

CHRIST'S PREACHING OF THE KINGDOM.

ALL are agreed that the subject of Christ's preaching was *the Kingdom of God*; but there is by no means agreement as to the nature of Christ's view of that Kingdom. Hitherto the prevailing idea has been that, while He regarded the Kingdom as belonging in its fulness to the future, it was in its essence spiritual and was actually, in Himself, His preaching, and work, present among men. God was present in Him in His Grace, and men might become members of God's Kingdom now, partakers of a present, spiritual salvation. Of late, however, there has been a tendency in some quarters to regard His conception of the Kingdom as wholly, or almost wholly, outward and future, a Kingdom which was to come from God in a miraculous manner, agreeing in this respect with the popular expectations of His people and time. Of this view Professor Bousset's very interesting and suggestive book entitled *Jesus* may be taken as an example. According to him, after all modifications have been made, "the fact remains that the Kingdom of God as Jesus preached it lay principally in the domain of the future, and wholly in the domain of the miraculous." In keeping with this view was Christ's conception of Himself as the Son of Man and Messiah. He was to come again, outwardly and literally, in the clouds of Heaven as the Lord of the Kingdom. Now, of course, "History, the irrevocable march of events, have proved that the expectation of an immediate and mighty transformation" such as this outward and miraculous conception of the Kingdom (including His own coming again in the clouds of Heaven) implied, "was mistaken." The questions therefore arise: Is this view of Christ's preaching

well founded ? and, if so, How does it affect our view of His Person ?

To take the last question first, it may be said that if with respect to matters of ordinary knowledge Jesus showed Himself a true "Child of His time," this, in itself, would not be inconsistent with any view of the Incarnation or of the Person of Christ which holds that the Divine found its expression in that which was genuinely human. But unless, at the same time, with respect to the highest spiritual conceptions, Jesus showed Himself to be above His people and before His times, what ground should we have for affirming the supreme presence of the Deity in Him or the uniqueness of His Person ? If our Lord had no truer knowledge than His contemporaries concerning that which was the central subject of His teaching—God and His Kingdom—we have no evidence, save His miraculous works, of a fuller presence of God within Him. That which distinguished Christ and was the supreme proof of the presence in Him of "the Spirit of the Father"; that which enabled Him to do the work that He did and seated Him on the throne of the world was just the spirituality which inspired His thought, His preaching, and entire life-work. It is suggested that His miraculous healing power was to Him the proof of the Divine Presence and of the nearness of the miraculous Kingdom. But His consciousness of the presence of God within Him was much more than this. The Divine Spirit was not manifested to Him only in the miraculous works He was enabled to perform. Jesus had a far higher thought of God than that of a miracle-working Power. There was something very much deeper than this implied in that exclusive knowledge of the Father by the Son and of the Son by the Father which our Lord is admitted to have possessed and asserted. The story of the Temptation alone shows that to the mind of Christ the

mere power to work miracles was not sufficient, that the true fulfilment of His mission depended on how that power was used, and that from the first the idea of an outward Kingdom was decisively rejected.

Bousset, indeed, earnestly and most convincingly maintains that Jesus had a far truer conception of God than those around Him possessed. [God was for Him "a reality, clear, living, present, above all others," and it was in this faith in God, the Father of men (although He was at the same time "a terrible God who filled His soul with a sense of His unspeakable majesty, and surrounded His whole being with impenetrable darkness and mystery,") that the power lay which enabled Jesus to rescue religion from the fetters of Jewish nationalism and make it individual and universal. But if this superior knowledge of God still left Him to entertain the thought that the Kingdom of God, the coming of which He preached as His Gospel, was something outward and miraculous, something which, in fact, never came, something, for us, "absolutely inconceivable" —not only does this seem contradictory to that high spiritual conception of God which is ascribed to Him, but it left Him subject to a strange misconception with reference to that which He regarded as His special "message" from and concerning God.

The contrasted views are really very different. To preach the Kingdom of God was to proclaim the coming of Redemption; it was to announce the glad tidings that God was drawing nigh to His people to save them. If Christ did not expressly say *how* this Redemption was to come, He made plain what it was from: it was from all the evils that afflicted the people in this life and from the sin that is the source of all real evil. The question is, Was it only a future, and not a present salvation that He preached? Did He merely call on them to draw nigh to

God and seek righteousness in order that they might be found among His people and share in a Redemption that was coming to them in an outward and miraculous manner in the future ; or, was the essential Redemption itself to be found just in this very drawing nigh to God, which made them members of the spiritual and eternal Kingdom and ultimate sharers in all its blessings ? Was it this spiritual and eternal salvation that filled the mind of Christ, or did He merely preach a future, external salvation in a Kingdom that was to come from God in a miraculous manner ? The question is very important. For, in the one case we should see in Him that deep spiritual insight which discerned in contrast to those around Him in what *salvation* really consisted. In the other case there would be the absence of such insight : the salvation would still be something external, to be found in a coming miraculous Kingdom, which, as a matter of fact, never did come.¹ In such a case, Jesus, with the spiritual conception of God and the realizing faith in the Divine Presence which are ascribed to Him, might still be rightly claimed as "the Leader of the ages and the nations to God," but He would be made to stand lower than His followers in His conception of the nature of that Kingdom of God in which He promised men salvation.

Let us turn, therefore, to the actual teaching of Christ and inquire in what way He viewed that Kingdom of God which He proclaimed ; let us ask specially, whether or not He held a spiritual conception of it.

He certainly employed the popular forms of speech concerning the Kingdom. It was also a Kingdom which was to come in the fulness of its power in the future—a Kingdom

¹ In many parts of his volume Bousset maintains the spiritual nature of Christ's teaching ; but this seems inconsistent with that external view of the Kingdom which is attributed to Him.

that was to come from God and in God's own way. That He also pictured it in outward forms, as a Kingdom which men might enter or from which they might be excluded, cannot be denied. But Christ had to speak so as to gain the people's interest and attention, and the phrase "the Kingdom of God" was that which for them summed up the supreme good of man. By proclaiming the near approach to them of God's Kingdom He need have meant nothing more than that the highest hopes of the people might now be realized in their truth and the supreme good be found by them, that God in Himself was nigh them in that Grace of Forgiveness which all acknowledge to be the essential note of the Gospel in its permanent form. It may well have been the very spirituality of His conception of the Kingdom as inward and spiritual, and for that reason *always* nigh to men, that induced Him with so great confidence to announce its immediacy. The popular phrase "the Kingdom of God" need have been nothing more than a *form* in which He proclaimed the nearness to all of God, of the highest blessing in this life, and of the eternal life which they looked for beyond merely ; which were spiritual, not outward goods at all. But it was more than a convenient phrase. The Kingdom of God means also the *reign* of God, and it was only through the sole rule of God in the heart that man's highest good and real salvation could be found. Surely Christ knew this and taught this : it was the very essence of His teaching ; but if so, His own conception of the Kingdom must have been essentially spiritual. In this spiritual relation to God, men, according to Christ, did enter the Kingdom ; it belonged to them even now. The mere placing the emphasis on the fact that it was the Kingdom of *God* would not be sufficient. It depended on what was meant by *God* ; and Christ's conception of God was that of a spiritual Being, a present God

and Father to whom He invited men to draw nigh now and become His subjects and children, so that they might find the blessing of that Kingdom which all hoped for and which He proclaimed as real and nigh to them. What was this but the preaching of a spiritual good as the true good under the form of the Kingdom of God? When Jesus spoke of the Kingdom as belonging to Israel, and of Himself as being sent to the lost sheep of the house of Israel; when He even described the future as a sitting at meat in company with the patriarchs of the old Covenant, "all this," says Bousset, "formed but the mould into which His genius poured a new content." Is not this just what is true of the entire representation under the form of the Kingdom? He represented that Kingdom in the popular modes of conceiving it; but at the same time He made men realize its essential spirituality. When Jesus pictures the Kingdom of God as something local, to be set up in Palestine, an illuminated palace or a banqueting hall into which men might enter through a door, in which they should eat and drink with the patriarchs, or from which they might be shut out, beating at the door in vain for admittance, out of which the unworthy should be flung, bound hand and foot, into the outer darkness; when He says that it is better to enter halt or with one hand and one eye into life than to go whole-bodied into Gehenna, is it not quite out of the question to take it all literally, and if it is not to be all so taken, who is to draw the line and say this is spiritual and that is literal? The Kingdom of God was but a *form* in which Christ clothed His spiritual teaching. It was a good form, a most fruitful form, the best, doubtless, that was open to Him; and it is still, perhaps, when freed from all that was merely temporary and accidental, the best form in which to present the Gospel; but it was only a form, and to press it to the length of excluding its spiritual content is quite unwarranted.

It is admitted that the Kingdom was in some sense present in its beginnings—in the miraculous works of Christ, especially in His healings and castings out of demons. These were evidences of the presence of the Kingdom because they were manifestations of the presence of God in His reign and in His power over evil. But, apart from the special passages to be considered immediately, was not the very essence of the Kingdom also present in Christ's preaching of the nearness and love of the Heavenly Father, in the freeness of His gift of His Holy Spirit to all who asked Him, in the forgiveness of sins, in the rescue of the Sabbath for man, in the reversal of the old Law and teaching of the Sermon on the Mount in general, in the revelation to "babes" of the things that had been hid from the wise and prudent, in the things which many prophets and righteous men of old longed to see but did not behold, in "the word of the Kingdom" which was sown like seed by Christ, in the salvation of the sinful, in the joy in Heaven over repenting ones, and in the rest to the weary and heavy laden which was found in bowing to the yoke of the great Teacher? Were not men and women thus truly becoming, not merely members of the Kingdom who should one day enter it in an outward sense, but actual partakers in its Divine life and blessedness; while that which should bring this spiritual Kingdom in the fulness of its power still lay hid in the womb of the future and in the counsels of God? The Kingdom of God *we* know is in its truth the reign of God's love in the hearts of men. Did not Jesus know this? Can we really assert for ourselves a spiritual knowledge superior to that which He possessed?

Again, if we can trust St. Paul and the gospel narratives, the coming of the Kingdom of God was with Christ the same thing as the establishment of *the New Covenant*. That New Covenant, as it was described by Jeremiah, was

certainly spiritual in its content,—“ I will put my law in their inward parts, and in their hearts will I write it ; and I will be their God and they shall be my people ” (surely this is just the Kingdom of God) : and we cannot suppose that Christ was behind the prophet in His conception of the essential spirituality of that which had to the people of His time become so sadly materialized. It was just here that He stood forth in such marked distinction from the people and their teachers.

We have already referred to our Lord's confident preaching of the immediacy of the Kingdom—His proclamation of it as something that had come nigh to the people. The question arises, What was it that gave Him this confidence—a confidence which He maintained unshaken to the very last ? To attribute it to calculations based on Daniel and other prophets such as many of the Rabbis of His time engaged in, would be out of keeping with all that we know of Christ. To say that it was His possession of miraculous powers would be inadequate. It was not this alone that gave Him the conviction that He was the *true* Messiah of His people. To ascribe His belief to a special inspiration would be psychologically insufficient ; for there is no inspiration apart from some reason for it—more or less clearly discerned. Is not the most consistent explanation of His confident proclamation of the nearness of the Kingdom His strong conviction of its essential *spirituality* ? That to which the people were looking to find their true good in was indeed the Kingdom of God. But that Kingdom was really in the first instance the reign of God in their hearts : out of that all other good would come. And God was nigh to them in His grace and forgiving love, seeking to enter their hearts and reign. They were making the great mistake of looking to the future merely for that which was ever nigh to them. Therefore, to this spiritual religion

Jesus called the people, saying, "The Kingdom of God is at hand."

It ought to be noted also that, although in the time of Christ the idea of the Kingdom seems to have been widely conceived in an outward manner, His use of the phrase in a spiritual sense was by no means unprecedented. In the Wisdom of Solomon it is said that Wisdom showed to Jacob "the Kingdom of God and gave him a knowledge of holy things" (x. 10). "Here," as Principal Drummond remarks, "the expressions are parallel, so that seeing the Kingdom of God is equivalent to receiving a knowledge of holy things; it is, in short, to apprehend the reality and meaning of the Divine rule in oneself and in mankind" (*Hibbert Lectures*, p. 129). The equivalent phrase "the Kingdom of Heaven" is frequent on the part of Rabbinical writers in a spiritual sense. In the words of Dr. Edersheim: "A review of many passages on the subject shows that in the Jewish mind the expression 'Kingdom of Heaven' referred, not so much to any particular period, as in general to the *Rule of God*, as acknowledged, manifested, and eventually perfected. Very often it is the equivalent for personal acknowledgment of God: the taking upon oneself of the 'yoke' of 'the Kingdom,' or of the commandments—the former preceding and conditioning the latter" (*The Life and Times of Jesus*, i. p. 267). See also Dalman's *The Words of Jesus*. He says that "no doubt can be entertained that both in the old Testament and in Jewish literature" the meaning is "always the 'kingly rule,' never the 'kingdom,' as if it were meant to suggest the territory governed by Him" (p. 94).

Coming now to the particular sayings which are noted by Bousset as those which are generally supposed to support the idea of a present spiritual Kingdom, we have—

1. Matthew xii. 28: "If I by the Spirit of God cast out

demons, then is the Kingdom of God come unto you." It is admitted that in the eyes of Christ the Kingdom of God was already present. But it is said that this was "spoken at a moment of great excitement, in which He likens His own miracles and casting out of devils directly to the miraculous power of God with which He would presently set up His Kingdom and trample Satan, the prince of all the devils, under foot." But this is mere assertion: there is no such comparison; He simply adduces the miracles as a proof—the only kind of proof they seemed capable of understanding—of the actual coming upon them of that Kingdom of which they had so much to say and which they were looking for in the future only. It seems an express repudiation of the idea that the Kingdom was only in the future. As Dr. Weymouth notes (in his *New Testament in Modern English*), "the verb employed (in 'has come upon you') is found nowhere else in the Gospels except in the parallel passage, Luke xi. 20, and probably implies, 'Before you were expecting its arrival,' which sense of the verb is retained in modern Greek. In Luke's version of the saying the meaning is plain: 'If I by the finger (or power) of God cast out demons, then is the Kingdom of God come upon you.'"

2. Another very important saying is Luke xvii. 21: "And being asked by the Pharisees when the Kingdom of God cometh, He answered them and said, The Kingdom of God cometh not with observation (close watching for it), neither shall they say, Lo here! or There! for lo! the Kingdom of God is within you." The margin of the R.V. gives "in the midst of you," and that of the A.V. "among you." As this saying has often been misinterpreted, it deserves fuller consideration. There is no apparent reason for the rendering "among you" (or "in the midst of you") save only a subjective one. It was first adopted, in all

probability, because our Lord's words were addressed to the Pharisees, of whom it seemed impossible to say "it is within you"—a general statement being taken for a particular one. The word employed by Luke, *ἐντός*, means "within" in contrast with *ἐκτός*, "without." It means always *within*, in whatever sense that term can be applied to that which is spoken of. No instance has as yet been adduced to prove that it may mean "among" as distinguished from "within." It occurs, in the New Testament only here and in Matthew xxiii. 26, where it indicates the "inside" of the cup or platter as contrasted with the outside of it. It is found five times in the Septuagint Version, Dan. x. 16; Ps. xxxix. 3; ciii. 1; cix. 22 (Biblical enumeration); Isa. xvi. 11; Cant. iii. 10. In the first four instances it can only mean *within* (in the Psalms, "my heart within me"); and in the last instance it points to the inside of Solomon's palanquin as distinguished from the outside of it. It is found also in the Apocrypha (Ecclus. xiv. 26; 1 Macc. iv. 48) with the same meaning. Dalman, retranslating into the Aramaic, holds that the rendering "within you" is the correct one—in the secrecy of men's hearts. "In other places Luke has *ἐν μέσῳ* for 'among': see Luke ii. 46; viii. 7; x. 3; xxii. 27, 55; xxiv. 36; Acts i. 15; ii. 22; xxvii. 21. When he writes *ἐντός* in this case, he certainly means something more than 'among,' namely, 'within'" (*The Words of Jesus*, p. 146). The few instances that have been adduced from Classical literature to justify the rendering "among you" entirely fail to do so. That from Xenophon's *Anabasis*, i. 10, 3, quoted by Alford (and frequently referred to by others both before and since his time), points to what was *within* the soldiers' quarters, and is so rendered in Watson's translation; or "within their own lines," as others render it. Dr. Plummer (who holds either rendering to be admissible) adds two more in-

stances, one from Xenophon's *Hellenes*, ii. 3, 19, and another from Plato's *Leg.* vii. 789, A (where it occurs twice); but in all these cases the meaning is certainly *within*—"within the womb"; "within (in the sense of taking under their arms)"; "bad men within the Three Thousand as well as outside it."

Of course, *if* the Kingdom were something outward, like the goods and people within the ranks of the soldiers in the *Anabasis*, it would be correct to say "in their midst"; because it would not be possible for it to be within them in any other sense. But this would be to pre-judge the nature of the Kingdom as outward, and also to assume that Christ was addressing them as a people or a community, instead of thinking of the relation of the spiritual Kingdom to the individual. But even "among you" would be quite in keeping with the idea of the spirituality of the Kingdom. As Alford, who adopts it, remarks, "The meaning 'among you' includes, of course, the deeper and personal one, 'within each of you.'"

"Lo here! or, There!" could only be said of what was *outward*. Christ here affirms that it could not be said of the coming of the Kingdom; but it is exactly what would apply to the sudden descent of an outward and miraculous Kingdom. That the exclamation applies to *place* is plain from the verses that follow (*vv.* 23, 24; see also *Matt.* xxiv. 23, 24; *Mark* xiii. 21); where the comparison of the Coming of the Son of Man to the shining forth of the lightning points, probably, not merely to the suddenness but to the universality and spirituality of His presence.

Bousset's remark that we have here again "an inspired and paradoxical saying of Jesus in which he was certainly thinking of his own actions, but in their miraculous, not in their moral aspect," as on another occasion He pointed the disciples of John to the wonders He had wrought, seems un-

founded, and, in any case, it would prove nothing respecting the real nature of the Kingdom. He suggests in a note that perhaps the right translation is, "For lo! the Kingdom of God will (suddenly) be among you," in which case the whole passage would refer to the future Kingdom of God. But we have already seen that it is "within," not "among"; and, surely, the sudden appearance of such a Kingdom "among" them would elicit the exclamations referred to.

3. The "Parables of the Kingdom" are generally regarded as teaching a spiritual view of the Kingdom of God. They are certainly parables of *the Kingdom*, in which it is likened to certain material things, and as certainly do they have reference to *the spiritual teaching* of Christ—which was like the seed sown in a field, or the leaven hid in the meal. Perhaps, in the parable of the mustard seed, which, Bousset bids us remember, was a garden-plant that sprang up in a single summer, there may be no direct reference to "the development of centuries," rather, to something "swift"; but, whatever the reference to *time* may be, it is the development, not of anything outward, but of *that which was sown in the hearts of men* that is spoken of.

No doubt, also, the merchant who parts with all for "the pearl of great price" does not find the full value of his gain in the immediate present, but he certainly does not "hazard all present goods for the sake of a future and yet to be acquired good" merely. That which he shall gain in the future is but the fruition of what has entered his soul in the present through his response to the call of Christ. And if, as Bousset says, in the parable of the peasant who casts seed on the earth and then can do nothing but await the harvest, "the emphasis lies, not upon the description of the gradual growth of the seed, but on the idea that the corn ripens to the harvest of 'itself,'" it was the ripening of the spiritual

teaching of our Lord that was in view—not the coming of a miraculous Kingdom.

There are other special sayings, besides those that are noticed, which convey the idea of a present spiritual Kingdom. Amongst these we may quote the opening words of our Lord's ministry according to Luke (iv. 17-21): "To-day hath this Scripture been fulfilled in your ears": to preach "the acceptable year of the Lord" was to proclaim the coming of the Kingdom of God. "Whosoever shall not receive the Kingdom of God as a little child, he shall in no wise enter therein" (Mark x. 15). It was something presently offered to them. "From the days of John the Baptist until now the Kingdom of Heaven suffereth violence, and men of violence take it by force" (Matt. xi. 12); the meaning of which is evident from Luke's version of the same utterance: "The law and the prophets were until John: from that time the gospel of the Kingdom of God is preached, and every man entereth violently into it." When He sent the seventy forth to preach, they were to heal the sick and say, "The Kingdom of God is come nigh unto you"; and, if rejected, they were to repeat the saying: "Howbeit, know this, that the Kingdom of God is come nigh" (Luke x. 9, 12). To the scribe that answered discreetly Jesus said, "Thou art not far from the Kingdom of God," which implied its presence as a spiritual reality. To His disciples "the mysteries of the Kingdom" were revealed, which were surely something more than miraculous healings; and He said, in words already referred to: "Blessed are your eyes, for they see; and your ears, for they hear" (it was not merely *seeing*). "For verily I say unto you, that many prophets and righteous men desired to see the things which ye see, and saw them not, and to hear the things which ye hear, and heard them not" (Matt. xiii. 11, 16, 17). What were the things that they *heard*, if not

those of His spiritual teaching, which was the seed of the Kingdom in their hearts ?

Bousset, of course, as already intimated, maintains that Jesus did much more than preach the coming of an outward Kingdom : otherwise the results of His preaching would be inexplicable. He liberated religion from its national limits and sent it forth on a new and higher course of life. "Though steeped in the eschatological hopes of his time and country, he yet succeeded in altering and purifying them at the critical point and in breaking through the limits which hemmed them in." But in stating the way in which Jesus did this he seems to render incredible what he has asserted concerning Christ's view of the Kingdom. The distinction in Christ's view of the Kingdom, he says, lay in this : that, while according to the people of His time the Kingdom of God was also the Kingdom of Israel, Jesus had no interest in the merely national aspect of the Kingdom, and placed the emphasis on the fact that it was the Kingdom of *God*. "What did fill His soul to the brim was the thought that God would come, that God would bear rule, that righteousness would conquer and good triumph." No doubt this is true ; but does it not refute the idea that Jesus in His own mind viewed the Kingdom as outward and miraculous and in the future merely ? If He thought of it as *God's* Kingdom and universal, He must also have conceived it as spiritual and present. No doubt God was yet to come in all the fulness of the power of the Kingdom ; but was not God thought of by Jesus as also *here* ? Was He not "the Father who is in secret ; who sees in secret and rewards openly" ? And, if the Kingdom meant *the rule of God*, then, surely, the Kingdom was truly present wherever God's rule was accepted.

It is true, however, that up to the very last Jesus looked to the future for the coming of the Kingdom, not only in

its Judgment-aspect and in its eternal form, but also in its full spiritual power. It should come with His own coming again after His Death and Resurrection. There were some of them who should not "taste of death till they had seen the Kingdom of God already come in power"; they should not have "gone over the cities of Israel till the Son of Man be come." He saw that His *death* was the necessary prelude to the coming of the Kingdom in its power. Then "all should be fulfilled"; then He should "drink the new wine with them in His Father's Kingdom." To the High Priest He said, "Ye shall see the Son of Man sitting at the right hand of power and coming in the clouds of heaven." He expected the Kingdom to come in all its power and glory immediately after, and as the result of that death which sealed to them the "New Covenant." It is certain, however, also, that the outward, miraculous Kingdom did not appear, and that Jesus as the Son of Man did not come in His glory in the clouds of heaven. Was Jesus then to some extent under an illusion? Was He disappointed in His expectations? But now, can we seriously suppose for a moment that one with the insight of Jesus really believed that He should come riding on the clouds of heaven? Is not this as manifestly a figurative expression, denoting His spiritual triumph (which the High Priest could not understand) as are the expressions in the eschatological discourse in Mark, where the sun is said to be darkened, and the moon to be turned into blood, and the stars to fall from heaven? No one in his senses would take such prophetic language literally; why then interpret similar language on the part of Christ in a literal manner? Christ *did* triumph through His Cross; the Son of Man did immediately thereafter come in the true glory of His Father, and the Kingdom did then begin to come in the fulness of its spiritual and eternal power. That sacrifice of Himself to which He had come

so to look forward, till the accomplishment of which He felt Himself so greatly "straitened," completed that which His spiritual teaching began. In the holy love which there poured itself forth ; in the message of forgiveness that was preached in His Name ; in the conviction of the reality of a spiritual life in God which came through belief in the Risen One ; in the new spiritual power—the fulness of the Holy Spirit of God—that went forth through the Cross, convicting men of sin and leading them to embrace the grace of God, who was there reconciling the world to Himself ; in the new life of love that was quickened in their hearts ; in the "righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Spirit" that thus came to them ; in the inspiration to be co-workers with God in this life, and in the power of the eternal life which thus possessed them, with its "Hope of Glory," the Kingdom of God came, as Christ believed it would come, in the fulness of its power. It came thus as that spiritual, present, yet eternal Kingdom which, deepest of all, He saw it from the first to be, and therefore proclaimed its nearness and openness to all, although He found by experience that His sacrifice of Himself alone could bring it in all its Divine power. And that Kingdom still continues to come and will go on increasing wherever the gospel is proclaimed in its truth and fulness and the life of love is thereby produced. It is the failure to see how truly the Kingdom came in the fulness of its spiritual power through the Cross of Christ that leads some at present to so literalize the sayings of Jesus as they would never dream of doing with those of any other great religious teacher.

W. L. WALKER.