

-1945-

SOCIETAS



1 9 4 5



Back Row: R. E. Sherlock, J. Johnston, J. J. Goodman, J. S. Elliot, L. S. Werry, M. Williams, K. B. Roughly, H. J. Edwards, J. R. Payne, A. Yuill, R. Weir, R. Patfield, R. Bosanquet, D. C. Hayes.

Third Row: W. G. A. Tooth, K. L. Walker, F. G. Taplin, E. W. Fisher-Johnson, G. Fletcher, J. Ross, R. Gray, J. Bootle, W. F. Carter, D. W. Draper, R. A. Woodward, R. V. Ash, G. Fuhrmeister, L. R. Buckman.

Second Row: D. A. Langford, R. G. F. Morris, C. L. Goodwin, G. B. Simmons, W. Merrell, R. L. Rolls, D. E. Langshaw, J. W. Holmes, R. B. Gibbes, A. C. Tipping, T. E. Crawford, T. F. McKnight, W. G. Twine, A. H. Crigan, A. R. Lormer.

Front Row: R. H. Palmer, H. R. Minn, Archdeacon J. Bidwell, Archdeacon A. L. Wade, Rev. M. L. Loane, The Principal, The Archbishop of Sydney, Bishop Hilliard, Miss M. J. Steel, Rev. C. K. Hammond, Rev. H. Bates, Rev. E. K. Cole, B. D. Reed.

Societas

MOORE THEOLOGICAL COLLEGE
NEWTOWN, SYDNEY, N.S.W.

1945

S. JOHN BACON
Marshall, Morgan & Scott Ltd.
317 Collins Street, Melbourne

*And let Thy Patriarchs' desire—
Those great-grandfathers of Thy Church, which saw
More in the cloud than we in fire,
Whom nature clear'd more, than us grace and law.
And now in heaven still pray, that we
May use our new helps right,—
Be satisfied, and fructify in me;
Let not my mind be blinder by more light
Nor Faith, by Reason added, lose her sight.*

—John Donne.

FOREWORD

by

FRANK CASH

Registrar of the Australian College of Theology

THE Editor has allowed me a glance at the proof sheets of this copy of "Societas." The academic flavour of it is evident immediately, a characteristic which makes its appeal intensive if limited.

The excellency of a production is no guarantee that it will find a large circle of readers. The Prophets of old and the splendour of their message are scarcely known among ordinary people to-day; and the unravelling of the Pauline Epistles in the original text is no easy task for the student of theology.

Readers of "Societas," however, in a field far outside the College environs will feel proud that so meritorious a publication has been produced by its staff and students.

As I rapidly inspected the proofs in the Common Room of the College in the middle of August, 1945, we heard outside the exulting shouts proclaiming that the war was over. Voices spoke to us out of the past, and the mist was in our eyes. Thoughtful people will see instantly that the present number of "Societas" proclaims a message for our day.

August 27, 1945.

CONTENTS

	Page
Foreword	3
Rev. E. F. N. Cash, M.A., B.D., Th.Soc.	
Barthianism and Nature Theology	5
Canon T. C. Hammond, M.A., Th.Soc.	
Christianity and Culture	12
Harry Reynolds Smythe, B.A., Th.L.	
The Prophecy of Isaiah, Ch. xxviii.	20
H. R. Minn, M.A., B.D.	
The Sinner of Galilee	29
Rev. M. L. Loane, M.A., Th.L.	
Education and the Christian Religion	38
Rev. E. C. Cole, Th.L.	
— — — —	
College Information	43

Barthianism and Natural Theology

T. C. HAMMOND

IN my "Reasoning Faith" I ventured to assert that Karl Barth has little or no use for what is called "Natural Theology." I said that on his interpretation "'Natural Theology' has its use. It bears witness in its futility to the fact that God dwelleth in light which no man can approach. Beyond this it has no message." In the context I quoted Brunner and have been reminded that Brunner and Barth divided sharply on the question of the Image of God. That fact should have been noticed in this context and I hasten now to make honourable amends. But in defence of the general attitude, I would maintain that Brunner drew inspiration from Barth and it may well be that the Barthian element in his teaching now and again collides with other factors. In the passage I quoted, Brunner says:—"In all periods when faith has been strong it has been the prime interest of theology to work out clearly the opposition of reason and revelation, of 'natural' knowledge and will on the one hand and faith on the other hand, whereas conversely an apologetic attitude has characterized the eras poor in faith." Brunner enters on a long and penetrating criticism of speculative idealism and decides against its ability to give us theology proper. With much that he says here the ordinary supporter of Natural Theology would agree. It is this see-saw in argument that makes the whole problem at once so interesting and so complex. When we turn to Barth's Gifford Lectures on "The Knowledge of God and the Service of God" we find him writing—"I certainly see—with astonishment—that such a science as Lord Gifford had in mind does exist, but I do not see how it is possible for it to exist. I am convinced that so far as it has existed and still exists, it owes its existence to a radical error . . . I am, of course, aware that both in the past and in recent times there have been Reformed Theologians also, to whom 'Natural Theology' at least in a rather weakened and obscure sense of the term, appeared to be no impossible pursuit. I feel, however, that precisely the strong and clear sense in which this concep-

tion appears in the will of Lord Gifford, must make it clear even to the most innocent of men—even if he does not know it otherwise—that it cannot really be the business of a Reformed theologian to raise so much as his little finger to support this undertaking in any positive way . . . I expressly reminded the Senators of this University of the fact that I am an avowed opponent of all 'Natural Theology'."

The type of Natural Theology to which Barth takes exception is the type which asserts that "There does exist a knowledge of God and His connection with the world and men apart from any special and supernatural revelation . . . a knowledge which he only requires to discover as something which he himself possesses as he discovers the mathematical laws which lie at the basis of chemistry and astronomy in order then to apply them to these sciences."

Karl Barth is the leader of an important School of Theology. He has both courage and insight. He has rendered invaluable service in reviving the essential features of Reformed Theology. His insistence on the sovereign grace of God is a noteworthy episode in its character as a revolt from the smug complacency which by implication at least denies any great pertinency to Job's question, "Can a man by searching find out God?" All this may and must be conceded. Are we therefore to accept the view that all Natural Theology stands over against Theology rightly understood? Are we to assert that "There is no important statement in the Scottish Confession (Barth's basis of comment) which the representative of Natural Theology can avoid considering as the direct opposite of his own tenets"?

After giving earnest attention to the kindly and unkindly criticisms that have reached me, I confess I am still unable to see that this is a necessary or a wise conclusion. It may well be, as has been more than once suggested, that Barth's thought is so profound that it leads to misconception on the part of the ordinary reader. But such suggestions carry us a very little way on the path of understanding. On the whole it seems best to develop the argument as it appears to the observer leaving it to more acute minds to effect the readjustments that will restore the perfect balance of thought.

Barth seeks to maintain the position that there is no innate knowledge of God which the theologian can employ, not as a substitute for revelation nor as an independent and complete system, but as a hint that in the language of St. Paul, man, even in his fallen state, seeks after God, if haply he may find Him. He does indeed admit, as we

have seen above, that Reformed theologians did regard Natural Theology, in a rather weakened and obscure sense of the term, as a not impossible pursuit. It is rather unfortunate that Barth has not indicated quite clearly the difference between this weakened form and the form which he regards as quite inadmissible. It is also unfortunate that he directs his criticism more than once against the elements of Natural Theology in the reformed writings without informing us whether the references are to the weakened and obscure sense or to the strong sense of Lord Gifford. Others may be able to overcome this difficulty but to me, I confess, it still remains a problem. There is a looseness in definition which adds to the difficulty of an admittedly difficult subject.

Barth insists very strongly on man's inability. That is a sound plank in Reformed Theology, but the question presses insistently as to the nature of this inability. There is the inability occasioned by the original constitution of a being. A plant is not sentient. It is unable to give expression to feeling after the manner of a sentient creature. Such an inability could never be blameworthy. But the inability of which we speak in Theology is occasioned by a violation of the original constitution of a being. Professor Drummond would use as an illustration the parasite, but his illustration fails because there is no evidence in the case of a parasite of the exercise of a deliberate choice. In the case of man the revelation of God assures us that he has so chosen to depart from light and truth. It does not follow that having departed he can return. The testimony of God is that he cannot return unaided. Such a being has still, even though they have been perverted, the great capacities of a self-determining creature. Speaking of the heathen moralists, St. Paul tells us that they "show the works of the law written in their hearts, their conscience bearing witness therewith, their thoughts (or reasonings) one with another accusing or else excusing them." Here is an important difference. It is the difference between the non-religious and the irreligious. There are witnesses in man's nature to his high destiny, but because of his fallen condition he cannot adequately employ these witnesses, yet he can never wholly neglect them. The strongest language that Barth or Brunner employs in relation to the final incapacity of man to find God can be adopted, and yet it can also be said that man struggles impotently to seek after God and find Him. This is at once his misery and the promise of his redemption through grace.

Barth sets a gap between knowledge and faith. It may

be confessed that here he has penetrating ideas. Yet in the end we are left with a dualism in knowledge. Some things which are truths are comprehended by the intellect of man. Other things belong to the region of what he calls faith knowledge. This dualism is not overcome though it could be overcome. He speaks vigorously against the anti-intellectualism that possesses the churches in many quarters, yet he insists that the knowledge of faith is, in quality and origin, quite different from any knowledge which man can attain otherwise.

It seems possible to get a clearer conception if we consider that all knowledge, just because it is inadequate, is based on faith. The scientist would not be able to make any progress did he not believe that the world which he is studying is an ordered world and that he is capable of penetrating to some of its secrets. Faith in God, we may assert, would be natural to man, as natural as his faith in the interpretability of the Universe, were it not for the debility occasioned by sin. The blindness which has fallen upon Israel may serve as an illustration of this strange defect. Man did once seek after God truly and he has this consciousness remaining in him but, through his perverse action in resisting the Divine claim, he has placed himself in a position where he must inevitably go astray in the higher regions where faith operates. This is a very different thing from saying that revelation comes to him in a manner wholly distinct from that which he experiences when he exercises his natural gift of reason. The antithesis between reason and revelation is unduly emphasised in the Barthian position. The truth seems to be that because of man's sinful state the irrational controls, or to put it still more clearly, there remains an irrational element in all his determinations which would be completely excluded were man in harmony with God.

Brunner indeed, in his "Philosophy of Religion," has a different view of the irrational in thought. According to him it is the given element which is not reason but something which is supplied from yet another source. It seems truer to suggest that what Brunner calls the irrational is better described as that element in our knowledge which indicates our limitation. It is a commonplace even in the much criticised idealistic philosophy, to assert that the particular as such cannot become an element in knowledge. Might it not be said that the existence of the particular is a hint to us that all our unifications are approximations so that the complete whole in knowledge is never present to us. It would be far fetched and impossible to declare

that because this is the case our approximations have no element of truth whatever in them. When we introduce the problem of sin we pass beyond natural limitation to those cramping influences that are the result of our wayward sinful revolt against God.

A great deal is said in the Barthian theology about the object grasping the subject. The criticism of idealism is constantly urged that it gives us a subject but does not give us a true unity in a person. It still presents the known world as an object to thought, but here we seem again to meet with a confusion between limitation as such and defect. It is true that we can only dimly perceive the unity of subject-object even to ourselves. When we present ourselves to reflection, we are objects of thought. It is true, as Stirling puts it, that we cannot say "I" once without saying it twice, but the second "I," which also appears in grammar as "me," must present itself as an object. The complete union is conceived but scarcely realized in the processes of thought. This lies behind Hegel's famous saying that "understanding divides but reason unites." Along this line there is something of value in Barth's position. The doctrine of the Trinity supplies to us the true union of subject and object in the perfection of the Godhead. Our personality is but a faint reflection of that perfect union. The fact that we require others to develop our special nature is a hint that we are not isolated and wholly independent in our personal life, but it is only a hint. We remain remote from those others who nevertheless fill out our being. This is part of our finitude. To transcend it would be to pass beyond the bounds of nature.

But this is wholly different from a declaration that faith knowledge is different in kind from our capacity for ordinary understanding. It is different in content. It relates to the nature and character of God and this nature and character are concealed from us through our blindness until they are restored again by the operation of the Holy Ghost. Furthermore, the very influence of the Divine Spirit, putting into our minds good desires and yet remaining Himself to some extent unperceived, is the deepest hint of a higher unity and personality that has yet been afforded to man in his present condition. We are sensible of the influence of the Spirit though we can only contemplate that influence in the sending forth of the cry of the penitent and the trust of the child.

As St. Paul puts it, "The Spirit helpeth our infirmities. He maketh intercession for us . . ." and the union is so intimate that it never finds full expression in the content of

our thought. There are "groanings which cannot be uttered."

Calvin seems a safer guide in the matter of the relation between knowledge and faith. He asks, "Shall we esteem anything laudable or excellent which we do not recognize as proceeding from God?" An American critic retorted here that a citation like this from Calvin must not be tabled without a recognition of his doctrine of common grace. Is there not a confusion here? Calvin would hold strongly and so would every Reformed Theologian, that the power to think wisely or rightly in any department of life comes from God. We here touch on the perplexing question of the relation of the Creator to those who are in permanent rebellion against Him. We must hold that even devils exist by the will of God, unless we are to forfeit our doctrine that He is the Creator of all things, that "without Him was not anything made that was made." Devils exist by the will of God but they exist in a condition of complete rebellion. Grace in the sense of a bestowal of favour no longer operates in their case. If then the gracious operations of God were to be withdrawn altogether from the affairs of men, man's existence would be comparable to that of the angels who kept not their first estate. If, on the other hand, man had not fallen, he would not only still owe all his powers and virtues to Him Who had created him, but he would duly seek God's gracious favour as do the unfallen angels. Common grace, then, is an evidence to us that, notwithstanding man's rebellion, God still influences the course of his activities, allowing him to retain some knowledge of truth and operating upon his moral nature by His Spirit to bring him again into conformity to the image of Christ Jesus our Lord.

We can consider in this connection, when reflecting on the nature of the relation between knowledge and faith, the paradox in I. Cor. 13. where Paul says, "Knowledge shall be done away," and yet adds, "Then shall I know even as I am known." In the same context he assures us that faith abideth. Here we seem to grasp dimly, and it can only be dimly grasped, that there is an ascending scale of comprehension in which perfect faith and perfect knowledge form the topmost peak. It may be argued that Paul is thinking of Christian progress and therefore no knowledge apart from living faith is in view throughout. This may be so in that particular instance, but it certainly offers a suggestion that the words which he quotes with approval on Mars Hill belong to the same scale, though at a much lower point—"We are also His offspring" was born of a true idea though it is the utterance of Aratus on whom the

Page 10

light of revelation had not broken. Similarly Epimenides has grasped the conception "In Him we live and move and have our being" though he had no knowledge of the truth as it is in Jesus.

Man's waywardness and departure from God have caused these thoughts, part of his original inheritance, to struggle in vain against the depressing influences of his fallen nature, so that Paul is able to say "The things which the Gentiles sacrifice they sacrifice to devils and not to God." Truth in its essence remains hidden until grace awakens living faith, yet there are rays from truth that penetrate the darkness and awaken premonitions of a higher destiny for man than that which, in his wilfulness, he pursues.

If these reflections have any weight it seems that we are able to accord a place to Natural Theology, and that further we do not feel compelled so to separate reason and revelation as to make them alien and contrary elements.

It may be contended that Karl Barth had too strong a sense of the ultimate reality of things ever to adopt a position in which he places reason and revelation in complete hostility. It may be contended on the other hand that he started with such a hostility to Natural Theology as to leave man in a condition of complete ignorance of all Divine ideas but that the incidence of his arguments forced modifications upon him. The student can read Barth for himself, and he is worth reading, and can determine the issue, towards which determination it is hoped that this brief examination may offer some help.

* * *

Christianity brings and preaches salvation by the conversion of the will,—humanism by the emancipation of the mind. One attacks the heart, the other the brain. Both wish to enable man to reach his ideal. But the ideal differs, if not by its content, at least by the disposition of its content, by the predominance and sovereignty given to this or that inner power. For one, the mind is the organ of the soul; for the other the soul is an inferior state of the mind; the one wishes to enlighten by making better, the other to Socrates and Christ.

—Amiel.

Christianity and Culture

HARRY REYNOLDS SMYTHE

"Thy sons, O Zion, against thy sons, O Greece."

—Zechariah 9: 13.

WHEN we, with our little minds, attempt to reason concerning the nature of the Divine Being, we normally divide His attributes into the *immanentia* and the *transeuntia*, the quiescent and the active. The former are those which are proper to the nature of God as God; the latter, those which are more clearly seen, by men, throughout the creation, even His eternal power and the unity of His Godhead. Among these, the active attributes, come first in order omnipotence and omniscience, all-powerful, all-wise. Now—and if you fail to grasp this point, my exposition is meaningless—in God there is no conflict: His attributes are inseparable from His essence. His mercy does not strive against His justice, for He is both the Holy One and the Just. His knowledge is not rendered impotent for lack of power, nor does His power become arbitrary and impulsive in its exercise for lack of thought. God both thinks and wills. All God's attributes agree amicably the one with the other, and are expressed in His Will harmoniously.

Now man was created in the image of God, a free, thinking, sentient personality, and we naturally expect to find in man a perfect reflection of the Eternal Harmony, a likeness to the great Original, a personality, one, integrated, and moral; for like begets like, and a God Who is Himself a perfect moral unity could not create man less than a perfect moral image of Himself. This is attested in the 8th Psalm. What is, is from what was; and so man came into being as a circle within a Circle, perfect within his limitations.

"But the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and pleasant to the eyes. . . . and she did eat, and gave also unto her husband with her; and he did eat." Sin came into the world and upset man's Paradise; and now the light

is shining in the darkness, though the darkness overcame it not. Light and darkness co-exist in the world side by side.

But the harmony in man is become a discord, the dream is fled; so that now, in man, knowledge is rendered impotent for lack of power, and power is become arbitrary and impulsive in its exercise for lack of thought. Man both thinks and wills. But all man's attributes quarrel one with another, and are expressed in his will disproportionately, inharmoniously: "That which I do I approve not, for what I would that do I not; but what I hate, that do I." This is schism in the soul. Even in the regenerate the real is no longer the ideal. There are men who are merciful, but unjust; men who are just, but unmerciful; men who are powerful, but unwise; men who are wise, but powerless. This is the lesson of all experience; this is the teaching of all literature. To illustrate what I say, allow me to quote an acute criticism of the greatest flaw of our English mind, given by Sir Richard Livingstone, Vice-Chancellor of the University of Oxford, in his illuminating little book, **Education for a World Adrift**:

"There is a common assumption among the English that a boy good at games will be good in practical life, and that a boy good at books will not. Neither of these beliefs is borne out by facts or shared by any other nations except those of English blood. But the English nurture in the depth of their hearts a feeling that intellectual interests are enervating. They do not really believe that the claim of Pericles for Athens—'our intellectual interests involve no effeminacy'—could be really true about anybody. They are better pleased with the ideal of the Spartans 'who from their cradle cultivate manliness by laborious discipline.' The long roll of English statesmen and men of action from Raleigh and Chatham to Gladstone and Cromer, who have found inspiration, delight, and consolation in literature, is nothing to them. They would have thought Wolfe incapable of taking Quebec if they had known his enthusiasm for Gray's *Elegy*, and been nervous about Charles James Fox's passion for Euripides, if his gambling debts had not suggested that he was a man of affairs. They would regard Napoleon's and Wellington's fondness for the *De Bello Gallico* as a dangerous symptom; as doubtless they would have disbelieved in Caesar's practical capacity, because he wrote a book on the theory of grammar during his Gallic campaigns, and quoted Menander when he crossed the Rubicon."

And still we ignorantly persist in disintegrating the human personality into "faculties," falsely distinguishing between

the theoretical and the practical, although the research work in psychology into the nature of human intelligence has proven incontestably that every single human ability, every single human quality, is correlated with some other ability or quality—But whence the power to reunite each to each in perfect unity, to make theory and practice synonymous terms, to make knowledge powerful and power wise?

Thy sons, O Greece, were the first amongst the peoples of the ancient world who consciously strove to resolve this discord in the attempt to make life harmonious again.

*In religion, for example, we learn that the Greek mind had a wide range of consciousness, based on a poetical conception of the world. The Greek gods were made in the image of man, and men could therefore devote themselves to the art of living without restraint, free from the embarrassments of moral scruples or the perplexities of doubt. Religion to them was external and mechanical: "Untroubled by perplexities of conscience, they were not aware of any spiritual relation to God, nor of sin as alienation, nor of repentance as a means of restoration to grace. Thus, from a metaphysical and ethical point of view, their religion brought them into harmony with the world." To such a people, Jesus and the resurrection was truly the setting forth of strange gods.

"This, however, was a harmony for life, not for death. The more completely the Greek felt himself at home in the world, the more freely he abandoned himself to the unrestrained exercise of his powers, the more intensely he lived in action and passion, the more alien and incomprehensible did he find the phenomena of age and death"; so that at last, with the quickening perception of the philosophers, with the deepening of the intellect, with the growing realization that in man's very soul there was a lie, the brief music of his life was broken. As Dickenson puts it, the eating of the tree of knowledge drove the Greeks from their paradise."

Let us pause for a moment to see how this Greek principle of harmony was carried out in their art. As the world is charged with the grandeur of God, the key to the exquisite perfection of Greek art, in subject as well as in form, lies surely in their identification of the good and the beautiful. To Plato the love of beauty became the beauty of love. How deplorably different it is to-day! Ethical

*The views on Greek civilization here expressed are based on, and adapted from, Lowes Dickenson's **The Greek View of Life**. The facts supporting the argument, not my originality, or personal opinions, are here ad rem.

value with the Greek went hand in hand with the æsthetically ideal. What, for example, is our reaction to the Discobolos? Does there not go virtue out of him? A kind of ennobling, communicable cleanness? "None of their genius," a certain writer says, "was more central or characteristic than this of art, whose essence"—I beg you note these words—"is the comprehension of the many in the one, and the perfect reflection of the inner in the outer." . . . "That they all may be one; as Thou, Father, art in Me, and I in Thee; that they also may be one in Us . . . I in them, and Thou in Me, that they may be perfected into one."

The ideals of life formulated by the highest minds of the Greek civilization were, as we all know, exceptionally inspiring. These men were keenly sensitive to the qualitative side of life. They delved deep into the wellsprings of Eternity: it was a case of

"et extra

processit longe flammantia moenia mundi,"

as Lucretius said of Epicurus. The world is ruled by great ideals. Bishop Westcott said. The soul responds to them. Ideals are the only realities abiding truly. And a life that is fired and enriched by high ideals is the greatest and noblest of lives. Let us be as swimmers into cleanness leaping. Listen for a moment to Plato as he speaks on the ideal of true friendship between man and man:

"He who in his youth has the seed of these ideals implanted in him and is himself inspired, when he comes to maturity desires to beget and to generate. He wanders about seeking beauty that he may beget offspring—for in deformity he will beget nothing—and naturally embraces the beautiful rather than the deformed body; above all, when he finds a fair and noble and well-nurtured soul, he embraces the two in one person, and to such a one he is full of speech about virtue and the nature and pursuits of the good man; and he tries to educate him; and at the touch of the beautiful which is ever present to his memory, even when absent, he brings forth that which he had conceived long before, and, in company with him, tends that which he brings forth; and they are married by a far nearer tie and have a closer friendship than those who beget mortal children, for the children who are their common offspring are fairer and more immortal." . . . "Have salt in yourselves, and be at peace one with another."

The Greeks, then, found a harmony truly, but a harmony that eventually would not stand the restless probings of their reason. To them indeed beauty implied good-

ness, and goodness beauty, as each ought still to do; but the harmony of their civilization, noble and honourable as many of its aspects were, was inherently paradoxical. Their ethic was restricted to the privileged class; their mythology had become barbarous to Plato; their perfection of life could not deliver from death. They did not take cognisance of all the facts of experience, and, from these, weave a pattern consistent with Reality, and the spiritual life must take everything into account. This failure, this discord, the Greeks at last realized—to their infinite sorrow. But remember that it was Greeks who came to the disciple Philip, saying: "Sir, we would see Jesus."

And as we hearken through the dark backward and abysm of time, we hear the same note struck in Renaissance Italy of the 14th and 15th centuries, a new springing forth of the human spirit towards fullness of life.

"During the Middle Ages," writes John Addington Symonds, the distinguished historian, "man had lived enveloped in a cowl. He had not seen the beauty of the world, or had seen it only to cross himself, and turn aside and tell his beads and pray. Like S. Bernard travelling along the shores of Lake Lemman, and noticing neither the azure of the waters, nor the luxuriance of the vines, nor the radiance of the mountains with their robe of sun and snow, but bending a thought-burdened forehead over the neck of his mule." Heaven to them was hard to win.

Now it was easy for the Church to pass from this state of mind to the belief that learning in itself was impious. Monkish scribes, we are told, gloried in their ignorance and paraded want of grammar as a sign of grace; or, to use Gibbon's witticism, were pleased to spend the lazy gloom of the Middle Ages in diversifying the deaths of the early martyrs. Gregory the Great defies the pedantry of the pedagogues, whilst a fanatic of Cordova writes:—Profound apologies, Gentlemen—

"Let philosophers and impure scholars of Donatus ply their windy problems with the barking of dogs, the grunting of swine, snarling with skinned throat and teeth; let the foaming and bespittled grammarians belch, while we remain evangelical servants of Christ, true followers of rustic teachers."

Are these thy sons, O Zion? Spiritual pride is surely hardest of all to break.

The Church has often been afraid of this world's learning. Tertullian goes so far as to say that the search for truth is a confession of apostasy. Dante, I think, was among the last great poets to make the world one in Christ. A

bishop of the 19th century argued that Christianity demanded what he was pleased to call "a prostration of the intellect."

Now let us set our house in order. With deep concern I note the contempt for culture shown by self-styled "practical" Christians. I observe with unhappy anticipations of coming evil the anti-intellectualism of many Evangelicals, together with a widespread, vitiating misconception of the nexus between culture and life. . . . Ye fools and blind. . . . Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God. There is a false pietism overwhelming our reasonable approach to life, with the result that the whole of modern society is suffering from what a Professor of the University has recently called "an innate befuddlement of the expressive faculties." Indeed, Nature seems to have given most men heads merely for the sake of conformity—to hang their hats on; but let us be thinkers, not ecclesiastical chameleons. Again, there is a loss of sensibility to the finer things of the soul, music, letters, and true filial communion with God. The active encroaches on the contemplative life, so that the channels of life are constricted, and narrowed, and hardened. Remember that the smaller the wheel, the greater the number of its revolutions. Speed, to-day, is the quickest way to Hell.

Lastly, I make mention with abhorrence of the negativism of modern Christianity: I can't . . . I can't . . . I can't. The message of the Gospel is: I can . . . I can . . . I can do all things through Christ which strengtheneth me; and let this not be religious fanaticism, but the serene and thoughtful use of power. God needs men who, because of the greatness of the Vision, are brave and splendid and honourable enough to make mistakes. Lack of will-power is caused by the fact that the life-principle is dead: Ye have not received the Holy Ghost, because Jesus has not yet been glorified.

"The true death," Plato said, "is that which separates the soul, not from the body, but from truth." "I am the Truth," says Jesus Christ, "and he that believeth on Me shall never die."

Is there no harmony for us? Is there no true æstheticism? Are elegance and culture inconsistent with piety? Thy sons, O Zion, forever against thy sons, O Greece? To the unregenerate these things are antithetical, to the regenerate, synetical. Behold, I shew unto you a more excellent way:

"Having made peace through the blood of His Cross . . .

"Having made peace *through the Blood of His Cross* . . ." O stupendous sacrifice!

"I have been all things, and nothing has answered," the Emperor Hadrian said in despair. The Galilean alone will satisfy.

That the ideology of Greece, or the humanism of the Renaissance, will save your soul, we are not so foolish as to pretend. But this we do pretend: that, absorbing into yourself the culture of the past, enriching your soul with the waters of life from the glorious stream of human achievement, and, as it were, subsuming into yourself the greatness of the glory of the years that are gone, then, then only, will you bring to man the whole Christ, Christ the power of God and Christ the wisdom of God, **Christus Consummator!** Let all learning be hallowed by faith in Him. Rich towards God! for in Him are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge. I like to think of culture, someone has said, as a vast Mediæval Cathedral, as Canterbury or Chartres, where, despite the amazing complexity of the parts, every single detail is subordinated to the one simple ground plan of the Cross.

Let us not be afraid of the learning of the world. A Church that cannot face this world's learning is not worthy to lay claim to this world's life. Were the Ancients indeed so much without the Light? No. John tells us that He was coming into the world:

"The Light was ever coming . . ." through the ages. It is given to the sons of men to sift the chaff from the wheat. I plead for a balanced interpretation of life.

Let then the Divine image be restored. Too long we confuse what is with what ought to be. Let us see the things of Time transfigured in the light of Eternity. Let body with mind according well reflect the Eternal Harmony, unity in diversity, diversity in unity; the incomplete within the Perfect striving, the pattern within the Pattern tending to fulfilment. . . . "That they may be one, even as We are one; I in them, and Thou in Me, that they may be one in Us." To borrow a beautiful image let culture serve you as the sycamore tree served Zacchæus, to gain a clearer vision of the Incarnate Truth. Then luminous already, and like the sun shining in the practice of beneficence, may you speed by righteous knowledge through the love of God to the holy mansions on high, there to be an abiding light, unchangeable for evermore.

Let us pray with S. Augustine.

"Behold. O Lord my King; whatsoever good I have learned, being a boy, unto Thy service let it be directed, yea, whatsoever I speak, or write, or read, or number, let all serve Thee."

Amen.

[A sermon delivered in the Chapel of Moore Theological College on the morning of the 18th of August, 1944.]

* * *

EPHEMERON

Man being of short continuance doth not many times live to observe a full point in the works of God. Their beginning may be in one age and their end in another. That part which I see in my days may appear to me full of disaster and confusion—a heap of stones and lime and other provisions for a goodly building, whereas if I did live to see the end of God in such works, it would appear that in their time of maturity they would be full of beauty.

That fruit which is most sweet and delicate in its season is sour and unpalatable while it is yet green. It is the end of God's work that sets forth its beauty. Works of providence, as works of creation, may begin in a chaos, and seem without form and void, but they end in admirable order and beauty. So here is the doctrine of the excellent beauty which is in God's providence.

The reason why man is not thereby persuaded into contentment and patience in all estates is his natural impotency to observe the same. The grounds of that impotency are, firstly, his worldly-mindedness, and, secondly, his short continuance. Yet he ought by faith and the evidence of God's dealings in other ages, to rectify this defect, and upon that ground to build his cheerful enjoyment of blessings while God bestows them upon him.

—Bishop Reynolds.

The Prophecy of Isaiah

CHAPTER XXVIII.

TRANSLATION AND COMMENTARY

H. R. MINN.

The Fate soon to befall luxury-loving Samaria, the Capital of the Northern Kingdom, foretold, and made the Basis of a stern warning to Jerusalem.

- 1 Alas! for the proud coronet of the drunkards of Ephraim,
And for the fading flower of his glorious beauty,
Which is on the head of the fertile valley
Of them laid prostrate with wine.
- 2 Behold! a strong and unflinching one hath Jehovah;
Like a storm of hail, a destructive tempest.
Like a storm of waters—mighty, overflowing.
Hath he cast it to the earth with force!

28: 1-6. The faithful pen picture given us here of morality and public life in the gay Samaritan capital is 'full of historical suggestion, and also full of meaning for thoughtful statesmen and citizens of all modern nations.' (McCurdy.)

1. In these lines two images are fused together—that of the revellers with the chaplets of flowers which garlanded their brows at their debauches, and of the picturesquely situated city of Samaria, with its crown of towers intertwined with the greenery of vines and olives. Drunkenness is described as a sin of Samaria in Amos 4: 1, and, especially, 6: 1-6. Vide also Hosea 7: 5. Delitzsch remarks on the 'intentionally bombastic' diction of the prophet, 'He heaps genitives upon genitives as in 10: 12, 21: 7. The words are combined in pairs. . . . The *sesquipedalia verba* are meant to give the impression of extravagant worldly delight, against which the woe goes forth.'

1b. fading flower. 'Fading' because the Northern Kingdom

was already tottering to its fall. Most scholars assign this opening movement to the period before B.C. 721.

1c. fertile valley. Lit., 'valley of oils.' Samaria stood on a hill of a long oval form, which swells up in the midst of a wonderfully fertile valley, shut in by mountains. 'The site was imperial, the hill terraced to the top, the neighbourhood lovely.'

2a. a strong and unflinching one. The Heb. may also be taken as neuter = 'something strong, &c.' In either case the reference is to Assyria as the instrument of Jehovah's vengeance. Cf. 10: 5; 7: 17-20; 8: 7.

2d. with force. Lit., 'with hand.' 'This strong one, rushing in with the force of a tempest, has laid his hand on both crown and garland, and flung them to the ground.' (Kay.) If he be applied directly to Jehovah, the 'hand' may be understood as the 'absolute hand,' the 'hand of all hands,' the 'omnipotent hand,' as Delitzsch renders. 'What brave rhetoric is here!' exclaims Trapp admiringly.

3. With the feet shall it be trampled.
The proud coronet of the drunkards of Ephraim!
- 4 So shall the fading flower of his glorious beauty.
Which is on the head of the fertile valley, become
Like a first-ripe fig before the fruit-harvest,
Which he sees that seeth it—while it is yet in his hand,
He swalloweth it!
- 5 In that day shall Jehovah of Hosts
Become a coronet of beauty and a diadem of majesty
Unto the remnant of His people:
- 6 And a spirit of justice to him that sitteth on the
judgment-seat.
And strength to them who turn back the battle to
the gate.

* * *

4c. The first-ripe fig or 'boc-cora,' gathered in June, some six weeks before the usual fig season, was a special delicacy.

4de. The emphasis is on the eagerness with which so sweet a morsel is eaten. The passing eye fastens on it, and, in Gill's homespun English, 'as soon as he has got it into his hand, he can't keep it there to look at, or forbear eating it, but greedily devours and swallows it down at once.' A delightful little action cameo, most pictorial.

5-C. ' . . . God's swift storm drives up the valley—hail, rain and violent streams from every gorge. Flowers, wreaths and pampered bodies are trampled in the mire. The glory of sunny Ephraim is as the first ripe fig a man treadeth, and while it is yet in his hand, he eateth it up. But while drunken magnates and the flowers of a rich land are swept away, there is a residue who can and do abide even that storm, to whom the Lord Himself shall be for a crown, a spirit of justice to him that sitteth for justice, and for strength to them that turn back the

battle at the gate. . . . There are men who have the secret of surviving the most terrible judgments of God, and lift their figures calm and victorious against the storm-washed sky.' (G. A. Smith.)

5a. 'When this great act in the drama of judgment is over, there will be an incipient fulfilment of the Messianic promise.' (Cheyne.) Why 'incipient'? in that day need not be denied its full-orbed meaning. The Targum, instead of 'Jehovah of Hosts,' has 'the Messiah of Jehovah.'

5c. remnant. Whom are we to understand as constituting this? Delitzsch speaks of the 'eternal person of Jahve Himself' becoming the 'ornament and pride' of the survivors of Ephraim, and of the people of the twelve tribes in general. But many follow Henderson: 'Isaiah directs attention to the manifestations of Divine favour to be experienced by the kingdom of Judah. God would be the protection and boast of his remaining tribes.'

6b. gate. I.e., probably, the enemy's own gates. It is bravery exhibited in defensive warfare.

- 7 Yet here too (in Jerusalem)
 With wine do they reel,
 And with strong drink do they stagger;
 Priest and prophet reel with strong drink.
 They are swallowed up by wine.
 They stagger with strong drink;
 They reel in their "seering."
 They totter pronouncing decision.
- 8 For all tables are full of vomit, of filth—
 No place without it!

Tipsy Men's Insolence

- 9 Whom would he teach "Knowledge,"
 And whom school up in "the Tidings"?—
 Those that are weaned from the milk,
 Just set free from the breasts?

7a. **yet here too.** Lit., 'But as for these.' Isaiah follows the method of Nathan with his 'Thou art the man!' Having portrayed the drunkards of Ephraim in their squalid passions, he now turns to portray in still darker hues the riot of debauchery prevalent in court circles in Jerusalem.

7b. . . . **reel . . . stagger . . . totter.** The Heb. verbs run: **shagu, taghu, shagu, taghu, shagu, paku.** We can hear the lurching of the toppers! The priest was forbidden to touch wine or strong drink while discharging the immediate duties of his office. Vide Lev. 10: 1-9. The vocation of prophet partook of the Nazarite character (1 Sam. 1: 11).

7c. **swallowed up.** 'They swallowed the wine down, and it swallowed them up!' (Gill.) 'They are bucked in beer.' (Trapp.)

8. 'The most loathsome features of their drunkenness are printed in v. 8 with a boldness which is almost photographic.' (Plumptre.) 'In v. 8 we hear them vomit. All tables at the drinking bout are full, with no space left; all is flooded with vomit. The prophet paints here after nature, without idealising. He

catches up their conduct in the mirror, and holds the mirror up to them, the men of full age with heavy tongue.' (Delitzsch.)

9-10. 'These are the contemptuous and ironical words with which the prophet is greeted as he comes upon the drunken revellers.' (McFadyen.) 'The drunken leaders resent the never-ending lessons of this prophetic pedagogue, as they think him.' (Davidson.) 'Isaiah's earnest and sane counsels were received by the rulers of his people with contempt and taunts. They complain that his words are simply . . . a constant reiteration of the same monotonous gabble. For men bent on rebellion, and disgusted with the burden of foreign tribute, Isaiah's plain, oft-repeated statement of what would be the consequences of rebellion were in the highest degree distasteful.' (Kent.)

9b. **the Tidings.** I.e., what he claimed to have received from Jehovah. His Divine revelation, whether general or special.

9cd. Are they to be treated as kindergarteners? they jeeringly inquire, in modern parlance.

10 For it is

Law upon law, law upon law,
Saw upon saw, saw upon saw,
A leed-le bit here, a leed-le bit there!

Burlesque Retorted

11 Yea, with stammerings of lip, and with an alien tongue,
Shall He speak to this people!—

12 He who said to them:

This is the (true) rest! Give ye rest to the weary!
And this is the (true) refreshment!

But they would not hear.

10. 'We must conceive the abrupt, intentionally short, reiterated and almost childish words of v. 10 as spoken in mimicry, with a mocking motion of the head, and in a childish, stammering, taunting tone.' (Ewald.) The actual terms may be translated in many ways, for they are more like the babble of drunken men than sober and intelligible speech. At the same time, although they manifestly imply the condition of those who uttered them, they were evidently designed as a burlesque imitation of the child-like plainness and incorrigible simplicity of the precepts of righteousness which the prophet used in his customary ministrations, and which they lampooned as goody-goody nursery rhymes. Monosyllable is heaped on monosyllable. The speakers not improbably tipsily adopted the tones of fond mothers addressing their babes. To illustrate by the original, one of the shameless roysters would say: 'Qaw laqaw qaw laqaw, tsaw latsaw tsaw latsaw, ze'er sham ze'er sham; that is how that simpleton Isaiah speaks.' And then, doubtless, a drunken laugh would go round the company, and half a dozen of these worthies would be mouthing their Qaw laqaw, tsaw latsaw at once. We reproduce in our text Whitehouse, modifying in 10d.

11a. 'The prophet retorts their own language upon them. Yes; it shall be in fact as you say. This childish monotone shall indeed sound in

your ears. The description which you give of the revelations of Jehovah shall be exactly applicable to the harsh, laconic commands of a merciless invader.' (Cheyne.) Such was the strange and terrible form God's message was destined to assume. The same jingling sort of words would be heard in the streets of Jerusalem. G. A. Smith is very fine: 'You call me Stammerer! I tell you that God, Who speaks through me, and Whom in me you mock, will one day speak again to you in a tongue that shall indeed sound stammering to you. When those far-off barbarians have reached your walls, and over them taunt you in uncouth tones, then you shall hear how God can stammer.' Though closely allied to Hebrew, Assyrian was sufficiently dissimilar to be regarded by Isaiah's contemporaries as a barbarian patois.

12a. said. I.e., by His prophets.

12bc. 'The prophets had counselled peace with Assyria; the avoidance of relations with Egypt, and, above all, faithful obedience to Jehovah' (Geikie). The (true) rest was a matter of quiet trust in God (31: 15), and abstention from political ambitions and foreign alliances such as Judah was then apparently negotiating with Egypt. Isaiah claims that his preaching, despite its monotony perhaps, pointed to the one effective remedy for the ills of the weary—of his harassed nation.

13 So shall be to them the word of Jehovah

Law upon law, law upon law.
Saw upon saw, saw upon saw,
A leed-le bit here, a leed-le bit there!

That they may go on and fall backward, and be broken
And ensnared and taken.

Agreements no Safeguard

14 Therefore hear ye the word of Jehovah,
Ye scornful men who rule this people which is in
Jerusalem.

15 Because ye have said:
We have solemnised a treaty with Death,
And with Sheol have made an agreement;
The "Overflowing Scourge," when it passeth through,
shall not reach unto us,
For we have made lying our refuge,
And in falsehood have hidden ourselves;

13ef. The words are an echo of 8: 14, 15. "Instead of taking advantage of the 'resting-place' provided, they continue on the course which they have begun. It will end in disaster" (Kissane).

14b. **scornful men.** Jehovah pronounces judgment. He addresses—not the king, who is passed over in silence in most of the Hezekiah discourses of Isaiah—but the "rulers," the politicians. (Cheyne.) Cf. vs. 9, 10, 22.

15. The section ends with an oracle denouncing the irreligious reliance of leaders and people upon mere diplomatic cleverness for warding off impending danger. When a storm of judgment descends, all such subterfuges will be swept away. (Box.) McCurdy summarises: "When they reply, in words put into their mouths by the Prophet, that by their adroitness and cunning they have made even death and Sheol their allies, so that the threatened scourge of the Assyrian invasion of Palestine would not reach to them (v. 15), he rejoins by assuring them that there is but one foundation on which Jehovah's land and people can rest and be secure—the stone that is laid in Zion, &c." He adds that as the righteous Jehovah is their true stay and refuge, so the

fortress of their present hopes, which is but a refuge of lies, shall be tried by the line of justice and the plummet of righteousness (cf. Amos vii. 7ff.) and, when found false and unsure, shall be swept away by the hail-storm of judgment, so that the waters shall overflow their hiding-place (vs. 16f.).

15c. 'Or,' 'we have had an interview'—an '*colloquisme*'; so as to be on a perfectly good understanding with it. (Kay.)

15d. **overflowing scourge.** Heb. = 'shot shoteph.' A sceptical jibe probably at the imagery used by Isaiah in driving home the menace of the Assyrian invasion. Cf. 8: 7, 8; 10: 24.

15ef. Diplomacy is to the politicians a means of insuring themselves against going down to Sheol (5: 14). Their present object is an alliance with Egypt, which involves much secrecy (29: 15) and craft (30: 12) and also perhaps the breaking of an oath to Assyria. Hence Isaiah's phrase **a lie.** (Polychrome Bible.) "The prophet's penetrating scorn," says G. A. Smith, "drags up into their boast the secret conscience of their hearts, that after all lies did form the basis of this political arrangement."

- 16 Therefore, thus saith the Lord Jehovah:
Behold! I am He that hath founded in Zion a stone,
A stone of testing, a costly corner-stone of firmest
foundation;
He that believeth shall not haste about!
- 17 And I will set justice for measuring-line,
And righteousness for plummet-weight;
And be swept away by hail shall the refuge of lying,
And the hiding-place shall waters overflow;
- 18 And wiped out shall be your treaty with Death,
And your agreement with Sheol shall not stand;
The "Overflowing Scourge," when it passeth through—
Ye shall become unto him for trampling upon!

16b. 'Jehovah has provided a safe refuge which can withstand both storm and flood. Its foundation stone is confidence in Jahweh.' . . . (Kissane.) He cites 16c as explaining the meaning.

16c. This **stone of testing**—a stone, in other words, tested itself, and testing others. Cf. v. 17 and Zech. 3: 9—is 'costly in itself,' says Delitzsch, 'and guaranteeing to all that is built upon it the firmest foundation and the most inviolable protection.' The foundation stones of Eastern public buildings were frequently of enormous size and cost. The **corner-stone** was laid at the point where the two sides of the building met at right-angles, the respective walls resting on it, and being bonded together by it.

16d. 'He shall not be in trepidation at this or that change of events. Instead of hurrying after human schemes, he quietly abides God's time.' (Kay.)

17. The architectural figure is continued. 'The **refuge of lies** is that which the rulers of Judah have chosen (15e-f), viz., trust in material resources, and particularly in the help of Egypt.' (Kissane.)

18a. 'The **b'rith** is conceived as

a document . . . the covenant will be annulled as one annuls a false word by drawing a line over it with ink and making it illegible. They believe they have assured themselves against death and Hades, but Jahve gives these unlimited power over them' (Delitzsch.)

18cd. 'There can be no doubt that the idea of a human invader was before the prophet's mind,' observes Alexander, 'but the mere rhetorical incongruity is not at all at variance with the Prophet's manner, and is the less to be dissembled or denied, because the scourge will still be described as **overflowing**. The attempt to reconcile the language with the artificial rules of composition is in this case rendered hopeless by the combination of expressions which cannot be strictly applied to the same subject. An army might trample, but it could not literally overflow; a stream might overflow, but it could not literally trample down. The time perhaps is coming when, even as a matter of taste, the strength and vividness of such mixed metaphors will be considered as outweighing their inaccuracy in relation to an arbitrary standard of correctness or propriety.'

- 19 As often as it passeth through, it shall take you away,
For morning by morning shall it pass through,
By day and by night;
And then it shall be stark terror to understand "the
Tidings"!
- 20 For too short is the bed to stretch oneself out,
And the covering too narrow to wrap oneself in it.
- 21 For as in Mount Perazim shall Jehovah rise up,
As in the valley of Gibeon shall He break forth.
To work His work—alien His work!
And to execute His task—strange His task!
- 22 And now, behave ye not as scoffers,
Lest drawn tighter be your bonds;
For of a final destruction, and that a decreed one, have
I heard,
(Coming) from the Lord Jehovah of Hosts, upon all
the land.

19a. 'The image is that of a flood which carries off more and more human victims at each time of its appearance. Repeated Assyrian invasions.' (Cheyne.)

19d. **the Tidings.** Cf. 9b. 'The cross is the best tutor,' dryly remarks Trapp. When Isaiah proclaimed his 'tidings,' they thought his warning beneath their attention. The grim preaching of facts, however, would—too late!—have a different issue.

20. In other words, the Egyptian alliance would not **cover** the situation to be met.' (McFadyen.) 'They will be compelled to recognise its insufficiency. They have built themselves a bed, procured a bed-cover, but what a mistake they have made in the measure!' (Delitzsch.) 'This proverb seems to be struck out of the prophet,' says G. A. Smith, 'by the belief of the politicians that they are creating a stable and restful policy for Judah. It flashes an aspect of hopeless uneasiness over the whole political situation. However they make their bed, with Egypt's or Assyria's help, they shall not find it comfortable. No cleverness of theirs can create a satisfactory condition of affairs, no political arrangement, nothing short of faith, of absolute reliance on that bare foundation stone laid in Zion—God's assurance that Jerusalem is inviolable.'

21a. Cf. 2 Sam. 5: 20; 1 Chron. 14: 11.

21b. Vide Joshua 10: 10; 2 Sam. 5: 25; 1 Chron. 14: 16.

21cd. 'The "strangeness" of Jehovah's procedure lies in the fact that He fights His own people through their foreign foes.' (Box.) His overwhelming power is no longer exerted on their behalf. 'The strange and unusual conduct ascribed to Jehovah, is his not only punishing the Jews, instead of punishing their enemies, but his punishing them with a severity which they had never before experienced. Such the destruction of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar proved; and such, in a still more eminent sense, was the character of its destruction by Titus.' (Henderson.) 'His work is His plan to chastise Judah by means of the Assyrian invasion.' (Kissane.)

22b. 'It is presupposed that they are already in bonds, namely the bonds of Assyria (Nah. 1: 13). From these bonds they are minded to free themselves by treachery, with the help of Egypt, but not of Jahve, and they deride the warnings of the prophet.' (Delitzsch.) But by persisting in this ill-advised course of action, they but aggravate their sufferings.

22cd. Cf. 10: 23. It is possible that Isaiah reproduces his own language as having been made the butt of special derision.

God's "strange Work" vindicated by a Parabolic Poem on Ploughing and Threshing. The Almighty is shown to be the "All-Methodical."

- 23 Give ye ear, and hear my voice;
Attend ye, and hearken to my speech.
- 24 Always is the ploughman ploughing in order to sow?
Is he ever opening and harrowing his ground?
- 25 Doth he not, when he hath levelled its surface,
Scatter fennel, and cummin sow broadcast,
And plant wheat in rows,
And barley in the place marked out for it,
And vetches along its edge?
- 26 Yea, he treateth each as is fitting,
His God instructing him.

23. In this passage a lesson in the principles underlying God's treatment of Israel is read from a consideration of ancient methods of husbandry. Like the farmer, Jehovah varies His procedure according to circumstances, and according to the character of that with which He is dealing. The point of the parable is evident. God is not mere force or vengeance. His judgments are not chaos. Even the calamity impending over Judah has its measure and its term. Even in His violent treatment of His people, God is to be trusted as having in view some positive, some constructive, end.

24ab. Such initial operations do not claim the whole of the year. In their very nature they are not ultimates. There is a further intention in them. As Gill puts it: 'He may plough a whole day together when he is at it, but he does not plough every day in the year; he has other work to do besides ploughing.' 'To a nation passing through this stage. Assyrian invaders

scoring their long furrows visibly on the surface of the land, the parable gave the hope,' says Plumptre, 'that this was preparing the way for the seed-time of a better harvest.'

25b. Indiscriminate sowing, the seeds being very small.

25cd. A more deliberate process—'dropped in,' so to speak.

25e. The **vetches** formed apparently a kind of herbaceous border round the fields of grain.

26. 'The prophet looks on the skill of the tiller of the soil, which seemed the outcome of a long experience, as nothing less than a gift of God. The legends of the Gentiles embraced that thought in the myth of Osiris and Oannes, of Dionysius and Triptolemos; Isaiah states the fact without the mythos.' (Plumptre.) 'It is a Divine instinct, in accordance with which the husbandman acts thus; for the God who in creation instituted agriculture, Jahve to wit, not Osiris, has given man also understanding for the work.' (Delitzsch.)

- 27 For not with threshing-sledge must be threshed out fennel,
Nor must wain-wheel upon cummin be turned.
But with a staff must be beaten out fennel.
And cummin with a rod.
- 28 Bread corn is crushed, then (to powder?).
Nay! for not perpetually is he found threshing it.
Or driving his wain-wheel and his horses (over it):
(He thresheth it indeed, but) he crusheth it not
(to powder!).
- 29 This also from Jehovah of Hosts cometh forth:
Wonderful His counsel, great His wisdom in act.

27-29. 'Parable of the threshing. The purpose of threshing is not to bruise or crush the grain, but to separate the seed from the stalk. Man adopts the appropriate method for each variety of crop, and when the end is attained, the process is discontinued. Similarly, Jehovah's purpose in punishing Israel is not to destroy but to purify, and when purification is complete, suffering will come to an end.' (Kissane.)

27a. **threshing-sledge.** Or 'corn-drag.' The "haruts" . . . was a kind of sledge drawn by two oxen, in the front of which stood the driver . . . or sat on a piece of wood fixed crossways on the car. Under this machine were rollers of wood, with sharp stones, or pieces of iron, by which the straw was cut in pieces, and the grain separated from the ears.' (Henderson.) **fennel.** To use a corn-drag on so frail a plant would be monstrous and nonsensical. The severity of the process would crush and destroy the small aromatic seeds entirely.

27b. **wain-wheel.** The "agalah" was also a car, but differed from the former by having wheels instead of rollers, which, being serrated, produced the same effect, when drawn over the corn. Besides oxen, both horses and asses were employed in drawing these instruments.' (Henderson.)

27cd. Both "nigella" and cummin

seeds are readily detached from their capsules. Yet even here a difference is to be noted.' (Kay.) 'While the cummin can be easily separated from its case by a slender rod, the harder pod of the "nigella" (i.e., fennel) requires to be beaten with a stout staff.' (Tristram, 'Natural History of the Bible,' p. 115.)

28. Even when rigorous methods have to be used, they are not persisted in to the point of extermination. The aim throughout is the preservation, not the destruction, of the true grain.

29a. **this.** The husbandman's judicious procedure is 'taught from above.'

29b. The Divine government of the world, reflected in this 'excerpt from the **Georgics** of Palestine,' 'combines the minutest attention to detail with an all-comprehending unity of design.' (Kay.) **Wisdom in act.** "Yet," says Isaiah, "**Jehovah of Hosts is wonderful in counsel, and excellent in that sort of wisdom which causes things to succeed.**" This last word of the chapter is very expressive. It literally means "**furtherance,**" "**help,**" "**salvation,**" and then "**the true wisdom or insight which ensures these: the wisdom which carries things through**" It splendidly sums up Isaiah's gospel to the Jews, cowering like dogs before the coming calamity.' (G. A. Smith.)

The Sinner of Galilee

M. L. LOANE

"Behold, a woman in the city, which was a sinner."

—Luke 7: 36.

"Mary Magdalene, out of whom went seven devils."

—Luke 8: 2.

"It was that Mary which anointed the Lord with ointment, and wiped His feet with her hair. . . ."

—John 11: 2.

THE lovely incident of the sinful woman is one of those matchless stories which Luke alone records in the Gospel Memoirs. A Pharisee whose name was Simon had gone out of his way to entertain the Lord Jesus, and they were seated at his table in the reclining posture of the day. Presently "a woman in the city which was a sinner" came into the room where they were dining, and went up to the place where He was sitting. Her tears began to fall on His feet like "a burst of rain," the tears of grief for her guilty past and of love for her gracious Lord. Then she stooped down to wipe them with the loosened tresses of her hair, and to soothe them with the tender kisses of her mouth. An alabaster cruse of ointment was in her hand, and now she poured out its contents upon His feet. This was all done in an atmosphere of profound silence, but the Pharisee was looking on with an air of surprise and disdain. He would not violate the laws of courtesy by a spoken protest, but his mental comments were steeped in secret contempt: "This Man if He were a prophet would have known who and what manner of woman this is that toucheth Him; for she is a sinner" (Lk. 7: 39). But Christ perceived what was in his heart, and He would not let it pass without rebuke: "Simon," He said, "I have somewhat to say unto thee." And Simon replied with formal courtesy: "Master, say on." (Lk. 7: 40). Then the Lord told him the story of two debtors who owed larger and smaller sums of money, but who were equally penniless and unable to pay. But when it was clear that they had nothing to pay, they were both frankly forgiven. "Tell Me therefore," the Lord asked, "which of them will love him most?" (Lk. 7: 42). Simon

was compelled to admit that it would be he to whom most was forgiven, and the Lord at once replied that he had rightly judged. Then He told him to look on the woman, while He pressed home the point. Simon had brought no water to wash His feet, but she had washed them with her tears and dried them with her hair. Simon had met Him with no kiss of kindly welcome, but she had not ceased to kiss His feet since the time when she first came in. Simon had spared no oil with which to anoint Him, but she had poured her precious ointment upon His feet. The lesson was complete, and Simon was obliged to hear it out: "Her sins which are many are forgiven, for she loved much; but to whom little is forgiven, the same loveth little" (Lk. 7: 47). Then He dismissed the woman with words of mercy, and the narrative ends with their echo in our ears: "Thy faith hath saved thee; go in peace." (Lk. 7: 50). It would have been to share the kindness of our Saviour if we had been content to let this poor nameless woman pass from our view; but she has been dragged out of her refuge in anonymous obscurity to be identified by the whims of popular tradition both with Mary Magdalene and with Mary of Bethany. This has been a great disservice to the study of the Gospels and a gross injustice to the honour of both women, for there is not one sound argument on which to build either tradition.

The ground on which this nameless woman has been identified with Mary Magdalene is her career as a sinner, for this is said to correspond with Mary's character as a demoniac. But a detailed study of the sacred text fails to yield the slightest hint that would bear out such a claim. The story of the sinful woman no sooner ends than the story of the grateful Mary begins; there is not a moment's pause, not a letter's break, between the two scenes as they succeed each other. We reach the end of one chapter, and then we read without delay; "And it came to pass afterward, that He went throughout every city and village, preaching and shewing the glad tidings of the Kingdom of God; and the Twelve were with Him, and certain women which had been healed of evil spirits and infirmities, Mary called Magdalene, out of whom went seven devils, and Joanna, the wife of Chuza, Herod's steward, and Susanna, and many others, which ministered unto Him of their substance" (Lk. 8: 1-3). This is a new section of the Gospel in which Luke proceeds to sum up the Lord's work in city and hamlet with His disciples and followers. We are told that there were certain women with Him on these journeys as well as The Twelve; they all gave Him of their substance.

and some of them had been healed of demons. Three of these are mentioned by name, and Mary Magdalene heads the list; but there is not one word that would connect her with the woman who was a sinner. There is no more reason to link Mary with this woman than there is to link the name of Joanna or Susanna with that of the anonymous sinner, for like Mary, they had also been saved from awful bondage to evil spirits. All three women are mentioned together as those who had been in the following of Christ for some time, and it is plainly inferred that their release from demon thralldom looks back to some stage prior to the incident in the house of the Pharisee. Their names are brought before us as though up to this point they had been quite unknown to the narrative; can we believe that Luke would have introduced the name of Mary in the detailed manner of this verse if she were identical with the woman whose contrite faith and tender love he had just described? He draws one breath, and he tells us of the nameless sinner whom the Master dismissed with the gracious words: "Go in peace" (Lk. 7: 50); he draws a new breath and tells us of a worthy woman who had been a devoted follower of her Master in His circuit through the country (Lk. 8: 2). The name of the one was withheld in mercy; the name of the other was preserved in honour. Thus to interpret the text as though these two women were one and the same would be to ignore the historical accuracy, the balance and finesse, of the most careful and cultured of all the Evangelists.

Mary Magdalene is twice described as one "out of whom went seven devils" (Lk. 8: 2, Mk. 16: 9). But we have no right to treat this phrase as though it were a synonym or substitute for the case of one who had been freed from her life as a prostitute or courtesan. Nowhere in the New Testament is the curse of Satanic possession linked with professional impurity, and least of all in the considered narrative of the beloved physician. The correct use of medical terms and the precise art of technical names form a leading feature of Luke's account of physical and spiritual ills. Demon possession and sinful obsession were two distinct concepts; the power which the demons exercised over those who had become victims of hell was entirely different from the power which the devil exercised over those who had become servants of lust. If demon possession in the case of Mary Magdalene were meant to imply that she had led the life of a common harlot, it would be bound to imply the same in the case of other victims. But the wife of Chuza was set free from demon control without reproach to the

distinguished position of her husband in the court of Herod, and many others were released from the awful bondage of evil spirits without slur or stain on their moral character. Thus Luke's considered reference to the sevenfold possession of Mary Magdalene was no mere metaphor to paint a ruinous life of sin, but the terse description of a serious case of Satanic energies. We are not told in what way the seven demons held sway over Mary, but we can get a clear picture of their malevolent activity from the man whose name was Legion. Her release was no doubt as instantaneous as was his; she had been restored to mental health and reclothed in rightful mind through the mercy of the Saviour. Her name often recurs in the Johannine narrative of the Passion, where great care is observed in reference to persons, if confusion were apt to arise (cp. Jn. 11: 16, 14: 22). Thus a line of distinction is drawn between the three Marys who stood nearby on the day of the cross by the addition of some special phrase to their names (Jn. 19: 25). But though we read of "Mary Magdalene out of whom went seven devils," (cp. Lk. 8: 2) we never read of "Mary Magdalene who loved much because she was much forgiven" (cp. Lk. 7: 47). It is quite false to the language of either Luke or John to think of demon control as a moral defect; there is not a shred of evidence in their use of words for the tradition which would link Mary Magdalene with the penitent sinner.

There is yet another argument which runs counter to the attempt to identify these two women. Mary Magdalene, like Joanna and Susanna, was one of that band of faithful women who had not only followed the Lord in His tour of Galilee and Judaea, but who also ministered to His need from their own financial resources (Lk. 8: 3, Mt. 27: 55-56, Mk. 15: 40-41). This helps to make it clear that they must have belonged to the wealthy classes of the day, and that they must have had the social standing which wealth entails; and this is borne out further still by the fact that Joanna was the wife of a man who held an official appointment in the court of Herod Antipas. The same women had no trouble when they required a sum of ready money for the purchase of costly spices in order to anoint His body after His death on the cross (Mk. 16: 1, Lk. 24: 1). These are facts of no mean value when we take into account the vastly different social position of the woman who was a sinner. We need not pass judgment on the inner moral life of the various segments of society, but we cannot admit that it would be at all likely that a member of the wealthy classes like Mary should become known as a public harlot

Page 32

like this nameless sinner. Women of the upper strata at least preserve their external reputation, and it is from women of the lower strata that recruits are mainly drawn for commercial impurity. This view helps to throw light on the conduct of Simon the Pharisee; it shows up quite clearly what it was that really provoked him when the woman came into his house. It was not her immoral character so much as her immoral profession that he disliked; she was one of those with whom the Pharisees were most anxious to have no intercourse. She was received by the Saviour in spite of the stains of sin and shame, because she came with humble heart and contrite faith; but her life in the past would make it most improbable that she should join that band of women who were His intimate companions in Galilee and Judaea. We are therefore on safe ground in ruling out claims for the identity of this penitent sinner with Mary Magdalene. Much more grateful to us is the view that having obtained pardon and mercy, she withdrew with a thankful heart from all the glare of that publicity in which her sinful life had once been involved.

The ground on which this nameless woman has been identified with Mary of Bethany is her conduct as a penitent, for this is said to correspond with Mary's conduct as a disciple. But a patient study of the sacred text fails to yield the slightest proof that would back up such a claim. The story of the sinful woman was firmly wedged into the narrative before Luke was ready to bring Mary of Bethany into his manuscript; there is a lapse of three chapters, an interval of many incidents between the two brief character sketches. We pass from one scene to another, and then we read: "Now it came to pass as they went, that He entered into a certain village; and a certain woman named Martha received Him into her house. And she had a sister called Mary, which also sat at Jesus' feet and heard His word" (Lk. 10: 38-39). This again is a new section of the Gospel in which Luke depicts one brief scene in the story of Mary and her sister; but there is not one word that would connect her with the woman who was a sinner. But John seemed to do what Luke did not do when he came to relate the miracle of Lazarus. He brought in the personnel of his story and their place of residence with a certain air of formality: "Now a certain man was sick, named Lazarus, of Bethany, the town of Mary and her sister Martha" (Jn. 11: 1). This should have been enough to make it clear which Mary he meant, but he went on to describe her in detail: "It was that Mary which anointed

the Lord with ointment, and wiped His feet with her hair, whose brother Lazarus was sick" (Jn. 11: 2). It is clear that John's words refer to a well-known and oft-told tale; but his readers would know of two such scenes. They knew that Luke had described such an incident in the first days of His ministry (Lk. 7: 36-50); did John refer to this? They knew likewise that Mark and Matthew had described such an occasion in the last days of His ministry (Mk. 14: 1-9, Mt. 26: 6-13); did John refer to this? They would soon discover that John himself meant to describe such an occurrence in a way that would plainly correspond with the episode in Mark and Matthew (Jn. 12: 1-9); would this mean that John referred to one occasion in the first chapter and described another occasion in the next chapter? The more obvious solution to this problem is that John's words in reference to Mary were meant to anticipate the narrative which his next chapter would supply in its correct chronological setting. There is only one objection to this view, and that is John's use of two aorist participles in his first reference to Mary (Jn. 11: 2); if he meant to refer to an anointing yet to be described, why did he not rather make use of a future participle? But from the real standpoint of author and reader alike, the anointing was in fact a thing of the past; John chose a past tense just because he was pointing to a well-known event. His words with regard to Mary were not so much a preliminary reference to an incident which he would recount later; they were rather an explanatory allusion to an incident which was well-known to his readers. It is certain that John does not mean us to understand that Mary anointed the Lord on two occasions, once as the penitent sinner and once as the devoted servant. Thus to interpret the text as though these two women were one and the same would be to ignore the literary sensitiveness, the beauty and feeling, of the most tender and gracious of all the Evangelists.

The only new material which John's words would impart to his readers at this point of his narrative was that the one who had anointed the Lord was the sister of Lazarus of Bethany. Mark and Matthew had both withheld her name in their account of that affair, partly because they told the story just as a supplement to the great events of Passion week and partly because they had made no previous reference to the disciples from that home in Bethany. Thus when John for the first time found an opportunity to introduce Lazarus and his two sisters into the narrative, nothing could have been more natural than that he should point out in passing that Mary was the one who had bathed

her Master's feet with precious ointment. There would be no danger that his readers would be in doubt as to which anointing he had in mind; they would only need to read on in order for the whole subject to be made clear. They would learn that Mary, like her brother and sister, was a well-known resident of Bethany; she was the favoured daughter of a well-to-do family, in good social standing with Jews of local birth and breed. It was to comfort Mary even more than to console Martha that the Jews came to their home on the death of Lazarus, and the text makes it plain that it was not as though these Jews belonged to the inner circle of Christ's friends and disciples. John bluntly calls them "JEWS" five times over (11: 19, 31, 33, 36, 45), and this is the term which he applies with a political significance to the followers of the Pharisees (cp. 11: 46). These were the men who so often reproached the Lord because He kept company with sinners; would such men have paid a friendly visit to the home of Mary of Bethany if she were the woman of the streets who had so provoked the ire of Simon the Pharisee? The men who despised the Name of Jesus would have fled from the house of one who had lived as a harlot. There is not one word that would show how the penitent sinner of Galilee whom the Pharisee disdained could have become the blameless resident of Bethany whom the Pharisees consoled. It is quite false to the language of either Luke or John to think of these twain as one soul; there is not a shred of evidence in their use of words for the tradition that would link Mary of Bethany with the penitent sinner.

There is yet another argument that runs counter to the attempt to identify these two women. The two occasions on which our Lord was anointed at the hands of a woman are so distinct in small detail that there is no risk of confusing the two narratives; but they also have so much in common that it would be unnatural not to look for some connecting thread between them. Not one of the Gospels leaves us with the idea that it was a strange thing for a woman to do; there is not a hint of surprise that such an action should have taken place. The only element in the two episodes which stood out as of more than usual interest was the attention paid to His feet. The Woman of Galilee first dried His tear-stained feet with her hair, and then laved them with her ointment (Lk. 7: 38); the Sister of Lazarus first poured her ointment upon His feet, and then wiped them with her hair (Jn. 12: 3). This may have been an uncommon point of coincidence, but Theophylact has long since offered a very suggestive explanation. If there

were something strange or unusual in the manner or method by which the penitent sinner owned her love and gratitude for the Saviour, it would only serve to make the event better known in the circle of His friends and disciples. They would all be aware of the pleasure which that token of grateful love had brought to His heart long before the day when at length He sat down to that banquet of tranquil joy in Bethany. The two sisters of the one whom He had raised from the dead were both eager to show their gratitude and love, each in some way that would befit their own natural character. Martha found that way in serving at the table where He sat as the Guest of honour, but Mary thought of a more personal way in which to express her love. She would do what had been done once before; she would anoint His feet with precious ointment, and would wipe them with the loosened tresses of her hair. But it would not be mere imitation of an example from the past; it would be the loving consecration of her Redeemer for the cross. She would renew all that had so rejoiced the heart of the Lord in the anointing in Galilee, but she would avoid all that might have been out of keeping with her own totally different character. This is a view which gives us a natural explanation of all the points of likeness and of contrast, while it also allows us to trace a reasonable connection between the two events. We are therefore on safe ground in ruling out claims for the identity of this penitent sinner with Mary of Bethany. Much more grateful to us is the view that having obtained pardon and mercy, she retired with a thankful heart to all the shade of that obscurity in which her after life could best be redeemed.

The whims of that tradition which loves to identify the anonymous sinner of Galilee either with Mary Magdalene or with Mary of Bethany are thus without the least support in the sacred text of Holy Writ. But there is yet another tradition which ignores the sinful woman but which seeks to identify Mary Magdalene with Mary of Bethany. There is not a breath of support for this view either in the text of Scripture or in the character of the women. Luke brings Mary Magdalene into his narrative as one who had been rescued from the power of demon control and who had then become a devoted follower of the Lord in His travels throughout Galilee (8: 1-3). Then he brings Mary of Bethany into his narrative as the sister of a certain woman named Martha and as one who sat at His feet to hear His word (10: 38-39). Who would think that Luke meant us to believe that the companion of the Lord Jesus

in His circuit through Galilee was one and the same as the sister of Martha who gladly received Him into her home? Who would think that Luke meant us to infer that the one who had loved to minister to Him by the way was now the one so eager to be ministered to by Him as though she seldom enjoyed such a privilege? There are other allusions which show that Mary Magdalene was in the company of Christ right up to the time of His death (Mt. 27: 55-56, Mk. 15: 40-41, Lk. 23: 49, Jn. 19: 25), while Mary of Bethany was a resident in her own home right up to the week of the cross (Jn. 11: 1-3). Thus the text alone is enough to show that the two Marys were distinct and separate characters, and this is fully borne out by the details which have been preserved with regard to their individual disposition. Mary Magdalene was an active member in that band of women in whose company we always find her with one exception; her solitary vigil by the sepulchre after her friends had gone is the only time when we meet her by herself. She was one of those who followed the Lord from place to place, and lavished her wealth upon His needs. She was the last at the cross and the first at the tomb; she was the messenger who first brought news of the empty tomb to the Two and then brought news of the Risen Lord to the Twelve. All this bespeaks a woman of no mean social interest as well as a woman of no mere selfish energy. But Mary of Bethany was a reserved daughter in that home of friendship in whose privacy we always find her with one exception; her disconsolate visit to the sepulchre after her Lord had come is the only time when we meet her out of doors. She was one of those who listened in love when He spake, and worshipped in faith while He tarried. She was found at His feet alike in sorrow and gladness; it was the place where she could drink in His words or pour out her grief in perfect freedom. All this bespeaks a woman of the most devout sympathy as well as a woman of the most retiring nature. Thus the character of the two Marys makes it clear that they were distinct and separate persons; it would be easier to trace a likeness between the stirring spirit of Mary Magdalene and the busy Martha than between the constant journeys of Mary Magdalene and Martha's homely sister. We may conclude the whole study with the verdict that Mary Magdalene is not to be identified with Mary of Bethany and neither Mary is to be identified with the sinner of Galilee. The story of each of these three women is to be treated as a separate narrative, and each is to be honoured as an individual personality in the Memoirs of our Saviour.

Education and the Christian Religion

E. K. COLE

IN a book entitled "What Is Life?—The Physical Aspect of the Living Cell," based on lectures delivered under the auspices of the Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies, Trinity College, Dublin, in February, 1943. Professor Schrodinger throws considerable light on the relation between the living and the non-living. From a study of genetics, combined with his extensive knowledge of wave-mechanics in which he has gained a world-wide reputation, he shows that matter in all probability consists only of force—different types of matter resulting from different combinations of forces.

Whilst his theories are still somewhat conjectural, Professor Schrodinger admirably illustrates the truth that departments of knowledge cannot be isolated. An intimate relation exists between the physical, mental and social sciences. Further, all science culminates in a philosophy which is but an explanation of abstract things derived from the concrete. Physics merges into philosophy; mathematics goes hand in hand with philosophy; medicine especially in more recent times looks to psychology or the psychical. All departments of knowledge merge as a pyramid into philosophy, which endeavours to find the ultimate reality behind matter, the integrating principle relating all knowledge.

Education to be complete must deal with all departments of knowledge. Many hold that the field is so broad that everyone is forced to specialise in one or another particular section. This is indeed true. But at the same time care should be taken that while specialising, a broad vision of the complete whole—the synthesis of all learning—is not forgotten. A physicist may have to specialise in electricity for example, but he should not be ignorant of the results of the philosopher who makes use of his specialised knowledge.

The education of children should therefore be more than instruction in one particular sphere. Naturally there must be specialisation, but care should be taken that a concept of order and correlation exists between all departments of learning. The aim should be to equip the mind of those

educated that foundations may be laid to enable them to participate in the fullest life possible.

The idea of the indivisibility of the various departments of knowledge leads automatically to the concept of order as a reality. But concept of order is spiritual, using the term in the broader sense of the word. Are not spiritual things, therefore, real? And if they are, have we not an obligation to present the spiritual to those to be educated? Can we not but postulate that if there is order, there must be a Cosmological Force; if there is design there must be a Teleological Power; if there is a subjective conception of the ultimate Reality in man, there must be an objective existence of the Reality apart from man? Can we say our education is complete, our life the fullest, if we ignore the postulate that the emergence of all knowledge is what Kant chose to call the Divine Architect, and what the theologian calls God?

Knowledge of the Supreme Force implies that the Force manifests itself; a concept of the Force having Order and Design and Thought implies It has a mind; our highest concept of mind involves personality. Our instruction of the Force should therefore include personality. Two problems then emerge. What conception of personality can we attribute to this Integrating Force, and will not this conception be governed by the limitations of our own mind?

The solution to these two problems can only be found in the fact that man is so constituted that, as he has the capacity to perceive order in the Universe, so he has the ability to discern good from evil. Some may say these terms are purely relative, which is so. But the fact of experience is that good can be discerned from the bad. With this innate capacity man considers his highest achievement is goodness, the most complete expression of which is found in the New Testament in the Person of Christ. The conception of personality attributed to the Integrating Force is therefore that which was manifested in Christ. While the conceptions we have of Him must of necessity be governed by our human perception, nevertheless we must be content in saying that He is the highest good whom man can contemplate. And should not this be taught?

The teaching of the Personality of the Divine Originator is the essence of religion. Not rites or ceremonies, not creeds or dogma but a Spiritual Force, energising and maintaining the whole of Creation in order and with a purpose. Therefore, to the end that an intelligent comprehension of knowledge may be made, instruction in religion is essential.

II.

Education should not be concerned solely with the academic side of a child's life. Man is essentially a social animal and his very existence demands intercourse with his fellow beings. The ability to live agreeably with his fellows requires an objective concept of what is right and what is wrong. A purely subjective estimate of good and evil may differ with the individual although this in itself should not be disregarded. Not only is a knowledge of the law required, but also a motivating power enabling the knowledge to be put into practice. Education should be concerned therefore with the teaching of a moral standard and instruction in the ability to maintain this standard.

The first problem of the educator in this respect is then—What is the necessary moral standard? What is the norm of conduct? Many writers of natural ethics take as their base "man is the measure of all things." With the extension of evolutionary theories from the material to the immaterial sciences—the evolutionary naturalism of Darwin and Spencer; the socialistic naturalism of Marx and Engels; the individual naturalism of Goethe and Nietzsche:—the a priori theory has been propounded that man's moral perception has evolved from a crude notion of justice to the concept of the highest good, viz., love.

On the other hand the Intuitionists—e.g., Cudworth, Clarke, Shaftesbury and others—claim that the knowledge of right and wrong depends on the individual conscience of man. Obey your inward voice in the matter. Right and wrong will vary for the individual, therefore the individual must be the interpreter of what is the good and evil for him.

Both the naturalistic and the intuitionist schools of ethics are almost entirely subjective. But is the good only subjective? Is the norm of right and wrong governed by individual caprice? The presence of Order and Purpose in the Universe compels the postulate that Law is real objectively. The objective law is the right and the departure from the law is wrong. The moral standard must be objective. The norm of conduct must have its origin, not in man but in the Ultimate Mind of Law, that is to say, God.

The revelation we have of the moral law of God is in the Bible. If not, where is there a fuller manifestation of it? But some will say—Are not the writings of Scripture subjective thoughts? The answer is yes and no. The manifestation of law in itself is objective not in so far as it did not come from the mind of man, but in that it was in reality before it found place in his thought. Education should there-

fore teach the moral value of law as revealed in the Bible.

The second problem of the educator in connection with moral education is—What is the adequate dynamic enabling performance of the moral standard? Confucianism and Buddhism contain high moral teaching but they entirely disregard the problem—how the moral standard can be lived. Islam demands belief in the axiom "might is right." The Christian religion claims a solution, transcending the lifeless wisdom of the Confucian, the nerveless Nirvana of the Buddhist, and the sensual self-indulgence of the Moslem. The Person of the Infinite was manifested to mankind in the Person of Christ—an inference drawn from the objective facts of His flawless life, His unequalled teaching, His death, and His reappearance from the dead—a hypothesis manifesting its truth in the courage and fortitude of the early followers; in the phenomenal spread of Christianity throughout the Roman Empire; in the awakening of the mind in the Renaissance and the Reformation; and in the moral force of the Evangelical Revival and missionary enterprise of the last two centuries.

Moral standards may be temporarily maintained by a sense of duty, by a fear of punishment, or by a realisation that existence depends upon the observance of common law. But permanent observance can only be maintained by the immanence of the Law and the Lawgiver being always real in the experience of the observer—a knowledge of the living Christ in the mind and life of the individual. Education should therefore seek to inculcate this inward dynamic into the experience of those being educated.

III.

If education then is to be for the welfare and happiness of those educated it should make some provision for instruction in the unifying principle behind all knowledge—God; and for the inculcation of the Spirit of Christ enabling performance of a moral standard which makes for true happiness.

Such education is but the common right which a democratic government owes to its people. The Census of the 30th June, 1933, reveals that 86.39% of the Australian population is nominally Christian. With the possible exception of the Unitarians which comprise, according to the Census 0.02% of the population, every division of the Christian community assents nominally to the Person of the Creator and the Life and Teaching of Christ. It is admitted that the figures represent nominal adherents, but it is urged that underlying the admission of adherence to a domination

there is absence of conviction against the accepted formularies of the denomination.

There is therefore an obligation resting upon the government to ensure that education is given in those principles to which its people subscribe by such an overwhelming majority: there is an obligation of education itself to present all departments of knowledge: there is the obligation on those who have a knowledge of a full and complete life, to impart that knowledge to posterity.

As the first Interim Report of the Educational Sub-Committee of the Central Committee on Post-War Problems in England says:—

“ . . . Religion . . . needs to be conceived politically and administratively, in general terms, as a basic and vital element in the national life to be deliberately encouraged and fostered.”

*

*

*

“FULL MANY A FLOWER . . .”

There is much beauty in the world that is never seen by man. In most out-of-the-way localities there is most exquisite beauty, and doubtless has been for centuries, for the moment man discovers it unexpectedly, it is there in its completeness, not adding to its pristine beauty because of his presence. How many rare flowers have bloomed and perished; how many lovely shells and plants have existed for centuries at the bottom of the sea; how many consummately beautiful birds have lived and died; how many delicate sunsets have flamed and faded—all of them before a human eye could behold them and a human soul rejoice in them! Then why all this unnoted beauty? Ah! was it unnoted? What is its rationale? Was it merely an age-long waste? Was so much beauty created without a purpose? Suppose we simply assume that there is a Creator and Preserver who, like ourselves, loves the beautiful in all its forms, would not that assumption offer a rational explanation of all the phenomenal beauty and magnificence there are in the world? If this is not the true explanation, there is none that is rational and adequate. Hence both teleology and cosmology in the realm of beauty point indubitably to a personal Creator and Sustainer.

—Keyser, “A System of Natural Theism,” pp. 80-81.

MOORE THEOLOGICAL
COLLEGE



*"But he that creeps from cradle on to grave,
Unskilled save in the velvet course of fortune,
Hath missed the discipline of noble hearts."*

—Quoted by Sorley in "Moral Values,"
cf. Hebrews 12: 5-11.

Moore Theological College

Founded 1856

President and Visitor:

His Grace the Most Reverend the Archbishop of Sydney.

Trustees:

The Lord Archbishop of Sydney. The Ven. Archdeacon H. S. Begbie.
A. L. Blythe, Esq., O.B.E.

Committee:

Ex-Officio: The Trustees and the Principal.

Ven. Archdeacon S. M. Johnstone, M.A., F.R.H.S.	Rev. T. Knox.
Ven. Archdeacon J. Bidwell, B.A., L.Th.	V. C. Hughesdon, Esq., LL.B.
Ven. Archdeacon S. H. Denman, L.Th.	F. Langford-Smith, Esq., B.Sc., B.E. (Hon. Secretary).
Rev. Canon R. B. Robinson, L.Th.	H. G. Smith, Esq.
Rev. H. N. Powys, Th.L.	C. P. Taubman, Esq.
	W. J. Williams, Esq., M.B.E., B.Sc. (Hon. Treasurer).

Clerical Organising Secretary:

Rev. H. N. Powys, Th.L.

The Women's Auxiliary Committee:

President: Mrs. H. W. K. Mowll.

Associate President: Mrs. T. C. Hammond. Secretary: Mrs. G. R. Rees.

STAFF:

Principal: Rev. Canon T. C. Hammond, M.A., Th.Soc.

Vice-Principal: Rev. M. L. Loane, M.A., Th.L.

Registrar: Rev. A. W. Morton, M.A., Dip.Ed. (On Active Service).

Resident-Tutor and Lecturer:

H. R. Minn, Esq., M.A.(N.Z.), M.A., B.D.(Lond.).

Lecturers:

The Rt. Rev. C. V. Pilcher, M.A., D.D., Th.Soc.
The Rt. Rev. W. G. Hilliard, M.A.
Ven. Archdeacon A. L. Wade, M.A., B.D.
Ven. Archdeacon J. Bidwell, B.A., L.Th.
Rev. Canon R. B. Robinson, L.Th.
Rev. C. K. Hammond, M.A.
Rev. H. Bates, B.Sc.
Miss M. J. Steel, M.A., Dip.Ed., S.Th.

Hostel Warden: Rev. E. K. Cole, Th.L.

STUDENTS, 1945

4th YEAR (non-resident)

Rev. R. G. Fillingham, Th.L.	Rev. J. W. Holmes, Th.L.
Rev. R. B. B. Gibbes, Th.L.	Rev. D. E. Langshaw, Th.L.
Rev. T. J. Hayman, Th.L.	Rev. R. L. Rolls, Th.L.
H. R. Smythe, B.A., Th.L.	

3rd YEAR

A. R. Lormer.	Ridley College, 1940-42.	Melbourne.
T. F. McKnight.	Army Education Service.	Sydney.
M.A., B.Ec.		
W. J. Merrell.	Army Medical Corps; 3rd year	Sydney.
	Arts, University of Sydney.	
B. D. Reed.	University of Melbourne (Architectures), 1937-41; Deputy Senior Student; Editor of "Societas."	Melbourne.
A. C. Tipping.	N.S.W. Govt. Tourist Bureau.	Penrith, N.S.W.
W. G. Twine.	Maritime Services Board of	Sydney.
L.T.C.L.	N.S.W.; A.C.F.	

2nd YEAR

L. R. Buckman.	Accounts work; Served with	Sydney.
	A.I.F. in New Guinea; Delegate to United Theological Students' Representative Council.	
E. D. Crawford.	Army Psychological Service.	Mittagong, N.S.W.
B.A.		
A. C. H. Crigan.	Served with Field Ambulance in Northern Australia.	Benalla, Vic.
E. W. Fisher-Johnson.	Bank of New South Wales; Army Signals.	Sydney.
C. L. Goodwin.	Electrical fitter ship construction.	Sydney.
D. A. Langford.	Served in New Guinea; 1st year Arts, University of Sydney.	Melbourne.
G. J. Morris.	Fitting and machining, Sydney Technical College.	Sydney.
R. H. Palmer.	A.I.F.; 3rd year Economics, University of Sydney; University hockey Blue; Senior Student.	Sydney.
G. B. Simmons.	Christ College, University of Tasmania, 1938-41.	Sydney.
F. G. Taplin.	A.I.F., Middle East and Darwin.	London.
W. G. A. Tooth.	Army Medical Corps, England, North Africa, New Guinea.	Townsville, Qld.
K. L. Walker.	Church Army, 1937-40; Served with Artillery in Syria, Western Desert and New Guinea.	Sydney.
R. A. Woodward.	Electrical fitter in ship construction; 1st year Arts.	Sydney.

1st YEAR

R. V. Ash.	Fitting, machining, marine engineering, Sydney Tech. College.	Sydney.
J. S. H. Bootle.	Served in New Guinea.	Sydney.
R. F. Bosanquet.	Served Bougainville, N.G.	Sydney.
W. F. Carter.	Served Owen Stanley Campaign; Secretary of Students' Union.	Sydney.
D. W. Draper.	Army Signals and Y.M.C.A.	Sydney.
J. S. Elliot.	Served with Army Engineers in Middle East and New Guinea.	Sydney.
H. G. Fuhrmeister.	M.B.L. Diploma; Worked with Evangelization Society of Australia.	Baddaginnie, Vic.
R. F. Gray.	Served in New Guinea with Army Medical Corps; 1st year Arts.	Sydney.
D. C. Hayes.	Served in New Guinea with Army Engineers.	Sydney.
J. M. Johnston.	C.I.M., China, 1938-44.	Geraldton, W.A.
J. A. Ross.	Mech. engineering draftsman.	Sydney.
R. E. Sherlock.	Office work.	Sydney.

READING FOR MATRICULATION

H. Edwards: Sydney.	J. R. Payne: Sydney.
G. M. Fletcher: Sydney.	K. B. Roughley: Sydney.
J. J. Goodman: Sydney.	R. C. Weir: Sydney.
R. Patfield: Wentworth Falls.	M. T. D. Williams: Woollongong.
A. C. H. Yuill: Sydney.	

PROSPECTUS OF THE COLLEGE

LOCATION

The College is situate on the corner of City Road and Carillon Avenue, and adjoins the University of Sydney, within the boundaries of Sydney. Postal address: Moore Theological College, Newtown, N.S.W. Cable address: Theology, Sydney.

ENTRANCE STANDARD

Matriculation

It is also necessary to be medically examined. Tuition for Matriculation is provided by the College for accepted students in residence.

COURSE

Having passed the Matriculation Examination, students are trained in the First Year Preliminary course, and thereafter in a two years' course according to the syllabus of the Australian College of Theology for the Diploma, Licentiate in Theology (Th.L.), and in addition are required to spend a further year in a specially prescribed course for the Moore College Diploma.

Subjects: Doctrine, Old Testament, New Testament, Greek, Church History, Prayer Book, Psychology and Education, Hebrew, Philosophy, Voice Production, Pastoralia, and Homiletics.

ACADEMIC YEAR

The College period consists of three terms annually—Easter, Trinity and Michaelmas—of about eleven weeks each. Students are expected to be in residence during these terms, unless especially exempt by the Committee.

A fourth term for special studies is held early in the following calendar year.

FEES, SCHOLARSHIPS, BURSARIES AND PRIZES

The annual fee, including residence, is £90.

The Eleanor Abbott Scholarship is awarded to the student who comes first among Moore College candidates in one section of the Th.L.

Numerous Bursaries, e.g., the James Sandy, the Walter and Eliza Hall, etc., make it possible for deserving students to get assistance with their College fees.

The Dean Talbot Memorial Essay Prize is awarded annually.

The Thomas Watson Memorial Prizes for reading are awarded by examination during the Michaelmas term.

The S.P.C.K. makes a grant of books to the value of two pounds to each student; and a further similar grant on ordination.

CHAPEL SERVICES AND DAILY ROUTINE

Rising Bell	6.30 a.m.
Chapel Bell	7.25 a.m.; Wednesdays, 8.25 a.m.
Breakfast	8.15 a.m.; Wednesdays, 7.45 a.m.

Bell for Lectures	9, 10.5, 11.10 a.m. and 12.5 p.m.
Lunch	1.0 p.m.
Evening Chapel Bell	5.55 p.m.
Dinner	6.30 p.m.

There is no Evening Chapel on Saturday and Sunday or Morning Chapel on Monday. Litany is said on Wednesday and Friday.

Holy Communion is celebrated on all Sundays and Holy Days in term, and on other special occasions.

The Principal and the Staff give an address of a devotional or practical character in the Chapel at the Morning Services and the Mid-day Devotional Service on Friday.

MOORE COLLEGE DIPLOMAS

An annual ceremony is held for the conferring of Diplomas. Holders are entitled to wear the hood, which is of black silk lined with purple.

COLLEGE MAGAZINE

The title of the Magazine is "Societas," and it is published annually.

RECREATIONAL ACTIVITIES

Cricket, soccer, tennis and debating, including the Annual Athletic Carnival for the Wilbur Chaseling Cup, are arranged by the United Theological College Representatives' Council, and held during the year.

OLD STUDENTS' UNION

A Reunion of former students is held annually during the session of the Diocesan Synod. The Rev. R. W. Hemming is the secretary.

EXAMINATION RESULTS

Australian College of Theology: November, 1944

Licentiate in Theology (Th.L.)

1st Class:

H. R. Smythe (First place in Australia: Hey Sharp Prize).

2nd Class:

R. H. Winters (Second place in Australia).

D. E. Langshaw (Third place in Australia).

Pass (in alphabetical order):

R. G. Fillingham, R. B. B. Gibbes, T. J. Hayman, J. W. Holmes,
Rev. J. Richards, R. L. Rolls.

Passed in first half of course (in order of merit):

W. J. Merrell (First in Australia in this half of course).

B. D. Reed (Third in Australia in this half of course).

A. C. Tipping, N. R. Glover, Rev. A. W. Prescott, B.E., W. G. Twine.

Held over: A. R. Lormer.

The omissions from this section of the Magazine will doubtless occasion disappointment to some of our friends.

Believing, however, that the voice of the College will find agreeable listeners in circles outside the range of student affairs, the Editorial staff regret the necessary absence of the usually interesting commonplaces.