These finders are recipients of grace, and Luke's parallel parables here deal with the manifestations of its possession, and of its lack. The Good Samaritan, and Two Debtors reveal more or less of grace in active operation, while Dives stands for the typically ungracious man. The relationship, in which the several personages of these parables stand to those they meet with, is distinctly a casual one, creating no more immediate duties than those of humanity and natural kindness. In this the figures here have their resemblance to those of Matthew's third group. There are debtors here, as there was one there, and there are those whom fortune favours and gives chances to, just as it did in the cases of the treasure finder and pearl merchant.

The distinctly dutiful relationship of Matthew's next group is also that of the equivalent parables of Luke's Gospel. In the Farm Servant, and in the royal servants set to trade with their master's Pounds, we have those whose duties are most obvious. The Barren Fig-tree, too, has in its own fashion its duties, in the way of bearing the fruit for which it is kept and attended to, and although alone among the imagery of the later parables, in being drawn from a lower realm than the human one, has had more vogue and currency, as depicting the useless man's cumbering of the ground, than the more intelligent and exalted Tenants of its Matthean parallel.

Just as with this fourth group, so with the fifth and last, a distinct feature, that of complimentary relationship, is common to the figures of Luke's and Matthew's parables. We have here, again, the guests bidden to a Great Supper, although all do not accept the gracious invitation; we have, too, a Steward so trusted that he is enabled to utilize his master's wealth for the benefit of his own personal interests; and a Rich Fool, a favourite of fortune at any rate, if he be not one of wisdom's children. In all these cases, we have those so highly trusted and honoured, as to make it apparent, how fully the making or marring of their eternal fortunes is in their own hands. The divine goodness and grace at least have dealt benignly and most bountifully with them.

In the case of these parables from Luke's Gospel, affording as they do so fair a parallel to the Matthean sequence, we find enough of the same advancing symbolism to encourage that view of them which we have taken, and this in no respect more markedly than in those features distinguishing the several groups into which the developing doctrine here set forth most naturally divides them.

That development, as we have now traced it through the two advancing sets of symbolism presented in the Lucan and Matthean records, has brought us from the contemplation of its initial pictures of man's soul, as abandoned soil, and a lost coin, to see this same immortal spirit represented by figures proclaiming it as the honoured associate and trusted vicegerent of the Deity. Nor could the course of this development, alike on its symbolical and spiritual sides, be at once more natural, reasonable, significant, and inspiring. Nature's progressive advance through the mineral, vegetable, and animal kingdoms up to man as its head, is here beautifully paralleled in that progress, which, starting from the rudimentary morality involved in the conscious distinction between right and wrong, passes through the apprehensive longings of spiritual growth, appreciative reception of grace, and consequent recognition of Godward duty, to the supreme responsibilities and glorious rewards of the divine fellowship and service.

The Pilgrim's Progress.

By the Rev. John Kelman, M.A., D.D., Edinburgh.

The Argument.

The passage which follows is not without high value, and there are depths of tenderness and pathos in it. But there is also a state of nerves in which the temper of both men is upon edge, and the tone of the passage is less pleasant than is usual in the story. One wonders what Bunyan's reason may have been for introducing so apparently unnecessary and disagreeable an element, which deals with petty misunderstandings between great spirits. The answer must be that this daring

realist in homespun knows that that is the sort of thing that happens, and that many men find it more difficult to bear themselves like Christian gentlemen among little things than among great.

The trouble rises from a retort of Christian's, intended for a jest, but spoken in irritation. Hopeful's wonder that Little-faith did not sell or pawn his jewels called forth the announcement that Hopeful was talking like a chicken with its head in the shell. It was not a very brilliant piece of humour; but humour was not Christian's forte. He jokes clumsily, and sensitive people should keep out of the way of elephantine sport, whose weight is apt to impress them more than its brilliance. Those who incline to such facetiousness would do well to remember that its cost in friendship is often greater than its reward in amusement, and that afterwards it is apt to appear unmannerly.

Bunyan appears to be rather on the side of Christian in this episode, for his side-note in the original edition is 'Christian snubbeth his fellow for unadvised speaking.' Everybody knows how provoking a sensible man finds the fatuous remarks of one who has nothing to say and yet insists on speaking. Christian was one of those clever and serious men who 'cannot bear idiots,' and Hopeful's talk about selling the jewels struck him as mere stupidity—the sort of thing a man says without thinking of the meaning of his words.

Yet there is a deeper reason for the tartness than appears in that explanation. The jewels stand for all that a man has of worth and hope for eternity, and to sell them is to seal his doom for ever. It is one thing to be a coward and a weakling, but it is another thing to hold lightly the gift of eternal life. That it should have occurred to Hopeful even as a possibility that Little-faith should have sold his jewels,—that it seemed a quite natural thing for a man in his circumstances to do,—offended Christian's sense of proportion in spiritual things, and put a touch of temper into his reply. In this light the incident shows a particularly deep insight into character in the author.

Yet in spite of this, Hopeful's words are not so stupid as they seem. There are two arguments involved in Christian's impatient expostulation:—

1. *Nobody would value the jewels enough to buy them.* Men of the world esteem lightly the Christian's treasures, as the cock in the fable who found a diamond and wished it were a grain of corn. But, as a matter of fact, though such men do not delight in the Christian's treasures, they do delight in seeing the Christian sell them. Little as they covet such spiritual wealth, it irritates them to see another man endowed with it; and his parting with it, by putting him on a level with themselves, appears to justify their poverty.

2. *The appalling loss which such parting with the jewels must involve, in excluding the seller from his eternal inheritance, is so great that no man would knowingly incur it.* But facts are again on the side of Hopeful. Spiritual suicide is not impossible; it is not even of rare occurrence. Had Bunyan thought of Spira he would have remembered a case in point. In times of dejection men often cast away all that is best in character and plunge recklessly into sin.

Thus it was not wholly Hopeful's fault that this conversation had become somewhat acrimonious. As Offor remarks, Hopeful is not the first to be 'almost angry' in an argument about the perseverance of the saints. And if it be asked why both of the men are in so bad a mood, Christian tart and Hopeful inclined to anger, we have only to recall familiar instances in our own experience, of nerves too highly strung and unexpected petty worries that easily rasp them, after a season of specially exalted religious communion. Christian ends the dangerous incident without apology, and Hopeful is big enough to accept his fellow's terms and 'pass that by,' without demanding the last word. So they pass from personalities to the abstract question in dispute. Yet Christian's subsequent exposition still shows a tendency to become personal, which a less gracious spirit than that of his friend might not unjustifiably have resented.

Esau.

The conversation passes on to that perennially interesting study, the character of Esau in contrast with that of the godly but imperfect man of faith. The usual contrast is between Esau and Jacob: here it is between Esau and Little-faith. The two types, thus standing over against Esau, have much in common. Both are comparatively dull and uninteresting, and each has moral peculiarities which compare unfavourably with the dashing figure of the huntsman, whose very sins have a

primitive picturesqueness about them which throws into all the meaner light the craftiness of Jacob and the pusillanimity of Little-faith. The late Professor A. B. Davidson had a very characteristic saying that 'There are some modern critics who prefer Esau to Jacob, and Saul to David, and Judas Iscariot to the Apostle John.' Possibly he may have referred to such a writer as Charles Kingsley, whose fellow-feeling for the sportsman led him to shield Esau from the general attack. Such men of letters as De Quincey and Ruskin, as well as many others, might be quoted as representatives of the same general tendency and point of view. Large-hearted and broad-minded humanists are apt to find the champions of a high spirituality too severe in their judgments of the natural man. There is much to be said on that side, and it is certainly wise to cultivate a habit rather of lenient than of severe judgments.

Yet Christian cannot be expected to make any such allowances. To him Esau is a wholly despicable character, a *caitiff*, and there is no more to be said. For Christian's mind is not a subtle one, nor, where the one grand issue is concerned, can he see any of the minor issues. For him the dividing line of life runs clear and unmistakable, the line between nature and grace, between the converted man and the unconverted. The lionizing of the natural man is but delusive trifling to him, whose eyes can never for a moment stray from that sharp and infinitely significant distinction. And if he had been taxed with any unfairness to the more interesting and brilliant aspects of the character of the natural man, he would have answered that in the end it is reality and depth that tell. For him, he is interested in the root of the matter, and all surface and showy things may well be left to take care of themselves.

Hopeful's Judgment of Little-faith.

Hopeful is hard on Little-faith. He himself is not a character of gigantic strength, but he has the imaginative delight in strength which is often found in the weak, and which sometimes keeps them from compassion. His very freshness and sunny geniality have their defects. His nature is a simple one, and his experience has been simple. In some respects he is but too like Little-faith, though the two are so opposite in others. Neither of them knows the world well, nor is deeply versed in the varieties of character and experience which it presents. They are a pair of children, and Hopeful's judgment has all the unwitting harshness of a child's. For him, Little-faith's plight presents small difficulty. Had he been there he would have fought the three, who were evidently cowards, and of no account. It was this air of superiority to a good man who had been sorely pressed and had failed, that Christian found provoking. Perhaps John Bunyan, writing this passage, may have had in his mind some reminiscence of a great passage from his beloved volume, Luther upon Galatians (vi. 1), where he had read these sentences—'The kingdom whereunto ye are called is a kingdom not of terror or heaviness, but of boldness, joy, and gladness.' Yet, 'Paul, therefore, addeth this earnest admonition that the pastors should not be vigorous and unmerciful towards the offenders, or measure their own holiness by other men's sins.'

Christian's Judgment of Little-faith.

This is a rare and classical passage. The native chivalry of Christian rises in arms at once against anything that seems to be unfair or excessive censure even of a very sorry pilgrim. He remembers how unpopular such a type of character is, and how lonely his battles are therefore sure to be. No one came to this lonely and weak man's help, neither Great-grace nor any other of the King's champions, and it touches Christian's heart to think of him fighting alone, with neither aid nor sympathy. So he at once takes his part and does this vigorously all along. It is a most tender and sympathetic plea for the 'weak brother.' It must be confessed that such a plea is needed, for the weak brother is a very provoking person. Stevenson tells us that he is 'generally the most worthless of mankind,' and those who have wearied their souls in futile attempts to help him in spite of himself are tempted to acquiesce in the sweeping censure. But this man was after all 'only weak, not bad,' and in all Christian's defence we perceive a man whose pity is founded on a serious view and a serious experience of human life. He has felt and has not forgotten the supreme difficulty of being a strong and worthy character. So long as a man is trying for that, and going forward, in however uncouth or despicable a fashion, Christian will deal gently with him.

He never quite admits his rudeness to Hopeful, but he has not forgotten his friend's reminder, and here and there one can perceive him finding it a

little difficult to be courteous, and yet trying to keep his speech in check. It was hardly becoming in one who had recently lived through the experiences of Doubting Castle and its grounds to condemn a weak brother so uncompromisingly as Hopeful did, and an obvious retort was open to Christian. But he suppresses that, and passes on to more worthy lines of speech.

His plea for the weak brother is long and somewhat discursive, repeating some of its arguments as is the way of a man in an hour of expansive talk. But the entire discourse moves between two points well worth noting and remembering. These are (1) his sense of danger; (2) his allowance for the limitations of the weak one.

1. *His sense of danger.* He knows the terrible power of these assailants. It is all very well, from the point of view of a distant onlooker, to say how the battle might have been better fought. It is quite true that Faint-heart, Mistrust, and Guilt were cowards after all is said. But yet they are hard to fight and conquer for all that. It is cheap to underrate another man's conflict, as many passages from Rudyard Kipling's songs and stories of soldiers remind us. It is a different thing to stand up face to face with even such despicable enemies and to play the man.

Besides, these enemies are but 'journeymen thieves,' and all the powers of hell are at their whistle. To John Bunyan, as to Martin Luther, the devil is alive and personal with a vengeance, and 'he is never out of hearing.' We would refer again to Professor Masson's well-known essay on *The Three Devils*—an essay which every reader of the *Pilgrim's Progress* should study. This personal agency and power of Satan and his hosts was a thought that haunted Bunyan, and gave their significance for him to all departments of experience. And certainly, whether one is prepared to accept John Bunyan's demonology or not, the fact which these recurring words express is but too familiar to us all. In times when mistrust and the sense of guilt have got at the spirit, a whole host of temptations usually come to back them, and whatever the explanation be, the fact is terrible enough.

What gives point and earnestness to Christian's speech is the fact that he himself has had to fight these enemies. The reference is probably to the Valley of the Shadow of Death, which Christian is not likely soon to forget, and to the previous fight with Apollyon. His armour had all been needed to save his life that day—what wonder if he pities the plight of this unarmed pilgrim? His armour had been necessary, yet such armour is a challenge to the enemy; and he cannot but feel an additional compassion for this simple and quiet traveller, challenging nobody, and only desiring to lead a gentle life, yet so cruelly and gratuitously assaulted. 'He laughs at scars who never felt a wound,' and young and callow Christians are often more severe as judges than those who are, in Patrick Walker's covenanting language, 'Exercised, painful, and disciplined believers.' In the famous passage about 'such footmen as thou and I are,' which follows the description of Job's horse, Bunyan has said the last word that the Christian heart needs to hear upon this subject. He himself could speak in this line from experience. He had been a soldier in the Civil War, and he had a soldier's fear of battle. If we want to get at the truth of actual war, it is not to the imagination of poets or of arm-chair critics that we go. For the full horror of battle, we turn to such a book as Lord Roberts' *Forty Years in India.* And for the true estimate and account of spiritual conflict also, we may well turn to Bunyan as to one who knows. None of all God's wise men has made a more systematic or constant habit of turning experience into conviction, and gathering insight into the things of God, and compassion for his fellowmen, from his own conflicts with the devil.

A further point which emphasizes the sense of danger, is the remarkable passage about Great-grace, and the difficulty which even he had found in this encounter. We had taken it for granted, from the fact that the thieves fled upon the mere rumour of him, that this must be one of those unconquered men—heroes that had never known defeat, or even been compelled to take their fighting seriously. One of our great Scottish stories is that of him who, carrying a famous heart for burial in Palestine, by way of Spain, was passing through Seville. A Spanish knight, noticing that his face was free from the marks of wounds, asked him in wonder how that had come to pass, and received the answer that all his life his hands had been able to keep his cheeks from scars. Such had not, however, been the fortune of Great-grace, as the 'scars and cuts' upon it gave demonstration. He can manage his weapons excellently as long as he can keep his enemy at sword's point

distance, but once the enemy gets 'within,' the chances are against even Great-grace. At close grips, even he is no more invulnerable than other men, and we hear a distant sound of moaning and groaning and roaring from far-off centuries, heard distinctly still across so great a gulf of time. It is Great-grace, whom his foe has got *within* his sword-play—Great-grace in the person of Paul, and David, and Heman, and Hezekiah, and Peter. Who that has heard that sound, and lifting up his eyes has caught sight of all those scarred faces of the older world, will forget the sight, or will ever again speak foolishly in the style of Hopeful?

2. *Christian's allowance for the limitations of the weak brother.* He reminds Hopeful that the natural build and disposition of a man must be taken into account in judging others. In character as in physique there are limitations beyond which it is impossible for a man to go. To expect Little-faith to show the mettle of Great-grace would be to blame a wren for not displaying the strength of an ox. This is especially relevant in the matter of courage, which is largely a physical and constitutional quality. This is not a champion, and he never will nor can be one. He is not a great man nor a hero of any kind. Fortunately this does not deliver him from being one of God's true pilgrims. We cannot all be champions, and from such men this is not expected. The passage reminds us of Thomas à Kempis: 'Thou art a man, and not God; thou art flesh, not an angel. How canst thou look to continue always in the same state of virtue, when an angel in heaven hath fallen, as also the first man in Paradise?' It is but this exposition of the Scriptural assurance that a man shall be judged according to that he hath, and not according to that he hath not.

It is a kindly doctrine, and full of the considerateness and compassion of Christ. Yet it is only for some men that it is legitimate, and it is often taken advantage of by those who have no right to it. There is a curious anticipation of Darwin in the sentences, 'Some are strong, some are weak . . . this man was one of the weak, and therefore he "went to the wall."' The steadily increasing acceptance with which the doctrine of evolution has met from the modern mind has been one of the most illuminative influences in our times. But undoubtedly one of the dangerous elements which it has brought in with it is a tendency to fatalism consequent upon a too exclusive attention to the doctrine of natural selection and the survival of the fittest. The weak are apt to excuse themselves from effort on the plea of this weakness, until a fatalistic paralysis of will and distrust of their powers sets them wholly at the mercy of outward circumstances and inward moods. So much is this the case that one becomes almost afraid to show any compassion for the weak brother, or to acknowledge the fact of his constitutional weakness, lest he trade upon the sympathy and cease to strive.

The tenderness of Christian,[1] however, is, as Dr. Kerr Bain points out, rested not upon a sentimental but upon a moral basis. The tenderness is based on Christian's good opinion of the man, not the good opinion based on the tenderness. He is no Great-heart, but he is an emphatically good man—a man of genuine and sincere character. That is what appeals to Christian, and enlists his strong regard. In spite of his begging, and his lifelong grievance, Christian cannot forget that he was still going forward even while he begged and complained. Cheever finely says in this connexion that 'God brings not a pair of scales to weigh your graces, and if they be too light refuse them: but He brings a touch-stone to try them, and if they be pure gold, though ever so little of it, it will pass current with Him.'

The whole passage has been aptly called 'a monologue on Christian tenderness,' and it has been remarked that the effect of it is strengthened by the fact that the story is not part of his actual experience, but only a matter of hearsay to him. This subtle touch given by throwing the passage into indirect history, adds to our sense of Christian's chivalrous nature. His habit is to speak kindly of those who are in fault. 'If ever there be a shade of harshness in Christian when he is face to face with (false pilgrims), it is well to note that there is little trace of this, but oftener a tone of lowly charity, when he is speaking of them to others.' There is an old story, told by that curious moralist Mr. Todd, in his once famous *Students' Manual*, of a man who habitually stayed to the end of any gathering in which he happened to be. When asked his reason for always being the last to leave the room, he replied that it was because he had noticed that the talk always went against the person who had just gone from the company.

[1] Compare the fine passages on this subject in Dr. Kerr Bain's first volume, pp. 428, 430, etc.

Christian is never seen in a better light than in his defence of an absent brother.

The descriptions of Leviathan and Job's horse are introduced in a somewhat odd fashion. The former is understood by Bunyan as a symbol of the devil, while the latter is apparently irresistible from its sheer literary strength and vividness. From the Book of Enoch downwards, these picturesque passages have tempted the allegorist; and, as Ewald says, 'the strangest things have been imported into the description.' Job is a wonderful piece of writing even as a book of nature. It touches upon the ways of many birds and beasts, among which are the war-horse and the Egyptian crocodile; which, as Leviathan, we see here on its way towards those many conceptions of dragons which delighted the imagination of the Middle Ages. In the Book of Job the argument is simply, 'If the creature God has created be so terrible, who will stand before God who has created him?' Bunyan does not pause to define the original meaning or connexion of these brilliant descriptions. It is their brilliance that has fascinated his ear and eye, and he brings them in because he enjoys them so. In the notes to Professor A. B. Davidson's Commentary on Job there is a remarkable rendering of Renan's translation of the two passages, which is well worth reading.

It is well for us that the happy thought of introducing these figures occurred to Bunyan, for it led him to the closing passage of the whole narrative of the discussion—undoubtedly one of the finest pieces of writing that ever came from his pen. The author of *The Heavenly Footman* gives us his plea for humility in 'such footmen as thou and I are.' It needs no comment, and once read it can never be forgotten. It is a masterpiece of appreciation of a soldier's humility. And it closes with two practical advices which sum up the moral of the entire story. First, never to go out unharnessed, and especially never to leave one's shield behind. Second, never to go alone. And the latter advice falls back into the teaching of the 23rd Psalm, 'I will fear no evil; for thou art with me.' The ultimate defence of every Christian man is the presence of God with his soul. No wonder if that closing note breaks out into Bunyan's most unrestrained eloquence.

The International Critical Commentary on 'Esther.'[1]

By Rev. J. A. Selbie, D.D., Aberdeen.

The most diverse opinions have been held about the Book of Esther. No book of the Bible has secured a stronger hold on the affections of Jews, none has been more repugnant to the feelings of Christians. Luther uttered a characteristically hostile judgment regarding it, and it would be a real relief to many if the book had never obtained admittance to the Canon. Yet, in spite of many objectionable features, and the absence of any positive moral or religious value, the Book of Esther possesses significance for the study both of Judaism and of Comparative Religion; and even the ordinary reader of Scripture may study it with profit if he apprehends its standpoint and aim. To guide him to the latter he will find a welcome aid in Professor Paton's Commentary, regarding which we have no hesitation in saying that it is the first work of the kind which has made it possible for English-speaking students to understand the Book of Esther.

After treating of the place of Esther in the Hebrew Bible and in the Septuagint, respectively, Professor Paton deals at length with the text. The special feature in this department is the presence in the Versions (LXX, Old Lat., Vulg., Pesh.), Josephus, the Talmud, and Targums, of a number of remarkable additions to the Massoretic text. These additions, which have hitherto not been readily accessible to the student, have been collected by Dr. Paton, and introduced (in translation) at the appropriate places in the Commentary. In this he has certainly rendered a valuable service, and has added materially to the interest of his pages. Passing to the sphere of

[1] *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Esther*. By Lewis Bayles Paton, Ph.D., D.D., Professor of O.T. Exegesis and Criticism, Hartford Theol. Seminary, Hartford, Conn. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1908. Price 10s. 6d.