tinise his every sentence, he ventured to place his friend beside Isaiah, John the Baptist, St. Paul and St. Augustine. The note of personal sorrow was hushed as he dwelt with awe and gratitude on the work divinely accomplished in these latter days through Luther. "And there came a fear on all; and they glorified God, saying, That a great prophet is risen up among us, and, that God hath visited His people."

JANE T. STODDART.

THE TEACHING OF PAUL IN TERMS OF THE PRESENT DAY.

VIII. THE BASIS OF PAUL'S THOUGHT—(2) GOD IS GOOD.

THE religion of Paul was definitely and absolutely inconsistent with the characteristic Oriental doctrine of a pantheistic type. Yet all such forms of thought start, as Paul did, from the perception that man is by the very fact of his existence separated from God and ought to aim at reunion with Him.

Why then did not Paul take the step which so many Asiatic forms of religious thought have taken? How did he avoid the pantheistic view and the inference from it, which was so tempting to an intensely emotional and devotional nature like his, that man should seek re-absorption in the Divine through liberation from the human nature, that man should strive to lose his individuality and to be merged in the one God?

Paul was saved from this step by the whole force of Hebrew tradition and the promise given to his fathers. The Promise had been made and must be fulfilled; and fulfilment of the Promise led in the diametrically opposite direction from that dream of absorption in the Divine nature, which was the goal of the highest Asiatic religious thought outside of the Hebrew people. The fulfilment of the

Promise lay in the perfecting of the race through the perfecting of the individual, not through the loss of individuality.

The Promise is just a more simple expression, such as an early people could most readily understand, of the philosophic principle that God is good. In the act of creation He has bound Himself; he has given a pledge or a Promise. He will never violate the Promise which He has repeated time and again to His chosen people. What God has done must be good and perfect; it cannot fail or become worse; it must grow towards perfection. Man, who was made in the image of God, must attain to the true end of his nature in some way and by some process, planned from the beginning by God. This process was to be realised through the coming of the Messiah. That is the Promise, or the Covenant or Testament (*διαθήκη*).

Promise, Covenant, Testament, these are terms that describe only in an imperfect way the act which they designate. Being English terms, they denote things that are different from the things which were designated by the ancient words thus translated. Moreover, even the ancient terms denote human actions, whereas this action of God is unique and unlike any ordinary event: it is alone in its class, and names that describe other acts do not exactly suit this action. Yet each of these terms describes correctly some side or aspect of its character. Like a promise it is purely voluntary: it comes entirely from one side and is received by the other: the giver is all-powerful, the receiver has no influence over it (except the influence of prayer). Like a covenant it is legally binding and cannot be broken; it makes and is the law, and has all the force and inviolability of law. Like a testament[1] it is a legal document, in which

[1] The term is not much used in the text of the English Version; but it is the ordinary rendering of the Greek term *διαθήκη*, and it is the name given to each part of the Bible.

one party alone confers by his free act all the validity and legal force, and in which the person benefited simply accepts without having any authority to influence the act. On the other hand the term covenant is unsuitable in so far as it suggests the idea of two parties entering into a voluntary agreement: the term testament is free from the suggestion that there are two parties, but it has serious defects as implying that it is revocable at any time by change of mind in the testator and that it comes into force only at his death[1]: the term promise loses all the solemnity and the terror (so to speak) of the law.

The Promise of God is the necessary expression of His goodness. It is His free gift to man, yet it arises inevitably from His character and His relation to man. It is the outcome of His nature, for His nature is love. The early Hebrews did not lay much stress on the love which is the nature of God. They dwelt far more on His power, as was inevitable in the earlier stages of their history, because the fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom; and thus they were taught by the law as their pedagogue to obey and to be in a certain degree wise. Yet they had a firm hold on this expression of the love of God in the Promise, which implies that ultimately His love will be triumphant and unmistakably manifested.

That God is good, that He has made the Promise to the Hebrews and through them to the whole of mankind, was not a principle that Paul sought to prove by any ratiocination. He seems always to say to his audience, "You know it for yourselves." In the perception that *God is*, there is also involved according to Paul's view the perception that

[1] Even in that early stage of the development of a testament, when it was instantaneous in its effect and irrevocable (according to Maine, *Ancient Law*), the testament denuded the giver to enrich the heir; but such a stage need not be considered.

God is good. Only through a perversion of view can we imagine that God exists really without being good, for it is only through His gifts and goodness that we perceive His existence. From His works we know Him.

This principle was burned into Paul's nature by generations of experience. He was the heir to many centuries of Jewish history. None but a Jew could have had that perfectly firm and unhesitating grasp of this truth. The fabric of Paul's thought is purely and simply Hebrew.[1] Already before his birth he was marked out first as the Apostle, and secondly as the Apostle to the nations, because the whole of Hebraism and all the results of Jewish wisdom and religious experience were interwoven in the constitution of his thought. He could not hesitate himself. He could not understand, nor sympathise with, nor pardon and make allowance for, any hesitation on the part of others. They must see. They must know. His own intense and unhesitating belief, the very fact that he could not allow any doubt or seek to demonstrate to his hearers the axioms of the Faith, made him such a power among men. Had he been capable of feeling and of pardoning doubt, he might have been greater as a lecturer on abstract philosophic theory, but he could not have become such a power in the world as he was and is.

Here again Faith is the initial force which makes men recognise this truth. Faith is really a force that moves the minds of men. It is not a mere fact: it is a driving power. The failure to recognise this truth is already a mark of degeneration and degradation, i.e. of sin, which deteriorates

[1] So far Dr. Garvie is, as I fancy, wholly in agreement with me: the strength and the power of Paul were purely Jewish and Greek had no share in his deeper nature, but only in the expression of it and in the moderation, the reasonableness and the charm (the ἐπιείκεια and the χάρις) which characterised it. Paul always knew where to stop, which the purely Semitic mind frequently does not know.

and distorts the will. Paul estimates the sanity and the working power of men according to their ability to discern and believe the unseen. The Divine truth is not to be handled and weighed with common scales. It is appreciable through the natural power, granted to all men, to recognise the truth, and the natural tendency to follow it. This power is Faith, and by their possession of the power we must estimate men.

These may seem to be two very big assumptions. What right has Paul to take as the obvious and necessary principles of right thinking, these two axioms, that God is, and that God is good? Is that philosophically justifiable, or must we admit that after all Paul had not thought out a philosophic basis for his religion, and that the Greek form of thinking was in the last resort alien to him and lay outside of his circle of thought?

The refusal to doubt the truth of one's thought, however, is not necessarily a proof of an unphilosophic mind. The tendency to divest oneself of one's thought, to hold it apart from oneself and contemplate and reason about it, and frame arguments to justify it, was discordant with Paul's emotional and active nature. He found that this tendency became strong in his Hellenic Churches, as they were established. The purely philosophic mind was in danger of losing itself in abstract contemplation; and all the while there were the Greek cities, the Roman Provinces, the Latin cities, the barbarian tribes, the whole world, to conquer, to convince and to save. Such abstract speculation was hateful to Paul. He saw in it the enemy taking a new form in his young Churches; and as this enemy grew more clearly defined he denounced it with the vehemence of his nature.

Those who regard the thoroughgoing denunciation of this kind in the Pastoral Epistles as un-Pauline miss a

certain side of Paul's nature. In those letters he does not refute, but simply sets aside as wrong and dangerous and fatal all the heresies and false teaching to which he refers. In the case of a Church like Colossae, founded only a few years ago by his coadjutors, or of the Galatian Churches, founded not long before by himself, he could in his letters regard their errors as due to a mistaken zeal for right. Especially was that the case with the Galatian converts: they were full of eagerness to do well: they were unsparing in exertion and in the observing of useless yet burdensome ceremonies. Their zeal had to be guided; and the way to guide them was to proclaim and explain more fully the Gospel with its knowledge now revealed, i.e. its mysteries and their meaning. Later, in the letters to Timothy at Ephesus, another method was needed. It was vain to explain mysteries and revelation to those who were deliberately wasting the golden opportunities for making the resurrection known to the heathen and for saving the world, while they indulged in curious speculations about the nature of the resurrection and its time, and the meaning of time, and so on. Such people had already too much knowledge, or rather too much conceit of their knowledge. They did not need more knowledge, they wanted the whip and the rod. There is a fit time for all things, a time for the refutation of errors by the imparting of further knowledge, and a time for denunciation and flat condemnation. Just as Paul would have denounced the pagan hearer who declared that there was no God, and would have refused to argue where argument was vain and unprofitable, so in A.D. 66 he denounced the Ephesian Christians who theorised and allegorised and reasoned instead of acting. The Christian life, to Paul, lay not in contemplation but in work.

Such was Paul's character. Is it inconsistent with a consciously thought out basis for his action? Is it unworthy

of the mind that has passed through the philosophic stage, and gone on to the religious stage, and resolved to carry its religion to the world? This impulse to move the world was to Paul the essential nature of God and of the man who is made in the image of God. God exists to make and to perfect the world. The world is His creature, and He is the Creator: but a creator who creates nothing is a contradiction in terms. Equally self-contradictory and absurd is the creature that disregards its Creator and tries to ignore Him and to live without Him. Every breath that we draw is through the Divine power. Every thought that we think is through the Divine mind. Nothing is rightly understood except in its relation to that First Power: the world becomes real only as the envisagement of Him. If we refuse to recognise this, and if we turn away from God, we are reducing our own life to a negation; and we are turning from life towards death. There is no truth without this recognition of God: there is no real truth except this, that God is. Every other truth arises out of this in orderly evolution.

That then is Paul's position, and it is a perfectly sound philosophic position. As he says in Romans xi. 36, "from Him and through Him and to Him are all things."[1] Outside of Him there is nothing, for anything that existed apart from Him would be an independent existence over against Him, and therefore a negation of the truth that *God is*. So again in Ephesians v. 6 "one God and Father of all, who is over all and through all and in all,"[2] or in 1 Corinthians viii. 6, "for us there is one God the Father, from whom are all things and we unto Him,[3] and one Lord Jesus

[1] εἰς, i.e. with a view to Him, to attain to Him again.

[2] Compare Colossians i. 19 f.

[3] εἰς, the same preposition as in Romans xi. 36, used with the same force.

Christ through whom are all things, and we through Him." Everything originates from God and returns to Him; the Divine power through whom the world is maintained and carried on in its process or evolution is the Son and Saviour. God is the goal and final stage of salvation; the process of salvation moves on "with a view to God," i.e. it is a process of returning through Jesus to its origin.

It is of course implied in this that God is not real and existent apart from the world which He has created. It is His nature to concern Himself with His creation, to regulate it, to make it good. It is the true nature of man to have faith in the justice and goodness of God, and never to regard Him as malevolent or as careless of man. The pagan doctrine that God is cruel and must be soothed and propitiated, the philosophic doctrine that the gods live a life apart from and heedless of the world, are both equally abhorrent to the Hebrew belief and to Paul as a Hebrew sprung from Hebrews.

In the nature of the real and true God it is also involved that He must be always in communication with the men whom He has created. They are not merely "from Him": they are also "through Him." In every act and thought and word of theirs pulses the Divine power, for they are made after His fashion. He must rule and guide His creatures. They have to attain the goal and return "to Him." In doing so they realise His will and purpose. It is in accordance with the nature and consciousness of man that they must recognise that will in the process of realising it. To know it and to become conscious of it are equivalent to the working out of it in life. To know God's purpose and will you must make that purpose your life: nothing merely abstract and inactive is real knowledge. You must live it before you can know it.

This way of consciously living their knowledge comes only

"through Him." Therefore the knowledge is communicated by Him to man. Once more the motive power lies in Faith. The intense belief, this mighty driving power, brings man into relation with God. Man knows with all his heart and might that God cares for His creatures, and that He cannot stand apart and leave them unaided to their own devices; He is constantly guiding men, and revealing Himself to them if they will only listen to His voice. Everything that takes place in the world around us, when rightly understood, is the expression of His will and the declaration of His character. All the powers of nature are His messengers, and "if He thunder by law, the thunder is still His voice"; but most true it is that, as the prophet of old found, that the Lord was not in the wind, nor in the earthquake, nor in the fire, but in "a sound of gentle stillness."[1] To each and every man, according to his nature, the will of God is manifested in the most suitable way, if he is ready to hear; and one must will intensely with all the power of one's nature, if the attaining unto God is to be possible.

In the case of Paul the critical and epoch-making manifestation of the Divine will and nature took a form that appealed primarily to the senses, and only subsequently to the intellect. The reason why that fashion of revelation to the man of most acute and powerful intellect among all who were then living was suitable and necessary will be discussed in the sequel.

Paul was well aware that revelation of the Divine purpose may take place in many ways. In Acts xvi. 6–10, it is described as having been made to him three times in three different fashions. The characteristic of it is absolute certainty. When a man has heard the Divine voice, there is left no room for doubt. What he has heard or seen becomes a

[1] The literal translation, as given in the margin of the Revised Version: 1 Kings xix. 12.

lasting possession and a power in his life. He sees the nature of the world and the permanent values of things in a new way, and he cannot acquiesce in his former valuation of them. In every case where a man, in what we might call a moment of inspiration or exaltation, seems to himself to appreciate more truly the nature of the world, his own relation to God and to other men, and the worthlessness of most things [1] that men strive after, Paul (as I doubt not) would recognise a Divine revelation. There are such moments, few or many, in every man's life, when conventional values are recognised as shams, and one stands face to face with truth, or as Paul would say, with God.

Faith is the force that raises man above all hesitation regarding the goodness of God. If the experience of life instils a doubt, as the losses increase, as apparently purposeless and unmerited suffering obtrudes itself all around, as friends depart—the one penalty of growing old—and life grows grey in their absence; or if history appals us with its crimes and massacres and the ruins of great civilisation what is Paul's answer? Suffering is training and preparation: we must suffer that we may attain the glory of God: through Faith we have this assurance about the future: we must "suffer with Him, that we may be also glorified with Him: I reckon that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory that shall be revealed towards us." [2] The assurance of this is the guarantee that it will be. Paul's feeling was expressed in the words of the old Hebrew prophet, "though He slay me, yet will I trust in Him." The suffering, the evil, the disappointment, are a stage in the purpose of God.[3]

[1] Philippians iii. 8, "I suffered the loss of all things, and do count them but refuse."

[2] Romans viii. 17 f.

[3] *τὸν ὑποτάξαντα*, him who subjected it (Rom. viii. 20), is certainly God and not some power counteracting God.

This reliance on the goodness of God we attain through the power of Faith, and do not learn through any process of ratiocination. We must feel that there is this Divine purpose and Promise, that the world is the unfolding of the will of God, that the will of God is the soul of history, that to suffer is to learn (in the literal Greek phrase of the poet). But this you must assume—through Faith: you must accept—through Faith. To be able to do this you must strip off all your wisdom, you must get down to the simple first principle that God is good, you must be born again; otherwise you cannot hear the voice of God and you cannot enter the Kingdom of Heaven. No mere intellectual acceptance possesses any power over the deeper feelings of man.

At this point[1] we begin to come in contact with Greek influence and Greek expression in Paul's conception of religion. Yet it would be a profound blunder to lay too much stress on this, or to infer from such a passage as Romans viii. 20 ff. that Paul regarded evil as undeveloped good, and as a necessary stage in the upward progress of man towards God. Gloss it over as you may, wrap it up in such form of words as you please, the Greek idea of sin or error is always involved in that opinion, which is radically opposed to the Hebraic and Pauline idea. To the Greek[2] what he might call sin (*ἁμαρτία*) was only a failure to hit the true aim, an overplus or a falling-short which keeps him from hitting the true mean: it was a mistake ultimately intellectual, a stage in the process towards true knowledge and wisdom and Sophia. However some Greek thinkers might attempt to introduce into their idea of "error" or "sin"

[1] That suffering is learning was the lesson on which Aeschylus insists, e.g. *Agamemnon*, 170.

[2] Aeschylus has a deeper and truer conception of sin than any other Greek of the Classical period: to him sin is typically the issue of *ὕβρις*, the arrogant trampling on the right order of nature.

an element of volition, they could not get free from this thoroughly Greek way of contemplating the problem of evil except by de-Hellenising their thought (as some were trying to do, though imperfectly and in theory) of which, owing to the loss of most of their writings, we are not perfectly informed. To Paul, on the contrary, sin is not merely an error of the intellect: it is a deterioration and degradation of the will, progressive and illimitable, ending in death, as "righteousness" leads towards life. To the Greeks sin was a failure; to Paul it was a crime. The Greek blamed the Gods, or Fortune, or Necessity, or Ate, or some such superhuman conception, for his error. Paul laid the fault on man himself. To the Greeks, error was an episode, happily and usually only temporary, in the natural life, a failure to balance accurately the various powers of nature which unite to form the man's being, producing as a consequence the temporary ascendency of one among these powers. In the estimate of Paul sin was a voluntary declination from nature, carrying man away from the Divine life, weakening his will and leading inevitably onward in progressive deterioration, out of which the only hope of salvation lay in a reinvigoration of the power of Faith, so that the sinner might be strengthened in will towards salvation. Taking a rough illustration the career of a drunkard exhibits in a simple form the Pauline conception of sin; the first indulgence weakens the moral power, which continuously deteriorates with fresh indulgence, so that there is no limit to the depths of infamy and degradation yawning to engulf the sufferer; no cure is of any value, no drug has any real influence, unless the will of the drunkard can be strengthened; and (so far as experience shows) no salvation is possible for him except through reawakening his faith in the goodness and kindness of God.

In this simple case the contrast between the Greek and

the Pauline view is clear. To the Greek the drunkard is a worshipper of the divine power Akrateia. To Paul he is a slave of the devil, turning his back on God and good and on faith in the goodness of God. To recreate Faith in the criminal is the only way of Salvation: no other force or power is of any avail.

Thus Faith is the force which makes a man capable of hearing the Divine will. The perfect belief that God does enter into communication with man and the strained eager longing to be so favoured are both necessary. Faith is not merely an intellectual belief; it is a moral and an emotional force. At every stage and in every act of the higher life, Faith is the one supreme requirement. Without it nothing can be achieved. With it everything becomes possible.

Although our examples and quotations must necessarily be taken from Paul's writings, and therefore belong to his Christian period, yet I cannot doubt that, when he was persecuting the Church, or still earlier, when he chose the Divine life and came to Jerusalem, he was eagerly bent on hearing and obeying the Divine voice. As he said to the High Priest and the Council, "I have lived before God in all good conscience unto this day"; and undoubtedly he included in this claim his early pre-Christian life. He had from infancy believed in the Promise, and was ready always to stake his life on the assurance that the Promise must be fulfilled and the Messiah must come. It was through a new revelation, made possible because of his unhesitating Faith in the Promise, that he learned that the Messiah had already come; and the conviction that his mind and life must be remade was the necessary result of this revelation.

Something can be gathered from a comparison between the Pauline basis of thought, as stated in these two principles, and the Confession of Islam. Mohammedanism is essentially a revival of the Hebrew religion in a form suited

to appeal to the Arab tribes. Although (as I believe) it must have arisen in the soul of Mohammed after intercourse with Christians, and especially with Christians who had rejected the orthodox doctrine through disapproval of the stress which that doctrine laid on the person and the sacredness of the Mother of God, and although it accepts the Divine character of Jesus, yet it loses almost all the Christian development of Judaism and emphasises specially the older and simpler elements in the common Faith.

The Confession of Islam is expressed in two propositions. The first is practically identical with the first of the two Pauline axioms: it shows merely verbal variation, though there is much history and psychology and poetry (on which we need not dwell), underlying the variation: "there is no God but God." The second proposition exhibits very marked variation from the second Pauline axiom, yet the variation is less than appears superficially: "Mohammed is the Messenger of God." The stress is here laid on the personality of Mohammed, a historical fact in the development of the original Jewish Faith as expressed in the first proposition of the Islamic confession: Mohammed was the prophet and apostle to whom the further truth was revealed. In other words, revelation by God has been continuous and progressive in Judaism and Islam; the old Hebrew prophets had shared in this revelation of truth (as was fully admitted); but their knowledge required to be completed by Mohammed's revelation. The fact that Mohammed was a man to whom the truth was revealed by God is the guarantee offered by Islam that revelation of the Divine nature and will to man is always possible.

Thus, apart from the historical fact, the second proposition involves several fundamental truths about the nature of God: He reveals His truth to man in a progressive series of acts; He cares for man, and guides man's course in the

world : He is good. Still, Islam lays little emphasis on the kindness or the love of God, even less emphasis than Judaism did. It has fallen back from the great progress which Christianity made in that respect. It lays almost all stress on the greatness, the power, the justice, the awfulness, of God : the Promise of God fades away into an extension of Islam by force, by massacre and slavery, by the Holy War, so that it shall become the universal religion by the extermination of unbelievers.

The comparison shows how thoroughly Hebraic was the texture of Paul's religious thought : the development of Hebraism in his mind was not an addition of any foreign or discordant element, but merely the explanation and emphasis of an element already existing. Even in Islam, that revival of Judaism, the same element is not wholly lost, but is partly left unemphasised and partly distorted.

As yet we have found no Greek element in Paul's thought except the way in which he explains the suffering of the apparent evil in the world. This is not necessarily or exclusively Greek ; but, as we shall see, it is expressed by Paul in a form that is characteristic of Hellenic philosophy.

The Promise is the free, gracious act of God, proceeding out of His own nature and purpose, and not earned by man as a reward or resulting from any joint agreement or bargain between the two parties—as, for example, was the case according to certain common pagan conceptions of sacrifice. So Promethus offered a victim as a sacrifice, and divided the carcase into two parts, offering the gods their choice : they chose the larger heap, which included all the bones and worthless parts of the victim, leaving to the offerer the finest portions of the flesh. So, again, the Hindus acquired merit (*dharma*) proportionate to the number and splendour of the victims offered ; and each acquisition of *dharma* was stored up as invested power in the bank of

faith, until in one case a king acquired such an accumulation of strength as to be dangerous to the gods themselves. So in the common conception of Greek and Roman suppliants the act of prayer was a regular bargain between the worshipper and God: the suppliant entreated for such and such reward, stipulating by vow that he would pay so much in offering and gifts: if the deity thought the reward sufficient, he fulfilled the prayer, and the suppliant paid his vow: it was however always possible that the suppliant might cheat the god after the prayer was granted, though by such dishonesty he incurred the wrath of the god and was sure to suffer ultimately by some act of the divine power. He had made his god his enemy. So again the blood of the victim was in some cases regarded as a means of giving strength to the god and thus enabling him to fulfil the prayer of the suppliant.[1]

All such theories of the divine nature were to Paul degrading to man and sure to work a deterioration in his character and conduct; and this deterioration is progressive, increasing from stage to stage. The Promise and the gift of salvation are the free act of the goodness of God, unbought by man.

Yet while this act is perfectly free and not motived by the conduct of man, it must be earned by man before it becomes operative. There is no contradiction between the two statements: the Promise is the free gift of God, and yet it must be earned by man. The two assertions are quite harmonious. As Paul said to the pagans of Lystra, rain and fruitful seasons are the free gift of God to men, "filling their hearts with food and gladness." The rain and the climate and the soil are always there; but the food

[1] This was specially characteristic of the cults in which the dead man, weak and bloodless in death, was yet an embodiment of superhuman power, that could be strengthened to help living men.

and gladness are gained by work. Before rain and soil can be made to produce harvest, there is much toil needed on the part of man. He has to earn the gifts before they become anything to him. He has to go out of himself, to expend energy, to sacrifice the present for the future, and to give a part of himself, before the free gifts of God materialise in real benefit to him.

There is always needed this double action, both on the part of God and on the part of man. The latter must respond to God. He must seek for Him. Such is the rule of the universe. The Divine in man answers to the Divine above man, and makes a step in the long course upwards towards reunion. This principle is evident in the humbler and more material sphere ; otherwise human life would fail. Judaism and Christianity universalised this principle over the moral universe. In other words the Hebrew Faith, as Paul learned it from his birth and inherited it from his forefathers, forced into his nature the truth that we attain to God, not by sacrificing and shaking off our individuality, but by perfecting it.

From the statement of this truth we started in this section, and to it we now return.

Paul states this apparent contradiction most emphatically in the letter to the Philippians iii. 7–15. His righteousness is not his own : it is the gift of God through Faith : there is nothing else of the smallest value in the whole world except this knowledge, through which he has obtained fellowship with the sufferings of Jesus and has come to be in conformity with the life which was consummated by the death of Jesus. He had no part in attaining this condition : he had simply been seized upon by Christ without conscious action on his own part. Yet, as he also says, he has not yet actually succeeded, on his own side, in seizing Christ : he has not yet attained : he has not yet been made righteous : in other

words, his part has not yet been done. He is only struggling onwards through the hard trials of life, forgetting everything except the prize of righteousness that lies before him, hurrying towards the goal like a runner straining every nerve and staking all his energy in reaching the mark and gaining the prize. He has not attained salvation, and yet he has attained it. He has not been made perfect, and yet he is made perfect: "let us therefore, as many as are perfect, be thus minded" (verse 15).

The perfect union with God, then, is the perfect development and perfection of the individual nature. Not even Mohammedanism, much as it has sacrificed of this truth, has forgotten it wholly. These are all religions of energy and of work (though history shows how little Islam has remained true to its start).

W. M. RAMSAY.

THE ELEPHANTINÊ PAPYRI.

THE long-expected collection of Aramaic Papyri and Ostraka from Elephantinê is now before the world; and general admiration is being aroused by the editor's patience and industry, ingenuity and learning. The difficult texts, some hundreds in number, have been deciphered, copied, translated (to a great extent), elucidated, indexed, and had their grammar and vocabulary tabulated; whatever is now said about them can only be in the nature of gleanings after Professor Sachau's harvest. A volume of the first order has therefore been added to the archaeological library of the East.

Yet it must be confessed that the result is most disappointing. Even if the authenticity of the Biblical books were still generally maintained, we should look eagerly for the discovery of copies or parts of copies nearer the time of the authors than those late MSS. whereon our editions are based; for even the most "orthodox" would allow the