
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

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

It is noteworthy that it is only in these chapters that the question of Messiahship comes up for public discussion. The title is not found on the lips of disciples after the first chapter, except in 11^{25}. The rulers consider only the claim of Jesus to be a Prophet (7^{52}). The threat of expulsion from the synagogue alluded to in 9^{32} shows, however, that there was a tendency to regard Him as Christ, which had to be kept in check.

It is fatal to any true understanding of the narrative to impute to the protagonists on either side the bitterness of spirit with which theological controversies, whether Jewish or Christian, have made us only too familiar. If the Evangelist really represents Jesus as wrangling in that sense in these chapters, Lord Charnwood is fully justified in refusing to accept the account as historical. Whatever basis of genuine reminiscence may underlie it, his description of Jesus is out of character and cannot be true to fact. But, if we admit, as we must, that the Evangelist shows in the rest of his Gospel a singularly deep and sympathetic appreciation of his Subject, we shall hesitate long before we acquiesce in this solution.

The situation, we must remember, was unique. A New Order of human experience, a new stage in the emergent evolution of the human race, began with Jesus. It is not surprising, therefore, that the problem with which He was confronted, when He strove to give an account of Himself to His contemporaries, should have proved well-nigh insoluble. There was no language—in the nature of things there could be no language—to fit the case. Words spring out of experience, and are intelligible only in the light of it. So no words could express what Jesus was. Nothing short of His life in human flesh, His Death, His Resurrection, and His Ascension could do that. And, even so, only those who were willing to learn from Him could understand Him. Unless we realize the limitations against which Jesus was struggling, it is impossible to do justice either to the recorder of these discussions, or to those who took part in them.

The hints that the Evangelist gives from time to time of the comments current in various circles are illuminating, but we must confine our attention to the occasions in which Jesus Himself is speaking.

easily intelligible exceptions; *e.g.* 'The Passover of the Jews'; 'The Jews have no dealing with the Samaritans'; or, on the mouth of Pilate. Their attitude is throughout critical, often aggressively hostile, though some even of them are from time to time won over. This usage strongly suggests that the writer was a Galilean.

He has, we must remember, two distinct objects in view. He has to help men to understand who He was and the work that He had come to do. He has also to keep before their minds the causes and the consequences of rejecting His claim.

His self-revelation begins with a comment drawn from Him by the popular confidence that they knew all that there was to know about His origin. It is in form affirmative, but it was meant to rouse heart-searchings. 'Ye know both me, and whence I am; and I have not come from myself, but he that sent me is true, whom ye know not. I know him; for I am from him, and he sent me.'

The first clause, though it is in strong contrast to the second, is not, I think, an ironical echo of the popular confidence, but a solemn assertion of the fact that, even as they stood, they had a real, however dim, sense of the meaning of His claim.

His next utterance follows an official attempt to arrest Him. It asserts that the origin of His mission was also its goal, and that when after His departure they began to feel their need of Him, He would be inaccessible. The people, however, fail entirely to apprehend His meaning.

Then on the last day of the Feast Jesus takes the occasion presented by the commemoration of the Divine provision made for the wants of Israel in the Wilderness to invite men to come to Him for the Water of Life, just as He had claimed to be the true Manna in the Synagogue at Capernaum. This invitation to all the thirsty is closely akin to the invitation to all the weary in a strikingly Johannine context in St. Matthew. The people are conscious of a Divine drawing in these words, but are put off by the Judæan prejudice against Galilee, which finds a voice even in the Sanhedrin.

Jesus then lays hold of yet one more of the experiences of Israel in the Wilderness as a symbol of the service that He had come to render. Israel had been guided in their wanderings by 'the fiery, cloudy pillar.' Jesus is the true Shechinah, the Light of the World, the source of the Light of Life to all who follow Him.

He is at once rebuked for self-assertion, perhaps with intentional reference to His own words in 5^{31}. He makes no effort to defend His verbal consistency. He takes up the question of testimony, which their objection raises, and adds to His previous list of evidences the testimony of His own consciousness. He knew as His critics did not, His own origin and goal. And His confidence in the evidence of His own consciousness was not due to self-delusion. It was supported by the evidence of the Father that sent Him. But, as long as they refused to

recognize Him, they could make nothing of His appeal to His Father.

Jesus then brings them back to the question of His approaching departure. This time it is to emphasize the spiritual consequences for them of separation from Him. Failure to recognize Him must issue in death. The form in which He expresses this failure is a striking indication of the bankruptcy of human language. He says simply, 'Unless ye believe that I am.' No word is added, or can be, to define more closely 'What' I am. The phrase means simply that 'It is I,' 'that I am myself,' that 'I am what I am,' or possibly, that, 'I am he' (cf. Is 43^{10} LXX). It evokes, therefore, inevitably a challenge for a more explicit statement. 'Who art Thou?' And to this no verbal answer is possible. He meets it with a sigh at the hopelessness of any attempt to communicate His meaning by words, coupled with a recognition of the fact that even so the words that He used were judging them. This responsibility He can face only by virtue of His trust in the Father from whom the words came. And He had this consolation: their rejection of Him would be His exaltation, and in the end their eyes would be opened to understand the secret of His being. Meanwhile He has the constant support of His Father's approval.

This appeal was not without effect, and Jesus begins at once to apply a searching test to their incipient faith. He offers them spiritual freedom, arising from contact with reality as the result of persevering discipleship.

If Saul of Tarsus, after his conscience had been aroused, had been there, he would have felt the attraction of this promise. But to the Pharisee, proud of his own righteousness, it seemed insulting. Jesus could only repeat that as long as sin is natural to a man, he is a slave, however truly he may be a member of the household of God, adding that no one who was at heart a slave could retain his place in that household. Only the spirit of Sonship ministered by the Son could emancipate.

He proceeds to confront their pride of race with the determination to put Him to death, which came from their national refusal to accept His leadership. His words came from His experience with the Father. So He calls them to obey the message that has come to them from Him. They take refuge in the fact of their physical descent from Abraham. This vain confidence can only be broken down by being sharply confronted once more with their determination to put him to death. Such a purpose betokened a very different spiritual ancestry from that of Abraham.

The only other parentage that they can acknowledge is that of God. 'God,' says Jesus, 'cannot be in any effective sense your Father, while you reject me. The spirit that is possessing you is the spirit of a diabolic sonship. This is what explains your failure to accept the truth when it is put before you.' The Jews regard this as wild Samaritan or demoniac raving. Jesus, in answer, can only once more commit His honour into the Father's keeping. He then goes on to promise to the loyal freedom, not only from Sin, but from the power of Death.

However little the Jews understood the power of Sin, they had no doubt about the power of Death. A man who professes to deliver from Death must be more than a Prophet, more even than Abraham. But the place of Jesus in relation to the race depends not on His own claims, but on His Father's appointment. It could not be an afterthought. It had in it an element of eternity. 'Your Father Abraham rejoiced to see my day.' 'Before Abraham came into being I am he.' In other words, He claims to be the root as well as the seed of Abraham.

If we put ourselves reverently and humbly into the position of Jesus, and remember that those to whom He spoke had the truth presented to them by Jesus Himself and failed on moral grounds to apprehend it, and if we then ask ourselves if there is any lack of love in the plain speaking which is found in these chapters, I have confidence that St. John will stand the test. Must not a man who is shutting his eyes to the truth and plotting to murder the innocent be denying his Divine parentage and making himself a child of the devil? If so, what can perfect love do, but strive to open his eyes to the fact?

The healing of the man born blind and his expulsion by the Jewish authorities are followed by a comment on spiritual blindness, and by the claim of Jesus to be the Door of the sheepfold and the Good Shepherd, in contrast with the robber and the hireling. In connexion with this claim Jesus declares that the object of His coming is to bring life, and indicates that He would have to lay down His own life in the fulfilment of His duty to His sheep.

A renewed challenge to claim Messiahship is met by a reassertion of His oneness with the Father, and of the evidence that His works provided of His intimate communion as Son with the Father.

When this claim is denounced as blasphemous, He points to the evidence in Scripture to the kinship between the Divine Nature and the human. If men appointed to act as judges in the land

are called gods, because they had to declare the decision of God in disputed cases, Jesus was more than justified by His public consecration and commission in claiming to be Son of God.

The raising of Lazarus only brings the designs against the life of Jesus to a focus. In spite of this, Jesus goes up to Jerusalem for the Passover and enters the City amid the hosannas of the crowd, accepting for the first time in the Gospel public homage as King of Israel. The request of certain Greeks to see Jesus introduces a lesson on the fruitfulness of sacrifice, followed by a sharp anticipation of the Agony in the Garden, a declaration of the judgment on the Prince of this world, and of the power of the Cross to draw all men to Jesus. After one last appeal to the people to believe in the light before it is taken from them, the public ministry comes to an end.

The Evangelist adds a brief comment on the failure of the people to respond to the appeal based on the prophet Isaiah. Then after declaring the reasons which kept back some of the leaders from being true to their convictions, he concludes this section of his Gospel with a concise summary, which he assigns to no special occasion (12^{44-50}), of the teaching of Jesus on His relation to the Father and to the world as implied in His public teaching. In this He asks for complete surrender because the Father is with Him, and can be known in the revelation that the Son has given of Him. This revelation is light, and can dispel the darkness which covers all the world that knows not God. The coming of the light brings judgment to those that neglect it. But the purpose of its coming is not judgment, but salvation. Any clear call of duty which comes to a man and is spurned by him will rise against him 'in the last day.' It is a word of the Father mediated by the Son. It springs from the eternal fountain in the heaven—from the Will of the Father mediated to men by the willing obedience of the Son, who has learnt in His own experience that Life Eternal is the issue of obedience, and can therefore utter the words that His Father gives Him to utter in spite of the judgment that is their immediate result.

Such is the account that St. John gives of the efforts that Jesus made to explain His claim to those in authority, and to the people at large, before their trial day came on the first Good Friday. There remains one further direction in which Jesus had to make clear the position and authority which He claimed to one whose office forced him to come to some conclusion with regard to the claim, inasmuch as the supreme judicial authority with the power of life and death was by Divine appointment at that time committed to him. We should have been at a loss to conjecture the form that this exposition took, if it were not for the account in Jn 18^{33-37} of our Lord's examination by Pontius Pilate.

Pilate is inquiring into the charge that his prisoner had been claiming to be a king. To his evident surprise, Jesus does not deny the charge; though He makes it clear that the sovereignty that He claimed differed fundamentally in origin, and in the force that lay behind it, from that which it was Pilate's duty to exert as the representative of Cæsar. To avoid the possibility of mistake, Pilate repeats his question: 'Art thou a king then? and Jesus answers, Thou sayest that I am a king. For this have I been born and for this I came into the world, that I may bear witness to the truth. Every one that is of the truth heareth my voice.'

These are clearly words of inexhaustible significance. As Dr. Westcott points out, they are 'the good confession' which He witnessed before Pontius Pilate: corresponding to the confession before the High Priest. They reveal the purpose of the Incarnation, not now as the fulfilment of the promises of God to His chosen people through the prophets, but in terms which make it the answer to the age-long searching of the human spirit. It is, however, by no means easy to determine how far Pilate was in a position to grasp their meaning, especially in relation to the subject immediately under discussion.

We may assume that he was an educated Roman gentleman, familiar with the points at issue between the rival schools of philosophy, Stoic, Epicurean, and Academic or Sceptic, that flourished in his day. If so, a claim to kingship based on a witness to the Truth would have suggested the well-known Stoic doctrine that the Wise Man was the true king. Plato had declared that his ideal State must await realization until a king appeared who was also a philosopher. The Stoic went further and maintained that the ideal Wise Man, with or without a crown, had the essential characteristics of a king. He, and he alone, had the vision of Truth, the intelligent apprehension of reality, which made him master of his circumstances and gave him the capacity to guide and rule his fellows.

Jesus, therefore, in basing His claim to kingship on His witness to the Truth, at least gave Pilate a reminder of the existence of a Kingdom, in this world though not of it, in which Cæsar's writs did

not run, and which his legions could not help him to annex. Pilate's answer, 'What is truth?'—in spite of Bacon's epigram—was no jest, though he did not wait for a reply. It was the natural answer of a 'Sceptic' when asked to give his assent to any positive proposition. It suggests that He had caught at least this much of the Lord's meaning. A deeper understanding of the words, as they themselves declared, depended on a spiritual condition which Pilate, alas! failed to fulfil. As his subsequent conduct showed, he believed in the innocence of his prisoner, but dared not face the consequences of acting up to his convictions. He was not 'of the truth,' and so failed to hear the voice of the King.

We must not, of course, limit the words to the meaning which Pilate was capable of apprehending. There is no reason to suppose that they were addressed exclusively to him. The truth expressed in them concerns the whole world. The examination was held in open court, though religious scruples prevented the prosecution from setting foot in it. So there may well have been among those who heard 'the Good Confession' some who were better qualified than the Roman Governor to appreciate it. If, for instance—and it is by no means an extravagant supposition—'the other disciple' who had followed His Master into the house of the High Priest, followed Him on into the Governor's palace, and himself heard the cross-examination which he reports, the reference to the Truth would have recalled at once the revelation to St. Thomas which he had heard but a few hours before. And the two utterances would have begun at once to give and receive light each from the other, as they cannot fail to do as soon as we take them together.

Such in outline is the account in St. John of the claims put forward publicly by our Lord in the course of His ministry.

Here, as in St. Mark, His consciousness of Himself as 'the Christ the Son of God' is all-pervading. With the details of that consciousness as it affected His personal relations to His Father in heaven we have dealt only in passing, as they came into expression when He was on His defence before the Sanhedrin. This part of the subject demands a fuller treatment, which must include an examination of the more intimate self-revelation that He made in His intercourse with His disciples, especially in chapters thirteen to seventeen. For on this side also of the life which he records, St. Mark leaves us asking searching questions and looking for fuller light. But our immediate subject is limited to the consideration of the claim to authority over the people of God that Jesus put forward on the strength of it, and of the steps that He took to make His claim clear to the constituted authorities in Jerusalem. In St. Mark our attention is concentrated on the final crisis, and we are given no hints of any preparation that Jesus had made for the inevitable conflict. St. John shows us how Jesus all through His ministry had been in close touch with the Jewish authorities, the Sadducean High Priests and the Pharisaic lawyers. There is nothing in this that conflicts with any positive statement in St. Mark. There is much that throws welcome light on St. Mark's account of the last week of the ministry. And, we may add, the account of the examination of Jesus before Pilate in St. John goes far to explain the action of Pilate, which in St. Mark is so summarily treated as to be utterly unintelligible as it stands (15^{2-5}).

St. John's account is self-consistent. The only point in which we are conscious of a residual conflict of testimony lies in the impression that we gather from Mk 8^{29} that faith in the Messiahship of Jesus was the goal of discipleship, while Jn 1^{41} seems to make it the starting-point. When we consider how fluid the conception of Messiahship was, we shall, I think, hesitate long before we regard it as an irreconcilable contradiction. And still longer before we assume that the error, if there be an error, is to be put to the account of St. John.

Literature.

DR. C. G. MONTEFIORE ON THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS.

IN the first volume of Jackson and Lake's 'The Beginnings of Christianity' (1920), Dr. Montefiore wrote: 'I should be far from attempting to deny the original elements in the Gospel teaching. The summons not to wait till they meet you in your sheltered and orderly path, but to go forth and seek out and redeem the sinner and the fallen, the