

# 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](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php)

pdfs are named: [Volume]\_[Issue]\_[1<sup>st</sup> page of article].pdf

'see visions and dream dreams,' without which no Christian can be 'what he was intended to be—a mystic and an idealist.'

*The Rationality of Public Worship*, by Rev. J. E. Roscoe (Skeffington; 2s. 6d. net), is described in the subtitle as 'a polemic,' but there is really little of the controversial spirit in it. The argument is not closely knit, but the writer has many pleasant things to say about the value of public worship from the intellectual, moral, and social points of view.

Dr. W. O. E. Oesterley has put us once more in his debt by his translation of, and commentary upon, the difficult but highly important *Tractate Shabbath* (S.P.C.K.; 6s. net), which he has prefaced with a really illuminating introduction. To Christian sentiment much of the tractate seems wearisome in the extreme, and more intelligently than ever, in the light of this little volume, can we rejoice over the liberty from Rabbinic views of the Sabbath which was won for us by the emancipating words and acts of Jesus. Its painfully minute directions as to what is and what is not permitted on the Sabbath, and its unedifying subterfuges must not blind us to its real importance, both for the understanding of the New Testament and as illustrating folklore. Dr. Oesterley has brought out these and other points in a lucid and stimulating way.

The publication of *The Philosophy of Confucius*, by C. Y. Hsu (S.C.M.; 1s. 6d. net), is most opportune. Every attempt to interpret Chinese thought to Western minds is to be welcomed, and especially is it necessary to endeavour to see China through Chinese eyes. Mr. Hsu has given a brief but most

helpful summary of the teaching of Confucius, in which among other things he reveals some remarkable points of contact between the best Chinese thought and the teaching of Jesus. His conclusion is that 'Confucius' idea of God is more or less similar to that of Christianity, and that Confucius, though he was not a religious founder, has paved the way for Christianity in China as Plato did in Greece. Thus the gulf between Confucian philosophy and Christian doctrine can easily be bridged, if both are understood thoroughly and interpreted properly.'

There are now seven volumes in the 'Modern Series of Missionary Biographies' which is being published by the Student Christian Movement. The latest addition is *George Grenfell, Pioneer in Congo*, by Mr. H. L. Hemmens, the Assistant Home Secretary of the Baptist Missionary Society. It in no way takes the place of the classic life by the Rev. G. Hawker, or of Sir Harry Johnston's volume on 'George Grenfell and the Congo.' But it has a place of its own, telling the story of Grenfell shortly but in an admirably fresh and interesting way. And it contains not a little new information. Perhaps the most interesting concerns that strange recluse of Leeds—Robert Arthington. He literally modelled his life on a missionary's words, 'Were I in England again, I would gladly live in one room, make the floor my bed, a box my chair, and another my table, rather than that the heathen should perish for lack of knowledge of Christ.' He was straitened so that the Missionary cause might not suffer, and it was his gift of £1000—offered in the famous letter of May 14th, 1877—that led to the opening up of Congo by the Baptist Missionary Society.

---

## The Messiahship of Jesus.

### II.

#### The Evidence of St. John (I).

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

IN studying St. Mark we were in touch with the earliest stage in the transmission of the Gospel story. The sources of St. Mark date back to the time when the earliest converts in Jerusalem gathered round the Apostles to hear the story of the

things that they had seen and heard in the course of their discipleship. Jesus, as they believed, had been raised from the dead to His throne at the right hand of God as Christ and Lord. His will was the law of their life, and guidance in the dis-

cernment of that will came most naturally through reminiscences of the things that He had said and done. There would have been no demand at first for 'a Life of Jesus,' nor could the Apostles at that time have any sense of their Subject as a whole.

St. Mark retains the spontaneity and freshness of this early period. Each narrative has a value of its own. It is not regarded as a subordinate part of a greater whole. No attempt is made to mark distinct stages in our Lord's ministry, or to define the process of His self-revelation. It is this quality more than any other that accounts for the high estimation in which St. Mark is held to-day as an historical document. The Evangelist is under no suspicion of having distorted the tradition that came to him.

St. John has to meet the needs of a later generation. Christians are no longer content to ask for light on the character and will of their Lord, or for 'scripture proofs' of the necessity of the Cross and the Resurrection. They have become conscious that He is in some sense both human and Divine. Speculation is busy with the problem of the inter-relation of these two elements in His personality. In view of the absolute chasm that separated God and Man in the popular conceptions alike of Jew and Greek, any solution seemed easier than the essential and permanent union of these two elements without the destruction or diminution of either in the unity of His Person. The First Epistle of St. John shows that an alternative theory had already been propounded. This may well, as early tradition asserts, have been the theory of Cerinthus. It draws a sharp distinction between the human Jesus and the Divine Christ who descended on Him at His Baptism and left Him on the Cross. It denied that Jesus could be personally identified with the Christ,<sup>1</sup> and refused to acknowledge the possibility of an incarnation of the Christ. The theological implications of this theory St. John expounds and denounces in his First Epistle. He sets himself in his Gospel to give historical grounds for the faith which was in him, and which was

<sup>1</sup> To avoid confusion we must remember that the term 'Christ,' as we find it in Cerinthus and in the First Epistle of St. John, has a far richer content than it could have had in Palestine in the course of our Lord's ministry. The vague and confused anticipations, partly political, partly apocalyptic, that were connected with it then had for sixty years been acquiring clearness and power, at least in Christian circles, from the fact that it was as Christ that Jesus was ruling in their hearts, and was coming to judge the nations of the world.

clearly the traditional, however dimly apprehended, Creed of the Church.

We cannot therefore ignore the fact that the Fourth Evangelist has a dogmatic interest in writing. He takes pains to force the fact on our attention. Whether he thereby destroys his credibility as an historian must depend ultimately on the truth or falsity of his creed. A man would have no need to wrest facts to support a true creed. And, if he believes that human flesh has been the vehicle of a manifestation of God, he is of all men least liable to substitute figments of his own imagination for the Divine fact, especially when he insists that the revelation of the Word of Life, which meant everything to him, had been tested by sight and sound and touch. For with St. John faith is no synonym for lazy credulity. He is alive to the necessity for supplying proofs for the Christian Creed. He calls special attention to the variety and the fullness of the evidence to which Jesus Himself appealed in claiming the allegiance of the Jews, at the same time that He laid bare the moral causes that led them to reject Him.

The object of this paper is to examine the account that St. John gives of the self-revelation of Jesus and to compare it with that which we saw in my last article to be implied in St. Mark. His object in writing simplifies our task, at least to this extent: we have no need to look under the surface for our material. The self-revelation of Jesus is the central subject of the whole Gospel. Our chief difficulty arises from the wealth of the material thus put at our disposal.

To keep our treatment of this material within limits we shall follow strictly the simple outline of the subject as it came before us in St. Mark. The key to the self-revelation of Jesus in St. Mark lay, as we saw, in the fact that Jesus came from His Baptism with a strong sense, on the one side, of His Divine Sonship, and on the other, of a mission to preach the gospel of the Kingdom of God. We saw that with a view to bringing in this Kingdom He gathered round Him a band of disciples from whom He claimed absolute devotion, and from whom He elicited a confession of His Messiahship.

If with this sketch in mind we pass to the consideration of St. John, we shall be struck by the fact that point after point that lay under the surface in St. Mark is brought into the clearest light by St. John. For instance, the witness of the Baptist to Jesus had to be inferred in St. Mark from our Lord's answer to the Jewish authorities at the end of His Ministry. It is the one point in the ministry of the Baptist which has an interest for St. John.

The thought of 'Mission,' again, is found once in Mk 9<sup>27</sup>. It is implied in the Parable of the Vineyard and the Husbandmen (Mk 12<sup>9</sup>, Mt 21<sup>37</sup>, Lk 20<sup>13</sup>). It is found in St. Luke in the text of His sermon at Nazareth, and again in 4<sup>42</sup> (cf. Mk 1<sup>38</sup>). But when we come to St. John the thought becomes dominant and all-pervading. It is found no less than forty times, coming in every chapter from the fourth to the seventeenth, and culminating in the words in which after the Resurrection Jesus sends His disciples to carry on the mission committed to Him.

Notice next the stress laid on the fact that the source of this mission is 'the Father.' We saw that the thought of the Fatherhood of God is present in St. Mark, most significantly in his account of the Agony in the Garden. But it is found hardly anywhere else. In St. John the Father appears again and again as the source of His mission. Jesus regards it as more important that men should recognize who sent Him than that they should discuss who He Himself might be, or what precisely was the work that He had been sent to do. It seems, indeed, as if faith that He had come forth from God takes the place in His training of the disciples that faith in His Messiahship holds in the Synoptists (Jn 16<sup>30</sup> 17<sup>8</sup>, 21, 25).

The fact is that while we are anxiously scrutinizing every syllable to find out what He said and thought about Himself, His own interest is not there at all. He is doing all He can to fix our thoughts on the Father, His Father and ours. Of course, He called Himself, as the Father had called Him, 'Son.' Of course, as Son He had a special position to fill both towards God His Father and towards His brethren. And it was of vital importance that His brothers should understand that position, not only for their sake and His, but also for His Father's sake. But His first object is to be true in His own life to His Sonship, and so to reveal His Father to men, and bring them back to Him. He says no more than is necessary to help them to find the Father where alone He can be found by them, in the life of perfect obedience which He lived in human flesh in their sight.

The fundamental fact of His completely surrendered Will is revealed once for all by St. Mark in his record of our Lord's prayer in Gethsemane. And one significant utterance makes obedience to the Will of God the token of spiritual kinship with the Son. But in St. John the thought of the sovereignty of the Divine Will colours the whole

<sup>1</sup> Kindred sayings are found in Mt 10<sup>48</sup>, Lk 9<sup>48</sup> 10<sup>14</sup>; cf. Jn 12<sup>46</sup> 13<sup>20</sup>.

life. 'My meat is to do the will of him that sent me, and to finish his work.' 'I seek not my own will, but the will of him that sent me.' 'I do always the things that are well pleasing in his sight.' 'The Son can do nothing but what he sees the Father doing.' 'The things which I speak I speak not of myself, but the Father abiding in me doeth his works.'

In the light of this fact it is less surprising that in speaking of the fact of His mission He seldom gives any hint as to the work He had been set to do. His work was to bring the wisdom and power and love of God into manifestation in the service of men in His Father's Name. By living as an obedient Son, doing His Father's works and speaking His Father's words, He so manifested His Father's Name to men that when He came to die He could say, 'He that hath seen me hath seen the Father.'

In so fulfilling His commission—and there are indications from time to time that the fulfilment would involve the laying down of His life—He could claim from His brethren a like completeness of loyal surrender to Himself by virtue of the authority inherent in that commission, and so open the way for them to the Life of the New Age, on which He Himself had entered, and which He had come to bring within their reach.

The Gospel of St. John sketches for us the different stages by which, starting with this conception of His office and work, Jesus strove in the course of His ministry to bring His claim home to the hearts and consciences of men. Two strands were closely intertwined throughout the narrative. The one concerns the self-revelation and all that it implies for the New Birth of Humanity as shown to the little band of disciples. The other records the efforts which Jesus made again and again, first to win the allegiance of the people and their leaders, and then to open their eyes to the spiritual causes of their murderous reaction to His appeal. We must confine our attention in this paper to the second of these threads. It fills what we saw was an obvious gap in the Gospel according to St. Mark. It records the preparation that Jesus made for the final appeal to the High Priest and the Sanhedrin at His trial.

The scene throughout is Jerusalem. It began, St. John tells us, with the Cleansing of the Temple at the first Passover after the Baptism. By this act He laid public claim to the authority to which the witness of the Baptist entitled Him. His zeal is kindled for 'his Father's house' (2<sup>16</sup>). The act itself was an act of righteous indignation. It was an appeal to the national conscience at head-

quarters. It was a claim to be accepted as leader in a moral regeneration. The authority claimed was prophetic, rather than political. The High Priestly leaders refuse to submit to this authority, taking refuge under a demand for 'a sign.' The claim, however, is not to be enforced by any form of material or spiritual compulsion (cf. Mt 12<sup>18</sup>, Is 42<sup>1-4</sup>). The rejection, as Jesus foresaw, must be consummated on the Cross (2<sup>19</sup>).

There seems no inherent improbability in the supposition that the Cleansing was repeated, when, at the end of the ministry, it was necessary once more to assert publicly in act the authority with which He had been invested. The difference between the words of the Lord on the two occasions is significant. On the first occasion the rulers are rebuked for making 'his Father's house a house of merchandise.' When their attitude towards Him is fully declared they are told that they are making the House of Prayer into a robbers' den. The authorities in the Temple were for the time allowed to go their own way.

The thought at the back of our Lord's answer is the same as that of the Parable of the Vineyard and the Husbandmen, and of His refusal on later occasions to satisfy similar demands from the Pharisees, as recorded by St. Matthew.

The same visit to Jerusalem was the occasion of an attempt to help an inquirer from among the Pharisees to understand the spiritual conditions which must be fulfilled by those who would understand our Lord's teaching or enter with Him into the New Order.

The conversation with Nicodemus fits the situation created by the work and witness of the Baptist. The reference to the Kingdom of God is in line with the account of the earliest preaching of Jesus in each of the Synoptists. The experience of Jesus at His Baptism—if that marked, as I have suggested, the moment of His own entrance into the Kingdom—illuminates His teaching with regard to the New Birth of 'Water and Spirit.' Even though the time had not yet come when He could Himself give to others the Baptism of the Spirit, He had Himself experienced it. And the Baptism of Repentance, which John was preaching, was of God's appointment for the whole nation. The Pharisees were defeating the counsel of God so far as they themselves were concerned by refusing to submit to it (Lk 7<sup>30</sup>, Mt 21<sup>32</sup>). Nicodemus and his friends would be vaguely conscious of the presence of a new power in the world. But they could not understand the laws of its operation until they had surrendered themselves to it. Jesus and the

Baptist were testifying of what they had seen and heard. No further progress was possible until that testimony is accepted.

The healing of the impotent man at the pool of Bethesda raised a fresh issue. By this act Jesus challenged the religious leaders of the people to reconsider the fundamental principles of their teaching of the Law. Here, as in all the recorded cases of healing on the Sabbath, the violation of the Pharisaic rules of Sabbath observance was direct and deliberate. The cases were all chronic. None could be described as urgent. This impotent man had been ill thirty-eight years, and might easily have been kept waiting till sunset, and there was no obvious necessity for him to take his bed home at once. Jesus cannot have been unaware of the criticism that His action would arouse. In fact His attitude to the Sabbath antagonized the religious leaders from the start, and set them planning His destruction. It was as direct a challenge to the religious, as the cleansing of the Temple had been to the political, leaders of the people. It contradicted fundamental principles of their religious teaching, and called them to accept from Him a revolutionary vision of the righteousness of the Kingdom.

Jesus, when challenged to justify His act, does so expressly on the ground of His relation to God as Father. St. John records in 5<sup>19-47</sup> an exposition of the principles on which His life as 'Son' is regulated; of the authority that belonged to Him; and of the witnesses to the truth of His claim which he would commend to their consideration. This defence, Dr. Westcott suggests, was given before the Sanhedrin. It is important to notice that the claim which is being expounded is Sonship, not Messiahship.

It will be worth while to examine this exposition in detail: 'My Father,' He says, 'worketh even until now, is at work at this present moment, and I work.' The point of this defence clearly is that, as Son, His life must be expected to reflect the life of His Father. And so His hearers understood Him. For, instead of raising the objection which we should have anticipated, that the commandment speaks of God as resting, they fasten on the pronoun 'my,' and the very practical application that Jesus was making of the relationship as revealing the law of His own life. He was making God His Father in a sense altogether strange and unprecedented. In spite of this commandment it had never occurred to them that their lives ought to reflect the life of God.

Our Lord, therefore, is able to leave on one side

the speculative question of the compatibility of rest and activity in the Divine life, and to re-state from various sides the claim that was exciting opposition. It is no doubt a wonderful claim, but, rightly understood, it is anything but self-assertive. It called men to realize, from what they saw, the power of God working through an utterly surrendered will. He had, no doubt, marvellous powers to exercise, and a position to fill of unique dignity and responsibility. All judgment was committed to Him. All men must honour the Son as they honour the Father. But He has not come in His own Name, seeking glory for Himself from men, but in His Father's Name. He does not even bear witness to Himself. He is content to leave the truth of His claim in His Father's keeping. But, for the sake of His hearers, He will remind them of the evidence already before them—the testimony of the Baptist; the testimony of the works that He was showing them from the Father, and the word of the Father Himself, acknowledging and commissioning His Son. But, alas! they were out of touch with the Father and so could not recognize His Son, or bring the testimony of their own Scriptures to fruition by enrolling themselves as disciples of Him of whom they spoke.

Such is the spirit of the whole defence. In the light of that spirit, utterly free from any taint of self-seeking, yet clear and resolute in its assertion of the position assigned to Him by His Father, and so sure of God that He can face without flinching

the unbelief and even the murderous hate of the leaders of His people—we can venture to look a little more closely into the revelation that He gives us of the source and spring of all His Human activity. 'The Son,' He tells us,—it is the principle of all filial action,—'can do nothing strictly self-originated. He can only throw Himself into any work on which He sees that His Father is engaged.' Even so the range of possible activity that is open to Him is startling in its extent. 'For, whatsoever work the Father is engaged in, that the Son undertakes after His example.' It must of course seem strange to us that one in our flesh should have such insight into the counsel and working of God. Yet if the word 'beloved' heard at the Baptism corresponds, as we should expect, to a real fact in the relationship between the Father and the Son, is it not natural that there should be no secrets between them? And is not a work of healing, utterly beyond the power of uninspired human faculty, wrought in the Father's Name, a witness that the enabling insight is a reality, and has been given to the Son? Can we doubt that even more marvellous works are yet to come from the same source?

No record is given of any decision on the part of the Jewish authorities. It is clear that no condemnation could be secured on a charge of Sabbath-breaking. The determination to put Him to death (5<sup>18</sup>), to which St. Mark also bears witness (3<sup>6</sup>), persisted, and was matter of common knowledge at least in some circles in Jerusalem (7<sup>25</sup>).

---

## The Rest of the Future Life.

BY THE REVEREND J. M. SHAW, D.D., PROFESSOR OF SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY  
IN THE UNITED CHURCH COLLEGE, HALIFAX, NOVA SCOTIA.

THE thought of the future life as a life of rest is one that has appealed to men in all ages. It was a thought which appealed in particular to the early Christians, compassed about as they were in the early days of the Church's history with organized persecution and devastating horror and havoc.

### I.

But this rest of the heavenly life has often been represented in a way which does less than justice to the Scripture representation. It is not a rest

of ecstatic idleness or glorified inactivity—what Browning calls in his *Paracelsus*, 'the lone, sad, sunny idleness of heaven.' It is the rest rather of fuller and more harmonious activity. 'They rest from their labours,' says the voice from heaven which John heard in his vision, 'for (not 'and' as in A.V.) their works follow with them' (Rev 14<sup>13</sup>, R.V.). The striking collocation or juxtaposition of the words is to be noted. There is in the original a contrast between the two words 'labours' and 'works.' The word translated 'labours' (κοποιαι) carries with it a sense of weariness, of spentness,