

# THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

---

## Notes of Recent Exposition.

THE *Historical New Testament* has had a great reception. But there has also been some searching of heart over its 'Prolegomena.' That part of the work has been recognized as 'advanced.' It is advanced, if indeed that is the right word for it, and not 'backsliding.' But it is a serious student's honest findings, and deserves all the attention it is receiving. It will come before us again.

---

In his little book entitled *Two Lectures on the Gospels*, Mr. F. C. Burkitt touches on the word *Amen*. As used by our Lord to introduce one of His solemn statements (when it is translated 'Verily' in our versions), it is quite peculiar to Himself. In Jewish literature no parallel is found. The Jews used 'Amen' very much as we do, as the answer to the leader in praise and prayer, or as solemnly affirming the words of another. And Mr. Burkitt agrees with Dalman when he says that it was used by our Lord at the beginning of a sentence to serve the purpose and yet avoid the use of an oath—which He had forbidden. This in effect is Jerome's explanation: 'The *As I live, saith the Lord*, of the Old Testament is the *Amen, I say unto you*, of the New Testament.'

---

We are told that angels 'desire to look into' the things that concern the redemption of men.

A recent American writer has been looking into the things that concern the angels themselves, and he has come to one surprising conclusion. His book, which is less than sixty pages, receives a review of great length in the *Presbyterian and Reformed Review* for the present quarter. Its title is *The Love of God revealed to the Universe by Man's Redemption*. The author is the Rev. Joseph H. Bradley, D.D., of Virginia.

---

The conclusion to which Dr. Bradley has come concerning the angels is that they cannot love. He thought first perhaps of what human relationship does for human love. The angels have no relationship. They neither marry, says our Lord, nor are given in marriage. So they at least lose that occasion, or have not that necessity, for the exercise of love.

---

But Dr. Bradley holds that they do not know what love is. Much of his evidence is from silence and some from bad exegesis. But the statement he seems to rest upon most confidently is that they 'desire to look into the things' concerning our redemption. They do not understand it, he thinks. They are puzzled by it. They know that the only-begotten Son was sent into the world to redeem it. But the reason they do not

know. For the words 'God so loved the world' possess no meaning for them.

---

One of the best examples of evolution is our postal system. And it has the advantage of an evolution that still goes on before our eyes. Its history, if not so hoary as Darwin demanded for the transmutation of species, is still very ancient. To the third volume, which contains the English translations of *The Letters and Inscriptions of Hammurabi* (published by Messrs. Luzac, and reviewed last month by Professor Sayce), Mr. King has written an Introduction, in which he carries the evolution of the letter as far back as the days of Sargon of Agade, that is to say, some three thousand eight hundred years before Christ. The letters were then parcels, as they threaten to become again in our day. They were made of clay, and apparently wrapped in clay, and when the cord was tied round them, they were sealed and addressed, and sent by convoys to their destination.

---

The next step in the historical evolution of the letter takes us down to Hammurabi's time, sixteen hundred years later. The letters are no longer parcels. They are neat tablets of clay, from three to four inches long, and from two to three inches broad, with an inch in thickness. And they are enclosed in close-fitting envelopes. All is still clay. But it is neatly made and baked, and a little powdered clay keeps the envelope from sticking to the letter. Kings use scribes to write their letters, and one scribe has a small neat hand, another a large bold hand. The science of graphology may already have been in its cradle. Private persons presumably wrote letters with their own hands. At any rate, the private letters which Mr. King describes have all the appearance of privacy and confidence. And now a regular postal system is found established throughout the empire, if not even over the civilized Semitic world. The postmen were called *mārē sipri* in their proper tongue. We know not yet

how many despatches and deliveries there were in a day or a week. But the kings, we discover, had a special service of 'swift runners' for themselves, the embryo of the 'Royal Mail.'

---

Correspondents of those early days of letter writing were usually more complimentary than they are to-day, and they were always more pious. It is true that the letters which the great king writes to his subordinate officials are curt in the extreme; but the letters of one monarch to another, as in the Tel el-Amarna correspondence, give up a considerable space to preliminary compliment before the matter of the letter is reached, and the complimentary matter is longest when the substance of the letter is least agreeable. Even private letters were very pious. They regularly invoked the blessing of two gods or goddesses on their readers before their news began.

---

Professor Jannaris of St. Andrews is a modern Greek—with the emphasis on the adjective. Most of us come to the study of the New Testament from above, he comes to it from below. We study the ancient Greek authors first, he is first familiar with the language as it is spoken in Greece to-day, his own mother tongue.

---

It is not surprising therefore that when we meet upon the New Testament we should differ. It is perhaps not surprising that he should tell us that the New Testament text, for which we have done so much, 'as it appears in our printed editions, alike Received and critical, is perhaps the worst edited of all ancient texts.' But when he tells us that the Logos, or Word, in St. John's Gospel never means more than speech or utterance, we are both surprised and incredulous.

---

Professor Jannaris has contributed an article on the Logos in St. John's Gospel to Preuschen's *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*. He first asks whether the word *logos* is ever used outside the New Testament and Christianity in

an anthropomorphic sense. He answers, No. The word has two meanings: first, that which is spoken, 'utterance,' 'word'; and second, that which is commanded, 'command,' 'deliverance,' 'decree.' Out of these primitive meanings was developed a philosophical application, 'reason' or 'intelligence,' but that is never found in the New Testament. An application that *is* found in the New Testament has finally to be noted. Under the influence of the Aramaic *memra*, 'word,' the *logos of God* came to be used for the 'person of God,' that is, for 'God Himself,' as in modern Greek the polite phrase 'Your Logos,' (τοῦ λόγου σού) means 'Your Honour.'

Then he asks when it was that the word Logos was used anthropomorphically so as to denote the second person in the Godhead. And he concludes that it was by Justin Martyr, who wrote between 150 and 165 A.D. The earliest occurrence is in Justin's *Apology* i. 5, 'The Logos having assumed form and become man, and having been called Jesus Christ' (τοῦ λόγου μορφωθέντος καὶ ἀνθρώπου γενομένου καὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ κληθέντος).

In the New Testament, he says, it is not so. The crucial passage is the beginning of St. John's Gospel. Now the first thing to notice there is the abrupt introduction of the Logos. It is also called *the* Logos, as if it were already known. But how could the writer or his readers know it? Professor Jannaris denies reliance on Philo, as indeed almost all modern scholars do. Where then did this well-known Logos come from? It came, says Professor Jannaris, from the first chapter of Genesis. It is God's word of creation. 'God said, Let there be light.' That was *the word*.

It is true that in the fourteenth verse it is stated that the Word became flesh. But Professor Jannaris cannot believe that the writer could go back for his antecedent here to the first verse. It must refer to something in the immediate context. It is the word of *authority* just spoken of, 'As many as received Him, to them gave He

authority to become sons of God.' And this same authority or word of power then became flesh in us, took up its abode in our flesh. It is a difficult passage for Dr. Jannaris. He does his best with it.

And then he concludes by punctuating the Greek in his own way and translating it thus: 'In the beginning was the utterance. Now the utterance was (made) unto God, and was a god. This utterance was in the beginning (made) unto God. All things came into being through it, and without it not a thing came into being. . . . And the mandate became flesh and lodged in us, and (so) we beheld his [the Light's] glory.'

The *Pilot* for 26th January contains an account of the chief archæological discoveries made in 1900. The scene of discovery is Babylonia, Egypt, and Crete.

Beginning with Babylonia, the writer mentions Mr. King's *Hammurabi*, and notices that the chronicle of that king's reign dates the Cassite conquest of Babylon three centuries earlier than had hitherto been thought possible. He also speaks of the acquisition by the British Museum of some very fine monuments of Akurgal, king of Telloh, of his son Eannadu, and of his grandson Entemena. These tablets are inscribed not in cuneiform or wedge-shaped characters, but in the linear script which preceded that manner of writing. They belong to a period before 4500 B.C., for that is the latest date that is assigned to Entemena.

But the greatest Babylonian discovery of the year was made in Lower Chaldæa by Father Scheil. It is a clay tablet inscribed with real Babylonian hieroglyphics. Archæologists are now agreed that even some of the cuneiform scripts of Babylonia are older than anything found in Egypt; the linear script is older; but they have been led to believe that there was a still older style of writing than the linear in Babylonia, an original hieroglyphic or pictorial script. That belief has

now been confirmed. Dr. Scheil's tablet bears pictorial representations of the vase with pointed base so often found in tombs of the earliest period, a bobbin or distaff-head, a comb, and a human foot, together with more conventional signs representing the sky and seven planets, a canal with plants, and what seems to be the figure of a man.

In Egypt the chief discoveries of the year were made by Professor Flinders Petrie at Abydos. Working among the debris left last year by M. Amélineau, Professor Petrie was able to prove that we have here a cemetery of Manetho's first Egyptian dynasty. And not only is the dynasty thus rescued from the land of myth, where it seemed in much danger of being lost for ever, but proof is abundant that the Egyptians who belonged to it had already reached a high level of culture, including the use of metal weapons and tools, together with an elaborate system of pictorial writing and the use of cylinder seals as evidence of personal ownership.

Where that civilization came from, it is as yet impossible to say. But it came from somewhere. It did not belong to the earlier native population. For the dried corpse (this writer refuses to call it mummy) of a native chief has been found, and is now on exhibition in the British Museum. He lay on his side in a shallow pit scooped out of the sandstone rock; his knees were drawn up to his chin and his hands placed before his face; and beside him lay his red clay pots, and his weapons, which are all of polished stone. He belongs apparently to a native race with strong negroid and even Bantu affinities, who were invaded and conquered by some foreigners with weapons of iron. His period is earlier than that of the first dynasty, and his attitude and accompaniments, including the careful preservation of his body, show that already the Egyptians believed in a life to come. The body was found at Gobelein, in Upper Egypt.

Crete is an entirely new field for archæological discovery. But perhaps the most surprising 'find' of the year has been made there. It is the discovery by Dr. Arthur Evans, on the site of the ancient Cnossos, of a palace covering two acres in extent, and rich with the remains of Mycænæan art. More than that, Dr. Evans believes that in the ruins of that palace he has come upon the very Labyrinth of Minos. Our writer is not quite sure about that, but he is in no doubt about the value of the clay tablets discovered in the archive chamber of the palace. They are judged, from the imported articles found with them, to belong to about the twelfth Egyptian dynasty, or 2500 B.C. They are inscribed in two distinct scripts, one pictorial and one linear, but different from any other scripts, whether Babylonian or Egyptian, yet discovered.

From all these discoveries the writer in the *Pilot* concludes that we are thrown back upon Babylonia as the ultimate, though not the proximate, source of all the culture of the ancient world, and 'it is at any rate of no disservice to this theory that it is in striking accord with the tradition presented in the Old Testament.'

But it is strange that this well-informed writer has missed a discovery of 1900 which touches the Old Testament closer than any of those.

On the 24th of April 1900 Professor George L. Robinson of the M'Cormick Theological Seminary, Chicago, set out from Jerusalem to visit the remains of Petra, the ancient capital of Edom, by the Dead Sea. When he reached the rock-cut ruins of that city (well called Sela, the Rock, in the Old Testament), he discovered, or rather recognized, for the ruins had been seen by Mr. E. L. Wilson in 1882, what he believes to be the great 'High Place' of ancient Edom. It is a large square court, 47 by 20 feet, cut out of the rock on the summit of a low hill. On its west side are two large altars, one rectangular with steps and a trench, the other round, also

provided with steps, and with a drain from its depressed upper surface to a blood pool a little way from its base. Both altars face the east. They have no ornament or inscription. There is a pool of water some thirty feet away.

Professor Robinson gives an account of his discovery in the *Biblical World* for January. He believes that he has discovered the chief 'High Place' of Edom. He believes that it is an exact counterpart of Israel's sanctuary, which also possessed court, laver, altars, and the rest. He believes that its want of ornament proclaims its great antiquity. He believes that it was the scene of bloody sacrifices. And he finally believes that it bears witness to the accuracy of the statement in 1 K 11<sup>1</sup> and 2 Ch 25<sup>14, 15, 20</sup> that Edom worshipped more gods than one.

When the Master of Trinity Hall, Cambridge, was in Constantinople, the year after he published his book called *Pastor Pastorum*, he visited the burial ground, which lies close to the ancient city walls. While he was there, several funeral processions came in. The corpses were carried on biers, borne on men's shoulders. They all lay face upwards. The fashion of the grave-clothes varied, but one particular was in all cases alike. The face, neck, and upper surface of the shoulders were in every instance uncovered, so that between the grave-clothes and the cloth that enveloped the crown of the head, a space of a foot or more, the body was wholly bare.

What made Mr. Latham notice that? It might have been by chance (as we speak of chance) that his eye fell on the first body. But the moment it did so he recalled something that he had once read in a pamphlet, about the clothes that covered the body of our Lord, and the napkin that was about His head. And the appearance of that first body so remarkably agreed with what he had read there, that he was led to observe the other bodies as they were brought

in. They were all alike as to this peculiarity. And now the argument of the pamphlet came back to his mind, and impressed him very deeply.

The pamphlet had been written by the Rev. Arthur Beard when he was Chaplain of King's College, Cambridge. It contained a novel argument for the resurrection of Christ. Much of the argument turned upon the way in which a body was laid in a Jewish tomb and the clothes that it wore. It had therefore made no convert of Mr. Latham, though it made a lasting impression on his mind. When he saw that the bodies of the dead in Constantinople were dressed exactly as Mr. Beard had supposed Jesus' body to be dressed, and that they were laid in the tomb exactly as he had conceived Jesus' body to be laid, and when he remembered how slowly customs change in the East, and how slowly burial customs change everywhere, the whole circumstance of the pamphlet returned to his mind, and he believed that he had found a new and impressive argument for the resurrection of our Lord from the dead.

So after much thought and a careful study of the Gospel narratives, Mr. Latham wrote another book. He calls it *The Risen Master* (Bell, crown 8vo, pp. 504, 6s.). As no one can mistake Mr. Latham's style for that of another, it is evident that he owes no more of his book to Mr. Beard than its introductory argument. He covers the whole ground of the Resurrection, Forty Days, and Ascension. He examines the separate narratives with curious but most reverential care and delicious originality. He even offers a complete and exactly dove-tailed syllabus of the various appearances of our Lord to His disciples. But he never makes another discovery like the one which he frankly owes to Mr. Beard's pamphlet, *The Parable of the Grave-Clothes*.

This is the discovery. The sepulchre in which our Lord's body was laid was hewn out of a rock. You entered by a low doorway, which was after-

wards secured by a heavy stone rolled against it. There were two ledges, one on either side. When the body was brought in, it was laid on one of these ledges. And the head was allowed to rest on a step, a little higher than the ledge for the body, at the farther end from the door.

Now when Peter and John heard in the early morning that the body of Jesus was gone, they ran both together towards the tomb (Jn 20<sup>4</sup>). John (we shall suppose it was John) outran Peter and came first to the tomb. The stone was rolled away, but he did not go in, he only stooped down and looked in. What did he see? Very little indeed. The place where the head had lain he probably could not see, for it was farthest from the door. But he saw the linen cloths lying, and he saw that there was nothing within them.

Then came Peter and went into the sepulchre. At once he saw that something most unusual had taken place. The linen cloths were lying—lying as if the body were still in them, except that they had fallen flat, for the body was not in them, but was gone. The body was gone out of them, but it had not displaced them. Moreover, he saw that the napkin that had enveloped His head was lying on its raised step by itself, still with its 'roll' in it. It too had fallen a little flat, for the head was gone, but otherwise it was undisturbed. Indeed the evangelist uses a word which properly applies to the head round which the napkin is rolled, not to the napkin itself. It was a 'rolled-round' napkin, he says (*ἐντετυλιγμένον*).

All this arrested Peter's eye. John looked in and only sees (*βλέπει*); but Peter, when he went in and was arrested by this remarkable phenomenon, beholds (*θεωρεῖ*) the cloths as they lie and the rolled-round napkin in the place by itself. If he had seen that the linen cloths (not clothes, remember, but cloths) had been unwrapped from the body and then had been folded up and laid on the ledge, and if he had seen that the same attention had been shown to the napkin, he would

have gathered no more from that than that the body was gone, and he saw that in any case. Any hands might have unwound the cloths and folded them up so carefully. But, from what he saw, it was plain that no hands had been there at all. The body had simply moved out of the cloths without disturbing them, and then they had fallen flat; the head had simply moved out of the napkin without disturbing it, and then it also had fallen a little flat. It was plain that the body had not been removed; it had actually risen. No man's hand had done it; it had been done by the mighty power of God.

'Then went in also that other disciple, which came first to the sepulchre, and he saw and believed.' He saw it, he tells us, not merely as something for the eyes to light upon (*βλέπει*) as before, nor even as Peter saw it with the interest of close observance (*θεωρεῖ*), but with intelligence (*εἶδε*), understanding the meaning of it at once. He saw *and believed*. To see that the body was gone was not to believe. But to see that the body had gone out of the cloths without disturbing them, though they had been wound round and round, and that the head had gone out of the napkin, leaving it 'wound round' still—that was to believe that Jesus had risen from the dead.

The men were astonished, but they did not lose their heads. They had eyes to observe, they had a mind to believe. They evidently saw all there was to be seen, and they tell us. And it is remarkable that in doing so they say nothing of a heap of spices. For spices had been freely used about the body of Jesus. An hundred pound weight of spices had been used, wrapped carefully within the folds of the linen cloths. Where were these spices now? If the cloths had been unwound from the body, they would have dropped in a great heap upon the ledge or floor of the tomb. It is plain that they had not so dropped. They were invisible to Peter and John. For the body had risen without disturbing its wrappings, and the spices were still concealed within its folds.