

# THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

---

## Notes of Recent Exposition.

THERE is always something waiting for the diligent student of the Gospels. The Rev. Arthur WRIGHT, D.D., Vice-President of Queens' College, Cambridge, has studied the Gospels diligently all his life. He has now made a most interesting discovery, which he announces in *The Interpreter* for July.

Most discoveries are made in the search for causes. The fact to be accounted for here is the extraordinarily miscellaneous way in which the narratives in the life of Christ, and especially His sayings, are distributed throughout the first three Gospels. An obvious and easy explanation is that the disarrangement was already in the great source, called Q, from which the evangelists drew so much of their material. And so far as it goes that explanation is probably true. For it is one of the assured results of criticism that Q was a distinctly amorphous document. And so, when St. Matthew tried to arrange in some order the material which he took from Q—and chronologically if possible—he gathered it into five long groups, while St. Luke arranged his material in twenty-four short groups. But, after all, that explanation only throws the difficulty a little farther back. Why was Q so chaotic? If the Synoptic Gospels found their source in confusion, what caused the confusion?

---

The answer probably is that Q had no clear idea

VOL. XXVI.—No. 2.—NOVEMBER 1914.

of the chronology of the works of Christ, much less of His words. That is probable even to those who hold by documents and nothing else as the sources of the Gospels. To Dr. WRIGHT, who believes that the Gospels were largely due to direct reports of oral teaching, it is still more probable. Well, if the editor of Q did not know the order of events and sayings, and yet had to set them down somehow, what principle would he be likely to go upon? No doubt those that would fit in chronologically would be fitted in first. Then those that were alike in subject-matter would be thrown together. But there was one device left. What that device was is Dr. WRIGHT's discovery.

It was the use of catchwords. The use of catchwords is not confined to the Gospels. The editor of Q must have been familiar with it, as it occurs in the Psalms and in the Prophets. Suppose that some Temple musician or scribe had before him a collection of psalms without historical prefaces or conclusions. He had to arrange them for synagogue reading and teaching. He would follow the hints of chronology as far as he could. When that aid failed him he would work on the subject-matter. Last of all he would call to his help the use of catchwords. The editor of Q followed the same method; and the evangelists carried it out still more fully after him.

Take Mk 11<sup>26</sup>: 'And when ye stand praying, forgive, if ye have aught against any one, that your Father which is in the heavens may forgive you your transgressions.' The mere tyro in criticism, says Dr. WRIGHT, will see that this saying has no connexion with what precedes or what follows it. He calls it 'a misplaced boulder.' How did it fall into this position? It belongs to Q. It is one of the few utterances of our Lord which St. Mark has taken from that source. It is clear also that it belongs to that edition of Q which was used by St. Matthew; for the phrase 'your Father which is in the heavens' is notoriously Matthæan. The utterance is not found in St. Luke, the nearest approach being the saying on the cross, 'Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do,' and that saying is not genuine.

Now, when St. Matthew was arranging the material which he took from Q, he placed this saying in the great group which we call the Sermon on the Mount. For he observed its connexion in subject-matter with one of the petitions of the Lord's Prayer. He did not, of course, interrupt the Prayer itself, to make the insertion. But he added it after, as if it had been spoken by our Lord by way of commentary on one of the petitions, or in order to give that particular petition peculiar impressiveness.

But St. Mark has no Sermon on the Mount. Why did he, or why did Q before him, place the saying just where we now find it? The simplicity of the answer is almost amusing. The eye of the editor of Q was caught by the word 'pray' in it. That word occurs in the saying which immediately precedes. It was the last resource, but it sufficed. Because both sayings had this one catchword they were set down together.

There is a more convincing example in Mk 9<sup>49</sup>. In that passage we have three utterances concerning salt. 'For every one will be salted with fire'—that is one. 'Salt is good, but if the salt shall become saltless, wherewith will ye season it?'—

that is another. 'Have salt in yourselves and be at peace with one another'—that is the third.

The first and the third of these utterances are peculiar to St. Mark. The second was found in a longer form in Q. St. Luke took it and inserted it in his fourteenth chapter. St. Matthew changed 'Salt is good' into 'Ye are the salt of the earth,' in order to balance with 'Ye are the light of the world,' and then placed both the clauses in the Sermon on the Mount. But why did St. Mark put all the three together?

He knew nothing about their chronology—we may be sure of that. They are not connected by subject-matter. Quite independent sayings, it is easy to see the force of them when taken alone; it is impossible to bring them into line with one another, as the wonderful variety of efforts so to do has abundantly shown. The only explanation is the catchword 'fire.' That word occurs in the preceding verse: 'Where their worm dieth not and the fire is not quenched.' The other three homeless but priceless sayings about fire found a resting-place beside that saying.

One of the most dreadful doctrines in our fathers' eyes was the doctrine of Patripassianism. It is one of the most delightful doctrines to us. How that great change has come about it is not very easy to say. The chief cause is perhaps our renewed interest in the doctrine of the Atonement. The sight of the Suffering Son leaving the Father unmoved came to be intolerable to our modern sense. The question was asked: Is it then impossible that God should suffer? And no sooner was it asked than the answer came that it is altogether fitting and beautiful and blessed.

It cannot be said to be a commonplace yet of the pulpit. Will it ever become a commonplace? Is it not too great to be compassed, too gracious to be exhausted? For the present, at any rate, it is the freshest and most arresting of all the doctrines

of Christianity. And it is no surprise to find that a volume of sermons by Professor WARFIELD of Princeton does not end until it has set forth this doctrine without reserve.

The title of the volume is *The Saviour of the World* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s.). It is in the last sermon that this doctrine is declared. It is called, 'a very great and marvellous thing,' this doctrine of God's self-sacrifice and suffering. Again, it is called 'a wonderful thing.' For to Professor WARFIELD at least it is no commonplace yet. 'Men tell us that God is, by the very necessity of His nature, incapable of passion, incapable of being moved by inducements from without; that He dwells in holy calm and unchangeable blessedness, untouched by human sufferings or human sorrows for ever, haunting

The lucid interspace of world and world,  
Where never creeps a cloud, nor moves a wind,  
Nor ever falls the least white star of snow,  
Nor ever lowest roll of thunder moans,  
Nor sound of human sorrow mounts to mar  
His sacred, everlasting calm.

But it is not true. 'Let us bless our God,' says Dr. WARFIELD, 'that it is not true. God can feel; God does love. We have Scriptural warrant for believing, as it has been perhaps somewhat inadequately but not misleadingly phrased (the qualification is truly Warfieldian), that moral heroism has a place within the sphere of the Divine nature.' And when he is charged with 'gross anthropomorphism,' he answers heroically, 'We are careless of names: it is the truth of God.'

Although religion has for a long time been making approaches to science and science has for a short time been making approaches to religion, it must not be supposed that the two are just about to become one. It must not be expected that in the near future the scientific man will be found to be religious and the religious man scientific. It ought to be so. In every case it ought to be so.

But it is not likely to be so for a long time to come.

It ought to be so. Every man of education ought to be both scientific and religious. For science and religion are alike based on fundamental natural instincts. They appear spontaneously all over the world. Moreover, they naturally tend to appear in the same individual in such a way that each impulse is dependent on the other for its full development. No man, therefore, is the man he ought to be unless he is both scientific and religious.

Time was—you will find the story of it in an article which Dr. Havelock ELLIS has contributed to *The Atlantic Monthly*—time was when every thinking man was both scientific and religious. It is a long time ago. To find it you must go back to what is called primitive times. Or, what is the same thing, you will find it if you cross the earth to what are called primitive peoples to-day. With rare exceptions, so rare as to be fairly called abnormal, the thinking man, the clever man, the shaman or whatever name he goes by, is both scientific and religious. He may not be highly scientific and he may not be deeply religious. But the point is that when he is the one he is also the other. The 'medicine-man' of all primitive races is both scientific and religious. His science helps his religion and his religion his science. Like the Hebrew prophet, who also was primitive in this as in some other respects, he uses his knowledge, whether of the weather or of the ways of men, to make more impressive his devotion; and he uses his devotion to inspire confidence in his knowledge.

The religion of the medicine-man is very poor religion, and his science is very poor science. But then, in combining religion and science in one person, he is more in harmony with the universe than is the modern man of science with all his knowledge, if he is only scientific; or the modern man of religion with all his piety, if he is only religious. It may be asserted that the shaman is not scientific enough because he has practised

religion along with his science, and it may be argued that he is not religious enough because he has practised science along with his religion. But that does not alter the fact that science and religion should be practised together. Give the shaman true science and true religion, and having both he is a greater man than if he were a Darwin or a Teresa.

Is it not possible to practise both together? It seems to be very difficult. Dr. Havelock ELLIS believes that we are born with both instincts. But from our birth we may have a bias in favour of the one or the other. That bias we encourage. It appears to us in our ignorance to be the proper thing to do. We ought, we say, to follow the bent of our nature. The result is a state of atrophy of the one instinct and of hypertrophy of the other. And then comes antagonism. Darwin does not understand Teresa, and Teresa does not approve of Darwin. There ought to be no antagonism. It is due to a morbid state in both. Strip Teresa of her atrophied pseudo-science, which in her case is mostly theological science, and there is nothing in her attitude which would not harmonize with and exact that absolute adoration and service to natural truth which inspired Darwin. Strip Darwin of that atrophied feeling for poetry and the arts which he deplored, and that anæmic secular conception of the universe as a whole (these are the words of Dr. Havelock ELLIS) which he seems to have accepted without deploring, and there is nothing in his attitude which would not serve to fertilize and enrich the spiritual exaltation of Teresa, and even to remove far from her that temptation to *accidie* or slothfulness which all mystics who are mystics only have recognized as their besetting sin, minimized as it is in Teresa by her practical activities.

If it is difficult to practise science and religion together, it is more difficult to restore the balance when it has once been lost. See the man who has suddenly become alive to the fact that he is hypertrophied on the one side and atrophied on the other, see him as he attempts to remedy his

onesidedness, 'The heroic and ostentatious manner,' says Dr. Havelock ELLIS, 'in which ill-balanced people hastily attempt the athletic feat of restoring their balance has frequently aroused the interest, and too often the amusement, of the spectator.'

He recalls Sir Isaac NEWTON—'the most quint-essentially scientific person the world has seen.' In his old age Sir Isaac NEWTON realized that the vast hypertrophy of his faculties on the scientific side had not been compensated by any development on the side of religion. 'He forthwith set himself to the interpretation of the Book of Daniel, and puzzled over the prophecies of the Book of Revelation, with the same scientifically serious air that he would have assumed in analyzing the spectrum. In reality he had not reached the sphere of religion at all; he had merely exchanged good science for bad.'

And then he turns to Sir Oliver LODGE. 'It would be a double-edged compliment,' he says, 'in this connexion, to compare Sir Oliver LODGE with Sir Isaac NEWTON. But after devoting himself for many years to purely physical research, LODGE also, as he has confessed, found that he had overlooked the religious side of life, and therefore set himself with characteristic energy to the task—the stages of which are described in a long series of books—of developing this atrophied side of his nature. Unlike NEWTON, who was worried about the future, LODGE became worried about the past. Just as NEWTON found what he was contented to regard as religious peace in speculating on the meaning of the Books of Daniel and Revelation, so LODGE found a similar satisfaction in speculations concerning the origin of the soul, and in hunting out tags from the poets to support his speculations. So fascinating was this occupation that it seemed to him to constitute a great "message" to the world. "My message is that there is some great truth in the idea of pre-existence, not an obvious truth, nor one easy to formulate,—a truth difficult to express,—not to be

identified with the guesses of reincarnation and transmigration, which may be fanciful. We may not have been individuals before, but we are chips or fragments of a great mass of mind, of spirit, and of life—drops, as it were, taken out of a germinal reservoir of life, and incubated until incarnate in a material body.”

‘The genuine mystic,’ says Dr. Havelock ELLIS, —and by mystic he simply means religious person, —‘would smile if asked to accept as a divine message these phraseological gropings in the darkness, with their culmination in the gospel of “incubated drops.” They only show that when the hypertrophied man of science seeks to cultivate his atrophied religious instincts it is with the utmost difficulty that he escapes from science. His conversion to religion merely means that he has exchanged sound science for pseudo-science.’

Nor does Dr. Havelock ELLIS think it any easier for the man with hypertrophied religious instincts to recover his balance by cultivating his atrophied scientific interests. The religious man does not so often try to do so. He more rarely sees any occasion for it. For the instinct of religion develops earlier in the history of a race than the instinct of science. It is also more fundamental. The man who has found the massive satisfaction of his religious cravings is seldom at any stage conscious of scientific cravings; he is apt to feel that he already possesses the supreme knowledge. Genuinely religious men who have exercised their scientific instincts have generally found scope for the exercise within an enlarged theological scheme which they regarded as part of their religion. In that way Augustine found scope for his full and vivid, if capricious, intellectual impulses, and in that way Aquinas, ‘in whom there was less of the mystic and more of the scientist, found scope for the rational and orderly development of a keen intelligence which has made him an authority, and even a pioneer, for many who are absolutely indifferent to his theology.’

The Rev. J. D. JONES, M.A., B.D., has published a volume of sermons and called it *The Gospel of the Sovereignty* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s.). The title is significant. Whether it belongs to the whole volume we cannot yet tell. It belongs to the first sermon in it. And it is significant that that is the subject of *any* sermon in the volume. It is significant that that sermon has been placed first.

For we have heard little of the Sovereignty of God for a long time now. It has all been of God’s Fatherhood. There was a certain system of theology which was built upon God’s Sovereignty. That system, almost as long as we can remember, has been out of favour. It has not been forgotten. There is something about it that makes forgetfulness impossible, but it has been greatly spoken against. The very name of Calvinism has been a byword and a reproach. But no system of theology has ever used the Sovereignty of God as Calvinism has done. And the Sovereignty of God is coming to its own again.

In coming to its own it is not going to overwhelm the doctrine of God’s Fatherhood. The pendulum is on the turn; but it is not going to swing so far the other way as to make us forget the Fatherhood—a doctrine which was gained for us and our generation not without tears. Mr. JONES preaches the gospel of the Sovereignty, but ‘I too,’ he says, ‘rejoice in the Fatherhood of God: I delight to proclaim God’s tenderness and compassion and infinite love.’ It may be that for a time the preacher of the Sovereignty will have to preach it almost exclusively. For pendulums do not swing of themselves. We have gone so far away from it, and with such disastrous consequences, that it may be necessary to accept the appearance of forgetting the Fatherhood for a little that the Sovereignty may come to its own again.

The consequences have been disastrous. ‘We are living,’ says Mr. JONES, ‘in a rather limp and flaccid time. The intellectual temper of our day

is that of a genial humanitarianism. Our manners are soft, our beliefs are invertebrate. And the Church's condition corresponds somewhat to the condition of the age. For years now we have been bemoaning our ineffectiveness and lack of power. The fact is, a genial humanitarianism will never carry a Church to victory. What we need is a new vision of God—the Mighty God.

Men have called the Puritan religion "the Hard Church." But is it not time, as Professor PEABODY says, to face the perils of "the Soft Church"? That is our peril to-day—the peril of the Soft Church. We want a breath of the Puritan's bracing faith. For Churches and for men it remains eternally true—"the fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom."

## A Solution of the Chief Difficulties in Revelation xx.-xxii.

BY THE REV. R. H. CHARLES, D.LITT., D.D., F.B.A., CANON OF WESTMINSTER.

IN the year 1892 I was struck by the remarkable contradictions existing in the text of the above chapters. To some of these I drew attention in my first edition of the *Book of Enoch* in 1893, where on p. 45 I wrote as follows: 'We have here (*i.e.* Rev 21<sup>1-2</sup>) a new heaven and a new earth, and a New Jerusalem coming down from heaven: yet in 22<sup>15</sup> all classes of sinners are said to be without the gates of the city. But if there were a new earth, this would be impossible.' This is only one of the many difficulties that confront the serious student of these chapters. Now, to make the problem before us clear, it will be best to deal shortly with a few of the passages which make it impossible for us to accept the text as it stands.

1. In 20<sup>7-10</sup> after the close of the Millennial Kingdom, Satan is loosed, and the nations (*Gog and Magog*) which have refused to accept the Christian faith, march against Jerusalem and the camp of the saints, but are destroyed by fire from heaven. Satan also is cast finally into the lake of fire and brimstone to be tormented there for ever and ever. *Thus the prime source of evil and his deluded followers (Gog and Magog) are removed finally from the world, and their power to influence the world for evil made impossible for ever.*

2. In 20<sup>11-15</sup> the old earth and the old heaven are given over to annihilation. Then the final judgment takes place, and all the dead are judged according to their works, and death and Hades are cast into the lake of fire, together with all whose names are not found written in the book of life. *At this stage we have arrived at the final overthrow of all evil, together with the destruction of death itself.*

3. Now that all evil and death itself are cast into the lake of fire, the new heaven and the new earth come into being, and the New Jerusalem comes down from heaven, and God Himself dwells with men (21<sup>1-4</sup>).

*It is clear from this passage that we have arrived at the closing scene of the great world struggle between good and evil, and that henceforth there can be neither sin, nor crying, nor pain, nor death any more. In fact, there can be no place at all for these in the universe of God—the new heaven and the new earth and the New Jerusalem that cometh down from God to the new earth.*

The conclusion just arrived at is inevitable, if there is a steady development in the visions of the Seer. Now since such a development is manifest in chapters 1-20, when certain verses and glosses are excised, and a few disarrangements of the text set right—especially that in 18—we naturally conclude that our author will not lightly fall into contradictions, even of a minor sort, in the last three chapters. But unhappily this is not our experience as we study them; and at last we stand aghast at the hopeless mental confusion which dominates the present structure of these chapters, and are compelled to ask if they can possibly come from his hand, and, in case they do so, to ask further, if they have been preserved as they left his hand.

But we must first justify the above statement, though we shall adduce here<sup>1</sup> only a few of the main contradictions in these chapters.

<sup>1</sup> Others will be brought to light in the rearranged text which is printed at the close of this study.