

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The 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

which appears merely an ordinary sketch to others, and He who knew what was in man could pierce to the hidden springs which were not to yield their rich secrets for many a long year.

Devotion would lead the Lord to entrust His mother to a 'son of Thunder.'

Youth is very critical of individuals, and apt to dwell upon the feelings of others, but when once its sympathies are enlisted it is capable of intense hero worship.

The beloved disciple being a young man would bear his Master's image on his heart, he would always be thinking of Him whenever Christ was present, his eyes would follow Him were they separated from each other, the disciple would half consciously to himself draw nearer and nearer to Him. It was the Lord's personality, not His ideas, that drew the beloved disciple to Him.

Love may quicken a person's power of perception, so that in connexion with any particular individual upon whom he may have fastened his affections, he will be quick to note what has happened to him, he will be very much alive to anything concerning him. This does not necessarily apply to quick discernment of his spirit and teaching. This, I venture to think, explains how the beloved disciple came to recognize that the Lord was risen. The Evangelist is most careful to point out that not only did Peter not know the Scriptures, but that this was the case also with the beloved disciple. This indicates that when the Resurrection had taken place the beloved disciple did not display such wonderful powers of insight as those with which he has been frequently accredited. Otherwise the repeated teaching of our Lord would have sunk deep in his heart and left a very definite impression upon his mind.

The other argument brought forward by Mr. Griffith, that Jn 18¹⁵ cannot apply to the Apostle John, is beyond the limits of this paper and has been partially met by Mr. Draper (THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, June 1921, p. 429). Whilst Archdeacon Charles believes in the early martyrdom of the Apostle, other competent authorities, e.g. Harnack and Stanton, neither of whom accept the Johannine authorship, take the contrary view. It is not fashionable to believe in the apostolic authorship of the Fourth Gospel, but more can be said in its favour than has hitherto been given.

At any rate, it would be strange to think that it

was reserved to this age to make the discovery that Lazarus was the author of the Fourth Gospel, a person to whom the early Church never dreamt of assigning 'the spiritual gospel.' H. RIGG.

Beverley Minster, E. Yorks.

Heb. ii. 16 in the Peshitta Syriac Version.

I SHOULD like to draw the attention of those who do not read Syriac, and of those who do but who may not have seen the edition of the *Peshitta N.T.* recently published by the British and Foreign Bible Society, to a remarkable reading of He 2¹⁶.

The difficulties connected with the interpretation of this verse are well known; speaking broadly, there are two main lines of explanation. One, which is the general opinion of the ancient expounders, is that the writer is affirming that our Lord did not assume angelic but human nature, typified for himself and his Hebrew readers by the seed of Abraham. The A.V. has made us familiar with this view: 'For verily he took not on him the nature of angels; but he took on him the seed of Abraham'—a translation, however, which is so far wrong in that *ἐπιλαμβάνεται* is present, 'he takes,' not 'he took.' The second general opinion is that the writer is saying that our Lord does not help angels but mankind, typified by the seed of Abraham: and this appears to be the view of most modern interpreters.

The chief difficulty lies with *ἐπιλαμβάνεται*. This verb occurs nineteen times in the N.T., and over fifty times in the O.T. and Apocrypha, but in none of these places does the word mean 'assume' or 'take upon oneself,' nor does it appear to have any such meaning in classical literature. Its meaning is, 'to take hold of,' or 'to grasp,' or 'to seize.' The R.V., keeping strictly to the grammar, has: 'For verily not of angels doth he take hold, but he taketh hold of the seed of Abraham.'

Chrysostom, whose competency in the Greek language is beyond dispute, evidently felt that *ἐπιλαμβάνεται* with difficulty fitted the view that the meaning is that our Lord assumed human nature, for he says: *τί ἐστιν ὁ φησιν; Οὐκ ἀγγέλου φύσιν ἀνεδέξατο, ἀλλ' ἀνθρώπου. Τί δέ ἐστιν ἐπιλαμβάνεται; Οὐκ ἐκείνης, φησίν, ἐδράξατο τῆς φύσεως τῶν ἀγγέλων, ἀλλὰ τῆς ἡμετέρας. Διὰ τί δὲ οὐκ*

