

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

IN the announcement of the programme for the present volume of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES it was stated that arrangements were being made for a series of articles on the theological and religious life of various countries. Already an article has appeared on Canada by Professor Symonds, of Toronto University. Now we shall commence a series of papers which will deal fully with Switzerland and Protestant France. The writers will be Professor Gretillat, of Neuchatel, Professor Bois, of Montauban, and Professor Frommel, of Geneva, and they will not only describe the religious and theological movements in that country at the present day, but also give a separate account of the work and influence of most of their leading theologians.

Further, it was stated that arrangements were under progress for a series of articles on our own and other great writers in theology and leaders in religious thought. We are in no haste to complete these arrangements. But while mentioning that already an article of acknowledged insight has appeared on Thomas Hill Green, by Professor Iverach, we may state that others have been definitely arranged for as follows :—

Godet, . . . By Professor Gretillat, D.D.
Vinet, . . . By Professor Bartlet, M.A.
Dillmann, . . . By Principal Witton Davies, B.A.

VOL. IV.—6.

Lotze, . . . By Rev. A. E. Garvie, M.A.
Herrmann, . . . By Rev. David Eaton, M.A.
Westcott, . . . By Rev. J. O. F. Murray, M.A.

We shall also commence very soon an important series of papers under the title of "Keswick at Home." The papers will be written by the recognised leaders in that remarkable movement which is now best known by the name of the Keswick Movement, and they will present a systematic and what may be regarded as an authoritative exposition of the teaching known as the Higher Life. Such a series of articles will be widely welcomed.

The Sunday School, the weekly journal for which the editor of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES is responsible, has made a most encouraging start, and has been received by the Press with a favour which we believe to be quite exceptional. Professor A. B. Davidson contributes a column or more every week, and he is putting into it such work as only ripe scholars can fully appreciate, though we all can enjoy it. Nor do we know that the Rev. Mark Guy Pearse, who also contributes a paper weekly, has anywhere shown himself happier than in some of his recent expositions there.

The publishers of *The Sunday School* are willing to send a parcel of free copies, carriage paid,

to any one who will take the trouble to distribute them. If any of our readers will let us know how many they can conveniently dispose of, we shall gladly send their names on to the publishers. Address the Editor, at Kinneff, Bervie, N.B.

We should like to add that while our main consideration in *The Sunday School* is for those who have to do with the teaching of the young, we have a strong desire to supply another very pressing and widely felt need—the need for a good-toned weekly paper which may safely be used for family reading on Sunday. Will our readers try it in that light also, and if they find in it the thing they have been looking for, will they commend it to their friends?

There was a time when the complaint was freely made that the theological magazines neglected the just claims of the Old Testament. But that was before the publication of *Lux Mundi*, and when the Higher Criticism was only a name for an unfamiliar thing, with the words “made in Germany” stamped upon it. Now the complaint may with more justice be made that the Old Testament receives more than is fairly due to it, and that it is the New that is in danger of neglect.

Certainly the risk is less that the New Testament should suffer any permanent neglect. And we have all been fully aware that while the controversy raged round the criticism of the Scriptures of the Old Testament, the unsettled problems of the New but slumbered for a little, and would by and by awake to press their yet more urgent and more vital claims upon us.

To one of the greatest of the New Testament problems we have opened our pages somewhat largely this month. We make no apology for the space it occupies. It is worthy that we should do

it justice, and to do it justice we must give it room. But we should greatly like to carry all our readers with us as we proceed. And if there are those who have not yet had the opportunity of making any study of it, a word or two of a strictly elementary kind will be welcomed, and all the rest will forgive.

The problem has long been known as “The Synoptic Problem.” But the name is false and misleading, and it is an excellent sign of a better attitude towards the matter to find Dr. Sanday and others insisting that it is not a Synoptic problem, not a problem of the three Gospels Matthew, Mark, and Luke only, but a problem into which John must also enter, if it is ever to see its solution.

The problem is this: How to find a satisfactory theory of the origin of the four Gospels which will account for both their resemblances and their differences. You may know nothing about it as long as you are content to read the Gospels one after another, and accept the abundant edification such reading is able to bring you. But the moment you remember, in reading the story of the Feeding of the Five Thousand in St. Mark, that you read a similar story in St. Matthew also, and turning back compare the two narratives together, you are confronted with it, and not likely to forget it ever again. For you easily see that, while the story is one and the same in both, in respect of all its essentials,—as a story in short,—there yet are most surprising resemblances in language, if the two narrators are independent, and no less surprising differences if the one is copying the other.

Let us see clearly how the matter stands. The first narrative which is told by all the Evangelists is the one to which we have just referred, the Feeding of the Five Thousand. Let us exhibit it in parallel column in the words of the Revised Version, placing the resemblances as nearly as possible in a line with one another:—

MATT. XIV.

- 13 Now when Jesus heard it, He withdrew from thence in a boat, to a desert place apart; and when the multitudes heard thereof, they followed Him on foot from the cities.
- 14 And He came forth, and saw a great multitude, and He had compassion on them, and healed their sick.
- 15 And when even was come, the disciples came to Him, saying, The place is desert, and the time is already past; send the multitudes away, that they may go into the villages, and buy themselves food.
- 16 But Jesus said unto them, They have no need to go away; give ye them to eat.
- 17 And they say unto Him, We have here but five loaves, and two fishes.
- 18 And He said, Bring them hither to me. And He commanded the multitude to sit down on the grass;
- and He took the five loaves, and the two fishes, and looking up to heaven, He blessed and brake and gave the loaves to the disciples, and the disciples to the multitude.
- 20 And they did all eat, and were filled: and they took up that which remained over of the

MARK VI.

- 32 And they went away in the boat to a desert place apart. And the people saw them going, and many knew them, and they ran there together on foot from all the cities, and outwent them. And He came forth and saw a great multitude, and He had compassion on them, because they were as sheep not having a shepherd: and He began to teach them many things.
- 35 And when the day was now far spent, His disciples came unto Him, and said, The place is desert, and the day is now far spent; send them away, that they may go into the country and villages round about, and buy themselves somewhat to eat. But He answered and said unto them, Give ye them to eat. And they say unto Him, Shall we go and buy two hundred pennyworth of bread, and give them to eat?
- 38 And He saith unto them, How many loaves have ye? go and see. And when they knew, they say, Five, and two fishes.
- 39 And He commanded them that all should sit down by companies upon the green grass. And they sat down in ranks, by hundreds, and by fifties. And He took the five loaves and the two fishes, and looking up to heaven, He blessed, and brake the loaves; and He gave to the disciples to set before them; and the two fishes divided He among them all. And they did all eat, and were filled.
- 43 And they took up broken pieces, twelve basketfuls,

LUKE IX.

- 10 And He took them, and withdrew apart to a city called Bethsaida.
- 11 But the multitudes perceiving it followed Him: and He welcomed them, and spake to them of the kingdom of God, and them that had need of healing He healed.
- 12 And the day began to wear away: and the twelve came, and said unto Him, Send the multitude away, that they may go into the villages and country round about, and lodge, and get victuals; for we are here in a desert place.
- 13 But He said unto them, Give ye them to eat. And they said, We have no more than five loaves and two fishes; except we should go and buy food for all this people.
- 14 For they were about five thousand men. And He said unto His disciples, Make them sit down in companies, about fifty each. And they did so, and made them all sit down.
- 16 And He took the five loaves and the two fishes, and looking up to heaven, He blessed them, and brake; and gave to the disciples to set before the multitude.
- 17 And they did eat, and were all filled: and there was taken up that which remained over to them

JOHN VI.

- 1 After these things Jesus went away to the other side of the sea of Tiberias. And a great multitude followed Him, because they beheld the signs which He did on them that were sick.
- 3 And Jesus went up into the mountain, and there He sat with His disciples. Now the passover, the feast of the Jews, was at hand. Jesus therefore lifting up His eyes, and seeing that a great multitude cometh unto Him,
- saith unto Philip, Whence are we to buy bread, that these may eat? And this He said to prove him; for He Himself knew what He would do.
- 7 Philip answered Him, Two hundred pennyworth of bread is not sufficient for them, that every one may take a little. One of His disciples, Andrew, Simon Peter's brother, saith unto Him, There is a lad here, which hath five barley loaves, and two fishes; but what are these among so many?
- 10 Jesus said, Make the people sit down. Now there was much grass in the place. So the men sat down, in number about five thousand.
- 11 Jesus therefore took the loaves; and having given thanks, He distributed to them that were set down; likewise also of the fishes as much as they would.
- 12 And when they were filled, He saith unto His disciples, Gather up the broken pieces which re-

MATT. XIV.

broken pieces, twelve
21 baskets full. And they
that did eat were about
five thousand men, beside
women and children.

MARK VI.

and also of the fishes.
44 And they that ate the
loaves were five thousand
men.

LUKE IX.

of broken pieces, twelve
baskets.

JOHN VI.

13 main over, that nothing
be lost. So they
gathered them up, and
filled twelve baskets
with broken pieces from
the five barley loaves,
which remained over
unto them that had
eaten.

Now when this narrative, or even a small portion of it, is examined, it is seen why this problem has been called the *Synoptic* problem. It is seen why the three Gospels Matthew, Mark, and Luke have been called the Synoptics,—that is to say, the Gospels with one outlook. For the resemblances are very close between these three; John is much more independent than any of them. He is outside to a great degree. And if this is seen to be so here, it is seen to be still more so when the whole Gospel of St. John is compared with the others. Still it is manifest from this narrative that we cannot separate John from the others, and settle the problem without him. The attempt to do so has been short-sighted and disastrous.

Taking John with us, then, the question at once arises, How do they all differ where they differ, and how do they so closely resemble one another where they resemble? That is the problem before us—the Gospel Problem.

The most natural answer undoubtedly is, that one of the evangelists wrote his Gospel, and the others used it freely. They used it freely, not slavishly. They incorporated his very words where it suited them, they left them out where they chose, and they added others of their own where they could, or cared to do so. And that is the answer which has been made by some very great scholars, English and German. It is the view that was worked out with great patience by the late Professor T. R. Birks, and it is the view elaborated with no less patience and enthusiasm by the Rev. J. J. Hal-

combe. And these names are sufficient for our purpose in the meantime. But it should be mentioned that while Professor Birks held that the order of writing was the same as the order in which the Gospels stand in our Bible, Mr. Halcombe holds that St. John wrote first, and that the others then followed in the present order.

Why that first and most natural view has not satisfied every one, eminent scholars will tell us. Those who are dissatisfied with it have suggested other two explanations, and have followed the one or the other of them.

Some hold that there was a Gospel, or even more than one Gospel, in writing before any of our present Gospels were written, and the four evangelists (or at least the first three) used that earlier Gospel, whence their resemblances and their differences. The earlier Gospel may have been in Greek, as some say, or it may have been in Aramaic, as others say, and translated by our evangelists into Greek—of all that we shall hear. Professor Marshall tells in the present issue why he believes they used an original Aramaic Gospel.

Others, however, hold that while there is little if any evidence of the existence of an earlier Gospel, there is as little need for it. The whole problem may be solved, they believe, by supposing that the earliest disciples, beginning at the very apostles themselves, made the facts of Christ's life and His teaching the subject of oral instruction to their converts. Most things were learned and known by word of mouth in those days, and

memories were retentive. If St. Peter, for example, repeated his story over and over, till his followers had learned it by heart, and they again repeated it to others, till at last it got recorded by St. Matthew and the rest,—that would account for the remarkable resemblances between the Gospels, and account for their differences also, for which, of course, defective memories and the like would be to blame. Bishop Westcott has ably expounded the oral theory, and Mr. Arthur Wright, of Queen's College, Cambridge, is at present its very capable advocate.

The revolution that is now passing over the interpretation of prophecy was touched upon in the last issue of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, and a striking illustration was found in Professor Kirkpatrick's Warburtonian Lectures. But in Professor Driver's new volume of sermons, to which reference has already been made (*Sermons on the Old Testament*. Methuen), there is a still more striking instance of this reversal of the interpretation of prophecy. The prophecy is that remarkably impressive passage in the sixty-third chapter of Isaiah, which describes the return of the solitary blood-stained conqueror from Edom:—

“Who is this that cometh from Edom,
With dyed garments from Bozrah?
This that is glorious in his apparel,
Marching in the greatness of his strength?”

The reversal of the old interpretation of this passage is not due to Professor Driver, or to any school of interpretation to which he may be said to belong. Many years ago there was a sermon preached on this prophecy, by the late Bishop Lightfoot (it may now be found in his *Cambridge Sermons*. Macmillan), which repudiated the old interpretation as heartily to the full as Dr. Driver does, and gave a memorable exposition of the new. Here are the Bishop's words of repudiation: “I have explained the passage thus at length, because from very early times it has suffered much from

misrepresentation. It has been supposed that the prophet's words refer immediately to the scene on Calvary; that the figure seen approaching is our Lord Himself; that the solitary treading of the wine-press represents His submission to the Father's wrath endured for our redemption. I think it will be plain from what has been said, that this view does not at all meet the requirements of the context. I think it will be seen, also, that the image of treading the wine-press, till the garments of the treader are drenched with the blood of the crushed grape-clusters, must signify, not the endurance of punishment, but the infliction of punishment. And, if so, we need not stop here to inquire whether in any proper or natural sense our blessed Lord could be said to endure the Father's wrath when He ended a life of self-devotion by this sublime act of self-sacrifice, which was the fulfilment of His Father's will. Far different is the lesson which the text sets forth.”

As in all these cases the new interpretation is found by paying attention to the actual circumstances under which the prophecy was delivered. And in this instance the circumstances are of special interest. Edom and Israel were enemies. The closeness of their kinship made their enmity only more bitter and personal. It began early. When Israel returned from Egypt and reached the land of Edom, they craved permission to pass through their brother's land, but the Edomites churlishly refused. “Edom refused to give Israel passage through his border; wherefore Israel turned away from him.” Perhaps the Israelites never forgot that insult. The Edomites had no desire that they should. Age succeeded age, and generation made way for generation, but the hostility between these close neighbours never abated its bitterness. “Other nations varied in their demeanour toward the chosen people, being at one time in alliance and at another in enmity; but Edom never swerved from his attitude of implacable hostility. As Amos expresses it, ‘His anger did tear perpetually, and he kept his wrath for ever.’”

For the most part throughout their history, Israel maintained the supremacy and kept the Edomites down, or at least compelled them to use treachery to gain their ends. But Edom's day of vengeance came. When the Babylonian conqueror passed across the sacred land, destroying its cities and its vineyards, and carrying its inhabitants to a miserable captivity in a far land, Edom made common cause with the ruthless foreigner, laid snares for the fugitive Israelites who sought to escape, and either treacherously murdered them or treacherously betrayed them into his hand. And so, as the children of Israel sat and wept by the rivers of Babylon in the days of their captivity that came after, their plaintive song was suddenly interrupted by the memory of Edom's cruel joy in the day of their calamity, and they cried: "Remember the children of Edom, O Lord, in the day of Jerusalem; how they said, Down with it, down with it, even to the ground."

If, then, there is any message of consolation for Israel; if the prophet is sent with the promise of a coming triumph for the downcast nation; how can it ever be complete till Edom is brought low? But who is sufficient for it? Edom is secure within her fortresses; "she dwells in the clefts of the rocks," "she sets her nest among the stars." And she is as able as she is unscrupulous in her methods of warfare. What can this handful of Israelite captives do against the proud nation?

Suddenly the prophet sees a solitary champion approaching from the way of the strongholds of Edom. He comes majestically as a conqueror, and his garments are dyed red with the blood of the slain.

"Who is this that cometh from Edom,
With dyed garments from Bozrah?"

The answer is sublime:

"I that speak in righteousness, mighty to save."

Plainly he has wrought a deed of vengeance. But, see! it is in the cause of righteousness. It is in no wanton spirit of revenge he has bared his

arm. If he has had to visit one proud sin-stained nation with chastisement, it is that he might save another that is humble and needy. But the prophet is impressed with the deep stain upon his raiment. Surely it is no ordinary conflict he has passed through.

"Wherefore art thou red in thine apparel,
And thy garments like him that treadeth the wine-press?"

It is because the terrible task of chastisement had fallen upon himself alone. Alone he had passed through this nation and visited it with the wrath of God's displeasure. There was no human hand who dared assist him.

"The wine-press I have trodden alone;
And of the peoples, no man was with me:
And I have trodden them in mine anger, and trampled
them in my fury;
And their life-stream is sprinkled upon my garments,
And I have stained all my raiment."

"This, then, is the force of the passage,"—we now quote the words of Bishop Lightfoot. "It is a prophetic announcement of Israel's triumph at the moment of Israel's deepest humiliation; a prophetic denunciation of vengeance on Israel's enemies, when those enemies were proudly triumphing over their prostrate foe. The chief offender, the bitterest and most insolent foe, is Edom, Israel's brother Edom. In the day of vengeance Edom's punishment shall be the greatest, because her crime was so unnatural, her hostility so uncalled for. Though the horizon is now so dark and stormy, though all hope seems to have vanished, though Israel stands alone among the nations, while her enemies are many and strong and unscrupulous, yet there is One Whose arm is all-powerful, One Whose aid is never invoked and never rendered in vain, One Who will silence all insolence and crush all opposition, the never-failing ally of Israel, the Lord Jehovah Himself. This reliance in God alone in the absence of all human aid, is the leading idea of the passage. Again and again it is reiterated: 'I have trodden the wine-press alone. Of the people there was none with Me. I looked, and there was none to help; I wondered that there was none to

uphold. Therefore Mine own arm brought salvation unto Me.'"

Does any one fear that to give up the old interpretation is to put away the possibility of one excellent and eloquent sermon? Read this sermon by the Bishop of Durham. How many preachers have we left who can stand beside him? What the power of the spoken voice may have been many of us know not, and will never know. But here, and in the volumes that match with this, is marvellous and abundant evidence that it could not well have surpassed the eloquence of the written word. Further on, in this same volume of Cambridge Sermons, there is one on the Wrath of the Lamb, and it handles its magnificent subject so capably that we think it might be chosen as a pattern for all earnest students to follow. Let us endeavour, in as few words as possible, to point out the line of treatment that is taken.

The text is very short—"The wrath of the Lamb," Rev. vi. 16. "This title," he begins—"the Lamb, the Lamb of God—as applied to our Lord, is found only in the Gospel and the Apocalypse of St. John." It is one of the links that bind the two together. But the word occurs twice only in the Gospel, twice on one single occasion, and never is heard again. In the Apocalypse it is reiterated not far short of thirty times. Thus he brings our minds to rest upon the Apocalypse where his text is, and the first part of his task is due.

Now he wishes us to perceive the boldness, the superhuman audacity of the apostle in the use of this figure in the Apocalypse. He tells the story of the Van Eycks' celebrated picture. He tells it with great fulness of detail, once or twice verging on the risk of losing our interest if he loses our comprehension of the whole. But he admirably brings out at the end the unutterable surprise with which we discover that the Central Figure upon whom men below and angels above, and even the adorable Father of all, bend their gaze, is a lamb

pure and simple. "The painter seems determined that the adoration of the Lamb shall be the adoration of a lamb; and a lamb he has given us. There is an incongruity, a perversity, a paradox, a bathos in this treatment which we can hardly explain, and cannot forgive."

But this paradox is not the painter's, it is the seer's. This incongruity belongs first to the vision in the Apocalypse. If the painter did not fear to disappoint, the seer delights to shock us. "Nay, he seems bent on enhancing the incongruity by all the accessories which he can gather about it, welcoming every paradox of language and every inversion of metaphor which will give point to his lesson." It is a lamb, yet it is the shepherd of the flock. It is a slain lamb, yet it has power over the Book of Life. Its blood is crimson, yet the robes of the redeemed are made white in it. Though a feeble, helpless creature, it is the emblem of power and of victory. And it is all of set purpose. "Once the Apocalyptic seer stumbles on an image more akin (one might have thought) to the ideas which he wishes to convey—'Behold the Lion of the tribe of Judah.' Here was a magnificent image, recommended alike by its prophetic prestige, by its historic relations, and by its intrinsic propriety. The monarch of the forest, springing on his prey, would suggest just those conceptions of sovereignty and vengeance and might with which he would desire to invest the Person of the glorified Lord. Yet it is dropped at once and for ever; and the image of the Lamb replaces it, never again to be relinquished. The mode of transition, too, is remarkable. 'One of the elders said unto me . . . Behold the Lion of the tribe of Judah . . . And I beheld, and, lo . . . a Lamb as it had been slain.'"

Has the preacher spent too much time over this paradox? Nay; the point of the sermon is there. He will spend a little longer yet. For he has to lead straight up to the climax of the paradox, the *wrath* of the *Lamb*. He would get these two incongruous ideas together—the wrath of divine

vengeance, and the guilelessness of the lamb—that you may see how much lies, that everything lies, in the very incongruity of them.

Then when you have seen how utterly paradoxical they are, his message is borne swiftly in upon you with irresistible persuasion. Does the seer of the Apocalypse terrify us with hideous images of the physical agonies in which the lost lie tortured and tormented? No. For the most part a thick veil is drawn over the fate of the lost. And when a glimpse is given, it is to suggest a wholly different order of ideas. “Every eye shall see Him, even they which pierced Him.” “Hide us from the face of Him that sitteth on the throne, and from the wrath of the Lamb.”

For what *is* the agony of the lost? It is the blessing spurned, and the opportunity gone. It

is the glory and the goodness, in which we yearn to slake our burning thirst, and the cup is dashed away from our lips. “What was it that wrung from those foolish ones in the parable, the mournful, hopeless cry, ‘Lord, Lord, open unto us’? Not certainly the howling of wild beasts, nor dread of robbers, nor deadly night-chill, nor menacing storm. It was the light streaming through the casement, and the shadow of the bridegroom thrown on the chamber wall—the light they might not share, and the bridegroom whom they might not greet.” For “our highest capacities become our fiercest tormentors. The agony is that love itself is inflicting vengeance. He is not changed, but we are changed. He is the Lamb still. His truth, His purity, His love are eternal. But our perversity has transformed them into avenging angels. That is the agony of it. That is the supreme torture—it is the wrath of the Lamb we endure.”

The Kingdom of God.

BY ERICH HAUPT, D.D., PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY, HALLE.

IN the Synoptic Gospels the kingdom of God is the main theme of the preaching of Jesus. There is the same difficulty, however, in understanding the term “kingdom of God,” as there is in understanding all other central and leading expressions used by Him. He nowhere gives an express explanation of the sense which He connects with such terms, but leaves it to His hearers to gather His meaning gradually from the totality of His words and from the various occasions upon which He uses them. This is what we have to do in the present case. For the purely lexical explanation does not carry us far. The expression “kingdom of God,” taken by itself, might signify two things—the territory subject to God, or the sovereignty of God. Each of these two meanings suits individual passages, but neither of them is suitable in all cases. What a strange thing it would be for Jesus to threaten the Jews that the “territory subject to God” would be taken away from them (Matt. xxi. 43), or for the Jews to ask, when the “territory subject to God” cometh, and for Jesus to

answer that it cometh not with observation (Luke xvii. 20 f.). It would be equally inappropriate to preach the gospel of the “territory subject to God” (Matt. iv. 23, xxiv. 14), which, at the most, could only refer to the universal extent of the kingdom, without saying anything as to its content. Nor do we succeed better with the second meaning, “sovereignty” of God. The promise that the “sovereignty of God” belongs to the poor, the persecuted, the children (Matt. v. 3, 10, xix. 14), could, in that case, only mean that they would share in God’s royal dignity; whereas the meaning plainly is that they shall belong to the kingdom ruled by God (*vide* also Luke xiv. 15; Matt. viii. 11). We must, therefore, see whether the term was used in pre-Christian Judaism, and if so, what meaning it had. But in doing so we must use great care. The demand, on the one hand, that we should understand the thoughts of the New Testament in accordance with the Old Testament, and, on the other, that we should seek the key to the words of Jesus and the apostles in the thought and language