---

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

# THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

## Notes of Recent Exposition.

ANYTHING that comes from the pen of the Chief Rabbi deserves our most earnest and respectful consideration, and this consideration will certainly be accorded to Dr. J. H. HERTZ'S *Affirmations of Judaism* (Milford; paper, 2s. 6d. net; cloth, 5s. net). These 'affirmations,' however, are not addressed to Christians, but to Jews. Their secondary aim is to unveil the true nature of Liberal Judaism and to show that it is inconsistent with, and even hostile to, essential Judaism, as the Chief Rabbi conceives it; but their primary aim is, in his own words, 'to clarify opinion, remove doubt, and strengthen love for our Faith in the minds of both groups.'

Apparently all is not well with the Jewish Church to-day any more than with the Christian Church or with the world. A new barbarism is settling down upon us, and the soul—the Jewish soul too—is being frittered away by the vulgarities and distractions of the thoroughfare and of the market-place. There is an impatience with all authority, moral and spiritual alike. There are Jews in whom the wish to remain Jews burns but feebly; and sad indeed it is to learn that 'the eve of *Tisha b'Av*, the hour when in sorrow and anguish the House of Israel has for eighteen hundred years and longer read the Lamentations of Jeremiah, is not infrequently selected for dances and balls by American Liberal congregations.'

Dr. HERTZ passionately believes that the essential spirit and the real mission of Judaism are gravely imperilled by that form of it which is commonly known as Liberal, of which the most brilliant exponent in this country is Dr. C. G. Montefiore. What, then, is the real Judaism, as Dr. HERTZ understands it? It is not, as the late Dr. Krauskopf defined it, 'merely the *ism* of little Judæa,' which is now outgrown. It is nothing less than 'a religious civilization—a spiritual culture aglow with a passion for righteousness,' nothing less than the sanctification of human life. But we imagine that Dr. Montefiore himself would be not unwilling to accept these definitions. Speaking broadly, the point where they part company is in their attitude to the Torah. The Liberal Jew could part, without a pang, from most of its multitudinous ceremonial regulations, because to him the supreme thing in the Old Testament is the prophetic spirit: to the orthodox Jew, the Torah is one of the foundations of the world.

It is in reality the modern form of the old quarrel, already visible and audible in the Old Testament, between the prophet and the priest. And there are more phases of it than their respective attitudes to ritual: there is the attitude to tradition. The real Torah, Dr. HERTZ tells us, is not merely the written text of the Five Books of Moses, but the exposition of that text given by later ages. The Oral Law, which represents the interpretation of it by successive generations for two thousand years, 'forms the soul of Judaism and gives it individuality and uniqueness among the living

faiths of men.' To the Liberal Jew this is a hard saying. The attitude it embodies towards tradition is not unlike that of the Roman Catholic Church, which again resembles orthodox Judaism in its appreciation of rite and ceremony.

---

But the count against Liberal Judaism is more serious even than that. It is not only that it is 'dry rationalism—irreverent and disintegrating,' and not only that its demand for a re-interpretation of Traditional Judaism that shall be in harmony with modern thought and life is essentially foolish, as there is really no consistent body of ideals which can be called modern life, nor would it be any advantage to Judaism, or, for that matter, to religion in general, to be in agreement with such a body even if it did exist. No; the real trouble is more fundamental.

---

It is not only that the sacred days and fasts and festivals of the Jewish year—for example, the Sabbath, Passover, Tabernacles, and even the Day of Atonement—receive short shrift at the hands of these moderns, but that some of the beliefs which are popularly supposed to be indispensable to any religion worthy of the name appear to be light-heartedly discarded. We can understand, whether we sympathize or not with, Dr. Montefiore's official declaration made on behalf of the London group, 'we recognize no binding authority between us and God, whether in a man or a book.' But we are told that German-American Liberals go the length of doubting the existence of God, His revelation to Israel, and the immortality of the soul. This is radicalism indeed, of a type so astounding that we must take the liberty to give the exact words.

---

Dr. Emil Hirsch is quoted as saying, 'I myself do not believe in personal revelation, nor does my congregation in Chicago.' And Dr. HERTZ goes on to say, 'He also denied the immortality of the soul. In 1914, the preacher of the sermon at the Conference of American Liberal Rabbis not only repudiated the Mission of Israel and scoffed at Israel's history and martyrdom, but expressed his disbelief in God, the incumbency of the moral law, and the immortality of the soul.' It is admitted that this thoroughgoing scepticism was not representative of the general spirit of the conference, yet it seems that 'only last year a young American radical published a book on Liberal Judaism, in which he writes that he is not prepared unhesitatingly to declare that God exists or that there is a life after death.'

---

Certainly if utterances like these were typical, as we hope and believe that they are not, we could only share the chief Rabbi's horror of Liberal Judaism. But another element in his horror is the approximation of Liberal Judaism to Christianity, sometimes even in its Trinitarian form. Its representatives are guilty of an 'indiscriminating adulation of the Founder of Christianity,' whose whole life—we are amazed to hear—was one of 'enmity and warfare against the foundations of our Faith,' surely a singularly inept description of One who defined His mission as *the fulfilling of the Law and the Prophets*.

---

In particular, Dr. Montefiore's appreciation of the New Testament in general, and especially of the Gospels, seems to be anathema to Dr. HERTZ. His sorrowful indignation is roused by the reminder of that distinguished leader of Liberal Judaism that it will be needful for Liberal Jewish theologians to consider the new modern interpretations of the doctrine of the Trinity, and to discuss how far these are or are not in accordance with Jewish views of the unity. On such a point Dr. HERTZ will tolerate no compromise whatever.

---

It is not without significance that he is hostile to the dominant literary criticism of the Pentateuch. Wellhausen and his successors are represented as tearing the Torah to tatters and reducing its contents to legend and fiction, and even 'Dr. Driver and his English, American, and Scottish colleagues work for the undermining of our confidence in the trustworthiness of the Hebrew Scriptures.' There must be thousands of preachers all over the world who would vehemently deny that this is the effect of the work of these scholars, and who would gladly acknowledge that by that work their own insight

into and reverence for the Bible had been deepened.

The features which should, according to Dr. HERTZ, be emphasized in Jewish Religious Education are Jewish Religion, the Hebrew Language, the Sacred Scriptures, and Jewish History; and loyalty to Israel should manifest itself in religious observance, Synagogue affiliation, and participation in the rebuilding of the Holy Land. The fact that Liberal Judaism is so often indifferent to Zionism stamps it in the eyes of those who emphasize the Torah and ritual observance as alien to the true and essential spirit of Judaism.

The Chief Rabbi pleads earnestly for the establishment of a Jewish Public School: that would, he believes, be one effective way of preserving the values of Judaism. Education he happily defines as 'the gradual adjustment of the child to the spiritual possessions of the race, and Jewish education is consequently the gradual adjustment of the Jewish child to the spiritual possessions of Israel.'

Of special interest is the explanation given of the prayer, 'Blessed art thou who hast not made me a woman.' One rabbi interprets this thanksgiving thus, that the woman is less blessed because many of the ceremonial duties were not incumbent on her; the man, however, so far from resenting his additional burden, thanked God for it. Let us charitably hope that this is the true explanation, but we fear there are some whom it will not convince.

Recent theological literature reveals the fact that a great deal of thought is being devoted to the doctrine of the Spirit. And this is not surprising, since the truth involved in it is the truth of God's immanence in the world, and more particularly the way in which the redemption wrought out in Christ is made ours in experience. It is possible to take a very narrow view of this fact, as though the Spirit were confined within the barriers of an external organization and attached to certain forms and rituals. And it is possible to take a very vague view of it, as though the Spirit had nothing to do with externals at all. The best corrective of these extreme views is to look at what Scripture teaches us. It will be found that the Bible doctrine is both surprisingly broad and surprisingly narrow.

The Spirit in the Old Testament is simply God working in the world, and working in special ways. It is the energy of God appearing in exceptional manifestations. It is the Divine agent in creation.

> Darkness profound
> Covered the abyss; but, on the watery calm,
> His brooding wings the Spirit of God outspread,
> And vital virtue infused, and vital warmth,
> Throughout the fluid mass.

It is the equipment of all sorts of men for any special work. Bezaleel was filled with the Spirit for the erection of the Tabernacle. The prophets were qualified to speak for God by the Spirit. Gideon was made a successful leader and soldier by the Spirit. And in Ezekiel's vision of the dry bones the Spirit is the source of life and reality.

It is mainly the marvellous and the exceptional that are traced to the Spirit in the Old Testament. Yet may we not say that here we have at least a suggestion of a great truth, that all that is good and true and worthy in the world, all life and beauty, all achievement, are due to the creative ministry of God? It is only a slight extension of the Old Testament doctrine to say that the Dialogues of Plato, the maxims of Confucius, the poems of Browning, the persistence of Columbus, the heroism of a V.C., have been the inspiration of the God who is in us all and behind all the work that is sound.

When we pass to the New Testament we find an equally valuable truth in the Synoptic Gospels. There the outstanding fact is that everything in the ministry of our Lord was due to the Spirit of God. The Spirit came into His heart at the Baptism, fitting Him for all He did and was afterwards. His preaching and teaching were due to the Spirit in Him (Lk $4^{18}$), His miracles were wrought by the Spirit (Mt $12^{28}$), and it was in the power of the Spirit He rose from the dead. The significance of

this truth lies in this, that it makes our Lord's example a real example to us. If He was incapable of sin, if He was so far removed from us that He had resources which we do not have, His victory would be of little value to us. But if He depended on the Spirit of God, a Power equally open to us, and if He achieved all He did through this Power, then our weakness also may be sustained and our humanity perfected through the same Spirit.

It is in St. John's Gospel that we find the great Promise that was to mean so much to the early Church, and to the believer ever after. Christ promised a Spirit who was to be to His disciples all He had been. He was to 'go away,' but the Spirit was to come to men who would be lonely and discouraged and be their 'advocate,' to stand by them in their hour of weakness, to guide them as He had guided them, to lead them into truth and sustain them in their trials.

Now the wonderful thing about this Promise is that the whole New Testament (after the Gospels) is a series of examples of the ways in which the Promise was fulfilled to the letter. Take first the Book of Acts. There are three critical occasions at which the Church took a decided step from the narrow confines of Judaism to the fuller liberty of the gospel. On each occasion this step was taken under the inspiration of the Spirit. The three occasions were the baptism of Cornelius, the first mission of Paul and Barnabas, and the Council of Jerusalem (Ac 15). These were momentous occasions, on which the future of the world hung. And, at each, the decision of the Church was made consciously by the direction of the Spirit. How magnificently Christ had made good the great Promise. And how marvellous it is to watch this little band of obscure men making an incredible adventure on the bare word of their Master alone.

But the Epistles give us as clear an instance of the fulfilment of Christ's great Promise of a different kind. We wonder at the richness and depth and fullness and gladness of the religious life exhibited in these letters. But in reality they are one prolonged commentary on the Promise of Christ. The writers were humbly certain of the source of their knowledge and of the Power in which they lived their life. They do not seem to distinguish clearly between the Risen Lord and the Spirit. But they know that it is by the Spirit, who is the Spirit of Christ, they have been redeemed, and by this Spirit they are daily sustained and guided. It is a wonderful picture this in the New Testament, first, of a great Promise, and then a constant stream of fulfilment in the lives of men who turned the world upside down. If this is true, and if this power is available for to-day, surely there never has been any message greater or more joyful proclaimed to the sons of men.

Most of the articles by the BISHOP OF MANCHESTER (*Essays in Christian Politics and Kindred Subjects*: Longmans; 7s. 6d. net) appeared previously in the 'Pilgrim,' that quarterly review whose demise in January of this year was so much regretted. The papers in the first section of the volume deal with Christian Politics—such subjects as Fellowship, Christian Social Principles, God and the State, Loyalty and Democracy. The second section deals with miscellaneous subjects—one of which is Faith and Works—although Dr. TEMPLE gives it the title of 'Coué and St. Paul.'

'I had not known sin,' says St. Paul in Ro $7^7$, 'except through the law: for I had not known coveting, except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet.' 'Here,' says Dr. TEMPLE, 'we see that trouble began through the stimulation of the righteous will by the prohibition of the law. St. Paul was "alive" in the sense that he could control and direct his conduct along right lines until he became conscious of a commandment prohibiting actions to which he had a natural, though apparently inhibited, tendency. Becoming conscious of this prohibition, he increased his determination to repress that tendency; what M. Coué calls his "will" was strengthened. But the result was not enhanced self-mastery, but loss of the self-mastery hitherto enjoyed. For with the strengthening of the "will" came a still greater strengthening of the "imagination" so that, whereas the man had

been " alive " or self-directing, he was now " dead " or moved by the blind force of an impulse. " When the commandment came, sin revived, and I died." ' On this basis the moral problem is found to be insoluble. The more the man struggles against the chain of his sin, the closer it binds him. It is the very earnestness of his effort to do right which ensures his doing wrong. ' O wretched man that I am ! who shall deliver me out of this body of death ? '

---

How is the moral problem to be solved, then ? St. Paul finds a solution through being caught in an experience which lies outside the scope of the conflict between ' the evil that I would not ' and ' the good that I would.' If we read without a stop from Ro $7^{5}$ to Ro $8^{39}$, ' I have God through Jesus Christ our Lord . . . for the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus made me free from the law of sin and of death,' we shall grasp Paul's meaning. What St. Paul experienced was no help in the conflict by any reinforcement of his will. In so far as the experience was appropriated the conflict was over. ' If we imagine a man vainly toiling up a steep ascent on which he makes no headway because his footing slips down beneath him every time he strains upward, he would be helped, no doubt, by some pressure supporting his back and enabling him to make his strides longer and more rapid in succession ; but the struggle and effort would remain. It is so that many Christians think of the assistance of divine grace. It is exactly not so that St. Paul describes it. What he describes is much more like the discovery that close beside the steep and stony ascent there is a moving staircase, on to which the man must step of his own motion, but on which, when once he is there, he is borne without further struggle to the summit of the ascent. The essential act of the will in Christian experience, as St. Paul describes it, is surrender.'

---

Dr. TEMPLE finds in the teaching of M. Coué and his school, although somewhat concealed by their terminology, the same opposition of Faith and Works. It is found in the law of reversed effort : ' when the will and the imagination are at war the imagination invariably gains the day.' For when we look into it we find that imagination is just faith, and will is just works.

---

M. Coué used the word ' imagination ' in an unusual way. He did not mean by it having a visual or an auditory image, but rather the concentrating of attention on an idea. This is clear when we think of his formula of helpful auto-suggestion, ' Every day and in every way I am getting better and better.' It is this concentration on an idea which will succeed when what he called ' will,' but which is rather ' self-consciousness,' will fail. The conflict of which M. Coué spoke is not between will and imagination ; it is between the idea that we take for granted and the idea that we picture ourselves realizing. The idea that we take for granted will always win, because whatever attention is given to it is given without anxiety, or what St. James calls double-mindedness. The ideas that we take for granted constitute our faith ; the ideas that we picture ourselves realizing, even with great effort, are our works. And faith always beats works.

---

An illustration makes the argument clearer, and Dr. TEMPLE writes : ' It was my good fortune several years ago to take the chair for Dr. Walford Davies on an occasion when he was teaching about two hundred working men and women to sing songs in unison. The result of his method was something astounding. We began by singing a well-known song, and we did it very badly ; the quality of tone was harsh, the rhythm was uncertain, the pitch was various, and the expression non-existent. Two hours later we were singing songs that we had never heard till that evening, and we made a truly glorious row. As soon as we were convinced that we sang very badly a song that we all knew we were switched off to songs quite new to us. Dr. Davies told us to listen as hard as we could while he played the tune to us ; he called for a real effort of concentrated attention. Then he said, " Now sing it. Don't *try* to sing it, but just sing it. All you have to do is to enjoy it, and the music will sing itself." . . . Dr. Davies, when things went wrong, said, " I know you are trying. Stop trying. Just enjoy it." But I have

also heard conductors say with manifest justification, "You are not trying a bit." What is wrong is not the effort but the direction of the effort. The effort should be not an effort to perform but an effort to attend. It is often hard to keep the mind fixed on the job in hand, but it is the essential act of will and the condition of all success. The singer should think steadily of the beauty of the music and enjoy it; then the performance will spontaneously be as good as his natural and technical qualifications permit. The seeker after health should fix his mind on health, and (if he has visual imagination) picture himself moving healthily, and he will become as healthy as conditions permit. The Christian should fix his mind on the beauty of the Holy Love, which is God, and is set forth for our adoring contemplation in Jesus, and Holy Love will both possess his soul and govern all his actions.'

In the fourth chapter of Philippians St. Paul writes, 'Finally, brethren, whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are august, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report, if there be any virtue and if there be any praise, occupy your minds with these things.' The Will chooses its master or its absorbing interest and maintains its loyalty by a perpetual act of choice.

What of bodily health? We want something better than M. Coué's formula. In it the attention is focused on the self, even though it is on an improving self, and we are urged to tell ourselves what is not true in the hope that it will become true. The Christian formula will rather be, 'God's Will is my welfare, God's Will is my welfare.' 'For the Christian God's will is the sovereign power; it accomplishes its purpose except so far as it limits itself to leave scope for the free action of created wills. I can shut God almost entirely out of my life; but if I open my heart and mind towards Him, He will work in me what He pleases, which will be better than I could have hoped for myself. But the heart and mind must be truly open; there must be expectation; and the limits of expectation will set limits to the full working of God in me. We have mostly excluded the whole bodily side of our nature from our expectation of divine blessing. This is false to the Gospel and implies a disastrous dualism in our philosophy. There is only one universe; and God is the life of it.'

It is our prevailing custom in these Notes to enlarge on some point handled or suggested in new publications. The reasons for that are obvious and sound. Yet our readers may pardon us if, once in a while, we go back to an older book to see if a re-reading has anything fresh for us. We have been re-reading Otto's great work *The Idea of the Holy*, and have got the suggestion of a suggestion which, we think, is of great interest, and perhaps some importance.

Readers will remember how Otto adduces the 'theophany' in the closing section of the Book of Job as an illustration of the 'numinous' in the Old Testament; and shows how Job is led from querulousness to adoration by an overpowering realization of *mysterium tremendum*. Now it is not Otto's concern to explain *Job*, and it is not ours to consider the 'numinous.' But Otto here suggests to our mind an answer to the questions, What is really the point of God's answer to Job? Is there an answer at all, and how does it meet Job's problem?

We are probably justified in saying that that has proved a perplexity to every reader of what Carlyle called 'the greatest book in the Bible or out of it.' How did it meet Job's problem of unmerited suffering to describe to him Behemoth and Leviathan, and ask him questions he could not answer about such things as the lightning, or the ostrich, or the wild goat? To a man ruined in home, happiness, and health, and clamouring with well-nigh frenzied insistence for an answer to his indignant *why?*, what answer is it to put such a catalogue of problems, the bearing of which on his case is so far from obvious? Yet it was an answer. Job felt that it was, and he must be allowed to know best. Expositors have been hard put to it to discern even a glimmer of the light which undoubtedly Job saw and which gave him

peace. Their views will be found sufficiently indicated in, for example, Strahan's masterly work, 'The Book of Job Interpreted.'

---

Well, Otto has suggested to us where light may be found. It has not to be searched for hidden away in the long chapters in which God is represented as speaking to Job, nor has it to be distilled out of them. It is so prominently placed that it has escaped most eyes. It lies in the very opening words, 'the Lord answered Job out of the whirlwind.' *Out of the whirlwind*—those are the only really important words; all that follows is by way of illustration—illustration of the 'whirlwind' features of human experience—the bizarre, the irrational, the insoluble, the unknowable, or the unmanageable. If the story of Job be historical at all, what happened was this. Job, puzzling his brains almost to distraction about the ways of God, suddenly either witnesses or remembers a whirlwind, that incalculable, inexorable, but majestic natural phenomenon. In the world of Nature, so orderly, so rational, there is the whirlwind to be remembered. And in the experience of man or of nations there is a 'whirlwind' feature too. Job had come into the path of a 'whirlwind.' In face of the whirlwind the dictum of Ecclesiastes holds good, 'there is one event to the righteous and to the unrighteous.' The question of personal merit or demerit is simply irrelevant.

So Job perceives that in the 'whirlwind' experience of suffering such as his, the question of his desert did not necessarily arise at all. There is the whirlwind, and however strange it seems, and whatever problems still remain, the realization of the fact of it has this merit at least, it opens a way out of the dilemma in which Job seemed shut up—either there is no God who cares, or I must have been a great sinner. Had Job come to either of those decisions, Satan would have been right in his contention. But between his wife, who urges him to atheism, and his friends, who press for a confession, Job finds a way out. There is such a thing as the whirlwind,—that answers his friends. God is in the whirlwind,—that answers his wife.

---

Again we repeat there is the 'whirlwind'—the incalculable, the inexplicable, the irrational; yes, there is all that to be possibly met in life. But God is in the whirlwind. We cannot say why the 'whirlwind' should be there: it is sufficient to know that God is in it. That is Job's view of human experience, that is Job's faith, that is what gave him peace. And even the New Testament merely makes a little more explicit what this unknown but supreme genius saw more or less clearly so long before: 'all things work together for good to them who love God.'

# The Messiahship of Jesus.

## III.

## The Evidence of St. John (2).

By the Reverend J. O. F. Murray, D.D., Selwyn College, Cambridge.

After an interval of uncertain duration, which included a Passover and the Feeding of the Five Thousand, Jesus returned to Jerusalem for the Feast of Tabernacles. His claim to be the Bread of Life, and the discussion to which that claim gave rise, can best be considered in connexion with His self-revelation to His disciples.

St. John's account of this visit to Jerusalem gives a vivid picture of the ferment in the popular mind about Him. Even before He appeared the crowds were full of eager questionings and were sharply divided in opinion about Him. But freedom of utterance was checked by fear of 'the Jews.' [1]

[1] This title in many places in these chapters suggests 'Judæan' as distinct from Galilean (*e.g.* $7^{1}$ $8^{31}$ $11^{45}$). It may be that this is always its meaning, with a few