

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

a language with which recent events have proved us to be so imperfectly acquainted.

The theory of Winckler, according to which the history of the Pentateuch is a fiction invented by David, is of course not overthrown by the fact of Solomon having commented on it, but it would require some very powerful evidence to make us believe that David's fiction could in so short a time have obtained such circulation and recognition.

That our Book of Genesis was known to Solomon may be inferred from the Song of Songs vii. 11, where the bride says, "Unto him is my desire," with an obvious reference to the familiar words said to Eve after the fall. But Wisdom without question contains references not only to Genesis, but to Exodus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, and Joshua, with whose work its history stops, whereas Isaiah is already familiar with the history of the Judges.

D. S. MARGOLIOUTH.

CHRIST AND HUMAN EMOTIONS.

THAT our Lord shared with men every true and pure emotion is a fact which no instructed Christian could deny. To deny it would be to rob Christ of the perfection of His manhood.

Thus we know that He felt "joy," and that of a radiant character, upon the return of the seventy.¹ It filled His inmost being, and found its natural expression in praise to the Father. Nor does the triumphal entry into Jerusalem exhaust the instances in which the Man of Sorrows must have rejoiced in heart. It was a "joy" at once peculiarly His own, and yet capable of passing out from Himself to the enrichment of His disciples.² Again, He felt, as none of the sons of men could fully feel, "compassion." All

¹ St. Luke x. 21 (*ἡγαλλιάσατο*).

² St. John xv. 11.

but two of His miracles were prompted by this most tender of the emotions. The hospital of His divine pity was open wide to every sufferer. The distant claim of the centurion's servant was treated with the same graciousness as the case of His own Apostle's wife's mother. So far we are on sure ground ; but one need not be a psychologist in order to see clearly that there are other emotions which belong to our human nature, but which are not of this high and winning type. To be possessed by them, and, indeed, to express them, may be right and entirely justifiable. But it is seen that they require watching in the interest of the character of the individual. Their source and spring may be now false, now bitter. It is observed that if these emotions must be felt, they are often better unexpressed. Moral philosophy, ancient and modern, has deprecated such emotions as destruction of the mental equilibrium. The way of the Christian faith is not sternly to crush them, but to purify and consecrate them, so that every feeling and each transient emotion shall serve a true purpose, and that purpose will be manifested in their right expression.

What then of such feelings as fear, anger, sorrow, anxiety? There is no bright light about these emotions ; they are easily poisoned at the root ; they pass by quick or slow transition into unbecoming, and even wild, expression ; so fear passes into cowardice, anger into passion, sorrow into melancholy, anxiety into pessimism, and vexation into distrust and spite.

The Christian perceives at once the necessity of guarding such "first springs of thought and will." But he will not, if he could, banish them clear from the sphere of his personality. He will not because his Master, in all reverence be it said, did not do so.

It will be seen that our Lord not only permitted Himself these emotions, sharing them fully with men, but allowed them natural expression. The materials in the Gospel

narrative seem scanty enough for forming such a conclusion, but they are not inadequate, and it is the object of this paper to show that such a conclusion as to His perfect example is right and suggestive for the religious life of His followers. Taking, then, the emotions in the order above indicated, it may be first asked, Did Christ ever feel fear? If the answer be rightly in the affirmative, it will require to be protected from any misunderstanding. He never could have showed physical fear. To think of this as a factor present in the agony of Gethsemane is to misinterpret utterly not only that narrative, but the subsequent mystery of the Passion. A hostile but unintelligent criticism has indeed sought to fasten a charge of cowardice upon Christ in two instances, the one at Nazareth,¹ when His foes in their fury would have cast Him headlong over the brow of the hillside whereon the little city was built; the other at Jerusalem, during the feast of the dedication,² when, not for the first time, the citizens were ready to deal with Him as they dealt later with the protomartyr. Whether Christ's escape in these instances was supernatural or not, it is plain that He was prompted by an instinct of self-preservation. But both events, it must be noted, occurred early in His ministry. At such a period self-preservation was a first law of His divine and human nature. The fall of a general in a battle may be a very splendid or a very foolish thing; it is the latter when a life necessary to the successful issue of a campaign is prematurely and recklessly sacrificed. It is a sufficient answer to the charge of moral cowardice to say, in the Master's phrase, "His hour was not yet come." When it came,³ He was ready, calm, courageous, even eager. But let any one read the whole passage in St. Luke x. 22-39, with an imagination which need not be indevout because it is lively,

¹ St. Luke iv. 29.

² t. John x. 39.

St. Luke xxii. 5

of the scene with the Saviour girt by the circle of His persecutors with uplifted stones in their hands, alternately drawing closer and then sullenly receding, and hear His fearless words, and he will find there not only no cowardice, but the instance perhaps of the most dauntless courage ever exhibited in Christ's earthly life.

Again, courage at its best and highest is not merely contagious; it is inspiring, communicable. Our Lord had about Him, as an inner group, a little company of twelve timid, shrinking men. The chief of these, as his career and his letters (if one may be permitted to use the plural number) show, was also the greatest coward. Christ had constantly to appeal to this body to be strong and of a good courage, and He based that appeal upon nothing else than Himself. The *Ἐγὼ εἰμι, μὴ φοβεῖσθε*¹ reads like a formula of frequent service for cheering faint and timorous hearts. Was there, then, no fear at all which Christ could possibly share with His own? The reply must surely be that He felt fear. Light is thrown upon an issue which is mysterious by our Lord's words to His disciples, in which He discriminates between fear true and false, between fear which must be felt and fear which may not be felt.

"Be not afraid of them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul, but rather fear Him which is able to destroy both soul and body in Gehenna."² Here, for all time, is the reprobation of physical fear, of mere cowardice in Christians; here, too, is the commendation of a right fear, "the fear of God" in the Old Testament sense, which flies from evil suggestion, which shrinks from dishonouring Him, a fear which is the realization both of the holiness and power of the Supreme Being. If there is one passage in the Lord's life more than another where we may in all reverence associate such fear with His Person, it would be the occasion of His temptation in the wilderness.

¹ St. Matt. xiv. 27.

² St. Matt. x. 28.

Fear is an essential factor in any real temptation. Of physical fear during that time our Lord knew nothing: the interesting Marcan addition to the narrative, *ἦν μετὰ τῶν θηρίων*,¹ point conclusively to this; but that He felt a godly fear during the awful contest seems plain, though this was cast out, in the issue, by the triumph of a perfect love.²

Next for consideration comes the feeling of anger. Moral philosophy had made its pronouncements upon this issue long before Christ taught, or the Apostles re-echoed, His teaching. Anger was regrettable, as being disturbing in character and in consequences, but it was often inevitable and right, and in the last resort it was better to be passionate than to lack spirit. So Plato and Aristotle, as every scholar knows, so later Cicero, so our own Bacon. Nor can it be too often emphasized that Christian teaching takes up every real and permanent truth of moral philosophy, and in doing so ever transmutes and purifies it.

It is a mere truism that a man who neither feels nor expresses indignation at moral wrong is himself immoral. Anger of this sort is not a "furor brevis"; it is sane and permanent, blazing out at every proper occasion when cruelty, lust, or oppression are rampant and tyrannous. It is not too much to say that whenever such anger finds expression, men share in that which is a Divine attribute, the "wrath of God" revealed against wilful evil. St. Paul, in his adaptation of the phraseology of Psalm iv.,³ illuminates the situation for Christians in his "Be ye angry and sin not," for he would show that there is no necessary link between *ὀργή* and *ἀμαρτία*.

That our Lord must have felt the "nobler anger" often during His ministry is patent from the Gospel narrative. Wherever He went He seems to have been pursued by a compact, dark, sinister group, mostly of Pharisees, but

¹ St. Mark i. 13.² 1 St. John iv. 18.³ Ephes. iv. 26.

sometimes in strange combination with Sadducees, and even with Herodians. It is simply inconceivable that any mere man should not have now and again hurled back against them some passionate word. Yet only once in the Gospels does it stand on record that He was angry, and even then it was not anger at his personal foes, but anger at their spirit, at falseness to their trust as teachers and leaders of the national conscience and life. The incident is appropriately narrated by that "honest chronicler," St. Mark.¹

"Healing," said these foes, "on the Sabbath day was work, and work must not be done." There was anger in the Lord's glance around and upon them, but its spring was a holy grief at the spectacle of hearts as hard as stone, untouched by love, embittered by the very thought of a manifested goodness.

Nor indeed was Christ's deep displeasure reserved only for such implacable and crafty foes. St. Peter was made to feel it, it may be on more than one occasion, but the most notable one finds record in all the Synoptists. There was a righteous anger in the rebuke, "Get thee behind Me, Satan,"² the awfulness of which is perhaps lost in its familiarity, and the cause and reasonableness of it are at once made known to the Apostle. Christ must denounce unsparingly the worldly spirit in one from whom better things might have been expected.

And in one striking instance³ His displeasure fell not upon a single disciple, but upon the whole body. The picture of the Saviour taking the little children to His embrace and giving them His fervent blessing has its obverse in His indignant remonstrance to the disciples. The verb in the fuller Marcan account, which describes Christ's attitude to them on the occasion, viz., ἀγανακτεῖν, is neither adequately rendered by the A.V. "much dis-

¹ St. Mark iii. 5.

² St. Matt. xvi. 23.

³ St. Mark x. 14.

pleased," nor by the R.V. "moved with indignation." Both classical usage and its employment elsewhere in the narrative of the Gospels¹ show that here too a deep resentment was felt by our Lord at the idea of shutting out little children from His kingdom; and what He felt He surely expressed by look as well as word.

Of all the emotions, sorrow, both in its sense and expression, might, on the face of it, have seemed to be the most dominant in our Lord's instance. Somewhat, then, with a sense of surprise the student marks that this feeling is nowhere directly attributed to Christ. With the solitary and awful exception of Gethsemane, it is not once ascribed to Him.

Thus, indeed, it is with the sorrows of the stronger among mortal men. They reserve sorrow for privacy. With Bacon they perceive the fitness of "joy for company"; but personal griefs, if felt they must be, will be by them expressed in secret. So it was with the one Perfect Man. It is quite possible that the Church, through the medium both of Christian art and Christian literature, has exaggerated the portrait of the Man of Sorrows. True, that upon Him, according to the evangelical prophet, the Lord hath made to light the iniquity of us all, and therefore the burden of His sorrow was unique--ineffable; yet, according to the Gospel narrative, its expression was rare, and as none could share His sorrow, He obtruded it on none. But whenever the grief was one which He could share with His own, and sharing lighten it, then He permitted sorrow to find its natural expression. Thus a cry as of pain² broke from Him as from the slopes of Olivet He gazed downwards upon the doomed city. So at the grave of Lazarus the tears fell³ that were expected of Him, and He wept whose tender message to other mourners

¹ e.g., St. Mark xx. 24.

² St. Luke xix. 41 (ἐκλαύσεν).

³ St. John xi. 35.

was ever, "Weep not." It is, however, in connection with this passage in the fourth Gospel that the student lights upon a word suggesting rather the expression of an emotion than an emotion itself. The verb *ἐμβριμάσθαι*, which occurs twice¹ in the section, is a crux both for philologist and translator. If the usual derivation is to be trusted, then the expression of the underlying emotion, which is plainly one of indignation, grief, or vexation, is to be sought rather in voice than in look; but as these are never inharmonious in any emotion, so it may be supposed that both voice and look told upon those who heard and saw Him on the occasion. The verb, not uncommon in classical Greek, is only used thrice elsewhere in the New Testament,² of our Lord, and in either case of His stern charge that the gratitude of those whom He had healed should not result in making Him known before the time. The remarkable variety of renderings of the verb, both in versions and by commentators, show how baffling it is in exact interpretation. All that may be safely concluded is that the word indicates a blended consequence of two emotions, and that when it is applied to Christ, it pictures Him as looking and speaking "more in sorrow than in anger."

If tears are the natural expression of sorrow, sighing may be taken as the symbol betokening an anxious heart. We sigh when doubt and fear meet in the breast; we sigh not only at a present disappointment, but in the forecast of one. Twice is it recorded that our Lord sighed, and some one must have been very close to Him at the time with eye and ear observant. It is therefore significant that on both occasions we are indebted to St. Mark's pen for the account. A deep sigh³ escaped our Lord when, after and in spite of the "Miracle of the Four Thousand," the

¹ St. John xi. 33, 38.

² St. Matt. ix. 30 and St. Mark xiv. 5.
St. Mark viii. 12.

Pharisees sought of Him a sign from heaven. Such a sigh is not difficult of interpretation. His tempters were unworthy alike of His confidence or His love. Their unbelief would make any sign meaningless; but while there was indignation in His hurried departure,¹ His spirit was filled with a sense akin to despair for such a temper, and those who saw and heard Him knew that He sighed.

The other occasion when Christ is said to have sighed is of singular interest. It was when² He was about to heal the deaf and dumb man of Decapolis. Something then and there touched our Lord which was too deep for tears. Why did He sigh? According to most commentators, patristic and modern, it was due to the unbelief shown either by the witnesses of the miracle or by the sufferer himself. The interpretation, if not faulty, is inadequate. It is surely preferable to explain the sigh here also as expressive of disappointment, not so much at the present as in regard to the future. What was our Lord about to do? He would restore to this sufferer two senses of hearing and seeing, either lost or imperfect. No wonder, therefore, if Christ sighed, who knew how men abused these gifts, and who knew, as men know not, the awful responsibility of their exercise. So before the mysterious word of power was uttered He lifted His face heavenward, and He could not but breathe a sigh.

This inquiry into the Gospel narrative shows therefore the fulness and completeness with which Christ shared human emotions. As has been seen, it is natural to link with His sacred Person all those feelings which, as we are possessed by them, or exhibit them, seem to make the passages of life brighter and purer. But the issue is whether He also participated in those feelings which in men so often spring from some unworthy source—which

¹ St. Mark viii, 13.

² St. Mark vii, 34.

are sombre in character, and in expression are disquieting, vexatious, and disturbing.

From what has been collected from the Gospel narrative, it is concluded that He shared these also. But in Him they never could spring but from a pure source. The fear He felt was not cowardice, but a holy instinct in and through which real temptation was triumphantly met. The anger which He displayed was a deep displeasure now felt against wilful, moral evil, now against deliberate hindrances to the good. The sorrow which He must so often have "dressed in smiles" sprang from the thought of His own awful task as the Saviour of a sinful world. The anxiety which wrung His heart was due to the oppositions or unbelief of those whom He was come down to deliver.

And as He is man's pattern in the possession of such emotions, so He remains a perfect example in their expression. He realized in Himself that *αὐτάρκεια*, to which moral philosophy, past and present, vainly points as the ideal for the individual. These graver and distressful feelings were with Him not only under completest control, but were guided and manifested for the advantage and blessing of others. None ever saw Him angry, or sad, or vexed without finding, if they would, some deeper sense of the sinfulness of sin or some fresh token of the wealth of His love.

In some quarters of Christendom it is fondly imagined that men may grow in grace by contemplation of the picture of some saint. Here is a Portrait which they may more wisely adore, and, as they worship, gain ever fresh strength from One who is not only their pattern, but the hope and stay of the human race.

B. WHITEFOORD.