

fect fidelity. Ritschl thus sums up: "In the predicate of His Godhead are united the two needful significations of Christ as perfect Revealer of God, and as perfect archetype of spiritual dominion over the world." Though Christ in his phenomenal form is man like other men, yet, since being is known only in its manifestations, inasmuch as Christ has for us the value of God, therefore, he is God, or as Ian Maclaren puts it in his clear English: "He is God because he discharges a God-function." To thought he is man, to faith he is God.

Ritschl, directly and by name, rejects the doctrine of the Incarnation, and with it the ontological Trinity. Yet he holds the union of the human and the divine in Christ as something far more real and vital than a union of natures, namely a union in the sphere of will. Everywhere else, he declares, one judges that it is in the form of will the nature is known. "The word was made flesh," means that in him Revelation took the form of a human person. "By him all things consist," that he is God's end in creation. "Communion with him" is a formula for the permanent results of his historical appearance. His state of exaltation is assumed, but has for us no religious value. Religion has to do with Jesus only from his birth to his death.

As elsewhere, the Kingdom of God is made the starting-point when Ritschl comes to discuss the Doctrine of Sin and Guilt. The idea of the Law of God is rejected as a starting-point, both because the idea of a moral law is not prior to the idea of the kingdom but a deduction from it, and because the conception of an absolute righteousness of God, of which the moral law is the expression, is metaphysical. Original sin is shut out by his theory of knowledge which allows no subsistence to the soul other than its activities. Sin is no part of the contents of Revelation. It could not be so. It is only a fact of experience. Sin is no end-in-itself; its notion only arises in comparison with the good of which it is the contradiction. Sin is known in connection with the kingdom as the negation of the law of love. Ritschl rejects the idea of an original state of innocence, and accounts for the origin of