

The Expository Times

VOLUME XXXI
No. II
AUGUST 1920

EDITED BY
JAMES HASTINGS, D.D.

MONTHLY 7d.
ANNUALLY 8/6
NET

Contents

	PAGE
I. Notes of Recent Exposition. —Professor H. R. Mackintosh's New Book—The Originality of the Christian Message—A Definition of Christianity—The Revelation of God in the Face of Jesus Christ—'Yet how few we Friends are'—Why?—A Quaker on the Sense of Sin—And on the Atonement—And on the Trinity—And on the Person of Christ—The President of North-western University finds Nothing of Abiding Reality in Man that is not already in God—The Social Life of God	481
II. Synoptic Variations. —By the Reverend WALTER F. ADENEY, M.A., D.D., formerly Principal of Lancashire Independent College	487
III. 'I am the Good Shepherd': A Study. By the Right Reverend JOHN A. F. GREGG, D.D., Bishop of Ossory	491
IV. Literature	494
V. Nicodemus. By the Reverend GEORGE STEVEN, D.D., Edinburgh	505
VI. In the Study—	
1. <i>Virginibus Puerisque</i>	508
2. <i>The Christian Year</i>	512
VII. Our Lord's Cry on the Cross. By WILLIAM E. WILSON, B.D., Woodbrooke, Birmingham, and the Reverend J. A. SMALLBONE, Southport	519
VIII. Contributions and Comments—	
1. <i>Paul's Buffeting of his Body.</i> By the Reverend B. B. WARFIELD, D.D., LL.D., Litt.D., Professor of Didactic Theology in Princeton Theological Seminary	520
2. <i>'The Only-Begotten.'</i> By the Reverend T. H. WEIR, B.D., Lecturer in Arabic in the University of Glasgow	521
3. <i>St. Chrysostom's Prayer.</i> By the Reverend A. STANLEY PERCIVAL, M.A., Newcastle-on-Tyne	522
4. <i>'The Pure in Heart.'</i> By the Reverend ARTHUR JONES, M.A., Birmingham	522
5. <i>Psalm xlvii. i.</i> By the Reverend JAMES KENNEDY, D.D., New College, Edinburgh	523
IX. Entre Nous—	
1. <i>Some Texts</i>	524
2. <i>Some Topics—Interpretation—Scottish Life—Mysticism</i>	525
3. <i>New Poetry</i>	526



Publishers: T. & T. CLARK, 38 George St., EDINBURGH
SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, HAMILTON, KENT, & CO. LTD.
CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

PROFESSOR H. R. MACKINTOSH is best known by his volume on *The Person of Christ* in the 'International Theological Library.' But he has published a volume on *The Originality of the Christian Message* (Duckworth; 5s. net) by means of which we believe that not only his skill as a writer but his learning as a theologian will be still more clearly seen. It is a volume of lectures—lectures delivered on the Haskell Foundation, in the Theological Seminary of Oberlin College, Ohio—and Professor MACKINTOSH is one of the very few learned theologians who can lecture well. Nothing is ever lost of the learning in the lecture, and nothing is ever lost of the lecture in the learning.

His purpose is to prove that Christianity when it appeared in the world was essentially a new religion. Some of us believe that that needs little proving. But Dr. MACKINTOSH is aware of the literature that has gathered round the Study of Religions. He knows that the originality of Christianity is the most difficult thing in the world to prove now. And he also knows that it is the thing most worth proving.

It is most worth proving. For if Christianity is not essentially original, it is not essentially superior to other religions. And if it is not superior to other religions, what has the missionary

to carry with him to peoples professing Buddhism, Muhammadanism, Taoism, or any other of the great religions? What has he to say to the adherent of Judaism? 'It is a matter,' says Dr. MACKINTOSH, 'of crucial moment for the advocate of foreign missions.' And he quotes Mr. J. H. Oldham, an unrivalled authority on such a subject: 'The nerve of missionary endeavour,' says Mr. Oldham, 'is the conviction that in the Christian revelation there is something distinctive and vital which the world cannot do without.'

But it is very difficult to prove the essential originality of Christianity. 'It was one theme of the second-century Apologists, and well-known discussions of it abounded in the eighteenth century, though the chief disputants showed very little sense for history. But on the modern mind it bears with a quite peculiar sharpness of impact. The scientific Study of Religions, which has recently made giant strides and has proved of such value to theology in its historic and apologetic branches as permanently to widen our view of the religious life of man, prevents us from assuming so naively as our grandfathers did that the Christian faith is unique and independent. God has nowhere left Himself without witness.'

'A great missionary once said that he had never preached the Gospel anywhere without finding

ence of His presence to one and withhold it from another. The difference must be in the recipient. If, then, we have accounts of two martyrs, one of whom was rapt away from all feeling of his torments and knew only the love of God in Christ, while the other manfully bore them, not unconscious of communion with God and supported by it, but still terribly aware of his own agony, we shall attribute the difference in experience not to diverse measures of divine favour, but to the diverse mental and spiritual factors in the two cases; or to something in the circumstances of the latter that prevented him having the divine obsession.

It appears to be on this line that we may explain the forsaken cry of our Lord. Had His mind been free, it would undoubtedly have been filled with the experience of His Father's presence, just as the mind of the martyr often was. But it was not free. We have no need to ascribe to Jesus the nervous shrinking from pain and the fear of what was coming next, which may in some cases have prevented the martyr having the beatific vision in all its intensity. For this implies a self-regarding impulse which we ought not to attribute to Him who was supremely unselfish. But there is surely one line of thought that we have every reason to suppose was present with Him: the thought of man's sin and separation from the divine harmony, which was manifesting itself in rejecting and slaying God's Ambassador of Peace. This cannot have been absent from our Lord's mind. The writer to the Hebrews speaks with wonderful insight of Jesus enduring the *contradiction of sinners against themselves*.¹ It was that which filled His mind. The realization that He had used all His powers during His ministry to bring men to see the Father and to take the true way of life, and that they, even

¹ He 12³, R.V. reading, following Westcott and Hort and the best MSS.

the best, did not rise to it; that the most religious were convinced they knew better; that all forsook Him, and most joined in condemning Him, because they could not, or would not, see God in Him. This realization finally filled the whole field of His consciousness, so that for one moment (it may have been no longer) that consciousness of communion with God, which He had never been without, was interrupted, and He felt Himself desolate. Jesus Christ on the Cross suffered from the obsession of the sin of man, and hence came His momentary cry of despair. But this does not mean that our sin was in any way transferred to Him. Such a thing is impossible. Sin is opposition to God. Jesus never opposed God. The obsession was due to sympathy for man—a sympathy which realized how the will of the Father was the good of men, which they in their sin and folly opposed, thinking it meant them evil. The poignant anguish of a world 'separated from the divine harmony' occupied the whole field of our Lord's consciousness, so that for the moment God was shut out. In His purity and complete union with God He felt by sympathy the tragedy of man's sin as no other man ever felt it.

This explanation is satisfactory as others are not. It does not admit a real separation between Christ and God. The sense of desolation is a phenomenon purely of our Lord's supraliminal consciousness (to use the jargon of the psychologist). But being that it is not the product of moral or reprehensible weakness, as might be the case if it were the product of a self-regarding fear of pain whether physical or mental. It is entirely due to a supremely unselfish concentration in sympathy on the sad plight of men. It is therefore the experience of one who was one with the God of Love—and never more closely one than at that moment.

Contributions and Comments.

Paul's Buffeting of his Body.

THERE is a tendency among the commentators on 1 Co 9^{26, 27} to deflect it from the official to a more personal application than Paul had in mind. Thus, for example, Hans Windisch (*Taufe und*

Sünde, p. 136) wishes us to see in these verses an intimation that Paul required to keep under his bodily passions—or, as Windisch expresses it, 'the temptations to sin which arise from the body'—lest he should be led by them into sin. Accordingly he generalizes from them: 'In the body of

the Christian there moves a sinful power, according to this confession, which the Christian distinguishes from his ego, and which he seeks, with all the energy which his ego can exert, to prevent from coming into action.'

Windisch is much nearer right in an earlier remark to the effect that 'this self-characterization stands in relation to Paul's calling as a teacher'; although he applies this remark wrongly. The Apostle appears, in point of fact, merely to be alluding in these words to the hardships to which he voluntarily subjected himself in preaching to the Corinthians. Others ate and drank and married; he not only denied himself these common rights of man, but laboured without charge, not even taking the gleanings by the way secured by the law to the very labouring oxen, and bringing himself into nothing less than bondage to all. It was thus that he buffeted his body, not that he might overcome its evil impulses, but that by its bondage he might the better prosecute his labours. It was not that he feared his body's passions, but that he was consumed by zeal for the work of the gospel. When he says, 'Lest I myself should be rejected,' he but repeats his 'Woe is me, if I preach not the gospel.' We learn nothing, therefore, from this passage of the Apostle's consciousness of sin, or of 'the psychology of the sinless man.' What we learn is the strenuousness of the Apostle's labour in the gospel, and his subordination of the comforts, and even the necessities, of personal life to its prosecution.

Windisch is quite right in rejecting the remark of Max Meyer (*Der Apostel Paulus*, p. 26), to the effect that the passage shows us the great rôle which 'sin' played in the life of the Apostle, as well as the more generalized one of A. Titius (*Seligkeit*, iii. p. 81), to the effect that it enables us to observe the degree of power which 'sin' still possesses in the believer. But the ground on which he rejects them is not appealing. The Apostle, says he, presents himself as a constant victor; and impulses to sin constantly repressed are not sin. It is quite true, in itself, that 'the natural tendencies to sinful movements remain in Christians.' But it is not of them that this passage speaks. The natural tendencies which the Apostle here represents himself as crushing out were not only in themselves lawful, but their gratification would have been lawful. He was, for his work's sake, denying himself legitimate satisfactions of legitimate bodily needs.

We are far from learning from this passage that 'the Christian is distinguished from the heathen by his conscious thinking and conduct being uninfluenced by his concupiscence,—by being sinless.' What the passage teaches is that Paul, in the matter of the satisfaction of his bodily needs, denied himself, for his work's sake, above other Christians. The contrast is between himself and other Christian workers; not between the Christian and the heathen. And the contrast between the Christian and the heathen which is attributed to the passage, so misunderstood, would not be possible on Paul's lips. The conscious activities of the Christian are not thought of by him as cut loose from his underlying natural movements of impulse. The underlying natural movements of impulse of the Christian are not thought of by him as unaffected by his salvation. With him as with his Lord, the tree is made good that its fruit may be good: his very instincts he expects to be sanctified. So far as his activities were good, they were in his view good, not because they were unaffected by, but because in conflict with them they overcame, inward impulses which, being yielded to, would have made them evil.

B. B. WARFIELD.

Princeton Theological Seminary.

'The Only-Begotten.'

THIS is one of those half-metaphysical half-physiological terms the use of which in the Church might well be discontinued with advantage from every point of view. The expression is taken from the Latin *unicus*, which is a rendering of the Greek *μονογενής*, which again comes from the Hebrew יחיד.

This Hebrew word, however, does not mean 'only begotten.' It is used of Isaac (Gn 22^{2, 12, 16}), who was not even the first-born, and very far from being an only son (cf. Gn 25). But we do not require to go back to the Hebrew. The Greek word *μονογενής* itself has not always the sense which the dictionaries give it. Thus Aquila and Symmachus use it of Isaac in the passages cited above, and so does the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews (11¹⁷). So also does Josephus (*Ant.* i. xiii. 1), as he does of Izates, prince of Adiabene, although he had a full brother older than himself, and other brothers besides (*Ant.* xx. ii. 1), whom Josephus mentions in the immediately preceding context: 'He (Izates' father) had Monobazu, his