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

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[Issue]_[1st page of article].pdf

intensely interested as an instrument for a lesson of a special kind. The teacher should seize every such occasion and use it in the way suggested above. But it is a different matter altogether to be asked to give up the regular instruction by the daily Bible lesson. For one thing, the criticism directed against the ordinary teaching by syllabus of Bible narratives is excessive and misdirected. No Bible lesson is properly taught unless its permanent meaning for the soul and for life is made clear, and unless its practical bearing on the present lives of the children is made very real and urgent. And there is nothing that children love better in a well-taught Bible lesson than themselves pointing out in which ways the truth in a story bears on their own lives. The present writer was lately teaching a class of boys and girls of about eleven years of age in an East End school. The lesson was the Good Samaritan, and he elicited from the class parallels to it such as Nurse Cavell, Sir Philip Sidney, and Robert Louis Stevenson in Samoa. And when the children were asked what being a neighbour meant for them, they showered answers on the teacher: 'Helping a blind man across the road, running a message for a sick woman, looking after the baby,' and so on. But it must be said, in addition to this, that nothing can take the place of a system of teaching which makes the Bible familiar to a child and helps him to a true understanding of its progressive revelation. The weak point of the 'Projects' method is that it uses the Bible unsystematically just to illustrate whatever experience crops up. There may be large parts of the Bible which the children know nothing about, and they will know *nothing* of it as they ought to know, as a record of the progressive unfolding of the mind and will of God. I suggest, then, that teachers in our schools might well make more use of this method of teaching by actual situations, for there is no doubt that the surest and truest way of teaching any truth is by doing it. And in a parish the teacher may well use all kinds of agencies—boys' brigades, boy scouts, girls' guildry and guides, games, and all kinds of 'movements' for the training of his children in character. The occasional use of this method when the occasion fills the minds of the children with some urgent interest would add immensely to the ethical and religious efficiency of the religious education. But it will not and ought not to supplant or to set aside the regular and systematic and the intelligent and practical instruction by way of Bible teaching.

Judaism and Universalism in the Gospels.

By Professor C. J. Cadoux, M.A., D.D., Yorkshire United Independent College, Bradford.

II.

IV. The Universalism of Jesus.

The previous article set forth in full the evidence for what we may call the Judaism or particularism of Jesus. Deferring further study of it until we have all the material before us, we must now turn to the universalistic features in His life and teaching. We do not need here to treat 'Matthew' separately. All three Synoptic Gospels are here more on a level than in portraying the Jewish sympathies of Jesus: they were written when the world-wide mission of the Church was in full swing, and when there was constantly a tendency to magnify the Master's own universalism. Careful scrutiny, however, enables us to distinguish roughly between the truth and the exaggerations of it.[1]

(*a*) Common to all our sources is the representation that Jesus was profoundly influenced by the Old Testament in general, and by the prophetical books in particular; and the universalism to be found in the prophets could not have failed to leave its mark on His mind and teaching.[2] He addresses

[1] On the general subject, cf. Harnack, *Mission*, Eng. tr., i. pp. 36–38, 42; Mayor in *The Expositor*, Nov. 1899, pp. 385–399; A. T. Cadoux, *The Gospel that Jesus preached*, pp. 231–236. There is a Catholic monograph on the subject, replying to Harnack, by Max Meinertz, *Jesus und die Heidenmission* (Münster i. W. 1908: 2nd ed. 1925).

[2] Holtzmann, *N.T. Theol.*, i. p. 277.

God in prayer as 'Lord of the heaven and the earth' (Mt 11^{25}=Lk 10^{21} Q), and describes the Temple—in the words of Trito-Isaiah (Is 56^{7})—as 'a house of prayer for all the nations' (Mk 11^{17}: not the parallels; cf. Harnack, *op. cit.*, i. 40, note 1). He regards the mission of Jonah to pagan Nineveh as a sign of His own ministry (Mt 12^{39} 16^{4}= Lk $11^{29f.}$ Q), and contrasts the Ninevites and the Queen of Sheba with His fellow-countrymen as shining examples of religious responsiveness (Mt $12^{41f.}$=Lk $11^{31f.}$ Q). He quotes from Hosea (6^{6}) the anti-ritualistic oracle: 'I desire mercy, and not sacrifice' (Mt 9^{13} 12^{7} M). The suffering Servant of the Lord, whom Jesus regarded as foreshadowing His own life (Lk 22^{37}), had been charged with a mission, not to Israel only, but to the Gentile world.

(*b*) Next, the teaching of Jesus is characterized by a broad moral humanism and individualism, in the presence of which any idea of excluding the Gentiles, or of confining Divine blessings to the Jews, seems irrelevant.[1] The disciple of Jesus is to love and serve his enemies and friends alike, with the same impartial magnanimity as God, the universal Father, shows in sending rain and sun (Mt $5^{43ff.}$=Lk $6^{27.35}$ Q ?), to treat men generally as he would like them to treat him (Mt 7^{12}= Lk 6^{31} Q), and to be a fisher of *men* in the cause of the Kingdom (Mk 1^{17}=Mt 4^{19}; cf. Lk 5^{10}). The leaven of the parable permeates the whole lump (Mt 13^{33}=Lk $13^{20f.}$ Q). Jesus' own life is given as a ransom, and His covenant-blood poured out, on behalf of *many* (Mk 10^{45} ||, 14^{24} ||s)—striking reminiscences of the universalistic phrases of the great Servant-Poem (Is $52^{14f.}$ $53^{11f.}$). Broad human utterances resting on the sole authority of 'Matthew' are: 'Happy are the gentle, for they will inherit the earth' (Mt 5^{5}); 'Ye are the salt of the earth . . . ye are the light of the world' (Mt 5^{13-16}; Harnack, *loc. cit.*); 'Thy will be done, as in heaven, so on earth' (Mt 6^{10}); and, in the doubtful interpretation of the parable of the Tares, 'the field is the world' (Mt 13^{38}).

(*c*) Then, in the third place, we have Jesus' free and independent attitude to Scripture and the Law. He freely revised the dictates of the Mosaic Code, both ceremonial and moral, on His own authority (Mt $5^{21f.}$ $27ff.$ $33ff.$ $38ff.$ $43ff.$)—in particular, superseding the law permitting divorce (Mt $5^{31f.}$ 19^{1-11} ||s), cancelling the distinction between clean and unclean foods (Mk 7^{19}; cf. Mt 15^{17}), and refusing to participate in the legally specified punishment of an adulteress (Jn 8^{10}), or to encourage His disciples to fast (Mk 2^{18-22} ||s). His allusion, in the last connexion, to the new patch on the old garment and the new wine in the old wineskins is generally understood to mean that His dispensation as a whole could not possibly be combined or harmonized with Judaism. That is probably making too much of the passage; it is more likely that we have here simply a picturesque exposure of the unseemly incongruity of fasting in a season of rejoicing: but even so, the words express a claim to be free from the yoke of traditional legalism. Jesus did not display great zeal for the sacrificial system: God, He said, desired not sacrifice, but mercy (Mt 9^{13} 12^{7}). He preferred to describe the Temple as a house of prayer (Mk 11^{17} ||s) rather than of sacrifice. In His presence there was something greater than the Temple (Mt 12^{6}): it would one day be overthrown (Mk 13^{2} ||s; cf. Lk $19^{43f.}$), but He would speedily rebuild it (Mk 14^{58} ||, 15^{29} ||; Jn 2^{19}). He contended that the Messiah would not necessarily be a descendant of David.[2] He was often at issue with the religious authorities: He denounced the scribes and Pharisees, the champions of the legal tradition, for hypocrisy; the priests and Levites He pilloried in His story of the Good Samaritan; He provoked both classes into an attitude of deadly enmity to Himself. On the other hand, He called those who were oppressed by the yoke of the Law to come to Him for rest and relief (Mt 11^{28-30}; cf. 23^{4}=Lk 11^{46} Q ?), and made Himself the friend of tax-collectors and sinners (Mt 11^{19}= Lk 7^{34} Q), *i.e.* of the folk of humble rank who could not be bothered to observe the myriad injunctions of the scribes. In regard to the Sabbath, He Himself ignored the scruples of the Rabbis, and was evidently not even prepared to observe and defend the precept: 'On it thou shalt do no work': He appealed rather to the broad principle that the Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath, and that therefore it was for man to say how he would use it (Mk 2^{23-28} ||s, 3^{1-6} ||s; Mt $12^{11f.}$=Lk 14^{5} Q; Lk $13^{15f.}$).[3]

[1] Holtzmann, *N.T. Theol.*, i. pp. 277–279; Stevens, *Theol. of New Test.*, p. 37.

[2] Mk 12^{35-37} ||s, a passage which even makes it doubtful whether Jesus regarded Himself as of Davidic descent.

[3] On the general question, cf. Heiler, *Katholizismus*, pp. 27–35, 268, with note 23.

(*d*) A still more positive and explicit universalism frequently appears to be in His mind.[1] Thus, at the Temptation, He sees all the kingdoms of the world as His prospective realm (Mt 4^{8} = Lk 4^{5} Q); and we must not interpret His refusal of the temptation to undertake the conquest of them as a sign that He abandoned interest in them and their politics. His address in the synagogue at Nazareth, with its references to Naaman the Syrian and the Sidonian widow (Lk $4^{25ff.}$: Harnack, *op. cit.*, i. p. 41, note 5), was so distasteful to the amour-propre of His Jewish audience that they hounded Him out of the building. He chose a Samaritan as a type of neighbourly love (Lk 10^{29-37}; Harnack, *ibid.*). The birds that roosted in the branches of the mustard-tree may possibly be a hint at the inclusion of Gentiles in the Kingdom (Mk 4^{32} ||s). The mission of the Seventy (Lk 10) is probably another hint, this time a practical one —seventy being the ideal Jewish number of all the Gentile nations (Gn 10; cf. Schürer, *Geschichte*, ii. p. 406 note [Eng. tr., II. i. p. 344—much briefer]; Montefiore, *Synoptic Gospels*, ii. p. 928). A well-attested saying recorded in Q runs: 'Many will come from east and west and north and south, and will recline (at table) in the kingdom of heaven with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; but the sons of the kingdom will be cast out into the outer darkness' (Mt $8^{11f.}$=Lk $13^{28f.}$).[2] On two occasions Jesus explicitly foretold the proclamation of the Gospel of the Kingdom to the Gentiles—in the great eschatological discourse (Mk 13^{10}=Mt 24^{14}, *i.e.* outside the limits usually given for the 'little apocalypse') and at the supper-table in Bethany (Mk 14^{9}=Mt 26^{13}). In neither of these cases have we any *documentary* grounds for doubting the accuracy of the report, though many scholars are unable to believe that such were really the words of Jesus.[3] Peculiar to 'Matthew' are the statements that the disciples would be taken before governors and kings 'for a testimony to them and the Gentiles' (Mt 10^{18}; contrast Mk 13^{9} and compare Harnack, *op. cit.*, i. p. 38, note 1), and the picture of the Last Judgment, at which Gentiles who have been kind to needy Christians are called to inherit the kingdom prepared for them from the foundation of the world (Mt 25^{31-46}). Allusion was made at the end of the first article to the difficulty of believing that Jesus explicitly enjoined on the disciples the evangelization of the Gentiles. Such injunctions —couched in very dissimilar words—are found in 'Matthew' ($28^{18f.}$), Luke ($24^{46f.}$), and the spurious ending to Mark ($16^{15f.}$). The divergence in the wording used, the prescription (in 'Matthew') of the Trinitarian baptismal-formula, the undoubted later tendency to refer customs of the Church to orders supposed to have been given by the Risen Christ, and finally, the delay in starting the Gentile mission and the opposition to it when started—all combine to make us doubt whether Jesus ever gave any such explicit instructions to the Twelve.[4]

(*e*) Whatever be the exact truth in regard to the theoretical universalism of Jesus, we observe that His practical universalism seems to have been generally subordinate to His personal mission to the Jewish people. The relevant incidents are easily enumerated. He does not shrink from travelling through Samaritan territory (Lk 9^{52}; cf. Jn 4^{4}): He cures a Samaritan leper (Lk 17^{11-19}; Harnack, *op. cit.*, i. p. 42 note). He cures the slave of a Gentile centurion in the service of Herodes Antipas at Kapharnaum, and declares that He has not found in any Jew such faith as the centurion had shown (Mt 8^{10}=Lk 7^{9} Q). The significance of the incident is a little affected by the probability that the man was a proselyte of some inferior grade, for he loved the Jewish race and had built them a synagogue (Lk 7^{5}). When once Jesus went on to predominantly Gentile soil, it was not in order to begin a Gentile mission, but probably to escape notice (Mk $7^{24f.}$; contrast Mt $15^{21f.}$). While He was there, the persistence of a Phœnician woman, begging His help for her afflicted daughter, overcame His hesitation, and He performed the cure (Mk 7^{28-30}=Mt $15^{27f.}$).[5] When we read in Matthew (15^{31}) that a crowd, seeing Him cure a number of sufferers, 'glorified the God of Israel,' the expression *may* imply that it was a Gentile crowd and that they were Gentile sufferers[6]: but this interpretation is not certain, and the unsupported statement of Matthew is insufficient to command one's belief. When He prayed: 'Father,

[1] Heiler, *op. cit.*, 33 f.

[2] Wendt, *Teaching*, Eng. tr., ii. pp. 347, 350; Harnack, *op. cit.*, i. p. 40, top.

[3] Wendt, *op. cit.*, ii. p. 349 note; Harnack, *op. cit.*, i. pp. 39–42.

[4] See the literature quoted at end of first art., THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, November 1926, p. 60.

[5] Wendt, *op. cit.*, ii. p. 347 f; Harnack, *op. cit.*, i. p. 39, top.

[6] See McNeile, *Matthew*, p. 232 f.

forgive them, for they know not what they do' (Lk 23^{34}), He probably had in mind the Gentile soldiers in the Roman army who were crucifying Him.

(*f*) There is one special phase of Jesus' universalism which has become clear only in comparatively recent times—I mean His concern over the feud between Israel and Rome. As Messiah He was to fill a *national* rôle: as one who included all the nations of the world in His sweep of vision, He must have been interested in the relations existing between Israel and all these other peoples: as one who claimed, and at first hoped, to win national obedience, He could not have ignored the most glaring and clamant Jewish problem of His day, viz. the struggle with Rome. His own personal example and His ethical teaching clearly reveal the solution He advocated. It was that by gentleness, goodwill, and religious leadership, Israel should change the suspicious tyranny of Rome and the contempt of the Gentile world into a peaceful fellowship, and should thus become the 'guide, philosopher, and friend' of mankind and the builders of a real and world-wide kingdom of God. The only alternative was a bloody fight to a finish. With the growing hostility of the Jewish leaders and the growing coolness of the rank and file, particularly at Jerusalem, Jesus watched the scales of history slowly inclining to the side of hatred and disaster. It must have become clear to Him at a fairly early date that certainly *all* the Jews would not become His followers. The early parable of the Sower shows Him realizing that all His seeds would not bear fruit, and the Marcan version of His subsequent explanations represents Him as speaking of 'those without' (Mk 4^{11}; but cf. McNeile, *Matthew*, 189 *b*). He pours forth His 'Woes' over the unrepentant Galilæan towns in which He had worked, declaring that the great heathen cities of the ancient world would at the Judgment incur a less terrible penalty than they (Mt 11^{20-24}=Lk 10^{13-15} Q). The point of the parable of the Great Feast (Lk 14^{16-24}=Mt 22^{1-10}) is that those for whom it was intended would forfeit their privilege because they did not value it: what they had scorned would be given to the despised outsider.[1] 'Matthew,' by adding a reference to the destruction of Jerusalem, shows only too well how clearly he had grasped the point: the king sends his armies and destroys those who had murdered his messengers, and burns their city (Mt $22^{6f.}$). The mournful sentence of exclusion begins as a threat, and finishes as a certainty. With heroic bravery, Jesus struggles to avert it. At one point in Luke's story we see the Messiah making His last agonized appeals to the nation to repent and abandon their policy of hatred before it is too late. The scene is probably Jerusalem.[2] First, He urges them to read the signs of the times, as they would study the weather (Lk $12^{54f.}$); then He pleads with them to be reconciled before their inexorable creditor claps them into hopeless prison (Lk 12^{57-59}). They try to rouse His patriotism by telling Him how Pilate had actually slaughtered some Galilæans at sacrifice; but He replies that, unless they repent, they will all perish likewise, and He thrusts His warning home with the parable of the barren fig-tree that was spared from destruction for one more brief year (Lk 13^{1-9}). But He saw that they would not change; and when later He rode into the city for the last time, He wept over it, and said: 'If only thou hadst known, in this thy day, the things that lead to peace; but now they are hidden from thine eyes. For the days will come upon thee when thine enemies will build a rampart round thee and surround thee and hem thee in on every side, and overthrow thee and thy children within thee, and will not leave one stone on another in thee—because thou didst not know the season of thy visitation' (Lk 19^{41-44}). In the controversies that ensued within the city, He told the Jews that the kingdom would be taken from them and given to others (Mt 21^{43}; cf. Harnack, *op. cit.*, i. 39, notes 2, 3), and urged them to pay the tribute that Rome demanded (Mk 12^{13-17} ||s). He told His disciples that Judæa would be overrun by foreign armies and the Temple destroyed (Mk $13^{2.\ 7f.\ 14-20}$ ||s). That, indeed, would not mean the final defeat of God's purpose. The King's supper-table would not lack guests.[3] Though the Temple be destroyed, He would rebuild it in three days—a cryptic pictorial allusion to His forthcoming triumph

[1] Though Harnack (*op. cit.*, i. p. 39, note 2) denies that Gentiles are here to be thought of.

[2] I have given full reasons for this suggestion, and have discussed the subject generally, in an article in *The Expositor* for March 1925, pp. 182–191. To the literature there cited I would add Holtzmann, *N.T. Theol.*, i. pp. 274–276, and Mess, *Studies in the Christian Gospel for Society*, pp. 19, 32, 189, 202 f.

[3] Cf. Wendt, *op. cit.*, ii. p. 346 f.; Harnack, *op. cit.*, i. p. 37.

(Mk 14^{58} ||, 15^{29} || ; Jn 2^{19}). But it did mean that Israel had finally refused the honourable task to which God had called her, and that she would reap the inevitable harvest in the miseries of a Roman conquest. It meant, too, that He Himself must die a criminal's death as the price of obtaining the Messianic crown He was destined to wear ; and the thought of His own sufferings mingled with that of His people's in one terrible picture of gloom. 'Daughters of Jerusalem ! weep not for me, but weep for yourselves and your children. For behold ! days are coming on which they will say, Happy are the barren, and the wombs which have not borne, and the breasts which have not nourished. Then will they begin to say to the mountains, Fall on us ; and to the hills, Cover us. For if they do these things when the tree is green, what will they do when it is dry ?' (Lk 23^{28-31}).

V. Conclusion.

In conclusion, it seems to me to be hopeless to search for a single formula that will combine both the Judaism and the particularism of Jesus in such a way as to prove His attitude to have been throughout uniform and consistent. The mind of the modern Christian naturally finds our Lord's universalism most intelligible and acceptable, and is tempted, either to ignore His Judaism, or to treat it as if it must have been in some way unreal, a kind of intentional pretence, solemnly kept up —no one knows why—because, in some mysterious way, so it had to be. That is to do violence to our records. The particularistic feelings of Jesus were real, not assumed ; nor can we argue that He laid them all aside towards the close of His ministry. Nor, I think, can we claim that Jesus Himself ever consciously, explicitly, and fully harmonized His Jewish loyalties with His world-wide sympathies. The dualism visible in this aspect of His ministry reminds us of the dualism visible in His treatment of Scripture. At one moment we find Him assuming that, if a commandment is found in the Pentateuch or an oracle in the Prophets, it is thereby clearly of Divine authority : at another moment, He boldly uses His own discretion to correct one Scripture by another, or to set it aside altogether. Where is the consistency ? A modern disciple may find a synthesis in the doctrine of the Inner Light ; but it is tolerably certain that Jesus never undertook to discover and explain such a synthesis Himself. So, too, with His Jewish and Gentile interests. He did not undertake to solve in advance all the problems which His ministry would suggest to later generations. The fire of His own instinctive religious life was kindled within the limits set by His Jewish parentage and racial traditions ; but it blazed and burned in this direction and in that as the breath of the Spirit of God might drive it, without staying for a consistent intellectual system to be worked out as each stage of its advance was reached. And yet we cannot doubt that the higher unity is really there for us to discover. Though we may not claim that Jesus ever in His earthly life laid aside altogether the strong particularism natural to every Jew, it is fairly clear that the universalism, which was *implicit* in His gospel from the very first, became more and more explicit and conscious and dominant as His ministry proceeded. It never, indeed, drove Him to leave the Jewish communities and begin a mission among the Gentiles within Palestine or without : it probably never moved Him to enjoin definitely such a mission on His disciples. But it did give Him a sublime ideal of His people's destiny—an ideal of world-service and leadership through religious enlightenment, an ideal fraught with inspiration for the Christian patriot of all ages. And it expressed itself in a magnificent campaign to induce His fellow-countrymen to pursue that ideal—a campaign which was defeated at one level of human experience only that it might issue in a still more glorious victory for God on a higher and more eternal level. It sprang from a fellowship with God so real—and a love for man so strong—that it was bound to force its way through the limits of even the broadest Judaism, and to spread out into that fair majestic growth whose leaves have been for the healing of the nations.