
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

exposition of the Calvinistic as Althaus of the Lutheran conception of the State; and the Churches in Czechoslovakia send a joint production on the same subject. The summary of the discussions is most excellently done.

The volume within its 184 pages contains a great deal of interest and value, which cannot be further discussed in detail. But a few general reflections may be added. For profitable discussion the fetters of antiquated dogma must be cast off, and the subject must be approached with unsectarian impartiality. Our modern knowledge should be appreciated and applied to both the doctrinal basis and the practical superstructure. As we have a *dynamic* and not a *static* view of God in relation to the world, it is the Divine purpose in history which should be the guiding principle. There seems to me to be an anachronism in separating the creative, providential, and redemptive order, as all are parts of the one Divine activity, and the redemptive is the revelation of the meaning and the value of both the creative and the providential. It is not to what man may be supposed to be by *nature*, but to what God means him to become by *grace* that the churches' conception of both Church and State should be referred, and so their mutual relations be defined. It appears to me to be a theological error, which does practical injury, to contrast Church and State in the way in which some of the writers in this volume do. Even if we were justified in saying that the State arises out of nature, and the Church has its roots in grace, we should qualify such a statement by remembering that the Creator is the Redeemer. Much as I appreciate the scholarship and discernment of the writers in this volume, some of them use what to me is now a theological language which I have outgrown. Not the confessional, but the œcumenical, is now my mother-tongue.

ALFRED E. GARVIE.

London.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

The Christ of the Andes.

BY THE REV. SIDNEY H. PRICE, GREAT SHELFORD, CAMBRIDGE.

'Wisdom is better than weapons of war.'—Ec 9^{18}.

'SOONER shall these mountains crumble to dust than Argentines and Chilians break the Peace which, at the feet of Christ the Redeemer, they have sworn to maintain.' These are the words graven on the monument to Christ and to Peace, erected at Puente-del-Inca in 1904 to commemorate the ending of old feuds and the beginning of a new life of peace.

On the opposite side of the pedestal are the words, 'Peace on earth, goodwill to all men.'

The statue itself was cast in the arsenal at Buenos Ayres from the bronze cannon of both Argentina and Chili, and stands high in the Andes, 14,000 feet above sea-level, as a constant reminder to the people that they have chosen the way of peace.

On March 13, 1904, crowds of people from both countries encamped on the hillsides just as two armies might have prepared for battle. At daybreak they were ready and eager for the celebration of unveiling their statue, which they dedicated to the cause of peace throughout the whole world. There, from the pinnacle of a mountain, the world may take the lesson of peace and goodwill to all men. Travellers by road from one country to another may pass by this statue, but, unfortunately, those who go by train enter a two-mile tunnel before reaching this level, and so miss seeing it.

How came the statue to be erected in the first instance? For many years Chili and Argentina had disagreed about their respective boundaries, and after much quarrelling they came to the very wise decision to ask some one else to settle the matter for them. A Convention meeting at Santiago on April 17th, 1896, referred the matter to a Commission, with Queen Victoria as final arbitrator. Before an agreement was reached, however, the Queen died, and by December 1901 the relations between Argentina and Chili became very strained. An appeal was made to King Edward VII., who gave his award, which was joyfully accepted by both sides.

It follows, of course, that two countries who have made such a stand have no further need to prepare for wars. So these two South American countries sold some of their battleships and stopped spending money on munitions, with the result they were able to increase their industries at home and help their people become prosperous.

Many people to-day are very anxious that all countries should follow the example of these two. War is so contrary to the spirit of Christ that Christian people should do all in their power to put an end to it. We can all help, of course, by joining the League of Nations Union and showing our support of its efforts for peace and the many other matters the League takes in hand for the good of mankind. We can also help by learning the ways of peace ourselves in dealing with one another.

Your headmaster at school might have a shock if two of you asked him to arbitrate instead of fighting it out in the school yard, but it would be a good thing for you to do, and might even be a part of your headmaster's education into the bargain. Next time you have a really lively quarrel with some one (and I hope it will not be soon) try the way of arbitration and see for yourself how it works.

Gold in England.

By the Rev. Gordon Hamlin, B.A., Cardiff.

'I have given gold.'—1 Ch 29[3].

When November comes, one of the sights of London is the Lord Mayor's Show. How boys and girls love it! And what a lot of things there are to see! A year or two ago I was very interested in one of the wagons arranged by that society called the Druids. Their tableau showed some ancient alchemists at work, trying to turn base metals into gold. What that group on the wagon were really illustrating, however, was the way that ever so many people are actually turning tin into gold to-day. Yes, by collecting tinfoil for hospitals and other good causes many are turning base metal into gold.

Indeed, I saw in my newspaper soon after that Lord Mayor's Show that £20,000 had been raised in this way for our hospitals. Now, boys and girls, let us do the same for Jesus. The best for Jesus —gold.

For instance, there is a Sunday school I know where they collect farthings—ever so many farthings. So many farthings, indeed, that during the year they collect for their Missionary Society pounds and pounds! Surely, that is turning copper into gold! And another day I found a little girl who was selling toffee and was glad to welcome a customer. She was making and selling those sweets for Jesus. Some one laughingly said to her: 'That toffee is a gold mine.' It was! Gold discovered in England, and all for Jesus.

In the city where I live there is a home for old people. Outside you may see a big box for gifts of tinfoil. All this is sold to bring happiness into the lives of those old folk—again, tin into gold! Not far away is a place for the blind, where they are taught to make many things and so earn their living. Outside this place, also, there is a box for tinfoil, which will be turned into gold for the blind. A day or two ago I listened to the Children's Hour on the wireless, and heard some one thanking boys and girls who had sent gifts of tinfoil, which would be turned into gold. Their gifts were toward the support of a cot in a local hospital for children. So what the old alchemists and Druids could not do, those boys and girls could do! So can we, if we try.

The other day I saw in my newspaper a very important notice in big letters: 'NEW GOLD FINDS.' Underneath I read about a new gold mine discovered in South Africa; also that there was good hope of developing another gold-field in Australia. Now, let some of us who have not been helping so far, make up our minds at once that there shall be gold in England . . . NEW GOLD FINDS . . . gold for Jesus.

> This is the famous stone
> That turneth all to gold:
> For that which God doth touch and own
> Cannot for less be told.

Yes, that's it!—our love for Jesus will help us to make everything golden—the best, the brightest, and the most beautiful.

Do you remember that wonderful story in the Old Testament which tells how King David gathered together all the materials for the Great Temple which Solomon was to build? In the gifts, 'gold' comes first. And David said: 'Because I have set my affection to the house of my God I have *of mine own* proper good given gold and silver over and above all that I have prepared.' He must give something of *his very own*; and he must give gold, as well as silver. God must have the best.

Shall not we do the same? Certainly let us gather as much as we can, and by the alchemy of love turn lots of lesser things into gold. But let

us give something of our very own as well. Ah! there is something far more precious than all the gold and all the gems which you can give to Jesus. I think you know what that is . . . yourself!

The Christian Year.

TWENTY-FIFTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Forgiveness as giving for.

'Forgiving one another . . . as Christ forgave you.'—Col 3^{13}.

St. Paul has the direct authority of our Lord Himself for this: 'A new commandment give I unto you, that ye love one another as I have loved you.' 'A new commandment.' But is it really new? 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself' was old enough, reaching back over hundreds of years in the Old Testament. As John Stuart Mill points out in his rather ponderous way in one of his essays, commending this injunction, it is true as the highest human obligation and morality, but he deems it necessary to observe in a footnote that, of course, this is not 'new.' But he didn't quote it all. 'As I have loved you.' That was the 'new' in it. 'As Christ forgave you.' It has often been said that there is nothing 'new' in Christian morality. On the contrary, the one vital thing about it is not only 'new' but quite unique. More and more it is going to be discovered that the crux of what we call morality is not going to rest with laws and regulations, but with the question of motive. And in the end a pure motive will break a bad law. The crux of the Christian morality is the question of motive. That is the 'new' thing about it.

Talk they of morals, O Thou dying Lamb?
The true morality is love of Thee.

In closest relation to this is the Christian doctrine of forgiveness. 'Christian forgiveness'? But there is nothing new, or specifically Christian, about forgiveness either. Oh, but there is! We can find forgiveness in the Old Testament truly. We would find it in Positivism—if there is any of it left—that brand-new religion of Humanity devised by the energetic M. Auguste Comte. And why did Positivism fail—'the religion of Humanity'—surely a high-sounding and attractive claim enough? Precisely for the reason that we are considering—that it was, as is the best of the new Humanism, in effect, Christian ethics, without the supreme Christian motive. It was being good without loving The Good.

'Forgive him—oh yes, I forgive him, the graceless scoundrel; but if he ever does it again. . . .'

'She forgave him,' as an excellent modern writer says in a recent novel, a study of modern marriage, 'she forgave him, but kept him at arm's length.'

'You forgave him,' said the old priest in the book later, after the rift had become irreparable, 'but you don't know what forgiveness means. You covered yourself with a *chevaux-de-frise*, with conditions and reservations and stipulations. You don't know what forgiveness means.'

What does it mean? Shall we try to discover?

1. There is much about forgiveness in the Old Testament. Forgiveness there is a blotting out—'blotting out the handwriting that is against us.' 'Though your sins be as scarlet they shall be as white as snow: though they be red like crimson they shall be as wool.' That is very fine, splendid in its intensity and its simplicity—the topmost height of Old Testament religion. That is God forgiving, freely, fully, divinely, by blotting out and forgetting.

But in the New Testament God does not forgive by forgetting, but by giving. Forgiveness in the New Testament is not a mere act of cancellation, but of sacrifice. The inscription round the Cross in St. Paul's Cathedral has it exactly—'*Sic Deus dilexit mundum.*' This is how God loved the world. Christ died to show us what the divine forgiveness meant. Christ's dying gave a new content, a new appeal to the divine forgiveness. It taught us that at the heart of the divine forgiving is giving: that the divine forgiving is 'giving for.' The act of obliteration becomes an act of oblation.

'As Christ also forgave you,' that is the new standard of Christian forgiveness. At the heart of all true forgiveness, now, is 'giveness.'

'You forgave him, but kept him at arm's length.' In the story the man found the woman's forgiveness harder to bear than her anger. It did not heal: it wounded. There was no 'giveness' in her forgiveness. In a fortnight he had left her for good. And the old wise priest told her—to her profound and indignant surprise—that it was her fault, the fault of her forgiveness. To her profound surprise, for she had been rather pleased with herself.

'Forgiving one another—as Christ also forgave you.' Our first condition generally is that the other should come and seek it. God in Christ is seeking us. God makes no conditions. None of us needs to bespeak God's forgiveness. It is ours

in the Cross. God forgave before He was asked. 'While we were yet sinners, Christ died for us.' He did not even say, 'You can be forgiven when you have ceased to be sinners.' The Cross is God's forgiveness: and it is always there. The Cross is God's forgiveness, because it is His supreme 'giveness.' We say, so pleased with ourselves, 'provided you do not do it again'—or more than seven times. They said to Jesus, 'How often shall a man sin against us, and we forgive him? Unto seven times?' And Jesus said, 'Unto seventy times seven.' For God's forgiveness in Christ is not mere remission: it is not a mere cancellation. It is a perpetual gift. It is not something He grants us: it is something He offers us. It is not God making a pledge: it is God offering Himself. When we come to God for forgiveness, we get more—much more—than anything we have ever understood by forgiveness. We not only go free: we go singing, walking on air: because not humiliated, but enriched.

If this is true, it is the most wonderful thing in human history—the most wonderful thing in all history. For it is more than 1900 years old—much more. 'For the Lamb was slain from before the foundation of the world.' So the Cross was not an afterthought for a world gone wrong, the grudging expedient of a surprised and angry God. The Cross was before Calvary: before man: before sin. It is the deepest and oldest secret of the heart of God that the Eternal Power is the Eternal Pity: that the forgiving of God is God's gift of Himself. We read the books of the men who are beginning to find out things, Lodge's *Ether and Reality* and Jeans' latest book, which tell us on every page how little we really know, and make atheism a petty, contemptible, childish, conceited thing. And we stand in awe and breathless humility before the amazing wonder of the Reality that lies beyond, that men are striving to find out, and are finding out.

But this is something that men would never have found out—this Cross in the heart of God: that, somehow, God had to declare or we had never known or believed it.

In the Cross of Christ I glory:
Towering o'er the wrecks of time,
All the light of sacred story
Gathers round its head sublime.

2. But that is not all that this text lays upon us. It is not only for our wonder. The Cross sets our standard, too. That is as much in the text as the other. 'Forgiving one another—as Christ forgave you.'

New Testament forgiveness is not merely negative: it is positive, it is redemptive; as, on the Cross, God forgives by giving for, so always the 'gift without the giver is bare.' God's forgiveness is not our liberation from punishment, but our salvation. Have we not often been very disappointed about our forgiveness? We meant so well. But it doesn't seem to have done what we expected. It has healed the breach, perhaps, but not the hurt. Of course it was a rotten thing that the man did. But we are not going to think about that any more. It is wiped out. Yes: as far as we are concerned. As far as he is concerned—No. Or not yet. And until it is wiped out for him, too, it is not really forgiveness. Has our forgiveness pushed him farther down the hill of humiliation? For that is what God's forgiveness never does. It is often harder to be forgiven than to forgive. God knows that. God may have forgiven us, but it has not brought us together—or has it? Until it has, God has not finished with it. For God's forgiveness not only forgets, but redeems.

There is a forgiveness that galls, that makes us want never to see the person again. But there is a forgiveness that saves, that binds the heart with cords of steel, that turns the bitter poison of the wound into a balm of healing and of life. The old Law wiped out: things were as before: the law of the Cross wrote upon the stricken heart its new, best word of love. What Christ did on the Cross was to use the very offence as a door of entrance into the estranged heart. God forgives by giving—His Son, Himself. 'Forgiving one another, as Christ forgave you.'

O Cross that liftest up my head,
I dare not ask to fly from Thee:
I lay in dust life's glory dead,
And from the ground there blossoms red
Life that shall endless be.

'Life'—that is it—the true end of forgiveness is not merely forgetting—it is life.[1]

SUNDAY NEXT BEFORE ADVENT.

Personal Survival.

'Or ever the silver cord be loosed, or the golden bowl be broken, or the pitcher be broken at the fountain, or the wheel broken at the cistern; and the dust return to the earth as it was, and the spirit return unto God who gave it.'—Ec $12^{6,7}$ (R.V.).

How do we think of the soul after death? What is the soul? Christians are taught to think of man as being body, soul, and spirit, but in common

[1] H. E. Brierley, *Freedom and Faith*, 26.

speech we have so misused the word 'soul' that we have lost its distinctive meaning, and frequently use it as though it were the same as 'spirit.' This is an error. The body is our physical life, the flesh and blood form in which we live; and the spirit is God Immanent in us, the Holy Spirit of God by whose indwelling presence we are the children of God; the soul is the emotions, the mind, and the will. It is the soul which gives personality, not the body or the spirit. The spirit is impersonal, it comes from Deity, it is that which links us with God. It is the soul which is our individuality, the thing which makes us *you* and *me*.

It is clear that Christ attached a very sacred importance to personality. Mrs. Besant, when giving a course of lectures in the Queen's Hall on the great religions of the world, dwelt in each case on the particular gift of teaching that each religion had given to mankind; and she chose as the most characteristic gift of Christianity the sense of value of the individual soul. This comment from one who is not of the Christian faith is very significant. Of course, those of us who call ourselves Christians would say that the gift of Christianity to the world was the idea of a God of Love, but certainly the second thing we should say was that Christianity had given an enhanced sense of the value of personality. This is the result of two lines of thought. First of all, it is the result of centuries of Christian teaching, which taught in parable after parable, saying after saying, act after act, the worth that Christ set on the individual soul, however degraded. He would seek, He told His followers, for one out of a hundred sheep; would not abandon one soul, so great was His love of each. Then, more recently, science has taught us the same thing. We see in the course of evolution the development of individuality. Coming up from the very slime of creation, through uncounted millions of years, the human race has at last been evolved. Through blood and sweat, through agony and toil, through aspirations and errors, the human being has come. And the higher his development the more distinctive he appears. He does not evolve into the mass, he evolves into the individual. The finest men and women are the most individual, unlike other people, distinct in themselves. So has science itself endorsed the teaching of Christ: so has science set its seal on the high value of personality.

To suppose that, at death, the soul goes back to God who gave it, in the sense that a drop of water falls into the ocean and ceases to be, is to suppose that the spiritual world reverses all that we know of the world in which we live. It is strange to realize that the 'heaven' of Buddhism is the nearest approach to 'hell' for the Christian. To be lost in the All-ness of God as the drop in the ocean still seems to many devout minds heaven enough. To Christ it was not gain disguised but loss; for to Him personality was supremely precious.

These two converging lines of thought—of the love of Christ for the individual person, and of the knowledge of the long ages of struggle that have gone to the evolution of personality—have created in many people the conviction that we all survive and all ultimately find our way to heaven, to peace, to God. Not the spirit only, but the soul 'returns to God who gave it.' Yet it seems impossible to claim that this was the belief of Christ. This 'universalism,' as it is called, is due not to any one saying or parable—for of these there are very few to justify it—but to the general impression that it is impossible to believe that a God of Love would allow even one to be destroyed.

It is an attractive belief; yet we do not believe it. Is our moral responsibility so unreal? Are the choices that we make of good and evil, of life and death, so unmeaning? In the sphere of the spirit is nothing eternally significant? If one treats his body amiss, the consequences follow as the night the day. The means he takes to remedy the ill have also their certain consequences. Everything we do in the physical world follows a law which cannot be broken. Can this be so in the material world, and in the world of spirit our choices have so little reality, our actions no meaning at all? It is true that when we say, 'God gave us freedom,' we mean a limited freedom, for all of us are limited by the very conditions of human life. Still, even so, most of us believe that we have some kind of freedom. Is that freedom *wholly* a delusion? Can we really never make a final choice? Is God, who is the Truth itself, so careless of the truth that He can let us imagine we are free, while in fact we are free only as a child is free who moves about in one of those little wooden pens that they make for children just learning to walk? They pull themselves up by the railings and walk round and round, quite happy and contented at first. But that pen was no further use from the moment that the child found that its freedom—which seemed so great when first it wandered round the little wooden railing, thinking itself 'lord of infinite space'—was a delusion. If God has really so conditioned us that in the end we *cannot* choose anything but God, what reality is there in our freedom more than in that child's? There is an

element of unreality in this conception of a benevolent God who will pluck us back to Himself at last, our choice a delusion, our freedom a lie.

There is no sentimentality in the teaching of Christ. That God is Love was a truth for which He was prepared to live and to die—a truth of which He was so certain that death became to Him a victory. Great love and utter truth go hand in hand. If there is no final moral responsibility in us for the laws we obey or disobey, for the life we accept or refuse, our religion is a sham. But it is not so. Again and again Christ warns us of the possibility of utter loss. Again and again He tells us that the *soul* may be destroyed—self-destroyed—and the spirit go back to God who gave it. This gives an urgency to His gospel that many of us have lost in the vast amiability of our religion.

It may be that we have opportunity after opportunity; that the death of this body is but a small event in that long progress which, God helping us, ends only with Him, but if, through age after age, we continually choose death, is our freedom so unreal, our moral responsibility so utter a delusion, that in the end God will force eternal life upon us?

In the parable of the choice of plucking out the eye, of cutting off the hand or foot, Christ conveys His sense of the infinite value of the soul—not the spirit, but the *form* that the spirit takes within us—which makes us each different as the stars differ from one another in glory. There is also the stern reality of the thought that to attain good is not an easy path to which God will always lead us back, but something for which we are ourselves responsible. He who taught us that if we did not use our talents, we are condemned, said also, 'If your right hand offend you, cut it off, and cast it from you. It is better to go into eternal life having one hand than having two hands *to be destroyed*.'

We have a right to choose; we must choose, and our life here is immeasurably more significant than we realize. The vague amiability which makes right and wrong almost the same thing robs it of reality. It is possible that in the end 'the *spirit* returns to God who gave it,' because the *soul* has been destroyed. Herein is reconciled the love and the truth of God. It could not be a God of Love who should condemn any child of His to everlasting, and therefore senseless, punishment; but it is quite consistent with the love of God that we may, if we choose, quench in ourselves the spirit. The soul, the individual personality, the *form* the spirit took in us, ceases to be, and 'the spirit returns to God who gave it.'

What is it that makes us immortal? They that dwell in love dwell in God, *and God in them*.[1]

First Sunday in Advent.

The Lord's Prayer.

'Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done, as in heaven, so in earth.'—Lk 11[2].

In the Lord's Prayer we begin by praying, 'Our Father which art in heaven, Hallowed be thy name,' which lifts us at once into the presence of the eternal majesty of God. The recovery of our sense of the importance of this point of view is characteristic of twentieth-century theology, connected as it is with the names of Rudolf Otto and Karl Barth. But in this recovery the pendulum may have swung too far to one side. According to some of the extremists in the school of Karl Barth, God is to be thought of as so utterly above us and so utterly unknowable that we must simply accept His revelation of Himself uncriticised by our useless minds. We must not think that our earthly activities in shaping civilization are of any value or interest to God; they are destined to be destroyed in the flames of His judgment, whilst His redeemed are to be saved through His grace.

This tendency has sometimes a great attraction for us in our present mood of disillusionment with earthly things. At such moments it is well for us to look back to the Gospels and to realize anew the historical situation at the time of the coming of Christ. There were at that time among the Jews those who looked for the fulfilment of God's promises through the prophets by the coming of an earthly leader, a Messiah who should drive out by force of arms their Roman overlords. But besides those who looked thus for the coming of a 'Son of David' there were others who had despaired of this world. This world was too far gone to be redeemable; not in its history could the Kingdom of God be established. This must be the work of a Messiah conceived of as a Divine Being appearing in the clouds of heaven, to blast with the breath of His mouth the enemies of Jehovah. When the promised Redeemer came in the Person of Jesus Christ, He rejected the second of these expectations no less than the first. If He would not fight for this world with earthly arms, neither would He despair of it. He did not turn to His Father, saying, 'Father, this world is hopeless. There is nothing for Me to do with it, except to destroy it and gather up the few faithful souls to bring them back with Me to heaven.' No. He comes

[1] Maude Royden, *Here—and Hereafter*, 228.

out from that sojourn in the wilderness which we call His Temptation, clear in His mind concerning the work which, as His Father's representative on earth, He is called to do, and He comes to it as one who has come to teach, by deed as well as word, that this world can be redeemed, that in this world the Father's Kingdom can be established. And how can this be? By the way of the Cross.

What, for Him, was meant by the Kingdom of God?

By the Kingdom of God is meant life, whether individual or social, organized with righteous love as its principle. In other words, where loving righteousness is law, there is the Kingdom of God established, whether it be in the life of one person or in the corporate life of any group of society. For example, we are in this country at the present time engaged in enacting a Bill to deal comprehensively with the whole problem of unemployment. What is to be the spirit which this Act of Parliament is to express? If it expresses the spirit which says, 'How can we keep these troublesome fellows quiet with the least possible trouble and expense to ourselves?' then the law which is passed and the society which it regulates will not be a society in which the Kingdom of God is established. But if the spirit which it expresses is the spirit which says, 'How can we best help our less fortunate brothers and sisters in their time of need, at whatever cost of trouble and expense to ourselves may be necessary?' then we are taking a step forward towards the establishment on earth of the Father's Kingdom for which our Lord bids us pray.

And what, for Him, was meant by the way of the Cross?

It was the submission of Himself to the circumstances in which His work had to be done, so that, by willingly shouldering the burden they imposed, He might overcome their power for evil and make them issue in good. In this modern world it helps us to understand what Christians mean by the way of the Cross if we compare it with our modern saying that 'Nature is conquered by being obeyed.' What does this last saying mean? What it means is that, in order to carry out our aims and realize our ideals in this world, we have to study the actual way in which Nature behaves in order that we may bend it to our purposes. The doctor who is carrying out research into the cause of some obscure disease does so in order that he may be able to free mankind from this dreadful scourge, but for this purpose he must spend laborious days in patient observations, and it may even be necessary that his own health may suffer and even his life be lost in the process. This submission of himself to the circumstances in which alone his work for humanity can be carried out is surely a literal following of the way of the Cross. Christ did not choose to be crucified. He came on earth to establish the Father's Kingdom, but owing to human nature being what it was, this could not be done except at the cost of Gethsemane and Golgotha. He did not argue that it must be possible to redeem the world by some other and easier path. When St. Peter made such a suggestion to Him at Cæsarea Philippi He rejected it as of Satanic origin.

We have seen the parallel between the world at the time of the coming of Christ and our world of to-day. We have seen how then there were many who looked for the coming of a son of David, who should usher in the Kingdom of God by force of arms, and we know that to-day there are many who would seek by war to make their nation dominant in the world. We have seen how then there were many who despaired of this world and looked for the appearance in the skies of its Divine Judge, and we know that to-day there are many who despair entirely of this world and of our civilization. But the Lord who teaches us to pray, 'Thy kingdom come, thy will be done, as in heaven, so on earth,' is the Lord who took for His own vocation the work of establishing the Father's Kingdom here on earth by the method of the Cross. When God entered as man into this world's history, for this world's redemption, He found concentrated upon Himself the forces of evil; He overcame them by the power of love unconquered and unconquerable, as He died with the prayer 'Father, forgive them' on His lips. He rose triumphant, and He lives to-day as our unseen but ever-present Lord and Master, our King, and the King of this His world.

And why does the coming of the Father's Kingdom still tarry?

Looking into our own hearts we know the answer. That optimism, that faith in this world's future, which is so greatly needed to-day can only be won at a cost which we find it terribly difficult to pay. The conviction that 'all things work together for good' is only possible for 'them that love God.' Only if we have begun our prayer by viewing the world from the standpoint of the High and Holy One, seeing it as His world in which His name is waiting to be hallowed and His will done. Only if then, in the light of this vision, we have stripped from ourselves every vestige of selfishness, individual selfishness, family selfishness, class selfishness, professional selfishness, and national selfish-

ness—and made *everything* subordinate to finding and doing our Heavenly Father's will. And only if we accept the condition that, this world being what it is, we must not expect the Kingdom of God except through our following the way of the Cross. Only so can we bring to the world what the world needs so badly and what it has a right to look to Christ's Church to supply.[1]

SECOND SUNDAY IN ADVENT.

The God of Hope and the Hope of Civilization.

'The God of hope.'—Ro 15^{13}.

The author of this phrase was not one who was naturally disposed to take an excessively cheerful or optimistic view of life. He did not conceal from himself or his disciples that without him were troubles, within him were fears. He was intimately acquainted with the world and its ways, and never for a moment was he duped into imagining that the world-spirit was the Spirit of God, or that the splendid materialities of contemporary Roman civilization were the visible tokens of the advent of the celestial kingdom.

And yet, in spite of all, St. Paul was a decided optimist. Perhaps his idea may be stated in this way. Happen what may, the forces of God must infallibly triumph in the long-run. Then, just in so far as men are prepared to join their human forces with the superhuman forces, just in so far as they are prepared to work with God along the lines that His all-wise Providence has marked out for them—why, they can no more fail than God Himself can fail.

The tendency of the modern world is to place its hope in man—in human thought, human will, human effort, and in the vast and complex result of human ideas and human strivings which we roughly sum up in the term 'modern civilization.' The antithesis, thus badly put, is rather startling, is it not? Here is the Pauline outlook, and there is the modern—trust in God, hope based on God, upon the one hand; trust in man, hope based on man, upon the other. Let us consider for a few moments what is meant by this civilization in which so many put their trust, and what is the justification of the hope that is based upon it.

There are many who still interpret civilization mainly in material terms. Civilization, according to the popular conception of it, stands for something like this—houses all heated and lit by electricity; motor-cars in myriads; Atlantic liners, like monster hotels, with Marconi installation; huge airships plying with passengers between London, Paris, and New York; telephones everywhere, lifts everywhere, public kitchens in every district, picture palaces at each street corner. Do these material accomplishments in themselves and by themselves sufficiently justify our hope for the society which has accomplished them? Surely we are forgetting, in our pride at our own successes, that other societies have flourished in the past with a wealth of material resource, of mechanical contrivance and of artistic skill, different from ours, indeed, but not unequal to that of any modern people. And what has happened to them now? What has become of the civilization of ancient Rome or of ancient Greece or of ancient Egypt? In one of the novels of Mr. H. G. Wells a character moralizes upon the fate of the old nations that once were established along the borders of the Mediterranean. 'The world,' he says, 'is littered with the remains of booms and swaggering beginnings. . . . This Mediterranean is just a museum of old Americas. . . . Why, anywhere you're running about among ruins—anywhere. And ruins of something just as good as anything we're doing to-day. Better in some ways. . . . We're too conceited about our little modern things.'

But the word civilization we may say stands for something deeper—for the modern development of the human mind and spirit, for the diffusion of knowledge, the quickening of intelligence, the growth of liberty embodied in the new democracy, the expansion of humanitarian sentiment, and the like. Well, be it so. No one denies that there have been changes in these directions. Yet it is open to question whether any or all of these changes, by themselves, can afford an adequate basis for optimism.

But let us go to the root of the matter. After all, the only thing which can justify our hope for civilization is the character of the people. Is the individual, is society, is the world becoming better? He would be a bold man who would answer unhesitatingly in the affirmative. Leigh Hunt, referring to Napoleon in his latter days, remarks that 'no great principles stood by him.' And would it be wholly unfair to apply the observation to contemporary society? Our views of right and wrong have become indistinct and blurred. We have one opinion one day, and another opinion another day. We have no great principles, no commanding moral standards. This does not mean to say, of course, that we are desperately bad; on the whole we do pretty much what all good people are expected to do by all other good people. But

[1] L. Hodgson, *The Lord's Prayer*, 15.

our standards are sadly defective. And, as some one has justly said, 'The worst sign of an age is not evil living, but low standards.'

Can we seriously believe, then, that this modern civilization guarantees the complete fulfilment of our bright hopes about the future? Why, even now there are many observers who discern in this civilized order fewer promises of progress than symptoms of decline; who tell us that we are on the road, not to any earthly paradise, but to an overwhelming world-catastrophe. A great French writer, for example (struck not so much by the levity, as by the sordid greediness of the age), looks forward into the coming years, and this is the vision that he sees. The cities grow vaster and vaster. The houses are piled up storey upon storey, and the ground below is honeycombed with a network of tunnels and subways. Men breathe an artificial air. The wealth is enormous. Immense trusts, run by multi-millionaires, control the capital and dominate the State. The old aristocracy is abolished, and society is reconstituted on the cash foundation. And for a while the new social structure seems to be practically unassailable. But when all appears most secure, then suddenly the end cometh. Gigantic strikes, anarchist outrages, all kinds of social shocks follow each other in quick succession, and at last there is a world-revolution from which society cannot recover. Then the wealth disappears; commerce and industry vanish away; and the great centres themselves gradually cease to be inhabited.

It is not civilization by itself that gives us encouragement to hope. Civilization apart from God is dismally disappointing. It offers us no hope. If we really want that, we must seek it where St. Paul sought it and where alone it can be found—in 'the God of hope.' Yes, it is only when we have settled into a right relationship with God, only when we are striving sincerely and intelligently to discover and perform His Will, that we can be assured that our affairs are going right and will work out right. God deals with societies as He deals with individuals. He calls each people to do a certain definite work, and He equips them with strength to do it, and He means that they shall do it. And if contumaciously they refuse to do it, then God rejects that people, and finds an instrument somewhere else. But for those who obey there is solid ground for hope. The end of the game cannot, by any possibility, be checkmate for them. The whole movement of things is with them. All the forces of God are behind them.

The only real hope for human society lies in the progressive conformation of the social will to the Will of God. But there is this further truth, which we so easily lose sight of, that this progressive transformation of the social will cannot otherwise come about than by the progressive transformation of the wills of individuals. Every reform has been conceived and carried through by individuals. Take, for instance, such a reform as the suppression of duelling in England. Duelling was still common in the reign of George the Third, and even as late as the year 1829 a man so great as Wellington thought himself bound to fight a duel. Why, then, is the practice obsolete? It is because a few individuals—at the first a very few—saw the criminal stupidity of the whole proceeding, and were brave enough, when challenged, to refuse to fight. Of course they suffered for their conviction. They were turned out of the army; they were blackballed at the clubs; they were thrown over by the women whom they had hoped to marry. But their opinion made its way, and at last even the dull-witted British public was impressed.

Now, as it was with duelling, so it is with all reform. It begins with individuals. It is carried on by individuals. What, then, are we doing about it? Are we showing ourselves alive to our great responsibility? Are we really exhausting all our powers and possibilities in the cause of God's Kingdom and righteousness? If we truly care, most of us can do much for the elevation and Christianization and regeneration of human society. But even if we can do but little, is that a reason why we should do nothing?

So it is only as we surrender ourselves to God, and allow Him to have His way with us, that we can reasonably harbour optimism. But when once God takes command, then there is nothing that we need be anxious about or afraid of any longer. The future is ours, and the promises are ours, and all the blessings which are prepared for those that love the Lord are ours. For, though empires fall, and nations perish, and civilizations decay, still the Kingdom of God, to which we belong, goes forward.[1]

THIRD SUNDAY IN ADVENT.

The Coming of Christ.

'Art thou he that cometh, or look we for another?'—Mt 11[3] (R.V.).

Advent means coming. And when He did come there were many who doubted whether He was really the One whom they had expected. Was

[1] F. H. Dudden, *The Dead and the Living*, 47.

this in very truth God's last word? Appearances were against Him. Well might John the Baptist in prison lose faith and begin to speculate upon the possibility of a mistake having been made. Generations of Jews ever since have queried the legitimacy of the Church's interpretation put upon Jesus of Nazareth. They still look for the promised Messiah, and deny that the historical Figure who appeared in Palestine so long ago was really the promised One.

There were certain happenings in Palestine in those far-away days associated with Jesus of Nazareth which led the little band of disciples to seize upon the category of Messiahship as the only possible explanation. Because He had risen from the dead, He must have been the promised Messiah. The miracle of the Resurrection was the foundation-stone of their belief. Upon it the Church rested, and with it the Church challenged an unbelieving Judaism and won vast stretches of the Gentile world to the obedience of Christ.

Was the interpretation a sound one, and does it still hold good to-day? All are agreed that such was the interpretation put upon the life and work of the historical Person, Jesus of Nazareth, who appeared in the days of Cæsar Augustus, and was crucified under Pontius Pilate. The Church ransacked three worlds of thought, Jewish, Greek, and Roman, in a desperate effort to do justice to what it had come to believe was the true significance of His Person and work. The intellectual explication of the Faith of the Church did not stop short of predicting absolute Deity to an historical Person. It is a staggering proposition, appalling in its significance for the whole human race, if it be true. And it is precisely its truth which was, and still is, questioned. The Church asserted, and still asserts, it. The world denied, and still denies, it.

On all sides the question presses in the light of modern thought: 'Art thou he that cometh, or do we look for another?' Is there not a more rational and reasonable explanation of those happenings in Palestine than that which the Church gave?

Our thought naturally tends to frame itself in terms of evolution, whilst the Jewish and Early Christian world-view was catastrophic. It is easy to fit Jesus into an evolutionary world-view and to regard Him as a natural product in the age-long quest of humanity after an ideal Man. He appears in the natural course of the evolution of the religious consciousness, and exhibits in His own Person a thirst after things Divine which dominated His whole life. His reward was a realization of the Presence of God never before achieved by any son of man. Hence in Him we see the climax of the Divine immanence in a person's life. He was a prophet mighty in deed and word before God and all the people. 'Follow Me,' He says, 'and I will lead you to where alone your hearts can find rest, namely, the bosom of our Father, yours and Mine.' Hence, He can be accounted for as the finest flowering of an evolutionary process and a natural emergence from the womb of Palestinian Judaism.

'No,' says the Church, 'such an explanation is inadequate. The claim of the Church is that this historical Person was alive and transcendent above the world-process before appearing in it at a point in time. It was not a case of the climax of the Divine Immanence in a person's life, but God the Son, the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity, leading a personal life in the world which owes its origin to His activity in creation. The Logos in Christian teaching was the agent in creation.

The more we allow our minds to dwell upon the full significance of the magnitude of the claim which the Church makes on behalf of its Lord and Master, the more staggering is it realized to be—Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever. If such a One as this really did appear once in time and was seen of men, one greater can never appear, and His Advent was *the* Advent. Our question is answered. 'Art thou he that cometh, or look we for another?' He who did come, the Church claims, was God Incarnate. No greater, therefore, can ever appear. The evolutionary process, let it continue for endless stretches more of time, and it may yet throw up a greater than John Baptist, but it can never produce God the Son who Himself produces *it*. His Advent into the world of time and place was, therefore, catastrophic. He came first in lowly guise, born of a woman, born under the Law. None the less, the insignificant mode of entry into our world must not hide from us either the greatness of Him who entered it or the significance of His entrance. His Presence is our guarantee of the truths which Jewish eschatology vainly tries to describe. After Time, Death; after Death, Judgment.

It is curious to note how this strange Figure which appeared once in Palestine clothed in human form still haunts our modern world and still baffles it. We devise all kinds of picture-frames in which to confine Him, and we construct all sorts of settings in which we think we can make Him intelligible to our modern world. Yet He walks out of all our frameworks and transcends all our categories of thought. Evolution cannot contain

Him nor account for His production. The Heaven of heavens cannot contain Him; how much less our finite minds? Yet He haunts our literature and confronts all our relativity with Himself as an Absolute.

We challenge Him to give some reasonable explanation of His Presence and seeming failure, and He still points us, as of old, not to intellectual disputations concerning His Person, but to indisputable evidences of His Power. 'Go your way and tell the things which ye do hear and see: . . . And blessed is he, whosoever shall find none occasion of stumbling in Me.'

The world will always find it easy to pick holes in the intellectual formulation of the Christian faith. The historical happenings in a far-away past must always be open to question, and the documents which contain the records are never exempt from critical investigation. The tests which the Master Himself bids us employ are experimental in character. From the evidences of His Power we deduce His Divinity. Do we need a greater proof of His transcendence than our failure fully to account for Him purely in terms of what we know as human? Is not His omnipotence witnessed to through the ages in the story of the transformation of sinners into saints? Does not the presence of the supernatural shine through the natural as He transfigures us by His grace and reveals Himself in the Breaking of the Bread? Is it not true that there is in each one of us a region, deep in the core of our being, into which nothing human can penetrate, but in which none the less we find Him, or rather are found of Him? His Presence, 'closer than breathing and nearer than hands and feet,' binds us so vitally to the Invisible God that we need no other assurance of Advent, but in Him find that which bears with it the marks of true authentification—Immanuel, God with us.

What would we more? Why should we look for another and greater than this One when Christ sufficeth us? If at any time in a world of shadows a faltering faith halts in doubt, there is still open the way back to the very heart of mercy of our God through Jesus Christ. He withholds from us intellectual certitude, but never spiritual assurance if we ask in faith. And faith has a way of finding Eternal truth which eludes the grasp of the wise and prudent. A reckless flinging of ourselves, without reserve, into the service of the Master when all seems hopeless and lost brings with it over and over again a certitude, not otherwise obtainable, that behind the flux of becoming is Being; penetrating the natural is the supernatural; in time is eternity; working through change is the changeless God, and underneath are the everlasting Arms. The saints are His witnesses through the ages, and their verdict is unanimous at least in this: they did not look for another because in Him they found all which they sought.[1]

[1] H. M. Relton, *Messages from a Troubled Church to a World in Trouble*, 53.

Recent Biblical Archaeology.

By the Reverend J. W. Jack, D.D., Glenfarg, Perthshire.

New discoveries have been made at Tell el-Amarna, in Egypt, where so many valuable texts bearing on Palestine were unearthed in 1887. Mr. J. D. S. Pendlebury, Director of the Egypt Exploration Society's expedition there, has re-excavated the official buildings, offices, and sanctuary which the 'heretic' Pharaoh, Akhenaton (previously known as Amenhotep IV.), built in the fourteenth century B.C., when he instituted his new monotheistic sun-worship, and attempted to displace the older worship of Amen. In the Records Office, where the original fragments were discovered, the excavators have succeeded in finding seven other interesting tablets, while they have discovered an eighth in the clerks' houses adjoining. According to Dr. Cyrus Gordon, of the American School of Oriental Research, one is the filed copy of an order to Itia, the governor of Ascalon, commanding him to guard the town securely; another is a Palestinian letter, which may have come from Abdashirta, or his son Aziru, the crafty rulers of Amurru, who were attacking the Phœnician and North Syrian cities on the coast as far as Ugarit (Ras Shamra), while representing themselves as faithful servants of Egypt; a third is apparently part of the epic poem 'Shar Tamkhari' (or 'King of Battle'), relating the exploits of Sargon I. in Cappadocia; others are vocabularies of Sumerian and Babylonian signs, which were