
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.

It is exactly nine years and a half since Solomon Schechter died. He was an indefatigable worker in the cause of Jewish scholarship, and he delivered his last lecture only five hours before he died. Among his most important contributions were two series of *Studies in Judaism* (1896–1908); and to those who care for things Jewish it is a matter of great satisfaction that some of his published and unpublished papers have been collected and issued as a *Third Series* (The Jewish Publication Society of America, Philadelphia).

The wide range of subjects attests the versatility of the man. The opening chapter deals with Jewish Saints in Mediæval Germany; the concluding chapter represents Notes, lovingly collated by a pupil, of Lectures on Jewish Philanthropy. One chapter is devoted to the Talmud, a reprint of the article in Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible: another deals with the Study of the Talmud. A chapter is given to Abraham Geiger, and another to Leopold Zunz, two scholars who represent very different types of Judaism. And there is a chapter on a theological romance which appeared under the title 'As Others saw Him: A Retrospect, A.D. 54.' The 'Him' is Jesus; so that we have in this volume the attitude of a powerful and singularly well-equipped Jewish mind, not only to the history and literature of the Jewish people, but also to the great figure of the Christian faith.

We turn first to the chapters on the Talmud. Schechter had dealt with this before in the Second Series of Studies, but this is an altogether new discussion. The writer laments, no doubt justly, that to most people the Talmud is an almost entirely unknown quantity. Whether he is right in saying that 'for every Englishman who has read a line of the Talmud there are ten who have read the Rig-veda,' he is certainly within the mark when he says that there are 'numerous writers who have never read a line of the Talmud and yet have not hesitated to judge it.'

His chief complaint is that the Talmud, when it is studied at all, has not been studied for its own sake, but always to subserve some foreign purpose. It has been 'used or misused for every purpose except that of honest, dispassionate, and scientific inquiry.' Schechter illustrates his point by subjecting to a lengthy and searching criticism Edersheim's 'Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah,' which, while admitting its erudition, persuasiveness and earnestness of purpose, he regards as 'a signal example of the manner in which the Talmud is misinterpreted and misapplied.' In particular he objects to his 'jaundiced' opinion of the Rabbis as a body, and of the scant courtesy with which he treats them. Since this essay was written, more justice has been done to Pharisaism, but the chapter is a wholesome reminder of the knowledge and

skill which are necessary to tread these labyrinthine ways.

To one who is interested in the Jewish Reform Movement not the least interesting chapters of the book are those on Geiger and Zunz. Geiger was the most prominent leader of the Reform Movement among the German Jews during the nineteenth century, but though SCHECHTER is constrained to acknowledge his profound scholarship, he has little sympathy for the spirit by which his work was animated. Geiger was bitterly hostile to any national aspiration on the part of the Jews, which he regarded as alike romanticism and reaction. To him Jerusalem was a symbol rather than a place, and the longing for Palestine was something morbid and diseased. He was definitely hostile towards such symbols and ceremonies as tended to preserve the distinctiveness of Israel. What Israel needed was to be humanized.

This to SCHECHTER is intolerable. 'Is this the time,' he indignantly asks, 'when the thought of nationalization is universally accepted, to destroy it as far as Israel is concerned? Should we not rather cherish it as the best antidote against the poison of utter assimilation which threatens us now as never before?' His ideal among modern scholars is Zunz, who 'never apologized for the existence of Israel,' but 'loved Judaism with all his heart, and regarded the separateness of Israel, alike in nationality and religion, as a historical fact, which needed no apology.' The Essay on Zunz presents a valuable summary of the argument and contents of his famous 'Gottesdienstliche Vorträge der Juden.'

The chapter on Philanthropy covers a wide range, including among other things the Jewish attitude to suffering, poverty, work, hedonism, asceticism, and celibacy. Some of the best things, however, in this connexion are said in the first essay. Note these characteristically kindly references to animals, which are almost worthy of the writer of the Book of Jonah—they are taken from a mediæval Book of the Saints. 'The man who is cruel to animals will have to answer for it on the Day of Judgment, and the very drivers will be punished for applying the spur too often.' 'Be ever careful to feed the poultry in thy house before thou takest thy meal.' 'Never keep back thy mercy and compassion from anything which the Holy One, blessed be He, created in this world, be it even a dog or a cat or a creeping thing, or even a fly or a wasp.'

For Christian readers the chief interest of the book will probably centre round the chapter 'As Others saw Him.' Though there is much with which they will disagree, there are some things from which they may learn. Here is a thought, for example, provocative in both senses of the word: 'A thorough study of Jewish literature will lead to the conviction that Jesus was less meant as an incarnation of God than as an incarnation of Israel.' Again, there is the 'provocative' suggestion that the original text of Lk 10^{33} ran, 'a certain *Israelite*' instead of '*Samaritan*.' 'We shall thus have to replace the Good Samaritan of the Parable by the Good Israelite, who is the third estate of Jewish society, as the Priests and Levites were the first and second.

SCHECHTER's criticism of the story of Jesus and the money-changers can only seem to a Christian reader to rest upon a pathetic misconception of the originality and force of Jesus. He argues that neither beasts of sacrifice nor doves were sold in the Temple, but either in some stables in or outside the city, or on the Mount of Olives; and further that 'even with regard to the money-changers, there are still grave doubts whether they had their stalls in Jerusalem or in the Temple: the former is the more likely.' In a well-disciplined society, we are told, in which every member received his orders from the chief official, 'neither the scourge nor even quotations from the Bible are the proper means to effect a reform.' It appears that 'the reformer would first apply to a proper court, which alone had the power of altering the regulations.'

Are we really asked to believe that such con-

ventional standards of action are applicable to the unconventional and intrepid Jesus, the Jesus who hurled His radical challenge at so much, and who fearlessly criticized the venerable Mosaic law itself? When SCHECHTER urges that 'those who are so anxious for the rehabilitation of Jesus in the synagogue had best apply themselves to the rehabilitation of Israel in the synagogue,' we can only say that any adequate rehabilitation of Israel must include the rehabilitation of Israel's greatest Son. The synagogue will be all the richer and better for the presence within it of Jesus.

Readers of the Rev. T. W. PYM's excellent book on 'Psychology and the Christian Life' will welcome its sequel, now published under the somewhat unfortunate title of *More Psychology and the Christian Life* (S.C.M.; 4s. net). It is an eminently wise book and deals in a most helpful way with the bearings of the new psychology on the problems of the Christian life. The use and misuse of the imagination, its influence on belief, instinct and will, and the relation of faith and auto-suggestion are some of the topics handled, all of them in a finely Christian way.

On the sublimation of the primal instincts Mr. PYM is particularly good. A situation has arisen which urgently calls for right handling. The theories of the new psychology have been perverted or honestly misunderstood to fit the low prevailing standard of morality. 'Darwinism, either truly repeated or misunderstood, became popular talk much more slowly than the mixture of truth and falsehood, commonly supposed to be "the new psychology" straight from the lips of Freud and Jung, has invaded the mind of the man in the street. It is commonly and quite erroneously argued that here is scientific justification for the old lie—"You can't help it; it's human nature." Ten years ago the young man seeking to justify sex-irregularities would say, "After all, we're made like that; it's natural; and it's no good going against Nature." To-day he says, "Repression's most awfully dangerous. Lots of people who have nervous breakdowns get them through trying to be too moral. One mustn't sit on the safety-valve."'

What is the Christian answer to this new popular gospel of self-expression? In the first place, let it be made plain that mere stifling of impulse never was a cardinal point in the teaching of Jesus Christ; and the Church must learn, if she has not already learnt, that repression is not an adequate method of teaching moral conduct. On the other hand, it must be pointed out that certain emotions may have been stimulated in an unnatural and sinful way till they have become overwhelming lusts. 'It is absurdly untrue to say of the emotion so stimulated and intensified, "It's natural; I can't help it." It is in its way as artificial as the new appetite created during the banquet by the emetic in ancient Rome.' To preach surrender to these lusts is to renounce morality and claim to live as do the beasts. Still further, men must be taught that it is always possible to find for emotional energy other avenues of expression and means of satisfaction. 'Religion itself, all that is meant by loving God; the call to help mankind in however humble a way, a call that is instinctive in us really because we are members of a group or herd; expression through music and the other arts; the pursuit of adventure; friendship and worship—these will absorb some of the emotion which may not be spent in physical indulgence.' There will still remain for some a surplus of emotional energy which, apparently, must be controlled rather than expressed, but the struggle is not impossibly hard, nor need it result in defeat. 'Provided that mere repressive control has not been the policy adopted towards the sex-instinct as a whole, no harmful results need be feared as a consequence of the control of what remains, and there can be few psychologists of repute who would say otherwise.'

The reply, then, of Christianity to claims for self-expression is anything but a sheer negation. But it is no use pretending that the gospel of Jesus

can be so easily accommodated to what is really the claim advanced by many, that they are free to do exactly what they like. For the heart and centre of Christianity is not self-expression at all, but self-sacrifice. Here the self-expressionists raise a profound objection which cuts at the very roots of the faith. 'The Cross is a denial of life and a denial of self. As the Cross was physical mutilation, so are self-denial and self-sacrifice a mutilation of personality. It is inartistic, they say, it is ugliness and starvation. This line is urged, not only by the avowed hedonist, but by many who are quite sincere in believing that if God there be He must needs be Beauty, as well as Truth and Goodness.'

Again, what is the Christian answer? Briefly it is this, that assuredly beauty is an essential part of the Christian religion, but there is such a thing as beauty of character. We shall differ, no doubt, in our judgment of what is beautiful in character. 'But no matter whom we select it will never be one who has lived life on the principle of giving rein to primitive impulse. It will always be someone who has trained and disciplined or used natural impulse to what he conceived to be the best.'

Still there remains an extremity of self-sacrifice, as we see it in the Cross, which does seem to some an utter negation of life, and the question is asked, 'What else is this than starvation of life? In what is it creative?' Awkward as the question seems at first, it is amazing that it can be asked at all, for sacrifice is as creative as the act of the mother who gives her life for her child. 'Through the Resurrection Christians believe that the Cross is the Gateway of Life. But even those who as dogmatically assert that Calvary was the end of Jesus Christ cannot deny entirely the creative value of Good Friday.' Even standing alone, the Cross of Jesus Christ, the symbol of utter and complete self-surrender, has proved the most truly positive and creative symbol in the history of the world. 'Our experience of life to-day witnesses the same. It is blasphemy both against living and dead to say that those who have dedicated themselves at the risk of life itself to a cause or person other than their own are, or were, starved and mutilated personalities as a result of their gift. The compelling force that issues from many a man and woman is engendered by self-sacrifice alone. Yet here again those whose system of values is narrowly material, who deny the reality or the use of the spiritual, take no account of the most important element in personality. They do not see how true it is that those who are prepared to lose life find it, and that self-sacrifice is the climax of self-expression because it is the highest expression of Jesus Christ who is God.'

There seems to be at the present time a marked increase in propaganda of one kind and another. In religious circles it takes the form of 'Tracts for the Times,' and no less than three series of these have come our way and been noticed from time to time. The latest is the issue of *Papers in Modern Churchmanship* (Longmans; 3d. each), the title of which sufficiently indicates their general position. We have received four, one by DEAN INGE on *Liberalism in Religion*; the others on *The Nature of Punishment and Forgiveness*, by Mr. Douglas WHITE, M.A., M.D.; *What is the Church?* by Dr. Hastings RASHDALL; and *Criticism and the Old Testament*, by Professor KENNETT.

DEAN INGE is President of the 'Churchmen's Union,' and his tract may be regarded as a manifesto of Anglican Liberalism. It will be of interest, therefore, to give some account of it in columns which are devoted to the record of contemporary thought. The DEAN begins by deploring the fact that a clergyman is often regarded simply as a partial advocate who is bound to support the beliefs of his 'school' rather than as a fearless exponent of truth, and he claims that a belief in intellectual honesty is the mark of the theological Liberal, a complete confidence in reason as man's highest endowment and a rejection of obscurantism as treason against the spirit of truth.

This is mainly where the Liberal is to be distinguished from the Modernist. The DEAN thinks it is a pity 'Modernism' is becoming a usual designation of progressive thinking, for Modernists repudiate any sympathy with Liberals and reject their whole system. 'Modernism' is the accepted name of a school of thought in the Roman Catholic Church, and it differs fundamentally from Liberalism, being based on a different philosophy and a different attitude towards Church History.

The Modernist leans to pragmatism. The Church's dogmas are not truths of science; they are means by which the religious idea, embodied in the Church, came into the life of the people. Truth, in the religious sphere, means not factual accuracy, such as the historian and the man of science aim at, but whatever brings the mind into right relations with the Divine. 'Lex orandi, lex credendi,' which means that truth is what has devotional value. In consequence, the historical and scientific discoveries of the present day, which have had such destructive effects upon the faith of the educated, do not really touch the Catholic faith, which is not based on reason. Religion is fundamentally irrational. That is the philosophy of Modernism, and it reveals the actual methods by which the Catholic Church, as a great political institution, has flourished. To sum up, Modernism is Catholic, institutional, anti-rationalistic, and pragmatic.

Liberalism is very different. To begin with, it is Protestant, and this means that the centre of gravity in its religion is not the Church, but the Person of Christ. If Loisy and Tyrrel are representative Modernists, Matthew Arnold, Seeley, Harnack, Dr. Rashdall, and Dr. Glover are typical Liberals. Secondly, it is rationalistic. 'Rationalism' is often used loosely as a synonym for infidelity, but it really signifies a reliance on reason. The fact that the Modernist calls his opponents 'Intellectualists' and the Liberal calls his opponents 'Traditionalists' sufficiently indicates the divergence on this point. 'If I could not believe that Christianity is essentially rational,' Dr. Rashdall declares, 'I could not be a Christian.'

DEAN INGE then proceeds to a crucial point. 'In what sense, it may be asked, does the Liberal believe in the Divinity of Christ?' It is not possible, he says, to give an answer which holds good for all the school; but 'most Liberals would say that since Christ has lived and died, we have learned that an Incarnation of the Deity under the conditions of human existence must manifest itself in a perfect moral character and a supremely self-sacrificing life.' Dr. Glover has put the matter in the right way. Christian apologetics have been chiefly concerned in proving that the Incarnate Christ had the attributes of God. But what Jesus came to teach was not that He was like God, but that God was like Himself. 'He that hath seen me hath seen the Father.' If we look upon the matter in this light, we shall envisage the essential attributes of Divinity rather differently, and admit that nothing more Divine can be conceived than the human Christ.

But this is not the whole of a Liberal's faith. He does not worship a dead Christ, nor turn his gaze only upon the first century of our era. The Pauline and Johannine doctrine of the Holy Spirit means a great deal to him. This doctrine is that though Christ is withdrawn from our bodily eyes, His Spirit lives and works in the world. The presence of the Holy Spirit is a continuation of the Incarnation under another form. This is part also of the Catholic teaching; but whereas the Catholic finds the guidance of the Holy Spirit in the official acts of the Church, and in the sacraments which are dispensed by the Church's ministers, the Protestant looks for evidence of the activity of the Spiritual Christ mainly in the lives of saintly men and women and in the experiences of private prayer.

'In proportion as the Liberal Christian is leading a devout and Christ-like life, he will be found to make the centre of his religion the personal intercourse which he believes to exist between the human soul

and the glorified Christ, "the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever." He is indifferent to the evidence that Christ rose, because he feels and knows that He is risen.' The modern believer has the same reason as St. Paul for making the identification of this indwelling Spirit with the human Jesus, namely, the 'testimony of the Holy Spirit,' the felt unity of the Christ whom we know from the Gospels, and the Christ who is with us when we pray.

The Sunday School and the Child.

By the Reverend Carey Bonner, General Secretary of the National Sunday School Union.

The title given by the Editors brings us at once to the heart of the subject. It sets before us two factors: (*a*) an organization—the Sunday School, and (*b*) a living being—the child. Which is the greater in importance? and which is to have our first concern? Is the Child to be fitted to the Sunday School? or is the Sunday School to be fitted to the Child? The questions are vital ones. Many workers—implicitly at any rate—are, in their methods, answering 'Yea' to the first query. To them, the Sunday School is a moral and spiritual machine that gives shape to the scholar's character. Their position may be stated thus: 'Here are we, adult Christians, with our adult theology, experiences, and ideas. Bring the children to us and we will mould them according to our plan.' Such a position in my judgment is both false and harmful.

There is a better way. When our Lord spake concerning the institution of the Sabbath, and its relation to the living creature—Man, He gave us an infallible principle for guidance in such matters. Following that principle, we may take as our axiom that 'the Sunday School was made for the Child, not the Child for the Sunday School,' because we realize, as our Master did, that a living being is greater than an institution.

Without a doubt, therefore, our first concern is with the scholar. The Sunday School is simply an instrument aiding us to bring that scholar into a real relationship with God. But the bringing must be done in a child's way.

Speaking generally, the end we have in view is the religious education of the young people, in the Christian sense of that term.

I. We train life. Accordingly, WE MUST FOLLOW THE METHODS THAT ARE RELATED TO THE LIFE OF THE SCHOLAR. Organization should be the outward expression of life. Our first task is to study the child's interests and features of character. No sooner do we enter upon such study than we discover widely varying characteristics at the different stages of the child's development, and, at once, it becomes apparent that our plans must be carefully adapted to each of these unfolding stages.

At the first, when dealing with little folk, from, say, five to seven or eight years of age, we find them with abounding activity, loving to do things; with their outlook on life dominated by imagination and by feelings rather than by reason; with their interests chiefly centred upon what they see going on around them; and with an ability to understand abstract truth only when it is put in concrete form.

How can we so plan our organization as to provide for the outward expression of these faculties? An answer is supplied when we witness the working of a true 'Primary Department' such as may be found in hundreds of modern Sunday Schools. Here the little people have their separate spacious meeting-room, made beautiful by flowers and pictures, with a small chair for each scholar. Here, with marches and other outlets for activity, with simple songs and verse-prayers whose words are well within their apprehension, with the Leader's telling of Bible stories, and with Nature Talks, we find that every item of work gives the young scholars an opportunity to express their actual interests. As a result, there is good order and an atmosphere of joy and reverence. Surely it is right and fitting that a small child's first learning of the love of God in Jesus Christ should be associated with one of the brightest and happiest experiences of the week.

Then, when passing to the ages of from eight to