

# 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 Expositor* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_expositor-series-1.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php)

*ST. PAUL'S GOSPEL : AN EIRENICON.*<sup>1</sup>

AMERICA should make much of Dr. Du Bose. I strongly suspect that in his own proper field—which I might perhaps describe as the Philosophy of the Christian Religion—he is the wisest writer on the other side of the Atlantic ; indeed it may not be too much to say, the wisest Anglican writer (with so French-looking a name it seems wrong to speak of Anglo-Saxon, and it narrows the ground a little to confine it to a single communion) on both sides of the Atlantic.

America should make much of him—and by this I mean, not so much praise and honour him (America is sure to do that to any one who is worthy !) as utilize and assimilate his work and thought for its own advantage. It should do this just because there are features about him that are not in the narrower sense American. He might be described as an encouraging example of what one American type may come to ; but this particular type is, I imagine, not at present largely developed, and therefore it is all the more valuable. It differs a good deal from the type or types with which we are most familiar.

First and foremost—and indeed perhaps everything in a word—here is an American who is not in a hurry, as he might himself say, “tremendously not” in a hurry ! Not that I am going to blame the American hurry ; it is natural enough and right enough, for a nation situated as they

<sup>1</sup> *The Gospel according to St. Paul.* By W. P. Du Bose, M.A., S.T.D. Longmans, 1907.

are. They have a big continent to subdue; and they feel its promise; and it is not strange that they should also feel that no time is to be lost in subduing it. That feverish energy is accomplishing, and will accomplish, great things.

But something more is wanted for a nation really to possess its soul. That something is wisdom; and wisdom cannot be had without calm. And therefore it is that it seems to me that America must specially prize this quality of calm; all the more where, as in the case of Dr. Du Bose, it is calm of the right kind—active and not passive, a quiet self-contained and self-controlled creativeness, that hastes not and rests not, like the great Creator Himself.

This quality is impressed upon the opening chapter, and so strikes the key-note of the whole book. We feel at once that we have to do with a large outlook upon the world and upon the ways of God with men—an outlook large, considerate, and intrepid, strong and yet dutiful, untroubled and unshaken by anxieties either without or within.

The ultimate aim of each one of us should be not to save ourselves from error, but to advance the truth. We may safely rely upon it that our truth will in the end be accepted and our error corrected. . . . I hold what I hold subject to the revision and correction of the deeper truth of the Scriptures and the larger wisdom of the Church. . . . There are those who object to our making salvation, the life of the spirit, the life of religion in general, too natural a process. We cannot kick against the pricks, the world has begun to make the discovery, and it will not go backward in it, that the natural is God's way. The natural is the rational and the divine. . . . These are times—but, let us remember, not more so than were the earliest and most living ages of Christianity—of thought and speculation, original and independent thought and speculation, upon the truth as it is in Jesus Christ. They are not times of unthinking and unquestioning acceptance of foregone and foreclosed inquiry and investigation. The fact may be condemned and lamented, but no amount of shutting our own or others' eyes and ears to it will make it any the less a fact. . . . The position

here taken is, to my mind, independent of any present or future conclusions of scepticism or criticism with regard either to the Scriptures or the Church. I fully recognize not only the function, but the necessity of both scepticism and criticism, in their true meaning and use; and I presume neither to limit nor to define these. But the fact will always remain that we receive our Christianity through the Scriptures and the Church, and that these are the tribunal of final resort for determining what Christianity is. (pp. 3, 4, 8, 9, 11, 14.)

No doubt there is at the present time in many quarters a disposition to go beyond this, not so much to appeal to the Scriptures as to sit in judgement on them, and to ignore the mind of the Church. That is very largely the attitude of critical schools on the Continent of Europe. But I think we may be thankful that Dr. Du Bose draws the line where he does; it is certainly not either narrow or illiberal.

## I.

Most of my readers will be aware that the volume now before me and of which I am to give some account is practically the continuation of another published about a year ago under the title *The Gospel in the Gospels*. I had the privilege of reviewing this earlier work in the EXPOSITOR for May, 1906, and I will not repeat what I there said. Just as the earlier volume aimed at giving in a connected form the essential meaning of the Gospels, so the present volume aims at giving in like manner a connected view of the leading or root-ideas of St. Paul. It is substantially a commentary on the first eight chapters of the Epistle to the Romans; not a commentary of a formal kind with detailed notes on each verse, but rather a series of essays upon the epistle taken section by section, and trying to bring out broadly what is most central and permanent in the contents of each. I do not think that we have anything quite like it in English; and yet it is just what most

of us, or at least those of us who are general readers, would wish to do for ourselves ; the professed student needs to study his text closely word by word, but the general reader prefers to hold his text as it were at arm's length and to see the leading thought in it stand out in clear relief. It is just in this way that Dr. Du Bose seeks to help him ; what he gives is practically a succession of bird's-eye views of the paragraphs and divisions into which the text of the epistle naturally falls.

I do not think we can be surprised that Dr. Du Bose should make his discussions revolve round the Epistle to the Romans in this way. It certainly is a complete and coherent presentation of the fundamental ideas of the Apostle's teaching ; and it adequately represents and summarizes the main points in the two earlier groups of epistles ; it also no doubt made the whole task easier, to be able to follow the outline of a single continuous argument. And yet perhaps this procedure is open to the criticism that it does not quite take in the whole of the Gospel according to St. Paul. The later epistles bring out some sides of it—more especially that side which presents the closest parallel to the Logos doctrine in St. John and the relation of Christ to the Church—which are but slightly touched upon in the Epistle to the Romans and therefore practically fall out of Dr. Du Bose's purview. Perhaps it may be said that these are not strictly parts of "the Gospel," but rather corollaries or developments of it. The Gospel is primarily the glad tidings of salvation ; and the whole groundwork of salvation is fully and searchingly treated.

In my previous review I had occasion to point out the great completeness and coherence of Dr. Du Bose's teaching. It is no mere aggregation of loosely related doctrines but essentially a system, and a system well knit in its parts and carefully rounded off as a whole.

And another remarkable thing that I had to point out was the close resemblance which this system presents to that which we in England associate with the name of Dr. Moberly. As we were fated to lose the one writer before his time, our satisfaction is all the greater that the other should survive to continue his work ; for *The Gospel according to St. Paul* not only takes up the *The Gospel in the Gospels*, but also, if it does not exactly take up, at least reviews and to a great extent goes over the same ground as *Atonement and Personality*. It might be said to be a restatement, with characteristic difference of language and independence of thought, of the teaching of that book.

Perhaps one's first thought is that the new book does not add much of quite fundamental importance to the old. The root-ideas of both books are the same. We might at first sight suppose that the later work was only the arrival of a strong reinforcement in aid of the earlier, the appearance on the field of a weighty champion of the same cause. But, when we come to look into it, we see that there is really more in the matter than this. The six years that have elapsed have not been in vain. It is, I think, true that no new factors are introduced in the treatment of the main problem. But at the same time the restatement is so careful and so searching and so balanced that it seems to me to constitute a real advance. I will venture to say even more than this. I cannot claim to have followed the recent literature of the leading subject involved very closely ; there may have been anticipation of which I am not aware ; but to me at least Dr. Du Bose's book seems to offer something very like the definitive solution of an age-long controversy. Just as the Gospel of St. Paul and the Epistle to the Romans has been the chief battle-ground of that controversy, so does what I conceive to be the satisfactory solution of the main question arising out of St. Paul's

Gospel, and his greatest Epistle seems to carry with it a virtual and sufficient settlement of the controversy that has gathered round them.

The reader will guess that I am referring to the vexed question that has agitated the Christian world in an acute form for nearly five centuries, the question that will perhaps be best understood if I call it by its old name, the doctrine of Justification by Faith.

It seems to me, if I am not mistaken, that Dr. Du Bose's statement of this doctrine, with perhaps one or two cautions added by way of explanation, furnishes the material for a more complete *eirenicon* than has hitherto been reached, and in particular for one that is more complete than was quite possible under the form in which the statement of the doctrine was left by Dr. Moberly.

I take upon myself to say this because I approach the doctrine from a different side—I might even say, from the opposite side—to both writers. They are close allies, and I am (so to speak), on this ground and within the limits of this particular subject, the enemy. But, if I am the enemy, I beg leave to say that I shall not only send out a flag of truce, but that I shall authorize my representative to conclude the terms of a permanent peace.

## II.

It will make the exposition of my meaning easier, if I may be forgiven a certain amount of apparent egotism, and if I may go back to an article of mine in the *EXPOSITOR* for May, 1901, reviewing Dr. Moberly's *Atonement and Personality*. In that article I tried (I am well aware how imperfectly) to state a case for a more old-fashioned view, and I pleaded that in the Christian Church alternative views should be regarded as tenable. In that, I confess, I

was altogether wrong. The two views are not alternatives that can be placed and tolerated side by side. I still think that there is an element of truth on the side that I was defending, just as I willingly and indeed eagerly acknowledged that there was a large element of truth on the side to which I was opposed. But the fact is that the opposing truths are not really *in pari materia* ; they are not truths than can be held side by side ; they belong rather to different spheres, and the reconciliation between them is to be effected, not by proposing the one as an alternative for the other, but by the careful delimitation of these different spheres.

Dr. Moberly and Dr. Du Bose are both primarily philosophers ; the position that the one maintained and that the other now repeats is essentially a philosophical position. In regard to this, and in regard to the ultimate truth of things, they are both absolutely right. So far as I took up ground against this, I evacuate that ground with all my forces, horse, foot and artillery. I knew that there was something wrong, when I wrote, but I did not see where the error lay. I believe that (with the help of Dr. Du Bose) I now do see this. The reservations that I really wish to make are of another kind, and come under other heads ; they do not belong to the region of philosophy, but in part to that of history, and still more to biblical exegesis and practical religion. In relation to the absolute truth of things, the truths that I desired to assert are subordinate, and can only be asserted as such. Dr. Du Bose, I am glad to say, sees this ; and he so states the truths that are dear to him as to leave room for those that are dear to me. For this I am sincerely grateful to him. If his ally had lived (alas, that he does not, if only to welcome such congenial aid !) I do not doubt that we should have come to terms along the same lines ; it is just the maturing and mellow-



ing, and in my case the clearing of the brain, that where the heart is right comes with time.

At this point I do not think that I can do better than try to set forth Dr. Du Bose's teaching as far as possible in his own words. When this has been done I will add a few remarks; but in the meanwhile I will take the liberty of italicizing those parts of the statement that are especially welcome to me as keeping an opening for those supplemental truths that I contend for. In the case of single words the italics are the author's.

I have described the main issue as turning round the doctrine of Justification by Faith—of course, in the largest sense, with all that goes with it. I use this familiar phrase because it will probably best cover the ground and call up the history of the subject, with all those kindred issues and sub-issues that we associate with it. Dr. Du Bose does not use the phrase often; indeed it may be said of him generally that he avoids hackneyed technicalities, with the best result for freshness and reality of presentation. The chapter of his book which corresponds most nearly to what we might call Justification by Faith is headed "The New Righteousness." The "New Righteousness" is naturally that teaching on the subject of righteousness, in relation at once to man and to God, which is most characteristic and distinctive of St. Paul and of the Epistle to the Romans. The asserting of the New Righteousness is based upon the break-down in actual fact of Old Righteousness, so far as that depended upon human efforts after the observance of law.

No man who knows what righteousness is, will come into God's presence with a claim of his own to it. . . . The Gospel of Jesus Christ was for sinners of every type save the impossible one of self-righteousness. This sense of being received, accepted, regarded, treated, as righteous is carried on from the mere negative statement under consideration to a positive form of it which gives a new and

important step in St. Paul's Gospel. It is this being *treated as* righteous, not on the ground of being righteous, but on the ground of a certain relation of faith to Christ's righteousness, upon which is laid the chief emphasis in St. Paul's system. (p. 71.)

Nothing can be more explicit, on a point where one is glad to see explicitness. Those who contend for the same ultimate conclusion as Dr. Du Bose have been too often tempted to evade the evidence which goes to show that St. Paul speaks of the sinner as "regarded or treated as righteous," and not made actually righteous. This is further illustrated by the parable of the Pharisee and the Publican.

The Pharisee who went up into the temple to pray and reminded God of his own righteousness was not thereby justified ; while the publican who afar off was conscious only of his own sin in the sight of God was, we are told, justified. That cannot mean either that he was recognized as actually being sinless, or that he was by act of God at the time made sinless, or righteous. The term "justify" is not in the parable of the Gospel used in the developed, almost technical, sense of the epistle before us, but *it is exactly on the line of it, and it illustrates the progress and the propriety of its later use. . . .* The publican is accepted on the ground of his, at the time, occupying the right posture or attitude, the only right attitude possible for him, towards righteousness and at the same time towards his own conscious unrighteousness. . . . It is the attitude which negatively towards our own unrighteousness we call *repentance*, and positively towards the righteousness of God we call *faith*. . . . The condition of possible or future righteousness is the right attitude or intention of mind and feeling towards actual present unrighteousness. . . . In the initial moment of contrition the only possible and the necessarily first right posture of the sinner is that consciousness of himself which could not be the beginning of hatred of his sin if it were not to the same extent the beginning of a love of holiness. . . . Righteousness in us cannot begin otherwise than as an incipient sense of sin and that *prolepsis* or pre-vision and apprehension of holiness which we call *faith*. Faith is therefore with a divine truth and propriety reckoned or imputed to us as being righteousness, for it is a necessary moment or stage in our righteousness. (pp. 72-74.)

It will be seen how fully Dr. Du Bose recognizes what there is of truth in the view opposed to his own. At the same time he safeguards his own view by laying stress upon

the end of process, which is not complete until the sinner becomes actually righteous.

It is the end always that determines the meaning and nature of the thing, and the Gospel is the power of God unto an actual righteousness of men ; and only by the way, or in a secondary sense, a gracious treating of sinful men, as not sinful, and of a faith which is not yet righteousness as being already such. . . . The Spirit of God, the holiness, righteousness, or life of God can do us no good save as they are our own, and they are our own only in our own possession and exercise of them. *It is an infinite initial blessing, a present Gospel, to us that God does not wait for us to be good, that He takes us to Himself from the moment of the birth in us of the will to be good, and by treating us as though we were makes us good.* But let us beware of stopping with the Gospel of being accepted and not going on to the real Gospel of being good. For there is no other real good for man than that of being good, of his own goodness. Any other is only a blessing on the way, a refreshment, and a help to the consummate end and blessedness of being what God is. And let us remember, too, what the goodness is that is our only real good. It is the spirit, nature, and life of God, it is love, service, and sacrifice. We have heard it said, I am content to be a sinner saved by grace. In the first place, in its truest and highest sense, to be a sinner saved is to be one who having been a sinner is so no longer ; to be content to be saved in and not from sin, to be saved and still a sinner, is no true contentment. . . . For one in that stage and attitude of faith and waiting, it is indeed a present though not the whole or highest blessedness of the Gospel that we are already, with God and in Faith, all that we shall be in God and in fact. *Indeed, in St. Paul's immediate crisis of thought and contention, this stage and phase of the matter is so uppermost for the time that he almost seems to treat it as the whole Gospel.* He never really does this, though his ardent and one-sided partisans have abundantly done so ever since. St. Paul has ever in his own mind the whole undismembered conception of salvation in Christ, but he is passionately in earnest in establishing the present gracious status of believers as already and completely in possession in faith, though not yet in fact, of all that God has made ours in Christ. (pp. 76, 78, 79.)

Dr. Du Bose is certainly not an "ardent and one-sided partisan," though he is really more "ardent" than his calm and deliberate language might lead us to suppose. I value especially the last sentence which I have italicized, because it does justice—and at last full justice—to the real

mind and purpose of St. Paul, which I cannot help thinking was a little twisted even by Dr. Moberly.

There is another phrase that I must italicize, because as between the joint position of Dr. Du Bose and Dr. Moberly and my own it is very important.

The response of the Gospel to the human sense of actual sin and unattainable holiness is *not the half-grace of forgiveness but the whole-grace of redemption and deliverance*. God manifests Himself in it, that is to say, in Jesus Christ, not as pitier and pardoner of man in his sin, but as redeemer and saviour of man from his sin. He is there seen, in all the completeness of justifying, sanctifying, and saving grace, as at once Righteous and righteousing or Rightouser. (p. 102.)

We note in passing that Dr. Du Bose sticks to his guns in regard to such coinages as "righteousing" and "immanental." Attention was called to these by several critics of the earlier book, especially on this side of the water. But I confess I think, with his second book before me, that its author is right in keeping the words and ignoring the criticism. He is right, I believe, doubly in these cases; at once because they come naturally to him—it is part of his idiosyncrasy to be rather fond of coining new words, and these particular words serve a real purpose in the expression of his thought—and also because they fill conveniently a vacant place in the English language. We want something to correspond not only to "transcendent" but to "transcendental," and we also want something which can be treated as the exact equivalent of the Greek *δικαιοῦν*, covering both the sense of "to account righteous" and "to make righteous."

The next pasage that I shall quote illustrates, not perhaps quite favourably, one or two little turns of expression that are characteristic of the author's style—he is especially fond of the figure "zeugma," and I am not sure that there is not some slight risk of its becoming not

only a manner but a mannerism. However, it is of course not for this reason that I quote the paragraph, but because it will help to complete and explain the thought to which I have just referred.

John the Baptist's preaching and baptism contained everything that belongs to religion except, as he himself confessed, the power of it or the possibility of its realization. As has been more than once said, not only the primary condition, but the actual first step in religion, by which we mean the right relation of man to God, is the knowledge and sense or feeling of his own condition, his wants, and above all his own not only shortcomings or failures but transgressions and sins ; and not only his sins but his sin. The prodigal felt not only that he had sinned, but that, deeper than that, he was a sinner. Everything depends upon man's own attitude towards sin and his own sin. That attitude we express by the word *repentance*. Applying again the principle that a thing is truly defined only by what it is in its completeness, I say that repentance means the putting away of sin. In the first place it means the actual putting it away, and in the second place it means the putting it away by the sinner himself. Any desire or any conferring of only pity or pardon is only, at the best, an imperfect or incomplete either repentance or remission. And in the second place, even God Himself can in the full sense confer the true remission or truly put away sin only as He can impart a true repentance or the inward disposition, power, and act of the man in himself putting away his sin. A real *aphesis* is neither if it is not both God's and the man's act. (p. 104 f.)

I will conclude the exposition of the train of thought which we have been so far following with the description, which really belongs to it and crowns it, of the state of peace into which the Christian enters.

The first immediate consequence of the blessedness made ours in Jesus Christ is the sense of *present peace*. It is necessary to make a distinction between this present peace and what we may term *real peace*,—if it be only for the purpose of taking in the gift of God in its entirety, its end as well as its beginning and progress. . . . To one who is ill and about to die it would bring great present peace to know that he was brought into possession of certain cure and so of assured recovery and health. But the real peace to the sick man is health itself, and the wonderful comfort and peace brought to him by a sure faith in it and a certain hope of it is, in a large measure at least, only proleptic or anticipatory. In a large measure,

but not wholly so. The patient may find in his very anticipation and hope a real beginning and progress of the return of actual health, and so his possession and enjoyment may be not all only future; and the believer not only looks forward in faith and hope to the actual fruition of God and holiness and life, but has an ever increasing foretaste of them now. That, too, is real peace so far as it goes, and is to be classed, in theological language, rather with the real peace of sanctification and final glorification than with the immediate present peace of justification. . . . If the worst sinner at this moment in the world could be brought to an immediate spiritual apprehension of the full meaning of Christian baptism, what it is that is made all ours by that divine instrument, assuredly that act of spiritual apprehension on his part would be the first tremendous step in the process of real righteousness, or sanctification, on his actual way to God. But of real righteousness, or righteousness of his own, how little would it be! Of real reception or reception by actual participation there could indeed be but a drop from the infinite ocean; but, on the other hand, by the reception of faith and hope, or of anticipatory appropriation, it can be all his in a moment. *He may in one ecstatic sweep of vision behold all God become human, his own, righteousness and life.* In that one happy moment, or in the longer happy moment, of his whole earthly life of faith and hope, it is not his own paltry attainment of personal righteousness or life with which God credits him. Rather it is all that his faith takes in and appropriates to itself of the infinite and eternal righteousness of God Himself. All of Jesus Christ, who is God's promise and gift to us of His own divine righteousness,—all of Jesus Christ, who is consequently also our own perfect actual participation in the righteousness of God—is reckoned, accounted or imputed to, is as it were put to the credit, of the worst sinner who by a true faith accepts and appropriates Him to himself. (pp. 129-131.)

In the latter part of this last paragraph new thoughts come up, about which more will be said later. But in the meantime, what a noble outburst in the midst of all this severe reasoning, in that "one ecstatic sweep of vision"! It is a grand expression of that complementary truth for which I would plead.

### III.

When all concessions are made—and in the passages I have quoted there is much that, if not exactly put forward as concession, is at least qualifying truth—<sup>†</sup>it will still be

seen that Dr. Du Bose, like Dr. Moberly before him, is rigorous and uncompromising enough. Not many pages are allowed to pass anywhere in the volume without some reminder that the only righteousness in which it is possible really to rest is the man's own actual righteousness, not imputed but imparted, and realized in himself. It is to me a marvel what multitudinous ways are found of saying this one thing in different words. I should have thought the iteration almost excessive ; but I can understand the wish to drive home this point, in view of the extent to which a laxer theory has prevailed.

Both with Dr. Du Bose and with Dr. Moberly the whole weight of character, temperament and intellectual leaning told in the same direction. In both writers there was and is an innate veracity that is intolerant of any form of fiction. In both writers there was and is an intense moral earnestness that could not be trifled with. Both writers manifest a keen sensitiveness to the currents of modern thought, especially those that are often directed against Christianity. And lastly, both writers are philosophers, in quest of a complete moral theory of the universe, and unable to acquiesce in anything less.

And yet there is another point of view ; and, whatever condemnation I may bring down upon myself by the confession, I must confess that I have shared in it myself. That theirs is the better part I willingly acknowledge. But some of us could not help saying under our breath, when the theory was broached, *e pur si muove*—in a reactionary sense the opposite of Galileo's ; we felt that after all there was an element of truth in the discarded propositions.

Suppose one, perhaps not wholly without a sense of veracity, but yet sufficiently a student of past history to be aware that God has allowed a great deal to enter into His plans

for mankind that is not exactly naked truth as it stands. Suppose one, further, who though not altogether indifferent to the claims of righteousness was yet very conscious of living in a mixed world in which those claims could not always be asserted to the uttermost. Suppose one, yet again, upon whom the "mystery of things" weighed somewhat heavily, who felt that he could believe an ordinance to be divine without being able at once to see all the reasons for it. Suppose this same person to have a kind of natural drawing towards the publicans and sinners as contrasted with "the unco' guid or the religiously righteous"; and suppose that in yielding to this natural drawing he was conscious of a special attraction in the idea of "free forgiveness"; and suppose that the atmosphere in which his mind habitually moved was that expressed in Browning's

What I aspired to be,  
And was not, comforts me.

Suppose a mind like this in an attitude of inquiry, with no strong philosophic instinct and content with something a good way short of ultimate truth, but in part a student of the Bible and conscious how much both Testaments had to say about "forgiveness" without any hint of anything behind or beyond, and in part an observer of the more pathetic side of human frailty. Is there not in these conditions the making, at least, of a different point of view from that of Dr. Moberly and Dr. Du Bose ?

I believe that there is the making of such a different point of view. But I hasten to add, as I began by saying, that I am very nearly satisfied with the revised statement of the position as I find it now put forth by Dr. Du Bose. And I believe that he will accept the one or two modifications for which I should still like to ask. I should like to have a clear understanding that the actual righteousness for which he contends belongs strictly *to the ultimate truth*



*of things.* That means that, for most of us, it will never be attained otherwise than very imperfectly on this side the grave. This is just a case in which we must let

the heavenly period  
Perfect the earthen.

We have the admission that, for St. Paul, in the Epistle to the Romans, the first stage and phase of the matter, the stage of repentance and forgiveness, "is so uppermost for the time that he almost seems to treat it as the whole Gospel." And the reason is obvious, because for so many of us it is the urgent, insistent, dominating stage in the practical experience of life. I, on my part, am quite ready to admit that ultimately, in the Divine counsels, there must be "forgiveableness" corresponding to the forgiveness; but that is a question for God and for His government of the world, not for us; at least we may be content with the simple knowledge that it is there.

Dr. Du Bose has touched with a needle's point the heart of the matter when he speaks of "the half-grace of forgiveness" and "the whole-grace of redemption and deliverance." But, having won our assent to this as a statement of underlying principle, he will I think lend an ear to our petition that it may not be used to the disparagement of forgiveness, which is far too precious and beautiful a thing to have disparaged.

The two views are not alternatives; the one is included in the other; it is the first step, the initial stage in the carrying out of the great scheme of salvation. All I would contend for is that this first step is for practically all of us so near at hand, so important and so indispensable, that we cannot afford to relegate it to a second place even in thought. It is quite true that everything that can be called a scheme must be looked at as a whole, and cannot be rightly interpreted apart from its end. But at the same time, in the

case before us, the end is so remote—it concerns us really in another state of existence than the present—that it seems to me even now that there is some lack of proportion in the relative treatment of end and beginning. At least we must always remember that Dr. Du Bose is a philosopher, and is writing as a philosopher.

#### IV.

We are, of course, compelled to touch only upon a selection of points, and in that way much that is very noticeable has to be passed over. I should, however, like in passing just to call attention to what seems to me to be a particularly valuable paragraph on the place in history and in the Divine scheme of the Law. This is very apt to be misunderstood, and the following comments will do more than anything I remember to have seen to redress the balance.

There is so much said in St. Paul's presentation of the Gospel of the impotence and consequent superseding of the Law, that we are in danger of forgetting under his seeming disparagement how much he is really magnifying it. The fact is that the Gospel itself is only the Gospel in so far as it is the true, and the only, fulfilling of the Law. The Gospel is the power to fulfil the Law. And if there had not been first the developed experience and sense of the Law itself and of the necessity of fulfilling it; and then the no less true experience of the impossibility of the Law fulfilling itself in us, or of our fulfilling it in ourselves; and then again, the experience of actual transgression and the consequent sense of sin,—if all this had not gone before, there would have been neither truth in itself nor possible meaning for us in the Gospel of Jesus Christ. The Law, therefore, was the most immediate and essential presupposition of the Gospel; and the Hebrew development of the moral sense and the moral law, the Hebrew passion for righteousness and sense of sin, was the most necessary historical preparation for the advent of the Gospel. (p. 24 f.)

But in regard to the train of thought that has so far been occupying us, the leading point that still requires to have something said about it is the objective ground of salva-

tion ; in other words, the Death of Christ. On this head I believe that the following will bring out the points that I should most desire to emphasize.

To go no further as yet, I am convinced that the term *sacrifice* and the idea or principle for which it stands can never be dispensed with. To begin with, it is not Jewish but universal, and although it has been and still is undergoing the refining and purifying treatment to which all human thought and feeling needs to be continuously subject, yet all future progress in the matter can be only in the direction of its better understanding and fuller appropriation. At the same time it ought to be finally decided that we are going to interpret the meaning of sacrifice by the universal and eternal truth of it realized in the life and death of Christ, and not going to bring that truth down to fit into the little system of Jewish, or any other incomplete and imperfect human thought or understanding of it. In other words, we shall interpret the sacrifice of Christ by itself, or in its independent and inherent significance, and make use of all prior meanings or uses of sacrifice as only pointing to and not at all sufficing to express or explain it.

One other principle or method of procedure I wish to make plain. As humanity will never be known except in the completeness of its exposition in Jesus Christ, so Jesus Christ cannot be known except in most essential and universal terms of our humanity. To understand our Lord in any act or situation of human life it is necessary to understand what is the eternally proper or right human attitude or action in that situation. And so in general I would say that what Jesus Christ did in our humanity in order to be our salvation was just precisely what humanity needed of itself to be and to do in order to be saved. We exactly express or explain any act of His, and so the supreme and decisive act, when we say that humanity did it in His person, and that it was just precisely what humanity needed to do in order to its own redemption and completion. In His person humanity righted itself with God, redeemed itself from sin, raised itself from death. . . . Up to the present point I would answer to any question of how we are saved by the death or the blood or the sacrifice of Christ simply in the well-known line of the poet : In His death our sins are dead. (pp. 125-127.)

Here there are two paragraphs, of which the second is both important in itself and very characteristic of the author's thought. But as it will come before us later in another connexion, I will not say more about it now. I might even have postponed the quotation of this second paragraph,

but for the fact that the exposition of our present subject would have been too incomplete without it ; and the two paragraphs together really take us to the centre of the matter.

In regard to the first paragraph, I would express the pleasure with which I read Dr. Du Bose's statement. It has all the philosophic breadth and care to which we are accustomed from him ; the warning that we must interpret the lower by the higher, and not the higher by the lower, is very far from being superfluous. And yet I am very glad that so modern a thinker should not discard but should rather emphasize the conception of the Death of Christ as a sacrifice. As one who comes to these questions from different antecedents and from a different point of view, I welcome the more than usually sympathetic treatment of the ideas I cherish from Dr. Du Bose. He does not, I rejoice to say, dismiss the idea of Vicarious Suffering, or even the idea of Substitution. It would be more than human to expect that, holding the philosophy that he does, he should do otherwise than (as I should put it) try to minimize the force of these conceptions. It seems to be something of a relief to him, having recognized their reality, to be able to pass on and leave them behind. I should like, for myself, to go a little further than this ; I should like to dwell upon the place that, if we look steadily at it, Vicarious Suffering really holds in the nature of things and, mysterious as this dispensation of Providence may be, I should like to dwell on the deep pathos and beauty of it from the side of the sufferer.

## V.

A marked characteristic of Dr. Du Bose's work is its freshness, independence, and originality. I have said that it all hangs together as an interconnected whole. Even

where he is continuing the thought of others, that thought has passed through the crucible of his own mind, and it comes forth as his own. But in some cases I suspect that the originality goes beyond this. The following is striking.

We have then to inquire into the meaning of our Lord's having come in the likeness of sinful flesh, or of the flesh of sin. From the longest and most careful reflection upon the language and the matter of the New Testament, I am unable to accept the words as containing in themselves the implication that our Lord came into a nature or condition which was *like* but was *not* the flesh of sin. I feel the theological or doctrinal difficulty, but I also feel that that, and that alone, is the reason or excuse for modifying the meaning of words which are nowhere else so modified. I should much rather meet the real difficulty some other way; or, if I cannot fairly do so, then face it squarely. Like and likeness in the New Testament do not mean "like, but different"; they mean like in the sense of identical. When our Lord was made, or became, in the likeness of men, He did not become something similar to but not the same as man; He became *man*. When He was tempted in all points like as we are, His temptations were not in some points only and not in others like our own; they were essentially and identically our own, with the sole additional circumstance, which does not affect the nature or character of the temptations, that whereas all we are overcome by them, He overcame them. And, humanly speaking, that is all the difference between sin and holiness. Sin or holiness cannot be in mere nature or condition; they can be only in what *we* are or do in the nature or the condition." (p. 221 f.)

In accordance with the argument of this fundamental passage there are a number of places in which it is insisted that the victory of Christ over sin must be in all ways parallel with ours ("there was that in Him which He needed to deny, to mortify, to crucify," p. 173; cf. pp. 107, 135, 144, 174, etc.). I am not prepared to challenge the conclusion as a whole; on the contrary, I believe that it may be defended both philosophically and exegetically; but I am afraid that I must challenge at least one important premiss on which it rests. It is a very sweeping and untenable statement to say that "like and likeness in the New Testament . . . mean like in the sense of identical." We

have only to think of the formula so frequent in the Gospels, "the kingdom of heaven is like, or likened, unto" mustard seed, leaven, etc. Every one knows that "like" in these cases is very far from implying identity; the use is rather wide and lax, and denotes sometimes even a small degree of resemblance.

Another very questionable statement is the following:—

St. Paul objects to the *mediator* in the phraseology of Christianity, because a mediator is not of one but of two; whereas God and man are not two, but one in Christ, and there is nothing, not even a mediator, between them. (p. 243.)

Surely it is forgotten here that the one instance in which St. Paul does exclude the word "mediator" (Gal. iii. 19, 20) has nothing to do with Christianity, but has reference to the *promise* of God in the Old Testament. On the other hand 1 Tim. ii. 5, Heb. viii. 6, ix. 15, xii. 24, expressly affirm the use of the word in Christian phraseology.

In the same context exception is taken to "communion or fellowship" as inadequate renderings of *koinonia*.

I object to the words communion and fellowship simply as not going all the way of that unity of God and man in Christ which is the truth of the Holy Ghost. The truth of the Spirit of God is the truth of the spirit of man. The *koinonia* is not real or complete so long as the spirits are two and not one. We have it in its completeness only as the eternal, personal Spirit of God is the actual personal spirit of the man.

Doctrinally (as we shall see) this is important, and I should not wish to question it. But, for myself, I have always regarded "communion" as the exact equivalent of *koinonia*; it surely means an actual sharing in, actual partaking of, or joint possession.

As I am upon these small points, I may perhaps just mention two rather disconcerting misprints on page 131: line 8 from bottom, "place" should be "peace"; on page 22, line 16, "prophecy," should I think be "prophesy." Three Greek words occur in the book, and two of these have

wrong accents. As in the previous volume, there are one or two examples of doubtful grammar; to us in the old country such a construction as this would not be tolerable, "it is not part God and part we, but all God and all we" (p. 37, cf. p. 32); we should avoid it somehow probably by saying "part God and part ourselves."

## VI.

I suppose that the most really central and really important of all the problems discussed in the book is that relating to what Dr. Du Bose himself calls "the universal humanity of our Lord," that property of His Person by virtue of which He not only represents but expresses "the universal right mind of humanity." We have already quoted (p. 402 *supra*) one significant passage in which this difficult conception is applied with marked lucidity. I will place by the side of this another, also very lucid, which I think not only helps to explain the idea but also helps us to understand its genesis.

All the Old Testament promises fulfilled in Christ were primarily promises made to humanity, and to be fulfilled finally only in the general life and destiny of man. The interpretation of one such promise, which will do for all, may be studied in the second chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews. There is a promise made to man that, though for a time made lower than the angels, he shall be exalted above them and to the head of God's creation. Now as yet we see this promise very far from fulfilled in man, or in humanity at large, but we do see it most completely fulfilled in one man, Christ Jesus; and fulfilled in Him as head and representative and forerunner of all. It pleased God, for and through whom are all things, in bringing many sons to glory, to perfect (first) the Captain of their salvation. The promises are made generally to man; they are fulfilled first in the Son of man; and then through Him they are fulfilled in all who are in Him" (p. 120.)

We are familiar with this aspect of Biblical Prophecy and its interpretation. We are familiar with the subtle and easy transitions from collective to individual personality, and *vice versâ*. We know how the "I" of the Psalms

often stands for the community. We know how the Servant of Jehovah represents the nation in terms of the individual and as finding expression from time to time in some select individual. We know how (e.g. in Ps. lxxxix. 19-45) the promises to David and to Israel pass into each other, and are finally fulfilled in a personal Messiah. This alternate expansion and contraction of idea is undoubtedly characteristic of the Bible. There is also something very like it in the Patristic treatment of the Person of Christ. Dr. Du Bose may well claim to have upon his side in what he says on this head both "the truth of the Scripture and the mind of the Church." He also has the emphatic agreement of such a modern as Dr. Moberly.

And yet such teaching is sure to be called in question. It is bound to be rejected by all Individualists in philosophy. When I reviewed *Atonement and Personality* in 1901 I had not a little hesitation on the subject myself; but I may be allowed to say that since that date I have been more and more led to think that my English friend and my American friend are right.

It cannot be said that the latter has not the courage of his opinions, or that he fails to meet the difficulties involved in them fairly and squarely. He states the principal objection thus :—

One says, "You lay great stress upon the view that our Lord was not a man, but man. I find this a difficult conception; does it mean that humanity has a concrete real existence apart from the individual persons who are human, and that this Universal becomes visible in Christ? If this be so, does it not lead us to a metaphysical Realism, not now generally held"? (p. 297.)

The answer Dr. Du Bose gives is as follows :—

The universality of our Lord's humanity is only explicable upon the fact that His personality is a divine one. It is only God in it that can make it applicable to all or the truth of all. And since, according to St. Paul, it is always Christ Himself who brings Himself to us and makes all that is His our own, it follows that, according to



St. Paul, Jesus Christ can be to us nothing less than divine. The concrete universal of humanity which may be found in Jesus Christ belongs to it not as humanity but as God in humanity. It is God in it which makes that particular humanity of our Lord, His holiness, His righteousness, His life, valid and available for all ; so that every man may find himself in Christ, and in Christ find himself.

It is substantially the same answer that (as I showed in my previous article) is given by Dr. Moberly. There is only this difference, that Dr. Moberly refers this all-embracing activity more explicitly to the Holy Spirit, who is the Spirit of Christ and of God. It is of course only a difference of language, the meaning is precisely the same. The Holy Spirit is the bond which binds all humanity together in one. In each one of us He is present after our measure, but in Christ He dwelt as the fulness of the Godhead bodily. It is that fulness of indwelling which gathers together the multitudinous units into Him and communicates His experiences to them.

The whole work of Jesus Christ in humanity must be expressible, whether or no we may succeed in expressing it, in terms of distinctly human activity and experience, human effort and attainment, human predestination and realization. Jesus Christ accomplished and became precisely what it was the proper and destined task of humanity in Him to accomplish and become. This is not to say that the work of Christ is not equally expressible in terms of the divine activity. Jesus Christ means to us, what God is, and has done, and is doing in humanity. God was and is in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself, imparting Himself to us and taking us up into participation with Himself. But God is in us only what we are in Him, and God does in us only what we do in Him ; and what that is, must be as perfectly expressible in terms of us as of Him. (p. 225 f.)

The reciprocity is perfect :

The complete being in Christ means the complete being of Christ in us. The branch is completely in the vine only when the life of the vine is completely in the branch. (p. 234.)

I know nothing more instructive than that parable or allegory of the Fourth Gospel. As the sap circulates through the vine, so do spiritual forces circulate through that Body

of which Christ is the Head ; and life in circulation carries with it the properties of the source from which it springs.

I will only speak of one more difficulty which Dr. Du Bose directly meets, so far as it can be met. Here, too, there is no flinching.

One says, " My difficulty is as follows : The agony in the Garden and the cry of My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me ? seem to show that our Lord was as personally distinct from God as we ourselves are, that His personality, His self-consciousness and will, was not a divine personality, but a human ; so human as to be capable of losing its hold upon God, just as we may lose our hold upon God." (p. 298 f.)

This is just a case where Dr. Du Bose's thorough-going humanizing (if I may so call it) of our Lord stands him in good stead. He asks whether we should wish " to construe these experiences of our Lord into some other, non-human experiences." And then he goes on to ask if the whole difficulty is not " already expressed for us in the very word Incarnation ; a difficulty which the most of us evade by simply not taking the word seriously, in the fulness and reality of its meaning ? " He adds : " In the instance we have been analyzing, what do we see but the disposition common to us all to find in our Lord's temptation experiences that are not human, and in Himself one who was not truly man " (p. 301).

This is precisely the kind of language used (as I also showed before) by Dr. Moberly, who deprecated the attempt so often made " to keep open, as it were, a sort of non-human sphere, or aspect of the Incarnation."

It is a pleasure to me to bring out once more the harmonious thinking of my two friends. Dr. Moberly has no nearer or truer successor than the American theologian whose work I have been studying, more than 4,000 miles away.

W. SANDAY.