

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_expositor-series-1.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php)

anchorage in God, innumerable entities may possibly be admitted to a participation in the Divine aeon. But what interest in the favour of God can belong to falsehood, to malignity, to impurity? To invest *them* with aeonian privileges, is in effect, and by its results, to distrust and to insult the Deity. Evil would *not* be evil, if it had that power of self-subsistence which is imputed to it in supposing its aeonian life to be co-eternal with that which crowns and glorifies the good.

---

ST. ANDREW.

COMMENTATORS have often pointed out<sup>1</sup> that, in all the lists<sup>2</sup> of the Twelve Apostles given in the New Testament, they are divided into three groups of four each; and that each of these groups has some common, notable, and distinguishing characteristic. In the first group, or quaternion, we have the natural leaders, the born princes and rulers of the Apostolic Company; the men of largest make, and most conspicuous gifts, and most fervent devotion; men capable of guiding and inspiring their associates—Peter and Andrew, James and John, the sons of Jona and the sons of Zebedee. In the second group we have four reflective and naturally sceptical men, men who must see before they can believe, men who require proof, and at times both require too much proof and are a little hopeless of getting it—Philip and Thomas, Nathanael and Matthew. In the last group we have men of a practical and business turn, the ministers, managers, servants of the Company, men with a keen eye for seeing “where a nail

<sup>1</sup> Cf. THE EXPOSITOR, vol. i. pp. 29 *et seq.*

<sup>2</sup> St. Matt. x. 2-4; St. Mark iii. 16-19; St. Luke vi. 14-16; Acts i. 13.

will go," and a faculty for driving it home—James the bishop, Jude the Hearty, Simon the Zealot, and Iscariot the market-man and treasurer.

Such a division of "the glorious company" into likeminded groups was natural and inevitable. Take any twelve men you please, set them to some great enterprize which will task and occupy their best energies, and it will not be long before they begin to associate and group themselves according to their several affinities, this man drawing to that by a law of natural selection, each finding his co-mate or co-efficient for himself; nor will it be long before the more bold and adventurous spirits among them, the men of clearest insight and heaviest weight, the most original and enthusiastic, come to the front and take the lead. It is not improbable even that, in any such company, the very three characteristic groups of the Apostolic Company will reappear. Besides the men who originate and lead the movement, who attract and inspire and command, there will be the men who think and write, who, having themselves been convinced by argument and proof, find arguments for the cause; the men who bring it to the test of reason and experience and common sense, who record the progress of the movement and vindicate it against all gainsayers. And to these there will almost inevitably be added the practical men of a business turn who work out the plans of the leaders to their minutest details, who collect and administer the funds of the movement, who are quick to see opportunities and to seize on them, who know how to take advantage of every turn of events, every change in public opinion, and to save their more thoughtful and reflective companions from being either

too timid or too rash. Such a grouping of the associates in any public enterprize is natural, common, reasonable; and therefore we need not be surprized to find these three groups in the Company of the Apostles, but should rather look for them and expect them.

Andrew was of the first group. In all the lists he is named with Peter and James and John. And, as I have said, this first group was composed of men whose capacity and force of character qualified them to lead the rest; men of larger natural make, more bold, adventurous, original, of a more heroic stamp, a more fervent and intense faith, a more passionate devotion; men who went by intuition rather than by reflection, men of a sublime enthusiasm rather than practical men of affairs. But when we have placed a man in his proper group, and have noted the characteristics of that group, we have by no means done with him, by no means explained and accounted for him. There is still much in him which we need to study, and which will probably yield us valuable instruction. In addition to the qualities he has in common with others, there are qualities peculiar to himself; and it is these which are the true *differentiæ*, the individualizing and specially instructive characteristics of the man. When we have got him into his true class, therefore, our next question is—What place does he hold in that class? and for what reason does he hold it?

We know too little of most of the Apostles to carry our analysis of them very far, to determine with much exactness what they were like individually. Probably we know at least half a dozen of them better than we know Andrew, or have at least formed more definite

conceptions of them—Peter, John, and James, for example, and Philip, Thomas, Matthew, and Iscariot. But there is one fact in the history of St. Andrew which is very striking when once we take note of it; very pathetic, I think, when we reflect on it. He is always reckoned in the first group of the Apostles, and that *after* the death of Christ<sup>1</sup> as well as before, and yet he does not always, nor commonly, stand in the front rank. Of the first four only *three* were admitted to the innermost circle of our Lord's confidence and affection. When He raised the Ruler's little daughter from the dead; when He talked with Moses and Elias on the Mount, and his essential glory shone through the accidents of his human form; when He endured the bitter agony of Gethsemane which strengthened Him for the passion of the Cross, only Peter and James and John were with him, not Andrew. And on these notable and eventful occasions, the innermost Three are spoken of in a tone which leaves the impression on our mind, and has left it on the mind of Christendom, that our Lord habitually chose them to be with Him in the highest moment of his power and glory or in the most sacred moments of his anguish. Where was Andrew then? and why was *he* left out?

Andrew was probably the very first disciple whom Jesus drew to Himself. He was certainly one of the first two.<sup>2</sup> It was he who first found his own brother Simon, and brought him to Jesus, just as it was John who brought his brother James. He is never excluded from the first group, never bidden to take a lower place, never classed with Philip and Thomas, for instance. And yet he is quietly dropped out from the

<sup>1</sup> Acts i. 13.

<sup>2</sup> St. John i. 35-41.

company of his natural and admitted associates whenever there is to be a special manifestation of the Divine Glory or Love. Why? Was there something lacking in the man after all, so that, while he was worthy to rank in the first four of our Lord's disciples and friends, he was not worthy of the special intimacy vouchsafed to the first three, with whom he is nevertheless constantly grouped, as though he stood, and was worthy to stand, on the same level with them?

This, naturally, is our first impression—that, able and gifted and honoured as he was, he must have lacked some quality of greatness which the other three possessed, some quality which fitted them for an honour he was not able to sustain; and this, for aught I know to the contrary, may be the true impression. There is much to suggest and confirm it. For we know our Lord too well to believe that He withholds from any man any gift which he is able to use for his own welfare or the welfare of others, any manifestation of love or power which he is capable of turning to good account. If, therefore, Andrew was excluded from the most intimate circle of fellowship with Christ, we can only conclude that he was *self*-excluded; that there was some defect, some "little rift," in his character, which unfitted him for that grace.

And, possibly, this defect may have been that he was of a spirit less open and quick, less bold and adventurous, than the other three—as it must have been that he was in some way a lesser man. For, after he became a disciple, we never find him taking the lead in anything. Little is recorded of him, indeed; but what little there is is not of the same quality as that recorded of Peter and John, and even of James. He

does not take the initiative as they do, and, significantly enough, on the only two occasions on which he speaks he is more or less coupled with Philip; Philip being, as I have said, the leader of the reflective and sceptical group, of the men who must see, and think, and ask questions, before they can believe. On the first of these occasions we may even detect in his words an echo of their characteristic tone. When our Lord was about to multiply the loaves and fishes, seeing, I suppose, that Philip was calculating how much it would cost to feed that great multitude—and perhaps seeing also that Philip was discussing his calculation with Andrew—He asks him, “Where shall we buy food, that these may eat?” By the very promptitude of his reply Philip shews that he *had* been counting up the cost, and has arrived at the conclusion that “two hundred pence”<sup>1</sup> will hardly do it. Then, as if the two had been speculating on ways and means, Andrew<sup>2</sup> strikes in with the suggestion, “Here is a lad who has five barley loaves and two small fishes.” And, no doubt, both the loaves and the fishes looked even smaller than they were to Andrew; for, in the very tone of Philip and his group, he asks, sceptically and despairingly, “*But what are these among so many?*” Yet he had seen water made into wine, and the wine multiplied till it met all needs, at Cana of Galilee, and should not therefore have distrusted the power of the grace of Christ.

On the second occasion it is the reflective, rather than the sceptical, tone of Philip which appears in Andrew. As our Lord was passing through the Court of the Gentiles on his way from the Temple, certain

<sup>1</sup> About £7 of our money.

<sup>2</sup> St. John vi. 8, 9.

Greeks—Greeks, and yet no doubt proselytes, or they would not have been in the Temple—intimated their wish to *see, i. e.*, to speak with Him.<sup>1</sup> Only on the previous day Jesus had cleared this Court of the Gentiles from the traffic and merchandize by which it was transformed into “a den of thieves,” and had declared the Temple to be “a house of prayer for all nations.” It was not unnatural, therefore, that certain Greeks should desire to know something more of the Jewish Rabbi who affirmed that the Temple was meant for them, and not only for the Jews. They mention their wish to Philip, Philip mentions it to Andrew; and, again, “Andrew and Philip tell Jesus.”

In this brief record we have to note (1) that Andrew and Philip were the only two Apostles whose common names were Greek;<sup>2</sup> and that it was therefore very natural that the Greeks should apply to them, or to one of them, for an introduction to Jesus, as they might well suppose that men with Greek names would be, if not Greeks themselves, at least friendly to the Greeks. (2) That the sacred historian is careful not to name Philip simply, but to describe him as “Philip, who was of Bethsaida of Galilee,” for Galilee was a half-heathenized province, and there were many Gentiles in Bethsaida; so that these Greeks may have come from Bethsaida, or from some of the Greek cities of the neighbouring Decapolis, and may have felt that they had the claim of neighbours on Philip. But Andrew was also of Bethsaida, and bare a Greek name; so that when Philip brought the Greeks to him, they may have felt no less at home with him than with Philip.

<sup>1</sup> St. John xii. 20-22.

<sup>2</sup> Thomas was also called *Didymus*, but not commonly.

(3) That Philip *does* bring them to Andrew, as if he felt that Andrew stood nearer to Jesus than himself, was in a more intimate fellowship with Him, and would be likely to know more of his mind and of what would be acceptable to Him. So that here we have the very leader of the second group of Apostles paying a certain deference to the last and least favoured in the first group. (4) That, in all probability, both Andrew and Philip had reflected more on the universalism of the Old Testament than some other of the Apostles, since they do not scruple to bring even Greeks to *their* Master; and so were more ready to catch the universal tone in his own teaching, and to believe that He was the Saviour of all men, and not only the Redeemer of the Jews.

From all which we may gather that, if Andrew was less favoured than Peter and John and James, if he did not belong to the first three, he was indubitably recognized as belonging to the first *four*. And, perhaps, we may also infer that what kept him from ranking with the first three was that he was of a slower, a more reflective and doubtful, temperament than they were; that, though a leader in the Apostolic Company, he was less of a leader—less bold, less original, less adventurous—than the other men of the group to which he belonged.

Two other indications of his character and position may be found in the Gospels which confirm this view of him. On the one hand it is a singular fact, and surely denotes a certain qualified inferiority, that he is commonly called not Andrew simply, but Andrew, "*Simon Peter's brother*." I confess I have sometimes felt it was a little hard on him that even from the first,

before Peter had risen to his primacy among the Apostles, Andrew should be thus described ; that even when we are told of the very first two men who left the Baptist to follow Jesus,<sup>1</sup> it should be said, "One of the two who followed him was Andrew, *Simon Peter's brother*," although at that time Peter did not know that the Messiah had come. For we know what is implied when a man is commonly described as So-and-So's son, or brother, or father, or husband. As a rule that mode of designation indicates not only that the person of whom it is used is less known, but that he is also less worthy to be known ; that he is of a character less conspicuous and remarkable than the other to whom he is, as it were, appended. And though we should wrong Andrew were we to consider him as simply an appendage to Simon Peter, yet we can hardly escape the conclusion that there was in some sense *less of him*, or *less in him*, than there was in his brother, though what there was may have been of the same fine quality.

That he *was* a man of fine quality and stamp is proved by the fact that he is placed and kept in the first group, among the Apostolic leaders. From that place he never fell. And, indeed, St. Mark tells us of an incident that occurred in the very last week of our Lord's ministry, which shews conclusively that to the end Andrew was singled out for a special, though not for the most special, intimacy and favour.<sup>2</sup> When our Lord sat on Olivet, over against the Temple, and spoke to his disciples of the time when the Temple should be destroyed and the Jews be scattered to the ends of the earth, we read that it was "Peter and James and John *and Andrew*" who asked Him privately, "When shall

<sup>1</sup> St. John i. 40.

<sup>2</sup> St. Mark xiii. 3.

these things be?" This is the only occasion on which, except in mere lists of names, Andrew is associated with the first three; but he *is* associated with them here, as one who was admitted to a closer privacy with Christ than others: so that even to the end he kept his place, although he was not always *in* his place, and does not give so many signs as his immediate associates of an original and ruling mind.

It may be thought that we hear little more of James than of Andrew, that John's brother occupies a no more conspicuous place than Peter's brother. But that is not so. James is *always* associated with Peter and John when our Lord is about to make any special manifestation of his glory or of his grace, whereas Andrew is not. And, moreover, whenever James appears in word or action, he shews a specially bold, forward, adventurous nature. No second place would have contented *him*. Once, with John, he wants to call down fire from heaven on the Samaritans who would not receive Christ.<sup>1</sup> Once, he begs that he and John may sit, the one on the one side, and the other on the other side, of Christ when He ascends the throne of his glory.<sup>2</sup> And when, in after years, Herod Agrippa began to bestir himself against the Church, the very first man he laid hold of was this "son of thunder," whom he "killed with the sword"<sup>3</sup>—fastening on *him* even before he arrested Peter, and fastening on him, possibly, as at that time, and in some ways, the more bold and prominent of the two.

No, St. Andrew stands by himself. He, and he alone, takes the pathetic attitude of one who is *in* the first group, and yet not altogether of it; not of it in

<sup>1</sup> St. Luke ix. 54.

St. Mark x. 35-37.

<sup>3</sup> Acts xii. 2.

the same full sense as the other three, and therefore not admitted either to the Mount of Transfiguration or to the Garden of Gethsemane, not witnessing either the highest glory or the profoundest grief of the Master and Friend whom nevertheless he loved so well. And the reason of the attitude is as pathetic as the attitude itself, if it be, as I suppose it was, that he was of a less prompt, active, adventurous temperament than his associates; more reflective, more disposed to ask questions and raise doubts and look on both sides the shield: in short, a man with a touch of Hamlet in his blood.

Such men are common enough, and wear many forms. Most of us, I suppose, have known men of the highest powers who somehow have not risen to the highest place, who were passed again and again by men of far inferior faculties and gifts to themselves. And we can hardly read the biography or letters of any admittedly great man without finding that *he* knew of some man far greater than himself—more learned, or more wise, or more original—of larger capacities and loftier nature and wider scope. Yet *these* were men of whom the world never heard; they made no public or no conspicuous mark, although pronounced greater by those whom the world esteemed its greatest. Sometimes, no doubt, these men of the *first*, but not of the *front*, rank do not take their due place through diffidence, awkwardness, self-distrust, dislike of the world and the world's ways, contempt of the petty aims which most men pursue, or of the petty and sordid means by which even great public aims are often reached. At other times they are disabled by some fatal stroke early received, some irreparable loss, some deep wound to the

heart occasioned by the injustice and fickleness of the world, or by the faithlessness of a trusted friend, or even by their own waywardness, or rashness, or the insolence of conscious but unacknowledged strength.

But there are also men, not disabled by any crippling wound, not averse to distinction if it may be fairly won, who seem to possess all the faculties and gifts and accomplishments which mark men out for distinction, and yet do not reach the distinction to which we feel that they are entitled. Every one speaks well of them, every one holds them in affection and respect ; and not a few set great hopes on them, and believe that they must win honour and renown. It is not easy to see why such men fail. Their failure, or comparative failure, is often a surprise to their friends and to themselves, to the very end. Nevertheless, if we look closely at them, we may find that some of them are too much abstracted from the common affairs and aims of life to make a deep impression on their fellows ; too remote, if not " too bright and good, for human nature's daily food." Capital men to be with on Sundays and holidays, you want another for workday use. They are too much in the air, too much in the clouds even. They inspire respect and affection for their purity and unworldliness, but they do not inspire the passionate devotion which waits on a born leader of men. They are neither prompt to seize occasion, nor to turn their fine gifts to the best account. They lack the ardent and victorious will which beats down, or overleaps, all opposition ; or they lack the steadfast and cheerful patience which saps opposition or converts it into power. Or they are not themselves quick to take and spread the contagion of high and generous and self-devoting

impulses. Or they are men of slow growth, worth much when they are ripe, but taking so long to ripen, that by the time they gain their full sweetness and strength of spirit, their eye begins to grow dim and their natural force is abated. Or, like Andrew, they are men of thought rather than men of action; they see all round things, or try to see all round them, and so are often passed by men who see only one side of a question and go straight at it. Or, still like Andrew, they are a little sceptical and hopeless, and stand weighing possibilities and difficulties, till the time for action has gone by.

Whatever the causes which lead or contribute to their failure, such men as these get but scant justice from a world which does not mean to be unjust, but is much too busy to make an elaborate study of them, much too preoccupied to discover and rate them at their true value. There is the more need, therefore, that Christ, the true and final Judge of men, should recognize their hidden worth, and teach us to recognize and honour it. And He who knows what is in man *does* recognize their worth. He ranks them, as we see in the case of Andrew, among the very first in his service and kingdom, even though they have not all the qualities desirable in the first, because the qualities they have are so precious. He gives them, as He gave Andrew, all that they can take, calls them only to such duties as they can do, and sees that they get their full honour and reward, both here and hereafter. Yes, even *here*: for there are wonderful compensations and joys in a quiet and thoughtful life; and, moreover, such a life is often, in the end, more fruitful in influence, and even in activity of the highest kind, than that of

many a practical and successful man. Men of action, who stand full in the eye of the world, commonly derive their stimulus and guidance from men of thought, of whom the world seldom hears. And when we pass out of this world into the larger and more equitable world beyond, there are many of these last who will there be first, and shine as stars, and stars of the first magnitude, in the spiritual firmament for ever.

S. E. C. T.

---

THE BOOK OF JOB.

IV.—THE SECOND COLLOQUY. (CHAPTERS XV.—XXI.)

---

5.—ZOPHAR TO JOB. (CHAPTER XX.)

WHEN Zophar first appeared on the scene I described him as “the common good man of his day, the vulgar but sincere formalist; the man who implicitly believes what he has been taught, and demands not only that every one else should believe it too, but also that they should accept it in the very forms in which it has commended itself to him, and, above all, that they should refuse to believe anything *more*. He is sharp and bitter and hasty in his tone, moreover. . . . A dangerous man to differ from or to outstrip; the kind of man with whom it is of no use to go a mile if you go but a single inch beyond him; the kind of man, too, who is very apt to call down fire from heaven whenever he cannot conveniently lay his hand on the match-box.” And again, when he first opened his lips, I described him as the champion of orthodoxy. “A man without culture or erudition, he stands for and utters the common thought, the current conceptions and formulas, of his time, and savours of bigotry, as self-styled ortho-