
A table of contents for *The Expository Times* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[Issue]_[1st page of article].pdf

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THE discovery among the books of the month of a book by Professor Swete is an event of most uncommon interest. For Professor Swete does not publish often; but when he publishes, whatever the subject may be, there always follows a comfortable sense of completeness. His commentaries on St. Mark and the Apocalypse contain everything, and they contain nothing more.

The new book is entitled *The Holy Spirit in the New Testament* (Macmillan; 8s. 6d. net). That is its title and that is its topic—that finally, we say, and nothing more than that. And there is an air of authority also that comes with it. For Professor Swete, who represents the sanity of English scholarship at its best, writes objectively, not once using even the editorial 'we,' but leaving the facts to make their own impression.

His subject is the Holy Spirit in the New Testament, and, as we have said, he does not depart from it. But his book is clear evidence of the presence of the Holy Spirit in the Church and the individual to-day. For it was certainly the Holy Spirit that directed him to make the doctrine of the Holy Spirit his special and lifelong study, that he might give reality again to a doctrine which has become unreal and almost incredible to the general mind through much hysterical handling.

Now there is no part of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit that stands more urgently in need of exposition than the relation of the Spirit to the personal life. And in that part of his subject Professor Swete is most orderly and convincing. It is a development of the doctrine which we owe to St. Paul.

For the Old Testament, with one or two possible exceptions, makes no reference to the ethical action of the Spirit of God on the individual man. The Spirit there stands in relation to Israel, or the Messiah, or the prophetic order. Nor do the Synoptic Gospels carry us much further, for the baptism of the personal life by the Spirit of Christ did not begin till the ministry was ended. The Spirit 'was not yet.' Even the Book of Acts is limited to the effects of the Spirit's coming on the Church and the world. It is St. Paul, says Dr. Swete, to whom the honour belongs of having called attention to the change which the Pentecost made in the possibilities of the individual human life.

The first thing is the psychology of the matter. And that is the first thing with St. Paul. In the earliest of his Epistles (1 Th 5^{23}) he represents man in his completeness as consisting of body, soul, and spirit. Professor Swete does not believe that an actual trichotomy is contemplated here,

but there is at least a mental distinction made between three elements in our nature which are regarded as necessary to its perfection. Of the soul the Apostle says nothing in this connexion beyond contrasting 'psychic' men, those who are not under the control of the Spirit of God, with 'pneumatic' or spiritual men, those who are under that control. It is the human spirit that is the sphere in which the ethical work of the Holy Spirit is carried forward.

Now the Holy Spirit does not create the spirit in man. The spirit is present in every man from the beginning. In each individual of the race, 'the spirit of the man which is in him' (1 Co 2^{11}) answers to the Spirit of God. But although the Spirit of God finds in man a spiritual nature in which it can work, the human spirit is in so imperfect or depraved a condition that a complete renovation, even a re-creation, is necessary.

There must therefore be a moment at which this change begins, or there must be an act in which it is potentially included. That moment and that act, says Professor Swete, are identified with the admission of the convert into the Church, by baptism into the death and resurrection of the Lord Jesus. This is his palingenesia, his second birth, his renovation by the Spirit of Christ, giving the promise of a new life.

Professor Swete is not so foolish as to suggest that the act of baptism is the moment of regeneration without regard to the state of mind of the recipient. The right state of mind is taken for granted, and in the early Church, at least, would almost always be there. Then, although the baptized man may afterwards grieve the Holy Spirit (Eph 4^{30}), outrage Him (He 10^{29}), and even extinguish the Divine fire in his heart (1 Th 5^{19}), yet from that moment he can never again be in the position of one to whom the Spirit has not come. In that moment, with that great sacramental act, the life of the Spirit begins.

But as it proceeds the life of the Spirit encounters a hostile force. St. Paul calls that force the Flesh. And henceforth the history of the Christian life is the history of a lifelong war: 'The flesh lusts against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh, for these powers are opposed to one another' (Gal 5^{7}). What is this flesh? It is not human nature in itself. It is human nature as fallen and sinful. It is the principle of moral decay, the precise opposite in man of the principle of life which is communicated by the Spirit of God. And as the one principle or the other holds the upper hand with a man, that man is said to walk 'after flesh' or 'after Spirit.' Neither the one man nor the other pursues his course of life without resistance from the opposite force. But as the Spirit gains upon the flesh, there grows up within a man the 'mind of the Spirit,' an attitude of thought and will which changes the direction of the inner life, inclining it to the divine and the eternal.

St. Paul lays emphasis upon the warfare between the flesh and the Spirit because of the reality of it, and also because of the intensity of it in the case of his Gentile converts. They live in an atmosphere, and they have been rescued from habits, which make it necessary for them to be ever on their guard against relapsing into the lusts of the flesh. But this warfare is not everything. While defending the human spirit against the flesh, the indwelling Spirit is also busily engaged building up a new life within, and so restoring the human life to the image of God. This is what is called the work of Sanctification, and this is why the Holy Spirit is called the Sanctifier. The Holy Spirit is not the only sanctifier. There are places in the New Testament in which sanctification is connected with our relation to Jesus Christ, and they are perhaps more numerous than those in which sanctification is attributed to the Spirit. Yet there is no term, says Dr. Swete, which so fully covers the effects upon human nature of the presence in it of the Holy Spirit of God as this word Sanctification.

For the first result of the coming of the Spirit is our consecration to the service of God. In this sense the change is merely one of relation and non-moral, so that even the body receives consecration from the Divine indwelling (1 Co 6^{19}), and a heathen who has married a Christian woman is said to be sanctified by the union (1 Co 7^{14}). But the word 'Sanctification' expresses also the actual equipment for service of each of our faculties—that progressive sanctification which gradually brings under its sway every part of our person until the whole man is renewed after the image of Him who created him.

Professor Swete describes the steps of this progressive sanctification. First of all the Holy Spirit creates in us a sense of our filial relation to God. The Spirit in the human heart is 'the spirit of the adoption,' which corresponds with the spirit of sonship in the Christ, and cries in us as in Him, 'Abba, Father.' Thus there is opened a communication between God and the individual life, and the same Spirit that opened it keeps it open. It is through the Christ that we have our access to the Father; but we have it in the Spirit.

With the reopening of this fellowship the love of God is poured into the heart, awakening on man's part a responsive love to God. Hope, peace, and joy follow in the region of the Spirit. And there is a new apprehension of truth, another powerful instrument of Sanctification. The truth is learnt in the experience of the Christian life, but the Holy Spirit is the teacher, leading into all the truth. This apprehension of truth is not merely an addition to our intellectual furniture; it is a power in the life. It makes for righteousness and holiness of truth.

For as the work of Sanctification proceeds it is made known in character and conduct. St. Paul names nine great characteristics of the Christian, calling them the fruit of the Spirit (Gal $5^{22.\ 23}$). The list begins with those which indicate the attitude of the inner self to God. For the Spirit first creates right relations between the soul and God. The fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace. From these it proceeds to remodel personal and social life. For as St. Paul saw the religion of the Spirit, it not only filled men with love, joy, and peace, but it surrounded them with an atmosphere of forbearance, kindness, goodness, honesty of purpose, ability to endure affront, and self-control.

Now it was surely a great thing that a character such as this should have been realized even in part within a generation after the coming of the Spirit, in the midst of heathen surroundings, and in the lives of men who had recently escaped from heathenism. It went far to establish the Divine authority of the gospel—further, indeed, than the greatest of physical miracles. God, it was evident, had set His seal on men who manifested such signs of a supernatural life, some of which could be seen by all observers. To use another Pauline metaphor, they were an open 'letter of Christ,' which all the world could read, written with the Spirit of the living God.

The last metaphor is appropriate. For the last thing is this. The life of the Spirit of Christ in the individual believer is the very life of Christ in him, reproducing the character of Christ by 'forming Christ' within his heart: 'He that is joined to the Lord is one spirit'; there is a spiritual unity between Christ and himself, of which the human spirit is the sphere, and the Spirit of Christ the author. The indwelling of the Spirit is the indwelling of Christ; and Christ, dwelling in the heart by the Spirit, becomes the life of our lives. The inner life is strengthened and enriched until at last it is 'filled unto all the fulness of God.'

The same month in which we receive from Cambridge Professor Swete's book on the Holy Spirit, we receive also a book scarcely less notable from Oxford. And the Oxford book follows on just where the Cambridge book leaves off, as if it had been written for the purpose. The author is

Dr. R. L. Ottley, Canon of Christ Church, and Regius Professor of Pastoral Theology. The title of the book is *Christian Ideas and Ideals* (Longmans; 7s. 6d. net).

It is a volume of Christian ethic. And inasmuch as the ethic of the Christian life is the fruit of the Spirit, every volume of Christian ethic may be said to follow after a volume on the Holy Spirit. If Professor Ottley had proceeded to describe the various Christian virtues, he would have fitted in well enough with Professor Swete. But there would have been no surprise in that. The surprise is that Professor Ottley, dealing with the great ethical ideas of Christianity, with those principles of conduct which issue in the several Christian virtues, begins with the idea of the indwelling of the Spirit of God—begins with that idea and ends with it, his whole book being an exposition of it, and all other ideas falling into their place within it.

'The supreme end and aim of Christianity,' says Professor Ottley, 'is the communication of power. The gospel is not merely a revelation of the Divine nature—rich, satisfying, many-sided, and corresponding profoundly to the complex needs of humanity; nor merely a system of ethics—spiritual, comprehensive, and in the truest sense practical. It is a principle of life, of energy, of movement; it heightens vitality; it makes for efficiency in work and for greatness of character. The gospel is *the power of God unto salvation*. The kingdom of God is not in word, but *in power*.'

Now the point is that this power is not communicated from without. It is part of the man's own personality. It is not a gift bestowed upon a man in order to meet an emergency. It is there before the emergency arises, ready to be drawn upon at will. There is a gift, but it is the Holy Spirit, given once for all, and the power is the might of the Spirit working in human hearts and strengthening them to receive, to know, to act, and to endure.

When St. Paul makes his prayer for the Ephesian Church, what does he pray for? Not only, or even chiefly, the spiritual enlightenment of his converts, not their protection and support amid the fiery trials of life in a great heathen city, not the growth in them of the graces of brotherly love and unity of spirit. What he prays for is the gift of the indwelling presence of Deity. For the Spirit of God, making for Himself a habitation in the inmost recesses of a man's personality, is more than knowledge, or resistance, or fellowship. It is power.

It is therefore no surprise to discover that the desire of power has a place in Christian ethic. There is a word in the New Testament which signifies to be ambitious (φιλοτιμεῖσθαι). It is one of those words which have been rescued from base associations and ennobled by the gospel. Its use is peculiar to St. Paul. For it is in the writings of St. Paul that the word 'power' continually recurs as a kind of watchword or keynote. Three times St. Paul employs the word, each time giving it its full value in the suggestion of power as a legitimate object of attainment, but each time with a difference. So that when the three occasions are taken together, St. Paul's use of this one word covers the whole round of practical Christian life.

The first occasion is in writing to the Thessalonians (1 Th 4^{11}). 'We exhort you, he says, to make it your aim (φιλοτιμεῖσθαι) to be quiet and do your own business.' The next occasion is in his letter to the Romans (15^{20}). Here he describes himself as making it his aim to preach the gospel not where Christ was already named. The third occasion is in his Second Epistle to the Corinthians, where he says, 'We make it our aim, whether at home or absent, to be well-pleasing unto him.'

Canon Ottley does not suggest that the three occasions were chosen deliberately to cover the whole round of spiritual activity. What he sug-

gests is more important than that. It is that to the mind of this apostle, the apostle who felt himself to be a living monument of God's redemptive might, and whose characteristic message to Churches and individuals is, 'Be strong' (1 Co 16^{13}, Eph 6^{10}, 2 Ti 2^{1}), this word carried the immediate thought of power, and whenever it was used, it was used to determine one of three important stages in the progress of the moral life.

In the first use of it the man's thoughts are turned upon himself; in the second they are turned upon the world; in the third they are turned upon God. The Christian has his own business. Has he chosen it, or has it been thrust upon him? It may not greatly matter. He has his own business, the occasion for the use of his own faculties. These faculties are not the gift of the Holy Spirit, but as certainly are they not suspended thereby, or any particular characteristic of them obliterated. Rather are they sharpened, differentiated, brought individually to the manifestation of the fulness of their power. And as he uses his own faculties to do his own business, he does not needlessly disturb others.

The next time that St. Paul uses the word he looks away from himself. For the man in whom the Spirit dwells is not encouraged to live in a small circle of personal or family interests. He does actually live in a world of sin, in a world that needs a gospel. He is ambitious of power, and in order to obtain it he must no doubt make it his aim to train his faculties. But when they have been trained, how is he to use them? Not merely in providing for his own and for those of his own household, but in giving to others that very gift which has given him the use of his faculties and the possession of his power—the gift of the gospel. He must preach the gospel, because it is 'the power of God unto salvation.' And he must preach it in his own way, in his own circumstances, not imitating another man's method in whom the same Spirit of God has produced a diverse operation; nor following another into his field of operation, but finding his own work, whether in regions where Christ has not already been named, or in those regions where His name has been named so often that it has become a hardening commonplace.

On the third occasion St. Paul looks to God: 'We make it our aim, whether at home or absent, to be well-pleasing unto him.' For this is the home to which the spirit of man, which has had its faculties disciplined by doing its own business and then goes out to preach the gospel to a world of sin, ever returns for rest and renewing. To be well-pleasing to Him. This was the purpose for which man was made at the beginning: this is the purpose which the new man fulfils at the end.

There is a discussion on another page of the proper translation of St. John 14^{1}. The translation in the Authorized and Revised English Versions is, 'Ye believe in God, believe also in me.' The translation of the American Revised Version, called the 'Standard,' is 'Believe in God, believe also in me.' Other translations are considered. And at last the conclusion is reached that perhaps the most probable translation of all is the translation of the Sinaitic Syriac, 'Believe in God and ye believe in me.'

Is that possible? We do not mean the translation, for certainly the translation is possible, but the doctrine. Is it possible that our Lord said, 'Believe in God, and, as an inevitable consequence, ye believe in me'? If He did, what a doctrine it is. What an apologetic for Christianity. If the doctrine is true, the doctrine that belief in Jesus as Son of God and Saviour of the world is the natural and inevitable result of believing in God, what have our professional apologists been doing that they have not used this overwhelming argument for the propagation of the gospel?

And it is assuredly true, whether this is the best translation of the first verse of the fourteenth

chapter of St. John or not. It is the meaning of other passages of St. John's Gospel, in the Greek of which there is no ambiguity. Is it not the meaning of Jn 5^{23}, 'He that honoureth not the Son honoureth not the Father which sent him'? Is it not the meaning of Jn 6^{45}, 'Every one that hath heard from the Father, and hath learned, cometh unto me'? And most unmistakably of all, is it not the meaning of Jn 8^{42}, 'Jesus said unto them, If God were your Father, ye would love me'? And not only is it found in the Fourth Gospel. It is found in St. John's Epistles. It is found in all the Scriptures of the Old Testament and of the New. It is the one thing concerning Himself, embracing all other things, which Jesus drew from the Scriptures as He walked with the two disciples towards Emmaus. It is a doctrine that commends itself to every man's conscience in the sight of God the moment his eyes are opened to it.

But we must be careful. These words may seem too rhetorical yet to eyes that are only opening. And the issues are so great that no risks must be run. 'Believe in God, and ye believe in me'—if any man does not believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God and Saviour of the world, he does not believe in God—that is the truth, in its most sober and simple clothing. Let us justify our declaration that the Bible contains it, and the conscience approves of it.

And in order to do so let us notice first of all *how easy it is to believe in God.* No doubt there have been unbelievers always, but they have always been in the minority, a poor foolish fraction of mankind. 'When I look up into thy heavens'—men have always said '*thy* heavens.' And when they have looked down into the earth they have said the same: 'The earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof.'

'When you were children,' said the late Professor Elmslie (you will find the passage in his *Memoir and Sermons*, edited by Dr. Robertson Nicoll, p. 81)—'When you were children, some time or other, I suppose, in your young lives, you got hold of a flower-seed and planted it in a pot of moist earth, and set it in the sunniest corner of your room. Morning after morning, when you awoke, you ran to see if the flower had begun to grow. At last your eagerness was rewarded by the sight of some tiny leaves which had sprung up during one night. Then the stalk appeared, frail and tender, and then more leaves, and buds, and branchlets, till at length there stood, blooming before you, a fair and fragrant flower. Who made it? Somebody worked to produce that flower. It could not make itself. The dead earth could not shape that lovely leaf; the bright sunshine could not paint those tendrils. A deep-thinking man, when he sees these wonderful things, must ask himself, Who fashioned them? Not the sunshine nor the air, but God, willed that that plant should grow. God toiled to make the plant—in your room, at your side.'

The argument is intelligible; it is unanswerable; and for nearly all of us it is enough. We have only to look up into the heavens; we have only to look down into the earth, and we find God. Even the difficulties of God's providence have not led to the denial of His existence. The great problem of the ancient Hebrews was the injustice, or at least the unjustifiableness, of unmerited suffering. It was the great problem of the ancient Hindus also. It is the great problem of Hebrews and Hindus still. But who will call the Hebrews or the Hindus atheists? It is easy to believe in God. That is the first thing.

But the next thing is, *how difficult it is to believe in Christ.* It was difficult for the disciples, and it is difficult for us.

It was not always difficult for the disciples. It was not difficult when they saw His glory at Cana of Galilee. It was not difficult for the three chosen disciples when they were with Him in the Mount. It was not difficult for the disciples to

believe in Him when they stood by the tomb of Lazarus and the four-days-dead came forth, bound hand and foot with grave-clothes. It was not difficult at the descent of the Mount of Olives, when 'the whole multitude of the disciples rejoiced and began to praise God with a loud voice for all the mighty works which they had seen, saying, Blessed is the King that cometh in the name of the Lord, peace in heaven and glory in the highest.' It was not difficult then. But sometimes it was difficult.

It was difficult in the Upper Room. For the triumph of the Entry was all forgotten in the awe and mystery of the words which He was speaking about desertion and death. The ring of the 'Hosanna in the Highest' was far away now, as Jesus, being troubled in spirit, testified and said, 'One of you shall betray me.' It was difficult to believe in Him when they found themselves scattered, as He had prophesied, every man to his own; when the chief priests and rulers condemned Him to death; when Pilate delivered Him to their will; when He was crucified between two malefactors; when He was dead and laid in the tomb. It was difficult for the disciples to believe in Him in all the hour of the power of darkness.

And it is difficult for us to believe in Christ. For it all occurred so long ago, and we have so very little historical imagination. It all occurred so long ago, and so naturally, so humanly, so finally. 'In the lone Syrian town he lies'—is it not so? Are we really able to believe that He rose again from the dead and that He lives? That He lives? Do we not remember how near the end of his life it was that Dr. Dale of Birmingham made the discovery — Dr. Dale of Birmingham, the preacher of the gospel, endowed also with the gift of historical imagination—do we not remember how late in life it was, and with what a surprise the discovery came upon him?

And then there are the miracles. Do we really believe in miracles now? Or are we only saying angrily that we do? Do we believe that He was born of a virgin, or is it a relief to be told that the Virgin Birth is not an essential article? 'Go and tell John what things ye have seen and heard; the blind receive their sight, the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear, the dead are raised up, the poor have good tidings preached to them.' It was enough for John and John's disciples. But was He not simply in advance of the art of healing of His day? Was He not simply able to anticipate the facts which psychology has now made the common property of us all?

But He claimed to be the Son of God. For there is no reasonable doubt that He did make that claim, and that the claim meant nothing less than Deity. The Son of God on earth, in human form, the Son of God dying, the Son of God dead!

Is that all? No, that is not all. There is the demand that He makes upon us. 'Now there went with him great multitudes: and he turned and said unto them, If any man cometh unto me, and hateth not his own father, and mother, and wife, and children, and brothers, and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple.' There are those who are undisturbed when He makes Himself equal with God, but turn back and walk no more with Him as soon as they hear Him make a moral demand like that. Or again, 'If any man will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross daily, and follow me.' That saying is the parting of the ways to others. There are those, we say, who accept the Divinity, but deny the right of God Himself to say 'hate' to any man on earth. And there are yet more who accept the theology and are untroubled by the morality so long as it costs nothing in the application of it; but words like 'deny himself' are more than they can hear. The Sermon on the Mount is delightful in its extravagance, until the day comes upon which the hungry enemy is found waiting to be fed. How difficult it is then to believe in Christ.

And yet there is one great difficulty more. It is the difficulty that all this structure of perplexing theology and heart-searching ethic seems unnecessary. God is a Father. An earthly father is content with a reasonable obedience, and if his son has transgressed he is satisfied if he comes to him in sincere repentance, and gladly forgives him. Is God less willing to forgive? Why should we first lay the burden of a standard of life upon men's shoulders greater than they are able to bear, and then demand an atonement for the transgression of it, and that not even from themselves, but from the Son of God? How easy it is to believe in God, how difficult to believe in Christ.

But *it is impossible to believe in God without as a consequence believing in Christ.* 'Believe in God, and ye believe in me.'

For the God we believe in must be good, and He must take some interest in us. He must be good. And how good must He be? He must be altogether righteous. There must be no iniquity in Him. 'God is light, and in him is no darkness at all.' That is the God we believe in.

A little book has just been published with the title of *Karma and Redemption*. Its author is Professor A. G. Hogg, of the Christian College in Madras. Its object is to commend to the Hindus a better religion than that which they acquiesce in under this name of Karma. And what is that better religion? 'It seems to me,' says Professor Hogg, 'that the secret spring of real living religion anywhere can be nothing but a simplicity of assurance that the supreme religious Reality is humanly satisfying, or in the words of the Christian apostle that "God is light, and in him is no darkness at all." No message less tremendous than this seems worth erecting into a religion. No faith less glorious than this is big enough to live upon.' The God whom we believe in must be good.

But He must also take some interest in us. Now, if He takes an interest in us, it must be to make us good as He is. It cannot be less than that. It must be in order that we also may be light, that in us also there may be no darkness at all.

Clearly, then, it is not enough that He should be ready to forgive us whenever we come to Him in repentance. Nothing short of fulness of fellowship is enough: nothing short of actual indwelling—we in Him, and He in us. And as no other way has apparently been thought of by God or devised by man to effect this fellowship except the one way of the Word made flesh, belief in God involves belief in Jesus Christ.

That way has actually effected the fellowship. The Word made flesh brought the spiritual or sinless into contact with the unspiritual or sinful; and the victory of the Cross left the spiritual in possession. And not only is this the one way that has been suggested, and not only is it the way in which fellowship between God and man has actually been accomplished, it is also the only way that could have been suggested or that could have accomplished it. For the fellowship between God and men must be complete. And in order to make the fellowship complete, either we must ascend to Him or He must descend to us.

Why, then, should we stumble at the miracles which He did? If the Son of Man had to descend from heaven, why should we expect that He would bring no trailing clouds of glory with Him? And if He descended, why should we hesitate to believe that when His work on earth was done He should ascend again? We place our emphasis on the Resurrection as if it were the crowning and incredible miracle. The crowning miracle is the fellowship. And the fellowship is not incredible. It is a fact of experience, widespread and undeniable. If God, in the fulfilment of His great interest in us, was in Christ reconciling the world to Himself, the Resurrection was the most natural event in the reconciliation.

What remains of the difficulties of believing in Christ? There yet remains, perhaps, the ethical demand which He makes upon us.

We have called that demand appalling. But is it more appalling than the demand of the God of Abraham? Jesus said, 'If any man cometh unto me, and hateth not his own . . . children.' What did the God of Abraham say? He said, 'Take now thy son, thine only son, whom thou lovest, even Isaac, and get thee into the land of Moriah, and offer him there upon one of the mountains which I will tell thee of.' Do we answer that the God of Abraham is not our God? If we do, we do not mean it. All we mean is that the *form* of the sacrifice which God demands of us is not the form of the sacrifice which He demanded of Abraham. But the sacrifice itself is the same. It certainly cannot be less. For if the fellowship which He offers is perfect, it must be accepted by us whole-heartedly. No one can ever stand between us and Him. Every affection, as well as every duty, is to be offered on the altar of love to the Highest. 'I could not love thee, dear, so much, loved I not honour more.' Shall we not say—'loved I not *Jesus* more'? It is no parody; it is the lifting of the familiar sentiment up to the final reality.

The Pilgrim's Progress.

By the Rev. John Kelman, M.A., D.D., Edinburgh.

Hopeful's Story of his Soul.

It is noteworthy that in John Bunyan's experimental conversations and narratives, he does not linger upon the beginning or the end, but expands at great length the intermediate times of struggle and approach. The beginning gives its bare catalogue of sins, without any suspicion of longing or of afterthought, such as is apt to make narratives of spiritual experience dangerously suggestive. The end is brief, and in these close-packed paragraphs of spiritual victory we have the richest and most wonderful of all Bunyan's masterpieces (cf. the matchless conversation at the table in the House Beautiful, Faithful's closing sentence regarding the Valley of the Shadow, and the whole structure of *Grace Abounding*, on whose experiences all Bunyan's literary conversations are built). Here also, as in these other conversations, the bulk of the narrative is occupied with the struggles of the intermediate period. These may be divided into three parts, viz.:—

1. The Awakening of Conscience.

This Hopeful traces to his meeting with Christian and Faithful in Vanity Fair. There is a touch here of Bunyan's characteristic genius, in the concentrated significance of one sentence especially. Hopeful found by considering the things which he heard 'of beloved Faithful that was put to death for his faith . . . that the end of these things is death.' To the careless eye it would seem that the end of faith is death, judging by the fate of Faithful. But the impression made on Hopeful is precisely the opposite. It was Vanity Fair, and not its martyr, that was really under the doom. For the time being, death seized upon the immortal, and let the mortal go. But so great was the impression upon Hopeful of Faithful's hold upon immortality that he saw through the delusion and understood the secret of eternal life. Thus may death itself overreach its aim, and betray its secret of immortality, in the lives of followers of Him who has, through death, brought life and immortality to light.

In simple and graphic language, Hopeful goes on to describe his treatment of these first convictions. His Hopefulness, not yet grown wise and deep enough to deal with the facts of life, 'was not willing to know the evil of sin nor the damnation that follows,' and so he shut his eyes against the light. This is that vain optimism that refuses to face the facts, waiting as yet for its transformation into the blessed optimism that 'has faced life and is glad.'