

# 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 Expository Times* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_expository-times\\_01.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php)

pdfs are named: [Volume]\_[Issue]\_[1<sup>st</sup> page of article].pdf

accomplished fact. At the time of Joshua we find in S. Canaan peoples who were unknown at the time of the Tahutmidæ, the preponderance of the Amorites is broken, the priestly State of (Uru)salim has disappeared, and in its place rears itself the defiant fortress of Jebus, a foreign tribe quite isolated in Canaan, while in the district of Hebron the Arabo-Aramæan peoples of Jerahmeel and Amalek are settled. These changes must be viewed as due to the incursions of the Ḥabiri, for the letters of Abd-ḥiba describe the severe straits to which (Uru)salim has been reduced by these; but the condition of things at the time of Joshua's invasion shows very clearly that (Uru)salim is in foreign hands, in possession of a warlike tribe, that it has become a tyrant's hold; nay, that it has even lost for the time its original name, which was first restored in David's time along with its elevation to the same sacred character that it had enjoyed as the ancient sanctuary of El Elyon.

For the date of Israel's migration to Egypt we must accordingly fix upon the period between the accession of Tahutmes III. and the invasion of the Ḥabiri, *i.e.* during the reign of Amenhotep III. Now we know that especially during the Syrian wars of Tahutmes III. numerous prisoners and many of those vanquished were taken to Egypt, where some of them had portions of land assigned them in the eastern Delta for cultivation or for pasture, and others were employed as temple slaves. According to the Jahwist, the tribes of

Israel and Jaḳob lived in blood feud with the Shechemites on account of the seduction of Jacob's daughter, Dinah,—it is significant from our present point of view that the Jahwist, in agreement with the Tahutmes list, makes the tribe of Israel (Gn 34<sup>7</sup>) to have been then settled in the neighbourhood of Shechem. In prosecution of this feud 'the sons of Jaḳob' fell upon Shechem and slaughtered its inhabitants. In consequence of this 'the sons of Jaḳob,' presumably the Israelitish tribe known to the Egyptians under this name, saw themselves compelled to move much farther south, to the district of Hebron. One portion of them, the tribe of Joseph, came hence to Egypt as captives,—so is the story of Joseph that has come down to us to be interpreted,—and were settled to the east of Heliopolis in the still uncultivated districts there, which probably belonged to the Tum temple at Heliopolis. Some portions of the tribe of Jaḳob may have followed voluntarily. From the annals of Tahutmes we learn that many of the inhabitants of Canaan removed to Egypt after the decisive battle at Megiddo; it is therefore very natural to suppose that among these there were found also Israelitish elements. But some portions of Israel remained, as we shall yet see, in Canaan. The invasion of the Ḥabiri and *ṣabî GAS* was consequently subsequent to the departure of Israelitish tribes for Egypt.

(To be concluded.)

## Training according to Bent.

BY THE REV. JAMES M. CAMPBELL, LOMBARD, ILLINOIS.

INTO this proverb the wisdom of ages has been packed. The thought which lies upon its surface appears to be simple and self-evident; yet few of the utterances of Scripture have been more egregiously misunderstood. As generally interpreted, it has inflicted many a needless and cruel wound upon sensitive and godly hearts.

I. *Consider what this proverb does not mean.*

(1) It does not mean that those who have to

'Train up a child in the way he should go: and even when he is old, he will not depart from it.'—Prov. xxii. 6.

do with the religious training of youth are guilty of the neglect of duty if the end of that training has not been secured. The common conception of these words is that they contain an implied promise on the part of God that if parents do their part in the religious training of children the result aimed at will be infallibly attained; and hence where there is failure the inference drawn is that parents have come short of duty. They have

been too strict, or too lax—at any rate, the fault lies at their door. This inference is often a monstrous injustice.

Parental influence cannot, any more than divine influence, necessitate character. In its last analysis character is self-chosen. Every man turns to his own way—the way that he has deliberately chosen for himself. Generally speaking, that way will be the one into which his infant feet have been guided; but not always. Even God does not always succeed in getting men to take His way.

The utmost that can be drawn from this text, as it is ordinarily read, is that, as a general rule, people, when old, will abide in the ways in which they have been trained in youth. But there are so many exceptions to this rule that relief has been sought by emphasizing the latter part of the verse, 'when he is old, he will not depart from it.' However far he may stray from the right path, he will come back at last. There is of course a strong probability that he will. As the Scotch proverb says, 'Evening brings a' hame.' Earliest impressions are the deepest, and they are seldom altogether effaced. They may be overlaid, but like the buried seed they often sprout up again in after years. Yet not always. Alas, alas, there are seeds that rot. And there are wanderers who persistently refuse to return into the paths of virtue in which their youthful feet have trod.

(2) This proverb does not mean that if children are taught certain truths they will inevitably adhere to them when they grow up. There are few who do not grow away from the teaching which they have received in childhood; and there are few who do grow away from the things in which they have been trained. Hence in this proverb the emphasis is to be put upon the word 'train.' A distinction is implied between teaching and training. The abiding power of training is stronger than that of teaching. Things which we have been trained to do in childhood we keep on doing in after life from the sheer force of habit.

This indicates the practical aim which should be held before the educators of youth. They are not instructors merely, they are trainers. They are not to pour knowledge into the mind as water into a vessel; they are to develop life; they are to reduce the instruction given to practice. For instance, it is not sufficient to tell a child that it is wrong to lie, he is to be trained up in the habit of truthfulness. Instruction may slide off, but

training sticks. It is the warp and woof of life, and becomes part of the man himself. For what is man morally considered but a bundle of habits!

II. *Consider what the proverb does mean.* Literally it reads, 'Train up a child according to his way' (R.V.m.), that is, according to his bent, 'and even when he is old, he will not depart from it.' 'Educate him with a due regard to his natural bias. Study his special characteristics, and train him in the direction of his peculiar tastes.' Commenting on this text, Moses Stuart says, 'The words translated, "his way," mean the bent of his mind or inclinations, the capacity he has to pursue this occupation or that. The Hebrew can be made to mean no more than that the child should be educated or trained up for usefulness in such a way as the bent of his genius indicates that he ought to be trained.' To the same effect are the words in *The Speaker's Commentary*, 'According to (the tenor) of his way means the path especially belonging to, specially adapted for, the individual's character.'

Here, then, we touch one of the fundamental principles in education. We can apply it to the religious development of youth, but it has a much wider sweep. That principle is that *there is a way specially belonging to each individual—'his way,' his own way*, as distinguished from the way of every other person in the world—the course in life for which he is specially fitted. Each child is a separate creation. There never has been, there never will be, another person exactly like him. He ought therefore to be studied apart, as to his temperament, tastes, and aptitudes. Find out 'his way,' train him according to his bent. Get him into right relation to the circumstances around him, so that he may be able to make the most of himself. Success in life is largely a thing of right adjustment. On the other hand, many a life is ruined because special tastes and aptitudes have not been duly considered. Many a man finds himself in the wrong place. He is a square peg in a round hole. He expends all the forces of life trying to do things towards which he has no special inclination, and for which he has no special fitness.

In the science of education it is an accepted maxim that 'the purpose of education is to cherish and unfold to the highest extent the capacities of every kind with which the God who made us has endowed us.' A recent writer on child-culture

fitly remarks, 'The soul of the child is not a piece of blank paper to be written upon, but a living power to be quickened by sympathy, and educated by truth.' His individuality is to be respected. Liberty and opportunity are to be given him for the development of the creative principle. The forces of his life are not to be run into a fixed mould, but are to be directed according to individual tendencies and original endowments.

This educational principle, which has happily become a commonplace, throws a flood of light upon the proverb before us. Its application to the religious development of the young ought to be more thoughtfully considered. There is too much artificiality in religion. The religious life of the young is too often something developed from within. It lacks the charm of naturalness. Every child stands by himself. In his religious

life his individuality ought to have free play. Care must be taken not to check what ought to be encouraged, and encourage what ought to be checked. A wise directive power must be exercised over the child to guide his activities into right channels, so that religion may become a habit from which he has no inclination to shake himself loose.

The best system of education will sometimes fail with individuals, for there is the natural perversity of the human heart to be taken into account, and there are also cross currents of influence coming into life, deflecting it from the upward course which it may have taken. But the general results are sure. The proverb, 'Train up a child according to his bent: and even when he is old, he will not depart from it,' is an illustration of the adage that exceptions prove the rule.

---

## At the Literary Table.

### THE BOOKS OF THE MONTH.

DOCTRINE AND DOCTRINAL DISRUPTION. BY W. H. MALLOCK. (*A. & C. Black.* Post 8vo, pp. viii, 253. 7s. 6d. net.)

With undiminished faith in his own insight, with undiminished relish for his own handiwork, Mr. Mallock has written another book to set the Church of England right. And we believe in his insight, and relish his work as much as he himself. For he has the persuasive pen of the accomplished man of letters. Where he is weak he either adroitly conceals his weakness or candidly confesses it, and the last is more irresistible than the first. He actually confesses that he knows nothing about the subject of his book. But we feel at once that he does not need to know. The subject of his book is Biblical Criticism. He not only does not know it, he does not even know where to go for an account of it. But it does not matter. His point is that, whether Criticism is true or false, it has been the cause of the present crisis in the Church of England, and he charms us into believing that. Now, if Criticism is the cause of the present crisis in the Church of England, 'Out upon Criticism' say all they whom that crisis has disturbed. Not so, says Mr.

Mallock. Criticism is a cause, but first it is an effect. Criticism is in the line of God's government of His Church. It had to come. And now that it has come, our business is to see that our crisis is no 'childish squabble about lace frills and birettas,' but a question of authority. 'To whom shall we go?' Men and women have been putting that question anxiously. The crisis in the Church of England is due to an attempt to answer that. It is possible that once again Mr. Mallock has written a book that will make the ears of all that hear of it tingle.

EVOLUTION AND THEOLOGY. BY OTTO PFLEIDERER, D.D. (*A. & C. Black.* Crown 8vo, pp. 306. 6s. net.)

Into this volume Dr. Orello Cone has gathered translations (mostly made by himself) of some essays recently published in America by Dr. Pfeleiderer. It is the kind of work which Dr. Pfeleiderer does best now. These essays are masterpieces of lucid, precise exposition. They not only leave no doubt of their author's meaning, but they place their subject in so clear (sometimes almost fierce) a light that its position is unmis-