
A table of contents for *The Expository Times* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[Issue]_[1st page of article].pdf

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. Caiaphas' 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,

Esther, Hittites, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Jonah. That on Isaiah (1881) is of great importance for the criticism of second Isaiah. About the same time as the publication of this article, his well-known commentary, *The Prophecies of Isaiah*, was issued (1880-81). The critical problems of the book are kept in the background, though the exegetical data for their solution are given. The work is universally recognised as a masterpiece of exegesis. The only regret one can express is that it is not complete in itself, but presupposes another commentary. In 1882 his small commentary on *Micah* appeared in the *Cambridge Bible*, and *Hosea* in the same series in 1884. In 1883–85 *Jeremiah and Lamentations* came out in the *Pulpit Commentary*. *The Book of Psalms*, a new translation, with introduction and notes, was issued in the Parchment Library in 1884. *Job and Solomon* appeared in 1887, *Jeremiah* (in 'Men of the Bible'), and *The Hallowing of Criticism* in 1888. In the same year his commentary on *The Book of Psalms* was published. The Bampton Lectures on *The Origin of the Psalter*, delivered in 1889, appeared in 1891. As a pendant to this, treating of the criticism of the David narratives in Samuel and containing some Psalm studies, his *Aids to the Devout Study of Criticism* was published in 1892. In 1893 *The Founders of Old Testament Criticism* appeared. Last in the long list comes the *Introduction to the Book of Isaiah*. I must not forget his co-operation with Professor Driver in editing the Old Testament portion of the *Variorum Reference Bible*. Besides all this, he has made numerous contributions to periodicals.

Professor Cheyne's most determined enemy could not deny him the merit of untiring industry. He has not only written much, but his books are founded on very exhaustive, independent research, and take account of every noteworthy piece of work done on the subject. When we remember that for a long time past his eyesight has been such that all strain upon it has had to be carefully avoided, our wonder is increased at the heroic energy with which his work has been done. A more important matter suggested by the list of books I have given, is the development in their author which they reveal. It may be well to say at the outset, that he has throughout been faithful to the same critical principles. On this he is himself quite explicit. 'Though I should now soften some too incisive statements of earlier days, I have written nothing which in the light of further experience I can wish absolutely to retract. The thought of a palinode, which has been imputed to me, has never entered my head.' It may seem strange that any one should have suspected Professor Cheyne of having at one time turned his back on his old critical opinions. It was simply due to the odd association of critical views with heresy and irreligion that is inveterate in so many minds. The publication of the commentary on *Isaiah* in 1880 is no doubt largely responsible for this opinion. The evangelical spirit it displayed, combined with the suppression of the critical problems, led many to imagine that the author had surrendered his former critical views. But while it is untrue that there has been any change of this kind, there has been change on several important critical questions. It would have been little to his credit if there had not been. In Hexateuch criticism it is interesting to see that as early as 1871 he had accepted the Grafian hypothesis, and Kuenen has throughout exercised a marked influence upon him. But his own inclination has led him rather to the prophets and the Hagiographa than the Hexateuch, though he has for a long time been working at Genesis, and we may hope to see the fruit of his labours. To Isaiah he has returned again and again. In 1869 he treated second Isaiah as a unity. But in 1881 his article in the *Britannica* showed that he had reached conclusions as to its composite authorship much in advance of those to which Ewald and Bleek had come. Other critics have much more recently reached similar results. The merit of pioneer work very clearly belongs to him here. He has also changed his views, on important points, in the earlier part of *Isaiah*. He has shaken off the Sargon theory of the Assyriologists, which he defended in his commentary, and has returned to the view of the Exilic origin of xxi. 1–10. On both points students generally will agree that the change is for the better. Similarly xxxii. 1–8 and xxxiii. are now placed by him in the post-Exilic period. In 1887 he was inclined to place Job in the Exile before second Isaiah, though admitting that a later date was possible. Now he places it in the Persian period. In the case of Proverbs there is a curious instance of return to an older view. In 1881 the Praise of Wisdom (i.–ix.) was regarded as Exilic or post-Exilic, in 1887 he dated it before the Exile, but in the Bamptons the former opinion

was reasserted. In the *Founders* he states his opinion, that not only it, but much of the rest of the book is post-Exilic. The case of the Psalms is also interesting. When he was preparing his commentary, published in 1888, he held as a working hypothesis that there were some pre-Exilic and some Exilic Psalms. In 1889 he held that all the Psalms, with the exception of the 18th, were post-Exilic. To these changes of critical opinion I shall recur. I call attention to them, because a disposition has been shown to use them to point the moral of the instability of the newer views.

A few words may be devoted to his religious and theological development, and any delicacy one might have felt in speaking on such matters is set aside by the fact that he has given us the example. He had early seen that rationalism and mysticism 'might serve to indicate a higher region where contradictions repose in the light of God's truth.' Down till 1880 it would seem that the former of these predominated with him. He tells us that his too exclusive devotion to criticism was injurious to his spiritual life. But at length a change came. 'A high tide of God's Spirit,' he says, 'had been sweeping over Oxford and the Church. In one obscure student its influence showed itself in this —that Johannine religion reasserted its supremacy over criticism and speculation.' If one must label him at this time, he must, I suppose, be called a pronounced Evangelical, though of a special type. His combination of rationalism with mysticism did not mean a denial of miracle, as is clear from reference in his *Isaiah*. So far as his religious life is concerned, I see no reason for doubting that Johannine religion maintains the supremacy it formerly asserted. He is naturally profoundly religious, and this element was bound sooner or later to come to its own. He has frequently insisted on the need of a personal religious experience to qualify a man for sympathetic exposition of Scripture. But his present theological position would be more difficult to define. He would probably dislike to be classed, and perhaps in justice this should not be attempted. My own impression is that he has affinities with Ritschlianism, but I should not like to call him a Ritschlian, and my impression may be quite wrong. In this connexion it is interesting to observe that his attitude towards a somewhat radical New Testament criticism is more sympathetic than that of most English scholars, who are friendly to advanced Old Testament criticism. But he emphasises the need for 'the most genuine spiritual faith in God, and in His Son, and in the Holy Spirit,' and asserts that whatever the results of the criticism of the Fourth Gospel, 'all truly religious students would believe, with heart and head, as strongly as ever in the incomparable nature and divine mediatorship of Jesus Christ,' 'on the ground of the facts which would still be left by the historical analysis of the Gospels, and on the correspondence between a simple Christian view of those facts and the needs of their own and the Church's life.' Finding that biblical criticism, untouched by 'the apologetic interest,' 'cramped the moral energies,' he has since 1880 felt it his duty to contribute as far as he could to the solution of the difficulties raised by criticism. He seems more sensitive now to the objections that may be urged against the Kenotic theories than in 1887. But he is all the more pronounced in his belief that the Holy Spirit is still guiding His people into all truth, and that no less in the critical than in other movements. He has also in some of his works, especially *The Hallowing of Criticism* and *Aids to the Devout Study of Criticism*, tried to draw edification from certain Old Testament narratives critically treated. Even if we feel, as some no doubt feel, that this is not the kind of work in which he is most successful, it is none the less to his honour that he has taken the need to heart and tried to meet it. Whether he rightly reads the signs of the times or not is questionable. I mean that it is not quite certain whether we have got beyond the need for *vermittelung*. He may be right in thinking that it is a mistake to present critical results in a modified form. But it still seems to be more of an open question than he admits. One is tempted to doubt whether he has his finger on the Church's pulse, when one remembers that his most outspoken critical work was the Bampton Lectures. It was courageous, but surely it was a tactical blunder. And even apart from this, the great majority of those who attended the lectures would be unable to follow much of them, and where they could, would frequently be unfamiliar with the exegetical, critical and historical data presupposed. The book was pre-eminently one for specialists, and not for a popular, even though academic, audience. The soundness of the views expressed in it is still a matter of controversy, and likely for some time to remain so. Several of his

followers still hesitate to accept them. But it is recognised that criticism will in the future have to start largely from his researches, and perhaps critics will some time come to acquiesce in the main conclusions held by him in common with Robertson Smith.

The mention of the Bampton Lectures, the most vigorously hissed of all his books, leads me to speak of the attacks that have been made upon him. While these have been made by Christians, and in the supposed interests of true religion, they have frequently exhibited little of the Christian spirit. Perhaps he had this in his mind when he wrote of Kuenen's reviews: 'How mild and gracious is his treatment even of those from whom he differs. Fairness one expects in an opponent, but *graciousness*—how seldom is this Christ-like temper found in a critic.' Even fairness was not present in some of Professor Cheyne's opponents. The style of controversy was of a kind that one might have hoped had almost died out. I do not wish, in common justice, to deny that the Bampton Lectures, if I may use the phrase, 'set people's backs up.' Partly because they were Bampton Lectures, partly because the Psalter is a subject on which many are sensitive, especially in communities where the Psalms are much used in public worship. But there were other reasons. The majority of his hostile reviewers probably had not that familiarity with the more recent criticism of the Psalter, which would have helped them to understand how he had reached his results, nor perhaps had they so thoroughly absorbed the results of criticism in other sections of the Old Testament as to realise how profoundly they affected that of the Psalter. I would not say that this was the case with all of his critics, but these reasons go a long way towards accounting for the tone of the reviews. But added to this was the Introduction, which many found irritating. Autobiography smacks of vanity to them, and Professor Cheyne is nothing if not autobiographical. And his references to other critics and to the course of criticism seemed to reveal a tendency to regard his own position at the time as an absolute standard. But these charges, while they have their explanation in a superficial reading of his character, are really quite unjustified. If he is frankly autobiographical, it is because he thinks that this may help the reader to reach the point of view from which the book is written. I grant that he is self-conscious, but humility is much more truly a note of his character than vanity. What gives the appearance of vanity is that he talks more frankly about his work than most people care to do, and claims due recognition for it. But this, I think, is due to a certain unworldliness that may be observed in him. And we must take with this his willingness to confess a mistake, which is too rare in critics, and his frequent deference to the opinion of experienced critics. Nor should it be forgotten that if he asks for his own work to be recognised, he asks the same for the work of others when it is in danger of being overlooked. Like most sensitive men, it is painful to him to be misunderstood, and much that has been attributed to vanity may be assigned to this cause. If he is wounded by unkindness, he is deeply touched by any generous words of praise. He has told us how 'humbled' he has felt by them; would such a feeling be possible to vanity? Nor do I think that he takes his own views as the absolute standard of truth in criticism. He would scarcely use language implying this except where he had a consensus of several critics. Nor does he disguise the fact that in many cases he regards his own conclusion as provisional, or as the more probable of two or three possible alternatives. He often indicates that he should feel obliged to accept a view that he at the time rejects, if he could see his way clear to a different solution to another question. A careful reader will see that while in many cases he feels that he has reached assured results, in others his conclusions are tentative, and he will not be dogmatic about them.

Another charge is much more serious, that of disingenuousness. This is based on some sentences in the Introduction to the Bamptons. He tells us that in 1880, in view of the circumstances of the Church, his *Isaiah* was marked by a self-suppression and a 'willingness to concede to tradition all that could with any plausibility be conceded.' 'In 1880,' he says, 'seeing too much with the eyes of my expected readers, I adopted a possible, but not sufficiently probable, view of certain psalms, and a possible, but not sufficiently probable, view of the central prophecy of the second Isaiah. In 1890, seeing entirely with my own eyes, not less as an apologist than as a critic, I offer my readers the truest solution which I can find of these and of all other problems, believing that the course is now, for the Church itself, both necessary and right.' In considering these statements, it is well to bear

certain facts in mind. At the same time as the commentary on *Isaiah* appeared, there came the article in the *Britannica*, strangely forgotten by his critics, in which his critical views were stated. Then he warns the readers of his commentary that when they have reached his point of view he will be able to rewrite his notes on Isaiah liii. But apart from these facts, he has held and acted on the principle, that in certain instances it is right 'to *adapt* Old Testament criticism and exegesis to the prejudices of orthodox students by giving the traditional view, in its most refined form, the benefit of the doubt, whenever there was a sufficiently reasonable case for doubt.' And twelve years ago he thinks the application of this principle was 'sorely needed.' Now it is quite easy to raise a prejudice on the score of dishonesty. But practically every progressive teacher knows that truth has to be given to people as he thinks they are able to bear it. And it is not as though Dr. Cheyne had actually given his sanction to views that he knew to be untrue. They were views which he felt might be right, although the balance of evidence seemed to dip against them, and they represented the maximum of possible concession from his readers. He still adopts a similar principle as when he states his own view, but for those who cannot accept it points out a possible alternative. And it is quite open to question whether, in 1880, his conviction as to the relative probability of the alternatives was so pronounced as he believed it in 1890 to have been. In any case, I think the matter has always presented itself to him as a question of policy and expediency rather than one of principle. I have heard him blamed by the 'children of the market-place,' both for the reserve he practised in 1880 and the outspokenness that marks his present work. In thinking of the criticism of his views, I am reminded of a review of Mr. Jennings' book on Mr. Gladstone, in which the writer asked if so delicate a work as the dissection of a complex personality like Mr. Gladstone could be adequately performed with a hatchet. This appeared in the *Guardian*. Here, too, one doubts the value of the tomahawk as a dissecting-knife. It must be confessed that Professor Cheyne does give himself occasionally into the hands of the Philistines, though only an ungenerous enemy would take advantage of this. Imagine the delight with which a Philistine reviewer would read at the end of the author's sketch of his own development prefixed to the Bampton Lectures: 'The reader will, I think, have seen that my outer and inner history was preparing me to produce exactly such a book as this.' The whole development would stand in the light reflected from the goal attained. One more criticism may be touched upon, that based on his changes of view. It is a characteristic he shares with every critic who does not fall a prey to stagnation. Delitzsch himself had accepted the view of the composite authorship of Isaiah in the winter of 1879–80, though in July 1879 he argued for the unity. In Dr. Cheyne's case, various causes have been at work. There is the clearer knowledge of the post-Exilic period. Then there is the fact that any fresh result attained is bound to affect the solution of other problems, so that where the balance of probability was slight it may easily be shifted. Further, he does not wait to attain ideal perfection, as some critics do, and die before they have produced much; but after he has reached fairly probable conclusions, he gives them to the world. This is certainly the best plan if the spread of light is the end in view, but it makes errors on points of detail inevitable.

But I may turn with relief from these things to speak more directly, though briefly, of his qualities. He is great alike in criticism, in exegesis, and in biblical theology. Perhaps he has a tendency in criticism to lay stress on minute indications of date, and to give too much play to imagination. But generally his views rest on a large induction of facts. And he has emphasised a principle to which too little weight has been attached, that it is dangerous to treat special problems of introduction in too isolated a way; and since results in one department must rest on those in another, the best way to study the Old Testament is to do it in a comprehensive way. Perhaps his finest work is exegetical. His fine literary instinct, delicate insight and sympathy with the deep things of God have combined with other qualities to give him a unique place among commentators. It must have been the experience of many that they have found just what they wanted in his notes after vainly searching for it elsewhere. Nor can one be blind to the value of his contributions to Old Testament theology, especially in the exposition of the meaning of biblical ideas. I may mention his sympathetic feeling for mythical phrases and survivals of mythical ideas, which often makes his work delight-

ful to a student of religions. With his other qualities we must not forget the range of his reading, which is truly remarkable. And generally his views are stated with lucidity and in a charming literary style, though sometimes, owing to the nature of the subject, they may seem ill-arranged. A very pleasing feature in his writings is the generous way in which he speaks of others. What he has said of Ewald, Kuenen, Delitzsch, and Robertson Smith might be quoted in proof of this. In spite of all that his critics have said about him, he is one of the brightest ornaments of Old Testament study, in his combination of profound faith and reverence with the most fearless criticism. When we think of the long list of his writings, we can only hope that he may be long spared to bless us with as many fruits of his genius and unwearied industry in the future as in the past.

At the Literary Table.

THE BOOKS OF THE MONTH.

(The Prices of the Books mentioned below will generally be found in the Advertisement pages.)

I.

THE INTERNATIONAL CRITICAL COMMENTARY. A CRITICAL AND EXEGETICAL COMMENTARY ON DEUTERONOMY. By the Rev. S. R. Driver, D.D. (*T. & T. Clark.* Post 8vo, pp. xxiv, xcv, and 434.) This is the first volume of that new enterprise in which Messrs. T. & T. Clark have gone hand in hand with the great publishing house of Scribners in America, the International Critical Commentary. As the title-page and even the binding (which is most effective) tell us, the editors of the series are Professor Driver and Dr. Plummer for this country, with Professor Briggs for America.

Turning the pages of this volume, the thing that first strikes one, and it strikes one forcibly, is the skill with which the space has been made use of. Five hundred and fifty-three pages are a fair allowance for a modern commentary, but Dr. Driver has put, without cramming or confusion, as much matter into his book as another would have got into two volumes of this size.

The next thing, though it comes after a little examination, is its extraordinary accuracy. Large type and small type, Hebrew word and scriptural quotation, page after page has been examined, and as yet not one single slip has been detected. Some men despise such accuracy as this. They call it laborious, and even wooden. But it is the possession of all our ablest scholars, and it is doubtful if a man should be called a scholar who has it not. He may be a great and uncomfortable genius, but a scholar to work with and confidently rely upon he cannot very well be. Surely the scholar is the man who counts nothing too small for his utmost care and conscience.

But the third surprise of Dr. Driver's book is just that breadth of outlook, that freedom of flight, which is supposed to belong to the genius, and be no concern of the scholarly commentator. Dr. Driver has mastered his author's statements in detail; he has also entered into his spirit; he has caught sight of his ideal; and he has worked along with him towards its attainment, sharing his work of faith and labour of love and patience of hope. 'Wooden,' did they say? then Deuteronomy is wooden also. For the great accomplishment of this volume is that it has given the Book of Deuteronomy back to us, and we feel the same life and interest in it as they felt to whom it first came. That is what every commentator seeks to do. It is Canon Driver's 'infinite capacity for taking pains' that has given him this great success in doing it.

THE ETHICS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT. By W. S. Bruce, M.A. (*T. & T. Clark.* Crown 8vo, pp. 292.) A manual of the Ethics of the Old Testament has been long called for, and it is a surprise to everyone that it has not appeared till now. For the subject is quite accessible. In an occasional way much has been written upon it; and the general lines are well established. Moreover, it is quite a popular study now. We