

Editorial

I had hoped to discuss the sanctuary both in this issue of *Historicism* and in No. 17/Jan 89. There are answers as well as questions. We are not through with this topic from either perspective. But the paper is not ripe. Maybe next year.

In this issue of *Historicism* I examine the very broad philosophical question of how divine things relate to human things in three specific areas. My conclusion is that they do. They relate. Neither factor can be discarded or minimized. As an objective starting point my model takes the classic historical position of the Christian church on the nature of Christ. He could not be fully God and fully man if the two facts contradicted each other. In Christ there was no contradiction. Both poles of existence were fully present at the same time and within the scope of a single personality.

Christ was with God in the beginning (John 1:1). He then took human flesh and came into the world as a man (John 1:14). There are some things that we can learn from these facts as soon as we acknowledge that they are true. But as we continue to study this mystery we continue to learn from it. This is not a temporary situation. His was an infinite sacrifice and as such it will reward study over infinite time. We will not exhaust the topic either now or in eternity.

There is a question how people can profitably spend a long time learning new things about old things. This does not mean relearning the same facts endlessly, but seeing how established principles apply in situations where we had not previously expected them to. That is what I hope to accomplish in my paper, "Three Examples of Divine-Human Relationships." There I explore implications that follow from the nature of Christ for our understanding of the nature of Scripture and of how God influences the course of secular human history. In each case divine influences and human influences should not be seen as competing with or displacing each other. There is room for both when both are correctly understood.

In a second paper I discuss Ezra's return from Babylon against the backdrop of events happening elsewhere during the reign of Artaxerxes I (465-424). The two papers are not unrelated. In the one I point out some of the pressures that influenced Artaxerxes to act as he did. In the other I claim that attempting to see these very human circumstances through Artaxerxes' eyes is not the same as attempting to avoid seeing them from God's point of view. On the contrary, if God meets man in history, as He surely did in the case of Ezra, then we must go to history to find Him. If that is where His mighty acts took place, that is where we must search for them. History is not a substitute for spiritual insight, but a prerequisite for achieving it.

Frank W. Hardy
Editor