

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 Expositor* can be found here:

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

to emaciate the creed of Christendom (as he would have it) until it has no more distinction than this: "Originality is not an addition to knowledge, it is only a new arrangement of colour" (p. 51).

If this is indeed all, one pities the apologists of the next century. And yet, perhaps, if this be all, their inevitable defeat need not concern us or them very sorely.

G. A. DERRY AND RAPHOE.

CHRIST'S ATTITUDE TO HIS OWN DEATH.

III.

THE ministry in Jerusalem is the supreme moment in the history of Jesus, and we have therefore to inquire whether it reveals, and, if so, in what degree it defines, His idea as to His death. We must keep clearly in view the positive features in the situation: He comes to the Holy City, the heart of the religion, the home of the temple, the throne of the priesthood, the one place where sacrifices acceptable to God could be offered. He was under no illusion as to the fate that there awaited Him: the prophet could not perish out of Jerusalem.¹ Hither He came speaking and acting consciously as the Christ, with everything He was to do and suffer stamped by Him and for Himself with a distinct Messianic character. What now was the idea as to His work and fortunes as the Messiah which governed His consciousness? Let us attempt to discover it by an analysis of His words and acts.

I.

A. We begin with the triumphal entry. It can hardly be regarded as an accidental or even spontaneous outburst of popular enthusiasm. The Synoptists were agreed in

¹ Luke xiii. 33.

ascribing the initiative to Jesus; He sends for the ass and the ass's colt in order that He may fitly enter the Holy City,¹ and though John is less detailed he is almost as explicit.² The disciples read the command as a public assertion of His claim to Messianic dignity, and proceed to possess the multitude with their belief. And so Jesus is welcomed as the King come to claim His own by a jubilant people, crying, "Hosanna to the Son of David!" He does not rebuke their joy, or, as He had once done,³ enjoin silence as to His being the Christ, but accepts their homage as His rightful due. Hence when the Pharisees said, "Master, rebuke Thy disciples," He answered that, were they to be silent, the very stones would cry out.⁴ He thus endorses and vindicates their recognition. But He knows that while the people are trustful and waiting to be led, the rulers are suspicious and watching to crush the leader and—to fulfil His prophecy. For to subtle rulers nothing is so easy as to use a simple people as they will.

But for His judgment on these public events we must turn to words spoken in the intimacy of His immediate circle. On the morrow, as He returns to the city, He speaks the parable of the barren fig tree.⁵ It has a double moral, one pointed at the Jews, another at the disciples. The first tells how in the season of fruition He came to Israel, and instead of fruit "found nothing but leaves." And what was the good of the fruitless tree save to be bidden "to wither away"? The scribes, who ought to have been the eyes of the people, saw not the time of their visitation, saw only that their own custody of the parchment which held the oracles of God was threatened, and so they made the great refusal. The chief priests, who ought to have been the conscience of Israel, had no

¹ Matt. xxi. 1 ff.; Mark xi. 1 ff.; Luke xix. 29 ff.

² John xii. 14.

³ Matt. xvi. 20.

⁴ Luke xix. 40.

⁵ Matt. xxi. 18-22.

conscience toward God but only to themselves, and so they could think of nothing but the happiest expedient for effecting His death. So read, the parable is a piece of severe prophetic satire. The second moral told the disciples to have faith; with it they could accomplish anything, without it nothing at all. They were to be the antithesis to the rulers, and exemplify not a faithlessness which the world overcomes, but the faith which overcomes the world. The two combined show the twofold attitude of Jesus, on the one hand to the men who were to erect the cross, on the other to the men who were to preach in His name to all nations. What is significant is the place and function which the parable assigns to Himself: to fail to receive Him is fundamental failure; to believe in Him is to be qualified to effect the removal of mountains.

B. The immediate sequent of the entry must also be noted. Jesus went straight to the temple, where, Mark significantly says, "He looked round upon all things,"¹ and, returning on the morrow, "He cast out all them that bought and sold in the temple, and overthrew the tables of the money-changers, and the seats of them that sold doves."² This incident has been very variously judged: it has been regarded as an outbreak of passion, as a lawless act, as even an act of rebellion and revolution; as a desperate attempt to precipitate a conflict, and by a sort of surprise attack save Himself and defeat the priests and rulers.³ These seem to us shallow views. We could not feel as if Jesus became sinful simply because He was angry; nay, the more sinless we think Him to be the more do we conceive indignation and resentment as natural and even necessary to Him. There are acts and states that

¹ xi. 11. ² *Ib.* 15; Matt. xxi. 12.

³ Keim, *Jesus of Nazara*, vol. v., pp. 118-23, for example, speaks about "His uncurbed anger," "His passion for rule and revolution," and describes His action as the "Nothakt eines Untergehenden."

ought to provoke anger, and not to feel it would argue a singularly poor and obtuse moral nature, without any power of recoil from the offensive and reprehensible. And from what He saw in the temple Jesus did well to be angry, yet His anger was without passion. Matthew finely indicates this by two things, "the blind and the lame"—the two most timid classes—came to Him to be healed, and the children, who are ever sensitive to passion and instinctively shrink from hate, were attracted to Him and sang in His praise. The anger which was terrible to the guilty seemed tenderness to the innocent. And so the chief priests and scribes said, in suspicion and alarm, "Hearest Thou what these say?" But He justified the children thus: "Yea, did ye never read, Out of the mouths of babes and sucklings Thou hast perfected praise?" And His own action, how does He justify it? By comparing the ideal with the actual temple¹: the ideal was to be a House of Prayer for all nations, but the actual had been made a den of robbers, *i.e.*, they had narrowed it, and had prostituted the pure house of God to their own sordid uses. And He claimed the right to raise up the fallen ideal—and as Messiah He could claim no less—and to open the door wide to the pure in heart, who could see God, but could not trade in the holy place.

He thus, in effect, said that as they had failed to understand prophecy, they had failed to realize worship. The counterpart of the dumb oracle was the defiled altar. And so He affirmed His right to govern the house of God, to declare invalid the authority of the men who claimed to stand in the Aaronic succession and to sit in Moses' seat, to abolish the old and institute a new order, to introduce the hour when the true worshipper was to "worship the Father in spirit and in truth." But in order to see the full meaning of the act, we must here introduce a dislocated

¹ xxi. 14-16.

saying. At the trial two false witnesses appear and testify : " This man said, I am able to destroy the temple of God, and to build it in three days,"¹ and the words were repeated by the mockers at the cross.² The saying, which was truly told, but falsely interpreted, evidently belongs here, and means that He had conceived Himself as the spiritual reality of which the temple was the material counterpart. What it was in symbol He was in truth—the medium for the reconciliation of man and God. In Galilee His controversy had been with the Pharisees touching tradition and the law, here it was with the priests touching worship and the temple ; but the same idea lies behind both—His transcendence of the system which the Jew regarded as absolute and final : the Son of Man is greater than the temple,³ and the Lord of the Law ;⁴ both are from Him, through Him, and for Him. In the background of His mind, regulating His speech and action, is the thought of the ideal temple, which was profaned in the profanation of the actual, and as the pure Sacrifice He purged the place where sacrifices were impurely offered.

II.

But it is still more in the teaching peculiar to the Jerusalem period that His idea is defined. It falls into two divisions, which we may call the exoteric and the esoteric.

A. In the exoteric, or outer, there is a new note ; His words are graver, sterner, much concerned with His death, and the part in it the rulers were to play. Ideas and principles also appear, different from any He had expressed while He lived in Galilee. (i.) There is the parable of the husbandmen, who first beat and kill and stone the servants, and finally slay the son that they may seize on his inheritance.⁵ What is this but a picture of the scene which was

¹ Matt. xxvi. 61.

² Matt. xxvii. 40.

³ Matt. xii. 6.

⁴ Mark ii. 28.

⁵ Matt. xxi. 33-41 ; Mark xii. 1-9 ; Luke xx. 9-16.

passing before His eyes and theirs? (ii.) There is His interpretation of the stone which the builders rejected, but which yet became the chief stone of the corner.¹ The builders are the rulers; He Himself is the stone, hastily set aside, but so terrible that it breaks whoever falls on it, and grinds to powder the man on whom it falls. No words could more clearly forecast their respective parts in the immediate future and in the subsequent history. (iii.) There is the parable of the Marriage Supper,²—full of the tragedy of the moment,—the bidden guests scornfully refusing to come, the servants spitefully entreated, even slain, but the slayers are themselves soon to be slain, and their city burned up, while the wedding is to be furnished with fitter guests. The meaning is obvious: He is the King's Son, now is the festival of the marriage, and the rulers, who in spite of their proud claims are yet only guests in the House, are rejected of God for the rejection of His Son. (iv.) There is the attitude of Jerusalem to Him and His to her. He has a marvellous vision³; on the one hand the city is as it were personalized, and stands pictured as a colossal persecutor, inheritor of the guilt of all past martyrdoms, and so charged with all the righteous blood which has from the days of Abel been shed upon the earth; and on the other hand He stands as Maker and Leader of martyrs, a colossal Person in whose veins flows all the blood of all the righteous; and by whose will the new prophets are fitly to be sent to deliver their testimony and endure the cross; *i.e.* He conceives the hour to be at hand when acts are to be done which will epitomize and embody all the martyrdoms of all the holy who have ever lived. But He who sees Himself and His thus suffer at her hands, is the very One whose mission and passion it was to save and shelter her. (v.) In the most authentic and sublime of the Apocalyptic discourses He affirms a principle He has

¹ Matt. xxi. 42-44.

² Matt. xxii. 2-10.

³ Matt. xxiii. 34-39.

often implied but never expressed—the vicarious. The good or ill of His people is His; they are one with Him and He with them. The smallest beneficence to the least of His brethren is done to Him; the good refused to them is denied to Him.¹ And, we may add, this idea implies its converse: if their sufferings are His, His are theirs; what He endures and what He achieves, man achieves and endures.

We can hardly misread the significance of these passages. They bear witness to this: that the moment when He foresees His death most clearly He conceives His person most highly, that He regards this death as a calamity to those who reject, an infinite good to those who accept, Him, that those who compass it participate in what may be termed a universal crime, which shall work their disaster while constituting His opportunity to effect everlasting good. The principle which explains these things is His complete identification with all the righteousness of time, or the unity in Him of the being of all the good who are hated of all the evil.

B. But these are more or less external views, conditioned by the antithesis under which they are developed; for His more inward mind we must turn to His words to the disciples.

i. What this mind was is evident from the incident in the house of Simon, the leper.² The conflict in the city and with the rulers is over; and He can speak to His own quietly and without controversy concerning the secret things of His own soul. As they sit at meat a woman, bearing “an alabaster box of very precious ointment,” steals softly up behind Him, and “pours it upon His head.” What followed shows how little the disciples had learned, and how much of their old spirit still lived within them. “To what purpose is this waste?” is their indignant question, while their sordid feeling is disguised as concern for the poor. But

¹ Matt. xxv. 35-40, 42-45. ² Matt. xxvi. 6-13; Mark xiv. 3-9.

the reply of Jesus expresses His innermost thought: "She is come to anoint My body aforehand for the burying." His death fills His mind, and it is to be a death which will leave no chance for assuaging the grief of the living by the last tender ministries to the dead. And He rejoices to see His own acts of sacrifice reflected in the gracious act of the woman; the love that surrenders life feels comforted by the kindred love which covers with grateful fragrance the body so soon to be lifeless. But there is an even finer touch, showing the faith that lived in the heart of disaster. Jesus, while He anticipates death, anticipates universal fame and everlasting remembrance. His gospel is to be preached "throughout the whole world," and the woman's act is to be everywhere "spoken of as a memorial for her." This consciousness of His universal and enduring import is a note of the sayings which belong to His last days, and stands indissolubly associated with His approaching death. His words are to abide for ever;¹ His gospel is, like the temple of God, destined for "all peoples." And these things He speaks of as simply and confidently as He speaks of His death.

ii. But the most solemn and significant of all His utterances concerning His death are the words spoken at the institution of the supper. And here we must strictly limit ourselves to their theological import; their sacramental interpretation lies outside our present purpose; so does the interesting question which has been recently raised, whether we owe the change of the Supper into a permanent sacrament to Jesus or to Paul, and whether the suggestive cause of the change was Jewish custom or Greek mysteries. This question requires a broader and more searching treatment than it has yet received. The later action of the mysteries, and the tendencies that created the mysteries, upon the ideas of the Supper, of the elements, the conditions, the

¹ Mark xiii. 31.

effects, and the modes of observance, may be established by various lines of proof; but we see no reason to doubt that the Supper had become a Christian custom before Christianity had felt the delicate yet subduing touch of the Hellenic spirit. This question, however, does not affect ours, which is simply, "What did Jesus mean by the words He used as to His own death at the institution of the Supper?"

In the several narratives the formulæ are not quite identical. As has been often remarked, there are two main versions—that of Paul and Luke on the one hand, and that of Matthew and Mark on the other; but even the versions which are alike significantly differ from each other, and as significantly agree with a representative of the independent tradition. Thus the formula for the bread is simpler in Matthew (*Λάβετε, φάγετε· τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου*), and Mark (who omits *φάγετε*), but more detailed in Paul (*τοῦτό μου ἐστιν τὸ σῶμα τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν· τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν*), and most detailed in Luke (*τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον· τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν*). The variations affect both the theological and the sacramental idea, the former in *τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν*, the latter in *τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν*. In the formula for the wine, the cross agreements and differences are still more instructive. Mark is simplest: *τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ αἷμά μου τῆς διαθήκης τὸ ἐκχυννόμενον ὑπὲρ πολλῶν*. Matthew changes *ὑπὲρ* into *περί*, and adds *εἰς ἄφεςιν ἁμαρτιῶν*. Paul says: *τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ αἵματι*; while Luke combines Matthew and Mark with Paul, thus: *τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐν τῷ αἵματί μου, τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυννόμενον*.

These variations are easily explicable, and show, so far as the sacramental idea is concerned, that the validity of the ordinance did not depend on any uniformity in the formula used; for words so freely altered could not be conceived

to possess some mystic or magic potency capable of effecting a miraculous change in the elements. As concerns the theological idea, the difference in the terms represents no contradiction or radical divergence in the thought. Paul and Luke say, "the new covenant in His blood"—*i.e.*, the covenant which stood in the blood, or had therein the condition of its being. Matthew and Mark say, "this is the blood of the covenant"—*i.e.*, the blood which gives it being and character, which is its seal and sanction. They agree in their idea of the covenant, though Paul and Luke think of it as "the new" in contrast to "the old," while Matthew and Mark think of it, absolutely, as sole and complete. Paul says nothing as to the persons for whom the blood has been shed; Luke says, "for you"; Matthew and Mark, "for many." But the difference here is formal. Paul means what the others say, while the "you" is only the personalized and present "many," the "many" the enlarged and collective "you." Matthew alone definitely expresses the purpose for which the blood was shed—"unto the remission of sins"; but this only made explicit the idea contained in the *ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν* and the *ὑπὲρ* or even the *περὶ πολλῶν*; for what other idea could the consciousness of the disciples supply save that the blood shed "for them," or "in reference to many," was shed "in order to remission of sins"? The phrasing varies; the language is here less, there more, explicit, but the thought is throughout one and the same.

III.

What, then, did the words which our authorities thus render mean on the lips of Jesus? We cannot be wrong, considering where it stands, in regarding this as the weightiest, most precise, and defining expression which He has yet used concerning His death. The form under which He first conceived it was as an integral part of His

work as Messiah, yet as a fate He endures or suffers at the hands of the elders and chief priests. The next form under which He conceived it was as the spontaneous surrender of Himself "as a ransom for many." But here these two forms coalesce in a third, which is at once their synthesis and completion. His death has (*a*) at once an historical and an ideal, a retrospective and a prospective significance; it ends one covenant and establishes another; (*β*) it has an absolute worth irrespective of the form it may assume or the means by which it may be effected, for though inflicted by men, it is endured on behalf of man; and (*γ*) its express purpose is to create a new, an emancipated people of God.

A. But in order that these ideas may be understood they must be interpreted through His experience, the facts and factors that had shaped and were shaping His thought. The covenant which He established stands as "the new" in explicit antithesis to the "old," and finds its constitutive condition and characteristic in His blood. He dies at the hands of the old covenant, but in so dying He creates the new. This makes His death, as it were, the concrete expression of the antithesis of the covenants, and at the same time represents the inmost fact of His own conscious experience. While possessed by the feeling of radical unity with His people, He was as an alien to the actual system under which they lived. He consciously incorporated their most distinctive religious ideas, but He was as consciously in conflict with the men who claimed to be the official representatives and only authorized ministers of the old religion. The degree in which He embodied those ideas was the measure of His antagonism to the men, and theirs to Him. To be the Christ of prophecy was to be the Crucified of Judaism. This was the tragedy of the situation: the Jew had been in order to produce the first, but once He was there the Jew did not know Him, would not

love Him, had no room for Him, could do nothing with Him save compass His death. The words of Caiaphas, though preserved only in the Fourth Gospel, express the thought of his class as broadly written across the face of the Synoptic history: "It is expedient for you that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation perish not."¹ This was but the official version of what Jesus Himself had foreseen and so often foretold. His reading of the religion was the direct contradiction of theirs; both could not live together, and the only way in which they could effectually contradict His contradiction was by His death. But at this point, as to what was to be accomplished by His death, He and they radically differed; they thought that by the cross He was to die and they were to live, but He believed that they were through His death not to live, but to die. This idea fills His later teaching; it is the moral, not simply of the Apocalyptic discourses, but of the parables already noticed,² of His words to the women of Jerusalem,³ and of His lamentation over the city.⁴ It was the supreme Nemesis of history. What fate save death could happen to the system whose reward to its most righteous Son was the cross?

B. But this is an indirect, and, as it were, negative result of His death; the direct and positive is the new covenant which is established in His blood. We need not concern ourselves with the idea of "covenant"; enough to say, it is here held to denote a gracious relation on God's part expressed in a new revelation for the faith and obedience of man. What does very specially concern us is what Jesus says as to His blood. It must be explained through the moment and all its circumstances. He had strongly desired to eat the Passover with His disciples before He suffered,⁵ and He had sent Peter and John be-

¹ xi. 50.² *Supra*, pp. 20, 21.³ Luke xxiii. 28-31.⁴ Matt. xxiii. 38; Luke xix. 43, 44.⁵ Luke xxii. 15.

forehand to prepare it.¹ Now this means that its associations were vivid both in His mind and in theirs, and through these associations His words must be construed. The feast was the most domestic of all the feasts in Israel; in it the father was more important than the priest, the house than the temple. The lamb was not the symbol of sacerdotal supremacy, but of family and racial unity, especially in the eye and purpose of God. Its blood was not shed to propitiate a vengeful Deity, and induce Him to pass kindly over the family for whom it had been slain and the house where it was being eaten, but rather to mark them as God's own, to be the sign that they were His and doing as He willed; in other words, the paschal sacrifice did not make Him gracious, but found Him gracious, and confessed that those who offered believed themselves to be the heirs of His grace. It was the seal of a mercy which had been shown and was now claimed, not the purchase of a mercy which was withheld and must be bought. It signified, too, that since the people were God's, they could not continue slaves, but must be emancipated and live as became the free, obedient to the Sovereign whose supremacy could brook no rival authority. It was the symbol, therefore, of unity, all the families who sacrificed constituted a single people; Israel knew only one God, God knew only one Israel. Jesus did not receive these associations as a letter that killed, but as the spirit which gave life. They were translated by Him from the traditions which acted as the fetters of the past on the present into the ideals which were to govern the future. He manifestly conceived Himself as the sacrificial lamb, for only so can we find any meaning in the reference to this blood; and the figure was beautiful enough to apply even to Him. It was the symbol of innocence, meekness, gentleness, of one who was led to the slaughter, and was

¹ Luke xxii. 8.

dumb under the hand of the shearer; but it did not speak of a victim whose blood was shed to appease a vindictive sovereign. On the contrary, it told of His grace, and was the mark which distinguished His people. The blood could be in symbol only where it was in reality, and wherever it was it denoted a member of the family of God, a man spared, emancipated, introduced into all the liberties and endowed with all the privileges of Divine sonship.

C. So far we have been concerned with the relation of the blood to the covenant, but we are now met by another question: In what sense could it be said to be shed "for you" or "for many"? We have seen that He represented acts done to the least and the neediest of men as done to Himself; but the precise parallel of this is that the acts He does may be conceived as done by man; in other words, He is so the centre or keystone of family or racial unity that in a perfectly real sense His act is universal, while personal. His position is twofold: He conceives Himself as the Lamb sacrificed in order to mark and seal the people of God, *i.e.*, establish His covenant, but He also at the same moment sits in the seat of the host or father, who sums up in himself the household, acts and speaks as their sole and responsible head. As the one He distributes the elements which symbolize the sacrifice; as the other He is the sacrifice which the elements symbolize. The ideas proper to these quite distinct relations, blend both in His consciousness and in that of the disciples. According to the one He is offered for the many; according to the other His act is their act, in Him they live impersonated. Hence His suffering at the hands of man is theirs, and theirs His surrender to the will of God. The outer letter which is abolished by His death, ceases to have dominion over them; the inner obedience which is accomplished by His spirit, becomes a fact of their history, and a factor of their new experience. In other words, by being made a curse for us

He redeems us from the curse of the law; and by means of the new spirit of life which is in Him, He sets us free from the law of sin and death. And so Paul sums up the innermost meaning of His words when he said: "Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one who believeth."¹

A. M. FAIRBAIRN.

CHRISTIAN PERFECTION.

I.

THE WORD "PERFECT" IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

IN modern religious life, the use of the word *perfect* to describe a definite stage of spiritual development and Christian character has been a matter of much discussion. Some have claimed for themselves or others, or as attainable, a measure of spiritual or moral maturity which may, they think, be fairly called *Christian Perfection*. Others have strenuously resisted all such claims. And this controversy has given rise to discussions about various side issues bearing upon the Christian life.

Inasmuch as the word *perfect* is found in the English Bible, in both Authorized and Revised Versions, as a description of Christian character, I shall introduce the subject by discussing in this paper the meaning of the word or words so rendered, and expounding the teaching of the Bible about the persons and character thus described. In a second paper I shall call attention to other important teaching of the New Testament closely related to the subject before us. And in a third paper I shall discuss Wesley's teaching about Christian perfection, and certain modern controversies on the same subject.

¹ Rom. x. 4.