviour. . . . He does not say, "I will take you on trial," but "All that I have is thine."' 'You must show your people that to believe in Christ, to share His overcoming energies, to believe as He believed about sin and righteousness, changes everything like the gaining of a great new friendship.' 'Personal religion cannot simply be taken for granted—it must be

appropriated. There comes an hour when the gospel cannot be treated as an inheritance but made our own—always preach for conversion.'

Such quotations from his lectures help us to understand how congenial—in spite of the extra work which it entailed—must have been the arrangement whereby one day in the week was devoted to a sermon class. Two men in turn gave outlines of their treatment of a given subject, while two others acted as critics. Mackintosh himself summed up the discussion and gave his own views of the sermons submitted. Most of us felt, I think, that his comments were too kindly, for his humility showed itself in the classroom as well as outside, yet he could be scathing on occasion, and leave a man who had not really tried deeply ashamed, not only of his failure, but of the evident disappointment that underlay the criticism. How often he threw new light upon the subject, unravelling our tangled thoughts and setting them in proper order! 'You must have your own minds clear about what you want to say, before you can even hope to make anything clear to others.' 'Once your ideas are set in order you must learn to write your sermon without stopping and beginning again—you will not have time for false starts in your ministry.' Many subjects were dealt with, and on all that belonged to sermon-making he had much that was wise to say. 'Sometimes, when you are not quite sure what to do with an illustration, the best thing is to leave it out.' 'When you are indebted to some writer for materials or ideas always imagine that he is in church listening to you, and make no use of your borrowing that he could feel to be unfair.' 'People will come to hear you for many reasons, but there is only one message that will always win and keep them, the message of forgiveness that sinners need—you dare not leave that out.'

V.

Forgiveness—and the wonder of it—was indeed the centre of all his thinking. The note of God's love seeking men—offering them forgiveness in Christ—was ever in his preaching. His lectures led us back again and again to the Cross, where redemption was wrought out for sinners by the love of God. His theology sought always to show how, for us men and our salvation, Jesus Christ came into the world, lived and died and rose again. For him the Life and the Death of Christ could never be separated, or His Person thought of apart from His redeeming Work. *The Doctrine of the Person of Jesus Christ* and *The Christian Experience of*

Forgiveness, with its treatment of Atonement, deal with two aspects of the one great theme—of the Saviour who came to bring divine forgiveness and of how by His Cross God's personal forgiveness of sinners is made sure for faith. He loved to speak of the grace of God, quoting Keble's lines :

Get up as early as you may,
Grace, like an angel, runs before,

or pointing out how much is asked of those to whom so much is given. 'Grace is both a gift and a challenge. We cannot face and feel the saving power that is in Jesus, and know that in Him we are meeting God, without the uplifting consciousness that the righteous Father is summoning us to be one with Him in His righteousness and in the purposes of His Kingdom.'¹ 'The cardinal truth about sin,' he wrote in another noteworthy contribution to the *ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS*, 'is that it can be so forgiven as to be replaced by Christian goodness, and that in His Son the Father has interposed to put it away by the sacrifice of Himself.'² The closing sentences of *The Christian Doctrine of Forgiveness* give memorable expression to his own conviction that 'the deep, personal certitude that there is forgiveness with God is the true spring and cause of all evangelism. In every age the guilty must be told of the remission of sins—it must be brought close to them by self-abnegating friendship. "With the Lord there is mercy, and with Him is plenteous redemption"—this is the note of authentic Christianity. And it is a note which men love to hear in a preacher's voice.'³ So he himself preached and taught and wrote, and by this faith he lived in loving service to the end.

¹ *E.R.E.*, vi. 367, art. 'Grace.'

² xi. 543, art. 'Sin (Christian).'

³ P. 290.

VI.

He pled with his fellow-ministers not to shrink from speaking of death. 'The Bible never ignores or minimizes it. Death was never out of the minds of those who wrote the Epistles and the Gospels. Truth concerning the end of all things, the great unseen future, is the very flesh of the Bible; remove it, and only a skeleton is left.'⁴ Every Christian doctrine, he believed, led faith out beyond this present life. Had he not written, in the dark days of war, that 'Our relation to God in Christ has a future as really as a past, a future which is no mere casual or problematic appendix to the present, but its living prolongation'?⁵ Death is 'the final task set by the Father, the summons to Christ's weary soldiers, the great transition which sets free the hidden powers of the soul.'⁶ So when he died in far-off Stornoway and the little band of missionaries, who had been waiting to learn more of God's love from him, carried his body from the steamer to the mainland in the early light of a Highland June, not a few in the world-wide company of his friends, in the Church to which he had been ever loyal and among the multitude of students who owed him so much, remembered his own quiet, confident trust that God makes all things new by death. 'It is not into an alien, unfriendly land that the dying go who know the Father; but to a land of goodness and gladness . . . where God is seen face to face. . . . It is a new world; for sin is dead, sorrow is over, parted friends are again together. It is a new world; for now we know even as we are known. And there, too, there as ever, it is the Eternal God who says, "Behold, I make all things new."'⁷

⁴ Closing Address to the General Assembly of 1932.

⁵ *Immortality and the Future*, 105.

⁶ *Ib.*, 151.

⁷ *The Highway of God*, 252.

Literature.

PROPHET AND PRIEST IN OLD ISRAEL.

DURING the last twelve years the attention of Old Testament scholars has been much drawn to the new theory of Israel's religious history propounded by Professor A. C. Welch. The subject was intro-

duced in his 'Code of Deuteronomy' (1924) and expanded in 'Deuteronomy: The Framework to the Code' (1931). Like some others (notably Hölscher and Kennett) Dr. Welch found it impossible to believe that the centralization of worship was possible in Josiah's reign. But while the scholars