

more he said until a quiet sigh put a period to his last breath, and so he fell asleep.

Izaak's closing prayer for the clergy of England we who are of them shall put up for ourselves: "Bless, O Lord, his brethren, the clergy of this nation, with effectual endeavours to attain, if not to his great learning, yet to his meekness, his godly simplicity, and his Christian moderation, for these will bring peace at the last."

Wordsworth's latest Church sonnet may fitly close this paper:

". . . . . That stream behold,  
That stream upon whose bosom we have passed,  
Floating at ease, while nations have effaced  
Nations, and Death has gathered to his fold  
Long lines of mighty Kings—look forth, my soul!  
(Nor in this vision be thou slow to trust:)  
The living Waters, less and less by guilt  
Stained and polluted, brighten as they roll,  
Till they have reached the eternal City, built  
For the perfected Spirits of the just."



## The Person of our Lord and the Kenotic Theory.

### II.

BY THE REV. F. S. GUY WARMAN, M.A.

LAST month we considered the view—fragmentary and inadequate, it is true, but still, I hope, fairly and justly stated—which St. Paul appears to take in this passage of this great fact of Divine revelation to man. St. Paul refers all the outward and physical manifestations of *κένωσις* to the mental attitude of our Lord. "Let this mind be in you which is also in Christ Jesus." We have striven to do likewise, and now it only remains, from the same standpoint, to examine two great questions which are pertinent to the correlation of the two natures of Jesus Christ—namely, the question of His relation to evil and that of His moral and mental development.

I. Christ came to "deliver us from the evil" by sharing our

battle with it, and by His victory and His death and resurrection to free us from the penalty and the power of sin. He shared our battle, and therefore He endured temptation. As to His temptation, we gather from Heb. ii. 18—"For in that He Himself hath suffered being tempted, He is able to succour them that are tempted"—that temptation was necessary to Christ in order to perfect Him in sympathy and power to help. Is this temptation contrary to His true Divinity, or his sinlessness to His true humanity? Christ's humanity was sinless. The entail of transmitted guilt (original sin) was cut off by the supernatural birth. He was exempt from sinful self-will. He had all the faculties to which sin appeals, but those faculties were untainted. Sin is no true part of human nature, but "the fault and corruption of every man's nature," as our article puts it—*φθορά* (St. Augustine) or *ἀνομία* (Tertullian). Sin is a fault or taint of the will, and Christ's human will was sinless. And yet His temptation was real, because He was not exempt from ordinary innocent human instincts, physical infirmities, limitations of our manhood, which cause some things to be desirable and others distasteful—*e.g.*, hunger, pain, fatigue, etc. Temptation ensued wherever the gratification of innocent instincts was contrary to the will of His Father. Obedience often meant a painful effort, a tremendous sacrifice. His will oftentimes fought and conquered His desires, but these desires were always natural, and in themselves innocent. Christ was perfect man, without sin, because sin is not essential to perfect humanity. There is no place for Manichæism in a Scriptural estimate of the power of Christ. There is no place for sin in the temptation of Jesus, either in its origin or its result. Sin could never deceive Him or entice Him. He resented evil by a continuous fidelity of will; and without ever desiring that He might be free from obedience, He might desire that obedience might be compatible with escape from suffering; and so we may reverently suppose—I am again quoting Professor Ottley—that the struggle was real and intense, His Divinity conferring on His humanity in the one Person only such strength as was sufficient to bear Him

through His fearful conflict. Our Lord's was the ideal state of human will, truly free—*i.e.*, liberated from hindrances to its true natural activity. Christ's victory over temptation was not a necessity, because the power of deity overbore the freedom of the human will. Christ is truly free in His temptation, and His victory can be described in two ways—in Anselm's neat phraseology, *potuit non peccare*, or *non potuit peccare*. He could abstain from sin implies power to be tempted, and the faculty of sin if he willed. But perish the thought that He should will! He could not sin implies that there was in Him a counterpoise stronger than the force of temptation, the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, keeping every natural faculty in perpetual fidelity to the Divine will. So, in the case of the temptation, an ethical view rather than a logical or metaphysical one aids us in estimating its reality, and gives us some idea of the nature of the *κένωσις*.

2. In turning to the question of Christ's mental and moral development, we come to that aspect of the *κένωσις* which has, almost to the exclusion of any other, absorbed the interest of present-day critics and theologians both in Germany and elsewhere. The method of argument on the subject has generally been, if not entirely the reverse of the true one, at any rate somewhat antagonistic to a true result. German theorists—and most of our popular theology on this point should be branded "made in Germany"—have first formed their own conception of what Christ ought to know, explaining the Gospel statements in the light of their conception, and then have formed therefrom their own view of the *κένωσις*. Thus, nearly all the differences of kenotic theorizing cited by Professor A. B. Bruce in his work on the "Humiliation of Christ" may be referred to the different standpoints on the question of Christ's knowledge which the various theologians take. Let us, then, look at the facts in the light of the conception of the *κένωσις*, however faulty—and no conception can claim to be perfect or complete—which has already been adduced.

From Luke ii. 52—"Jesus advanced in wisdom and stature

and in favour [or grace] with God and man"—we learn that there was in the life of Christ growth and illumination of mind in a measure analogous to that of the prophets. The Gospels describe the life of Christ as a life of prayer, and the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews calls Him *ἀρχηγὸς πίστεως*. Christ has faith, although that has been denied Him. Let me quote Bishop Westcott on the subject: "In Jesus Christ Himself we have the perfect example—perfect in realization and in effect—of that faith which we are to imitate, trusting in Him. He, too, looked through the present and the visible to the future and the unseen. In His human nature He exhibited faith in its highest form from first to last; and placing Himself, as it were, at the head of the great army of the heroes of faith, He carried faith to its most complete perfection and its loftiest triumph." To prove the existence of this faith, the ascription of which to Christ he counts as of the highest importance for the realization of His perfect humanity, he quotes, amongst other texts, John xi. 41—Christ's faith in the matter of Lazarus. He thanks God for answering a prayer of which the tangible answer has not yet been completed. Further, our Lord at least once expresses surprise, and more than once asks for information; and as to one matter He professes ignorance in the much controverted text (Mark xiii. 32): "But of that day or of that hour knoweth no one, not even the angels in heaven, nor the Son, but the Father." These facts as to mental growth, faith, prayer, and knowledge, do not correspond to what we should expect of Divine omniscience. They point rather to human faculties supernaturally intensified. They have been treated in a variety of different ways, have been explained in accordance with various tenets, and have been made to fit in with the dogmatic statements of heresy and orthodoxy alike. Some have held that Christ's soul was like ours even in ignorance. This is the Arian standpoint, and tends to deny the true Divinity of our Lord. He becomes an inspired man, not the incarnate Son of God. Others, on the contrary, take a view which leads to docetism, and denies the reality of the manhood. Cyril and

his school, in their antipathy to Arius, attribute to Christ an economic ignorance—an ignorance assumed or “pretended,” as Cyril himself dares to say—from motives of utility and expedience. His growth in knowledge is only a gradual manifestation of His knowledge. Again, others, with Thomas of Aquinas as representative, deny to our Lord the graces of faith and hope. His knowledge was from the first infinite, and the only limitation Thomas admits is that it embraced all present reality, but not all future possibility. But even here he speaks guardedly. All, present and past, He knows, but probably not all future history. Jerome and Augustine avoid the difficulty in a charmingly ingenuous and ingenious way by referring statements of Christ's ignorance and mental and moral growth to His body the Church. Comment is needless. Athanasius and his school draw a sharp distinction between the two natures—the Divine and human. The Godhead in Christ is not ignorant, but it is the property of the flesh to be so. He allows the possibility of real ignorance in Christ as man, but he speaks guardedly, and gives several explanations of Christ's profession of ignorance in Mark xiii. 32. Christ knew, but said He did not, as man, in accommodation to human infirmity. But this would either deny the unity of person, or amount to a *suppressio veri*. In another place he says Christ said he knew not to stop questioning and idle curiosity for our advantage. But is not this applying the false morality of the end justifying the means? But he never hints to us that there was a real limitation, brought about for a purpose of love. Origen, however, seems to have grasped this truth when he asserts Christ must needs learn to stammer, and to speak as a child with children. To the extent of a fact resulting from love we have no right to set limits of our own. God is love, and for a purpose of love the Son of His love submitted to self-limitation. Metaphysically we cannot understand that self-limitation; we can only think of it as submitted to perfectly voluntarily for a purpose of love. He “emptied Himself,” “He became poor,” are statements of fact, and we must not rob them of their real meaning. Our Lord was a perfectly willing

agent ; He refrained from the exercise of faculties and the use of knowledge to which He was entitled. He did it because He loved us. We cannot explain, we can only illustrate. Watch one of the world's learned men, replete with scientific knowledge of every kind, telling a little grand-daughter a fairy-story, sinking himself to reach her level because he loves her, and you have an illustration—faint and incomplete, I know—of the *κένωσις* of the Lord Jesus Christ. A word of caution is needed : we must never think of the humiliation of Christ as a weakening of the Divine nature—a self-depotentiation. Love is the greatest of the Divine attributes, and includes all the rest, and it would be ridiculous to say the love of God was depotentiated, weakened, laid aside, in the Incarnation. Far from it ; it never shone more brightly than in the great humiliation of our Lord.

There are two questions which must be briefly answered, both of urgent practical importance. First, can we, in the light of the *κένωσις*, regard our Lord as the supreme authority as a Teacher ? Indubitably yes. He taught as one having authority. He never allows us to think of Him as otherwise than infallible. His revelation of God is absolute, His gospel is final, His message (and His message is summed up in Himself) the truth. Love caused the *κένωσις*, and love demands infallibility, or it is not wholly love. Love, as Swayne puts it, compelled Him to communicate to and through His humanity a Divine and infallible knowledge. Secondly, what is the bearing of the *κένωσις* upon those matters which seem to have lain outside His province. Many social, political, historical, scientific, and perhaps we may add critical, questions He does not touch on, laying down, however, principles which govern their consideration.

One of these questions has provoked tremendous discussion—viz., Christ's attitude to the authorship and composition of the books of the Old Testament. Liddon, in his last Bampton Lecture, ventures to assert that Christ endorses the traditional view of the Old Testament. Possibly the assertion is a little too strong, but in the main it is doubtless true. The extreme critics have been compelled to face the fact, and have in con-

sequence, most unwisely it seems to me, committed themselves to a theory of the *κένωσις* mainly devised to account for Christ's opposition to the speculations as to the Old Testament which they please to consider proved facts. Christ knew no better than the men of his day, because *ἐκένωσεν ἑαυτὸν*. The reasoning is highly dangerous; some of us at least do not accept the premises, and to most of us the conclusion is utterly abhorrent. But I am disposed to think, and I speak with all deference, that conservative critics are sometimes inclined to lay too much stress on Christ's attitude in meeting their critical opponents. They assert that Christ accepted the Davidic authorship of the 110th Psalm, and that is sufficient to ensure their acceptance of it. It is, however, just possible, though to me it is barely probable, that Christ used the *argumentum ad hominem*, that He simply asked the Pharisees to draw the inevitable conclusion from their own premises, whether the latter were right or wrong. Even this very improbable supposition weakens slightly the conservative position if it is only based on Christ's words. And sometimes we are loftily told that we—I am assuming our general conservatism—have only this argument to rely on. In a popular magazine a little time ago, Dr. Hastings assumed that if the work on the Old Testament for the last half century is worth anything, it is certain that the 110th Psalm was not written by David. I have not the qualifications to break a lance with Dr. Hastings, but surely, in the light of the chapter in Dr. Rouse's book,<sup>1</sup> his statement is far from true. Professor Orr, in his able book,<sup>2</sup> quotes with approval Baethgen's verdict that Professor Cheyne's attempt to explain this Psalm from the Maccabæan or Greek age is a complete failure. Surely we need to adopt more largely the method that Professor Orr pursues scientifically and Dr. Rouse with careful adaptation to the popular reader, and face the extremer criticisms with the evidence of the spade and the study, without preconceived notions, but with common sense; and then as complementary

<sup>1</sup> Rouse, "Old Testament Criticism in New Testament Light."

<sup>2</sup> Orr, "Problem of the Old Testament."

attestation our Lord's attitude will be weighty indeed. Conservative criticism has been inclined to depend too completely on our Lord's attestation, an attestation which has in consequence been explained away by a new exegesis of His own words or by an illegitimately extended theory of the *κένωσις*. It is only now that extremer critics are being met in dispassionate language on their own ground, and it is being shown that true scholarship can use the weapons of criticism in the furtherance of the conservative position. It is not intended here to depreciate the attestation of our Lord : God forbid ! It is only intended to emphasize that which we are beginning to see is a fact—viz., that the best human scholarship, in its quest for truth, will sooner or later have to sit at the feet of the infallible Teacher, and see that after all it has only discovered afresh, perhaps in a fuller realization, what He told them long ago.

For the rest let this suffice. The self-emptying of our Lord was a reality : it was based on His everlasting love, knowing but the limits of love and truth, and its depth and height we shall never know or understand until we realize the fullness of His love and truth in His presence ; and meanwhile He is our perfect Saviour, our infallible Lord, very man and very God.



### The Effects of Mohammedanism.

BY THE REV. C. T. WILSON, M.A.

**I**N seeking to arrive at a true estimate of the effects and results of Islâm in their various aspects, two dangers have to be avoided. On the one hand one must beware of the Scylla of regarding Islâm as wholly void of any good features in doctrine or practice ; and on the other of the Charybdis of claiming for it a position but little inferior to the religion of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Islâm has, unquestionably, a measure of truth in it ; and