

# 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 Churchman* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_churchman\\_os.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php)

Bishops have no longer the monopoly of learning. And in our days the Bishops are so much better employed in their spiritual duties, that they have neither the time nor the aptitude to act the part of Judges. The judicial mind, the power of taking in and balancing both sides of an argument, and of deciding independently of preconceived opinions, is of far more consequence than, a previous knowledge of the facts and the particular points of law involved in any case. These latter are brought forward by counsel on either side, and in a difficult matter the Judges can make themselves acquainted with them. The former can seldom be acquired except by long habit.

Let us not be like Cowper's kite, which in trying to get higher broke its string and came to the ground.

Instead of fretting because things are not just what we should like, let us take our circumstances as God's Providence.

Suppose, for instance, we were a Church of Christian Moors. Suppose the Sultan of Morocco, in a strange fit of liberality, had given us leave to hold our services, only on the condition that our ministers wore the turban and burnous, should we reject the concession? I trow not.

Let us, I say, make the best of our circumstances, and remember that our task is to let our light shine before men.

In an age of false doctrines, heresies and schisms, let us cultivate truth, unity and concord. Let us try to understand our brethren who differ from us, to compare notes, to meet together in the spirit of love, whether at a round table or in a court of law, and so by all means to understand what we ought to do.

In an age of lawlessness, let us set the example of loyal and dutiful obedience to those whom God has set over us.

Then we need fear nothing.

ROBERT W. KENNION.

Acle Rectory.

---

## ART. II.—THE PASSOVER.

OF the three great festivals in the Christian year, only one, that of Christmas, bears a name which is a plain definition of the event to which the day is devoted and dedicated. Of the many interpretations which have been assigned to *Whitsunday*, that only which explains the two first syllables as identical with *wisdom* traces a connection with the gift of the Holy Ghost, the effusion of *wisdom* from on high, which the Church then celebrates. But Easter, the "Queen of Feasts," most strange to say, goes under a heathen name—a name which is derived through Saxon sources, but is ulti-

mately equivalent to Astarte and Ashtoreth, whose worship is so severely denounced throughout the history of Israel. Once in the A.V. (Acts xii. 4) this word is introduced as a translation of τὸ πάσχα, *the passover*. It would have been better had the words *Pasch* and *Pentecost* been retained in ecclesiastical usage to designate the two Christian feasts which have continued and perpetuated in a higher form the Passover and the Feast of Weeks of the old covenant. The latter, indeed, only fixes the date of the festival relatively as a sequence to the former, and the former is a transliteration of the Greek word, which is a similar reproduction of the word which stands in our Hebrew Bibles as the original of *passover*. Familiar as this word *passover* is to us, it may not be an uninteresting question, especially at the present season, to inquire what is meant by this term, and what was the nature of the act embodied in this word.

In our language it is indefinite and doubtful whether we are to understand *passover* as representing the act of superposition or the act of omission—a hovering over to protect, or a fitting past to avoid. The latter is, doubtless, the impression generally accepted by ordinary readers of the Bible, and it is also the interpretation given in most of our leading commentaries and lexicons. We need not crowd our pages with quotations from such authorities, as most of them are within the reach of our readers. Still, we venture to think that the former interpretation can put forth the more forcible claims for acceptance derived both from external and internal evidence. It would appear that in ancient times and among the earliest translators the same doubt and hesitation existed, so that a certain amount of indefiniteness, or even of contradiction, is traceable in the renderings of the word *passover*, both when it represents the noun and the verb also. Let us examine, first, the evidence concerning the verb in the radical passage which gives the account of the institution of the rite in Exod. xii.

The Greek version of the LXX., which takes us back nearly three centuries before the Incarnation, renders ἐγὼ ἐπάσω, in ver. 13, "I will pass over you," A.V. and R.V. by σκεπάσω ὑμᾶς, "I will cover you;" but in ver. 23 ἐπάσω, "He will pass over," by παρελεύσεται, "He will pass by." The Latin Vulgate of St. Jerome reproduces the same uncertainty, but inverts the order, rendering the verb in ver. 13 by *transibo*, "I will pass by," and in ver. 23 by *transcendet*, "He will cross over." The Jewish Targum is consistent, and supports the interpretation of sparing by *covering*; דים is used as the explanatory term.

We may now seek for further aid by consulting the testimonies available concerning the noun. The LXX. did not

attempt a translation of the noun  $\pi\alpha\sigma\chi$ , but merely transliterated it by  $\phi\alpha\sigma\epsilon\chi$  or  $\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\chi\alpha$ . Philo, the Jewish philosopher of Alexandria, who was born B.C. 20, renders by  $\delta\iota\alpha\beta\alpha\tau\acute{\eta}\rho\iota\alpha$ , *offerings for a safe passage*; Josephus, who flourished during the latter half of the first century of our era, by  $\upsilon\pi\epsilon\rho\beta\acute{\alpha}\sigma\iota\alpha$ ; Aquila, who translated the Hebrew Scriptures into Greek in the second century, rendered it by  $\upsilon\pi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\beta\alpha\sigma\iota\varsigma$ . Both of these words are capable of either interpretation (see Liddell and Scott's Lexicon, s.v.  $\upsilon\pi\epsilon\rho\beta\alpha\iota\acute{\iota}\nu\omega$ ). Symmachus, who also made a translation in the same century, renders it by  $\upsilon\pi\epsilon\rho\mu\acute{\alpha}\chi\eta\sigma\iota\varsigma$ , *a defending*; and the Græco-Venet., a version made between the eighth and the eleventh centuries, by  $\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\mu\alpha$ , *a leap*. It may be added here that the Syriac version, as might be expected, retains both the noun and the verb in the equivalent and almost identical word of the Hebrew text.

It will be seen that, as we have said already, there was a certain amount of trepidation among these translators to determine positively the exact meaning of the word, some inclining to one interpretation and some to another, and the same at different times favouring different renderings, and some using indefinite terms. Internal evidence might have gone a long way in settling the question, had a careful examination and comparison of passages been made; but no attention was called to the matter apparently till the alternative and preferable interpretation was suggested by Vitringa, and afterwards was taken up by Bishop Louth. If any doubt, however, still lingered or difficulty were felt in any minds on the subject, every obstacle seems now to be removed by the discovery that  $\pi\alpha\sigma\chi$  is not of Hebrew but of Egyptian origin, and in that ancient hieroglyphic language the meaning of the word is to "spread out the wings over" an object, and so "protect" it. We are indebted to the learned Canon Cook, of Exeter, for bringing this before students of the Bible. In his notes upon Exodus in the "Speaker's Commentary" he writes: "It is remarkable that the word is not found in other Semitic languages except in passages derived from the Hebrew Bible. In Egyptian the word *pesh*, which corresponds to it very nearly in form, means to 'spread out the wings over,' and 'to protect'; see Brugsch, D. H., p. 512." And, again, in the Canon's valuable essay on Egyptian words in the Pentateuch, he says: " $\pi\alpha\sigma\chi$ . The Semitic derivations are doubtful. The Egyptian *pesh-t* corresponds very nearly in form, and exactly in meaning and construction. Champollion, Gr., p. 446, gives two examples: 'to extend the arms or wings over a person,' 'protecting him.'"<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The adoption of this ancient hieroglyphic into Hebrew usage is one, but far from being a solitary instance, of the strongest proofs that the

It will be seen from what has been advanced that all interpreters agree that the word signifies to *spare*; but the question is whether that sparing of the Israelites was effected by an act of Divine interception, by the protecting wing of Deity, or by the præter-mission, or passing-by, of the destroying angel. The external evidence, in our estimation, vastly preponderates in favour of the former.

Let us see if Scripture will lend us some light to guide us in the path of our inquiry. The testimony of the chapter which contains the history of Israel's redemption and of the institution which preserved the memory of it, claims our first notice. It is said in Exod. xii. 12, "For I" (that is, Jehovah) "will pass  $\text{אֶבְרָכָה}$ " (this is a totally different word from that under our consideration) "through the land of Egypt this night, and will smite all the firstborn in the land of Egypt." And in ver. 13, "When I see the blood, I will pass over  $\text{אֶפְרָח}$  you, and the plague shall not be upon you to destroy you when I smite the land of Egypt." And similarly, but still more distinctly, in ver. 23, "For Jehovah will pass through  $\text{אֶבְרָכָה}$  to smite the Egyptians; and when He seeth the blood upon the lintel and on the two side-posts, *Jehovah* will pass over  $\text{אֶפְרָח}$  the door, and will not suffer the *destroyer* to come in unto your houses to smite you." From both these passages, especially the latter, we infer that although Jehovah was the ultimate author both of the preservation of His people and of the plague that destroyed the firstborn of their foes, yet the immediate agents of these acts, the Saviour and the smiter, were personally distinct. To the destroying angel was committed the office of executing the judgment; and Jehovah reserved to Himself the office of sheltering His people from the stroke, which otherwise would have fallen on all the inhabitants of the land, Egyptians and Hebrews, alike. Thus, while the one was busied in spreading death and desolation through the land, the other was intent on delivering the dwellings which, according to the Divine prescription, bore the seal of blood. This passage is adverted to in Heb. xi. 28, where the same distinction seems to be observed: *πίστει πεποιήκε τὸ πάσχα καὶ τὴν πρόσχυσιν τοῦ αἵματος, ἵνα μὴ ὁ ὀλοθρεύων τὰ πρωτότοκα θύγῃ αὐτῶν.* The *destroyer* in Exod. xii. 23 is rendered by *ὁ ὀλοθρεύων* in the LXX.; the same word is retained in this Epistle, and this, it may be observed, is the only instance of the use of the word in the New Testament.

The next passage to which our attention may be directed is

---

author of the Pentateuch was well acquainted with the language, and such knowledge supports the early date usually assigned to the Pentateuch and the authorship of Moses, and goes far to refute the recent theories of Kuenen, Welhausen, Robertson-Smith, etc.

Ps. xci., which is manifestly a poem composed upon the subject now under our consideration. The previous psalm, both by its title and by an old tradition, is attributed to Moses. Without pressing the Jewish canon that a psalm without a title is to be referred to the authorship of the preceding one, it is certain that the two psalms deal with kindred subjects: the former setting forth the sins and sufferings of the people in the wilderness, and the latter rehearsing the deliverance of Israel at the time of the exodus from Egypt. Thus we have mention made of "the noisome pestilence," "the terror by night," "the pestilence that walketh in darkness," and the "ten thousand falling at Israel's right hand, but not coming near them." All these expressions point conclusively to this crisis in their history. But how was the deliverance effected? The first and fourth verses tell us: "He that dwelleth in the *secret place* of the Most High shall abide under the *shadow* of the Almighty;" "He shall *cover* thee with His *feathers*, and under *His wings* shalt thou trust; His truth shall be thy *shield and buckler*." And again, in the ninth and tenth verses: "Because thou hast made the Lord, which is my *refuge*, even the Most High, thy *habitation*, there shall no evil befall thee, neither shall any *plague* come nigh thy dwelling." The idea maintained throughout the psalm is that of shielding and protecting by interposition. But the figure in the fourth verse, borrowed from the sheltering care of the mother bird brooding over her young ones, carries us on to another passage of still greater interest, because the same word is employed as in the history of the passover, and shows that the prophet was well acquainted with that event and understood the meaning of the word which described it. In Isa. xxxi. 5 we read: "As birds flying, so will Jehovah Sabaoth defend Jerusalem; defending also He will deliver it, and *passing over* ה' יִפְדֶּה He will preserve it." It is distinctly taught here that Jehovah will shield the beloved city as birds do their nests. Now, when the parent bird espies the approach of some well-known enemy, she does not flit by or omit her young ones, but flutters, hovers, and broods over them, so as to be between her nest and the threatened harm. She enwraps her fledglings with her sheltering wings, and *passes over* them to screen them from the foe. Though the meaning here is incontrovertible, the ancient translators seem to have felt the same hesitation in pronouncing a final opinion as to the exact force of the word as in the radical passage in Exodus. The act of sparing is sufficiently enunciated, but the mode in which that act was performed is equivocally stated. The version of the LXX. has *πρωτοῖσενται*, *He will protect*; some copies have *ὑπερβήσεται*, which may mean either (see Liddell and Scott's Lex., s.v.). There is

also another reading—*περιβήσεται*, *He will go round for the purpose of protecting*, which Bishop Louth thinks is the true one. Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion have *ὑπερβαίνων*, the Latin Vulgate *transiens*, and the Targum *He will deliver*.

But we have another passage of Scripture to produce which claims the highest interest, as it suggests the interpretation of the word as taught by our blessed Lord Himself. In St. Matt. xxiii. we read that at the beginning of the last week of our Lord's earthly career He made His public entry into Jerusalem, and when He looked down from the hillside upon the city He exclaimed, "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them that are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth" (*ἐπισυναγάξει*) "*her chickens under her wings*, and ye would not" (ver. 37). We must call to mind the season at which these words were uttered and the attendant circumstances. It was the *passover* week; the city at His feet was busied in making preparation for the feast. He was about to fulfil the type of Israel's ransom from the house of bondage, and to become the "very Paschal Lamb," and to accomplish His decease, the *exodus* (see St. Luke ix. 31), at Jerusalem. How fitting, therefore, was the reference to the miracle that attended the salvation of Israel from Egypt, now that the type was about to give place to the Antitype! Moreover, if this reference is accepted, there is something singularly striking in the fact that the ancient Egyptian hieroglyphic word, which had been adopted into the text of the Hebrew Scriptures and sanctified by the highest symbolism, should have its full meaning, which had been to some extent forgotten or obscured, restored and reasserted by the lips of the Lord Himself. Thus interpreted, the passover was the type and token of all future deliverances, at once the promise and the picture of salvation. So also, it is to be noted, it was the seed and source of sacrificial and sacramental ordinances under both covenants. We trace in the passover lamb the embryo of the whole Levitical system. All the various sacrifices of the Law were branches developed from this root. The burnt offering, the sin, and trespass, and 'peace offerings had each their proper features and functions, but each reflected some phase that was contained in the nucleus of this original rite, which was the mother of them all.

We do not think we are overstraining the argument or introducing a too refined fancy into our interpretation if we urge that the *passover* lamb was, according to the above view, understood to be the lamb of *covering* or *protecting*, and that the word which we render *atonement*, which is both the essence and the end of the sacrifices under the Law, literally signifies

covering. The latter is the Hebrew rendering of the former, which we have shown to be an Egyptian word; or, if this be thought pressing the point too much, it must be conceded, at all events, that it was an application of the lesson contained in the word. The blood of the atoning sacrifice sprinkled on the penitent offerer was a shield that sheltered him from the demands of justice, and a token that cancelled the claim that condemnation had against him. Moreover, this parentage of the passover is not restricted to Jewish rites and ceremonies; it forms also the foundation of the highest of the Christian sacraments—the Lord's Supper. In Exod. xii. 47 we read: "All the congregation of Israel shall *keep* it"; literally it is "shall *do* it"; and when our blessed Lord presided at the passover feast, which "with desire He had desired to eat" with His disciples, He quoted or applied this very phrase in the ever memorable "*Do this* in remembrance of Me"—"Do this as My memorial. No longer celebrate the deliverance from Egypt, but the *exodus* I am now accomplishing—the sacrifice I am about to offer to God as the 'one all-sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world.'"

Looking back through the vista of the ages illuminated, as they are, with miracles of Divine interposition and ordinances apocalyptic of the love and purposes of God, we see how far-reaching the passover was from the day of its institution alike in type, doctrine, and ritual. It was the first-sown seed of sacramental mystery, the first picture drawn of the central sacrifice upon the Cross, and the first spark of dawn that unfolded from "the womb of the morning" the rays of that light that shines brighter and brighter to the perfect day of His presence, when the Son of righteousness shall "pass over" His elect, and enfold them in the bosom of salvation for ever and ever.

F. TILNEY BASSETT.



### ART. III.—THE JESUITS AND CASUISTICAL MORALITY—PROBABILISM.

*Geschichte der Moralstreitigkeiten in der römisch-katholischen Kirche seit dem sechzehnten Jahrhundert mit Beiträgen zur Geschichte und Charakteristic des Jesuitenordens. Aux Grund ungedruckter Aktenstücke bearbeitet und herausgegeben von IGNAZ VON DÖLLINGER und Fr. HEINRICH REUSCH. Nördlingen, 1889.*

THE Company or Society of the Jesuits has been figuratively described as "a naked sword, whose hilt is at Rome, and whose point is everywhere." This sword is rightly described as naked. It is never sheathed, and has never