

The Theology of P. T. Forsyth and its Significance for us Today

BY RICHARD E. HIGGINSON

PETER TAYLOR FORSYTH, one time Principal of Hackney College, London, was one of the most challenging, and possibly the greatest *theologian*, especially in the sphere of dogmatics, in Great Britain this century. After a temporary eclipse he has come into his own again since the centenary of his birth in 1948 and the reprint of some of his books by the Independent Press. Yet he has never been appreciated at his true worth because the obscurities in his style and the arresting nature of his ideas have never been in step with the prevailing fashion in theology. Unfortunately for him he did not live in an age which was concerned with theology as such. The popular taste preferred something less realistic than he could give, or would do so. In the scientific field he was also out of step because the scholars working therein were engaged in other interests than his own. He lived in the heyday of higher criticism, and while not despising it as a necessary medium for preparing the ground for dogmatic reconstruction, he felt that the finest critic was often incapacitated from rendering service to theology by his preoccupation with preliminaries. He lived in a day when men's minds were wrapped up in the doctrine of the Fatherhood of God. Forsyth was in continual opposition to the way in which this biblical doctrine was held by his colleagues. His grasp of moral realities was greater than theirs and he did not conceive it as an obvious doctrine. It depended entirely upon the place Jesus Christ occupied in the scheme of things. Christology could not be treated as a matter of subordinate moment. It imperilled soteriology, which is central to the Gospel. Forsyth supplied what the churches needed, but not what they wanted. In this sense he was, to use Dr. J. K. Mozley's description, "a prophetic theologian". His contemporaries failed to realize the fact and he was left out in the cold. He was big enough, and humble enough, for the task of challenging the liberal tendencies of his day without belonging to the obscurantist camp. When the "*New Theology*" was all the rage its chief challenge came from Forsyth who pointed out that a real knowledge of theology was the indispensable requirement for a revision of theology. This factor his opponents lacked in no small measure. Before he ended his life's work, discerning scholars were beginning to note his real worth, but it was left to this era to pay him lip service.

* * * *

Forsyth never wrote a formal treatise and it is impossible to sketch his thought as though it were a logical and coherent system. Yet there are few loose ends to his thinking. The three books which approach orderliness are *The Principle of Authority*, which is a monumental work demanding close attention and patient study; *The Justification of God*, which is a statement of a Christian theodicy, written during the first world war when the question uppermost in the

minds of many was simply, "Why did God allow it?"; and *The Person and Place of Jesus Christ*, possibly the greatest of his books and one worthy of study by all, whether lay or cleric, student or pastor, theologian or inquirer.

The distinctive feature in Christianity in the eyes of Forsyth was the Gospel. Nowhere does he give such a declaration of its greatness as in *Positive Preaching and Modern Mind*, the Yale Lectures for 1907. His own generation was engrossed by such categories as the Bible and the Church, the individual and society. His concern was with the Gospel which created the Church and sustained it, and was the controlling principle in the Bible for which it existed as a book, to convey to all generations the good news of salvation in Christ Jesus. Through the Gospel the individual was recreated and made into a true member of Society, which needed such a dynamic transformation of its members to save it from disintegration.

He produced a popular work, in conjunction with Dr. Munro Gibson, on the nature of the Bible, but his most serious contribution to the subject was written for the *Hibbert Journal*, October, 1911, entitled "Revelation and Bible". He began by suggesting that the old method of handling the Bible had broken down through the newer methods of historical criticism. It could no longer be regarded as an inerrant text-book, and revelation could not be equated with the words of Scripture. Rather he viewed the Bible as a necessary medium for the preservation of the record and the propagation of the Gospel. The Bible was the outward and visible sign, the Gospel the inward and spiritual grace. "The Bible is at once a document of man's religion and, more inwardly and deeply, a form of God's word, and the chief form that we now have; but it wears a human and historic shape, it is not immune from weakness, limitations, and error. The Bible is the great sacrament of the Word, wherein the elements may perish if only the Word itself endure." It is easy enough to *assert* such things, it is not so easy to *ascertain* such things.

God's redeeming action in Christ Jesus, by which He reveals His holy love and grace to guilty man, has its enduring witness in the Bible and in the Church. The company of all faithful people are as vital to the preservation and proclamation of the Gospel as the Bible is, only in a different way. Ministry and Sacraments both prolonged God's great ACT, the redemption of the world, by conveying it and portraying it in preaching and rites. This concern for the true nature of the *Church* was completely out of fashion in Forsyth's era. His colleagues were engrossed with the idea of the coming of the Kingdom of God. They had little time and thought for the Church with its dogmatic creed. They were working for the Kingdom and pressing individuals to enter it, but such atomistic individualism was foreign to the Gospel. Christ died to redeem the world, He represented the race in His agony on Calvary. "It was the race that Christ redeemed, and not a mere bouquet of believers. It was a Church He saved, and not a certain pale of souls. Each soul is saved in a universal and corporate salvation. To be a Christian is not to attach one's salvation to a grand individual, but it is to enter Christ; and to enter Christ is in the same act to enter the Church which is in Christ" (*The Church and*

Sacraments, p. 40). His grasp of the Church principle was different from that of his Free Church colleagues. In that decade the Church was regarded as a religious club, or a coterie of likeminded pious people. In this Forsyth respected the Church of Rome which had not lost its conception of the Church in that of the Kingdom as the Free Churches of his day had. For him the Church was the Kingdom of God in the making, the scaffolding for the erection of the final structure.

In a decade that viewed the Sacraments as mere signs and means of recalling Christ's Passion he stated a positive doctrine in relation to them. They were actions setting forth the Gospel and preaching the Cross. Yet his treatment is more brilliant than satisfying on the whole, and lacks that historical examination of questions which are rooted in events, and cannot be described solely in a scintillating phrase. His handling of this subject belongs more to *ideas*, suggestive and valuable in the extreme, but merely ideas for all that. He protested against reducing the two sacraments to "memorial rites", and dismissed the idea of the sacrament as heavenly food as too theosophic, and limited his conception to the *Word Visible* aspect. Preaching he would include as the other great sacrament. Through the medium of man's word God uttered His own significant word to the believing soul. By its instrument Christ became contemporaneous as the Spirit spoke to the conscience of its guilt and need, and of the offer of pardon in a Saviour crucified and risen.

* * * *

Dr. Sydney Cave, in his tribute to his master, has a touching yet telling testimony to give. He says: "In the clarification of my thought I owe much to theologians, but Dr. Forsyth has been to me much more than a great theologian. In the faith, of which theology is the expression, I owe to him a debt I owe to none except my parents. They led me in childhood to that knowledge of Christ which is life's best possession, but it was from Dr. Forsyth that I learned to realize the holiness of God, the infinite condescension of divine grace, and the strange and humbling experience of God's forgiveness, so that devotion to Christ as a beloved Master passed into, and remains, an awed and grateful faith in God whose holiness and power are manifested in Christ's Cross and Resurrection." This brings us to the heart of Forsyth's message. He was a prophet of the Cross. No one in modern times has penetrated nearly so far into the moral reality of the Cross as he did. "Christ was driven by His experience to recognize that the crowning thing He came for was to die" (*The Cruciality of the Cross*, p. 83). The theology of the atonement meant ethic at its intensest. The Cross was the moral and religious centre of the world. It was God's own act. Nothing so clearly revealed the holiness of God, who judged sin and redeemed the sinner in the act of reconciliation through the Cross of Christ. Forsyth did not merely reiterate the penal theory of the atonement; he gave it new life and meaning and emphasis. His concern was to do justice to the unshakeable foundation of justification by faith in Christ alone. Hence his stress upon the "finished work" of Christ upon the Cross. The salvation of the race, of the Church, and of the individual (in that order) was grounded

in this strange act of God in Christ at Calvary. As Dr. H. F. Lovell Cocks says: "It was the lack of this note that made theology of his day so impotent to speak to nations or to achieve anything beyond ambulance work." The Cross is the vindication of the moral order of the universe. Indeed, it is its source.

Why must holiness be satisfied before love can forgive? Forsyth is emphatic that the work is of God. Christ is not interposed between the stricken sinner and the divine thunderbolts. There is no question of playing off the attributes the one against the other. Divine love did not mollify divine holiness. The love that saves us is *holy love*. God in His holiness secures the moral order of the universe by judging sin in the person of the Son of His love. Christ as the suffering servant is God's gift to the world, but given through the willingness of the Son to do the will of His Father. This is grace in action so that salvation is not mere salvage work, but the most radical thing in the world. We are not saved unless the Creator saves us. The omnipotent God acts in love and holiness at Calvary, where He hallows His holy Name by dealing with *sin*. "Christ bore God's penalty on sin. That penalty was not lifted even when the Son of God passed through it." "The atoning thing being the holy obedience to the Holy, the same holiness which satisfies God, sanctifies us" (*The Work of Christ*, p. 222). This "holiness of Christ was the one thing damnatory to the Satanic power. And it was His death which consummated that holiness. It was His death, therefore, that was Satan's final doom . . . and what we call the last judgment is only the completion of the deadly judgment passed on collective evil in the Cross" (*Missions in State and Church*).

We may thus summarize the section: an ethical atonement is secured by holy love in action for the redemption of man from his lost estate. Where there is holiness there must be judgment. The whole moral crisis comes to a head in the opposition between God's holiness and the sin of the world. There is the *divine* necessity for a cross. "The sacrifice is the result of God's grace and not its cause. It is given by God before it is given to Him" (*The Cruciality of the Cross*, pp. 52f.). The same note is sounded again in *The Work of Christ*: "The real meaning of an objective atonement is that God Himself made the complete sacrifice. The real objectivity of the atonement is not that it was made to God, but by God. It was atonement made by God, not by man" (p. 92).

* * * *

Most modern works, in dealing with the atonement, stress the inclusive humanity of Christ. As man He was offering to God what man could not offer by way of penitence and satisfaction. The confusion existing to-day in sacramental theology in the Church of England is due to misunderstanding at this point. There is too close an identification of Christ with His Church, without the corresponding truth of His difference from us being stressed, or recognized. "Christ is more precious to us by what distinguishes Him from us than by what identifies Him with us" (*The Principle of Authority*, p. 207). This aspect is not congenial to mid-century churchmen as it was not to the first

decade of Free Churchmen in this present century. Forsyth is not only concerned about atonement and its centrality to the Christian faith and the faith of the Christian, but he is also concerned with Christology. A true doctrine of Christ's Person is imperative to a proper understanding of His work. It is a tragedy that students of theology in their college course do not read Forsyth's masterpiece, *The Person and Place of Jesus Christ*. Its greatness cannot be disputed, even though it does not handle the subject from an examination point of view, nor provide ready answers to the questions it raises. There is a solemn grandeur in his handling of this majestic theme which never fails to arrest the thoughtful reader whenever he turns afresh to the book for guidance. His best work went into the making of it, and he does justice to the best interests of both theology and religion in it. It is impossible, he argues, to find the secret of Christ's greatness in His teaching about the fatherhood of God and His ethical demands on the soul. With such themes the churches of his day were more than preoccupied. This line is weak because it does not face the full content of Christ's own self-consciousness, that is, His sense of mission, of finality, of revelation, and the atoning work of His cross is omitted simply because He could not speak to His apostles of that which remained to be accomplished. Through them He spoke to the world of its final meaning and perennial power. When Forsyth treats the pre-existence of Christ he does not follow the well worn track of patristic theology and grapple with the nature of the Logos. He interprets Christ pre-incarnate through the categories of Sonship, as did the apostles and the wise master builders who followed them. No belief does justice to Christ as the Divine Son, in time and in eternity, which lays its stress elsewhere. This fact has been vindicated in the *life* of the ongoing Church as well as its most vigorous *thought*. In dealing with the problem set by the incarnate life of the Son of God, Forsyth breaks new ground. Through the twin notions of kenosis and plerosis he threads his way through the labyrinth. Of special interest is his handling of Christ's manhood with relation to the possibility of sinning. In answer to the question—which is the true formula: *potuit non peccare* or *non potuit peccare*?—he affirms the second rather than the first. At first sight this may appear to threaten the reality of Christ's manhood. Forsyth argues that what is possible is the reality of temptation and testing, but not that of sin! He knows how great a strain he is placing upon thought at this point in making his assertion. Yet he is only following the path made by the theologians of Chalcedon: "because Christ was true man He could be truly tempted; because He was true God He could not truly sin; but He was not less true man for that" (p. 302).

The most original chapter in the book is that on the *Self-fulfilment of Christ*. Wherein lies the importance of this creative chapter? In a theologian, to whom the reality of Christ's Godhead is essential to Christianity, seizing hold of the idea of an "acquired divinity" and using it to great effect to express a true and complete doctrine of Christ's Person. Hitherto the idea had been opposed to the essential divinity of Christ. This feature occurs time and again in Forsyth. He is able to see the truth at the root of every theological error and

transmute it to the service of the Gospel. Hence "Christ came to be what He always vitally was, by what I have called a process of moral reintegration. He moved by His history to a supernal world that He moved in by His nature" (p. 338). The student of early church history knows what a price the ancients paid for their true and noble insistence upon the reality of the Lord's deity. They were not sufficiently interested in the human life of Jesus. Hence the dreary controversies which arose to rend the unity of the body of Christ . . . two natures, two energies, two wills, etc. With all his fierce opposition to Liberalism with its caricature in the "historical Jesus", Forsyth never lost his grip on the humanity of Jesus. We may take leave to criticize Dr. W. L. Bradley at this point. There are times when Forsyth appears to have a docetic Christ in his ringing the changes as he works out a doctrine far removed in language from the tone of the Synoptic Gospels, yet he is always within reach of his foundation in the life and ministry of Jesus Himself. Dr. J. K. Mozley has pinpointed the issue in quoting from *Religion and Recent Art*. Forsyth is discussing Holman Hunt's picture, "The Shadow of Death," and he affirms: "We never can have a Christ in Art whose divinity is as unmistakeable as His humanity. We have neglected and falsified the humanity in the effort to render such a Christ. Our artistic effort must now, perhaps, be rather to represent the divine Man than the human God. If Art will help us to realize the Man, if imagination will bring near to us, and endear to us, and ennoble for us, the passion and presence of His human life, there are other resources which will keep us in the truth as to His godhead" (p. 195). What he declared in his earlier work on art, he affirmed in his later work on theology.

Certain features are absent from his treatment of the subject. There is no speculative metaphysic nor philosophical theology in it. He distrusted those tendencies in theology which were uppermost in his day. Neither was he concerned with credal definitions and conciliar statements. They were lifeless and belonged to the sphere of textbooks rather than to the experience of the living Church. Religion must not degenerate into mystic theosophy but remain ethically dogmatic and dynamically ethical. The Incarnation was to be interpreted by way of the atonement. "There is the incarnation which puts us at once at the moral heart of reality—the Son made sin rather than the Word made flesh. The incarnation has no religious value but as the background of the atonement" (*Positive Preaching and the Modern Mind*, p. 182).

* * * *

Without doubt Forsyth's largest work was *The Principle of Authority*. This major theme had held his attention throughout his life and reappears in all his writings in one way or another. Thus in delivering the Yale Lectures on preaching in 1907 he declares: "The Gospel for the sensitive (the keynote of the modern ethic) lacks the note of authority which is the modern world's chief need, and which is heard in its power, not in the heart, but in the conscience. Authority's seat and source is not God's love, but God's holiness" (p. 332). This problem is still with us and no nearer of solution. What is the Gospel,

and what is the source of our certainty concerning it? On the one hand is it the "Catholic" insistence on the Church, and on the other hand is it the Protestant insistence on the infallibility of the Bible? Forsyth went behind both Bible and Church to that which is the creator of both—the Gospel of God's redeeming and recreative act in Christ. "Remember that Christ did not come to bring a Bible but to bring a Gospel. The Bible arose afterward from the Gospel to serve the Gospel. The Bible, the preacher, and the Church, are all made by the same thing—the Gospel" (*Positive Preaching and the Modern Mind*, p. 15).

In this day of ecumenism the nature of apostolic authority is important since it gives rise to controversies over the character of the Church as an institution, and the quality of the ministries of the divided church. Forsyth's contribution to this pressing issue appears to have been overlooked. The fifth and sixth lectures of *The Person and Place of Jesus Christ* still offer valid insights into the subject which are needed to-day. Have we in the Apostles a true and inspired interpretation of Christ? With startling and trenchant words he says that "most of the higher pains and troubles of the Church to-day arise from the displacement of its centre of gravity to the Gospels. The Epistles are more inspired than the Gospels. We are in more direct contact with Christ. We are at one remove only. We hear the man who had Christ's own interpretation of His work." If the apostles were wrong in their conception of Christ's saving work, how was it that Jesus did not save them from this initial and fatal error? "Apostolic inspiration, therefore, is a certain action stirred by the heavenly Christ in the soul, by which His first elect were enabled to see the moral, spiritual, and theological nature of the manifestation with a unique clearness, a clearness and explicitness perhaps not always present to Christ's own mind in doing the act" (*The Person and Place of Jesus Christ*, p. 176). This does not mean that the apostles were infallible as men, in the same way that the Pope of Rome claims to be infallible when speaking *ex cathedra*, but right in their proclamation of the central verities of the faith, and human in those things that lie further from the centre. What they offered to the world was a Gospel, a *kerygma*.

This means that authority can never be confined to men or books. It can be mediated through them. The final authority is that of God Himself, exercised in a personal manner upon individuals through delegated channels. This authority begins in the new creation when the soul is brought into touch with the living God through the activity of the Holy Ghost. In this moment of revelation by Christ His Lordship is established and maintained through the fellowship of the Church, the instruction of the Word, read and heard, and the inner testimony of the Holy Spirit. Society at large will only be renovated as this dynamic force converts its members to the sovereignty of the Most High. Political programmes are limited in their success, and society likely to perish because of the radical nature of human sin, until God has established His reign in the individual and in society. This is the burden of Forsyth's major work. It is no narrow gospel, but comprehensive and penetrating, and the outworking of the idea

of authority into every sphere of life. Christ's Gospel answers the situation created by man's sin and reaches out to the whole of humanity. "Humanity is not a mere mass of units. It is an organism with a history." God's treatment of it is redemptive, grounded in history. "The content of this redemption is the living, loving, saving God; its compass is cosmic, its sphere is human history, actual history."

This leads us on naturally to Forsyth's theory of knowledge. He has really provided us with a philosophy of religion and an idea of God. He takes sides with those who lay the emphasis upon the *will*. He is a voluntarist and not an intellectualist. Kant has influenced him at this point. Hence his stress upon ethical religion and moral doctrine. "The last reality, and that with which every man willy-nilly has to do, is not a reality of thought, but of life, and of conscience, and of judgment. We are in the world to act and take the consequences. Action means and matters everything in the world" (*The Cruciality of the Cross*, p. 121). Twentieth century thinkers and theologians are too concerned with ideas. Admittedly "ideas have legs", but so often they are confined to the mind rather than the morals. They are no more than mere subjectivism. What is Christian experience? It is essentially certainty. This is not a product of our own thinking, but of that which is given to us by God in the experience of coming to know Him as the living and true God. This certainty can only exist where there is revelation by God Himself to the believing soul. Faith is "an organ of real knowledge". Yet this faith is the creation and gift of God. As Irenaeus put it: "It is impossible to know God except through God." Forsyth, with his usual epigrammatic form of statement says: "Our knowledge relates not to an object but to a subject who takes the initiative, not to what we reach but to what reaches us, not to something we know but to someone who knows us. It is knowledge not of a known thing but of a knowable God" (*The Principle of Authority*, p. 102). This relationship is established in the conscience and in the will. In that region we are saved and recreated by God's own power. In this moral universe man at last confronts His Maker and Judge and finds salvation in Christ, "commensurate with the sanctity, the majesty, the rock reality of things".

* * * *

Within the space limited to our study it is now necessary to assess the abiding worth of Forsyth's contribution to the current theological debate. This has been done well by Dr. William Lee Bradley in his thesis, *P. T. Forsyth, the Man and His Work* (Independent Press, 1952). He asks the question: is he a man of extraordinary insight or merely a crank? Forsyth appeared to lose the fight in the controversy with the Rev. R. J. Campbell in 1907 over "The New Theology". His writings have been criticized by friend and foe alike because of their bizarre titles and scintillating, but sometimes confusing, wealth of presentation. Dr. James Denney, in a letter to Dr. W. Robertson Nicoll writes: "I enclose a short notice of Forsyth's book, *Missions in State and Church*, which I have found very difficult to read. If this is how one feels who is heartily at one with the writer, how must

it strike the unsympathetic reader? He has more true and important things to say, in my opinion, than anyone at present writing on theology." Writing to the same person about *Christ on Parnassus: Lectures on Art, Ethic, and Theology*, Denney concludes: "I like Forsyth's book very much. It is wonderfully free from his usual peculiarities . . . and really full of ideas and interest." To his sister he writes about a visit to Hackney College to deliver a lecture, and describes his host as "an extremely clever though rather tantalizing man". These insights into his character were never intended for publication, and are the more valuable in showing us what his contemporaries felt about his contributions to the thought of his day.

Dr. A. S. Peake, in the obituary notice in the *Holborn Review*, touches another aspect in answer to the problem postulated for us by Dr. Bradley: "He challenged with ringing, piercing note the tendency of our time to dilute or explain away the vital essence of salvation. For him the death of Christ was not a reassuring message from God that we needed only to repent and His free forgiveness would be bestowed. It was rather the solution devised by God of a moral problem otherwise intractable, a solution which taxed His wisdom while it expressed His love. And behind the challenge thus offered there was the weight of a personality and an equipment which could not be ignored. He spoke as one gifted with prophetic vision and power of utterance who was also versed in the learning and wisdom of the schools. A more gracious and sympathetic approach might have opened some hearts to his message which were closed by resentment at his tone."

Dr. W. L. Bradley ends his summary with the conviction that "the present interest in Forsyth will decline, but it is unlikely that he will be forgotten as he was before. Theology has caught up with him now." I cannot share this view. Theology has not yet completely caught up with P. T. Forsyth. In its present preoccupation with the doctrine of the Church, ecumenism has only just commenced its task. The ultimate question concerning the *foundation* of the Church has yet to be asked. Hitherto the questions of order and government have reigned supreme. The time will come when men will ask deeper questions. What makes the Church the *Church*? Lying at the root of all these discussions is the fact of a valid atonement with perennial power to convert the unreached with the good news of salvation. No work of outstanding merit on the Atonement has been produced (with the exception of *The Death of Christ* by James Denney) in this century. Several attempts have been made to provide a synthesis of current views. Perhaps Forsyth will come into his own again in this sphere? Unfortunately his three books on this subject were only occasional productions and lack that systematic treatment which would have made them enduring. Yet even here Forsyth would affirm that religious works should never be systematic since that feature belongs to philosophy proper. To reduce religion to a system is to destroy it. The only value of one great book on the subject would have been the clearing up of his meaning in places where it is doubtful. As Dr. Peake put it, "this amazing gift of expression was combined with a real defect in the gift of conveying his precise meaning, even to sympa-

thetic and intelligent readers". Because of this characteristic his contributions have been described as "fireworks in a fog". Peake alters the metaphor: "Many a reader has been left dazed by a series of electric flashes which did not succeed in dispelling the obscurity that gathered around the subject." A generation reared on Barth and Bultmann does not feel the same difficulty, or perhaps they rely more on the reviewers to present them with a "digest" which suffices. Forsyth's value to younger men lies in his ability still to enable them to preach a redemptive Gospel with intellectual conviction. His books may tax the reader, and he may see distinctions and differences where the plain man does not, nevertheless the cumulative effect of his books is tremendous. He is at one with critical scholarship, yet no modernist. While others are bewildered by the processes, he is reaching out for the chief gains. With all the passion of his soul he presents Jesus Christ, as Son of God and Saviour. Mind and heart go into the preaching of the Gospel. An index to his real worth is given by Canon J. K. Mozley in his invaluable text-book on the doctrine of the atonement. More space is given to Forsyth than to any other of the moderns. Forsyth is concerned to defend and to interpret in modern categories the central verities of the Gospel of the grace of God. The finest critique of Forsyth's theology is that provided by Dr. Mozley in his book *The Heart of the Gospel* (S.P.C.K., 1925). Indeed, the book is dedicated to him in grateful and affectionate remembrance.

The greatness of Forsyth lies in his feeling the pulse of Christianity and recognizing its weaknesses. He begins his *magnum opus* with these words: "The conviction in these pages is that the principle of authority is ultimately the whole religious question." He saw the critical importance of the theme in a day of revolt against it. So many of his colleagues had lost themselves in lesser issues. To this centre ecumenism must sooner or later return. "By what authority doest thou these things, and who gave thee this authority?" Forsyth is at pains to point out that authority expressed in terms of statutory law, institutional religion, or even religious experience, is not final but secondary, and derived from an ultimate source, which is found in God alone. These delegated authorities find their sanction in the measure that they convey God's sovereign rule. Our Holy Overlord uses these lesser ordinances of Bible, Church, and experience to express His own dominion over the soul. In this humble submission is found "perfect freedom". In Forsyth's day this vast subject was neglected. Yet, as Dr. John Oman has shown, "the ultimate problem of the last two centuries has been the relation of faith and freedom". Forsyth's answer is given in terms of the Cross. "That is where our real faith is fixed—on the finished redeeming work of the Saviour on the Cross, sealed indeed in the resurrection but finished on the Cross, published in the resurrection but achieved on the Cross" (*Positive Preaching and the Modern Mind*, p. 270).