
A table of contents for *The Expository Times* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[Issue]_[1st page of article].pdf

well-known delight in long words, and some use, though indeed it must be very cautious and sparing, may be made of this.

Now and then you will find a child in the act of thinking, and get a glimpse into the workings of his mind. Most of our precious child-stories are records of such privileged moments. And they are indeed golden moments for the teacher. Reverence their questions and difficulties, their oddities and mistakes. Never silence them, nor treat them simply as jests and *bons mots*. By all means take them seriously, and encourage fearlessness of thought. Nothing that a child has thought out for himself is ever really irreverent or trifling, and by encouragement and sympathy we may educate him more by one of his own adventures in thinking than by a great deal of other teaching.

Richter makes one striking exception to this rule, which it may be well to leave to the consideration of teachers. His contention is that *morality* is the one point on which questioning should be suppressed; morality, not conventional etiquette or behaviour. In morality the teacher should be a fate to his pupil. No reasons should be given nor questions allowed; but 'It is right' and 'It is wrong' should be final. To give reasons for morality, showing a boy or girl that it will pay, that it will get them on well in the world etc., is to lend to morality the interest of selfishness. But that is not the proper interest of morality. It has a solemn interest of its own, the awful interest of 'must' and 'ought,' which is the interest of a fate, a necessity, a doom. Consequently, the enforcement of morality should be deliberate, clear, authoritative, final. Small politenesses need to be backed by reasons; great moral principles, never. To obey moral laws in order to gain selfish ends is 'to shoot wild-fowl with diamonds, to knock down fruit with a sceptre.'

One other point must be touched upon, namely, the interest of *imitation*. Your personality is more vivid to your pupil than your teaching. There is a counter-interest running side by side with the interest you are able to awaken in the subject: he is mainly interested in *you*.

This has a great deal of teaching for teachers. Anything striking about dress or person, or any little nervous habit of movement in face or hands, may spoil the ablest of lessons. But far more deeply than that does this principle hold. The children are reading their teacher. They are looking into the very depths of his soul and character. Some of them perhaps know him better than he knows himself. This leads the teacher solemnly back to his own soul and its own interests. For every man's own interests—the things to which he gives heartiest and most willing attention—these and nothing else are his influence. Too often this is ignored, and people try to make the interests of children and others whom they influence better and purer than their own. It cannot be done, and upon all teachers the responsibility lies of having their own souls such that the interested little souls shall be better for their interest in them. For the atmosphere that a child feels about him in presence of his teacher, and the discoveries he makes in his teacher's soul, are the things which will most strongly fascinate his interest and mould his character.

Recent Foreign Theology.

The Christian Doctrine of Sin.[1]

THERE are signs that the attention of theology is once more to be specially concentrated on the doctrine of sin. To this reawakening of interest various factors have been contributing: modern philosophy, which has its own speculations about the origin and necessity of evil; Darwinism, which compels further reflexion upon the original condition and the Fall; and the Ritschlian theology, which has attempted to lighten and reconstruct the traditional Protestant doctrine. And it may be expected that the discussion now going on will be quickened by the treatise of which Dr. Clemen of Halle has published a programme and an instalment. For not only is Dr. Clemen's book planned on the scale of the great doctrinal monographs of the century, not only does it display the learning and give some promise of the power needed for the task, but it challenges in the name of Scripture almost every head of the doctrine of sin associated with evangelical Christianity.

The published instalment is an exposition of the

[1] *Die christliche Lehre von der Sünde.* Von Lic. Dr. Carl Clemen. Erster Theil. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1897.

biblical teachings on the subject of sin. For the O.T. the critical standpoint is that of the school of Wellhausen, for the N.T. the substantially conservative position to which the main body of German scholars have reverted. The method is, distinguishing the three heads of the nature, the origin, and the consequences of sin, to track each topic in turn through the successive strata of the O.T. and the N.T. Scriptures. And the result of the investigation is that, if Dr. Clemen is right, the biblical writers hardly agree upon any point, except in discountenancing the cardinal positions of the Augustinian system.

Beginning with the *nature*, he finds wide diversity of utterance in Scripture as to the idea or kinds, the gradations and the prevalence of sin. As regards the conception of what constituted sin, it is pointed out with manifest truth that the standard varied at different periods, and that acts tolerated by O.T. standards were condemned as sinful when the perfect norm was given in the teaching and example of Christ. But upon the next point—the distinction of sins according to degrees of heinousness, even the N.T. is alleged to be divided against itself. That sins of ignorance are not sins at all, is thought to be maintained by Paul against the teaching of his Master and of Peter, who treated them as merely more venial; while the unpardonable sin is said to be represented by Jesus as the condition of hardened impenitence, in Hebrews as apostasy, and in 1 John as denial of the Divine Sonship of Jesus (pp. 99, 100). The biblical teaching as to the prevalence of sin in general acknowledges it to be a universal fact of human experience, but with this qualification, that the prophets taught the possibility of its future subdual, a section of the O.T. history told of men who had overcome it in the past, while Paul not only declared sinless perfection to be now possible, but conceived himself to have attained it (p. 122). To sum up the doctrinal bearing of this section, Dr. Clemen finds in the scriptural references to the kinds of sin no trace of a condition of depravity inherited from Adam which has the character of guilt, and only very slender authority for the imputation of Adam's guilt to his posterity,[1] while he cites the authority of Paul as a perfectionist against the doctrine that a 'corruption of nature during this life doth remain in those that are regenerated.'

But if thus far the authority of the Bible seems to support the rankest Pelagianism, a further surprise is in store in the discussion of the *origin* of sin. The hyper-Calvinistic tenet of supralapsarianism rather understated what Dr. Clemen takes to be the prevalent biblical view as to the responsibility of God for human sin. According to the prophets, God was directly the author and promoter of sin; and although in the N.T. God's agency seems to be restricted to foreseeing and permitting it, it is held that the theory there dominant, viz. that sin has its seat in the flesh, leads to the same result (p. 215). For if man was destined to sin because a being of flesh, and if he derived this nature from God, the necessity of his sinning is carried back to God. That there is another account of the origin of human sin, viz. through an abuse of free will on the part of our first parents, is registered with the comment that the story of the Fall, except for two Pauline references, is virtually ignored in Scripture (p. 179).

The section dealing with the *consequences* of sin begins with an interesting study of the punishment of sin by its multiplication, and especially of the N.T. conception of the σκάνδαλον. Under this head attention is drawn to the gradual development of the teaching as to the relation of sin and suffering—the latter being originally interpreted as purely penal, described by Jesus as in the main salutary, and exhibited by Paul under both points of view (p. 233). On the subject of death, on the other hand, thought moved on the whole in the opposite direction; while in the O.T. only the premature or violent death was regarded as punitive, in the N.T. it had come to be regarded generally as 'the wages of sin,' at the same time that the point of view is never entirely lost that death is normal or natural (p. 254). Thus the biblical evidence would be strong but not decisive for interpreting all the miseries of this life with physical death as entailed by human sin.

In an epilogue Dr. Clemen indicates which of those results are to be utilized in the positive treatment of the doctrine of sin. The more important negative requirement is the abandonment of the ideas of imputed guilt and of original sin,

[1] Clemen uses 'Original Sin' in the restricted sense of the imputed guilt of Adam's sin, while for that which with us is 'commonly called original sin,' he uses the term 'angeborne Sünde' (p. 2). In the old Reformed Theology, it may be noted, original sin usually included both the imputed guilt and the transmitted corruption of nature.