

*THE RESTATEMENT OF THE GOSPEL FOR
TO-DAY.*

I.

(1) THERE are three factors in modern thought which are generally regarded as making the restatement of the Christian Gospel an urgent task—criticism, science and philosophy. It may be conceded that criticism has so altered our view of the Bible, that science has so modified our conception of nature, and that philosophy has so affected our intellectual standpoint in relation both to nature and to man, and consequently to God also, that some adjustment of Christian doctrine to the new mental environment is absolutely necessary. (i.) Criticism has driven us from a false to a true view of the purpose and character of divine revelation; it has taught us that revelation is *personal* through the transformation of human lives, *practical* to foster goodness and godliness, *progressive*, advancing from lower to higher stages of thought and life until *perfected* in the truth and grace of Christ, throughout its course *redemption* in promise until in Christ it is *redemption* in fulfilment. It has taught us that the Scriptures are given of God to **make men wise unto the salvation which is in Christ Jesus**, not to give them knowledge of astronomy, geology, biology, or anthropology. It has relieved the Christian Church of the grievous task of reconciling Scripture and science by making it clear that with the process of creation, with the origin and development of man as included in that process, the divine revelation has no concern; but all inquiry and

discovery in this realm is left to human science. It has concentrated attention on that in the Bible which has spiritual significance and moral value, God's purpose of truth and grace fulfilled in Christ. It is not loss, but gain, that Christian theology can withdraw from the defence of the temporal and local knowledge of nature and man which is embodied in the Scriptures as human literature, even though inspired ; and can give itself to the advance of that permanent and universal divine truth and grace which is enshrined in the Scriptures because inspired human literature. No Christian theologian need dread criticism ; it may be welcomed not as a foe, but a friend to Christian faith. (ii.) This does not mean that critics are infallible, that every new critical theory is to set us to revising our creed in feverish haste. As a *method* criticism has so surely established itself that the new view of the Bible it leads us to cannot be rejected ; as regards its *results* it too knows something of fleeting fashions. It was a short time ago a common assumption among critics that in the earlier prophets there was only denunciation of judgment, and there was no announcement of mercy, and all passages relating to the Messianic hope must be treated as interpolations ; more recently it has been maintained that the eschatology of the prophets is a survival of a much older mythology. As regards the New Testament writings Harnack represents in Germany at least a conservative reaction ; he admits Luke's authorship of the Third Gospel, assigns the Second Gospel to Mark, reproduces the Logia or earliest report of Jesus' teaching and work as embodied with comparatively little change in the First Gospel. These instances teach us that we must not be always revising our creed to bring it into accord with the last book we have read, but may await with patience and confidence the assured results of the new movement.

(2) Science has made many discoveries which fuller knowledge is not likely to disprove ; it has also indulged in many hypotheses that are changing from day to day, (i.) Christian theology may be required to acknowledge, and there is no reason why it should hesitate to acknowledge, the exclusive authority of science in its own sphere, the observation, classification, and explanation of *phenomena*, not only physical, but even mental and moral, although in the latter self-consciousness compels the interpretation of them from a higher standpoint than that of science. With facts, laws, causes, science is concerned. It tells us what *is*, not what *can be*, or *ought to be* ; the *actual*, not the *possible* or the *ideal* is its sphere. It is necessary to insist on this ; as Christian theology has sometimes been required to yield, not to a legitimate demand, but to an unwarranted encroachment of science. Science can describe for us the ordinary processes of nature ; it cannot determine whether extraordinary occurrences are possible or not. It can tell us what are the common processes of human thinking, feeling, willing ; it cannot tell us whether divine inspiration may or may not stimulate and direct these activities. It can report the dictates of conscience and the sense of freedom as facts of consciousness ; it cannot prove the validity of the one, or the value of the other. This limitation of the sphere of science needs to be insisted on if intellectual confusion is to be avoided. (ii.) Science has banished a *supernaturalism* which set no value on the manifestation of the divine reason and character in law and order, a physical and a moral *cosmos*, a regular and harmonious universe, and looked for the evidences of the divine in the exceptional, however trivial and purposeless. That evolution is the method of divine working in nature and history, that grace even has its own law and order is a conclusion that modern science presses on the acceptance of Christian theology, and

Christian theology will interpret the works and ways of God to men more truly as it accepts this. Science may demand of Christian theology that no miracle shall be affirmed unless good reason can be shown why the ordinary processes of nature or of mind were departed from. Science is within its rights when it insists on careful scrutiny of whatever presents itself in the Scriptures as supernatural. (iii.) It exceeds its authority, however, when it affirms that miracles are *impossible*, or even *improbable*. It can tell us only that God habitually works thus and thus, it cannot declare that God cannot work otherwise in an original fashion. The rejection of the supernatural as impossible is not a demand that science may lawfully make; and, therefore, the restatement of the Gospel, which recognizes the truth of science, need not exclude miracles. Science cannot sound the abysmal depths of man's need of redemption; it cannot scale the empyrean heights of God's grace in redeeming; it cannot therefore pronounce any judgment even on the *probability* of miracles. There is no justification for the assumption that to be *scientific* in our thinking it is necessary for us to distrust, doubt, or deny the supernatural and the miraculous. God's grace unto salvation does not belong to the realm that science can observe, classify, and explain. We must see to it that we do not mutilate the Gospel in order to lay it as a vain sacrifice on the altar of science.

(3) Into philosophy, which is the attempt to interpret the world as a whole, not to explain it in its parts, as is the function of science, the personal equation inevitably enters more largely. It is a speculative construction of the *data* collected by experience. (i.) It comes into contact with Christian theology at more points than science or criticism. If a speculative system declares the ultimate problem of existence insoluble, or solves it by some other conception

than that of a personal God, it comes into inevitable conflict with the Christian Gospel. No speculative system, however, has or can have the certainty of the religious experience of the grace of God in Christ, and accordingly Christian theology does not need to wait on any philosophy for the terms of its restatement of the Christian Gospel. Nevertheless, not a few Christian teachers have allowed themselves to be unduly influenced by current philosophical ideas without testing their validity by the moral conscience or the religious consciousness. (ii.) The absolute idealism of Hegel, for instance, has been considered by many as offering the only appropriate intellectual forms for the expression and explanation of the Christian faith, even though that system appears to exclude the personality of God and the reality of sin. That idealism has rendered service to Christian thought in proving the inadequacy of any agnostic or materialistic solution of the problem of existence may be fully conceded ; that its exposition of a reason in, through, and over all may be subordinated to a Christian view of the world may as fully be acknowledged ; that its ambition to think things together may be a stimulus to constructive theological thought, the writer can from personal experience testify. But, as it does not do full justice to the testimony either of morality or of religion, it cannot claim to dictate to Christian theology how the Gospel shall be presented to-day. A theologian is neither obscurantist nor reactionary who refuses to cut and carve the Christian oracles into the shapes presented by this attractive, but also deceptive speculation. (iii.) It is worthy of note that at the very time when some Christian teachers would enthrone Hegel in Christian theology, the claims of his philosophy are being most vigorously and effectively denied by philosophical thinkers. In England there is the school of personal idealism, which seeks to escape the abstract intellectualism of *Hegel's* view ; in the

more extreme form of pragmatism all thought is regarded as dominated by practical needs. In Germany *Lotze* vindicated the conception of personality in application alike to God and man in distinct opposition to the one-sided insistence on reason as constituting reality in Hegel's system. The latest phase of German philosophical thought is the activism of *Eucken*, which maintains that it is by achieving in himself the spiritual life that a man wins the standpoint for the true philosophy. This system has much closer kinship with Christian faith than Hegelianism. It is not intended to depreciate philosophy, but only to make clear that no system is final ; and that therefore no system offers so assured a standpoint for thought that Christian theology is under obligation to satisfy all its demands in the restatement of the Gospel.

(4) Criticism, science, and philosophy are complex movements, and require to be studied with discrimination. Not every new conclusion is a permanent contribution of thought, and Christian theology has not only a right but also a duty to prove all things, and hold fast only that which is good. (i.) Some who are most eager about making the statement of the Gospel up to date to-day show a glaring inconsistency in their treatment of the theology of former days. That the Fourth Evangelist used Philonic metaphysics, and the Apostle to the Gentiles Rabbinic exegesis, are facts insisted on to invalidate their authority ; that the ecumenical creeds show the influence of Greek philosophy and of Roman jurisprudence is emphasized to diminish their value. Are not these all instances of adapting the Christian faith to its intellectual environment ? What is asserted as the duty of the theologian to-day is the offence of the theologians of former days. What we have to ask that we may judge righteously is : was the essential Christian experience mutilated, or was it preserved in the theological expression

and explanation given to it in any age ? That the creeds did in some degree obscure the truth and grace of Jesus Christ is by most modern theologians conceded. But does the Philonic metaphysics hide from us in the Fourth Gospel the glory of the only-begotten of the Father, and does the Rabbinic exegesis take from us the assurance of the perfect salvation which Paul found in Jesus Christ ? The test of every theological restatement of the Gospel is this : does it or does it not accord with Christian experience ? (iii.) Accordingly, it is necessary to insist on the old principle that the heart makes the theologian ; it is a comprehensive and intense Christian experience which alone qualifies a man to attempt with any safety or promise of success the restatement of the Gospel. He must live what he thinks and teaches. One cannot but feel that a good deal of theologizing to-day, especially by young men, lacks this indispensable quality. There are a great many men who have, as it were, inherited the Christian *ethos*, without having passed through the Christian experience. They have learned to know, trust, love and serve Jesus as Teacher, Example, Friend, Master ; but they have never had the Son revealed in them as the Saviour, and the only Saviour. Because they have never said with Paul, " O wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me out of the body of this death ? " they cannot say with him, " But far be it from me to glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, through which the world has been crucified unto me, and I unto the world." The Cross, as it is interpreted by evangelicalism, is an offence and foolishness to them, not the power and the wisdom of God, because they have not felt its healing virtue from the plague of sin. The writer would venture to suggest that we must become very much more Christian ourselves before we can express and explain in new forms the Gospel. Criticism, science, philosophy, we must know all these, and be

ready to learn whatever each may teach us, but what we need to know above all is that in Christ we have passed out of darkness into God's marvellous light.

II.

(1) Besides these three intellectual conditions—criticism, science, and philosophy, there are two practical demands for a restatement of the Gospel. The Foreign Mission and the Social Reform enterprises of the Christian Church are by some persons regarded as an urgent reason for theological change. It is said that we must not take our theology, based on our philosophy, to India and China with their ancient civilizations and cultures, whatever we may do in regard to the savages of Africa and the Pacific Islands. That our temporary and local opinions and customs should not be thus imposed on other peoples, no one can doubt for a single moment. But it is a very serious question how far we are bound to modify the statement of the Gospel so as to adapt it to the new environment into which it is to be carried. Is the offence of the Cross due to the Cross itself, or to our Occidental methods of presenting it to Oriental minds? There are a few misconceptions which must be removed before we can face the question. *First of all*, let it be remembered that the Gospel is not a native product of European thought and life; but came to our forefathers from another race—the Semitic, distinguished by many characteristic features from the Aryan, to which not only Europeans but even the Hindus belong. *Secondly*, let it be remembered that the forms of thought and modes of life that appear at first sight to be most thoroughly our own are found, when traced to their roots, to be due to the Gospel itself. *Thirdly*, the term Oriental is so vague a term that its use in this connexion can only confuse. The characteristics of the Chinaman and Hindu, although both can be

described as Orientals, are very far from being the same ; racially, they are farther apart than the Hindu and the Englishman. They have not that in common in distinction from the European which would enable them to understand Christ better than the European can. *Fourthly*, even if as regards external custom and costume the Hindu or the Chinaman might have the advantage of greater familiarity with the conditions of Jesus' earthly life than the Englishman, yet for the understanding of the Gospel that counts for nothing. For, *fifthly*, what has been rightly emphasized as the characteristic of Jesus is His *universality* in thought and life ; what is distinctive and essential to His Gospel is no more Oriental than Occidental. *Lastly*, the Gospel has modified European thought and life, correcting defects and imparting excellences ; and it claims no less to transform the thought and the life of China and of India. The writer's conviction is that, if the Gospel were to be adapted to Indian or Chinese thought and life as some writers to-day maintain it should, it would become as a salt that had lost its savour. There are some distinctive elements in the Gospel which we must maintain whether they offend the Chinese or Indian mind or not, because they belong necessarily to it as the power and wisdom of God unto salvation to every one that believeth, whether European or Asiatic. We may better understand our own Gospel, if we now endeavour to observe the features we must insist on in our Foreign Missions. To the writer there seem to be at least three : the personality of God, the reality of sin, and the necessity of atonement.

(2) The ethical monotheism which is the basis of the Christian Gospel is the result of a long and often painful religious and moral discipline of the Hebrew nation. (i.) It has been said that the Semitic conception of the divine is *theocratic*, while the Aryan is *anthropomorphic* ; the Semite emphasizes the supremacy of the divine, its distinction from the human,

as the Aryan does not. While a natural tendency towards monotheism cannot be assumed in the Semitic race, and still less, even if it existed, could it be regarded as an adequate explanation of the ethical monotheism, yet it is significant that the people to whom so unique a religious and moral history was divinely appointed belonged to a race that emphasized the difference between God and man. The divine revelation that was progressively given to this people did not obliterate, but emphasized, this distinction not merely as between Creator and creature, Sovereign and subject, but above all Holy God and sinful man. The national discipline which was the historical condition of this divine revelation presents to us a far-reaching divine providence. The empires of the Ancient World are in turn used as instruments in God's hand for the fulfilment of His purpose with His people. This ethical monotheism in which the personality of God is emphasized, appears not as the religious peculiarity of this one people, but as the intended result of a progressive revelation. The Christian Church inherited it, and opposed it to the corrupt polytheisms of Greece and Rome. If any fault is to be found, it is that in contact with paganism the Church did not maintain this ethical monotheism with adequate rigour and vigour, and allowed polytheism to steal in again in the form of saint and angel worship. (ii.) For the unity of the Godhead it is not necessary now to contend; polytheism is once for all discredited for human thought. But the personality of the one God needs still to be maintained. The popular polytheism of India is accompanied by a speculative pantheism; and it is sometimes urged that from this Christian theology has much to learn, and that in India at least the Gospel might be transferred from its monotheistic to this pantheistic basis. In making this contention the following consideration should be insisted on. *First of all*, pantheism is tolerant of poly-

theism ; if all is God, and God is all, plant, tree, stone, bird, beast, as divine, may be so worshipped. If the speculative pantheism is compromised with, the popular polytheism will not be conquered. *Secondly*, this polytheism meets a religious need that the pantheism does not, even the need of personality in the object of worship. Man craves mind, heart, will, responsive to his appeal, in God. The polytheism that meets this need can be got rid of only as the one God in, over, through all, is recognized as personal. *Thirdly*, this speculative pantheism obliterates moral distinctions ; if God alone is, and everything is God, vice is as divine as virtue, sin has no meaning, and goodness no worth. Those familiar with Hindu life have testified that this is no theoretical objection, but a practical difficulty. It is difficult to convict the Hindu conscience of guilt. *Fourthly*, this speculative pantheism fosters a type of piety which must be condemned. By meditation to reach the consciousness *tat twam asi*, that art thou, the absorption of the human in the divine, this is Hindu saintship. Can that inspire a progressive Christian culture or civilization ? Is it not the negation of thought, work, life itself ? India, to give it spiritual vitality and moral vigour, needs the ethical monotheism.

(3) This ethical monotheism, which affirmed the perfect personality of God, also deepened in men the sense of their sinfulness. The reality of sin is not a distinctive doctrine of the Christian Gospel ; it is presupposed rather than announced. But it is the intention of the Christian Gospel to make men more conscious of their weakness and unworthiness that they may more fully realize their need of the salvation offered. (i.) Confucius was a moralist who laid down great and worthy moral principles. If he gave the Golden Rule in a negative form, his illustrations of it show that he did not apply it only negatively. If he fell short of

Lao-tse's teaching not to return evil for evil, but good for evil, he at least forbade vengeance and insisted only on justice in return for evil. But he regarded man as by nature good, and his disciple, Mencius, still more emphasized this view; he believed that good government could bring about moral reform; he confused manners and morals, attaching to propriety of conduct an undue importance; and he put an arrest on moral progress. The influence of Confucius on China has been to make it exclusive, conceited, self-satisfied. The popular religion makes good fortune depend so much on the Hung-Schui, the Wind and Weather, that is, physical conditions, that the relation of character to circumstances is obscured. What China does need is moral quickening, the presentation of a moral ideal in the person of Jesus Christ which will bring home to it how narrow and low are its Confucian precepts. If China is to enter into the comity of the cultured and civilized nations, the commonplace morality that has marked it in its isolation will need to give place to something more exacting, and therefore more humbling to its pride. (ii.) In regard to India this is still more necessary. Religion there consecrates many moral abominations, lust, and cruelty. Its pantheism, as has already been observed, blunts its moral sensibility. Before it can be made morally better, it must be made to feel how morally bad it is. To suppose, as some seem to do, that the sense of sinfulness in Christian saintship is morbid, that the Hindu's moral indifference is something to be commended rather than rebuked, is surely to commit one of the gravest possible errors. History has shown conclusively that repentance is the first step towards reform, that there can be moral progress even in outward habits only as there is a growing moral sensitiveness as regards even the moral dispositions. If India is to take the place it may take among the nations of the earth, its conscience must be made more

acute and exacting ; it must be made to drink the bitter cup of penitence. (iii.) To narrow down sin to selfishness, to wrongs done to, or kindnesses withheld from, others, is to lower morality. A Gospel of social duty only is not the Gospel to be taken to the dark places of the earth. Men need to be convicted of sin in their relation to God, their indifference to, distrust of, and estrangement from, God must be brought home to their consciences as sin. The absolute demand of God's holy love, as Jesus Himself realized it, and as He imposes it on men, must be presented as well as the social obligations of one man to another. This conviction of the reality of sin may in many cases be wrought most effectively by the better life of the Christian missionary reflecting, however feebly, the moral glory of Christ, awaking new moral aspirations, and therefore showing men clearly the old moral failures. The Gospel must convict of sin that it may convert to God.

(4) If, on the one hand, the Gospel presents the holy God, and on the other the sinful man, it will reinforce, it does not need for the first time to evoke, the consciousness of the necessity of atonement. (i.) A common feature of the religions of the world is sacrifice ; if it cannot be affirmed confidently that in every religion sacrifice is thought of as atoning for sin, yet there are abounding instances of this conception of sacrifice. Cruel and corrupt as are many of the modes of sacrifice, superstitious as are many of the ideas connected with it, this feature of religion is too wide-spread and deep-rooted to be disregarded. Although ritual has been a substitute for righteousness and men have often thought that they could compound for their sins by their offerings, yet sacrifice does reveal a human necessity which has not found any permanent and adequate satisfaction apart from the Cross of Christ. For, as soon as conscience is developed, the insufficiency of the sacrifices is realized ; a broken and a

contrite heart, or an obedient will comes to be regarded as more acceptable unto God, and yet men feel how difficult it is for them to bring this offering. (ii.) While in presenting the Gospel the utmost care must be exercised in correcting the false and wrong views that generally attach to the institution of sacrifice, while, above all, the God and Father of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ must replace the greedy and the cruel gods, to whom sacrifice is usually offered, yet the promise of better things that is in the rite should not be disregarded; and a point of contact for the doctrine of the Cross can here be found. What man in his sacrifices has vainly tried to do, that God in His sacrifice has freely done, has presented Himself as propitious, and has reconciled men to Himself. To lay emphasis on the cost of this salvation, the sorrow, shame, and suffering of God's only-begotten and well-beloved Son, will quicken conscience with a sense of the exceeding sinfulness of sin, as well as assure the heart of the greatness of the love of God. Probably those in whose religious life sacrifice has had a place constantly will not find the same difficulty in apprehending the necessity of atonement as some Christian thinkers to-day feel; and if, as the history of the Christian Church shows, the religious revivals have followed a lifting-up of Christ Crucified, it may be argued that in heathen lands too it is the Cross which will prove the power and the wisdom of God unto salvation. Difficulties that thoughtful and serious men to-day feel about the doctrine of the atonement should not be allowed to stand in the way of the Cross showing its saving efficacy in the foreign mission enterprise. Harnack has pointed out that animal sacrifices have ceased as the Gospel of the Cross has been preached and believed, and we may confidently expect the same results in future days. (iii.) It is not in any unsympathetic attitude towards the other religions of the world that it is here urged that in our foreign missions the

distinctive features of the Christian Gospel should be thus constantly and confidently maintained, but because it is certain for Christian faith that while God has never and nowhere left himself without witness, yet He has entrusted to the Church a revelation of His truth and grace in His dear Son which is as the sunlight to the moonlight of all other faiths ; He has treated humanity as one body, entrusting to its several members different functions, but each for the good of the whole body, and to the Christian peoples the function to make known the unsearchable riches of Christ to all mankind.

III.

(1) Jesus likened the Kingdom of God to the leaven as well as to the mustard seed ; He recognized its pervasive as well as expansive quality. We have been considering the restatement of the Gospel in its relation to the foreign missionary enterprise ; we must now turn to its leavening power in our society at home. (i.) One of the urgent calls on the Church to-day is for social reform. We are learning that human liberty is limited by heredity and environment ; that, therefore, moral character and religious disposition are affected by the inheritance society brings to, and the influence it wields on, the individual ; that the condition of society for weal or woe, for good or evil is determined by many factors, but one of the most potent is the economic organization. What may be without any exaggeration described as an industrial revolution took place at the beginning of last century, and society has not yet adjusted itself to this far-reaching change. Socially we are in the death-throe of an old, and the birth-pang of a new order. What is needed more than anything else is this, that the Spirit of God in the instruction and influence of the Christian Church should brood over the chaos, so that it may pass

into a cosmos. The Christian Church is now beginning to realize its social mission as well as individual message. The conception of the Kingdom of God is securing a recognition in Christian theology that it has never had before; the nature of the Christian salvation is being defined not so much in relation to individual gain as social good. It would seem that the Divine Providence in external history and in inward movements of the Spirit of God is presenting the opportunity and enforcing the obligation.

(ii.) The writer's personal experience of Christian work in the slums and mean streets of a great city has rooted deeply the conviction that this urgent call should find a more ready and hearty response than it has as yet received from our churches. There is not only what Dr. Paton, one of the noblest and most honoured leaders in the movement, has called the *social redemptive mission of the Church*—the relief of the misery, the comfort of the sorrow, the help of the need which our present social condition involves from the motive, by the method, and in the manner of the Cross of Jesus. There is also the holding of the keys of the kingdom by the Church, the binding and the loosing; that is the declaration of what is right and what is wrong in our social relations and our industrial organization. The Church is, as Dr. Forsyth has argued, the Moral Guide of Society. The Church is in the world not only for *mercy*, as exercised in this *social redemptive mission*, but also for *judgment*, in the exposition and enforcement of the Christian ideal in relation to the sad and hard and evil conditions around us.

(iii.) It is felt by very many that if this call is to be obeyed, there must be a modification in our theological statements. If the Church is to be made to recognize its social obligations, it seems necessary to many that the conception both of divine grace and human faith should be so modified as to make clear that grace is the inspiration and faith is the recognition of a

ministry of succour, comfort, help to others. As the evangelical interpretation of the Cross of Christ contains all that is needful to enforce this social obligation, we need not look elsewhere for power and guidance in this task. Let us consider the elements in the Christian Gospel which in this connexion need to be emphasized.

(2) The Cross of Christ, if we first of all fix our regard on the spirit and the purpose of the Crucified, is the supreme instance in human history of the sacrifice of self. (i.) The mind that was in Christ was this : though He was in the form of God, yet He did not regard it as a prize to be snatched, or to be held fast, to be on an equality with God, but He emptied Himself, and humbled Himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the Cross. This was the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, that though He was rich, yet for our sakes He became poor. As Gethsemane and Calvary show, He was willing to surrender what was the highest good, the joy of His Father's presence. More even He, the Son of God, could not offer ; His was love unto self-sacrifice to the uttermost. (ii.) This perfection of the character of Jesus has sometimes found clearer recognition and closer imitation in those who have been estranged doctrinally from evangelicism ; and it is to be confessed with shame and sadness that many who gloried in the Cross as the means of their individual salvation have not gloried in the Cross as the power that crucified them to the world, and the world unto them. Faith is the apprehension, the appreciation, and the appropriation of the grace of Christ. It can, therefore, receive and respond to the sacrifice of Christ only in such a surrender to Him as will enforce and enable any sacrifice for others that His will to save others may require. The salvation that is by sacrifice is necessarily unto sacrifice. He for whom Christ is crucified must also be crucified with Christ. It is surely time that we stopped cheapening sal-

vation and so vulgarizing the Gospel of the grace of God, if with a popular revivalism we have been overdoing it before. Only he who has the spirit of Christ is Christ's; only he is saved, who is delivered from selfishness, who by grace has ceased to care for his individual gain, and seeks only the common good. When Paul declared that he was willing to be *anathema* from Christ for his brethren's sake, his kinsmen according to the flesh, the wish itself made the fulfilment impossible; the willingness to surrender, if need be, for the sake of others the Christian salvation made him most thoroughly secure. (iii.) This spirit is not a luxury to be enjoyed by the few elect saints; it is an obligation which rests on all. No man has a right to claim that he is saved unless he is growing daily in the life of the Cross. That does not mean any arbitrary or artificial asceticisms; the sad countenance and the disfigured face, that they may be seen of men to fast, is the ostentation of the Pharisee which Christ condemns. But it does mean a willingness to give up any worldly goods or selfish gains which hinder the whole-hearted and single-minded surrender of self to the cause of Christ, the Kingdom of God on earth. Why do so many sympathetic yet discerning observers declare that we are not ripe for socialism? Because the spirit that so aggravates the evils of the competitive phase of our industrial organization, the spirit of greed and pleasure and pride—in a word, of selfishness—has not been exorcised, and there is not enough unselfishness to make even a restricted experiment of collectivism practical. Whether socialism be the remedy for our social disorder or not, this is certain, that no better order than the present can be reached until the Church of Christ be baptized with the Eternal Spirit in which Christ offered Himself on the Cross.

(3) Let us look a little more closely still at the spirit of the Cross. Wherein lay for Christ the *sacrifice of self*? We can

answer in one phrase, *substitution for others*. (i.) He became poor, though Himself rich, that the poor might be made rich. He who knew no sin was made sin that the sinful might be made the righteousness of God in Him. He became a curse that He might redeem men from the curse. In a word, He exchanged with men. He took our lot ; He gave us His life. This truth of substitution has often been so misrepresented, that it seems needful to define very carefully what we mean by it. It means no legal fiction, but a real experience. It does not mean that Jesus was regarded by God, or regarded Himself, as guilty ; it does not mean that the wrath of God as a personal feeling rested upon Him, or that He ever felt that God was angry with Him ; it does not mean that He was punished, and knew Himself to be punished instead of man. The sinless and beloved Son of God could not, and did not, experience any of these things. It is inexcusable and intolerable that evangelicalism should be so caricatured, and that the crudities of the street-corner preacher should be attributed to the trained theologian. This substitution for others does not mean only that Jesus endured the outward pains and woes which living in a sinful world involved, that He submitted to death as the event that cometh to all. This substitution for others involved such an identification of Himself with others that He experienced as His very own the struggle, the sorrow, the shame, the darkness, the desolation, the despair with which sin invests both life and death ; and His experience was so much more intense as He in moral conscience and religious consciousness transcended man. (ii.) The sacrifice of self to which Christians are called in this work of social reform involves for them also *substitution for others*. This problem will not be solved by our gifts unless we also give ourselves. The West End cannot by its subscriptions to societies, by its philanthropy by proxy, save the East End. Nothing so hinders the redemp-

tion of society as the separation of classes, the distance between those who need help, and those who can help. It is only at close quarters that these evils can be gripped and grappled with. Reading will not give the clear and full knowledge that living among the poor and the outcast does. The heart cannot be so touched and moved by the printed page as by the living epistles of sorrow and shame when we read them for ourselves by personal contact. Accordingly the will cannot be stimulated to energy in succour and service unless the need and the peril of the brother man make their direct appeal. An American humorist has said that the Golden Rule means, Be the other fellow. How much charity is stupid, cruel, and hurtful because the giver has not through love lived himself into oneness of feeling and wish with the recipient. University settlements are a practical application of this principle of substitution for others. But how numerous and manifold must the applications of the principle be before it makes itself felt to be a potent factor in the salvation of society ! The strong must bear the burdens of the weak, but not at a distance, nor yet on the helpful hand only, but also and above all on the tender heart. We may surely commend and confirm this necessary method of doing good by making clear to men that it is an essential element in the sacrifice, through which comes their salvation.

(4) But we must press our question further. Why was the *sacrifice of self in substitution for others* necessary in the Cross of Christ ? The unhesitating answer must be, because both the outward testimony of the Scriptures and the inward witness of conscience alike demand it. It was for the *satisfaction of righteousness*. (i.) It was not an angry God, who had to be appeased ; *modern evangelicalism* holds no such opinion. It was not even moral law that had to be vindicated or a moral order that had to be maintained, although

these views have been more recently advocated, and have in them truth, though abstractly. It was a Holy Father who, in restoring sinful mankind to Himself though His forgiveness, made plain beyond doubt, or denial, or question, His judgment of the sins He forgave. The *sacrifice of self* in Jesus culminated, the *substitution of Himself for others* was completed, in the tasting death for every man, *for the satisfaction of righteousness* in His submission to the moral order which conjoins sin and death, not as physical dissolution merely, but as separation from the light, the life and the love of God. The Son here in obeying revealed the Father ; He approved by endorsing this divine condemnation of sin. This truth cannot be proved by a logical demonstration; Jesus learned the necessity of His death as a moral intuition. It was upon His knees in prayer He said, " If this cup may not pass from me, Thy will be done." Our consciences must respond to this moral intuition of Jesus, and our forgiveness will mean so much more to us, because we know that in the Cross there is *satisfaction of righteousness*. Not only is the moral order maintained, but the holy love of God in Christ judges the sin it forgives. It satisfies conscience, that this holy love of God is on the Cross satisfied. (ii.) Can this aspect of the Cross be transferred to the task of social reform ? It is certain that the better order will not come unless this is fully recognized. We condemn the existing social order, not merely because it causes misery, but because it contradicts justice ; we advocate reform not in the name of pity only, but of righteousness. To make our protest and our plea more effective we must appeal to conscience as well as to compassion. Sweating is bad for the sweater as well as the sweated ; we want to save the sweater from the wrong he does, as the sweated from the wrong they suffer. We want to rescue Dives from his future torments as well as Lazarus from his present afflictions. From the standpoint

of Jesus worse is the condition of the oppressor than of the oppressed, of the defrauding rich than of the defrauded poor ; for sin is worse than sorrow, and wrong than misery. Should we not be as desirous of making society just as of showing it kind ? It is this that those who know and feel the evils of our present state desire. "Curse your charity, we want justice," may be a very rude expression of a very bad mood. But we have much to learn from it. A just state will be a kind state ; and righteousness will not err in its compassion. (iii.) Not only in society as a whole, but in the individuals we seek to help, we ought to aim at the satisfaction of righteousness. We are to put ourselves in the position of others, so as to realize their miseries and wrongs, but we are not bound to look on these as they look on these, or give them just the relief they may want. We are to do for them what will be for their highest good ; we must always seek to improve their character as well as relieve their necessities, and we must therefore relieve their necessities in such a way as will not injure their character. We give ourselves in putting ourselves in the place of others that they may give themselves to God. Social Reform needs for its motive, method, and purpose the Cross.

ALFRED E. GARVIE.

NOTES ON CHRISTIAN HISTORY IN ASIA MINOR.

I. THE PERSECUTIONS OF PAUL IN ICONIUM AND IN PISIDIAN ANTIOCH.

THE character and spirit of those two cities differed as much as their constitutions. Iconium was a Hellenic city, inheriting almost unchanged the traditions of Hellenistic time. It was, indeed, strongly Roman in feeling, and enthusiastically loyal to the Empire. It fully deserved the name "Claudian Iconium," which was bestowed on it