

dictionary has made on its undoubtedly great predecessor is in the definition of the words that are best known to those working men of whom you and I know nothing till they go on strike. These words are very numerous, and often very expressive. Though they are often new, they are already more familiar to the men who use them than the words in St. John's Gospel, and it is right they should be here. The days are coming when these words will be scattered through the literature that we shall most desire to read; and if the words convey no meaning, the literature will afford no joy.

The quotations that have been retained in illustration of special meanings are evidently the residue of a much longer list. They are few and apposite. But the feature of the book upon which most of the chief editor's care was spent is, of course, the derivations. Professor Whitney was our leading philologist. He held his science in the highest honour. And there is no doubt that the etymological part of the *Century Dictionary* is its highest claim to originality, its weightiest contribution to modern science.

It remains to say a word about the Cyclopaedia of Proper Names. It was once considered possible to include proper names in the dictionary itself. That was wisely abandoned. We want the proper names alone. We need them most. We need them as easily handled as possible. It seems a pity that the names of places were included in the volume. Most of us have a gazetteer of more or less truthfulness already, and the space was sorely needed for the names of persons. Yet room has been found for a very large and representative selection. And certainly there is no respect of persons. Nay, even racehorses are here, racehorses that were famous in their generation. The biographies are brief, but much can be said in an inch of small type, if it is said by a man who knows his subject, and can begin at once. The type is cleverly managed. Beginning of a fair open countenance, it becomes small and close just when you have become interested in the biography and now must read it to the end. Yes, the Cyclopaedia of Proper Names was most needed, it is well done, and most welcome.

The Meaning of Christ's Prayer in Gethsemane.

I.

By the Rev. W. M. ALEXANDER, Memphir,
Tenn., U.S.A.

In the July number of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, under the heading 'Notes of Recent Exposition,' you quote Drs. Schauffler and Trumbull in the *Sunday School Times* as giving a new view of the agony in Gethsemane. I do not know who *originated* the view advocated by them, but I find it fully elaborated in the *Revival Lectures* of Charles G. Finney, published in 1835. In the lecture on 'The Prayer of Faith,' under the 'IV' head, which deals with the proposition, 'This kind of faith always obtains the object,' after urging three reasons to prove the theme, he proceeds to answer objections, and writes thus:

'Perhaps you may feel a difficulty here about the prayers of Jesus Christ. People may often ask, "Did not He pray in the garden for the cup to be removed, and was His prayer answered?" I answer that this is no difficulty at all, for the prayer was answered. The cup He prayed to be delivered

from was removed. This is what the apostle refers to when he says, "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, was heard in that He feared." Now I ask on what occasion was He saved from death, if not on this? Was it the death of the cross He prayed to be delivered from? Not at all. But the case was this: A short time before He was betrayed we hear Him saying to His disciples, "My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death." Anguish of mind came rolling in upon Him till He was just ready to die, and He went out into a garden to pray, and told His disciples to watch, and then He went by Himself and prayed: "O my Father," said He, "if it be possible, let this cup pass from Me: nevertheless not as I will, but as Thou wilt." In His agony He rose from His knees and walked the garden, till He came where His disciples were, and then He saw them fast asleep. He awaked them, and said: "What, could ye not watch with Me one hour?" And then He went again, for He was in such distress that He could not stand still, and again He poured out His soul. And now the third time, He goes away and prays: "Father, if Thou be willing, remove this cup from Me: nevertheless not My will, but Thine be done." And now the third time of praying there appeared an angel unto Him from heaven, strengthening

Him. And His mind became composed and calm, *and the cup was gone*. Till then He had been in such an agony that His sweat was as it were great drops of blood, but now it was all over.

Some have supposed that He was praying against the cross, and begging to be delivered from dying on the cross. Did Christ ever shrink from the cross? Never. He came into the world on purpose to die on the cross, and He never shrunk from it. But He was afraid He would die in the garden before He came to the cross. The burden on His soul was so great, and produced such an agony, that He was on the point of dying. His soul was sorrowful, even unto death. But after the angel appeared unto Him, we hear no more of His agony of soul. He prayed for relief from *that cup*, and His prayer was answered. He became calm, and had no more mental suffering till just as He expired. He received the very thing for which He asked, as He says, "I knew Thou always hearest Me." . . .

Mr. Finney next deals with Paul's thorn in the flesh, showing that to be no exception to the rule that the prayer of faith always obtains the very thing for which we ask. Then he proceeds:

'I was once amazed and grieved at a public examination at a Theological Seminary to hear them darken counsel by words without knowledge on their subject. This case of Paul and that of Christ, just adverted to, were both of them cited as instances to prove to their students that the prayer of faith would not be answered in the particular thing for which they prayed. Now to teach such sentiments as these in or out of a Theological Seminary is to trifle with the Word of God, and to break the power of the Christian ministry. Has it come to this that our grave doctors in our seminaries are employed to instruct Zion's watchmen, to believe and teach that it is not to be expected that the prayer of faith is to be answered by granting the object for which we pray? What is to become of the Church while such are the views of the gravest and most influential ministers? I would not be unkind nor censorious; but as one of the ministers of Jesus Christ, I feel bound to bear testimony against such a perversion of the Word of God.'

So Finney wrote sixty years ago. Whether he was the originator of this exposition or not, I know not. But surely he preceded the work of Schauffler and Trumbull in the *Sunday School Times*. That lecture on the 'Prayer of Faith' is well worth perusing, whether one agrees with Finney or not. He shows that *faith* must rest on *evidence*. Faith without evidence would be *credulity* not faith. Then he shows that in order to pray the prayer of faith you must have *evidence that the thing prayed for is in accordance with God's will*. This evidence can be of but three kinds (1) from Scripture; (2) from Providence; (3) from a special conviction produced by the Holy Spirit.

II.

By the Rev. J. G. CUNNINGHAM, D.D.,
Edinburgh.

1. All children know what it is to receive a cup containing either the bitter mixture of prescribed medicine, or the sweet beverage which pleases the palate and quenches thirst. In Scripture we often find the word 'cup' employed to denote an appointed portion either of judgment (Ps. lxxv. 8; Isa. li. 17) or of mercy (Ps. xxiii. 5, cxvi. 13). Here it evidently denotes an appointed portion of suffering not yet endured, a cup as yet untasted, regarding which, as now put into his hand, He prays, 'If it be possible, let this cup pass from Me.' That this cup was the *death* to which He was now to be brought is evident from John xviii. 11, and from Mark xiv. 35, 36, where the *cup* is also called the *hour*—an expression as to which the Saviour's words in John xii. 27 leave no room for uncertainty.

The *bitterness* of this cup consisted not in the mere physical pain of death by crucifixion, nor in the shame attending it, nor in the experience of ingratitude, cruelty, and mockery at the hands of men, nor in the assaults of Satan, coming with all his force against the Redeemer in that hour of darkness and weakness. In all such things the disciples of Christ have been made 'more than conquerors.' Christ's cup was made bitter by that which never was mingled with the afflictions of any of His faithful followers, for in dying as our Surety He was bearing the wrath of God due to us for sin. Being 'made *sin* for us'—inasmuch as the Lord laid on Him the iniquities of us all—He was also 'made a *curse* for us' (2 Cor. v. 21; Gal. iii. 13). 'It pleased the Lord to bruise Him' (Isa. liii. 6, 10). Those only who have some knowledge of the power of God's wrath, revealed from heaven against the ungodliness of a rebellious world, can form any idea of what death was to the Lamb of God when He 'put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself.'

2. The Father's hand held forth the cup. It was His will that Christ should *freely consent* to all that He was to bear when, under the hiding of His Father's countenance, He would be compelled to cry, 'My God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken Me?' Therefore the Father appointed that Christ should, in Gethsemane, have a complete and realising anticipation of what that awful

sense of desertion would be. Such an overwhelming apprehension of the darkness of that hour, and the bitterness of that cup, had not been earlier presented to Him, because the agony which absorbed His whole soul in Gethsemane would have so crushed and bowed Him down as to hinder Him from working the work given Him to do. Not while the day of His active public ministry continued, but for one brief and awful season at the close of that day, the whole bitterness of that decease which He was to accomplish at Jerusalem was set before Him, in order that He might, in view of all this, declare His perfect willingness to 'pour out His soul unto death.' We have in the narrative before us only Christ's words, but we may plainly discern to what intimation of the Father's will these words were the reply. We seem to hear the Father say, 'All this is to be borne by Thee as the Sacrifice and Surety for sinful men. Thou didst say before the foundation of the world, "Lo, I come; I delight to do Thy will, O My God" (Ps. xl. 8; Heb. x. 9); wilt Thou still freely go forward, when the shadows of death, darkened by the hiding of Thy Father's countenance, are gathering in appalling blackness across Thy path? Wilt Thou take this cup from My hand?'

3. Notwithstanding his vivid realisation of all that it contained, our Saviour, moved by love to sinners, consented to die for them. His soul was *troubled* (John xii. 27) by the contemplation of the infinite pain which death was to bring to Him. He prayed in an agony of earnestness, 'O My Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from Me.' The suffering which He was to bear when He was 'wounded for our transgressions' was so real and so great that He could not but shrink from it; and had there been any other way in which the redemption of the lost could have been accomplished, He would have continued to urge the plea for deliverance from the anguish which this must bring on Him. But there was no other way. Therefore Christ took the cup from His Father's hand. Freely, and with full knowledge of all that it contained, He consented to drink that bitter draught (compare vers. 52-54). Out of compassion and love for the many sons whom He was to bring to glory, He surrendered Himself to endure the sufferings through which He was to be made perfect as the Captain of their salvation (Heb. ii. 10).

III.

By the Rev. D. G. WATT, M.A., London.

There are expressions employed in the account of this tragic incident which throw some light upon its meaning. I read in Matt xxv. 38, 'Then saith He unto them, My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death: abide ye here, and watch with Me.' *Watch with Me.* Why 'with Me'? Was it to warn Him of the approach of His betrayer? Surely John's statement, 'Jesus, therefore, knowing all the things that were coming upon Him, went forth,' answers that in the negative. Was it not rather meant to imply that Jesus felt deeply that some physical strain might so master Him that the sympathy and help of His disciples would be precious to Him? Was this the reason for *three* of them being placed at hand? *My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death.* Jesus used no *superfluous* words. If the phrase *exceeding sorrowful* told all He felt, He would not have added *even unto death.* Jesus did not use *exaggerated* expressions, and it seems as if the pressure was so heavy upon Him that He felt He should sink under it, if relief was not given. He was face to face with death in Gethsemane. If 'the renewals of our Lord's prayer indicate progress,' it would be progress in the consciousness that He was obtaining reinvigoration for the awful tension of the coming day.

I add, but with the doubt that hangs over a passage 'omitted in many ancient authorities,' that sufficient strength was supplied by the angel from heaven (Luke xxii. 43).

There is a very instructive comment on Heb. v. 7, in Steinmeyer's excellent *History of the Passion and Resurrection of our Lord*, and its reference to the scene in Gethsemane. Surely He who did not shrink from going up to Jerusalem, 'to be mocked and scourged and crucified,' would hardly shrink when the hour drew near, being such as He was.

IV.

By the Rev. GEORGE MILNE, Glasgow.

It is so extremely difficult, perhaps impossible, to get at the true inwardness of our Lord's agony in the garden, that one is thankful for every serious endeavour to make it intelligible. I fear, however, that to speak of 'cups' and 'hours,' instead of 'the cup' and 'the hour,' and of 'fear

of dying in the garden' lest our Lord 'should not die on the cross,' is to introduce confusion into what is already a profound and mysterious subject. When we take the thrice-repeated prayer in the garden along with the verses in Heb. v., they leave on our minds the impression [that what Christ feared was that under His terrible agony He might die to the will of God, by yielding to His own will instead. Dr. Robson disposes effectually of the views of Dr. Schauffler and others, and puts the true state of the matter before your readers.

But we are not a whit more enlightened than we were before this discussion in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES began. Our Lord knew perfectly that He was to die; that the issue between Him and the rulers, if He maintained His ground, could be nothing less than death. He sets His face as a flint to go to Jerusalem to suffer there; and, having thus accepted death as the Father's will for Him, He yet prays that, if possible, a certain cup might pass, so that He should not drink it. Can the cup, then, be the death He had already accepted with whatever bitter ingredients it might contain; or was it not His will that some other element might be put into the cup to relieve its bitterness, and remove the crushing agony? Is not this really the question that is still so difficult, because we cannot regard the mere physical pain of death on the cross as sufficient to awaken beforehand, or even while it might last, the intense agony Christ manifests in the garden?

And may not a great part of the difficulty we feel arise because we have been building our theories regarding the sufferings of Christ on a too narrow basis? Our inquiries may not have been pushed to a sufficient width to take in all the facts. Do we, for instance, get any help in answering the question from the presence of the three leading disciples at the scene of the agony, and our Lord's most singular and impressive command to them, to watch and pray, lest they might enter into temptation? What precisely was their temptation? Had it any relation to the cup; and if so, what? And if the cup as presented to Christ was to be a temptation and a stumbling-block to them, would not the cup, as Christ wished it, lose at once its bitterness to Him, and its tempting power to them also?

It is impossible now to go fully into this view; but we cannot even raise it without being imme-

diately carried further, till we are compelled to look at the life and work and aim of our Lord from the time He received the Spirit. And His work and purpose being one all through, and His temptations coming in connection with His work being also essentially one, it will be necessary to analyse with care the temptation in the wilderness. The point of the temptation was that Christ should break away from God, care for Himself, perform signs and wonders, and do His work altogether in an unspiritual fashion. But He refused to begin or to carry on His work in any such manner; and after the temptation was done, 'the devil,' it is said, 'left Him for a season.'

The work given our Lord to do was to found a kingdom of God on the earth. To do this He required to gather and to keep the men on whom He was to depend for the building of the kingdom. If He cannot do both, His work breaks down as soon as He takes it in hand. Very specially, therefore, He gave Himself to the training of the Twelve; for this was as important a part of His mission as any.

He did all this by the Spirit, trusting He would be successful in so binding the disciples to Himself, as to make it impossible for the world to separate between them. But they failed to receive or understand Him as He wished to be received and understood. When the last temptation came, against which He taught them to watch and pray, 'they all forsook Him, and fled.'

Was this not the cup the Father gave Him,—for reasons which might be shown at length,—that He should die without one visible token of success? Do we not see His mind working with this very matter, as, *e.g.*, when He asked the disciples if they had any weapons, as if at first He contemplated resistance, and then after His arrest, when Peter cut off the ear of Malchus, He ordered the sword to be sheathed, and said: 'The cup which My Father hath given Me shall I not drink?' Could He, by giving some sign or other, have kept the disciples steadfast, the temptation would have been powerless, and with this element in His cup, its bitterness had been taken away.

For, to conclude, the faith of the disciples in Him was the external proof and fulfilment of His Father's promise; but when they fled that proof departed, and He had again to wrestle, but now in very different circumstances, with the old

temptation of the wilderness regarding a sign. Ought He not to have given a sign? Or was He or the tempter right? The devil left Him for a season, but returned in the hour and power of darkness. While our Lord lived in the senses, though He also lived by faith, He longed, and naturally, for sensible proofs of His Father's presence—for believing men who would be the foundation-stones of His kingdom. When they were gone, to the senses He was left alone. And this made His submission to the will of God the decisive battle of faith with the sense-unbelief of

the world. But between the promise of the Father with its natural expectation, taken in conjunction with the leading of the Spirit, and the naked fact that He will be left alone, what wonder was it that His soul was exceeding sorrowful, even unto death? Had He not a right, so to speak, to look for some tangible evidence of success, as the result of the expenditure of love and grace He had lavished on His followers? And failing this, what could He do but with a breaking heart cast Himself on the will of His Father, and leave results to Him?

Is the Old Testament Authentic?

BY THE REV. J. ELDER CUMMING, D.D., GLASGOW.

V.

WE TURN now to another division of our subject of great importance—the relation of Jesus Christ and His teaching to the Old Testament Scripture.

1. The first step in this investigation is the fact—the admitted fact—that He was in possession of it as a single volume, in the same shape as we have it now. Says Professor Ryle, the latest authority who has written on the Hebrew Canon, and whose views are on a line with the 'New Critics' (though hesitating to adopt their more extreme positions): 'The full complement of Scripture had been arrived at a century before the coming of Him who came not to destroy but to fulfil the Law and the Prophets' (*Canon of Old Testament*, p. 178). 'It was thus divinely ordered that we should be enabled to know *the exact limits of those Scriptures upon which has rested the sanction conveyed by the usage and blessing of our Divine Master*' (p. 179). '*There was never any doubt what the limits of the Hebrew Canon were*' (p. 179). Here, then, is an important fact. The book in question (no longer so many separate books, but one), separated from all others by a gulf deep and wide, it being regarded as of divine origin, and all others as of human origin, is admitted to have been in the hands of Jesus Christ; and when He spoke of the book, *He spake of it all!*

2. Next we have to deal with two questions, which must be kept distinct. The first of the two, stated plainly, is this: 'Had Jesus Christ the requisite knowledge to determine the authority,

the value, and the authorship of the Old Testament and of its separate parts? Or was he in ignorance about these things, more or less complete?' This question will by some be deemed to transgress the line of reverence, and to border on a blasphemous denial of His divine nature. By others, it will be resented as an attempt to drag the discussion into a channel which they would fain avoid. But the discussion is needful, and is involved in the assertion that Jesus Christ could have settled the whole matter had He wished to do so. We shall have hereafter to deal with the second question, whether He *did* attempt to settle it; but our present concern is with the preliminary and most important question, Whether He could in any case be appealed to as an authority?

Without considering the reply given to this question by those who do not believe in Him as '*their Lord and their God*' (for to such at present I am making no appeal), we have to do with those who, believing in His divinity, yet maintain that it was not committed to His method of speaking on such subjects.¹

There is, then, the problem to which the late Dean Plumptre painfully called attention in his last publication: What were the limits of the

¹ I refer to the Bishop of Gloucester's *Christus Compro-bator*, for a line of argument similar to what follows. There are, however, some statements on the subject made there which I think might with advantage be reconsidered. See pp. 102, 110.