

R 1

and then of the less outstanding things, or would take the individuals in some particular order which seems logical for one reason or another. A strictly chronological process is something that does not regularly occur. We find chronology entering in in details and sometimes in the complete stress of description. Very often there is an intermixture of these things.

R 2

It is very difficult if you write a church history to, particularly from the reformation time on, to decide just how far to follow chronology and how far to follow logic in your relations, and some church history books that I have looked into are quite baffling for this reason, because they will maybe start in with the reformation in Germany and they will carry Germany up to 1650 and then they will start in with England again and you deal with a lot of events and then you go way back before these events happened and go on. Other books are still more baffling to try to take it almost year by year and you are jumping from one country to another and you're so confused you don't know where you are. It is--you have to make a combination of the two and decide how far you are going to go with chronology and how far you are going to use logic in your inferences, instead of pronouncing them. Well, now, in this case, we are in the position that I think that we can say definitely that chronologically v. 23 followed the first two-thirds of verse 22, but does it come between that and the last part of 22 or after the last part of 22? That is a thing of which we could not tell. We would have no way to be sure, and somebody says, "Why, of course, it comes in between. When they are in the prison, immediately, naturally the moon will be confounded, and the sun ashamed, and the Lord of hosts will then immediately begin to reign in Mount Zion," and somebody else says, "No, how absurd! Naturally the Lord won't begin His reign until they've actually been punished. They're set up in prison many days and we don't know why on earth