

# 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](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php)

pdfs are named: [Volume]\_[Issue]\_[1<sup>st</sup> page of article].pdf

# THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

---

## Notes of Recent Exposition.

Is it possible to find some middle term to describe our Lord? Some term that will show Him not merely man and not wholly God? Would 'Son of God' do? Thomas said, 'My Lord and my God': may we say, 'My Lord and my Son of God'?

---

Some such term the DEAN OF CARLISLE is evidently in need of. He does not believe that Jesus was God, and he does not believe that He was merely man. If he believed that He was merely man he would be a Unitarian. But a Unitarian he is not. Most emphatically he declares himself no Unitarian. 'If there are any people calling themselves Unitarians who feel they could with sincerity use such language of Christ, [as he himself is prepared to use] then of course they are not really Unitarians.'

---

Under the title of *Jesus Human and Divine* (Melrose; 3s. 6d. net), Dr. RASHDALL has published three sermons in which he vindicates himself from the charges made against him by the newspapers. The charges were made on the basis of reports of his Cambridge address. These reports appear to have been untrue, and sometimes unfair. And the charges which were based upon them repeated the untruth and doubled the unfairness. He defends himself indignantly.

And he does well to be indignant. But if there were any honest and accurate men among his reporters and editors he does not help them much. He does not tell them how it can be that Jesus of Nazareth was more than man and less than God. The Apostle Paul had evidently a firm belief in Beings of a middle order between God and man. But the DEAN OF CARLISLE does not share that belief. What will he have us call this Man who was divine as no other man is divine? Where will he send us to find Him?

---

During the War, and for some little time after it, the belief was freely expressed that the willing sacrifice of a man's life for his country cancelled past shortcoming, whether of faith or of morals, and opened the gate of heaven. The assurance gave much comfort to parents and friends. Then some zealous evangelical called it salvation by heroism, and the comfort of it came to an end. For how does salvation by heroism differ from salvation by works? And we know that by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified in God's sight.

---

Is that the end, then? It is not. Dr. Edward LYTTELTON has raised the question again in his *Letters on Education*, noticed on another page. He has raised it unintentionally, even uncon-

sciously, but he has raised it. For the sole purpose of these letters is to prove that salvation is deliverance from self. Teach the children, he says, to get rid of their ego, to get rid of all reference to their own interests; teach them to turn their thoughts to God and to refer all their affairs to His will and approval, and you educate them. That is what he says. He could as certainly say, 'and you save them.'

But the men did that. What happened in October 1914? Dr. LYTTELTON asks the question. And answers: 'A million of our young men came forward cheerfully and gave themselves—all they had, all they were—gave themselves cheerfully, as any one could see—gave themselves heroically, as we afterwards saw, for their country.' Whatever self had been to them hitherto, it was nothing to them now. They counted not their lives dear unto them, that they might win—what? Clearly salvation, heaven. And clearly they won it.

Dr. John Watson had much wrestling in his day with this matter. He threw his understanding of it at last into the story of Mr. Saunderson's housekeeper. 'Mr. Saunderson had a housekeeper whose name was Mrs. Pitillo, and he tells us of her gifts in the following strain:—

"She had the episcopal faculty in quite a conspicuous degree, and was, I have often thought, a woman of sound judgment.

"We were not able at all times to see eye to eye, as she had an unfortunate tendency to meddle with my books and papers, and to arrange them after an artificial fashion. This she called tidying, and in its most extreme form, cleaning. With all her excellences, there was also in her what I have noticed in most women, a flavour of guile, and on one occasion, when I was making a brief journey through Holland and France in search of comely editions of the Fathers, she had the books carried out into the garden and dusted. It was the space of two years before I regained mastery of my library again, and unto this day I cannot lay my hands on the Service-book of King Henry VIII.,

which I had in the second edition, or Rutherford's 'Lex Rex.' It does not become me, however, to reflect on the efforts of that worthy woman, and, if any one could be saved by good works, her place is assured. I was with her before she died, and her last words to me were, 'Tell Jean tae dust yir bukes ance in sax months, and for ony sake keep ae chair for sittin' on.' It was not perhaps the testimony one would have desired in the circumstances, but yet, Mr. Carmichael, I have often thought that there was a spirit of—of unselfishness, in fact, that showed the working of grace."

That is Dr. Watson. But Dr. Watson was not an evangelical? Very well. Was Dr. Alexander Whyte an evangelical? One day, in his pulpit in Edinburgh, Dr. Whyte was expounding the parable of the Good Samaritan. Suddenly he stopped. With a flash of his eye—that glare they knew, and called it so—he swept the congregation before him. 'But,' he said. Now notice what he said.

The text was, 'Go, and do thou likewise.' It was the Lord's last word to the lawyer who stood up and tempted Him. 'But,' said Dr. Whyte, 'some lawyer here, willing to justify himself, will stand up to tempt me, and will demand of me whether I mean to deny all my late sermons on the Romans? And to teach to-night that this Samaritan was justified before God simply because of this good deed of his? I quite admit that both our Lord and His Apostle sometimes teach economically, and paradoxically, and one-sidedly even, on occasion. All the same,—go you and do you as this good Samaritan did. And if death and judgment overtake you walking beside your mule on the way to the inn at Jericho: or if your Lord summons you to give in your account when you are up smoothing the pillow of a half-dead enemy of yours; I would far rather take your chance of eternal life than if death and judgment overtook you still debating, however Calvinistically, about your evangelical duty. Yes: Go at once to-night and do likewise.'

Is not that salvation by heroism? If not, it only lacks the hero. But, you say, surely evangelicalism demands faith—faith in God, faith in Christ. Surely it does. And it shall have it.

Had your million of heroes in October 1914 no faith? Why did they offer themselves? Says Dr. LYTTLETON: 'Any stranger would surely have expected us to deride these fellows as a swarm of lunatics. Did we? We did not; and if anyone showed the least inclination to disparage their conduct in the slightest degree we loaded him with unmeasured vituperation.' For the offering they made was made in faith.

It was faith in king, in country, in their homes, in father or mother, in wife, in children. But that is faith in God. That is faith in Christ. 'Inasmuch as ye did it unto one of these, ye did it unto me.' Not, ye did it just as if ye were doing it unto Me. Ye did it unto Me.

For He is one with His brethren. He is identified with them. He and they are inseparable. He is in them. They are in Him. Boundaries are banished. Physical barriers are swept off. Faith in wife and child, though they are so near to self, is faith in Christ. For it is not self; it is the denial of self. It sends a man into the firing line, where there is no room for self to be.

Messrs. Macmillan have issued the second volume of that elaborate work on the Acts of the Apostles which is edited by Professor F. J. Foakes JACKSON, D.D., and Professor Kirsopp LAKE, and which itself is part of a still larger work entitled *The Beginnings of Christianity*. This volume includes the second part of the Prolegomena to Acts and the Criticism (24s. net).

It is a composite production, curiously composite. For not only are nine different writers' work in it, in addition to that of the Editors

themselves, but there are three appendixes, all (somewhat remotely) bearing on the matters discussed, one of them an insurmountable surprise. The Editors tell the story of Margaret Catchpole and occupy twenty pages with it.

One of the writers is Professor F. C. BURKITT. It is he that expresses most unreservedly the purpose for which the book is written. That purpose is to estimate the historical value of the Acts of the Apostles. He divides the book into two parts. The historical value of the second part he probably rates higher than that of the first part. It is of the first twelve chapters that he gives his opinion.

He asks the question: 'What reason, then, have we for trusting the narrative of the first twelve chapters of Acts? Or rather, what measure of credence ought we to give them?' And he answers, 'Roughly, this: we should give them much the same measure of credence that we give to the story of the visit of Jesus to Jerusalem as related in Luke, as compared with the story in Mark. It seems to me that this measure of credence may be compared with that which we give to Shakespeare's *Henry V.* as compared with Hall's *Chronicle*. Shakespeare's play is very much more than a work of fancy. If we knew nothing about the great Lancastrian except what we get from Shakespeare, we should still have a great deal of solid information. We should know the outlines of the history and the heroic story of Agincourt. We should also have a not unhistorical picture of the character of the heroic king, drawn for us by a great literary genius. Something of this is what we have in the Lucan writings. In the Gospel we can partially control the author's tale, for we possess one of his sources. In the Acts we are almost entirely dependent on what he has chosen to tell us.'

Four authors discuss the identity of the editor (not author, you observe) of the Third Gospel and the Acts. The result is unexpected. One of the

authors is Mr. C. W. EMMET. Now he would be a hardy unbeliever who would accuse Mr. EMMET of giving the case away to the traditionalist. Yet Mr. EMMET finds the Acts and the Epistles in agreement, and not substantially only, but even in detail. And Herr WINDISCH, who is appointed to answer him, does not weaken the force of one of his arguments.

But the essay of deepest interest has been contributed by the Editors themselves. It goes by the title of 'The Internal Evidence of Acts.' It is long and loose. The whole volume gives the impression of indifference to space and time. But as the end approaches we find ourselves among matters of utmost importance.

There is, first of all, a comparison between the three Synoptists in respect of their primary purpose. Mark, we are told, had the single object of persuading his readers that Jesus was the Messiah, 'in spite of the fact that Jesus himself had not proclaimed this openly.' Matthew accepts the position of Mark, but goes a step further. He seeks to prove that Jesus gave a new Law, a Law which He intended should not merely supplement but take the place of the Law of Moses. Luke also accepts the position of Mark, and also goes beyond it. His special contribution is the claim that the Christian community is a Church, and the evidence that was required to support that claim.

More striking than that, more striking to the Editors as well as to us, is the discovery, if it is a discovery, that the theology of Acts and the theology of Paul represent separate lines of development.

They announce it as a discovery. For hitherto even the most radical critics have been under the influence of the tradition that Luke was a disciple of Paul, and so have searched for traces of Paulinism in Acts. But 'Acts and Paul are singularly independent of each other, for sometimes one and

sometimes the other seems to be the more advanced, and there is no satisfactory evidence that either borrows from the other.'

They find three sets of facts which go to prove the truth of this discovery. First, the word 'Christ' is used differently. In Acts it is a title; in Paul it has become a name. Next, there is little or no soteriology in Acts. The crucifixion is simply a Jewish crime, its value for reconciliation has not been reached. And, thirdly, 'the interpretation of the Servant of the Lord in Isaiah as a reference to the Messiah is markedly characteristic of Luke but is not found in Paul, although one would have supposed that, had he known it, Paul would certainly have made use of it to support his soteriological arguments.'

Does all that signify that the Acts is earlier than the Pauline Epistles? It seems to point that way. But the Editors will not have it. They hasten to say that the only conclusion we can come to is that Luke and Paul represent two lines of development in Christian thought.

But the most striking comparison with the writings of Luke is not offered by any book in the New Testament. It is offered by the Apostles' Creed.

Taking the Third Gospel and the Acts together, the Editors find certain articles of belief and set them forth in this way :

- '(1) God, as
  - (a) the Creator of the World, and
  - (b) the Father of the Lord and of his People.
- (2) Jesus, the Christ, as
  - (a) the Son of God, born of the Holy Spirit and the Virgin Mary ;
  - (b) the Lord,
    - who suffered under Pontius Pilate and Herod, died, was buried, rose again on the third day, ascended

into Heaven, sits at God's right hand,  
and is coming to judge the world.

- (3) The Holy Spirit.
- (4) The Church.
- (5) Baptism, and the Apostolic Laying on of hands.
- (6) The Forgiveness of Sins.
- (7) The Resurrection of the Dead.'

The likeness to the Apostles' Creed is evident enough. But it becomes still more evident if the remarks of K. HOLL to the Berlin Academy in January 1919 are taken into account. HOLL points out that the second article of the Creed begins with a double description of Jesus Christ as 'the only-begotten Son of God' and 'our Lord,' and that then this double description is explained by two paragraphs, each beginning with the article—'who was born (τὸν γεννηθέντα) of the Holy Ghost and the Virgin Mary,' and 'who was crucified' (τὸν . . . σταυρωθέντα). This is in closest correspondence with the doctrine of Luke, who alone treats the Divine Sonship of Jesus as beginning with His birth of the Holy Spirit and the Virgin Mary.

There are thus two types of doctrine in the documents which have been preserved. And now 'the problem which is opened up for the Church historian is to distinguish, so far as possible, the traces of that type of Christianity which is represented by the Synoptic Gospels, Acts, and the Apostles' Creed, from that other great line of thought, ultimately triumphant, which is represented by the later epistles of St. Paul, by the Fourth Gospel, and by the Alexandrian School of theology, and found final expression in the Nicene Creed.'

It is surprising to see how completely in a single generation the centre of interest has changed from the Old Testament to the New. Careful observers tell us that in the United States of America a great upheaval is at hand over the Old Testament.

In Great Britain we are clean past that. We are occupied now with the more vital problems of the New.

And the focus of interest is the Fourth Gospel. The intensity of interest in the Fourth Gospel is manifest in many ways. Some men are giving themselves to a discussion of its structure, some to an investigation of its contents, some to the keener question of its authorship. But for the moment the most absorbing interest of all is the study of its sources.

To that interest the latest contribution has been made by Dr. C. F. BURNEY, Oriel Professor of the Interpretation of Holy Scripture in the University of Oxford. It is no less than an attempt to prove that the Fourth Gospel was written in Aramaic.

Professor BURNEY does not say that the Greek we have is simply the translation of an Aramaic original. What he says, and what he believes he can prove, is that an Aramaic original underlies the present Greek Gospel. He believes he can prove that there was a Gospel written in Aramaic, which was translated into Greek, with freedom on the part of the translator, and with some faults. He believes he can prove that that Aramaic Gospel was substantially the Gospel which we now call 'according to St. John.'

His book is entitled *The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel* (Oxford: at the Clarendon Press; 16s. net). To do its distinguished author justice the book must be read. All that can be attempted here is to touch at one or two of the places where he seems to make persuasive points.

His work on the Prologue is based on an article contributed by Dr. C. J. Ball to THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for November 1909. But he has worked through the literature of the subject for himself, and in particular has missed no scrap of linguistic worth thrown up by the papyri or ostraka. Above all, he has rigidly refused to accept as evidence of

translation from the Aramaic words or phrases which may be traced to the Septuagint. He has remembered that the Septuagint diction is Hebraic—a different thing from an Aramaic diction.

Look first at the notes on the Prologue. In v.<sup>5</sup> we read: 'And the light shineth in darkness; and the darkness comprehended it not.' That is the Authorized Version. The Revised Version has 'apprehended,' with 'overcame' in the margin, and a reference to Jn 12<sup>86</sup>, 'Walk while ye have the light, that darkness overtake you not'—the same Greek word. The Greek word is *κατέλαβεν*. Now if this Greek word were turned into Aramaic, it would be represented there by a word which is very like another word meaning 'to darken.' Take it that the Greek translator mistook the one word for the other. We have then the excellent sense: 'The light shineth in the darkness, and the darkness obscured it not.' The sense 'obscure,' adds Dr. BURNEY, equally suits Jn 12<sup>35</sup>: 'that darkness shroud you not.'

In v.<sup>14</sup> we read: 'And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us.' The Greek verb translated 'dwelt' is *ἐσκήνωσεν*, tented, tabernacled (RVm.), from *σκηνή*, 'a tent.' It is a curious verb to use. Dr. BURNEY believes that it was suggested to the Greek translator by its resemblance to the Semitic root *s-k-n*, which appears in the Hebrew *Shekinah* and in the Aramaic *Shekinta*. The Aramaic word is freely used in the Targums. Hebrew passages which represent Yahweh as dwelling, or causing His name to dwell, in the midst of Israel, are represented in the Targums by the phrase, 'He caused His Shekinta to dwell' there.

Let us pass from the Prologue. More striking are certain mistranslations found in other parts of the Gospel. Take 7<sup>88</sup>: 'He that believeth on me, as the scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water.' What does it mean? Westcott says the thought is the distribution of the blessing in fuller measure by its recipient. It

may be so. But where is the scripture? It has not been found. Try the Aramaic.

In Aramaic the word for 'belly' is closely similar to the word for 'fountain.' Suppose that the one was mistaken for the other. We find the scripture then, for Joel speaks of a fountain that 'shall come forth of the house of the Lord, and shall water the valley of Shittim' (3<sup>18</sup>). Is there any difficulty in rivers of water flowing out of a fountain? Dr. BURNEY changes the punctuation. This is his translation:

'He that thirsteth, let him come unto Me;  
And let him drink that believeth in Me.

As the Scripture hath said, Rivers shall flow forth from the fountain of living waters.'

Take a last example. In 8<sup>56</sup> we read: 'Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day: and he saw it, and was glad.' The Greek is 'rejoiced *in order that he might see*' (*ἵνα ἴδῃ*)—a plainly impossible construction, and yet the word used (*ἵνα*) cannot be translated otherwise than 'in order that.' And then there is the tautology. If Abraham rejoiced to see, to say that he saw and was glad is to say the same thing over again.

Try the Aramaic. The verb meaning 'to rejoice' also means 'to long for.' In that meaning it is not found in W. Aramaic, but it occurs in Syriac. Its construction would naturally be with *ἵνα*. Whereupon we have the excellent meaning: 'Your father Abraham longed to see my day: and he saw it, and was glad.'

Every man has his own working theory of the Person of Christ. He has it chiefly from tradition. But he does not simply swallow the terms in which the men who were before him embodied their belief. He does not play at the children's game of shut your eyes and open your mouth. He considers what the traditional interpretation means

for him. He considers it in the light (or darkness) of other men's theories. Above all he considers it in the light of Scripture.

John Huntley SKRINE has his theory. Dr. SKRINE is a scholar. He has been Fellow of an Oxford College and Bampton Lecturer. He is a Doctor of Divinity. Above all he is himself. To an unusually close acquaintance with the mind of his fathers he adds an unusually independent mind of his own. This is not the first time that he has surprised us by his originality. But this is the greatest surprise.

For, so far as we know, it is the first time in the history of theology that the theory of the Person of Christ worked out by Dr. SKRINE has been suggested. He would himself know if it had been suggested before. He does not hint that it has been. He has worked it out by himself alone, using the materials that were ready to his hand in the Gospels.

What are these materials? They are certain facts about a certain person, Jesus of Nazareth, whose life's story is told by four historians. It is not necessary that Dr. SKRINE should accept every one of these facts as historically reliable. It is enough if there are reliable facts to form a judgment on—a judgment of the Person whose story they relate. For it is with the Person, and the Person only, that he has to do.

There are such facts. Dr. SKRINE has formed his judgment. This man, Jesus of Nazareth, differed from other men. He differed from other men in this that in Him dwelt the fulness of the Godhead. That is a Pauline phrase, but it is expressive and it is true. Nevertheless keep to your historians. What they say is that all the powers of God filled all the vessel of His manhood, so that He was one with God in vital union. There was nothing that God could do for a man that was not done for Him. There was nothing that a man could receive from God that was not

received by Him. That is how they represent Him, as they knew Him or were informed of Him. That is the portrait they draw of Him. It is consistent and it is credible. We see and believe it.

Then, when the time came, this man was received into the Godhead. Not His manhood. There is no such thing as manhood. There are only men. This one man, this man alone—for no other of the sons of men has ever had the fulness of God residing in him—this man was, when the time came, taken up into God. He was taken up as a man, and now exists, both God and man, the living, omnipresent, all-helpful Lord Jesus Christ.

When did the time come? It came when He ascended. Before He ascended He rose from the dead. And it is just this matter of the rising again from the dead that is the test of Dr. SKRINE's original theory.

He accepts the test. One chapter of his book—we have not named it, by the way. Its title is *The Gospel of the Manhood* (Skeffingtons; 5s. net). One chapter of his book is occupied with the Resurrection.

Jesus rose from the dead. Not in the body. The body of Jesus did not rise. But He Himself rose. For the body is not an inseparable part of the personality. Jesus Himself rose from the dead, leaving His body behind Him. He appeared to His followers. He was taken up into God. He ever liveth to be the giver of life.

Two questions. What became of His body? And how can that be said to rise again which never was laid down?

Dr. SKRINE cannot answer the first question, though he tries to answer it. His words are these: 'I offer no solution of the problem which the narrative presents as to what happened to the



body, though my expectation is, that it will be solved, if ever, by one of two alternatives: either the tradition was mistaken and the body was disposed of in some unknown but natural manner, or else the same creative power which had brought into being the mortal frame withdrew it into nothingness. If the latter is the fact, there would be to ask why such special intervention of Deity was needed? I do not know what other reason suggests itself than that the witnesses, in the then

state of psychologic knowledge, would have found it harder to accept the assurance of Jesus, "It is I Myself," if they had been sure that all the while Jesus was lying a corpse in Joseph's vault. They might have still believed that they were seeing but a ghost. This speculation will probably not seem very substantial, but I put it forward as the only conjecture I am able myself to form.'

The other question he takes no notice of.

## Thirty Years' Progress in Assyriology.

BY C. J. GADD, B.A., BRITISH MUSEUM, LONDON.

THIRTY years represent not much less than half the total life of Assyriology, which is thus among the youngest of the sciences, and shows a tendency to rapid growth thoroughly in accordance with its age. What directions this progress has taken will be summarily indicated in the following survey of its principal departments. It would, of course, be impossible, in dealing with so immense a body of material, to trace the history of work accomplished, and it is proposed, therefore, to outline rather the position attained as the result of that work, omitting entirely, since completeness would be impossible and selection invidious, any reference to the many brilliant men who have laboured so fruitfully in this field.

### I. EXCAVATIONS AND ARCHÆOLOGY.

The year 1890 found three major explorations in progress on Mesopotamian sites. The oldest of these was also the most fruitful, and the remarkable discoveries at Tall Loh, the ancient Lagash, remain unsurpassed in interest, whether historical or archæological. Here it must be sufficient to say that they revealed a new and splendid art, especially notable in sculpture, as well as a long chapter of the earliest history. The remains were almost exclusively of the early Sumerian age, and they have since formed the canon by which similar objects from other sites have been judged and classified. But their particular importance resided in this, that they established, once for all, the position of the Sumerian race in early Babylonian

history, and called at once into brilliant life a people whose very existence had been hitherto only a dark inference from the relics of their strange language. From the moment that the first inscribed statue of Gudea, or the Stele of the Vultures, came to light, the obstinate 'Sumerian question' was answered—against its raiser. And, further, it was now realized for the first time that the arts and culture of the later Babylonians stood in the direct tradition from this early people, among whom they were already in their full bloom. In the early third millennium B.C. the inhabitants of Lagash were already past masters in building, metal-work, and, above all, sculpture, both in relief and in the round, while in the beautiful craft of the gem-engraver they had attained a perfection never again to be equalled. From the stone heads discovered there emerged the physical characteristics of the race, which were strongly marked in the face, and the Sumerian type is now familiar, though the knowledge has not thrown much light upon the difficult question of the racial affinities of this people.

Meanwhile, in four expeditions, from 1888 onwards, an American mission excavated the ruins of the ancient Nippur, particularly those of the celebrated E-kur, or temple of Enlil, the most important shrine in ancient Babylonia. The construction of this temple was found to date back to Naram-Sin and Shar-gali-sharri, kings of Agade, but even below this level a deep bed of accumulated ruins served to indicate a much greater antiquity of the site. From a purely archæological