

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Expository Times* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[Issue]_[1st page of article].pdf

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THE indiscriminate selection of texts throughout the Bible is a method of establishing a doctrine which is not so common now as it used to be. But some of us still have to see its futility. We may see it in a single but sufficient instance if we turn to the English edition of *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* which Professor Charles of Oxford has just published.

The instance is Forgiveness. It is even but a portion of the whole doctrine of Forgiveness; it is a man's forgiveness of his neighbour. What is the Old Testament doctrine of a man's forgiveness of his neighbour? We know what it is in the New Testament. 'In the New Testament,' says Dr. Charles, 'from the first page to the last it is either explicitly stated or implicitly understood that a man can receive the Divine forgiveness only on condition that he forgives his neighbour. Indeed,' he says, 'in their essential aspects, these two forgivenesses are seen to be one and the same.' What is the doctrine of forgiveness in the Old Testament?

In the Old Testament it is quite different. God's forgiveness is granted without money and without price to the sinner who truly seeks it. But the penitent in the Old Testament can enjoy the Divine pardon and yet cherish the most bitter

feelings towards his own personal enemy. Professor Charles mentions the case of David on his deathbed. He does not forget that Joseph forgave his brethren. But that notable instance is isolated. The act of grace on Joseph's part made no impression upon later Old Testament writers. He does not forget the remarkable passage in the Book of Proverbs (25^{21, 22}): 'If thine enemy be hungry, give him bread to eat; and if he be thirsty, give him water to drink. For thou shalt heap coals of fire upon his head, and the Lord shall reward thee.' But again the admonition is exceptional. He finds the true attitude of the Old Testament saints to those who wronged them in the preceding chapter of the same Book of Proverbs (24^{17, 18}): 'Rejoice not when thine enemy falleth, and let not thine heart be glad when he is overthrown: lest the Lord see it, and it displease him, and he turn away his wrath from him.' He finds it again in the Psalter, where the righteous man can pray to God to make him strong enough to pay out his enemies (41¹⁰): 'Do thou, O Lord, have mercy upon me, and raise me up, that I may requite them.'

This is the contrast, then. In the Old Testament the saint may indulge in resentful feelings and even in personal vengeance, and be none the less a saint. In the New Testament the only

attitude is, 'If ye forgive not men their trespasses, neither will your Father forgive your trespasses.'

But the purpose of Professor Charles in pointing out this difference on the subject of forgiveness is not to warn us once more against the mistake of miscellaneous quotation from the Old Testament and the New. His purpose is to show that the gulf between them is bridged by the Apocryphal book called the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs.

The passage of most importance is found in the Testament of Gad. It consists of five verses in the sixth chapter (3-7). We need not quote all the five; the first and last are sufficient—'Love ye, therefore, one another from the heart; and if a man sin against thee, cast forth the poison of hate and speak peaceably to him, and in thy soul hold not guile; and if he confess and repent, forgive him . . . but if he be shameless and persisteth in his wrong-doing, even so forgive him from the heart and leave to God the avenging.'

Of this passage Dr. Charles says: 'These verses contain the most remarkable statement on the subject of forgiveness in all ancient literature. They show a most wonderful insight into the true psychology of the question. That our Lord was acquainted with them, and that His teaching presupposes them, we must infer from the fact that the parallel is so perfect in thought and so close in diction between them and Lk 17³, Mt 18¹⁵.'

Now we are not going to be troubled here with peddling questions about our Lord's originality. It is as original to rediscover a truth as to discover it. It is more original, in this world of ours, to be its embodiment in life. It is easy to instruct; he is the good divine who follows his own instructions. Whether the true law of forgiveness once discovered had been lost sight of by the time of our Lord, Professor Charles cannot say with certainty. But it was certainly lost sight of

in practice. Christ taught His followers to love their enemies; and then He died, the just for the unjust.

In the 42nd Psalm, that Psalm which begins with the beautiful words, 'As the hart panteth after the water brooks,' there is a verse which is a little puzzling, especially in the Revised Version. It is the fourth verse. The words are:

These things I remember, and pour out my soul within me,
How I went with the throng, and led them to the house of God,
With the voice of joy and praise, a multitude keeping holy day.

Though the rest of the Psalm is so simple, here the meaning is difficult to catch. If any of the readers of the Psalm have had a suspicion that there is something wrong with the translation, even with the Revised Version, they will find their suspicion made into a certainty by turning to the recently published volume, entitled *Sermons in Syntax*, of the Rev. John Adams, B.D. They will find that when it is translated with strict grammatical accuracy, this verse is as easily understood as the rest. They will find that it is now brought into harmony of thought with the rest. And they will find that now the Psalmist, who is an exile, instead of simply uttering a peevish lament on the misery of his present lot, is giving expression to a strong assurance of hope that God will deliver him.

In the first place, Mr. Adams points out that the tenses used are cohortative. No, that is not the first thing. The first thing of all is that the Revisers have missed the punctuation. In the first two lines they have followed the punctuation neither of the Masoretic Text nor of the Septuagint. Mr. Adams shows that in a number of MSS collated by Dr. Wickes the principal pause is at the end of the first line. Hence the colon of the Authorized Version is better than the comma of the Revised. And this is in accordance with the Septuagint. It follows that the word translated

'these things' refers to what has gone before, not, as in the Revised Version, to what is coming after. It is the suitable summing up of the previous verses.

Now the previous verses contain a vivid and pathetic description of the exile's present state. He is separated from Zion and the Temple-worship, though he pants for God like the hart for the water brooks; he has to bear the taunts of his heathen enemies—Where is thy God? Can he forget these things? He cannot forget them. But more than that, he is determined not to forget them. The tenses, as we have said, are cohortative.

These things let me remember,
and let me pour out my soul upon me.

Then comes the reference to the past. The present is the more bitter that the memory of the past is so sweet. '*For,*' he says, 'I used to pass on with the throng (it is the frequentative imperfect) and led them to the house of God.' Is he a Levite of the sons of Korah, as the title seems to say? Or is he even a high priest, as Duhm, bringing the Psalm down to the time of Onias III., will have it? In either case he is an exile now from the House of God, and the bread of exile is the bitterer to him that he remembers the time when he was wont to conduct pilgrims to Jerusalem and share in the solemn joy of the annual festivals.

Nevertheless he refuses to be cast down. He makes the memory of the past the very occasion of his confidence in the future. 'Why art thou cast down, O my soul?' He had formerly tasted and seen how gracious the Lord is. His experience in the past gives him confidence that God will be gracious to him again and deliver him:

Hope thou in God: for I shall yet praise him,
Who is the help of my countenance and my God.

There is no passage in the Old Testament of so much interest to theology as the 53rd chapter

of Isaiah, and it is strange that the commentators can come to no agreement as to the meaning of it. The chapter belongs to the group of prophecies which have to do with the Servant of Jahweh. If we knew who the Servant of Jahweh is, we should know what to make of the 53rd chapter of Isaiah. Thirty years ago an article appeared on the Servant of Jahweh in the *Westminster Review* which contained a remarkable but very fair statement of this vexed question, and left it vexed. An article appears on the same question in the *Westminster Review* of March 1908, and the author acknowledges that the thirty years have 'made little advance towards any generally accepted conclusion.'

The author of the article is the Rev. T. H. Weir, Lecturer in Arabic in the University of Glasgow. Mr. Weir has something to say on the subject. To use his own metaphor, he comes with a key in his hand which he hopes will fit this lock. But before applying his key he makes a collection of all the views which have been held about the Servant of Jahweh. He gathers them into three divisions.

First come the Jewish expositors. Ibn Ezra, Rashi, Kimchi, Abarbanel, to name the leaders only, take the term as denoting simply the Israelite nation. But the Servant is sometimes contrasted with Israel. Accordingly other expositors look upon the Servant as the nation of Israel in some ideal or select aspect—the ideal Israel, says Kleinert; the pious Israelites, says Bleek; the prophetic order, say Gesenius and De Wette. These may be said to form the first division. In the second group of expositors are those who take the Servant to be an individual, neither more nor less; either some historical person, as Hezekiah, Josiah, Jeremiah, or Zerubbabel; or an individual who has not yet appeared but who is to be looked for in the future—in short, the Messiah. The third group contains expositors like Dillmann and Delitzsch, who combine the foregoing views. Dillmann, 'by a sort of Platonic doctrine of

ideas,' says Mr. Weir, regards the Servant as at once the ideal Israel, the pious Israel embodying the ideal, and Israel as a whole containing the ideal. So Cheyne (in 1884), following Delitzsch, says: 'The conception of the Servant of Jehovah is, as it were, a pyramid, of which the base is the people of Israel as a whole, the central part Israel "according to the spirit," and the summit the person of the mediator of salvation who arises out of Israel.' With which of these groups is Mr. Weir himself to be classed? Apparently with the second. He holds the Servant of Jahweh to be an individual. But he will have none of the individuals who have already been named. He holds the Servant of Jahweh to be Cyrus.

There are four passages in Isaiah which are called the 'Servant' passages. In the first (42¹⁻⁴) Mr. Weir has little difficulty in seeing Cyrus, king of Persia. At the time it was written, the flower of the nation of Israel had for more than half a century been living as exiles in Babylon. Although the generation of those who had been originally deported was fast dying out, they had left as a legacy to the generation which had been born in the foreign land the assurance of deliverance. That assurance rested upon a prophecy which had been uttered by the last of their seers in the homeland. The prophecy made the duration of banishment seventy years. Several years yet remained to the time of its fulfilment. But deliverance was really at hand. The prophecy was anticipated by the event.

Quite unexpectedly the king of the province of Anzan or Anshan, in Elam, whose name was Kurash or Cyrus, entered upon one of those marvellous careers of conquest, of which South-Western Asia has so often been the scene. Within a few years he overthrew 'the tribal hordes' (the 'Medes'), and took prisoner their king Ishtumegu (Astyages); by the defeat of Cræsus and the capture of Sardis, he became master of Asia Minor; and the conquest of the Babylonian kingdom under the weak Nabonidus was only a matter of time.

These events are the historical background of the poems contained in Is 40-48. Mr. Weir believes that the poet anticipated the Persian conquest of Babylon and the end of the Exile. Cyrus is the central figure throughout. Twice the name occurs (44²⁸ 45¹): Mr. Weir is not sure that it has not been interpolated there. In any case, the author prefers as a rule not to name his hero, but to speak of him as 'victory from the east' (41²), or as 'one that calleth upon my name' (41²⁵).

Mr. Weir offers a rendering of this first 'Servant' passage, a strictly literal rendering. Mr. Weir is a reliable scholar. His rendering has points in it worth observing.

1. Verily, my servant whom I am sustaining,
My chosen in whom my desire is satisfied—
I have put my spirit upon him;
Justice for the nations he shall make to arise.
2. He doth not shout nor lift up,
Nor make his voice to be heard abroad.
3. A bruised reed he doth not break,
And a failing wick he doth not put out;
In very deed he shall make justice to arise.
4. He shall not fail nor run away,
Until he set in the earth justice;
And for his sway the Isles are waiting.

Now, in this first of the four 'Servant' passages, the significant thing is that Cyrus is looked upon as a monotheist. This is evident not from the use of the expression 'my servant,' for that expression is used also of Nebuchadnezzar (Jer 43¹⁰), but from the contrast between those verses and the immediately preceding context. The preceding context is a satire on polytheism and idolatry. 'My servant' must be more than 'the instrument of my hand.' The phrase must signify a worshipper of Jahweh; as in the Koran, for example, the word 'servant,' which means a *slave* in reference to men, is always a *worshipper* in reference to God. But if Cyrus is a worshipper of Jahweh, then of course he must be a monotheist.

In the second verse Cyrus is further contrasted with the Chaldeans, whose 'shouting in their ships'

was proverbial. 'He doth not shout nor lift up, nor make his voice to be heard abroad.' He is contrasted in the next verse in respect of his justice and clemency towards the conquered. The cracked reed and the dimly burning wick are the nations subdued by the Chaldeans, especially the nation of Israel. That Cyrus was no boaster, like the Chaldean kings, and that he would be likely to have mercy upon the nations lying in captivity—these were hopeful characteristics of the king that was coming. But to a poet of Israel they were completely overshadowed by the belief that Cyrus was a monotheist.

But Cyrus was not a monotheist. The Western world did not know this until last century. How many an excellent homily lost its point when the decipherment of the cuneiform inscriptions made it evident that Cyrus was a worshipper of Bel and Nabu, and all the gods of Babylon, and that he delighted to call himself 'the little servant of Marduk.' The Western world, we say, did not know this till last century. But Mr. Weir believes that the poet of the Servant of Jahweh made the discovery soon after he wrote his first Servant poem.

For in the remaining Servant passages the situation is wholly changed. There are no more satires against idolatry; there is no more exaltation of monotheism; there are no more pæans in anticipation of the fall of Babylon. It is manifest to Mr. Weir that between chapters 48 and 49 the Babylonian Empire has ceased to exist. The exiles of all nations have recovered their liberty, and are making their way back to their homelands. That is all evident. And what is equally evident, but much more remarkable, is the fact that throughout all these passages there is not a single reference now to the principal actor upon the stage. For Cyrus had entered Babylon, not at the call of Jahweh, but at the invitation of Marduk; not as an iconoclast monotheist (Is 46), but as the worshipper of Bel and Nabu.

Will the poet drop out Cyrus now from his con-

ception of the Servant of Jahweh? He transfigures Cyrus; he does not drop him out. When Mr. Weir passes to the 53rd chapter of Isaiah (or rather to that poem which begins at the 13th verse of the 52nd chapter, and runs to the end of the 53rd chapter), he finds that the hero is Cyrus still. For although Cyrus was no monotheist, was he not the deliverer of Israel, and, to that extent at least, the Servant of Jahweh's hand? Cyrus is the Servant of Jahweh still. And as Mr. Weir re-translates the 'hard and crabbed' lines of this mighty poem, and spells out his meaning from its ungrammatical and almost untranslatable language, he believes that the poet has ever before him the figure of Israel's great deliverer Cyrus, and directly no other figure whatever.

'It is a dirge or elegy,' he says, 'upon a fallen hero, whose marvellous career had been unprecedented, both in its splendour and in its eclipse (52¹³⁻¹⁵). Indeed, the rumour of his death was not believed (53¹). His early life had been one of hardship and poverty, which had left their mark upon his frame (2³). In the view of the author, his diseases, misfortunes, and death were an expiation for the sins of Israel, who, however, attributed them to the anger of Jahweh (4⁵). Yet he was an involuntary sacrifice (6⁷), and the use of the expression "my people" in v.⁸ would indicate that he was not an Israelite. His death was premature, such as was believed to overtake the wicked, although he was not one of these (9). His fate can be accounted for only as an act of the Divine will. His heirs will carry out Jahweh's business (the restoration of Israel); but the credit of it will belong to him (10-12).'

Was all this true of Cyrus? All this was true, says Mr. Weir, and applicable in a remarkable degree. In popular belief he had been brought up by a herdsman. His early successes were unparalleled, but it is not known how he came by his end. They say that he was defective in stratagem, and to this might refer the comparison of the slaughtered sheep. The qualities by which

he impressed himself most upon his contemporaries were his justice and clemency. His death might seem to some Israelites a punishment for their sin in not fully availing themselves, when he was alive, of the privilege of returning to Jerusalem; to others it might be a sign of Jahweh's displeasure against a polytheist. The only hope that remained was that his successors would finish the 'business' which Jahweh had placed in the hands of Cyrus.

Is it possible for a pope to repent? If it is possible, Pope Pius x. will repent of his Encyclical *Pascendi gregis* when he reads the paper upon it by Professor Swete which appears in the *Guardian* of January 29.

The title of the paper is 'Modernism and the Church.' By 'the Church' Professor Swete means not the Roman but the Anglican Church. The Pope does not acknowledge him. And he does not acknowledge the Pope. And that situation is, for the present purpose at least, of much advantage to both. It allows the Pope to read Professor Swete's article without the irritation which he might feel with the plain speaking of one of the faithful. And it allows Professor Swete to speak plainly.

What is Modernism? We may turn aside for a moment from Professor Swete to say that what a Roman Catholic, who believes in Modernism, understands by it, will be found in a book which has been published by Mr. Fisher Unwin, with the title of *The Programme of Modernism*. It is an anonymous book. For this is half the trouble, that in the Roman Church the Modernist and the anti-Modernist are compelled to answer one another anonymously. But it is an outspoken well-written book, which has been translated from the Italian and sent into the English-speaking world with such blessing as the Rev. A. L. Lilley can bestow upon it. It contains the Encyclical itself as well as a refutation of it; and the refutation cleverly comes first.

But clever and capable as this anonymous book is, as an answer to the Pope it is not to be compared with Professor Swete's article. For, as we have said, Professor Swete is at perfect liberty to speak his mind, neither urged by fear to conceal, nor driven by defiance to exaggerate. And then he is Professor Swete.

He is Professor Swete, we say. In this lies the value of the article. Is it nothing to the Pope that the Regius Professor of Divinity in one of the great English Universities should answer him? It is everything to him that the answer comes from a man to whom it is impossible to apply the epithet 'Modernist' with any offensiveness; from a man whose concern for the continuity of the life of the Church is as great as that of any pope can be, and who weighs every word he uses.

What is Modernism? The Pope does not stay to define it. Modernism is denounced throughout the Encyclical. We are left to gather what it is from the denunciation. The Modernist may be a philosopher, a believer, a theologian, a historian, a critic, an apologist, a reformer. In each of these characters he is judged in the Encyclical and found guilty. And then at the end the Pope reviews Modernism as a whole, and condemns it as a 'summary of all the heresies.' This is the nearest approach to a definition that the Encyclical contains, and the Vatican is no doubt content with it.

Professor Swete discovers what Modernism is from the Encyclical. He discovers that, in the judgment of Pope Pius x., the Modernist is a man who finds his religion in Christian experience instead of basing it upon the authority of the Church and of the Bible. He is a man who separates the Christ of history from the Christ of theology. And he is a man who applies the method of evolution to Christian doctrine. Professor Swete perceives that within these three divisions it is possible to gather all the clauses of the Encyclical. Modernism, it may be said in a sentence, is the application of psychology,

of criticism, or of evolution to the Bible and to Christian dogma.

The Pope believes that Modernism is an un-mixed evil. Father Tyrrell believes that it is an unmixed good. Professor Swete believes that it is neither. He considers first the doctrine of vital immanence—that is, the Modernist teaching that religion is not something external, imparted *ab extra*, but a sense and an experience begotten of man's innermost need. 'Now it is surely pure gain,' he says, 'that in the judgment of our time religion has its origin in the very constitution of human nature. It is pure gain also that religion is now understood to be a matter of personal experience, a vital movement within, not an intellectual process.'

But does not the Modernist say that *all* revelation is immanent? Does he not say that the inner religious sense, and the personal experience which comes from its exercise, are but the workings of God in man, answering to the natural faculty which he has implanted? Does he not say that in Holy Scripture God speaks through the religious experience of men, and not as dictating a revelation which came directly from Himself? Does he not say that even in Christ the Divine revealed itself through the human, and not by experiences or thoughts or words which belonged to a super-human life? The Modernist says all this, and Dr. Swete sees 'no just cause for alarm.'

Thus, throughout one-third of the long Encyclical, Professor Swete sees no occasion for the fears of the Pope's advisers, no justification for the censures of the Pope. When the Encyclical comes to speak of the attitude of Modernism towards the Person of Christ, he thinks that it is on somewhat firmer ground. He says that no one can read modern theological books and articles without noticing that in the course of a generation a considerable change has come over the conceptions of men in reference to this grave subject. 'While unbelievers generally take a more exalted view of

Christ than they did a quarter of a century ago, the tone which believers adopt is often less decided, less in harmony with the full Catholic Faith.' Professor Swete rejoices to know that the question, 'What think you of Christ?' was never so generally and never so seriously asked as now. But, on the other hand, he observes with some concern that the answer is not so definite as it used to be. The old Nicene answer does not seem to be sufficient, or, at all events, 'the more explicit and dogmatic form which the Nicene answer assumes in the *Quicumque*.'

Professor Swete does not think that men have really formed a different estimate of the Person of Christ. It is only that they look at the problem of His Person from a different point of view. 'Now that difference in point of view he believes to be due to two of the influences which the Encyclical censures. The doctrine of Immanence is one; the other is the fearless application to the Gospels of historical criticism. For the doctrine of Immanence has suggested to men that God reveals Himself in Christ in the same way as He reveals Himself in the experience of believers, although in a much higher degree, in a degree which is almost infinitely higher. The historical criticism of the Gospels has made a distinction between that which is historical and that which is ideal, and has, sometimes at any rate, declared that whatever savours of the superhuman and Divine in the life of our Lord belongs to the realm of the ideal, and not to the region of the historical.'

Does the Pope protest against such criticism of the Gospels as this? Professor Swete protests against it also. He does not deny that there is occasional advantage in looking at the Person of our Lord first from the human side, and then from the Divine. He has read Dr. du Bose's 'remarkably illuminating book,' *The Gospel in the Gospels*, and he has been struck by the success of the method of studying the Gospels, first upon the lower plane of common humanity which our Lord shared with ourselves, and afterwards carrying the

study on to the higher levels attained by St. Paul and St. John. But that is one thing. It is quite another thing if a man goes to the Synoptic narratives with the presupposition that, so far as they are historical, they describe a merely human Christ.

For then one of two things will happen. Either he will find in them nothing more than the merely human. Or if he does see manifest traces of the superhuman, he will mentally bracket such passages as interpolations; and he will explain the interpolations as due to a growing legend, to the fancy of an editor, or, if the textual evidence offers the slightest excuse for it, to the piety of an early *glossator*. He will even take upon him at times to determine, upon the strength of his own judgment, what Christ must have said or done in a certain case, or what He would not have said or done, and he will proceed to read the records accordingly.

Does the Pope protest against this burlesque of a genuine criticism? Professor Swete says that the Pope has every right to protest. And he says that the protest does not come a day too soon. 'But when Pius x. proceeds to include in his condemnation the literary criticism which reveals the sources of our documents and the process of their construction—when he censures the scholars who resolve the Hexateuch into J, E, and P, and the Synoptic narrative into Marcan and non-Marcan elements—he is fighting,' says Dr. Swete, 'against the fairly well-assured results of scientific research, and therefore fighting to no purpose. Worse than that,—and here we see how great the offence of the Pope is,—'worse than that,' says Professor Swete, 'he is rejecting, in the name of the great Latin Communion, some of the best helps to the study of the Bible which our age provides, and putting back, in so far as in him lies, the clock of time by a whole generation.'

The entire attitude of the Encyclical to the Bible is one of the greatest surprises of our time.

May it not be described as one of the clearest revenges of history? The Catholic believes in an infallible Church. Has he ever ceased to taunt the Protestant with belief in an infallible Bible? Yet the Encyclical maintains the absolute infallibility of the Bible. The Modernist says that manifest errors in science or in history are to be found in the Biblical writings; but since the purpose of these books is not to teach science or history, it does not seem to him that these inaccuracies invalidate the claim of Scripture to contain the Word of God on morals and religion. The Pope answers that this is equivalent to charging God Himself with using falsehood as the vehicle of truth. Thus the Vatican declares itself committed to the mechanical view of inspiration long after it has been abandoned by at least the great majority of educated Protestant believers.

But Professor Swete perceives that the Pope's chief concern is not for the infallibility of the Bible, but for the fate of dogma. The Modernist approaches dogma as he approaches the Bible, with the historical method of study. He believes that dogma is less than the absolute truth, that it shares the imperfections of the human mind through which it has passed. He believes that, the Christian religion being a living body of truth, its ideas must, like all living things, be subject to change in the way of natural evolution or development.

The Pope will have nothing to do with development in theology. Sixty years have passed since Cardinal Newman anticipated Darwin by introducing the idea of evolution into theology, but to-day the evolution of doctrine by the way of living growth is regarded at the Vatican with horror. To the Pope's present advisers the original deposit was not merely the germ, it was the compressed totality of the Catholic faith. In Father Tyrrell's effective illustration, there has been no vital development, but only the mechanical unpacking of what was given from the first. The deposit, we may all agree, held the whole sum of Christian ideas, but, according to the Vatican, it held them

not as the acorn holds the oak, but as a box holds properties, ready for use whenever it pleases the Pope to order the lid to be removed.

We come to the last and worst feature of the Encyclical. It is the suspicion with which its authors regard the laity of the Church. Nothing is more ominous than this. Nothing is more indicative to Professor Swete of coming disaster. The Pope speaks of 'that most pernicious doctrine which would make of the laity the factor of progress

in the Church.' Beyond all other things he dreads and detests what he calls 'laicism.' Professor Swete believes that, in England at least, the educated laity may prove to be the factor of progress in the Church. If they seem to move too rapidly, the clergy will always be there to guide, to check, and, if necessary, to restrain. But, in any case, the laity mean to make themselves heard in the future, and Professor Swete believes that henceforth any attempt to impose doctrine from above will fail.

Professor Harnack on the Second Source of the First and Third Gospels.

BY THE REV. CYRIL W. EMMET, M.A., VICAR OF WEST HENDRED.

PROFESSOR HARNACK'S remarkable vindication of the Lukan authorship of the Third Gospel and the Acts has been followed by a further volume, in which he examines the second source common to St. Matthew and St. Luke.¹ The first source is, of course, the Gospel of St. Mark, in whatever form it may have been used by the two later Evangelists. Of this Harnack has nothing to say here; he confines his attention strictly to the matter common to the other two Gospels alone. His purpose is by a careful comparison of the two versions, as given in St. Matthew and St. Luke, to obtain a hypothetical reconstruction of 'Q,' the common source which it is generally agreed must *in some form and in some sense* lie behind both.

He renews the protest which we find in *Lukas der Arzt* against flashy *à priori* theorizing, and asks for more 'spade-work,' a detailed examination of the actual data. 'What happens in many other of the main questions of gospel criticism, happens here; critics launch out into sublime questions as to the meaning of the "Kingdom of God," as to the "Son of Man," "Messiahship," etc., or into inquiries of "religious history," and questions of authenticity decided on "higher" considerations . . . but they avoid the "lower" problems, which involve spade-work and trouble-

some research (bei deren Behandlung Kärnerarbeit zu leisten und Staub zu schlucken ist)' (p. 3). He acknowledges the complications of the problem, the probability of an early harmonizing of the text of the two Gospels, the doubts whether Q was used by both in the same form, or whether one or the other may not have gone back at times to an Aramaic original, and the difficulty of deciding on the scope of Q. But the right method puts these questions aside for the moment and 'must first confine itself exclusively and strictly to the parts common to Matthew and Luke as against Mark, must examine these from the point of view of grammar, style, and literary history, and starting from this firm basis see how far we can go.' Not till such an inquiry has failed, need the problem be given up as hopeless (p. 2).

The common sections which are the material of the study, comprise about one-sixth of the third Gospel, and two-elevenths of the first. Harnack divides them into three groups: (1) Numerous passages where the resemblance is often almost verbal; these are treated of first, and must form the basis of any theory or reconstruction of Q. (2) Cases where the divergence is so great that it becomes very doubtful whether there was any common source at all; they include only Mt 21³² and Lk 7^{29, 30}, and the parables of

¹ *Sprüche und Reden Jesu* (Leipzig, 1907).