

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

THE NAME OF NAMES.

WITH us moderns name-words have been long ago discharged of all meaning, and speech has lost a distinct element of colour, since a man's name is no longer a picture but only a number. With the ancients a name had life and individuality: it told a story: it gave pledges of character: it was a title of honour. Round it gathered splendid associations, and it was invested with gracious attractions. Perhaps it marks the deliverance of a soul escaping from its meaner self and rising to its height, when Jacob the supplanter becomes Israel the "soldier," or "prince of God"; or it is the revelation of the deeper character hitherto hidden and unsuspected when Simon, the son of Jonas, is changed into Simon Peter; or it is the celebration of an excellency which has long been recognised and loved, when that good Levite Josès is named afresh by the apostles, "Barnabas, the son of consolation"; or it celebrates the beginning of a great career, when Saul of Tarsus, Pharisee and persecutor, becomes Paul, saint and apostle. The Bible names are chapters in the history of the soul; they are a living and heartstirring Evangel, and of them all the chief beyond compare is that of Jesus. This word is as a spring of water which never runneth dry, and round which the flowers are ever blooming.

One often reads in the biography of some Roman Christian that he had a special devotion to a certain saint, and among other things it is meant that there was a natural affinity between this Christian and say St. Francis

of Assisi or St. Philip Neri, because these saints had each some distinctive grace. Within the Person and character of the Chief Saint of God are contained all graces and sides of holiness, so that in Him can be discovered the special excellence of every one of His disciples. Each brought his pitcher to this Fountain, and filled it to overflowing without diminution of His riches, in Whom dwelleth all the fulness of God. As none can fill more than his own vessel none can know more than a measure of his Lord. This is all he can appropriate, and this is what he loves. There be therefore not one Lord, but many, as it were, in One, and so there be many names, each one of which has its own reason, without any one of which we had been poorer. Jesus, which is the personal and therefore may be called the original name, has burst into blossom with every spring of Christian feeling, and added title upon title, each a description, an honour, a gospel. Already in the consciousness of the Church He is Prophet, Priest, and King; Husband, Brother, Friend; Lord, Redeemer, Christ; Master, Shepherd, Bishop, and ages to come will create new caskets wherein to store the hitherto unimagined revelations of Jesus. It is given unto each disciple to travel through the length and breadth of this land, or at least to see its fulness from some high place, but he will make his home somewhere, and there he will abide in sweet content. According to what has been done for him, and according to the vision given him, will he know his Saviour: unto one name he will therefore have a special devotion. This name he must be allowed to use with perfect freedom, for it is his heritage, provided that he deny no other name, nor censure his brother, to whom it is a habitation and a home.

It is with amazement that one has to assert this birth-right of the Christian, and it is with shame that he finds it necessary to vindicate the use of Jesus, in its unadorned

and beautiful simplicity. There was surely a day when this name was the fond and free possession of every disciple, and it certainly could not have seemed credible once that this name would have to be used with care and reserve. It has, however, been discovered in certain quarters of religious thought that a distinct danger lies in its unguarded use, and that the person who calls the Master Jesus too constantly may fairly be suspected of false doctrine. Why, it is asked with much acuteness, should he say Jesus in this marked fashion, and not the Lord or Christ, and the suggestion is left in the mind, like tares sown in a field by night, that if the truth were known this person does not believe that Jesus is Christ and Lord. Were this unreasonable and uncharitable idea to seize the Christian mind—that to speak of the Lord as Jesus is to derogate from His divine honour—then not only would many simple-minded Christians be deprived of the dearest word they know through fear of watchful censors, but religious controversy, already widespread and bitter, would devastate an untouched field. Round many names it has raged—Augustine, Clement, Luther, Calvin, Jonathan Edwards, Wesley—and at their points of attack and defence the dead have lain thick and the earth has been soaked with blood. One name only has been held sacred, a neutral country into which no party must enter with arms in their hands, since it belonged to all; a building for which the Red Cross of Geneva secured immunity from shot and shell, since it was consecrated to Pity and Charity. There, under the shelter of Jesus, the wounded in the cruelest of wars, where alone poisoned weapons are allowed, could find safety and healing; there the nobler antagonists could meet in peace. Let it be laid down or secretly assumed that the Christian who has a partiality for this name does not hold the Catholic Faith, then it will be taken from timid believers and handed over to unbe-

lievers. This will be among the wonders of the latter day, that a man be an offender in the Church because he is too prodigal in his use of Jesus, and that only a stranger be allowed the unrestrained liberty of the Lord's personal name. One fears lest already there is a court guide in the matter of sacred titles, and one notices that certain say "Our blessed Lord" with a distinct sense of religious etiquette. The effect is not encouraging. When a Christian takes lessons how to call his Saviour, lest he commit a religious *faux pas*, conventionality and unreality have reached a disastrous height.

It is insinuated that any one within the bounds of faith who prefers to call our Master Jesus to, say, Christ or our Lord is a Unitarian at heart, whatever he may profess with his lips; and passing by the fact at present that the charge lies first of all against the Holy Evangelists, one is curious to know the state of the case. Is this assumption correct that the extreme Left in Theology can be distinguished by its use of Jesus and, what will then follow, the extreme Right by its carefulness to add titles to the name? If it were so, some disciples would not be in the slightest degree affected, because they would claim the liberty of naming their Master as they pleased, and therefore the matter is not one for laborious investigation, or arithmetical accuracy. At the same time it is instructive to take Martineau's *Endeavours after the Christian Life*, or Channing's sermons on *Love to Christ*, or Thom's *Spiritual Faith*, or Beard's *Hibbert Lecture*, especially at its fine concluding chapter, and to discover that not only is there no sustained and calculated choice of the name Jesus but a preference for the title Christ with frequent use of Jesus Christ. One could not, I fancy, mention four more representative Unitarians, so that if Jesus be a password of their faith, a sort of masonic sign not to be mistaken, then these eminent persons have not yet reached the inner circle.

It would be correct to say that a writer outside the Christian sphere, as, for instance, Strauss, or one inside but dealing with Christianity for the time from the outside as the Master of Balliol in his book on the *Evolution of Religion*, are accustomed to refer to Jesus, but quite inaccurate to impute this habit to the theologians of the Unitarian faith.

It will, on the other hand, be granted by every person that the extreme Right in the adoration of the Lord is held by certain devotional writers of the Roman communion, against whom it may be brought that they have made overmuch of the material Body and Blood of the Lord, although any excess of this kind may well be forgiven to the hearts who have made so much more of Himself. No one, not even the anonymous author of *Quia Amore Languet*, has written of the Master with such tender passion and such luxuriance of language as Faber; and yet in his *Precious Blood*, and his *Notes on Doctrinal and Spiritual Subjects*, and in his morning hymns it is almost ever Jesus whom he celebrates as the "Sweet Babe of Bethlehem," or the Victim of the Cross, to whom we shall be "for ever and for ever owing all and such an all," but also as the Divine Mediator in the Heavenly Places,—

"Jesus, who at this very hour,
At God's right hand in pomp and power,
Our nature still dost wear,
Oh! let Thy wounds still intercede,
And by their simple silence plead
Thy countless merits there."

Surely the heart of every Christian must be lifted when the north and the south meet,¹ and their voices blend in the

¹ It occurs to me as I correct this proof that to-morrow (16th January) will be celebrated by the Roman Church as the "Feast of the Most Holy Name of Jesus," when St. Bernard's hymn, so familiar to us all, "Jesu, dulcis memoria," will be sung throughout the whole Catholic world; and against the Roman Church no charge of Socinianism has, so far as I am aware, as yet been brought.

celebration of Jesus ; but the lover of the name turns to the highest authority for sanction and approval. Before any one submits to dictation as to what he shall call his Master or allows his faith to be suspected, let him acquaint himself with the usage of the Evangelists, the Apostles, the Lord and His Church. What can be more impressive and suggestive than the custom of the four Gospels, where the Son of God is described by no titles nor heralded with pomp at every turn, but is called simply Jesus, so that the artless narrative is beautified with a thread of gold? No device of art could carry such conviction or veracity, none so persuade the heart as this simplicity. Revise the Gospels and correct their nomenclature, adding in every second verse "Lord" and "Christ" to Jesus, and the Gospels would lose one of their charms. Stiff with embroidery, they would hang awkwardly on the lowly Nazarene, nor would they add any dignity to the Son of God. Unlettered men the first biographers of the Lord may have been, but they knew, as by an instinct, what was spiritually befitting, and nothing, neither sign nor miracle, caused them to depart from their simplicity. It is Jesus, when He hungered and thirsted, when He was weak and cast down, when He was scourged and crucified; He is also Jesus when He forgives sins and raises the dead and asserts His heavenly existence and power as the Eternal Son with the Father. Alike within the experiences and limitations of humanity, and exercising His power and authority of Deity, He remains Jesus. Nor is it only before He was crucified that the Evangelists wrote after this fashion; when He had risen from the dead He is still Jesus. Jesus appears in the upper room, the doors being shut, and bestowed peace on His disciples; Jesus joined Himself to the two on the way to Emmaus and caused their hearts to burn; Jesus showed Himself to the disciples on the shore of Tiberias. Writing from an after

time, when their Master's earthly life was closed and He had returned to the Father, they make no change from what they had heard with their ears and the angel had said unto Mary, "Thou shalt call His name Jesus."

When we enter the book, which has been felicitously called the Gospel of the Holy Ghost, and which records the spiritual energy of the Risen Saviour, we find that the life of Galilee and the Name are both continued. When the disciples follow their ascending Lord with wistful gaze, the angels comfort them with the assurance that this "same Jesus" will return. At the Day of Pentecost St. Peter refers boldly to Jesus of Nazareth. When a helpless man was healed at the "Gate Beautiful" of the Temple, the Apostle declared that God had glorified His Son Jesus, and the Church uniting in prayer sought that signs and wonders may be done by the name of Thy "Holy Child Jesus." The initial and decisive victory of the new faith was won by Him who had worked at Nazareth and preached in Galilee, had been persecuted in Jerusalem and crucified on Calvary—by Jesus.

Without question the unadorned name passes into a more stately form in the Epistles of St. Paul, where, as a rule, we read Jesus Christ, or the Lord Jesus Christ, and there is more than one reason for this advance. While the Gospels were doubtless written later than the Epistles they were more or less constructed from early material, and they represent the feeling of the first period—of faith without controversy, of religion before theology. It was not needful to assert or defend: it was enough to worship and declare Jesus. With St. Paul begins a new period, when the Church was face to face with a critical pagan world, was contending with Jewish bigotry, inflamed by the success of the Nazarene faith, and was threatened with heresy within her own borders. The name, which was sufficient for Faith and Love, for the conversion of sinners

at Pentecost and the doing of many marvels, was not pronounced enough for arguments and creeds, for Apologetic and Dogmatic. Unto the Gentiles, who were accustomed to think of innumerable gods, it must be made known that, as there might be many princes throughout the Empire, but one Cæsar, *ὁ κύριος* (Acts xxv. 26), so in the spiritual worlds there may be "principalities and powers," but one Lord, and He is Jesus. And in every city the Apostle must insist and prove unto his own people that the ancient hope of Israel had been fulfilled, and Him of whom the prophets spake had appeared in Jesus of Nazareth. And so Jesus is also Christ, and His full style in Christian theology is the Lord Jesus Christ. And yet when the Apostle declared the supreme glory of the Master in that great passage of the Philippian Epistle, it was neither Lord nor Christ which was pronounced the Name above every name, but the word of the Gospels, "That at the Name of Jesus every knee should bow."

One is also moved to ask another question with all reverence, which goes to the heart of the matter and beyond which there can be no debate. It will be the desire of every disciple, while jealously guarding every honour of the Lord and fondly cherishing any special revelation he may have received, to give the highest place to the name of the Lord's own preference. Among His wealth of names which does the Risen Saviour love and use? And this we can discover by noticing how He calls Himself. Twice He spoke from an open heaven with great authority to the Apostles, besides various other revelations and visions. Once it was to St. Paul, then an enemy, and St. Paul spake for us all when he said: "Who art Thou, Lord?" and the Lord answered us all, "I am Jesus." Once it was to St. John, then a martyr on Patmos, and to His friend He said, "I, Jesus, am the root and the offspring of David and the bright and the morning star." As an

angel gave his Name to the Blessed Virgin, so is He known by the same among the angels; and if it come to pass that disciples should grow fearful of the Name of names, it will be left unto the Master's own lips, so that unused in its simplicity on earth it will ever have its home in heaven.

Apart from the devotion of the individual who has his spiritual taste in names, Jesus has come to have a special value for the whole Church, because it has come by force of circumstances to be the vindication of a great fact. If Lord and, it may be, Christ assert the Master's Deity, then the historical name emphasizes the Master's humanity. So profound and rich is the mystery of His Person that it has been difficult for His disciples to hold the same with a well-balanced mind. They have been apt to fall into extremes, some denying that He is very God of very God, some doubting whether He is very Man of very man. It may be that the former error is the more dangerous and is attended with more disastrous loss, but in early days, when this matter was argued out, the Church contended only less keenly against the denial of our Lord's proper Humanity than against the denial of His proper Deity. As the custodian of the full and complete faith the Church must continue the same protest; and if a very sharp watch has been kept against the heresy of Arius, who minimized the Deity of the Master, too little attention has been given to the history of Apollinaris, who minimized the humanity. When one detects a vague dislike to the use of Jesus and a revulsion from the idea that Jesus had varying states of mind, such as joy, sorrow, anger, despondency, or that indeed He had any limitations or passions in His human nature, then it is apparent that persons who imagine themselves entirely orthodox are consciously losing the fulness of the Catholic Faith and in a little will have lost the complete Lord. The best of people, and not least likely some of those who are the most conscientious guardians of the

Creed, may be heretics without knowing it, and one would like to take them by (very simple) guile and put them to the test. Suppose this severely Trinitarian, and, let us assume, ultra-Protestant class should come across a book in which the Blessed Virgin was frequently called the "Mother of God," would not they condemn the author and accuse him of Mariolatry. And would it not be a salutary lesson in charity to such good people to be informed (or reminded) that it was not the first time that the supposed offender against the Faith was the orthodox man and his censors the heretics, since a Church Council decided that this very criticism was a heresy against the Person of the Lord, and that to call the Blessed Virgin "Mother of God" was a pledge of sound theology?

Many may suppose that if a person holds fast by the Deity of the Lord any mistake regarding His humanity is of little moment, but this is to miss the heart of the Catholic Faith. If Jesus be not as truly the Son of man as He is the Son of God, then is He not the Head of the Body which is the Church, then has He offered no Vicarious sacrifice for our sins, then is He not the firstfruits of them who sleep, then have we no High-Priest touched with a feeling of our infirmities and interceding for us in the Heavenly Places. No one really died or rose again; no one was persecuted or tempted, since in His Deity Jesus could have none of these experiences, and so the life and death of Jesus were only a deceptive appearance and a vain show. As a certain type of piety will ever be inclined to avoid and belittle the human side of Jesus' life, just as the same school dislikes and censures the human side of Religion, it is therefore the more needful that we hold by the Name which, as every one knows, affirms the real humanity of Mary's Son.

Surely one ought also most highly to value Jesus because it is the personal name of our dear Lord, and has on that

account an especial fascination. There is a use for titles and a use for a private name; the former are for the public, the latter for friends. There are occasions when it would be fitting to call one's friend by his title; but in the intimate moments of life we fall back on that which preceded and underlies all words of honour. About this word there is a fragrance and sweetness which have won the hearts of young and old in all generations since the home of Nazareth. If one turns to the hymnology of the Church, he cannot fail to notice the number and tenderness of those hymns which embody the passion for Jesus.

As children we sang :

“Jesus is our Shepherd.”

In youth when we heard His call :

“Jesus, Master, whose I am.”

In old age it will be :

“Jesus, Lover of my soul.”

It is not when they are coldest or farthest from the heart of the Lord that His disciples call Him Jesus.

Would it not be helpful to spiritual life if Christians were to address their prayers more frequently to the Lord, and to use the Name—especially in both the quiet hours and the sore straits of life? Times there are of communion, when the heaven opens above our head, as to St. John, and we see the Lamb in the midst of the throne. Times there are of temptation when we look up stedfastly into heaven, as did St. Stephen, and see Jesus standing on the right hand of God. Then is it our time to pray, with short petitions which go from heart to heart, saying, “Lord Jesus, bless me,” “Lord Jesus, help me.” and in the end, “Lord Jesus, receive my spirit.” So we in this lower place come “unto Jesus the Mediator,” and lay hold of Him by both His perfect and holy natures and so obtain all our

need through that Humanity which understands it, through that Deity which can supply it above all our imagination.

And would it not be expedient and gracious to use the name far more in preaching the Gospel? Of all the names it raises the least question, it offers the fullest blessing. There may be some who for a while shall not be able to say, "My Lord and my God," but whose lips linger on the sound of Jesus. There are many who cannot at once accept the mystery of the Holy Trinity, but there are none who would not desire to be saved from their sins. Wherefore the name is a conciliation, a commendation, an invitation. As a vagrant passing down a street in the cold winter time sees through an open door the unthought-of comfort and beauty of a home, so does the wandering soul behold the heart of God open in the word Jesus, and feel itself suddenly encompassed by the warmth and welcome of the Divine Love.

JOHN WATSON.

THE ARTICLES OF THE APOSTLES' CREED.

III. BORN OF THE VIRGIN MARY.

Qui conceptus est de Spiritu Sancto, natus ex Maria virgine. Who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary.

Rom.: τὸν γεννηθέντα ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου.—*Aqu.*: qui natus est de Spiritu Sancto ex Maria virgine.—*Afric.*: the same.¹—*Jerus.*: σαρκωθέντα καὶ ἐνανθρωπήσαντα.²—*Antioch.*: qui propter nos venit et natus est ex Maria virgine.³

The complete form of this Article in our Creed is almost unknown in all the Creeds, except those which can be

¹ Only *ex virgine Maria*. Close by is *qui natus est*, also *natum*.

² So according to Cyril (cf. Caspari, in the *norweg. Abhandlungen*, pp. 95-102); the Liturgy of James, if it made known the Creed up to this point, would unquestionably show an older, more popular form. In his 12th *Catechesis* Cyril does justice to the meaning of the other formulas.

³ On the variations of the fragmentary Greek text see Caspari, I. 79 f.