

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 Expositor* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php

on which one need not here enter, the speech of Peter goes off into a brief historical narrative and returns to the main subject. The narrative is partly explanatory, addressed by the historian to the readers. How much is explanatory, and how far Peter is regarded as incorporating narrative in his speech, no one can say exactly and confidently. This was the method of the age, when people stood, almost or completely, in the immediate presence of the facts. It belongs to that age. I wait for some proof that it was more characteristic of the second century than of the first. It is, generally speaking, characteristic of an attitude of mind; and it might therefore occur in any age, when the writer's mind was in a certain condition. It is perfectly harmonious with the tone of the first century.

W. M. RAMSAY.

THE BROKEN HEART OF JESUS.

"God has only one method of salvation, the Cross of Christ. God can have only one; for the Cross of Christ means death to evil, life to good."
Rev. Frederick W. Robertson.

"THEREFORE doth my Father love me, because I lay down my life that I might take it again. No man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down; and I have power to take it again. This commandment have I received of my Father. . . . I and my Father are one" (John x.). "He took Peter and John and James, and went up into a mountain to pray. . . . And behold, there talked with him two men, which were Moses and Elias, who appeared in glory, and spake of His decease which He should accomplish at Jerusalem" (Luke ix.). How was that life laid down? How was that exit accomplished in harmony with natural law? What was the physical cause of the death of Christ?

The Father, who has so fashioned our minds that they develop by questioning, does not bar us from asking this question. Neither does the Son, whose earliest recorded utterance, as we are told by St. Luke, was a double question, "How is it that ye sought me? Wist ye not that I must be about my Father's business?"—whose latest word on the way to the Cross, according to the same Evangelist, is still a question, "If they do these things in a green tree, what shall be done in the dry?"—and the records of whose interviews with all manner of people through all His public ministry were punctuated with interrogations. There is room here for scientific inquiry and reverent meditation. But we are in presence of the central fact in human history. We are on holy ground. Whether, therefore, he come as scientist or theologian, let the Eastern who draws near take his shoes from his feet, and let each son of Japheth uncover and bow his head.

The pathologist has set before him three men in the place of judicial death. They are not paying the common debt of nature. The wages of sin are being paid. Two of them are there as convicted evil-doers, and one of these confesses that they have been justly condemned. Among the various forms of judicial execution, crucifixion holds a pre-eminent place for degradation and cruelty, and the three men are each hung on a Roman cross outside the walls of Jerusalem. Criminals under such doom were sometimes left in thirst, fever, pain and untold misery till, after many hours—it might be two or more days—death came to their release. But the Jews who had called for the crucifixion of the Man on the central cross pressed the Gentile Governor to hurry the deaths, and have the dead and accursed bodies of the dispatched men taken away on the day of their execution. The military executioners accordingly broke the legs of the two malefactors, and, for aught we know, may have

finally secured their immediate death with a spear thrust through the heart. If so, then the spectators saw red liquid blood gush out from their respective wounds such as it courses through the hearts of still living men. When they came to the Man called Jesus, they saw that He was dead already. Still "one of the soldiers," we are told by one who stood there, "with a spear pierced His side, and forthwith came thereout blood and water."

The bystander is presented to us in the narrative as a young clear-eyed Galilean fisherman, one of the first two followers, and the most cherished disciple of the Victim on that central cross. It was the unforgotten "Behold," and again "Behold," of his earlier teacher that had led to his following this other Rabbi. The unforgettable first word which he heard from the lips of Christ was for him a germinating element in living out the Eternal Life of which he became a partaker and a herald. "Come and SEE" reproduced itself in his spiritual history; and when he afterwards wrote and spoke of Jesus on earth or in heaven, "I, JOHN, SAW" became a characteristic note in all his utterances. It is his sign-manual among the sacred writers (at least to a common reader). We are not concerned now with any possible theological conception that may have formed itself in the mind of the man who is known to our Bibles in the title of the last book as "St. John the Divine," when in after days he set himself to tell the incidents of the crucifixion of which he had been an eye-witness.¹ There is before us the simple observation of a man whom Caiaphas and his kindred classed among the "unlearned and ignorant." But he had as good eyesight, as commanding an intellect and as retentive a memory as the best of them, and what the son of Zebedee saw issuing from the gash made by the Roman spear was

¹Canon Winterbotham's treatment in the July EXPOSITOR of this incident in relation to the famous passage in 1 John v. is very convincing.

what looked to him like blood and water. The strange out-flow caught his observant eye ; it touched his imagination, and took a lasting place in his memory. He has given it an indelible place in the Book of Life.

Science asks—Could such a thing be ? In 1847 Dr. Stroud, a godly physician in London, wrote a work on *The Physical Cause of the Death of Christ*. He showed with much elaboration and large literary reference that rupture of the heart with escape of blood into the heart-sac was known to pathology as a cause of sudden death ; and further, that in such a case the effused blood naturally separates in its new receptacle into two portions—the more solid red clot sinking to the most dependent part, and the paler watery-looking serum rising to the surface. He suggested that the heart of Jesus burst and filled the pericardium with blood at the time when He said, “ ‘ It is finished,’ and He bowed His head and gave up the Ghost.” The anatomical post-mortem demonstration, Dr. Stroud held, was given after the lapse of two or three hours during which the separation of clot from serum was progressing, when an opening of about a hand’s breadth in size made from below into the serous cavity gave exit to what an unscientific beholder could not speak of otherwise than as blood and water. Dr. Hodgkin, who wrote a brief sketch of the life of Dr. Stroud, and who has so written his own name in pathology that through all time it will appear in one of the chapters in medical text-books, expressed his acceptance of his friend’s explanation. Dr. Stroud, he held, had “ placed the real cause beyond the reach of doubt.” In 1861 I heard Dr. Hanna give the lecture on the subject which appears in his volume on *The Last Day of our Lord’s Passion*. He adopted and made reverent application of Dr. Stroud’s suggestion, and appended to the volume letters from three medical members of his congregation—Sir James Young Simpson, whom the *Scotsman* of June 11, on the

occasion of the centenary of his birth, characterised as "the greatest medical man Scotland has ever produced"; Sir John Struthers, afterwards professor of anatomy in the University of Aberdeen; and Dr. Begbie, then the most widely consulted physician in Edinburgh. These, each in varying style, discussed and approved the explanation. "Any intelligent jury of medical men," concludes Dr. Lewis D. Mason of Brooklyn, N.Y., "would certify that the cause of (Christ's) death was internal hæmorrhage, the origin of which was a ruptured or broken heart."

The only attempt at a refutation that I have seen from the side of pathology appeared in the *Encyclopaedia Biblica*. The attempt is a failure. The Editor (i. 959, art. "Cross") says, "The probability is (if the kernel of Jn. xix. 31-37 be accepted as historical) that the two malefactors first had their legs broken (*crucifragium*) and then received their *coup de grâce* by being pierced with a lance." There is nothing to be said against this "probability" of Professor Cheyne. Let him rather be thanked for a sane probability. But his next sentence cannot go unchallenged. It is this: "That the statement of the 'eye-witness' has come down to us in its original form, cannot, however, be safely asserted, because of the impossibility of explaining the issuing of 'blood and water' from an internal source physiologically." The "impossibility" so dogmatically declared is just another of those "impossibilities" with which some literary minds can hypnotise themselves and one another, and which, if they had a due sense of humour, they would cease to multiply lest they become themselves Impossible. The professor supports himself with a couple of paragraphs in small print for which Dr. Charles Creighton is responsible. They read: "With regard to the hypothesis of Dr. Stroud (*viz.*, that death was sudden from rupture of the heart, and that the blood and water were the separated clot and serum of the

escaped blood in the pericardial sac which the spear had pierced), it is sufficient to mention the invariable fact of which this physician appears to have been ignorant; that the blood escaping into a serum (*sic*) cavity from rupture of a great organ such as the heart (aneurysmal aorta) or parturient uterus, does not show the smallest tendency to separate into clot and serum ("blood" and "water," as he takes it), but remains thick, dark-red liquid blood." The "ignorant" physician is not Dr. Stroud, but his critic. Changes somewhat such as Dr. Creighton imperfectly describes may be seen any day by the surgeon who has to open an abdomen because of hæmorrhage into that serous cavity from some ruptured organ. But in that case the hæmorrhage *has not been immediately fatal*. The sufferer has survived the shock of the accident, and it needs no long time for the absorption of the serum to begin, followed by other changes in the blood. That is nowise the case in question. It is, looking at it merely in its physical aspect, more like this. In 1867 a patient sent for me urgently one evening to come and see her husband who was dead or dying. When I came, the young man (he was between thirty and forty years of age) was already dead. He was not known to be the subject of any disease. His business affairs had been going wrong. He had come home from his office earlier than usual, very despondent, saying he felt ill, and refusing food. After a time his wife persuaded him to go to bed. Later she brought him a cup of strong coffee which he drank. Soon thereafter he rose up on his elbow, gave a sobbing cry and fell back on his pillow. My friend, Dr. Samuel Moore, then pathologist to the Glasgow Royal Infirmary, came with me the following day to make an autopsy to enable me to certify the registrar as to the cause of death. When the thorax was opened the pericardium was seen to be greatly distended, so that an incision into it let out a large quantity

of clear serum, and the heart lay high up at the back of the sac imbedded in a mass of firm coagulum. A small aneurysm behind one of the aortic valves had burst, and the blood distending the pericardium had stopped the action of the heart. After death the effused blood had undergone the invariable change to be seen on any occasion when blood passes from a living blood vessel into a cup outside the body, or into another cavity in the interior. The fibrin had coagulated carrying with it the red corpuscles to the most dependent part whilst the serum had risen to the surface. We remarked that if the body of that patient had been placed at death in the upright position, and a free opening afterwards made into the pericardium from below, the red clot would have been seen escaping first, followed by the water-like serum.¹

“The notion,” Dr. C. C. goes on to say, “that the wound was on the left side is comparatively late. It is embodied in some of the newer crucifixes, where the wound is placed horizontally about the fifth costal interspace; but in most modern crucifixes, and probably in all the more ancient, the wound is placed somewhat low on the right side. That it was deep and wide, is inferred from the language of John xx. 27, where Thomas is bidden to : reach hither thy hand and thrust it into my side,’ namely, the side of the spiritual body.” Let the artists of all the centuries be free to use their imaginations in depicting the wound. They are not historical

¹ It is perhaps worth while to correct the impression (Andrewes, *The Life of our Lord*) that coagulation of the blood implies a decomposition that “can scarcely be considered as other than the initial step of corruption.” In a body that survives internal hæmorrhage, the blood that is coagulated is not decomposed. The serum becomes quickly absorbed, and the clot under favouring conditions of survival becomes more gradually transformed. Corruption or decomposition implies the access of decomposing microbial agents to fluids or tissues that have lost their vitality and are unable to resist the invasion. For this there is no room in the theory of Dr. Stroud.

authorities. That the wound "was deep and wide" is not an inference from what the risen Christ said to Thomas, though it is in accordance with the invitation which the now believing disciple did not need to act upon. The unprejudiced reader would judge that it was "deep," because the soldier had been trained to strike through to the heart and meant to do it; that it was "wide," because the stroke was made with the broad lance-head of a Roman spear.

There follows yet a paragraph of unspeakable ineptitude. It is prefaced patronisingly with a bracketed commendation by the Editor beginning, "The ordinary view of the motive of the soldier, viz., that he wished to make sure of the death of Jesus; is, of course, mere conjecture," and so on. "May it not," asks the pathological critic, "have been a thoughtless, rather than a brutal act, the point of the lance being directed at something on the surface of the body, perhaps a coloured wheal, bleb, or exudation such as the scourging might have left, or the pressure of the (assumed) ligature supporting the weight of the body might have produced? Water not unmixed with blood from some such superficial source is conceivable; but blood and water from an internal source are a mystery." It was the act of a man who in that solemn hour was neither thoughtless nor brutal. Writers of sentences such as these forget that in whatever mood that praetorian band may have entered on the task set them in the morning by Pontius Pilate, however much it may have amused them to mock the King of the Jews with their imperial robe and the reed in His hand, however light-heartedly they may have whiled away some of their forenoon watching time in dividing among themselves the clothes of the condemned and casting lots all round for the seamless robe, by the end of the day things had happened that brought the change of a great awe over their spirits. If criticism will still let us say it, "When the centurion and

they that were with him watching Jesus, saw the earthquake, and those things that were done, they feared greatly, saying, Truly this was the Son of God." And when to one of these greatly fearing men fell the stern duty of making sure that Jesus was already dead, or of putting an immediate end to His suffering if perchance He were still alive, he fulfilled it with the swift, sure, skilful stroke of his lance at the heart which opened wide the distended pericardium. The answering outflow told that the life had been laid down already. And here comes a paltering critic to say that for centuries believers have been beguiled—that the awe-struck soldier lifted his death-dealing spear just to puncture a bleb! Was ever such inanity? Happily the way is open for any of us to escape from the perplexities of criticism to the simplicity that is in Christ. But if something of the awe that fell upon these pagan soldiers possessed all scholars, as it possesses many, they would dry their pens rather than emulate one another in blurring or obliterating from the sacred page one of the most throbbingly vital paragraphs in the Book that, as it stands, is to uncounted multitudes the Word of Life.

Whatever there may have been of preternatural in all that is told us concerning the Man on the middle cross, accredited pathology finds nothing contra-natural in the phenomenon which St. John emphatically records. Science and common sense see in it a proof that it was a real man, and not a simulacrum—a dead man, and not a man in a faint, that was taken down from the cross and laid to rest in the new tomb of Joseph of Arimathea. Saving grace teaches that the Man, through whose members for over thirty years that broken heart had sent its tides of life could say, as no other could, "I delight to do thy will, O my God: yea thy law is within my heart." The forerunner of the Old Covenant, who indited the fortieth psalm, went on to pray, "Let them

be ashamed and confounded together that seek after my soul to destroy it." Jesus the Fulfiller, and the Surety of the New Covenant, prayed when they nailed Him to the cross, "Father forgive them, for they know not what they do." A heart like to His beat in no other breast. The Will that willed all things into being and that wills the well-being of the universe, was incarnate and enthroned in it. Its every beat was in harmony with the mind of the Universal Lawgiver. Self had not a place in it. The prince of this world, who has something of his own in the hearts of all other men, came to the heart of Christ and found he had nothing in it—nothing. In the fateful hour when human wickedness was doing its wickedest, this sinless heart took on itself alike the grief of the yearning Father and shame for the sinning brethren. Bursting under the measureless strain, it poured out the blood that was to woo and win His brethren back to their Father with a love that would blot out their sin, and that would write His law within their hearts also, and so write it that to break God's law would thenceforth be for them a heart-break. To see with the eyes of the heart the issue of blood and water recorded by the beloved disciple, gives peace to the penitent; to proclaim it, is the power of the preacher who wins souls.

Perhaps it may be admitted as not altogether irrelevant to this subject of study, if, ere we pass from it, we look at the title which Pilate wrote in Hebrew and Greek and Latin and put upon the cross—"Jesus of Nazareth, the King of the Jews." This bids us remember that whilst the Jews were willing to see their rejected King crucified, *there was no drop of the blood of Jesus on the hand of any Jew*. The Church has strangely forgotten this. How else could it happen that a little rascal in Fife was had up before the magistrate last year for stabbing a schoolfellow in the forehead with his

pocket-knife, and saying, "Take that, you Jew, for killing Christ." Parents, preachers, Sabbath-school teachers, should take to heart and make the young understand that they were all sinners of the Gentiles like ourselves who took in hand the doing of the awesome deed that day. To be sure the Jews said, "His blood be on us and our children," when they clamoured for His death. They cried, "Not this man but Barabbas," when Pilate would have set Him free. "Now Barabbas was a robber," says St. John, and he adds immediately, "Then Pilate therefore took Jesus and scourged Him." It was the times of the Gentiles. The World-Ruler who had the power of death or life, of sentence or acquittal, was a Gentile, and was represented by the Gentile Pontius Pilate, under whom Christ suffered and was crucified. Gentile hands held the lictors' rods that bruised Him. Gentile hands platted the crown of thorns they put upon His head. Gentile hands smote the thorn-crowned head with the reed which they had put in His hand when they hailed Him "King of the Jews." Gentile hands built the heavy cross that burdened Him while they hustled Him along the Via Dolorosa. Gentile hands hammered the nails that pierced His hands and feet on Calvary. Gentiles hung Him up in the shame of nakedness between earth and heaven and gambled for His vesture while He poured out His soul unto death. And when the day was drawing to a close it was the hand of a Gentile soldier—drafted, who knows? from our northern wilds—that thrust the lance into His side, and let out the blood and water which told that all was finished. These things we Gentiles did. Then kindly Jewish hands took down the sacred body from the cross and gave it reverent burial in a Jewish grave. And no Gentile eye ever saw Him after. It is only from Jews like St. John, gifted with eyes in head and heart, that we can learn, as he puts it, "that which was from the beginning, which we have

heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled, of the Word of life." "And *they feared* as they entered into the cloud."

A. R. SIMPSON.

*THE NON-SECONDARY CHARACTER OF
"EPHESIANS."*

By the courtesy of the Editor I have been enabled to see in proof Dr. Moffatt's reply to my August article, "The Epistle to the 'Ephesians' not a secondary production." His article has not in the least shaken my position, and, though I fear I cannot hope to convert him, from the fact that our points of view appear to be irreconcilable, I welcome the opportunity kindly afforded by the Editor to write a rejoinder to his reply. This I do the more gladly, as it has been represented to me that the final note in my article might be taken as a charge of fraud against the learned author, whereas all, of course, that I insinuated was carelessness. It appears that even in this I was wrong, for he tells us that "the omission [to note the variants in i. 15] was deliberate." All that I can say, then, is that the author is convicted on his own statement of omitting deliberately a fact which has a cardinal bearing on his argument. If an author sets out to show by parallels the close relationship between two documents preserved in MSS., it is surely his duty to present the *variae lectiones* of these MSS., especially in a case like this, where, as it turns out, the purest Eastern and the purest Western evidence combine in a reading of importance. Yet he passes it over in silence.¹

It is my inability to understand a point of view like this

¹ I instance as a parallel case, worthy of imitation, the insertion by Dr. Huck in the later editions of his well-known *Synopsis* of the Gospels of the more important textual variants. Surely every one will admit that the value of his book is thereby much increased.