

thought. Scribes were ready to hand on the Tradition which was as directly the commandment of God as the Scriptures which they expounded ; and to them it was said, *Be not called Rabbi, for one is your Teacher . . . nor be called Directors for your Director is one, the Messiah.*

J. H. A. HART.

THE CROSS IN RELATION TO SIN : CAN A MORAL THEORY LEAVE THIS OUT ?

THE question of the relation of the Cross of Christ to man's sin and to the Gospel of the Divine forgiveness is raised afresh by the very comprehensive discussions of Dr. Stevens in his recently published Work on *The Christian Doctrine of Salvation*. After much consideration of all theological theories and of the Scriptural teaching on the subject, Dr. Stevens decisively adopts what he terms the "moral theory" of the Cross as distinguished not only from all those described as "penal" and "ethical satisfaction" theories, but also from any such conception of the relation of the Cross to sin as is implied in, for example, St. Paul's teaching in the first half of the Epistle to the Romans. We have no intention of attempting a criticism of Dr. Stevens' very suggestive volume : others no doubt will do this. We have a very full sympathy with Dr. Stevens in his desire to remove the misconceptions that have often gathered around the Cross and the character of God and to present a doctrine of salvation that shall be in line with the whole teaching and work of Christ and with His revelation of God. But we feel compelled to ask, whether a moral theory of the Cross, if it is to be complete, must not take up into itself, in some form, that element which is at the basis of the rejected theories— an element which, in whatever way some of its theological statements may be judged, has certainly been the nerve of

that which we commonly understand as "evangelical Christianity," viz., that the sufferings and death of Christ had a direct relation to human sin and to the Gospel of Divine forgiveness; that, in some real sense, Christ "bore our sins," not merely by sympathy but by suffering and death; and that this was necessary in view of the Divine grace of forgiveness which, through the Cross of Christ, comes to us with saving power. The moral theory is defined by Dr. Stevens as that which "attempts to construe the work of Christ as an actual saving power directly operating upon human life, and, accordingly, to interpret His death, primarily, as a factor in his influence upon the moral life of the world." So far as this goes, no one will refuse assent. All theologians will describe their theories as moral in this sense. Any theory that is not one of moral influence is at once ruled out for that very reason. But the above definition is meant to exclude that special conception of the death of Christ in relation to sin to which we have referred, and we venture to think that apart from its inclusion the theory is sadly incomplete as a moral theory.

We shall here deal with the subject quite broadly, without raising any of the questions of exegesis or interpretation that might well be raised. The Cross stood as a great and unexpected fact for the interpretation of the first disciples under the guidance or stimulus of the Holy Spirit. All the Apostles were men of Jewish birth and training, and it was inevitable that they should apprehend and interpret the significance of the Cross in the terms that were familiar to them. Dr. Stevens rejects Paul's leading interpretation partly because it was the result of his training in Rabbinic theology. That the *forms* of Paul's apprehension of the meaning of the Cross were derived from his Jewish training cannot be denied; but was there no substantial reality underlying these forms of thought? Was not the Pauline, and the first-Christian inter-

pretation of the Cross generally, really reached under the influence of the Holy Spirit? But how can we recognize the reality of the Spirit's guidance of these men if, not only the form, but the very substance of their thought concerning the Cross was wrong or mistaken? They would be made wrong thus in their very conception of God.

Paul, as Dr. Stevens says, regarded the death of Christ as meeting the demands of "the law" for the sinner's "death," that God's moral righteousness might be vindicated, that "God might be just and the justifier of him who believes in Jesus." He was "made sin for us," "made a curse," we are justified in His blood, etc.

That the *forms* under which Paul apprehended the Cross were derived from his Jewish training is no contradiction to the reality of the Spirit's teaching, provided that the underlying substance which they were meant to express was *there*. Paul could not have apprehended it otherwise unless he had been made over again. It is quite true also that these Jewish forms of thought do not have the same direct and immediate application to *us* as they had to those who were Jews. We, certainly, were never under the Jewish Law. No death-penalty stands written against us as it stood against the sinner under the Law. No Christian man can believe that "cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree." We cannot say, in the same sense as the Jew, that Christ has made us "free from the law," or that He has "redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us." It is true that death—natural, physical death—stands before us all; but we cannot regard physical death as the penalty of sin. It is a necessary consequence of our limited bodily life; it is here in order to the perpetuation and furtherance of life on the earth. Had it not been for physical death, not one of us would have been in the world to-day. Physical death comes to saint and sinner alike. It could not be the

absence of physical death that Paul referred to when he spoke of that "passing over of sins" which made the Cross necessary as a manifestation of God's righteousness; for it had never been absent. The death-penalty under the law was a violent death, an off-cutting in judgment, death as a punishment for sins. "The soul that sinneth it shall die" cannot refer to merely natural death, for that happened equally to the soul that was "righteous," or that turned from sin to righteousness. It was not the mere death of Christ, but (in one aspect) the violent death of Christ, that Paul interpreted as a substitute for that death for sin which the law threatened the sinner with. We can easily understand how Paul, truly under the Spirit's guidance, was led to this interpretation, and we can see and acknowledge that it cannot have the same immediate reference or application to us as it had to those who were "under the law." But Paul applies the same principle to all men—to the Gentile as well as to the Jew. Though not under the written Jewish Law, the Gentile showed the work of the law written in his heart. His works proved that he was as truly under sin as was the Jew, and his conscience, Paul affirmed, bore witness that they who did certain sinful things deserved "death," that is, death as a visitation, death as a punishment, death as representing the supreme punishment at the hands of a righteous God. This visitation had not fallen on men as a recognized fact in the Divine procedure, and the proclamation of Divine forgiveness in Christ went forth freely to all, Jew and Gentile alike. Was God, then, indifferent to sin? So it might appear. But all this was, Paul said, in the merciful forbearance of God, that He might have mercy upon all. Now at length the Divine righteousness had been manifested in the suffering and death of Christ in the name of all, while at the same time the Divine forgiveness went forth to all.

Now, it may be said that this wider application of the

Cross is still based on the Jewish legal conception, and that there are points at which Paul's reasoning is inconclusive ; that all that can be validly inferred from an appeal to the universal conscience is that we are all under a moral law and that sin is an evil and deserves to be punished. But this much certainly *can* be inferred, and is inferred, by all normally constituted consciences. Do not all feel certain also that sin cannot be allowed to perpetuate itself in an eternal Kingdom of God ? Is it also certain that sin is not visibly punished in this world as men's consciences tell them it deserves to be punished, and that God sends a gracious message of forgiveness to all ? Is it not necessary then, Paul would ask (and surely it is a question that we must ask as well), that some adequate manifestation of God's righteousness should be made in the world—some such manifestation as Paul believed was made by the suffering and death of Christ in our name and in our behalf, if God is to be known in His true relation to sin, and if the Gospel of His grace is to go forth with moral, that is saving, power into the sinful world ? It is from sin that God seeks to save men ; it is sin that is the source of all the evil in the world ; sin is not only something against God, but against man himself ; "the wages of sin is death"—the death of the soul, that separation from God or exclusion from His eternal Kingdom which is the only thing man needs to fear. If then God in His love was to save men from sin, must not the reality, the evil, the doom of sin be in some way impressively manifested ? The Christian consciousness in general, as well as that of Paul, has seen that manifestation in Christ's suffering and death on the Cross and has felt its moral power. Leave out this aspect of the Cross, and a very essential element of its moral power is gone.

It is true that forgiveness has always been free to the penitent sinner and that Christ preached the Divine forgiveness

before He endured the Cross. It is also true that all proceeds from the love of God, and that the Divine mercy, and not the Cross, is the ground of the Divine forgiveness. But the question is not that of the ground of forgiveness, but whether it was necessary, along with the Divine forgiveness, that God's absolute moral righteousness in relation to sin should be made manifest to the world. Dr. Stevens does not deny that this was necessary; he affirms that it was made; but he denies that it was made in this way by Christ on His Cross. But what is often overlooked is that the question here is not as to the forgiveness of the penitent sinner, but as to that "passing over of sins" in general of which Paul speaks, and as to that proclamation of Divine forgiveness to the whole sinful world that goes forth through Christ. The Cross was the great appeal of God to men. There He was "reconciling the world to Himself" and pleading with men to enter into that reconciliation. But at the same time, said Paul, so far from sin being made to appear a light thing, Christ who knew no sin was "made sin on our behalf, that we might become the righteousness of God in Him"—justified and saved. "*In Him*," because of what He did in our name and of what He is unto us. The "righteousness" and salvation come to us through that Cross on which our sin was acknowledged by Christ in our name. Suppose that no such manifestation of the Divine righteousness and of the reality and evil of sin had been made, suppose that a Gospel simply of mercy and forgiveness had been preached to the world, the evil of sin being illustrated only, as Dr. Stevens says it was, by what Christ suffered in order to bring it to us, would it have had the same moral influence on men as the actual Gospel of the Cross has had? Even if it had moved men sufficiently, would it have satisfied their own consciences so as to give them that assured "peace with God" which is at the very foundation of the filial life toward Him? That faith in a Christ who

died for us can produce this assured peace and at the same time quicken or renew the moral nature is one of the most remarkable effects of the Gospel, strongly attesting its Divine origin. If men do not see God to be absolutely righteous and sin to be necessarily doomed to the death of exclusion from the Eternal Kingdom, how can they be effectually saved from sin and brought really into full filial fellowship with God? A moral theory, therefore, if it is to be complete, must, we say, embrace in some form, as an essential and prominent element, that conception of the manifestation of the Divine righteousness and the evil and doom of sin which Paul saw in the Cross and which has been the very life of evangelical Christianity.

Before attempting to answer the question, in what form can we to-day, with the full assent of reason and conscience, apprehend this aspect of the work of Christ, let us turn for a moment to the relation of the Cross to Christ's own teaching and work in general. This must of course be, as Dr. Stevens insists, the guiding light in all our attempts to understand the Cross, and the final test of theories. We do not at present insist on any special interpretation of the various sayings of Christ with respect to His Cross, nor do we point now to the picture in Isaiah of the suffering Servant of Jehovah which we believe was in His mind. But it is certain that, at the last, in Gethsemane, Christ accepted the Cross solely in obedience to the will of His Father in relation to the fulfilment of His mission in the world. The object of that mission was certainly, as stated by Dr. Stevens, to bring men to God, to repentance, to faith, to sonship, to membership in the Kingdom of God—in Christ's own comprehensive phrase, to bring in the Kingdom of God—the reign of His grace and of His Will in the world. It was, as He said again, to establish "the new covenant" which was founded on the Divine forgiveness of sin and which should lead to the

dwelling of God with men. His words and bearing after His final acceptance of the Cross show His conviction that it should be the means of accomplishing the great Divine work committed to Him. His blood should seal the new Covenant; the redemption which the Passover foreshadowed should then be fulfilled; after His death He should drink the new wine with His disciples in His Father's Kingdom.

(1) Now we ask, in the first place, Why was it necessary that Christ should suffer as He did in order to the accomplishment of His mission? No doubt His enemies put Him to death; but He accepted His Cross, not as compelled by the forces that were arrayed against Him, but solely because it had been made plain to Him that it was His Father's will that He should do so. It was not because He could not have been saved from it, but because the grace of God to the world's salvation could only go forth effectually in that way. And why should He not only have to die but to suffer as He did, in the silence of God and with that absence of the sense of His Father's presence that was allowed to come upon Him? Why should He, to whom that presence was the very light of life, be left without it in that hour of completest obedience to His Father's will? Do not these questions find their most reasonable answer on the theory that Christ was there as the Representative of sinful men whom God in His love was seeking to save from their sin? That, is, if we believe in the reality of God and in the possibility of His manifesting His Presence to men—above all to Him who stood in such a relationship of Sonship to Himself as no one on the earth ever did before or has done since, and who had, up to that moment, lived in the closest fellowship with His Father. That Christ did in His life experience a special communion with God is essential to our conception of Christianity as divinely true. Why was it not manifested just at this particular stage? Dr. Stevens says

of the cry on the Cross, that "it seems more accordant with this old Testament exclamation (for such it is, Ps. xxii. 1), as well as more congruous with Jesus' view of the reciprocal relation between the Father and Himself, to suppose abandonment to suffering, rather than abandonment to God's displeasure or to desertion to be meant." No doubt ; but it is just this abandonment to suffering without the sustaining sense of His Father's presence on the part of one who had hitherto enjoyed it, that requires to be explained. Had Christ accepted his Cross simply to bring men to repentance, (etc.), as is suggested, He would have known *why* He had to suffer.

(2) Let us ask, in the second place, In what way was the great Divine purpose committed to Christ actually accomplished through the Cross ? How did it bring in the Kingdom of God's grace and love ? It, was, undoubtedly, by means of that interpretation of the Cross which Paul and the other Christian Apostles reached under the influence of the Holy Spirit that proceeded so largely through the Cross. It was by means of that interpretation of the Cross in which they apprehended it as a sacrifice for sin, and as meeting the demands of the law—the Jewish law and the universal law of righteousness—so that God could be "just and yet the Justifier" of sinners believing in Christ. It was an interpretation which, accepted in faith, enabled men to draw nigh to God with confidence in His forgiving love. It did away with "the Law," whose demands had all been met, and introduced in its stead the Kingdom of Grace, winning men's hearts for God, who had so loved them as to give up His Son so to die for them. It cannot be doubted that it was this interpretation of the Cross that actually served that Divine purpose the realization of which was the supreme end of the life of Christ. That it was first reached under certain Jewish presuppositions does not alter the fact ; it was, as we have seen, inevitable that it

should be so reached. By means of this interpretation of the Cross the effectual coming of the Kingdom of Grace was accomplished for the whole world, and by means of it, in one form or another, it has remained effectual for the greater part of Christendom. We are privileged to-day to rejoice in the light of that revelation of Divine Fatherhood and Grace which came to men through that very interpretation of the Cross. Not only has the burdensome Jewish law disappeared, but, while the moral law that rules the life can never pass away, provision has been made for turning the rule of mere outward law into the inward law of love. Through this interpretation the power of God has certainly gone forth into the world to work towards its salvation. Can we believe that all this rests on pure illusion, that this interpretation of the Cross was a radically mistaken one, that there was not, deeper than all that we may credit to Jewish beliefs merely, a profound Divine reality? Can we still have the Gospel in all its power if we leave this out?

Dr. Stevens presses us hard for a distinct statement of what that reality was. Let us endeavour to state it in the light of St. Paul's interpretation of the Cross. He admits that Paul's statements in Romans iii. do not necessarily imply "penal" suffering on the part of Christ. If "penal" implies punishment, then, of course, Christ could not, as an individual person, be punished. He is expressly set forth as "He who knew no sin." Not knowing sin, He could not suffer as a sinner. How far His sympathy might carry Him into participation with such suffering as sin deserved is, however, another question. Dr. Stevens speaks of Christ taking us into His own sense of the evil of sin. How does He do this? Nor have we anything in Paul which suggests that God demanded a sacrifice before He would or could forgive sin, or that He sought "satisfaction" to His offended

honour, or outraged law, or retributive justice, etc. These, and many other forms of statement, are in theological, not in Scriptural terms. What is implied in Paul's statement is simply that in consequence of God's "passing over of sin," and in view of His proclamation of forgiveness to the sinful world, it was necessary, in order to the salvation of men, (*from sin*) that a manifestation of His moral righteousness in relation to sin should be made, and that this was made in the suffering and death of Christ in the name of sinful men. His suffering and death there as their representative before the gospel of forgiveness could go forth in its full power, and (according to the representations of the Gospels) in order that it might so go forth, was a sufficient manifestation of the Divine righteousness in relation to the sin which God was forgiving. This done, the Gospel could go freely forth so as to save men.

Dr. Stevens wishes to know what was the precise relation of the Cross to man's sin; what it was that Christ did that showed forth the righteousness of God in relation to sin; how the suffering of Christ, endured at the hands of sinful men, could be, in any real sense, a bearing of our sins or a manifestation of God's righteousness in view of sin. But, as we have seen, it all came upon Him *in the will of God*, with a Divine saving purpose in it. We can say *certainly* that Christ accepted it all in order that the Divine purpose might be accomplished, in order that God's grace might go forth effectually to men with saving power. Why it could only go forth effectually *thus* is the real question. Certainly the Cross was not to "satisfy God," but to save men. It was not meant to operate on God, but on men. It was something which, under the Spirit's influence, men should so interpret as that it should become a power of God to their salvation. It was not Jewish training merely that led them to this interpretation. The conscience had a large part in it;

men felt that there Christ suffered what sin really deserved to suffer ; that there God's righteous condemnation of sin was revealed as truly as His love for sinners. And they believed that Christ could so suffer for them because He was (as all admit) our Representative—the Representative Man in whose death, as Paul said, we all died.

Now, *if Christ accepted* His sufferings and death, not as that which was due to Himself personally, but as that which the sin of the men whom He represented deserved, which sin needed to be so acknowledged and set forth, if men were to be truly saved, do not His sufferings and death become to us a real bearing of our sins, and a manifestation of the righteousness of God in relation to sin ? Do we need anything more definite than this ? We may raise various logical difficulties as to the procedure if we choose ; but may it not still be found that “ the foolishness of God is wiser than men ” ? It is not a *legal* transaction we have before us—one in which such definitions are required as theologians have often sought to give with reference to the Cross ? It is something primarily for the conscience to interpret. If in the Cross we see Christ voluntarily enduring such suffering and death as our consciences tell us we as sinners deserved rather than Christ, and doing this for our sakes in order to manifest the Divine righteousness in relation to sin and to enable us to take to our hearts with confidence and with saving power the proclamation of the Divine forgiveness, do we not have in this all that is essential ? Such words as “ legal,” “ penal,” “ satisfaction,” etc., are quite unnecessary and only confuse the mind. Is it not just by seeking logical and legal definitions for that which was a *great Divine act*, appealing first of all to the consciences and the hearts of men, that theologians have often erred and have surrounded the Cross with a legion of needless difficulties ? The Cross, preached as what Christ suffered in consequence

of our sins in order to bring to us the assurance of the Divine forgiveness and to save us from sin,—which no theory can dispute,—makes quite a sufficient appeal to men apart from all minute disputation and definition. The conscience will still interpret the Cross in the old way; it will still see in it what Paul saw in it—a manifestation of the Divine righteousness as well as of the Divine love. Very few of those who believe that “Christ died for me,” that He “suffered for my sins so that the Divine forgiveness might come to me in spite of my sinfulness,” who have “peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ,” and have had a new life of love kindled in their heart, could give any theological explanation of the Cross. It was a *Divine* act which the Divine Wisdom knew would be so interpreted that the Divine Grace could reach men so as to save them.

But we by no means admit that there need be any discord between the Conscience and the Reason in view of the Cross. The Cross stood, as Paul said, in the Wisdom of God, and (whether we can reach it or not) its rationale in relation to sin can assuredly be reached by deeper thought. We may approach it by asking, in the first place, how men’s sins are dealt with in this world in the righteousness of God. They are not always visited by direct external infliction of punishment; the wicked man may prosper in his wickedness, and there may be no bands in his death. Evil is apparently suffered to proceed untouched and unchecked, so that men are often compelled to ask whether there be a God who judges on the earth. Some impressive manifestation of the evil of sin and of God’s Righteousness is sorely needed.

But does sin really go unpunished? No; Christ, above all others, has made us feel certain that sin becomes its own punishment. The sinner reaps in his own character the reward of his unrighteousness, even, it may be, to the extent

of the loss of his soul, the destruction of his higher nature. This is true of the individual. But God does not deal with men as separate individuals merely ; we stand also before Him in families, in communities, in nations, in Humanity as a whole ; and it is in these relationships that we *see* most plainly the consequences of sin. They come on the innocent as well as on the guilty : the innocent are continually suffering from the sins of the guilty. Not only do the sins of the fathers fall on the children, but the sufferings consequent on the sins of an individual member of a family often come with much greater force on some innocent representative member of the family than they do on the immediate sinner. So it is with the sins of a people or of a nation. These often come in the fullest measure on those who had no direct part in the sins, but who are bound up with the sinners in a common collective life. They may come, most manifestly, on some patriotic representative of the people, or on some pre-eminently righteous person, as in Israel the sins of the nation are set forth as lighting on the head of the righteous Servant of Jehovah. It was the sins of his people He was bearing—their consequences, their penal consequences, in the wide sense of the term, must we not say ? So again, God deals with Humanity as a unity. Man brings blessing or suffering on himself and on his fellow-men. The individual is suffered to go on his way, but the consequences of his sins—their punishment—take effect, not only on the individual sinner's own nature, but—as suffering—on those who are associated with him. We all share, more or less, in the fruits of the righteousness and in the results of the evil-doing of Humanity as a whole. No man can wholly cut himself off from the well-doing or from the ill-doing of the race. Humanity is a unity—an organic unity—before God. It stands, not merely in its individual members, but as a single man before the Divine Righteous-

ness. And, therefore, the sufferings which manifest a rule of righteousness, or which are the results of departure from righteousness, come on the personally innocent as well as on the personally guilty. Now, Christ was the true Representative of this our Humanity—its genuine Head. In His personal character He represented it in its true life before God. But Humanity in itself was a sinful Humanity—the race that He represented was one that, as a whole, had departed from righteousness; it was as yet a Humanity “after the flesh,” not “after the Spirit.” As such it was under the necessary condemnation of God; as such it was doomed to perish, not because of any arbitrary Divine decree of punishment, but because sin becomes its own punishment; the wages of sin, in its very nature, is “death.”

Now, if God was to save this sinful Humanity (and only God could save it) must not this, its true relation before the Divine Righteousness, be impressively manifested, so as to be felt by the consciences of men? Otherwise the salvation will not go deep enough. Must not He who truly represented this Humanity before God bow before the Divine Righteousness in recognition of its sin and of the necessary doom of sin? Was not Christ only standing true to His representative capacity in so acknowledging our sin in order that the Divine Grace should reach the sinful world so as to save it? If Christ was really (as Dr. Stevens, and all, admit) the Representative Man, is it any wonder to see Him called to make this recognition of the sin of the race He represented, in order to save it from its sin?

But this is not all. In that act we can see Christ as, in the most literal sense, “bearing our sins.” All His suffering was directly caused by sinful men; but as such it truly expressed the consequences of sin as these had gone on accumulating. In the characters of those men who cruci-

fied the Son of God the sin of man found its culminating expression. It came to a head there, and this, as the consequence of sin upon sin. Apart from Christ, those consequences, in their last result, could only have come on this sinful Humanity itself with a destructive force. Christ suffered them to fall upon Himself in order to save the world—in order to turn back that tide of sin which would otherwise have submerged the race. He became that “Lamb of God” who bore, so as to take away, the sin of the world. He placed Himself where the results of men’s sins—in which their real punishment always lies—fell upon Him in their ultimate, extremest form. Looking to Him as He suffers on that Cross, we sinners of the world can truly make our own the confession of those who beheld, and were led to interpret rightly, the suffering of the righteous Servant of Jehovah: “All we like sheep have gone astray, we have turned every one to his own way, and the Lord has caused to light on Him the iniquities of us all.”

Christ thus literally “bore our sins in His own body on the tree,” not by sympathy merely, but by suffering what the sin of man brought upon Him, as that sin had gone on reaping its punishment in increasing sinfulness. The righteousness of God in relation to sin was thus impressively set forth, the destructive nature of sin was revealed, and the grace of God for the world’s salvation went forth in the fulness of its power through the Cross.

All this was done by Christ, as our Representative, dying “for all,” as Paul said, that we who representatively died with Him, or in Him, might live a new justified and righteous life unto God. The *moral* death that we must die with Christ (of which Dr. Stevens says so much) is based on this representative death of us all in or with Christ. It is not “ye *must* die with Christ,” but “ye *died*” in Him. Only because we have been thus united with Him in His

death is it possible for us to become united with Him in His life (which, of course, implies union with Him in His death in the spiritual or moral sense). It is not primarily such a moral appeal that God sends us in the Gospel, but a proclamation of Divine *grace*, through the Cross, such as will both give peace to the conscience and stimulate it to new life. To go back from "grace" as the first word to sinful men is to go back from the Gospel. The Faith in which we are saved is a faith that accepts Christ as our Representative, that endorses His act on our behalf, and accepts God's assurance of its sufficiency. Union with Christ in Spirit follows and results from union with Him in His representative death. It is its natural consequent indeed. For in Christ "the flesh" died utterly, and all those who accept that representation for themselves die in principle with Christ and have only before them the new life of the Spirit. Therefore it was that Paul said that thenceforth he "knew no man after the flesh."

The Christian life, whether it be described as spiritual or as ethical, or as mystical, arises naturally out of this union with Christ in His representative death on our behalf. Sin doomed man in the flesh to "death"; but Christ has acknowledged in our name the necessity of this, so that, although we are consciously sinners, we can take to ourselves confidently the Divine forgiveness and know ourselves made heirs of eternal life. *Therefore* the Christian feels that it is for him "no longer to live to the flesh to the lusts of men, but to the will of God"; for in Christ he "died," and his true life is "hid with Christ in God."

The Divine grace thus comes to us through the Cross in direct continuation and completion of the work of Christ prior to His Cross. It comes to us with saving power. It comes "convincing of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment," moving us to turn from sin to God who so loved us

as to give up His Son to die for us, in order that His grace might reach us in unison with that Righteousness in being raised to which alone *salvation* is to be found. We repeat, therefore, that unless this conception of the Cross be embraced in a doctrine of the Cross, it cannot be a completely moral one.

[The writer of the foregoing may be permitted to say that in his Book, *The Cross and the Kingdom*, he sought to confine himself to what he believed could be fairly inferred from the Synoptic narratives alone; St Paul's Doctrine of the Cross was dealt with in his previous work, *The Spirit and the Incarnation*].

W. L. WALKER.

A DAUGHTER OF JACOB.

THE conversation between Jesus and the woman of Samaria passes into the first of its deeper phases with the Lord's remark, *If thou knewest the gift of God, and who it is that saith to thee, Give me to drink, thou wouldest have asked of him, and he would have given thee living water.*

If thou knewest. But she did not know. She failed as yet to realize her opportunity. The woman was upon the edge of the supreme moment in her life, and apparently she could find nothing better to do than talk and tease, until it seemed as if she would actually allow the chance to go, oblivious of its size and offer. For, as not unfrequently is the case in human experience, the turning-point came unawares. Nothing warned this woman of the significance attaching to the conversation or of the wide possibilities with which she was trifling in this interview. No presentiment, inward or outward, had she of the crisis, ere swiftly and quietly it was upon her. The sunlight flickering on the sand, the stones and water of the well, the common sights and sounds of the place, were as they had been on