

In the Study.

A Study in Apostleship.

THE name Apostle means 'one sent forth.' But the Apostle is more than a messenger. The Greek word for mere messenger is *angelos* not *apostolos*. The apostle is also a representative or delegate of the person who sends him. He carries something of that person's authority with him; he is responsible to that person for the discharge of his mission.

Let us see (1) to whom the name of Apostle is given; (2) what entitles a man to be called an Apostle.

I.

To whom is the Name of Apostle given?

1. *Christ*.—It is given to Christ as the delegate of the Father. The passage is Heb 3¹, 'Wherefore, holy brethren, partakers of a heavenly calling, consider the Apostle and High Priest of our confession, even Jesus.' Jesus is one who is sent, and He is sent as one who carries authority: He is both messenger and delegate.

(1) He is a Messenger. He often spoke of Himself as 'sent.' 'My meat is to do the will of him who sent me, and to finish his work' (Jn 4³⁴). That He was sent is indeed asserted no fewer than thirty-six times in St. John's Gospel alone.

(2) He is also a Delegate. When one sovereign or government desires to treat with the sovereign or government of another people, an ambassador is sent. His instructions are given to him; he has a message to deliver. It is not his business to try to shape affairs according to any fancy of his own, but being accredited from a sovereign and government, he becomes their agent to express their views, and to treat for them. If he closes any matter and signs any treaty, it is not in his own name and by his own authority, but as the agent and representative of the sovereign head of his state. Christ Jesus is the Envoy from God to men, 'Who hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son.' He is the appointed means of communication between heaven and earth, the Envoy Extraordinary. This point is emphasized by St. John, 'For he whom God hath sent speaketh the words of God' (Jn 3³⁴). He does not deliver His own message to mankind, but God's message. Christ was sent to the world with a message from

God; sent to each one of us with the message of 'so great salvation.' Am I in doubt as to truth? Here is an accredited messenger. Do I want to know God's views on matters which concern me? Here is One authorized to declare them with authority. Do I want to know the terms on which the Almighty will treat with me, a sinner? Here is the appointed Envoy, the Apostle, Christ Jesus.

2. *The Twelve*.—When Jesus called the disciples to Him and chose twelve of their number to be with Him and to be sent forth, He called them Apostles. So St. Luke tells us: 'And it came to pass in these days, that he went out into the mountain to pray; and he continued all night in prayer to God. And when it was day, he called his disciples: and he chose from them twelve, whom also he named apostles' (Lk 6^{12, 13}).

The occurrence of the word 'Apostle' in the Gospels is, however, surprisingly rare. Hort believes that the phrase, 'whom he also named apostles,' occurred originally in Mark's account of the choice of the Twelve (Mk 3¹⁴) as well as in that of Luke (see also R. V. m.). But the only occurrence in our present text is at 6³⁰: 'And the apostles gathered themselves together unto Jesus; and they told him all things, whatsoever they had done, and whatsoever they had taught.' It is more frequent in Luke. It occurs six times. Once it is possibly used in its etymological meaning of *messenger*; in two other places (6¹³ 9¹⁰) it may be used to designate the special mission on which the Twelve were first sent; but in the remaining three (17⁵ 22¹⁴ 24¹⁰) it is employed to designate the Twelve in their capacity as the representatives of Jesus, the sense which it commonly bears in the Acts. Matthew, on the other hand, gives even less prominence to the title 'Apostles' than Mark. He tells us (10¹) that our Lord 'calling his twelve disciples unto him gave them authority over unclean spirits so as to cast them out and to heal every disease and every sickness.' 'Now the names of the twelve apostles,' he adds, 'are these. . . . ' Thenceforward Matthew never uses the term 'Apostle.' When he needs a precise designation, it is usually, 'His twelve disciples,' or 'the twelve,' and once (28¹⁰), 'the eleven disciples.' St. John's usage is more remarkable still. He never calls the

Twelve 'Apostles,' unless it be by indirect allusion (13¹⁶), 'A servant is not greater than his lord; neither an envoy (one sent) greater than he that sent him.' Of the Twelve he speaks in 6⁶⁷⁻⁷⁰, 'Jesus said therefore to the twelve, Would ye also go?' 'Did not I choose you the twelve, and one of you is a devil?' besides his use of the term to describe Judas (6⁷¹) and Thomas (20²⁴).

3. *The Witnesses of the Risen Christ.*—The number of the Apostles was originally twelve. On the death of Judas Iscariot that number was restored by the election of Matthias. It might therefore be expected that that number would be preserved by similar elections as the death of any of the original Twelve took place. But there is no evidence for that. It has been suggested that James the brother of our Lord was chosen to fill the place of James the brother of John, but without evidence, and even contrary to the probabilities. For we find that soon after the Ascension others besides the Twelve were called Apostles. Besides James, both Paul and Barnabas are certain; and there are others that are almost certain, as Silvanus (1 Th 2⁶), Andronicus, and Junias (Ro 16⁷).

The fact that there were people who claimed, without any right, the title of 'Apostle' (2 Co 11¹³, Rev 2²) amounts to proof that in the Apostolic Church there were 'Apostles' outside the Twelve. It is incredible that there were people who claimed to belong to a body so well known as the Twelve. Very soon, though not in the N.T., the title of 'Apostle' was given to the Seventy. It is not likely that Joseph Barsabbas and Matthias were the only persons among the one hundred and twenty gathered together after the Ascension (Ac 1¹⁵) who had the apostolic qualification of having seen the Lord; probably most of them had been His personal disciples. All of those who took to missionary work would be likely to be styled 'Apostles'; and it is not impossible that the 'false apostles' who opposed St. Paul had this qualification, and therefore claimed to have a better right to the title than he had.

4. *Delegates of Churches.*—All the apostles already spoken of claim to be directly sent by Christ, whether before or after His resurrection. But the name of Apostle came to be given to others who were sent forth by some Church and carried its commission. Such were the brethren

mentioned in 2 Co 8²³, and there described as 'apostles or delegates of the churches.' Again, Epaphroditus is called *ὑμῶν ἀπόστολον*, 'your delegate' (Ph 2²⁵), as being the bearer of the contributions of the Philippians. Possibly Andronicus and Junias were also apostles in this sense, *i.e.* delegates of a Christian Church, though other explanations are admissible. On the whole, it would appear that this sense of the word may have been borrowed from Jewish usage, as both the Jewish and Christian delegates were occupied with the care of contributions. The account given by Philo (*de Monarchia*, 2³) of the selection by merit of the most approved persons to carry the contributions of the Dispersion to Jerusalem, shows that this system was before St. Paul's mind in his institution of messengers of the churches to take charge of the alms (see 2 Co 8¹⁸⁻²³).

5. *Missionaries generally.*—As the earlier decades passed, the numbers of men who were called 'Apostles' increased rather than diminished. They were wandering missionaries whose special duties were to the heathen and to the unconverted. All these men called 'Apostles' have one distinguishing characteristic: they have given themselves for life to be missionary preachers of the Gospel of the Kingdom of Christ. They were all engaged in a life-work of a peculiar kind, aggressive pioneering missionary labour. The crowning vindication of their career was what they were able to accomplish; their courage, their self-sacrificing endurance, the 'signs, wonders, and mighty deeds' which accompanied their labours, and, above all, the results of their work.

'It were much to be wished,' says Sanday, 'that we knew more about the wider use of the name "apostle"—its use, I mean, not merely for the "delegate" of a particular Church, as in 2 Co 8²³, but for what would seem to be a lesser copy of the original institution. Suspected before, as, *e.g.*, by Bishop Lightfoot, this use has been proved beyond dispute by the discovery of the *Didaché*, in which the wandering apostle and the wandering prophet clearly take precedence of the officers of the local Church. The existence of this wider sense creates a certain amount of ambiguity in more than one passage. It would be a pertinent question to ask how far the peculiar claim which is made for the Twelve is supposed to extend. If it includes St. Paul, does it also include St. Barnabas and St.

James, the Lord's brother? If it includes these, does it include the whole class referred to in the *Didaché*? And if it includes the whole class, on what ground is the claim made for those outside the direct recipients of the two commissions given by our Lord before and after His Resurrection? The absence of any sharp boundary between the Twelve and the larger class who bore the same name involves the exclusive claim which is made for the Twelve in serious difficulties.¹

6. Although the use of the title 'Apostle' was thus on the one hand enlarged, and although on the other hand the members of the original Twelve were gradually passing away, there was a tendency, especially in apocalyptic, to preserve ideally or symbolically the original number of twelve. In Mt 19²⁸, where it is said that the twelve apostles shall sit on twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel, the original twelve may be referred to, but McNeile (Com. *in loc.*) thinks that 'the present form of the verse, with its symbolic "Twelve," may be due to later thought.' But in Rev 21¹⁴, where the wall of the heavenly city is described as having 'twelve foundations, and on them twelve names of the twelve apostles of the Lamb,' the ideal use is unmistakable. And just because the use is ideal or symbolical it is idle to ask who are the Twelve there spoken of. The author of the Apocalypse has the original Twelve in his mind, and does not stop to consider the question raised by the lapse of Judas. Renan misses the mark when he says that 'Paul has no place among the twelve apostles of the Lamb' (*L'Antichrist*, 479).

II.

What gives a Man the Title of Apostle?

We find the best answer to this question in the life of St. Paul. He claimed the title of Apostle; he had to prove his right to it. Sometimes he appealed to the fruits of his ministry as proving that he possessed the powers of an apostle. 'If I be not an apostle to others,' he says to the Corinthians, 'at least I am to you.' Their conversion was the seal of his Apostleship (1 Co 9³). In another passage he speaks in like manner of his having wrought the *signs* of an Apostle among them (2 Co 12¹²). The signs, which he contemplates in these passages, our modern conceptions

¹ W. Sanday, *The Conception of Priesthood*, 52.

would lead us to separate into two classes. The one of these includes moral and spiritual gifts—patience, self-denial, effective preaching; the other comprises such powers as we call supernatural, 'signs, wonders, and mighty deeds.' St. Paul himself, however, does not so distinguish them, but with more of reverence regards them rather as different manifestations of 'one and the self-same Spirit.'

But this was only the proof that his claim to apostleship was valid. He made the claim for two reasons: first, because he had seen Christ, and next because Christ had sent him to tell others what he had seen. And these two, the Vision and the Witness, are the marks by which all Apostles or missionaries have been known from the beginning until now. The name may be given because of the witness. Whether we use the word 'apostle' taken from the Greek language or the word 'missionary' taken from the Latin, the meaning is 'one sent forth.' But it is Christ that sends apostles forth. And He sends them in order that they may declare that which they have seen and heard.

I. THE VISION.—The vision may be of the human Jesus, or of the risen Lord, or of the heavenly Redeemer.

(1) *The human Jesus*.—This was the first experience of the first apostles. By what seems to be a double process of selection (though the word selection is not used), proceeding wholly from Himself, our Lord set aside twelve for two great purposes, kept apart in the Greek by the double *iva*: the first, personal nearness to Himself 'that they should be with him': the second, 'with a view to sending them forth,' this mission of theirs having two heads—to preach, and to have authority to cast out the 'demons,' these two being precisely the two modes of action which St. Mark has described in 1³⁹ as exercised by the Lord Himself in the synagogues of all Galilee.

The mission did not take place immediately (Lk 9^{1ff}, Mk 6^{7ff}). For the mission was not the only or the immediate object of the choice, as we learn clearly from St. Mark, who places the 'being with Jesus' as His first aim in choosing them, and their mission to preach as the second. St. Matthew does not record the choice, but only their summons to receive a charge before going forth. The very words used seem to imply that the Twelve had been previously set apart (Mt 10¹). A main

object of their mission was to 'preach the kingdom of God' (Lk 9²), and for this they had been prepared by our Lord's parables of the Kingdom, delivered for the most part to the multitude, but privately interpreted to the Apostles. They had received an esoteric teaching, which was nevertheless not properly esoteric, for it was hidden only that it might afterwards be made known, and those to whom it was addressed were not selected as intellectually capable of advanced teaching, but, so far as mental gifts went, were samples of the average intelligence of the nation. They were armed for their mission with supernatural gifts and protection, and to emphasize these were forbidden to make the commonest provision for the journey. No details are given of the events of their mission. It cannot be doubted that its object was much more the preparation of the Apostles for their subsequent employment (cp. Lk 22^{35, 36}) than any immediate result.

The Sermon on the Mount is regarded by many as an address delivered by our Lord when He chose the Twelve. The note of time in the Gospel of St. Luke ascribes it to this occasion, and there is no reason to reject this testimony. Besides, it has the greatest internal probability in its favour. The appointment of the Apostles formed an epoch in the ministry of our Lord; what more natural or suitable than that He should avail Himself of the occasion to explain and enforce His convictions as to the true life of man? The time was most opportune for such a deliverance. The hearts of the disciples were deeply moved; their whole natures were quickened and alert; why not sow seed which might afterwards bear abundant fruit? The character of the Sermon itself is another argument confirming this conclusion. It is didactic rather than hortatory. It expounds truth rather than proclaims the mercy of God.

(2) *The Risen Lord*.—When Matthias was chosen to fill the place of Judas, the choice was made from those who had followed Jesus in His ministry from the very beginning. But a new qualification was added, the choice must fall on one who may 'become a witness with us of his resurrection' (Ac 1²²). Again, in an important passage (1 Co 9^{1, 2}), where St. Paul is maintaining his authority against gainsayers and advancing proofs of his Apostleship, he asks, 'Have I not seen the Lord Jesus Christ? Are not ye our work in the Lord?' It would appear then that

the having seen Christ was a necessary condition of the apostolic office. It may be urged, indeed, that St. Paul is here taking the ground of his Judaizing opponents, who affected to lay great stress on personal intercourse with the Lord, and argues that even on their own showing he is not wanting in the qualifications for the Apostleship. This is true. But independently of St. Paul's language here, there is every reason for assuming that this was an indispensable condition (Lk 24⁴⁸, Ac 1⁸). An Apostle must necessarily have been an eye-witness of the resurrection. He must be able to testify from direct knowledge to this fundamental fact of the faith. This knowledge, which was before lacking to St. Paul, was supplied by a miraculous interposition, so as to qualify him for the office. All the others, who are called or seem to be called Apostles in the New Testament, may well have satisfied this condition. Andronicus and Junias were certainly among the earliest disciples (Ro 16⁷), and may have seen the Lord, if not while His earthly ministry lasted, at all events during the forty days after the resurrection. Barnabas was a well-known and zealous believer in the first days of the Christian Church (Ac 4³⁶), and is reported to have been one of the Seventy. James and the other brethren of the Lord were at least so far qualified. Silas also, who was a leading man in the church of Jerusalem (Ac 15²²), might well have enjoyed this privilege.

(3) *The Heavenly Redeemer*.—The time came when the title of Apostle had to be extended beyond the number of those who had been with Jesus in His earthly ministry, and even beyond the number of those who had been eye-witnesses of the risen Christ. Nothing could take from the 'Eleven' the fact that they had been personally selected and trained for their missionary work by Jesus while He was still with them in the flesh. This gave them a unique position not only within the Jewish Christian Church, but also throughout all Christendom. This also was the basis of the apostolate in the narrower sense of the term. Others might be, and were, 'separated unto the gospel of God,' might devote themselves, in obedience to the 'call' that came, to a life of active missionary work, and have their 'call' vindicated in the abundant fruit of their labours. The risen Christ had appeared to many others besides themselves. What separated the 'Eleven' from other apostles was that the Lord, *while in the*

flesh, had selected them and had spent long months in training them for their work. They were missionaries like the others, and made missionary tours like them, but this special preparation which no others possessed gave them a position apart.

But apostles, in the wider sense of the term, existed in the Church of Christ even in New Testament times, and are with us still in the missionaries and missionaries of the various branches of the Christian Church. In lands where the language of the New Testament is still spoken, the name as well as the thing survives; the missionaries and missionaries of the modern Greek Church are still called 'holy apostles.'

2. THE WITNESS.—The second characteristic of the Apostle is his work of bearing witness. This comes out with special clearness in St. Peter's address to the brethren with regard to providing a successor to Judas: 'Of the men,' he says (1²¹), 'that accompanied with us all the time that the Lord Jesus came in and went out unto us, beginning from the baptism of John unto the day that he was received up from us, of these must one become a witness with us of his resurrection.' The prayer that follows describes the office itself as 'the place of this ministration and mission,' just as St. Peter had previously (v. 17) called it 'the lot of this ministration.'

The Twelve seem to have been selected originally because of their fitness for bearing witness. They were not specially qualified for grasping or expounding theological doctrines; nor were such qualifications greatly needed, for the doctrines which the Master taught them were few and simple. Yet they had difficulty in apprehending some of these, and sometimes surprised their Master by their inability to understand (Mk 7¹⁸ 8¹⁷ 9³²). But because of their simplicity they were very credible witnesses of what they had heard and seen. They had been men of homely circumstances, and their unique experiences as the disciples of Christ made a deep impression upon them, especially with regard to the hopeless sense of loss when He was put to death, and to the amazing recovery of joy when their own senses convinced them that He had risen again. They were thus well qualified to convince others. They evidently had not the wit to invent an elaborate story, or to retain it when it had been elaborated,

and therefore what they stated with such confidence was likely to be true. They were chosen to keep alive and extend the knowledge of events that were of the utmost importance to mankind—the knowledge that Jesus Christ had died on the Cross, and had risen from the grave. That He had died and been buried was undisputed and indisputable; and all of them could testify that they had repeatedly seen Him alive after His burial.

The Apostles did not argue; they simply stated what they knew. Every one who heard them felt that they were men who had an intense belief in the truth of what they stated. There is no trace in either Acts or Epistles of hesitation or doubt as to the certainty of their knowledge; they knew that their witness was true (Jn 21²¹, 1 Jn 1¹⁻³). And the confidence with which they delivered their testimony was communicated all the more effectually to those who heard it because, without any sign of collusion or conspiracy, they all told the same story. They differed in age, temperament, and ability, but they did not differ when they spoke of what they had seen and heard.

'The unanimity of the eleven,' says Latham, 'both as to their testimony and as to their adoption of a particular course of conduct, has been less dwelt on by Apologists than I should have expected. If one or two could have been gained over by the Scribes to dissent from the account of the rest, the moral force of the evidence would have been lost. The chances against the agreement of the entire body in an illusion or a misrepresentation are enormous. But an event so transcendent as to wipe out of the minds of the witnesses everything else—"all trivial, fond records" would efface small subjective differences by the overwhelming force of the objective impression; and the occurrence of such an event would account for that perfect agreement in action among men who had not uniformly agreed before, which is among the many striking phenomena which the Book of the Acts of the Apostles discloses to our own view.'¹

If He should come to-day and stand beside me,

And I should see Him as He was of yore,
When veiled in flesh in all His stainless beauty
He walked beside the Galilean shore;

¹ H. Latham, *Pastor Pastorum*, 242.

If He should speak and beckon me to follow
 A lonely path and dreary up life's hill—
 I wonder—should I dare to go unflinching,
 Caring for naught—save but to do His will?

If I should see Him, scorn'd of men, rejected,
 Bending beneath that bitter Cross, anew,
 With patient eyes that smile through tears of
 anguish—

His brow thorn-crown'd, scarr'd hands,
 pierced through and through—

If He should hold to me the cup of suffering,
 Bidding me drink the dregs and trust Him
 still—

I wonder—should I shrink from such a testing,
 Or stretch out hands of faith to do His will?

If I should see Him in His risen splendour,
 Bearing the palm of perfect victory,
 Love's very self enthron'd, triumphant, tender,
 Gleaming in light of awful purity;
 If He should touch me with those radiant
 fingers,

Sealing me His, His purpose to fulfil,—
 Should I refuse that claim to my allegiance
 Or, strong in faith, go forth to do His will?

Virginibus Puerisque.

I.

July.

A LAD WHO HAD A VISION.

'There is a lad here, which hath five barley loaves.'—Jn 6⁹.

MANY of you children have been looking forward to the month of July for a long time. To one boy, July means a visit to friends in the country, to another, a single day's fun at the seaside. In the minds of the greatest number, however, and in that of both boys and girls, it stands for the end of the school year.

'What month do you like best?' I asked some boys in an Industrial School. 'July,' was the answer. 'Why July?' 'Because that's the month we'll get out of this place.'

I felt sorry. They were, as I said, Industrial School boys. Their lives were very different indeed from yours; they were not living with their fathers and mothers, they were placed under a discipline in which there seemed to be but little love. Yet, I believe that with a good many of you, there

is much the same feeling about the month of July. You say to yourselves, 'When July comes, I'll be away from school altogether.' There are a few amongst you, I know, who are eagerly looking forward to going to the University. That means the beginning of a wide and interesting life, and now that life is not far off. May God's blessing go with you.

With every one of you, leaving school means a break in your life. To-day, my mind is specially with the boy, with the girl, who, instead of proceeding to the University, is about to make a start in business, or at other work of some kind. I thought of those boys and those girls as I read of the lad with the five barley loaves, and I want to say a few words to them.

You think that leaving school will mean freedom for you. It will certainly mean freedom of a kind. But freedom may be a very dangerous thing. You must have noticed that certain young animals, such as foals, are sometimes kept tied up. That is to prevent them from hurting themselves. They would be almost certain to do this if they were allowed to run about just as they liked. And some of you are old enough to have heard stories of big boys having gone out into the world away from the restraint of their parents, and wandered into paths that led them far away from the 'Father's House.'

When boys and girls do go away from home to make their way in the world, I think their chief danger is in forgetting certain things. One autumn morning I met a lad of fourteen who had been in my Sunday class. I knew he had only left the day-school in July. He was carrying a small parcel. 'What are you doing now?' I asked him. 'I'm a draper,' he said proudly. 'I have to be an apprentice for four years, after that I'll be a journeyman. I'll be eighteen . . . that's a pretty old man.' He seemed very 'keen' on his work, and I should say promised to be successful in business. But I just wondered if, in his eagerness, he was forgetting, and would continue to forget, such things as the beauty of the world, or the messages that such a month as July brings. July has more than one message for boys and girls. It reminds many of you of the holidays; to others it means a start in life; to some of the older people the beauty of it brings the message that God is good.

I can believe that the little lad of the text,

although younger than many of you, had just finished with school, and was going on an errand. My boys and girls, that errand meant his meeting with the Lord Jesus Christ. In July, the world is, as I said, very beautiful; everything speaks of God's love. As you go about your new work, whether it be in a shop, an office, or in your own home, don't forget that there is another side to life. When you get out into the open air—it may be to go on some errand—look round about. If you do that with a pure heart you will be led to think of Him who made the summer. The thought will come upon you, you will scarcely know how, 'This is God's work; this is His life which is in the air and on the earth. It is He who makes the birds so happy.' You will feel, like the little lad of the New Testament, that you have had a vision of the Lord Jesus Christ, and have heard Him calling you.

We must rise or we must fall;
Love can know no middle way:
If the great life do not call,
There is sadness and decay.

God often gives us chances to make fresh starts in life. You will never have a better than you have now. The little lad had not much to offer: 'There is a lad here, which hath five barley loaves.' We can imagine him going home carrying his basket, careful not to spill a crumb that had been blessed by the Lord.

He may have grown up to be a successful man, but he would never forget that day of the great crowds, the wonderful Teacher, and the look Jesus gave him.

He was just such another as any of you. What a setting out in life. You may have the same if you ask for it. If you say, 'Here is my life—my five barley loaves—take them'; at this, the beginning of your manhood and womanhood you will get the vision, you will get the blessing.

II.

Seaside Lodgings.

'He lodgeth . . . by the sea side.'—Ac 10⁶.

The summer holidays have come round once more, and very soon we shall be packing our boxes, and brown-papering our windows, and setting off for 'somewhere' in the country. Now it is my opinion that the best place for a holiday is the

seaside, because there we find so many nice things to amuse us. There is the cool water in which we can splash on a hot day, and the pools at the water's edge just made for paddling. There are the sands where we can have such glorious fun riding on donkeys, building houses, and making turreted castles surrounded by moats. And there are the rocks with their pools in which we can find all sorts of wonderful things—shells, and crabs, and shrimps, and small fish, and beautiful sea-weeds. There are the small boats in which we can spend the afternoons fishing and rowing, and there are a dozen other things of which you will be able to think far better than I can. We leave home rather tired and pale, and we come back strong and brown. Why, even the very sea-weedy smell as we sniff it at the railway carriage window makes us feel well.

Yes, I think the seaside is one of the very best places to spend a holiday, so to-day I have chosen a seaside text—'He lodgeth . . . by the sea side.' Now I suppose you know who it was that was lodging by the seaside. It was Simon Peter, and he was staying at Joppa, with a man called Simon, a tanner by trade. Joppa was an important seaport in those days. It was the seaport of Jerusalem—just as Leith is the seaport of Edinburgh; only Jerusalem was a hundred miles distant. It was to Joppa that the cedar wood from Lebanon was brought for building Solomon's temple at Jerusalem. The town still exists, but it has changed its name to Jaffa, and it is from there we get those lovely, big, juicy oranges called Jaffa oranges. The spot where Simon Peter stayed is still shown to visitors, though a mosque has taken the place of the house in which he lodged. From that point there is a lovely view out over the Mediterranean Sea, and the waves wash right up to the walls of the courtyard, so that Peter could not have been nearer the sea unless he had lived in a boat.

Now I am not going to speak to you about the wonderful thing that happened to Peter at Joppa, because you can read that for yourselves in the Book of Acts, but I want you to think of a few of the lessons the seaside teaches us.

I think I hear some one saying, 'Oh, lessons again! We don't want to hear any more about lessons for weeks and weeks.' But then, you see, the seaside teaches its lessons in such a nice way that they are just like stories.

I want to speak to you about the rocks and some of the curious things you find there. Well, first of all there are our friends the crabs. Do you know how a crab grows? His outer coat or shell, as we call it, is very hard and will not stretch in the slightest degree, so when he wants to grow he has to change his coat, or rather get rid of the coat he has and grow a new one. This he does about once a year until he is quite full grown. It takes him a few days to complete the change and he always hides himself during that time, because, when he has got rid of his old coat of mail, and has not yet grown a new one, his body is quite soft and unprotected from his enemies.

Now I often wish some people were more like crabs. You hear them saying, 'Oh, it's no use trying to be good. I've tried already dozens of times, and I've always failed.' Well, no wonder these people have always failed, because they are always thinking of their failures. They stick to their old coats which have grown too small for them, and they will never 'grow in grace' until they leave their old coats behind, forget about them, and put on a new coat of fresh endeavour.

We are meant to remember failures only as they help us to avoid the same mistakes the next time: we are not meant to think about them until they cramp us and stunt our growth. So if you have failed in any way, take heart and try again. Forget that you have failed, and make up your mind that you will win yet.

If you hunt in the muddy pools at low-water you may find a creature which looks something like a hairy slug. It is between three and four inches long and its almond-shaped body is covered with long hairs. This curious creature is a Sea Mouse. It looks very dull and dingy, but if you wash it repeatedly in clean pools until all the mud is gone, you will see that it is very beautiful. All the colours of the rainbow seem to be chasing each other over its bristles, and altering with every movement and every change of light. Doesn't it seem strange that this beautiful creature should live with its beauty covered up? And yet, I think lots of boys and girls, and men and women, are like this Sea Mouse. They show a very ugly outside to the world, and people never guess what a great deal of beauty they have underneath. And do you know, I think we are all like this dingy Sea Mouse until Jesus touches us and washes away the

ugly mud of sin that covers up the beauty of our souls.

There is just one more sea-creature I wish to talk about, and that is the jelly-fish. You often see jelly-fish floating in the water when you are paddling or bathing—curious bluish creatures that look like jelly. But the jelly-fish you really should avoid is the big yellowish-brown one which sometimes comes in the early autumn. It has a fringe all round its body of what look like hairs, but these harmless looking things are really stings; if they sting you they can hurt very badly, and if you have a thin skin, they may make you seriously ill. Now there are two things I should like to say, 'Don't be a stinging jelly-fish. Bitter, angry words can hurt and sting the heart just as much as the stings of the jelly-fish can hurt the body. And don't be a thin-skinned person who magnifies little stings into big hurts. Such people are a great bother to their friends, and they make themselves needlessly unhappy. Think of other people, not of your own poor little feelings. That is the best recipe for growing a stronger skin.'

There are many, many other curious and wonderful things down by the sea which you will be able to study for yourself. Somehow or other God seems very near to us at the seaside. We remember how Jesus loved the sea too, how He loved to walk by it, and to sit by it, and to preach from it, and to sail upon it. When we look at the grains of sand—countless in number—they speak to us of the multitude of God's loving-kindnesses to us. When we study the millions of tiny creatures He has made and remember that not one of them is forgotten in His sight, that not one little life is lived unknown to Him, we marvel at the wonders of His greatness. And when we look out to the vast ocean stretching away and away into endless space, we remember the boundless love with which He has loved us, and the infinite forgiveness which casts all our sins into the depths of the seas.

@ Communion Address.

The Brotherhood of the Burning Heart is the title given to a volume containing twelve Communion Sermons (Boston: Pilgrim Press; 75 cents). The preacher is the Rev. Oscar Edward Maurer, Minister of the Center Church, New Haven. The title of the book is the title of the first sermon in it. The text of that sermon contains the explana-

tion: 'Was not our heart burning within us while he spake to us in the way, while he opened to us the scriptures?' (Lk 24³²). We should like to commend the little book. The best way to do so will be to quote one of the addresses. At the end of each address there is a prayer. We shall quote the prayer also.

Jesus Christ: Guest or Host?

'I will keep the passover at thy house.'—Mt 26¹⁸.

'This private message of our Lord to an unknown friend in Jerusalem has always been to me an occasion for much speculation. Whether or not there had been a prior understanding and arrangement between the Master and the friendly citizen, the man was not taken by surprise. When the two disciples delivered the request, he showed them a large upper room, furnished and ready. But the question has often come to me, Why was the host absent from the feast? We hear nothing about him, except in this incidental reference. Jesus and the twelve passed into the guest chamber, but the man himself did not join them at the table. He had the pure, yet half anxious joy of knowing that they were in his house. He might hear their voices occasionally in conversation and in singing the final hymn. Yet, there he was, in his own house, an outsider. He did not himself partake of that eucharistic feast of love. Did he feel a wish to be with them and of them, or was he content? Was it enough for him that Jesus should be in his house?

'We must not press the question too far, for possibly the man was not invited to share in the Passover. But as we face the Communion Table I want to ask the question, What is your relation to Christ? Is He your guest or is He your host?

'The incident suggests the relation of many to Christ. They provide Him with the guest chamber. He comes to them in their reading, in their study, in their inherited traditions; and there is about Him something so impressive, so suggestive of moral dignity and worth, that courtesy and reverence, if nothing else, prompt them to admit Him. He awakens a sincere admiration. It may even be said that He is welcomed into the house because His presence gives it a real distinction. But despite all this, there is no fellowship. He is in the guest chamber, but the doors are shut, and they are on the outside.

'Is not this a fair statement of the relation which

Christ has to many of us? He is for us a great and significant historical figure. We cannot deny Him. He compels our recognition. He holds our imagination, just as any other historical or literary figure does. We honour His name, and are interested in the literary document which refers to Him. He is the subject of speculative interest. But He is only a guest. The guest room and the parlor are reserved for Him but He never gets into the living room. The intimacies of the fireside are not for Him.

'It must be granted that there is an inspiration in the study of the great life; a quickening of the imagination as we follow Jesus, step by step, seeing Him resist the power of temptation, hearing the great sermon on the mount, feeling ourselves among those whom He healed, marvelling at the mystery of that death on Calvary. But after we have perfected ourselves in such a study, still our knowledge of Him is mostly biographical. He may have entered into our prophet's chamber, but that does not signify much, for probably other great souls whom we have encountered in history have lodged there. He is still not of us. He is not the vine and we the branches. He is the marvellously beautiful cereus blooming once in a lifetime, and we the admiring botanists examining into the nature of the wonder. He is the Christ of history, but not of experience.

'But notice that, the real host being absent, Jesus, the Guest, becomes the Host. The positions are reversed. "Behold, I stand at the door and knock. If any man open the door, I will come in to him, and will sup with him, and he with me." It always ends that way. We think to accept Christ, and find that He has accepted us. When Frederick Denison Maurice lay dying, a friend spoke about laying hold of God. Maurice answered, "We do not lay hold of God, but God lays hold of us." So here, He who has entered as Guest has now become the Host. How this sums up human experience in meeting Jesus Christ! We have opened the door to Him as if we were showing Him grace and hospitality and perhaps just a little good-natured condescension, and all at once we find that the Guest has become our Host, that He has filled up our scanty table with richer provisions than we even dreamed of, and is inviting us to sit down and eat with Him. All at once we realize that neither the guest chamber nor the house are ours at all. They belong to Him. We

have surrendered them. The life we live we live not to ourselves but Christ liveth in us. He is the Master of the House, bidding us sit down and break the bread of life and drink the wine of love, with Him.

'And after all, this is the true relation. It is the normal relation. We want more than a hero. We want more than a great or historic figure. What the human heart is really craving, what it has always craved with a longing deeper than any of the unprofitable desires which seem to form life, is communion with God. We search the heavens and His handiwork is there, but He is not there. We dig up the earth and His works are there, but He is not there. And yet we want Him. Our heart and our flesh cry out for the living God. And then we turn to man himself, and lo! we find God. We turn to Jesus Christ,

"Whose feet have toiled along your pathway
rough,
Whose lips drew human breath."

And when we turn to Him, the old vexed questions as to His nature and place never even occur. We are in a larger air of freedom and joy. He is the living Christ, and in Him, and with Him, we have found the Father and we are satisfied.

'This is not speculation, this is human experience.

"The healing of His seamless dress
Is by our beds of pain.
We touch Him in life's throng and press,
And we are whole again.

For warm, sweet, tender, even yet
A present help is He,
And love has still its Olivet,
And faith its Galilee."

'O men and women, I welcome you to-day to the hospitality of the living Christ, our Master, our Head, our Saviour, who shows us the Father, in whose will is our peace. Some of you are confessing Him to-day, for the first time before men. You are coming into the communion of the Holy Catholic Church. The Christ of that Church is a living Lord, not a dead Christ. I charge you never to forget that the Church sprang out of a great, living, God-filled person; that it was not an idea, but a life; that this Table, covered to-day with fair linen, is a direct link between us and the

early group which was thrilled by the presence of that life. And remember, too, that personality is eternal. You don't want an idea to comfort and strengthen yourself with, when the press and stress of life comes on. You want a Friend. You want a Master. You want a Lord—great, pure, holy, divine, in whom you can find God.

'The Table is spread: Is Jesus Christ the Guest of this Church? Or will He be your Host to-day? Will you come and eat with Him?

'O Lord and Master of us all, this is Thy Table and Thou art the Leader of the Feast. We thank Thee with grateful hearts for Thy loving invitation. We are not worthy to sit down with Thee. And yet we come unto Thee, because we are weary and heavy laden: because we are hungering and thirsting for Thy righteousness. Break Thou the bread of life for us, dear Lord, as Thou didst break it for Thy disciples in the upper room. Strengthen us with Thy spirit, O gracious Host, that we in turn may strengthen our brethren, and all of us remain faithful to Thee through life's long day, until Thy Church shall behold Thy face in glory everlasting. Amen.'

Point and Illustration.

A Volcano.

'Why did God make Volcanoes? I know the optimist answer from people who do not live on volcanic soil and have never seen the thing except in a picture book. It is that you cannot have a cooling globe without volcanic action, and therefore it is all right. Only they do not tell us why the globe had to cool, and its surface to crack and exude fire, nor why it could not have been started at a proper temperature both inside and out. They simply say "It is so," and then reiterate that "So it is." That is the pretty optimist's way.'

And the optimist has his way with Scripture. For 'the Scriptures, too, placid as they look, are a volcanic deposit. Some parts of them, especially the Epistles, were at one time so hot that the post-man burnt his fingers in carrying them.'

Dr. Rendel Harris, whom we are quoting, takes for example the Epistle to the Galatians. The Epistle 'is a blow-hole and crater of the first magnitude. Nothing in the New Testament is so instinct with passion, so charged with double cracks of innuendo as this Epistle. If you tried to edit it

you would know, if you tried to print it or to give it a historical interpretation you could tell. You would use up your hyphens for the broken sentences and exhaust the auxiliary signs both of question and of amazement which chase one another up and down the properly edited and rightly printed page.'

But we can now pass over the volcano of the Epistle to the Galatians without feeling a tremor. We can pass from the fifteenth to the sixteenth verse of the fourth chapter with unconcern. Of all the recent commentators only Dr. Douglas Mackenzie in Garvie's 'Westminster New Testament' sees anything unusual and makes a note of it. In the fifteenth verse the Apostle reminds the Galatians that once they would have plucked out their eyes and given them to him, such was the love they had to him. In the sixteenth verse he suddenly says, 'So then am I become your enemy, because I tell you the truth?'

There is surely something in that word 'enemy' that we do not see. Had anybody called him an enemy? Had the Galatians been persuaded by anybody to call him so? There is nothing in the texts we favour. But Dr. Rendel Harris turns to the Western Readings of the Acts of the Apostles and finds abundant suggestions of hostility to St. Paul under the actual title of 'the Enemy.'

'For instance, when St. Paul comes to Jerusalem for the last time, and a riot breaks out in the temple courts, we are told (Ac 21³⁶) that "the mob followed after him, shouting out 'Down with our enemy.'" And when Paul recounts what happened in the riot, on his trial before Felix, he says that the disturbance was due to some Jews from Asia, "who laid hold on me and shouted out 'Down with our enemy'" (Acts xxiv. 18). Further, when Paul reaches Rome and has conference with the Jewish leaders as to the reason of his arrest and appeal to Rome, he says that at the trial in Cesarea, the Jews made an uproar and shouted out "Down with our enemy."

These statements are found only in Western Manuscripts. That is true. But, whatever their actual value as readings, they are part of the text in the second century. They are therefore evidence for at least as far back as the second century as to what certain people thought of St. Paul. And they give the passage in Galatians an intense reality and terrific force.

All this is to be found in an address which Dr.

Rendel Harris delivered at the Twenty-First National Council of the Evangelical Free Churches. The address is published in the *Free Church Year Book* for 1916 (Meyer). And much more than this will be found in the same volume. For it contains as fine a series of sermons and addresses as any volume that has yet been issued. Among the rest it contains the much-discussed, and some say epoch-making, presidential address of Mr. Shakespeare.

Jealous or Zealous?

Dr. Hermann Gollancz has published a second series of *Sermons and Addresses setting forth the Teachings and Spirit of Judaism* (Chapman & Hall; 6s. net). As becomes a Professor of Hebrew in the University of London, Dr. Gollancz is keenly interested in the Hebrew language of his texts.

In one sermon he deals with the 'jealousy' of God. He recalls the use of that word in one of the Ten Commandments, 'a connexion which will be known to every Jewish man, woman, and child.' He does not approve of the translation, 'Thou shalt not bow down to them, nor serve them, for I, the Lord thy God, am a jealous God.' He knows that 'jealous' is merely an archaic expression for 'zealous,' but in that 'merely' there is more than most of us are aware of. 'For the child, unable to make a distinction between archaic and modern forms of speech, grows up with the idea that the quality of "jealousy," in the sense in which we now use it as applied to man, is also an attribute of God—the Creator and Preserver of the Universe.'

This is the rule which he lays down: 'Wherever in the Scriptures this word "jealous" or "zealous" or the substantive, "jealousy" or "zeal," is used as applied to God, it occurs only in contexts which speak of the sin of idolatry, and of the necessity in the interests of man and for man's own good, of putting it down, and crushing it out of existence, by every means possible. In this sense only, God is a "jealous" God, "zealous" rather in His desire that His creatures on earth shall not go astray after the dictates of their own hearts, shall not give their allegiance to, or put their trust in, false objects of adoration—false gods, fashioned by human hands, that cannot help when appealed to, frail and transitory as the fashioners of the idols themselves.'

He then gives two examples :

(1) 'When Phinehas, the grandson of Aaron, incensed at the corruption which Israel's contact with the people of Moab had brought about, on one occasion took the law into his own hands and destroyed the offenders, we read the following words: "And the Lord spoke unto Moses, saying, Phinehas, the son of Eleazar, the son of Aaron the priest, hath turned my wrath away from the children of Israel, in that he was jealous with my jealousy among them, so that I consumed not the children of Israel in my jealousy" (Numbers xxv. 10-11). This is the wording of the Anglican and Revised translations. Who can understand the meaning of Scripture from such a rendering of the Hebrew? What is really meant is this: God approves the act of Phinehas, and withholds His anger from the people because Phinehas, "was zealous in maintaining God's authority among them"; in other words, because "he took God's part and vindicated" the principles of morality and purity among the people.'

(2) 'Again, when Elijah went about in danger of his life at the hands of Jezebel, and he came into a cave and lodged there, and the word of the Lord came unto him saying, "What doest thou here, Elijah?" he answered (1 Kings xix. 10-14): "I have been very jealous for the Lord, God of Hosts." But the original Hebrew conveys the sense, "I have been very zealous on behalf of the Lord, God of Hosts," i.e. "I have maintained His authority, vindicated His honour and His Law," in having shown to the priests of Baal and the people the hollowness of idol-worship, the impotence of their support; so that, as narrated in the previous chapter, when all the people saw it, they fell on their faces and said: "The Lord He is God, the Lord He is God!" Here was a clear vindication of God's authority, made manifest in the sight of the people.'

Medley of Rawdon.

Rawdon College is a place dear to many men. Pleasantly situated on a wooded hillside in the West Riding of Yorkshire, it is associated with

happy memories of student days. And of these memories none is more sacred than the memory of William Medley, who taught Logic, Scientific Method, Philosophy, Ethics, Theism, and the New Testament—and taught them, taught them all, so as to make his pupils feel the joy of living. 'As a tutor he delighted to speak of himself as a Lamp-lighter. Customs are rapidly changing, but most of us can remember the man described by William Canton :

From lamp to lamp, from street to street,
He speeds with faintlier echoing feet,

A pause—a glint of light!
And lamp by lamp, with stars he marks his
round!

One of Medley's pupils, the Rev. P. F. Chambers, Minister of Unthank Road Baptist Church, Norwich, has made a selection of his sayings—some from his few books, more from notes of lectures. The little book is called *The Lamp of Fellowship* (Norwich: The Author; 1s. 6d.). It is difficult to select from the selection. Let this stand as a fair example :

'How necessary a thing it is to keep vividly alive within us a quick responsiveness of feeling to every presentation of duty or noble opportunity. The later stages of reflection and balanced consideration are so apt to quench the quick spirit of instinctive intuition. For it may well be that intuition will furnish us with a more direct approach to the Divine Mind, and apprehension of the Divine Will, than any self-conscious process of thought can ever attain.

'And how needful it is also to endeavour to convert mere transient impulses into permanent habits of moral life firmly based on reason and conscience. They will then be rescued from contingency, and gradually assimilated to the substance of character.

'Surely it is possible to maintain in balanced harmony the fresh, spontaneous instincts of a child, and the reflective thought and judgment of the experienced man. Thus should we escape our Lord's rebuke: "Hidden from the wise and prudent, but revealed unto babes."'