

it conceives Christianity ought to be; it does not interpret what Christianity has been and is. And it is because in Paul we have, behind and beneath the thought forms of his time, the classic representation and interpretation of this saving significance of Jesus, that for a true conception of the Jesus of history our cry must be, not 'Back from Paul to Jesus,' but 'Back to Jesus through Paul.'

The aim which the religious-historical movement has set itself, viz. to recommend the gospel to 'the modern mind,' is one with which every good and honest heart must sympathize. A restatement of the Church's faith in terms more suited to modern thought—this is a crying need. For it cannot be denied that many at the present day are estranged from the Church, because of the Church's bondage to the doctrinal formulation of a past age. The Church—the believing community, that is—must assert and exercise its Christian liberty to state its faith as to the meaning and significance of Christ in terms more suited to the modern mind. And towards this restatement the new historical-psychological study of religions has helped not a little by calling men's minds back to the distinc-

tion between religion and theology—between the religious attitude of the soul to Christ, which we call faith, and the doctrinal formulation of the faith. But our quarrel with the movement is, that it gives us not so much a new theology as a *new faith*, a view of Jesus and His Gospel which is true neither to Jesus' own teaching nor to His apostolic witness, and is not the Gospel that sinners need.

In the religious-historical theology we have one more attempt—this time from the side of the historical-psychological science of comparative religion and mythology—to eviscerate Christianity of all that in it is unique or original, and, under the guise of doing right by the genuine historical character of Jesus, find its centre in that which it has in common with other religions. But we cannot accept from any theology, whatever claims it may make to the 'scientific,' a picture of the historical Jesus to which the only history we have bears no witness. Nor can we allow the Jesus whom the history we have does attest, to be dismissed from the world of historical reality on grounds which after all are not historical but 'dogmatic.'

In the Study.

LET NO MAN DESPISE THEE.

The Future Leadership of the Church is the title which Mr. Mott has given to a volume of lectures on the Christian ministry (Hodder & Stoughton; 3s. 6d.). The first chapter contains the problem. The problem is to find ministers and missionaries enough, and to find them of the right kind. One way is to make young men believe in the greatness of this calling. Mr. Mott quotes Woodrow Wilson, President of Princeton University. 'The only profession which consists in being something,' said Dr. Wilson, 'is the ministry of our Lord and Saviour—and it does not consist of anything else. It is manifested in other things, but it does not consist of anything else.'

Mr. Mott believes that it is the home that makes the minister or the missionary. Professor Austin Phelps tells us how his father magnified his office: 'He honestly believed that the pastoral

office has no superior. To be a preacher of the Gospel was a loftier honour than to be a prince of the blood royal. So pervasive was this conviction in the atmosphere of our household that I distinctly remember my resolve, before I was four years old, that I would become a minister.'

But sometimes the eye is opened afterwards to the height of this high calling. 'Principal Rainy of Edinburgh not long before his death told me that the spiritual quickening he received at the time of the great Disruption turned him from his plan of being a physician and made him a minister. He added, "It woke me up. Religion became great in my eyes."'

THE SAINTS.

New Things and Old in St. Thomas Aquinas (Dent; 3s. 6d. net). Is there anything in this? Is there anything in it for the modern pulpit? Mr. H. C. O'Neill has translated certain writings

of the Angelic Doctor, and written a long introduction to them. The introduction is excellent; a useful addition to the literature of St. Thomas. There is no way of describing the contents of the book but by quoting one of the writings translated in it. The title of this one is 'The Saints.' It is an exposition of the words 'so great a cloud of witnesses' in Heb 12¹.

'Now the saints are called clouds, firstly, by reason of the sublimity of their conversation: "*Who are these that fly as clouds?*" (Isa 60⁸). Secondly, because of the fruitfulness of their teaching: "*He bindeth up the waters in his clouds, so that they break not out and fall down together*" (Job 26⁸), and likewise (36²⁷): "*He poureth out the showers like floods that flow from the clouds.*" Thirdly, by reason of the utility of spiritual consolation: for just as the clouds furnish refreshment so also the examples of saints: "*And as a cloud of dew in the day of harvest*". (Isa 18⁴). We have therefore this cloud of witnesses given us, since from the lives of the saints to some extent the necessity of imitating them is brought home to us. "*Take, my brethren, for an example of suffering evil, of labour and patience, the prophets*" (James 5¹⁰). "*As the Holy Spirit speaks in the Scripture, so also in the deeds of the Saints, which are form and precept of life to us*" (Augustine). (*Epis. to Hebr. chap. xii. lect. 1.*)'

ANOTHER MISUNDERSTOOD TEXT.

'And so I remember how the same venerable elder, in reading Psalm ciii, paused after the words, "He will not always chide, neither will he keep his anger for ever," to expound the words as meaning that the Lord will not always limit himself to chiding, but will take much more decisive measures; nor will he much longer keep back his anger, but will launch his thunderbolts of wrath'—J. Allanson Picton, *Man and the Bible*.

PLAGIARISM.

The Muhammadan name for it is 'brand-seeking.' Professor D. B. Macdonald of Hartford has published his Haskell Lectures on Comparative Religion. Professor Macdonald says, 'I am neither metaphysician, psychologist, nor ethicist; I am simply a student of Arabic and of Islām who desires to suggest to those who are

metaphysicians, psychologists and ethicists some of the problems which lie for their science in that vast and so broadly unknown territory.' He discovers and discusses three things in Muhammadanism: first, the reality of the Unseen, that is, of a background to life unattainable to our physical senses. Second, man's relation to this Unseen as to faith and insight therein; that is, the whole emotional religious life ranging from a prayerful attitude and a sense of God's presence to the open vision of the mystic with all its complicated theological consequences. Lastly, the discipline of the traveller on his way to this direct knowledge of the divine and during his life in it.

But Professor Macdonald very modestly calls himself a borrower, and just misses calling himself a plagiarist. That he is not a plagiarist, we know. We know that he is no more of a borrower than he ought to be. Few men have done so much original work in Muslim theology or know so many of its texts at first hand. Yet he almost calls himself a plagiarist, for he opens his new book in this way:—

'You may remember how Robertson of Brighton used to say, speaking of his sermons and their inspiration, "I cannot light my own fire; I must convey a spark from another's hearth." The same idea and the same expression occur in Islām. Muhammad, following the usage and speech of the desert, tells (*Qur'ān*, xx, 10; xxvii, 7) how Moses left his family and went aside to the Burning Bush to seek from it a brand, a *qabas*, for their own fire. Thence *iqtibas*, "brand-seeking," persists in the rhetorical language of Islām, for such borrowing of fire from predecessors. Permit me, then, having both Christian and Muslim authority, to quote, by way of text for these lectures, a couple of sentences from Mr. William James's *Varieties of Religious Experience*, that give very precisely the thesis which I propose to set before you as illustrated in Islām. At the beginning of his third lecture, when approaching the broad question of the reality of the Unseen, he says: "Were one asked to characterize the life of religion in the broadest and most general terms possible, one might say that it consists of the belief that there is an unseen order, and that our supreme good lies in harmoniously adjusting ourselves thereto. This belief and this adjustment are the religious attitude in the soul."

The name of Mr. Macdonald's book is *The*

Religious Attitude and Life in Islam (University of Chicago Press; \$1.75).

ABOUT RESULTS.

Nothing better has been said about results than a saying of Mr. W. L. Watkinson's brought to light by the Editor of the *Christian World Pulpit* and now to be conveniently read in *The Art of Sermon Illustrations* by Mr. H. Jeffs (Clarke; 3s. 6d. net)—by no means the only good thing in that book.

'We ought to know better than to despair over the visible result of spiritual endeavour. During a recent visit to Johannesburg I spent a day at one of the gold-mines. There was immense activity, gangs of workers, clouds of dust, hissing steam, deafening stamps, heaps of quartz, torrents of water and cauldrons of slime; but I came away without having seen a single speck of gold. The engineer touched the bottom of a turbid stream, and exclaimed, "There is a particle"; it was, however, as invisible to me as the same metal usually is on the collection-plate. Yet, when on the return journey our ship anchored at Southampton, we discharged boxes of gold-dust to the tune of a million. Thus to-day our evangelical work proceeds with noise of machinery, smoke and stir, sweat and blood, and a thousand things that are trivial and trying to the carnal eye, but the practical spiritual gain is often depressingly dubious (Isa 55¹¹).'

ABBA, FATHER.

I.

1. There are a few words in our English version of the New Testament which clearly do not belong to the English language. Without including words that are almost proper names, like Aceldama (Ac 1¹⁹), Gabbatha (Jn 19¹³) and Golgotha (Mt 27³³), they are such as corban (Mt 27⁶), mammon (Mt 6²⁴), raca (Mt 5²²), maranatha (1 Co 16²²). The New Testament is written in Greek, and the Greek is translated into English. But these words are Aramaic, which is the dialect of Hebrew that was spoken in Palestine at the time of Christ, and as they have been preserved in the Greek New Testament in their Aramaic form, they have been taken over in that form into English. Among the most noticeable of these foreign expressions are three that occur in St. Mark's Gospel: Talitha cumi (5⁴¹), Ephphatha (7³⁴), and Abba (14³⁶). Let us look at the last example, Abba.

2. The word 'Abba' is found three times in the New Testament, in Mk 14³⁶, Ro 8¹⁵, and Gal 4⁶; and in each case it is followed by the word

'Father' (Gk. ὁ πατήρ). Now 'Abba' itself means Father; so that to a person who could speak both Aramaic and Greek the meaning would be 'Father, Father'; and the Syriac versions have actually found it impossible to avoid the repetition.¹ Why is it, then, that the word for 'Father' is given in all these three passages first in Aramaic and then in Greek?

A number of interesting suggestions have been made.

1. Bishop Lightfoot thinks that our Lord in Gethsemane repeated the name 'Father' as an expression of the earnestness of His prayer, and that He gave it in both languages just because He was acquainted with both. He quotes an instance from Schöttgen of a woman who begins her intreaty to a judge in two words, one Aramaic, the other Greek, and both meaning 'my lord.' And then he recalls the other examples of doubles in the New Testament—Abaddon, Apollyon, in Rev 9¹¹; and satan, devil (*diabolos*) in Rev 12⁹ 20²; and he finds in the combination 'a speaking testimony to that fusion of Jew and Greek which prepared the way for the preaching of the Gospel to the heathen.'² Sanday and Headlam in like manner think that our Lord, 'using familiarly both languages, and concentrating into this word of all words such a depth of meaning, found Himself impelled spontaneously to repeat the word, and that some among His disciples caught and transmitted the same habit.'³

Still more emphatically Salmond says: 'The double title is the utterance of deep emotion. Strong feeling is apt to express itself in reduplicating terms; and in the case of those accustomed to speak at times an acquired tongue, it is the fond vernacular that springs first to the lips in moments of profound or agitated feeling.'⁴

If this is the explanation, the use of the repetition by St. Paul would be either some imitation of its use by our Lord in Gethsemane, or else a like spontaneous outburst of emotion in the thought of the new filial relationship to God which he had found in Christ.

On the supposition that the repetition is due to Jesus Himself, other explanations of it have been given, two of which are worth noticing.

¹ Although it is possible in other languages to leave the Abba simply untranslated as in A.V. and R.V., this has not always been done.

² *Galatians*, p. 169.

³ *Romans*, p. 203.

⁴ *St. Mark*, p. 328.

(1) 'Abba' was probably in the time of Christ, and certainly a little later, applied as a title of reverence to men as well as to God. Several of the Rabbis mentioned in the Mishna and Tosefta have this title¹ of whom the most distinguished is Rabbi Saul. There is a story in the Talmud² to this effect: 'There was a great drought in the land and the Rabbis sent the little children to Hanan the Hidden One, to ask him to pray for rain, and when the little ones came to him they said, "Abba, Abba, Father! Father! give us rain!" Hanan knelt in prayer and cried, "O Master of the World! For the sake of the innocent ones, who know not how to discriminate between the Father who giveth rain and the father who cannot give, but only ask for rain, hear our prayer!"'³

Now it has been suggested that Christ added the Greek word because it was necessary in order to give 'Abba' its unmistakable application to God, and fill the word with its fullest reverence.

(2) On the other hand, Dr. E. A. Abbott⁴ points out that in Greek the article with the nominative when used in addressing a person is often vernacular and imperious, as addressed to a slave. While, therefore, it was possible to use the vocative of the word in the Greek (*πάτερ*) as is done in Luke's version of the Lord's Prayer (11², R.V.), it required the combination of the Aramaic and the Greek, or some other method of the kind, to give the Greek word its proper value when addressed to God. In that case, however, the repetition would not likely be due to Jesus, but would be added by the evangelist or some other.

2. The opinion has been held that our Lord did not repeat the word in Gethsemane, but that the repetition is due to transmission.

(1) The Greek might be an explanation of the Aramaic word inserted by the Evangelist himself, or found in his source, just as in other cases he adds the explanation of Ephphatha and Talitha cumi. But it must be observed that in these cases attention is drawn to the assertion by the words 'which is, being interpreted' or 'that is,' while here there is no such notice given.

(2) Bishop Chase has suggested⁵ that in each of the three occurrences of the expression there is a reference to the first clause of the Lord's Prayer. He thinks the addition of the Greek word is due to

¹ From 'Abba' comes the title Abbot with its cognates; and Kohler claims that the Church simply took it over from the Synagogue.

² See J. Kohler in *J. Q. R.* xiii. (July 1901), p. 567 ff.

³ In *Sanhedrin*, 113b, Elijah is called 'Abba Elijah,' and there is a curious story told of a certain Rabbi who accused him of being quick-tempered because of his treatment of King Ahab. Jastrow thinks that the title 'Abba' is used sarcastically, and Bacher translates 'Väterchen Elias.' But Kohler holds that he is called 'Father Elijah,' just as any other highly venerated Rabbi (*J. Q. R.* xiii. 579).

⁴ *Johannine Grammar*, p. 519.

⁵ *Texts and Studies*, vol. i. No. 3, p. 23.

the Evangelist and that the omission of such a phrase as 'that is' or 'that is, being interpreted' may be accounted for by its incongruity with the context. But his own opinion is that by the time St. Mark's Gospel was written the repetition had become a familiar form of words to Christians in prayer. Now if the Lord's Prayer began with the simple word 'Father,' as in St. Luke, Hebrew Christians would use the Aramaic word and Greek Christians the Greek; whereupon it would become customary to combine the two, and the Prayer might even be known by the combination, just as we call it the *Pater noster*.

(3) In any case it is now held by many expositors that by the time when St. Paul wrote and therefore, of course, when St. Mark wrote, it was customary for Christians to begin their prayer by using both words. It was almost a liturgical formula, just as at the end we sometimes say 'Amen, so let it be.'

II.

I. We have then, as to the origin of the 'Abba, Father,' a choice between two opinions. Either the repetition was due to our Lord in Gethsemane, or else it was due to the fact that the early Christians spoke sometimes Aramaic and sometimes Greek; and that in public prayer it became customary to open with the word 'Father,' according to Christ's command, and to express it at once in both languages. It is of little consequence which opinion we make ours. The important thing is that 'Abba, Father' occurs three times in the New Testament with a meaning which is the same every time but is not fully understood until the three occasions are studied separately and then brought together. The three occasions are these: (1) By Jesus in Gethsemane. The words are: 'And he said, Abba, Father, all things are possible unto thee; remove this cup from me: howbeit not what I will, but what thou wilt' (Mk 14³⁶). (2) By St. Paul, in writing to the Galatians. The words are: 'But when the fulness of time came, God sent forth his Son, born of a woman, born under the law, that he might redeem them which were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons. And because ye are sons, God sent forth the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying, Abba, Father' (Gal 4⁴⁻⁶). (3) By St. Paul to the Romans. The words are: 'For ye received not the spirit of bondage again unto fear;

but ye received the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry Abba, Father. The Spirit himself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are children of God: and if children, then heirs; heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ; if so be that we suffer with him, that we may be also glorified with him' (Ro 8¹⁶⁻¹⁷).

2. Take the thoughts in order.

1. Here are all the persons concerned in redemption: (1) the Father, to whom the cry is made; (2) the Son, who makes the cry for Himself in Gethsemane; (3) the Spirit of the Son, who makes it in the heart of the other sons; (4) the sons themselves, who under the power of the Spirit, cry, 'Abba, Father.'

2. The cry is the cry of a son to a father. That in every case is the whole point and meaning of it. In one case it is the cry of the Only-Begotten Son; in the other cases it is the cry of the adopted sons. But it is always the cry of a son who has the heart of a son. An adopted son might not have the heart of a son. But in each case here the Father says, 'My beloved son,' and the son responds, crying, 'Abba, Father.'

3. The true heart of a son whereby we cry 'Abba, Father' is due to the gift of the Spirit. Look at St. Paul's argument to the Galatians. There he states two things: First, that when the fulness of the time came God sent forth His Son into the world; second, that because we are sons God sent forth the Spirit of His Son into our hearts. Why did God send forth His Son into the world? He sent Him to make us sons. That is the whole purpose in a sentence. The Son fulfilled that purpose. He did not make us all sons, because we did not all receive Him. 'But as many as received him to them gave he the right to become sons.' Then, when we had become sons, God sent the Spirit of His Son into our hearts. This is an additional gift. It is necessary, because without the Spirit of His Son in our hearts we should not be able to feel that we were sons, we should not be able to respond as sons, we should not be able to behave as sons. After Jesus rose from the dead He ascended to the Father. He had done the work which God had sent Him to do. To as many as received Him He had given the right to become sons, and they had become sons. But they were not conscious yet of their sonship. They were not conscious of it until that day, the day of Pentecost, upon which God sent

forth the Spirit of His Son into their hearts. Then they became conscious of their sonship. They cried, 'Abba, Father,' and the place was shaken where they were assembled together. And they said to the rulers who threatened them, 'Whether it is right in the sight of God to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye; for we cannot but speak.' Thus to the fulness of sonship two gifts are necessary—the gift of the Son unto the world to make us sons, and the gift of the Spirit of the Son into our hearts to make us conscious of our sonship.

3. What are the advantages of receiving the Spirit of God's Son into our hearts? That is another way of asking, what is the Spirit of God's Son?

1. *It is a spirit of knowledge.* We come to know God as the Son knows Him. Now the Son knows God as Father. God was not known as Father before Jesus came into the world. We must say that with full responsibility, and yet with emphasis. The relationship of father to son is applied in the Old Testament metaphorically to the relationship of Jehovah to the nation of Israel, and even to the individual Israelite. But it is merely a figure of speech. It is a rhetorical comparison; and in all the Old Testament there are only sixteen passages in which the comparison is used, while in the New Testament God is called our Father, or we are called His children two hundred and sixty-three times.¹ In the time of Christ the Jewish Rabbis were careful *not* to speak of God as Father,² but used some periphrasis in order to avoid it. The name which Jesus preferred to use, and which He taught His disciples to use, when addressing God was 'Father.' Dalman thinks it probable that He always said '*my* Father.' For no doubt He used the word Abba, speaking Aramaic; and properly 'Abba' is not simply 'Father,' but '*my* Father.' Therefore the Spirit of God's Son is the knowledge of God as Father, as my Father. And to address God as '*my* Father' is to receive new knowledge of God, with the sense of a new and wonderful experience.

When Paul says, 'Ye received the spirit of adoption, in which we cry, Abba, Father. The spirit itself bears witness with our spirit that we are children of God; because ye are sons, God sent forth the spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying, Abba, Father'; and when John says, 'Behold what

¹ See the statistics set forth in Dr. James Drummond's *Hibbert Lectures*, p. 173 ff.

² Dalman, *Words of Jesus*, p. 191.

manner of love the Father has given us that we should be called children of God'; it seems clear that the writers are referring to some new experience, which had imparted to their minds a holy exaltation, and awakened within them the consciousness of a hitherto unacknowledged relationship. The semi-pantheistic absorption of the soul in the essence of God had become the conscious intercommunion of Father and child; philosophy had turned into faith; and to become a perfect son of God was not only the intellectual ideal, but the operative aim and purpose of life.¹

2. *It is a spirit of confidence.* This is the immediate result of the knowledge of God as Father. And it is the object of all Christ's teaching about the Father to beget this confidence. 'Fear not, little flock, your Father knoweth.' It is confidence both in His power and in His willingness. His power was recognized already. The God of Israel was known as the Almighty God. The Spirit of God's Son reasserts His power. 'Abba, Father, all things are possible unto thee.' The new knowledge is that the Almighty God is a loving Father, withholding no good thing from us. When the leper came to Jesus, saying, 'If thou wilt, thou canst,' he recognized, like Nicodemus, that Jesus was a Prophet come from God, because He had the power of God. His hesitation as to Christ's willingness was due to his ignorance of God's Fatherhood.

3. *It is a spirit of liberty.* This is St. Paul's point, both in Galatians and in Romans. But there is a difference. In Galatians it is liberty from the bondage of the Law that he emphasizes; in Romans it is liberty from the bondage of the flesh, from sin and death. (1) The Spirit of God's Son is a spirit of liberty from the Law simply because it is a spirit of sonship. If there are slaves in the household they must be governed by laws—'Thou shalt not.' But who ever heard of a father drawing up a code of rules of conduct for his children? If they have the heart of children it is a heart of love; and they need no other constraint than the love of the father. It is a great point with the Apostle that the sons of God are not under law. He spoke and wrote often about it although there was so much to do in the way of making men sons. (2) But liberty from the law is not liberty to do the deeds of the flesh. The Spirit of God's Son is liberty from habits of

sin, even from any desire or motion towards sinfulness. It is the liberty that gives us courage to say in every temptation, 'Get thee behind me, Satan.'

4. *It is a spirit of obedience.* 'Howbeit, not my will, but thine be done.' My will?—Yes, because it is a spirit of liberty. The Son of God said, 'My will' in Gethsemane. And when the sons of God receive the Spirit of God's Son they can say 'My will' for the first time in reality. But 'our wills are ours to make them thine.' 'Not my will, but thine be done.' There is a cup put into our hands. We shrink from it. Shall we drink it? Our wills are ours. Yes, we shall drink it. We may say, and we may say it with something of the deep emotion of a Gethsemane, 'Abba, Father, let this cup pass from me'; but we shall add, 'Nevertheless, not my will, but thine be done.'

In their great reprint of Wyclif's Bible, published in Oxford in 1850, Forshall & Madden give some illustrations to show the courage that was necessary to translate the Bible in Wyclif's days. From a manuscript volume preserved in Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, they quote the apprehension which one unnamed translator felt: 'Brother, I knowe wel, that I am holde by Crystis lawe to parfome thyn axinge, bote natheles we beth now so fer yfallen away fram Cristis lawe, that if Y wolde answeere to thyn axingus, I moste in cas vnderfonge the deth; and thu wost wel, that a man is yholden to kepe his lyfe as longe as he may. And perawnter it is spedful, to holden oure pes awhile, tyl that God foucheth saf, that his wille be yknowe.'

I said, Let us walk in the fields;
He said, No, walk in the town.
I said, There are no flowers there;
He said, No flowers, but a crown.

I said, But the skies are black,
There is nothing but noise and din;
And He wept as He sent me back—
There is more, He said, there is sin.

I said, But the air is thick,
And fogs are veiling the sun.
He answered, Yet souls are sick,
And souls in the dark undone.

I said, I shall miss the light,
And friends will miss me, they say.
He answered, Choose to-night,
If I am to miss you, or they.

I pleaded for time to be given.
He said, Is it hard to decide?
It will not seem hard in heaven
To have followed the steps of your guide.

¹ Drummond, *Hibbert Lectures*, p. 172.