

has always seemed to me that that revision was probably connected with Lucian of Antioch and his school, which exercised great influence all through the fourth century. This type of text is prominent in his disciples, most prominent indeed in Theodore of Mopsuestia, where it reaches its

culmination. The school was in close contact with the Syriac-speaking churches and writers, and I have always suspected, although I cannot prove it, that this Traditional Text, of which Mr. Miller is so fond, owes its origin ultimately to Lucian of Antioch in Syria.'

A. B. Davidson, D.D., F.F.D.

BY PROFESSOR THE REV. S. D. F. SALMOND, M.A., D.D., F.E.I.S., ABERDEEN.

II. HIS WRITINGS.

In a former paper we said something of Professor A. B. Davidson as a teacher, and of the academic chair as the first source of his remarkable influence. Great, however, as he is in that position, he is not to be measured by that alone. He is not only a teacher ranking with the most select few in the large roll of theological lecturers; he is also a writer, and one of a penetrating faculty and original vein. We should, indeed, give a very imperfect idea of what he is, and a very inadequate account of what we owe to him, if we did not attempt some estimate, however rapid, of his published works. There are other things of which it might also be fitting to speak, especially the services which he rendered as a member of the Old Testament Revision Committee. But these must be passed over in order that some attention may be given to his writings.

His contributions to theological literature have a distinct value, which is gratefully recognised by all students, and best appreciated by those most competent to judge. They are also of considerable amount, and there is more in preparation. He is largely involved in the new *Dictionary of the Bible*, which is announced by Messrs. T. & T. Clark, and those who have seen certain articles now in type for that important publication know them to be of great interest to the scholar. He is also engaged on two works which are peculiarly congenial to him, and from which much is anticipated — a *Commentary on Isaiah* and a treatise on the *Theology of the Old Testament*. The one is to form part of the *International Critical Commentary*; the other is to make one of the volumes of the *International Theological Library*.

These are subjects which belong to the most favoured studies of his lifetime. In both he is an acknowledged master, and his promised volumes are looked for with eager expectancy. He has never been in haste, however, to rush into print. In this, as in other things, he has aimed at the *multum* rather than the *multa*. Of all our recent scholars, the late Dr. Hort of Cambridge is the one to whom he may be best compared as a writer. There is much in common between the two. In both we have the same rigorous standard of values in authorship, the same punctilious carefulness of statement, the same precise and finished style, the same exacting ideal which makes it natural to shrink from quick production or frequent publication, the same jealousy of all that comes short of the best and most honest work.

There are two kinds of literary producers. There are those who write easily and steadily with all the regular continuity of well-set but level instruments, and turn all they have to say into print—preachers who make books of each series of sermons, *litterateurs* who make volumes of each set of papers that see the light in magazine or journal. And there are those who take the pen only when the fire burns, who seem slow where others are precipitate, who refuse to write but at their best, and limit themselves to one or two subjects which they make their own by severe self-repression and lengthened silence. Neither class is to be despised. Each has its audience, by whom it is appreciated and whom it profits. But it is the more restricted work of the latter that has the finest quality, the most quickening influence, the most enduring worth. It is to this class that

Professor Davidson belongs. Like Dr. Hort, he knows nothing of the *cacoethes scribendi*, and is as unpractised as a child in the arts of the popularity-monger or the methods of the book-maker. He is never betrayed into writing diffusely. He is incapable of hasty, pretentious, or facile work. His books are of modest compass, and still more modest look. But they are packed with thought that comes straight from the mint of a keen, capable, observant, original mind. In concise form and well-considered phrase, they give the results of the studies and reflections of years. If the ways with which many writers in these days have made us familiar were followed, large and imposing volumes might be made of his smallest books. Each sentence tells. Nothing is allowed a place that is beside the purpose or incapable of satisfying the author's jealous sense of what the quality of work should be that the public are asked to accept.

As we should expect, his writings are mostly on Old Testament subjects, the prophets and the poetical books having his chief attention. What distinguishes his literary work, and gives it its peculiar value, is the combination of easy command of the language, trained critical faculty, insight into the Hebrew genius, and the most correct exegetical conscience, with a historical sense and a historical imagination which make Hebrew times and Hebrew ways, Hebrew thought and Hebrew faith, present realities. Of his treatises on *Hebrew Grammar* and *Syntax* it is unnecessary to speak. They have won extensive acceptance at home and abroad by their precision, their balance, the scientific arrangement of their contents, their skilful use of exercises, their judicious adaptation to the needs of learners. Neither shall we venture to say anything of his book on the difficult and technical subject of the *Hebrew Accents*. But in his recently published Primer on *The Exile and the Restoration* we have a performance of a very different order. It is a remarkable instance of his gift of compressed lucid statement, as well as of his readiness to spend of his best on things of modest pretension. It may be safely said that nowhere within anything like the same narrow limits will one get so vivid a view of that period of Old Testament history, so capable and convincing a treatment of the many difficult questions connected with it, so true an appreciation of the character and purpose of the main events that fill

it, so just an estimate of its permanent effect upon the people. It is a book written for the general reader. But the trained student will find in its unobtrusive pages much to interest and instruct him in what it says of the two competing religions that were known in the Israel of these days, the failure of reforms that were carried by authority, the nature of the Judaism of Ezra's time, the judgment to be formed of the 'false prophets,' the way in which the 'death of the people' became 'the birth of the individual and the ruin of the State the rise of the Church,' the figure of the servant of the Lord, the idea and influence of the law, the prophetic voices of the period, and many things else.

Two volumes contributed to the *Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges*, one on the *Book of Ezekiel* and another on the *Books of Nahum, Habakkuk, and Zephaniah*, give us something of the fruits of his studies in important sections of Old Testament prophecy. Both are admirable examples of the historical interpretation which reads the writing from the writer's position and brings us face to face with the ideas as they were present to his mind. The second of these two volumes compresses a wonderful mass of scholarly matter into its modest bulk of 144 pages. It leaves no point of any importance in the exegesis or the literary history of these three prophets untouched. It is particularly successful in its discussions of the occasions of the books. It is happiest of all in its descriptions of their distinctive characters and special messages. It is the 'universal voice of humanity,' a voice that is heard more or less all along the line of Israel's prophets, that is heard in unusual purity and simplicity in Nahum. 'The prophecy,' as it is understood by Dr. Davidson, 'is the voice of the human mind expressing its revolt against the spirit and deeds of the brutal foe of the human race, and might almost have come from the heart of any of the oppressed nationalities trodden under the foot of Assyria. It is the blood, the wiles, and demonic witchcraft (iii. 1-4), and the spirit of the wild beast (ii. 11-13) that in the name of mankind the prophet appeals against; and if he adds the traffic and riches and luxury of Nineveh, it is only to complete the picture of the immoral spirit of the people.' The peculiar note in Habakkuk, again, is the prominence given to a conception different from what we have in

Jeremiah or Ezekiel—the idea that the excesses of the Chaldeans, the instruments of the Lord in punishing the sins of Israel, must themselves demand the Divine vengeance. That God could be silent and permit the atrocious inhumanity of the oppressor that engrosses the prophet's mind almost to the banishment of the thought of his own people's sin,—that is the moral problem in Habakkuk, and 'its answer comes in the shape of a moral distinction: "his soul is not upright in him, but the righteous shall live in his faithfulness." The different characters of the Chaldean and the righteous carry in them their different destinies. The moral destruction involves its final verification in events, though this may not come at once.' So, too, a few bold strokes set the central thing in the short prophecy of Zephaniah, the great idea of 'the day of the Lord,' before the reader in its magnitude and its just significance.

Little has been done by English students for the Book of Ezekiel. Professor Davidson's commentary, therefore, is all the more welcome that it relieves British scholarship of a reproach which has long lain upon it. On its own merits it is an important addition to the limited number of scientific commentaries, which have helped us to a better insight into the structure and meaning of this prophecy. It is of great value for its treatment of the questions relating to the prophet's own position and function, the measure of historical matter in the book, the proportions of the real and the ideal in it, its symbolism of figure, action, and vision, the position in which the law appears in it, the influences discovered to have told on it, the impression made by it on the Pauline writings and the Apocalypse. The idea that Ezekiel was in any sense either a legislator or a 'sort of pastor, with a cure of souls,' with an office limited to the exiles, is shown to be inconsistent with the contents of the book. It is a feature of the prophecy that 'circumstances of actual occurrence are idealised and made the expressions of general conceptions and principles.' The key to the prophet's symbolical actions, which have been so fantastically interpreted even by some competent scholars, is found in the book itself; and though it is admitted that there may be some doubt regarding a few of them, they are taken as actions of the imagination. 'They passed through the prophet's mind. He lived in this ideal sphere; he went through the actions in his fantasy, and they

appeared to him to carry the same effects as if they had been performed.'

Above all, the master hand is seen in the presentation of the ideas of the prophecy—the conception of the holiness of God, the Divine name, the Divine attributes, especially as expressed by the bold imagery of the book, and the future. The question involved in the prophetic ascription of all things, not excluding the evil done by men, to God as author, has its peculiar difficulties in this book. But it is taken to come at last to this, that 'God appears as the author of sin only in a secondary and modified sense. He uses sin already existing, punishes it with delusion and worse sin, laying a stumbling-block before the sinner over which he falls and perishes.' Another series of questions which are handled with characteristic discretion are those raised by the points of contact and distinction between Ezekiel and the ritual law—questions concerning the age of the law in its present written form. Here the first consideration with Dr. Davidson is one which the critic is often tempted to overlook. That is, the logic on which a sound criticism must thrive, and in this case in particular the caution with which inferences should be drawn from the comparison of Ezekiel with the law, by reason of the freedom with which the prophet handles 'institutions certainly older than his own time.' The differences in detail between Ezekiel and the law, on any hypothesis of priority, may be best explained, Dr. Davidson thinks, by supposing that, 'while the sacrifices in general, and the ideas which they expressed, were fixed and current, the particulars, such as the kind of victims and the number of them, the precise quantity of meal, oil, and the like, were held non-essential and alterable when change would better express the idea.' The affinities between Ezekiel and the small code are fully recognised, but the differences are too important, in Dr. Davidson's opinion, to permit us to say that the prophet was the author of the code, the materials too scanty to allow us to decide even whether he had any parts of it in written form before him. There are other things, not a few, in this volume of which much might be said; as, for instance, the way in which the great section in chap. xxxv., in itself and in its bearings on New Testament ideas, especially the Pauline doctrine, is handled. But it is at its best, perhaps, when it comes to the question of the 'emancipation of the

individual soul,' than which there is nothing of greater moment in Ezekiel. Nowhere have we a better example of the feeling for the historical, the discrimination, and the penetration which distinguishes Dr. Davidson's exegesis than in his exposition of this subject and the prophet's relation to it.

It is, however, in his *Job* that he will probably be felt to be at his highest. This has been a favourite study. It was his first attraction, and he has worked at it in various ways since the days of his youth. It furnishes a subject peculiarly germane to his genius, appealing to his poetic, imaginative, and speculative gifts, and to those broodings on the thick mystery of things and the deep problems of the kingdom of God which are natural to minds of finer cast. He admits the general correctness of the common view that the book is not altogether 'poetical invention,' but rests on historical tradition, however difficult it may be to say what parts belong to the one and what to the other. He describes it as *dramatic* rather than a *drama*, the action being 'internal and mental,' and the successive scenes 'representations of the varying moods of a great soul struggling with the mysteries of its fate, rather than trying external situations.' Taking prologue and debate together, we can see, he thinks, that it was at least one chief object of the book to enlarge men's ideas of God's ways by giving them a new view of suffering, as a trial of the righteousness of the righteous, not a chastisement for their sins. With true insight into the genius of the Old Testament, he reminds us at the same time that the Hebrew poet or thinker was never merely a poet or a thinker, but always also a teacher—one, too, who looked at men in their relations to God, and at the individual for the most part not simply as the individual, but as a member of the family of Israel. So he concludes it to be most probable that the main purpose of the book was practical rather than theoretical, and that it is to be recognised as also having a national scope, the new view of suffering being of national interest, the particular view indeed that was needed to 'comfort and uphold the heart of the people in the circumstances in which they were.'

Questions such as those regarding the date of the book and its relation to the Second Isaiah receive the cautious and restrained replies which alone are in point in a region which, as Dr.

Davidson puts it, is 'not that of argument but of impression,' and in which we have ideas instead of historical events. Of the former he will only say that the probability is that *Job* belongs to the age of the captivity of Judah. His reasons for thinking that it cannot be placed earlier than the seventh century, are taken partly from the condition of misery and disorder presupposed in the book, and partly from the new aspect given to old questions. The laws of providence 'are no longer calmly expounded,' he points out, 'but subjected to doubt; from being principles securely acquiesced in, they have become problems painfully agitated.' With respect to the latter subject he shows how difficult it is to say whether the coincidences between the figure of the suffering Job and that of the servant of Jehovah in the Deutero-Isaiah indicate a relation of similarity merely or one of identity, and how open the question is left whether the one author may have borrowed something from the other, or both writers may have made independent use of the same conceptions.

There is no line of study in which Dr. Davidson is more instructive than in the exposition of ideas which are common to various writers, but occur in these writers at the same time with characteristic differences. Among the ideas which are common to Job and some others of the Old Testament books, but which have a distinctive form in *Job*, that of a *future life* is of commanding interest. It is also one that is singularly difficult to define. To deal worthily with this, the finest faculty of the historical interpreter is required. Dr. Davidson's peculiar gift is seen in his statement of the affinities between the primary passages in Job and the deep intuitions of the Psalmists, the religious foundation on which the thought of an after-existence rests in both alike, the glories and the limitations of the hope to which they severally rise, the source which it finds in the longing for fellowship with God or in the experience of that fellowship. Most of all does his gift appear in the way in which the point is caught and explained at which the hope as we see it in Job is distinguished from the hope as we have it in such Psalms as the xvi., xlix., and lxxiii. The Psalmists speak out of the actual enjoyment of that communion with God in which they recognised life; and in them, therefore, we have a protest against death, a demand for the continuance of life that there may be a continuance of that communion, or else a negation of the old

idea of Sheol and the crave that the godly man shall somehow overleap its dark domain. But in Job we have one who feels that the Divine wrath is on him for all his earthly existence, and whose aspiration, therefore, is that God might suffer him to be hidden in Sheol until that wrath exhausts itself, and then visit him with a mercy which 'involves a complete return to life, for in death there is no fellowship with God.' So Job's solution, though to himself only 'a momentary gleam of light,' is interpreted as 'broader than that of the Psalmist.'

Old Testament subjects, however, do not wholly usurp Dr. Davidson's attention. Like the late Franz Delitzsch, he makes occasional flights into the territory of the New Testament student, and, as also in the case of Delitzsch, the best example of his skill in New Testament exegesis is his *Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*. This is a book of quite unpretending aspect, but of great value. It is one of the most informing expositions of that Epistle. The more it becomes recognised that the work of true exegesis is to get at the writer's ideas precisely as they were conceived by himself, the more will the worth of Dr. Davidson's contribution to the interpretation of this important section of the New Testament be appreciated. His general view of the Epistle is that it is addressed to readers who, under the pressure, perhaps, of trying external circumstances, were in danger of falling away from their faith, but of whose locality nothing more can be said than that it may have been somewhere in the Eastern Diaspora, where a Hellenistic type of Judaism prevailed. But the strength of the commentary lies less in its discussions of the literary and historical questions, excellent as these are, than in the precision of its exegesis and its fine treatment of the characteristic teaching of the Epistle. Its expositions of the conceptions of a 'covenant' under which religion is presented here, of the 'Rest of God,' the 'Word of God,' the Sonship of Christ, His Priesthood, the Day of Atonement, the ideas of 'purifying,' 'sanctifying,' and the like, furnish the careful student with much that will repay him by bringing him closer to the writer's mind. The important question of the Sonship and the Priesthood of Christ, as these appear in peculiar form in this Epistle, are handled in a way that deserves special attention. The resemblances between this Epistle and the later Pauline

Epistles in the region of Christology receive just recognition. But it is shown at the same time that 'the central place to which the Sonship of Christ has been elevated in the Epistle seems an advance on other Epistles, and suggests reflective systematising.' What this commentary says of that subject, as well as of the falling away of the difference between priest and high priest, the disputed question of the view given by this writer of the time when the Son assumed the high-priestly office, and much else that is most characteristic of this great Epistle, calls for more consideration than has yet perhaps been given it.

Any statement of Professor Davidson's literary work, however, would be altogether incomplete that left out of account his minor and more occasional writings. These amount to a very large number; and it is characteristic of the author that much of his best work will be found among them. Of his numerous contributions to dictionaries, encyclopedias, and journals, his early papers in the *Imperial Bible Dictionary*, his articles on the Apocrypha, Job, and Proverbs in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, his many papers in the *British and Foreign Evangelical Review*, the *Expositor*, *The Expository Times*, and other magazines, it is impossible to speak in detail here. It must suffice to say that many of them are of great value. Special mention may be made of a recent article in *The Expository Times* on *The Old Testament Doctrine of Immortality*,¹ and of the important series of papers contributed to the *Expositor* some years ago on the same subject, on *Messianic Prophecy*, the *Wisdom of the Hebrews*, *Isaiah*, and others of the Old Testament Prophets. Nowhere will we find more suggestive and instructive writing on the Messianic hope, the problem of the suffering servant of Jehovah, the functions of the Prophet, the Hebrew ideas of a future existence, than in these articles.

Nor must Dr. Davidson's work as a reviewer be overlooked. His briefest and most fugitive performances are strewn with important statements of principle, fruitful remark, luminous exposition. Nothing is ever done perfunctorily. This is true even of his notices of books. One cannot look into the briefest of these without finding something of moment. His choicest riches are often spent on these, and with no niggard hand. It would be easy to multiply instances of this as

¹ October 1896.

regards the ideas of the Old Testament books, the literary analysis of these books, the principles of criticism, etc. But the limits of space arrest us. It would be pleasant also to give some instances of the familiar humour which lights up even his most technical bits of writing, the fun and fine irony which dispose of many an exaggeration more effectively than the closest argument. But these two must suffice. Here is how he deals with the extravagances of men like Duhm on the Maccabean period and the authorship of the Prophecies and the Psalms: 'What a glorious view the Maccabean age presents to our admiring eyes! How rich the period was in literature! The great writers in the Psalter have shown us how every skirmish of the day had its poet, and how every rise and fall in the spirits of the little army have been photographed in the Psalms which we sing; and now Professor Duhm draws the curtain aside and exhibits a company of prophets no less numerous than the poets we knew before.' Then speaking of the prophecy in Isa. xix. 24, and how the occasion of it is made to be the fact that Jonathan the Maccabee was invited to the wedding of Alexander Balas, the Syrian usurper, with Cleopatra, the daughter of the king of Egypt, he proceeds thus: 'Such a meeting of such a three could mean nothing less than that the kingdoms of the earth would speedily become the kingdoms of the Lord. One thing is difficult to understand amidst this wealth of prophecy, namely, how the people should be so often represented in the Book of Maccabees as complaining and lamenting that they had no prophet. Had they, perhaps, the same opinion of their prophets as Professor Duhm has — that they were sterile in imagination and solecists in style?'¹

And here is how he exposes the tendency to excessive analysis and extreme disintegration which threaten in the hands of certain critics to bring discredit on a just principle: 'The criticism of the Pentateuch is a great historical drama, which needs to be put upon the stage with appropriate scenery and circumstance. When performed by a company of puppets called J. E. D. P., with all their little ones down to J³ and P^x, it loses its impressiveness. It will not be strange if some spectators mistake the nature of the performance

¹ See his notice of Duhm's *Das Buch Jesaias* in the *Critical Review*, vol. iii. p. 1.

and go home with the impression that they have been witnessing a farce.'²

This, therefore, may be said of Professor A. B. Davidson, that he is as a writer what he is as a teacher, and that the value of the service which he has rendered to his generation in both capacities consists above all in these things: first, he has familiarised succeeding bands of students with the conception of revelation as a historical process. What was done for the German student by men like Ewald, Rothe, von Hofmann, and others, each in his own way, has been done for the Scotch student by Dr. Davidson. He has emancipated us from an idea of revelation which was imperfect and misleading and had outlived its time, and he has done this so as to enlarge our regard for revelation. He has taught us also what *exegesis* is. He has grasped, as few British scholars have done, its real object, to wit, the apprehension and exposition of what was in the writer's mind—that and nothing else. There is a kind of exegesis which is attractive to many minds, particularly to Anglican minds, and which gets an undeserved popularity. It is the kind of exegesis that seeks mystic meanings in Scripture, and ties itself to the worst methods of the Christian Fathers. There is another kind that looks first to the preacher's need, and makes the sacred writers express fine nineteenth-century ideas of which they had no conception. All this, however interesting and however useful in a homiletical point of view, is *not* exegesis, and it is alien to Dr. Davidson. His one object is by grammar and history and the historical imagination, to get precisely what the writer thought and meant, and to set his ideas in their own proper light and historical position. He has given us, further, the guidance which was needed in Scotland in the methods, the principles, and the just appreciation of the results of the Higher Criticism—a guidance at once wise and cautious. And above all he has given us to know what *Biblical Theology* is. Here is perhaps at once his strongest point and the best of all his services. He has a rare insight into Old Testament Scripture, a wonderful grasp of its burden and its purpose, an exceptional gift for interpreting its ideas, placing them in their proper light and relations, and helping us to understand how in the long and changeable story of the kingdom of God they took

² See his notice of Cornill's *Einleitung* in the *Critical Review*, vol. ii. p. 31.

shape, and grew, and were purified, passing through a great process of development parallel to that of the history itself. It is an education to hear him or read him as he expounds the great Old Testament conceptions of sacrifice, immortality, the

Messianic hope, the righteousness of God, and the like. We have no one in our time and land who has done so much for us, or who is capable of doing us yet a richer service, in this most vital of all the subjects of Old Testament inquiry.

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF ST. JOHN'S GOSPEL.

JOHN xiv. 6.

'Jesus saith unto him, I am the Way, and the Truth, and the Life: no one cometh unto the Father, but by Me' (R.V.).

EXPOSITION.

'Jesus saith unto him,'—Unto Thomas, who, as usual, expressed the desire to walk by sight, as well as by faith. Thomas heard Jesus say He was going away, and let that pass, disconcerting as it was. But when he heard Him say further, that they all knew where He was going and the way He would take, he could not let it pass. 'Lord, we know not whither Thou goest, and how can we know the way?' Jesus answers both questions, but in the opposite order. First He points out the way, and then He tells where it leads to.

'I am the Way.'—This is the answer to the second question. And it turns the question round and makes it personal. The disciples said, 'We know not the way *Thou* goest?' He answers and tells them the way *they* must go. 'I am the way.' 'By *Me* if any man enter in he shall be safe.'

'And the Truth, and the Life.'—That is, according to the Hebrew way of expression, 'the true and living way.' Other ways have been offered, but all that ever came before Jesus were thieves and robbers, and the sheep did not hear them. He is the true way. He is the living way, because He has life in Himself, and He comes to give us life and that abundantly. The thief comes to take life away; He comes to give it. And He gives it by losing His own life. He is the true and living way, because He lays down His life for the sheep.

'No one cometh unto the Father, but by Me.'—This is the answer to the first question now. 'Lord, we know not whither Thou goest?' 'To the Father,' He says. But again it is turned round. It is not where *I* go, but where you go.

'Whither' and the 'Way.'

The conversation is still in the upper room. It is now wholly on the departure of Jesus, His near departure. He had said, 'I go away,' and their hearts were full of sorrow. He must go.

That single fact they seem to have made theirs. *Why* He must go they could not tell, nor *whither*, nor the *way*. He is now explaining all these. He is answering these three questions.

1. Why must He go? His answer is, that He has to prepare a Place for them, and He must go away to do it. Or rather, He must do it in the going away. The Place is at God's footstool. It is in God's presence. It *is* God's presence. Adam and Eve had a Place in Paradise. That *Place* was not a locality so much as a condition. It was friendship and fellowship with God. They walked with the Lord God in the cool of the day. Then Adam and Eve lost their *Place*. They sinned and were driven out of Paradise, and the flaming sword was placed at the entrance gate. It was not the loss of Paradise—the garden—however, it was the loss of the walk with the Lord God in the cool of the day.

Jesus has come to restore that lost Place. But He must go away to do it. He has come to open Paradise again to the seed of Eve. It is by *death* that He shatters the flaming sword, opens the gate of Paradise to all believers, and gives the disciples a Place.

2. Whither does He go? He goes to the Father. The Place is there, and as they are to get there, He must be there also. 'That where I am, there ye may be also.' 'Lord,' they said, 'we know not whither Thou goest.' His answer is, 'I go unto the Father.' He does not go to the Father for His own sake, but for theirs. He is to have their Place ready by entering the Father's presence 'without sin.' It is to the Father they must come. It is back to the walk with the Lord God in the cool of the day.

3. And the way? The way is Himself. 'Lord, we know not the way.' 'I am the way.' It is the