

# 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

though their bodies were healed. The other gave the first part of his new life, a part that could have been given to eager renewals of the life from which a leper had been excluded, as a sacrifice of thanksgiving for the miracle of the road. He brought the immediate joy and interests of a cleansed leper into renewed contact with the Jesus of the authoritative word, and he was enriched above the others. The urbane Jesus gave him wholeness of soul.

A soul is made comely by gratitude. There is a blight upon the ungrateful life. Though it has faith, it becomes warped and sere when it lacks the beauty and pleasantness of praise.

A cynic could sum up our general behaviour as always asking, always receiving, always forgetting. It should be as artistic and courtly as a well-set hymn. Not flattery—we cannot flatter God—but praise enriches life. I heard a Quaker break the silence of family worship with this sentence: 'O

Lord, Thy world is so full of benedictions that there is no need for us to pray—only to praise.' A prayer offered by a blacksmith in my old church expressed all the quality of praise, and anticipated all its rich reactions, when he spoke of our thanksgiving going up to God drawn by His mercy as the sun sucks moisture from the earth which will fall again upon the world as rain to keep it alive. He saw that the soul thrives when it responds to the pull of God's goodness. His mercy is from everlasting to everlasting; it is evident in the unfoldings of time; it holds the future when the Divine Spirit shall triumph in history. Let us give thanks. How is it to be done? Hear the words of a great Christian teacher and try to realize what they mean: 'I beseech you, therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a sacrifice of thanksgiving, holy, well pleasing to God, which is your logical and spiritual service.'

---

## Contributions and Comments.

### The 'Servant.'

IN Dr. A. E. J. Rawlinson's book, *The New Testament Doctrine of the Christ*, there is a valuable appended Note in which he discusses the views of Professor Burkitt on the references to the Servant passages of Deutero-Isaiah in the New Testament. Professor Burkitt is of opinion that 'the application of Is 53 as a prediction of the passion of Jesus was the work of Gentile Christians familiar only with the Bible in Greek.' He points out that such references are frequent in Acts, Matthew, 1 Peter, and Hebrews (the authors of which are all users of the Septuagint), but are scarcely to be found at all in Paul, 'John,' and the Apocalypticist. He further suggests that the reason for this is that the LXX has softened the *ebed* (lit. 'slave') of the Hebrew into *παῖς*, by which the idea of servitude is not necessarily implied. He suggests that Paul, who read his Bible in Hebrew, would scarcely like to use *ebed*, 'slave' of Christ.

Dr. Rawlinson very appositely counters all this by reference to the well-attested fact that, in Semitic lands, kings constantly called themselves the slave of their god, and adopted names such as Abd-Ba'al, Abd-Osir, etc., in which the word 'slave' is a part. This quite disposes of the necessity for assuming that the Servant passages

must first have been applied to Christ by readers of the LXX. But it does not explain why Paul should make such small use of Is 53. Dr. Rawlinson suggests as the explanation of this that Paul 'was affected not by Hebrew but by Greek social ideas about slavery.'

It is curious that both Burkitt and Rawlinson seem in this discussion<sup>1</sup> to have forgotten the fact that Paul is the one New Testament writer who does use the word 'slave' (*δούλος*) of Christ. It seems to me that Ph 2 completely disposes of Professor Burkitt's case. Is it possible that Paul had the 'servant' passages in mind when writing this, and that the words 'He emptied himself, taking the form of a slave' (*ἐαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν μορφὴν δούλου λαβών*) were intended to signify 'he took upon himself the rôle of the servant in Is 53'? Verbal similarities between this passage and Is 53 are lacking, but the tone and thought of both are the same—the servant, humiliation, death, and the value of it all. 'He shall see of the travail of his soul and shall be satisfied' may well stand as the prophetic adumbration of the great fact which Paul refers to in the words, 'Wherefore also God highly exalted him,' etc.

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Rawlinson does suggest in another place (p. 135, footnote 3) that Ph 2 may be an allusion to *ebed* Jahweh of Deutero-Isaiah.

If Is 53 was in Paul's mind, was not the connecting link his knowledge of our Lord's words, 'The son of man came not to be served, but to serve, and to give his life a ransom for many'? Here the word 'slave' does not occur, but it stands in the immediately preceding sentence. The ideal for the disciple is to be 'slave of all,' and the example of the Master is adduced to drive the lesson home. Does it not seem very likely that in the actual words Jesus used of Himself the idea of slave-service was conveyed, and the reporters softened it into the *διακονῆσαι* of our Gospels? Thus we come back to the time-honoured view that it was our Lord Himself who first applied Is 53 to His own work.

The question still remains why Paul uses this passage so little. May not the answer lie along the line of the marked difference between the idea of fulfilment of prophecy held by the ordinary run of Christians from at least the time of Matthew and Acts till to-day, and Paul's much deeper and sounder idea of the Old Testament preparing us for Christ? His attitude to the matter does not require the 'that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet.' He was concerned to show rather that Christ did what law and prophets failed to do. That occasionally he does use the old fulfilment method is true, but it was not necessary to his fundamental line of argument.

W. E. WILSON.

*Woodbrooke, Birmingham.*

## The Voice out of the Whirlwind.

APROPOS of the thoughts about the voice out of the whirlwind expressed in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES of July 1927, page 439, the following passage is interesting. It is the closing passage of F. W. Robertson's sermon, *Realizing the Second Advent*, Series I. No. 10.

'This is the blessing of affliction to those who will lie still and not struggle in a cowardly or a resentful way. It is God speaking to Job out of the whirlwind, and saying—In the sunshine and the warmth you cannot meet Me: but in the hurricane and the darkness, when wave after wave has swept down and across the soul, you shall see My Form, and hear My Voice, and know that your Redeemer liveth.'

GEO. L. HURST.

*Quebec.*

## The Four Anointings

(MATT. xxvi. 6-13; MARK xiv. 3-9;  
LUKE vii. 36-50; JOHN xii. 1-11).

VARIATION in writing stories is permissible and natural. This is apparent in the writings of one author; it is true also when many authors attempt to relate one incident or event. Not every man sees the same meaning in an experience. It is not possible to have uniformity in expression. Moreover, a story that has a setting in antiquity reveals, in the course of time, a tendency to be changed. Those who have the duty of handing down to posterity such a story may be guilty of changing the text or substance. It is also possible that as stories gain in retelling so may they gain when rewritten. The age of myth, legend, and fancies is a prolific source of exaggerated expression. Additions to original stories and sayings may be expected in such an age.

In the four incidents of our survey we have other possibilities. Theological conceptions, preconceived ideas, and accepted doctrines may have been reasons in the mind of the scribe or copyist for changing the meaning of the text. There are, therefore, general problems to be met before the incidents of the four anointings can be discussed separately. Are our stories the related experiences of eye-witnesses? Do they contain additions to the text? Can we discover any sign of abbreviation in the stories? Are there any indications of the incidents being recounted to suit accepted opinions?

In Mt 26<sup>6-13</sup> we seem to have an historical setting of the incident. Bethany is mentioned as the place of the event. The house of Simon the Leper is also mentioned. Apparently the truth of this setting cannot be questioned. Mk 14<sup>3</sup> is in agreement with these facts. Luke does not mention the place, and refers to 'a Pharisee,' not Simon the Leper, as the host of our Lord. This causes us to ask whether or not we can identify Simon the Leper with the Pharisee. St. John's Gospel, on the other hand, whilst mentioning Bethany, suggests that our Lord had Supper in the house of Mary and Martha. St. John's account shows a decided variation from the other three accounts. The correct account can only be decided by evidence or opinion.

As the story proceeds in St. Matthew's Gospel one is stimulated to ask questions. The difficulty lies in the matter of anointing the head. This appears to have been done. But we have no clue in this account of Matthew as to why an anointing of the feet could not have taken place. Mark is in agreement with Matthew. Luke and John mention

the anointing of the feet. We have to decide on the greater probability—the anointing of the head or feet. It is well worth noting that in Matthew and Mark the words put into the mouth of our Lord refer to the anointing of the body, the head not being specifically mentioned. In St. Luke mention is made by our Lord of the anointing of His feet, whereas in John no mention of the anointing of the feet or body is made by Him. The remainder of the narrative of Matthew is in agreement with Mark, but Luke's application of the story is different. St. John's account is obviously abbreviated.

The incident of Mk 14<sup>3-9</sup> is in entire agreement with St. Matthew's account. The disagreements of Luke and John with Matthew obtain also with Mark.

The reader of St. Luke's account finds that there is a different concern in that narrative compared with the other three writers. Apart from the fact that in this incident no place is mentioned and that the person referred to is not named, we notice the absence of the criticism of the disciples about the waste involved in the anointing. The discussion in this account ranges around the woman and Jesus. The statement that the woman is a sinner and that of our Lord's ignorance of the woman, combined with the criticism of Simon by Jesus, takes the place of the idea of waste involved in the anointing. We cannot escape the feeling, however, that here we have a story told quite naturally and without strain. We have a conversation which can be readily understood and which is most likely to be true when the principles of religious concern of our Lord's generation are known. And, again, we may observe how easily our Lord makes a transition from the fact of anointing by the woman who is a sinner to the great principles of love and forgiveness. The introduction of the Parable of the Two Debtors seems also a natural part of the conversation. In this connexion the problem arises as to why the Parable, seemingly so important to the teaching of forgiveness, is not referred to in the accounts of Matthew, Mark, and John.

The rebuking of the Pharisee also makes the account of the woman and her doings a striking antithesis, and hence enhances the probability of it being true. Then again, the anointing of the feet gains credence because of its naturalness. We should expect the woman who was a sinner to anoint the feet rather than the head. It must be acknowledged, however, that in Luke's account we have no reference to the anointing of the body

before burial. On the whole, then, the incident by Luke seems the most independent. It is the only one which does not mention the 'cry of waste' by Judas, and the only account having the Parable of the Debtors with the subsequent teaching on forgiveness. Moreover, the rebuke to the Pharisee is unique.

St. John 12<sup>1-6</sup> mentions the place of the incident as Bethany. Neither Simon the Leper nor 'the Pharisee' is mentioned. The home, apparently, is that of Lazarus. The woman who anoints Jesus is Mary, and evidently distinct from the woman of disreputable character. The anointing here takes the nature of a dedication of a great love, and seems distinct from the idea of the need of forgiveness. The feet are anointed; the head is not anointed. We also have the argument of waste and an expression of concern for the poor by Judas. There is no reference to the anointing of the body before burial.

In the four accounts we have likenesses and differences. Luke's account is most unlike any of the other three accounts, and hence, unless the accounts of Matthew, Mark, and John come from a previous original source, it seems the most likely of the four.

The opinion now offered is that the four stories are variants of two original accounts, or are the outcome of a misplacement of facts. One account underlies Luke and that part of John which refers to the anointing of the feet; the other incident is that which underlies Matthew, Mark, and that part of John which relates to the 'waste' idea of Judas. We therefore construct two stories.

The first anointing is by the woman of disreputable character, happening at a time distinct from that of the anointing mentioned by Mark. This woman anoints the feet. The scene is in Simon's home at Bethany. Here our Lord found an opportunity of teaching the lesson of love and forgiveness, and also of rebuking the artificial religionist, Simon. The second anointing is by Mary the sister of Martha and Lazarus. This scene is in their own home at Bethany. Mary anoints our Lord's head. This is likely to be true on account of the familiarity that existed between Mary and Jesus. The 'waste' idea of Judas seems to have a fitting context here. All the people in the house were known to each other. We can now understand the ready criticism offered by Judas. It was hardly likely that such a criticism would have been offered at the anointing by the woman who was a sinner. It seems more fitting for the expression of reverent love by Mary to evoke the

words of our Lord in reference to His burial, than the act of the woman who was a sinner.

T. W. BEVAN.

Rotherham.

## 1 Corinthians xi. 10.

THE variant MS. readings and transpositions of this verse seem to point to some unsoundness in the text (if not to interpolation, as v.<sup>11</sup> follows naturally upon v.<sup>9</sup>, and the sequence of thought is broken by v.<sup>10</sup>): διὰ τοῦτο ὀφείλει ἡ γυνὴ ἐξουσίαν ἔχειν ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς διὰ τοὺς ἀγγέλους.

One of the difficulties of the text is the phrase, ἐξουσίαν ἔχειν ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς. R.V. margin, 'to have authority over her head,' is a plain and straightforward rendering, but obscure in meaning. To take it as connoting that the woman is to keep her head in subjection, by wearing a veil or hood upon it, seems very forced. Adopting a MS. reading, οὐκ ὀφείλει, quite a good meaning is obtained, 'the woman ought not to have authority over the head' (i.e. the man; cf. v.<sup>2</sup> *sup.*). But that obviously from the context is not Paul's meaning. The rendering (A.V., R.V.) of ἐξουσίαν as 'a sign of authority' receives no support from N.T. usage, where the word invariably means simply 'power,' 'authority.' Conybeare and Howson, *in loc.* (*Life and Epistles of St. Paul*), translate ἐξουσίαν, 'a sign of subjection,' quoting in support Lk 7<sup>8</sup>. The correct rendering there appears, however, to be, 'For I, also, am a man appointed under authority (a centurion, by those having authority so to appoint), having soldiers under me.' The centurion compares his own position to that of our Lord who has been appointed 'under authority' to expel a word disease, even as he himself at a word to his men can enforce his will.

The great crux of the passage lies in the phrase, διὰ τοὺς ἀγγέλους. That angels were present at meetings for public worship, and would be offended at the presence of unveiled women, as the phrase is generally interpreted, is alien to N.T. writings (the 'Angels of the Churches' in the Apocalypse are obviously no parallel); and that they exercise any influence or authority over worshippers is foreign to Paul's thought, who set himself sternly against the

angelolatry which even in his day was beginning to show itself within the Church. Further, Paul settles the matter in question by saying (v.<sup>16</sup>), 'But if any man seemeth to be contentious (over this matter), we (I) have no such custom, neither the churches of God.' It is a matter of custom, says the Apostle. Why, then, should he appeal to the angels? From the context we learn that Paul has just said (v.<sup>7</sup>), 'the woman's part is to manifest her husband's glory,' i.e. she has his 'honour' in her keeping, and should accordingly avoid whatever might lead to any shadow being cast on that 'honour.' The Apostle has passed for the moment from the particular to the general (returning to the former v.<sup>13</sup> *ss.*). 'Woman,' as the 'glory' of her husband, should by no action, however seemingly trivial, do ought that tended to obscure that 'glory.' We might, therefore, expect Paul to indicate here (v.<sup>10</sup>) how (e.g. by covering her head) she might help in securing that object.

Accordingly I would read from MSS. either, διὰ τοῦτο ὀφείλει ἡ γυνὴ ἐξιοῦσα ἔχειν ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς διὰ τοὺς ὄχλους, 'The woman, when proceeding out of doors, should have (a covering, *τι* [understood]) on her head on account of the crowd; or, διὰ τοῦτο ὀφείλει ἡ γυνὴ ἐξουσίαν ἔχειν ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς διὰ τοὺς ἀγγέλους, 'The woman ought to have a covering (mantle) upon her head on account of the crowd.' Against this latter is the strange word, ἐξουσίαν, which might perhaps be an adopted word (Lat. *exuvias* [a mantle], *exuviae*) among the Corinthians. The Vulgate, *velamen*, would seem to imply that a word connoting 'a covering' of some sort was in the text before the translator.

In a city so notorious for its laxity of morals as Corinth (cf. classical writers, *passim*) it would certainly have been at least judicious for Christian women not to go out of doors unveiled, so as not to expose themselves to insult.

For ἀγγέλους, it may be noted, J. B. Köhler reads διαβόλους, which, owing to a misreading of its meaning here (enemies, detractors), may have caused the substitution of ἀγγέλους.<sup>1</sup>

W. D. MORRIS.

Kelso.

<sup>1</sup> For the variant MS. readings I am indebted to Theile's revision of Knapp's edition of the N.T.