

no cunning of the wildest fox in the world will prevail to hinder Him. He is doing His work to-day; He will do it to-morrow; and He will go on doing it until the day comes when He is able to look back upon it and say, 'It is finished.' We are told that one of the articles in the creed of General Gordon was the providence of God. General Gordon's belief in God's providence sent him into the thick of the battle without a tremor. Jesus believes in God's providence also. He is absolutely confident that there is no power upon earth that will for one moment hinder Him from carrying on the work which the Father has given Him to do until He has accomplished it.

But the providential care of the Father does not ensure a career of uninterrupted prosperity. 'Howbeit I must go on my way to-day and to-morrow and the day following: for it cannot be that a prophet perish out of Jerusalem.' No man may look for uninterrupted prosperity. Jesus does not. The only difference is that *He* knows when the sorrow will enter His life, and where. He must go on His way. It is something more than 'continue His journey,' but it includes that. We do not know where

the way is leading us. He does. It is leading Him to Jerusalem. For even apart from His knowledge of all the things that will befall Him, does not history itself declare that Jerusalem is the prophets' cemetery?

But this does not mean that, after all, Herod or the wily Pharisees are to have their way with Him. It means that the sorrow and the suffering are part of the work which the Father has given Him to do. When Pilate said, 'Knowest thou not that I have power to release thee, and have power to crucify thee?' He answered, 'Thou wouldest have no power against me, except it were given thee from above.' Pilate was an instrument in the hand of God. And now also neither Herod nor the Pharisees can have any power over Him except as their power over Him is part of God's plan for His life and for the redemption of the world. I continue my work, He says, altogether regardless of this cunning fox of yours, and I will continue it till it is finished; nevertheless, I know that I must go on my way towards Jerusalem, for it is the will of the Father that one day soon I should die there at the hand of the rulers of My people.

The Self-Consciousness of Jesus and the Servant of the Lord.

BY PROFESSOR THE REV. H. A. A. KENNEDY, M.A., D.Sc., TORONTO.

II.

The Attitude of the New Testament Writers.

LEAVING aside for the moment the evidence afforded by the Evangelists, let us very briefly review the attitude of the New Testament writers towards the conception of the Servant. Assuming that the early chapters of Acts give a substantially accurate account of Peter's preaching, we find him describing Jesus as the Servant (τὸν παῖδα) of God: 'The God of our fathers glorified his

servant Jesus' (3¹³);¹ 'God, having raised up his servant, sent him to bless you' (3²⁶). In 4²⁷ He is called 'thy holy servant Jesus'; and in 3¹⁴ He is spoken of as 'the holy and righteous one.' The epithet 'righteous' marks Him out in 7⁵² and 22¹⁴. There seems to be more than an accidental con-

¹ Is 52¹³: ἰδοὺ συνήσει ὁ παῖς μου . . . καὶ δοξασθήσεται σφόδρα.

nexion between these expressions and the combination 'my righteous servant' in Is 53¹¹. And the same idea is found in 42⁶: 'I have called thee [*i.e.* the Servant] in righteousness.' All these passages, therefore, obviously presuppose the identification of Jesus with the prophetic Servant of Jehovah in the early Apostolic Age. The designation 'Servant' has been used more than once by Peter. It is significant that the most striking recollection of the Ebed-Jahweh Songs in the New Testament is found in the First Epistle of Peter: *e.g.* 2²², 'Who did no sin, nor was guile found in his mouth' [the precise reading of \aleph^{ca} A Q in the LXX as against B]; 2²⁴, 'Who himself bare our sins . . . by whose stripes ye were healed. For ye were going astray like sheep.' Possibly this coincidence should be taken into account in determining the authenticity of 1 Peter. Paul's soteriology is steeped in the thought of Is 53. It is rather the general colour of his utterances than verbal quotations which is significant. The latter are certainly to be found, as, *e.g.*, Ro 4²⁵, 'Who was delivered up for our trespasses = Is 53¹², $\delta\iota\alpha\ \tau\acute{\alpha}\varsigma\ \acute{\alpha}\nu\omicron\mu\iota\acute{\alpha}\varsigma\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \pi\alpha\rho\epsilon\delta\acute{\omicron}\theta\eta$); Ro 5¹⁹ || Is 53¹¹; Ro 8^{33, 34} || Is 50⁸. Further, in describing the operation of the Gospel of Christ in Ro 10¹⁴⁻¹⁸, he quotes directly from Is 52 and 53. But the entire background of his conception of the virtue of the death of Christ is only explicable in the light of Is 53 (cf. also Phil 2⁷).¹ Additional traces of the influence of this prophecy may be found in Hebrews and 1 John.

A good deal of loose thinking has been indulged in, with reference to the New Testament identification of Jesus with the Servant of Jehovah. We are told that the early Christians, for apologetic purposes, seized upon the description of the Servant in Deutero-Isaiah, to account for the shameful death of their own Messiah, a disgrace which would be flung in their faces by the Jews. This idea belongs to that atomistic conception of the Divine purpose of redemption, to which the name of scientific theology is, in many quarters, restricted. Kautzsch speaks, without exaggeration, of 'the solitary glory of Deutero-Isaiah' (*H.D.B.*, Extra Vol. p. 706). That means that in this book the O.T. conception of God's redemptive purpose and

its operations has reached the crowning-point of its development. Is it not self-evident that the fresh illumination of this purpose which appears in the N.T. must, of necessity, stand in relation to the earlier? The fundamental requirement of N.T. interpretation at the present time is a more truly philosophical view of Revelation. If the moral order of the world is that which gives meaning and organic unity to history, then the process by which men's spiritual ideals are heightened must be conceived, not in sections, but as a living whole. From this standpoint it would have been unintelligible if the Apostles, who had been brought by personal experience into contact with the redemptive facts in the career of their Lord, had not related that unique disclosure of God, which transformed the world for them, to those O.T. foreshadowings which showed so intimate a kinship with it. Modern scholars are never weary of emphasizing the influence of the O.T. in early Christianity. That implies that these Christians were saturated with its spiritual ideas. Hence there could be nothing arbitrary or accidental in the identification of the Suffering Servant with Him in whom they had found the Christ of God. To have ignored the intimate connexion would have been to miss the unifying links in the history of salvation. The very fact that the identification was so inevitable is sufficient to justify that interpretation of Christ's work which it helped to suggest. It may therefore be affirmed that, in the interview of Philip with the Ethiopian treasurer (Ac 8²⁷⁻³⁸), the missionary was not led astray by a vagary of exegesis, but was true to historical fact, when he 'began at the same scripture (Is 53⁷⁻⁸), and preached unto him Jesus.'

Before we approach the centre of our subject, we must refer to one or two important passages in the Gospels. Chief among these are Mt 8^{16, 17}, 'And he cast out the spirits with a word, and healed all that were sick, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken through Isaiah the prophet, saying, Himself took our infirmities, and bare our diseases'; and Mt 12^{16f.}, 'He charged them that they should not make him known: that it might be fulfilled which was spoken through Isaiah the prophet, saying, Behold, my servant whom I have chosen; my beloved in whom my soul is well pleased: I will put my Spirit upon him, and he shall declare judgment to the Gentiles. He shall not strive, nor cry; neither shall any man

¹ Baldensperger's statement that 'the Apostolic Church, apart from the Synoptics, refers extraordinarily seldom to Is 53' (*Selbst-bewusstsein Jesu*, ed. 2, p. 145 note) should be checked in view of the actual facts.

hear his voice in the streets: a bruised reed shall he not break, and smoking flax he shall not quench, until he bring forth judgment to victory. And in his name shall Gentiles hope.' W. C. Allen ('Matthew' in *I. C. C.*, p. lxii), in a careful examination of the quotations in the First Gospel, shows that the first passage 'is an independent translation from the Hebrew,' while the second 'is from the Hebrew, with reminiscence of the LXX in the last clause, or more probably from a current Greek version . . . already implied in Mk 1¹¹.' On the basis of his investigation, he concludes 'that the eleven quotations [in Matthew] introduced by a formula . . . were already current when the editor compiled his work in a Greek form. They may come from a collection of Old Testament passages regarded as prophecies of events in the life of the Messiah.' This hypothesis had already been suggested. It is of great importance in the present discussion, for if, as is highly probable, the collection of passages 'originated in Jewish Christian, i.e. probably in Palestinian circles' (*loc. cit.*), it testifies to the general drift of opinion as to the relation between the Songs of the Servant and Jesus, in extremely conservative circles, and at an early date.

For it has to be carefully noted that at this period, Jewish theology was not *accustomed* to interpret the Servant-passages Messianically. We must linger for a little on this point, as it affects not only the present but also the subsequent course of our discussion. Keen controversy has surrounded this problem. A good many rash statements have been made on both sides.¹ The usual confusion has been introduced by the precarious practice of using as evidence quotations from Jewish treatises which belong to much later dates than the first century A.D. The habit has been unfortunately encouraged by Weber's *Jüdische Theologie*, which groups Rabbinic dicta under theological headings, without any regard for chronology. The labour spent in compiling that work is thereby rendered, to a large extent, useless. It is highly desirable that N.T. students should check Weber's conclusions, so far as that

is possible, by the thoroughly scientific collections of material in W. Bacher's works, in which the Rabbinic teachings are arranged under the names of their authors, and in chronological order.

Edersheim, for example, quotes from the treatise *Jalkut* comments on Is 49⁸ 52¹³ 53⁵ etc., to show that Jewish interpreters believed in a Messiah who should suffer for the sins of the people (*Life and Times of Jesus*, ii. p. 726 ff.; i. p. 160 ff.). But when it is borne in mind that the *Jalkut* is not earlier than the eleventh century A.D., and that long before that date, Jewish commentators, in their fierce disputes with Christians, were driven to extremities in attempting to vindicate the Old Testament, at all hazards, for themselves, and simply expressed private opinions (see Lagarde, *Symmikta*, vol. ii. p. 13, quoted by Cheyne), it is obvious that great caution must be used in founding arguments on such evidence. Thus, to take a further example, in a passage from the treatise *Siphre*, quoted by Raymund Martini, R. Jose, the Galilæan, is represented as saying: 'The King Messiah is humiliated and debased on account of the renegades, as it is said, He is pierced for our iniquity, etc. (Is 53⁵). How much more, therefore, will he make satisfaction for all generations, as it is written: And the Lord made him bear the guilt of us all (Is 53⁶).' As a matter of fact, the words are not found in existing texts of the *Siphre*, so they were, in all likelihood, an interpolation due to the exigencies of controversy.

A good deal of stress has been laid on some admissions of Trypho the Jew as to a suffering Messiah in Justin Martyr's *Dialogue with Trypho*, 294 C, D; 317 A, C. Apparently Trypho is willing to allow the reference of Is 53⁷ to the Messiah. But, as Baldensperger instructively points out (*Selbst-bewusstsein Jesu*, ed. 2, p. 147), this conception of a suffering Messiah is only found *after* the destruction of Jerusalem (A.D. 70). That fact is highly significant. The desolation of Jerusalem was classed among 'the woes of Messiah,' and the Messiah Himself as part of the living organism of the people was conceived as sharing in their sufferings. But even the conception so explained was no more than a scholastic idea. Schürer, who emphasizes Trypho's admissions, allows that the view, which he traces to the idea of the surplus sufferings of the righteous being credited to the people as a

¹ I have not had access to Neubauer and Driver's *The Jewish Interpreters of Isaiah* 53. Apparently the main issue of this collection of passages is that there was no binding tradition: it simply contains 'the anti-Christian interpretations of individual Jews' (Cheyne, *Isaiah*, vol. ii. p. 272).

whole, never became prevalent. Nor does there seem to be in any Rabbinic writing the slightest reference to an atoning character in the sufferings of the Messiah. In this connexion, it is worthy of note that in one of the oldest Rabbinic works, the Targum of Jonathan on the Prophets, whose origin is in the first century B.C., although its final form belongs to the fifth century A.D., the 52nd and 53rd chapters of Isaiah are referred to the Messiah. But the interpretation given entirely distorts the original sense. Thus, the humiliation of the Servant is explained of the people, and his vicarious suffering toned down to an intercession (see Schürer, *Geschichte*, ed. 3, vol. ii. p. 556). 'The year 70 A.D. only marks the first stage on the path of suffering for the Messiah. The study of Scripture urged them [*i.e.* Jewish scholars] on in this direction' (Baldensperger, *op. cit.* p. 149).¹

¹ Dr. C. H. H. Wright has pointed out that there are various allusions to Is 53 in the *Wisdom of Solomon*. But it is evident from their character that the author did not regard the prophecy as Messianic (*Expositor*, iii. 7, pp. 368-372).

These facts are sufficient to show that the transformation in the conception of the Messiah was due to none other than Jesus Himself. The effect of the transformation is visible from the manner in which the disciples received the announcements of the Passion. These men were certainly good representatives of devout Jewish society. They must have been well acquainted with the Messianic beliefs and expectations of their time. They were more ready than most of their contemporaries to welcome a spiritual view of Messiah's functions. And yet, after they have made their great confession by the lips of Peter, they are struck with sheer horror at the thought of the rejection and cruel death of Jesus. Such an attitude would be inexplicable, if the thought of a suffering Messiah were, in any sense, recognized in the current theology. Jesus, therefore, revolutionized the prevailing conception of Messiah by deliberately associating His own career as the Anointed of God with a course of suffering, shame, and death.

Here we reach the centre of our investigation.

Freedom by the Knowledge of the Truth.

BY THE REV. EDWARD WILLIAM WINSTANLEY, B.D., INSPECTOR OF RELIGIOUS EDUCATION IN THE DIOCESE OF LICHFIELD.¹

'The truth shall make you free.'—John viii. 32.

THE scene in which these words were uttered by our Lord, as it is depicted in the Fourth Gospel, is an interesting one. Jesus had been speaking in allusive terms of His going away, home to the Father, and had emphasized the truth of Him that sent Him, and therefore the truth of His own message; but the real meaning of His utterance was unperceived. Yet, as He spoke of the perfect harmony of will between Himself and the Father, many, we are told, believed on Him. Then, to those who were Jews, who had attained to a lower degree of apprehension of His message and His person, a lower phase of that process of 'believing' whose end is 'life,' He enunciates this separating test, this broad principle, coupled with a far-reaching promise: 'Ye, if ye abide in the logos

¹ Preached before the University of Cambridge, 16th January 1908.

that is mine, in my word, truly are my disciples; and ye shall come to know the truth, and the truth shall make you free.' We recall the words of the Stoic slave, 'I have come to know God's commandments . . . henceforth no man can lead me captive.' But, with an outburst of national exclusiveness, a glow of ancestral pride, the hearers seize on the word 'free' in its temporal significance, and leave unnoted the spiritual conception of the truth so rich in ever-developing fruitfulness.

However, the misinterpretation of these 'Jews' throws light for the readers and for us upon the meaning of the truth. For that same spiritual liberty that crowns the Christian's growing assurance, his increasing knowledge of the truth, is also a boon and an activity attributed to the work of the Son—'If therefore the Son shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed.' The truth, then, in its