

# THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

---

## Notes of Recent Exposition.

THE subject of the 'International Lesson' on a recent Sunday being the Agony in the Garden, the writers of the various Notes and Illustrations for the use of Sunday-school teachers were compelled to answer, or attempt to answer, the difficult question: Why did Christ pray that 'this cup' might pass from Him? For the most part they answered it in the usual way. 'This cup' was the death upon the Cross that now had come so near, and His prayer was that He might yet be permitted to escape from it.

But Dr. A. F. Schauffler of New York, who regularly writes the 'Teaching Hints' in the *Sunday School Times* of America, cannot accept that answer. When Jesus stood by the grave of Lazarus and lifted up His eyes to heaven, 'Father,' He said, 'I know that Thou hearest Me always.' But if in the Garden of Gethsemane He prayed that He might escape the death upon the Cross, then He was not always heard; this was one prayer—and a most agonising one—that the Father refused to answer. For it will not do to say that His prayer was answered in the angel who came from heaven to strengthen Him. That was not His prayer. And it is to escape one dilemma by falling into another. For if Jesus prayed for one thing and the Father granted another, then

our Lord knew not, any more than we do, what He should pray for as He ought.

'I believe,' says Dr. Schauffler, 'that the prayer of Jesus was not at all for deliverance from the Cross. I believe that what He most feared in the Garden was that the suffering He was enduring on account of the sins of the world would prove too much for His physical frame, and that He would die then and there under the burden. If that had happened, He could not have made atonement on the Cross, and so His whole life's work would have been frustrated.' His soul was sorrowful 'even unto death'; was there not the fear that He might actually die? 'So it seems to me that the "cup" from which He prayed to be delivered was not the death on the Cross, but death in Gethsemane itself. He was praying for strength to reach the Cross, not for grace to escape it.'

Dr. Schauffler claims that the advantages of this interpretation are obvious and very great. It delivers the prayer in the Garden at once from weakness and from ignorance. It lifts it into a place in which even we can recognise the noblest expression of moral heroism. It makes the whole scene in the Garden more impressive. And, above all, it meets the only possible meaning of that

famous passage in Hebrews which unquestionably refers to this event: 'Who in the days of His flesh, when He had offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears unto Him that was able to save Him from death, and was heard in that He feared' (Heb. v. 7).

Dr. Schauffler's interpretation was new to the readers of the *Sunday School Times*. To some of them it was also very welcome; and as they wrote to the Editor to tell him so, one of them suggested that some explanation might still be given of the sentence, 'Nevertheless, not what I will, but what Thou wilt'; and another ended with, 'But please explain to me John xviii. 11: "Then said Jesus unto Peter, Put up thy sword into the sheath; the cup which My Father hath given Me, shall I not drink it?" This was said after the Agony in the Garden, and the Cup had yet to be drunk.'

These letters gave the Editor an opportunity of saying that he was at one with Dr. Schauffler in his interpretation. 'It has long seemed to the Editor of the *Sunday School Times* that the agony of Jesus in Gethsemane was from the fearful pressure on Him of the consequences of sin, as culminating in His betrayal by a trusted "friend," in the failure of His chosen followers to understand Him or to be His sympathetic helpers, and in His rejection by His loved people, and by the world He came to save. Under that pressure on Him in the physical weakness of His humanity, it seemed as if He were to sink before the final crisis of His earthly hour came; for never before was humanity capable of such suffering, or had been called to it. That peril was the "hour" and the "cup" He then faced,—the peril of failure in His earthly life-work; and so He cried out against it.'

And as for the 'Nevertheless' that followed, it was simply His resignation of Himself into the Father's hands for this, as for all things else. If the Father thought it best that He should fail, why, then, He was ready even to fail; for He came not to do His own will even then, but the Father's will who sent Him.

But the 'Cup' spoken of at the Garden gate when Judas and his band had come to take Him, that was another cup altogether,—the cup of His trial and crucifixion, which He was always ready to accept, and which He did accept without flinching.

Apart from proper names, there is perhaps no Hebrew word so familiar to the evangelical Bible reader as the word *kipper*. For in the sacrificial theology of the Old Testament it holds a central place, and yet we have not been able to fix upon any unchallengeable English equivalent for it. Indeed, the variety of renderings it receives—not in the Authorized Version only, but in the Revised also—is surprising and significant. 'Appease,' 'make atonement,' 'pacify,' 'put it off' or 'put it away,' 'cleanse' or 'make expiation,' are only a few that immediately occur to one. Perhaps it is impossible to find one English word at once comprehensive and concise enough to cover all its applications, and so we shall never be independent of the exegetical commentator.

The latest exegetical commentator who touches the subject is Professor Driver. His Note, which will be found on pp. 425, 426 of his new *Commentary on Deuteronomy*, is so singularly lucid and complete that one is tempted to quote it as it stands. But lest that should be reckoned a counsel of despair, let the effort be made to reproduce it here in other words, and let the comparative failure be forgiven already.

'His Note' should strictly have been 'his Notes,' for twice in his Commentary Dr. Driver discusses the meaning of the word. The first is in the body of the book, when he reaches the verse, Deut. xxi. 8. The other is a much longer and more important discussion, which appears as an 'Additional Note' at the very end of the volume. On Deut. xxi. 8 he says: 'The root-idea of *kappēr* [the special form of the word in this verse] is either (from the Arabic) *to cover*, or (from the Syriac) *to wipe off*, in either case the

general sense being that of *obliterating* or *cancelling* sin, or (in the rare cases where the object is a person) *clearing* the sinner. In the Old Testament generally the subject is God; but in P. the subject is always the priest, the verb being used absolutely in the sense of *perform an obliterating (atoning) rite.*

The Additional Note at the end is longer and more conclusive. First of all, the Arabic origin of the word is preferred to the Syriac, and the general meaning of *cover* chosen as the most appropriate. Then it is pointed out that, although *kipper* means *to cover*, it is never used in a purely literal sense (for which there is the common word *kāsāh*), but always with a *moral* signification. That is to say, it always carries the collateral idea of either *conciliating* an offended person, or *screening* an offence or an offender. And with this meaning it has three distinct applications.

The most primary application is seen in Genesis xxxii. 20. Jacob, in dread of Esau's anger, says, 'I will cover his face with the present that goes before me.' He means that he will first *conciliate* his brother, by means of this present, and then he will risk meeting him face to face. The figure is taken from the notion of a person being blinded by a gift, so that he declines to see what perhaps he ought to see. Hence the significant command in Exodus xxiii. 8: 'Thou shalt take no gift: for the gift blindeth the wise, and perverteth the words of the righteous.' And the touching self-vindication of Samuel before all Israel: 'Here I am; witness against me before the LORD, and before His anointed; whose ox have I taken? or whose ass have I taken? or whom have I defrauded? whom have I oppressed? or of whose hand have I taken a bribe to blind mine eyes therewith?'

But the word *face* is frequently omitted. Then *kipper* alone acquires the general sense of *to conciliate, propitiate, appease*; and the means employed, though most frequently a sacrifice, may

be a gift, a prayer, or even conciliatory behaviour. When the children of Israel dishonoured the LORD in the matter of the Golden Calf, Moses said: 'Ye have sinned a great sin: and now I will go up unto the LORD; peradventure I shall *make atonement* for your sin' (Ex. xxxii. 30, R.V.). But the atonement was not a sacrifice. Already there had been much sacrifice of life on account of it; now Moses simply makes intercession to God, offering, it is true, the sublime self-sacrifice: 'and if not, blot me, I pray Thee, out of the book which Thou hast written,' but not as an atonement for the people's sin.

The means wherewith a person is conciliated is called in Hebrew the *kopher*. And *kopher*, says Canon Driver, 'is an interesting word which carries us deep down into the feeling and usage of the ancient Hebrews.'

Although it might be used for any gift, entreaty, or even conciliatory behaviour, such means as these being certainly employed, yet in actual usage the word is restricted to the price or equivalent of a *life*. Hence its regular translation in our English versions is the solemn but beautiful word *ransom*. Its meaning is clearly expressed in several passages. If an ox gored a man or a woman to death, and it was known to the owner that he was a vicious animal, not only did the ox die, but his owner deserved death also. It was in the owner's power, however, in such a case to rescue himself from death by the payment of a sum of money: 'If there be laid on him a *ransom*, then he shall give for the redemption of his *life* whatsoever is laid upon him' (Ex. xxi. 30). So at the time of a census, the half-shekel which each person had to pay was the ransom of his life (Ex. xxx. 12).

But there were crimes in Israel for which a man deserved to die, and die he must; there was no ransom that could keep his soul alive. The adulterer is warned against the hope that the injured husband will be satisfied with a bribe of money or of goods: 'He will not regard any

ransom; neither will he rest content, though thou givest many gifts' (Prov. vi. 35). And to ransom a murderer was to break an express commandment of the Law: 'Ye shall take no ransom for the life of a manslayer who is guilty of death; but he shall surely be put to death' (Num. xxxv. 31). Accordingly, when David says to the representatives of the murdered Gibeonites, 'Wherewith shall I make propitiation?' (2 Sam. xxi. 3), the satisfaction demanded is the lives of Saul's sons, and they are thereupon sacrificed to appease Jehovah's anger. And when we perceive the pressure of this law, we feel something of the Psalmist's confidence that though men may 'trust in their wealth, and boast themselves in the multitude of their riches; yet none of them can by any means redeem his brother, nor give to God a ransom for him' (Ps. xlix. 8); as well as the marvel of Job's expectation that some one may be found who will say, 'Deliver him from going down to the pit: I have found a ransom' (Job xxxiii. 24).

Thus then, in its first application, *kipper* means simply to propitiate or appease. The propitiator may be any person, and the means by which the propitiation is effected may be a gift of money or of goods, a prayer, or an entreaty; but is most frequently of all a bloody sacrifice, that speaketh better things than any of these. In its second application the means is almost always a sacrifice, and the subject is always the priest who offers the sacrifice, except in the rare instances in which the sacrifice itself is said to make the atonement. This distinctively priestly phraseology belongs to Ezekiel and the document which Criticism knows as P. The idea is the same as before. The sinner desires to *cover up* or *screen* his guilt from God's piercingly holy eye. The difference is that he does not offer the propitiation himself, but gets the priest to offer it for him.

In the third and last application God is Himself the subject. It is not the sinner or the priest who covers the face of God so that He may pass the sin by; it is God Himself who covers, that is,

*treats as covered, overlooks, pardons, condones* either the offender or else the offence. This is the application that creates the confusion. Evidently the primary idea of *covering the face* has been quite lost sight of. The metaphor has driven out the physical fact. And it shows how prevalent the idea of propitiation must have been, how frequently the words must have passed men's lips, that this new and more spiritual meaning, in which God is immediately regarded as forgiving the offence, the intermediate means being dropped unconsciously out of sight, came to be accepted as perfectly sufficient and intelligible. *We* have lost the liteness of the spoken tongue. To understand Hebrew we must begin at its first physical and philological beginnings. And so we actually find it hard to see how *God* can be said to cover sin or purge it clean away. How keenly the Revisers of the Old Testament felt the difficulty may be seen by a glance at the variety of translations which they give to *kipper* where God Himself is its subject. In Deut. xxxii. 43 it is, 'He will *make expiation* for His land'; in 2 Chron. xxx. 18 it is, 'the good Lord *pardon* every one'; in Ps. lxxv. 3 it is, 'As for our transgressions, Thou shalt *purge them away*'; in Dan. ix. 24 it is, '*make reconciliation* for iniquity'; and in Ps. lxxviii. 38 it is, what no doubt it ought to have been everywhere, simply '*forgave* their iniquity.'

It was recently said by a certain 'liberal' theologian that there are men who cherish a rigid orthodoxy for the mere pleasure of receiving occasional heretical shocks. If that is so, and there is any one in search of a shock from the heresy of the Higher Criticism, the book to find it in is Canon Cheyne's newly published *Introduction to Isaiah*. And he need go no further into it than the Prologue.

For in the Prologue to his *Introduction* Dr. Cheyne discusses the well-known difficulty about the building of the second temple. In the third chapter of Ezra it is recorded that in the second year after the return from Babylon, Zerubbabel and the rest 'laid the foundation of the temple of

the Lord.' This was the year 535 B.C. But in the fifth chapter of Ezra it is stated that Zerubbabel and Jeshua 'began to build the house of God which is at Jerusalem,' *in the second year of Darius*, which was 520 B.C., or fifteen years later. And Haggai (ii. 15, 18) distinctly names the twenty-fourth day of the ninth month, in the second year of Darius, as that in which the foundations of the temple were laid.

Now it is easy to say that both these statements are correct. So little was done at the first founding that it could practically be ignored at the second. And even Canon Driver accepts that explanation. His words are: 'The truth probably is that the ceremony described in Ezra iii. 8-13 was one of a purely *formal* character, such as Haggai could afford to disregard altogether.' But it need scarcely be said that for Canon Cheyne such an explanation suggests the desperate resources of the harmonist. He will have none of it. He boldly says that the building of the temple was *not* begun in 535, and with good reason, for *there were no returned exiles then to build it.*

Canon Cheyne says there were no returned exiles in Jerusalem in 535, nor for a hundred years thereafter. He accepts the results which Professor Kosters, Kuenen's successor at Leyden, has reached, and disbelieves the whole story that is told in the beginning of the Book of Ezra. According to Professor Kosters, no Jews returned to Jerusalem in the days of Cyrus. The early chapters in Ezra, in which the return under Zerubbabel is recorded, was the pious invention of that same chronicler who lived in the third century B.C., and rewrote the early history of Israel. And although Canon Cheyne thinks that Professor Kosters has gone a little too far, and that a very few did return from the Captivity in the time of Cyrus, he nevertheless accepts Kosters' conclusions on the whole, and holds that, at any rate up to the time of Haggai and Zechariah, the returned exiles were so few that 'they had no appreciable influence.' The return from the

Captivity took place after Nehemiah's second visit to Jerusalem, that is in 432 B.C.

Yet neither Professor Kosters nor Canon Cheyne believes that the foundations of the temple were not laid till 432 B.C. The most startling part of the theory is that it was not the returned exiles who laid them. Kosters follows his own predecessor Kuenen, and Cheyne follows Kosters, in believing that the temple was rebuilt in the reign of Darius Hystaspis, between the years 520 and 516 B.C. And as there were no returned exiles then to rebuild it, it was rebuilt by the inhabitants of Judah who had not been carried captive. To the writer of the Book of Ezra, however, this was simply incredible. He lived in the third century, two hundred years after the events whose history he records. In his day the 'people of the land' were down-trodden and despised. It was impossible that they should have done so much for their religion. And he accordingly put the matter right by inventing these earliest chapters of the book, and giving all the glory to the Gôla or Returned Exiles. For it was the Gôla that was the spiritual aristocracy in his day, the only doer of great deeds, the creator under God of the new Israel.

In THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for April, a passing reference was made to a paper which Professor Thayer, the author of the *New Testament Greek Lexicon*, read at the Congress of Philologists in Philadelphia. The paper was wholly concerned with the true meaning of the expression, 'Thou sayest,' used by our Lord in answer to His judges. Professor Thayer has since then contributed it as an article to the *Journal of Biblical Literature*, and now, through the author's own kindness, a complete copy is in our hands.

What did Christ mean when He answered, 'Thou sayest'? It is a small matter. But no sincere student of the New Testament will despise it on that account. A single doubt laid to rest, a single and apparently trifling mistake set right, is a

gain, for which such a student is always thankful. And Professor Thayer, working with the scholar's instinct and patience, seems to have given us at last the true interpretation of this utterance, and fixed it once for all.

There are two forms of the expression (Σὺ εἶπας and Σὺ λέγεις). The former (σὺ εἶπας) occurs only in St. Matthew. It is the reply given to Judas at the Supper table: 'And Judas, which betrayed Him, answered and said, Is it I, Rabbi? He saith unto him, *Thou hast said*' (xxvi. 25). And it is the reply to the adjuration of Caiaphas at the trial: 'And the high priest said unto Him, I adjure Thee by the living God, that Thou tell us whether Thou be the Christ, the Son of God. Jesus saith unto him, *Thou hast said*' (xxvi. 63, 64). The latter occurs only in the response made to Pilate, but it is quoted by all four evangelists: 'Now Jesus stood before the governor: and the governor asked Him, saying, Art Thou the King of the Jews? And Jesus said unto him, Thou sayest' (Matt. xxvii. 11, and in Mark xv. 2, Luke xxiii. 3, John xviii. 37). The verbs made use of are different, but the only distinction that can be rendered into English is the tense. The one is past and the other present. As regards the *meaning* of the expression, both forms may be considered together.

Now the favourite interpretation—in modern times it is almost the only interpretation—is to accept these expressions as making a direct affirmation, just as if they were an idiomatic or courteous 'Yes.' Such an interpretation has the advantage of giving us a direct affirmation from Christ Himself of His own divine origin, and so is a useful item in apologetic. But besides its convenience, it seems to have the support of the evangelists themselves. For when St. Mark gives his account of the trial before the high priest, in place of St. Matthew's 'Thou hast said,' he uses the perfectly unequivocal word, Ἐγὼ εἶμι, *I am*. And when once this interpretation was adopted, parallels were sought and found in Greek and rabbinical writings. These parallels, however, have all fallen away on

close examination. The nearest approach to a substantial parallel is the reply which Moses makes to Pharaoh's command that he see his face no more: 'And Moses said, Thou hast spoken well; I will see thy face again no more' (Ex. x. 29). But neither will this parallel stand. It is only in the Septuagint that it has any reality; the Hebrew has another meaning, which is fairly brought out in the English version just quoted. Is it not a strange circumstance, then, that Jesus should make use of a phrase on three different occasions, to three different persons, which is nowhere else found with this meaning?

But our favourite interpretation not only finds no support elsewhere, it even makes considerable difficulty in the Gospels themselves. Take the trial before the high priest. St. Matthew's account is: 'Jesus saith unto him, Thou hast said: *nevertheless* I say unto you, Henceforth ye shall see the Son of man sitting at the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven.' What about that *nevertheless*? If 'Thou hast said,' means simply 'Yes, I am,' then we should have expected a plain 'And' after it, as it is in St. Mark. 'Nevertheless,' or any other adversative, is quite impossible indeed.

Or take the trial before Pilate. The Synoptists give our Lord's answer in the simple form, 'Thou sayest.' But St. John gives the fuller form, 'Thou sayest that I am a king.' Now if 'Thou sayest' is equivalent to 'I am,' then 'Thou sayest that I am a king' is 'I am, that I am a king,' and a way of speaking which is not customary with St. John. No doubt the word rendered *that* may be rendered *because*, but it does not greatly improve matters, 'I am because I am a king' being just as clumsy and impossible for St. John as the other. Besides, if Jesus did plainly assert His Kingship, He was at once convicted of high treason. Pilate does not so convict Him. On the contrary, his very next words, according to St. Luke, are, 'I find no fault in this man.'

Thus there are reasons for rejecting the popular interpretation. And when, on the other hand, we

observe how uniformly the emphatic pronoun is found in this phrase, and how dexterously Christ's answer catches up the questioner's own words, we are driven to the conclusion that, in place of a direct affirmative, which would have been useless and out of place, it is an appeal to the questioner's own conscience. 'Is it I, Rabbi?' asked Judas. Swiftly came the response, '*Thou* hast said it. Thine own conscience, which prompted thee to ask the question, has answered it for thee.' 'I adjure Thee by the living God,' said crafty Caiaphas, 'that Thou tell us whether Thou be the Christ?' '*Thou* hast said it,' is Jesus' ready answer. Cai-

phas' own question betrayed his uneasiness as well as his spite. It needed no answer; it carried its own sufficient answer within it. With Pilate the case is slightly different. For it seems most probable that Westcott and Hort are right when they print our Lord's reply as a question. 'Art thou the King of the Jews?' said the governor, half in scorn and half in amusement. 'Dost *thou* say this?' is Christ's response. For He is ever tender with this easily swayed but unmalignant Roman. 'Dost *thou* say this?' or, as the Fourth Gospel explicitly puts it, 'Sayest thou this of thyself, or did others tell it thee concerning Me?'

## Thomas Kelly Cheyne.

BY PROFESSOR ARTHUR S. PEAKE, M.A., MANCHESTER.

WHEN I promised to write of Professor Cheyne, it was with no feeling that I was in any way competent to give an adequate sketch of him. But I thought that I might use the occasion to pay him a tribute of the kind he would most highly value, of a learner to an honoured teacher whose works have been a constant source of help and stimulus. In this I knew that I should simply be giving expression to the gratitude of many others. And I felt that some protest was called for against the virulence of the attacks with which Professor Cheyne has been assailed. *Facit indignatio* may serve as a motto for this part of my paper. I may add that I am only slightly acquainted with Dr. Cheyne, but on the few occasions when I have met him, he has impressed me with the cordiality and yet the gentleness of his manner. While my paper cannot be other than sympathetic, I shall strive to preserve, no doubt not quite successfully, as objective an attitude as possible.

Dr. Cheyne is not far on the other side of fifty, although he has crowded so much into his lifetime that one would naturally expect to find him older. He was born in London, September 18, 1841. He was educated at Merchant Taylor's School and at Worcester College, Oxford. In 1869 he was elected to a fellowship at Balliol. He was Rector of Tendring, in Essex, from 1881 to

1885, when he returned to Oxford as Oriel Professor of the Interpretation of Holy Scripture, and Canon of Rochester. The year in which he was elected at Balliol was also the year in which his first book appeared, *Notes and Criticisms on the Hebrew Text of Isaiah*. In it he laid down the principle, now a commonplace with students, 'that preconceived theological notions ought to be rigorously excluded from exegesis.' His second work, which appeared in the following year, was also on Isaiah, and was cordially received by competent European scholars. It was *Isaiah Chronologically Arranged*. It was inevitable that its criticism should be largely controlled by Ewald, his old teacher, though it exhibited independence on some points, and even advance. In 1869 the *Academy* was founded by Dr. Appleton, and in it several very important reviews by Dr. Cheyne appeared. They are characterised by a maturity, a width of knowledge, and a grip of critical principles, results and problems, which are really remarkable, when we remember that their author was barely twenty-eight when the *Academy* was founded, and especially when we think of the state of criticism in England at the time. Their educational value must have been very great. Several articles in the *Encyclopædia Britannica* also appeared from his pen. These were Amos, Canaan, Cherubim, Cosmogony, Daniel, Deluge,