

THE PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY.

NO. 35.—JANUARY, 1896.

I. THE NEW CHRISTOLOGY.

THE completion of Dr. Gerhart's *Institutes*¹ prepares the way for a full consideration of the theory which the distinguished author sets forth and maintains. The volumes give us a new work on systematic theology. They emanate from the Reformed (German) Church. They are able and entertaining. The spirit of their author is calm and reverent; his mind is broad and grasping; his method is positive and constructive rather than polemical and controversial; his style is plain and vigorous. The work possesses great value, but that value is chiefly negative, because these volumes are a concrete demonstration of the utter inability of modern progressives to fulfil their promises of a new theology and to make good their criticisms upon the old. Others of this school have written incisively upon topics in theology, and have had the polemical advantage of having that particular topic separated to itself, so that it could not be reinforced from the general system of truth to which it belonged; but Dr. Gerhart, bolder, braver, fairer, and truer than all his school, undertakes the construction of a system. His mind sees, and his heart feels, that, if the new principle be

¹ *Institutes of the Christian Religion*. By Emanuel V. Gerhart, D. D., LL. D., Professor of Systematic and Practical Theology in the Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church at Lancaster, Pa. Complete in two octavo volumes, 1744 pages; per volume, \$3.00. New York, London, and Toronto: Funk & Wagnalls Company. 1894.

He, it must have both the courage and the ability to organize and articulate all the facts of theological science into a harmonious system. He undertakes the task which is thus logically imposed, and prosecutes it with as little special pleading as is possible. The work has been done as well as it could be done. That it is a failure is not due to Dr. Gerhart, but to the organizing principle with which he wrought. He is able, but his theologic principle is weak. His logic is prevailingly good, but his premises are prevailingly bad. His reverence and devoutness are everywhere manifest. He loves Christ; he loves the truth. He moves from a false centre. This is the single and sufficient explanation of all the entanglements in which he involves the gospel and all theology. These volumes are another proof of the indestructibility of Calvinism. Having withstood Pelagianism and Arminianism, Dr. Gerhart's failure will evidence its superiority to the new theology, which may be denominated *Christologicalism*.¹

The true method of investigation in any science is *natural*. The student follows the structure of the object. He does not make, but finds and follows, natural cleavage lines. He does not force his way along paths of his own making; that would be to be arbitrary and artificial. As Goldsmith said of Burke's oratorical method, "He winds into his subject like a serpent." The ancient, mediæval, and Reformation methods in theology were topical. The Trinity was the basis. Beginning with the divine existence and trinal nature of God, the investigator then discussed the acts and works of God in creation, providence, and redemp-

¹ While I was reading these *Institutes*, Dr. Gerhart came to Clarksville on a visit to his brother, who resides here. In this way I made his acquaintance, and enjoyed his fellowship for a few days. He impressed me as a man of great intellectuality and piety. His spirit was sweet, like that of his Master. I heard him preach, and he preached about the kingdom of Christ as one who had come under its power, and whose chief end was to promote its interests. On account of trouble with his eyes, he dictated both of these great volumes to an amanuensis. Because of the place in which I have installed him in my regards, it has been a great pain to me to find so much and so serious fault with his books. However, he would not love the man who would love him more than the truth. The office of an interpreter is always a difficult one. If I have misconstrued him at any point, it will give me great regret.

tion. During the present century Christology has been adopted by some theologians as the genetic topic in theology. They have filled the air with the cry, "Back to Christ." They have charged other systems with carrying the mind of the church away from Christ and centering it upon orthodoxy. In the new, the person of Christ is offered as the Archetype, the Organ, and the End of all theological facts. He, in his theanthropic constitution, is conceived as the pattern, the efficient cause, and the final purpose of all God's acts and revelations. He is these three things with reference to theism, cosmology, angelology, anthropology, hamartiology, soteriology, pneumatology, ecclesiology, and eschatology—the alpha and the omega of all theologizing. The new theology is an evolution, in which Christ, as theanthropic, is the antecedent and original ideal; then the active and organic principle; then the teleological and ultimate end. All began in him; all proceeds through him; all ultimates in him. He is the universal substance, the universal power, the universal phenomenon. Dr. Gerhart's *Institutes* are an earnest and able effort to construct a complete system of theological science "from the Christ-idea as its standpoint"; "it is an earnest effort to make answer to the call for a doctrinal system in which Jesus Christ stands as the central truth; not only as the instrument of redemption and salvation, but also as the beginning and the end of revelation." The Christ-idea is "the fundamental law of Christian doctrine." The incarnation of the Second Person in the Trinity—that was the eternal intention, the efficient means, and the final execution of all the energies of the Divine Being, of the intransitive as well as of the transitive activities of the Deity, of all Trinitarian motions *ad intra* as well as of those *ad extra*. The incarnation is the dynamic centre and purpose of the Godhead and of the universe. The aim is a pious one, namely, to honor the Saviour of sinners.

I. EXPOSITION OF THE NEW CHRISTOLOGY.

1. *The Nature of Christ's Person.* This topic is recognized as one of primary and regulative importance. The new Christology conceives and sets forth Christ as a divine-human person. So far, the language sounds orthodox enough. But the interpretation of

e hyphen, binding together the words "divine" and "human," leads to serious departures from the confessional doctrine of the Reformed churches. What is the nature of this union between divinity and humanity in the person of Christ? The question possesses primary and ruling significance for dogmatics. Dr. Gerhart gives the following interpretation of this union:

"1. The relation between God and man in the person of Jesus Christ is *internal*; it is brought about, not by forces foreign either to the infinitude of the Creator or the finitude of the creature, but by virtue of an original affinity and sympathy between the finite personal creature and the infinite personal Creator; there is adaptation of the nature of each to the nature of the other.

"2. Being internal, the relation is also vital or *organic*. The absolute life of God and the relative life of man become in Christ one personal life.

"3. The organic relation involves *ethical* unity. The life of God is the life of absolute love. The normal life of man is a life of love in God. God's love to man and man's capacity of love towards God are essential conditions of the personal union of God and man in Christ.

"4. The union of divine life of infinite love and of human life of finite love implies an *historical process*. The union has epochs and stages through which it passes according to laws of growth. It has a beginning, an onward progress, and a final consummation."—*Institutes*, Vol. I., p. 155.

These explanatory propositions are very definite. The relation between deity and humanity in Christ is *internal*, *organic*, *ethical*, and *progressive*. What is the import of these words as thus applied? Dr. Gerhart proceeds to make his meaning very plain by expounding these predicates throughout some thirty consecutive pages. In characterizing the union between divinity and humanity in Christ as an *internal* one he means to indicate the cause of that union; by denominating it an *organic* union he points to the metaphysical nature of it; by denominating it *ethical* he designates its moral quality; and by denominating it *progressive* he points out the development of it. These are all important and reconstructive in their influence. I shall attempt to bring out these points yet more clearly.

(1), The union is an internal one. Here we have a denial and an affirmation. It is denied that the union between divinity and humanity in Christ's person is constituted either by the will of God acting sovereignly, or by any circumstances in the history of man, such as his sin and fall. It is affirmed that the union was a necessary one, springing out of a correlation between God and

man. Between God and man there is a reciprocal fitness, a mutual aptitude. Deity craves humanity; humanity equally craves deity. Deity is a necessary complement to humanity; humanity is a necessary complement of deity. Each gravitates towards the other. Deity and humanity meet and merge in Jesus Christ. This union "is not effected by the operation of a cause or influence of an occasion other than the essential nature of God and the essential nature of man." There is no outward force acting upon God's nature, humanizing that nature, nor is there any outward force acting upon man's nature, deitizing it; but the motion in each nature towards the other is spontaneous and subjective; the resultant union is an essential one, the product of normal tendencies, which were eternal in God, but were created in man. The analogue is that of chemical affinity. The result is a divine-human person. "If human nature were not assumed into organic union with God, the original idea of manhood would fail of final actualization. The constitution of finite personality would be radically deficient." The converse of this, though not formally stated, is logically implied and plainly hinted: "If divine nature were not assumed into organic union with man, the original idea of Godhood would fail of final actualization. The constitution of infinite personality would be radically deficient." The author does say: "God and man become a unity in Jesus by virtue of a law of reciprocal demand immanent in both—in God as Creator, and in man as the crown of creation" (Vol. I., p. 158.) If the incarnation is the result of a demand immanent in the essential nature of God, prior to the incarnation God was a deficient God, even as man was a deficient man. Upon this first point the explicit teaching is, that the union between humanity and divinity in Christ was the result of reciprocal demands immanent in both God and man.

(2), The union is organic. This is the second feature of the union between humanity and divinity in Christ. "God and man are not composite parts of the Christ. Nor are they in juxtaposition. But Jesus is the God-man, the divine-human personal organism. . . . An organism is neither compounded of parts, nor does it consist of parts; it is a unity in which the whole and the

parts are alike original. . . . The personal One at the instant of conception was neither God as God, nor man as man, but a new creation, in which the life of deity and the life of humanity, Spirit and spirit, became one twofold principle in embryo. The divine factor supposes and includes the dynamic presence of humanity; the human supposes and includes the dynamic presence of deity." (Vol. I., pp. 159, 160.)

Here is an advance upon the church doctrine of the hypostatic union. According to the Reformed creeds, the union between humanity and divinity in Christ is personal. The metaphysical bond is personality. In the new Christology this bond is vital. Its metaphysical nature is life. The result is a "vital unity" instead of a personal unity. Christ is neither God nor man, but a third sort of being, called divine-human. His essence needs to be expressed by a new word, *theanthropicity*. "In the Son, the Creator and the creature, the infinite and the finite, the heavenly and the earthly, meet. Opposition and diversity are resolved into oneness and harmony." (Vol. I., p. 168.) As to the nature of his being, Jesus Christ is a metaphysical blend of deity and humanity. According to the established Christology, Christ is very God and very man, but one person; personally considered, he is a unit, but realistically considered, he is two. The new Christology considers him as both a personal and a metaphysical unit at one and the same time. His metaphysical, monistic substance is theanthropic in its essential and formative nature.

(3), This union is ethical. We have seen that divinity and humanity came together in Christ under the influence of reciprocal demands immanent in both divinity and humanity. We have seen that the resultant of such a union was a metaphysical, monistic, theanthropic organism. Now, it is further affirmed that this union possessed an ethical quality also; that is, God would have sinned and man would have sinned, had there been no incarnation of the Son. How shall we ground the morality of an immanent law, a movement which is the result of the essential nature of God and the essential nature of man? Appetencies which are connatural are generally construed as morally complexionless. Free agency and voluntariness are generally under-

stood to be the prerequisites of moral responsibility. But the incarnation was the result of demands which were immanent in both divinity and humanity. What, then, is the basis of the ethical character of such an incarnation? The new Christology works out an answer to this question in this way: "God is absolute spirit. The nature of absolute spirit is love. . . . Love is reciprocal. God's love to man implies man's capacity of loving God. . . . Love has its own sphere and its own conditions. The condition of love is love." (Vol. I., p. 169.) Love requires love. God is absolute love; that love ethically demands a responsive human love. Man is relative love; that love ethically demands a responsive divine love. To realize these reciprocal demands of divine and human love, the incarnation becomes an ethical necessity; without it, God could not fulfil his uncreated obligations to humanity; without it, man could not fulfil his created obligations to God. In Christ, God fully meets his moral obligations to man, and man fully meets his moral obligations to God. Hence the ethical quality of the incarnation is grounded in the essential nature of love.

(4), The union was progressive. It grew and developed. What grew and developed? This vital unity, the divine-human person. "This historical process is to be predicated of the organic whole, of the one person, Jesus, the Christ of God, in whom the divine nature and the human nature are a unity. The entire Christ is historical. We may not say that the human nature alone developed itself agreeably to the laws of growth, the divine nature being meanwhile unaffected. . . . God is, indeed, the infinite being; but infinite being is not rigid fixedness. . . . At his birth deity in Jesus was an infinite potentiality, a fulness of divine being, which was gradually actualized, from point to point, in his life, in his will and consciousness. No less God metaphysically at his birth than at his glorification, yet at his glorification the process of ethical unification had become complete. The status of his personal history was reached when the divine nature had imparted the largest measure of its fulness to the human nature, and human nature had developed the highest spiritual capacity of appropriating the infinitude of God." (Vol. I., pp. 175, 176.)

Christ is the unit which is presented for analysis to the theo-

logical chemist. By analysis he finds that this person is constituted of two elements—divinity and humanity. He also finds that there is a third element—that which unites them in his person. Why do they combine in his person to form the divine-human unit? The answer is, because of a law of reciprocal affinity immanent in both. When they are thus combined by this power of affinity, they make a neutral third, neither divine nor human, but a theanthropic and vital organism. But because of the nature of the combining elements, the personal unit possesses not merely physical qualities, but moral qualities also. And still further, because of the nature of the unit thus formed, it is capable of growth and improvement. Such is the Christ of the new Christology. “He is the ideal man,” the goal of the evolutionary struggle of humanity. He is also, by logical implication, the *ideal God*, for the essential nature of deity contains an immanent demand for humanity, even as humanity contains an immanent demand for “infinite of God.” Without humanity, God is deficient; without deity, man is deficient. Jesus Christ is the God-man—the ideal God, and the ideal Man.

The biblical representations of the person of the Redeemer make him to be a *complex* person, constituted of two natures. He is not merely God, nor merely man, but a union of both. He is a God-man. Four factors are necessary to a complete conception of the person of Christ: (1), True and proper deity; (2), True and proper humanity; (3), The union of deity and humanity in one person; (4), The distinction of deity from humanity in the one person, so that there be no mixture of natures. The Unitarians deny the deity of Christ; the Apollinarians deny his humanity; the Nestorians deny the unity of his personality; the Monophysites deny the duality of his natures. We understand this new Christology to be monophysitic in its character; that is, that the divinity and humanity in Christ unite to form one nature, and this new compound nature is denominated *divine-human*, or *theanthropic*.

2. *The Necessity of the Incarnation.* According to the confessional Christology, the necessity of the incarnation of the Son of God was purely pactional. The advent of the Second Person of

the Godhead, and his whole human history, became a necessity because of sin and the covenant of grace. Had there been no fall, and had there been no purpose of redemption, there would have been no incarnation. Christ came into the world to save sinners; had there been no sinners and no salvation, Christ would not have come into the world. The decree of election grounds the decree of incarnation. But the new Christology refers the incarnation to a necessity which was original and absolute. It affirms that there would have been an incarnation if Adam had never fallen. A glorified Christ, being the last in a divine-human series, was the first in the intention of God, so that the whole world and all world-history came into existence as so many stages or steps towards this final end. From this system, as ably developed by Dr. Gerhart, we are able to resolve this general reason for the incarnation into four particulars. From one point of view, the incarnation was a metaphysical necessity; from another, ethical; from a third, incidental; from a fourth, pactional or historical. These points need further development.

(1), The incarnation was metaphysically necessary. A true exposition of the metaphysics of the divine nature will show, as existing in the essential nature of God, an immanent demand for man—an uncreated, original, and necessary affinity of divinity for humanity. Such a primary and native aptitude is one of the facts in the divine constitution. A sound, human metaphysics, on the other hand, will discover a reciprocal, responsive, correlative demand for God immanent in man. Because of this psychological constitution, there is a movement downward of deity to man, and a movement upward of humanity to God. The two movements must meet, else each would fail to realize its ideal. When the two movements did actually meet, a divine-human person was the result, and the incarnation was a fact. In this reciprocal movement of each towards the other, under the influence of a law of attraction immanent in the essential nature of both alike, lies the psychological necessity of the incarnation. The principle of the incarnation is thus grounded “in the reciprocal connection between God and man.” The incarnation was, consequently, for God as well as for man. A few extracts will at once prove and clarify this position.

"The advent is in the first instance referable to God. In a subordinate sense it is referable also to man; referable to both, the personal Creator and the personal creature, in their reciprocal vital connection. Therefore, the advent is not an afterthought, not a supplement of the first creation; it is anticipated by the divine idea of the world. . . . The divine idea anticipates an actual development of the world from an inchoate beginning, through a succession of kingdoms, a history in time, and a given teleology. The proximate end of the creative process from below upward was the primeval man, the first Adam; the ultimate end of the primeval man, and through him the end of the entire creative work, was the ideal man, the last Adam. Conformably to the logic of universal history, grounded in the divine idea of creation, which, under the direction of Providence, is in process of normal actualization, the Christ comes into the world. . . . To man's nature in its original relation to God, the advent is referable by virtue of the fact that human personality is formed in God's image. . . . Man as man, apart from his sinfulness and misery, demands a transition from the lower to the higher plane of life; a transition from his original actual state in the domain of the natural and earthly, a transcendent state in the domain of the spiritual, world. Conformably to this profound human demand, a demand which is the outcome of God's own eternal purpose actualized in man's creation, God moves from heaven toward earth, descending in the person of his Son into the organic depths of humanity. . . . The ground of the advent is to be seen in both (God and man) as connected by the economy of creation. . . . If we look upon the incarnation, the advent of the Son of God in human nature, as having its grounds in God's eternal purpose respecting the history and scope of the universe, it will be seen to be not an afterthought, not an appendix devised by divine wisdom to supplement a defect in the plan of creation, or to display and glorify punitive justice, or merely to remove the consequences of man's failure. . . . In purpose and in possibility, the birth and history of Jesus Christ antedate both the fall of man and the fall of angels. More than this, it antedates the very beginning of the work of creation." (Vol. II, pp. 173-177.)

Comment is unnecessary. The passage grounds the necessity of the incarnation in the original, constitutional, and metaphysical connection between God and man. The passage is supported by the catholic teachings of both volumes. The same position is taken by Bishop Martensen in his *Dogmatics*, by Principal Fairbairn in his *Christ in Modern Theology*, and by Dr. Stearns in his *Present Day Theology*. The doctrine rules a certain type of modern Christology.

(2), The necessity of the incarnation is not only metaphysical; it is also ethical. The advent of Christ is thus grounded in the moral relations between God and humanity. Had there been no advent, there would have been no actualization of either metaphysical or moral being; such a failure would have been at once a consummate blunder and an atrocious crime.

"The organic relation [between God and man] involves ethical unity. The life of God is the life of absolute love. The normal life of man is a life of love in God. God's love to man and man's love towards God are essential conditions of personal union of God and man in Christ." (Vol. I., p. 155.)

"Not the physical only, but the ethical also, enters into the idea of the incarnation. The love of God to man conditions the love of man to God. If God were not absolute love, if man were not created in the image of absolute love, there would not be in God the aptitude of life-communion with man. Man occupies towards God a reciprocal attitude. . . . On the basis of vital affinity is developed ethical reciprocity. The organic union is perfected by the ethical union. And the ethical union, like organic unity, involves a process. . . . Ethical unity does not identify the two factors of our Lord's personal life. . . . This process of ethical oneness presents two phases. . . . The process of ethical transformation of human nature into ideal oneness with the Son of God is the process of self-assertion of distinctively true manhood." (Vol. I., pp. 168-173.)

"The tap-root and the immutable law of the advent is the eternal principle of love, the communion of love in the glory of the tri-personal Godhead." (Vol. II., p. 177.)

The law which rules the incarnation is the law of love. That law exists in and over the essential nature of God, and in and over the essential nature of man. God is love; man is the image of love. The law of love requires that love shall love love; God is under an ethical obligation to love himself because he is love, and to love man because he is the image of love; and man is under an ethical obligation to love God because he is love, and to love himself because he is the image of love. The ethical principle is subjective to the very nature of love. In order for love to fulfil its ethical duties to itself, it must, so to speak, create an object which will unify itself—a divine-human person, who is love's ideal and ethical satisfaction. The law of love holds reciprocal sway over God and man, and immanently draws them together into ethical oneness, and that ethical unit is Christ. If we think of the incarnation as not taking place, we must think of love as disappointed—as morally wronged and outraged. Love is the essential nature of God, and man as originally constituted is like God; love has a moral right to an object upon which it can fully and happily expend itself, for self-manifestation is of the very essence of love; hence, were there no incarnation, love would be wronged, and through love God would be wronged in his essential nature. The union, then, between God and man in Christ was not only organic and metaphysical, but it was also judicial and ethical. The

incarnation was a moral necessity, and the morality of that necessity was reciprocal between God and man; it was not, therefore, a duty which was purely and only pactional in its obligation, but one which was original, springing out of the inmost law of love reigning over divinity and humanity. From an ethical law of love as a premise, the new Christology in this way evolves the moral necessity of the advent of Christ.

(3), The necessity of the incarnation is not only metaphysical and ethical, but it is also incidental, that is, the grounds of the incarnation are partly circumstantial and adventitious. Here the new Christology is in sharp conflict with the old Christology. According to the traditional doctrine, the advent of sin and God's elective purpose concerning redemption are the exclusive reasons for the advent of Christ. Had there been no sin, there would have been no incarnation. Had there been no decree of redemption, there had been no enfleshment of the Son of God. But for the episode of the fall, there had been no assumption of humanity by divinity. What, therefore, the new Christology construes as an incidental and accidental reason for the incarnation, the old Christology postulated as principiant and exclusive; what, in the one system, is a secondary reason, in the other system is primary and of exclusive importance.

"The original communion of love between God and man is, however, by itself insufficient to explain the actual character of the advent. Due account has to be made of man's sinful condition, and the abnormal relation of the race to God which sinfulness involves. This abnormal relation is not really a factor of the advent. . . . The sent one of God, Christ, comes as the revelation of eternal love to a fallen world. He not only accomplishes the purpose of divine sovereignty, but he also satisfies the sympathy and compassion of God. God so loved our apostate race that he gave his only begotten Son. No less really does Christ come to satisfy all our human needs, especially the needs growing out of the prevalence of sin and the dominion of Satan. Whosoever believeth on the Christ shall not perish, but have eternal life. In revealing the divine compassion he becomes the Saviour of sinners; in coming to save sinners from the condemnation of sin he fulfils eternal love in the character of grace and mercy." (Vol. II, pp. 178-182.)

The fall affected both God and man. The change so wrought was both metaphysical and ethical in its character. Man and God are metaphysically and morally correlated to each other. Sin is an abnormal disturbance of that correlation, a foreign interfer-

ence with the reciprocal gravitation of divinity and humanity towards each other; if let alone, sin would prevent the union, but that union must be effected both for metaphysical and ethical reasons, hence the necessity of the incarnation; it was necessary to a normal and ideal evolution. But there is another point of view. God loves man; man becomes sinful and miserable, and these new attributes of his moral being elicit God's love in the forms of grace and mercy; they do not destroy the divine love, they only intensify it; hence, the original necessity for the incarnation rising out of the law of love is, by the fall, simply intensified. Sin and the covenant of grace made because of sin do not create the original necessity for the advent of Jesus; they modify that original necessity; they enhance, but do not make, the necessity for the birth of the Son of God and his history in human flesh. The new necessity is twofold—original and accidental.

(4), But there is yet a fourth ground of necessity for the incarnation. We have seen that it was made necessary by the very metaphysics of divinity and humanity, by the ethical relations of the two, and by the accidental fact of sin as a disturbing and disuniting factor in the metaphysical and ethical evolutionary process towards an organic oneness of God and man. This fourth factor roots itself in the covenant between God and man; it is pactional in its character.

"The twofold attitude of fallen man—his inborn aptitude for communion with God, and his profound yearning after reconciliation—is the natural basis of the pre-Christian economy of grace, founded by the Abrahamic covenant. A supernatural manifestation of God rooted in the primeval promise and an act of sovereign grace, this economy was no less a direct response from the bosom of Jehovah to the instinctive longings and the intense cries of distress that went forth from the heart of mankind." (Vol. II., p. 183.)

"In the life of the covenant people molded under the training of the law and the prophets we may, therefore, recognize a necessity for the advent of the Messiah which is peculiar." (Vol. II., p. 186.)

"The event [the birth of Jesus] may be said to have been the legitimate outcome of history, the result of natural and human forces, developed, disciplined and ripened by the covenant in the life of the chosen nation; not the result of human powers moving on the plane of 'the natural man,' nor yet merely of human life purified and ennobled by the sanctifying virtue of pre-Christian revelation. The event was the result of a concrete historical necessity; a necessity, on the one hand, referable to God as the author of the world and of man; on the other hand, the result of a necessity present and active in the constitution and

history of the Adamic race as lifted up, molded, and ennobled by the supernatural communication of Jehovah with man in the elect nation. Undoubtedly an event due to supernatural agency, the conception of Jesus is, however, just as certainly a natural mystery. It was the legitimate issue of spiritual laws and forces silently working for ages in the bosom of the Adamic race as individualized in the posterity of Abraham, and nurtured by the covenant." (Vol. II., p. 193.)

We are to think of God as eternally desiring fellowship with man; and we are to think of man as persistently yearning for fellowship with God. This reciprocal desire has an earthward and heavenward movement for gratification. One step towards its actual gratification was the creation of man. The fall damaged, but did not destroy, it. The next positive step towards its realization was the protevangelium, the seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent's head. The third great step was the formation of the Abrahamic covenant, which created a school of discipline in which the Adamic race was to be ripened for the reciprocal fellowship. The fourth step was the historic advent of Jesus, who, in ripening himself for glory, ripened the fellowship and union of God and man. When the evolution of this desire for a divine-human fellowship reached the stage of the Abrahamic covenant, the necessity of the incarnation took on a new form, and became pactional.

We now have the whole teaching as to the ground of the necessity of the incarnation, as set forth by the new Christology, before us. It was necessary, first of all, to realize the metaphysical tendencies which were immanent in the essential nature of both divinity and humanity. It was necessary, in the second place, to realize the ethical correlation between God and man, which was reciprocally ruled by the law of love. It was necessary, in the third place, to reverse the abnormal tendency which set in through the sin and fall of man, and so to prevent both a metaphysical and ethical miscarriage of the reciprocal motions of divinity towards humanity. It was necessary, in the fourth place, in order to fulfil the compact between God and the Adamic race as specialized in Abraham, which compact had been evolved by the co-working of supernatural and natural forces. For these reasons, so the new Christology teaches, it was necessary for God and man to get together—to organically unite in one person.

3. *The Mode of the Incarnation.* Upon this point the new Christology is out of harmony with our ancestral and confessional faith. "Christ, the eternal Son of God, became man by taking to himself a true body and a reasonable soul, and so was and continues to be God and man in two distinct natures, but one person, forever." So wrote the Westminster Assembly in its Catechism. We do not know of a single Reformed confession which goes beyond or falls short of this statement. The Father sent the Son into the world; the Son took to himself a human body and soul; the Spirit fashioned this human nature for him out of the substance of the Virgin Mary. The process of the incarnation is thus conceived and set forth as supernatural, miraculous, and sovereign. On the other hand, the progressive school represent the incarnation as the result of a pantheistic and evolutionary process; it is the product of demands which are immanent in the essential nature of both divinity and humanity.

"Religion is but the symbol of the kindred natures and correlated energies of God and man. It means that each nature seeks the other, is capable of finding it, and is susceptible to its touch." (Fairbairn, *Christ in Modern Theology*, p. 493.)

"The Christ-idea means not only that the Logos became flesh conformably with his own eternal nature, but that he became flesh also according to all the laws and normal processes of humanity. . . . At his birth deity in Jesus was an infinite potentiality, a fulness of divine being, which was gradually actualized, from point to point, in his life, in his will and consciousness. No less God metaphysically at his birth than at his glorification, yet at his glorification the process of ethical unification had become complete. The status of his personal history was reached when divine nature had imparted the largest measure of its fulness to the human nature, and human nature had developed the highest spiritual capacity of appropriating the infinitude of God. The incarnation is in no respect magical. . . . Not man, as man was born of Mary, nor God as God, but Jesus was conceived and born. He who was God in man and man in union with God; he who lived the life of God and the life of man in indissoluble personal unity, *he* was born. The birth of Jesus is an actual historical fact, including his Godhead as really as his humanity." (*Institutes*, Vol. I., pp. 175-196.)

"Jesus Christ in the process of becoming the perfect man realizes himself the divine ideal. . . . God in the person of his Son became man, and man, to appropriate the language of the Athanasian Creed, was 'assumed into God.' A union so real, so indissoluble, argues a profound essential connection between these two terms, God and man. . . . God and man become the same. Either God descends to man, or man ascends to God; either the divine takes possession of man, or man is transformed and deified. . . . His history is the concrete exposition of humanity. From his glorification we learn the truth hidden in pantheism. . . .

God adopts man into union with himself in the person of the incarnate Son, and translates man from present cosmical connections to his own right hand in heaven." (Vol. II., pp. 3-16.)

"The human nature is not less, but more truly, human for such exalted development and fellowship; since such exalted fellowship is none other than the fulfilment of the original intention of the Creator in forming man after his own image. And the divine nature is no less properly divine for the assumption of human nature into itself according to human laws and natural conditions; inasmuch as God's being is the archetype of man's being, and the normal life of man's constitution is the noblest and most perfect organ of God's presence and revelation." (Vol. II., p. 233.)

The idea of an evolutionary and pantheistic incarnation is everywhere taught by this new school. "The Normal Development of Jesus" is the caption of a chapter. The "Jesus" that is developed is a divine-human unit, the divinity in connection with the humanity, as well as the humanity in connection with the divinity. There is in humanity a "latent aptitude for divinization," and there is in divinity a fitness for "life-union with man." Deity is not "rigid fixedness." "God is, as it were, the eternal possibility of being incarnated, man the permanent capability of incarnation." There is an "affinity" between divinity and humanity. The union is effected "gradually" by the law of "kinship." There are ante-natal, natal, and post-natal stages in the process. God moves downwards to man; man moves upwards to God. The union was not constituted; it "became." The "becoming" was by "processes," "stages," and "epochs." At the end of the processes, stages, and epochs stands the "ideal man"—the "glorified Christ." There is a gradual "depotentialization" of deity and reciprocal "impotentialization" of humanity, until the two come into "internal," "organic," and "ethical" union. To a certain extent there is an "impoverishment" of deity and a corresponding "enrichment" of humanity, until finally a level is reached and union takes place. Finally, "the incarnate Son," says Dr. Gerhart, "the seed of the woman, opens into bloom and consummates life in full-grown fruit." We do not understand him, however, as teaching that divinity and humanity are so merged and mixed in the person of Christ as to lose their identity, though he often employs language which would bear this interpretation. We understand him as teaching that there was a process of union, a gradual

and evolutionary and reciprocal approach of deity and humanity, and that this divine-human movement was consummated in the glorification of Christ, when he sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high as the perfectly incarnated God, the ideal man.

4. *The Influence of the Incarnation.* The new Christology construes the incarnation as the central, the ruling, the underlying and informing fact of God and the universe. The incarnation is not a means to an end, but is itself the chief end of itself and all things. In the traditional and confessional theology, the incarnation of the Son is a means to the end of God's glorification of himself in the redemption of sinners; but in the new system, the incarnation is the ultimate end of all activities in the Divine Being and of all activities in human life—the historic goal of all divine and human movements. "The new movement," says Dr. Smyth, "is an endeavor to put all theology upon a christological centre." It insists "that all the doctrines contained in the Protestant confessions shall be lifted bodily up, off from their foundation in a system of decrees, and placed upon a thoroughly ethical and human—in one word, a christological—revelation of God." This new foundation for every theological fact is the "incarnate Word." "Not God's sovereign will, not God's eternal decree, but God himself, God in Christ, is the central truth and glory of Christian life and thought." Dr. Martensen tells us: "The advent of Christ, the revelation of the highest good, cannot be viewed as a means towards something else, but must be looked upon as its own end; all things, all nature, and all history must be looked upon as a means to Christ." Dr. Gerhart says: "Christ is the dynamic necessity of the universe, and its governing law. He is the law, 1, for the order and harmony of heaven; 2, for the development and teleology of the world; 3, for the origin, growth and triumph of the church; 4, for the final consummation of all things. This law Christ, is as the second man, as the head of the new race and the Redeemer from sin in one mystery." The incarnation is thus set forth as the dynamic centre of universal activity; he is the efficient cause and the final end of universal movement and history. All activities, proceeding from him as a source, return into him as an end. God, the world, man, angels, heaven and

hell—all are means to the incarnation, they bring about and interpret the Christ.

II. CRITICISMS UPON THE NEW CHRISTOLOGY.

1. The christological method so comprehensively and carefully followed by Dr. Gerhart is *fractional*. It is, therefore, inadequate and misleading. God incarnate is a single person in the Godhead; it is illogical and contrary to facts to rule the whole Godhead by him. Redemption is only one of the works of God; it is likewise illogical and contrary to the facts to conceive and interpret all the works of God in the light of this particular one. Sin is an anomaly in the universe, and all that history which is made by sin is episodic; it is thoroughly misleading to deal with sin and its eccentric history as original, and regulative of all theological science. The method does not cover the whole ground; the principle does not rule all the facts. It is not natural, it is not logical. All the spokes in the theological wheel do not go to the new centre. The alleged centre is a false one, because all theological truth must articulate at some point to form a system, an organism. A few illustrations will exhibit the truth of this assertion.

Theology proper is the doctrine of God. As a branch of general theological science, it seeks to prove the existence of God, to describe his spiritual and tri-personal nature, to enumerate and expound his attributes, and to trace the historical execution of his decrees. Our assertion is, that "the Christ-idea" will not interpret this department of theological science. Dr. Gerhart makes the attempt for us. Let us see what success he has met with, for his experiment, it may be safely assumed, is as good as can be made.

Does God exist? If so, what sort of being is he, and what has he done? These primary questions must be carried to Christ for their answers. He is their answer, their complete and only answer, according to the new system which we are reviewing:

"The doctrine on God is to be developed, not from natural intuition, nor on the basis of any philosophical system, either of ancient or modern times, but on the basis of the idea respecting the God-man. Belief in the Deity and theological conceptions do, indeed, antedate Christianity. The revelation of new truth by

Christ presupposes natural consciousness of God. This consciousness is universal. Nevertheless, the Christian doctrine, or the conception of the divine nature, which may stand as absolute truth, can be obtained only by reflection on God as manifested by Jesus of Nazareth." (Vol. I., p. 188.)

This passage gives up what it affirms. Does God exist? The incarnate God, Christ, is the answer to that question. But it is admitted that "the revelation of new truth by Christ presupposes natural consciousness of God. This consciousness is universal." Only those who know Christ can know God, yet there is a universal knowledge or consciousness of God antedating the very incarnation of Christ, and pregrounding every revelation made by him! This is a glaring contradiction, made necessary by the facts of the world's history. Was there no knowledge of God before the advent of Christ? Do the heathen, who possess no knowledge of Christ, possess no knowledge of God? Dr. Gerhart is too intelligent and too honest to contradict facts of so patent a character. He admits that God may be known, and is known, aside from Jesus of Nazareth. In making such a concession he surrenders the very principle for which he wrote these volumes, namely, that theology proper is, and must be, christo-centric. If the God-man, Jesus of Nazareth, is the only answer to the question, "Is there a God?" then he who does not know of Jesus of Nazareth does not know whether there be a God or not; but both the pre-incarnate world and the heathen world do know that God exists, and it follows, therefore, that "the light of nature" does teach the doctrine of the divine existence. If it be affirmed that Jesus of Nazareth is a glorious commentary upon that native knowledge which the world has of God, that is cheerfully conceded and contended for; but it is not the proposition of the school whose teachings we combat. Their proposition is, that ignorance of Christ necessitates entire ignorance of God, because "the Christ-idea" is the informing idea about the existence, nature, constitution, and works of the Godhead. The new Christology, so highly praised by its discoverers and its distinguished friends, breaks down when applied to the doctrine of God. A theology proper logically and chronologically precedes and presupposes all Christology.

Not only so, but the new method, when logically applied, yields

a false conception of God. The contention of this school is that Christ, the theanthropos, is the archetype, organ, and end of all theological contents, and so of theology proper. It must follow from this premise that the immanent *pattern* of divinity is divine-human, that the immanent *energies* of divinity are divine-human, and that the evolved *end* or *form* of divinity is divine-human. The logic remorselessly requires the substitution of a divine-human idea as the inmost and truest notion of the divine nature in lieu of the historic notion of trinality. The divine-human is the archetype, organ, and end of deity. Is there a God? According to the new theology, the divine-human Christ is the only answer to that question. If there be a God, what sort of a being is he? The new theology must answer, He is theanthropic in his constitution. What is the mode under which this Divine Being energizes? Again we get the answer, Through a theanthropic agent, a divine-human Christ. And what is the chief end of all divine activities? The answer comes back, the theanthropic Christ. God's existence, nature, life, works, activities, purposes, are all defined as theanthropic, divine-human. Such revolutionary consequences must logically follow the premise of this school, namely, that Christ, as divine-human, is archetype, organ, and end of theology proper.

But let us turn to anthropology with the new christological premise. Dr. Gerhart boldly affirms that the constitution of the humanity, in the first Adam, was potentially theanthropic.

"Jesus Christ in the process of becoming the perfect man realizes in himself the divine ideal of the race. To develop a Christian conception of humanity, of its beginning, its ultimate end, and present abnormal condition, it is needful to study the person and history of the Son of man." (Vol. II., p. 3.)

"What Jesus became as the result of his mediatorial work, that the first man was as to possibility and intention from the beginning." (Vol. II., p. 4.)

"The logic of Christian thought requires us to assume that the session of Jesus of Nazareth at the right hand of his Father in heaven is the final actualization of that divine principle of life which at his creation man received from the inbreathing of God." (Vol. II., p. 14.)

"So intense does the affirmation of the close connection between the divine nature and the human nature become, that both belief and philosophic thought identify the two worlds. God and man become the same." (Vol. II., p. 15.)

"We may develop an anthropology which holds the truth that underlies both

theories, pantheism and evolution, and escapes the one-sidedness and confusion which involve both in fatal error." (Vol. II., p. 34.)

Our author is a realist of pronounced type. He holds that humanity was created when Adam was created—the genus with, in, under the species. Humanity, as created in Eden, was much more potentially than it was actually. The first Adam was the normal beginning of human history; the ultimate end was theanthropic reality. If he had not sinned, if he had developed his possibilities normally, he would have developed into a divine-human being, into a Christ; the first Adam would have become the second Adam. But here is a great inconsistency as well as a great absurdity. Suppose the first Adam had not fallen, but had developed as God designed, he would have evolved into a theanthropic being, into the second Adam, into Christ; but, as we have seen, the new Christology teaches that there was an immanent necessity in the Divine Being which necessitated the incarnation of the Son; then, had the first Adam reached the theanthropic goal, starting from humanity as the initial point of evolution, and had the Son, starting out of the Godhead, reached the same theanthropic goal, we may ask, would there have been two Redeemers? or would the two evolutions have met and merged into one theanthropic unit? "What Jesus became as the result of his mediatorial work, that the first man was as to possibility and intention from the beginning." Our question is, What would have been the *status* of affairs if that "possibility" and "intention" had been realized? The author tells us that his anthropology is a blend of pantheism and evolution, an anthropology developed from the premise that Christ, the theanthropos, is the archetype, organ, and end of the constitution and history of man. The results are revolutionary, vague, and contradictory.

But let us turn, for further illustration, to the doctrine of sin. Is it possible to develop a sound hamartiology from the premise that Christ is the archetype, organ, and end of moral evil? The negative is obvious. We do not find our author even attempting it. The new Christology, as a theologic principle, is a failure.

2. The new Christology is in grievous error in that it represents the incarnation as the *end of itself*.

The orthodox confessional theology is accustomed to present the incarnation as a means to the redemptive purpose of God as the end. Christ came into the world to save sinners. But this new doctrine represents him as coming into the flesh under a reciprocal and immanent law of human and divine natures. The chief end of all decrees was the incarnation. The chief end of all works was the incarnation. The chief end of all sin was the incarnation. The chief end of the incarnation was the incarnation. The low Calvinistic theology is accustomed to give us the following order of the divine decrees: (1). Creation; (2), The fall; (3), Election; (4), Redemption; (5), Vocation. In this series the order is chronological, not logical. The creation was not in order to the fall, and the fall was not in order to election, and so on; but, in the order of time, creation was first, the fall second, election third, and so on. Now, this new Christology construes the incarnation—the union of God and man—as the chief end of all this series. In order to the incarnation, God created, permitted or brought about the fall, elected, redeemed, and called. The first in intention, the last in execution, was the incarnation. Universal history finds its meaning in the incarnation of the Son of God.

The objections to this view of the position and influence of the incarnation in the economy of redemption have been well stated by Dr. Watts, late professor of theology at Belfast, in his *New Apologetic*, page 199:

“1. It sets aside the sovereign will and eternal decree of God, to which we are indebted for the incarnation itself. Apart from that decree there had been no incarnation; and the incarnation is but one step in a vast chain of means, every one of which has been ordained of God for the execution of his eternal purpose of grace. In doing this it sets aside God the Father, and ignores his relation as the fountain-head of the whole economy. 2. Instead of being its own end, the incarnation is declared in Scripture to have been a means towards the expiation of sin. Throughout the Epistle to the Hebrews our Saviour's assumption of the nature of the sons of God, who are constituted his brethren, and whom he was appointed by the Father, in ‘the divine decree,’ to lead to glory, is represented as subordinate to the expiation of their sins. It was because of this that a body was prepared him, and it was for this reason that it behooved him to have somewhat to offer. 3. This is certainly the view of the ‘christological centre’ presented in the preaching of the apostles. Paul does not single out the incarnation as the ground of his glorying. On the contrary, he emphasizes the cross and the crucifixion, and avows his determina-

tion to know nothing among those to whom he ministered, save Jesus Christ, and him crucified. This preaching he proclaims as the power of God and the wisdom of God. 4. The cross, and not the incarnation, is 'the central truth and glory' in conversion. . . . 5. The cross is 'the central truth and glory' in sanctification. Here holiness is the end, and the suffering and death of Christ the means. 'Far be it from me,' says Paul, 'to glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, through whom the world has been crucified unto me, and I unto the world.' This is the rule by which he walked, and upon as many as walked by it he invoked peace and mercy. 6. The cross is 'the central truth and glory' of heaven. The great burden of 'the new song' is the redemption achieved through the blood of the Lamb; and when the angels join their voices to swell the volume of the mighty anthem, they found their ascriptions of 'power, and riches, and wisdom, and might, and honor, and glory, and blessing' upon the fact that he was slain. 7. The cross is 'the central truth and glory' in the functions of Christ's mediatorial office. This is very beautifully symbolized in the Book of Revelation, chapter v. 6, where the seven horns, representing Christ's omnipotent power as King, and the seven eyes, symbolical of the plenitude of the Spirit possessed by him as the Prophet of the church, are ascribed to him as the Lamb that was slain. It is as the Lamb that he occupies the throne, bears the sceptre, and administers the sealed book; and it is as the Lamb that he leads and feeds his blood-bought, blood-washed church."

The church has prevailingly held that the cross was the chief end of the incarnation; that there was a Bethlehem in order that there might be a Calvary; that, "when the fulness of the time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons"; that the saying which is "faithful and worthy of all acceptation" is, that "Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners"; that the Word which was made flesh, and dwelt among men, was "full of grace and truth"; that "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life"; that "God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world through him might be saved." The incarnation is thus uniformly connected with salvation as a means to an end. Had there been no sin, there would have been no redemptive purpose; and, had there been no redemptive purpose, there would have been no incarnation. These modern reconstructionists are in error, therefore, and out of harmony with the historic Christology, when they represent the whole scheme of redemption as revolving upon the incarnation; for the end of the incarnation was redemption, and not the mere enfleshment of God, not the mere realistic union of divinity and humanity.

3. This new Christology yields a novel and unacceptable doctrine of atonement:

"Given the idea of a veritable incarnation of the Son of God in the Son of man under violated law, and, as a logical sequence, we have the idea of a Mediator bearing the condemnation of violated law. The condemnation abiding upon a sinful world is not merely imputed to him; the juridical consequences of transgression attach to the humanity which he assumed. The humanity with which he is identified being under sentence of condemnation, he, by assuming it, voluntarily subjected himself to that condemnation. The Mediator came into the world to save sinners, giving his life a ransom for many; yet he offers himself on the cross, not primarily on behalf of individuals, but on his own behalf as the Mediator. As he was conceived and born to be the second man; as by parable and by miracle he declared himself to be the truth and the life; as he always did those things only which pleased his Father in heaven, because to do the will of the Father was his meat and drink; so, for the same reason, it was his will to lay down his life for the sheep. . . . The sufferings of Christ, like his positive obedience, were due from himself as the Mediator between God and the Adamic race. . . . Inasmuch as the sacrifice of Christ was due to God from himself as identified with the Adamic race, it avails for the benefit of all men. Scientifically considered, the Mediator did not lay down his life either directly on behalf of an elect few, or directly on behalf of all men. He suffered death on his own behalf. . . . The incarnate Son came into the world to reveal God and mankind in himself, and in himself effect a reconciliation of God and mankind. . . . The new human race of which he is the head is not circumscribed by the limits of our earthly history; the new race embraces believers in the intermediate state as well as believers on earth." (Vol. II., pp. 337, 344, 374.)

In Christ there was the realistic union of humanity and divinity. The humanity was tainted and judicially condemned. The humanity, now united to his divinity, was to be purged and freed from guilt by his life, death, resurrection, and ascension. This union had taken place under a reciprocal law immanent in both divinity and humanity. Hence Christ died primarily for himself. He made the atonement mainly for himself, because he could not deify at God's right hand an unholy and guilty humanity. It was humanity, the generic or specific substance, that fell in the first man, and it is this same humanity which is redeemed in the Second Man. The atonement was made for all men, because it was made for humanity, the human essence. This is realism run mad. Dr. Shedd, Dr. Baird, Jonathan Edwards, and others, have held to the doctrine of the constituted, or numerical, or specific unity of Adam and his posterity, so that the fall of Adam was the fall of the species, but these great theologians draw back and decline to apply

the same principle to the union between Christ and his spiritual posterity. Holding that the union between Adam and the race was realistic, they hold that the union between Christ and his posterity was forensic and representative, or federalistic. But Dr. Gerhart is a logical realist. "As in Adam, so in Christ." The union in Eden was realistic; the union on Calvary was likewise realistic. The first Adam was the father of a fallen race; the second Adam is the father of a regenerated race. The logic of the union requires this theologian to hold that Christ died primarily for himself, and secondarily for sinners. His mission, that to which he had been eternally commissioned, was to unite humanity and divinity. When the fulness of time came for him to execute his mission in concrete and historical fact, he found humanity a corrupt and a guilty thing; he had to take it as he found it, purge it, and justify it; individuals are incidentally beneficiaries of his mediatorial work; his primary object was to effect the incarnation, the union of divinity and humanity. Now, there is nothing in Scripture about Christ dying for himself, about his suffering and dying in order to the incarnation. This new view construes the atonement as being made for the sake of the incarnation.

In historic Calvinism, substitution and imputation are the Jachin and Boaz of the atonement. This neo-Christology substitutes for these ideas the incarnation. In the confessional theology the atonement is a real vicarious satisfaction of the law of God on behalf of the elect. In this new scheme the atonement is accomplished by a union of God and man. The necessity of the atonement is the necessity of this union, dating back to the eternal reciprocal aptitude of deity for humanity. The extent of the atonement is the extent of this union. Christ died for himself as the head, the realistic head, of "the new race." Christ glorified is conceived as the colossal heart of redeemed humanity, sending the fulness of his life and salvation throughout the mystical body, pretty much as the blood-currents flow from the first Adam through all the members of the human family. The deepest nature of the atonement is pantheistic; its profoundest necessity is in the eternal, immanent yearning of divinity for humanity, and the object of the atonement is abstract humanity. Dr. Gerhart repudiates

universalism, but it looks to us as if the logic of his system carries him to the extreme of universal redemption.

4. The new Christology yields a novel and unacceptable doctrine of the church. A few quotations from our author will exhibit the new doctrine:

"Mankind in the person of the second man was translated into that new and ineffable order of fellowship with God for which Jesus was conceived and born, a fellowship, moreover, which was the goal of 'the first man' in the image of God. . . . The growth of the mustard seed, the vine and its branches, and the human body, suggest the best figures of speech by which the teaching of the New Testament concerning the church may most fitly be represented in ecclesiology. If thought be governed by this imagery, we discover the church to be, not an aggregation of individuals, not an organization devised by human genius, but a spiritual organism, all of whose parts, like the mustard tree developed from the mustard seed, grow forth from the mystery of the personality of Christ glorified. The mustard tree is developed from the mustard seed by vegetal laws; the human body from the embryo by human laws; but the church of God, the body of Christ, attains unto a full-grown man, 'unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ,' by 'the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus.' . . . More real than the mustard tree, more mysterious than the human body, or the Adamic race, the church not only confronts natural perception, but addresses faith as a constitution, existing, living, firmly maintaining herself against her foes, and advancing from conquest to conquest, from age to age, by her own intrinsic vitality. The mode of her organization is constructed, like the size and shape of the body of an individual man, from within, by the law of her life; and by the force of the same immanent law she is constantly reconstructing and readjusting the form of her activity to her own inner growth, and to the changing needs of her environment. . . . Inasmuch as the Christian church is the new or second human race descending by spiritual birth from the glorified Christ, and grows by the immanent presence of the Holy Spirit, she is in a pre-eminent sense an organism, a living mystery. She possesses the marks and reveals the phenomena of a living constitution. . . . History presents three main branches of church life: the Greek Catholic, the Roman Catholic, and the evangelical Protestant. Though no one of these main branches has developed an ideal character, nevertheless each has a wealth of vitality peculiar to itself, which has been unfolded in varying forms of doctrine, worship, and organization. . . . Jealousies, antipathies, antagonisms, violate the fellowship of the church of Christ, not confessional or theological variations. . . . The Christian church, being the organized form of the race of the second man, is the sphere in which the redemption of the Mediator has normal force, and is fulfilled in its faithful members." (Vol. II., pp. 399, 461, 464, 472, 480, 481, 643, 646.)

The church is the technical name of the new race. This new race has a realistic descent from the second man. The life of the new race is the indwelling Spirit. This race progresses and

changes by an inherent vitality as the old race does by the power of its subjective life. The new race is the race of salvation. Membership in the church is the "transition of the sinner from membership in the race of Adam to membership in the race of the second man." The continuity of the race is unbroken. *Humanity* was the generic nature of the first race; *theanthropicity*, if we may coin such a word, is the generic nature of the second race. As the mustard tree grows from the mustard seed, as the human body grows from the embryo, so the church grows from Christ as a seed, as an embryo. The force is called spiritual in its nature, but the process by which this force acts in the production and development of the church is naturalistic evolution. The patriarchal church was one species; it was transmuted into the Abrahamic church, another and different species; and the Abrahamic church was transmuted into the Christian church, with some intermediate forms, and the Christian church is an entirely different species from any church which has preceded it. The glorified church is the glorified race of the second man—a goal which has been reached by a spiritualistic evolution. Every member of the heavenly race is like its head—a theanthropos, a divine-human individual in a divine-human organism.

All this pantheistic, evolutionary folly about the church is the logical fruitage of a false conception of the nature, the necessity, the mode, and the significance of the incarnation. The scriptural argument by which it is supported is drawn from certain parables and images which Christ employed to illustrate the nature of the kingdom of heaven. That which is avowedly metaphorical and figurative is dealt with as literal and substantive. The church is the *body* of Christ in a metaphorical, not a literal, sense. There is a mystical and vital union between Christ and his people, but this union is not realistic in the sense that whatever is Adamic in the Christian has been displaced by something which is Christic or theanthropic. The church is not a vital organism—a live society with Christ for a real head and with the Holy Spirit for a real heart. On the contrary, it is an aggregation of redeemed individuals, organized by Christ into a society, drawing all its rights as a society from him, and all its power from the Holy Spirit.

The conception of a person, with Christ as the head, and the church as the body, and with the Spirit as the life, is purely fanciful. A realistic church, whose external form is a new race with racial life, attributes, and powers, is a novelty. The idea is radical and reconstructive.

5. This Christology yields a novel and unacceptable doctrine of regeneration.

"Pentecost is a creative epoch. The gift of the Holy Spirit brings into being a spiritual constitution which before had no existence. The epoch may be compared to natural birth. Birth in one respect is the natural result of an antecedent process of the growth of the embryo; in another respect it constitutes a new individual and begins a new history. So, whilst Pentecost is the legitimate consequence of the mediatorial life and work of the incarnate Son on earth, this event brings into existence a new human race and begins a history for all time to come, which in point of quality is different from all other history, Jewish or pagan. This new race is the community of the Christian church, the body of which Jesus Christ is the head." (Vol. II., p. 445.)

Something was born on the day of Pentecost. What was it? The Christian church, the body of Christ, the new race. This birth was not figurative, it was literal. The thing born was not a society, it was an organism, it was the body of Christ, the new race. This new, regenerated race has an ethnic life, a racial life as distinguished from individual life. The original of this life, its heart and source, is the glorified Christ, and the glorified Christ, who was regenerated first of all, is communicated to the church, the new race, by the Holy Spirit, who descended into the body of Christ on the day of Pentecost. Up to that time the body had been in an embryonic state. Now it is born. Its life is the Holy Spirit. He circulates through it, like the blood, which is the life, courses through the natural body. But how does a member of the old race become a member of the new race? By birth, by a literal birth, a literal regeneration. In the first birth the Adamic substance is communicated to the child; in the second birth the Christic substance is communicated to his child.

"The Spirit does not beget a person anew by implanting Christ into him. By the Spirit he is implanted into Christ. The Son of man glorified is the principle of regeneration. He is the one new man, the regenerate personality. His sin-conquering life is the type of the new race. Men are born again by participation in his resurrection life. As we are members of the Adamic race by participation in the life of the first Adam, so we become members of the second race by par-

ticipation in the life of the last Adam. Whilst it is true that the Christ by his Spirit lives in his members as really as his members live in him, yet the order of this life-communion requires that fallen men pass from the natural economy into the spiritual economy. The natural man is implanted into Christ, and by that act he becomes a member of the new community. As a consequence, Christ by his Spirit lives in him." (Vol. II., p. 449.)

Birth implies the transmission of the *nature* of the parent to the child. Birth in the Adamic race means that every human being possesses the Adamic nature—a body and soul, with their respective endowments. Birth in the new race implies the possession of the new Adamic nature by every one of the new-born. The nature of the new Adam is dual, divine-human. He is not merely God; he is not merely man; he is both. He is proper and true deity; he is proper and true man; he is yet uni-personal. The Christian nature, accordingly, must be in like manner complex. Regeneration is a change of substance. The old substance, or nature, was Adamic, that is, only human. The new substance, or nature, is theanthropic, that is, divine-human. In regeneration the subject is born into a new race, with the theanthropos as the form, and with the Holy Ghost as the soul or spirit. "By incarnation human nature was assumed into organic union with God in his Son; so by the new-creating work of the Holy Spirit men are translated from 'this world' into mystical union with our risen and perfect Lord." As the Holy Spirit organically united divinity and humanity in the womb of the Virgin, even so does the same Spirit organically unite the sinner and the glorified Christ; and in the consummation of the case in sanctification, the humanity is eliminated and nothing is left but Christ in the Christian; he is, in a literal and substantive sense, Christianized. "When the young bird is mature," says our author, "it breaks the shell of the egg in which it has been developed. The shell is broken because the form of life is too vigorous for confinement within its walls. Analogous is the death of the Christian. He reaches the point in his history when 'the earthly house' is no longer his fit tabernacle; then 'the earthly house of this tabernacle is dissolved.'" The thief on the cross must have ripened with remarkable rapidity!

Regeneration is not the creation of any new *substance*. We

are the same sort of beings after regeneration that we were before that change. Regeneration is not a transubstantiation. But this seems to be Dr. Gerhart's idea. We are not merely changed, by the subjective work of grace, into the likeness of Christ's character, according to this new Christology, but we are changed into the likeness of Christ's substance, his nature. What is Christ glorified in his constitution? We have seen that he was the ideal man—the product of an immanent law of evolution, immanent in divinity and humanity. What is the Christian in the complete and final form of his religion? He is like Christ in his constitution. Not merely the character, but the being, of the Christian is Christ-like. Regeneration, expanded through sanctification, has transubstantiated him. We can make nothing else out of it. As a result of the new Christology, the new man, the new church, the new race, the Christian finally becomes a *Christ!*

The absurdity has reached its climax.

R. A. WEBB.