

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

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.

MANY books about the Future have been published since the War began. Two of them are of supreme value, the volume called *Immortality*, edited by Canon STREETER, and the volume with the title of *The World to Come and Final Destiny*, written by the Rev. J. H. LECKIE, D.D., and just published by Messrs. T. & T. Clark (10s. net). Both volumes are written by men who have given to this difficult subject special study, and both are written with an easy mastery of the English tongue. The sense of style is perhaps more appreciable in Dr. LECKIE'S book, but Canon STREETER and Mr. EMMET, to name only two of the writers of the other, are quite incapable of writing an infelicitous sentence. The two volumes agree also in another and even more momentous matter.

—

Their writers take it for granted that no one will be finally lost. They take it for granted. It has become a settled fact for them and for every one of them. They understand that it has become an assured belief for the generation they live in.

—

Is it the War that has done it? The men who have been killed have been good and bad. They have had the name of God on their tongue, some reverently, some blasphemously. But because they have been taken suddenly, and because they have died for their country, nobody has been able to send them, after death, the one to heaven and the

other to hell. Poet or preacher, there has scarcely been a moment's hesitation in saying of every one of them :

And when He saw his work on earth was done,
He gently called to him, My son, my son,
I need thee for a greater work than this.
Thy faith, thy zeal, thy fine activities
Are worthy of My larger liberties.

Then drew him with the hand of welcoming
grace,
And side by side they climbed the heavenly
ways.

—

But the War has not done it all. For a long time before the War poets had written quite unanimously of their confidence that no one would be finally lost. And before the War preachers had been as unanimous in availing texts that seemed to speak of everlasting punishment. The poets are interpreters to men of their own minds. The preachers are interpreters of the mind of God. Both have to adapt their interpretation to the spirit of their time. And both had already recognized that the spirit of their time—not the worldly but the Christian spirit—could not receive the doctrine of everlasting punishment.

—

Now the preacher's difficulty is that that doctrine is in the Bible. It is not in the Bible quite so frequently as it is popularly supposed to be.

There has been debate about the Apostle Paul, but for some time the opinion has been pretty nearly a settled one among scholars that Paul was a universalist. Of the other writers there has never been much dispute. The difficulty is that our Lord Himself seems to have declared the doom of the lost to be for ever. And that difficulty remains.

It remains in one passage. All the other references it seems to be possible to understand without the necessity of finding the doctrine of everlasting punishment in them. It is the passage about the sheep and the goats in the twenty-fifth chapter of St. Matthew.

Mr. EMMET in *Immortality* could not get over that passage. He resorted to the startling measure of claiming the right to go beyond Christ. It was credible to Christ that those on His left hand should go away into everlasting punishment prepared for the devil and his angels. It is not credible to us. We must go beyond Christ. How is that in our power? Christ Himself has put it into our power. It is the Spirit of Christ in us that has made it impossible for us to believe in everlasting punishment. Mr. EMMET looks upon it as one of the greater works which He said we should be able to do after (and because) He had gone to the Father.

Dr. LECKIE is just as much arrested by the passage in St. Matthew as Mr. EMMET. But he takes another way with it. He believes that Jesus never uttered the objectionable words.

Dr. LECKIE does not deny the genuineness of the whole passage. He says: 'There is, indeed, no apocalyptic passage in the Gospels that is more certainly interwoven with elements that are characteristic of the Saviour.' But he thinks that it may not be a verbatim report of His words. 'It is an elaborate piece of literary apocalypse, highly allusive, and showing an intimate acquaintance with the Jewish books. It is evidently founded

on the Judgment scene in the *Book of Enoch*, and might almost be reconstructed, so far as its imagery and accessories go, out of the "revelation" literature.'

And as for its closing declaration, 'These shall go away into eternal punishment, but the righteous into eternal life,' that, says Dr. LECKIE, 'is probably no part of the parable. It seems to be a comment of the Evangelist or of some later scribe; since it really distracts attention from the main purpose of the passage, which is not to declare the duration of punishment, but to explain the principle of judgment.'

Now both these remedies are somewhat desperate. Are we bound to them? There are two considerations.

The first is that Jesus was a prophet. Now the prophet has nothing to do with time or place. He speaks in the name of God, to whom one day is as a thousand years and a thousand years are as one day, and who is as ready to build Jerusalem in England's green and pleasant land as in the land of Canaan. When Isaiah represented God as saying, 'Before they call, I will answer; and while they are yet speaking, I will hear,' he did not mean to assert that God answers every prayer the moment it is uttered. He spoke in terms of time, but his thought was of certainty. When the Syro-Phoenician woman came to Jesus with her prayer, He answered her never a word. She prayed again; again He put her off. A third prayer was needed; time was spent; the disciples were becoming annoyed, 'Send her away, she crieth after us.' But the answer to her prayer was absolutely sure from the first. Jesus also, with this example, could say, 'Before they call, I will answer; and while they are yet speaking, I will hear.'

We are quite out of it therefore when we pursue the Greek word *aionios* through all its occurrences to find out whether it means everlasting or not. The idea of time is not in all Christ's thought. It

is the idea of certainty. What He says He says of course in language that will be intelligible to His hearers. What He means to say, that shall be intelligible to us all, is that sin is certainly followed by retribution. He knows the Universe, and He knows the God of the Universe, and He warns those who hear Him that well-doing will assuredly be rewarded and ill-doing as assuredly punished. It is no more, though it is more authoritative, than St. Paul's, 'be not deceived, God is not mocked; whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap.'

That is the first thing. The second is that He was speaking to the religious people of His day. Now we have to realize that our Lord's whole ministry was determined by the fact that society was divided sharply into two classes, the righteous and the sinners; that the righteous counted themselves all right simply because they observed outwardly the precepts of the Mosaic Law, and that they despised the sinners, telling them that there was no hope for them either in this world or in the world to come: 'This people which knoweth not the Law is cursed.'

Jesus set His face against that attitude. He told some of His parables directly to contradict it—the Parable of the Two Sons, the Parable of the Pharisee and the Publican, the Parable of the Prodigal Son. In the twenty-fifth chapter of St. Matthew we see Him again before those persons who trusted in themselves that they were righteous and despised others, telling them that the principle upon which the judgment of God rested was conduct. And their conduct was discovered by their attitude to these despised sinners. Treat these 'sinners' well, He said, and you will hear God's voice saying, 'Come, ye blessed'; treat them ill and you will receive the due reward of your deeds.

Sometimes He seemed to condemn all the righteous together. 'Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites.' He does not do so here.

He simply states the principle of God's judgment, and leaves every man to search his own conscience with it. But just as He is speaking to the righteous, so is He speaking of them. We are therefore entirely out of it again when we apply His language to the sinners. It is the sinners that He is careful for. They are His Brethren. No doubt they are unworthy; but He is careful for the least, the most unworthy of them all. He is sending none of them to Gehenna. He is sending those righteous persons there who despise and neglect them.

The foregoing Notes were written, and Phillips Brooks's *Essays and Addresses* was being run through for another purpose, when this passage leaped into sight (it occurs in the Essay on the Teaching of Religion): 'When men cry out against the teaching of an everlasting hell to which they have long listened, nothing could be more mistaken than to try to win their faith by a mere sweeping aside of the whole truth of retribution; nothing could be more futile than to try to make them believe in God by stripping the God we offer them of His divine attributes of judgment and discrimination. But if there comes, as there must come, out of the tumult a deeper sense of the essential, the eternal connection between character and destiny; if men looking deeper into spiritual life are taught to see that the wrath of God and the love of God are not contradictory but the inseparable utterances of the one same nature; if punishment be fastened close to sin as the shadow to the substance, able to go, *certain* to go, where sin can go *and nowhere else*—then the tumult will bring a peace of deeper and completer faith. But surely it will not be easier for a man to believe the new and deep than the old crude doctrine. It will lay an even deeper and more awful burden on his conscience. It will make life more and not less solemn, when men come to see and feel the punishment *in* the sin than when they listened for the threats of punishment as men at sea listen for the breakers on the shore while they are sailing in smooth waters,

which give them no intimation of how far away or near the breakers are.'¹

'I believe that if God could end such things as the horror of war and destroy the world's evil to-morrow He would, and that the simple reason why He doesn't is that He can't. I can see nothing else to believe and still keep my sanity and rationality. Can you?'

What are you to do with a man who puts a question like that? You answer him Yes, and you become like him. You answer him No, and you make him wise in his own conceit. We hear of reconstruction after the war. The most urgent form of reconstruction in a case like this is reconstruction of the man himself.

It is Mr. Edmund Henry REEMAN. His book, which has just been published by Messrs. Hurst & Blackett (3s. 6d. net), has a question for title: *Do We Need a New Idea of God?* The answer is, of course, in the affirmative. We are always in need of a new idea of God. It is the duty of every generation to form its own idea of God. If it takes over the idea of some other generation, the idea of God will be of little use to it. Interpretation is the first duty of the teachers of every time. And interpretation means the discovery and delivery of an idea of God that can be received by 'the modern mind.'

Now in our time the modern mind is both a scientific and a democratic mind. And Mr. REEMAN takes full account of both. The scientific mind, he says, has a scientific conception of life which demands a scientific conception of God. And it must be new, wholly new. 'For the simple fact is that between two such absolutely irreconcilable ideas as the newer scientific conception of life and the older theological thought of God there can be no compromise. And since it is impossible logically to believe both, we must choose one or the other.'

¹ Phillips Brooks, *Essays and Addresses*, 50.

The democratic mind also demands a new conception of God. Mr. REEMAN is interested in science; he is much more interested in democracy. If science calls for a reconstruction of the old idea of God, democracy demands an entirely new God. 'The most urgent and stupendous problem for modern theology and religion centres in the one question—Can the thought of God be anyhow reshaped in terms of democratic outreach and in such a manner as to be harmonious therewith and to serve as an interpretation of democracy? Is the conception of a democratic God anyhow possible? And, if so, what sort of a God will it be that such a conception will give us?'

The answer is a God, if it can be called a God, that is purely mechanical or material. Mr. REEMAN calls it a Life-Force. For 'at the core of the universe's life' there exists 'a mighty, mystic power which, to avoid the use of terms that may confuse our thought by their ordinary association, let us call a Life-Force. Throughout all its manifold activities the universe as it is known to the consciousness of man everywhere reveals not only initial impulse, but a continual urge. There is something back of all that we see and know that is for ever pushing things on, and that is everywhere and all the time present. It is the inner essence of all evolving life and the vitality and stability of every law by which life is anywhere and everywhere sustained. It is present in every one of us, and, though we cannot tell for what it may be, it is using us as one medium of its activity. Sometimes it would almost seem, as George Bernard Shaw somewhere says, as if it were taking us by the scruffs of our little necks and compelling and coercing us in spite of ourselves to serve its tasks and purposes. It is this Life-Force in man that has made him what he is, and all that he is. Not only are we identified with this Life-Force in the most vital sense and altogether dependent upon it, but in a profoundly true sense WE ARE THE LIFE-FORCE OPERATING IN A CERTAIN DIRECTION.'

The capital letters with which that paragraph

ends are Mr. REEMAN'S. And the sentence deserves capital letters. For this is Mr. REEMAN'S God. It is evident that what we need is not a new idea of God, but a new God. But what has this new God to do with democracy? Mr. REEMAN answers, Everything. He *is* democracy. 'So then'—these are his words—'it becomes no less true to say that God is democracy than to say that God is love, since in the realm of social consciousness democracy represents a development no less definite and important than that which love represents in the realm of ethical qualities.'

That sentence shows us where we are. Mr. REEMAN wants a God who is scientific and democratic; he is not looking for a God who is ethical. Science and democracy together make up progress, and progress is Mr. REEMAN'S name for human welfare. The Christian God is a God of love, and Mr. REEMAN has no place for Him. He does find room for good-will between man and man, 'a generous good-will'; but it is the outcome, not of the ethical choice of love, but of the urge of the Life-Force which he can neither obey nor disobey, but simply run on before.

And now also we see why Mr. REEMAN is dissatisfied with 'the old idea of God.' He has discovered that it is made up of three conceptions—sin, salvation, and judgment. If it is, then certainly to science and democracy, without ethics, it is a most inadequate combination. It is even offensive. For it is quite possible that the thought of sin, salvation, and judgment will stand in the way of progress, whether scientific or democratic, or both.

The book just noticed is worth the notice it has received. For if there is one word more than another which has captivated the minds of men at the present moment it is the word 'Democracy.' And that book, as clearly as any book we have seen, utters a warning significantly.

It is not a warning against Democracy. That

would have been foolish if in time, it would be futile now because too late. Democracy has come. Says the Rev. G. A. Studdert KENNEDY, in his book *The Hardest Part* (Hodder & Stoughton; 5s. net): 'I was driven to this truth about the British soldier by my wanderings as a preacher throughout the bases and the armies in the field, and I was driven against my will, for, in many ways, the prospect frightens me.'

What is the truth? That the one and only subject the British soldier is interested in, the one and only thing he has been anxiously fighting for, is Democracy. 'Everywhere I find among the men of the army that this is the one great thing that touches them and rouses real enthusiasm. They do believe in Democracy.' Those are Mr. KENNEDY'S words.

Does it mean that the British soldiers are republicans? It does not mean that. The British soldier, and his British chaplain, can be thrilled by the singing of the National Anthem. 'I never was thrilled by "God save the King" before. As a rule it leaves me cold; to-day it sent a tingling down my spine and gave me a lump in my throat. I wonder why. I suppose I am a bit upset really; hell is bad for the nerves. The parade was pretty awful too, so many splendid chaps absentees; it gets on one's nerves. I suppose I am a bit windy. We are all in for it again the day after to-morrow, and there will be more absentees. "The King" sounded so dauntless and determined. It seemed like the song of a thousand martyrs on their road to death. *Morituri te salutamus* business, only in a nobler cause. It thrilled one like a great confession of faith.'

It is not a matter of politics at all. It is a matter of individuality. It is the offspring of the new sense of the worth of every single human being. And the remarkable circumstance is that this sense has arisen on the battlefield where the individual life is seemingly of so little account.

But it is doubtful if the battlefield does give a man the impression that the individual life is of little account. He sees men fall in great numbers; he takes part in the wholesale slaughter. But none of these things makes him think his own life of little account. It is because his life is dear to him that he sells it at the highest price in his power. And then the battlefield makes him think.

That is the secret. The war has compelled the men who have been in it to think, and to think in close relation to themselves. It has made them ask why they are there. It has driven them to find an answer, and to find it at once. And the answer is that they have determined to make it impossible for one man, however exalted, ever again to make war on his own responsibility. It has made them resolve that, as far as in them lies, every man shall henceforth have a right to a voice in the government of his country. 'This conviction,' says Mr. KENNEDY, 'is the only one of an ultimate kind that I find common and intense throughout the British Army. If they have any religion, it is centred in this idea of Democratic Freedom. This is their faith, vague and shadowy, but enormously powerful and big with mighty issues, good and evil, for the days that are to come.'

'Big with mighty issues, good and evil.' Yes, that is the point. Democracy is not all good or inevitably good. Mr. REEMAN'S book has made that clear enough to be seen and read of all men. It is very clear to Bishop GORE for one.

Bishop GORE has been delivering his visitation addresses, and now he publishes them along with some other pertinent papers in a volume with the title of *Dominant Ideas and Corrective Principles* (Mowbray; 3s. 6d. net). In the very first address he says that there are three great ideas now dominant, and these three ideas are comprehended under the one word 'Democracy.'

There is first the idea of the equal worth of

every individual person. It means 'that every human person counts for one, and no one counts for more than one; that nothing can justify the misusing of any person in the interest of another man's profit or pleasure; that every one born into the world has a divine right to the opportunity of making the best of himself or herself and doing the best service of which he is capable.'

Next, there is the idea that the welfare of the community should be supreme over the profit of the individual. 'The individual cannot be allowed to "do what he will with his own," if he is thereby damaging the common life.' The basis of society must be brotherhood and mutual service.

Thirdly, just as 'the interest of the community shall be dominant over the individual and family, so the interest of the whole group of nations must be made effectively supreme over the ambition of any one.' 'While the war has intensified patriotism, it has also made us feel afresh what an intensely dangerous virtue patriotism is. It becomes so easily corporate selfishness and lust of domination. Germany is before our eyes as an example of the false exclusive patriotism which threatens the welfare and liberty of every other nation. This is why we feel that we are fighting against Germany for what is vital, and must fight on till the militarist ambition of Germany is discredited and defeated.'

These are the great ideas which the war has thrown up. They may be comprehended, we say, under the one word 'Democracy.' So far as the soldier or the civilian has thought out what Democracy means to him, it means these three, 'the idea of the equal right of every person to the opportunities of the best life; the idea of the welfare of the community as supreme over the selfish self-aggrandisement of the individual: the idea of the fellowship of nations as supreme over the ambition of each by itself.'

Now these ideas are not contrary to Christianity.

They are Christianity at work in its ethical and social relationships. And the duty that lies before the Church is not to denounce Democracy, but to direct it into the right channels, remembering that, in Mr. Studdert KENNEDY'S words, it is 'enormously powerful and big with mighty issues, good and evil, for the days that are to come.'

It is not impossible. For the Bishop of Oxford asserts, and he is right in asserting, that men are not turning away from Christ, but rather turning to Christ as the prophet of the true humanity. The men, he says, who have discovered Democracy, have discovered also that all that it rightly covers is to be found in Christ. And he says they are turning upon the Church and demanding, 'Why have you left us to find all this out from more or less alien sources, as if it were no part of the Christian religion? Why have you left it to men who do not belong to the Church to re-discover these truths? Why have you professed followers of Jesus Christ been so stupidly-acquiescent in just those very evils which, in the name of your Master, you ought to have been denouncing? Why have you not stood up for justice—stood up for the oppressed and underpaid and underfed and ill-housed? Why have you not been scandalized by the extremes of wealth and poverty? Why did you acquiesce in a false philosophy, manifestly anti-Christian? Why have you been satisfied with a national Christianity, and forgotten your super-national society?'

These things are all in Christ, and only in Christ can they be made powerful for good. Christianity 'has said that all men are meant for liberty, but that they will never really be free save through the redeeming power of Christ and of His Spirit. "If the Son maketh you free, ye shall be free indeed." "Where the Spirit is Lord, there is liberty." Or again, it has said that all men are meant for brotherhood, but that it is only in Christ that real brotherhood can be established. Once more Christianity declares that the purpose of God can only be realized in a fellowship of all

mankind; but it also recognizes how deep in fallen human nature is the narrowness and exclusiveness of a false patriotism, and how thorough a change of heart is needed if men are to recognize real fellowship with those of other races.'

And so we discover the danger of Democracy. If it insists on its rights and forgets its responsibilities, its power will certainly be for evil. And there is no way of preventing that catastrophe other than the way which was pointed out by Christ Himself. 'History has proved abundantly that our Lord was a profoundly true prophet when He told men that they needed personal redemption as the means to social salvation, that "except a man be born again, he cannot see, or enter, the kingdom of God." And Christianity in its earliest history did really vindicate its claim to show the way to a true humanity. The Church did appear as a real brotherhood, which showed its capacity to be world-wide, and really enabled men to feel themselves free and spiritually equal, bound together in a fellowship of mutual service. It did this, not because it was primarily humanitarian, but because it put God first and believed in Jesus Christ as Lord and Son of God, and set itself to live by His teaching, and kept its standard of membership high and searching.'

Are we entitled to speak of a Soldier's Gospel? St. Paul spoke of a Gospel which he called his own: is the soldier entitled to his own Gospel? Dr. W. J. DAWSON counts him entitled. In that surprising book called *The Father of a Soldier* (Lane; 4s. net), there is, he says, 'a Gospel of the Trenches.' It is the soldier's Gospel, and Dr. DAWSON says the soldier has won his title to it.

The Gospel of the Trenches contains two doctrines. The first doctrine is that there is a life beyond death. Dr. DAWSON puts that doctrine second, but logically and systematically it comes first. There is a life beyond death. Dr. DAWSON himself has just discovered it.

Dr. DAWSON has been a preacher of the Gospel for some thirty or forty years, yet he has just made this discovery. It is, of course, a traditional belief. It is an inseparable part of Christianity. But like most traditional beliefs it has little real vitality. It has no firm grip upon the mind. 'I know,' says Dr. DAWSON, 'how little real vitality it has had for me by the pains which I have taken to maintain it. I have buttressed it by all sorts of vulnerable analogies drawn from nature, by the chance words of science, by the assertions of poets, by the rare conviction that visits the mind when a great man disappears from the theatre of action, that the qualities of his mind and character cannot be utterly extinguished. But the doubt remains, and for one analogy that points to the survival of human personality a hundred suggest its extinction. It is probable that most intellectual men who have a real interest in religion, in their secret thoughts, never move far beyond the dying declaration of John Sterling, that he anticipated death with much of hope, and no fear.'

But to Dr. DAWSON the life beyond death has become a real belief to-day: It is 'strong enough to stand firm without the vain buttresses of precarious analogies.' How has he gained it? 'I have learned it from no theologian; I have been persuaded to it by no elaborate argument; it is the natural deduction drawn from the grim but splendid facts of war. It is the soldier's faith.'

Letters had been coming from his son who was a soldier in the trenches. In all the letters this truth is assumed. For 'the soldier sees his comrade, who yesterday was a sentient, thinking, foreseeing creature, smashed into pulp by an explosive shell. His body has disappeared so completely that only a handful of pitiful fragments remain to witness that it once existed. He is no philosopher, but some inward voice assures him that this handful of battered clay is not his comrade. He speaks of him as not dead, but as "gone west." The west for him represents all that was most precious in life—the prairie farm, the ranch house in its

orchards, the child, the wife, the home he loved and toiled for—so he has "gone west."

— 'The phrase is not to be analysed, but its implication is clear—the body scattered in the mire of Flanders is not the man. The man has passed on, and taken with him all that composed his personality, his gaiety and courage, his unselfishness and heroism, and all the "endearing blend of his faults and virtues." The tragic ease with which the body vanishes from sight conveys the sense of something unreal in his disappearance. So, in his simple way, not arguing the matter or being capable of argument, the soldier assumes human immortality as a necessity of thought.'

— 'He could not go on with the work of war without it. He could not believe in God unless he believed that the spirit of a man returned to God when the red earth received the poor remnants of the broken body. He stands upon a field covered with the dead, and hears his Commander say, "As regards our comrades, who have lost their lives—let us speak of them with our caps off—my faith in the Almighty is such that I am perfectly sure that when men die, doing their duty and fighting for their country . . . no matter what their past lives have been, no matter what they have done that they ought not to have done (as all of us do), I am perfectly sure that the Almighty takes them and looks after them at once. Lads, we cannot leave them better than like that." He hears the brave message, and he accepts it as a vital gospel; and the words which he may have heard many times as an idle boast become to him a trumpet sounding over these fields of inhuman slaughter, "O Death, where is thy sting? O Grave, where is thy victory?"'

— The second doctrine of the Soldier's Gospel is the belief that the life beyond death is the reward of his heroism in this life.

— That doctrine is not so traditional as the other. It is not quite so undeniable a part of Christianity.

Is there not something of a surprise in the vigorous assertion of it by so ardent an evangelist, and so successful an evangelist, as Dr. W. J. DAWSON? It is a new discovery also. Unlike the doctrine of the future life, he had not even believed that he believed in it before. He is thoroughly and joyfully convinced of it now.

And the first effect of it is to give him a new conception of Christ. He says: 'I find I have been deceived by the stress laid upon His meekness and His lowliness; even by the emphasis put upon His loving-kindness. These qualities have been interpreted to me as amiability. But I see now that Christ was not an amiable person, for amiability is weakness. An amiable Christ would never have given deliberate offence to the rulers of His nation, and would not have been crucified. He would never have insisted on men forsaking all whom they loved to follow Him; He would have been too tender-hearted. There was a sternness in His character which made Him terrible. He was against all soft and selfish modes of life. He could be pitiful toward error, but He had no mercy on complacent ease and deliberate cowardice. The whole impact of His life and teaching was to create heroes, and He did create them out of the most unpromising material.'

The Gospel of Heroism is thus the Gospel of Christ. And the soldiers have it. They do not claim it, certainly. They do not themselves call it so. 'They are unconscious of their own heroism. If we met them they would not remind us in the least of saints and apostles. They have faults, and some of them have vices. Their virtues they are accustomed to disguise; they would count it immodest to display them. But the

virtue is there, that supreme virtue of self-surrender to which Christianity itself makes its appeal, in response to which men exceed their own natures, and become the true supermen of the realms of the spirit.'

They do not claim the heroism, and they do not call for the reward of it. They simply take the reward for granted. 'A friend has just left my house whose boy has been home on his last leave before going overseas. He is only eighteen, and young for his age. He has been trying to enlist ever since his seventeenth birthday. He succeeded at last, and joined by choice a branch of the service which is generally regarded as the most dangerous. Speaking of him, his father said, "Of course he expects to die. They all do." The words were uttered calmly, as though they expressed a commonplace!'

'How does a boy of eighteen arrive at such a thought? There is only one way—the profound conviction that death is not the great disaster which a comfortable civilization supposes it to be. Years do not make a life. Deeds afford the only authentic measurement of life. Life is a quality of the spirit over which death has no power. There is no greater victory possible to the spirit of a man than the temper which ignores death at the call of duty. This boy of eighteen has won that victory. All these men of whom my son writes have won it, won it so completely that when volunteers are asked for some perilous service, from which it is certain only one or two can return, the difficulty is not to find volunteers but to restrain the men who jostle and outbid one another in the effort to secure the chance of dying.'