

- 7 N. Berdyaev, *The Russian Revolution* (1932), 68.
 8 R. Niebuhr, *The Nature and Destiny of Man* (1941), 6.
 9 J. L. Stocks, *Time, Cause and Eternity* (1938), 5-6.
 10 See A. E. Taylor, *Aristotle*, 42.
 11 *The Stoic Philosophy*, 32, 34.
 12 *N. & D. of Man*, 8.
 13 *The Stoic Philosophy*, 53, 51.
 14 A. N. Whitehead, *Science & the Modern World* (1938), 19.
 15 J. Macmurray, *The Boundaries of Science* (1939), 236.
 16 *Time, Cause and Eternity*, 34.
 17 *Ibid.*, 34.
 18 H. Cunyngame, *Short Talks on Philosophy* (1932), 184.
 19 C. E. M. Joad, *Guide to Modern Thought* (1942), 53, 59.
 20 *Ibid.*, 182.
 21 *The Boundaries of Science*, 204.
 22 *The N. & D. of Man*, 36, 44.
 23 E. Barker, *The Citizen's Choice* (1937), 15.
 24 Quoted by R. Osborn, *Freud and Marx* (1937), 242.
 25 See *The Russian Revolution*, 81-82.
 26 *Science & the Modern World*, 100.
 27 *N. & D. of Man*, 35, 35, 38.
 28 *Time, Cause and Eternity*, 86, 90.
 29 *The Boundaries of Science*, 183.
 30 J. Baillie, *Our Knowledge of God* (1939), 40-42.
 31 *N. & D. of Man*, 151-3.
 32 *Our Knowledge of God*, 16.
 33 *Ibid.*, 258.

The Doctrine of Man.

BY THE REV. J. RUSSELL HOWDEN, B.D.

THERE are two principal divisions in all Christian teaching and preaching. One is the doctrine of God, and the other is the doctrine of man. It is this latter which we are to consider in the present paper.

Our teaching about man will necessarily include the consideration of man's origin, and our ideas as to the nature of man will naturally be coloured by our ideas about this. There are two principal views on this. One is the doctrine of Evolution and the other the doctrine of Creation.

Creation implies the direct act of God, and, therefore, is essentially miraculous.

Evolution, in the common use of the word, pre-supposes the activity of nothing more than natural causation. Of course, even in saying this one has to beware of an ambiguity into which it is so easy to slip. And the ambiguity is this, that until we are quite clear as to what we include within the sphere of the natural, it is confusing to begin to talk about the supernatural. However, leaving this on one side, it is generally thought that the idea of evolution precludes any direct Divine activity. Indeed, in its extremist form the doctrine is usually so expressed as to eliminate the idea of God altogether.

On the other hand, it is to be remembered that a good many Christians believe in some form of evolution as a method of the Divine

working. A notable instance of this is found in Dr. J. Y. Simpson, in such a book as *The Spiritual Interpretation of Nature*.

We may agree, therefore, that evolution is in itself a term of doubtful meaning. The real crux of the question is whether God is recognised at all. In other words, the two main accounts of man's origin may be summed up as theistic or atheistic.

The latter class of theories supposes that originally man was only a somewhat improved ape, and it was thought that a highly-trained chimpanzee might be nearly as intelligent as the lowest races of mankind, such as the pygmy of Central Africa or the native of Australia. Such theorists further hold that there are indications which have been discovered of intermediate forms between man and some sub-human creature, simian or otherwise in its general characteristics.

As to the relationship between the highest form of ape and the lowest form of man, it is most misleading to talk as though an intelligent ape had anything approaching the intelligence of even the lowest races of mankind. It is possible to teach apes, like other animals, to do certain tricks, and their tricks are made the more impressive by the general anthropoid appearance of the performers. But between even the cleverest and most highly trained animals and the lowest form of human being there is an obvious and great gulf fixed. Dr. Rendle Short, in a recent booklet *The Christian and the Scientific Outlook*, says:—"You must not judge of human intelligence by degenerate specimens in middle life who have never had a fair chance. The only way of judging human intelligence is by what can be done with the well-trained child." Professor Short points out that an Australian aborigine became a noted mathematician, and others have been selected to play cricket against an English Test Team.

Then with regard to the supposed missing links, we may venture to affirm that the missing links required by the theory of evolution do not, as a matter of fact, occur. Particular instances that have at different times been set forward as examples have themselves been sharply criticised by anatomists and biologists upon various grounds. But as instances of missing links are still sometimes brought forward, it is well to notice the possibilities of error which may arise in connection with them.

First, there is a possibility of error in estimating the date of the geological strata in which the remains are found.

Secondly, there is a possibility of error in referring remains to their proper origin. The explorer comes upon very scanty remains of a skeleton, and he has to decide whether these bones belong to a human being or an animal. The most likely mistake will be in confusion between simian and human, but other and more unlikely confusions have occurred. Remains have been discovered in various parts of the world, particularly in China, California, and the South of France, and with regard to every example there has been considerable difference of opinion as to whether the bones belonged to a human being or to an anthropoid ape.

In the third place it is necessary to enter a caution as to the explanation of finds which may accompany such remains. For instance, chipped flints are frequently discovered in conjunction with fossil remains. It is often assumed that these are incontrovertible evidence

of human or sub-human activity. We need to remember that there are at least two other ways in which such flints may have received their peculiar shape—the first, and the most likely, being the action of natural forces, such as the wearing of water, or the splitting caused by frost; the second, which is little more than a possibility, would be through the activities of flint-chipping apes—though this last is purely a supposition.

The fourth and most serious likelihood of error lies in the reconstruction of remains, and particularly of skulls. It is obvious that when a very small portion of a skull has been found it is a matter of considerable delicacy to determine the radius of the arch of the skull. In fact, such reconstructions have been contested from time to time by anatomists themselves. When these reconstructions have been essayed, and when highly imaginative drawings based upon them have been published, the plain man will do well to ask two questions: First, how much exactly of the skeleton has actually been found. Secondly, how far were the bones, especially those of the skull, broken or otherwise when found. These are simply commonsense precautions which the ordinary reasonable man will do well to observe if he wishes to arrive at the truth. It has been popular for some illustrated papers on both sides of the Atlantic to put forth from time to time highly imaginative pictures of hairy, low-browed creatures which purport to be missing links. "Evidence for the existence of these creatures has never been discovered except in the imagination of the artists." (Dr. Rendle Short).

Dr. Rendle Short sums it up thus. The more recent anthropologists emphasize not the narrowness but the width of the gap between man and the apes. "Although they mostly state that man was derived from a primitive primate, no one seriously suggests now that man was derived from any of the existing anthropoid apes, or from any creature at all like them."

The foregoing will suffice for all that there is opportunity to say now by way of criticism of what I may call the vulgar forms of evolutionary theory.

Leaving this on one side, we may now turn to consider the Creationist's view of the matter. He bases his ideas upon the Bible. In Genesis i. 26 we read: "God said, Let us make man in our image after our likeness." In ii. 7: "The Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life." These two verses assert, on the one hand concerning the physical nature of man, that he is formed of matter, which he shares with all other created beings; and, on the other hand, that he is akin to God Himself. In Luke iii. 38, Adam is called "the son of God."

The Bible, therefore, clearly sets forth man's nature as being a duality—physical and spiritual.

More than this, I Thessalonians v. 23 indicates that the non-material part of man is itself dual, comprising both spirit and soul. Various meanings have been assigned to the word soul, and it is perhaps unfortunate that there is no general agreement amongst Bible students as to the connotation to be assigned to this word. If we confine ourselves to Scriptural language, we may distinguish three meanings

of the word : (1) It is used as equivalent to spirit, as in the *Magnificat*, where, according to the rules of Hebrew parallelism, it seems to be implied that spirit and soul are identical. (2) It is used of the emotions, as in Luke ii. 35. And (3) in the Thessalonian passage already referred to it appears to be sharply distinguished from spirit.

There is no difficulty about the first two meanings to be assigned. The difficulty is as to what we are to understand when the terms soul and spirit are thus distinguished. To begin with, it is to be observed that soul is predicated, not only of man, but of the lower creation also. Even the swarming marine life of the *primaevae* sea is spoken of as having soul (Genesis i. 20). We seem, therefore, forced to the conclusion that in this sense the soul is something which man shares with other creatures. And I would suggest that this something is the unifying centre of consciousness. Modern surgery has referred the action of each of the physical senses to its appropriate brain centre, so that if that centre be injured, the sense apparatus corresponding to it is rendered useless. The impressions conveyed by the senses, however, are presented in consciousness as a unity. No physical centre of the unifying process has been discovered. It appears, therefore, as if such a centre must be supra-material, however little we may be able to assign such a meaning to such a term. The non-material part of man is that which is described as his spirit. I use the term spirit as equivalent to mind. I do this with some diffidence because so many people use the term mind as equivalent to soul. But, personally, I find it difficult to assign any meaning to spirit which does not include the operation of man's mind. The Greek word for soul is, of course, *ψυχή*, but the science of mind is termed psychology. In my view of the matter it would be better if this could be labelled pneumatology, if such a word might be coined, but, of course, it is now too late to alter the common nomenclature. Psychology teaches us that the mind, or the spirit, is threefold as to its functions—thought, feeling, and will. These three functions of the human spirit correspond to the three ultimate categories of the true, the beautiful, and the good. It seems, too, that in the Bible itself we have an endorsement of this common classification of the human mind. In Luke x. 27 we read : "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind." Here the heart appears to stand for the whole spiritual being of man, and is distinguished from the other three particulars by the use of a different pronoun. If this be correct, the soul will correspond to the emotions, the strength to the will, and the mind to the reason.

Such then is the spiritual nature of man in respect of which he is like God. But the declaration in Genesis i. 26 appears to refer to the whole man, and not merely to his spiritual nature. It may be difficult to regard man's physical nature as being in any way like God, when we remember that God is a Spirit. But the difficulty seems to disappear when we remember that man's physical nature was an adequate vehicle for the incarnation of the Lord Jesus Christ ; and, further, when we remember that man's material nature is fitted for eternity. There is a natural (or soulish) body, and there is a spiritual body. Whatever the unknown conditions of Resurrection

life may be, at least they are something for which man's physical nature is fitted.

The soul or the spirit then exhibits the three functions of thought, feeling and will. It is to be observed, however, that though we may separate these three functions in our own thought, they are not separable in life. For we know ourselves to be doing any or all of these three things at the same time. They are simply the ways in which our self acts. But these are the constituent elements of personality. They are distinguishable functions, but they are united by being functions of one and the self-same subject. (Illingworth). This is what we mean when we speak of the personality of a man. This is what makes him a person.

But the Bible assures us that man is made in the image of God. Therefore we may venture to say that God Himself is a Person. Some people find a difficulty in thinking of God as a Person, because a person is essentially separated from all other persons, and is accordingly limited by the existence of other persons. Therefore limitation seems to be of the essence of personality, and that is unthinkable in the case of God. Lotze, however, points out: "Among the things which a personal being recognises as in this opposition to itself are its own inner states of consciousness and its own thoughts. Therefore the thought of God's personality does not require us to assume a reality outside Him and limiting Him, but only the production in Him of a world of ideas to which He finds Himself in contrast as to His own states."

Further, Illingworth points out that the development of the doctrine of God's personality has always proceeded side by side with the recognition of the personality of man. To know God as a Person is the very essence of true religion, and, as a matter of fact, it is something which is peculiar to Christianity. Our Lord Jesus Christ revealed the Father as in essential personal relationship with man, and He also supremely crowned the individual man with glory and honour which is given to him by no one else. The fear of the Lord in the Old Testament corresponds to faith in the New, and they both mean fundamentally the recognition of the personality of God. Eternal life as predicated of a human being is nothing less than this entering into personal relationship with the Infinite and Eternal God. "This is life eternal, that they might know Thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, Whom Thou hast sent." (John xvii. 3).

Assuming then that man has a spiritual as well as a physical nature, the further question arises as to how this spiritual nature is to be regarded. Three main views may be distinguished.

(1) Transmigration. This involves the idea that every human birth means the cutting off, so to speak, of a certain amount of spiritual existence from the great reservoir of it which is supposed to be supra-mundane. Wordsworth, in his familiar *Ode to Immortality*, sets forth this view. But we must not allow the beauty of the poet's language to obscure the difficulties which underlie the idea.

(2) Then there is the view known as Conditional Immortality. There are various aspects of this theory. Some hold that the soul or spirit is created, to be destroyed by physical death. In connection with this it is commonly held that immortality is to be regained at the

Resurrection. Other people regard the soul as unconscious between death and resurrection. From the point of view of Bible doctrine, one special difficulty which meets this view is that it is necessary to suppose, in the case of the wicked, that they are first destroyed by physical death, then they are re-created for judgment, and thereafter destroyed a second time. This view, therefore, seems to raise more difficulties than it solves.

(3) There is the view which I may perhaps venture to call the ordinary Christian idea. That is, that each separate person is a separate creation from birth, or, better, from the moment of conception. This separate creation carries with it the gift of immortality.

It should be carefully borne in mind that man is always presented in the Bible as consisting essentially of two natures, spiritual and physical, and that neither is complete without the other. There are beings, whether angels or demons, who are merely spirit. There are also animals, which have body and soul but apparently no spirit. But man is a denizen of two worlds, and his final complete state is not a mere ghostly immortality, but the resurrection union of spirit and body. The body is as really a part of man's personality as the spirit. Philosophy, particularly heathen philosophy, is apt to look upon the body as a mere vesture, or, still worse, a prison house, and to regard salvation to consist essentially in getting rid of it.

Professor Orr wrote : "The soul was made and meant to inhabit the body, and was never intended to subsist apart from it. Hence death . . . is not something natural to man, but can only be regarded as something violent, unnatural, the rupture or separation of parts of man's being which were never meant to be disjoined. The soul, in virtue of its spiritual personal nature, survives the body, but in separation from the body itself, as for example the doctrine of Sheol shows, exists in a mutilated, imperfect condition."

Modern psychology increasingly lays stress upon the close relationship between soul and body—in the theory of psycho-physical parallelism. And the Bible doctrine of man harmonises with this idea, and gives honour to the body as well as to the spirit of man. "Know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost?" (I Cor. vi. 19).

In accordance with the foregoing, redemption is represented in the Bible as including body as well as spirit. St. Paul told the Roman Christians that they were "waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of the body." (Romans viii. 23). A redemption which already has been secured by the death of Christ, and which is to be fully realised at His Second Advent.

Another feature to be observed with regard to man is the sense of frustration which attaches to his life. He is out of harmony with his environment, and in this respect appears to differ from the brute creation. Luthardt, in his *Fundamental Truths*, enumerates four sets of contradictions which continually beset man. (1) There is the sense of his helplessness with regard to nature and, at the same time, the greatness of his power over nature ; (2) There is man's insatiable curiosity concerning his surroundings and the ignorance of which each new advance in knowledge makes him more aware ; (3) There is the incessant conflict between desire and disappointment ; and (4)

most significant of all there is the power of choice and will combined with frequent and strange weaknesses in carrying out that will.

The Bible explanation of these anomalies is that man is a fallen creature. His frustrations and unhappinesses are due to this one terrible infection of his nature which is sin. The root trouble is that man is alienated from God. To paraphrase Pascal's words : Man is made for God, and yet is contrary to God.

Man's sinning has caused his will to be emasculated, so that even when to some degree he apprehends the good, he nevertheless fails so often to do it.

Moreover, sin has not only affected man's spirit, but his body also. In the day that he fell his body became mortal. " Sin entered into the world, and death by sin." (Romans v. 12). St. Paul does not say that there was no death in the universe before man's sin. He does not appear to be concerned there with the universe as a whole. He is talking about man, and it is death as affecting man that he has in mind—the death with the sting in it. And Scripture throughout quite uncompromisingly connects this with man's disobedience.

The narrative of the Fall is criticised on the ground that the occasion appears to be too trivial to have carried with it such far-reaching consequences. But our assumptions as to what is trivial and what is important may be sadly at fault. The important point to note in the narrative is that sin entered because man, unfallen man, made his own choice the law of his life. That is the essence of all sin. " Sin is lawlessness " (I John iii. 4). It is not, therefore, to be wondered at that a decision of this nature on man's part should involve very far-reaching results, and the Bible is emphatic that this is just what has happened. A little reflection will show us that Adam's transgression is paralleled daily in our own experience apart from the keeping grace of the Lord Jesus Christ. And remembering the necessary and intimate connection between man's spirit and his body there is nothing at which to be surprised in the fact that the transgression had results which affected both parts of man's nature.

But just as man's dual nature has been spoiled by his sin, so that nature has been redeemed in its entirety by Christ. Our Lord's death secures the justification of every sinner who will accept " the gift by grace." (Romans v. 15). The believer has been now justified by Christ's blood (Romans v. 9). That is to say, he is put back spiritually into the right relationship with God from which Adam fell by his transgression, and in which alone man can find his true satisfaction.

Spiritually this becomes true as soon as ever a man by faith accepts the reconciliation, as multitudes can testify from their own happy experience. They know that the cloud between them and God has gone, that they have been brought back again into that right and happy relationship with Him, and that life henceforth for them is a new thing.

But they are still face to face with the consequences of sin in the body. Even if Christ be in them, and they in Christ, their " body is dead because of sin " (Romans viii. 10). But the redemption which our Lord secured through His passion and death is something which includes man's whole nature, body as well as spirit. Man, therefore,

is still "waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of the body" (Romans viii. 23).

This redemption of the body is to be realised at our Lord's Second Coming. "We shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump." (I Corinthians xv. 51-2). What this change will involve is, of course, something which is entirely outside our own experience, and about which we know nothing. But it seems clear that the resurrection body somehow partakes of the characteristics of the present mortal body. (I Corinthians xv. 42 f). And this is consistent with the fact that man is declared to have been made in the image of God. We saw at the outset that this included the capacity for sharing the resurrection, whatever else it might mean.

The foregoing is an attempt to set forth briefly the Bible teaching concerning ourselves. It is teaching which is at many points being sharply criticised to-day, as indeed it has often been. And it is, therefore, teaching which is all the more necessary for the Christian unflinchingly to urge upon the attention of his fellowmen.

The Word and the Wisdom of God.

BY T. MILLER NEATBY, M.A., M.D., CANTAB., M.A., LOND.

ONLY by the Evangelist John is the title "Word" (in the Greek, 'Logos') applied to the Second Person of the Holy Trinity.

For Matthew, Christ is "Great David's Greater Son," heir of his throne and Israel's promised Messiah. For Mark, He is the Divine Servant. For Luke, He is the Perfect Man. For John, He is the Word, the Son of God, Himself God blessed for ever.

The abrupt introduction, without preliminary or explanation, of this title in the first verse of St. John's Gospel shows that the Logos, a conception hovering uncertainly upon the confines of theology and of philosophy, was familiar—superficially, at least,—to those for whom the Apostle was writing. What, then, is the meaning of this title "The Word," applied by St. John to our Lord?

From a very early date philosophic Greeks had perceived at the heart of the visible ordered world or 'cosmos' a rational principle which they called the 'logos' or "reason." They argued, reasonably enough, that a world that displayed such order revealed also an ordering intelligence. Many of them—the Stoics, for example—rejecting, as do the fashionable scientific pantheists of to-day, the idea of a personal and transcendental intelligence, located the 'Logos' in the 'cosmos' itself.

Others, more intelligently, regarded the supreme intellectual principle—or principles, for some of them held that there were several—as independent of, and above, the material world, and as an emanation or creation of the Supreme Being.

Philo, the Jewish philosopher, born shortly before the Christian era and living his whole life in Alexandria, wrote as a Jew, zealous indeed for monotheism but deeply attracted by Greek speculative