

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 *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php

winding, emerged once more on the plain of Damascus. The old aqueduct is, at this point, nearly perfect. It is carried across the opening of this Wady on an embankment of hewn stones; two fine arches spanning the central part.

We now turned our horses' heads to the city. In fifteen minutes we passed the fine fountain of Kusair. Our way now led through extensive vineyards to the large village of Dûma, which we reached at 3.60. We soon after struck the Aleppo road, and entered the gates of Damascus at six o'clock.

This, I fear, is the last journey I may be privileged to make for a long season. Since my return I have been almost a prisoner in my house. When I venture abroad, I am assailed with insult and threats by the fanatical Muslims. The aggressions of Russia have roused their ancient spirit of tyranny; and it will be well if they do not wreak their vengeance on the unoffending Christians in this city. We consider it as no small grievance, that, while English fleets are contributing to support the Sultan on his tottering throne, English subjects should be exposed to the grossest abuse in the streets of one of his principal cities.

Damascus, December 24th, 1853.

ARTICLE II.

OUR SAVIOUR'S DISCOURSE IN THE SYNAGOGUE AT CAPERNAUM.

By E. P. Barrows, Professor at Andover.

OF the remarkable discourse addressed by our Lord to the Jews in the synagogue at Capernaum (John 6: 25—65), in which he exhibits himself in his personality as "the living bread which came down from heaven," and teaches that eternal life is to be received only by eating his flesh and drinking his blood, the words of the Apostle to the Corinthians: "The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them, because they are

spiritually discerned,"¹ hold good in a preëminent sense. In their interpretation, everything depends on a true apprehension of Christ's person and office, and the relation which believers hold to him. If any man be right here, his eye is single, and, as he reads, his whole body will be full of light. But if he have a wrong view of Christ's character and the work of redemption committed to him by the Father, his eye is evil, and his whole body will be full of darkness. Mere learning and genius will avail but little for the apprehension of a passage that has to do throughout with the inward spiritual relation that subsists between the Redeemer and his disciples. The first and main question must be: Who is Christ, and what is his office? It will not be inappropriate, therefore, in attempting an exposition of the passage under consideration, to discuss this question somewhat at large. We, accordingly, divide the present Article into two parts: the discussion of the ground-idea that underlies the whole passage, which can be no other than the ground-idea of Christ's person and office; and the exposition of the passage itself.

I. OUR LORD'S PERSON AND OFFICE IN THEIR RELATION TO THE BELIEVER.

"Whom do men say that I, the Son of man, am?"² This is the question which Jesus proposed to his disciples in the region of Caesarea Philippi. The answer to it was then, and will ever remain, the great problem of Christianity. On this occasion the disciples replied: "Some say that thou art John the Baptist; some Elias; and others, Jeremias, or one of the prophets."³ Again the Lord asked: "But whom say ye that I am? And Simon Peter answered and said, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God."⁴ Our Lord's reply to this confession of Peter: "Blessed art thou, Simon, Bar-jona; for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven,"⁵ is full of weighty instruction. It teaches us that our blessedness depends on a correct apprehension of his person and office, and that for this apprehension we need a heavenly illumination, such as no mere human instruction can give. It will be noticed that the apostles, in enumerating the various opinions

¹ 1 Cor. 2: 14.

² Matt. 16: 13.

³ Matt. 16: 14.

⁴ Matt. 16: 15, 16.

⁵ Matt. 16: 17.

concerning Christ, omitted those of his malignant enemies who said: "He hath a devil, and is mad, why hear ye him?"¹ "He casteth out devils through Beelzebub, the chief of the devils;"² because these were unworthy of notice, having their foundation, not in any rational conviction, but only in hatred and prejudice. We propose, in the present discussion, to imitate their example, confining ourselves to those views of Christ's person and office, which are maintained by such as acknowledge him to be a true religious teacher. And, that we may not proceed at random, but according to some fixed rules that shall conduct us, when faithfully followed, to certain results, we think it wise to state explicitly at the outset the two great criteria of truth in this investigation.

First. The true view of Christ's person and office will harmonize all the different statements of Scripture respecting him. We do not mean that it will explain all that is mysterious in his nature and the manner of our receiving redemption through him, but that it will agree with all the great facts pertaining to his character and work which the word of God sets forth. This rule needs no demonstration, for it has its foundation in the common sense of mankind. And its adequacy will be manifest to any one who considers how numerous and how diversified are the Scriptural statements respecting both Christ's person and his work. The traveller, who holds in his hand a correct map of North America, with a full description of its various towns, rivers, and ranges of mountains, and faithfully uses it, need not go far astray. Certainly he will not mistake the road to St. Louis for that to New Orleans, nor find himself in Charleston in endeavoring to reach Halifax. If he is pursuing the right course, it will be certified to him all along the road by numerous agreements between what he finds written and described in his guide and what he sees before his eyes. But if he is out of the way, everything around him will be wrong. His only way of making out an agreement will be that of the perpetual perversion of descriptions and falsification of distances. Throughout his whole journey he must put miles for furlongs, and furlongs for miles; convert brick walls into granite columns, square towers into lofty spires, and level plains into rugged mountains; and this only to arrive at last where he

¹ John 10: 20.² Luke 11: 15.

would not. Now the descriptions which the Bible gives us of Christ's person and office, are so full and various, and they view him and his work on so many different sides, that we have in them an adequate guide to the solution of the great question: "Who is this Son of man?" The right view will be in constant harmony with the testimony of Scripture; the wrong view, in perpetual disagreement with it, leading, as the certain result, to scepticism in respect to the authority of the record, and forced interpretations of its contents.

Secondly. The true view of Christ's person and office will satisfy the deep spiritual wants of the soul. Certain it is that the holy Scriptures offer us in Christ a perfect Saviour, one who is able to meet all our necessities as sinners, and is, therefore, worthy of our unlimited confidence. Their constant testimony concerning Jesus is, that "he is able to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him."¹ If, then, we adopt a view of his character and work that leaves our deepest necessities unprovided for, we want no other proof that it is false; for the Saviour whom God has provided for sinners, will surely be able to meet and satisfy all their wants.

Taking these two simple rules for our guidance, let us examine some of the views that have been held respecting Christ's person and office.

1. The lowest of these views is that which recognizes in Jesus of Nazareth only a *human teacher*; a great and good teacher, but still a teacher invested with no Divine authority, and whose doctrines and precepts are all to be subjected to the crucible of human reason, and received or rejected accordingly. Of this view it is enough to say, that it is in open contradiction to our Lord's own declarations concerning himself, and that it gives us no sure foundation for our faith. He constantly affirmed that he came in God's name and acted by his authority. "The works which the Father hath given me to finish, the same works that I do, bear witness of me that the Father hath sent me. And the Father himself, which hath sent me, hath borne witness of me."² "He that believeth on me, believeth not on me, but on him that sent me. And he that seeth me, seeth him that sent me."³ "I have not spoken of myself; but the Father which sent me, he gave me a commandment, what I should

¹ Heb. 7: 25.

² John 5: 36, 37.

³ John 12: 44, 45.

say, and what I should speak."¹ These words, which are but specimens of our Lord's constant doctrine concerning his relation to the Father, are absolutely conclusive. They prove that, if he was a good and upright man, he was a teacher sent from God, and commissioned to speak and act in his name.

2. The next view is that which acknowledges in Christ a teacher sent from God, but still *only a teacher, with no Divine nature*, and, consequently, *in no proper sense a Redeemer*. According to this view, our Lord's office is all comprehended in the work of bearing witness to the truth, first by his doctrines, secondly, by his example. His doctrine was a bright revelation of truth; his life, a bright example of conformity to truth; his death, the seal which he affixed to his testimony in behalf of the truth; and here his mission ended.

According to this view, the relation of believers to Christ is only that of obedient and confiding pupils to their master. He is their *head* in the same sense in which Socrates was the head of his followers, the only difference being that Christ was a more perfect teacher than Socrates. The union between Christ and his true disciples, upon which the Scriptures so much insist, and which they describe in such strong terms, is reduced to a simple *moral union*—a harmony of views and feelings such as exists between all good teachers and good disciples. Of a proper redemption this view can know nothing, for it acknowledges neither a propitiation for sin through the blood of Christ, nor a Divine influence proceeding from him into the human soul, which quickens its moral perceptions, illuminates it in the knowledge of God and of itself, renews it in holiness, and thus restores it to communion with God and makes it victorious over sin. Whatever help Christ bestows upon his disciples in the work of making them "meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light," is exhausted in that of precept and example.

If now we try this opinion concerning Christ's person and the relation which he holds to his followers, by the two canons that have been laid down, we shall find it alike condemned by both.

First. It is at variance with the whole tenor of the New Testament, which constantly represents Christ as holding to his disciples another, and a far higher relation than that of a mere

¹ John 12: 49.

teacher and witness for the truth. How utterly irreconcilable it is with our Lord's discourse in the synagogue at Capernaum, will be shown hereafter. Not to insist now upon the very remarkable view which this discourse, in common with the institution of the eucharist, gives of the relation which subsists between Christ and his followers, and which has ever been a stumbling-block to those who fail to recognize in him a Divine Redeemer, there are many other representations whose depth and fulness of meaning cannot possibly be exhausted in the simple idea of a teacher and pattern of holiness. Thus he describes himself as opening in the soul a fountain of living water. "Whosoever," says he to the woman of Samaria, "drinketh of this water, shall thirst again: but whosoever drinketh of the water that I shall give him, shall never thirst; but the water that I shall give him, shall be in him a well of water springing up into everlasting life."¹ "In the last day, that great day of the feast, Jesus stood and cried, saying, If any man thirst, let him come unto me, and drink. He that believeth on me, as the Scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water." And "this," the Evangelist adds, "spake he of the Spirit which they that believe on him should receive."² Again, he represents himself as the vine, and his disciples as the branches that receive from him all their life, nourishment and fruitfulness. "Abide in me, and I in you. As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine, no more can ye, except ye abide in me. I am the vine, ye are the branches; he that abideth in me, and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit: for without me ye can do nothing. If a man abide not in me, he is cast forth as a branch, and is withered; and men gather them, and cast them into the fire, and they are burned."³ Once more, he is the resurrection and the life. "I am the resurrection and the life: he that believeth on me, though he were dead, yet shall he live; and whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die."⁴

Not to mention, further, those numerous passages which represent Christ as having given his life a ransom for sin; as being invested by the Father with all power in heaven and in earth; and as appointed by him to be the final Judge of all men, let any one seriously weigh the import of these declara-

¹ John 4: 13, 14. ² John 7: 37-39. ³ John 15: 4-6. ⁴ John 11: 25, 26.

tions of Christ concerning himself which have just been enumerated, and he must feel that their deep meaning cannot be exhausted in the simple idea of a teacher and witness for the truth. This will, perhaps, appear more clearly, if we make the supposition that such language should be employed by any merely human teacher. Consider the incongruity, not to say blasphemy, of declarations like these proceeding from the lips of Isaiah, or Peter, or Paul! How could either of these men, nay more, how could the angel Gabriel, presume to say: "Who-soever drinketh of the water that I shall give him, shall never thirst; but the water that I shall give him, shall be in him a well of water springing up into everlasting life." "If any man thirst, let him come unto me and drink." "He that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live: and whosoever liveth and believeth in me, shall never die." "I am the vine, ye are the branches. He that abideth in me, and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit: for without me, ye can do nothing." These words were manifestly intended to convey the idea that he had in himself unlimited power to help and save, and demanded of men their unlimited confidence.

But for the possession of such power, demanding of men such confidence, there must be an adequate ground; and that ground can be no other than an unlimited, that is to say, a Divine nature. That which is in itself finite and dependent, cannot receive and exercise an unlimited endowment, and become itself the centre of universal dependence. Here we wish neither to deny nor conceal the fact that the Scriptures uniformly represent Christ as *receiving* from the Father his office in all its parts. He comes into the world not of himself, but the Father sends him, and his doctrine and works are not his own, but those of the Father. "My doctrine is not mine, but his that sent me. If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God, or whether I speak of myself."¹ "I have not spoken of myself; but the Father which sent me, he gave me a commandment, what I should say, and what I should speak. And I know that his commandment is life everlasting: whatsoever I speak, therefore, even as the Father said unto me, so I speak."² "Verily, verily, I say unto you, The Son can do nothing of himself,³ but what he

¹ John 7: 16, 17.

² John 12: 49, 50.

³ *ap' eisautou*; "suopts arbitrata," of his own will, in contrast with what he

seeth the Father do; for what things soever he doeth, that also doeth the Son likewise."¹ Among the works which the Father has committed to him to do, our Lord names, in immediate connection, those of raising the dead and judging all men. "As the Father raiseth up the dead, and quickeneth them; even so the Son quickeneth whom he will. For the Father judgeth no man; but hath committed all judgment unto the Son."² "For as the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself; and hath given him authority to execute judgment also, because he is the Son of man."³ And, finally, he represents himself as having received from the Father "all power in heaven and in earth,"⁴ an investiture which includes in itself all the particular offices above enumerated.

And because Christ is thus sent by the Father with a commission what to do and teach, it follows, even without the direct Scriptural statement of the fact, that he is *subordinate* to the Father, since, without contradiction, he who sends is greater than he who is sent. The attempt to explain such declarations of our Lord as the following: "My Father is greater than I,"⁵ on the simple ground of his humanity, would be, in our apprehension, entirely unsatisfactory; for his subordination to the Father, as the *receiver* to the *giver*, extends to those offices that are manifestly above the capacity of a finite nature. Of that subordination of the Son to the Father which runs through all the Scriptural representations concerning him, we have no new explanation to give; for we regard the old explanation, that of *official investiture*, as abundantly sufficient. The Son *receives* from the Father his mediatorial office in all its parts;⁶ he acts *under him*, and *by his authority*, and is thus *less* than the Father, not merely as "the man Christ Jesus," but also as "God manifest in the flesh." But the question still remains: How can any

does in accordance with the Father's will, and by his authority. The words do not mean, as we shall presently see, that the Son can do nothing by virtue of a power that resides in himself and is properly his own.

¹ John 5: 19.

² John 5: 21, 22.

³ John 5: 26, 27.

⁴ Matt. 28: 18.

⁵ John 14: 28.

⁶ It is not to the eternal Word that "was in the beginning with God," and "was God," that the mediatorship between God and man pertains; but to this Word "made flesh." Our Lord's divine nature had no beginning, and could not possibly be a subject of divine constitution. But his mediatorial office as "the man Christ Jesus" had a beginning. He received it of the Father when he "came forth from the Father, and came into the world."

but a Divine being *receives* the office which the Father commits to the Son?

"The Father judgeth no man; but hath committed all judgment unto the Son." The office, then, which the Son holds, as the judge of all men, is not one which he has of himself, but one which has been committed to him by the Father. He exercises it, not in his own name, but in that of the Father, and under his authority. But the office of judging "the quick and the dead," judging them for the purpose of determining their destiny for eternity, implies the original capacity to search the hearts of all men. Accordingly the Lord Jesus claims for himself, along with the power of life and death, this attribute: "And I will kill her children with death; and all the churches shall know that, I am he which searcheth the reins and hearts; and I will give unto every one of you according to your works."¹ But the capacity of searching the secrets of the heart; not some particular secret of a particular heart, but all the secrets of all hearts; is, if any other, Divine and incommunicable.

Again: "As the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself."² And, in accordance with this gift, "As the Father raiseth up the dead and quickeneth them, even so the Son quickeneth whom he will."³ The Father has life in himself as the original possessor and author of life, who gives life to whom he will. In this respect, he has made the Son equal with himself. He too has "life in himself," and "quickeneth whom he will." It is manifest that our Lord here speaks, not of the bestowment of a capacity, but of an official investiture with the office of having life in himself to be bestowed at his own pleasure upon whom he will, which implies a previously existing capacity to receive such an office. And this capacity can be nothing else than a Divine nature, originally possessing life, in and of itself. The eternal Word who "was in the beginning with God," and "was God," "was made flesh and dwelt among us." It was in this twofold manifestation, as "the Son of God" and "the Son of man," that he undertook the mediatorial office, and received from the Father authority, as *Mémediator*, to judge all men, and to give life natural and spiritual to whom he would.⁴

¹ Rev. 2: 23.

² John 5: 26.

³ John 5: 21.

⁴ To the same purport Calvin. Having said, commentary on John 5: 26: "The meaning of the words is this, that God did not wish to have life hidden

Finally, and to sum up in one all the offices of Christ: he has received from the Father "all power in heaven and in earth." But this, again, implies the original capacity to exercise "all power in heaven and in earth," which can be no other than a Divine capacity.

In entire accordance with this view, our Lord uniformly represents himself as performing his mighty works by a power that resides in himself and is properly his own. The authority to perform them he has received from the Father, for they are "the works which the Father hath given" him "to do;"¹ but he is himself, in the true and proper sense, their author. Not so his apostles. They do not, in and of their own power, work miracles by virtue of a commission received from God; but God, by his power, works miracles through them, miracles of which they are in no proper sense the authors, and the efficiency of which they are careful to ascribe to God. So Peter said to the lame man: "In the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, rise up and walk;"² and, afterwards, to the wondering multitude: "Why look ye so earnestly on us, as though by our own power or holiness we had made this man to walk?"³ and again: "Aeneas, Jesus Christ maketh thee whole."⁴ He carefully turned away men's confidence from his own person to Christ. But Jesus everywhere speaks and acts as one who claims from men unlimited confidence in himself. He does not say: "My Father maketh thee whole;" or "My Father forgiveth thy sins;" but "Thy sins be forgiven thee;" "Arise and walk." He is careful to have it understood that the forgiving and healing power proceeds from himself as its proper source. His prayer at the grave of Lazarus constitutes no exception. For this was not for power to do that which he had no ability to do in and of himself; but, as he himself explained, for the sake of the bystanders, that they might believe that the Father had sent him.⁵ Thus the malignant accusation of the scribes and pharisees, that he wrought his miracles by virtue of a power received from Satan, was effectually cut off, and it was demonstrated to all that he acted in God's name and by his authority.

and, as it were, burl'd with himself (apud se); and he accordingly transferred it into the Son, that it might flow to us;" he adds: "Hence we infer that this title is properly ascribed to Christ so far as he is manifested in the flesh (quatenus in carne manifestatus est)."

¹ John 5: 36. ² Acts 3: 6. ³ Acts 3: 12. ⁴ Acts 9: 34. ⁵ John 11: 42.

So far, then, is the Scriptural representation that Christ *receives* from the Father his office, and is thus *less* than the Father, from proving that he does not possess a Divine nature, that, on the contrary, the very nature of the office committed to him implies the previous possession of that divinity which is in so many passages expressly assigned to him. But if he be Divine, he must be equal with the Father in power and glory, since divinity admits of no degrees; and also, one with the Father, since God is one. The view that recognizes in Christ only a teacher sent from God, with no Divine nature, is thus found to be utterly inconsistent with our first rule of judgment, namely, that the true view of Christ's person and office will harmonize the different statements of Scripture respecting him.

Secondly. It is equally at variance with our second rule, that the true view of Christ's person and office will satisfy the deep spiritual wants of the soul. That Christ is, in the highest sense, a teacher sent from God, is one of the first truths of the New Testament. And one of the very first effects of his teaching is to convince men that they need something beyond mere light and instruction. The more they learn, under the illumination of his Word and Spirit, of God and of themselves, the deeper and more distressing is their sense of guilt that needs some better propitiation than they are able to offer to God, and of inward corruption that needs for its removal some higher power than their own unaided strength. It is precisely they who have the truest apprehension of their condition as sinners, that feel most deeply their need of a helper who shall be not only a teacher, but also a Redeemer, and a Redeemer who has unlimited fulness of power both to expiate sin and to deliver the soul from its dominion.

Since, then, that view of Christ's person and office which regards him as simply a divinely commissioned teacher and witness for the truth, fails to meet the deep spiritual wants of the soul in the same proportion in which they are truly apprehended, it must be false. It is, in truth, a view, which is compatible only with superficial ideas concerning the majesty and spirituality of God's law, on the one side, and on the other, of man's guilty and helpless condition as a violation of that law. It has its roots in self-ignorance and ignorance of God; and for this reason nothing is so fatal to it as that true inward experience of the malignant nature and terrible power of sin which comes

through a Scriptural apprehension of God's character. "I was alive without the law once," says the Apostle, "but when the commandment came, sin revived, and I died. And the commandment which was ordained to life, I found to be unto death."¹ Why find the commandment "to be unto death," if all he needed was to be taught what it was? The Apostle himself furnishes the answer: "When the commandment came, sin revived, and I died." The knowledge of the commandment brought to his soul an awful sense of guilt, but it gave neither expiation for sin nor deliverance from its power. It showed him that he was ruined, and there it left him, crying: "O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death?"² It was this apprehension of his lost condition — not the discovery that he wanted more light, but, through light already received, that he needed a Redeemer — which led Paul to Christ. Thus we are naturally brought to the true view of our Saviour's person and office, which is:

3. The view that regards him as a *Divine Redeemer*. This includes both his *person* and his *office*. In his person he is "God manifest in the flesh," and his office is to "save his people from their sins;" save them in every respect in which they need salvation. The moment that we apprehend Christ as a *Divine Redeemer in the person of the eternal Word made flesh*, every declaration concerning him, in both the Old and the New Testament, falls into its right place, and becomes natural and appropriate; and we become, at the same time, delightfully conscious that in him we have found the Almighty Helper whom our souls need, a haven where our tempest-tossed spirits can cast anchor and find rest "sure and steadfast." Here, then, we have both the criteria of truth, which we found to be both wanting in the former views. Christ offers himself not only as an all-sufficient teacher, to show us our duty, but also as an all-sufficient Redeemer to deliver us from our sins. The salvation which he offers is a complete salvation. It extends to all our wants, and satisfies them all; so that in him we find the very Saviour set forth in God's word as "able to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him?"³ No view of the redemption which God offers us through his Son is more animating than this of its comprehensiveness. Its provisions cover the whole ground of our fallen condition, and meet all its necessities.

¹ Rom. 7: 9, 10.² Rom. 7: 24.³ Heb. 7: 25.

The gift of the Holy Spirit is itself the fruit of Christ's redemption, and he leads the soul to Christ for help. One of the first effects of his illuminating influence is a sense of guilt, which becomes the more deep and distressing the more we learn of God's infinite purity, and of the comprehensiveness and spirituality of his law. This sense of guilt, when it comes through the study of God's word, carries with itself the evidence that it is no fantasy, but a dreadful reality; and it sets us at once upon the inquiry: "How shall I make my peace with God?" It is only the ignorant and light-minded that can here think of their supposed good works. In the same degree in which we have a true and deep apprehension of God's wrath as resting upon our souls, do we also feel our inability to lift off from them the dreadful burden. To know, through the revelation of God's Word and Spirit, that we are under condemnation as sinners, is to know that we can offer to God no propitiation for our sins. Thus the way is prepared for a revelation to the soul of Christ's atoning sacrifice; and the deeper our sense of guilt, the more glorious does this revelation appear. It rises upon the tempest-tossed soul like a clear morning after a dark and tempestuous night. Here is help, indeed, laid by God himself upon one that is mighty. God himself "has loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins,"¹ and he cannot but accept the atonement which his own grace has provided. The great question of justification before God is solved by his own act in setting forth Jesus Christ "to be a propitiation through faith in his blood," "that he might be just, and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus."² How does the sinner, whose soul has been pressed down to the earth under a sense of guilt, exult in having found a way of justification that stands not on the ground of his own merit, but of God's sovereign grace! And, as he advances in the Divine life, he is constantly making new discoveries of his exceeding sinfulness, such as must utterly overwhelm him and drive him to despair, were it not that God, at the same time, makes corresponding revelations of the infinite fulness of Christ's atoning sacrifice; so that, while he is continually sinking deeper in self-abasement, his confidence in Christ's redemption rises higher and higher. He is emptied of self-righteousness that he may be filled with the fulness of Christ's righteousness.

¹ 1 John 4: 10.² Rom. 3: 25, 26.

Another feeling which always accompanies the sense of guilt awakened in the soul by God's Spirit, and which grows with its growth, is that of moral impotence. If the convicted sinner sees that he can offer to God no satisfaction for his sins, he sees, also, with equal clearness, his inability, without the help of God's grace, to deliver himself from their power. It is only they who are profoundly ignorant of God's law and of themselves that can imagine the work of turning inwardly and outwardly from sin to holiness to be one that is to be accomplished by their own unaided power as free agents, whenever it shall suit their convenience. He who has made the discovery that God's law is "spiritual," extending to his inmost thoughts and affections, has learned also that he is "carnal, sold under sin,"¹ and that a mightier arm than his own is needed to break off his fetters, and set his soul at liberty. It is true that, in yielding himself to the dominion of sin, he is consciously free; and it is precisely this that makes his condition so dreadful. Were his sin necessitated, he might plead this in self-justification. But now he is inwardly conscious that the same faculties which he gives to the world he has power to give to his Maker; that, in choosing the service of Mammon rather than of Christ, he acts as a free responsible being; that neither God, nor man, nor Satan compels the choice, but that it is his own proper act for which he will be justly held responsible at the last day. But, with this full consciousness of freedom and responsibility, he becomes more and more convinced of the impotence of his will in respect to everything good — its moral, not its natural impotence — till he comes at last to feel, in the very centre of his being, that, unless God interpose, sin will have dominion over him, and that, if the question be whether he shall, by his own proper power unaided from above, lift his soul out of the pit of corruption in which it is sunk, and raise it up to holiness and communion with God, his case is absolutely hopeless, as much so as if he were already in the pit of despair. Thus is he forced to cry out: "O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death?"² And to the man who sends up to heaven this prayer from the inmost depths of his spirit, it is vain to offer a Saviour who is no more than a teacher and witness for the truth. It is the knowledge of the truth which has shown him his helplessness

¹ Rom. 7: 14.

² Rom. 7: 24.

condition and filled his soul with the blackness of despair. He needs redemption from the indwelling power of sin, not less than from the curse of God's broken law; and such redemption God offers him through Christ in the gift of his Spirit. And how glorious does this grace appear in the hour of the soul's extremity! Christ offers himself to the sinner as his sanctification, not less than his justification; as one who can and will make all who come to him in faith, victorious over the inward corruption of their hearts, and raise them at last to the perfect purity and blessedness of heaven.

These two provisions of Christ's redemption, pardon and sanctification, include in themselves all other needed blessings, guidance, discipline, protection, support, comfort, and the everlasting fruition of heaven. "He that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him also freely give us all things?"¹ They who have learned to depend on Christ for pardon and sanctification, have learned that in him all fulness dwells. They daily lean their whole soul upon him with holy composure and gladness, and are filled with the delightful assurance that in him all their wants are satisfied. Christ lives in their souls, as the centre about which their warm affections cluster, and without their souls in their daily life. Now they need no human teacher to expound to them the meaning of those strong figures by which the holy Scriptures set forth the union between Christ and his disciples, and the quickening power that flows from him through this union, into their souls. They have themselves drank of the water that Christ gives, and it has become in their souls "a well of water springing up into everlasting life,"² and flowing out thence in "rivers of living water."³ They have become branches of the true vine, and they feel the life-giving current flowing from it through their whole being, and making them green and fruitful.

It is from this position alone that we can rightly understand and interpret our Lord's discourse in the synagogue at Capernaum. The ground-idea which underlies it throughout is: *Christ in his personality, the life and sustenance of the soul.* Throughout the whole address our Lord draws the confidence of his hearers

¹ Rom. 8: 32.² John 4: 14.³ John 7: 38.

to his own person, as the centre whence flows forth the redemption of both soul and body. He does not occupy himself, as did the prophets before him, with directing them to God for salvation (though this he might have done, for in the work of redemption he and the Father are one¹), but he sets forth himself, as having in himself life, and giving life to all that come to him. And he not only calls himself "the living bread which came down from heaven," of which all who eat shall live forever, but he particularizes his flesh and his blood: "Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day. For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed."² Thus, while he makes the idea of faith in his person more certain and prominent, he also foreshadows, as will be shown hereafter, the great idea of the eucharist, which is: *Christ crucified, the life and sustenance of the soul.*

The true view of Christ as a *Divine Redeemer* who has made propitiation for sin through his blood; who, through the indwelling of the Holy Ghost, cleanses the heart from the pollution of sin; and who will, at the last day, raise the bodies of all who believe on him in glory; so that in him we have pardon, sanctification, the resurrection of the body, and life everlasting; this view of Christ's person and office makes the language of the discourse under consideration natural and appropriate. It is the very language in which the believer who knows Christ as his Redeemer loves to express the fulness of his confidence in him, and the completeness of the salvation which he receives through him. But to the man who has been unable to discern in Christ anything more than a great and good teacher, sent by God to instruct him concerning his duty, it must appear both exaggerated and incongruous. A strange way, truly, of conveying the simple idea: Except ye listen to my doctrine, ye cannot know the truth and be saved by it; so strange that, if Christ be only a teacher, and not a Divine Redeemer, one might be excused for saying: "This is an hard saying; who can hear it?"

¹ Compare John 10: 27—30: "My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me: and I give unto them eternal life; and they shall never perish, neither shall any pluck them out of my hand. My Father which gave them me, is greater than all; and none is able to pluck them out of my Father's hand. I and my Father are one;" where the salvation of believers is ascribed to the joint act of the Father and the Son.

² John 10: 64, 65.

II. EXPOSITION OF THE DISCOURSE.

The historic events that gave occasion to this remarkable discourse, are familiar to our readers, and need not be stated in detail. Our Saviour had miraculously fed a great multitude in the desert region that borders the north-east coast of the Sea of Galilee.¹ Under the immediate impression of this miracle, the people were ready to "take him by force, to make him a king."² To avoid this, Jesus retired "into a mountain himself alone;" and, in the course of the following night, miraculously joined his disciples, who had sailed for Capernaum, by walking on the sea. The day following, the people, finding that both Jesus and his disciples had departed, followed him to Capernaum, where they found him teaching in the synagogue.

V. 25. And when they had found him on the other side of the sea, they said unto him: Rabbi, when camest thou hither?

"The other side of the sea" is here the western side, to which they had just returned from "the desert place, belonging to the city called Bethsaida." Their question implies wonder at the unexplained manner of our Lord's passage. They had been present when the disciples embarked without him, and yet there was no other boat in the place.

V. 26. Jesus answered them, and said: Verily, verily, I say unto you, Ye seek me, not because ye saw signs, but because ye did eat of the loaves, and were filled.

The words *εἶδτε σημεῖα* (*σημεῖα* without the article) should be rendered: *ye saw signs*. They contain a general reference to his miracles which the multitudes had witnessed. Our Lord does not mean to deny that they had, in some sense, been moved to follow him by the sight of his miracles; but he teaches that it was not the miracles themselves that attracted them, but only the earthly good which they had received from them. The true end of Christ's miracles was to manifest his Divine glory, and

¹ It was "a desert place belonging to the city called Bethsaida" (Luke 9: 10), which lay in Gaulonites, at the north-eastern extremity of the lake, near the entrance of the Jordan.

² V. 15. *Ἀρνῆσαι αὐτόν, to seize and bear him off in triumph; the appropriate word for such an act. Tacitus, Hist. L. I. Cap. 29.*

thus draw men to himself as their divinely constituted Teacher and Lord. But these men valued them only for the loaves and fishes which they had furnished, and they sought in Jesus only a minister to their earthly wants.

V. 27. Work¹ not for the food which perisheth, but for the food which endureth unto everlasting life, which the Son of man shall give unto you; for him hath God the Father sealed.

Ἔργασθαι, with the Acc., is here, *to gain by labor*. The uniform doctrine of the Scriptures is, that, while salvation is a gift of God's free grace, the condition of our receiving it is that we labor for it. So in the book of Proverbs we are exhorted, if we would find knowledge, to seek her as silver, and search for her as for hid treasures, because "the Lord giveth wisdom;"² and the Apostle's injunction is: "Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling. For it is God which worketh in you both to will and to do of his good pleasure."³ — *The food which perisheth*, is food whose nourishing power perishes; and which cannot, therefore, give eternal life. To this is opposed *the food which endureth unto everlasting life* — food which has power to give everlasting life to those who partake of it. — *To seal*, is here, *to certify*; that is, to attest as the Messiah. God sealed Jesus as the Messiah both by his testimony at his baptism,⁴ and by the Divine works which he commissioned him to perform.⁵

Our Lord advances slowly, and by several successive steps, to the full development of the great doctrine: "Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life."⁶ The present verse contains his first position: The Son of man has for all who will come to him, food that endureth unto everlasting life. He does not yet exhibit his *person* as "the bread of life," but only declares that he has this bread to bestow upon men. The occasion of this figure, which he unfolds with such Divine grandeur and majesty, rising continually higher in his representations of himself, was the perishable bread wherewith he had fed the multitude on the other side of the sea. Thus he sought to raise their low and earthly minds to the pursuit of spiritual good.

¹ *Ἔργασθαι*. By rendering "*Labor not*," our translators have obscured the connection between this exhortation and the question in the verse following.

² Prov. 2: 3—6.

³ Phil. 2: 12, 13.

⁴ Matt. 3: 17, *al.*

⁵ John 5: 36.

⁶ V. 54.

V. 28. They said, therefore, unto him: What shall we do that we may work the works of God?

The works of God, are works which he requires and approves. Jesus had just exhorted the multitude to work for the food which endureth unto everlasting life. They correctly understood him to be speaking figuratively of a religious service which God will reward with eternal life; but, in accordance with their legal notions, they thought at once of some particular outward duties. The plural number is not without significance. It points to "the broken manifoldness of legal works."¹

V. 29. Jesus answered and said unto them: This is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent.

He calls off their thoughts from the multiplicity of outward legal observances, through which they had been taught to seek salvation, to the one inward and spiritual work of faith in himself; a work which comprises in itself the sum of all that God requires.

Vs. 30. 31. They said, therefore, unto him: What sign showest thou then, that we may see and believe thee? what dost thou work? Our fathers did eat manna in the desert; as it is written: He gave them bread from heaven to eat.

Nothing can more forcibly illustrate the truth of our Lord's declaration: "Ye seek me, not because ye saw signs, but because ye did eat of the loaves, and were filled," than this reply to his demand of faith in himself. If his miracles had made on their minds a true impression, by revealing to them his Divine character and mission, then would they have been ready to receive him, and submit themselves to his authority. But in the Saviour's mighty works they had seen and admired, not his glory, but only the gratification of their earthly desires. Now that he attempts to call them away from earthly to spiritual good, they at once deny his claim to their faith and obedience. Here the words of Calvin are very pertinent: "If Christ had offered them hope of earthly felicity, they would have greeted him with continued applause; he would have been saluted by them without controversy as Prophet, and Messiah, and Son of God; now, because he rebukes them for being too much given to the flesh, they do not think him worthy of being further listened to."²—

¹ Die zerplitterte Vielheit der Gesetzwerte.—*De Wette*, in loco.

² Commentary on John, in loco.

What sign showest thou then, that we may see and believe? They set aside the miracles which they had already witnessed, as incompetent to prove his Messiahship, and demand of him a sign of a different character; namely, a sign from heaven, which the pharisees also demanded.¹—*What dost thou work?* that is, what work that may claim our faith in thee as the Messiah.—*Our fathers did eat manna in the desert.* This seems to be an indirect way of demanding from Jesus a repetition of the miracle of the manna. And this is made more probable by the Jewish tradition that the Messiah should renew this wonder, which may be found in all the collections of Rabbinic doctrines. We quote from Schöttgen:

“Midrash Coheleth, fol. 73, 3. Rabbi Berechia has said in the name of Rabbi Isaac: As was the first Redeemer [Moses], so also shall be the last. The first Redeemer caused manna to descend (הוריד את המן); as is said, Ex. 16: 4: *And I will rain bread from heaven for you.* So also the last Redeemer causes manna to descend, as is said, Ps. 72: 16: *There shall be a multitude of corn upon the earth.*”² They lay stress on the fact that the manna descended from heaven: *He gave them bread from heaven to eat.*³ Thus they represent the manna as a sign from heaven, in contrast with the Saviour's miracles, which were only earthly signs. In this objection of the multitude we have a perfect embodiment of the spirit of unbelief, which is always captious and unreasonable, demanding, not simply evidence of a solid and satisfactory character, but such evidence as it chooses to prescribe.

¹ Matt. 16: 1. Mark 8: 11.

² Midrasch Coheleth, fol. 73, 3. R. Berechia nomine R. Isaac dixit: *Quam admodum Goël primus, sic quoque erit postremus. Goël primus (הוריד את המן) descendere fecit Man, q. d. Ex. 16: 4. Et pluere faciam vobis panem de coelo. Sic quoque Goël postremus descendere fucit Man, q. d. Ps. 72: 16. Erit multitudo frumenti super terram. Schöttgenii Horae Hebraicae et Talmudicae; Vol. I. p. 359.*

In the last of the above quotations, that from Ps. 72: 16, the words of the original are: *יהי עשׂת-גבׁי בְּאֶרֶץ צִיּוֹן וּבְרֵאשִׁית הַרְרֵיהֶם*, while the English version renders: *There shall be an handful of corn in the earth upon the top of the mountains.* But many take the word עשׂת, as did the Rabbi here quoted, in the sense of *abundance*. This gives the following: *There shall be an abundance of corn on the earth on the top of the mountains; which Rabbi Isaac interpreted of an abundance of manna covering the mountain-tops.*

³ The reference is to Ps. 78: 24, 25.

V. 33. Then Jesus said unto them: Verily, verily, I say unto you, Moses gave you not that bread from heaven; but my Father giveth you the true bread from heaven.

In this answer the Divine wisdom of our Lord shines forth with heavenly brightness. Instead of pausing to discuss with them the question of a renewal of the sign of manna, he calls off their thoughts at once from the material to the spiritual; and, at the same time, prepares the way for exhibiting himself as a true sign from heaven in the highest and noblest sense. — *Moses gave you not that bread from heaven.* The meaning is, that the manna which Moses gave to the Israelites came only from the material heavens, and was, like them, material in its nature. It was “the meat which perisheth,” and therefore unable to give life to those who partook of it.¹ — *But my Father giveth you the true bread from heaven;* bread which comes from the true heaven, and is itself true bread. Thus he sets it in strong contrast with the manna in respect to both its source and its nature.

V. 33. For the bread of God is that which cometh down from heaven, and giveth life unto the world.

That which cometh down from heaven. That this is the true rendering, and not, as in our version: *He which cometh down from heaven,* is manifest from the following considerations: *First,* it agrees best with our Saviour's progressive method of unfolding the truth in this discourse. To have announced *himself* as the bread of life, at this stage of the discussion, would have been premature. *Secondly,* the annunciation in the thirty-fifth verse following: “*I am the bread of life,*” plainly contains a new idea, and, as such, makes a new impression on the minds of the multitude. Their response to the declaration in the present verse was: “*Lord, evermore give us this bread.*” But the moment that he announced himself as the bread of life, “they murmured at him.” *Thirdly,* the present participle, ὁ καταβαίνων, cannot refer to the historic fact of Christ's descent from heaven. In this case the perfect καταβέβηκα, is used, or the aorist participle καταβάς. It denotes rather the *inherent quality* of the bread as heavenly in its origin, for which the present tense is appropriate. “The varying use of the present, ὁ καταβαίνων ἐκ τ. οὐρ. vs. 33, 50; and of the aorist, ὁ καταβάς ἐκ τ. οὐρ. vs. 41, 51 (compare vs. 38, 42, καταβέβηκα ἐκ τ. οὐρ.), does not allow us to think here of

¹ V 49.

an enallage of tenses. But the ground why John uses, in the one case, the participle of the present, and, in the other, that of the aorist, is the following: vs. 33 and 50 contain only the general description of the true heavenly bread — what it is in contrast with the earthly manna, so that, in both instances, the present *ὁ καταβαίνων ἐν τ. οὐρ.* is used only in an adjective sense."¹

V. 34. Then said they unto him: Lord, evermore give us this bread.

To determine the exact meaning of these words is a work of difficulty. The opinion of several of the ancients, as Chrysostom and Augustine, and of Calvin among the moderns, that they were spoken ironically, must be decidedly rejected. According to Tholuck, they did not clearly apprehend what Christ had intended, but hoped, nevertheless, for something that was in its essence earthly; very much as the Samaritan woman met our Lord's offer of living water with the response: "Sir, give me this water, that I thirst not, neither come hither to draw."² But perhaps they understood our Lord's words in the preceding verse of a repetition of the miracle of manna in a higher form, and asked accordingly that he would evermore feed them with such bread.

V. 35. But Jesus said unto them: I am the bread of life: he that cometh to me shall never hunger; and he that believeth on me shall never thirst.

Our Lord now announces, for the first time in this discourse, the great central doctrine of the Gospel, that he is *himself* the life and sustenance of the soul. Towards this his words had been tending from the beginning. The order of development is this: Christ has the bread of life *to give*,³ this bread *descends from heaven*,⁴ this bread is *himself*. What follows is an expansion and particularization of the high truths contained in the present annunciation. We must carefully notice the solemn earnestness with which our Lord insists on the fact that salvation is not something out of himself, to which he can direct men, but a well-spring residing within himself and flowing out from himself to sinners. Prophets and apostles could instruct men where eternal life may be found, and to this work was their office limited; but Christ *gives* men eternal life of his own

¹ Lücke, Com. über Joh. in loco.

² John 4: 15.

³ V. 27.

⁴ V. 33.

proper power. He does not direct them elsewhere for help, but offers himself as an all-sufficient Helper.—*He that cometh to me, shall never hunger.* To come to Christ is to give ourselves up in unlimited faith, love and obedience to his control. Thus we feed on Christ, and find all our wants satisfied.—*He that believeth on me shall never thirst.* This is added to complete the idea of sustenance. In food and drink lies the full nourishment of the body. So Jesus is the food and drink of the believer's soul, and in him all its desires are satisfied.

V. 36. But I said unto you, that ye have both seen me, and believe not.

The Saviour understood well how offensive to the multitude would be this announcement of himself as "the bread of life;" and he anticipates their cavils by upbraiding them with their unbelief.—*Have both seen me;* that is, have seen my miracles.—*And believe not.* You refuse to receive the evidence which they give of my Divine mission. The question has been raised: *When* had Jesus said this? Not directly in the present discourse, but virtually in the twenty-sixth verse; for the words: "Ye seek me, not because ye saw the miracles," imply that, though they had seen his miracles, they had hardened their hearts against their proper influence, which was to produce faith in himself. If one is not satisfied with this explanation, then he must refer the words either to something omitted in the Evangelist's record, or (what is more probable) to former declarations made by Jesus to the people of Capernaum.

V. 37. All that the Father giveth me, shall come to me; and him that cometh to me, I will in no wise cast out.

The neuter *πάντα* is used here, as elsewhere by John, collectively for the masculine.¹—*All that the Father giveth me.* God gives men to the Son in his eternal purpose,² and also by his executive act in carrying out that purpose. The reference here is to the executive act, that of *drawing*³ and *teaching*,⁴ which will be considered hereafter. Having upbraided his hearers with their hardness of heart and unbelief in rejecting him, the Saviour adds a solemn admonition of their dependence on his Father's grace that they may receive him and be saved. Thus he seeks to humble their pride and bring them to serious con-

¹ V. 39. 17: 2. 1 John 5: 4.

² Eph. 1: 4, 5. 3: 11.

³ V. 44.

⁴ V. 45.

sideration and repentance. Then, from the fulness of his compassionate heart, he sets forth the greatness and certainty of the salvation which he offers to lost sinners.

Vs. 38—40. For I came down from heaven, not that I might do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me. And this is the Father's will who hath sent me, that of all which he hath given me, I should lose nothing, but should raise it up at the last day. For this is the will of him that sent me, that every one who seeth the Son and believeth on him, may have everlasting life: and I will raise him up at the last day.

Not to do mine own will. This accords with the uniform representation of the New Testament, that Christ acts not of himself, but in accordance with a commission received from the Father. He comes to do, not his own, but the Father's will, as has been fully shown in the first part of the present Article. What is the Father's will in sending him he proceeds to unfold.—*I should lose nothing.* He had just before declared, that all whom the Father had given him should come to him. He now adds that not one of them shall be lost. He will keep them all to the end, and raise them up at the last day. This agrees with another of his declarations: "My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me: and I give unto them eternal life; and they shall never perish, neither shall any one pluck them out of my hand."¹ In both of these passages there is a tacit claim to the possession of "all power in heaven and in earth,"² for unless he were able to overcome all opposition in heaven and in earth, he could not thus guarantee the final salvation of every one whom the Father has given him.—*Seeth the Son and believeth on him.* These words are opposed to those which he had already used of the multitude: "Ye have both seen me, and believe not."³ To see the Son, is to have an inward discovery, through the Father's drawing and teaching, of his Divine glory and excellence. Such a view of Christ is always connected with faith in him.—*May have everlasting life: and I will raise him up at the last day.* These two expressions contain the whole idea of salvation. *First*, they who believe on Christ, *have* everlasting life as a present spiritual possession. Through their union with Christ, which implies the incipient restoration of their souls to God's moral image, eternal life is already begun within them, and shall be perpetuated and per-

¹ John 10: 27, 28.

² Matt. 28: 18.

³ V. 36.

fectured in eternity. In this sense Christ repeatedly declares that they who believe in himself, shall never die. "This is the bread which cometh down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof and not die."¹ "Whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die."² *Secondly*, they who believe in Christ shall be *raised up* by him at the last day. The restoration of the life of the body, in a glorious and perfect form, is the crowning act of Christ. Thus he abolishes death spiritual and corporeal, and presents his ransomed ones before his Father's throne "holy and without blemish" in both soul and body.

Vs. 41, 42. The Jews, therefore, murmured at him, because he said: I am the bread which came down from heaven. And they said: Is not this Jesus, the son of Joseph, whose father and mother we know? how is it then that he saith: I came down from heaven?

Our Saviour's gracious words found no response in the hearts of his hearers. They could see only the lowliness of his outward condition. It did not accord with their ideas of the Messiah that he should be of humble parentage, like themselves. How the son of Joseph and Mary, whom they had so long known as their neighbors, should claim a heavenly origin they could not comprehend; and they would not receive his testimony.

Vs. 43—45. Jesus, therefore, answered and said unto them: Murmur not among yourselves. No man can come to me, except the Father who hath sent me draw him: and I will raise him up at the last day. It is written in the prophets: And they shall be all taught of God. Every man therefore, that hath heard, and, hath learned of the Father cometh unto me.

Jesus did not pause to answer the question raised by the multitude: "How is it then that he saith, I came down from heaven?" The mystery of "God manifest in the flesh" is to be received, not upon philosophic explanation, but upon Divine testimony; and such was the testimony of Jesus, for God had doubly sealed it; by his own voice from heaven, and by the miracles which he commissioned him to perform in his name. Instead of wasting time in the discussion of this point, the Saviour warns them against a murmuring spirit, and, in connection with this, reminds them of their dependence upon his Father's help for ability to believe on himself. The *drawing* of the Father is the same as

¹ V. 50.

² John 11: 26.

his teaching; for the passage from Isaiah: *And they shall be all taught of God,*¹ is plainly cited as an example of this drawing. The natural condition of all men is briefly but most forcibly described by the Apostle Paul: "Having the understanding darkened, being alienated from the life of God through the ignorance that is in them, because of the hardness of their hearts."² They are ignorant alike of God and of themselves, and do not understand their need of a spiritual salvation, such as Christ offers. Hence he must be to them "as a root out of dry ground," in whom they can discern "no beauty that" they "should desire him." And as this is a *willing* ignorance, having its ground in "the carnal mind" which is "enmity against God," they will never, self-moved, recover themselves from it; but will cherish it, and perish in it. To say this, which is but to repeat what the Scriptures declare on almost every page, is to affirm two things: *first*, that men's alienation from God and ignorance of him constitute, in the fullest sense of the words, *a voluntary state*, for which God justly holds them responsible;³ *secondly*, that it constitutes *a fatal hindrance* to their salvation; so that, if God do not interpose to bring them back to himself, they must perish. The Father draws men to Christ by teaching them both their need of spiritual salvation, and the glorious excellency and sufficiency of the Redeemer whom he has provided for them; and also by giving them grace to yield themselves up in hearty obedience to his authority, and make him the centre of their confidence and love; or, in Scriptural language, he "shines in their hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ;"⁴ and "works in them to will and to do of his good pleasure."⁵ Thus they, with the inward ear, hear and learn of the Father, and come to the Son for eternal life.⁶

In these words of our Saviour we have an instructive example of the true method of dealing with caviling unbelievers. This is, not to be always reasoning the case with them, and dwelling

¹ Isaiah 54: 13.

² Eph. 4: 18.

³ The carnal mind (*τὸ φρόνημα τῆς σαρκός*) is the free preference of the world to God; and, therefore, every state of mind that arises from it is also free.

⁴ 2 Cor. 4: 6.

⁵ Phil. 2: 13.

⁶ *Trahi eos dicit, quorum mentes illuminat Deus, et corda flectit ac format in Christi obedientiam.* Calvin in loco. This gives the two parts of which the Divine drawing consists; the *illumination of the mind* — "mentes illuminat," and the *influencing of the will* — "corda flectit ac format."

upon their ability and obligation as free agents; but also to exhibit, in full measure, their dependence upon Divine grace, and urge upon them the duty of a childlike and believing spirit. Human ability and responsibility constitute an important part of the truth, and should, therefore, be preached clearly and boldly; but human perverseness and dependence upon God is an equally important part, and should be preached with equal clearness and boldness. And this latter portion of the truth is peculiarly adapted to humble that proud and self-sufficient spirit which is the true root of caviling and unbelief. When exhibited in a Scriptural form its tendency is, not to quiet men in procrastination and inaction, but rather to impel them to "work out" their "own salvation with fear and trembling," under the awful conviction that, if they provoke God to withdraw from them his grace, they are undone forever. If any one hesitates to make a full exhibition of the Scriptural doctrine of men's dependence on God for moral power to receive Christ, through fear of its being perverted, let him remember that the doctrine of human ability has also, in a countless multitude of cases, been perverted to presumptuous self-confidence, and the consequent fatal neglect of repentance and faith. It is the preacher's duty and wisdom to exhibit all parts of Divine truth in due proportion, and put men upon their responsibility to God for the right use of it.

V. 46. Not that any man hath seen the Father, save he who is of God; he hath seen the Father.

These words, in their outward form, seem intended to guard against a misapprehension of the declaration just preceding: "Every man, therefore, that hath heard, and hath learned of the Father, cometh unto me;" as if it had referred to an immediate and full vision of God. But while they do this, they also set in strong contrast our Saviour's knowledge of the Father and that of all mere men. All who are taught of God see him indirectly by an inward spiritual vision. To some, as to the ancient prophets, he has made a direct revelation of himself, but only in a certain measure, such as the present wants of his church demanded. But the Son has "seen the Father," in a full and absolute sense. He dwelt from eternity in his bosom, and his knowledge of him is perfect, in both manner and measure. "No man hath seen God at any time; the only

begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him."¹

Va. 47—51. Verily, verily, I say unto you: he that believeth on me hath everlasting life. I am the bread of life. Your fathers did eat manna in the wilderness, and are dead. This is the bread which cometh down from heaven, that one may eat thereof, and not die. I am the living bread which came down from heaven: if any man eat of this bread he shall live forever; and the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world.

Jesus now enlarges upon his previous declaration: "I am the bread of life," and contrasts it with the manna which the Israelites ate in the wilderness. That was "the food which perisheth," and they who partook of it died; but he is the living bread from heaven, of which whosoever eats shall live forever. In what sense this is spoken, has been already shown.²— *This is the bread which cometh down from heaven.* The meaning is: This, and not the manna which your fathers ate. The interpretation of *ὄντας* in the sense of *such, of such efficacy*,³ is unnatural. — *I am the living bread.* Jesus calls himself the living bread, because he has life in himself, and therefore gives life to all who feed upon him.

Thus far our Lord carries out the simple figure of "the bread of life." But he now adds: *And the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world.* There can be no reasonable doubt that these words refer to his expiatory death on the cross, and thus contain an allusion to the *way* in which he is to become, to all who believe on him, the bread of life. For, *First*, this is their most natural (rather, we might say, their only natural) reference. *Secondly*, it is altogether in accordance with our Lord's manner, in addressing the multitude, that he should thus allude beforehand to his death. "When ye have lifted up the Son of man, then shall ye know that I am he."⁴ "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me."⁵ "Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone; but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit."⁶ "I lay down my life for the sheep."⁷ *Thirdly*, these words are the introduction to the address that follows on eating Christ's flesh and drinking his blood, which, as will presently be shown, must refer to his flesh and blood as made an offering for sin.

¹ John 1: 18.

² Notes on v. 40.

³ So De Wette: "*Solches* (von solcher Kraft) *ist das — Brod, dass.*"

⁴ John 8: 28.

⁵ John 12: 32.

⁶ John 12: 24.

⁷ John 10: 15.

V. 52. The Jews, therefore, strove among themselves, saying: How can this man give us his flesh to eat?

Taking his words in a gross outward sense, it was natural that they should ask this question. But Jesus, instead of pausing to answer it, proceeded at once to reiterate and enlarge upon the declaration at which they took offence.

Vs. 53—58. Then Jesus said unto them: Verily, verily, I say unto you. Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you. Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day. For my flesh is food indeed, and my blood is drink indeed. He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him. As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father; so he that eateth me, even he shall live by me. This is the bread that came down from heaven; not as your fathers did eat manna, and are dead: he that eateth this bread shall live forever.

The exact interpretation of these words has been a matter of much controversy. We may mention, as one extreme, the opinion that our Lord is only reasserting here what he has already said in the declaration: "I am the living bread which came down from heaven." Those who maintain this view of the passage understand by Christ's flesh and blood simply his earthly manifestation in a human form, taking the expressions, *flesh and blood*, for the totality of his earthly personality. So among the ancients Basil, as quoted by Tholuck: *ἡ σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, πᾶσα αὐτοῦ ἡ μυστικὴ ἐπιδημία*, "the body and blood of Christ are his whole mystical sojourn among men." The same interpretation has been adopted by several of the moderns. But Tholuck well remarks, on the fifty-first verse, that, "if Christ wished by these words to express only the very same idea which he had before uttered, one cannot understand why he should have changed the perfectly clear expression, *ἐγὼ εἶμι ὁ ἄριστος ὁ ζῶν*, into the obscure *ἐγὼ δώσω ὑμῖν τὴν σάρκα μου*;" and the same principle applies to the whole of the present passage, as compared with vs. 48—50. But further than this, the repeated mention of Christ's flesh and blood, in connection with the declaration already considered, that he will give his flesh for the life of the world, naturally leads our thoughts to his bloody death on the cross, when his blood was "shed for many for the remission of sins."¹

¹ When the words *σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα* are used in the New Testament, as a general expression for humanity, they always contain the accessory idea of weakness, VOL. XI. No. 44.

The opposite extreme is that of those who refer these words directly to the eucharist by way of anticipation.¹ This has been maintained by many from ancient times, and is especially advocated by the interpreters of the papal church, since here they find a principal support for their dogma of transubstantiation. But when we take the true view of the Lord's Supper, that its elements are *symbols* of Christ's atoning sacrifice, it must appear highly improbable that in these solemn asseverations our Lord should have referred to *symbols* of an institution yet to be established, and not to the *truth itself* which that institution symbolically sets forth. Rather was it the great central truth of Christianity, his propitiatory sacrifice for the salvation of the world, which gave rise to the symbols of the eucharist, that our Lord here anticipated, than the eucharist itself.

And here we see the true relation of the present words to the eucharist. They are not a reference to that institution, but to the great fact of Christianity which it sets forth in a symbolical way. The eucharist and this address in the synagogue at Capernaum both have for their foundation the same view of Christ in his relation to believers. That which makes the figurative language of the discourse so pertinent and forcible, gives also to the symbols of the Lord's Supper their pertinence and force. They both set forth *Christ crucified as the food and drink of the soul*. And, in respect to the manner of representation, the agreement between the symbols of the eucharist and the words now under consideration, is remarkable. In both, Christ's body is exhibited as the food, and his blood as the drink of his disciples. It is, indeed, true that, in the institution of the eucharist, Jesus employed the word *σῶμα*, *body*, not *σάρξ*, *flesh*. But, since he

physical or moral. Matt. 16: 17. John 1: 13. 1 Cor. 15: 50. Gal. 1: 16. Eph. 6: 12. Heb. 2: 14. In this latter passage it is expressly affirmed that Christ became a partaker of flesh and blood, that he might be made subject to death, this being the way in which he was to destroy him that had the power of death. So far, then, as the argument from the union of these words goes, it shows that they denote, not so much the simple manifestation of Christ in human nature, as his subjection to death. But we doubt the correctness of the parallelism.

¹ The reader may see in the third part of Dr. Turner's "Essay on our Lord's Discourse at Capernaum," a good summary of the views entertained by the early fathers, and by some modern divines, on this point. To this treatise we are indebted for valuable suggestions, although the learned author's aim is different from ours. He is combatting the great error of Romanism — that of transubstantiation — rather than a low humanitarian view of Christ's person and office.

made a distinction between this and his *blood*, the meaning of *σῶμα* must, in this case, come to that of *σάρξ*. We are not, however, to inquire for the significancy of Christ's body given for the life of the world, apart from that of his blood shed for the remission of sin. The two constitute one inseparable whole. In giving his body, he gave also his blood; and in giving his blood, his body. His body procures life for the world through the remission of sin; his blood procures the remission of sin that leads to eternal life. Each symbol, then, of the eucharist represents the whole of Christ's propitiatory sacrifice; although, in accordance with the Divine declaration: "Without shedding of blood is no remission,"¹ that of the wine brings most distinctly to view the idea of expiation; for the blood, which this represents, is the life of the body,² and expiation lies in the giving of life. Accordingly, it was not to his body, but to his blood, that our Saviour ascribed the power of expiation. The eucharist reaches the inner spiritual man through a representation made to the outward senses; and its twofold exhibition of Christ's propitiatory sacrifice under the two emblems of bread and wine, gives vividness and completeness to the impression. Precisely the same effect is produced in the passage now under consideration, by our Lord's twofold specification of his flesh and his blood. Each of them contains in itself the idea of his expiatory sacrifice; but the separate mention of the two adds distinctness and force. That Jesus does not mean to ascribe to the eating of his flesh a significance separate from that of drinking his blood, is manifest from the general course of representation. He begins by mentioning his flesh alone;³ then he specifies his flesh as "meat indeed," and his blood as "drink indeed;"⁴ and, finally, includes all in eating *himself*;⁵ with this returning to the representation with which he had begun: "This is that bread which came down from heaven."⁶

To these general remarks, we add a notice of some particular clauses in the passage. In the fifty-fourth verse, the Saviour ascribes to eating his flesh and drinking his blood precisely the same efficacy which he had already done in the fortieth verse to seeing the Son, and believing on him; he *hath eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day*. From this his hearers might

¹ Heb. 9: 22.² Lev. 17: 11.³ V. 51.⁴ Vs. 53—56.⁵ V. 57.⁶ V. 58.

have reasonably inferred that he employed these remarkable words in a spiritual, and not in a gross outward sense; although they would have still contained a mystery which nothing but his death and resurrection for the salvation of men could solve. So in the fifty-sixth verse, he represents the effect of eating his flesh and drinking his blood to be a mutual union between himself and his disciples, he *dwelleth in me, and I in him*; which again points to a spiritual meaning. Then, in the following verse, he compares the living union which exists between himself and those who eat him, to that which exists between himself and the Father. — *As the living Father hath sent me.* The Father is called *living*, because he has life in himself, and is the source of all life. Why the words: *hath sent me*? Doubtless to show that he is acting in accordance with the Father's will, which is essential to the idea that follows. — *And I live by the Father.* Of these words the best explanation is found in another declaration of the Saviour: "As the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself."¹ As Jesus is the ground of life to those who eat him, so the Father is to him the ground of life. He lives, not separately from the Father, but by virtue of his union with him. Thus all is made to depend upon the Father, "that God may be all in all."² This is an idea upon which Jesus elsewhere dwells with solemn earnestness and pathos. "That they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us; that the world may believe that thou hast sent me. And the glory which thou gavest me, I have given them; that they may be one, even as we are one; I in them, and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one; and that the world may know that thou hast sent me, and hast loved them as thou hast loved me."³ The same idea of oneness and subordination to the Father, as the supreme Head of all things, is thus expressed by the Apostle Paul: "All are yours; and ye are Christ's; and Christ is God's."⁴

V. 59. These things said he in the synagogue, as he taught in Capernaum.

These words indicate the close of our Lord's discourse in the synagogue. What follows seems to have been spoken elsewhere, perhaps, as De Wette suggests, on the way from the

¹ John 5: 26. ² 1 Cor. 15: 28. ³ John 17: 21—23. ⁴ 1 Cor. 3: 22, 23.

synagogue home; yet, in immediate connection with the foregoing, and to a part, at least, of the same auditory.

V. 60. Many therefore of his disciples, when they had heard this, said: This is an hard saying; who can hear it?

This is an hard saying. They refer to what Jesus had said of the efficacy of eating his flesh and drinking his blood. The saying was "hard," not so much in the sense of *unintelligible*, as of *distasteful*, offensive.

Vs. 61—63. When Jesus knew in himself that his disciples murmured at it, he said unto them: Doth this offend you? If then ye shall see the Son of man ascending up where he was before? The spirit is that which quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life.

The meaning of these words has been a matter of much discussion, and, in the interpretation of them, commentators have differed greatly. Without attempting to enumerate all their various opinions, we shall content ourselves with proposing that view which seems to us most accordant with the context. The words: *Doth this offend you?* we refer to the whole tenor of the preceding discourse. In this our Lord had represented himself as "the living bread which came down from heaven," and had declared that, "if any man eat of this bread, he shall live forever;" and, what seemed a still harsher assertion, he had affirmed of his flesh and blood: "Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day." Not only was the idea itself of feeding on his flesh and blood offensive to them, but his high claim to be the living bread which came down from heaven, and which had power to give eternal life to all that should partake of it, gave still higher offence to them. That the son of Joseph and Mary should not only claim for himself a heavenly origin, but also the power to bestow upon men eternal life, and the resurrection of the just, was what they could not endure to hear. In view of this Jesus asks: *If then ye shall see the Son of man ascending up where he was before?* as much as to say: If what I have now claimed for myself offends you, what will you say when you see me ascending up to my original abode in heaven,¹ and invested with all

¹ De Wette denies any reference here to our Lord's *bodily visible* ascent to heaven, on two grounds: first, that John says nothing concerning this; secondly, 61*

power in heaven and in earth? Instead of receding from his lofty position because of the offence which it gave to his hearers, he advances to a still higher eminence. This is altogether in accordance with his general manner in dealing with cavillers and opponents. The very points at which they take exception, he presses the more earnestly and asserts in still stronger terms, because they are points of vital importance, upon which depends the true apprehension of his character and office.— *The spirit is that which quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing.* In these words our Lord guards his hearers against the error of understanding what he had said concerning himself, as the bread of life, and concerning his flesh and blood, as the food and drink of his disciples, in a gross material way; as if he had said: I have spoken of myself as the living bread which came down from heaven, and of my flesh and blood as the food and drink of men, but think not that you are to feed upon me in a literal and outward way. “The spirit is that which quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing.” “The spirit” here is not the spirit of Christ in opposition to his flesh, nor his Divine, in opposition to his human, nature; for it is upon “*the Word made flesh*” that believers feed; but, “the spirit” and “the flesh” are here taken in their generic sense, the former denoting that which is spiritual, and the latter, that which is material. Jesus means that it is the spiritual, not the material, feeding upon himself that gives life.— *The words which I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life.* These words of Jesus contained the true doctrine concerning his person and office. The loving and believing apprehension of them constituted, therefore, the very act of feeding upon him in a spiritual way. Thus they became, to all who truly received them, spirit and life.

that, as Christ's flesh had not descended from heaven, so we cannot conceive of it as ascending up where Christ was before (John 1: 1. 16: 28. 17: 5). But neither of these arguments has any true force. As to the first, it is sufficient to say, that John's omission to notice *in a historic way* (for he does notice it, as here, incidentally) the fact of our Lord's bodily visible ascent to heaven, is to be explained rather from its *universal recognition* as a cardinal truth of Christianity, which made the explicit mention of it unnecessary, than from his ignorance or denial of it. Who, indeed, in his senses, can suppose that the beloved disciple omitted from his Christianity the fact of Jesus's ascent in a bodily form to heaven, which was as universally received by the primitive church as that of his resurrection?

As to the second, it is enough to observe that it was *in the flesh*, and, therefore, in a *bodily visible form*, that the eternal Word ascended up where he was before.

Vs. 64, 65. But there are some of you that believe not. For Jesus knew from the beginning who they were that believed not, and who should betray him. And he said: Therefore said I unto you, that no man can come unto me except it be given unto him of my Father.

Jesus again reiterates what he had already said concerning an unbelieving spirit, and concerning the necessity of Divine grace to a true apprehension and reception of himself. — *But there are some of you that believe not*; as if he had said: I know that my words will be of no avail to some of you, for you are under the control of an unbelieving spirit — *Except it be given unto him of my Father*; the same as, except my Father draw him;¹ except he hear and learn of my Father.²

In bringing the present Article to a close, it may be well to dwell for a few moments upon the question so much agitated by some of the commentators: Why did our Lord exercise so much reserve in explaining the highly figurative language of this discourse? To the multitudes in the synagogue he seems to have offered not a word of explanation. On the contrary, when they took offence at his language, he only reasserted it in stronger terms. It was not till after the close of the address that he gave to his attendants the brief solution: "The spirit is that which quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life." And we find, upon examination, that this accords with his usual mode of dealing with the people. So to the ignorant Samaritan woman he said: "Whosoever drinketh of this water shall thirst again. But whosoever drinketh of the water that I shall give him shall never thirst; but the water that I shall give him shall be in him a well of water springing up into everlasting life;"³ and left her to ponder in her heart the deep meaning of the words. Very similar language he addressed to the multitudes assembled at the feast of tabernacles.⁴ It was not to the multitude, but to his disciples, that he explained the parables of the sower, and of the tares in the field.⁵ His general rule is thus stated by Mark: "And with many such parables spake he the word unto them, as they were able to hear it. But without a parable spake he not unto them: and when they were alone, he expounded all things to his disciples."⁶

¹ V. 44.² V. 45.³ John 4: 13, 14.⁴ John 7: 37—39.⁵ Matt. 13: 13, 36.⁶ Mark 4: 33, 34.

At first thought it might seem best that the figure and the explanatory key should go together. But a little reflection may perhaps convince us that this view is more plausible than profound. Why did Jesus address the multitudes in parables, and not by the plain statement of spiritual truths? It was not certainly because he wished them to remain in ignorance and perish. To many of them this was, indeed, the result, the foreseen result. But it was not the proper end which he proposed to himself in adopting the parabolic method of instruction. That end is sufficiently indicated in the words just quoted: "*As they were able to hear it.*" Their dulness of apprehension is assigned by Jesus himself as the reason why he spake to them in parables.¹ They were not prepared to receive instruction in a more direct form. There was a "needs be," lying not in Jesus's loving and compassionate heart, but in their low and carnal views, why he should veil "the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven" beneath the drapery of parables; although to many with the sad issue (represented by the Saviour as the just penalty of their unteachableness), "that seeing they might see, and not perceive; and hearing they might hear, and not understand; lest at any time they should be converted, and their sins should be forgiven them." Now if we admit the validity of the above reason, assigned by our Lord, why "without a parable spake he not unto them,"² it would seem to be both unreasonable and illogical to demand that he should immediately subjoin an explanation in plain terms. With the disciples, who had already the foundation of a spiritual character, and had made some progress in the apprehension of spiritual truths, this method might be employed, but not with the multitude. In their bosoms the seeds of spiritual truths were to be sown, and they could not receive them, except they were, so to speak, encased in a shell of material images. And the images selected by our Lord have a singular pertinency, as well as a wonderful depth and fulness of meaning. They are, indeed, baskets of silver net-work containing apples of gold. The apparent harshness of some of them, as that of eating Christ, of feeding on his flesh and drinking his blood, constitutes their excellency; for in this lies their strength. No figure less forcible could have been a suitable vehicle for the idea of that inward union with Christ by which

¹ Matt. 13: 13—15. Mark 4: 11, 12. Luke 8: 10.

² Matt. 13: 34.

he becomes the life and nourishment of the soul. It was our Lord's intention that the people should ponder the meaning of these images, and have "great reasoning among themselves" concerning them. Thus all who were of an earnest and teachable spirit, would gradually come to the apprehension of the high truths which they covered, and only the careless and light-minded remain ignorant of their spiritual significance. The premature attempt to unfold their meaning in plain language to the multitude (aside from the fact that some of them pointed to events yet future, and could, therefore, have only a historic interpretation), would have had no other result than that of destroying the shell without feeding the soul with the kernel which it covered. The Divine wisdom of Jesus left to the people themselves the work of enucleating the kernel from the shell, and finding that it was, in very deed, spirit and not flesh. His example in this particular deserves the serious consideration of all religious teachers. In dealing with the ignorant they should be careful lest their laborious explanations, designed to bring everything spiritual within the apprehension of the finite human understanding, prove to be an *eliminating* rather than an *illuminating* process.

ARTICLE III.

ANSELM'S DOCTRINE OF THE INCARNATION AND ATONEMENT.

A TRANSLATION OF THE "CUR DEUS HOMO."

By James Gardiner Vose, Milton, Mass.

[In presenting a translation of this work, it may be proper to give a brief account of the career of its author, and of the manner in which he developed the monastic life and discipline.

Paul of Thebes and Anthony of Alexandria have each been called the father of monasticism. Yet neither the one in his lonely grotto, nor the other in the devout community gathered around him, could have foreseen the system which here had its