

# THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

---

## Notes of Recent Exposition.

THREE articles in appreciation of W. T. STEAD are published in the May number of *The Contemporary Review*. One is written by Mrs. FAWCETT, one by Professor SCOTT HOLLAND, and one by Mr. E. T. COOK.

Professor SCOTT HOLLAND says: 'He was a most lovable man. He had something of the child about him, which drew and endeared. I recall the old days of Bulgarian atrocities, in which he and Liddon struck up their surprising friendship. I think of his confiding to Liddon, on a drive to Dunkeld, that he had learned more from John Knox than he had ever got out of St. Paul. "Indeed, dear friend; that, I confess, has not been my own experience," came the answer, in Liddon's softest tones.'

Mr. COOK, among other things, says: 'As I close these remarks, a letter reaches me, in which a friend of his recites a recent conversation. "When my work is done," he said, "I shall die a violent death." "How do you know?" "I cannot tell; but I have had a vision, and I know that it will be true, as surely as that I am talking to you." It is unlikely that we shall ever be told how he died; but those who knew him will be in no doubt. He must have faced his doom unflinchingly; for he knew no fear, and he did not believe that death meant separation. And, if

occasion arose, he must have comforted and strengthened any weaker brother within his reach. It was what he was doing all his life.'

From Mrs. FAWCETT's article we wish to quote several paragraphs. But let one paragraph precede them. It is from the *Life of Cardinal Manning* (vol. ii. p. 653): 'It is with diffidence and shrinking of heart that I venture, as I needs must, to touch upon an episode in Cardinal Manning's life which every man of right mind cannot but recall with infinite regret. Himself of stainless purity of life and thought, it never entered into his imagination to conceive the grossness of the methods pursued, under the pretext of purging the streets of London and its sin-spots from their moral foulness and impurities, by a pseudo-apostle of purity. Even good motives do not suffice to atone for methods so atrocious. Deluded, deceived by a sensational journalist's gross imaginings; accepting as true, horrid and harrowing tales of lust and cruelty which turned out in the main to be the product of a foul imagination running riot, Cardinal Manning gave his countenance and confidence to a man, whose name shall not defile even this unhappy page in the life of an austere and holy prelate. Even after the offender against the law of man as well as against the Divine Law was condemned to purge his rank offence in gaol, Cardinal Manning, in his strange infatuation, kept

up communication and correspondence with the evil-doer, still regarded him as a martyr to the cause of public purity.'

Now for Mrs. FAWCETT—and we shall not weaken her words by a syllable of comment: 'All who care for justice to women and who desire to see the law and its administration make sure that, as far as possible, the world shall be a place of happiness and safety for children, have lost a stalwart friend in the death of W. T. STEAD, who went down, on April 15th, with the *Titanic*.

'I first became aware of a new note in journalism—at any rate in London journalism—in the early 'eighties. Here was some one writing with a pen touched with fire about the things that really mattered—clean living, and the protection of children from the deepest of wrongs; and the pen did not give the impression of being guided by sentimentalism; it was evidently wielded by a man who had made a careful study of facts, and was prepared to give battle to defend the right. I do not think I ever heard his name till everybody heard it in 1885, when all London—and, indeed, all the world—rang with the shameless and cruel traffic for immoral purposes in little children, exposed for the first time in the *Pall Mall Gazette*.

'This traffic could have been, and ought to have been, stopped by law; but the Bill dealing adequately with these horrors, though it had been passed more than once through the House of Lords, had been, session after session, talked out, counted out, and blocked in the House of Commons. It was counted out no more after Mr. STEAD had carried out his plan of insisting that all the world should know that these devilish things were of common everyday occurrence in a so-called Christian country. When he undertook his chivalric campaign, the age of consent in Christian England was thirteen; little children of thirteen could therefore legally consent to their own ruin, and no legal redress could be obtained from those who were worse than murderers. Many other

offences of the deepest villainy were unrecognized as such by the law, and therefore were liable to no legal punishment.

'All this was changed by the action which Mr. STEAD took. He was blamed for his sensationalism, for his want of good taste. But he knew what he was doing, and his training as a journalist told him that in order to rouse the torpid conscience of the House of Commons, shock tactics were necessary. I remember well his personal description of how he had been worked up to take the action which he did take. As a young man he had been greatly influenced by Mrs. Josephine Butler and her great crusade against the immoral Contagious Diseases Acts.

'It was Mrs. Josephine Butler who came to him with her heart-rending story, drawn from facts in her own experience, of the sale and purchase of young children in London for the purposes of immorality. Stead felt her message as a call for personal service. "Whereupon, O King Agrippa, I was not disobedient unto the Heavenly vision," he might have said—the Heavenly vision of trying to get God's will done on earth as it is in Heaven. But though he was full of the spirit which leads to personal service, he was careful and cautious in regard to facts. He felt he must make the groundwork of positive knowledge firm beneath his feet. He went, therefore, with his story, Mrs. Butler's story, to Sir Howard Vincent, then Head of the Criminal Investigation Department. "Just tell me," he said, "are such things possible?" The reply was: "They are not only possible, they are of common occurrence." Stead broke in, "It ought to rouse hell!" and Sir Howard rejoined, "It does not even rouse the neighbours."

'Stead determined it should rouse the neighbours and the whole country, and through them the miserable indifference of the House of Commons to villainy which was contaminating the life-blood of the nation at its source. He made a plan for the fictitious, but apparently real, sale of a child,

safeguarding himself and her at every stage by the presence of trustworthy witnesses of his *bona fides*. He also took into his confidence beforehand the Archbishop of Canterbury, Cardinal Manning, and other high ecclesiastics. He then spread broadcast in the columns of the *Pall Mall Gazette*, of which he was the Editor, the whole story. He accomplished what he set out to accomplish. The House of Commons boggled no more over the Criminal Law Amendment Bill; there were no more counts out and talks out of that long-delayed measure. The sons of Belial did what they could in the House to minimize its stringency, but they were no longer masters of the situation, and the Act which was finally passed was an enormous improvement on anything which up to that time had found a place in the Statute Book.

‘The enemy furiously raged together, and going over the whole of STEAD’S story told by himself with the utmost circumstance and publicity, discovered a joint in his armour of precautions, and that he had actually, in his crusade, committed a technical breach of the law. A grateful country sentenced him to three months’ imprisonment as an ordinary criminal. But he was almost immediately made a first-class misdemeanant, and went on editing the *Pall Mall Gazette* from his cell in Holloway.

‘It is pleasant to read’—thus Mrs. FAWCETT ends her article—‘it is pleasant to read what every one is saying of him now; that to him death was but the passage from one room to another of his Father’s house; that it was quite certain that he would be among the last to leave the ship, that among the tragic uncertainties of this tragic event there was, at any rate, one positive certainty, and that was that he would never seek his own safety at the cost of others, but would die, as he had lived, heroically. No one pretends that he was faultless; but he had a great and generous heart, a boundless and intense vitality, and the spontaneous desire everywhere and always to protect

and cherish the weak. We may be thankful for his life. “We are a nation yet,” as long as we can breed such men as he was.’

---

A volume of *Studies in the Development of Judaism and Early Christianity* has been published by Mr. Edward Arnold, under the title of *The Parting of the Roads* (10s. 6d. net). The volume has been edited by Dr. F. J. FOAKES JACKSON, Fellow and Dean of Jesus College, Cambridge; and the essays it contains have all been written by members of the same College. It is therefore a witness to the important place that the study of theology still retains in a Cambridge College. It is at the same time an agreeable testimony to the vitality of the teaching and influence of its Dean.

The Introduction has been written by the Dean of St. Paul’s, and it is of the Introduction that we have something to say. But as these notes must serve for a review of the book, let us glance at the other essays first and at least give their titles and their authors’ names.

---

Dr. FOAKES JACKSON himself tells the fascinating story of ‘How the Old Testament came into Being.’ The essay is not a mere re-statement of the results of recent Old Testament criticism. There are elements in it that are new, and some that may be disputed. ‘That Abraham was originally a native of Ur Chasdim (Ur of the Chaldees) may well be a historical fact; but at the same time the prominence given to the circumstances that he left the country never to return, and that this was the proof of his obedience to the Divine call, suggests that, when the prelude to the Law was compiled, the ancestral home of the patriarch was the centre of idolatry, which he forsook because the true God could not rightly be served there. The way in which Abraham enjoined his servant Eliezer never to permit his son to go back to Mesopotamia, lends additional plausibility to this theory. I am disposed, there-

fore, to believe that the compilation of the Book of Genesis is part of the great polemic against idolatry, which resulted in the promulgation of the Priestly Law.'

The Third essay (for Dr. INGE's Introduction is reckoned as one) has been written by the Chaplain of the College, the Rev. Richard Thomas HOWARD, M.A. Its subject is 'The Devotional Value of the Old Testament.' This is another and better way of asking, What is the authority which after criticism the Old Testament carries? The conclusion which Mr. HOWARD comes to is that in the ordinary sense of the word the Old Testament carries no authority whatever. And if you ask him what is the use of it then, he answers that there are six most precious uses to which it may be put. We may learn the nature of God from it; we may by the reading of it appropriate to ourselves the religious experience of the saints; we may be brought by it into communion with God; it may serve as a practical guide to life and morals; it may be of use for the instruction of children and the ignorant; and it may even lead men to Christ—though rarely,—or at least—and this quite commonly—it may teach men to know Christ better.

The title of the fourth essay is 'Judaism in the Days of the Christ.' Its author is Dr. W. O. E. OESTERLEY, who starts at once by showing us that the Judaism into which our Lord was born was definitely marked by two tendencies, one Palestinian, the other Hellenistic. Palestinian Judaism was a religion of law; Hellenistic Judaism was a religion of hope. Both tendencies are apparent in the Gospels. Christ accepted the law as a whole, although He was occasionally critical towards it and sometimes directly antagonistic. The religion of hope, which found its outward expression in the Apocalyptic literature, was adopted by Christ as the basis of His teaching. At the present time it is to this religion of hope in the Gospels, or what is called their Eschatology, that attention is almost entirely directed. Its difficulties are very great. Dr. OESTERLEY does not think that we can remove

them without further light. But he seems to be convinced that we are not bound to admit that Christ was mistaken in His thoughts about the future. It is better to say that our witnesses misunderstood and misrepresented Him.

Perhaps the most difficult of all the essays, and perhaps the most successful, is the fifth, written by Mr. H. G. WOOD, M.A. For Mr. WOOD's title is 'Some Characteristics of the Synoptic Writers.' And the difficulty with such a subject is simply to say anything that has not been well said already. It is, however, necessary that we should hear the latest word even on a well-worked theme; and Mr. WOOD has the additional interest of a phraseology that clings. He speaks of the 'pessimistic Judaism' of St. Matthew, and the 'sanguine Universalism' of St. Luke.

The Rev. W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE, M.A., writes the sixth essay on 'St. Peter and the Twelve.' The title is not to be taken as if the discovery had been made that St. Peter was not one of the Twelve. Nor is Mr. CLARKE a Roman Catholic to separate St. Peter from the rest of the Apostles and compel them to do obeisance after the manner of Joseph and his brethren. When he says St. Peter and the Twelve he simply means that he is going to write the history of the Twelve, and especially the history of St. Peter.

Four essays remain. It is enough to name them. Mr. George Bertram REDMAN, B.A., writes on 'The Theology of St. Paul'; Mr. Bertram Tom Dean SMITH, M.A., on 'The Johannine Theology'; Mr. Ephraïm LEVINE, B.A., on 'The Breach between Judaism and Christianity'; and Mr. Percival Gardner SMITH, B.A., on 'Revelation.'

A word on Mr. LEVINE's essay. Mr. LEVINE is a Jew. The editor tells us that he is an orthodox Jew and seems drawn towards the ministry of the Synagogue. His contribution to *The Parting of the Roads*, says Dr. FOAKES

JACKSON, 'is valuable as giving us a Jewish view of the matter.'

Mr. LEVINE's contribution is certainly brimful of interest. In dealing with the breach between Judaism and Christianity, a Jew of the present day is pretty sure to resent the picture of the Pharisees presented in the Gospels. But Mr. LEVINE is not unreasonably resentful. 'The Pharisees,' he says, 'whose purpose and aims have, I venture to think, been entirely misrepresented by many, were engaged in the further development of the faith of Israel. The Gospel statements and the evidence of the sources do not justify the condemnation of a body of God-fearing men for the misconceptions of individuals. Pharisee ought never to be used as synonymous with hypocrite.'

But Mr. LEVINE passes to much more doubtful ground than this. He declares emphatically that the death of Jesus was due to the Romans, and that the Jews had nothing to do with it. Perhaps it is not out of place to assure him that Englishmen have no desire now, however it may have been in the past, to lay the burden of this great guilt upon the Jews. They would rejoice unfeignedly if he could prove that the Jews never said, 'His blood be on us and on our children.' But it is not possible to accept his arguments as sufficient. There are many objections, he says, to any attribution of the death of Jesus to the Jews, but he names only three. First, there is the objection that crucifixion was not a Jewish but a Roman mode of execution; second, that a threefold execution at one time is doubtful; and third, that an execution on the Friday or on the day before Passover would be most unlikely. That is all, and in the face of the testimony of the Gospels, that is not enough to make out even a good case for investigation.

Now let us return to the introductory essay. It is written, as we have said, by the Rev. WILLIAM RALPH INGE, D.D., Dean of St. Paul's and Hon.

Fellow of Jesus College. It has no title, for the same reason, we suppose, as John Wesley's parish had no name. Its subject is Christianity. But a volume of University essays must not be too discursive, nor must it say over again, however cleverly, what has been said before. It must mark progress, and it must make it. Dr. INGE recognizes the obligation.

Its subject is Christianity, and the first question is, Where did Christianity come from? The ordinary answer is that it came out of Judaism. Dr. INGE at once denies the sufficiency of that answer, and even seems to deny that there is anything in it. Christianity could not have come out of Judaism, for the simple reason 'that the cradle of our faith was not Judæa but Galilee, and that the Galileans had probably hardly a drop of Jewish blood in their veins.'

But there is another reason why Christianity could not have sprung from Judaism. Christianity is a religion, Judaism is not. What does he say? Judaism is not a religion? He says so. He knows how often it has been asserted that the Jews had a unique genius for religion, but he does not believe a word of it. There was one thing that they had a unique genius for: that thing was patriotism. 'Fanatical, indeed almost insane, patriotism was the dominant passion of the average Jew.' And so when the ancient Hebrews adopted Jehovah as their God, they fiercely declared that He was the only real God upon earth, simply because, as in the words of Philo, the Jew was the only real man. It was their patriotism, therefore, says the Dean of St. Paul's, that led the Jews into monotheism. For it was their patriotism that gave them any religion they ever had. With them patriotism and religion were in truth indistinguishable. And so whatever blessing they looked for in the future, it was always a blessing upon earth, not in heaven. There might be something of an ideal in it—the future must always be more or less idealistic—but whatever the future should bring forth to the Jews,

it must be recognized as among the good things of this present material world.

But surely the Jews had some consciousness of sin, and where there is consciousness of sin, how can there fail to be real religion? Dr. INGE does not believe that their consciousness of sin was of much account. 'As a learned Jew once told me, persons of his faith are never encouraged to "worry about their sins" (in Sir Oliver Lodge's phrase); with them the one and only requisite is to "turn to the Lord." In other words, conversion of the will is enough; by-gones may be by-gones.' And even their consciousness of sin, he says, was usually awakened by national calamity. When the political horizon was bright their conscience was at rest. When the political horizon looked very black indeed, it behoved every patriotic Jew to omit no precaution, no minutest detail of pious observance, if so be that the wrath of God might be turned away. And thus it came to pass that the religion of the Jews was not only confined to this world, but was also limited to legal observance.

Where, then, did Christianity come from? There is another possible source. It is the religion of the Greeks. Were the Greeks more religious than the Jews? Dean INGE seems to think that they were, and yet he does not deny the truth of the current conception of Greek religion. The contrast, he says, between the Hellenic and Hebraic views of life has been drawn out by many since Matthew Arnold. 'The difference is indeed striking between the narrow and fierce absorption of the Jew in the fortunes of his nation, his indifference to all but concrete tangible marks of Divine favour, his intense will-power and defective æsthetic sensibility, and (on the other side) the genial, open-minded mentality of the Greek, full of curiosity and enjoyment of nature, an artist to his finger-tips, as the Japanese, and no other nation, are to-day; whose religion was a poetical and symbolical mythology; who lived in a present which he loved to enjoy and

ardently desired to understand; who, like a child, craved only to see all that is to be seen of this wonderful world and the spiritual mysteries which may lie behind it; whose intellect was so much more developed than his will, that he sincerely believed that to see the truth was to possess it, vice being only ignorance and virtue knowledge; and whose sense of the finer values of life was so keen that he frankly despised unnecessary apparatus, and lived a hardier and healthier life than any civilized race has lived before or since.'

Is this the religion that is the true ancestor of Christianity? No, this is not the religion, and these are not the Greeks. Of these Greeks, the classical Greeks as we call them, few, if any, were left in the time of Christ. The race was all but extinct. It had been swamped in the mongrel horde with which the Roman Empire was filling its Eastern provinces. But as the ancient Greek race died it gave birth to Hellenism. As the classical Greek age passed away, the Hellenistic age came into existence; and when Dr. Inge says that Christianity owes more to the Greeks than to the Jews, he means that it owes more to the Hellenists than to the Hebrews.

For the paradise of the Hebrew was on earth; the paradise of the Hellenist was in heaven: and Christianity preferred the paradise of the Hellenist. The Greek conception of religion, at least in its later form, was a complex of three parts—ritualism, ethics, and mysticism—and Christianity accepted that complex. The Greek (by which he always means now the Hellenist) possessed a symbolical mythology. He possessed also a philosophy which tended more and more to become a strict ethical and devotional discipline, conducting the soul through purification to illumination, and through illumination to the beatific vision of God. Christianity took over both the mythology and the philosophy.

But now Dr. Inge seems to repent a little. He seems to fear that he has taken too much from

the Jew, and given too much to the Greek. Before the essay closes he brings the two races together. He places their religious peculiarities side by side. On the one side stands the Hebrew with his inveterate habit of forcing all ideas into the form of time. On the other side stands the Hellenist whose ideal world was exalted above time. How different, he says, from the Greek mysteries, with their promise of a blessed immortality to the initiated, is the Jewish dream of universal sovereignty over a transfigured earth, with Jerusalem as the world's capital. He now bids us consider these two racial types, utterly unlike each other, as they stand confronted—on the one side, 'Thy sons, O Zion,' on the other, 'Thy sons, O Greece.' And what he sees in the end is these two uniting and begetting 'that strangest product of time,' Catholic Christianity.

And he concludes by asking how it is possible for fire and water thus to coalesce. 'The deepest and truest answer is surely this, that the Divine Founder of Christianity was above the antithesis.' In Christ there is *both Jew and Greek*.

The question of miracles is always with us. Men grow impatient regarding it, but they cannot get rid of it. There is no denying, and there is no longer any possibility of ignoring, the fact that it is simply the miracles that make the difference between the believer in Christ and the unbeliever. The one asserts that not to believe in the resurrection of Christ from the dead is not to believe in Christ. The other answers that resurrection from the dead is a physical impossibility. Thus the gulf is fixed, and no one seems able to discover a way of bridging it.

The Rev. J. H. SKRINE has discovered a way. He has been driven to a reconsideration of the subject of miracle 'through the occurrence recently of a practical incident' in the Church of England. The reference, no doubt, is to the startling outcome of the Rev. J. H. THOMPSON'S book on *Miracles in the New Testament*. He

starts with the word miracle itself. Antagonists, he says, in order to find a common resting-ground, have resorted to the dictionary. He resorts to the dictionary also. But he does not open the English dictionary. He does not transcribe the ordinary English definition, that a miracle is an occurrence which is not in agreement with the known laws of nature. He opens a Latin dictionary, 'the more elementary the better.' He opens at the word *miraculum*. He finds that *miraculum* is defined as a thing which makes us wonder. That definition of miracle he accepts.

A miracle is a thing which makes us wonder. But what is wonder? It is not the same as surprise. An object that is simply new may excite surprise. A horse which shies at meeting a novel instrument of transport has an emotion of surprise; for animals are as susceptible to surprise as men. But the Chinaman who met the first railway engine in China experienced more than surprise. He experienced wonder; because the thing which he met was mightier than man and all his works. His wonder was a movement of the whole man in response to the stimulus of a thing too great for him. His mind recognized something beyond its compass, his heart felt the throb of fear, his will addressed itself for self-protection.

Now when a Christian receives on his soul the effect of miracle, his feeling is a feeling of wonder. And this wonder is the response of his whole nature to the stimulus of the new, which is greater than he is. It stimulates his thought, and he answers as did the subject of the first Christian miracle, 'How shall this be?' It stimulates his emotions. He seeks to 'love the appearing' of the Divine One who is the agent. It stimulates his will, and he utters the 'Be it unto me according to thy word.' Thus to believe a miracle is to respond to the wonder of it with the whole personality.

Here, then, is the critical moment in the problem of the miraculous. The wonder is before our

eyes—the wonder of the Virgin Birth, or the wonder of the rising from the dead. What response do we make to it? If we repel it, we determine to remain impervious to the intrusion of that which is greater than nature; we refuse communion with the Divine. But if we welcome it, the movement of wonder ends in an act of self-surrender, self-surrender to the new-found greatness in the world which encompasses the soul—and wonder has passed into Faith.

Now as wonder is greater than surprise, so faith is greater than wonder. For wonder may dwindle into incuriousness, it may smoulder to extinction; but, on the other hand, it may grow into conviction, it may flame into life. Then faith comes, and faith remains. And thus faith and unfaith are the respective issues of a miracle, the alternatives of response or refusal of response to the stimulus of a fact which presents itself as the wonderful. Mr. SKRINE claims that this account of the function of miracle in religion differs essentially from the account usually given, that miracle causes belief by operating a breach of natural law and thereby giving evidence that the greater than law is here. 'Our account,' he says, 'differs from this, not by contradicting but by comprehending it; differs from it as the whole differs from a part. We say that miracle proves truth, not by imparting knowledge to the understanding, but by pricking the personality into life.'

Mr. SKRINE then applies this function of miracle to the two most momentous miracles of the New Testament—the Incarnation (or more particularly the Virgin Birth) of our Lord, and His Resurrection from the dead. Accordingly, while the title of his book is *Miracle and History*, the sub-title is 'A Study of the Virgin Birth and the Resurrection' (Longmans; 1s. net).

On both miracles Mr. SKRINE has something new to say. Take the Incarnation first. He finds that the word Incarnation is almost invariably used as if it were another name for the Nativity. The

Incarnation is supposed to have taken place when Mary gave birth to her Babe, or rather, when she accepted at the Annunciation the action on her of the 'power of the Highest.' But the word has another meaning than that. That is the historic Incarnation. There is also, however, an Incarnation which is timeless. There is a current of Divine action which is always passing along the plane of human existence, and always making for the reconciliation of God and man. Just as in the inanimate world we have the law of Gravitation, and in the animate world the law of Evolution, so in the world of personal existence we have the law of Incarnation.

Now when the Incarnation of the Son of God took place, by His birth of the Virgin Mary, there took place simply one act of that law of Incarnation which is perpetually going on in the world, just as the falling of an apple is one act of the law of gravitation. And so just as the falling of an apple does not contradict but exemplifies the law of gravitation, and therefore is no miracle in the usual English-dictionary meaning of that word, so the Incarnation of Christ is no miracle in that sense. But in the other sense it is a miracle indeed. For it is a cause of unceasing wonder. And through the sense of wonder it works upon the human personality, upon the thoughts, the emotions, and the will of man, until he surrenders to the almightiness of it and responds with saving Faith.

Mr. SKRINE does not mean that every single act of incarnation, that is to say, of reconciliation between God and man, of entrance of God into the life of man and of man into the life of God, must have this result. The wonder of this act is in the greatness of it. And the greatness of it is due to the greatness of Him who became incarnate. In what does His greatness consist?

It consists in this, that while He is a man, He is not any man, but all of Man. Mr. SKRINE does not mean that Jesus exhibited all the varieties of

human character and fortune\* in His one brief existence. He was not all men in that sense. But He was all manhood in the sense of being in His life's action that which humanity in its essence and perfection is. For in its essence and perfection humanity is the creature of God, realizing wholly the Creator's will, and becoming the thing which God meant when He said, 'Let there be man.' And this is the person that the Christian believes Jesus to have been.

Jesus became what the Creator meant when He said, 'Let us make man,' simply because He realized to the full the Creator's will. And how did He realize it? He realized it by making His life an unreserved sacrifice of self to the Father and to His fellow-men in the Father's name. In His action and in His suffering, from the cradle to the grave, not His will but God's was done. And this sacrifice was a sacrifice which God accepted. That also must be added. In Mr. SKRINE's words, 'The fire of the Lord fell, and answered the sacrificer's gift by a gift of the Eternal's Self.' Jesus was declared the Son of God with power by the resurrection from the dead. This is the object of wonder that ends in Faith. This is the Incarnation that is unique. The Son gave Himself to the Father in the fullness of self-surrender; the Father gave Himself to the Son in the fullness of loving communion.

And now we see the place and necessity of the Jesus of history. Incarnation, which is an eternal principle, is seen on the stage of history in Jesus Christ. Timeless, it enters into time in the Babe found in a manger. We are assured of the principle, when we look upon the fact. The law of gravitation was in existence before Newton saw the apple fall. The fall of the apple gave him experimental assurance of it. The Virgin Birth is no longer a miracle in the old sense of that word, but in the new sense of the word it is a miracle that leads to God.

The second great miracle in Christianity is the

Resurrection of Jesus from the dead. Mr. SKRINE, if we follow him, has already made the way open to an understanding of it. The Resurrection is part of the Incarnation. It is a phase, it is a moment, of that whole Divine action. Mr. SKRINE even places the Resurrection over against the Incarnation as if he held that it also was a timeless principle, the reality of which has been revealed in time by the great act of the Resurrection of Jesus from the dead. 'As there was a universal, spiritual, mystical Incarnation,' he says, 'a force by which God for ever and everywhere is drawing His creature Man into union with Himself, while there was also a particular historic Incarnation, an exhibition of that time-long, world-wide force in the actual union of the Divine nature with the human nature of one man Jesus—so is there a spiritual or eternal Resurrection, a force in things by which self-sacrifice causes Soul to live beyond the physical incident called death, and there is also a temporal historic Resurrection, an exhibition of that force once in time through the spectacle of what befell the soul of Jesus who by self-sacrifice lived through death, suffered as behoved the Christ, and entered into His glory.'

The tenet of an ideal or universal Resurrection is not a tenet of Christians only, any more than the tenet of an ideal Incarnation is exclusively theirs. What is specifically Christian is the historic survival of Jesus. It is the fact and not the law that is ours; not the reality of Incarnation or of Resurrection, but their assurance. 'We are not sure of the law that sacrifice makes life until we see it realized in the objective world. It was so realized when one man who was All of Man, did by His sacrifice live on through body's death. Then we learnt that the Spirit of Sacrifice, of which our simpler name is Love, not only is "Lord of All," but this one time was Lord in this one thing of All, the soul of Jesus and His fate. Love whom we had guessed to be strong as death was in a visible trial of strength proved stronger. Christ had loved utterly even unto death, and behold He is alive for evermore.'