

arranging his affairs. From Antioch it was easy to reach Troas.

Ramsay has shown that Luke's allusions to the geography of Asia Minor are singularly accurate. But the allusions are restricted. Tarsus and Cilicia are barely mentioned, and the same is the case with Pamphylia, Mysia, and Bithynia; in Asia we only have recorded the stoppages of a company of pilgrims in which Luke travelled. His minute allusions are to the cities of Lycaonia and the region of Galatic Phrygia, exactly the district in which Pisidian Antioch was a chief town. The same detailed accuracy is to be seen in the references to Macedonia, where admittedly Luke laboured, while his geographical references to Achaia are not minute, though accurate. Such facts give further probability that Luke knew well 'the region which was called Phrygian geographically and Galatic politically.'

It may be worth mentioning that Paul's first presence in Pisidian Antioch was due to an infirmity of the flesh, so that his meeting a physician there was very desirable. But we may not insist on Luke's presence in the great company bearing

money to Jerusalem. Gaius of Derbe and Timothy could represent all Galatia, and no other representative of Philippi is hinted at, unless it be Luke, who had stayed there on the second journey, and rejoined Paul there on the third.

Certainly he is not mentioned in the Epistle to the Galatians, but that is not extraordinary. He was not an elder (Ac 14^{22, 23}); no Galatian at all is mentioned; he was not with Paul when the letter was written; indeed, Ramsay thinks that the letter was penned before Luke came into any close connexion with Paul.

The only letters that do mention Luke were sent to the Colossians and to Timothy at Ephesus, to the province of Asia, whence a high-road ran through Pisidian Antioch, and to a man from another Galatian town.

There seems, then, no reason to be gleaned from the New Testament against the theory that Luke first met Paul at this colony in Galatia, and that he was converted on the outward half of the first journey. Many trifling touches confirm it, and the language of Luke himself implies it in his usual modest fashion, but plainly.

In the Study.

Q Study in the Sphere of Supposition.

THE latest volume of sermons by the Rev. G. H. Morrison, M.A., is called *The Return of the Angels* (Hodder & Stoughton; 5s.). The last sermon in it is called 'The Sphere of Supposition.' Mr. Morrison has taken the word 'supposing' out of three places in which it is found in the New Testament, and made it the subject of his sermon.

It is a manner of preaching that is not so common as it might be. The objection to it is that it is so easy. But when trouble is taken with it, as Mr. Morrison takes trouble, there is no manner of preaching that is at once so interesting and so edifying. It has the interest of variety; it has the edification of systematic theological instruction.

Mr. Morrison's word is 'supposing.' It is not a strong word. It is not the word of strong people. 'I suppose so'—but why do you not think? why do you not find out?

I. The first text is Lk 2⁴⁴—'Supposing him to have been in the company.' It is taken from the story of the visit of Jesus to the Temple when He was a boy. It is a story of singular charm. It is both natural and supernatural. There are other stories of His infancy, but they are only supernatural, and therefore incredible.

When the Feast was over, Joseph and Mary turned home again. They were with their friends. It was a large company. And, 'supposing that Jesus was in the company' also, they went a day's journey. They were a little to blame. They should have found out. But do we not ourselves sometimes suppose that we have what we have not? Do we not sometimes suppose that we have Christ?

Where is He? He is about the Father's business. He is always about the Father's business. We can therefore always tell whether we have Him or not. We have Him if we also are about the Father's business. If we are not about the Father's business, we have Him not.

And if we have not Christ, we have not the things of Christ, however we may think we have them. That is the point which Mr. Morrison makes. 'We think that what yesterday we loved and cherished is still in the circle of our life to-day. And we know not that in secret it has left us, and stolen away from our side on feet of wool, and onward we move unconscious of our loss, supposing it is still in our company. The fact is,' says Mr. Morrison, 'that all we ever gained has to be kept with an unceasing vigilance.' There is an anecdote in the *Memoir of Sir Wilfrid Lawson*, another of the books of the month, 'I was once sitting in a room where I had to wait for half an hour before a meeting, and by the fire was sitting a poorly clad, rather wretched-looking, old man, gently moaning at intervals. I asked him if anything was the matter, and he said, "No—I was only just thinking what a deal of trouble it takes to get the world right and to keep it right." Yes, it takes trouble.

2. The second text is Jn 20¹⁵—'She, supposing him to be the gardener.' It is again taken from a charming story, a story mingled of the natural and the supernatural. It was the morning of the Resurrection, and Mary Magdalene had come early to the tomb. She found it empty. It was a surprise and a great shock to her. Did art invent the surprise and the shock? Did art invent the angels? She saw two angels in white sitting, one at the head and one at the feet where the body of Jesus had lain. 'Woman, why weepest thou?' they asked. She answered, 'Because they have taken away my Lord, and I know not where they have laid him.' Then she heard a movement in the grass. She turned round, and Jesus was at her side. But she, supposing Him to be the gardener—

We suppose Him to be the gardener still. A working man, we say. And we feel so religious as we say it. Here is something from another book of the month, from a remarkable book, *The Laws of the Inner Kingdom*, by Henry W. Clark (Robert Scott). 'They are everlastingly drawing pictures,' says Mr. Clark, 'of the Christ in which the mere outward frame, as it were (wherein He was one of us), is correctly given, but wherefrom all sign of that inner light of infinite holiness (which stamps Him as coming from a world we never saw) has been left out; and the loud-mouthed demagogues are ever proclaiming that

most grotesque of all modern gospels, that Christ was a working man.'

He *was* a working man. But when we have said it, what have we said? Can a working man save us? Was it a working man that endured the cross, despising the shame? Was it a working man that felt the joy that was set before Him? He *was* a working man; but one evening He laid His tools aside for the last time and went out to save the world.

That evening, when the Carpenter swept out
The fragrant shavings from the workshop floor,
And placed the tools in order, and shut to
And barred for the last time the humble door,
And, going on His way to save the world,
Turned from the labourer's lot for evermore,
I wonder, was He glad?

That morning, when the Carpenter walked forth
From Joseph's cottage, in the glimmering light,
And bade His holy mother long farewell;
And through the skies of dawn, all pearly bright,
Saw glooming the dark shadow of a cross,
Yet, seeing, set His feet towards Calvary's height,
I wonder, was He sad?

Ah! when the Carpenter went on His way
He thought not for Himself of good or ill.
His path was one through shop or thronging men
Craving His help, e'en to the cross-crowned hill,
In toiling, healing, loving, suffering—all
His joy and life to do His Father's will,
And earth and heaven are glad!

And is there not the danger that we may make this mistake with others also? Is it not possible that we may misunderstand a neighbour—supposing him to be the gardener. That is Mr. Morrison's point here. 'We have lived with them,' he says, 'and seen their faults and failings, and think we have gauged them in their strength and weakness. Then unexpectedly there comes an hour to them when they are called to do or suffer in the heroic way, and in that hour it is farewell for ever to our pitiful estimates of yesterday.'

3. The third text is Ac 16²⁷—'Supposing that the prisoners had been fled.' The story has not the idyllic charm of the other two. For Luke is not so fascinating as a writer when he relates the deeds of the Apostles as when he relates that

which Jesus began to do and teach. But it is a graphic account of one of the most memorable incidents in history.

Paul and Silas, having deprived some men of the gains they got by exploiting a poor demented woman, were thrust into prison and their feet were made fast in the stocks. But at midnight they prayed and sang praises. Then their chains fell off and the prison doors flew open. Again it is a combination of the natural and the supernatural. The jailer was roused out of his sleep, and drew his sword to kill himself, 'supposing that the prisoners had been fled.'

But he did not know the nature of the prisoners he had. He never had Christians in his cells before, and he did not know how they were likely to behave. 'Do thyself no harm; for we are all here.'

And even yet, even when Christianity is so familiar as a profession and a practice, men of the world suppose that Christians will act as they would act themselves. They try to 'give as much as they get,' and when a Christian turns the other cheek, they suspect some simplicity or cunning. They do not even understand the language of Christianity. There is an amusing story in the *Memoir of Sir Wilfrid Lawson*. But it is a story with plenty of the tragedy of life in it also. A wife was once complaining to a clergyman of her husband's unsatisfactory conduct. 'You should heap coals of fire on his head,' he said. To which she replied, 'Well, I tried boiling water, and that did no good!'

The world does not understand the very language of Christianity. It is surprised and puzzled with the conduct of Christians. But, says Mr. Morrison, it is the unexpected that is the charm of the follower of Christ.

Studies in Failure.

I.

The Many and the Few.

Mt 22¹⁴, 'Many are called, but few are chosen.'

I. There is nothing that receives more attention on earth than failure and success. The newspapers are mostly occupied either with the advantages obtained by those who succeed, or with the misfortunes of those who fail. And even the

great philosophy of our day—that philosophy, called Darwinism, which has revolutionized thought in almost every department of knowledge—is based on the observation of success and failure. Its very title is 'The Struggle for Existence, and the Survival of the Fittest.'

And the fittest are the few. So says Darwinism, and so says the Bible. Of all upon whom the Flood came, 'few, that is, eight persons were saved.' Of all the inhabitants of the Cities of the Plain, only Lot and his two daughters escaped the destruction. Of the vast multitude who left Egypt for the Land of Promise, only two, Caleb and Joshua, entered into possession of it.¹ For many are called, but few are chosen.

It is not a matter of election, at least not yet. The calling is the invitation to the marriage feast. The words are found at the close of the Parable of the Labourers, but their place is not there. Their place is at the end of the Parable of the Feast which the king gave on the occasion of the marriage of his son. Of the many who were invited to that feast, only the few accepted the invitation. It is simply that fact, at first. And the fact is seen in every department of life—few accept, and many refuse.

The word 'remnant,' says Newman, is frequent with the prophets, from whom St. Paul takes it. Isaiah, for instance, says, 'Though the number of the children of Israel be as the sand of the sea, a remnant shall be saved.' Jeremiah speaks of 'the remnant of Judah,' and the 'small number,' to which a return was promised. Ezekiel, too, declares that God 'will leave a remnant,' 'that ye may have some,' continues the divine oracle, 'that shall escape the sword among the nations, when ye shall be scattered through the countries. And they that escape of you shall remember me among the nations, whither they shall be carried captives.' And so well understood was this, that the hope of good men never reached beyond it. Neither the promise, on the one hand, nor the hope, on the other, ever goes beyond the prospect of a remnant being saved. Thus the consolation given to the Church in the Book of Jeremiah is, that God 'will not make a full end; and Ezra, confessing the sins of his people, expresses his dread lest there should be 'no remnant.' Thus Christ, His Apostles, and His Prophets, all teach the same

¹ See R. H. McKim, *The Gospel in the Christian Year*, 137.

doctrine, that the chosen are few, though many are called: that one gains the prize, though many run the race.¹

To every thoughtful person, the most perplexing of all problems is the apparent waste of human life, the comparative failure of the gospel of Christ to regenerate the world. If I might speak for myself, I should say that I find no difficulties at all in religion compared to this.

When I pass through the streets of a great city, when I am in the midst of the thronging crowds of London, or when I try to realize to myself the teeming millions of human beings in India or in China, when I think of the innumerable multitude who are outside all religious influences whatever, or when I remember the myriads of those who *have* heard of Christ, who *have* listened to His gracious invitations, and yet are still so unmoved, so careless, so worldly, so wrapped up in their business and their pleasure, apparently so regardless of the unseen, the spiritual, and the eternal; when all this is borne in upon my soul, I do feel that other difficulties pale into insignificance compared with them. Sure I am that it is this seeming waste of human life, of the individual life, which weighs most heavily upon the souls of those who think and feel for their brother-men; it is this thought which wrings the almost despairing, the pathetic cry from our great modern poet, as he contemplates it in nature—

So careful of the type she seems,
So careless of the single life;

That I, considering everywhere
Her secret meaning in her deeds,
And finding that of fifty seeds
She often brings but one to bear,

I falter where I firmly trod,
And, falling with my weight of cares
Upon the great world's altar stairs
That slope through darkness up to God,

I stretch lame hands of faith, and grope,
And gather dust and chaff, and call
To what I feel is Lord of all,
And faintly trust the larger hope.²

2. But what is success? There is material, intellectual, or moral success.

1. Success is material. It is making money, a position; it is 'getting on in the world.' Few get on in the world. And it is not for the want of direction. There are innumerable books, written mostly for young men, which contain the rules for getting on in the world. One of them³ reduces the rules to these five—Push, Tact, Faith, Grit, Skill. The aim is obvious. The very words are worldly. For 'faith' here is simply venture. The man who is to succeed must sometimes take risks. Yet if he

is to get on in a worldly-wise manner, he will reduce the chance of mistake as much as possible; he is advised to look well before he leaps. But with all encouragement, only the few succeed. Take the unassailable evidence of Professor Mackenzie's *Manual of Ethics*:⁴ 'Those who fix their attention on the lives of individuals have always sufficient ground for Pessimism. Even the most favoured human beings attain only a small part of what they hope; and what they hope is generally but a small part of what they would wish to be able to hope. And a large proportion of the human race scarcely seem to get the length of hope at all.'

2. Success is intellectual. Turn again to Professor Mackenzie, 'Conscious of the failure of life and society, many of the finest natures have taken refuge in Art. Matthew Arnold, in one of the most striking of his poems,⁵ represents Goethe as turning from the vain strife of his age, after having exposed its weaknesses, and proclaiming to his contemporaries as their last resort—"Art still has truth, take refuge there." But what does Goethe say at the end of it? 'I will say nothing,' he writes in 1824, 'against the course of my existence. But at bottom it has been nothing but pain and burden, and I can affirm that during the whole of my seventy-five years, I have not had four weeks of genuine well-being. It is but the perpetual rolling of a rock that must be raised up again for ever.'⁶

Intellectually, Goethe had been one of the few who succeed. Their number is less than the number of those who succeed materially. But even when intellectual success is obtained, it does not seem to be always satisfying.

3. Success is moral. This is what Professor Mackenzie comes to. 'Men may seek a temporary relief in Art,' he says, 'from the struggle of life; and it may be a not unworthy commendation to say of a great poet—

The cloud of mortal destiny,
Others will front it fearlessly—
But who, like him, will put it by?

But even this service can be rendered to us by Art only so long as it is believed by us to be a revelation of a deeper truth in things.' Now this deeper truth is found in harmony with nature with-

⁴ Fourth Edition, 1900, p. 440.

⁵ 'Memorial Verses.'

⁶ Quoted by W. James, *Varieties of Religious Experience*, 137.

¹ J. H. Newman, *Parochial and Plain Sermons*, v. 255.

² See G. H. Fowler, *Things Old and New*, 58.

³ *Factors of Success*, by H. T. Whitford.

out and with the moral law within. It is found in harmony with the will of God. And again, if moral success is harmony with God's will, it is evident that many are called to it, but few are chosen.

There is an American book among this month's issues entitled *Victorious Manhood* (Revell; 2s. 6d. net). The author is Dr. Howard A. Johnston. It is moral manhood that is the subject. And if we would see how few they are that find it, we have but to read the titles of the chapters. He who reaches moral manhood has (1) the Spirit of Sonship, (2) the Spirit of Surrender, (3) the Spirit of Stewardship, (4) the Spirit of the Soldier, (5) the Spirit of the Servant, (6) the Spirit of the Soul-winner, (7) the Spirit of Strength through Hardships, and (8) the Spirit of the Saint.

But this is no more than our Lord meant when He told the young ruler to keep the commandments. Only the few can answer, 'All these have I kept from my youth up.' And what is that? Who can sell all that he has and give to the poor? Who can be perfect as the Father in heaven is perfect?

3. What are the causes of failure?

1. One cause is that while many are called, only few are chosen. And what is that? It is simply that they themselves do not choose. The parable makes that unmistakable. Many were invited to the wedding feast, few accepted the invitation. They were busy otherwise, one with his farm, another with his merchandise. The parable passed into real life, and became deep enough tragedy, when Jesus stood over Jerusalem, and said, 'How often would I . . . but ye would not.'

But the word is very significant. It is not 'few choose'; it is 'few are chosen.' It is parallel to that other word, 'they which were bidden were not worthy.' Not worthy? They were the élite of the land. In comparison with those who came from the lanes and byways they were surely worthy to sit at a king's table. The king himself says they were not worthy. And their conduct proved it. For if they would not rise to a sense of the honour done them in receiving this invitation, they were not worthy to sit at the table. And, in like manner, they who do not choose to come are not chosen. It is no mystery of election. It is the will of man refusing to fall in with the will of God.

2. The only other cause of failure is that men choose in a wrong way. When the king came in

to see his guests he found a man who had not on a wedding-garment. He had come, but he had come in his own way. The rest of the guests were provided with a wedding-garment as they entered; he refused it. He was content with the garment he wore. And very likely it was better than the garment in which many of the other guests came to the door. The garment of the Pharisee who went up to the Temple to pray was very likely better than the garment of the Publican. And yet it was the Publican who went down to his house justified.

Can there, then, be any doubt as to the meaning of the wedding-garment? It is God's way of acceptance, not man's. It is 'the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe.'

Dr. John Pulsford¹ warns us that we must have a righteousness of our own, and the warning is wise. But only our own in the sense that the wedding-garment, once gifted to the guest, is now his own. Certainly the righteousness of Christ is none the less righteousness that it is received, and none the less our righteousness. And certainly righteousness is just right living. But the acceptance, the place at the Feast, is not ours because we are righteous; it is ours because we have 'put on Christ.'

There is no clearer illustration than the life of Chalmers. When he was called to the parish of Kilmarnock, Chalmers simply did not know God. He chose the ministry as a profession, but he would have preferred a Chair of Mathematics if he could have got it. Then came his great illness. He was face to face with the seriousness of life. He was face to face with death. On his recovery, he began to keep a journal. It is a record of heroic efforts to make himself acceptable to God. It is heroic, but it is pitiful. For he has little success in it, and no satisfaction in the little success he has. He has come to the feast, but he is determined to wear his own wedding-garment. At the end of a year he read Wilberforce's *View of Christianity*. Ten years afterwards, in a letter to his youngest brother, he described the result.

MY DEAR ALEXANDER,—I stated to you that the effect of a very long confinement, about ten years ago, upon myself, was to inspire me with a set of very strenuous resolutions, under which I wrote a Journal, and made many a laborious effort to elevate my practice to the standard of

¹ *Loyalty to Christ*, ii. 355.

the Divine requirements. During this course, however, I got little satisfaction, and felt no repose. I remember that somewhere about the year 1811, I had Wilberforce's View put into my hands, and, as I got on in reading it, felt myself on the eve of a great revolution in all my opinions about Christianity. I am now most thoroughly of opinion, and it is an opinion founded on experience, that on the system of—Do this and live, no peace, and even no true and worthy obedience, can ever be attained. It is, Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved. When this belief enters the heart, joy and confidence enter along with it. The righteousness which we try to work out for ourselves eludes our impotent grasp, and never can a soul arrive at true or permanent rest in the pursuit of this object. The righteousness, which, by faith, we put on, secures our acceptance with God, and secures our interest in His promises, and gives us a part in those sanctifying influences by which we are enabled to do with aid from on high what we never can do without it. We look to God in a new light—we see Him as a reconciled Father; that love to Him which terror scares away re-enters the heart, and, with a new principle and a new power, we become new creatures in Jesus Christ our Lord.¹

Ⓐ Study in the Life of Isaac.

It is the first sermon in a volume which Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton have published, and of which Professor Hugh Mackintosh, of the New College, Edinburgh, is the author. Its title is *Life on God's Plan* (5s.). That is also the title of the first sermon.

Life on God's plan—that, says Dr. Mackintosh, was the life of Isaac. For there are three elements in a life lived according to the will of God, and they are all in the life of Isaac, and all 'within the four corners' of Professor Mackintosh's text. 'Isaac builded an altar there, and called upon the name of the Lord, and pitched his tent there; and there Isaac's servants digged a well' (Gn 26²⁵)—that is the text. And the three elements are the *altar*, the *tent*, and the *well*. That is to say, *religion*, *home*, and *work*.

I. Religion.—'He builded an altar there and called upon the name of the Lord.' The erection of an altar is almost a standing formula in the history of the patriarchs. And the Pilgrim Fathers, when they stepped on the savage shores of the New World, provided first for the house of God. It is the first or basal element in a complete existence.

2. The second element in our life, as God plans it, is a **Home**. 'Isaac pitched his tent there.' A

¹ W. Hanna, *Memoirs of the Life and Writings of Thomas Chalmers*, i. 185.

tent? Emblem of the life of the 'sojourner as in a strange country'? Yes, a tent, that we may remember to cultivate a detached spirit in regard to things unseen. For, as Robert Barbour used to say, 'Like the Jacobites, our King too is over the water.' But although a tent, it was a home. Round that little shed of canvas clustered Isaac's dearest hopes. Thither Rebekah came. There his children were born. There he exercised the hospitality so dear to an Oriental heart, and sat in the evening light to dispense justice to his people. To him it was the focus of experience.

Dr. Mackintosh observes the simplicity of Isaac's home life. And then, more emphatically, the pervasion of Isaac's home-life by the spirit of religion.

3. Work.—'There Isaac's servants digged a well.' For work is not necessarily toil, but different, and these two will one day be separated once for all. 'His servants shall serve him,' when 'sorrow and sighing shall flee away.' Does not the well feed both tent and altar? As for the well and the altar, the one means work, and the other means sacrifice; and how can a man offer sacrifice who does no work? How can a man be made fit for the high fellowship of God, or indeed for the pure felicity of home, if he escapes the discipline, the long education, of worthy and honest toil?

Two Studies in Old English.

A MERE MAN.

The first is the adjective *mere*. There is a substantive *mere* also, but it is a different word. The substantive—which means 'the sea,' and is of Teutonic derivation, though connected with Latin *mare*—is altogether obsolete, although it may still be used effectively in poetry or in poetic prose. There are two substantives indeed, the other meaning a boundary, also of Teutonic origin and connected with the Latin *murus*.

As there are two substantives, so, to be quite exact, are there two adjectives. There is an old adjective *mere* which means 'illustrious,' and of which no clear example has been found by Murray later than the fourteenth century.

The adjective we have to do with is of classical origin. It comes from the Latin *merus* which means 'undiluted' as applied to wine, or 'unmixed' as applied to peoples and languages.

Now this adjective 'mere' has passed through

one of the strangest experiences of any word in the English language. The best account of it is given by Craik in his book on *The English of Shakespeare*. Speaking of the adverb 'merely,' Craik says: 'It separates that which it designates or qualifies from everything else. But in so doing the chief or most emphatic reference may be made either to that which is included, or to that which is excluded. In modern English it is always to the latter; by "merely upon myself" we should now mean upon nothing else except myself; the *nothing else* is that which the *merely* makes prominent. In Shakespeare's day the other reference was the more common, that, namely, to what was included; and "merely upon myself" meant upon myself altogether, or without regard to anything else. *Myself* was that which the *merely* made prominent. So when Hamlet, speaking of the world, says (i. 2), "Things rank and gross in nature possess it *merely*," he by the *merely* brings the *possession* before the mind, and characterizes it as complete and absolute; but by the same term now the prominence would be given to something else from which the possession might be conceived to be separable; "possess it merely" would mean have nothing beyond simply the possession of it (have, it might be, no right to it, or no enjoyment of it).'

Craik gives a good example of the misunderstanding that sometimes arises through the change that has taken place in the meaning of *mere* and *merely*. His example is from Bacon's essay 'Of Vicissitudes of Things.' Bacon says: 'As for conflagrations and great droughts, they do not merely dispeople and destroy,' meaning that they do not *altogether* do so. But modern editors have changed the sentence, sometimes leaving out the 'not' and sometimes changing the 'and' into 'but.'

The word does not occur in the A.V., but it is an important word in the history of theology, where its misunderstanding has done something to discredit the doctrine of election. 'God, having of his mere good pleasure, from all eternity, elected some to everlasting life'—so the Shorter Catechism—and the liberal theologian holds up his hands in horror. But the word is as gracious as it is expressive. In the last sermon which Latimer preached before King Edward, a sermon on Covetousness (the date is 1550), we read that the sparrows 'are fed by God's mere providence and goodness.' In the Pastoral Letter which Knox left with his

brethren in Scotland when he accepted the call to the English congregation in Geneva (the date is 1556), we find a like sentiment: 'Let your toungis learne to prais the gracious gudness of him wha of his meir mercie hath callit you fra darknes to lyght and fra deth to lyfe.'

As illustrative (and perhaps the original) of the passage in the Shorter Catechism, take this from *The Judgement of the Synod at Dort*: 'Now Election is the vnchangeable purpose of God, by which, before the foundation of the world, according to the most free pleasure of his will, and of his meere grace, out of all mankinde, fallen through their owne fault, from their first integrity into sinne and destruction, hee hath chosen in Christ vnto saluation a set number of certaine men, neither better, nor more worthy then others.'

TAKE NO THOUGHT.

The other study may be short. It is the word *thought*. There is an article on it in the *Dictionary of the Bible* (iv. 754). It is referred to here because in an article in the *Hibbert Journal*, of which there is some account on another page, the writer, from want of the knowledge of the meaning of this word in the Authorized Version, charges our Lord with utterly condemning provident regard for the future. His words are these: 'Provident regard for the future is utterly condemned. "Take no thought for the morrow" is an absolute injunction. But all our Insurance Societies are avowedly founded on the opposite of this. Friendly, Co-operative, and Trade Union Societies are organized on the principle condemned in this sermon, and Christian governments prepare their national budgets at least twelve months in advance. The principle of some of these instructions may have its value as an ideal. But as regulative ideas for the government of personal conduct and associated life they have been useless, and they have been mischievous.'

On this characteristic paragraph it will be sufficient to quote the comment of Dr. James Drummond: 'Mr. Roberts declares, "Provident regard for the future is utterly condemned. *Take no thought for the morrow* is an absolute injunction"; and he seems greatly pleased that the world has shown itself superior to this foolish precept. A note to Pope's translation of the *Odyssey* says: "When critics find fault, they ought to take care

that they impute nothing to an author, but what the author really speaks, otherwise it is not criticism, but calumny and ignorance." On the justice of this remark I must allow the readers to pronounce. I am sure Mr. Roberts would not willingly lapse into the fault which is here stigmatized; but I fear that in this case he has yielded to one of those deluding naps to which even the "good Homer" occasionally succumbed. As Macaulay would have observed, "every schoolboy knows" that there is no such precept as Mr. Roberts quotes in the Sermon on the Mount, and that its

appearance in the Authorized Version is due to a phrase which, in its modern meaning, has become a glaring mistranslation, and accordingly has been altered by the revisers. It is not necessary to remind readers of the HIBBERT JOURNAL that the precept is directed against the distrustful "anxiety" which makes the "word" unfruitful. It will be a happier as well as a better world when men are filled with the quiet content of an assured trust, and, having fulfilled their duties, leave their outward lot without doubt or fear to the disposal of Providence.'

The Logia of the Baptist.

BY THE REV. J. C. TODD, M.A., B.SC., OAKFIELD SCHOOL, CROUCH END, LONDON.

ST. JOHN the Baptist is one of the most striking figures in Jewish history, but both sources of our knowledge of him (Josephus and the Gospels) have been regarded with suspicion. The passage in Josephus (*Ant.* XVIII. v. 2) has been denounced as an interpolation, and the accounts of the Evangelists are supposed to be coloured by the prejudices of the Apostolic Church.

It is therefore highly important to show (if we can) that we are in possession of a document which is free from taint and proceeds from the disciples of St. John himself.

In the first section of St. Mark's Gospel (1²⁻⁸) we have obviously the regular Christian account of the Baptist in so terse a form that it seems to carry us back to the pre-literary stage and to be designed for oral repetition. We have, first, the two great texts from the Bible (*i.e.* the Old Testament); the former used on the authority of our Lord (Lk 7²⁷), and the latter on that of the Baptist himself (Jn 1²⁸). Then follows a brief account of St. John's Baptism; and lastly, his great 'witness' of the 'One stronger than I,' and the prophecy of the gift of the Holy Spirit.

The account of the Baptist's food and clothing (v. 6) is probably due to the Evangelist himself, being one of the graphic details in which he delights.

When we turn to the third chapter of St. Luke we find something totally different, and it is the object of this paper to show that in the first

twenty verses we have a source-document of the Baptist's teaching, and that it owes nothing to Christian editing except the abridgment at its conclusion.

1. The elaborate list of reigning authorities (the Emperor, the Procurator, three Tetrarchs, and two High Priests) is given definitely as the date when 'the word of God came to John.' This is not a sufficiently specific *Christian* date to justify the use of some forty words in expressing it. The suggestion of von Soden (*Enc. Bib.* 'Chronology,') that it is really meant to help us to the date of the Crucifixion, can hardly be correct, since it is almost impossible to say how long a period the Evangelist assigns to the ministries of the Baptist and our Lord. A Christian compiler might *incorporate* such a statement but hardly *compose* it for himself.

2. The sonorous roll of these names reads like the beginning of a treatise, and we find the phrase 'the word of the Lord (or God) to . . .' in the *opening verse* of seven of the fifteen prophetic books of the Old Testament. The Greek is usually *λόγος Κυρίου πρὸς*, but in Jer 1¹ we have *ῥῆμα θεοῦ ἐπὶ* as here. Otherwise the sentence more nearly resembles Zec 1¹.

3. The section (v. 10-14) which relates the questions of the people and the answers of the Baptist has no Messianic or Christian significance, and is on that account omitted in the parallel text of St. Matthew.