

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

should be restored to the text of the Gospel, as well as to the spaced matter in Ephrem's commentary. They form an excellent parallel to those other sentences in which Jesus speaks of Himself as the living bread which came down from heaven. The existing text of John is in defect, by loss of an important sentence. It does not, however, appear that any other of the great Harmonies, such as the Liège Harmony of Dr. Plooij, has anything to suggest the omission of the passage. Its restoration is due to the Syriac Diatessaron, and, as far as the present inquiry goes, to that only.

It is no slight satisfaction to have restored even a single sentence to the discourse of our Lord in the Fourth Gospel. Nor need we refrain from putting

the passage into the Film of a Commentary. The well into which the woman is peering downwards is *Tradition*; she says so; our father Jacob drank of this well and gave it to us: the well was what St. Peter calls *πατροπαρόδος*. The heaven toward which the Redeemer is pointing is *Illumination*; He says so. Here ends the commentary; I hope it has not obscured the text.

At this point I was touched on the sleeve by another writer who says that he also has commented on the lost verse, in the words:

An endless fountain of immortal drink
Pouring unto us from the heaven's brink.

His comment is truly Johannine, and he says his name is John Keats.

The Messiahship of Jesus.

I.

The Evidence of St. Mark.

BY THE REVEREND J. O. F. MURRAY, D.D., SELWYN COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

IN a paper¹ on 'The Witness of the Baptist,' I examined the first of the objections which Wendt brings against the historical value of the Fourth Gospel. Wendt's second objection turns on the difference between St. Mark and St. John with regard to the publication of the Messiahship of Jesus. This objection is urged afresh by Lord Charnwood in his vigorous and welcome contribution to the discussion of the Johannine problem in *According to Saint John*. An account, in which all public reference to Messiahship is strictly repressed until the final visit to Jerusalem, stands, no doubt, in startling contrast to an account, in which the first disciple to follow Jesus goes at once to call his brother saying, 'We have found the Messiah.' It is difficult to resist the assumption that the contrast amounts in fact to an irreconcilable contradiction.

The issue, however, is by no means as simple as this. We cannot, as Foakes-Jackson and Lake rightly insist, treat the term 'Messiah' as if it possessed a fixed and universally recognized content. It clearly meant one thing to the Jew and another to the Samaritan. The hopes that it

aroused in the heart of the aged Symeon in Jerusalem had very little in common with the hopes of Judas of Galilee. There is therefore no *a priori* objection to the hypothesis that the conditions were such as to make an indiscriminate use of the title in Galilee extremely dangerous. At the same time the Office or Offices connoted by it stood in an organic relation to 'the Kingdom of God.' And, if the title meant so much to Jesus that, as Lord Charnwood admits, He was ready to die rather than forgo His claim to it, it is incredible that He sprang His claim to the title on the Jewish authorities in Jerusalem, in the last week of His ministry, entirely without preparation. 'The clear-cut sequence of facts, as St. Mark conceives them, concerning His declaration of Himself whether as "Messiah" or as "Son of God,"' which appeals so strongly to Lord Charnwood (p. 122) cannot be a complete account of this matter. There is room for an inquiry whether here again, as in regard to the witness of the Baptist, the accounts of St. Mark and St. John, so far from being in direct contradiction, are in fact complementary.

The issue is at once too deep and too wide to be limited to the discussion of the meaning and use of a

¹ THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, December 1925.

single word. It raises the whole question of the relation of the Person of Jesus to His work, and of the method and process of His self-revelation. I propose, therefore, to go over the familiar ground once more to see exactly 'who' and 'what' 'the Jesus of the Gospels' claimed to be, and the way in which He developed and defined His claim. For the purpose of this inquiry, the question of the relation between 'the Jesus of the Gospels' and 'the Jesus of History' does not arise because we are concerned only with an alleged contradiction between the Gospels as they stand.

Here, as before, it will be well to begin with St. Mark. Only we must premise that the Evangelist did not set out to write a 'Life of Jesus' in the modern sense of the term. He makes no attempt to collect and record ordinary biographical details, or to illustrate the personal characteristics of the Master. His interest is concentrated on the separate scenes as they follow one another. There is no evidence that he stood far enough away from the Personality of Jesus to see it as a whole. His story speaks for itself. His readers are left to draw out for themselves its dogmatic implications. At the same time he writes, as St. Peter his master was accustomed to teach, as a Christian for Christians, who had been baptized in the name of Jesus Christ, and to whom the general outline of the life was already familiar. For them, as for him, the gospel of the Kingdom had become the gospel of Jesus Christ.

St. Mark's account of the ministry begins with the appearance of Jesus in Galilee after the Baptist had been 'delivered up,' 'proclaiming the gospel of God.' Jesus has behind Him (Mk 1¹⁰¹.) His experience at the Jordan. He had heard the Voice of God saying to Him, 'Thou art my son, the beloved, in thee I am well pleased.'

In my first paper I gave my reasons for believing that Jesus in preparation for His Baptism had shared with the Baptist what I am glad to see that Dr. Rawlinson¹ recognizes as His 'profoundly original reading of the Old Testament.' If, as we saw in my article on the witness of the Baptist, Jesus felt that He had come to fulfil all the promises of God by bearing the sins of His people, if, with that intent, He consecrated Himself to death in the waters of the Jordan to bring in the Kingdom of God, and if He was taking up the rôle of the Suffering Servant on His way to the throne of the Messiah, this voice from heaven, combining as it does both the prophetic strains, must have been for Him a direct assurance that He had rightly interpreted

the message of the Scriptures, as well as a public commission to undertake the task so marked out for Him. St. Mark himself is not directly interested, after his opening sentence, in the fulfilment of prophecy, so it is not surprising that he should not call attention to this aspect of the meaning of the words. It is enough for him that we should know from the first that Jesus had received from God direct assurance of His Divine Sonship.

This relationship, we must admit, does not often come to the surface in his narrative. Even the use of the title 'Father' for God is singularly rare. Jesus only once speaks of God as 'His Father' in this gospel (8³⁸), and only once speaks of Him to His disciples as 'your Father' (11²⁶). Still the fact of Sonship is presupposed throughout. Jesus claims to be differentiated from all the prophets who had preceded Him by virtue of His relation as 'beloved son' to the Lord of the Vineyard (12⁸; cf. 1¹¹). He accepts the title 'Son' in connexion with Messiahship in answer to the challenge of the High Priest. He sets 'the Son' above angels in close relation with the Father (13³²). And, when His soul is stirred to its inmost depths in the garden of Gethsemane He cries again and yet again, 'Abba, Father' (14³⁶). Mr. Middleton Murry, therefore, in his *Life of Jesus* is fully justified in treating this filial consciousness towards God as the key to St. Mark's whole account of the ministry of Jesus.

We must not, however, forget that Divine Sonship cannot be dissociated from Messiahship. The Son promised to David was to be in an especial sense 'the Son of God'—a sense which implied in the judgment of Jesus, as His appeal² to Ps 110 shows, a mysterious personal superiority to His royal ancestor. He was the root as well as the offspring of David. At the same time the relationship was not one which destroyed His sense of kinship with His fellow-men. His Father in heaven was their Father also. And of any one who was willing to enter with Him on the path of filial obedience to the will of God, He was prepared to say, 'the same is my brother and sister and mother' (3³⁵).

We may pass on now to consider how this filial consciousness expressed itself in word and deed. In outward form the work of Jesus in His public ministry, as St. Mark pictures it, though he records curiously little of His actual teaching, was pro-

¹ Mr. Middleton Murry's confident reliance on Mk 12³⁷, as involving a direct repudiation of Davidic descent, is wrecked on the fact that St. Paul, who knew James, the Lord's brother, asserts that Jesus was 'of the seed of David after the flesh' (Ro 1³; cf. 2 Ti 2⁸).

² *The New Testament Doctrine of the Christ*, p. 47.

phetic. He came 'preaching' as a fully accredited messenger or herald from the Lord. He knew on the strength of Is 61¹ (cf. Lk 4¹⁸) that He had been anointed to bring good news of God to men. The content of the good news that was to crown 'the voice of him that cried in the wilderness' was to be 'Behold your God' (Is 40⁹), or, as further defined in Is 52⁹, 'Thy God reigneth.' The glad tidings were to be, as St. Matthew describes them, 'glad tidings of the kingdom.' St. Mark's summary of the earliest Galilean Gospel is in perfect harmony with this. 'The time is fulfilled. The kingdom of God has drawn near. Repent and believe in the power of the glad tidings' (1¹⁵).

At the back of this simple proclamation of the gospel, there lay, as I have already hinted, a claim to authority. No one could make such a proclamation unless He claimed to be speaking in God's Name. And Jesus, as His own words show (9³⁴), was conscious of a mission, which implied an especially close link with God who sent Him. The Baptist also, whom St. Matthew credits with a closely similar pronouncement (Mt 3²), claimed a Divine commission. There is, however, this deeply significant difference between the two. John, though in the judgment of Jesus he was the greatest of the prophets, yet remained to the end outside the Kingdom. Jesus proclaims its advent from within. The advent of the Kingdom is for Him already a *fait accompli*. He declares expressly that a new era in human history has begun, the ripe fruit of an age-long preparation. The experience of nineteen centuries acclaims the truth of this intuition.

Even if we grant, however, that Jesus came, as the words imply, declaring in God's Name the advent of the Kingdom as one who was already a member of it, we have still to ask what this membership of the Kingdom meant. For the thought of this Kingdom of God is no less manifold than the thought of the Christ. The root idea of it would seem to be a sphere in which the will of God can express itself freely without let or hindrance from rebellious wills. In this sense the Kingdom of God did come on earth, when Jesus gave Himself up to God in the Jordan to do His will, that He might be an instrument in His hand for spreading the Kingdom among men.

If this be so, we can understand in the light of the link that, as we have seen, connects spiritual Sonship with obedience to the will of God (3³⁶), why the good news of God which Jesus brought to men took shape, not in any attempt to describe the glory and the prerogatives of Divine Sonship, but

in a call to accept the glad tidings of the accessibility of the Kingdom, and to return in heart and mind to God. For the nature of that Kingdom could be known only by those who would do what Jesus had done. They must take the yoke of the Kingdom upon themselves, and in the Spirit of Sonship enter into the eternal life,¹ the life of the New Age, by doing the will of their Father in heaven.

To do this in its fullness must, however, be beyond their power, until they, too, had been baptized with the spirit of Sonship. It was not enough, therefore, simply to preach the advent of the Kingdom. Men must be led to long after and to lay hold of that Spirit. Jesus was under no delusion as to the difficulty of the task thus laid upon Him. He had consecrated Himself to death for its achievement. He had come, and knew that He had come, to give His life a ransom for many (Mk 10⁴⁵, Is 53¹²). It was no light thing to get men to put away their sins and to turn to God.

On the other hand, God *is* our Father. The eternal life *is* our true life. It was possible by living that life in human flesh and blood in the sight of man to make some at least conscious of spiritual capacities as yet undeveloped, and so to arouse in them a hunger and thirst after righteousness. It was possible to express in human language the inner secrets, the fundamental laws of life in the Kingdom (4¹¹), in forms which those who had ears to hear might learn to interpret. It was possible not only to reveal in act the powers of the age to come by delivering the oppressed from bondage, whether spiritual or physical, but also to train those, who were admitted to share with Him in this work, to understand the faith in God that was the condition of its effectiveness, both in the instrument and in the recipient of the deliverance (9^{23, 29}).

Side by side, therefore, with His preaching in the synagogues the Evangelist shows us Jesus at work gathering around Him an inner circle of personal disciples, whose education and training absorbs more and more of His attention from the time that the opposition of the religious leaders of the people had been hardened into murderous hate by His open defiance of their traditional rules of Sabbath observance (3⁶).

The call to discipleship was in some cases direct.

¹ It is interesting to notice that in St. Mark 'entering into life' or 'having eternal life' is more than once treated as equivalent to 'entering into the kingdom' (Mk 9^{43, 44}, cf. 9⁴⁷; 10^{17, 20}, cf. 10^{23, 24}).

It involved a sharp severance of old ties. Fishermen left their nets, the tax-collector his office, to join the company of Jesus in response to a personal invitation. The prospect that He held out before them was to become 'fishers of men.' When the invitation is broadcast, stringent conditions are laid down defining the completeness of the self-surrender required of those who would enter on the relationship. This passage (8^{34ff.}), which comes at a turning-point in the ministry, should help us to realize that the gathering of disciples round a teacher, which in itself is so natural as to seem commonplace, had unique features about it. Is there any other instance of a teacher, who on his own showing is on his way to public execution, demanding of those who feel drawn to follow him a complete surrender of all self-will, and a readiness to sacrifice all personal ties, and even life itself for his sake, and for the sake of the message with which he was charged? Was there ever any one before His time who could stand up to Death and defy its power for himself and for all who followed him, not in the heroism of despair, but in the quiet confidence of assured mastery? It is not out of character that one who could do that should look forward to coming in the glory of His Father with the Holy Angels, and warn a disciple tempted to disloyalty that he would find himself face to face with his Lord on the day when the secrets of all hearts are revealed.

At the same time it is noteworthy that Jesus required no specific confession of faith in Himself from His disciples before He appointed them. It was enough that they were prepared to join His company. This dispensing with any initial credal test did not come, as we shall see, from any hesitation as to the importance of a clear understanding of His Person and of the office that He had come to fulfil. It came from the fact that the only road to such knowledge lay through loyal discipleship. Only a life in personal touch with Him could give a real content to their thoughts about Him.

Jesus does not, even in the first stage of their discipleship, speak directly about Himself to His disciples. When He has to speak of Himself in any official capacity He calls Himself 'the Son of Man.' For instance, they must have heard Him claim authority as 'Son of Man' to forgive sins (2¹⁰), and to be Lord even of the Sabbath. The title had manifold associations in the Old Testament, but it was not in common use as specifically Messianic. It was therefore free from distracting misconceptions, and the disciples and common people alike might be left to grow in their apprehension of its

significance, as He applied it to Himself now in one connexion and now in another.

The second stage in discipleship began at Cæsarea Philippi. The express challenge to the disciples to put their faith into words reveals unmistakably the goal which He had had in view all through. There were, no doubt, many earthly elements in the faith and hope and love that inspired Simon Peter's confession, 'Thou art the Christ.' Yet the root of the matter must have been in it. The opposition of the religious leaders was known to be irreconcilable. Jesus had rejected the sovereignty which the undisciplined enthusiasm of the common people would have thrust upon Him. To confess Him as Christ implied, therefore, at least a conviction that God had sent Him, and was on His side, so that His triumph was assured in spite of all that men could do to prevent it.

In any case, Jesus accepts the confession, though He bids the disciples abstain for the present from any public use of this title.

A new stage in discipleship begins, marked by quite plain teaching about Himself and the path of suffering by which He must enter into His glory. But His words found no entrance into their understanding. The thought of a crucified Christ was literally inconceivable to them. Simon Peter ventures at first to remonstrate, and is met by a stern rebuke. After that, though the disciples admittedly failed to understand, they were afraid to ask Him. They followed Him to Jerusalem under an oppressive sense of an approaching crisis, which the promise of an equally inconceivable Resurrection failed to relieve. In one of the accounts (Lk 18³¹) Jesus gave a hint, as later in the Garden of Gethsemane (14⁴⁹; cf. 9¹²), that the path was defined in Holy Scripture. But it was impossible to relieve their perplexity by anything that He could say. Nothing but the event itself could enlighten them.

For the present, however, the certainty of a coming triumph was stronger than the vague fear engendered by these mysterious warnings. And the inner harmony of the Twelve was disturbed again and again by wranglings about precedence in the Kingdom, which are memorable for us because they led first to a revelation of the Divinity of the childlike (9³⁷; cf. 10¹⁴); and then of the dignity of service, finding its ultimate expression in atoning sacrifice (10^{43ff.}).

At last came the entry into Jerusalem amid the hosannas of the Galilean pilgrims, who were going up with Him to the Passover. Jesus does nothing to repress this sudden outburst of popular en-

thusiasm. Indeed, He deliberately gave the incident the character of the Royal Progress defined in Zec 9⁹. He was coming into His Capital as the Anointed Son of God to claim His inheritance meekly but firmly.

His first act was to cleanse the Temple, denouncing the authorities as lawless usurpers. When challenged for His credentials, He appealed to the witness of the Baptist. He then laid bare the whole situation in the Parable of the Vineyard and the Husbandmen, defining his own relation as 'the beloved Son' of the Lord of the Vineyard, both to the prophets who had preceded Him and to the usurping husbandmen who had already decreed His destruction. He adds a solemn warning of the ultimate issue of their rebellion. He takes for granted, we must notice, not only that the authorities at Jerusalem knew of the Baptist's testimony to Him, but also that they had definitely refused to acknowledge the authority that He claimed in accordance with it, and had decided to put Him to death. Could He have passed such a judgment on men whom He had never met face to face, and who had never been directly confronted with His claim?

For the time being Jesus was protected by the support of the common people. So the rulers set to work to undermine His popularity, not unsuccessfully, by raising the question of tribute to Cæsar. He sets them in return the problem of the son of David who was also David's Lord—a problem which, if they had faced it, might have saved them from condemning Him for blasphemy when His trial came.

Then, after a stern denunciation of Pharisaism, He retired from the Temple, and in answer to a question foretold its destruction in that generation, describing in apocalyptic language the signs of the coming of the Son of Man in the clouds that would be the spiritual force at the back of that destruction.

In the last stage of His intercourse with His disciples we may note especially (1) the hint that He gave of a coming world-wide extension of the gospel (14⁹; cf. 13¹⁰): (2) the longing for an intimate and abiding communion with them through the sacrifice that He was offering that found expression in His words with regard to the Bread and Wine at the Last Supper: and (3) the evidence that is given by the prayer to His Father in Gethsemane of the reality and distinctness of His human will.

It only remains to call attention to the one utterance on the Cross recorded by St. Mark. Experience shows that this is liable to tragic mis-

conception. The words themselves, 'My God, my God, why didst thou forsake me?' are of course a quotation from Ps 22. They express a 'dark night of the soul' of unimaginable intensity through which the Sufferer had passed, when He drank to the dregs a cup of which, at least in imagination, the inspired writer had drunk before Him. But for Jesus, as for the Psalmist, the suffering was over before it could find relief in words. So far from being a cry of disillusionment and despair, His words are the opening words of a poem which has an even more indefeasible right than Tennyson's *In Memoriam* to be regarded as 'One of the most victorious songs that ever poet chanted.' His hope was deep-rooted in the living God, and it did not disappoint Him.

On this note ends the revelation that Jesus gave of Himself in the course of His public ministry, so far as we can infer it from the material provided by St. Mark. It will be well before we close to recall the path along which we have been led.

St. Mark has shown us how Jesus, declared by the Voice from heaven to be Son of God, at once the royal Messiah and the Suffering Servant of the Lord, came preaching the Kingdom of God as a present reality from within. Entrance into that Kingdom comes through obedience to the Will of God, and implies sharing in the Divine Sonship. This obedience can only be rendered as a result of the baptism with the Holy Spirit, which was to be the characteristic work of the mightier than John. The work of the earthly ministry of Jesus was to prepare men for this baptism, by drawing together a body of disciples, who could learn something, as it were from outside, of the laws of life in the Kingdom, and of the powers of the age to come, by living in close personal touch with one who was already within the Kingdom. They were left to form a judgment for themselves from the things that they heard and saw as to the nature and person of their Master. His claim on their loyalty and devotion was absolute. Their faith, when challenged, crystallized into the confession of His Messiahship for which He had been working all along. They had learnt to believe that He had indeed come from God to be the promised Prince and Deliverer.

They were then ripe for the revelation of the Cross. And, though they failed to apprehend the meaning of His words at the time, He went up at their head to deliver His final challenge to the authorities at Jerusalem, and to face the death that, as He knew from the Scriptures, was awaiting Him at their hands.

He denounces them for refusing to accept Him as a fully accredited messenger from God: and is condemned for claiming 'to be the Christ, the Son of the Blessed,' the living head of the New Order, seen by Daniel in his vision of the Son of Man. He dies, quoting the opening words of a Psalm in which the bitterest agonies of the Passion are transfigured by the joy of a triumphal deliverance out of the very jaws of death.

Such, as far as I can decipher it, is the sequence of facts, as St. Mark conceives them, concerning His declaration of Himself whether as 'Messiah' or as 'Son of God.' It is not quite so clear-cut as the view put forward by Lord Charnwood. But it goes deeper and takes into account a wider range of facts. I propose in a later article to compare with this sequence the self-revelation of Jesus as it is presented to us in the Gospel according to St. John.

Literature.

ST. PAUL.

If St. Paul was neglected or undervalued in previous ages, certainly our age is making reparation. The books on Paul's life and teaching come steadily from the press. We have noticed several in recent months, and now we have two more, one at least of particular interest because of its author. There is a story about Jowett to the effect that he once went to hear Howson preach, and, when he was asked what he thought of him, replied, 'Conybear must have been a very clever man.' When one reads any book by Professor F. J. Foakes-Jackson, one unconsciously murmurs, 'Lake must be a very wild fellow.' All Dr. Foakes-Jackson's books are marked by the same mental quality of balance, cool judgment, common sense, and caution. And they are all pervaded by the same adequate scholarship. If we reverse the process and go to 'The Beginnings of Christianity,' which was the joint work of Dr. Lake and Dr. Foakes-Jackson, we should be compelled to ask, 'What is Dr. Foakes-Jackson doing in this galley?'

In *The Life of Saint Paul: The Man and the Apostle* (Cape; 10s. 6d. net), we have Dr. Foakes-Jackson alone. There is a peculiar fascination about this book, peculiar because it is difficult to account for. There is not a great deal that is new in it. It goes steadily on from point to point, covering the whole ground, and doing it quietly and effectively. But what makes the book grip the reader is that on nearly every incident or topic Dr. Foakes-Jackson has something suggestive and 'different' to say. He certainly leaves out a great deal that ordinary Lives of the Apostle contain. He has nothing about the countries Paul visited, the cities he lived in, the political situation of the world. As a matter of fact he gives us just what

we want—all about Paul and what he was and did.

The closing chapters, in which the writer discusses briefly the doctrine of Paul and gives us an estimate of Paul's work, are of very great interest. To one question that is often asked: Was Paul the real founder of Christianity? he gives a decided negative. To another, Was Paul greater than Jesus? he gives an equally decided negative. 'It is profoundly untrue to say that Paul made Jesus, or even gave Him an importance He would not otherwise have had. It is a literal fact that Jesus made Paul, and the greatness of the disciple is one of the chief miracles wrought by the Master.' These are the closing words of the book. And they express the sober conservatism of a work which has its own place, and a very high place, in the Pauline literature.

The other book is an elaborate and careful treatise on Paul's teaching: *Christianity according to St. Paul*, by Professor Charles A. Anderson Scott, D.D., of the English Presbyterian College (Cambridge University Press; 12s. 6d. net). A first reading of this essay produces a very favourable impression. It is obviously the result of many years' study and reflection. Professor Scott agrees with Professor Foakes-Jackson in repudiating the theory of Paul's indebtedness to Greek influences. The Hellenistic element in Paul was slight, the Jewish element predominant. His own experience and the Old Testament are the main sources from which his doctrine came. Dr. Scott rather inclines to the belief that Paul may have seen Jesus, indeed may have been a witness of His trial. He also points out that Paul knew much more of Christ's teaching than is commonly supposed, not only because he refers definitely to our Lord's words on divorce and gives a careful account of the Supper