
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

and on the beauty of babes and sucklings, and on the beauty of great men's lives, and, above all, on the beauty of the name of the Lord declared to me; yet you will not get the fulness of the blessing, unless every day you bring both the prayer and your own selves fully into the light of the face of the Lord Jesus. He is the brightness of God's glory. He is the Word of God that was made flesh; and God magnified His word above all His name, so that in Him the guilty can find a clearing which leaves no more condemnation, and in Him they can see the face of God and live and find life abundantly. But how shall you escape if you neglect so great salvation? Be jealous over yourselves, lest by easy sloth and neglect the pleasant plant of my prayer wither in your hearts and homes, and be a gift received in vain, much admired and most desirable, but the soul of the sluggard desireth, and hath nothing. But if day by day you bring yourselves and my prayer under God's shining in the face of Jesus and in all His travail of soul for you, then you will never fail to get blossoms of beauty, and renewed and multiplied with more beauty and more grace all your life long — beauties of godly sorrow and earnest repentance; beauties of the peace of God, and of power by His Spirit to newness of heart and of hope; beauties of loins girt up to well-doing and of perseverance and of patience; beauties of the sacrifice of self for the work of the Lord; beauties of many a refreshing and restoring of soul; beauties of love at home, and of brotherly love; beauties of the heart's thought set on whatsoever things are lovely, and delivered from all unloveliness of spirit; beauties of being kept by the power of God through faith unto that heavenly salvation, in which, seeing your Lord and Saviour as He is, in His glory, you shall be like Him, your names written in Heaven in the Lamb's Book of Life. Great grace be upon you all. The beauty of the Lord our God be upon us.'

JAMES HENDRY.

Forres.

Harnack and Moffatt on the Date of the First Gospel.

BY THE VEN. WILLOUGHBY C. ALLEN, M.A., LECTURER IN THE HISTORY OF DOCTRINE IN THE UNIVERSITY, AND ARCHDEACON OF MANCHESTER.

IN his recent and very remarkable work on the date of the Synoptic Gospels,[1] Harnack places the First Gospel immediately after the Fall of Jerusalem, but admits that the composition of the book before that event is not certainly disproved. He rejects the view that chaps. 1 and 2 are non-Palestinian and late. There is nothing in $1^{18\text{-}25}$ which cannot have been written about 70 A.D. The sojourn in Egypt is possibly historical. The stories of Herod and the Magi need not be late. $16^{17\text{ff.}}$ and $18^{15\text{ff.}}$ may be early, but are more probably later interpolations into the Gospel. The stories of the death of Judas, of Pilate and his wife, contain nothing which could not have been related at a very early date. The legend of the rising of the dead saints 'seems to me to be ancient (uralt).' $28^{9\text{-}10}$ does not belong to the original form of the Gospel, and does not therefore affect the date. $28^{16\text{ff.}}$ is ancient, but the words ascribed to the Risen Christ are perhaps a later interpolation. However, this does not follow from the Trinitarian formula. $27^{62\text{-}66}$ and $28^{2\text{ff. }11\text{-}15}$ may have been narrated very early. The place of composition was Palestine. The Gospel is the book of that law-emancipated Christianity which stood in sharp opposition to the Scribes and Pharisees. It originated amongst the Hellenistic Jewish-Christians, who at an earlier period were represented by Stephen, and from amongst whom missionaries had preached the Gospel at Antioch to the heathen.

It is the purpose of the following pages to urge that Harnack's position as outlined above can only be a temporary one, and that the Fall of Jerusalem is not an important factor in the discussion as to the date of the Gospel. If that factor be put aside, the next important point is the date of St. Mark, and if that Gospel could be thrown back

[1] 'Neue Untersuchungen zur Apostelgeschichte' (*Beiträge zur Einl. in das N.T.*, iv. Heft). 1911.

behind the early part of the sixties to which Harnack assigns it (though with the admission that this may be the date rather of an edition than of a first writing of the book), there are many features in the First Gospel which suggest a date nearer 50 than 70 A.D.

1. Harnack's admission that the matter peculiar to the First Gospel is for the most part of an early character, with the possible exception of one or two passages which may be later interpolations, destroys all the evidence for a date after the year 70. For 22^7, to which Harnack appeals, is no certain witness that the Fall of Jerusalem was accomplished when the Evangelist wrote. Indeed, Harnack himself is half inclined to place the Gospel in the late sixties. Moffatt,[1] on the other hand, argues rather dogmatically for a date after 70, but his only arguments are—(1) That St. Mark in its present form was completed after that date, and that therefore St. Matthew is later. Against the first part of this see Harnack, pp. 88ff. (2) 'The general impression that a considerable period has elapsed since the days of Jesus, during which the Church has become organised and faith developed.' On this see below. In any case, 'a considerable period' need not bring the Gospel later than the year 70. Moffatt's only real reason is the dependence of the First Gospel on the Second, and the assumption that the Second Gospel dates about 70.

2. Admitting then, with Harnack, that the year 70 is a *terminus ad quem* rather than a *terminus a quo* for the First Gospel, we ask when and where it is most likely to have been written? The place must have been Syria or Palestine, but more probably the former than the latter, for the fact that the book was written in Greek points rather to Antioch than to Jerusalem. Moreover, the publication of a book so anti-Scribal would be easier at Antioch than at the capital of Palestine. The Greek language, the anti-Scribal tone point to Antioch. The relation of the Evangelist to the Law, the implied character of the Church, and the eschatology all point to an early rather than to a late date.

1. Relation to the law. Harnack describes the Gospel as the book of the law-emancipated Jewish-Christianity. Of course if by law, Scribal law is meant, the description suits the Gospel, for the book is largely a polemic against the Scribes and all their works. But an evangelist who from beginning to end of his book assumes that the Mosaic Law is still the law of the community of the Messiah, can hardly be termed law-emancipated. How can a writer who at the beginning of his book places the sermon in which Christ is represented as asserting the permanent validity of the Mosaic Law be regarded as law-emancipated? Or what sort of freedom from law had the writer who, when he read in his St. Mark that Christ had abolished distinctions between clean and unclean meats, made so subtle a change that his readers would believe that what Christ had done away with was not these distinctions but the Scribal rules about hand-washing? Or what sort of freedom from the law had he and the community for whom he wrote that Christ bade them observe the Deuteronomic law of the two witnesses, and the law of the Sabbath? The writer and his readers are clearly members of a community which regarded itself as bound by the Mosaic Law, though free from the burden of the Scribal traditions. They represent that quite natural position of the first disciples of Christ, who, believing Him to be the Messiah, took it for granted that He was the fulfiller of the Mosaic Law, not in the sense of abrogating, but of interpreting it in a sense which should enhance its value. From this point of view the book might well proceed from the earliest days of the community at Jerusalem. But when we take into account the anti-Scribal polemic, it will be more natural to find the writer's home a little later at such a centre of controversy as Antioch. There Greek was the natural language for a Gospel. There rather than at Jerusalem St. Mark's Gospel would be found. There as well as at Jerusalem were the representatives of the older type of Jewish Christianity which took it for granted that the Jewish Messiah had reasserted the supreme sanctity of the law, and that His disciples were still bound by it.

2. The implied character of the Church. Moffatt, as quoted above, speaks of 'the general impression that a considerable period has elapsed since the days of Jesus, during which the Church has become organised and faith developed.' Is there any ground for such an impression? How long a period need have elapsed for a community to exist in which the officials could be termed 'wise men and scribes'? How long for a community to arise in which St. Peter was regarded as

[1] *Introduction to the Literature of the N.T.*, p. 214ff. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1911.

the spokesman and legislator? How long for a community to spring into being in which it was assumed as a matter of course that the ecclesia of the Jewish Messiah must consist of Jews, and of proselytes?[1] For nothing which is said in the Gospel anywhere suggests that the Gentiles, to whom the Gospel was to be preached (just as according to the prophets Judaism was to be preached to them), were to be excused from the obligations of the law. The earlier we can place the Gospel the easier it is to account for the description of the community implied in it, with its exclusive character and its primitive constitution. And the earlier we place it the easier it is to account for its reception by the Western Church as a sacred book. For if written in Palestine, as Harnack thinks, near the year 70 (after St. Mark and St. Luke), or if written, as Moffatt thinks, between 70 and 110, why should the Church, which already possessed St. Mark and the Book of Sayings, which was used by the writer of the First, and, as many think, by the writers of the Second and Third Gospels, receive from Palestine a new Gospel, which transformed the Christ of the Universal Church into a Jewish Messiah, and recast His language in technical terms of Jewish devotion? Or, once again, 'a considerable period has elapsed . . . during which . . . faith has developed.' Is, then, the eschatological teaching of the Gospel a late development? Which is earliest, the eschatological teaching of the Thessalonian Epistles and of the early chapters of the Acts, or the universalism of Romans or of St. Luke? How is it conceivable that a Gospel which contains teaching like this could have been written at the latest more than a few years after the year 70? Harnack is right here when he says that he could believe that the Gospel was written before the Fall of Jerusalem more easily than he could suppose that it was written even ten years after that event.[2] Moffatt says that the editor's anticipation of a prolonged period during which the Gentile mission was to proceed apace is of more moment than the eschatology, and appeals to 28^{20}. That verse is a poor haven, for nothing is more certain than that the editor believed the end of the age which is there spoken of to be within the lifetime of the contemporaries of Christ.

[1] 'The Alleged Catholicism of the First Gospel' (THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, July 1910).

[2] P. 94, footnote 1.

On all these grounds, therefore, the relation of its Evangelist to the law, its limitation of the membership of the ecclesia to Jews and proselytes, its primitive organization, its eschatological teaching, the earlier the Gospel can be placed the better. What is there to prevent our dating it about the year 50?

'The literary dependence on Mk is by itself sufficient to disprove all such hypotheses,' says Moffatt. This is too strongly worded, for criticism is already beginning to move backwards for the date of St. Mark. Wellhausen has declared for a Palestinian origin, and seems inclined to favour a date between 50 and 60. Harnack still holds to the tradition which connects the Gospel with Rome and the presence there of St. Peter and St. Paul, but he thinks that whilst the Gospel may have been edited at Rome, it had been written earlier.[3] The present writer has elsewhere tried to show that there are reasons for thinking that our present St. Mark is a translation from an Aramaic original.[4] However that may be, the Council at Jerusalem is the event with which the composition of the two Gospels should be connected, rather than the Fall of Jerusalem. About that period St. Mark was probably brought into the form in which it was used a year or two later by the writer of the First Gospel.

So far we have been dealing with aspects of the First Gospel which are rather incidental than primary. If we turn to the main purpose with which the book was written the argument for an early date becomes even stronger. Let me try to summarize in a few words the main object of the work and the situation of its writer and readers.

The writer is a member of a community of Jewish-Christians who have put their faith in Jesus as the Messiah. They believe that He is shortly to return to them to inaugurate the Messianic Kingdom. Meanwhile they are to obey His teaching, and win converts to Him. Their most bitter opponents are the Scribes and Pharisees who slander Jesus as base born, and accuse Him of blasphemy against the Mosaic Law. The Evangelist wishes to rebut these slanders and to prove that in spite of all appearances to the contrary Jesus was the true Messianic King, of the line of

[3] The present writer has already suggested this. 'The Alleged Catholicism,' etc., *ibid.*, p. 443.

[4] *Studies in the Synoptic Problem.* Oxford, 1911.

David, who had been foretold by the Prophets. If we do not read the book through 'Catholic' spectacles, we shall see that the community thus presupposed is not the Pauline Ecclesia, but the exclusive Jewish-Christian Ecclesia of the early days of Christianity.

On the other hand, what has such a book as this to do with the period after 70 A.D.? Who needed, then, to have detailed proof that Jesus was the Messiah of the Jews? Not the Catholic Church, for it had long adopted the position that He was Christ, not of the Jew only but of the Gentile also. Not the Jewish-Christian Church, for the Fall of Jerusalem had temporarily removed the stress of controversy between themselves and the Scribal party. Controversy of that kind was renewed in the second century when the Jews had had time to recover from the shock of the break up of their national life. And it would be perhaps easier to suppose that the Gospel was written in the second century than it is to think that it was written in the first two decades after the year 70 A.D. In a book so filled as is this with the heat of controversy, we should certainly have had in the latter case, not the obscure allusions to the Fall of Jerusalem which the modern critic professes to find there, but some sure hint that judgment had at last fallen on the Jewish authorities for their stubborn resistance to Israel's Messiah.

Once accept a date before the year 70, and the earlier we can go back the more intelligible does the book become. The atmosphere in which it was written is that of the early days when St. Peter was practically Primate of the Church in Palestine, when Scribes and Pharisees were foes to be dreaded because they could persecute, and when, whatever others might do, the Palestinian ecclesia of the Messiah held itself stiffly for the Mosaic Law, because it believed that that Law had been re-sanctioned by the Messiah Himself.

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF THE PSALMS.

Psalm xxxvii. 7.

'Rest in the Lord, and wait patiently for him.'

1. In the first verse of this priceless Psalm the Lord found His servant liable to fretfulness and envy, and He exhorted him to cease from fretting; then, in verse three, He taught him to trust; in verse four He led him on to delight; in verses five and six He conducted him into a peaceful committing of his way to God; and He did not stay the operation of His grace till He had perfected that which concerned him, and brought him up to the elevated point of the text: 'Rest in the Lord, and wait patiently for him.'

2. 'Rest in the Lord, and wait patiently for him.' These words are the climax of the series of steps on which the Psalmist here dwells, and they express in a sentence the entire spirit and theory of what has gone before. They have been married to immortal music, but they hardly need music to interpret them, or to express or embalm them. They are a melody in themselves, and they have come down in many a generation upon troubled and anxious hearts like the gracious rain that has come down upon the withered herbage and blossoms of our world.

We all feel something of what it means. The very words have in them a sort of peaceful music:

> Music that gentlier on the spirit lies
> Than tir'd eyelids upon tir'd eyes.

'Rest in the Lord, and wait patiently for him':

> Such words have power to quiet
> The restless pulse of care;
> And come like the benediction
> That follows after prayer.

But they may be much more to us than a pleasant sound of peace; they may be a deep principle of calm, strong, trustful life.[1]

I.

Rest in the Lord.

Restlessness seems to be inseparably connected with humanity. How restful is nature. How beautiful she appears on a summer's evening, when the setting sun bestows on the landscape a parting

[1] B. Herford, *Courage and Cheer*, 251.

gift of glory, when the voice of the zephyr murmurs the tired earth's lullaby, and when all things seem sinking into rest. Beautiful? Yes; but suggestive of a mournful and startling contrast:

For, in the deepest hour of nature's peace,
The human heart's disquiet will not cease.

Yet rest cannot be quite impossible for man, for it has been occasionally achieved. The Psalmist, for example, had practised what we find him preaching in our text. 'The Lord is my shepherd,' he says, 'I shall not want. He maketh me to lie down in green pastures; he leadeth me beside the still waters. . . . Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil; for thou art with me.' 'My soul waiteth upon God. My expectation is from him. He is my rock and my defence. I shall not be moved.' Faber, too, had attained to a restfulness not less perfect than the Psalmist's. You remember his words:

I love to trace each print where Thou
Hast set Thine unseen feet.
I cannot fear Thee, Blessed Will,
Thine empire is so sweet.

I love to lose my will in Thine,
And by that loss be free,
I find my strength in helplessness,
And meekly wait on Thee.

Ill that God blesses is our good,
And unblest good is ill,
And all is right that seems most wrong
If it be Thy sweet will.

1. The literal meaning of the word 'rest' is 'be silent'—'be silent' towards the Lord. With the eye fixed on Him let all unbelieving thoughts be stilled, such thoughts as rise and rankle in the querulous spirit when it sees only its troubles, and not God in them, when the mists of earth hide from its sight the eternal stars of heaven. Then, like Jacob, we may say morosely, 'All these things are against me'; or, like Elijah, despondingly, 'It is enough, now, O Lord, take away my life'; or, like Jonah, fretfully, 'I do well to be angry.' In regard to all such dark and unbelieving suggestions, the heart is to keep silence, to be still and know that He is God; silent as to murmuring, but not silent as to prayer, for in that holy and meditative stillness, the heart turns to commune with Him. What is 'resting in God' but the instinctive movement and upward glance of the spirit to Him; the confiding of all one's griefs and fears to Him, and feeling strengthened, patient, hopeful in the act of doing so.

There is a pathetic illustration of silence to God in the case of Aaron when his sons had offered strange fire, and had died before the Lord for their disobedience and sacrilege. The record says: 'And Aaron held his peace.' He even made no natural human outcry of grief. He accepted the terrible penalty as unquestionably just, and bowed in the acquiescence of faith.

The gift of quietness is, first of all, the gift of growth. We are like the roses in this respect. I have a friend who is a great gardener. In the days when he knew little about gardening he always wondered why the stake was thrust deep into the ground by his standard roses. On one occasion, seeing the gardener at his work, he said to him, 'I suppose the stake is by the rose tree to keep the tops from blowing about?' 'No,' said the gardener, with a smile, 'the stake is by the rose tree not to keep its top steady, but to keep the root still; for unless there is stillness at the root things won't grow.' Thank God for the stake in our lives that keeps the root still; thank God that there you can see, as with roses, *growth*.

2. The secret of this rest is in *submission*. It is the spirit exhibited so beautifully in all the three Marys. In her whose only answer to the most wonderful revelation ever made to human being was, 'Behold the handmaid of the Lord; be it unto me according to thy word'; and of whom, as mysteries multiplied around her it is written, 'Mary kept all these things, and pondered them in her heart.' And in her who 'sat at Jesus' feet, and heard his word,' and who showed, in anointing Him for His burial, how she had entered more deeply into the mystery of His death than even the beloved disciple. And in her, too, who sought her Lord in the house of the Pharisee with tears that spake more than words. It is a soul silent unto God that is the best preparation for knowing Jesus, and for holding fast the blessings He bestows. It is when the soul is hushed in silent awe and worship before the Holy Presence that reveals itself within, that the still small voice of the blessed Spirit will be heard.

When I was in Athens some years ago I was struck, not only with the exquisite beauty of the architecture and sculpture, but also with the soft golden colour of the marble, toned as it has been by the sunshine and showers of over two thousand four hundred years. I availed myself of an opportunity for climbing Pentelicus, not only that I might see the Bay of Marathon when the sun rose, but also that I might visit the great quarries from which all the marble had been taken. Now imagine one block of marble standing there

in its lonely grandeur for centuries, undisturbed and unthreatened, suddenly being attacked by the Athenian workmen employed by Pericles. By many a blow, and by many a desperate pull, they would at last detach it, and it would be rolled down to lower levels far from the serene heights of its quiet rest. Humbled and broken, ready to become anything, it would be sawn and chipped, carried away over rough roads to the city, and there, by hammer and chisel, would have to submit itself to the sculptor's hands. Rest would be exchanged for turmoil, freedom for submission; but what of the result? Instead of the loneliness of death on the mountain-top, it would be for ages to come the presentation of life in its most beautiful form. Thus the block of Pentelicus became the ornament of the Parthenon. Think you not that if any man may do thus with dead matter, God can and will shape each of us aright? Will He not, by trials, temptations, and vexations, transform Christian character into the image of His Son? And at last, as the perfect work of Phidias was raised on high, so the perfected man who waits and trusts will be manifested in glory.[1]

Let nothing make thee sad or fretful,
Or too regretful,
Be still, what God hath ordered must be right,
Then find in it thine own delight,
My will.

But oh, be steadfast, never waver,
Nor seek earth's favour,
But rest. Thou know'st God's will must ever be
For all His creatures, so for thee
The best.

3. What are the things that prevent us from resting in the Lord?

(1) *There is so much to do.* But resting need not prevent us from doing. What is the hardest element in the toils and labours of life? Is it the mere exertion we have to make, and keep on making, in the doing of them? No, indeed. It is the fret and worry with which we do them—the fretfulness we feel because the conditions under which we work are not as we would have them; and the anxiety we feel as to what the result is going to be. Now, here it is that rest is possible even during work. A man may 'rest in the Lord' even while he is busily occupied, while he is still going right on with what he has on hand—not resting his hands, perhaps not even resting his brain, but resting his heart, resting his soul. There are those, as Keble says:

Who carry music in their heart,
Through dusky lane and wrangling mart;
Plying their daily task with busier feet,
Because their secret souls a holy strain repeat.

[1] A. Rowland, *The Burdens of Life*, 94.

And there is no strain more helpful to the 'busier feet' than this of 'resting in the Lord.' For it is no music of the folded hands, but of the resting heart,—feeling another, larger will than ours in the whole conditions amid which we have to work, and in that larger will resting, even while working.

Do you remember that prayer of one of the captains in the old Puritan times, on the morning of a great battle: 'Lord, Thou knowest that I must be busy to-day; but if I forget Thee, do not Thou forget me!' A noble word, that; noble in its manly honesty. Depend upon it, a man who goes into his work in that spirit, remembering God, when his work is over will not only rest, but rest in the Lord.

(2) *We are anxious about the results.* But what is to be the final outcome of our work,—this also is, in the reality of things, God's concern, not ours. Our care is still, simply to do our best. This is true from the least things to the greatest. It is true for the farmer sowing his seed; it is true for the business man carrying out his far-reaching enterprises; it is true for the statesman toiling for the welfare of a nation; it is true for the philanthropist labouring for the improvement of the world, and the prophet spending himself for the coming of the Kingdom of God. Whatever we have in hand let us try to see what is the right thing to aim for, accept the conditions as we find them, look forward as far as we can see, and—do our part faithfully—and then, for the issue, rest in the Lord.

The Master of us all met with disappointment on every hand. The people whom He so longed to save would not be saved in *His* way—the only way that had any real salvation in it. The disciples into whom He tried to infuse His own thought and spirit were disputing which should be the greatest the very night before His crucifixion. Of all that 'year of the Lord,' there was not, at the end, enough visible results to have made even the meagrest kind of an Annual Report. But, all through, He had rested in the Lord, and gone about doing good; and even when His whole life-work seemed, humanly, most a failure, He still rested in the Lord; and now we know, both what sweet peace and trust He found in God, and how that trust was justified.

(3) *There is the uncertainty about the future.* The future is dim, after all our straining to see into its depths. The future is threatening, after all our efforts to prepare for its coming storms. A rolling vapour veils it all; here and there a

mountain peak seems to stand out; but in a moment another swirl of the fog hides it from us. We know so little, and what we do know is so sad, that the ignorance of what may be, and the certainty of what must be, equally disturb us with hopes which melt into fears, and forebodings which consolidate into certainties. We are sure that in that future are losses, and sorrows, and death; thank God! we are sure, too, that He is in it. That certainty alone, and what comes of it, makes it possible for a thoughtful man to face to-morrow without fear or tumult. The only rest from apprehensions which are but too reasonable is 'rest in the Lord.' If we are sure that He will be there, and if we delight in Him, then we can afford to say, 'As for all the rest, let it be as He wills, it will be well.' That thought alone will give calmness.

Why should'st thou fill to-day with sorrow
About to-morrow,
My heart?
One watches all with care most true,
Doubt not that He will give thee, too,
Thy part.[1]

4. One thing remains, and it is the most important thing. We must rest *in the Lord*. Let us therefore see that we are where He is to be found. When Zacchæus wanted to see Christ he climbed a tree along the route that Christ was coming. When the poor blind man wanted to find Jesus he went where Jesus was. But is it not the case that we have plenty of professedly Christian people who never put their hand to the plough of Christian work?

Labour is o'er;
Daylight is gone;
Toil we no more!
Night cometh on.
Tired grow our hands
As twilight grows dim—
'God loveth weary ones'—
Rest we in Him!

Weary with labour,
Toiling for bread?
In love for thy neighbour
Is't thou hast sped?
Working for others
Wearied each limb?
God loves such weary ones;
Rest thou in Him!

Or, for mankind
Spendest thy might?
Bringing the blind
Back into light?
Bright rays of holiness
To the soul, dim?
God loves such weary ones!
Rest thou in Him!

Always when weary,
Fighting our way
Through the path dreary
Leading to *day*,—
Life's cup of sorrow
Filled to the brim—
'God loveth weary ones,'—
Rest we in Him!

And when the soul
Ceaseth from strife,
Weary and worn
In the battle of life,—
Then, as our life
Like a lamp groweth dim—
'God loveth weary ones,'—
Rest we in Him!

[1] Paul Fleming.

II.

Wait patiently for Him.

True, waiting is one of the hardest things in all the world. We talk of hard work. We should talk sometimes of hard waiting. For work is often sweet and satisfying. But waiting seldom is. Did you ever wait at a wayside station for a train? The minutes seem like hours. Their feet are leaden. We should almost think time's sand-glass was choked. Had we been working, playing, travelling, how swiftly these moments would have gone. But we were waiting. And the time limps and lags. For we have never learned the secret of waiting well.

Bulstrode Whytlock was bound for Sweden with most important dispatches to its Government from our own. He had reached Harwich, and in order to prevent war and no end of mischief it was most desirable that he should be able to sail on the morrow. But that night, oh, how the wind did whistle, and how outside the harbour the ocean kept rushing and booming! and the anxious ambassador lay measuring as well as he could with his ear the strength of each blast. After midnight his secretary came in and found his chief wakeful and excited, and, learning the reason, he asked, 'But, sir, did not the Almighty govern the world before you were born?' 'Yes.' 'And won't He govern it after you are gone?' 'Yes.' 'And if His winds and waves should keep you a prisoner here all this month, will not He go on and govern the world even though Mr.

Whytlock is confined to Harwich?' This thought gave rest first to the mind and then to the body of the agitated envoy. He fell asleep, and awoke to find that the day would suit delightfully for the intended voyage.'[1]

Did you ever watch an untrained collie with the sheep? You know at once it is untrained because it never waits the shepherd's word. It barks and pants and chases. It works heroically. And after all is done, nothing is done. The sheep are dazed. The shepherd is in a temper. The poor dog has been doing mischief and not service. It had far better been asleep and dreaming by the peat fire than this. But the trained collie says in his own dog-Latin to the shepherd, 'Take my will and make it thine.' He waits upon the shepherd, and will not stir without his word. And *his service* is often wonderful, just because he has learned to wait.

Not long ago we were all thrilled by the news that one of the bravest men in the British army had been murdered on the Indian frontier. His name was Henry Havelock Allan. If ever there was a man who loved the battle, it was he. He was a noble warrior. But he was a noble waiter too. Once when a lad of some eight years his father, General Havelock, took him to London, whither he was going on business. There was a well-known clergyman with them, Dr. Brock. When the three were passing over London Bridge, the father bade his son wait in one of the recesses of the bridge, till he and his friend paid their business call. This was about noon. And business so engrossed them that when the call was over, they forgot all about the lad. At six in the evening Henry was remembered. It flashed upon the General when dinner was announced and Henry was nowhere to be found, that six hours before he had left his son standing on London Bridge. Jumping into a cab, he hurried to the bridge, and there was his boy, not one whit the worse, waiting like a true son and soldier for his father.[2]

1. This waiting upon the Lord and upon the words and will of Heaven is no idle laziness, it is no abstaining from labour, but, in fact, the highest result and crown of the best spiritual labour we can give.

In that great battle which, in the beginning of this century, gained for Europe freedom from the ambitious projects of the first Napoleon, it stands upon record that one of our Highland regiments held their ground hour after hour under the deadly fire of the enemy. The cannon balls ploughed their way through the ranks. The splendid cavalry dashed themselves against a wall of living granite, and recoiled each time from the bristling steel and the deadly volley. The Emperor, whose tenure of power depended upon breaking up the compact array, was heard to exclaim, 'These soldiers seem rooted to the ground!' No! it was not a case of being rooted to the ground, as was seen a few hours afterwards, when the word of command was given, 'Charge!' it was simply a case of waiting, of waiting patiently, and often as look and voice besought the British commander to order the advance, the reply was, 'Wait, maintain your position, everything depends upon your standing still.'[3]

2. Nor does it mean that we are to make no plans and use no means for the successful accomplishment of our purposes. It is when the Christian Church is up to date in its Christian service, and when all the machinery of the church and school and mission and for the help of humanity are in perfect order, that we can rest and believe that God will meanwhile help on His kingdom. We can rest, only when we are in harmony, and up to date with the will of God.

I know some engineers, and they tell me that the only time when they can have a few minutes' rest in the engine-room is not when everything is out of order and out of gear, but when every wheel is right, when every screw and crank is in its proper place, when every nut is tight, when every wheel is properly oiled, and when everything is in perfect condition—then they can rest.[4]

There is a little incident told of Mohammed which always seems to me to go right to the heart of the matter. One evening when his army was halting for the night, and camping, he heard one of his Arabs say, 'I will loose my camel, and commit it to God.' 'Friend,' said the prophet, 'Friend, tie thy camel, and then commit it to God.'[5]

3. But we must give attention to the word *patiently*. For this may be the testing word of the exhortation. There are many who may wait, but they do not wait patiently upon God. They soon lose heart and lose expectation. They think that everything is against them, because in the little space that they can cover, and the little vision that they possess, they cannot discern that for which they wait. This is especially the case with Christian men in their Christian work. They want the reaper to tread upon the very heels of him that sows the seed. They wish to gather in the harvest almost as soon as they have ploughed the soil or cast in the grain. If they have not a speedy return and speedy fruit they lose heart. They have no heart to sow if they are not able very speedily and very readily to reap also. They forget that they are fellow-workers with God, and that God's working-day is all time and all eternity.

We have prayed that God would quicken His steps among the stars; yet still He seems to tarry, till wondering impatience cries aloud, 'Why does He not hear us? Why does

[1] James Hamilton, *Works*, vi. 386, 387.
[2] G. H. Morrison.
[3] J. Kay, *Paulus Christifer*, 84.
[4] E. Hamilton.
[5] B. Herford.

He not make an end of sin? If He be the Lord, why does He not make haste to save us and our poor devil-hunted world?' Was it not this that led even the sweet and gentle Whittier to say once, as he fought for the down-trodden slave of America, 'I confess when I think of the atrocities of slavery, I am almost ready to call for fire from heaven.' And I have heard of one who, when speaking of the desolations wrought in our own fair land by the thrice accursed drink traffic, cried in one passionate outburst, 'Oh, if only I were God Almighty for ten minutes!' It is this—'the godless look of earth,' as Faber calls it—that tries our faith far more than 'our mysterious creed'—

> Ill masters good: good seems to change
> To ill with greatest ease;
> And worst of all, the good with good
> Is at cross purposes.

And amid it all

> He hides Himself so wondrously,
> As though there were no God;
> He is least seen when all the powers
> Of ill are most abroad.

And this it is that stirs our doubt and quickens our impatience till we are ready to ask, 'Is God as man and could not if He would?' 'Rest in the Lord, and wait patiently for Him. Fret not thyself because of evil-doers. Commit thy way unto the Lord; trust also in Him and He shall bring it to pass.'[1]

4. Why must we wait patiently?

(1) Because *impatience never forms a true estimate of evil.* Sometimes it overestimates it, sometimes it underestimates it, but it never rightly estimates it. It creates an atmosphere in which everything is blurred and distorted, which never allows us to see things as they really are.

There is a very instructive incident in the life of Ahaz, king of Israel, preserved for us in the Book of Isaiah. Syria and Ephraim had formed a confederacy against him, and the king was in great fear: 'His heart was moved, and the heart of his people as the trees of the forest are moved with the wind.' Then the prophet is sent unto him, and his first word is, 'Take heed and be quiet'; as long as you are in this flurry and flutter you will do nothing right—keep yourself still. Then when he has quieted the fears of the frightened king he bids him look the facts in the face. These his enemies—Ephraim and Syria—that are causing him to quake, what are they? 'two stumps of smoking firebrands!' 'The head of Syria is Damascus, and the head of Damascus is Rezin'—is he worth fearing? 'And the head of Ephraim is Samaria, and the head of Samaria is Remaliah's son'—is he worth fearing? 'If you will not believe, surely you shall not be established.'

(2) Impatience always misses the remedy. Some one has pointed out the contrast between the calmness and sagacity of General Gordon, in the presence of the gigantic slave traffic in Africa, and the crude, hasty, well-meaning, but mistaken suggestions of philanthropists at home. What was the explanation? Gordon believed that God's hand was upon even this iniquity, that even of this hideous trafficking in flesh and blood God had said, 'Thus far shalt thou go, and no further'; and in that faith he could wait and watch and plan, till he saw the way clearly, which others in their impatience would never find.

Every now and again an African traveller comes home and assures us that the reports of foreign missionary work are exaggerated, that if we saw things as they see them we should not believe all we hear, that—you know the rest. Well, we take all that with a pretty big pinch of the proverbial salt; if we have to make our choice between the 'report' of the missionary and the 'report' of the traveller, some of us, at any rate, will not be long in making up our minds. But, perhaps, there is just enough truth in the traveller's depreciation of missionary work to give us a not unneeded warning. Who is to blame if missionary statistics sometimes creep ahead of actual facts? Not the missionary abroad, but Christians at home, who will only give where they can get 'something in return for their money.'

(3) Patience alone is justified in the end. The Lord reigneth; therein is the vindication of our patient waiting.

> This fine old world of ours is but a child
> Yet in the go-cart. Patience! Give it time
> To learn its limbs; there is a hand that guides.

Alas! we forget the hand that guides. The noise of the water-floods is in our ears, that we cannot hear the voice of Him that sitteth as King above the floods. Still the old cry goes up to heaven: 'How long, O Lord! how long before Thou come again?'

> 'Still in cellar, and in garret and on moorland dreary,
> The orphans moan, and widows weep, and poor men toil in vain.'

[1] G. Jackson, *The Table-Talk of Jesus*, 131.

And still does the answer come back to us:

'Blind! I live, I love, I reign; and all the nations through
With the thunder of my judgments even now are ringing.'

'Be patient; stablish your hearts; the coming of the Lord draweth nigh.'[1]

Before I went into the ministry I used to like to go into the engine-house of the works where I was engaged. We had there what were called 'horizontals,' two of them, working like two mighty arms, each 600 horse power. It was something to stand and watch those mighty arms, moving almost in silence, and doing all the driving work of that big firm. It was an inspiration to stand and watch them. But out of sight there was the engine bed, high blocks of stone, cemented together, and if you moved one of those stones, the great arms would pull the place to pieces in a minute. Fixed and settled you had all that might fulfilling its purpose in silence. It is when the soul is fixed immovably to God that it can do all its work, and it is only then.[2]

[1] G. Jackson.

[2] J. Whitehead.

Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem.

By the Rev. Arthur Wright, D.D., Vice-President of Queens' College, Cambridge.

After seventeen years of careful deliberation Dr. Sanday and some members of his 'Seminar' have issued a volume of essays. Had they been unanimous in supporting the 'two document hypothesis,' or had they agreed about the nature and contents of the document which they call 'Q,' they might have caused considerable anxiety to the upholders of the oral hypothesis. But as one of them (Dr. Bartlet) issues a 'minority report,' in which he repudiates the two document hypothesis as far as 'Q' is concerned, and pronounces it inadequate with respect to St. Mark; while another (Mr. N. P. Williams) declares that the simplest explanation of St. Luke's omissions is that 'he omitted them because they were not in his copy of St. Mark'; while a third (Mr. Streeter) writes that '"Matthew"[1] and St. Luke would each have been a catechist before he became an Evangelist, and each would look least closely to his written source where he knew best his materials by heart,'—I for one am relieved to find that truths for which I have been contending during twenty-one years, have made such progress towards acceptance in the sister University, and I gladly rush into the fray to assist the independent thinkers with whom my sympathy lies.

And first, to show goodwill, let me supplement Dr. Sanday's account of the conditions under which the Gospels were written by two suggestions, one of which he has perhaps overlooked, the other he has not cared to record. (1) The ancients had neither spectacles nor magnifying glasses. Since, therefore, some of them were admittedly men of sixty or upwards, it is reasonable to assume that their eyesight was imperfect. They could read a MS. when all was plain, but a blur or a blot would baffle them. In this way a believer in documents may most easily account for St. Luke's rendering of 8^{14} and of several other passages. (2) The ancients had no law of copyright. If a man possessed a MS. and took pains to correct it, his corrections might be accepted and would actually drive out the original readings. In this way Cod. C of the Gospels underwent a grammatical revision, and Cod. D was shamelessly harmonized. There is therefore nothing strange in Dr. Sanday's contention, that our St. Mark is not derived from the book which St. Mark wrote, or from that copy of it which St. Luke and 'Matthew' made use of, but from a corrected copy which has superseded the original. I submit, however, that the loss of the last page of St. Mark points rather to the fact that his Gospel was not copied till St. Mark was dead. Nor is this surprising, for its short and severe chronicle could ill compete with the fuller and more attractive history which was current in Rome orally. If so, the revision must have been made by St. Mark himself, when he resolved to publish, or by some literary expert whose professional skill he employed. That there was such a revision is supported by the weighty authority of Sir John Hawkins, who

[1] The word 'Matthew' in inverted commas is used for brevity to signify the author of our first Gospel. Critics are now generally agreed in holding that Gospel in its present form to be the work of an unknown author.