

# THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

---

## Notes of Recent Exposition.

LAST year, in the month of May, the Hartford Theological Seminary of America reached its seventy-fifth year, and the event has left its mark upon theological literature. In the first place, the *Hartford Seminary Record* for July is filled entirely with the speeches delivered at the celebration of the anniversary. And, in the next place, a volume of six hundred pages has been published containing eighty-three articles, by nearly as many authors, each article giving an account of the work done in some particular department of theological study during the last seventy-five years. The editor of the volume is Professor Lewis BAYLES PATON. Its title is *Recent Christian Progress* (Macmillan; 12s. 6d. net).

It is a volume of greater value than one would have believed it could be. Not one of the authors has ten pages to turn himself in. But the editor has taken care that if the space was small it should be well used. Once or twice a line is lost in the complaint that there are no lines to lose. But for the most part the authors have something to say, and they proceed at once to say it. The article to which we have been most attracted is written by Professor George ELLSWORTH DAWSON. Its title is 'The Psychology of Religion.'

We shall return to that article in a little. But, first of all, let us look at one of the addresses

which were delivered at the celebration, and which are contained in the *Seminary Record*. Let us look at the address on 'The Present Task of the Ministry.' It was delivered by President WOODROW WILSON.

Hartford is a theological seminary. President WILSON addressed men who were graduating in theology on the day upon which he addressed them. He addressed them as an outsider and a layman, at once apologizing for his 'touch of temerity,' and at the same time confidently asserting that 'every profession is best estimated from the outside.' And he told them that he knew of 'no more difficult, no more delicate, no more tremendous' undertaking than theirs. It was an undertaking, he said, that would daunt any man who depended on his own strength to accomplish it; and unless these men were going with the conscious support of the Spirit of God, he did not see how they could have the audacity to go at all. For 'we live in an age,' said he, 'when *a particular thing cries out to be done which the minister must do, and there is no one else who can do it.*'

We have thrown the last sentence into italics. When we read it first we did not see the significance of it, and we wish that our readers may see it at once. We did not see that there was more in it than in other sentences, of similar sound, which

simply tell the student of theology that the Christian ministry is the noblest of all professions and he must profess it nobly. We did not see that President WILSON was laying upon the men who are entering the ministry in our day a definite task, a task exceeding in difficulty and in importance that which the Christian ministry has ever before been called upon to execute.

For a change has come over the whole attitude of men to knowledge. There was a time, 'which we can all remember,' when men of science were content with a certain materialistic interpretation of the universe. They were actually content, repeats Dr. WOODROW WILSON, with such an explanation of the universe as was supplied by their own investigations. They knew that other men, some other men, spoke of a spiritual order of things. Their attitude to that order was not defiant. They were simply unconcerned about it. They did not look into such matters because they were convinced that no examination of them would affect their assurance and content with the conclusions regarding the universe at which they had arrived in the pursuit of their own particular studies.

But that time has gone by. Men of science now feel that the explanation which they can give of the universe is a partial explanation. They see that, for the benefit of their own thought, apart from the benefit of their own souls, it is necessary that something should be added to it. They recognize, as they never did before, that their own study is part of a great circle of studies, and that the circle will not be complete when all these studies have been made to fit together, unless a spiritual segment is supplied.

'In other words,' says President WOODROW WILSON, 'we are in the presence of the absolute necessity of a spiritual co-ordination of the masses of knowledge which we have piled up and which we have partially explained, and the whole world waits for that vast task of intellectual mediation to

be performed. And he asks, 'Who shall mediate between our spirits and our knowledge? Who shall show our souls the tracks of life? Who shall be our guides, to tell us how we shall thread this intricate plan of the universe and connect ourselves with the purpose for which it is made?'

His answer is, the Christian minister. 'The world offers this leadership, this intellectual mediation, to the minister of the Gospel. It is his if he be man enough to attempt it—man enough in his knowledge, man enough in the audacity and confidence of his spirit, man enough in the connexions he has made with the eternal and everlasting forces which he knows to reside in the human spirit.'

Well may President WILSON say, 'I take that to be a very great and a very difficult task.' But well may he say also, to these men graduating in theology, 'I congratulate you that this is your high and difficult function in life.' For they will not shrink from it if they are persuaded that the task is theirs. Is this the task of the ministry of to-day? The task of the minister of Christ in every age is to preach the Gospel. Is this the preaching of the Gospel?

The question is plainly in President WILSON'S mind, though he never gives it such bare utterance. It is in his mind; for he mentions two popular methods of preaching the Gospel, and sets himself against them. The one method is to preach the Gospel by selling the box of ointment and giving it to the poor. The Gospel is for the poor. Dr. WILSON does not, of course, deny that. But it is also and as often for the rich. And he does not believe that the Christian Church should be chiefly a philanthropic institution.

More than that, he doubts if we do not err when we greatly cultivate compassion for the multitude. Jesus had compassion on the multitude, and He did well, for they needed it. But they do not need it now as they needed it then. Now they need to be assured that they have an

inheritance, 'the richest and completest inheritance that it is possible to conceive'; and instead of looking for pity, they must be challenged to assert in themselves those things which will make them independent of pity. Dr. WILSON does not deny, you observe, that the Church stands at the centre of philanthropy. But he asserts that it stands also at the centre of education, at the centre of science, at the centre of philosophy, at the centre of politics; in short, at the centre of all sentient and thinking life.

The other method of preaching the Gospel which Dr. WILSON disallows is the placing of the whole emphasis on rescuing the individual soul from the wrath to come. He understands that the Gospel came into the world to save the world as well as to save individual souls. And he does not think that much of its task is accomplished, or the noblest part of it, when men are merely advised 'to run to cover.' Nay, there is even the risk of making the cross of Christ of none effect by reducing it to an instrument of the most unsocial selfishness.

If we do not misunderstand him, Dr. WILSON accepts pity for the poor and the rescue of the individual as parts of the preacher's task. But he refuses to see his whole task accomplished in them. In actual fact, he says, the pulpit itself has discovered the inadequacy of these two, singly or together, as the fulfilment of the preaching of the Gospel. And to make up the deficiency it has attached to itself musical entertainments and cooking classes and bowling alleys.

What is it, then, that the preaching of the Gospel chiefly signifies? This, in a sentence, that God is a God of purpose, and within that purpose desires to gather all the lawful occupations and interests of life. It is the business of the preacher to gather them all within it.

That God is a God of purpose—that is the first thing. How do we know that? There is a

sentence in the record of the Gospel which is able to tell us. It is, 'when the fulness of the time came, God sent forth his Son, born of a woman, born under the law, that he might redeem them which were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons' (Gal 4<sup>4</sup>). 'When the fulness of the time came'—that is God's purpose declared. But if we have learned it otherwise, if we have learned it of Evolution, or left others to learn it of Evolution, is it too late yet to recognize and rejoice in it? Is it too late to make this the great theme of preaching, that it is not the will of our Father which is in heaven that one of these little ones, or any activity of theirs, should remain outside His purpose of grace?

'I wonder,' says President WOODROW WILSON, 'if any of you fully realize how hungry men's minds are for a complete and satisfactory explanation of life? I heard a very pathetic story the other day about a poor woman, a simple uneducated woman, in one of our cities, who had by some accident got hold of one of Darwin's books—I forget if it was the *Origin of Species* or not—and who had found, even to her unlettered mind, a great revelation in the book, a revelation of the processes of physical life and of the plan of physical existence. She told a friend that it had taken out of her—in her expression—"all the kick there was in her." She said: "I don't find anything in the preaching that I hear. It listens good, but it is so soft. It doesn't seem to give me anything to chew on. It doesn't enable me to understand what happens to me every day any better than I understood it before. It doesn't even put bread in my mouth or in my children's mouths. But I read that book, and I saw that there was something doing. I saw that there was something going on of which I was a little part, and it has taken all the kick out of me."'

The language is occasionally unfamiliar. But behind its unfamiliarity we see a fact. It is the tragic fact that we may have left such an one outside our ministry because we had no word to

preach that made life orderly or even intelligible. We have had much to say about the antagonism between science and religion; we have forgotten that religion is the explanation of science, the lost segment of the circle which all the sciences are looking for. We have spoken carelessly about 'the man in the street,' without asking how it is that he comes to be there, without considering that it may possibly be because, in the words of the American woman, we have 'nothing to give him to chew on.'

Now there is no denying it that if this is the task of the ministry in our day, the minister needs much equipment of knowledge. Dr. WILSON does not deny it. He calls on these graduates to equip themselves with knowledge. He admits that they cannot be perfectly equipped at the outset. But he looks forward to the time when they will grow in knowledge and in power as they understand the plan of the world and what they are called to do for men.

And this brings us to the question where the knowledge is to be found, and so to the volume we have already been introduced to.

For the knowledge with which the minister must acquaint himself is the knowledge of life. Beyond life, physical, mental, spiritual, he happily does not need to go. And the article by Professor DAWSON on 'The Psychology of Religion' gives the first absolutely necessary directions.

Professor DAWSON defines the Psychology of Religion as the science of the religious life. It is therefore that very lost segment which Dr. WILSON is in search of in order to complete the circle of the sciences. Then Professor DAWSON shows how the segment may be made to fit into its place and finish the complete round.

First of all, in the light of the Psychology of Religion, the science of Biology finds its place. It is no disparagement of the religious life to admit that, as a science, Biology had the start of

it, and has even had much to do with its present position. 'Since Darwin published his *Origin of Species* in 1859, human experience in every department of life, and not least in that of religion, has taken on absolutely new meanings and values. The human mind is becoming *biocentric* in its outlook upon every type of experience. There is no other explanation of the changes that are rapidly taking place in literature, art, education, religion, and social institutions. Biology has discovered a new way of looking at things.' There is no harm in admitting all that. The point is that now the way is open for the Christian minister to answer the request of the biologist for a spiritual interpretation of life.

'The processes of cell-conjugation and cell-division,' says Professor DAWSON, 'reveal phenomena for which there is no explanation by any generally accepted standard of knowledge.' It may be that before we are able to furnish this explanation we shall have to modify somewhat our conception of the human soul and God's relation to it. Cellular Biology may react on Religious Psychology. And then there may come a radical reconstruction of religious philosophy. It may be that the revelations of Cellular Biology will be the means of making such a doctrine as the Divine immanence more than a philosophical speculation. But nothing will ever hinder the science of religion from holding the first place among the sciences and being the explanation that binds together and uplifts human knowledge, unless it be the ignorance or the cowardice of those who are now graduating as ministers of the Gospel.

There is just one other science that has to be attended to immediately. It is the science of Anthropology. This science 'investigates man's development racially, as Biology investigates his development as a living being. On the psychical side, it discovers the origin of beliefs, customs, works, and institutions of the various races and levels of civilization. Its investigation of the religious life of the race has created the science of

Comparative Religion; and this science supplies the Psychology of Religion with facts and principles that enable it to derive universal laws of religious development. Thus there have been brought to light the unity of religious consciousness in all mankind; the essential elements of that consciousness; the objects that evoke its activities under the varying conditions of racial environment; the forms these activities take, in ceremonials, sacrifices, worship, and institutions; and the religious sanction of conduct throughout racial evolution.'

And again this science of Anthropology seems to precede and almost to create the science of the religious life. But precedence in time is no mark of superiority in a science. The patriarchs and prophets preceded the early Christians. Yet it was one of the latter who said, 'God has provided some better thing for us, that apart from us they should not be made perfect.' It is the spiritual interpretation of life, the interpretation which only the minister of the Gospel can give, that makes perfect the whole round of science and philosophy.

Canon Rayner WINTERBOTHAM has contributed an article to the *Expositor* for December on 'The Omniscience of our Lord.' He does not believe in our Lord's omniscience. 'I do not hesitate to avow,' he says, 'that I hold the latter (that He was *not* omniscient) with all the strength of my religious conviction.'

Now it requires no great endowment of courage to make this avowal of unbelief. Canon WINTERBOTHAM does not pretend that it does. It is a well-recognized and widespread attitude to Christ at the present time. It is the attitude of all those to whom Christ, with varying degrees of excellence, was still 'a mere man.' It is also the attitude of many who believe heartily in His divinity. Canon WINTERBOTHAM believes in His divinity. And he uses the word 'divinity' in the sense in which the Church has ever used it.

But if it demands little courage to express one's unbelief in the omniscience of Christ on earth, it requires much circumspection. For it is easy to express it so as to deny Christ Himself. It is easy to express it, and it is now constantly being expressed, in such a way as to deny all that Christ has stood for throughout the history of Christianity, including His true divinity, and to leave Him at best but a degree better than the men we pass on the street.

Canon WINTERBOTHAM is not so careful as he might be. In the first place, he uses a word which is open to misunderstanding. It is the word 'omniscience.' We prefer the word 'knowledge.' We do not say that the Church has not claimed omniscience for our Lord on earth. We do not say that it has. What we say is that knowledge is enough to speak about. The circle may not be lessened nor its centre shifted by the substitution of knowledge for omniscience. But it is a better word to work with. It is more intelligible, it is more easily tested, and it covers the whole of the ground that has to be covered.

In the next place, Canon WINTERBOTHAM does not seem to have considered—certainly he has not made clear—what he means by 'omniscience.' If he means an attribute that is so peculiar to God that it had to be laid aside by the Son of God when He became man, then the question falls. We all believe that He 'emptied Himself.' If the emptying necessarily meant the loss of omniscience, there was no occasion for the writing of this article. The word does seem to be used occasionally in that sense. But the article as a whole shows that this is not the meaning. Canon WINTERBOTHAM admits the possibility that Christ 'knew everything all the time.'

But the most serious oversight is a confusion between the fact of knowledge and the source of it. Canon WINTERBOTHAM does not believe that Jesus knew everything all the time. He believes that He knew only 'what was needful for us men and for our salvation.' But when he speaks of

Christ knowing what was needful for us men and for our salvation, he inserts a parenthesis 'by intuition, experience, or revelation of the Spirit.' And that parenthesis obscures the issue. For the question is not, How did Jesus know? but, Did He know? When the believer in Christ's knowledge comes to the question of the source of His knowledge he may be at one with Canon WINTERBOTHAM. He may even say that the very reason why he still believes in the knowledge of Christ on earth is not, as it used to be put, because He was God and therefore could not be ignorant, but because as the Son He was in perfect communion every day with the Father.

But, once more, is Canon WINTERBOTHAM quite clear on the difference between knowing 'everything all the time' and knowing 'what was needful for us men and for our salvation'? Christ came for us men and for our salvation, and He came for nothing else. Is there anything, then, that He said or did which had any other reference? What is this other 'everything all the time'? And if we see from the records of His life on earth that there were things of which He was ignorant, how can we be sure that these things were not necessary for us men and our salvation?

It is easy to limit the things that are necessary for our salvation. We have seen them limited in our day to a very small number of things, and then we have been told that Jesus was ignorant of all the rest. And not only ignorant of them, but also subject to transgression in respect of them. We have been told pretty freely of late that all that is needed for us men and our salvation is a fairly good example.

We do not say that Canon WINTERBOTHAM is wrong in denying Christ's unerring knowledge, we only call for carefulness. Whether Christ knew or not is a question of evidence. And as a question of evidence Canon WINTERBOTHAM deals with it.

What are his arguments? He finds his argu-

ments in the Gospels and in the Epistle to the Hebrews. In the Gospels there are three passages, or classes of passages. It is said (Lk 2<sup>52</sup>) that Jesus 'advanced in wisdom and stature.' It is said (Mk 6<sup>6</sup>) that He 'marvelled' because of the unbelief of the people of Nazareth. And it is said (Mk 14<sup>88</sup>) that He 'began to be greatly amazed and sore troubled.' Besides these passages there is the statement about the day and the hour, which will be touched upon in a little.

Now we must not begin to explain away these passages. We must not for a moment harbour such a desire. Explaining away has prevented whole generations of men from understanding the Bible. And here at any rate we have no temptation. For Canon WINTERBOTHAM himself quotes just as many texts on the other side. Not only is it stated that Christ 'knew all men,' and that He 'knew what was in man' (Jn 2<sup>25</sup>), but in His intercourse with men He also showed on various occasions 'an apparent supernatural acquaintance with their circumstances (Jn 1<sup>47, 48</sup> 4<sup>17, 18</sup> Mt 17<sup>25</sup>) and their thoughts (Mk 2<sup>8</sup> 9<sup>38-37</sup> Lk 7<sup>40</sup> Jn 6<sup>61</sup>).' So that what is evident without any explaining away is, that to the Evangelists Christ seemed to know everything that was going on and yet was unmistakably human.

And is not that all we can say about His knowledge? Is it not all we need to say?

But this is not the whole of the evidence. Canon WINTERBOTHAM goes to the Epistle to the Hebrews. In the Epistle to the Hebrews he finds it stated that our Lord was 'really and truly one of ourselves,' and that He was 'tempted just as we are.' Is this evidence of want of knowledge? Temptation may be: it would be difficult to prove that it must be. Canon WINTERBOTHAM makes no attempt to prove it. He exclaims, 'But surely, surely, to admit that He was tempted with evil, and at the same time to deny that His knowledge was or could be limited, is to strain out the gnat and to swallow the camel.' Perhaps so:

But 'surely' is never an argument, not even when it is repeated.

It is a remarkable fact that there is just a single passage in the Bible which states explicitly that of anything whatever our Lord was ignorant. And it is significant that of that passage Canon WINTERBOTHAM makes very little. For he knows that it belongs to the eschatological teaching of our Lord, and that the eschatological teaching of our Lord stands by itself and must be treated separately. The passage is Mk 13<sup>32</sup>, in which Jesus Himself testified that the Son did not know (any more than the angels) the day or the hour of the Second Advent.

The passage, we say, belongs to the eschatological teaching of the Gospels. It is part of Christ's revelation of the future. And there is no doubt that at the present time our Lord's eschatology is more difficult to receive than any other part of His teaching. Canon WINTERBOTHAM is keenly sensitive to the difficulty of it. And in this, at least, he is very far from standing alone.

A new volume of 'St. Ninian Lectures' has been issued. Its title is *Religion and the Modern World* (Hodder & Stoughton; 5s.). One of the lecturers is Dr. James MOFFATT, whose lecture is on 'Modern Criticism and the Religion of Jesus.' In that lecture Dr. MOFFATT quotes Herrmann on the eschatology of our Lord, and accepts the situation as Herrmann explains it. His words are: 'It is certain, as Herrmann puts it, that, once our attention is called to the eschatological standpoint of Jesus, we are compelled to make two admissions. In the first place, we feel that a barrier is raised between Him and us by our having honestly to confess that we do not share that standpoint—we are not very greatly affected by the idea of an approaching end of the world. Secondly, circumstances in which we see the promise of a better future, in His eyes were only harbingers of ruin. In Him there was nothing of the zeal of the political and economic reformer.'

Well, what are we to do with that? We are to accept it and make the best of it, if it is the right word on the subject. We are on no account to twist and torment it in order to extract out of it the meaning we most desire. Is Herrmann's the right word?

The point of difficulty is succinctly and unerringly stated by Canon WINTERBOTHAM. 'It is almost impossible,' he says, 'to resist the evidence that our Lord believed, and led others to believe, that He would come again within a short time.'

Now, in the first place, it is possible, as Canon WINTERBOTHAM admits, that 'the Evangelists misreported Him.' Or, as Dr. MOFFATT more delicately expresses it, there is 'the critical uncertainty as to how far His recorded words have been sharpened in the course of their preservation by the next generation of His disciples.' There is also the possibility, as Canon WINTERBOTHAM again admits, that He did come again within that very generation. But there is something else.

There is the fact that Jesus was a prophet. Being a prophet, He foretold the future. And He foretold the future in such language, or with the use of such imagery, not necessarily as He himself was capable of, as in the case of other prophets, but as would best convey the spiritual facts of the future to the minds and consciences of His hearers.

First of all, He was a prophet. But that needs no proving. Next, being a prophet, He foretold the future. For the latest discussion of this statement, turn to another new book, *The Unfinished Symphony* of the Rev. Hugh FALCONER, B.D. (Duckworth; 6s.). We have for some time been laying much emphasis on the fact that the Hebrew prophet was a 'forth-teller.' Foremost of all, says Mr. FALCONER, he was a fore-teller. And he quotes the great authority of SMEND in

favour of it: 'I take it that Smend is entirely right when he says that "in Amos and his successors prophecy (in the sense of pre-vision) is the starting-point of their whole discourse and action; all new knowledge which they preach comes to them from the action of Jehovah which they foretell. *Consequently the greatness of a prophet is to be gathered from the measure in which he foresees the future.*"'

Now Jesus was the greatest of the prophets. Therefore, if SMEND is right, He foresaw the future as no one else foresaw it. And, foreseeing, He foretold it. But He had to foretell it as His hearers were able to receive it. Well, we know something of the men His hearers were; we know something about their upbringing and their outlook; and we may safely conclude that it was not possible for human language to convey to them the spiritual kernel of the teaching without misunderstanding as to its external envelope—its times and its seasons.

But it does not follow that Jesus Himself was mistaken. If we say that He was mistaken, our conclusion is drawn, not from the facts before us, but from other considerations. DR. MOFFATT, confining himself to the eschatological teaching, is able to say: 'We cannot doubt that Jesus Himself must have looked through such forms and beyond them even as He employed them.'

And now comes the significant thing. Why did our Lord say anything about the future if He knew that it would be misunderstood? The answer is that the revelation of the future was His business as a prophet. More than it had ever been the business of any prophet before Him, it was His business to reveal the future. For He had come to make the future. And he could not make it without in some degree making it known. For the making of it was to be, not His own immediate act, but the work of His disciples. And He knew that they would not misunderstand it **always.**

He knew that they would not misunderstand it always. Did St. Paul misunderstand it? Turn once more to a new book. The Rev. A. L. LILLEY has published a volume of sermons on *The Soul of St. Paul* (Griffiths; 3s. 6d. net). He believes that St. Paul misunderstood. But, he says, 'within the brief period of his ministry St. Paul had abandoned his apocalyptic hope of a visible advent, abandoned it, no doubt, because he had come to feel how much greater than any such magical transformation of the visible order could be, was the silent transformation which from his own experience he knew that the Spirit of Christ was effecting, and would increasingly accomplish, in and through the hearts of men.'

And not only did our Lord know that His words would not be misunderstood always. He knew also that by such teaching as was at first misunderstood, and had to be searched into, that its meaning might appear, had the revelation of God been made from the beginning. CANON WINTERBOTHAM has taken us to the Epistle to the Hebrews. Let us detain him there a little. The triumphant chapter is the eleventh, the chapter which contains the Roll-call of Faith. What is it that is singled out as at once source and evidence of the heroic in these heroes? It is the fact that they were ever kept looking for something beyond their present attainment. And when did they at last obtain the fulness of insight and enjoyment of the promises of God? Not in this life. 'These all died in faith, not having received the promises, but having seen them afar off, and were persuaded of them and embraced them.' It is the bravest word that this Epistle contains. We think there is no braver or truer word (apart from the words of Jesus) to be found in all the Scriptures.

The truest, we say, as well as the bravest. For Abraham was not misled when he went out to find a country on the other side of the River, though afterwards he learned to look for a city which hath foundations whose builder and maker is God. And if there are 'some rare spirits' among us



still who sing our great hymn of praise, and joyfully say, 'We believe that Thou shalt come,' it does not mean that they are misled. In his new volume, entitled *Christus Crucifixus* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s.), the Principal of the Clergy School in Leeds has no hesitation in joining the small band of expectants. Mr. SIMPSON takes the words of Frances RIDLEY HAVERGAL, 'our modern English St. Cecilia,' and makes them his own; and he knows that as he makes them his own, and that fervently, he is not misled:

Thou art coming, O my Saviour,  
 Thou art coming, O my King,  
 In Thy beauty all-resplendent,  
 In Thy glory all-transcendent;  
 Well may we rejoice and sing;  
 Coming! In the opening east  
 Herald brightness slowly swells;  
 Coming! O my glorious Priest,  
 Hear we not Thy golden bells?

In the article in the *Expositor* by Canon WINTERBOTHAM, to which reference has just been made, there is an interesting exposition of a familiar and important verse in the Epistle to the Hebrews. It is the verse, 'We behold . . . Jesus, because of the suffering of death crowned with glory and honour, that by the grace of God he should taste death for every man' (2<sup>o</sup>).

'Crowned with glory and honour'—when? We have held—have we not all held hitherto?—that the crowning took place at the Ascension. Canon WINTERBOTHAM holds that it took place at Pilate's judgment-seat.

What the author had before his mind's eye was certainly not that "crown of pure gold" with which He was (figuratively speaking) crowned when He sat down at the right hand of God, King of kings and Lord of lords. It was obviously that other crown, of thorns, with which His mother, the Jewish Church, crowned Him in the day of His espousals—when He purchased to Himself the universal Church to be His bride for ever. What the sacred writer saw was Jesus as Pilate led Him forth wearing the crown of thorns and the robe of mockery.' And for proof of it Canon WINTERBOTHAM refers his reader to the original Greek.

And what is the advantage? The advantage is that 'no conceivable "glory and honour" could ever come near to the moral dignity of that supreme self-sacrifice.' It may be that 'all the crowns of empire meet upon that brow' in heaven above. But it is the *moral* splendour, the *spiritual* dignity, of the Redeemer which must hold and fascinate every Christian eye, and that shines out resplendent in the Crucifixion.

## Taoism, its Christian Affinities and its Defects.

BY THE REV. P. J. MACLAGAN, M.A., D.PHIL., SWATOW.

### II.

#### What is Tao?

THERE are other passages which might be quoted to illustrate the metaphysical meaning of Tao; but I do not know that they would add much to the light or glimmering of light we may have already gained. If, then, we ask what did Lao-tsze mean

by Tao, it must be admitted that the answer cannot be very definite. We may almost be inclined to take up Lao-tsze's own words and say, 'How vague! how confused! How confused! how vague!'

It may perhaps help us to notice some of the