
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

Mosaic colour to the requirement of resort to the central sanctuary, he also added: 'A permanent statute shall this be to them for their generations,' meaning thereby to say that though camp and tent were things of the past, sacrifice at the central sanctuary (now the second Temple) for all time still held good? In Leviticus as it now stands, P was legislating not for the whole nation, now largely in exile, but for the small community in Jerusalem and Judæa after the return. Centralization was therefore no hardship in the new conditions. The people had become accustomed to non-sacrificial worship in their own neighbourhoods, and accepted as natural and right the obligation to attend the Temple at the three Annual Pilgrimage Feasts.

3. Deuteronomy 12. (See the concluding article next month.)

Supplementary Note on 'Sanctuary.'

There are two words translated 'Sanctuary' in the A.V.

i. We have spoken of one (*miḳdash*) already in Articles I. and II. In Art. I. (p. 13), I should have said, 'six times,' because, in addition to the five passages there mentioned, it is found in Ex 15^{17}. It there refers either to Shiloh or Jerusalem, but the song (vv.$^{2\text{-}18}$) is of late date.

If the word was in use for the tabernacle before the entrance into Canaan (P, twelve times), it is remarkable that (with the extremely doubtful exception of Ex 15^{17}) it is never used of Shiloh or even of Jerusalem before the Exile, whereas in the four pre-exilic passages (and in Lv 26^{31}) it is used of high places. It is not once used in Deuteronomy, Judges, Samuel, or Kings, but occurs twenty-nine or thirty times in Ezekiel, and twenty-four times elsewhere (outside the Pentateuch), almost always of the Temple. When, therefore, Wellhausen speaks of high places as sanctuaries, he is following Biblical usage, whereas Wiener, who rejects such usage, is not.

ii. Another word (*ḳōdĕsh*) is translated 'the sanctuary' sixty-seven times in the A.V., and 'the holy place' twenty-nine times. It always has the article, when used in this sense, and means literally 'the apartness' or 'sacredness.' Passages in which there is a separate word in Hebrew for 'place' are not included in these figures. The word also occurs eleven times in the phrase translated in E.V. 'Holy of holies' or 'most holy place.' It is used of the Temple thirty-four times, of the Tabernacle sixty-two times. Here, again, we want an adequate explanation of the fact that at the beginning and end of the Hebrew Bible we have such frequent use of the phrase, while in the middle section it is almost non-existent, Zeph 3^{4} being the only sure example. (The double use in 1 K $8^{8\text{-}10}$ occurs in a notoriously interpolated passage.)

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

The Door that wouldn't open.

By the Reverend Alexander Small, B.D.,
Boreham Wood, Herts.

'A door was opened unto me of the Lord.'—2 Co 2^{12}.

Bruno is an Irish terrier. He has lovely brown eyes, and when he looks up at us, we know he is trying to speak. He begs for his food; he holds up his paw to be shaken, just as if he is shaking hands; he will carry a kettle downstairs and do other tricks. But sometimes he is naughty. He does just the opposite of what we tell him to do. Then we have to scold him, and his tail stops wagging and he puts it between his legs. Sometimes we lose him. We call him and he does not come. We look for him downstairs and find no trace of him. Then, knowing as we do, that he thinks he has the right to roam all over the house, we go upstairs, hunt through the rooms, the doors of which are open, but Bruno is not in any of these. Then we come to the study door. It is closed. He cannot be in there, we think. No dog can get through a closed door. Yet we know he must be somewhere and we open the door. There he is, the rascal, perfectly contented, lying in the soft comfortable arm-chair. But sometimes we have found him behind the door, waiting to be let out, for try as he might he has not been able to get out by himself. He found it easy to get into the room, for he pushed open the door

with his nose ; but as soon as he entered, the door closed behind him, and made him a prisoner and he had to wait till his master or mistress opened the door for him, and set him free.

There are in life some rooms whose doors open easily but shut behind us when we enter them. From the outside these rooms look very pleasing. We think we shall be very comfortable when we get inside. When we do enter, for a time we seem to be happy, but sooner or later we become miserable, and we are sorry we ever entered the room. Then we try to get out. We go to the door and endeavour to open it, only to find that it has closed fast, and, do what we will, we cannot unfasten it.

There is one such room over which is the name 'Falsehood.' It seems so pleasant inside, so comfortable. We think life will be ever so much easier for us if we go in, and that we shall be saved from a great deal of unhappiness. Jacob entered that room when he put on Esau's clothes and went to his aged father and said, when his father questioned him : 'I am Esau thy firstborn.' Jacob knew it was an untruth ; but he thought it would make him happy because his father would give him his blessing. But his one falsehood led to another, as falsehood always does, and poor Jacob, who thought that he would be so happy, had to run away from home to escape from his angry brother. Some boys and girls enter the room of falsehood to get out of doing difficult tasks. They omit to do their home lessons or to prepare for their examinations, and they think everything will be all right if they say they have been unwell: their teachers will not know they are telling a lie, and by that means they will escape the difficult task and the punishment that they would otherwise receive. It seems such an easy way of getting out of a difficulty ; but they do not see that the door is shutting behind them and making them prisoners. They do not see that they are making trouble for themselves and for others. Later on, when one falsehood leads to another, people will not trust them, and then they will come to wish they had never entered the room and try to escape, but they will find that the door that opened so easily has shut fast.

There is another room, the room of 'Selfishness.' It looks so beautiful and so comfortable inside. We think we shall be so happy if we go in, and so we push open the door and enter. For a time things seem to go on very well. We get our own way. We do as little as we can for others and get others to do as much as they will for us. We think how splendid it is to live there. But after a while we find that nothing seems to make us happy. We get very sick of thinking about ourselves, of having so many things done for us. We find that those who were our friends tire of us. Life becomes very dull, and we find ourselves often having fits of the blues. Then we see that we have been deceived : the room of selfishness is not beautiful at all, and we are not happy in it. We wish we had been wise and remained outside of it. We try to escape, but the door has shut behind us and we become more miserable than ever.

But if we are unable to open the door ourselves, there is One who can help us to open it and help us to be free. Jesus came to set prisoners free. He was always helping people to open doors of rooms which they should never have entered and which had shut behind them when they did enter. Some had entered the room of falsehood like Zacchæus, but when he accepted the friendship of Jesus, Jesus helped him to open the door of that room so that he might escape, and Zacchæus became true. Some had entered the room of selfishness like James and John, who wanted the best seats in Christ's Kingdom for themselves, but Jesus helped them out and set them free from selfishness. Some had entered other rooms, the room of fear, the room of pride, the room of impurity, and although the door closed behind them and made them prisoners, Jesus came and helped them to escape into freedom.

I wonder if there is some room you have entered into which you wish you had never gone. Ask Jesus to come into your heart, and He will help you to open the door and will set you free. Better still, if we keep close to Him, He will keep us from ever entering into any of these forbidden rooms.

Where To-day is Yesterday.

By the Reverend Cecil Nicholson, Darwen.

'From the rising of the sun unto the going down of the same the Lord's name is to be praised.'—Ps 113[3].

Can you help to solve a problem for me ? I have been puzzling with it, and I feel like the Mayor of Hamelin Town in Brunswick, a famous Hanover city, in the poem about the Pied Piper.

> 'I'm sure my poor head aches again,
> I've scratched it so, and all in vain.'

One thing consoles me. There are so many clever children in the world, and they learn so many wonderful things at school, that I am sure some one will help me out. So here goes !

The cricketers in Australia began it. Perhaps

it is not fair to say they began it. It was the newspapers when they began to report the Test matches in Australia. They told us that play would begin at twelve o'clock noon, Australian time, and that this would be two o'clock in the morning, English time. How funny! Things like this happen: Mr. Hobbs and Mr. Sutcliffe open the English innings, or Mr. Larwood bowls Mr. Ponsford at half-past twelve, or Mr. Hendren scores a century before luncheon, and we read about it when we come down to breakfast the same morning (and not a late breakfast, either)—what would be evening news about a match in England is morning news about a match in Australia.

That is not the puzzling thing, because I believe the world is round, and the sun can shine on only half of it at once, and so the opposite sides of the world have their day-time at different hours. That is all right, and quite as it should be. I don't mind at all about the Australians having their luncheon so long before I have my breakfast that there is time for it to get into the newspapers. It enables me to get the cricket news earlier, and when there are Test matches about, I cannot get it too early. That is not the trouble. It is something else. I will try to explain.

The other day I went into the new Underground Station at Piccadilly Circus in London. It is a most wonderful place. There is a great circus, and a more interesting one than if there were horse sor acrobats. The great hall is to be decorated by pictures, and one of them is already in place. It is a picture map of the world by Mr. Stephen Bone. It is about six yards long. The two hemispheres are laid out flat, and the British Empire is shown in red. The really striking thing about the map is that the artist shows us by pictures the sort of people we should see, and the sort of things they would be doing, in various parts of the world. In the far north we see men fighting polar bears and catching seals, and driving dog-teams; nearer the tropics they are reaping corn and planting tea, sailing junks and riding camels and killing lions. Farther south they are harpooning whales and rounding Cape Horn and exploring the Antarctic regions. They are shown in all kinds of dress and with every variety of outfit, doing the things that are done in their part of the world, and north and south the map stretches from the Arctic to the Antarctic, and East and West it stretches from the Pacific to the Pacific.

That is really the trouble. East and West the map stretches from the Pacific to the Pacific. The map does that because the day does that. If you look at an ordinary map you will see on it upright lines, and you will notice that they are numbered. The line that goes through Greenwich is numbered 0. The line on the other side of the world, which goes through the Fiji Islands, is numbered 180. The day begins in the Fiji Islands twelve hours before it begins in England.

In Australia the day begins ten hours earlier than in England. That is why we get the 'lunch score' at breakfast time. If you travel across the world and go to the middle of America, the day begins six hours later than in England. If you go farther west it must be nine hours later; go farther still, and it must be twelve hours later. But when you have reached the place where the day begins twelve hours later, you are in the Fiji Islands, where it begins twelve hours earlier. When does Fiji get its cricket news? Does it get it the day after, or the day before? Is Fiji a place where To-day is Yesterday? It is rather a problem, but I am sure you can work it out.

I am not bothering about it any more. The thing I remember is this. The day begins twelve hours before we get it. We have it for twenty-four hours. It lasts twelve hours after we have done with it. $12 + 24 + 12 = 48$. The day, in its passage across the world, lasts forty-eight hours. How splendid! Take Christmas Day, for instance. Parties and puddings and presents, love and kindness and jollity, Christmas bells and Christmas carols all round the world for forty-eight hours on end.

Every good day is like that, and you know what it means. God, our Father, made the world, and He made the sun to shine, and He made all the people it shines upon. They are all His children. They are all brothers and sisters, and we all belong to one another, and we ought to love everybody as He loves everybody. If some of God's children are black, it means they get more sunshine on their bodies then we do, but we may have more sunshine in our souls, and we ought to give it to them. We ought to love, and pray, and give, so that all through the long day, and all round the great world, 'all people that on earth do dwell' are drawn by chains of love and prayer and praise to the Father who loves us all.

The Christian Year.

QUINQUAGESIMA.

Faith: An Adventure into the Unknown.

'Now the Lord had said unto Abram, Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy

father's house, unto a land that I will shew thee.'—Gn 12^1.

'By faith Abraham, when he was called to go out into a place which he should after receive for an inheritance, obeyed; and he went out, not knowing whither he went.'—Heb 11^8.

These two commands—(1) 'Go forth from thine own land and thy father's house,' and (2) 'Enter into the land that I will shew thee'—are in reality no abnormal or extraordinary requisitions, but are simply the expression of the injunction that in some form or other God issues to every child of man, when first he wakes to the knowledge of Divine truth and duty, and to the consciousness of his own grievous shortcomings in thought and character.

Seldom does the command come in childhood, for as yet the child has not outgrown the limits of his own small world: his aspirations do not as yet mar his satisfaction, nor do his desires, amply provided for as they are by the world around, lead him to think of other and higher worlds of being. And thus, as his longings and requirements are in harmony with his environment, the child enjoys peace; but this peace has little in common with the peace of God, for it is conditioned by, or based upon, ignorance or inexperience, and is therefore transitory, and vanishes when the consciousness of a higher life dawns on the opening mind, and makes for ever impossible the renewal of this primitive condition.

For every man this command has some special and individual meaning. Whilst on all men it enjoins first and pre-eminently personal faithfulness to God in Christ, it summons one to raise the standard of purity and truth and self-denial in the home, another it requires to go forth and redress some social or economic wrong in the body politic, another to break with the benumbing traditions of the elders in Church or State, and taking his life in his hand to lead the way to that far-off country that awaits the coming of the faithful of all peoples and of all times.

To this summons most men will not at first give ear: they prefer the life they know, with all its familiar good things and promised pleasures, to embarking on a strenuous life of possible trial and loss, which they know not. Hence they cling to the material life with its obvious attractions, and resolve to enjoy it to the full. Of these some are mere triflers, loiterers on the path of life, who regard almost with aversion the thought of duty and the strenuous existence. But the main body of this class is not such; the bulk of men must work whether they will or no, and so we have the vast competing crowd, which labours indeed, but labours only or mainly for the bread which perishes, and hopes to find its full satisfaction in a world where, if God has any place, it is the second and not the first. Now, however we describe the vast class who refuse the call of God to a new and higher life, it is clear that the reason of such refusal is all but universally the desire of a life of self-satisfaction or self-indulgence, in the belief that such a life is after all the true source of happiness.

But, happily, the number of those who hearken earlier or later to the call is large. These might be divided into two classes: (1) Those who embrace the life of duty, but rise no higher; (2) those who embrace the life of duty, but rise further into the life of religion. Both classes in greater or less degree go forth in obedience to the call of God, and they go forth not knowing whither they go.

1. First let us consider the life of duty. So far as a man's life is a life of duty, it is one of action and strenuous effort. The law of conscience claims his obedience, and so he must ever toil to bring every affection and thought and act into harmony with its requirements. Not a few of this class stand in no conscious relation to God, and yet fashion their lives according to the dictates of a high morality. To such characters we cannot but offer our profoundest admiration; at the call of duty they forsake the ease, and the comforts, and self-indulgences we rate so highly, and go forth not knowing whither they go, so long as the voice that summoned them still companies with them and makes its utterances felt within them. And not infrequently on such men are bestowed the good things of this world also, and in their experience is realized the truth of those oracular words of Cromwell: 'One never mounts so high as when one knows not whither one is going'; for even the commonplace world can read such lives, and is apt in its hour of need to fall back on their strength and claim their service.

But, if from the life of conscience the man fails to rise to the life of religion, how terrible is the strain of such a life: the will must be for ever on the stretch, the muscles for ever tense, the perceptions for ever on the alert. So long indeed as the vital energies are in their prime, things go well with this moral athleticism, but, when the muscles grow flaccid, the nerves overstrained, and morbid fancies engross the mind, only the noblest of this class can evade the onset of despair, and boldly confront the darkness to which according to their own stern creed they are hastening.

2. We may take it as a rule that the life of duty

rises into the life of religion unless in exceptional cases. Under the former we do what is right under compulsion—the compulsion, it is true, of conscience; under the latter we do what is right from willing choice, because what is right has itself become the object of love.

Now the doctrine of habit helps us to understand how this transformation of motive comes about. Let us suppose that we have a certain duty to do, but that not only have we no desire to do this duty, but actually regard it with strong aversion. If then, despite the absence of the right affection and the actual presence of the wrong, we go and do the duty, and that not once or twice but persistently, as often as the duty arises, then the very affection and enthusiasm that have for their object the fulfilment of the duty are in due time born within us, and we come to discharge from love the obligation which hitherto we could only fulfil through the compulsion of conscience. Now in the course of such a process we have consciously or unconsciously come into more immediate touch with God, the only Source and Inspirer of all excellence and all truth, and, in so far as a man gets into such actual touch with God, he has begun the religious life, he has so far passed from the kingdom of law into the kingdom of grace.

It is obvious that in the light of such a truth none of us is perfectly religious. More or less of our life, more rather than less, is still under the dominion of law. We have many duties laid upon us by God, which owing to our manifold failings we regard as heavy burdens and accordingly bear with reluctant and joyless spirit. Again and again we pray for their removal. And when at last we have learnt that it is God's will that we should bear them, still, how slow, even then, are we to give ourselves heart and soul to the task, and draw from God the strength and grace that will enable us to fulfil with willingness, if not with joy, the purposes and ends for which God sent us into the world. And yet if, despite inward reluctance and repeated failure, we steadfastly begin afresh and leave behind us ease and comfort and quiet, and press onward in the rugged path our God has chosen for us, resolved to pursue it, though we know not for the time whither we go or to what sacrifice it leads, then sooner or later on the way, our Lord, who had companied invisibly with us from the very outset, will manifest Himself and lift us into fellowship with His Spirit, and lead us even here into that goodly land He hath prepared for us, where our chief and outstanding prayer will be—not for ease and self-indulgence, for quiet days and restful nights, not for exemption from mortal weariness and human sorrow; but for courage, for loyalty to truth, for a patience that endures to the end, for a readiness for His completed will, for true fellowship with Christ, and worthiness to suffer and endure for His sake.[1]

First Sunday in Lent.

Penitence.

'Despisest thou the riches of his goodness and forbearance and longsuffering, not knowing that the goodness of God leadeth thee to repentance?'—Ro 2^4.

St. Paul is addressing a typical sinner in a strain which has not lost its impressiveness or cogency at the present day. We summarize the passage. 'Do you suppose,' he says, 'that a special exemption will be made in your favour, and that you will personally escape punishment for your sins? Or are you presuming on God's abundant goodness and forbearance and longsuffering, which have hitherto delayed the punishment? If so, you make a great mistake. The object of that goodness is not that you may be exempted from punishment, but to induce you to repent, while in your hardened, impenitent heart you are laying up for yourself wrath against the Day of Wrath, when the righteous judgment of God will be revealed.' Such an expostulation in substance, if not in actual words, might be addressed to any who year after year have put off turning to God with all their heart. They may not perhaps consciously argue that the goodness of God will exempt them from punishment, but that is the feeling at the back of their minds. They do not see that the real object of the Divine goodness is to induce them to repent. They drift along, vaguely trusting that all will be well, and all the while in their impenitent hearts they are treasuring up for themselves wrath in the Day of Judgment.

Every Lent that comes round we have to ask ourselves the question: Are we trying our best to be truly penitent? Penitence, of course, does not mean exactly the same thing to different people and under different circumstances. There must always indeed be conviction of sin, confession of sin, and contrition for sin; but the extent to which these are felt and their mode of expression often differ. There is the penitence of the sinner, and the penitence of the saint. Take two extreme cases. First the penitence of conversion, when the soul after many years suddenly or gradually

[1] R. H. Charles, *The Adventure into the Unknown*, 1.

realizes its alienation from God. Those who have had experience know how tremendous is the revulsion of feeling which accompanies the first beginnings of a complete and fundamental change of character and life. Then, secondly, as an opposite extreme, the penitence of saintliness—the daily penitence of the lifelong servants of God, who still, while striving after holiness, find the continual need of sorrow for sin in their humble-minded and scrupulous consciences. That stands in sharp contrast to conversion and repentance. It deals with smaller sins; it is more delicate in its self-restraint, deeper in its self-knowledge, less violent in its expression; but the feeling of contrition below the surface is equally sincere and equally fervent.

Between these two extremes there are various types and degrees of the penitential feeling. To each of us probably penitence has a meaning of its own. Some of us perhaps are conscious of sins in the past, the influence of which still continues to affect our spiritual life. Or there may be some sinful habit in our lives which we cannot overcome, lacking strength to resist the temptation when it presents itself, in spite of previous good resolves.

'The goodness of God leadeth thee to repentance.' God's goodness must always be a condition of man's repentance. Without it we could no more repent than we could do any other good thing. But it is not the only motive to repentance. The sense of God's goodness and longsuffering, the thought of Christ standing patiently at the door of the heart and knocking, stirs our highest emotions. But there is another motive which appeals to many minds—the thought of God's wrath. The penitent in the early stages of his pilgrim progress has to try to balance and adjust his feelings of love and fear towards Almighty God. Is he to love God more than he fears Him, or to fear Him more than he loves Him? As we pass onward and upward, from penitence to amendment of life, from conviction of sin to sanctification of character, it is true, as a general rule, that our fear of God becomes more or less modified, while our love of Him becomes fuller and deeper. But both feelings are always an indispensable condition of the Christian life. From the very first beginnings of the new life there *must* be love of God in the penitent heart. And on the other hand, the Christian will never probably on earth attain to a state of perfectness in which his love of God will cast out all sense of fear. To the last his love will be tempered by awe. He will have lost indeed all blind superstitious dread of God's judgments; he will have substituted for the slave's grovelling terror of punishment the son's humble, reverent attitude towards a Father who is infinitely wiser and more perfect than himself; but that fear of the Lord which is the beginning of wisdom will remain to the end of his life an element in his character which mingles with and modifies his growing and deepening feeling of love.

It is not then merely the love of God's goodness which leads men to repentance. Love and fear are strangely welded together in the making of the Christian character. We are sometimes perhaps too much inclined to minimize unduly the importance in religion of a due fear of God's wrath. Men say God is love; need we be afraid of His anger? Can we attribute to a Perfect Being such a feeling as wrath? Is not the dread of Divine anger a survival of the teaching of the Old Testament, abrogated now by the new dispensation of love? Such ideas are more or less consciously present to many minds nowadays, and we may perhaps admit that anger and wrath have been somewhat unfortunate terms to use of a Being of infinite holiness. But substitute for wrath or anger righteous displeasure against sin, hatred of wickedness, inflexible determination to uphold goodness, and do we not feel that these things must form part of our conception of God's nature? There is a Divine displeasure of which no human being can help standing in fear, and that displeasure is represented as a characteristic of God in the New Testament as well as in the Old. Though this aspect of Christ's teaching is less conspicuous than what He says about the loving-kindness of the Heavenly Father, still we cannot ignore it. He unquestionably appealed to the motive of fear as well as to that of love. He told men that except they repented they would all likewise perish. He bade them fear Him who was able to destroy both soul and body in hell. He spoke of a mysterious outer darkness into which sinners were to be cast. In St. John's Gospel He is recorded to have said that the disobedient man shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him.

Rightly viewed, the higher fear of God is almost the same thing as the sense of the hatefulness of sin in God's sight. If our penitence is to result in permanent restoration, we must keep alive in our heart this conviction of God's hatred of sin. We know perhaps how difficult this sometimes is. When the fervour of our penitence abates, we begin to make excuses to ourselves. We say that we

are no worse than other people. We say that the sinfulness of sin is often exaggerated; we argue that our individual temperament makes temptation exceptionally strong to us. Once adopt this attitude towards sin and we are virtually on the path of the backslider. 'O ye that love the Lord,' says the Psalmist, 'see that ye hate the thing that is evil.' [1]

SECOND SUNDAY IN LENT.

The Abuse of Religion.

'But whereunto shall I liken this generation? It is like unto children sitting in the marketplaces.'—Mt 11[16] (R.V.).

In his Ode on Immortality, Wordsworth has drawn the imitative, imaginative child. Take him, says the poet, at the age of six:

'See, at his feet, some little plan or chart,
Some fragment from his dream of human life,
Shaped by himself with newly-learned art;
A wedding or a festival,
A mourning or a funeral;
And this hath now his heart,
And unto this he frames his song:
. . . . . .
But it will not be long
Ere this be thrown aside,
And with new joy and pride
The little Actor cons another part;
. . . . . .
As if his whole vocation
Were endless imitation.'

This is native to the child's health and charm, this elastic power of being able to respond quickly to various emotions or impressions. But what is pretty and even natural in childhood may be a weakness afterwards. Make-believe is never the staple of a mature life, and it is a thin character which has no higher vocation than reproducing indiscriminately a series of passing phases in religion or in anything else. Jesus, looking at some of His contemporaries in Galilee, declared that their attitude towards the gospel reminded Him of nothing so much as of children, of children at play—and at play *in the marketplaces*, where serious business was afoot. You Galileans, said Jesus, are as childish. You are trifling with life in the very sphere of serious interests. All you are fit to do is to play with the forms and phases of religion; while earnest people are putting heart and soul into it, most of you are simply amusing yourselves with it instead of allowing your hearts to be penetrated by its convictions and appeals.

The Galileans were a volatile and dramatic race. Josephus, who commanded their troops during the Jewish war, describes how he fell into sudden disfavour with them, and how the people expressed their resentment by conducting a mock funeral of himself in his own presence, placing his effigy upon a gorgeous bier, and going gravely through the burial ceremonies. Jesus marked the same sort of fickle, imitative tendencies in their treatment of Himself and John the Baptist. They were captious and careless.

1. Religion is abused when the so-called religious interest becomes censorious. 'John came neither eating nor drinking, and they say he has a devil. The Son of man came eating and drinking, and they say, here is a glutton and a wine-bibber, a friend of tax-gatherers and sinners!' This censorious temper Jesus pronounced simply childish. What disturbed these Galileans was not John's austerity nor the genial tone of Jesus, but the Divine intensity which led both to make inconvenient demands upon fastidious natures. There are people who can always find some plausible excuse for setting aside a religious appeal. They show a perverted ability in tabling objections to any form of religion, ascetic or otherwise, which impinges on their aloofness. What they really dislike is not this or that expression of religion; it is religion itself.

2. Censoriousness is mainly superficial, but religion is abused not only when exception is taken to features which are for the most part external, but also when attention is devoted to such elements. 'Children sitting in the marketplaces call to their companions and say, We piped to you, but you did not dance; we wailed, but you did not beat your breasts.' It was imitation, not experience, and the imitation cost them nothing. Many a Pharisee could, and perhaps did, affect the behaviour of John. Many an impressionable Galilean could copy the outward demeanour of Jesus. But in either case it was a piece of play-acting, and it is so still. People can discuss and compare the varieties of religion to their heart's content; they may be able to repeat its language, and to reproduce some of its phases, even to proselytize on behalf of their particular form. Yet, in many instances, it is perfectly obvious to any one who is inside that this is simply trifling with the surface.

3. The result is that religion is further abused by being treated sentimentally. Some years ago one of our Indian civil servants described the average Filipino as a moral wreck, 'light-minded,

[1] H. G. Woods, *Christianity and War*, 71.

easily caught by glitter and show, as irrational and inconsequent as a child.' A Roman Catholic, 'he knows little or nothing of the faith to which he nominally belongs, but he hates and despises all others. The laws of his Church are exacting, but they do not trouble him at all, for unless he be stretched upon his deathbed and beset with superstitious fears, he can very rarely summon the energy necessary to obey them. He delights in feast-days, because they appeal to his sense of glitter, and afford him opportunities for outbursts of the appalling music of which he is passionately fond.' This analysis of the Filipino's religion recalls the childish Galilean temperament of which Jesus speaks. Even when the Galileans did imitate John or Jesus, they were *like children*. A child's emotions are easily stirred.

The gift of being impressed is always valuable; still there is no moral value in being content to feel moved, and to let that be all. Jesus has only sorrowful indignation for the æsthetic or emotional appreciation of the gospel which is impatient of any searching and thorough discipline for the will. How can there be any religion without the willingness to come under definite obligations to God? To be sentimental, according to George Meredith, is to enjoy without incurring obligation, and in the sphere of Christian experience this means to mistake self-gratification for moral passion, to amuse the intellect with convictions on which we have no serious intention of acting, and covertly to admire ourselves for our religious emotions and aspirations. To treat the gospel thus is to abuse it. There is a fatal tendency to stop short with the theory of some religious belief, as if that absolved us from the need of going any further. And on the emotional side, the danger is even more obvious. Discussion for discussion's sake, feeling for feeling's sake—that is what, with unconscious irreverence, we often allow to determine our relations with religion. It corrupts reason and emotion alike, and it interposes a barrier of unreality between the soul and Christ.

The levity with which people will accept the gospel is sometimes more astounding than the levity with which they permit themselves to dismiss it. Their reasons for devotion are at times even more undesirable than their pleas for incredulity. And yet, if our connexion with Christianity is nothing better than a mixture of captious criticism and transient enthusiasm, with a dash of graceful posing thrown in, we are in danger, like these Galileans, of just playing with Christ's religion—playing, too, *in the marketplace*, surrounded by the realities of life and death, where business has to be done with God.[1]

THIRD SUNDAY IN LENT.

The Way to a New World.

'That ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven.'—Mt 5^{45}.

This clause, which might as fitly conclude other sentences from the Sermon on the Mount as the one in our text, expresses the inner motive and spirit of the Christian life and can by no means be bound down to any particular injunction or command. It reveals the motive and driving power which lies behind every venture of Christian faith and service. This is the secret passion round which all the romance of Christian history is written, the heartfelt desire that, come what may in life, the spirit of man may bear the marks of kinship with his Creator and Redeemer.

The Sermon on the Mount has been called the lawbook of Christ, and in a slightly different vein it has been regarded as a vivid picture of the Kingdom of God as that Kingdom is mirrored in the portrait of a citizen. We see here the Divine society as society is seen in terms of personal living and its spirit. One of the shortest, as it is certainly one of the most satisfying, pictures of the new world which we are still talking about was that given by the prophet Isaiah centuries ago. 'A king shall reign in righteousness, and princes shall rule in judgment. And a man shall be as an hiding-place from the wind, and a covert from the tempest; as rivers of water in a dry place, and as the shadow of a great rock in a weary land.' It is *man*, and not a type of government, which fills the old picture.

Now the Sermon on the Mount is Christ's picture of what a man shall be in the new Kingdom. Through it all He is saying to us, a man shall be this, and this, and this, and as He builds up the picture of the man, the vision of the Kingdom grows before our eyes. And just as man is the heart of the Kingdom, so the text takes us to the heart of the man. He lives with this supreme passion ruling his heart that he may be a child of his Father who is in heaven.

Without the spiritual passion of likeness to the Father the whole dream of the Kingdom vanishes into thin air. Indeed, it is impossible to understand or appreciate Christ's ethical teaching as a whole apart from this underlying motive. Yet some of the sanest of men have reluctantly reached

[1] J. Moffatt, *Reasons and Reasons*, 131.

the conclusion that it may be a picture of the citizen of God's Kingdom, but that it could not be carried out here and now without the gravest risks both for the individual and society. How would it be possible to live without judging others? How could a man expect to live in the spirit of reckless generosity suggested in our Lord's words, even though you do not interpret those words literally? What would become of the social and industrial order if men loved and forgave as they are bidden to do by Christ? The whole of the teaching here has a touch of extravagance in it. It is far removed from the reserves and qualifications and cautions of ordinary life.

Now, if we look at all deeply into such idealism as the Sermon on the Mount, we will not be long in doubt as to where that element of extravagance comes from. It is born of the vision of God in the soul of man. There is really nothing more extravagant in this world than the Christian conception of God. A God who makes His sun shine on the just and the unjust equally, who never adjusts His gifts to men's thankfulness for them, is not one whom you can fit into the narrow limits of any practical scheme. What has the ordinary man of the world to say about such a tremendous truth as that of forgiveness? Would he think it wise to meet men who had disobeyed his orders and outraged his laws with the spirit of Mercy, and a willingness to receive them back into the old relationship? The world has come to take these things for granted after the fashion of Heine's famous comment—'Of course God will forgive, it's His business to.'

But if there be any truth which our Lord taught with the whole emphasis of His mind and spirit it is that there is a fine balance between God's relationship to man and man's relationship to his fellow. In parable and simile and incisive saying He told men that their spiritual receipts would be adjusted to their spiritual expenditure, and that the measure of human giving must set the measure in which God would bestow. Men sometimes forget that there is a Divine practicality as well as a human one, that we are forgiven so that we may forgive, blessed so that we may bless. Man's sonship to God is an empty title unless the vision of God penetrates through the whole of life in that fashion.

How often have we stood before these great principles of living almost paralysed by their difficulty. 'How can we love our enemies?' we have asked. 'How can we give and forgive amid such ingratitude and wrong?' The words which tell us to do so have seemed remote and cold, shining above the snow-line of the spiritual heights. Thinking in that way we have missed the secret of Christ. The heart of man is like metal in this respect, that it must be melted before it can be shaped, and the teaching of Christ is not cold and remote, but heated to the pitch of passion. There is a gospel behind every principle in the Sermon on the Mount. It is because God forgives us that we are asked to forgive; because God loves His enemies that we are told to love ours; because God gives to the unthankful as well as to the grateful that we are bidden to give without reckoning the return. In a word, before Christ asks us to do the impossible He asks us to open our hearts to receive the impossible.

Christian morality apart from Christian religion is a system without a source, and the only thing which will lift men out of their moral impotence is the passion for God, the desire to be His children with His likeness imprinted upon them. In these strange times of ours, do we not find that on the one hand religion has come to such a pass in our day that for vast numbers of men the Christian language about God wakens no deep response in their heart? They do not deny its truth, many of them are not concerned enough with the subject even to deny it; they simply let it pass them by. It is not that the life of our time is specially corrupted; men hold generally to an ideal of decency and fair play, and these qualities are by no means to be despised, but about the deep things of life their hearts are listless and unmoved. The problem is not so much that men neglect the duty of worship as that they feel no need of it. They do not live as though the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ reigned above us all. Faith in that living sense is dormant. It will wake to life again some day, but for the present other matters dominate the thoughts of men.

That is one fact of the present situation. The other is that everywhere in the world of to-day the crux of things turns on the issue whether men are prepared courageously to follow the light of Christ's teaching about life. What is the need of the world? To get men to take a sane and responsible share in the duties of life, to think through things, to work hard, to realize that everything, in the last resort, must be interpreted in the light of individual responsibility. That is the first thing, and Christ called it service, consecrating oneself, losing one's life. Then, beyond that on every horizon of the world, there are the numberless questions that gather about class and nation. How are the

classes to work together? How are the nations to forget old animosities and trust one another. Hatred is a hardy annual in the garden of life, and bears its fatal blooms with unfailing regularity. We must break that disastrous circle if the world is to be saved; and saved it can be, but only by one thing—the way and spirit of Christ.

There will be a cross in it, of course, the seeming weakness, the shame, the contempt, but it is the only way nevertheless, and the world is beginning to realize it, however far men are from setting out on the path. We cannot, however, begin to practise the Christian ethic as though we could take an old and neglected recipe out of a drawer when everything else had been tried and had failed. The thing on which men are driven back as a last resort is never a thing they practise wisely. They turn to it as though it were magic, and there is no swiftly working magic in this world of ours. The only way to recover the Christian ethic is through the Christian religion, that widely neglected thing.

It is the kindling touch of God we need to move us to that extravagance of mercy and forgiveness and service that the world needs with so deep a hunger of spirit. And it is our task in the Church to lead the way. That is our high calling, our heart-searching business, our privilege and travail, to understand our gospel better, to preach it with new passion and conviction, to live it out with new courage and adventure until the fire spreads and the Word has free course again.[1]

[1] S. M. Berry, *Revealing Light*, 208.

The Problem of St. Paul's Conversion.

By the Reverend G. J. Inglis, M.A., Bishops' College, Cheshunt.

The conversion of St. Paul is a spiritual crisis of unique significance in the evolution of early Christianity, and it presents a problem because its precise nature has not yet been determined on lines which command general agreement. In view of the importance of the subject of the experience, the problem remains one of perennial interest; and every age, in the light of its own knowledge, furnishes its own tentative solution. We may ask what is the tentative solution which is offered in our own age—an age which has seen so great a development in the sciences of historical criticism and practical psychology. As a preliminary to answering this question, we may attempt to consider the surviving records of Paul's experience in the light of historical criticism and psychological investigation, in order to furnish, not a theological or ontological solution of the problem, but an outline of the historical and psychological data on which such a solution may be based. In other words, we are not concerned to prove or to disprove the proposition that Paul's own account of his experience is to be taken as final; we are merely concerned to discover, on the basis of the existing evidence, what that account is, and to indicate the nature of the historical and psychological facts to which it points.

In this case the first-hand evidence consists of references in Galatians and 1 Corinthians (for Paul has left no full first-hand account of his experience), while the second-hand material is provided in Acts. At the present day there is adequate justification for the view that Galatians and 1 Corinthians are authentic Epistles, and that Acts is the work of Luke, who has good claims to be regarded as a reliable historian. Moreover, the three accounts in Acts may safely be taken as constituting a triple tradition. Ac 9 contains a narrative, from Luke himself or from a source which he approved, designed to give an intelligible account of a decisive event which marked the most important stage in the spread of the gospel from Jerusalem to Rome; while Ac 22 and 26 contain reports of the Apostle's speeches, of which each is adapted to the special circumstances in which it was delivered. The variations in the narratives serve to indicate their independence of each other. Without attempting to deal with the various problems presented by these records, we may indicate a line to be followed in certain relevant points where there is room for doubt. We shall treat Paul's conversion as a process consisting of three stages: (1) a stage of preparation, (2) a stage of crisis, and (3) a stage of interpretation.

I. *The stage of preparation* consists of the development of a complex in the unconscious mind. In