

# THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

---

## Notes of Recent Exposition.

WHAT is it that has sent the doctrine of the Atonement into a subordinate place in the thinking and theology of our day? The late Mr. Andrew Jukes believed that it is the incredible and untrue doctrine of Substitution with which it is evangelically identified.

In one of his Letters newly published—the book is elsewhere noticed—Mr. Jukes describes ‘the popular pseudo-Evangelical’ doctrine of Substitution. It is the doctrine ‘that Christ took our place *that we should not take it*, and died *that we should not die*, and suffered *that we should not suffer*.’ He entirely dissents from that doctrine. He says that it is opposed not only to Scripture but to fact and experience.

Yet Mr. Jukes holds that there is a doctrine of Substitution, and that there is no doctrine of the Atonement without it. What is the true doctrine of Substitution then? we ask. What is the true meaning of *substitute*? Mr. Jukes asks in return. A substitute in the literal sense is one who *stands under*. Christ was our Substitute because He stood under our burden. But He did not stand under it instead of us. He stood under it along with us. He stood under it because we are under it. He identified Himself with us in our curse, in order that we might be identified with Him in

His deliverance from the curse. He died with us, that when He rose we also should rise with Him to newness of life.

And that is only half the doctrine of Substitution. Christ stands under our burden still. He identifies Himself with us now. When He came to earth and became our Substitute, He stood under the burden of our sin. When He ascended to heaven He left Himself free to stand under the burden of our care. He took our sins upon Him on the Cross, and there is no more offering for sin. He takes our care upon Him in heaven, and He carries it every day.

*The Journal of Theological Studies* for April last contained an article by the Rev. G. H. Box, M.A., on ‘The Jewish Antecedents of the Eucharist.’ Mr. Box sought to show that the Lord’s Supper was not a Passover, nor was ever meant to have any relation to the Passover. It was the Jewish weekly supper called Kiddish.

In the *Journal of Theological Studies* for the current quarter the Rev. John C. Lambert, B.D., replies to Mr. Box.

Mr. Lambert begins by showing that the first

business of one who would set aside the connexion between the Lord's Supper and the Passover is to produce strong reasons against that connexion. Mr. Box recognized that as his first business. He produced his reasons. But Mr. Lambert counts them anything but strong. 'It is precisely at this important preliminary stage that the weakest links in Mr. Box's argument are to be found.'

The Synoptic evidence, said Mr. Box, is self-contradictory. The words of the Synoptic Gospels are 'on the first day of unleavened bread, when they sacrificed the Passover.' But they did not sacrifice the Passover on the first day of unleavened bread. The first day of unleavened bread 'has always been understood by Jewish writers, both ancient and modern,' to refer to Nisan 15th, whereas the Passover lamb was always sacrificed the day before. This contradiction alone settles the connexion between the Lord's Supper and the Passover for Mr. Box. His words were, 'This argument seems to me to be absolutely decisive.'

Mr. Lambert acknowledges the difficulty. But he points out that Mr. Box has scarcely been fair in stating it. He gives the credit for its complete exposure to 'the veteran Dr. Chwolson,' but he does not say that Chwolson himself finds a way out of it. Chwolson holds that there is a slight, a very slight, textual error, and that the original text in Mt 26<sup>17</sup> ran, 'The day of unleavened bread drew near, and the disciples drew near to Jesus.' In this way the self-contradiction is removed. And with this way of removing it Mr. Lambert points out that in an article in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for April, the Rev. Willoughby C. Allen agrees with Dr. Chwolson.

But Mr. Box has other arguments. He points to the 'significant' omission of any mention of the paschal lamb. Mr. Lambert sees nothing significant in it. The evangelists had already indicated quite unmistakably that the meal to which Jesus and His disciples sat down was a

paschal meal. It was no part of their purpose to give an account of the progress of the meal. All passovers were alike. What they were concerned with and what they reported, 'were those new and significant acts and words of Jesus by which He instituted that holy sacrament, which sprang indeed out of the preceding paschal meal, and yet completely transcended it.'

But Mr. Box points out, further, that only one cup is mentioned. In the Passover supper every person had his own cup: here one cup is partaken of by all. Mr. Lambert answers that again Mr. Box is confusing the Passover with the Eucharist. If at the Passover supper each man had his cup, what is there in that to prevent Jesus, when He came to the institution of the Eucharist, to take one cup and pass it round to each of His disciples?

Mr. Box's last argument is the discrepancy which he discovers between St. Luke's account of the Supper and that of the other Synoptists. But the discrepancy is there only when the shorter form of St. Luke's narrative, the form found in Codex D, is taken as St. Luke's proper account, and called 'the true text.' Mr. Lambert does not believe that it is the true text. Westcott and Hort certainly accepted it, and their 'deservedly great authority' has weighed heavily in the matter, especially with English students. But Sanday and Plummer, while still accepting it, no longer speak of it dogmatically as 'the true text.' And on the Continent the tendency of recent critical opinion is in favour of the received reading as the true one after all.

Thus Mr. Lambert removes Mr. Box's 'difficulties' out of the way. And when he has removed the difficulties to associating the Lord's Supper with the Passover, he finds no reason for associating it with the weekly Kiddûsh, and no cogency in the arguments by which Mr. Box attempts to do so. Before closing his paper, however, he returns to the date of the Eucharist,

on which he has something new and important to tell us.

The great difficulty is, and always has been, the discrepancy between the Synoptists and St. John as to the day on which our Lord ate His last Passover and instituted the Lord's Supper. The old way of removing the discrepancy was by discrediting St. John. Mr. Box rejects the Synoptists. There is a way, Mr. Lambert now thinks, whereby St. John and the Synoptists can both be shown to be right.

A small book was recently published by Messrs. Sands, and noticed in our pages on its publication, called *The Anglo-Jewish Calendar for every Day in the Gospels*. Its author was the Rev. Matthew Power, S.J. In that book Mr. Power claims to have discovered the secret of the working of a rule which prevented the Passover from ever falling on a Friday. The rule is known by the name of 'Badhu.' Its working was carefully concealed by the Jewish calendarists from generation to generation. We cannot tell why. Mr. Power suggests that it was to avoid the admission that the Jewish calendar could ever be subject to exception. The new moon governed the liturgical year. That was the rule, and there must be no confession of exception to that rule. However, Badhu is there, and Mr. Power claims to have discovered its secret. Its secret is that when the Passover would fall on the Jewish Friday, one day was added to the eighth month of the preceding year, so that when the Passover came round it fell, not on the Friday, but on the Saturday.

Mr. Power shows that the Passover would have fallen on a Friday in the year that Christ was crucified. But Badhu came in. A day was added to the previous year, and the Passover fell on the Saturday. Our Lord, however, did not recognize Badhu. He held the Passover on the day upon which it properly fell. And thus the Synoptists are right when they say that Jesus and His disciples ate the Passover upon the night before

He died, while St. John is also right when he says that the Passover was eaten by the Jews on the day following.

In the month of October last the President of Queens' College in Cambridge read a paper at Sion College, London, on the Supernatural elements in the Gospels. Dr. Chase was surprised when at the close of the paper those who were present came to him and requested him to publish it. He had written it, he says, under a deep sense of responsibility, but not for publication. But he agreed to publish it. Meantime there arose a great discussion throughout England over some words of Dean Fremantle on the Virgin-birth of our Lord. Professor Chase's paper included the Virgin-birth. Should he publish it now or should he not? He resolved to publish it still.

We may not be able in these notes to prove that Dr. Chase did right to publish his paper. If not, the fault will be ours. Let the paper itself be read and no doubt will linger with any one. It touches the questions that are most deeply exercising the minds of men at the present moment. It touches them and no more. But every sentence is well chosen and in its place. What is said, however briefly, is said with power.

The title of Professor Chase's paper is *The Supernatural Element in our Lord's Earthly Life in Relation to Historical Methods of Study* (Macmillan, 1903, 1s.). The fulness of the title is due to the fact that the pressure of the questions with which the paper deals arises from that method of studying the Bible which belongs to our day, and is called the historical method. It is a method of study that is applied, not only to the Bible, but to all past history. It is a new method. It produces new and often very perplexing results.

The student of the past who used the old method made it his business to glean from early

records a picturesque or a majestic story. The student who uses the new method is more precise. He analyzes his authorities; he compares them; he weighs them in the balances of his critical judgment. He considers what forces, both of thought and imagination, were at work in the period with which he deals and in the authorities for that period which have come down to him. If the authorities are contemporary with the events, then the same forces were at work in both. If they are later, then he has to consider what effect the writer's own environment may have had upon him. And when the subject involves social customs and religious beliefs, he claims the alliance of the anthropologist. For there is truth in Koheleth's words that there is nothing new under the sun, but that which hath been is that which shall be. Man is man for a' that.

The student of the historical method has one aim and only one. It is not grandeur, or pathos, or artistic beauty. It is historical truth. He may not always obtain it. His very method compels him often to be content with probability. There is a sense, says Professor Chase, in which it may be said that he can never gain results that are more than probable. For he deals with the past, and the nature of his evidence makes it impossible to obtain such certainty as is yielded by mathematical demonstration.

And with all this some men have no patience. They miss the attractive, the beautiful, the romantic in the past. They say—

Our meddling intellect  
 Misshapes the beauteous forms of things:  
 —We murder to dissect.

They find no footing for their faith in probabilities. They must know and be persuaded. Dr. Chase is not without sympathy for their impatience. But he believes that the historical method is both right and will obtain the best results in the end. Time will redress the seeming wrong, he says. Let science work on in the

belief that in the end there will come a great reward in pure and trustworthy knowledge.

The historical method of study has already been applied to the Old Testament. Ten or fifteen years ago its application drew attention to the Old Testament in such a way that the New Testament seemed almost to be forgotten. But the New Testament had not long to wait. To-day the centre of interest is Christ and the Gospels. The problems that rivet the attention are those associated with the so-called physical resurrection of our Lord, His miracles, and His supernatural birth.

It is true, we are not all interested in these matters. Many of us find the use of incense in divine worship a far more absorbing topic of interest. The President of Queens' College turns upon us at the beginning of his paper. 'I ask my brethren in the ministry,' he says, 'with all the earnestness of which I am capable, to rate at their true value disputes which, however violent, do but ruffle the surface of the Church's life, and seriously to ponder questions, the burden of which God seems to lay especially on our generation, and which must permanently affect the deep currents of religious thought and life.'

Now, there are certain new conditions which every generation has to take into account as it sets out to ascertain the reason of the hope that is in it. The conditions which our generation has to take into account are these.

First, the work of physical science. Physical science has emphasized the uniformity of nature. It has also startled us with its revelation that beneath the surface of this familiar world there are forces, hitherto unsuspected, ever ready to operate when we have learned the secret how to set them in motion. And one department of physical science, called psychology, has been teaching us to allow a larger province than men once allowed to the will of man as an agent in the

world of men, and perhaps also in the world of nature.

Next, the work of criticism. The criticism, that is the comparative study, of the Gospels is still in its infancy. It is premature to speak of final results. But certain conclusions seem to Dr. Chase to be already beyond reasonable doubt. There are different strata in the Gospels. Two main sources have been exposed. The one contains the story of the life of Jesus, and is in the main identical with St. Mark's Gospel. The other comprehends sayings or discourses of the Lord. That is the one conclusion. The other is that 'each evangelist edited and arranged the materials on which he worked, sometimes interpreting them, sometimes giving them greater point or fulness, sometimes adding information which he derived from some authority unknown to, or unused by, the others.' Dr. Chase should have printed the second conclusion in italics. We shall return to it.

The last condition that has to be taken into account by this generation in studying the Gospels is the work of anthropology. The Gospels present us with the miraculous. 'No class of phenomena is a more constant concomitant of the story of the rise and progress of religions than the miraculous.' So Professor Gardner reminds us, somewhat insistently. And we must consider whether the supernatural in the Gospels is the result of idealization on the part of the early disciples. Did Christ really rise from the dead; did He really work miracles during His earthly life; was He really born of a virgin mother: or did His disciples feign all these things?

Professor Chase takes these three things in order. But before we follow him into them we must return to what he said about 'editing' the Gospels, and discover what he means. He leaves us in little doubt of his meaning.

What Professor Chase means when he speaks

of the evangelists 'editing' their materials, he explains by three concrete examples. The first is found in Mt 27<sup>84</sup>. St. Mark says that 'myrrhed wine' was given to our Lord to drink as He hung upon the cross. St. Matthew says it was 'wine mingled with gall.' Dr. Chase says that the change in St. Matthew's account was made 'plainly in order to connect the incident with the words of Ps 69<sup>21</sup>.'

The second is taken from St. Luke. Six times besides the garden agony St. Luke refers to our Lord in prayer (3<sup>21</sup> 5<sup>16</sup> 6<sup>12</sup> 9<sup>18-28f.</sup> 11<sup>1</sup>). In five of these cases he is in agreement with the narrative in St. Mark, except in regard to the prayer. St. Mark does not mention prayer. Had St. Luke more precise information in each case? Or did he introduce the references to prayer in order to give 'vivid and concrete expression to what was certainly a characteristic of our Lord's whole life that he was ever holding communion with the Father'? Dr. Chase counts it more natural to suppose that he introduced them.

The third example is in St. Matthew. It is the statement (Mt 27<sup>51ff.</sup>) that upon the death of Jesus many bodies of the saints arose and made their appearance to many persons. The difficulties of the statement are obvious. It has no parallel in the other Gospels, and no support from them. Professor Chase supposes that St. Matthew 'has incorporated in his Gospel a story which was current among some early Christians, the true basis of which, in fact, it is impossible to conjecture.' Professor Chase had little occasion to say that his conclusions are not apologetic.

We turn with greater interest now to his views on the supernatural in the Gospels. He takes the Resurrection first. The earliest witness is St. Paul. The earliest reference is in the First Epistle to the Thessalonians (1<sup>10</sup>). 'His Son from heaven, whom He raised from the dead,' are the words. This Epistle was written little more than twenty years after the Passion.

But what did St. Paul mean by 'raised from the dead'? Does it demand an empty grave, or is it satisfied with spiritual appearances to the disciples? The question is comparatively new, but once asked it is persisted in. 'Did the apostle,' asks Harnack in his *What is Christianity?* (p. 161), 'know of the message about the empty grave?' He thinks it probable that he did. But he cannot be sure about it, and, in any case, he is certain that what the disciples regarded as all-important was not the state in which the grave was found, but Christ's appearances. Dr. Chase cannot understand how Harnack should hesitate. That St. Paul knew 'the message about the empty grave' is put beyond doubt by the fifteenth chapter of the First Epistle to the Corinthians. There the burial and the Resurrection are placed together; the third day is mentioned; and the inference is drawn as to the future resurrection of the bodies of men from the resurrection of the body of Christ.

But what evidence had St. Paul for the resurrection on the third day? Not the appearance of the glorified Christ to himself. That could not create the historical event, though it might confirm it. For the historical fact he had to go to others.

Now, in enumerating the witnesses to the Resurrection, St. Paul mentions two individuals by name. They are Peter and James. Why does he name these two? An incidental notice in the Epistle to the Galatians tells us. St. Paul had paid two visits to Jerusalem (Gal 1<sup>18f.</sup> 2<sup>9</sup>), and on both occasions he had conversed with Peter and with James. On the first occasion, indeed, he went up for the express purpose of 'seeing Peter,' and stayed with him a fortnight, and he and James were the only apostles he then saw. It is reasonable to suppose that he learned the details of the Resurrection on these occasions, and from these apostles. It is reasonable to suppose that he desired to see Peter for that very purpose. Now the first visit of St. Paul to Jerusalem 'must

be placed from five to eight years after the Passion,' so that we have here the clearest evidence, 'from documents which no reasonable critic disputes,' that within ten years after the death of Christ, Peter and James believed in His bodily resurrection. And when we turn to the Epistle to the Romans and read what St. Paul says to the church of Rome, a church which was not founded by him or any of the apostles, we find that he could take the belief in the Resurrection for granted. Thus the Epistle to the Corinthians proves the belief in the Resurrection to have been primitive; the Epistle to the Romans proves it to have been universal.

That is the result of the most strict historical criticism. We have already seen that Professor Chase binds neither his nor our belief to all the details of the Resurrection story. As he left the rising of the saints an open question, he now also leaves open the 'mysterious saying' recorded by St. Luke (24<sup>39</sup>), 'A spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have.' But the fact is attested. The evidence is both very early and very wide in favour of the 'physical resurrection.'

And there are two things more. Professor Chase does not love the phrase 'physical resurrection.' Certain writers use it with a note of disparagement in it. The resurrection of Christ from the dead is not simply the rising from the dead of Christ's body. It is the reconciliation of spirit and matter. It is an act which is on a level with creation. To believe in the Resurrection is to believe in the unique relationship which Jesus claimed to bear to God and man.

That is the first thing. And the second is, that to get at the whole case for the Resurrection, we must take into account its sequel. The Resurrection explains the Church. 'On the one basis of a belief in the Resurrection, the Christian Society arose and has lied, at times seeming to sin against its first principles, yet surviving; again and again, in the hour of its apparent decrepitude

renewing its youth, proving itself a moral power able to regenerate men of every type and of every race.'

Such is the historical evidence for the Resurrection of Christ from the dead. 'It is, I solemnly believe, adequate,' are the words of Professor Chase. And Professor Chase is no apologist.

The second subject which Professor Chase undertook to investigate was the miracles of our Lord's earthly life.

Now it is waste of words to answer arguments that are no longer advanced. So Professor Chase does not answer the old rationalistic view that the miracles are due to deliberate fraud either in Christ or His followers. The new rationalistic position is that Christ did works of healing which were then, at any rate, regarded as truly miraculous; but that the other miracles, the miracles that give Him credit for superseding the laws of Nature, by walking on the water and the like, are inventions. Or rather they are adaptations of similar stories told of other heroes and founders of religion.

To which Dr. Chase replies: (1) We can draw no distinction between words of healing and 'nature' miracles. Both are found in the oldest stratum of the Gospels, and critically they stand or fall together. (2) In all the New Testament, outside the Gospels, there are only two references to Christ's miracles. Both are in Acts (2<sup>22</sup> 10<sup>38</sup>). St. Paul alludes to 'signs and wonders' wrought in apostolic times, and so does the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews. But upon the miracles of our Lord the silence is complete and unbroken. This fact is most significant. 'In my opinion,' says Professor Chase, 'it constitutes a strong historical argument against the position that in the days when the Gospels were written there was a tendency at work among the disciples which impelled them to decorate the story of their

Master's life with fictitious miracles.' (3) In all the records of Christ's miracles in the Gospels the motive is the same. They are not regarded primarily as enhancing His dignity. They are looked upon as part of His proper work as the Saviour and Restorer of the whole of man's nature. (4) The great difficulty which science has raised turns on the impossibility of any of the laws of Nature being suspended. Science has lately been removing that difficulty herself. She has been enlarging our conception of the power of man's will. And so the 'uniformity of Nature' as a law blocking the way is itself suspended. For we have no experience of the power of a will which never has been weakened by sin, and has been strengthened by constant communion with God.

The last subject is the Virgin-birth. It is the most agitated, and it is the most difficult of the three.

Apart from its inherent improbability, two things which historical criticism has to take account of, are against the fact of the Virgin-birth. It is not found in the primitive Gospel, its story being confined to St. Matthew and St. Luke. And there is no tradition in the Church independently of these Gospels.

Nevertheless Professor Chase believes in the Virgin-birth. He lets the First Gospel go. It is critically anonymous. We have no clue to the source of its author's information. But he holds to St. Luke. For he believes that the Third Gospel was written by the companion of St. Paul; he believes that its writer not only visited James, the Lord's brother, in St. Paul's company, but spent the whole or part of the two years in which St. Paul lay in prison at Cæsarea in or near Jerusalem; he believes that during that time he gathered much of the materials for his Gospel; and he believes that, regarding the birth of Jesus, he derived his information from James and other members of the Holy Family.

Three little items of internal evidence are in favour of St. Luke's narrative. His general accuracy as a historian must be allowed its weight here. Again, the difficulty of the Census or Enrolment has been, by Professor Ramsay, advanced many stages toward historical probability. And, finally, the Christology of the passage is not post-Apostolic nor even Apostolic, but pre-Christian. 'He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Most High: and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David: and he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end'—that resembles the Messianic language of the Psalms of Solomon. It cannot be the invention,—Dr. Chase does not say of the Gentile companion of St. Paul,—but even of any believer in the Messiahship of Jesus, after the Jews had rejected Him, and after His Resurrection and Exaltation had raised the conception of His Messiahship to the height of a spiritual and universal sovereignty.

Is the evidence in favour of the Virgin-birth slight? Dr. Chase admits it. But there are other considerations. There is this. Christianity gained its victories as a power making for truth. In the first age it could not afford to be in conflict with its own first principles. 'I know,' says Professor Chase, 'that there are many surprises in the history of religion. But I confess that I find it hard to believe that in the inner circle of the earliest disciples—that is to say, at Jerusalem, and within forty years of the Passion—there grew up and took shape, not poetical and idealized adjuncts to the story of the Lord's birth, but a story itself wholly fictitious.'

'Who then is this?' There are four chief answers. The first, 'Is not this the carpenter's son?' and the second, 'This is my beloved Son,' and the third, 'This is indeed the Saviour of the world,' have already been dealt with. The last answer is, 'My Lord and my God.'

It is found in St. John's Gospel (20<sup>28</sup>). It is the climax of that Gospel. When St. John set out to write the life of Christ, he set out to write it in such a way that we might believe that Jesus was the Christ, the Son of the living God. And when he had so described the Person, that it was possible for one to say of Him, 'My Lord and my God,' and when at the same time he had so traced the history that at last one actually did say that, St. John's work was done. After that he had only to bring his history to a swift conclusion. That was the last word that had to be spoken.

It was spoken by Thomas. It is the greatest word that can be spoken of Christ, and it was spoken by doubting Thomas. Well, we are not so much astonished at that as our fathers would have been. The doubter has been having his day. Tennyson has let him have it—

You say, but with no touch of scorn,  
Sweet-hearted you, whose light-blue eyes  
Are tender over drowning flies,  
You tell me, doubt is devil-born.

I know not: one indeed I knew  
In many a subtle question versed,  
Who touched a jarring lyre at first,  
But ever strove to make it true.

Perplexed in faith, but pure in deeds,  
At last he beat his music out.  
There lives more faith in honest doubt,  
Believe me, than in half the creeds.

So we are not so much astonished now that Thomas should have said it.

Nor need we be astonished. Thomas was just the man to say it. For Thomas never was the doubter that we think. What he wanted always was reasonable evidence, and when he got it he never refused to believe and to do.

Four sentences from the Gospels make up the history of Thomas. The first he spoke when Jesus told the disciples that He was going to Judæa again. 'Master,' they urged, 'the Jews of late sought to stone thee, and goest thou thither



again?' But when He would go, Thomas said, 'Let us also go, that we may die with him.' It was not the utterance of despair. It was the firm expression of determination. The evidence was clear enough. Jesus was going straight to death. When Thomas saw what he had to do, he did not shrink from doing it. \_\_\_\_\_

The next was in the Upper Room. 'Whither I go, ye know,' said the Lord, 'and the way ye know.' This was the opportunity for Thomas. He did not know. If he knew, he would do or suffer with the best of them. 'Lord, we know not whither thou goest, and how can we know the way?' If Jesus could have told him the way—told him so that Thomas could have seen it—he would not have been of the number of those who forsook Him and fled. But Jesus could not tell him yet. \_\_\_\_\_

The third was after the Resurrection. Thomas had not been with the disciples when first the Lord appeared to them. He has been much blamed for not being with them. But the disciples did not blame him, and the Lord did not blame him. And we who blame him so freely know nothing of the reasons why he was not with them. He was not with them, that is all we know. And when they told him, 'We have seen the Lord,' he said, 'Except I shall see in his hands the print of the nails, and put my finger into the print of the nails, and put my hand into his side, I will not believe.' \_\_\_\_\_

This is why we call him 'Doubting Thomas.' But surely he had a right to doubt so much as that. Have any of us ever doubted less? He wanted evidence. And faith is never opposed to evidence, but rests upon it. He wanted evidence where evidence could be given. He wanted all the evidence that could be given. And then, the moment that he got it, he said, 'My Lord and my God.' \_\_\_\_\_

When Thomas asked for evidence, Christ gave

it him. He never refuses evidence where evidence can be given. He sends us deliberately to look for evidence. He tells us never to be satisfied till we have all the evidence that can be had. And then, when evidence can go no farther, it is the man who has given himself the trouble to find the evidence who proves himself the man of faith. Thomas said, 'Except I see'; and so it was Thomas who could say, 'My Lord and my God.' \_\_\_\_\_

It is true that Jesus said, 'Because thou hast seen me, thou hast believed: blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed.' And we think that means that Jesus gently reproveth His doubting disciple. He did not reprove him. But He said that the time was at hand when this evidence would no longer be available. Thomas was blessed that upon his evidence he was able to rise to such a sublimity of faith. They too will be blessed, they will even be more blessed than he, who, upon less evidence, can reach the same sublimity. \_\_\_\_\_

How did Thomas reach it? The Samaritans made a great leap of logic when they said, 'Because He is our Saviour, He is the Saviour of the world. This was as logical a leap and farther into the unknown. How did he make it? 'My Lord' was easy. In the earthly life Jesus had claimed to be Lord and Master. 'Ye call me Master and Lord, and ye say well, for so I am.' It was given to Him then by courtesy or by affection. They called their religious leaders Rabbi; they were willing to call Him Rabbi also. But now He had the right to it. He had risen from the dead. In raising Him from the dead, God had set to His seal that all that Jesus claimed was His due. 'My Lord' was inevitable. But how did he reach 'My God'?' \_\_\_\_\_

He reached it by the Cross. He reached 'My Lord' by the Resurrection from the dead: he reached 'My God' by the death itself. For Jesus had not only proved His right to rule, He had proved His power to love. And that is the only

revelation of God. 'God is love'—that is His character. But that is more than His character, it is Himself. It is His revelation. When we see God we see love. And when we see love we see God. 'God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, *Christ* died for us.'

'My Lord and my God'—it is the last word we need; but we need it all. 'My Lord' will not do. We may call Him Lord, Lord, and yet do not the things which He says. 'Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, . . . and then will I profess unto them, I never knew you.' 'Lord' gives right; but 'God' gives power.

---

## Evangelicalism.

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

### I. ITS STANDPOINT AND ITS POWER.

THE English use of the name 'evangelical' is much narrower than the German. In Germany it is commonly used as the antithesis of Catholic, and as a positive synonym for Protestant. It is claimed with equal assurance by theologians who uphold a rigorous Lutheran orthodoxy; by others who resolve the Christian doctrines into a few philosophical tenets; and by yet others who see little in Protestantism save a duty of criticism and of deference to the religious spirit of the age. The classification into theological schools comes later. At this stage all can be described as evangelical in that, on the one hand, they reject the Roman theory of salvation, and that, on the other, they base their hopes of salvation—with whatever variety of thinking in theological detail—on some conception of the mercy of God in Christ. And for the usage which thus identifies Evangelical with Protestant there is much to be said. It meets the want, often keenly felt, of a term which will bring clearly out that Protestantism is not a mere 'dissidence of dissent,' but that it has a positive message, which can be detached from its criticism of the Catholic system. It also serves to make clear the fact that Protestant theology is not, as is often alleged, a welter of doctrinal chaos, but that there is a deeper unity which underlies the antagonisms of the leading schools. In Great Britain the name 'evangelical' has long ceased to be the common property of Protestants, and has been set apart to designate one of the party-divisions of the Protestant Church. In accordance with our

want, the party-names have been popular and memorable, rather than expressive formulas for the precise fundamental distinctions. In the Eighteenth Century the Evangelical was contrasted in Scotland with the Moderate,—the implication being that the one was thoroughly in earnest, the other only half-hearted, in the publication of his message; while the antithesis of principle was rather between the preacher of saving faith and (if such existed) the mere moralist. In the Nineteenth Century parties were popularly distinguished, especially in England, as High Church, Low Church, and Broad Church. This classification has the merit of using a single and important principle of division, namely, the attitude of different schools towards ecclesiastical authority in matters of faith and worship, but it leaves it quite undetermined what is the difference of Low and Broad. It seems to suggest, what would often be quite unjust, that the Broad Churchman is one whose beliefs have been so beaten out, and have in consequence become so thin that he discounts the authority of the Bible as well as of the Church, and is properly to be labelled as a rationalist. Again, when evangelical is used as synonymous with Low Church, there is some reason to complain of a private appropriation of public property. Apart from the fact that many a 'Broad Churchman' honestly claims to be evangelical, it is probable that the evangelical aspects, and the evangelical doctrines of Christianity, are at present proclaimed in the 'High Church' pulpits of England and Scotland with a clearness and a fervour which it might be difficult to match in the