
A table of contents for *The Expository Times* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[Issue]_[1st page of article].pdf

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

We are all at present for the love of God and none of us for His wrath. The very word is an offence to us. It is true that the Scripture tells us that God is angry with the wicked every day. It is true that the great theologian of the New Testament assures us that the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men who suppress the truth within them and go on indulging in their iniquities. But we have somewhat superseded St. Paul in these days. And theology is out of date.

We are altogether for God's love and nothing for His wrath. And yet we ourselves make much of wrath and little of love. For two reasons. One reason is that we find it hard to forgive ourselves when we see that we have really done wrong. 'Words which we spoke many years ago, and deeds of which we were guilty, but which have been long forgotten by those against whom they were done, still rankle in our memories and make us ashamed of ourselves.'

The other reason is that we find it very hard to forgive others. 'As we read the story of wrongs done to innocent women and children, of cruelties and barbarities unutterable, there bursts forth within us a burning indignation, a consuming fire of wrath against the guilty men. We demand punishment for the crimes; we will not listen to pleas of mercy; the earth, we argue, must be purged of such corruption.'

The Rev. George STEVEN, D.D., an up-to-date theologian, a preacher who all his life has made a point of keeping in touch with the times, discusses the wrath of God in a new book which he has written—*The Warp and the Woof* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s. net). His courageous purpose in the chapter on the Wrath of God is to find a place for the anger of God while not letting one beat be lost of His heart of love.

But first of all he disposes of the superficial explanation: 'God loves the sinner but hates the sin.' It is an explanation which has been offered recently by so eminent a person as the Bishop of Winchester, but it has been properly rejected as unintelligible to the mind of a man of the world like Sir Arthur CONAN DOYLE.

Not that Sir Arthur CONAN DOYLE is right—or half so right as the Bishop of Winchester. For while it is true, as Dr. STEVEN declares, 'that sin is not a thing in itself, which you can separate from the sinner, deal with and destroy, leaving him scatheless; while it is true that sin is a state of a man's mind, that it lies within a man's thought and heart and will'—while that is true, we must be ever on the watch lest we stretch that truth wide

enough to cover the personal hatred, the wilful or careless misrepresentation, the petty spite, with which the earnest advocate of some cause which he thinks indubitably right very often follows up the man upon the other side whom he believes of course to be indubitably wrong.

What are the disadvantages of such a disposition? Listen to the weighty words of Bishop Phillips BROOKS: 'First, it puts it absolutely out of the angry partisan's power, in case he is not wholly right, to get any advantage or correction from the opposite light in which his opponent sees the same transaction which he thinks so wrong. Second, it robs the furious hater of the chance to learn charity and personal consideration, for of course the chance to think tolerantly of a man who differs from us comes to us when we differ from him, and if, the moment that we differ from him, we begin to hate him, it is as if we shut up the door of one of our best school-rooms and turned the key of prejudice upon it. And, third, yet again it makes turbid and heavy and dull that stream of simple indignation against evil and love for righteousness which, when it is absolutely fresh and pure, is the most strong and persistent power in the world.'

'These,' says Bishop Phillips BROOKS, 'are the reasons why it is a sad loss when the fighter with wickedness turns his struggle against wickedness into angry attacks on men against whom perhaps their wickedness has first provoked him, but whom he has come now to hate for themselves. This was the spirit of our Lord's disciples when they wanted to call down fire on the village of Samaria. This was Luther's spirit when at Marburg he lost sight of the simple fight with error and plunged into a personal attack on Zwingle. It is the danger of all earnest men. It seems sometimes to be so inseparable from earnestness that the world thinks that it must not call it a vice to take any note of it in the earnest man. But no really earnest man can be so self-indulgent. Ever he must struggle to know who his true enemy is, and to fight finally with him alone. With wickedness we may be unmitigatedly indignant. We may hate it with all our hearts. Towards it there is no chance, there is no right, of indulgence or consideration. But with the wicked man, because he is both man and wickedness, we may be at once full of anger and full of love, and out of the spirit of the highest justice, both to him and to ourselves, insist always that it shall be the wickedness and not the man that we hate!'

'At once full of anger and full of love'—yes, that is the way it ought to be with us, for that is the way with God. Return to Dr. STEVEN. The wrath of God, says Dr. STEVEN, is simply the consuming fire of His love. 'The love of good men or women for their children, as every good man or woman knows, is not an easy-going, soft-hearted good-nature. It is not a pampering and defending and excusing of them in their faults and blunders and excesses. It is righteousness aglow with the fire of love. It is goodness in full activity in order to make their children good. Love never shrinks from causing pain to one who has done wrong; it speaks out firmly; it is sharper than a two-edged sword; it is not afraid of causing suffering, but only of leaving the root of evil in the wound. In all this, it suffers more pain than it causes, but it takes no account of the cost it may have to pay. Love will pay anything, endure anything, inflict anything, if only it can save the one beloved.'

So far is the love of God from driving out His wrath that the strength of the one within Him is in proportion to the strength of the other. We know it is so because of the revelation of God in Christ, and because of the experience that we have every day of the heart which God has given us. Says Dr. STEVEN: 'A man's wrath against sin is strongest against those whom he has trusted, and is at its fiercest against those whom he has loved and who have outraged him. The word wrath does not at all describe the feeling we have at the crime of an unknown man in a foreign land.

The crime of a son or a daughter stirs us to the very depths of our being. We feel the shame of it, perhaps the ingratitude of it, and there is also wrath. King Lear's indignation against his two daughters, to whom he has handed over all his power and wealth, but who turn him in his old age from their door out into the pitiless storm, is surely the utterance of the common heart of man:

I tax not you, you elements, with unkindness;
I never gave you kingdom, called you children,
You owe me no subscription; then let fall
Your horrible pleasure; here I stand, your slave,
A poor, infirm, weak, and depised old man:
But yet I call you servile ministers,
That have with two pernicious daughters join'd
Your high-engender'd battles 'gainst a head
So old and white as this. O! O! 'tis foul!

The Jewish Publication Society of America has issued a new translation of the Bible. The title is *The Holy Scriptures according to the Masoretic Text* (Philadelphia: Jew. Pub. Soc.). 'The Bible' means of course the Old Testament.

In 1892 a committee was formed. Its members were Dr. Marcus Jastrow, Dr. Joseph Krauskopf, and Dr. Cyrus Adler. The idea was to obtain the co-operation of Jewish scholars in Great Britain as well as America, and assign the different books to different translators.

But the method proved unworkable. A larger committee was formed, a committee of Editors (the word was preferred to Revisers), Dr. ADLER being Chairman, and Professor Max L. MARGOLIS Editor-in-Chief. Professor MARGOLIS made the translation and submitted it to the Board of Editors. 'Each point was thoroughly discussed, and the view of the majority was incorporated into the manuscript. When the Board was evenly divided, the Chairman cast the deciding vote.'

The new translation is really a revision. It is a revision of the Revised Version. And it is freely confessed to be. But there have been discoveries since 1885—archæological, philological, even geographical and grammatical discoveries—and all these discoveries have been made use of. Let us see.

In Gn 49^{10} A.V. and R.V. read 'until Shiloh come,' with R.V. margin 'till he come to Shiloh.' The New Version of the Jews reads 'as long as men come to Shiloh.' The question is at once raised: Have these Jewish translators deliberately set themselves to obliterate the traces of Messianic promise? We turn at once to the greatest prophecy of all—and we are satisfied. This is the rendering in the New Jewish Bible of Is 53^{4-6}:

Surely our diseases he did bear, and our pains he carried;
Whereas we did esteem him stricken,
Smitten of God, and afflicted.
But he was wounded because of our transgressions,
He was crushed because of our iniquities:
The chastisement of our welfare was upon him,
And with his stripes we were healed.
All we like sheep did go astray,
We turned every one to his own way;
And the LORD hath made to light on him
The iniquity of us all.

In 1 Sam 13^{21} we light upon a pretty example of the use of the new discoveries. 'All the versions hitherto published read: "Yet they had a file for the mattocks, and for the coulters, and for the forks, and for the axes, and to set the goads," or something to that effect. Even in a translation the difficulty of this verse is quite apparent. We are told in the preceding verses that "there was no smith found throughout all the land of Israel . . . but all the Israelites went down to the Philistines, to sharpen every man his share, and his coulter, and his axe, and his mattock." Now verse ^{21}, according to the old interpretation, flatly contradicts this statement. The textual difficulty in the Hebrew is still more baffling. The word

pim, which is not represented in the above translation, could not be satisfactorily explained. Fortunately a weight was discovered by Macalister in Palestine which bore the inscription *pim* in old Hebrew characters. Another weight was excavated bearing the inscription *beka*, and hence we know that *pim*, whatever its etymology, was the name of a weight. Judging by the weight of the pim stone its value is about two-thirds of a shekel. Accordingly, the new version renders: "And the price of filing was a pim for the mattocks, and for the coulters, and for the forks with three teeth, and for the axes; and to set the goads."'

In Job 8^{14} our Jewish scholars succeed rather cleverly in preserving the parallelism of Hebrew poetry. The R.V. reads:

Whose confidence shall break in sunder,
And whose trust is a spider's web.

From the cognate languages we learn that the word translated 'shall be cut off' may denote something flimsy. Accordingly the Jewish Revisers give us:

Whose confidence is gossamer,
And whose trust is a spider's web.

There are some striking changes in the Psalter. In Ps 8^{2}, 'who hast set thy glory above (R.V. upon) the heavens,' is rendered, 'whose majesty is rehearsed above the heavens'—for the word rendered 'hast set' can by no stretch of imagination be taken as second person. In Ps 17^{3} the R.V. reads: 'Thou hast tried me, and findest nothing; I am purposed that my mouth shall not transgress.' The new version:

Thou hast tested me, and Thou findest not
That I had a thought which should not pass my mouth.

That familiar but unintelligible sentence in Ps 119^{96}, 'I have seen an end of all perfection,' is rendered, 'I have seen an end to every purpose.'

The 'virtuous woman' of Pr 31^{10} becomes 'a woman of valour'—which sounds very modern. The puzzling verse, Ec 12^{11} (much used for children's addresses), is translated, 'The words of the wise are as goads, and as nails well fastened are those that are composed in collections; they are given from one shepherd.' The word rendered 'appear' in Song 4^{1} (A.V.) is rather dubious. 'R.V. bases itself on the Arabic meaning of that root: "Thy hair is as a flock of goats, that lie along the side of mount Gilead." But the words "along the side of" can hardly be derived from the original.' The new version has: 'That trail down from mount Gilead.'

All these changes are acceptable. But what is to be said of the change which the Jewish editors make in Is 8^{20}? The words are, 'To the law and to the testimony,' and R.V. adds a point of exclamation to make the triumph of the invitation more emphatic. The translators of this new version carry on the previous sentence into this verse and the familiar challenge simply disappears. This is their translation: 'And when they shall say unto you: "Seek unto the ghosts and the familiar spirits, that chirp and that mutter; should not a people seek unto their God? on behalf of the living unto the dead for instruction and for testimony?"'

There is an epithet in St. Luke's Gospel which has caused a little discomfort to those who have looked into its meaning. It occurs in Lk 7^{2} (ἔντιμος) and is translated in the A.V. 'dear'—'And a certain centurion's servant, who was dear unto him, was sick, and ready to die.' The Revisers retain 'dear' but acknowledge their uneasiness in the alternative marginal note, 'or *precious to him*, or *honourable with him*.'

'Honourable with him' is very odd. But 'honourable' is the meaning of the epithet, and its only meaning. It is an epithet which was reserved in Greek for men (or things) of established position, and signified that they were held in honour. Its most usual application was to an

officer who had retired, and it signified that he had served with distinction and retired with honour.

If, therefore, it had been applied by St. Luke to the centurion, it would have been applied properly. But it is applied to the centurion's slave. Such a use of the word is absolutely unknown elsewhere. Dr. E. A. ABBOTT, who discusses the matter in *The Classical Review*, comes to the conclusion that originally it *was* applied to the centurion, but, by a misreading in the manuscripts, was taken as referring to the slave. It could then mean only 'dear' or 'precious,' and to make that meaning clearer St. Luke added 'to him.'

Dr. ABBOTT believes that the centurion had retired from active service. If he had not, he could scarcely have been in a position to build a synagogue. As a retired officer he would be properly (and most probably) styled distinguished or honourable. And he would be the more at leisure to discover the worth of a slave and to give him attention. The translation would then be, 'And the servant of a certain distinguished centurion (or "of a centurion retired with honour") was sick and ready to die.' And (if Dr. ABBOTT is right) our New Testament lexicographers must remove the meaning 'dear' or 'precious' from their lexicons.

For in the only other place in which 'precious' is used as the translation of this word, the meaning is missed thereby and the translation is greatly to be regretted. That place is 1 Peter $2^{4.6}$. The reference is to the stone which the builders 'disallowed'—'disallowed indeed of men, but chosen of God, and precious.' The point is not that it is precious, but that, 'disallowed' (that is, 'rejected') (R.V.) by men, it is chosen by God and set in the place of honour.

What is the Church going to do with its Chaplains? They are a small body, but they cannot be called a feeble folk. It is said that when a reform is threatened at one of the ancient Universities the country clergy come up to vote and 'the situation is saved.' The country clergy will probably be against the Chaplains. For they demand the most dreaded of all revolutions, a revolution in the conduct of Public Worship. The country clergy will not need to 'come up' in order to defeat that motion. They can defeat it by simply staying where they are.

The Chaplains are a small body. But they will not take defeat easily. For they have a great body behind them. They have behind them the whole British Army. And the British Army is drawn from every country parish in the land. It is the unanimous testimony of the Chaplains that the British Army, officer and soldier alike, will tolerate the Prayer Book no longer. If the country clergy resolve to save the situation once more by simply sitting still, then——

Then the British Army will leave them alone. That is what the Chaplains say. That is why the Chaplains are so earnest in the matter, and are likely to make themselves so troublesome. They do not threaten disturbance from the British Army. The Archbishop of Dublin says that 'only a minority of our soldiers are accustomed to look to the Church as their spiritual home.' After the War, if the country clergy 'save the situation,' the returned soldiers will make no unpleasantness—only, the Archbishop's minority will be smaller.

But what right have the Chaplains to demand a reform of the Public Worship of God in the name of the soldier? That question had better not be asked. For the answer is overpowering. It may be found in a new book, containing seventeen papers by seventeen Chaplains, and edited by Canon F. B. MACNUTT, himself one of the Senior Chaplains to the Forces. The title of the book is *The Church in the Furnace* (Macmillan; 5s. net).

What right? The right of men, the right of soldiers, and the right of Christ.

The officers and privates of the British Army have the right to ask that the services and worship of the Church should be made suitable for them, because they too are men. The public worship of God, as directed by the Prayer Book, and actually now in use, is unsuitable. It is suitable for saints, or at least for advanced and experienced Christians. For other men it is not suitable.

Listen to the Rev. E. MILNER-WHITE, M.A., Chaplain of King's College, Cambridge, and Senior Chaplain to the Forces. 'The Prayer-book as it stands is a volume that serves only those who are highly instructed in the Faith. Hardly a soldier carries a Prayer-book, because there is little in it he can use. We never guessed of old how removed it was from common wants; nor how intellectual are its prayers and forms of devotion. Its climate to the simple, ardent Christian is often ice. The warm romance of man's pilgrimage to God is absent from it, because it takes early stages for granted and can be used only by those who have ascended many hills of difficulty. How we have blushed for the incomprehensibility even of the Collects!'

Listen to the Rev. C. SALISBURY WOODWARD, M.C., M.A., Canon and Precentor of Southwark Cathedral. 'The language of many of the prayers is out of date, and therefore unintelligible if not actually misleading to the majority. "We have erred and strayed like lost sheep," "Graft in our hearts," "the continual dew of Thy blessing," are meaningless phrases to dwellers in great cities; "there is no health in us," "thy saving health," "the healthful spirit of thy grace," have physical rather than spiritual associations for most; "inestimable love," "unfeignedly thankful," "thy special grace preventing us," "acknowledging our wretchedness," "true and laudable service," "sore let and hindered," are but random examples of words which have passed out of current use and either lost or changed their meaning. So long as our prayers are couched in such language "how shall he that occupieth the place of the unlearned say 'Amen,' seeing he understandeth not what thou sayest?"'

And again: 'The length of the Psalms prescribed for daily use is another legitimate cause for criticism; the average number of verses prescribed is forty, and when, in Morning Prayer, we add to these some sixty verses in the Canticles, we find ourselves singing a hundred verses in a single service. It is little wonder that many worshippers occupy themselves before the clergy enter in reckoning the number of verses to be said or sung that morning, and breathe a sigh of relief when they find them to be below the average.'

And once more, from the same writer: 'The lessons are too long, they are often unedifying, and they are frequently quite out of harmony with the teaching of the Church's seasons. Few ordinary churchgoers can derive much help or comfort from listening to long passages from the Pentateuch or the historical books, or to isolated fragments from some complicated doctrinal argument of St. Paul. Simple minds must moreover be hopelessly confused by hearing an account of the Crucifixion of Our Lord read to them on one of the Sundays after Easter, or by listening to the incidents which followed the Resurrection on a Sunday in Advent; yet both are liable to occur, and do actually occur in the present year.'

Now it is open to the country clergy to say, if they care to say anything, that the Prayer Book is suitable for them and for their present worshippers. It is open to them to ask why they should disturb use and wont, and perhaps mar 'the incomparable beauty' of the Book of Common Prayer, for the sake of men who never worshipped with them before the War and may never worship with them after. They may ask that question, but they will not rout the Chaplains with it.

The Chaplains will still urge that the soldiers are soldiers. For this is a circumstance that has

greatly impressed the Chaplains themselves. It is very likely that the country clergy do not realize the fact; it is certain that they do not feel it so forcibly.

What is it to be a soldier? Ask the Chaplains. They cannot tell. Ask each of these seventeen experienced Chaplains, and not one of them will be able to tell you. They know it. They feel it. But it is too wonderful for them. They cannot find words to convey the wonder of it to another. They know very well that these soldiers were men in civil life who—but let us hear what one of them says about that.

It is the Editor himself who speaks. 'We have lived in closest comradeship with the young subaltern who used only to think of his silk socks and the shape of his felt hat, his bank-account and his revels; and we have seen him changed into the platoon commander who thinks of everything but himself, and is ready at any moment to fling his life away in the doing of some deed of service for his men. We have mixed daily with the hard-bitten coal-miner or factory-worker from the North, whose language would set an iceberg on fire, or the rough labourer from some "haunt of ancient peace" in rural England, with a head as hard as the sun-baked clay in which he digs trenches in summer to resist a counter-attack. They seemed in old days incapable of anything but rebelliously or listlessly following the dull routine of daily work with its parenthesis of often gross or lurid recreations. But now we know what fortitude and chivalry, courage and charity, fidelity and devotion lay waiting beneath the forbidding surface, for the demand which has made them the magnificent men we have seen fighting in the trenches, marching up to the attack and booking orders for Hun helmets, or almost invisible in the white bandages which swathe their tortured bodies in Casualty Clearing Stations or Base Hospitals.'

What do the country clergy say to that? Do they still ask, What right have they? The Chaplains will not be utterly routed even then. They have one argument left. It is the right of Christ. For now the Chaplains claim that the religion of the soldier, and not the religion of the country clergy, is the religion of Christ.

When the Archbishop of Dublin confessed that 'only a minority of our soldiers are accustomed to look to the Church as their spiritual home, and the organized institutions of the Christian religion have little attraction for them,' he added: 'But the practical Christianity of the trenches is very real and very widespread. Patience, faithfulness, cheerfulness, unselfishness: these are great qualities.'

Great qualities? They are the Apostolic Virtues. 'Instead'—it is now Canon J. O. HANNAY who speaks (you will know him better perhaps as the novelist, 'George A. Birmingham')—'Instead of making his own list of virtues,' says Mr. HANNAY, 'the Archbishop might have taken almost the whole of St. Paul's list of the fruits of the Spirit. Our soldiers—that is to say the best part of the young manhood of the Empire—possess in high degree just these virtues, love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, meekness.' This sounds like a paradox, for of all such catalogues none, surely, is at first sight less military than St. Paul's. But if we take the Apostle's words and translate them into a language which is not petrified by theological use, if we strip the things meant of the reverent draperies of ancient pieties, we see at once that instead of being a paradox this is a simple statement of fact. By love St. Paul meant more than comradeship; but he did mean comradeship, which elsewhere he calls brotherly love. In joy we recognize cheerfulness. Is peace—the inward peace which exists in spite of war—anything else than an outlook upon life untroubled by repining and fear? Long-suffering is surely the power of enduring, unrebelliously, hardship and even injustice. Gentleness and goodness are seen in unselfish, untiring care for

the weak and suffering. Is it not true that meekness, the ready subordination of personal will to the will of others, is the inward spirit of discipline? St. Paul would surely have recognized his list translated thus; though it is no doubt harder for us, coated with the quickly-hardening varnish of conventional religiousness, to recognize the fruits of the Spirit in lives which display everywhere comradeship, cheerfulness, endurance, calm, kindliness, and discipline.'

What will the country clergy say to that?

Yes—what will the country clergy say to that? And when we speak of the country clergy we mean, and have meant all along, every clergyman, priest, minister, or pastor in the land. What if the religion of Christ is to be found outside the Church of Christ? He said, 'There is joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth more than over ninety and nine just persons who need no repentance.' That the soldiers are sinners, there is no doubt. What if they are repentant—these Pauline virtues of theirs being as it were the sign of repentance? And what if the Prayer-book saints are such as have never needed repentance?

What *is* a saint? There is not a more beautiful word in the English language, nor one that is more despised and spat upon. You ask the soldier what a saint is and he will tell you to read 'Holy Willie's Prayer' and think of Holy Willie. But you ask the Chaplain, and you get another answer.

Seventeen Chaplains of the Church of England have been asked already. They did not consult with one another, but wrote independently. Yet they agreed in their definition of a saint. Now let us turn to two Presbyterian Chaplains. The Rev. Norman MACLEAN, D.D. (of the Church of Scotland) and the Rev. J. R. P. SCLATER, D.D. (of the United Free Church of Scotland) have together written a book about *God and the Soldier* (Hodder & Stoughton; 3s. 6d. net). In that book they have directly and deliberately set themselves to answer the question, What is a saint?

They say that this tree also is known by its fruits. The first fruit is Self-control. It may take the exaggerated form of asceticism—sometimes the asceticism of the Catholic, sometimes the asceticism of the Puritan—but if it is self-control, it counts for saintship. Self-control is the first and most unmistakable mark of the Chaplain's saint.

And he finds it in the soldier. The soldier sent us to Holy Willie; the Chaplain sends us to the soldier himself. 'You will not find amongst soldiers much encouragement for the idea that control of appetite is not part of the ideal. On the contrary, it is remarkable to discover how highly the mastery of the flesh is respected. Here and there, in the Army as out of it, men may be met with who "sit in the seat of the scorner," and deride what they call the ethics of the vicarage; but they are rarer than might be imagined. For the most part, our men have a high thought of purity, and are quite certain that a worthy religious life cannot be maintained without it.'

The next fruit of this tree is Courage. Courage, bravery — there is certainly no need to prove laboriously that the men in the field bring forth that fruit. But how is it one of the fruits of sainthood? Because it is one of the fruits of the character of Christ. 'Some one has related that a Japanese General was given the Gospels to read for the first time, and after he had perused them, he was asked what was the quality in Jesus Christ that struck him most. "His bravery," was the reply.'

But courage moves upward to a virtue nobler still. For courage at its highest merges into fortitude, which is a mark of natures that are noble indeed. Botticelli, seen through Ruskin's eyes, has the right way of it, when he paints his

figure representing this virtue, not in the guise of some proud warrior, ardent for the fray, but as one who is weary, who will rejoice greatly when the word comes to disarm for the long day's work is done, but whose hand, nevertheless, again will resolutely clasp the sword-hilt, and whose spirit again will shake itself free from its fatigue, if the bugle calls to battle.

Now 'after this manner, in amazing measure, are our soldiery. Their Endurance, their purposeful good cheer, their absurd habits of grumbling about everything that is of no moment and thereby keeping their minds off the trials that might unnerve them, their grim will to carry on—these are the facts that again and again impress the observer, and bring to his lips, as a humble and sincere expression of his thought, the words:

"By the living God that made you
You're a better man than I am, Gunga Dhin!"'

Self-mastery, bravery, endurance—and then Charity. 'Some months ago, the present writer' (Dr. MACLEAN or Dr. SCLATER, we are not told which), 'the present writer happened to have occasion to take his walks abroad on a somewhat dismal French road. The usual mud abounded, and a rain was descending which would have done credit to the Hebrides. At the side of the road a military waggon was drawn up, and upon it two men seemed to be engaged in violent altercation. A nearer inspection proved that one of them had lost his overcoat and was, apparently, shivering and unwell. His friend was searching the outlying regions of a soldier's vocabulary—regions more vivid than refined—to describe the folly the other had displayed in mislaying so useful a garment on such a day; and ended his tirade by saying, "'Ere—put my coat on." With the hands of compulsion he forced his companion to take the covering, and himself proceeded to get wet, the while he chanted his desire that some one should take him home to dear old Blighty. The ritual of the act, so to speak, was scarcely evangelical; but the act itself was the gold of Christian charity. It was another case for reflections upon Gunga Dhin!'

And now to bring all these fruits together and lay them out, like 'apples of gold in salvers of silver,' so that we may see 'the beauty of holiness,' what is that which essentially *is* the saint? It is Selflessness.

And the soldier is selfless. 'Many unexpected men seem to have reached the point of assent to what may come of pain and loss to themselves, provided that the world is to grow fairer thereby. Sometimes the expressions of this selflessness are on a lofty scale, as in the case of a young Scottish minister, who served as a combatant, and has lost his life, who declared his perfect willingness for annihilation, if only so could the world's betterment come. But simpler men reach the same point. A sergeant in a base camp some time ago was returning to his unit after being wounded twice. He was, as we have it in Scotland, "fey." A presentiment was upon him that he would not come back, and to all optimistic prophecies he turned a deaf ear. "But," he said, "I don't mind. It's going to be a better world for the kiddies afterwards."'

What is a saint? Christina ROSSETTI has an answer. The marks of a saint, she says, are two—likeness to Christ, and readiness to find saintship in others. And what is that but selflessness? 'I live, yet not I, but Christ'; and then letters to Romans, Corinthians, Ephesians—many of them just recovered from unnamable vices—and the superscription of every letter, 'To the Saints.' First self lost in Christ and then self found in other saints. And this, say the Chaplains, is the soldier. Courage, endurance, charity, that is likeness to Christ, and all quite unconscious, whereby the Chaplains are often led to speak of the 'unconscious religion' of the soldiers. And then the discovery of other saints, for no soldier doubts for a moment the loyalty of his comrades

—their bravery, their charity, their high fortitude. 'A chaplain has reported that a story of treachery on the part of some man once went round a battalion, and the men spoke of it with bated breath, as of a horror too dire to be contemplated.'.

I saw a Saint.—How canst thou tell that he
  Thou sawest was a Saint?—
I saw one like to Christ so luminously
  By patient deeds of love, his mortal taint
Seemed made his groundwork for humility.
And when he marked me downcast utterly
  Where foul I sat and faint,
Then more than ever Christ-like kindled he;
  And welcomed me as I had been a saint,
Tenderly stooping low to comfort me.

Christ bade him, 'Do thou likewise.' Wherefore he
  Waxed zealous to acquaint
His soul with sin and sorrow, if so be
  He might retrieve some latent saint:—
'Lo, I, with the child God hath given to me!'

Profane Nations.

By G. Buchanan Gray, M.A., D.Litt., D.D., Professor of Hebrew and Old Testament Exegesis in Mansfield College, Oxford.

'Ah! Assyria, the rod of my anger. Against a profane nation *I* send him, and against the people with whom I am wroth I command him. But *he* meaneth not so, nor thus doth his heart devise; but to destroy is in his heart, and to cut off nations not a few. . . . For he saith, By the strength of my own hand have I wrought, and by my wisdom, for I have discernment' (Is $10^{5.\ 6.\ 7.\ 13}$).

The prophets, it has been said with substantial correctness, concerned themselves primarily and mainly not with individuals, but with nations. And in this lay in part a limitation, in part the secret, of their power. If a nation consists, as it does, of individuals, to neglect or too greatly to subordinate the reformation or uplifting of the individuals must render any national ethic ineffective, and the achievement by the nation of any high moral ideal impossible. No state composed of morally low individuals can be itself an embodiment of a lofty moral ideal.

On the other hand, a nation is more than the sum of the individuals; and has, as such, functions that could not be performed by a mere congeries of units. But the two functions are not morally inconsistent; reasons of state must not in national affairs replace morality; and a nation composed of moral individuals cannot make non-moral or immoral state action its ideal. Much of the abiding value of Hebrew prophecy rests on the testimony of the prophets that, though the function of the nation may be other than that of the individual, it is not so different that the nation ought to be less religious or less moral. It is the conviction of the prophets that the nation no less than the individual was made by God for divine ends, and for the conscious and willing achievement of those ends; the profane nation, like a profane individual, is one that lives and works with a practical disregard of this fact. It was the aim of the prophets to turn, in the first instance, their own nation from its profanity by clothing in fresh and vivid imagery the disregarded idea that nations were made by God for divine ends, and by pointing out what seemed to them evidence of God's working in and through the wayward and unruly lives of nations in such a way that His ends should not be ultimately frustrated.

The narratives of Genesis, using and transforming the ancient stories of another race, leave an indelible impression of the idea that God made man; neither there nor elsewhere in the Bible is the truth of that idea demonstrated by argument after the manner of a modern treatise on apologetics; nevertheless the idea in and through the stories is clothed with power. The prophets are less easily read, and are in consequence liable to leave upon the modern reader—it was different with the ancient hearer—an impression far less