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:

https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology

https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb

PayPal https://paypal.me/robbradshaw

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

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php

The remaining teaching of the Epistle to the Romans need not detain us. In chapter xiv. 9 we read that "for this end Christ died and lived, in order that both of dead and living He may be Lord." This implies that Christ died of His own deliberate will, and with a definite purpose. So in verse 15 we read, "destroy not him for whom Christ died." These passages are in complete harmony with others already expounded.

To sum up. So far as we have yet examined it, St. Paul's teaching about the death of Christ is a logical development of one fundamental idea, viz. that God gave Christ to die in order to remove a hindrance to the salvation of sinful man which has its root in the justice of God. And we have already seen that this conception of the purpose of the death of Christ explains the teaching of all the other writers of the New Testament.

In my next paper we shall consider other teaching of the great Apostle on the same subject.

JOSEPH AGAR BEET.

THE NOBLEMAN'S SON AND THE CENTURION'S SERVANT.

(JOHN iv. 46; MATT. viii. 5; AND LUKE vii. 1.

AT the threshold of the ministry of Christ, and in the very act of passing from seclusion to His immortal publicity, we saw Him pause to bless the marriage of two obscure and forgotten villagers. It was a natural and exquisite inauguration of His career, a pure and fit expression of the love in the heart of Jesus.

But no sooner does His work begin to grapple with the sad conditions of humanity, no sooner is a "Saviour" manifested, than salvation is demanded from evils far direr and

more stern than the failure of a wedding-feast, so that the whisper "they have no wine" is quickly exchanged for the wail of anguish, "Sir, come down ere my child die."

In truth it is the radical defect of all sentimental religions and all dreamy philosophies, that however they may appease our minor complainings, they have no solace for bleeding hearts. Yet these are everywhere. Stern disease, imminent bereavement, the importunity of a parent in his anguish, these give their tone to the second record of a miracle. This was not however the second that was actually performed, for in Jerusalem, at the passover, many had believed, beholding the signs which Jesus wrought (John ii. 23, iv. 45).

This miracle, the healing of the son of the nobleman, must be studied along with that of the healing of the slave of the centurion. Rationalism makes this necessary, by insisting on the identification of the two stories, to the confusion of both. And the true answer to its cavils leads us so far into the heart and spirit of the second, that a complete examination of it cannot then be postponed without involving intolerable repetition.

It is plain that if the two miracles are indeed independent they bear witness to one another. The same tone, the same spirit and character pervade the narrative in the two synoptics and that in John. Our witnesses (if this be so) will then be the rationalists who have actually mistaken one story for the other, Strauss and Schenkel, Ewald and De Wette, Baur and Weizsäcker,[1] besides Renan, who uses in this connection language of much interest and significance. "It is," he says, "a miracle of healing, closely resembling those which fill the synoptics, and answering, with some variations, to that which is related in Matthew viii. 5, and in Luke vii. 1. This is highly remarkable, for it proves

[1] It is by a mere slip, apparently, that Irenæus wrote, "Filium *centurionis* absens verbo curavit, dicens, Vade filius tuus vivit."

that the author did not imagine his miracles according to his own conceit, but in relating them followed a tradition. In fact of the seven miracles in John, there are only two, the marriage in Cana and the raising of Lazarus, which are without a trace in the synoptics. The other five can be recognised with differences in detail." (*V. de J.*, 15*th ed.*, *appendice p.* 495.) Now if it be considered how early a date this appendix assigns to John, the prior tradition which he used must have been primitive indeed. And the later modifications of Renan's theory become very intelligible, not as harmonizing better with the phenomena which suggested its earlier form, but as evading inexorable consequences afterwards discovered, and fatal to unbelief.

Now what are the statements which have to be dealt with? The rationalistic theories, as of the records in general so of these stories in particular, all require the Johannine narrative to be the last outcome of progressive improvements in legend, and advances of the tradition. Strauss makes the improvements deliberate and calculated. By placing Jesus in Cana, "an increase of the distance, and consequently an exaggeration of the miracle was obtained." The return of the father a day later left room for investigation, and showed that the hour of improvement was that of the interview with Jesus (*New Life*, ii. 201).

Keim also insists on the greater distance, the greater promptitude ("mysterious telegram of the Lord!") and the conversion of the household—"a detail of which the earlier writers know nothing" (iii. 220–1).

But it must be clear that in all cases of restoration from desperate illness, the persuasion of the household is assumed. We are told nothing of the state of mind of Jairus and his wife after the miracle; but who doubts it on that account?

Here it is expressly mentioned simply because John is engaged in tracing the beginnings of belief wherever Jesus

went, at Cana as well as in Capernaum, and in Samaria without any miracle at all. "Now we believe, not because of Thy speaking, for we have heard for ourselves, and know." So far is John from supposing that faith is a gauge for measurement of the relative bulk of prodigies. And when two miracles are said to have been wrought from a distance, it is almost a jest to appraise their comparative greatness by the number of miles between the operator and the patient.

In truth a much stronger case could be made out for precisely the inverse of their position, for reversing the order of the narratives, and pronouncing the story in the synoptics to be the later and more developed marvel. It could be argued that the faith, by which Jesus obtains honour, which was so wavering and unsteady in St. John, is confirmed and unhesitating now, the doubts of the early story having come to be regarded as unworthy and an insult. He is glorified by a confession, as formal as if it were a fragment of some creed, that all human ailments are to Him as the subordinates in a well-disciplined army, a position undreamed of by John. Above all, a hint which has been dropped by the earlier story, when it made the applicant a courtier, a Jew as yet, but contaminated by official relations with the foreigner, has since received the most significant exaggerations. The suppliant is now a faithful Gentile, a centurion; and even the notion that he was recommended by some courtesies shown to Judaism, which evidently prevailed for a while, is formally controverted by St. Matthew, who declares that the children of the kingdom are to be cast into outer darkness, and that it is from the outmost limits of the heathen world that the true recruits of the Church are to be drawn.

Are these not indications of the latest recension of the story, after the Church had ceased to have any hope of the Jews, and when the gospel had already proved successful in

the remotest realms? All this, and much more could have been plausibly urged, if the requirements of the sceptical case had been reversed. And it conclusively proves the folly of paying any regard to arguments of the kind, which can be tossed about, from one side to the other, like tennis-balls.

But it is not enough for us merely to insist that there are marked differences between the narratives (which will be met by an assertion that they have simply drifted far away from each other), nor to show that the evidence for growth, from the synoptics to John, has broken down. We must account for the resemblances between them, which are too striking to be entirely accidental.

These are three: the working of both miracles from a distance; the official station of both petitioners (however great the difference in their rank), and the really startling fact that both were resident in Capernaum. In these is the strength of the hostile position; but a closer consideration will show that the official and local proximity of the applicants can explain all the details of the second narrative, including the repetition of a cure from a distance; and that a comparison of the accounts is a help instead of a hindrance to our faith.

It is obvious that in such a life as that of Jesus, one incident must often lead to another, and certain events would tend to reproduce themselves, in the broad outline, yet with many differences in detail. Consider, for example, how hard it was for a woman, trammeled by oriental usages, to find any suitable expression for her loyalty; and then decide whether the fact that Jesus allowed one woman, and even a sinner, to anoint Him would not embolden a happier sister also to anoint her Master, when eager to do what she could, being at once grateful for a stupendous miracle, and foreboding His burial, which was at hand. The suspicion of some confusion in two narratives of the

same event soon gives place to a sense of natural and beautiful connection between two acts of love, different, but not wholly independent. We might almost divine, even if it were unrecorded, that such homage, having been accepted, would more probably happen twice than once only. And thus it is with the two miracles before us: they also are separate but not independent. Instead of wondering that both occurred in the same place, it would have been far more surprising if the second had happened elsewhere, if the centurion had conceived such extraordinary confidence without any knowledge of the experience of his neighbour, who had already learned how Jesus was obeyed when He said to a disease, Depart.

The faith at which Jesus marvelled becomes intelligible, without ceasing to be admirable, when we reflect that the centurion was evidently aware of the miracle formerly wrought for another inhabitant of the same city, an eminent person, one of the court which his own sword protected. That the two miracles performed from a distance should bear the same address would no doubt be strange if the manner of the first had not inspired the centurion to urge with remarkable insistence the manner of the second. It ceases to be surprising when we read that the second was suggested by an inhabitant of the town, deeply impressed by what had already been done, and very reluctant to overtax the generous condescension which would perform a miracle for the slave of a Gentile. The faith of the centurion, which was startling, even where the nobleman dwelt, would have been almost incredible elsewhere. And the natural sequence of the two narratives, as the Church receives them, may best be appreciated by reversing their order, and observing how strange would seem the incredulity of the noble, if already, in his town, the faith of the centurion had been rewarded. In exactly the same degree had the confidence of the latter been assisted.

And thus, adopting the Christian view, all is order and consistency, while the sceptical recension rends the fabric into pieces without even making a harmonious pattern of the patchwork.

It is now time to consider, in more detail, the first of these narratives, that of John. Who was the petitioner? The term *βασιλικός* might possibly denote one of royal blood, but then he would surely have been named; or perhaps no more than a member of the Herodian faction, but it is not in John's manner to mention so irrelevant and trifling a detail as this. It is reasonable to infer that he was simply a courtier. And here John is in agreement with Luke, who names Chuza and Manaan, in quite different connections, as having relations both with Jesus and with the court. A little later we find Herod himself excited by the miracles of Jesus, first to the slavish dread which believed Him to be "John whom I beheaded," and when this fear wore away with impunity, then to desire to see Him, with that idle curiosity to which no sign is given.

From the court of Herod, then, comes a man of sufficient rank to expect that Jesus, for his sake, should willingly undertake a journey, and to expostulate, with some impatience, when He delays to discuss the terms on which men should believe. There is no lack of sympathy in the first reply of Jesus to the prayer that He would come and heal a child at the point of death. The Syro-Phœnician woman would have been quick to detect, in His words, a hint that the sign should be vouchsafed.

But there is a keen discernment of the weakness of that belief which some would think strong enough, since it led the nobleman to undertake a journey, and to appeal to the Prophet of Nazareth for his son's life. Many who forget religion in prosperity take refuge, when afflicted, in passion-

ate appeals to heaven, and it is supposed to show how much latent religion men possess, that—

> "Eyes which the teacher cannot school
> By wayside graves are raisèd,
> And lips say 'God be pitiful'
> Which ne'er said 'God be praisèd.'"

But our Lord thought otherwise. The passionate energies of despair are not spiritual in their strength. And Jesus, fresh from His stay with the Samaritans, who believed because they heard, complained, "Except ye see signs and wonders[1] ye will not believe." Persons who sigh because the age of miracles is past, and who think that a revival of faith would regain signs and wonders for the Church, ought to observe that the very object of the miracles was to render themselves unnecessary, to bring on a condition of faith in which they can be put away as childish things. And so Jesus at the outset makes this courtier aware that He is no mere Thaumaturgist but a Divine Teacher, who requires faith in its simplest and most direct forms. This faith He absolutely exacts, for when the trembling father cries out against a delay which may prove fatal, it is peremptorily demanded that without seeing he shall believe, contented with an assurance, without any sign, except indeed what shone upon the heavenly face of Jesus. Thus was elicited, e-ducated, more faith than the man was conscious of, so that his heart left him free, either to transact other business, or else to visit friends upon the road home, which he might easily have reached, had he been impatient, between "the seventh hour," and nightfall.

It is impossible not to be struck by the similarity between this conduct of Jesus and that of Elisha in sending away Naaman, who also received only a promise, which took effect

[1] Note that the word *τέρας* never occurs alone, except in Peter's quotation from the Old Testament, Acts ii. 19. Even there the "wonders" in heaven are closely connected with the "signs" on earth.

when the applicant showed faith in it. In both cases it was a man of rank who was thus treated, a man to whom any observer of persons would have been specially obsequious. And we may well suppose that the ancient story helped the nobleman to believe the word which Jesus spake unto him.

The words of Jesus are in deep harmony with the blessing in this gospel for those who have not seen yet have believed, and also with the declaration elsewhere, that if moral agencies have entirely failed, men will not believe though one rose from the dead. In form that declaration goes beyond this. Here we read that only signs will bring the people to believe ("ye" not "thou"); there a supreme sign will fail. But there is only a formal inconsistency, for this passage speaks of the difficulty of inspiring a new faith, the other of the impossibility of converting men who are false to the truth which they profess. The sadness of Christ's statement was more than justified afterward, when, having done among them the signs which none other man did, He declared that they had both seen and hated both Him and His Father.

There is something very natural in the simple close of this story. The servants, surprised at their Master's delay, met the nobleman with good news; and though he had relied upon Christ's assurance, yet it was reasonable that he should test the miracle by asking at what hour began the gradual amendment which was all that he expected, and all that earthly medicine can bestow. But on learning that at the hour of his interview with Jesus the fever entirely left him, the man, already a believer, believed. One is always expecting some person to parade this paradox as an inconsistency. In truth it is what happens whenever we make larger proof of our privilege and of the power of prayer, and from happy experience draw a deeper and richer persuasion, a more spontaneous and adequate faith in Him, in whom we believed before.

It is a process which can be fatally inverted. After the sop Satan entered into Judas. But Satan had entered into him already when he first opened negociations with the priests. And even before that, he was a devil (John xiii. 27, vi. 70; Luke xxii. 3).

Some months later, when the Sermon on the Mount had been preached and several miracles wrought, the ease of this one inspired a centurion in the same town to make a bold request. Contemptible as a slave might be, this soldier was weak enough to love one. What he asked would imply condescension indeed, but no labour, since Jesus was nearer now (as the sceptics so carefully remind us) than when he healed a child by a mere word. It is worth notice that until His arrest, when He healed the ear of Malchus, this is His only recorded contact with that unhappy class, whose yoke He came to break, and for one of whom His apostle wrote the most exquisite and urbane epistle in all literature. We may infer indeed that slaves were among those who insulted Him, since they were prominent among those who overawed Peter (John xviii. 18, 26). Yet the fact remains that nothing of the kind is written: we only know of two, the two occasions, on both of which He worked miracles for their relief.

Evidently he did not mean to ask of Jesus much exertion for such a person, and was astonished when the Lord Himself drew near. No one dreams of saying a word about any merit of the sufferer. He had become "dear" to his master, but that was a feeling which he does not expect to weigh with others. And indeed the national pride and scorn of the Jew is exhibited without a touch of exaggeration or caricature, in the sole merit that is ascribed to the centurion himself, worthy because he loveth our nation, and hath built our synagogue. It is otherwise, in the Acts, when a Christian writer describes the virtue of

Cornelius, a devout man and one that feared God with all his house. Thus everywhere these narratives welcome the minutest tests of their veracity.

What then are we to make of the assertion in St. Matthew that the centurion came, while St. Luke tells us that he "sent elders of the Jews" to plead for him, and afterwards "sent friends" (naturally, since he had not another official deputation in reserve) to stop the personal approach of Jesus?

No one is perplexed by a discrepancy of quite the same kind, where a miracle is not in question. In Matthew it is Salome who asks the chief places in the kingdom for her sons; in Mark it is James and John themselves (Matt. xx. 20; Mark x. 35); but we understand at once that her action was also theirs. And what the centurion did by delegates he did himself, even if he did not in his earnestness add personal expostulations at last. Lord Tennyson is not wrong in singing that—

> "Down *we* swept and charged and overthrew . . .
> In that world-earthquake Waterloo."

Strict discipline is an excellent school for character. From rugged and stern surroundings have often emerged the strongest and the most veracious characters; and thus it is by no mere accident that so many of the centurions, the minor officers of the New Testament, are favourably mentioned. The second is he who discerned beside the Cross the righteousness of Jesus, and was therefore led on, amid the supernatural incidents of His death, to confess that He was the Son of God. And in the Acts of the Apostles we have Cornelius, and Julius, who courteously entreated Paul. This man had been attracted to the light which Israel held up, with however weak a hand, among the nations. He was one of the many God-fearing Gentiles, penetrated with Hebrew convictions, and yet free from

Jewish prejudice, who formed the bridge by which Paul was presently to reach the Gentile world. And Jesus does not hold back, nor require any such importunity, as when He had to deal with a mere Gentile, "a Greek, a Syro-Phœnician." The level from which she needed to raise herself by a memorable effort, the centurion had already left behind.

It is interesting to remark the colour given by his own vocation to his religious convictions. Taught equally by his own obedience and authority, He thinks of health and sickness coming and going at the bidding of their Master. It is a high conception, and implies more perhaps than he realized, the harmony and discipline of nature, and its obedience to a presiding intelligence.

Hearing it, Jesus marvelled. Only once again this expression is used of Him, and then also from a moral impulse; He marvelled at the unbelief of His own nation (Mark vi. 6). It is impossible to regard such expressions as unreal. They must be taken with all those which tell of His asking questions, of His advance in wisdom, of the day which He knew not. The inference is cumulative in its weight, and the true lesson is of adoration for His intellectual as well as physical self-sacrifice, in that He condescended not only to suffer pain, but to be like His brethren in all privation, yet without sin. But it does not follow that Jesus ever erred. Error is not the result of ignorance alone, but only in conjunction with over-confidence, with the false assumption that one knows; and therefore it always involves some modicum of presumption. The chasm is deep and broad between a frank recognition of the ignorance which Christ avowed, and any imputation of error to Him who is the Truth, and the Word made flesh.

Jesus then marvelled, and proceeded to demolish the vain-glorious assumption of superiority which led the elders

to recommend this centurion merely as a client of their own. He, whom human faith astonished, since He was man, straightway, as anointed teacher, declares the secrets of eternity, the coming of many from all quarters of the world to a kingdom whose natural inheritors shall be cast out, not merely some of them, but "the children" in bulk and as an aggregate.

This is the first clear announcement of that spiritual revolution, the loss of the exclusive privilege of Judaism, which had been foreshadowed in the discourse at Nazareth, by the stress laid upon the many lepers and widows of Israel who were unrelieved, while the prophet was sent to a Syrian and to a woman of Sidon.

And this announcement is joined with the very first commendation of human faith, the faith of a Gentile soldier.[1]

The approval distinctly accepts the rank of Master of all disease, and such a one as does not obtain healing by His intercession, but sends it by speaking the word only.

It may not assert His divinity in so logical a form as to forbid evasion. But no fact can be more significant than this, that the lowly Jesus never refuses any elevation whatever that is offered Him, except only the imputation of a goodness which is not divine. Any such goodness is inconceivable to Him.

Lastly, we observe in these two narratives the flexibility of our Saviour's manner, the tact, the adaptation to circumstances, which His followers covet, but rarely win.

The nobleman who would carry Him away to attend like a physician upon his child, must learn his place. Jesus obliges him to depart, trustfully, without a sign. But the centurion and the patronizing elders must learn quite a

[1] Even the word πίστις cannot accurately be said to occur before, although the idea, and the name of it, are implied in Mark i. 15 and Matt. vi. 30.

different lesson, the condescension of Christ to men of low estate. He will come to a Gentile and heal a slave. And yet there is an earnest humility which ought not to be constrained. Jesus yields to the urgency of lowliness, and perhaps feels that to insist further on a personal visit would be misconstrued by the bystanders. The servant is made whole at once.

G. A. CHADWICK.

CARDINAL NEWMAN.

NEARLY thirty years ago, Mr. Kingsley accused Dr. Newman of something like indifference to truth and sincerity. He brought into the field, in reply, both Newman's extraordinary power of effective statement, and his dexterity in seizing an opportunity. Newman virtually said, "Well, I will retrace the history of my mind, I will show how my opinions have come and grown; I will reveal the reaction created in my mind by all the events which have moulded my history; and then I will await the world's judgment upon my integrity." So there came out the *Apologia*, the history of his Religious Opinions. It was much more than an answer to Kingsley. It was an appeal, in a singularly effective form, as to the worth of the convictions which had mastered his life. In his perspicuous, nervous English, Newman told his tale, and allowed the story to ask its own questions and press its lessons on the public mind. Nobody thought any more about Kingsley's charges. The interest and the pathos of an unworldly and unique life alone remained. The book is one of those rare Confessions which men never will forget. Ever since then, Newman, who was remarkable enough before, has had a quite special hold of the interest of his generation.

Lately, at a great old age, the Cardinal passed away. Of