knowledge, and eternal life knowledge of God. The Greek sought this wisdom. He longed for some surer word than his own reasonings, some Divine Word (Simmias in the *Phædo*). This divine word has been uttered in Christ. None need now walk in darkness.

II. CHRIST DELIVERS FROM HELPLESSNESS.—In the night 'no man can work.' Fogs are more perilous to mariners than storms. The nations without Christ 'sit in darkness,' a picture of helplessness. Christian and Hopeful in By-path Meadow must needs sit till daybreak, for they could neither regain the lost road themselves, nor help Vain-Confidence who had fallen into a pit.

III. CHRIST BRINGS GLADNESS.—Joy accompanies light. Many things bring sorrow, but none so much as sin. Even to sinners Christ brings joy. It is said that when Adam and Eve were cast out of Paradise, as they sat bemoaning their fate, night came on. Thinking the sun had withdrawn his light for ever, they clasped each other in an agony of despair, and spent the night in tears. But when the sun came back, they dried their eyes and said one to another, 'Weeping may endure for a night, but joy cometh in the morning.'

IV. CHRIST SAVES FROM FEAR OF DEATH.—The darkest part of this world is the way out. In Tennyson's 'Gareth and Lynette,' the most formidable warrior to be encountered is indifferently called Night and Death. All others who have explored the region of death have never come back to bring us word of that they have seen. Christ has. He tells us that it is only the dark passage leading to our Father's 'many mansions.'

Contributions and Comments.

Fatherhood and Sonship.

WITH reference to the comment by Rev. William Newman Hall, M.A., on Eph. iv. 6 in January EXPOSITORY TIMES, it may be useful to call attention to a distinction which removes the difficulties that some theologians feel in admitting God's universal fatherhood, and man's universal sonship. The relation between father and son may be regarded from two points of view, natural and ethical. From the former point of view, the natural relation, which includes dependence of existence of son on father, affinity of nature of son and father, and thereby possibility of personal union in love and service of son and father, man's universal sonship and God's universal fatherhood may be, must be unhesitatingly affirmed. The latter point of view, the ethical, must, however, not be confused with this. Here consciousness and relation are of primary importance. Here the possibility of personal union begins to be realised. Man knows himself to be the son of God, and wills to be the son of God in trustful dependence, loyal affection, and ready obedience. Natural sonship is but a preparation for ethical sonship. But this ethical sonship is not universal; it is limited to those who in Christ are living unto God. It is God's will for all, but not all mankind has fulfilled that will.

If we are but to admit this distinction between natural sonship and ethical sonship, the latter narrower *in extension*, but richer *in intention*, it may be asked, Is there any corresponding difference in the divine fatherhood? It need hardly be said that the paternal relation of God to man is ethically perfect, alike to those who have reached ethical sonship and to those who know only natural sonship. Yet the ethical perfection of the relation necessitates an ethical distinction. There can be no confusion of moral distinctions in God's relations to men. He loves all; He cares for all; He wills the good of all; but He cannot treat the sinner as He treats the saint. He is grieved by the one, He delights in the other; His love is restrained from full expression by the one; it can flow out freely to the other.

ALFRED E. GARVIE.

Macduff.

Acts ix. 7.

IN the only commentary on this verse at present to my hand, I find the following note on 'ἀκούοντες μὲν τῆς φωνῆς,' and Acts xxii. 9, 'οὐκ ἤκουσαν τὴν φωνήν.'

'The two passages contain a seeming con-

tradiction, not a real one; in the first a genitive is put after ἀκούω, in the latter an accusative; now ἀκούω with a genitive means simply to *hear*, ἀκούω with an accusative means to *hear and understand*; we may conclude therefore that Paul's companions *heard* the sound of the voice, but *did not understand* the words which were uttered.' After careful considerations, I think the above explanation an impossible one. In the fourth verse of this passage St. Luke says, 'He heard a voice (φωνὴν) saying unto him, etc.' In the other passage St. Paul says of himself, 'I heard a voice (φωνῆς) saying unto me.' In the first passage the men stood speechless, hearing the voice (φωνῆς). In the other, 'they heard not the voice (φωνὴν) of Him that spake unto me.'

Here the usage of genitive or accusative would seem to be quite indifferent (see also Acts xi. 7, 'I heard also a voice (φωνῆς) saying unto me, Arise, Peter').

Is there an explanation of the discrepancy. St. Paul states that a great light shone about him. He does not here state that he himself saw the Lord. But he says so elsewhere (1 Cor. ix. 1, xv. 8), and it must have been on this occasion. St. Luke says the men saw no one; St. Paul says they saw the light. So far we have no contradiction. Did the men hear nothing? St. Paul says, 'They heard not the voice of Him that spake to me.' That does not imply they did not hear St. Paul addressing some one. It would rather imply they did. We would therefore translate the verse under consideration, 'The men stood speechless, hearing the *speaking*, but seeing no man' (that is, to whom the speaking could be addressed). Is there warrant for this translation? In John x. 3 we have, 'The sheep hear his voice (genitive), and he calleth his own sheep by name.' That is, they listen when he speaks to them.

John xviii. 37: 'To this end am I come into the world, that I may bear witness of the truth. Every one that is of the truth heareth My voice.' This can only mean 'listens to My speech.'

John v. 24, 25: 'Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that heareth My word, and believeth Him that sent Me, hath eternal life. . . . The hour cometh, *and now is*, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God: and they that hear shall live.' This surely also means, as before, 'the dead (those that have not yet attained to life in Christ) shall listen to Him speaking to them.'

Rev. iii. 20: 'I stand at the door and knock: if any man hear My voice (listen to Me when I speak) I will come in unto him.'

On the other hand, when the accusative is used the emphasis is in the sound made (compare Matt. xi. 9; Rev. i. 10, iv. 1).

Hence we see that St. Luke telling the story emphasises the fact that St. Paul heard the *sound* of a voice which said certain things to him, and to which he gave audible answer. The men heard the speaking, but saw no one. The speaking they heard was St. Paul's. St. Paul, on the other hand, emphasises the fact that he heard speech addressed to him, but says the men did not hear even the sound of the voice of Him who was talking to him. The men must, of course, have heard St. Paul speak. The reality to St. Paul was the bodily presence of the Crucified One in blinding glory and His voice in human accents; to the men it was a bright light and an apparent conversation with no one. T.

Christ's use of the Word 'Kingdom.'

I DO not wish to follow Dr. Jannaris into a discussion of passages, which, as he says, may be influenced by long and stereotyped habit of thought. I will merely quote one in which it seems to me that that has no room for play, in which Christ clearly defines His position, and which may therefore be taken to explain all the rest. I refer to John xviii. 33–38. In it Jesus is on His trial before Pilate, who puts to Him the question: 'Art thou the King of the Jews.' Jesus replies: 'My kingdom is not of this world. . . . Now is My kingdom not from hence.' Pilate then puts the question: 'Art thou a king then?' Jesus replies: 'Thou sayest that I am a king. To this end have I been born, and to this end am I come into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth.' In this passage Jesus claims to be a spiritual king, and to have a spiritual kingdom. But it is manifest that Jesus uses the word kingdom (βασιλεία), and Pilate understands it, as the abstract of king (βασιλεύς), not of Lord (κύριος). To show that He uses it in the latter sense in any other passage, equally clear evidence must be adduced.

JOHN ROBSON.

Aberdeen.