

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

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

home, school, and town. The 'Flu' is 'catching'; one gets it from another like passing the word along the line at drill.

Now, let us look at this word 'Influenza' which we call 'Flu' for short. Why, you keen girls and boys must have seen that it is just our English word 'Influence.' Only that, for some strange reason, it has been to Italy to have its tail cut off. The word has come back to us with the letters *za* instead of *ce* tagged on at the end. 'Influenza' is but Italian for 'Influence,' which means the in-flowing of a power from one person to another. We shall, for the moment, drop the foreign form of the word and keep our own native term to denote the *right* kind of influenza, something that does not make the head ache, but makes the heart glad and life rich and radiant.

You will remember the story of little Arthur in *Tom Brown's Schooldays*. On his first night at school, when Arthur knelt down to say his prayers by his bed in the dormitory, he was pelted with slippers by the other boys, who jeered at him. The following night, while still suffering from the effects of this 'ragging,' his first impulse was to creep into bed and say his prayers under the clothes. On second thoughts, however, he felt that this would be to play the coward. Besides, why should he be ashamed to wear the colours of his Captain the Lord Jesus Christ.

Arthur knelt down by his bed as on the previous night. Fewer slippers were thrown at him this time. The boys began to see that although a frail little laddie yet he was 'game.' By the end of the week every boy in that dormitory knelt down to say his prayers before going to bed.

They had caught the 'influence' from little Arthur.

This takes us right back to that scene by the Lake of Galilee where Jesus met two of His first disciples. They happened to be fishermen. Jesus, knowing this, said to them, 'Come ye after me, and I will make you to become fishers of men.' There was to *in-flow* from Him to them a spirit, or power, of goodness, which would be felt by others. They were to 'catch' men for Christ and His Kingdom. Thus it turned out to be. Andrew went after Jesus and was the means of bringing Peter, his brother. Philip, likewise, brought the 'influence' to bear upon Nathanael, and so the golden chain that links men to Jesus Christ goes on even to this very day.

It is a great honour to so live in close friendship with Jesus Christ that we may make disciples of others to learn of and serve Him. No one is too

small or too young for such a venture, for do we not read in the Bible, 'A little child shall lead them'?

The Christian Year.

THIRD SUNDAY IN LENT.

The Kingdom of Light.

'But what things were gain to me, those I counted loss for Christ.'—Ph 3'.

There are times in the lives of each of us when the Kingdom of Darkness stands over against the Kingdom of Light. It is no question of half shades, but a clear choice of black or white.

From much of the talk that we hear we might think that no man ever chose the evil when he clearly knew it to be evil, that all sinners have been misled, that they did not know what they were doing. That is not so. Evil has its own baleful fascination for us at times even when we know it is evil. Nine times out of the ten, when we are faced with the solicitation of that which we clearly see to be evil, we have no hesitation in refusing to choose it—but the tenth time we choose the evil. We have to admit these facts. They are ugly, and we would like to give them a finer name and delude ourselves, but truth compels us to acknowledge that in choosing the evil we were not deluded at all, in taking the black we were not blind for a moment.

It is not always a choice between good and evil that faces us, but between that which is good in itself and something which is far better—there is no attempt to convince us that our gains are not good, for they are.

Dr. Jane Harrison, who died in 1928 at the age of seventy-seven, was a brilliant lecturer and writer on Greek literature and art. On being asked why she had ceased to lecture on Greek art, she said, 'I simply can't; religion is so much more interesting.'

What were the gains that Paul counted as loss for the greater gain of being found in Christ? They were those things that formed the boast of his friends, and were the claims of his enemies, the things for which men seek and for which they yearn—birth, lineage, rank, education, social standing, moral attainments—the very things that men count precious. The reference is to those who would not become Christians, because they relied on their Jewish birth, on their fulfilment of

home, school, and town. The 'Flu' is 'catching'; one gets it from another like passing the word along the line at drill.

Now, let us look at this word 'Influenza' which we call 'Flu' for short. Why, you keen girls and boys must have seen that it is just our English word 'Influence.' Only that, for some strange reason, it has been to Italy to have its tail cut off. The word has come back to us with the letters *za* instead of *ce* tagged on at the end. 'Influenza' is but Italian for 'Influence,' which means the in-flowing of a power from one person to another. We shall, for the moment, drop the foreign form of the word and keep our own native term to denote the *right* kind of influenza, something that does not make the head ache, but makes the heart glad and life rich and radiant.

You will remember the story of little Arthur in *Tom Brown's Schooldays*. On his first night at school, when Arthur knelt down to say his prayers by his bed in the dormitory, he was pelted with slippers by the other boys, who jeered at him. The following night, while still suffering from the effects of this 'ragging,' his first impulse was to creep into bed and say his prayers under the clothes. On second thoughts, however, he felt that this would be to play the coward. Besides, why should he be ashamed to wear the colours of his Captain the Lord Jesus Christ.

Arthur knelt down by his bed as on the previous night. Fewer slippers were thrown at him this time. The boys began to see that although a frail little laddie yet he was 'game.' By the end of the week every boy in that dormitory knelt down to say his prayers before going to bed.

They had caught the 'influence' from little Arthur.

This takes us right back to that scene by the Lake of Galilee where Jesus met two of His first disciples. They happened to be fishermen. Jesus, knowing this, said to them, 'Come ye after me, and I will make you to become fishers of men.' There was to *in-flow* from Him to them a spirit, or power, of goodness, which would be felt by others. They were to 'catch' men for Christ and His Kingdom. Thus it turned out to be. Andrew went after Jesus and was the means of bringing Peter, his brother. Philip, likewise, brought the 'influence' to bear upon Nathanael, and so the golden chain that links men to Jesus Christ goes on even to this very day.

It is a great honour to so live in close friendship with Jesus Christ that we may make disciples of others to learn of and serve Him. No one is too

small or too young for such a venture, for do we not read in the Bible, 'A little child shall lead them'?

The Christian Year.

THIRD SUNDAY IN LENT.

The Kingdom of Light.

'But what things were gain to me, those I counted loss for Christ.'—Ph 3'.

There are times in the lives of each of us when the Kingdom of Darkness stands over against the Kingdom of Light. It is no question of half shades, but a clear choice of black or white.

From much of the talk that we hear we might think that no man ever chose the evil when he clearly knew it to be evil, that all sinners have been misled, that they did not know what they were doing. That is not so. Evil has its own baleful fascination for us at times even when we know it is evil. Nine times out of the ten, when we are faced with the solicitation of that which we clearly see to be evil, we have no hesitation in refusing to choose it—but the tenth time we choose the evil. We have to admit these facts. They are ugly, and we would like to give them a finer name and delude ourselves, but truth compels us to acknowledge that in choosing the evil we were not deluded at all, in taking the black we were not blind for a moment.

It is not always a choice between good and evil that faces us, but between that which is good in itself and something which is far better—there is no attempt to convince us that our gains are not good, for they are.

Dr. Jane Harrison, who died in 1928 at the age of seventy-seven, was a brilliant lecturer and writer on Greek literature and art. On being asked why she had ceased to lecture on Greek art, she said, 'I simply can't; religion is so much more interesting.'

What were the gains that Paul counted as loss for the greater gain of being found in Christ? They were those things that formed the boast of his friends, and were the claims of his enemies, the things for which men seek and for which they yearn—birth, lineage, rank, education, social standing, moral attainments—the very things that men count precious. The reference is to those who would not become Christians, because they relied on their Jewish birth, on their fulfilment of

the Law, their circumcision, their zeal, and their righteousness.

The prevalence and dangers of this attitude require that we should be on our guard, lest we be robbed of our greater inheritance, lest the proverbial bird in the hand, which is often a bird of fine plumage and sweet song, should cheat us of the still sweeter song of the bird in the leaves over our head.

Undoubtedly our first school-books were of inestimable value, and we could prove that nothing else could have fulfilled their work as well. Nevertheless, they have to be left behind if the mind is to grow. Could not Abraham have demonstrated that he stood to lose all that was most precious and undoubtedly good if he went out from his home in Ur of the Chaldees; and would not his friends point the moral of all this? Yet his salvation, and the development of truth and Divine revelation which followed, demanded that he should be a pilgrim on the face of the earth, and go out from his home not knowing whither his feet were taking him. But he came to the Promised Land.

The same principle lies at the heart of that coming of the rich young ruler to Christ. It was not fanatical hatred of wealth that made Christ demand that he should sell all if he would be truly emancipated. The secondary thing was in the way of the primary, the lower good in the way of the higher.

If the gains that are ours to-day are to rob us of the richer treasure of the morrows, we must not only regard them as rubbish but as loss. How can we think that the best came first? How could the highest truth, the best good, the fullest revelation, come to us in the infancy of the race? It must, by the very nature that is ours, be true that 'the best is yet to be.' Every generation can see the truth of this when it is applied to past times. But our eyes are holden and our passions roused when some bold spirit would physic our sick souls with the same astringent medicine. Whoever challenges the good in the name of the better is dubbed an enemy of the people.

Our sins shame us and challenge us to fight, but our little virtues make us afraid lest we be satisfied. We are not afraid of the Devil. We do fear the close demands of God. We turn and fight the Devil. We turn and flee from God. We hug that which is ours, thinking that we are on the side of truth against error, forgetting

How little I have gained,
How vast the unattained.

We join the crowd who stone the Stephens. We make our Galileos recant the new truth. Rather we should be amongst those who

Feel the earth move sunward,
Join the great march onward.

Hail to the coming singers!
Hail to the brave light-bringers!
Forward I reach and share
All that they sing and dare.

There is the religious application also of the principle we have been considering. Paul left the revelation of God in the Law which dealt with the deed, to follow the morality of Christ which dealt with the motive which brings forth the fruits of the Spirit. He left the commands of Moses to follow the commands of Christ, confident that all the good of Moses was to be found in Christ, and all that transfiguring 'more' which could never come to him through Moses. Paul left the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees and sought the righteousness of Christ.

The same call comes to us and to all men everywhere, and in every age. Neither individual nor nation can come into the full inheritance save at the cost of regarding as loss the previous gains, and going out with staff and wallet to follow the call of the higher.

The last stage of all has come when our contentment with the present attainment deafens our ears to the call of the highest. To what abysmal poverty we condemn ourselves if we do this; for we not only rob ourselves of the truest riches, but we cannot get the full worth of that which we already prize. If we revel in our primers, we not only can never revel in the glories of the greater literature, but we do not use well nor get the best out of our primers.

If we pride ourselves on our morality, on our respectability, our good manners, our culture, which are all good in themselves, all desirable possessions, we not only rob ourselves of the unsearchable riches of Christ, and of the Christ life, and the thrill of a rich soul life, but the very good of that we thus hoard turns to dross and poisons our life.

No man so well uses this world and gets the real good of this life as he who looks for a city that hath foundations, whose Builder and Maker is God.

'What things were gain to me, those I counted loss for Christ.'¹

¹ A. Hird, *The Test of Discipleship*, 74.

FOURTH SUNDAY IN LENT.

Seeing the Father.

'Jesus saith unto him, Have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known me, Philip? he that hath seen me hath seen the Father; and how sayest thou then, Shew us the Father?'—Jn 14⁹.

In these words we can discern not only the thoughts, but also the feelings of Jesus, and we shall often understand His thoughts better if we feel with Him. He is *disappointed*. 'Have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known me, Philip?' Nevertheless He is still *confident*. 'He that hath seen me hath seen the Father.' And so He is *surprised*. 'How sayest thou then, Shew us the Father?' Disappointment, confidence, surprise—all these emotions are blended in this claim that a Divine revelation, sufficient and satisfying, has been given in Him.

1. *Jesus' Disappointment*.—'Have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known me, Philip?' This emotion was once and again expressed by Jesus. As a boy in the Temple, He was disappointed that the motive of His remaining behind in Jerusalem was not understood. As a teacher He was often disappointed by the failure of His disciples to grasp His meaning. As a worker He was disappointed by the lack of faith of those who came to Him for healing. So here, at the very close of His earthly ministry, in His last talk with His companions before He suffered, He was disappointed by Philip's foolish and vain request for a more adequate and convincing revelation of God than He had as yet given.

Two reasons for Jesus' disappointment may be suggested.

(1) Jesus had brought His disciples into immediate contact and intimate communion with Himself. He had made them His intimates and His confidants. He had not concealed His inner life from them, but had made His spirit absolutely transparent to them. Doubtless there was a Holy of holies of His fellowship with God into which even they were not allowed to enter; but the glory of the God-presence there shone through all reserve and restraint into the holy place of His intimacy and confidence with them, and even streamed into the outer court of His teaching and training. The false man may make his life so skilfully a play-acting that from what appears upon the stage men may not even suspect what is going on behind the scenes. Even the good man has imaginations and impulses which his respect for himself and his regard for others compel him to conceal and repress.

Jesus had nothing to conceal, and by His very vocation almost everything to reveal. If God dwells within the soul as He is never fully seen in the life, and if Jesus was the revelation of God, His inner life was no private possession but a universal benefaction, which He did not and could not withhold from those whom it was meant to bless. When we lay aside our natural reserve and give another our full confidence, is there any disappointment keener than that we feel when we discover that we have laid bare our heart in vain? May we not suppose that Jesus felt that disappointment as keenly?

(2) The life which He had thus put within the reach of the knowledge and the understanding of His disciples was one of which a total impression could be formed, for it was so constantly consistent. The fickle and wilful man cannot be known and understood, for the impression he gives one day may be taken away the next. The truer and better a man is, with one inspiring motive, one compelling purpose, one definite direction in his life, the more easy is knowledge and understanding. It was Jesus' meat and drink to do His Father's will. All His thoughts were moulded by one spirit of truth; all His feelings moved by one impulse of love; all His deeds were directed to one purpose of the glory of God in the good of man. If our consistency is doubted, are not we disappointed? So, too, was Jesus.

2. *Jesus' Confidence*.—Had Jesus' judgment of Himself depended on the opinion of men regarding Him, His disappointment with His disciples would have shaken His confidence in Himself. For how often does a man begin to distrust himself when others show any doubt of him. But if we read the gospel record carefully, we shall discover that Jesus' confidence grew as popularity waned and opposition waxed. He meets Philip's request with this assurance that no other theophany than Himself is needed or can suffice—'He that hath seen me hath seen the Father.' Self-confidence is not usually regarded as an admirable trait. How can that be excellence in Jesus which is generally a defect in other men? We must not cut the Gordian knot by at once appealing to His Divinity, as His Divinity was revealed in perfect humanity.

(1) Self-confidence is generally so objectionable because it is unjustified. It rests on ignorance and not knowledge of self. Jesus both knew Himself, and was as He knew Himself. The judgment of the Church has confirmed His self-judgment.

(2) There is a humility which, as unreal because

unrelated to truth, is just as objectionable. A man should be true and just to himself as well as to others; and he should not libel himself in speech, manner, or conduct to others. It is better for a man to under- than to over-estimate himself; but exaggeration in either direction is equally marked by falsity. A man may fail by this false humility to do the work, give the example, or wield the influence for which he is fitted and God intended him. The best use of powers depends on the true knowledge of the possession of them. Jesus knew Himself, and must judge Himself as Son of God.

(3) The nature of a man's work determines the degree of confidence he must hold in his fitness for it and call to it. The harder the task a man must face, the greater the trust in his power to accomplish it he must command. No battles would be won by the general doubtful of his strategy. It was Jesus' vocation to reveal God as Father; how could He make men certain of God as Father, unless He was Himself confident that He as Son knew God, and was able to inspire others with this confidence in Himself? The world's certainty of God's Fatherhood waited on His confidence in His own Sonship.

(4) His relation to God as Son was one of such constant dependence and entire submission, as well as intimate communion, that His confidence was not so much self-confidence as confidence in God. He was sure of Himself only as He was sure of God. So, too, the Christian, confessing his own insufficiency apart from God, may yet boast his sufficiency in God. When Paul exclaimed, 'I can do all things in him that strengtheneth me,' he was not applauding himself, but adoring Christ. So Jesus in His confidence as Son was glorifying His Father.

3. *Jesus' Surprise.*—'How sayest thou then, Shew us the Father?' Jesus feels, and cannot but feel, surprise that Philip has not discovered the truth so certain to Himself. He who loved freely, trusted fully, hoped firmly, could not understand the lack of love, faith, hope in the disciples, which hindered their knowledge and understanding of Himself. If His perfection was a barrier to their understanding of Him, their imperfection was a barrier to His understanding of them. By His insight He often knew what they were thinking and feeling; but nevertheless their inner life was often a perplexity to Him. To God surely iniquity remains a mystery. A good man when he witnesses some forms of evil of which he himself would be incapable is forced to cry out, 'Oh, how could he do it?' It was no defect in Jesus, but an

excellence, that His attitude to God, so different from the attitude of the disciples to Himself, made their attitude a surprise.

Has our Lord and Saviour the same ground for being surprised at our lack of love, faith, or hope regarding Him? Have we frustrated His constant efforts to reveal God to us, and to redeem us unto God? If we confess such failure, should we not further press the question whether it is because our religion is a second-hand influence of the Church, and not a first-hand experience of Christ Himself? Only as we make the venture of faith in Christ shall we know Him as the Son of God, see in Him the Father, and be so satisfied that we shall not desire any other revelation of God.

Thou seemest human and divine,

The highest, holiest manhood, thou:

Our wills are ours, we know not how;

Our wills are ours, to make them thine.¹

FIFTH SUNDAY IN LENT.

Doubt.

'And the Pharisees came forth, and began to question with him, seeking of him a sign from heaven, tempting him. And he sighed deeply in his spirit, and saith, Why doth this generation seek after a sign? verily I say unto you, There shall no sign be given unto this generation.'—*Mk 8^{11, 12}*.

'Then saith he to Thomas, Reach hither thy finger, and behold my hands; and reach hither thy hand, and thrust it into my side: and be not faithless, but believing.'—*Jn 20²⁷*.

So doubting Thomas is given the sign that was refused to the inquiring Pharisees. Why is the treatment different in the two cases? Why are the Pharisees rebuked for inability to read the signs of the times, while Thomas, who had doubted the plain statement of the Apostles, supported as it was by the emptiness of the tomb, receives no rebuke, but is given the very sign that he demands? The answer to this question will tell us a good deal about the kind of faith and loyalty that our Lord demands.

Our forefathers used to think that any doubt with regard to religious doctrines was wicked; it was necessary that they should be reminded of the sympathy which our Lord showed for the doubts of St. Thomas. We are more inclined to look on any doubt with regard to religious doctrines as a fine thing, which marks us as what men call 'advanced'—though very often it is only retrograde; and it is necessary for us to be reminded

¹ A. E. Garvie, *The Master's Comfort and Hope*, 103.

that the Pharisees were condemned for requiring a sign. We feel inclined to protest that this was very proper scientific procedure ; of course they would not commit themselves to a position that was possibly dangerous and certainly eccentric until they had been persuaded by absolutely convincing evidence. But we see the real quality of this would-be scientific temper when it jeers beneath the Cross, ' Let him come down from the cross and we will believe on him.'

Their demand for evidence was not prompted by a love of truth. They did not wish to believe ; on the contrary, they wished not to believe, and they demanded the sign from heaven precisely because they believed that He could not give it ; they were ready to take His refusal as a confession of inability, and therefore an excuse for their disbelief. And so their desire for a sign was itself a sufficient reason for refusing to give the sign ; for had it been given, their reason would have been convinced while their hearts were still unconverted ; and that is perhaps the worst thing that can befall a man. To think our Lord is the revelation of God and to wish He weren't is about as far from discipleship as a man can be. And so our Lord deliberately leaves the Pharisees in unbelief rather than convince them against their will.

In just the same way the appearances of our Lord after His resurrection were granted only to those who knew and loved Him. There was no public manifestation to all the multitude ; but He appeared to Mary Magdalene, to James, to Cephas, to the eleven Apostles, to five hundred brethren. And to one who had been a devoted friend He gave the full proof that was needed to remove his doubts.

St. Thomas seems to have been a rather literal-minded man. When our Lord had said, ' Whither I go, ye know the way,' he replied, ' We know not whither thou goest ; how know we the way ? ' But though he was prosaic, he was utterly loyal. When our Lord determined to go to wake Lazarus from the sleep of death, though the Jews had sought to kill Him when He was last in Jerusalem, it was St. Thomas who said, ' Let us also go that we may die with him.' His refusal to believe in the Lord's resurrection was no failure in loyalty, as was St. Peter's denial. The insight of faith which can grasp the truth by perception of its quality is something better than St. Thomas's doubt ; ' blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed ' ; this insight, which is really a part of imagination, St. Thomas lacked.

Thomas Hardy was speaking for thousands of

honest doubters in his extraordinary poem, ' God's Funeral ' :

I saw a slowly-stepping train,
Lined on the brows, scoop-eyed, and bent and hoar,
Following in files across a twilight plain.
A strange and mystic form the foremost bore.

O man-projected Figure, of late
Imaged as we, thy knell who shall survive ?
Whence came it we were tempted to create
One whom we can no longer keep alive ?

Then in the background some I saw—
Sweet women, youths, men, all incredulous—
Who chimed, ' This is a counterfeit of straw ;
This requiem, mockery ! God still lives to us.'

And they composed a crowd, of whom
Some were right good, and many nigh the best.
Thus dazed and puzzled, 'twixt the gleam and gloom,
Mechanically I followed with the rest.

There is a story of an Arab chief who was reported to have been killed in battle. His wealth passed to his two sons, being equally divided between them. One day the news arrived that the chief had not been killed but only wounded, and was now returning to his home. One of his sons believed this, and was angry because he would have to surrender his portion of the inheritance ; the other would not believe it, but was ready for any sacrifice if the news might prove to be true. One believed what he was told and the other disbelieved ; but the believer was disloyal and the disbeliever loyal.

The belief of our minds is not something unimportant ; for it will influence our affections and our conduct ; and it will influence the belief and thereby the affections and conduct of our friends. Moreover, the knowledge of truth is one of the greatest aims of human life. But in the spiritual life the heart counts for more than the head ; loyalty of purpose is more important than correctness of doctrine.

In the days when he fought religious doubt and triumphed, Horace Bushnell, thrusting his hands through his black, bushy hair, cried out desperately, yet triumphantly, ' O men ! what shall I do with these arrant doubts I have been nursing for years ? When the preacher touches the Trinity and when logic shatters it all to pieces, I am all at the four winds. But I am glad I have a heart as well as a head. My heart wants the Father ; my heart wants the Son ; my heart wants the Holy Ghost—and one just as much as the other.'¹

¹ H. T. Kerr, *The Gospel in Modern Poetry*, 61.

People sometimes lament that the great fact of our Lord's resurrection should be recorded for us in such a way as may fail to convince men's minds. If everything turned on it, they say, why is the evidence for it allowed to be anything short of irresistible? Why should it be possible for honest men to doubt?

But if the evidence were convincing, the truth would be the prey of mere intellectual cleverness; we should grasp the truth here in the same kind of way that we grasp it—if we ever do—in geometry; and it would be most easily reached by the same people in this case as in that. But our Lord's method was always to reveal Himself only to those who loved Him; His Divinity is concealed by the veil of His Humanity from all except those who, loving Him as Man, try to take His life as their own and so pass 'through the veil, that is to say His flesh,' to the Divine secret that lies behind it.

It is the doubting heart, not the doubting mind, that is sinful. The doubts that are wrong come from the levity of mind that can see nothing great or noble, or from the clouded conscience when a man persuades himself that he may lawfully indulge in some forbidden pleasure. But perplexity of mind is no sin, if only the heart and will be loyal.¹

Professor Royce asserts that 'a study of history shows that if there is anything that human thought and cultivation have to be deeply thankful for, it is an occasional, but truly great and fearless age of doubt.' And in individuals it is only by facing obstinate questionings that faith is freed from folly and attains reasonableness.

Nor can religious experience, however boldly it claims to know, fail to admit that its knowledge is but in part. Our knowledge of God, like the knowledge we have of each other, is the insight born of familiarity; but no man entirely knows his brother. And as for the Lord of heaven and earth, how small a whisper do we hear of Him! Some minds are constitutionally ill-adapted for fellowship with Him because they lack what Keats calls 'negative capability'—'that is, when a man is capable of being in uncertainties, mysteries, doubts, without any irritable reaching after fact and reason. Coleridge, for instance, would let go a fine isolated verisimilitude, caught from the Penetralium of mystery, from being incapable of remaining content with half-knowledge.' We have to trust God with His secrets, as well as try to penetrate them as far as our minds will carry us. We have to

¹ W. Temple, *Studies in the Spirit and Truth of Christianity*, 121.

accustom ourselves to look uncomplainingly at darkness, while we walk obediently in the light. 'They see not clearliest who see all things clear.'²

PALM SUNDAY.

The Contrasts of Palm Sunday.

'Tell ye the daughter of Zion, Behold, thy King cometh unto thee, meek, and sitting upon an ass.'—Mt 21^b.

When a great general returned to Rome after a signal conquest, he was often welcomed to the city with 'a triumph.' It was a wonderful spectacle, and its traces are still to be seen in the old Roman Forum, in those magnificent triumphal arches through which the conqueror passed on his way to the Temple of Jove, there to offer sacrifice to the gods for the victory vouchsafed him.

Now this story may be truly called the triumph of Jesus. He was coming into the city which He loved and for which He was soon to die. He was coming after a life of the most wonderful victories over sin and sorrow and death; and He was doing so to crown them with the greatest victory of all—the Cross. It was therefore seemly that He should enter His capital city in triumph. He wished it to be so because He claimed to be its Messianic King, but how different His triumph from that of an earthly king! Here is no gaudy triumph or marble arches. All is meek and lowly and unpretending. 'Tell ye the daughter of Zion, Behold, thy king cometh unto thee, meek, and sitting upon an ass,' yea, 'upon a colt, the foal of an ass.'

1. We are at once arrested by the contrast between *the central Figure of the scene and the surrounding spectators of it; the contrast of a sorrowing Saviour and a rejoicing multitude*. It has been suggested that the whole conception of this triumphal entry was distasteful to Jesus. 'It was,' says the late Professor David Smith, 'a piece of acting, and pleasing as it was to the multitude, it was very distasteful to Him.' We cannot accept such a view. It is derogatory to the Master to think of Him as acting any part in which He did not believe. No, this was the whole meaning of the story, that He did claim to be a King and that in this triumphal entry into the city of David He was asserting His right to be called the Son of David. The cheers of the multitude were, therefore, not distasteful to Him and still less were the Hosannas of the children. He welcomed them and said, 'If these

^a H. S. Coffin, *Some Christian Convictions*, 38.

should hold their peace, the stones would immediately cry out.'

Nevertheless, though Jesus welcomed this triumph, there is this much truth in Dr. Smith's view, that He Himself was widely separated in feelings from those that gathered round Him to join it. Picture some great procession to-day in which the central figure of its cheering thousands is himself burdened by some secret sorrow or fear (such, for example, as attended the Archduke of Austria on the day of that fatal ride of his through the streets of Sarajevo), and we have a picture of Jesus as He listened to the resounding 'Hosannas' of the multitude on that first Palm Sunday.

What is the lesson to learn from this first contrast? Is it not this, that while the instincts of the multitude are right, they need to be wisely directed? The common folk welcomed Jesus because they knew He was their friend.

The instincts of democracy are on the side of Christ, if only we can get to its deepest heart. The working man has no real quarrel with Christ. His quarrel is that the Church does not represent Christ, and while he is often sadly led astray as to what the Church teaches, there is no doubt that sometimes he has a good case to make out for his complaint. There is far too much class-feeling in the modern Church. What we need is more of the spirit of the Democrat of Nazareth, who, as He beheld the multitudes, had compassion on them.

2. We notice this further contrast in the Triumph of Jesus, *a contrast between a steadfast Saviour and a fickle crowd*. That is finely brought out by Munkácsy in his great picture called 'Ecce Homo!' On the one side there is the howling Eastern mob crying out their execrations with distorted faces and garments, torn by fanatical passion, and on the other there is the calm, steadfast countenance of Jesus as He looked across this angry sea to the joy set before Him. He 'heeded not reviling tones.'

It has no doubt been suggested that the multitudes who cried 'Hosanna' to Him on Olivet were not the same as those who said 'Crucify' on Calvary. The one was the people of Galilee who loved Him; the other, the Jerusalem mob, stirred up by Priest and Pharisee. This is true; but it cannot be denied that the former made no effort to save Him, but weakly and cowardly stood by when He was delivered into the hands of wicked men. Some of them may have even joined in the roar of execration at the last. It is nothing new for the hero of to-day to be the martyr of to-

orrow. 'I lived for my country,' said Louis Kossuth, 'and therefore I die in exile.' Christ well knew how fickle were the promises of men. 'The hour cometh, and even now is, when ye shall leave me alone.' Yet there is no wavering.

So in our battle of life, whatever it be, whether in a great public struggle for righteousness or in a private fight with some secret sin or fear, we too have need of 'the kingdom of Christ's patience.' In every such battle there are ups and downs, Olivets of ringing cheers and Gethsemanes of bitter tears. At one hour we shall have the palm branch waving round us, and at another feel the chill shadow of the Cross; and what we need, to steady our souls in the midst of such contrasts of experience, is to fix our eyes on this Christ of Palm Sunday—to watch His calm face as He rides on amid the palm-waving crowd and sees beyond it 'a little hill called Calvary,' . . . sees it, but does not flinch.

3. Last of all there is a contrast here *between the Saviour approaching the most glorious, and Jerusalem approaching the most shameful, act in their respective histories*. Christ was entering Jerusalem to die, but still it was His triumph. True are the words of the Apostle to the Hebrews, 'Now we see Jesus, for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honour.'

Ride on! ride on in majesty!
In lowly pomp ride on to die;
Bow Thy meek head to mortal pain,
Then take, O God, Thy power, and reign.

While Jesus, by the Via Dolorosa, was thus marching on to glory, the city by the same road was marching to its doom. What to the one was a 'savour of life unto life' was to the other a 'savour of death unto death.'

Behind the conqueror in the Roman triumph there usually followed a train of specially selected captives, won by him in his wars. Some of these, when the journey's end was reached, were set free to show forth the clemency of the conqueror; while others were put to death to show his power.

It is this twofold result of the triumph of Christ Paul speaks of when he says, 'To them that are being saved we are a savour of life unto life; to them that are perishing we are a savour of death unto death.' It was seen in Christ's first triumph. To Him and to His believers it was a savour of life unto life; but to Jerusalem and its priests it was a savour of death unto death.

This is the last and greatest lesson we learn from the contrasts of Palm Sunday. The Triumph of

Jesus never ends. From age to age the King of Glory passes on His way; but still as in the past His triumph has a twofold significance.

God give us grace to make the wise decision, and

as He this day passes before us to the Calvary of His life, may it be ours to crown Him 'Lord of all.'¹

¹ W. M. Mackay, *Days of the Son of Man*, 87.

General Revelation in the Theology of Emil Brunner.

BY DAVID CAIRNS, B.A., ABERDEEN.

IN spite of the general agreement of viewpoint among the dialectical theologians, there is a healthy independence of each other, which in some matters goes beyond a mere difference of emphasis. Emil Brunner is by no means a paler copy of Karl Barth—the truth being rather that both are deeply influenced by the same thinkers and personalities, e.g. Kierkegaard, Blumhardt, Kutter. The reason for the writing of the present article is that British readers may learn something of Brunner's teaching about general revelation, which is interestingly different from Barth's.

Three years ago Brunner wrote in *Zwischen den Zeiten* (the periodical of the dialectical theology) the following words: 'Now that the antithesis between nature and grace is in some degree understood, it is high time for us to apply ourselves with the greatest industry to the problem of general revelation in all its phenomena. To reject from the outset a natural theology in every sense of the word is neither Pauline nor Reformed, however great the danger of the modern thought of continuity may be at this point.'

We can perhaps elucidate this sentence by showing where Brunner agrees with Barth, and where he parts company with him. They are agreed in rejecting the Roman Catholic conception of natural revelation which we may describe as the two-storey conception. According to this view in the sphere of ethics there are certain virtues which the natural man can in his own strength perfectly practise, and certain things which, through the light of Nature, he can quite certainly know about God and his duty. What is given by the special revelation is a further and supernatural grace. The coming of the special revelation does not alter that structure of knowledge and action which is already there; it merely affirms it. On this 'basement' of general revelation the 'first floor' of special revelation is built up. All this is utterly opposed to Brunner's teaching as it is to Barth's.

Another point of full agreement between Barth and Brunner is that they make a sheer difference between special and general revelation. One has only space here to indicate that they believe that the Ritschlian reaction against the relativism of Schleiermacher's Christology was not radical enough, and so logically slipped back into the relativism of Troeltsch and the Historico-Scientific school. Brunner believes that the dialectical theology has managed to make a clear distinction between general and special revelation. But now he fears that in avoiding Scylla some of his comrades are in peril from Charybdis.

The denial of general revelation in every sense is, he believes, particularly dangerous in face of the world situation which to-day confronts the Church. Missionaries know that they must find a point of contact (*Anknüpfungspunkt*) for the gospel in the conscience, religion, or customs of their hearers. And what forces itself as sheer necessity on the missionary is only seemingly a less urgent necessity for every preacher. The situation is everywhere rapidly becoming a missionary situation, the Church is everywhere faced by a world which does not understand churchly or theological language. In the article quoted above Brunner says: 'Especially in a time when all consciousness of God is diminishing, it will not do . . . to treat that consciousness of him which remains . . . as if it were not there, or of no significance. . . . By such a proceeding we can only spoil our opportunity of getting a hearing; for the man who, without being a Christian, knows something of God, will not let himself be persuaded that he knows nothing about him.' Brunner is also fond of quoting a saying of Luther's that it is as effective to preach to cattle as to men whose consciences you do not touch, and this principle is a central one in the practical instructions on preaching which it is one of his duties as Professor to give.

Starting ourselves from the standpoint of Christian