

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

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.

'THE supreme test of a religion is its power of producing saints.'

That is the saying of so accurate a scholar, so circumspect a writer, so unhesitating a Protestant, as the late Professor James Hope Moulton. It is found at the beginning of the chapter on Parsi Piety in his book entitled *The Treasure of the Magi* (Milford; 8s. 6d. net). Dr. MOULTON wrote this book in India. He went there to spend a year in studying some of the problems of Indian education and religion. He hoped to make friendships with Indians, and at the same time to do some lecturing and writing.

He remained some sixteen months in India and sailed from Karachi by the S.S. *City of Paris* for England. At Port Said he had the joy of meeting his friend Dr. Rendel Harris, who had left England several months before in order to join Dr. MOULTON in India, but, having been torpedoed in the Mediterranean, had stayed on in Egypt instead of proceeding to India. The two friends sailed together and had a time of delightful intercourse until the steamer was sunk by a torpedo in the Gulf of Lions. Passengers and crew got into the boats. But the weather was very stormy, and the boat in which the two scholars were was driven out of its course and did not reach the coast of Corsica until four days

later. Of the twenty-five souls in the boat twelve had by that time died of exposure, and amongst them Dr. MOULTON.

He had been invited to go to India largely that he might use his ripe Iranian scholarship in lecturing to the Parsis on Zoroastrianism, and he received from that community everywhere proofs of the warmest possible friendship and regard and of the keenest interest in his teaching. In Bombay they placed at his disposal a large theatre, and have since published his lectures in both English and Gujarati. Before leaving India he completed the manuscript of this book. The original autograph lies at the bottom of the Mediterranean. But he had sent a copy in type-script to his brother in England. It is the last but one of Dr. MOULTON'S writings that we shall see. There is yet to come the second volume of his Grammar of New Testament Greek, which he had completed before he went to India.

This book is an exposition of the religion of the Parsis. We speak of the Parsi religion as Zoroastrianism (at least when we speak of its founding) and we call its founder Zoroaster. Dr. MOULTON uses Zoroastrianism, but prefers to give the founder his own name Zarathushtra. It is the exposition of a man who had mastered at least three departments of knowledge, and with

a completeness of mastery to which few of us attain in one. But this was his earliest attraction, and it kept its hold most surely to the end. When the writer of these Notes met James Hope MOULTON for the first time, some five-and-twenty years ago, he was already absorbed in the study of Zarathushtra. He wrote the article on Zoroastrianism for the *DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE*. And when the *ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS* was undertaken he drew up the whole scheme for the Persian religion and contributed some of the most important articles in it. This book has all the finish of his most finished work, it has all the charm of his most charming writing.

The chapter on Parsi Piety is its most critical chapter. It is the criticism of one who was on the outlook always for the best to be found in man or in religion. It is the criticism of one to whom the religion of the Parsis in particular made almost irresistible appeal. Yet in respect of personal piety Zoroastrianism is found wanting. It has had no power of producing saints. And if a religion cannot produce saints, 'the most splendid array of poetry and philosophy will not redeem it from an inexorable doom.'

But what are saints? 'It would be a bold thing,' says Dr. MOULTON, 'to attempt a definition. Beauty, poetry, love—all the greatest things of life refuse to be defined. But the Book which has made more saints than all other books put together has a summary which goes far towards the portraiture we seek: "He hath showed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth Jehovah require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?" (Mic 6^b).'

Now it is not every man who would have quoted that text as the definition of a saint. The Roman Catholic would not have quoted it. The Evangelical would not have quoted it. There is too much of the flavour of 'good works' in it for the Evangelical. Dr. Moody Stuart used to tell the story of a Highland lady who waited till the

preacher from a neighbouring parish gave out his text, and when it proved to be these words from the prophet Micah, remarked that if there was an awkward text in the Bible that man was sure to find it.

If there is too much of the scent of good works in it for the Evangelical, there is too little of the demand for asceticism in it for the Roman Catholic. It is an awkward text for any one who has a narrower outlook, or let us rather say a dimmer insight, than Dr. MOULTON. He is satisfied with it as the definition of a saint because it is a definition of loyalty.

For loyalty is legality—with love in it. Matthew Arnold has told us that religion is morality touched by emotion. It depends upon the emotion. If the emotion is love, and if the love goes before the morality, finding its apology in 'I love because he first loved me,' then religion is morality—not touched by emotion, but brought into being by it. Dr. MOULTON finds that the saint is the loyal one, the man or the woman who loves and holds by the love through good report and through evil.

Now that is Evangelicalism. Good works? Certainly. But the outcome, not the origin. And that is Asceticism. Not the asceticism that suffers for the suffering's sake or for the sake of the merit thus built up, but the asceticism that suffers for Christ's sake, that His sufferings may be filled up and His Kingdom may come.

The Religion of the Parsis has no room for suffering in it. That is its one undeniable weakness. And that one weakness has condemned it to failure. For there is no doubt that Zoroastrianism has failed. To-day Gautama the Buddha claims thousands of followers for every follower that Zarathushtra has.

Why has Zoroastrianism no suffering in it? Because it has no love. Zarathushtra attained

to a doctrine of God that claimed and claims the awe, adoration, and obedience of men, but he was never able to say, 'God is love.' And because he never attained to the love of God, he could not inspire his followers with loyalty. 'No Elisha caught the great Prophet's mantle as he soared on the wings of fire to the House of Song; no gentle man of God remained to supplement the Elijah message of the One Deity, holy and righteous, with the gracious teaching that might win the hearts as well as the minds of men. Vishtaspa, Erashaoshtra, Jamaspa, and the rest were no doubt sincere and eager followers, but they did not supply the needed supplement to the message. The long roll of saints in the Farvardin Yasht, whose names are all we know of them—

the unknown good who rest
In God's still memory folded deep—

may well have included many a noble soul. But the possibility that there were mute, inglorious Zarathushtras *in posse* among them does not alter the fact that the religion bearing Zarathushtra's name has never received a fresh inspiration carrying it beyond the point at which the Founder left it.'

There was no loyalty because there was no love. And because there was no loyalty there was no self-sacrifice. How different was the history of Israel. Amos came as another Zarathushtra, with 'a wonderful grip of the great principles of God's inflexible righteousness, His judgement against sin, and His promises to those who should turn and seek Him.' But implicit in the religion of Amos was the love of God. And so, when Hosea followed, there seemed to be nothing in God but infinite tenderness for humanity, and a love that was ready to forgive until seventy times seven. St. Paul entered into the inheritance. The love became loyalty and the loyalty sacrifice. St. Paul 'was no faqir, no pursuer of asceticism as a means of grace. But he did "one thing"; if anything else came in the way of it he threw it aside. Hence the passion so well expressed in his modern interpreter's words:

Yes, without cheer of sister or of daughter,
Yes, without stay of father or of son,
Lone on the land and homeless on the water
Pass I in patience till the work be done.

And the inspiration of that utter self-sacrifice has been an even greater power in Christianity than the living letters that teach us the doctrine Paul spent himself to proclaim.'

—

The Rev. J. VERNON BARTLET, D.D., Senior Tutor of Mansfield College, and the Rev. A. J. CARLYLE, D.Litt., Lecturer of University College, Oxford, have together written a History of the Development of Christianity. The title is *Christianity in History* (Macmillan; 12s. net).

—

Their purpose is—but we had better use their own words. 'Ours is in fact an attempt to set forth the genesis and growth of certain of the more typical forms and phases which Christianity—whether as conduct, piety, thought, or organized Church life—has assumed under the conditioning influences first of the Roman Empire and then of the Western civilization that was its successor and heir. Thus, of books known to us, Professor Percy Gardner's *Growth of Christianity* is most akin to ours. Yet, apart from its larger scale, ours differs from his a good deal in scope and execution.'

—

It differs also, they might have added, in attitude. But of that in a moment. The history of the Church is divided into five periods—the Beginnings, Ancient Christianity, the Middle Ages, the Great Transition, and the Modern Period. The proportion of space allowed to each period is strikingly different. The period entitled Ancient Christianity occupies nearly half the volume. How do the authors account for that? We should have suspected that one man had run away with his neighbour's share of space. But it is not so.

—

'Doubtless,' they say, 'we have failed, time and again, to settle these questions of periods, proportionate fulness of treatment, inclusion and

omission of topics, in a fully satisfactory way. But we have been aware of them all along; and the actual shaping of the work is the result of a good deal of weighing of alternatives. The governing consideration has been the fact that we were looking at the whole development largely from the practical standpoint of the interests and problems present in men's minds to-day; and we gave the preference to what seemed of most value as data for forming a just judgment upon the general trend of things, as well as upon certain questions bearing on the true nature and genius of Christianity.'

Now it was the Catholicism which grew up under the conditions of the Roman Empire that determined the future. 'Its forms and their influence have persisted, without fundamental change, as the main intellectual factor in the general apprehension of Christianity down to the present day.' So they say, and we agree with them. It is true that the features of Early Christianity are more familiar to us than those of Mediæval or even Modern Christianity. But here also the child is father of the man. When we know the character—what we now call the genius—of Christianity, we can trace its growth throughout the ages simply by observing the unexpected and finding out the cause of its unexpectedness.

Two things are essential to success in so difficult an undertaking—good scholarship and a right attitude. These men are scholars. It means more than knowledge—judgment also, breadth of outlook, and the understanding heart. Have they the right attitude? Do they look at Christianity from without or from within? We shall see.

We shall see if we take the title 'Son of Man,' which Jesus used of Himself, and discover what they understand by it. Simple as it seems it is central. There is no test of a man's attitude to Christ or the religion of Christ that is half so searching as just this test—What does he think Jesus meant when He called Himself the Son of Man?

It was a Messianic title when Jesus came. That is to say, it had been read in the Book of Daniel, brooded over, and assigned to the promised Deliverer, the indefinite 'a son of man' of the prophet being easily altered into the definite and sharply distinguishing '*the* Son of Man' of the apocalypses. Jesus did not take it in the sense of the Book of Daniel. His use was definite always. Did He take it in the current apocalyptic sense? He did not.

A single passage is sufficient to make that clear. He put a question to the disciples at Cæsarea Philippi: 'Who do men say that the Son of man is?' (Mt 16¹⁹). He clearly referred to Himself, and so did the disciples understand Him. But when Peter answered, 'Thou art the Messiah,' He was much moved, and said, 'Flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven.' Now if He had used the title in the current sense there would have been no surprise at Peter's inspiration. The two words were in the common speech synonymous. The one stood for the other. And Peter would have done no more than simply identify Jesus as the Jewish Messiah. Such an identification would have been made not by inspiration but exactly by flesh and blood.

What then did Jesus mean when He called Himself the Son of Man? He meant that He was the Head of the Messianic kingdom divinely designated at His baptism, when the words were heard, 'This is my beloved Son.' He meant that He was there first of all as the representative of Israel, God's collective 'son' by election, and next as the representative of humanity. He meant that He stood in that perfectly filial relation to God which was the destiny of man as originally created 'in the image of God,' though it had been lost by Adam and never recovered until in His own experience and person. He meant that in His humanity He had a unique and archetypal relation to humanity at large.

Was Jesus justified in using the title 'Son of Man' in a sense which even His disciples could hardly understand? The answer is by another question. Was He justified in using parable at all? He had no desire to use it. We may be sure that if it had been possible He would have given everybody the opportunity of knowing the mysteries of the Kingdom. But then as always a man hears if he has ears to hear.

He was moved when at Cæsarea Philippi Peter discovered so much of the meaning of it. He was moved again, these scholars think, and yet more moved, when He Himself discovered what it was to lead Him to. How did He make the discovery? If He came to identify Himself with the Son of Man by reading the Book of Daniel, He may have come to see that the Son of Man must suffer many things by reading the Book of Isaiah. For before the hostility of the nation or of its rulers made itself manifest He was aware that the way He had to go in order to 'justify many' would lead Him through suffering and death, until at last He should see of the travail of His soul and be satisfied.

The new volume of *The East and the West* (S.P.G.), the volume for 1917, contains many good articles. One article, of interest now and of importance always, is 'A Lesson in the Progress of Ethics.' Its author is Miss Constance L. MAYNARD.

It is an article on Election—though Miss MAYNARD may be surprised to hear that. She herself would call it an article on Emancipation. And so it is. But the Election comes before the Emancipation, and remains after it. To look at it as Emancipation is to learn the lesson in the progress of Ethics which Miss MAYNARD teaches, and the lesson is right well worth learning. To look at it as Election is to stand beside the greatest teachers of the world and learn one of the greatest lessons that they have to teach us.

We ought to begin with the Election. It will be more convenient to begin with the Emancipation.

'Society,' says Miss MAYNARD, 'society in the ancient world was ruled by three great assertions or principles that were so closely interwoven with the fabric of human existence that not even the wisest men detected them as errors. Neither Plato nor Marcus Aurelius could lift himself above them and see their fundamental futility, and, though Buddha went nearer to the mark, he could not quite free himself from their entanglements. They were a part of the constitution of the world in which every one moved, and were to be accepted as such, just as we accept the facts of day and night, summer and winter.'

'The three principles were these: First, that one nation is more favoured than another, and is put forward, educated and honoured by Divine power, while other nations remain outside as barbarians and outcasts. Secondly, that one kind of man is inherently superior to another, and so may enslave his fellow-man and refuse him all rights. And thirdly, that the obvious and impassable distinction of sex, that chasm that divides the whole human race into two sorts, proclaims aloud that the woman is inferior to the man, and created for his convenience.'

Miss MAYNARD admits that in each of these assertions there is sufficient truth, not only to keep it alive century after century, but even, in the earlier stages, to help forward the progress of the world.

First, the favoured nation. 'It is far better that by some means a few men should be raised, than that all should live at one brutal dead level. The socialist may believe that by knocking the tops off the mountains he will elevate the vast dreary plain below; but the plan of the Divine Educator of the world has not run on these lines. Better one child taken out from a savage rabble, clothed and civilized, than none at all; better one

man called out of idolatry and separated from his fatherland, one little nation delivered from tyranny, educated with unswerving severity, yet shown glimpses of a glorious future to be gained by obedience; better for the whole world looking on that there should be this selective process, than that there should be no care taken to kindle and preserve the light of the knowledge of God, and show the powerful and noble effect such knowledge has on the human character.'

Next, the favoured man. 'We from our ethical heights condemn slavery as a system unmitigatedly bad, but there is a stage in development when it is better than nothing. The mass of the race have always been children, more ready to obey than to reason, and what plan shall we invent to raise them? Abraham's "three hundred and eighteen trained servants born in his own house" had a far superior education to that of the wild tribes who lived outside, and even the training given by the American plantation under its ordinary conditions was, though very rough, better than the stagnating masses of hopeless ignorance and brutality that are at the present day thrust out of sight here and there in the Southern States.'

Last of all, the favoured sex. 'Each question becomes more complex than the last, and we have to take care how we handle these matters. By the authority of Creation, one-half of the human race is told off to deal with the coming generation rather than the present one. The chief province of the woman is Immaturity. Birth, infancy, childhood, health, education, the initial sense of right and wrong, all are in her hands, and these are the constituents of the weal or woe of the immediate future. Passive and quiet occupations fall to her lot, making a strain on patience rather than on adventure, and in view of her obvious muscular inferiority it was no wonder that in rough old days the estimate formed was not a true one. The work of destruction is a sudden thing, whether in war, hunting, or felling trees, and makes demand on courage and inventiveness, but

the work of creation is slow and scarcely to be seen. So the woman became a possession of the man, doubtless his most precious possession, but still a thing rather than a person. The position was unavoidable so long as the eye of the world was not opened to a nobler standard, a region where muscular force goes for nothing, and even mental ability must take the second place.'

Well, the day came when the truth that each of these principles contained proved insufficient for its acceptance. It was discovered to be a lie, a downright lie, says Miss MAYNARD, a thing incredible and impossible. What was that day? It was the Day of Pentecost. When the Day of Pentecost was fully come, and a clear-seeing, plain-speaking man like St. Paul was ready to declare the results of it, he said, 'There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus.' Miss MAYNARD calls that St. Paul's sledge-hammer with its three crushing blows, one for each lie.

Did the three lies come to an end? Yes, they came to an end, but not all at once and not all together.

The separation of Jew from Gentile was broken down first. For St. Paul set himself to break it down, gave all his strength to it, and succeeded. 'The beatings, the stonings, the shipwrecks, the prisons, the contemptuous rejection of the learned few and the howling mob of the ignorant many, all are inwoven for ever into the history of the early Church. St. Paul dashed himself against the stone wall of prejudice, and was broken to pieces; but for all that he succeeded, succeeded through death, even as his Master had succeeded in a task infinitely harder. "There is neither Jew nor Gentile" is a principle established in Christendom; and never since in history (until we come to the Teuton of to-day) has a nation set itself up as the sole favourite of Heaven. It was a great deal to accomplish in the lifetime of one man.'

Slavery came to an end next. But not for a long time after St. Paul had finished his course. He did not give himself to the ending of Slavery. He accepted it as he found it. 'The incident of Philemon and Onesimus seems to be given us purposely in order to show his attitude towards this great question. There is the wealthy slave-owner, and St. Paul proposes to come and stay with him. The position and return of the runaway slave is explained with great courtesy, and a generous welcome is entreated for him, but there is not one word of indignation or suggestion that the whole system is wrong and unworthy, and that, as a member of the Christian Church, Philemon would do well to set his slaves free. For the bond-servant himself there was no difficulty, for he was in spirit "the Lord's free man," and that was quite enough (1 Co 7^{21, 22}). "Art thou called being a slave? care not for it," the position is not comfortable, but it will do as well as any other for this short life, and yet perhaps there is a cropping-up of the just instincts implanted in human nature in the words added at once, "but if thou mayst be made free, use it rather."

But St. Paul had the spirit which brought Slavery to an end. He counted on Philemon having it. He sent Onesimus back with it. Every man upon whom the tongue as of fire descended through all the centuries had it. And at last, as the direct result of the Day of Pentecost—who will deny it?—'On August 1, 1833, Britain washed her hands of the curse of slavery, and thirty years later America (whose temptation to uphold it was far greater) did the same. No one could return now on that barren and deteriorating system. The seed had been truly sown, and it had a life within it which, however long the pause, must finally appear in leafage, blossom, and fruit.'

The third of the three great lies (we use Miss MAYNARD'S word) came to an end last. Its end, or at least the event that shows the end at hand,

is no doubt the prophetic occasion of Miss MAYNARD'S article. It is so recent an event as the passing of the Reform Act of 1918, with the political emancipation of women.

Did the emancipation of women take place on the Day of Pentecost? If St. Paul is the interpreter of the Day of Pentecost, it does not seem so. 'Neither male nor female,' he says; but what of the demands for silence and subjection, for keeping at home and not going from house to house? What of the details about having long hair and wearing veils, and all the restrictions that prevent women from sharing in the government of the Church?

Miss MAYNARD finds excuse for St. Paul. First she reads of 'the heights of the spiritual world as described in the Epistle to the Ephesians, a world where the writer's own soul soars at ease, and is happy as a lark invisible in the vault of cloudless blue.' She finds no distinction of sex there. And then she turns to the missionary world of to-day and sees that it would have been impossible for St. Paul to carry out his principle into action in every detail. For in the missionary world of to-day we have the 'same position, the same impact of the Gospel of Christ on the established customs of heathenism. Dare we infringe the rights of the Indian purdah, and declare the restriction to be harmful nonsense? Dare we tell the Chinese girl to leave her timidity and self-depreciation behind, and take her place with us? Dare we even tell the Kafir wife that it is a foolish rule that she may not enter the wide gate of the kraal enclosure, but must have a little side door of her own? The rules of modesty may be most fantastic, yet to begin with we must obey them, or we shall find that modesty itself is swept away, and that we have plunged ourselves into a sea of troubles.'

The emancipation had taken place, but, says Miss MAYNARD, 'we have to wait patiently on tradition and custom, while we set the right spirit

to work, and allow it gradually to discover its own forms of expression. Looking back, I imagine the women of Corinth were fully as difficult as any we have to do with. Luxurious, vain, idle, tale-bearing, a flimsy mass of rouge and paint and other falsities without, and an empty-headed chatter of prejudices and wanton desires within, such a woman was a heavy task to manage as a convert. Unaccustomed to go out in the street alone, she was now sent round on errands of mercy, and, with what doubtless appeared to her to be new and dazzling liberty in front, there was all the more need to emphasize the restraining customs of the past. I only wonder that, in the judgment of a man brought up among such customs, the new regulations are not more strict. The Greek was a talker if he was nothing else, and what the silly gossip of the women must have been when they got together passes thought. It is noticeable that while the Apostle's unsparing lash falls again and again on the varied sins of men, he hardly ever mentions women without in some way referring to sins of the tongue.'

Now when Miss MAYNARD has ended her exposition of that great passage of St. Paul—'there is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus'—she sees that there is a wider reference in it than she has taken account of, and the doctrine of Election, with its unquestionable truthfulness almost breaks upon her sight. She does see that the principles, which when they cease to be necessary she calls lies, are simply examples of God's method of working in the Earth. What she does not seem to see, or at least does not say, is that this is the one method of God's working of which we are absolutely certain, and that the name it is known by is Election.

We miss the meaning of Election by making it applicable only to individuals. It is applicable to individuals. Every society is made up of individuals. But in Scripture it is rarely applied

to the individual standing alone. 'Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated.' Yes, but Jacob and Esau are the nations, not the men. Even when Jacob and Esau strove together in their mother's womb two nations were then at strife.

But if the doctrine of Election is misunderstood by applying it mainly to men, it is much more misunderstood by making it mainly a matter of privilege. Here indeed lies the heart of the horror which some men profess, and some men actually feel, regarding it. One man is taken and another left—for what end? For no end at all, we are told—simply taken and left. But we are never so told in the Bible. If any man or nation is taken for the enjoyment of some great honour—such honour as only God can take him for, such honour as is properly called Election, the choice of God from the foundation of the world—it is always because on that nation or that man is to fall responsibility. The responsibility is as great as the privilege. It is a responsibility which will cost all that the privilege confers. And the condemnation for failure to fulfil the responsibility will be severe according as the privilege is glorious.

The Election has a purpose to serve. Is it the Election of a nation? It is in order that through it other nations may be blessed. 'Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated'—we do not now misunderstand the Eastern form of speech. We know that its meaning is, Jacob have I chosen that Esau may be blessed in him. It is God's way of working. 'Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord'—could He not have said at the same time, 'Hear, O Edom'? We do not know what He could or can. We know that that is not His way.

Is it the election of one stratum of society? When all were slaves He chose one part of the nation to rule the other part. Was that for mere privilege and pride? Woe to the freemen who think so. They will suffer more than the slave. Is it the election of the male sex? Always the

situation is open to possibilities of utter misapprehension and unutterable mischief. But the evil is not in the election.

It is God's way. And we are not done with it yet. It is true that when the time has come, and the nations of the earth are able to receive the blessing, Israel sins grievously by attempting to withhold it. So the time came when there should be neither Jew nor Greek. The time came when there should be neither bond nor free. The time has come when there shall be neither male nor female. But that is not the end. It is God's way still.

There is an election to privilege and responsibility in the Kingdom of the Christ. It is the privilege of Saintship. It is the responsibility of finding other saints. Do not shrink from the election. And do not shrink from the responsibility of the election. The saint who does not accept the responsibility of finding other saints is not fulfilling the purpose of his high calling. And terrible is his condemnation. We read that story in St. Matthew's Gospel of the sheep and the goats—Mr. Emmet says it is the only portion of Scripture which he cannot make fit into his scheme of a universal return to God—for its words are: 'Depart from me, ye cursed, into the eternal fire which is prepared for the devil and his angels,' and again, 'These shall go away into eternal punishment.'

But who are 'these'? They are not the sinners we sometimes think they are. They are the righteous. They are not the prodigals. They are the elder sons. Their fault, and their only fault, is that they did not go after the prodigals to bring them home. They may have kept the commandments amazingly well, but 'inasmuch as ye did it not to one of the least of these, ye did it not to me.'

When will this election cease? Surely when all the saints of God have been gathered in. The responsibility cannot cease till then. And if that is not to be here, then it will have to be there. But we walk by faith.

And when this election comes to an end, when all the saints of the earth have been found and gathered to the feet of God, will God's method of election be brought to an end also? Our Lord seems to say so. 'Then cometh the end,' He says. But it may be that the end He speaks of is this particular end—the end of this particular purpose of God for men. After that may there not be a new election, the election of all men on behalf of those who are not men?

Is it a pure speculation? Well, it is a Pauline speculation. St. Paul saw that the whole creation was waiting for the manifestation of the sons of God. He did not mean that when the manifestation he looked for was accomplished the rest of the creation of God would mechanically share in the redemption. *That* is not God's way of working, and St. Paul never fancied that it was. It is not a pure speculation, and it need not be a profitless speculation if we believe that the race of man, its own emancipation over, is elected to a new responsibility—God saying to *Adam* now, not to Abraham, 'In thee and in thy seed shall all the families *in heaven* be blessed.'

All tended to mankind,
And, man produced, all has its end thus far:
But in completed man begins anew
A tendency to God. Prognostics told
Man's near approach; so in man's self arise
August anticipations, symbols, types,
Of a dim splendour ever on before
In that eternal circle run by life.