

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

Two series of volumes, five volumes in each series, have been published under the general title of 'The Scholar as Preacher.' A third series began with a volume by Dr. CLIFFORD, entitled *The Gospel of Gladness*—a volume as characteristic of this scholar and preacher as any that he has ever published. The second volume in the series is entitled *The Seer's House* (T. & T. Clark; 4s. 6d. net). Its author is the Rev. James RUTHERFORD, B.D.

What right has Mr. RUTHERFORD to a place in this series of books? He is a scholar, although he and Canon W. H. HUTTON alone have not yet proceeded to the doctorate degree. But is he a preacher? We shall test him by a sermon.

We shall not test him by the first sermon in the book, nor by the last. These two are always to be avoided if we would appreciate a preacher's preaching. These are exceptional. We shall test Mr. RUTHERFORD by a sermon which lies in hiding very near the middle of the volume. It has the simple title of 'Christ's Word to Simon.' The text is Lk 7⁴⁰: 'And Jesus answering said unto him, Simon, I have somewhat to say unto thee. And he saith, Master, say on.'

'As you read the Gospels, you cannot but notice this—how much of the teaching of Christ

is Table-talk. It is not preaching; it is conversation. It does not come to us from bench or pulpit, not from any artificial altitude. It comes to men as they sit at table in social fellowship.'

That is the beginning. Then, after contrasting Christ in this regard with John the Baptist, he says: 'You remember also how some of the best books in the world's literature come to us in this form. How much of the wisest and the wittiest is not the product of the study and the midnight oil, but is given off in the free play of mind with mind in social fellowship. It is Table-talk. We think of Luther's, Selden's, Coleridge's *Table-talk*, Goethe's *Conversations*, and Boswell. These are living books, full of quick, intense interest, often far more interesting, because far more truly revealing the mind and the man, than works that are much more careful and elaborate. There is a spontaneity, a sincerity, a heartiness, a lively vigour and impressiveness about such speech, that is more attractive than the finest writing. It shows the man when he is thrown suddenly on his resources and must speak out in answer to whatever the occasion demands.'

The example of Samuel Johnson is recalled effectively. Then—'This is what we have from Christ—not sermons or essays, not preaching, but conversation. Imagine the talk in any house,

at any table, when He was there—such wise and weighty and winsome talk! “Never man spake like this man.” He was always ready for any question, any sudden challenge, for anything the situation should require, any opportunity it might provide. He was always ready to look across the table to host or guest, and say—“Simon, I have somewhat to say unto thee.”

That is the introduction to the sermon. Then comes the exposition. Three facts are discovered. The first great fact discovered in the text is that *Christ has always something to say*. We are arrested at once with the description, not a word wasted, of a situation in which we have found ourselves, when we have had to break silence and knew the advantage of having something to say. ‘Many a difficult situation is relieved by a word; and we thank God for the man who has “something to say.” That man has the power; for knowledge is power—and wisdom and speech. In any society the leadership goes to him. Whatever we may say of the worth and the beauty of silence, I think that in this world it is ever true that the man who can speak is the master of those who cannot speak. Keep your eyes open, and you will see it. The advantage is ever with the person who has something to say.’

Christ had something to say. ‘On the grandest scale this is the power of Christ—that in this world of ours, with its problems and its mysteries and its miseries, in this strange life of ours, sitting with men beside Him, men often going wrong, wanting to go right, asking what it all meant—just there He had something to say. When all the rest are silenced, or at best perplexed, He speaks. This is His place in every company where He appears, in every house He enters, in every life He visits. He has something in His mind and in His heart—Oh! if He could only tell it, and if we would only hear it, the darkness would lift, and we would be happy and at peace. He is, and ever must be, in every company the Prophet who can speak.’

The second fact is that *Christ has always something more to say*. ‘There are people who have something to say, but when they have said it they have nothing more to say. You know the kind of people. The second time you meet that man he tells you the same stories, he makes the same reflections and remarks. You have got to the bottom of that well already, come to the end of his resources.’

‘But Christ is different. He has always something more to say. He is simply endless. You never exhaust Him, never come to the last word. This is the characteristic of His teaching as it is of Himself—that while it is so simple, coming near to us in familiar words, we feel that in His wisdom there are heights and depths beyond all that we know. It is “His fulness,” not the fulness of the pitcher, but the fulness of the fountain—the brimming well.’

Then follows, well expressed, one of the wonderful things about Christ, quite familiar, but always wonderful. ‘He rises above all the centuries with a message to the Twentieth Century as truly as to the First. The time never comes when Christ has nothing for us, the hour never comes when we feel that we have come to the end of Him. Let knowledge grow, let life advance, and He is still in front of us. We never overtake Him. Find yourself where you may, confronted by any experience, Christ will have His peculiar message and gift and greatness; we turn from every other teacher to cling to His feet, saying, “Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life.” You can always say to Him, as Simon said, “Master, say on.” Yes, on and on; say more and more; for Christ has always something more to say.’

The last great fact is that *Christ has always something personal to say*. ‘Simon, I have somewhat to say unto thee.’ But now we have given enough of the sermon. There is never a moment’s loss of interest. Even when the preacher speaks

of himself he speaks also of his hearers' experience—the only way of redeeming the personal note from egotism. 'Have you never had this experience—when someone far above yourself in intellect or in place has spoken to you? I remember such an experience in a dark day in my own life, when the man, for whom of all men living I had the greatest veneration, spoke a word to me, because he knew that I needed it. I have never forgotten it, never forgotten the spot where that word was spoken. Believe me, it is this personal note of kindness and knowledge, of sympathy and interest, that makes life precious.'

So the word to Simon was a word of sympathy. It was a kind word. That is the last lesson, and it is made very emphatic.

The Rev. A. J. MASON, D.D., Honorary Fellow of Pembroke and Jesus Colleges, Cambridge, and Canon of Canterbury, has prepared a volume on *The Church of England and Episcopacy*, which has been published handsomely by the Cambridge University Press (10s. 6d. net). We say the volume has been prepared. For it consists of 'a catena of passages,' to use the author's own words, 'from Anglican writers, from the Reformation to the Catholic Revival of the nineteenth century, for the purpose of showing their views on the origin, the sanction, and the obligation of episcopacy, and on the position which we ought to hold in relation to non-episcopal communities both abroad and at home.' It is one of the results of the Kikuyu controversy. Canon MASON's purpose in gathering together these passages from Anglican writers is to show that Episcopacy is of the *esse* of the Christian Church.

The book is reviewed in *The Churchman* for November. The reviewer is the Rev. H. A. WILSON, M.A., Vicar of St. Peter's, Norbiton, Kingston-on-Thames. Mr. WILSON recognizes at once that Canon MASON's desire is to meet the loud call which has lately been made for 'a restate-

ment of the High Anglican position on the Christian Ministry.' And he recognizes also that that position rests upon the reality of 'Apostolical Succession. Canon MASON sees that as clearly as Mr. WILSON, though he does not express it so clearly. A considerable portion of the book is occupied with the evidence for that doctrine, no fewer than fifty-five theologians (according to the Index) being quoted in its favour.

Now the doctrine of Apostolical Succession 'has fallen upon very bad times.' Mr. WILSON quotes the Rev. A. E. J. RAWLINSON, who stated in *Foundations* that 'with regard . . . to the sense, if any, in which what is called Apostolical Succession may legitimately be asserted as a literal fact of history, the evidence is almost, if not quite, non-existent.' And then, 'it is scarcely possible,' he says, 'to exaggerate the significance of these words, coming as they do from one who was then a tutor of Keble College. It is as if one in the immediate entourage of the Sultan of Turkey were to express doubts as to the existence of Mahomet, or a member of the Papal College suspicion as to the Episcopate of St. Peter. Doubt as to the very fundamental essential of High Anglicanism has invaded the college founded for the express purpose of fostering and preserving those views! This is but one of many indications that the need is great for believers in the High Anglican view of the ministry to present their case forcibly in the light of present-day historical criticism.'

Canon MASON has come to the rescue of the doctrine. Has he rescued it? 'If it is possible,' says Mr. WILSON, 'to fasten Apostolic Succession on the Church of England, Canon MASON has done it; and if he has failed, we are quite confident no one else has a chance of success.' Mr. WILSON proceeds to prove that he has failed. 'We have read the book, and are confident that the case has been put in the strongest way by an author who is as conspicuous for his scholarship as for the respect and affection with which he is

regarded in the Church; but we have put it down still utterly unconvinced and entirely unrepentant. We have not found adequate evidence to make us waver in the conviction that our Church's attitude, as expressed in its formularies and by the actions and words practically of all its great divines, was one of brotherly regard and Christian courtesy towards non-Episcopalian Churches.'

How is it, then, that Canon MASON is so well satisfied? There are three reasons. The first reason is that he is not, and does not profess to be, impartial. The conclusion that he reaches is the conclusion that he set out to reach. The second reason is that in spite of the size of his book and the multitude of his quotations, there are, and there were bound to be, serious omissions. These omissions, if they were supplied, would make the impression more 'complex' than it really is. The third reason is that naked quotations, apart from their historical context, are often gravely misleading, and there are such quotations here.

Of the first reason something will be said in a moment. Of the second Mr. WILSON gives two examples. One of these is Archbishop Whitgift. Canon MASON quotes Whitgift freely as an uncompromising Episcopalian. But Whitgift said this: 'That any one kind of government is so necessary that without it the Church cannot be saved, or that it may not be altered into some other kind, thought to be more expedient, I utterly deny.' And he also said this: 'I deny that the Scriptures do set down any one certain form and kind of government of the Church, to be perpetual for all times, persons, and places, without alteration.' Canon MASON does not quote these passages.

The other example is Bishop Jewel. Several times Jewel is referred to by Canon MASON as 'a stiff upholder of Episcopacy as an integral part of the faith,' and extracts are made from his writings which are fairly strong. 'But we are not given the passage from the "Defence of the Apology" in

which Jewel declares that if all the Bishops of the English Church were cut off, it would be no vital matter, she would not have recourse to Rome for a new succession—which reminds us of a well-known High Anglican who, in lecturing upon the Diocletian persecution, remarked that at one time Diocletian had all the Bishops of the Church in his clutches and, had he known it, by cutting off their heads he could have severed the Church from the channels of Divine grace. Happily, however, the Emperor did not hold High Anglican views upon the ministry!'

The third reason why Canon MASON is satisfied is that he had failed to consider the context of his quotations. It is impossible to estimate Hooker, Whitgift, Cooper, and others aright if the conditions under which they wrote are ignored. They had to state the case for Episcopacy against keen and not over-scrupulous opponents, and they had to put that case as strongly as they were able to put it. 'Their adversaries were bitter and narrow men, who saw in Bishops the "mark of the beast" and the Woman of Babylon, who maintained that our Church had barely taken the first step to Reformation, who used vile and coarse abuse of every Bishop. When we remember this, we get the right perspective in which to view the words of our defenders, and the same applies, with some necessary qualification, to the works of Caroline and post-Restoration writers.'

But the chief reason why Canon MASON has failed and does not know it is that his mind was already made up. How that affected his selection of passages Mr. WILSON is not sure. But he is quite sure that it induced him to pass over the evidence of the Thirty-nine Articles and all the pre-Elizabeth work upon the Prayer-Book. 'The fact that in the compilation of the Prayer-Book the Continental Churches were consulted, and their advice often acted upon, has apparently no significance for him. The fact that refugees from England at the time of the Marian persecution communicated freely with Continental non-Episco-

pallians is unmentioned, as also is the fact that, when the exiles from the Continent fled to England, they were given churches to worship in, and minister their sacraments to the present day in those churches. Bishop Gore once said that the Church of England would be rent asunder the day non-Episcopalians ministered at Anglican altars. This practice began in Elizabeth's reign, and is going on now in the Dutch Church in Austin Friars! A Huguenot congregation worships today in the crypt of Canon Mason's own cathedral.'

The root question which Mr. WILSON asks is this: Did the Reformation, Elizabethan, and Caroline divines regard the foreign Protestant bodies as Churches or not? If they did so regard them, then the obvious and inevitable conclusion is that they did not consider Episcopacy as essential to the existence of a Church. He maintains that the evidence mentioned proves that they not only admitted freely and fully the status of the Continental Churches, but acknowledged their equality with the Church of England. The farthest the old High Churchmen generally would go was to regard the Continental Churches as not so perfectly organized or so fully blessed as their own Church. A High Churchman like Andrewes could write that a man 'must be stone-blind that sees not Churches standing without' Episcopacy; and a staunch Laudian like Bramhall was of opinion that 'there is great latitude left to particular Churches in the constitution of their ecclesiastical regiment.'

Canon MASON has not prepared his book in vain. He has given Mr. WILSON the opportunity of showing the attitude of our younger scholars to the great issue raised at Kikuyu. That attitude, so ably maintained in this article, will give heart again to many a preacher of the Gospel, and especially to many a preacher of the Gospel abroad.

There is a beautiful figure used in the Book of Deuteronomy to illustrate the fatherly love of God for Israel.

'As an eagle that stirreth up her nest,
That fluttereth over her young,
He spread abroad his wings, he took them,
He bare them on his pinions.'

So the Revised Version. The figure is most beautiful. But is it true?

Professor DRIVER could find no first-hand example. He quotes Dr. W. L. ALEXANDER, who quotes from Davy's *Salmonia*: 'Two parent eagles on Ben Weevis were teaching their offspring, two young birds, the manœuvres of flight.' Rising from the top of a mountain, they 'at first made small circles, and the young imitated them; they paused on their wings waiting till they had made their first flight, holding them on their expanded wings when they appeared exhausted, and then took a second and larger gyration, always rising towards the sun, and enlarging their circle of flight, so as to make a gradually ascending spiral.'

That is pertinent, but it is scarcely enough. Dr. J. P. PETERS felt that it is scarcely enough, and when at first he looked about to find other examples he was completely baffled. Writing in the *Journal of Biblical Literature* for 1911, he said: 'Of the actual procedure of eagles, griffon vultures, or other similar birds in the earlier stages of teaching or helping their young to fly, described in the first two verses of the above quatrain, I am able to get no information from published works or from personal inquiry of the most distinguished ornithologists, whom I have in the last few months annoyed with many importunities.'

He found that certain smaller birds shouldered or jostled their young out of the nest and so compelled them to attempt to fly. 'They usually land on the ground as the result of the first attempt, whereupon the parent birds fly down to them, flap their wings and fly before them, as though showing them how to fly, rush at them and away from them, hover about them, sometimes hold food, before them at a little distance, and in general scold and coax them to flight.' But he was by no means

sure that he could argue from these smaller birds to the conduct of the eagle or the griffon vulture.

Dr. PETERS was seeking to reach the meaning of one of the words which are used of the eagle in Deuteronomy. It is the word translated 'fluttereth.' He did not think that 'fluttereth' was the meaning. But he was baffled in his search. He could find no one who could tell him from actual experience what is the way of the eagle with her young. And for a time he gave the matter up.

In the *Journal of Biblical Literature* for 1914 he returns to it. He has been making further inquiry. He wrote to Mr. HANAUER of Damascus for one. Mr. HANAUER replied: 'I have never seen either eagles or vultures "stirring up" their nests, or "carrying their young on their wings." I have, however, heard the late Bishop Gobat relate that when in Abyssinia, between the years 1829 and 1837, he had seen eagles assist their young in flight, by flying underneath them when the brood were beginning to try their wings, and seemed weary and about to drop. In this case the parent birds carried their young for a while till they had rested, and then let them start again by themselves. I have also the testimony of one of my sons, who takes a keen interest in such things, to the effect that he has seen ravens act towards their young in the same way.'

Dr. PETERS was not satisfied yet. It occurred to him that from the Rocky Mountains he might obtain some information as to the habits of eagles. He accordingly wrote to Bishop THOMAS of Wyoming, who sent a note to the missionaries in the mountain districts of that State, asking them if they could furnish any information as to the ways of the eagle with its young. This is the best of the answers that were returned: 'I have seen the young ones learning to fly several times. . . . When the young ones are full grown the old ones force them out of the nest. Then the young have to fly up on a near-by cliff before they will feed

them, going higher with each trial, until after about a week the young are able to go to any place on the ridge. Then one of the old ones will take a bird or small animal and fly across the canyon, continuing to do this until the young follow. Then they will fly around, letting the young ones come nearly close enough to get their food. After that the young are with the old birds for about three weeks, then they are absent for about a week, the old ones returning alone.'

That is not altogether sufficient, but it was supplemented by the report of a missionary among the Shoshone Indians: 'An old white trapper informs me that the eagle pecks at and jostles its young (when old enough) out of the nest until they take to wing and fly to a near-by crag; then it repeats the same thing until the young one, driven by the old bird, soars away. An experienced half-breed trapper tells me that, when the young eagle attempts to fly, should it get into difficulties, the old bird will seize it with its talons and carry it back to the nest, and that sometimes, when the young one becomes exhausted during its first flight, the parent bird will fly beneath it and bear it up on its back.'

Dr. PETERS is content. 'Without going further,' he says, 'this testimony, it seems to me, is sufficient to prove that the passage Deut. 32¹¹ is actually an eye-witness description, and that the process there described is as follows: The eagle (or griffon vulture) "stirs up" its nest, that is, it pushes, jostles, or in some way drives the young out; then, if the young does not fly, the eagle proceeds to entice it or to force it to do so, and the particular method described in this passage is the flying at the young with a violent down-rush flapping of the wings and the like. Then, if the young eagle, thus forced into flight, lose its courage or its strength, the old eagle flies under it and supports it with its pinions.'

But it was not to discover the meaning of this passage in Deuteronomy that Dr. PETERS set out

upon his search. It was to find out the meaning of a more important and scarcely less picturesque passage. He had come to believe that the translation of the second verse of the first chapter of Genesis is altogether wrong.

The translation is: 'And the earth was waste and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep; and the spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters.' In the margin of the Revised Version the last clause is rendered, 'the spirit of God was brooding upon the face of the waters.' This is the usual interpretation. As Dr. SKINNER puts it: 'The Divine Spirit is figured as a bird brooding over its nest.'

But Dr. SKINNER sees that this idea of the brooding bird is quite out of relation to the rest of the narrative. And not only is it out of relation to the rest of this passage; it is also out of touch with the rest of Scripture. Nowhere else in all the Bible is this idea found in reference to the universe. The cosmogonic world-egg is a wholly pagan conception.

Dr. PETERS attacked the word translated 'brooding.' He found it, in the particular form used here, in only one other passage in Scripture, the passage already dealt with in Deuteronomy. There, he believed, it describes the process of getting the young to take to the wing. After he obtained the necessary information he was convinced that the meaning was far from 'brooding.' It was not rest but motion; not hovering or brooding, but fluttering or shaking or rushing. In Deuteronomy the meaning is that the bird rushes upon her young to drive them out of the nest. And the true translation of the passage in Genesis is that 'the wind of God (the Hebrew word being equally capable of the translation wind or spirit) rushed upon the face of the water.'

In the issue of *The Constructive Quarterly* for September there is an article by Professor Jean

RIVIÈRE of the Grande Séminaire, Albi, France. Professor RIVIÈRE is a Roman Catholic. The subject of his article is the formula 'Outside the Church no salvation.' What does he do with such a subject in such a place?

He does not reject the formula. He maintains it both for himself and for his Church. He says, truly, that 'the Church affirms it in official documents and with perfect clearness.' Take the Fourth Lateran Council, the council of 1215. Against the Albigensians it was laid down by that council: 'There is but one Universal Church of the faithful, outside of which absolutely no one is saved.' Or take the decree for the Jacobites, which follows the Council of Florence. There we read, more particularly: 'The Sacrosanct Roman Church . . . firmly believes, professes and proclaims that none of those who are not in the Catholic Church—not only pagans, but also neither Jews, nor heretics, nor schismatics—can have any portion in eternal life . . . if they are not incorporated into it before the end of their life.'

And Professor RIVIÈRE has no difficulty in showing that this doctrine is in accordance with—not perhaps 'the most ancient Christian tradition,' as he says, but with tradition that goes back to the writings of Augustine. Preaching to the people of Caesarea, Augustine said of the Donatist Bishop Emeritus: 'Outside the Catholic Church he can have everything except salvation. He can have the [episcopal] dignity, he can have the sacrament, he can chant *Alleluia*, he can answer *Amen*, he can read the Gospel, he can possess and preach the faith in Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; but nowhere except in the Catholic Church can he find salvation.' A council of Circa (A.D. 412) declares in its Synodal letter, which Professor RIVIÈRE has no doubt was drawn up by the Bishop of Hippo: 'If anyone has separated himself from the Catholic Church, although he imagine himself to be thereafter leading an upright life, by that crime alone, which keeps him afar from the unity

of Christ, he shall not have life; but the wrath of God dwells in him.' _____

But Professor RIVIÈRE claims more than that this is the belief of the Church since Augustine, he claims that it is a doctrine of Scripture. St. Peter 'evokes the significant memory of Noah's ark.' St. Paul speaks of the wild slip grafted on the trunk of the olive, of the edifice built upon the sole foundation of Christ, and of the mystical body of which Christ is the head 'and we all ought to be members.' 'Is it necessary,' he asks, 'to say that a member which lives outside of the body is inconceivable, or a stone which keeps outside of the building?' _____

And not only does he find Apostolic witness for his formula, he finds authority for it in Christ. Observe the evidence. First he says, 'it was to His Apostles, united to Peter, their chief, that Christ entrusted the "keys of the Kingdom," which is the same as saying that men must receive the gift of Grace and of truth through their intermediation alone.' Next, he quotes the words, 'He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved'; and adds: 'but evidently he alone.' Lastly he refers to Jesus as the Vine and as the Shepherd: 'To live and bear fruit, the shoot must remain united to the trunk'; and 'There is only one spiritual sheepfold, outside of which the poor souls are the prey of wolves; and it is of this fold that Jesus is the door.' _____

But Professor RIVIÈRE did not write this article in order to prove that the formula 'Outside the Church no salvation' is a dogma of the Church of Rome, or even that it is a doctrine of Scripture. Sending it to *The Constructive Quarterly*, he sent it, we may be sure, for conciliation. He acknowledges that, as commonly understood, it is an offence to those who do not belong to the Church of Rome. His purpose is to remove the offence. How does he accomplish it? _____

First of all he says that there is one great excep-

tion to the application of the formula. It was never intended by means of this dogma to exclude from the blessings of salvation the invincibly ignorant. 'The adversaries without who attack the adage, "Outside the Church no salvation," and the pusillanimous believers who are scandalized by it, are wrong to ignore or forget that it represents only one aspect of revelation, that is to say, a partial truth, and one which, like all truths, becomes an error as soon as we attempt to take it for a total truth. To have the Catholic teaching in its integrity we must say: Outside the Church no salvation, that is, for those who, having been on the way to know it, are morally responsible for not having entered it; but those who are in good faith ignorant of it receive outside of it the graces necessary for their salvation.' _____

This is a considerable exception, certainly. The adage, which has all the appearance of universality, proves to be of only limited application. For we must still admit, however sorrowfully, that they who are ignorant of the claims of the Church are many more than they who are aware of them. But this is not all. There is another great exception. _____

The dogma in question applies only to the Church as a whole; it does not apply to individuals. It is an official declaration; it does not touch private persons. It has reference to the whole human race, as a race; it has nothing to do with the persons who compose the race. Of course this explanation is not original to Professor RIVIÈRE; it is as old as Augustine. But he adopts it without hesitation, and applies it without flinching. _____

And if these great exceptions are not enough, Professor RIVIÈRE is prepared to offer yet another. Every man who has ever lived in a Christian country has breathed the atmosphere of the Christian Church, and that is enough to entitle him to be called a member of it. "How many," he says, adopting the words of Professor Bainvel of the Catholic Institute of Paris, "How many, in fact,

live on the Church and by the Church, on the truth which it teaches and the grace of which it is the depository, without suspecting what they owe it?" Such, to begin with, is the case with the heretics and schismatics, kept by age-long prejudices in the bond of dissident sects. The Christ they venerate and the Gospel they meditate, have they not taken them from the Mother Church? And the sacraments they receive, are they not always, according to the beautiful doctrine of St. Augustine, the work of Christ and of His Church? "All the baptized are, so to speak, baptized Catholics. Thus baptized, the heretic or the schismatic, so long as he has not fallen short of his light, will continue to owe to the true Church the graces

which God shall be pleased to give him on account of the teaching which he will receive."

'Thus'—again quoting Père Bainvel—"thus," he says, 'the more we go into the reality of things, the more we see attaching themselves to the Church souls who at first sight would seem to have nothing in common with it. We need only continue the induction to arrive in all truth at the conclusion that not only is the Church here below the only society of salvation, but also that, according to the providential order and manifest intentions of God, every soul that is saved belongs in some fashion to the Church and is not saved but by being connected with it.'

A Sage among the Prophets.

BY THE REV. W. P. PATERSON, D.D., PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH.

'I turned about, and my heart *was set* to know, and to search out, and to seek wisdom, and the reason of *things*.'
—Ec 7^{35a} (R.V.).

THE Bible has not much to say about those interests and activities of the intellectual life which we comprehend under science and philosophy, and which have their modern symbol in a University. For one thing the Bible was given through a Semitic people, who were assigned a different task in the providential division of the labour of the spirit. The chief end of the Bible was to appeal to man as man, and to minister to those religious needs and moral aspirations which are the common stock both of cultured and uncultured humanity. At the same time there were those among the Biblical writers who shared and appreciated the purely intellectual impulse. As the band of the sacred writers represented every social grade, from that of the ruler of a people down to the peasant and the fisherman, so it included along with unlearned and ignorant men some who had felt that the pursuit of knowledge is one of the worthiest objects of human endeavour. And their intellectual interest was not suppressed, but only redirected and elevated, by their enlistment in the service of revelation. Among the New

Testament writers this position is illustrated by St. Paul, who had zealously mastered all that was taught in the narrow school of the synagogue, and for whom it was one of the glories of the gospel that it threw a flood of fresh light upon the deepest problems of the world and of human life. He speaks slightly, indeed, of the wisdom of this world, under which name he seems to comprehend summarily the intellectual achievements of classical antiquity; and he felt bound to pass this judgment in view of its failure in the supreme task of attaining a true and full knowledge of God and of His will. But the same Paul laid down the principle that 'all things are yours'—thereby putting in a Christian claim to everything that enriches and ennobles human life, while in mapping out the domain of the mind he bids it take possession of whatsoever things are true. The Old Testament contains a group of books known as the Wisdom Literature which is the product of criticism and reflexion working upon a comparative study of the data of revelation and experience. Among the writings thus described a special interest attaches for us to the Book of Ecclesiastes, since there is evidence that the author was a man who, at least during one phase of his career, had dugged for knowledge