

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THE Spring is on us, and several books have come. Some are of manifest importance, some are of promise and appetite. The *Life of Spurgeon*—the first of four great volumes, we should say—will be handled inadequately next month. Then also something will be said about the new volume of the 'Eras' series, a strong volume, *The Anglican Reformation*, by Dr. William Clark; also about a new *Teacher's Bible*, published by Messrs. Eyre & Spottiswoode, and a Bible for Young People, edited by Professor Bennett and Professor Adeney; about Professor Sayce's new book, which has come at the last moment; the first volume of a new series called 'The Churchman's Library,' which is edited by Mr. J. H. Burn; and a remarkable volume of sermons by Professor Martin of Edinburgh.

Professor van Manen makes complaint that the recent critical studies of Dutch scholars on the Pauline Epistles have been rejected by English students. We believe they will be rejected still. But Professor van Manen says that they have been rejected on insufficient or even false evidence. He says that English students have not looked at them directly. They have trusted to the German version of them and the German verdict upon them. He pleads, therefore, for a direct hearing; and we have not hesitated to

accord it. In the present issue of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES will be found the first half of an article by Professor van Manen, which is marked by very great ability, and which we do not doubt will receive perfectly fair consideration from every scholar who reads it.

The first volume of the new DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE will be published this month, and a prospectus will probably accompany this issue. It will be enough therefore for the present to say a word on the volume that is to follow it.

The most important article in the department of the Old Testament will no doubt be Professor Ryle's *Israel*; the most important within the range of the New Testament, Professor Sanday's *Jesus Christ*. Yet the article *God*, which is to be the united work of Dr. A. B. Davidson and Dr. Sanday, will be of scarcely less consequence. All these will fall within the second volume. That volume will also contain Professor Ramsay's articles on *Galatia*, *Galatians*, and the *Region of Galatia*; Professor Marcus Dods' on the *Epistle to the Galatians*; and Professor Bruce's on the *Epistle to the Hebrews*.

Other articles in 'Introduction' which fall within the second volume are Professor G. A. Smith's

Isaiah, Professor Ryle's *Genesis*, Professor A. B. Davidson's *Hosea* and *Jeremiah*, and Professor Driver's *Habakkuk*. The same volume will cover the two chief articles on *Language*: that on the Language of the Old Testament being by Professor Margoliouth; that on the Language of the New, by Professor Thayer. It will contain Colonel Conder's *Jerusalem*, and other geographical articles by Professor W. Max Müller, Major-General Sir C. W. Wilson, Lieut.-General Sir Charles Warren, Dr. Selah Merrill, Dr. F. J. Bliss, Professor G. A. Smith, and Professor Driver.

Finally, its most significant articles in Biblical Theology will be *Glory*, by Mr. G. Buchanan Gray and Professor Massie; *Grace*, by Principal Stewart; *Holiness*, by Professor Skinner and Professor Stevens; *Holy Spirit*, by Professor Swete; *Justification*, by Principal Simon; the *Kingdom of God*, by Professor Orr; and *Law*, by Professor Driver and Professor Denney.

The first thing, says Professor Sanday, that last winter's discovery in Egypt teaches us, is the importance of the definite article. Early in the year rumours came to this country that 'the Logia' had been discovered. Now what could 'the Logia' be but the Logia of Papias? And the word passed rapidly round that the long-lost Logia of Papias had been found. The discoverers were not to blame. They had found Logia. Their leaf of papyrus contains brief, authoritative, and as it were 'oracular' sayings—exactly what is meant by Logia. And so when they referred to its contents, they were quite entitled to speak of 'the Logia'—the particular Logia before them. But it was only a single worn papyrus leaf: it was not the Logia of Papias.

And yet, if it had been the Logia of Papias, would it have created much greater interest than this anonymous fragment has done? Would it within the time have produced a fuller array of literature? It is only six months since the Sayings

were made public. Professor Lock and Professor Sanday have just issued from the Clarendon Press (8vo, pp. 49, 1s. 6d.) two Lectures upon them. They begin with a bibliography. And although the bibliography does not profess to be complete; although it is 'professedly not complete,' although it deliberately mentions only such writings as seem to have made some distinct contribution to the discussion of the Sayings—it contains fifty-seven entries; itself is the fifty-eighth.

Fifty-eight published writings within six months, all given to the elucidation of this handbreadth of papyrus, and each making some notable contribution—it is a proof of the keen interest felt in exact scholarship in our day, it is a new evidence that the Scripture must be fulfilled which says that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow. But now the subject has had its reasonable share of discussion. The fifty-eighth contribution gathers the results together, and offers a survey of the whole.

It is divided into four parts. The first part contains the bibliography. It is the work of Professor Lock. We need not record that bibliography here. But as Professor Lock has abridged it for us, it is of interest to notice that after the discoverers' own edition of the Sayings, he places the Lecture which Professor Swete contributed to our columns. Then comes the monograph of Professor Harnack. And after that he commends the reviews of Clemen, Heinrici, and Zahn in Germany; those of James, Rendel Harris, and Cross in England; and that of Batiffol in France.

The second part is the text itself. That also is mainly Professor Lock's, but with elements from Dr. Sanday. Now everyone who knows anything at all of the subject, knows that the text is partly fixed and partly floating. That is to say, so much of the leaf can be read and so much cannot—so much is left and so much is torn or worn away. Of the words that are left, there are only two that

create any difficulty. In the second *logion* occurs the expression: λέγει Ἰησοῦς, Ἐὰν μὴ νηστεύσητε τὸν κόσμον, which being literally interpreted is, 'Jesus says, Except ye fast the world.' If the English is peculiar, so is the Greek. It is quite unique indeed. But Clement of Alexandria has the identical phrase with the genitive case for the accusative. And although Professor Lock has examined the original manuscript and has no doubt that κόσμον is its reading (even if the τὸν is not so certain), he boldly accepts the genitive from Clement, reads τοῦ κοσμοῦ for τὸν κόσμον, and gets the excellent sense, 'Except ye fast from the world.'

Professor Lock takes that liberty with the undoubted text of the manuscript, and Professor Sanday agrees. What is more to the purpose and more surprising, Professor Sanday agrees in almost every missing or illegible letter which Professor Lock supplies from conjecture. These lacunæ occur chiefly in the end of the third *logion* (for our editors agree with Swete and Harnack in reckoning the original third and fourth as one), and in the beginning of the fourth (the discoverers' original fifth). Dr. Swete conjectured the end of the third to be, οὐδὲ γινώσκουσιν ἑαυτῶν τὴν πτωχίαν, 'neither know they their own poverty'; Dr. Lock adopts πτωχοὶ καὶ οὐκ οἶδασιν τὴν πτωχίαν, 'poor and know not their poverty.' Dr. Swete's suggestion for the beginning of the fourth was, λέγει Ἰησοῦς, Ὅπου ἐὰν ᾧσιν πάντες μισόθει, καὶ πιστὸς εἰς ἔστιν ὁ μόνος, ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ εἰμι μετ' αὐτοῦ, 'Jesus saith, Where all are haters of God, and there is one believer only, lo, I am with him': Dr. Lock prefers, λέγει Ἰησοῦς, Ὅπου ἐὰν ᾧσιν Ἐ, οὐκ εἰσὶν ἄθει, καὶ εἴ που εἰς ἔστιν ὁ μόνος λέγω ἐγὼ εἰμι μετ' αὐτοῦ, 'Jesus says, Wherever there are two, they are not without God's presence, and if anywhere one is alone, I say I am with him.'

Between Professor Swete's early and independent suggestions and Professor Lock's latest and resultant conclusions, those are the only

important differences. And they do not affect the sense. The only question of meaning which arises, indeed, is over a sentence, of which every word is fortunately unmistakable in the manuscript. We need not add that it is the last half of the fourth (discoverers' fifth) *logion*: 'Raise the stone, and there thou shalt find Me; cleave the wood, and I am there.'

That is the translation. What is its meaning? The interpretations have been plentiful, and some of them highly ingenious. Only five, in Dr. Lock's opinion, deserve consideration. First of all, there is the suggestion thrown out quite independently by both Swete and Harnack that the *logion* has in mind a passage in Ecclesiastes (10⁹), where manual labour seems to be discouraged. Says Harnack, it is the benediction of the Carpenter's Son on the horny hand; says Swete, it is the Lord's encouragement to persevere in the spiritual upbuilding of the Church. The second interpretation finds in the words a reference to Christ's presence in nature. The third comes from Dr. James (hesitatingly). Its stress is on the imperatives; it is an exhortation to put forth effort. Dr. Barnes is identified with the fourth. He believes that the words have a distinct reference to *the* stone of the sepulchre, *the* wood of the cross. They are words of reassuring spoken to the disciples: 'Wherever you are, together or alone, I am with you; and whatever happens, My burial or crucifixion, I am there; lift up the stone of the tomb and you will find Me alive, pierce through the cross and you will find Me there.' The last suggestion finds the meaning in the ritual of sacrifice: 'prepare the altar, cleave the wood for the fire, and I am there in your worship.'

Now there is not one of these that does not have its attractiveness. Professor Lock prefers the second. He believes that this *logion* is an assertion of the presence of Christ in natural things, and Professor Sanday entirely agrees with him. 'I take the text,' says Dr. Sanday, 'as referring to the presence of Christ as the *Logos* in

inanimate nature as well as with the Church, even in its smallest fractions.' And he adds, 'This latter part of the Saying is peculiar, but not necessarily heterodox.'

The fourth part of this pamphlet is the work of Professor Sanday alone. It deals with the history and origin of the Sayings. And there, at once, Dr. Sanday answers the question we have all been asking from the beginning, Are these Logia genuine sayings of our Lord? He answers the question at once, and he answers it clearly: 'I cannot think that any of the new matter represents, as it stands, a genuine saying of our Lord.' He believes that the Logia are the work of a single hand. They have an individual stamp upon them, and a stamp which may well be called striking, but it is not *His* stamp. The author starts, as a rule, from genuine sayings. But he works them up in a sense of his own. Dr. Sanday does not call this method dishonest. He finds something similar, indeed, in the Fourth Gospel. The writer had long brooded over the sayings which had reached him, and the longer he brooded, and the deeper and stronger his own thoughts, the more likely he would be to fuse and transfuse his original, and to add to it elements of his own. 'The difference between the Fourth Gospel and the new Sayings I take to be that the latter do not rest on the same basis of personal experience.'

But the real heart of the enigma surrounding these Logia lies in the phrase with which each *logion* opens, 'Jesus says.' 'There is nothing exactly parallel to it in its repetition before (or possibly, as Harnack thinks, after) each Saying. We are driven to guess, and our guesses are very much in the dark.' In particular, why is the verb in the present? It is easily explained if, as Professor Lock counts possible, these Sayings are 'extracts from some notes made by a disciple in the lifetime of Jesus.' But Professor Lock is not so bold as to accept that explanation unreservedly. It is more probable, he thinks, that the present

has a mystical force. The saying is past, but the Lord is present. It is akin to Cowper's line—

Jesus speaks, and speaks to thee.

Or, he adds felicitously, we might compare the touching paragraph in Dr. Pusey's life: 'When his son Philip died, he rarely expressed himself as if they were separated. "Philip says" was a more frequent form of quoting the departed than "Philip used to say."' This would account for the personal name Jesus as well as for the present tense.

But Dr. Sanday is not so near accepting the genuineness of the Sayings as Professor Lock. The explanation that most commends itself to his mind is safer, if more prosaic. He accepts the suggestion of Mr. C. F. Burney that it is a Jewish formula, perhaps in unconscious imitation of the 'Hillel said' or the 'Shammai said' which we find in the Talmud, and especially in the early treatise, *Pirke 'Aboth*, or 'Sayings of the Jewish Fathers.' And so Professor Sanday inclines to the belief that the birthplace of the Logia is Alexandria, and their date about 120 A.D.

Messrs. T. & T. Clark have just published a new edition of Mr. Adamson's *Spirit of Power* (small 8vo, pp. 85, 1s.), and at the same time a new book by the same author, under the title of *Studies of the Mind in Christ* (post 8vo, pp. xii, 300, 4s. 6d.).

That *The Spirit of Power* should have reached a second edition so early is gratifying. It is a clear triumph on the side of Biblical Theology. For the little book is a study in Biblical Theology and it is nothing more. It does not deny the claims either of Systematic or of Practical Theology, but it does not pretend to fulfil them. It ends just where their claims begin. It takes the early chapters of the Acts of the Apostles, and, without the intrusion of any other thought or consideration, it asks what they have to say on the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. It thereby serves as a founda-

tion to a knowledge of that doctrine. Other men may lay other foundations; it is only such a foundation as this that will stand.

The new book takes a higher range. It is a study in Biblical Theology also, but its sphere is the four Gospels. It is a larger, and we believe it will be reckoned a greater, book. Its first effect, however, will be to disconcert.

For the title of the very first chapter of Mr. Adamson's *Studies of the Mind in Christ* is 'Christ's Ignorance.' And we do not turn many pages when we become convinced that in Mr. Adamson's judgment the title is real, and covers a reality. We only reach the beginning of the fourth page, indeed, when we read the words, 'To say that Christ was ignorant on this one point only, is to grant the principle without reaping its results.' The one point is 'the day and hour' of Mt 24³⁶ and Mk 13³². Mr. Adamson asserts that of that day and that hour Christ says frankly He was ignorant: he holds that He was ignorant of many things besides.

Yet it will not do to quote examples. It would be possible—some will say it would be easy—to show that every one of the examples is open to another interpretation. But Mr. Adamson's point is not in any example, nor even in any number of examples. It is in the principle itself—the principle and its results—and that he gets from the single, unmistakable example with which he opens—Christ's ignorance of 'that day and that hour.' Mr. Adamson's purpose is to reach the complete Personality that resided in Jesus Christ. One element in it is His real and approachable humanity. He finds that most unmistakably in the instances of human ignorance.

Perhaps it is a pity that the chapter entitled 'Christ's Ignorance' had to come first. It is a pity, indeed, if it not only disconcerts, but drives us off this harvest-field. For even the chapter on 'Christ's Ignorance' is used to a most godly pur-

pose. And as soon as it is passed, we find ourselves in an atmosphere in which we can breathe with delight. The title of the second chapter is 'Christ's Supernatural Knowledge.'

Now, Mr. Adamson does not discover many events which prove supernatural knowledge in Christ. He believes that not a few of the cases which seem to fall within that class can be explained on purely natural principles. But after all this reduction is made, there are eleven incidents which seem to him inexplicable in any other way. You observe, of course, that it is Christ's supernatural *knowledge* that is before us, not His supernatural *power*. You soon perceive also that Mr. Adamson makes a striking distinction between Christ's *supernatural* knowledge and Christ's *divine* knowledge.

That distinction is the book's chief claim upon our interest. The author is conscious of its importance. Yet he works towards it gradually. It is not till the fourth chapter is reached that it breaks upon us. And even then it opens slowly and takes possession unobtrusively. But it is the governing presence in the book. When we catch the force of it we retain it with us to the end. We retain it with us for ever, an impressive and productive discovery in theology.

'Recently a friend, in whose judgment I place great confidence, remarked in a letter to me, that Dr. McGiffert's book on the *History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age* contained the most powerful statement known to him of the view that the Acts of the Apostles could not have been written by Luke, the friend and pupil of St. Paul; and he urged that I should state clearly and precisely the attitude which I hold toward the argument so ably stated by the American professor.' Whereupon Professor W. M. Ramsay states clearly and precisely, in the *Expositor* for January, why he still believes that the Acts of the Apostles was written by St. Luke.

He does not review the book. He reckons it well worth reviewing. It is 'characterized by deep study and knowledge, long deliberation, and remarkable dialectical skill.' It contains 'many very great qualities,' and these qualities 'appear everywhere throughout the book.' As an example, he gives the defence of the Pauline authorship of the Epistle to the Colossians, 'which is an admirably concise and powerful piece of reasoning.' Still, Professor Ramsay does not review the book. He confines himself to one subject—the authorship of the Acts of the Apostles.

For the authorship of the Acts of the Apostles carries most things with it in apostolic Christianity. And it is because Dr. McGiffert's book has gone astray on the authorship of the Acts, because it has been 'spoiled by a bad theory as to the fundamental document on which it must rest,' that it has missed being ranked 'among the small number of really good books.'

Dr. McGiffert's theory is that the author of the Acts was not an eye-witness of any of the scenes he describes, but one who, writing after the scenes he describes were over, was dependent upon 'Sources' for his information. Now, in any theory as to the authorship of the Acts, the question of Sources, says Professor Ramsay, is one of great importance. Almost all believe that the author was a Greek, that he was a stranger to Palestine, that he was probably born after many of the events which he records had occurred. For these events, and for others besides these, he no doubt had to rely upon Sources; and 'we all admit that some of his Sources were written.' But what Professor Ramsay holds against Professor McGiffert is, that great part of the Acts is not dependent upon written sources, that it was gathered from the lips of the actors themselves, and especially that some of it—to be recognized by the use of the first person plural—was written down by the author from personal knowledge.

Professor Ramsay believes that St. Luke was the author of the Acts of the Apostles, and that he was himself an eye-witness of a part of what he describes. He believes that for much of the remainder he was indebted to the narrative of St. Paul. But he is ready to allow that there are signs of other Sources in the book. 'In chapters i. and ii. traces of popular traditions are visible; in chapter xii. 12 it is distinctly given the reader to understand that John Mark was the authority; the comparison of viii. 40 with xxi. 8, 10 gives an equally distinct hint that Philip was the authority for chapter viii.' In short, Professor Ramsay is ready to acknowledge Sources, and may admit that some of them were even written. But he holds—and the whole matter lies in holding—that the author of the Acts was able to use these Sources, and did use them, both skilfully and conscientiously.

Now the Source-theory is wholly different from that. It practically ignores the author. It gives him little credit for skill or for veracity. It scarcely affords him personality. Everything depends upon the Sources that he used. If they were good and early his statements may be accepted; if they were bad and late his statements must be summarily set aside.

But Dr. McGiffert is not an advocate of the extreme form of the Source-theory. A true critical instinct makes him recoil from the extremest form of the Source-theory. When he comes to the narrative of St. Paul's interview with Sergius Paulus he deserts his Source-theory and finds some ability in his author. 'The author,' he says, 'with the instinct of a true historian, evidently felt the significance' of the interview. But why did he feel the significance of this particular interview? Other advocates of the Source-theory simply say that the change of name from Saul to Paul is due to a change of Source. Professor McGiffert feels that it is not due to a change of Source; with 'a true critical instinct' he feels

that it is due to St. Luke himself. But why does St. Luke get the credit here for what is so persistently given to the Sources elsewhere?

Again, St. Luke 'was keenly alive to the dramatic possibilities of the position in which the apostle found himself' at Athens. Nevertheless he sternly resisted the temptation to work up those possibilities in a way contrary to the real facts recorded in his Sources. 'Now,' says Professor Ramsay, 'only a person endued with considerable literary feeling and historical sympathy is able to be keenly alive to the dramatic possibilities of a situation in past time and in a strange country; and only a person who has a strong sense of veracity will resist the temptation to touch up the situation whose possibilities he is so keenly alive to, and will rigorously deny himself the slightest embellishing touch which does not stand in the record. Yet this person did not shrink from the most shameless and stupid mendacity in other cases. He found in two "Sources" accounts of a visit of St. Paul to Jerusalem, and he thought they described two separate visits, and invented a whole chapter of false history in order to work in the second visit which his stupidity had conjured up.' How reconcile these contradictions? asks Professor Ramsay. 'Who is this author, who shows such literary feeling, such scrupulous veracity, such helplessness in literary expression, such unscrupulous disregard to truth? Who is it that sometimes transfers to his pages fragments of a "Source" more awkwardly than the feeblest Byzantine compiler, for he forgets to change a first person to a third; at another time selects and remodels till he has constructed a narrative which shows "the instinct of a true historian," "keenly alive to the dramatic possibilities of the situation?"'

It is a wonderful thing to discover an author like this, and Dr. McGiffert deserves the credit of the discovery. But his credit is greater still for the way he handles his 'Sources.' The older and better are no older than from 60 to 70 A.D.; the

later and worse are no later than from 70 to 80. An so, great credit is due, in Professor Ramsay's opinion, to the acumen of this scholar, who can preserve his balanced judgment as he walks along the sharp knife-edge between them, and can unhesitatingly distinguish between the older and the later source. 'We humble students of history cannot come up to such skill as that; and we are so rude and barbarous as to smile at it and disbelieve in it.'

Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton have published a volume of Addresses by the late Professor Drummond, under the title of *The Ideal Life* (crown 8vo, pp. 315, 6s.). It contains, among other things, the surprise of an address on 'The Three Facts of Sin.'

Dr. Robertson Nicoll and Dr. John Watson write 'Memorial Sketches' to open the volume with. The latter says, 'Christianity to Drummond was not so much a way of escape from the grip of sin, with its burden of guilt and loathsome contact, as a way of ethical and spiritual attainment.' We read that sentence and believe it. It is the thing we have always been told about Drummond. It is the cause, we have always understood, of 'the breach between the religious world and Drummond.' And then we come to this Address on 'The Three Facts of Sin,' and all the surprise of it.

Sin, says Drummond, is one of the words of the literary world at present, it is perhaps *the* word. Years ago it was the gay word 'Chivalry.' Later the word was 'Love.' But now the ruling word in poem and ballad and song, in novel and romance, is 'Sin.' It is therefore no surprise that in one of his addresses Professor Drummond should speak about Sin. But Professor Drummond himself says that when a word is borrowed by literature from religion, it is the duty of religion to see that it is borrowed whole. 'Truth,' he says, 'which is to pass into such common circu-

lation must not be mutilated truth; it must be strong, ringing, decided, whole; it must be standard truth; it must be Bible truth.' Professor Drummond's Address on 'The Three Facts of Sin' is standard truth, it is Bible truth, it is strong, ringing, decided, whole. That is the surprise of it.

The text is found in Ps 103^{3, 4}—

'Who forgiveth all thine iniquities;
Who healeth all thy diseases;
Who redeemeth thy life from destruction.'

The three facts of sin are found there. 'Who forgiveth all thine iniquities,'—that is the *Guilt* of sin. 'Who healeth all thy diseases,'—that touches the *Stain* of sin. 'Who redeemeth thy life from destruction,'—that expresses the *Power* of sin. And these three facts about sin—its Guilt, its Stain, its Power—are all we need to know of sin.

The greatest fact about sin is its guilt. Professor Drummond treats it briefly. Perhaps he felt his time run out. For he takes the guilt of sin last. We had better take it first. He recognizes, however, that it is the greatest of the three facts about Sin. It is the Godward side of it. There is a God with Whom we have to do. He has given us laws: He is our Judge. 'Guilty, or not guilty?' And we must answer 'Guilty.' We recognize the Guilt of sin. Then our sin takes on a darker colouring. It grows larger than our life. It suddenly seems to be infinite. The whole world is concerned with our particular sin, the whole universe. For God is concerned about it. We feel now that the Lord has turned and looked upon us as He looked at Peter, and we can only go out and weep bitterly.

Is this the thought of Sin that has impressed the literary world to-day? No. It is just this thought of Sin that the literary world ignores. The literary world knows nothing and can teach nothing of the Guilt of a sinner's soul. And so

the literary conception of sin is defective—seriously defective; for this is the greatest fact about sin—and it must be supplemented. Now Professor Drummond knows but one way of supplementing its defect. It must be got to look at Christ. For Christ moved through the wilderness of this world, and men shrank back—'Depart from me, for I am a sinful man, O Lord.' He moves through the world still; and above all, says Professor Drummond, He hangs still upon the Cross; and this is the climax of conviction, 'They shall look on Me Whom they have pierced, and they shall *mourn*.'

It is not sin's Guilt, then, that has caught the interest of the literary world to-day. It is its Stain. The world does not see the guilt of sin; its Stain it cannot miss. We see it in one another's lives. We see it in one another's faces. The Stain of the world's sin is troubling the world's conscience. It is troubling its Philanthropy, its Parliament, its Press. It is absorbing the finest writing of the day; it is filling our modern poetry; it is making a thousand modern books preach the doctrine of Retribution, which simply means the doctrine of the Stain of sin. Society is not wise enough to see the Power of sin, nor religious enough to see the Guilt of sin; but it cannot fail to see the Stain of sin.

And the Stain of sin troubles society. It lies at its doors; it is an eyesore to it. It is loathsome, and lying there! So society must do something with it. And this is what it does with it. 'In one corner it builds a prison—that will rid the world of its annoyance. In another corner it plants a madhouse—the sore may fester there unseen. In another it raises a hospital; in a fourth it lays out a graveyard. Prisons, madhouses, hospitals—these are just so much roofing which society has put on to hide the Stain of sin.' It is a good thing that the Stain of sin will not be hidden so.

A man's own sin-stains cannot be hidden so. Dark accumulated stains, they remain upon the

life, and he tries to take them off in vain. 'There was a time once, when his robe was white and clean. "Keep your garment unspotted from the world," they said to him, the kind home-voices, as he went out into life. He remembers well the first spot on that robe. Even the laden years that lie between have no day so dark—no spot now lies so lurid red upon his soul as that first sin. Then the companion stain came; for sins are mostly twins. Then another and another and many more, till count was lost, and the whole robe was patterned over with sin-stains. The power of God has come to make a new man of him, but the stains are sunk so deeply in his soul that they are living parts of him still.'

This is the difference between the Guilt of sin and its Stain. Great as is the Guilt of sin, the greatest fact about it, the Guilt of sin may be rubbed out; the Stain of sin may not. But does He not say, 'He healeth all thy diseases'? Yes, says Professor Drummond, the diseases may be healed, but the ravages they have wrought remain. Small-pox, he says, may be healed, but it leaves its mark behind. A cut limb may be cured, but the scar remains for ever. An earthquake is over in three minutes, but the ground is rent into gulfs and chasms which ages will not close.

But the Stain will end with life? No, says Professor Drummond, this is the bitterness of the Stain of sin; it does not end with the sinner's life. Every action of every man has an ancestry and a posterity in other lives. 'I am a part,' says Tennyson, 'of all that I have met.' 'A hundred years hence,' says Drummond, 'we all must live again—in thoughts, in tendencies, in influences, perhaps in sins and stains in other lives.' He quotes the sinful man who cried as he died, 'Take my influence and bury it with me,'—a thing that could not be. And he says, 'It were worth living a holy and self-denying life, were it only to join the

choir invisible of those immortal dead who live again in lives made better by their presence.'

The last great fact of sin is its Power, 'Who redeemeth thy life from destruction,' sang the Psalmist. For sin has the power to destroy the life. There is an old poem which bears the curious title of 'Strife in Heaven.' The poet supposes himself in the street of the New Jerusalem. He listens to a crowd of saints engaged in earnest discussion. The question they are discussing is, 'Which of them is the greatest monument of God's saving grace.' Vote after vote is taken, and their numbers are reduced to two. One of these two is a very old man. He describes the vicious life he has led—a life filled up with every conceivable indulgence, marred with every crime. On his deathbed, at the eleventh hour, Christ came to him, and he was forgiven. It is a mere waste of time, he says, for them to go further. A greater monument of the grace of God nowhere can be found. The other is an old man too. In a few words he says that he was brought to Christ when a boy; he has led a quiet life; he has looked forward to heaven as long as he can remember. The vote is taken between them. Every vote is given to the last. For this old poet knew that, though it requires great grace to pluck a dying brand from the burning, it requires yet more grace to keep a life from guilt through all its tempted years.

The Secretary of the S.P.C.K. writes in reply to some Notes in last month's issue on the translation of Maspero's *Struggle of the Nations* and Hommel's *Ancient Hebrew Tradition*. He says that he is not the translator of Maspero. He means that he is only the translator's husband. He also informs us that Professor Hommel is content with the translation of his book. It is very good of Professor Hommel to say so; but his saying so does not make it a good translation.