the universe. Agnostic immanence is the outcome of the system. Spencer tried to conciliate all interests in his solution. Knowledge is not of the Ultimate Reality, but only of phenomena, that is of things as they appear in conscious experience, limited as this is by correlation with a specific nervous organism. He thought that he conserved the truth of the various systems of religion and philosophy when he conceded to the Agnostic that the Ultimate Reality was unknowable, while to the Theist and the religious instinct generally, he gave the assurance of an Infinite and Eternal Energy from which all things proceed. The demands of the religious consciousness were met by the presentation not of an anthropomorphic God transcendent of the world, but by an immanent God whose presence in the world might still nourish all the religious feelings, and feed the feelings of reverence, awe, and devotion, formerly evoked by belief in a personal God. How far agnostic Immanence can satisfy the religious need of man, we shall inquire presently. At present we take Spencer as the latest exponent of that type of pantheistic thought, which merges God in the world, and leaves no room for any proper life in the Eternal Energy from which all things proceed. The Energy has no meaning apart from its manifestations of itself within space and time. God is identified with the world, and has no meaning apart from the world.

JAMES IVERACH.

THE DESOLATION OF THE CROSS.

(1) THE holiest spot for the Christian Church is Calvary; the most sacred symbol is the Cross; when in its most solemn ordinance it remembers its Founder, it is as dying. Immediately after the Resurrection the sacrifice of Christ

was moved into the central position of the thought and life of the Christian community. The inspired genius of Paul found its heaviest trust and its hardest task in the interpretation of the Cross. Whenever and wherever there have been in the history of the Christian Church times of refreshing from the Presence of the Lord, Christ has been again lifted up from the earth to draw all men unto Him. While theories of the atonement have varied from age to age, the saints of all ages have found pardon and peace through the precious blood of the Son of God. The Christian Church will lose its historical identity, will disown its spiritual heritage, will imperil its future in untried ways, when Jesus as Teacher and Example displaces Christ the Saviour through Sacrifice. Glorying with the Christian Church in the Cross, we may ask ourselves whether the Christian Church has done all it could to understand the Cross by penetrating with reverence and sympathy and devotion into the "inner life" of the Crucified. The writer has the conviction that it is only thus that in some measure its profoundest depths of mystery can be sounded, and its sublimest heights of glory can be scaled; and it is, therefore, in humility and contrition of spirit that he addresses himself to his present task.

(2) After the Agony in Gethsemane there remained for Jesus to experience calmly and bravely what He had anticipated with such trouble and shrinking of soul. The Father's will having been accepted, the Father's help was not denied. The remonstrance at the treacherous kiss of Judas (Luke xxii. 48), the warning evoked by the hasty blow of Peter in His defence (Matt. xxvi. 52), the healing touch on Malchus (Luke xxii. 51), the reproachful question to the priests and scribes (verses 52, 53), the scathing rebuke of the secret methods of His enemies (John xviii. 20–23), the solemn confession in response to the High Priest's

challenge of His Messiahship (Matt. xxvi. 64), the compassionate treatment of Pilate in his weak vacillation (John xviii. 36–37, xix. 11), and the tender expression of sympathy with the womanhood of Jerusalem in anticipation of its nearing judgment (Luke xxiii. 28–31) :—these suggest the burden He was bearing, and the struggle He was waging during these hours of unceasing trial to His spirit as well as of weakness and weariness of His flesh between the acceptance and the presentation of His sacrifice. The look that brought the denying Peter to bitter penitence (Luke xxii. 61), the silence which made Pilate marvel (Mark xv. 5) are not less significant than the words of Jesus. Conscious of His own greatness, confident of His own vocation, courageous in doing and daring all involved in its fulfilment, He was deeply grieved with human sin and unbelief, tenderly patient with ignorance and weakness, swiftly responsive to sympathy, and acutely sensitive to shame and pain. Even when it had been excusable if He had been absorbed in His own experience, He was interested in, and concerned about others.

(3) The utterances of Jesus on the Cross reveal to us His inner life, and thus give content to our conception of His sacrifice ; for it is surely the sorrow and the struggle of His spirit, and not the pain of His body that gives significance and value to His offering of Himself to God on behalf of man. The genuineness of some of these sayings has been doubted. The cry of desolation is reported both in Matthew (xxvii. 46) and Mark (xv. 34), although probably the former gave the Hebrew form, and the latter the Aramaic equivalent. Bruce's note may be quoted : " The probability is that Jesus spoke in Hebrew. It is no argument against this that the spectators might not understand what He said, for the utterance was not meant for the ears of men. The historicity of the occurrence has been called in question on

the ground that one in a state of dire distress would not express his feelings in borrowed phrases. The alternative is that the words were put into the mouth of Jesus by persons desirous that in this as in all other respects His experience should correspond to prophetic anticipations. But who would have the boldness to impute to Him a sentiment which seemed to justify the taunt, 'Let Him deliver Him if He love Him'? Brandt's reply to this is: Jewish Christians who had not a high idea of Christ's Person. That in some Christian circles the cry of desertion was an offence appears from the rendering of 'eli, eli' in Evang. Petri—ἡ δύναμις μου ἡ δ. μ.=my strength, my strength. Its omission by Luke proves the same thing" (*Expositor's Greek Testament*, pp. 331–2). The improbability of the words being put into the mouth of Jesus is so very great that we may confidently accept His well-attested saying as genuine.

(4) The prayer for forgiveness for His persecutors, the promise of Paradise to the penitent thief, the committal of His spirit unto God, are found in Luke's Gospel only (xxiii. 34, 43, 46); but this must not be assumed as a disproof of the genuineness of the utterances. Each must be considered on its own merits. Of the first Bruce says, "A prayer altogether true to the spirit of Jesus, therefore, although reported by Luke alone, intrinsically credible. It is with sincere regret that one is compelled, by its omission in important MSS., to regard its genuineness as subject to a certain amount of doubt. In favour of it is its conformity with the whole aim of Luke in his Gospel, which is to exhibit the graciousness of Jesus" (*op. cit.* pp. 639–640). May not the omission be due to the intense hostility felt in the Christian Church towards the murderers of Jesus? The saying is both fit for the occasion, and worthy of the person. While the second saying raises difficulties in regard

to the exact meaning to be assigned to the words "to-day" and "Paradise," the penitence of Jesus' companion in suffering and Jesus' comforting promise are not intrinsically improbable. As regards the third saying Bruce's comment is most suggestive. "This expression (*φωνῇ μεγάλῃ*) is used in Matthew and Mark, in connexion with the 'My God, My God,' which Luke omits. In its place comes the 'Father, into Thy hands.' Here, as in the Agony in the Garden, Luke's account fails to sound the depths of Christ's humiliation. It must not be inferred that he did not know of the 'Eli, eli.' Either he personally, or his source, or his first readers, could not bear the thought of it" (*op. cit.* p. 641). It does not follow that Jesus did not utter this "echo of Psalm xxxi. 6 as an expression of trust in God *in extremis*." It is probable that light broke through the darkness, and that despair gave place to confidence.

(5) The Fourth Gospel adds three other sayings: the commendation of His mother to John, the cry of bodily need, and the sigh of relief, or shout of triumph "It is finished" (xix. 26, 27; 28; 30). That these sayings are given only in the Fourth Gospel should not be allowed to raise a presumption against their genuineness. John, the beloved disciple, seems to have had closer connexions in Jerusalem than the other disciples, and he too seems to have lingered longest at the Cross. If the brethren of Jesus had remained unbelieving, and if the tragedy of the Cross was likely to harden their unbelief, it was most appropriate that Jesus should desire His mother to make her home with the disciple who would be most able to recall to her those tender reminiscences of Himself which would strengthen her faltering faith in Him. That this disciple alone reports the sacred charge need not awaken any doubt. Even if the confession of thirst is reported in this Gospel in opposition to the docetism which prevailed in the circles

to which it was addressed, we need not assume that it was invented for the purpose. One of the worst tortures of crucifixion was the burning thirst that accompanied it; and if Jesus felt this torture, was it improbable that He gave expression to His needs? John's reference to this cry as a fulfilment of prophecy is thus explained by Marcus Dodds: "Jesus did not feel thirsty and proclaim it with the intention of fulfilling scripture, which would be a spurious fulfilment, but in His complaint and the response to it, John sees a fulfilment of Psalm lxix. 22" (*op. cit.* p. 858). There is nothing about the last word John catches from the dying lips of Jesus that need arouse any suspicion; whether the word expressed His relief that the Passion was ended, or His satisfaction that His purpose was accomplished.

(6) Accepting the seven utterances from the Cross as genuine, we may now try to put them in the most appropriate order. The prayer for forgiveness there seems to be very little doubt was uttered as the soldiers were fastening Jesus to His Cross. Some time must have elapsed before the companion of Jesus was so impressed by the Person of the Crucified that unbelief was changed to faith, and the words of mockery gave place to the accents of entreaty. Later still the care for His mother found fit expression. Then there appears to have been silence on the Cross for three hours, while darkness shrouded the land. The cry of desolation broke the silence. When the inward struggle was ended, Jesus became aware of His physical anguish, to which His absorption in His spiritual agony had probably for a time made Him quite insensible, and He called for water. The strain of His inward struggle was relaxed even as the pain of His outward need was relieved; and to this change of mood the two last utterances testify. We cannot be certain how to place them.

On the one hand, it does seem appropriate that the last word from the failing breath should be "It is finished." On the other, one is still more attracted to the conclusion that He died in the very act of faith, committing and submitting Himself to God. Nevertheless it was in that trustful and thankful surrender of Himself to His Father that Jesus finished His work; and, therefore, on the whole it is more probable that the word, "It is finished," should be placed last of all the sayings on the Cross. Great is our gain that, having refused the stupefying drink (Mark xv. 23), He endured His Cross in full consciousness, and so gave us this precious revelation of His "inner life."

(7) The scope of the prayer of Jesus for His enemies (Luke xxiii. 34) has been restricted to His Roman executioners (Smith's *The Days of His Flesh*); but that restriction does not seem to be in accord with the largeness of the love of Jesus. As He taught His disciples to bless all who cursed them, and to pray for all who persecuted them, He Himself forgave, and sought God's forgiveness for all who had done Him any wrong. Sometimes a man does not avenge his own wrongs, but hands over His enemies to the vengeance of God. While he will not himself take judgment into his own hands, he anticipates, it may be even with what he regards as righteous satisfaction, the punishment from God which awaits them (compare Romans xii. 19). This was not the spirit of Jesus. He Himself so freely forgave that He used the filial privilege to intercede with God for His foes. There is something surprising in this intercession. As the Son of Man He claimed authority on earth to forgive sins (Matt. ix. 6), and with absolute confidence He assured the penitent of the pardon of God. "Thy sins are forgiven. Thy faith hath saved thee; go in peace" (Luke vii. 48, 50). Why, then, did He not Himself pronounce, instead of interceding for, the

pardon of His enemies? His mode of address, "Father," shows that in His hour of trial His faith in God's love had not failed Him; for His consciousness of God's fatherhood was too deep-rooted to be overthrown by any gusts of adversity. That God was willing and waited to forgive was an axiom with Jesus. How shall we explain the uncertainty that this intercession involves? It may be that in every case in which Jesus forgave sin there had been this intercession, though voiceless, and that the assurance was given as swiftly as the divine response came; but that in this case the divine response being delayed, the voiceless became articulate intercession. But why then this delay? In the other cases there were present the desire for and faith to receive the pardon of God; in this case sin was impenitent, and unbelief defiant. As in regard to the epileptic boy, whose cure was hindered by the unbelief of the disciples, of the father, of the multitudes, Christ had to put forth an increased energy of faith, such as would remove mountains (Matt. xvii. 20), so in this case His fervent intercession sought to make up for the lack in those for whom He prayed of the conditions on which the divine forgiveness depended. It was not because the wrongs were being inflicted on Himself that Jesus felt this difficulty of the divine pardon; for "the personal equation" did not disturb His unerring moral judgment. But the heinousness and horror and hatefulness of the sins of His persecutors was so intensely and vividly realized by Him that it was hard even for Him to believe that there could be cleansing for such "crimes of deepest dye." His love made it impossible for Him, however, to acquiesce in the condemnation of His murderers. That His death as the sacrifice for man's salvation should have as its immediate consequence *perdition* for those who were the historical agents in bringing it about was an obscuration of its glory that His loving

heart could not endure. That in forcing the conflict between Himself and the leaders and teachers of His people to this final issue He was driving His foes to their doom (and such a doom !) imposed an intolerable stress on Jesus, from the excessive strain of which He could find relief only in this increased energy of faith in fervent intercession.

(8) The plea on their behalf, which He advances, appears at first sight as strange as the intercession itself is surprising. Jesus could not regard those who had a share in His death as so ignorant as to be irresponsible : He recognizes responsibility even in pleading for pardon. One can hardly believe that there was no resistance of conscience to the resolution of the rulers of the Jews to put Him to death : that the crime of His Cross appeared to all a meritorious deed. Blindness of mind and hardness of heart, due to selfish ambition and worldly policy, in some measure explain the action ; but for this inward condition the actors were themselves responsible. This deed against the Son of Man, nevertheless, was in Christ's gracious judgment a sin that could be forgiven ; although it came very near being that sin against the Spirit of God for which there is no forgiveness (Matt. xii. 31, 32). The resistance and rejection of divine truth, righteousness, and grace as presented in the Son of God must appear to us as " the eternal sin " (Mark iii. 29), as the final decision of the soul against God ; but Jesus Himself made allowance for the prejudice and passion, the religious traditions, and moral customs, that obscured the judgment and obstructed the will even of His enemies, and so made their action, heinous and hateful as it was, less damnable than it would have been if they had fully realized all that was involved in it. He committed His foes to the mercy of God, because He, interpreting the mind and heart of God, believed that God judged sin, not according to its objective character, as it appears in His

own sight or in the eyes of men even, but according to its subjective intention, the measure in which the sinner himself realizes its guilt.

(9) That such a prayer even for His foes was not altogether a "forlorn hope" was surely proved by the penitence of one of His companions on the Cross. The penitent thief, too, appeared fixed in sin and unbelief; at first he also joined in the mockery (Matt. xxvii. 44; Mark xv. 32); but a change was wrought in him. The silence and patience of Jesus, so unlike the behaviour of the tortured on the Cross, impressed him; the scoffing words about the Christ of God suggested an explanation; the shame and pain of his death, stimulated his conscience; a sense of need and a hope of help were awakened in him; his rebuke of his companion, and his appeal to Jesus (Luke xxiii. 40–42) gave expression to his saving faith. Probably his conception of the Kingdom of the Messiah, in which he longed for a share, was very crude; not larger and loftier than the popular expectations of a national emancipation and a political restoration; but while his opinions were not true, the attitude of his soul was right. To recognize the Messiah in the Crucified, to commit himself in his extremity of need to the sufficiency of grace of his fellow-sufferer, implied a vision and a vigour of faith that made him, even on his cross, a new creation, the old things having passed away, and all things having become new. To him apply Browning's words:

> Oh, we're sunk enough here, God knows,
> But not quite so sunk that moments,
> Sure though seldom, are denied us,
> When the spirit's true endowments
> Stand out plainly from its false ones,
> And apprise it if pursuing
> Or the right way or the wrong way,
> To its triumph or undoing. (*Christina.*)

In such moments the bondage of the guilty past may be broken, and the promise of a better future may begin to have its fulfilment. The promise of Jesus, "Verily I say unto thee, To-day shalt thou be with Me in Paradise" (verse 43), was the appropriate response to the appeal; yet it corrects the expectation of the penitent in two respects. It is a present, not a future, boon that is promised; "a speedy release by death, instead of a slow, lingering process of dying, as often in cases of crucifixion." It is not a gain on earth, but a good in the unseen world that is assured; paradise is "either the division of Hades in which the blessed dwell, which would make for the *descensus ad inferos* or heaven." (Bruce in *Expositor's Greek Testament*, p. 641). The uncertainty about the meaning of the word *paradise* forbids the use of these words for the solution of the problem of the future life; the saying proves neither that there is an intermediate state in which believers await the resurrection, nor that saints at once pass to their final glory and blessedness. To use the promise of Jesus for any such dogmatic purpose is to miss its meaning, and to lose its worth. It should attract all our attention to, and concentrate it all on, Jesus Himself. During His earthly ministry He was sure of His Saviourhood, sure that even the worst who turned to Him in faith, and trusted in His grace, could be saved. Even on the Cross this certainty was not lost by Him. The taunt "He saved others; Himself He cannot save" (Matt. xxvii. 42) did not disturb the calm of His soul. Jesus, that He might save others, could not, and would not, save Himself. The case of this penitent was typical; the Cross of the sacrifice of Jesus was the throne of His Saviourhood. In uttering this promise Jesus not only comforted His companion, but He had Himself a foretaste of the joy that was set before Him, for which He endured the Cross, despising the shame.

(10) One element in the sacrifice which His Saviourhood involved is brought under our notice in Jesus' farewell to His mother. While His was a love, a care, a bounty, that reached to all men, none too great to have no need of Him, and none too low to be unheeded by Him, He had His own personal relationships of greater intimacy and deeper obligation; and at the Cross two of His dearly loved ones made their unspoken claim for His comfort and help. Although under the influence of His unbelieving brethren, His mother even seems to have misunderstood Him, and to have held aloof from His ministry; yet, when sorrow, shame, and suffering came upon Him, her mother-heart drew her to His side. She had not lost His love, but doubtless, as Jesus looked upon her from the Cross, the tender affection of the former years was revived. He yearned that she should find in Him, not a Son fondly loved, but a Saviour fully trusted, and a Lord freely obeyed; He desired, as the best token of His love that He could bestow, that the natural relationship should give place to the spiritual union. In confiding her to His beloved disciple He took the means best adapted to this end. Who so fit as the disciple who understood better than any other His "inner life" to guide the mother, step by step, from the natural affection to the spiritual devotion? Yet the words "Woman, behold thy son!—Behold thy mother!" (John xix. 26–27), as has already been shown in the Seventh *Study*, are full of pathos as well as promise. At the Cross mother and son were doubly bereaved; there was not only the severance of death; but the relationship of mother and son was ended. It is true that a holier bond was to take its place; and yet we are surely not mistaken in supposing that for mother and son alike at the moment the loss seemed greater than the gain.

(11) The thoughts, feelings, and wishes of Jesus had

been, even on the Cross, turned outwards in loving interest in, and helpful concern for, others. He had prayed for the forgiveness of His foes; He had assured the penitent of future good; He had bequeathed His bereaved and beloved mother to the care and counsel of His disciple. But a moment came when His inward trial absorbed Him completely. Doubtless, as the agony of His body increased, so did the anguish of His soul. So closely related are the physical and the spiritual in man, so greatly is the soul affected by the condition of the body, that apart from the tortures of crucifixion it may be that the spirit of Jesus would not have descended into so abysmal depths of darkness and desolation. Be that as it may, the cry, "My God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken Me?" (Matt. xxvii. 46; Mark xv. 34) is not explicable by His bodily pain. He was never so mastered by His body as to lose His soul's good. Within and not without was the cause of this desolation. In the previous study on *the Agony in Gethsemane* the cry on the Cross is regarded as meaning what the words taken in their plain sense appear to mean, "the interruption of His filial communion with God, the obscuration of the gracious and glorious vision of God's Fatherhood." This view is, however, rejected by many scholars to-day. To give one instance, the late Professor Stevens, in his book, *The Theology of the New Testament*, writes: "The exclamation on the Cross must not be didactically pressed into an assertion that in His death God withdrew from Christ His favour and fellowship. The Psalm from which it is quoted (xxii. 1) suggests rather the idea of abandonment to suffering than of abandonment to desertion by God" (p. 134). This opinion is even more emphatically expressed in his last work, *The Christian Doctrine of Salvation* (p. 51). He declines with "the traditional theology" to understand "that cry as expressing Christ's sense of desertion by God

in His experience of bearing the world's sin." In these statements there is lacking careful discrimination. To affirm the subjective sense of desertion by God in Christ is not the same as to assert the objective fact of that desertion. The Father did not abandon His Son, although the Son felt Himself so abandoned. Calvin himself makes this distinction: "We do not indeed insinuate that God was either ever opposed to or angry with Him. For how could He be angry with His beloved Son, on whom His mind rested? or how could Christ, by His intercession, propitiate for others a Father whom He had as an enemy to Himself? This we say, that He sustained the gravity of divine severity; since, being stricken and afflicted by the hand of God, He experienced all the signs of an angry and punishing God" (*Institutes*, Book I., chapter xvi. 11). While there are terms used in this statement that we should now hesitate to use, yet it is extremely valuable as making from the side of theology a distinction which from the side of psychology is imperative. We cannot interpret religion aright unless we distinguish the relation of God to the soul from the reflexion of that relation in the soul; the latter does not always with absolute accuracy report the former. The inner life of Jesus was usually as the unruffled surface of the lake which mirrors clearly the sunny sky above; but there were times when, as the tempest-tossed waters give only a broken reflexion, so His feelings, troubled and distressed, did not represent God's relation to Him. Never was the Son dearer to the Father, or the Father nearer to the Son, than when in filial obedience He experienced in His own soul the darkness and desolation of God's apparent distance and desertion.

(12) That Jesus felt to the uttermost this being forsaken of God must be affirmed emphatically, in view especially of the dread with which He anticipated His experience

in Gethsemane. To declare that the words on the lips of Jesus meant no more than on the lips of the psalmist, because He felt no more than the psalmist did, is, it seems to the writer at least, irreverence towards Him. His vision of God was so much clearer, His communion with God so much closer, His affection for God so much deeper, that the abysmal depths of the Son's agony cannot be fathomed by the pain and grief of which saint or seer may be capable. We must agree with Mrs. Browning that this experience of Jesus was unique as His Person, whether we agree or not with her in regard to its purpose.

Yea, once, Immanuel's orphaned cry His universe hath shaken—
It went up single, echoless, "My God, I am forsaken."
It went up from the Holy's lips amid His last creation,
That, of the lost, no son should use those words of desolation.
Cowper's Grave.

Deferring for the present the theological explanation can we give any psychological account of this experience? Such an attempt is often deprecated as an irreverent intrusion into the sanctuary of the soul. To the writer, however, it seems that the "inner life" of Jesus is both the revelation of God and the redemption of man, so that His experience is not a private possession, but a universal treasure. What has done injury to so many theories of the Atonement is just the failure to interpret it in the light of Jesus' own consciousness of His sacrifice. Avoiding the technical language of psychology, the writer would suggest that the experience of Jesus can be explained by two laws of the inner life, the law of *appropriating affection*, and the law of *absorbing attention*.

As has already been pointed out, love by its very nature as a giving of self to another so as not only to serve, but to suffer with another, is vicarious; it takes the other life into its own mind, heart, and will. The love of Jesus, in which there was no selfish narrowness or weakness, gave

itself thus fully and freely to others. The sorrows, needs, struggles, sins of others became a shadow, a burden, a strain, and a shame to Jesus. He loved Himself into oneness with mankind. Although He Himself knew no sin as personal guilt, He was made sin in experiencing to the full in His self-identification with sinners the consequences of sin. As the sting of death is sin, so He in His love for mankind tasted death for every man. It may be difficult for us to realize what His identification of Himself with mankind involved for Jesus; but as we become more unselfishly loving, does it become possible for us to feel the sin of mankind as our own grief and loss. On His Cross, where the world's sin was doing its worst against Him, He most fully realized its curse. Such an experience must absorb the attention. There are mutually exclusive ideas, emotions, and desires. May we borrow the terms of logic, and say that as the intention increases the extension contracts? The more intense the more restricted must the consciousness be. The absorption of Jesus in the sin of mankind meant the withdrawal of His attention from other objects. Not only so, this experience of the misery and shame and doom of sin necessarily excluded the help and comfort of God's fatherly love. The cloud was too thick to let the sunshine break through. Man's sin and God's Fatherhood exclude one another in so intense an experience as Jesus passed through on the Cross. The realization of the one obscured the other.

(13) In rejecting this view of the cry of desolation, Professor Stevens insists on interpreting it "on the basis of Jesus' teaching alone." (*The Christian Doctrine of Salvation*, p. 52.) But there is good reason for challenging this arbitrary restriction. The immaturity and inexperience of the disciples and the multitude imposed a restraint on Jesus' teaching for which due allowance must be made. Further,

it is possible that the reality of the sacrifice of Jesus depended on the limitation even of His own knowledge of all that it involved. He walked by faith and not by sight. In Gethsemane He was bewildered: "If it be possible, let this cup pass away from Me" (Matt. xxvi. 39). On Calvary He pleads, "Why hast Thou forsaken Me?" Had there been present to the mind of Jesus a logical demonstration of the necessity of His death, the trial would not have been so severe, nor would the trust have been so triumphant, It was religious faith and moral obedience which carried Him through "the hour and the power of darkness." To expect from Jesus Himself a theory of the Atonement, and to reject the subsequent apostolic doctrine of the Cross wherever it goes beyond the words of Jesus is to ignore the necessary conditions for such a sacrifice of vicarious love. The value of His sacrifice must be experienced in Christian life before the significance of the Cross could be interpreted by Christian thought. It was the Spirit of God who guided the apostolic Church into all the truth about the death of Christ. We have a right then, nay, it is our duty to turn to the apostolic teaching, especially the doctrine of Paul, to whom the Cross meant more than to any of the other apostles, that we may learn the whole meaning and the full worth of the experience of Jesus as expressed in this cry. What Christian thought has found in this experience of desolation and darkness is expressed in such apostolic sayings as these: "Him who knew no sin He made to be sin on our behalf; that we might become the righteousness of God in Him" (2 Cor. v. 21); "Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law, having become a curse for us" (Gal. iii. 13); "That by the grace of God He should taste death for every man"; "That through death He might bring to nought him that had the power of death, that is, the devil; and might deliver all them

who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage" (Heb. ii. 9, 14, 15); "Who His own self bare our sins in His body upon the tree, that we, having died unto sins, might live unto righteousness; by whose stripes ye were healed" (1 Peter ii. 24). These sayings cannot mean less than that Jesus, Himself sinless, endured the consequences of sin even unto the sense of desertion by God. He was not held guilty, nor was He punished by God, for these terms cannot apply to the sinless; but God willed that He should experience in its entirety the final issue of sin. How this was possible an endeavour has at least been made to show psychologically; why this, and nothing less, was necessary all theories of the Atonement attempt to prove theologically. This task lies beyond the scope of the present purpose; but the writer feels constrained to add, that his own conviction is ever deepening, that God's holy love required for its own satisfaction that in the very act of divine forgiveness through the Cross the ultimate consequence of sin as expressive of God's judgment (the judgment of holy love) should be made manifest. It was the Holy Father who willed, and it was the Holy Son who chose the drinking of this cup.

(14) The cry which expressed also relieved the agony of soul. The appeal to God like a mighty wind scattered the clouds that hid the sunshine of God. The inward tension relaxed, Jesus realized His bodily need. His complaint "I thirst" (John xix. 28) reminds us of the physical torture in manifold forms which He was enduring. Against the docetism, which assigned to Him only the semblance of a body, this utterance bore witness; and probably it is for this reason that it is reported by the Evangelist. If in the popular use of the phrase "the blood of Jesus" undue emphasis is laid on the physical aspects of the sacrifice of Jesus, in common Christian thought the

completeness of the humanity of Jesus is often ignored, and as a correction of this tendency this saying has still significance. It suggests one consideration which deserves brief mention. In savage races the endurance of bodily need and suffering without a murmur is regarded as heroic. Stoicism made a virtue of indifference to pleasure and pain alike. In the records of Christian martyrdom we meet often with instances of even a morbid craving for physical tortures. In former times there seems to have been a greater insensibility in inflicting as in submitting to pain. This cry of Jesus shows that the sinless perfection did not exclude an acute sensibility to, and did not prohibit a frank acknowledgment of, bodily suffering. It is not a weak sentimentalism which makes us to-day feel so much more keenly for the sufferings of others, even their bodily needs. Jesus felt hunger and thirst, and made known His wants. In His miracles He relieved the sufferings of the body. Even on His Cross He has hallowed bodily wants by sharing them, as in His ministry He consecrated their relief.

(15) Just as the release from spiritual desolation allowed the physical anguish to be felt, so the relief of the bodily need seems to have calmed and soothed the soul of the Crucified. The descent of the Son of God into the depths of desolation and darkness had been accomplished, and the ascent to the heights of the love and the light of God had commenced before physical dissolution. The filial consciousness was restored, and the filial confidence was exercised in His self-committal unto God. "Father, into Thy hands I commend My spirit" (Luke xxiii. 46). It may be doubted whether we are entitled to put into the words the meaning that "Jesus died by a free act of will, handing over His soul to God as a deposit to be kept safe (Grotius, Bengel, Hahn)" (Bruce in *Expositor's Greek Testament*, p. 642).

That Jesus, in obedience to God, chose to die, and did not merely submit to compulsion by men is a truth on which the Fourth Evangelist especially lays stress (John x. 18). But that His death was the necessary conclusion of the physical process already begun, and was not brought about by an act of His will, is more probable. He died willingly; He consented and did not merely submit to His death; but it was not necessary for Him to will to die. Dismissing, then, this explanation, the words may be taken as expressive of filial trust in, and surrender to, God. As such the words are inexpressibly valuable to us as following on the cry of desolation. He did not pass into the mystery of the unseen world under the shadow of God hidden, but in the light of the Father revealed. He did not perish in death. He was saved from death in that when physical dissolution came upon Him, His heart was stayed on God, whose rod and staff did comfort Him.

(16) Whether the word "It is finished" was a sigh of relief or a shout of triumph it is not possible nor necessary for us to decide. That His Passion was ended consoled Him, that His Purpose was accomplished satisfied Him. Both feelings were probably blended; but perhaps the triumph was more prominent than the relief. It is a saying that Christian faith can rest in. Christ by His Spirit is still living, working, and reigning in His Church, and through His Church, in the world; but on Calvary a work was ended that needs no repetition and bears no imitation. "The death that He died, He died unto sin once" (Rom. vi. 10). "This He did once for all, when He offered up Himself" (Heb. vii. 27). When Paul speaks of filling up "that which is lacking of the afflictions of Christ" (Col. i. 24), and desires to know "the fellowship of Christ's sufferings, becoming conformed unto His death" (Phil. iii. 10), he assuredly has no thought of an incomplete sacrifice, or an

unaccomplished salvation. For Christ as for the apostles the propitiaton, expiation, atonement was no permanent, universal process ; it was a solitary single act of the Incarnate Son of God on the Cross of Calvary. The working out of the salvation fills the centuries ; the salvation itself as accomplished in the sacrifice of Christ is, according to His own witness in dying, finished. To the lives of most men death comes as an interruption of effort, arrest of development, severance of affections ; to Jesus it came as a course run, a task done, a trust kept, a triumph won ; for the death itself was the baptism wherewith He was to be baptized, and He was straitened till it was accomplished. In dying He fulfilled His vocation. A. E. GARVIE.

THE DEMONOLOGY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT, ILLUSTRATED FROM THE PROPHETICAL WRITINGS.

I.

IN a former article [1] some reasons were given for believing that the existence of an Old Testament Demonology was to be looked for on *a priori* grounds. Some suggestions were also made to account for the, comparatively speaking, few references to the subject in the Old Testament ; though it was maintained that these references are larger in number than is usually assumed. Moreover, various details of the agreement between Arab, Babylonian and Jewish Demonology were given, in order to show that it is only by means of the comparative method that the many indirect references to the subject in the Old Testament are to be discerned.

It is desired to lay stress on the fact that the passages now to be considered do not in any sense profess to be exhaustive ; they are only given as illustrations of what a deeper study of the subject may be expected to afford. As hinted in the former article, such subjects as Animism, Ancestor-

[1] THE EXPOSITOR, April, 1907.