

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

IN one of the little books now being published by Messrs. Marshall Brothers under the title of 'The Keswick Library,' and elsewhere noticed, there occurs a clear statement of the distinction between faith and faithfulness. The distinction is no doubt understood and steadily observed by some, but not by all, and is well worth this fresh emphasis that Prebendary Webb-Peploe puts upon it.

He speaks from the passage in Galatians iii. 6-9, especially the ninth verse: 'So then, they which be of faith are blessed with faithful Abraham.' Have not some of us read these words as if they said, 'They who are of faith are Abraham's seed, for he was of faith also'? But they do not say that. They say that they who have faith in God will be faithful to God as Abraham was faithful, and inherit a like blessing. For faith is the capacity of receiving, and faithfulness is the power of giving; or, in Mr. Webb-Peploe's terse language: 'By faith we take whatever God will give, and by faithfulness we give whatever God will take.'

First comes faith, which is simply in proportion to the soul's hearing of God's holy Word. And then, as we step away from the place where God has visited us to give us the blessings for which faith has spread out our hands, we realise that these blessings are not given that we may rejoice in them with joy unspeakable, and end there.

VOL. VI.—4. JANUARY 1895.

Freely we have received, freely we must give. Faithfulness follows. And it is in proportion, not to our zeal or unselfishness or ability; but in exact and immediate proportion to our faith.

Professor Beyschlag, in his *New Testament Theology*, just issued in English (T. & T. Clark, 2 vols. 8vo), more than once expresses the opinion that Jesus accepted, as far as was consistent with His work, the current religious conceptions of His day. 'In all cosmic matters to which His teaching refers, He was content to use the forms of conception furnished to Him in the Old Testament and by His people and time, as He did not consider it His calling to be a critic in matters of worldly knowledge, and so become a scientific reformer.'

But Professor Beyschlag holds that even these conceptions He never left exactly as He found them. He put life into them. He infused them with the purest religious ideas. He spiritualised them. And now for us it is not the current Jewish beliefs of Jesus' day, it is Jesus Himself added to these, that are the truths and even the forms of truth which we accept and cannot do without.

Take the doctrine of Angels. The common belief of Christ's day regarding the angels we may discover not merely in the Old Testament and the

Apocrypha, but also, says Dr. Beyschlag, in those portions of the Gospels which belong not to Jesus but to the evangelists themselves. 'The angel of the Lord' of St. Luke (Luke ii. 9; Acts v. 19, xii. 7, 23) reminds us of the Old Testament 'Angel of Jehovah,' especially in the narrative of the nativity, where the 'Glory of the Lord' runs parallel with him. On the other hand, Gabriel in the preparatory narratives (Luke i.) belongs, he believes, to the more developed angelology of the later Judaism; he is one of the seven throne angels of God (Rev. viii. 2). But the current Jewish belief about angels, and how Jesus modified that belief in His own sayings, may best be seen in those passages in the Gospels and Acts which represent the angels as personal beings like men, a view which, according to Dr. Beyschlag, our Lord never expresses.

Jesus represents the angels in various ways, but never as personal beings. 'The angels of God, in whose presence there is joy over one sinner who repenteth (Luke xv. 10), or before whom the Son of Man will confess those who have confessed Him before men (Luke xii. 8), are a kind of poetic paraphrase for God Himself, to whom in both cases the words properly refer (compare the parallel passage, Matt. x. 32). They are the graphic representation of the higher world, to the citizenship of which the penitent returns, and in which the faithful confessor receives his crown.' The holy angels of the Son of Man, on the other hand, with whom He will come again in His glory (Matt. xvi. 27, xxv. 31), 'are the rays of His divine majesty, which is then to surround Him with splendour; they are the divine powers with which He is to awaken the dead, to dissolve the present order of the world, and set up a new and higher order.' And the twelve legions of angels for which the oppressed Messiah could pray to His Father (Matt. xxvi. 53), 'are the expression of the divine miraculous powers—alluding to the weak human powers of the twelve disciples—which He could call up against his enemies.'

The most remarkable passage, however, as Professor Beyschlag calls it (and his may be called the most remarkable explanation, though we have heard it from Canon Cheyne already), is Matt. xviii. 10: 'See that ye despise not one of these little ones; for I say unto you, That in heaven their angels do always behold the face of My Father which is in heaven.' This is the passage, says Professor Beyschlag, which we can least of all take in prosaic literalness. In the first place, the little ones are not children in years but in weakness—men who are least able to take care of themselves. And then there is no other way in which 'this entirely poetical passage' can be conceived, than that in every child of man a peculiar thought of God has to be realised, which stands over his history like a genius, or guardian spirit, and which God at all times remembers, so that everything which opposes its realisation on earth comes before Him as a complaint.

'After this manner therefore pray ye'—and then, says Dr. George Herron, our Lord uttered the prayer of a Christian Socialist. 'The Political Economy of the Lord's Prayer' is the title of the last chapter in his new book, *The Christian Society* (James Clarke & Co.). And he says it is a social prayer. God is not addressed as *my* Father, but *our* Father. We are not bidden to ask for *my* daily bread, but *our* daily bread. We are not to pray that *my* debts may be forgiven, but *our* debts. And in the petition, 'Forgive us our debts *as we have forgiven our debtors*,' the social obligation, he says, is recognised still more imperatively.

And then he passes through the petitions one by one. 'Our Father which art in heaven.' This is a confession of the brotherhood of men. It is the most revolutionary expression ever uttered, and the seed of mighty revolutions now on their way. *Our* Father means that railway manager and brakesman, employer and employee, rich and poor, ignorant and wise, privileged and unprivileged, are brothers. The drunkard in the street is the brother

of the saint. The wild-hearted woman of sin in her chamber of shame is the sister of the clergyman, and her shame is his shame. The vice and misery of the sweatshop are the ignominy of the philanthropic millionaire; for, whether he would have it so or not, his millions are red with the blood of the sweater's victims.

'Hallowed be Thy name.' And where do we find His name? In humanity. The name of God is found among men since God Himself became man. To hallow God's name, then, is first to live, as the old German mystics used to say, as though we ourselves were God. And next, it is to estimate man according to the worth God has given him when He Himself became man. Henceforth what God is to us depends on what man is to us. If man is dishonoured, God's name is unhallowed. And to treat the meanest man as apart from God is a kind of profanity.

'Thy kingdom come.' Thy kingdom—it is the social order of heaven. Thy kingdom come—it is the socialism of heaven realised on earth. This coming of the kingdom, this brotherhood of men under God is the hope which neither prophet, nor warrior, nor ruler, nor priest, nor poet, nor the great heart of the people would ever wholly yield. This is the hope into which the Hebrew nation was born. It is the hope with which Revelation, as in St. John's Apocalypse, closes, the majestic vision of the earth redeemed to universal brotherhood, united in one fellowship of sacrifice, the tabernacle of God spread over it, the word of God written in the faith and read in the obedience of every heart. *The interpretation of history is the coming of the kingdom of God.*

'Thy will' be done, as in heaven, so in earth.' Heaven is harmony. And wherever self-will asserts itself against God's will, wherever there is discord, there is hell. Now, God has a will concerning the management of railways, concerning municipal politics and police, concerning national finance, concerning the inmost domestic details. Indeed, to say that *anything* is outside

the sphere of God's will, of God's interest and government, is atheism. For what is secularism, but, as Dr. Herron has already said, atheism reduced to practice?

But the petition, 'Give us this day our daily bread'—is it not a prayer on my own behalf? Yes; if it were 'Give *me* this day.' But when I pray 'Give *us* our daily bread,' I pray that the starving child and the starved sweater's victim may get it as well as myself. I pray that I may help them to it. And so 'for any of us to claim what we have as our own, to make gain the lord of our energies while voices of hunger and murmuring fill the world, to be indifferent to wrong social conditions, to consent that millions shall have only poverty for their portion and the few control the wealth of the world, and then pray for *our* daily bread, is to be guilty of a horrible hypocrisy.'

'And forgive us our debts, as we also have forgiven our debtors.' The socialism is doubly defined in this petition. There is the *our* and the *us*, and there is the social promise, which is so expressed that it must be performance, before even the prayer is made—'as we *have forgiven* our debtors.' As we have forgiven—but what is forgiveness? 'Forgiveness,' says Dr. Herron, 'is not passive, not sentimental; nor is it a bargain between God and man, nor is it yet definable in the terms of the court-room. But one who forgives is always one who expiates the sin he forgives. Forgiveness is, after facing the enormity of another's sin, voluntarily taking that sin upon one's self, that the guilty one may be delivered from its power. The forgiveness of sin involves the most strenuous moral activity. It is the very energy of virtue seeking to bear away sin not its own. We do not forgive by letting the sin against us pass into pleasant unremembrance, by letting bygones be bygones, but by appropriating the sin we forgive as our own, and expiating, burning it up, in the holy flame of our own suffering on behalf of the forgiven one. To forgive our debtors is to pay their debts.'

And so we come to the last petition of all and authentic end of the prayer: 'And bring us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil.' Bring whom? Deliver whom? Not *me*, but *us*. That is, all the world, the whole brotherhood of men. Not deliver me from evil, surrounded as I am and ever have been, by all the influences for good that Christianity has furnished, but deliver him from evil who was born in the one-roomed loathsomeness, deliver her who was sent out to win her bread by moral leprosy before she knew to discern the evil. And this evil—it is political, it is social, it is economic, it is also ecclesiastic. But who is to deliver? It is God. Ah, then, He does not look for me to do it? Yes, He looks for me to do it through Him; or say, He waits to do it through me. Deliverance from moral evil can only be by a moral process. The engineer's will over his locomotive is arbitrary and irresistible, but only as man wills what God wills can the world be delivered from evil. We ask, Why does not God Himself remove the evil of the world since all the power and all the love are His? He asks, Why do not we deliver the world from its evil? He is ever crying unto men, out of the depth of His Fatherly heart, where the cross eternally is, to be delivered from the shame, the heartache, and the punishment of the evil that is devouring the life of His children. *God is praying to men to deliver Him from the evil of the world.*

'I wonder,' says Mr. Hugh Price Hughes, 'what impression this strange sentence produces on the mind of an average Englishman.' The words are the opening of a sermon on 'The Gospel according to St. Paul' in his recently issued volume, called *Essential Christianity* (Isbister, 3s. 6d.), and the strange sentence of which he speaks, and which is the text of his sermon, is this: 'Wherefore we henceforth know no man after the flesh: even though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now we know Him so no more' (2 Cor. v. 16, R.V.).

As it stands it *is* a strange sentence, and has had a strange history. It is quoted as the one great passage by which is determined the question whether or not St. Paul ever saw the Lord Jesus Christ when upon the earth. The 'average Englishman,' taking the sentence as he finds it, concludes that St. Paul had both seen and known Him. And not the average Englishman only. Quite a number of reputable expositors have taken the same view. To Ewald this verse is conclusive proof that 'the eager and inquiring young man Saul may have once, or more than once, seen Christ Himself during His last stay in Jerusalem, or that he may even have occasionally followed Him from motives of curiosity.' And Schaff lays stress on the order of the Greek particles which the apostle uses. The proper translation is 'even though' (*εἰ καὶ*), not 'even if' (*καὶ εἰ*). They therefore, says Schaff, record a fact; they do not put an hypothesis.

But Mr. Price Hughes reads this strange sentence in exactly the opposite way, and puts his reading down in characteristically emphatic words. 'There was one striking difference between the Apostle Paul and the other apostles which we have forgotten, but which neither he nor they ever forgot. He alone of the Twelve never met, or saw, or heard, Jesus Christ during His short life on earth.' What proof does he give of that clear statement? The words of his text seem to read the other way; why does Mr. Price Hughes reject their natural meaning? No doubt in a short sermon a man is not bound to give reasons for all his statements. Sometimes he is wise not to give reasons at all, whether his sermon be short or long. But Mr. Price Hughes gives us his reasons here. Because, he says, in his letters the Apostle Paul makes no reference to the facts of Christ's earthly life. 'Have you,' he asks, 'ever realised the startling fact that St. Paul never refers to the lovely human life of Christ as recorded in the four Gospels? He mentions only two events in that record—the death of Christ, and the resurrection of Christ—and these he names as great spiritual facts, without any of the human details and circum-

stances over which biographers would tenderly linger.'

But if the silence of St. Paul's Epistles upon the events of Christ's earthly life is to be accepted as proof that he knew nothing of these events, then it follows that St. Peter and St. John knew nothing of them either. As Dr. Denney correctly enough puts it: 'The Epistles of Peter and John are historically as barren as Paul's. They do not add a word to the gospel story; there is no new incident, no new trait in the picture of Jesus, no new oracle. Indeed, the only genuine addition to the record is that one made by Paul himself: "the word of the Lord Jesus, how He said, It is more blessed to give than to receive."'

Nothing is more surprising than this silence of the apostles in their Epistles. Nevertheless they are not absolutely silent. And a closer reading of St. Paul's Epistles in particular proves them to be the best witness to his *knowledge* of our Lord's earthly life. The classical work on this subject is Vice-Principal Knowling's *Witness of the Epistles* (Longmans, 1892), a book which has by no means taken its due position amongst us yet. A scholarly paper by Professor Banks in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, vol. v. p. 413, may also be recalled. And now a refreshing summary of the subject has just been made accessible to English readers in the second volume of Beyschlag's *New Testament Theology* (T. & T. Clark, 2 vols. 8vo). Says Beyschlag: 'It is a fact that Paul frequently appeals to sayings of Jesus, to sayings that are contained in our Gospels, and to sayings that are not found there, though they do not on that account bear less the stamp of genuineness (1 Cor. vii. 10, ix. 14; 1 Thess. iv. 15; Acts xx. 35). He knows, for example, in the chapter about marriage, what Jesus has declared about it, and what He has not spoken (1 Cor. vii. 10, 25). Certainly he makes but little use of such quotations in his Epistles and discourses. In general, he prefers, like the older apostles, to make the whole appearance and life of Jesus his text, rather than details of His teaching

and life. But when he appeared as a missionary, and had to lay the foundation of a Church just forming, then he manifestly proceeded differently, and made abundant use of the historical tradition, as is proved by 1 Cor. xi. 23, xv. 3; 2 Cor. xi. 4; Gal. iii. 1.'

One thing is clear, then, that St. Paul's silence does not prove that he did not know Jesus when He was upon the earth. He is no more silent than St. Peter or St. John. He is really not silent. Still, the conclusion may be right, though the premiss is false. St. Paul's knowledge of the facts of Christ's life might have been gathered from those men and women whom he haled to prison in the days of his persecution, and of whose defence he must have been a frequent, however impatient, listener. It might have been derived from Ananias and others after his conversion. It might have been obtained from one or more of those Gospel shreds which St. Luke refers to. It might even (let the assertion now be hazarded) have come from a deeply interested study of one or more of our present Gospels. No great harm, therefore, is done when it is said that St. Paul's silence proves he did not know the living human Jesus. But when it is said that he did not know the *facts* of our Lord's life on earth, that therefore he did not need to know them, and neither do we, the conclusion must be earnestly resisted.

It must be resisted whether it is made in the interests of belief or unbelief. We know to what clever purpose Baur of Tübingen turned this mistaken admission. If Paul knew nothing of the earthly life of Christ, then he was the easier able to credit Him with supernatural qualities, as pre-existence and divinity; his imagination had free play, and dogmas came forth as numerous as they were incredible. And although Baur's followers and representatives to-day have modified many of his extreme positions, this one they have retained as he left it; for it is the very foundation of the Tübingen system. Hilgenfeld finds nothing in the 'strange sentence' before us to suggest that Paul

knew the events of Christ's life; while Pfeiderer, with not a little assurance, says, 'It is now becoming generally acknowledged that the teaching of Paul regarding Christ is not founded on a historical knowledge of the details of the life of Jesus'; and then adds, 'We have no reason, then, beforehand to expect in the teaching of Paul as to Christ anything else than a *free Christian speculation regarding the contents of the Christian consciousness*'—and the italics are his own.

That St. Paul did not know, and that we do not need to know, the historical facts of the life of Christ is also said, however, in the interests of evangelical faith. This is the meaning and motive of Mr. Price Hughes' sermon. There are two ways of contemplating Christ, he says,—two totally different ways. We may think of Him as one who lived for three-and-thirty years, nineteen centuries ago. And we may think of Him as the Living Christ, the Risen Christ, the Christ in whom all things live and move and have their being. The one view is no doubt beautiful, inspiring, ennobling; but it is outside of us; it is far away from us; it does not stir the depths of our being. The other view is what St. Paul calls 'my Gospel'; it is the mystery which God revealed pre-eminently to St. Paul, and through St. Paul to us; it is the key to the enigma of the universe, to the mystery of sin, pain, and death—'Christ in us the hope of glory.'

Now if this means nothing more than that to know Christ in us is better than to know Christ in Capernaum, it is both unobjectionable and even at the present time well worth saying. But in the light of the text of which it is meant to be an exposition, it means something very different from that.

The text is, 'even though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now we know Him so no more.' And the interpretation is that St. Paul reckoned all knowledge of Jesus' human life needless and useless. Even if he once knew Him as a Man (which Mr. Price Hughes does not

believe), he is determined not to think of Him in that condition any longer; he is determined to think of Him only as the Risen Christ, the Christ who is seated at the Father's right hand in heavenly places, and at the same time dwells in our hearts by faith.

And if that is the right interpretation of the passage, Mr. Hughes' conclusion is right. If St. Paul says that he is determined not to have anything more to do with the life of Christ upon the earth, then we need not have anything to do with it either, and the cry of 'Back to the Gospels' is ludicrously out of place. Let us leave the Gospels alone, however 'beautiful, ennobling, inspiring' they may be. Let us follow St. Paul and know Christ after the flesh no more. Let us recognise without alarm that for us Jesus of Nazareth has passed by.

That is Mr. Price Hughes' advice to us. And let it be said again that he is right if his interpretation of his text is right. Dr. Dale of Birmingham has a great sermon on this same text. It may be found in his *Fellowship with Christ* (Hodder & Stoughton, 1891). Dr. Dale takes the same view of its interpretation as Mr. Price Hughes, for indeed it is the ordinary and almost universally current view. But he is not so bold as Mr. Price Hughes. 'Are we, then,' he asks, 'to forget His earthly history? Is that gracious, pathetic, entrancing vision to be lost and forgotten in the mists and clouds which gather swiftly and silently over the past? Ah, no! To us who see the Divine heights from which Christ descended when He became man, who see the Divine heights on which He now reigns, who know that even in His temptations and sorrows and death He did not cease to be the Eternal Son of the Father,—all the incidents of His earthly history have a new and wonderful pathos and power.' Surely. But why? St. Paul knew all these things as well as we. Yet he said that he would know Christ after the flesh no more. And why should it be otherwise with us?

So it simply cannot be that when St. Paul said, 'even though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now we know Him so no more,' he meant that he would have no more to do with Jesus' earthly life. What he did mean it may take us a minute to grasp. But we shall at least make the effort to grasp it when we have seen clearly that he could not have meant that.

And there are other objections. St. Paul not only says that henceforth he knows not Christ after the flesh; he also says that henceforth he knows no man after the flesh. Now it is most unlikely that in the same sentence he would have used this expression in two different senses. But if knowing Christ after the flesh means knowing Him in His humanity, what does knowing any *man* after the flesh mean? The accepted interpretation is that he is henceforth to make no distinctions among men, that he is to make no distinction between Jew and Gentile, rich and poor, bond and free. But how can such a meaning be squeezed out of the expression 'after the flesh'? Where is that expression else used in any analogous sense? And how does it mean that in one part of this verse, and something totally different in the other?

That the verse, so interpreted, starts up abruptly out of its context, coming out of nothing, and leading into nothing, might also be made clear; but that is generally allowed, amid needless remarks on the abruptness of St. Paul's thought and language. In short, there are many reasons that compel us to re-examine this passage and see if any other meaning can be found in it.

And then the first thing that strikes us is that the Greek is seriously strained to admit this translation, though it is found in all our English versions. A word for word translation would run in this way: 'Wherefore we henceforth no one know according to the flesh: even though we knew according to the flesh Christ, yet now no longer do we know.'

Now, amidst some minor things, there is one striking difference to be seen in that literal translation. It is the place of the expression 'according to the flesh.' In the first part of the sentence it is separated from 'no one,' and goes with the verb 'know'; in the second part of the sentence it is again carefully placed so that it will go with the verb 'knew.' It is not possible for any person to give the Greek its natural translation without endeavouring to show that 'after the flesh' does not refer to 'no one' or to 'Christ' at all, but goes always and only with the verb. In short, what St. Paul speaks about is not any man after the flesh, and not Christ after the flesh, it is about himself knowing after the flesh. We may have difficulty in discovering what he means, but what he says certainly is that henceforth he knows according to the flesh no one, and that even though he has known in this way Christ Himself, he knew Him in this way no longer.

And what he means by 'knowing according to the flesh'—that, at least, his words elsewhere very clearly let us understand. In the Epistle to the Romans he speaks of 'us who walk not after the flesh but after the spirit' (Rom. viii. 4). Again, he says, 'If ye live after the flesh, ye must die; but if by the spirit ye mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall live' (Rom. viii. 13). In 1 Corinthians he speaks of those who are 'wise after the flesh' (1 Cor. i. 26), and of 'Israel after the flesh' (1 Cor. x. 18). And in this very Epistle he asks; 'The things that I purpose, do I purpose according to the flesh?'; he is bold against 'some which count of us as if we walked according to the flesh'; and says, 'for though we walk *in* the flesh, we do not war *after* the flesh' (2 Cor. x. 2, 3); and, finally, that 'many glory after the flesh' (2 Cor. xi. 18).

Well, then, it is evident that he recognises a knowledge which is according to the flesh, and a knowledge which is according to the spirit, just as he similarly recognises a walk, a life, a wisdom, and a war. He says there was a time when his knowledge

of men was according to the flesh. Then came a crisis. And 'from henceforth' he knows no one according to the flesh. That crisis, as all allow, was his conversion. From that time his knowledge of everyone is according to the spirit, just as his walk is according to the spirit, and his war, and his wisdom, and his glory, and his whole life. And if you ask him what he means by knowing men now according to the spirit and no longer according to the flesh, you ask the very question which Agrippa asked. 'Then Agrippa said unto Paul, Thou art permitted to speak for thyself. And Paul stretched forth the hand and answered for himself—Whereupon, O King Agrippa, I was not disobedient unto the heavenly vision, but showed first unto them of Damascus,' and the rest, 'that they should repent and turn to God and do works meet for repentance.' Had he not done that before? Certainly not. He had held before that there were just two classes of men in the earth—those who needed no repentance, and those who needed it but would not get it. Had the change taken place in them, then? No. It had taken place in him.

For every person who, like himself, gets into Christ is a new creature, the old ways of knowing people and treating people, the knowledge according to the flesh, are passed away, behold they have all become new.

Nor is it of men alone that his knowledge has been changed. He once was brought into close contact with Christ before the crisis came. For he persecuted this Way unto the death. And the closer he came to Christ the more it maddened him. He cried with Peter, 'Depart from me,' but did not yet add, 'for I am a sinful man, O Lord.' Nay, he even cried out, as the poor demoniac, 'What have I to do with Thee, Thou Jesus of Nazareth?' He knew Christ intimately enough, and the knowledge was an intolerable anguish. For it was a knowledge according to the flesh. But the crisis came. Jesus said, 'It is hard for thee.' Paul answered, 'What wilt Thou have me to do?' 'Whereupon, O King Agrippa, I was not disobedient'; for now his knowledge was according to the spirit.

The Theology of the Epistle to the Romans.

BY THE REV. ARTHUR C. HEADLAM, M.A., FELLOW AND CHAPLAIN OF ALL SOULS COLLEGE, OXFORD.

THE NEED OF THE GOSPEL.

IN vers. 16 and 17 of chap. i. St. Paul has stated the theme of his Epistle, 'Righteousness by Faith.' He now begins a systematic treatise on the subject. And the first question that he discusses is, Why is this revelation necessary? The answer put very shortly is, Because of sin: because of the existence of sin in the world. This theory St. Paul proceeds to prove and develop in the passages which follow; the section, namely, beginning at chap. i. ver. 18, and ending at chap. iii. ver. 20. It will be convenient to study at the same time as these two other passages as illustrating St. Paul's theory of sin, chap. v. vers. 12-21; and chap. vii. vers. 7-25.

The argument of this first main section of the

Epistle is continuous and sustained. It may be summarised as follows:—

Why was this revelation of God's righteousness necessary? Because of the continuous revelation of God's wrath exhibited against the sinfulness of the world. First, St. Paul turns to the heathen world, and then in words glowing with indignation he describes their contemptible idolatry and consequent sin. There is a revelation of God in nature to all men. All mankind, if they would only read the lessons of nature and the universe with a pure heart, might learn something of God. 'The invisible things of God since the creation of the world are clearly seen, being perceived through the things which are made.' But although this