

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

WILL any of those who are in need of consolation at the present time go for it to Mr. L. Cope CORNFORD's book *The Secret of Consolation* (Williams & Norgate; 2s. 6d. net)? It is most unlikely. If they go, will they find the consolation they are in need of? It is nearly certain that they will not. And yet the consolation is there. It is there, and it is the best consolation that book or man can offer.

But before the consolation comes, before one word is said about consolation, a hundred and twelve pages have to be read. And very few who seek consolation will read them. They are well written. They are written with a literary artist's practised pen. But they do not contain any consolation. They do not offer even the prospect of it.

They contain other things that are interesting. There is, for example, this appreciation of the British Government: 'A group of politicians known to be corrupt, unprincipled, and treacherous. . . . These men are morally drenched in blood from head to foot. Creatures of the mob they flattered and deluded, they are not more guilty than the people who made them; nor little more to blame than the men, their partners in the great political imposture, who were ostensibly their opponents, who let all go, and who finally, to

complete their betrayal, joined them in order to prolong their lease of usurpation. These be your gods, O Israel.'

That is interesting. But there is no consolation in it, nor the promise of consolation. Then Mr. CORNFORD enters the hospital where the wounded men are lying. The atmosphere changes. We cannot believe any longer that the book is written for the mere joy of writing, or even to denounce the Government. For this is what we read:

'Among the wounded men in the long ward, whose air is tainted with the stagnant hospital smell, one sits propped up with pillows, wearing a monstrous cap of bandages, which shadow his bright, wild eyes. He is perfectly still. Suddenly he speaks in a high monotone. "Oh—oh—oh, the dreadful pain, the dreadful pain; wait a minute, the dreadful pain, I must go home—the pain." His voice rises. The soldiers about him look at him. "Shot through the top of the head, poor chap," says one. "Bullet came out through his forehead. He gets these sudden pains, like, but they're soon over." The nurse came quietly to the wounded man's bedside, and gave him morphia. His voice dropped to an unintelligible mutter, and he was silent. Then he said loudly, "I'm going home." The men about laughed, "Ay, ay," said one soothingly, "you're going home all right, mate."

The secret of consolation is not revealed immediately. But now it is sure to come. And when it comes at last, what is it? It is just the old story over again, the story made so familiar to us by all our evangelical hymnology.

There is a blessed home
Beyond this land of woe,
Where trials never come,
Nor tears of sorrow flow.

This from Mr. CORNFORD may be unexpected. But he is quite emphatic in asserting it. 'The truth is,' he says, 'that the most important question in the world is whether or not there is a future life.' Why is it so important? Because in the certainty of a future life lies all the secret of consolation. Just one thing, therefore, is necessary in order to the making of a comforter. It is the ability to prove that there is a life to come.

But is not that just the one thing which nobody can prove? Mr. CORNFORD does not believe it. He believes that he can prove it himself.

For in the first place he holds that we are entitled to *assume* that there is a future life. The desire for it, you may say the expectation of it, is the gift of God. God's very character, therefore, is bound up with the fulfilment of the desire. That is why Christ says: 'If it were not so, I would have told you.' He took the place of God as He said it. He knew that God had given us the expectation. He pledged Himself for the faithfulness of God. And not in word only. In deed also. In life and in death. He lived in hourly communion with the life beyond. He died to bring us into that communion. And He rose again from the dead to return to the Father from whom He had come, the Firstfruits of them that slept.

Thus the assumption of a future life is the certainty of it. And we need no further proof. But Mr. CORNFORD is well aware that that assumption can be made only by those who first of all

have their hope in God. For the rest he has other arguments, but it must be confessed that they do not come to much. He argues that the soul is separable from the body, relying upon the philosophy of Dr. Theodore Merz for the force of it. Not only is the soul separable from the body, but, says Dr. Merz, it belongs to a different sphere of existence. It does not follow, therefore, that when the body dissolves, the soul will perish with it. It follows rather that it will enter upon some other independent life.

He argues also that if those who do not believe in God could only believe in themselves they might obtain the assurance of a life to come. For faith has the power of creating its own desires. This is an argument for which he has gone to Dr. Schofield and Mr. Troward and other popular psychologists. It has not been well developed yet. But one thing is clear. A faith which cannot find hope in God or salvation in Christ is not likely to be able to create any good thing.

And yet Mr. CORNFORD refuses to confine his consolation to those who have hope in God. For he sees that often enough the certainty of a life to come will be but a poor consolation even to them. The consolation of a life to come lies in the prospect of reunion. But where is the prospect of reunion if those who have been taken have not had *their* hope in God?

Let us approach the matter in this way. It is Mr. CORNFORD who tells the story. 'A parson of the Church of England and his friend, gliding swiftly in a motor-car across the dreaming English landscape in high summer, ran into a little town, where were strolling groups of soldiers.

"It is now said," the clergyman meditatively observed, "that when a soldier is killed in action, he goes to heaven, whatever his sins may have been. I cannot believe it. Supposing he has seduced a girl and left her—is he to escape punishment, because he is suddenly killed in the service of his country?"

““What *do* you believe, then?” asked his friend.

““Pon my word,” returned the parson honestly, “I don’t know. But I find no warrant for the belief that plenary absolution accompanies the sacrifice of a man’s life.””

Then if the sacrifice of a man’s life does not obtain that ‘plenary absolution’ which would entitle his surviving friends to look forward to a joyful reunion, is there anything else that will do it? Mr. CORNFORD quotes another ‘parson of the Church of England.’ This parson believes that membership in the Church will do it. Has the stricken soldier been baptized? Has he been a partaker in the Holy Communion? That will do it. This parson is a sailor-parson. He employs nautical language.

‘The way I put the matter,’ he says, ‘is this. I say that the world is a big ship, leaky and unseaworthy, and the Church is the lifeboat which comes alongside to take off the crew and passengers. They can come or not as they choose. But if they do choose, they get into the boat as they are told; they must sit quiet and obey orders, or be beaten over the head with a stretcher. There’s enough to do to navigate the boat, without answering questions. The lifeboat will make harbour all right—no doubt about that. Time enough to answer questions when we’re safe ashore. And,’ added this bold ecclesiastic, ‘you can call the coming aboard the boat Holy Baptism if you like, and the rations served out, Holy Communion; for these, I reckon, are the two essential Sacraments.’

Does that way of it satisfy Mr. CORNFORD? Not altogether. It is racy; but it is irreligious. For it takes away a man’s responsibility. And without responsibility there can be no religious life. If the gifts and calling of God are without repentance, as we are told, then certainly God does not take back the gift of responsibility, and the call to be a man. If the sacrifice of a man’s life in the performance of his duty does not entitle

him to absolution, much less can we look to membership in the Church for it.

Mr. CORNFORD looks elsewhere for the consolation. And he finds it. He finds it in faith. For faith is not the acceptance of a certain set of beliefs, to be laboriously learned from the creeds and the catechisms. It is the throwing open of one’s life to the entrance of the energy of God. And the life may be thrown open in a moment. Then, though the sacrifice is not the cause of the absolution, it may very well be its occasion and evidence. And that is one side of it.

The other side is with the survivor. For faith in the survivor being again the opening of the life to the entrance of the energy of God, the prayer of faith has power with God Himself and prevails. It is able to create the very situation which it longs for. It longs for reunion with one who was taken suddenly as he went forward in the service of his country and counted not his life dear unto himself. God’s answer is, ‘O woman, great is thy faith, be it unto thee even as thou wilt.’

One problem for after-war settlement, and a difficult one, is Palestine. Among the few things that are clear about it is that the expectations of the Jews cannot be left out of account. It is quite true that the opinion is freely expressed that the Jews need not be taken into account, because they do not want to be taken into account. But that is a mistake. It is quite true again that the opinion is widely held that the Jews had better not be taken into account, because they would only exploit Palestine in the interests of a degrading commercialism. But that also is a mistake, and a greater one.

A volume has been published by Mr. John Murray on *Zionism and the Jewish Future* (2s. 6d. net). The volume, which is edited by Mr. H. SACHER, contains a number of essays on different subjects contributed by a number of authors of

different ways of thinking. But all the subjects turn upon the reoccupation of Palestine by the Jews, and all the authors agree that the Jews desire its reoccupation. One of the authors is Mr. Norman BENTWICH, M.A., Barrister-at-Law, Lincoln's Inn, and Inspector of the Egyptian Native Tribunals. His subject is 'The Future of Palestine.'

Now we are not to be understood as saying that the Jews are unconscious of the commercial possibilities of Palestine. Mr. BENTWICH begins there. 'Palestine,' he says, 'is essentially the land of religious influence and spiritual association,' and he will come to that. But first of all it is a land flowing with milk and honey—if only the Turks could be told to let it flow. And so he begins by showing what the possibilities are to the ancient nation of Israel, or such portion of it as to-day truly desires to make the Land of Promise a land of Reality.

And, first, its means of communication. 'The railway has taken the place of the road as the great means of communication between countries, but it follows the lines of the road; and it is along the Vale of Esdraelon and the maritime plain, where thousands of years ago the armies and caravans of Africa met the armies and caravans of Asia, that to-day the railroad linking India to Egypt must pass.' So the railway from Haifa to Damascus must be carried forward (it is a British undertaking) to the Euphrates and on to the Persian Gulf. The Euphrates portion is being pushed on despite the war; the rest must be completed after. When it is completed the near East and the far East will be linked up, and the whole of the Orient thrown open to the trade and prosperity of Europe. Already the Hedjaz line runs from Damascus southward, 'through the Hauran and the eastern side of Palestine, to Arabia Petraea and Arabia Felix, and opens up to economic and commercial enterprise a vast district, once one of the world's granaries, but for centuries abandoned to the marauding Bedouin.'

But agriculture is to-day, as it was 'in Bible times,' the main pursuit of the inhabitants of Palestine, the only considerable manufacture being that of soap from the olive-berry. And the Jews who go to settle in Palestine will go to cultivate the land. What is the prospect? Under the rule of the Turks the prospect is hopeless. But not because the land will not cultivate. The experience of the small German colonies which were planted some fifty years ago near Jaffa and Haifa, and of the Jewish colonies which have been scattered over the plains of Judæa and Samaria and the uplands of Galilee, has proved that the ancient fertility of the country may be restored by an industrious population.

And when the railways are in free working order agriculture will be assisted by trade. For 'mineral deposits exist in Palestine that promise industrial expansion. Phosphates are already mined on the east of the Jordan; the Dead Sea is known to be an untapped store of chemical wealth, which only awaits capital and a prudent administration to transform it into a kind of gold mine; oil has been struck in the same region; and it is said that the arid country to the south of Palestine contains workable veins of coal.'

One of the most familiar and far-seeing of the descriptions of Palestine is that it is 'a land whose stones are iron, and out of whose hills thou mayest dig brass.' It is a far-seeing description. It has taken all these centuries and this war to accomplish its fulfilment. But it will be fulfilled now. And then, 'with minerals to work factories, and an industrious labour force to man them, Palestine will have its manufacturing towns, and surely, but not, it may be hoped, too rapidly, it will become one of the commercial centres of the Near East.'

Be not alarmed. 'Palestine is not rich enough to attract those who are looking mainly for material advancement, but it is not too poor to provide for those emigrants who are willing to work for an

ideal. The mining of phosphates, moreover, will facilitate the intensive cultivation for which the Plain of Sharon and the Jordan Valley are adapted and the Jewish agriculturists, with their intellectual equipment, are peculiarly suited. Afforestation and terracing will restore the fertility and beauty of the hills and mountain-slopes. That in turn implies the need of a diligent and devoted peasantry, loving the land. But this condition should not be wanting, seeing that under the present unfavourable circumstances such a peasantry has been steadily increasing.'

But is there room for a large introduction of Jews into Palestine? There is plenty of room; even if by 'Palestine' we mean historical Palestine, that is to say, the territory between Dan and Beer-sheba and between the desert and the sea. Although it is a country only the size of Wales, embracing some 10,000 square miles, 6000 to the west of Jordan and 4000 to the east, yet Colonel Conder calculated that at one time it supported at least 10,000,000 persons, and that it could *immediately* maintain three or four times its present number of inhabitants. 'The density of population is now only seventy, and, excluding the towns, less than twenty-five per square mile. Even without the foundation of industries, by the good organization of agriculture it might be trebled and quadrupled. During the last century the population of Egypt has increased fourfold, while the country has remained almost wholly agricultural.'

Nor need Palestine to-day, says Mr. BENTWICH, be confined to its historic borders. 'When the Israelites were about to march from the Wilderness, they received at Horeb the message: "Ye have dwelt long enough in this mount. Turn you, and take your journey, and go to the mount of the Amorites, and unto all the places nigh thereto, in the plain, in the hills, and in the vale, and in the south, and by the seaside, to the land of the Canaanites, and to Lebanon, and unto the great river, the river Euphrates." From the Mediterranean to the

Euphrates, and from Lebanon to the river of Egypt—this is the territory which was to be the land of Israel, and in the future might be the Jewish land. All this area, this Greater Palestine, cries for a population to redeem it from the neglect and decay of centuries, and all of it is full of associations for the Jews. When Palestine was shut against them by the tyranny of Christianized Rome, they made a new Land of Israel in the country to the east; and when in recent times the door to Palestine seemed to be closed, Herzl looked to the El-Arish district as a starting-place of Jewish colonization on a large scale. The plateaux of Gilead and Moab and the plains that stretch away to the Tigris and Euphrates may be reclaimed by Jewish enterprise and industry no less than the stony hills of Judæa and Samaria and the green slopes of Galilee. Zionism, indeed, does not aim at leading back the whole of the Jewish people—the larger part will remain dispersed among the nations—but Greater Palestine may be a home for a very large remnant, numbered not in thousands, nor even in hundreds of thousands, but in millions.'

Does Mr. BENTWICH mean to say that Palestine is henceforth to be wholly Jewish? No, nor does he desire that. There is a Christian population in Palestine now, and he does not dream of dispossessing it. But the yearning of the Christians is rather for the control of particular sites than for settlement on the land. More to be taken account of are the Syrians and Arabs. The Syrians in the north have begun to cast covetous eyes on the sparsely populated tracts around them, and may set off the claim of neighbourhood against the claim of ancient title. But they are likely, Mr. BENTWICH thinks, 'to find a greater attraction in the rich valleys of Anatolia, when that province is opened up, than in the mountainous country to the south.' The Arabs of Palestine already number more than half a million, and the territory adjoining is the home of wandering tribes of Bedouin. But 'there is ample room for the children of Esau and of Jacob to live together in harmony on the land.'

'It is the Jews alone who will make any large and systematic immigration into Palestine, and it is Jewish enterprise and enthusiasm and devotion which will have to restore it to its former proud place in the annals of civilization. They will bring a higher standard of life from which the Arabs will gain, and they will require the Arabs' help in reclaiming the waste places. The interests of the present and the future population in fact coincide, and it should be within the powers of a just administration to secure a good understanding and co-operation between the two elements that are in origin akin and stand in material need of each other.'

The problem of the Person of Christ is settled for us when we settle the question of His sinlessness. It is settled for us practically. For however many and however hard may be the difficulties that remain, they are all theological or philosophical—difficulties of the mind only, not of the heart or will, not of love or loyalty. They who deny His sinlessness deny, and they know that they are denying, His Godhead, and all that historical Christianity has stood for.

Now the chief difficulty in accepting Christ's sinlessness is the Temptation in the Wilderness. It is not the difficulty that the unbeliever relies upon. He relies upon the cursing of the fig-tree, the overturning of the money-changers' tables, the challenge to the Ruler, 'Why callest thou me good?' The unbeliever who wishes to propagate his unbelief relies upon these because they have a popular appeal. But the unbeliever and the believer together know very well that the Temptation is the real difficulty. They do not worry over the difference between *non posse peccare* and *posse non peccare*. They simply say that a Being who was so constituted that He never sinned was never really tempted to sin.

The Rev. Stephen LIBERTY, sometime Subwarden of St. Deiniol's Library, is not an unbeliever. He has little sympathy with the small

bird-pecks by which Christ is represented as having been less than sinless. But he sees the difficulty that lies in the Temptation. He believes that Jesus was never tempted.

The book in which this startling statement is made is called *The Political Relations of Christ's Ministry* (Oxford University Press; 3s. 6d. net). It is occupied—a good occupation for the present time—with the national aspects of the Life of Jesus. It asserts that the Temptation in the Wilderness had no personal reference whatever to Jesus, but is to be taken entirely in a national aspect.

As a literal historical event the Temptation never happened. Mr. LIBERTY does not think it necessary now to argue that. 'No one to-day,' he says, 'would think of limiting its significance to the literal statements, or require that, even as an acted parable, Jesus must necessarily have been tempted to demand the transformation of stones into bread, or have really taken His stand on the roof of the Temple, or seen all the kingdoms of the world from a high mountain. Such an interpretation would have been as foreign to the Oriental thought of the first hearers as to the historical and scientific sense of the present day.'

That does not mean that the narrative is the product of some one's consummately clever imagination. Jesus Himself told the story of the Temptation. Mr. LIBERTY has no doubt about that. But whether He actually experienced it in a vision, or merely related it in the form of a parable, just as He related the experiences of Dives and Lazarus, he does not know, and he is not greatly concerned to know. Certainly if it was a vision it was a personal experience. But that does not alter the argument. If Jesus had a vision of that which we know as the Temptation in the Wilderness, He had it not for His own sake, not at all for His own sake, but wholly and solely for the sake of the nation. That is Mr. LIBERTY'S belief.

For to have had it for His own sake is not only to introduce all the difficulty into His sinlessness, it is to make so very little of Himself. Was He urged to use His Messianic powers in order to relieve His own hunger? Mr. LIBERTY says we have only to know Him to see how wide of the mark such a 'temptation' would have been. Was He invited to throw Himself from the pinnacle of the Temple in order to impress the people with His uniqueness? No doubt He was, and knew that He was, unique and altogether unapproachable. But the uniqueness that consists in working wonders He ever did His utmost to keep out of the people's sight. Was He shown all the kingdoms of the world in a moment of time and then told that they would be His without cross or conflict if only He would fall down and worship Satan? Mr. LIBERTY is not sure if Satan was there at all; but if he was, he is sure that he knew better than make such an offer with such a condition.

The Temptation was not for Him, but for the nation. If He represented it as His own, that was only because He was the nation's representative. There were three parties in the nation—Sadducees, Pharisees, and Herodians. The Sadducees were known for their love of ease, the Pharisees for their arrogance towards God, the Herodians for their readiness to compromise with the heathen world. These three parties with their characteristics gave Jesus the framework for the narrative of the Temptation, as well as the occasion for relating it.

First of all, the Sadducees were content with the mere continuance of the Jewish State as a State. They would have preferred to have it in their own hands. But they knew that, at present at anyrate, that could not be. So they were content to wait. Meantime they had a considerable share of 'peace' and wealth. And as long as they had that, why should they do anything to disturb relations which might easily be made worse? They had not the outward show of

statecraft, but they had many of its substantial advantages.

Thus the Sadducees were faithless to the promises of God. They were as unappreciative of the greatness of their high calling as the Israelites had been in the Wilderness. The promise had been of a land flowing with milk and honey. The Israelites took it literally. And they were content to let even the future literality go, if only they had their leeks and onions and garlicks now.

Jesus told the story of the First Temptation. The reference to the Wilderness journey is unmistakable. Just as the Israelites were content with the immediate satisfaction of their bodily cravings, so were the Sadducees content with the material advantages of the Theocracy. The answer of Jesus to Satan recalls them to their duty. 'Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God.' They knew what was meant by 'every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God.' The phrase was taken from Deuteronomy. It refers to Divine promises, not to Divine commands. As the Psalmist says, 'My covenant will I not break, nor alter the thing that is gone out of my lips' (Ps 89³⁴). 'How could He,' asks Mr. LIBERTY indignantly, 'viewing Himself as a solitary Messiah, be in danger of ignoring any of the promises of God?' No, but 'it was just their total indifference to the spiritual side of the nation's inheritance and to the promise of world-wide influence, which explained all the other unlovely characteristics of the Jerusalem leaders, their rationalism, their heathenish luxury, their political opportunism, and their deceitful attitude towards the Roman power.

The outlook of the Pharisees was very different from that of the Sadducees. Having the emoluments of office, the Sadducees were fairly well content. The Pharisees had the worship of the people, but only degenerate members of their order were content with it. They had a clearly

defined programme for the nation. God had promised them their land in absolute independence of the Gentile. And to its independent enjoyment He had attached the simple condition that the Law should be obeyed. Their whole purpose therefore was to obey the Law, and then put God to the test. Let us keep the Law, and see whether or not He will free us from the yoke of Rome.

Jesus came as the Messiah. Of course He would be a Pharisee and keep the Law. But that was not enough. As the Representative of the nation He must take the lead in freeing the land. It is well that He should give proof of His ability to lead. Let Him put God to the test by some preliminary and public act. Let Him throw Himself from the pinnacle of the Temple. The promise is unmistakable. 'He shall give his angels charge over thee.' If it fails the failure is Jesus' own; but if it succeeds they may go forward confidently under His leadership to deliverance.

Jesus refused the test. Why? Just because it was a test. There lay the whole Pharisaic blunder. They were doing over again that which their fathers had done in the Wilderness. 'And he called the name of the place Massah (Tempting), and Meribah (Strife), because of the striving of the children of Israel, and because they tempted the Lord, saying, Is the Lord among us, or not?' That was not the only time they 'tempted' God in the Wilderness. Of a later occasion the Psalmist says: 'They tempted God in their heart by asking meat for their lust. Yea, they spake against God; they said, Can God prepare a table in the wilderness? Behold, he smote the rock, that waters gushed out, and streams overflowed; can he give bread also? Will he provide flesh for his people?'

What right had the Israelites to 'tempt' God? They had no right. It was presumption. It implied a superiority on their part, either of insight or of goodwill. God alone knows when to inter-vene and how. When at last the Pharisees resolved

to 'tempt' God to the uttermost, and entered upon that awful event which we call the Jewish War, they did so, says Professor Margoliouth, in a reckless and desperate experiment to settle for ever the question whether the Jehovah of whom they boasted was or was not on a par with the Bels and Nebos ridiculed by their prophets as unable to defend their worshippers or their shrines, and carried into captivity with the nations who served them.

The answer of Jesus was, 'It is written, Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God.' In that answer the whole idea was condemned which gave the Pharisees a reason for their existence.

Following the order in St. Matthew, Mr. LIBERTY takes the temptation on the high mountain last. It seems to him also to be the subtlest. For what did the Herodians stand for? Was it not alliance with Rome, and was not alliance with Rome equivalent to universal dominion? The Sadducees and the Pharisees were too provincial. They would be content if Israel were in undisputed possession of the land of Israel. But surely the promise, the promise even to Abraham, was that 'in thee and in thy seed shall all the families of the earth be blessed.'

Jesus is taken up into a high mountain and shown all the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them. Well, they are to be His. That is the promise, even though the Pharisees and the Sadducees are denying it. 'I will also give thee for a light to the Gentiles, that thou mayest be my salvation unto the end of the earth' (Is 49⁶). Come, said the Herodian Satan, fulfil the prophecy.

Did he know how ardently the soul of Jesus longed for its fulfilment? He did not know. But he guessed somewhat. Yet Jesus did not hesitate. The kingdoms are His, and He will have them. But not in that way. 'Then saith Jesus unto him, Get thee hence, Satan: for it is written, Thou

shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.'

It was only a matter of method. The devil offered them without the Cross, did he? There was small temptation in that. Was Jesus likely to go back on the very purpose for which He had come into the world? The temptation lay, not in any personal consideration, but in consideration for the people of Israel.

For the Gentiles are not to be brought to God by a compromise between Jewish and Gentile ideas of God, such as the Herodians were working for.

That is not to fulfil the promises, but to reduce them to ridicule. From first to last the promises were that the Gentiles should *come to Zion*. The last of all the prophets was in the direct succession when he spoke of the City of God and said, 'The nations shall walk amidst the light thereof; and the Kings of the earth do bring their glory into it.'

The Herodians with their homage to all kinds of Gods and cultures were more dangerous than the Pharisees or the Sadducees. And to them the sternest word was spoken, 'Get thee hence, Satan.' For there is only one living and true God, and it is written, 'Him *only* shalt thou serve.'

The Preaching of Justice.

BY THE REV. J. M. E. ROSS, M.A., GOLDERS GREEN, LONDON.

'Justice, justice.'—Dt 16²⁰ (R.V. Marg.).

CIRCUMSTANCES do not alter Truth, but occasionally they alter the perspective in which we see it or the emphasis with which we state it. And while war-time has not cancelled any of the New Testament doctrines or duties, it has certainly thrown up into stronger relief some of the great discoveries of Old Testament experience. Some of us are not ashamed to confess the help the Old Testament has been to us during these last difficult months, when the strain on faith has been so heavy. The New Testament was produced, its fundamental facts came into history, in the era of the Roman peace. We have no clear indication of how the Apostles and their immediate followers would have behaved in a time of world-warfare,—of how the Great Exemplar Himself would have led in such a time; we are left with general principles of personal meekness on the one hand, of loyalty to the State on the other, which are differently interpreted by different men equally devout and sincere. This has led lately to a wistful re-examination of the Old Testament on the part of many—conscious that they must ever correct its tempers by the Christian ideals, yet thankful for prophets and psalmists, historians and law-givers who had to confront world-shaking experiences akin to our own. If the charge is brought against us that we

are meantime living in the Old Testament when we ought to be living in the New, we answer that at least a few discoveries were made in the Old Testament times which our Lord did not cancel and which nothing discovered since has ever annulled. One of these is that the Lord is a God of justice, and that righteousness and judgment are the foundation of His throne. That note—not entirely forgotten, perhaps, but scarcely emphasized since younger days when we first discovered the prophets and came under the spell of Thomas Carlyle—has been forced back into our preaching by the time. This doctrine, after being for a period an accepted commonplace, has become a passionate necessity: in such an hour there is no other resting-place.

The repetition here—*Justice, justice!*—almost suggests a momentary wave of emotion breaking over the lawgiver's soul. Men of law are not usually given to emotion; they do not dip their pens in flame; if they allowed passion to sway them, they could not do their work with the rigid, undeviating exactness which it requires. So for the most part the lawgivers of the Old Testament leave emotion to the prophets; they themselves go about their cold work in their cold way. Here, however, it looks as though, even in a mere passage of rule and regulation, the writer's pen trembled