

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

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

Lud, Maacah, Machi, Machir, Machpelah, Magdiel, Mahalalel, Mahalath, Mahlah, Mahli, Mahol, Makheloth, Malchiel (?), Malchijah, Malchiram, Malchi-shua, Malluch, Malluchi, Mamre, Maon, Masrekah, Matri.

We have gone far enough to reach an estimate of the whole volume. There are 42 names in the above list. Between Laadah and Matri, 95 Old Testament names are dealt with altogether. We thus obtain some idea of the proportion of Old Testament names which Dr. Cheyne would restore to their original form of 'Jerahmeel.'

In this respect the third volume is an advance upon the second, and a still greater advance upon the first. In dealing with the words given above, Dr. Cheyne incidentally mentions that the following names are also corrupted from Jerahmeel:—Aram, Amram, Abram, (Abraham), Deborah, Ham, Ariel, Elam, Abishalom, Kemuel, Azrikam, Jerubbaal, Hamor, Elam, Jehallelel, Bela, Balaam, Eliel, Bahurim, Hamul, Kehelathah, Hammelech, Harim, (Beth)lehem, Ammon, Amalek, Hul. Some of those words occur in the first volume, but none of them are there traced to Jerahmeel, while of those which fall within the second, only Kemuel, Jerubbaal, Jehallelel, Hamul, and Hammelech are so traced.

Of the many questions which Dr. Cheyne solves by textual reconstruction one may be mentioned. Melchizedek, king of Salem, is spoken of in Gn 14 and in Ps 110. In Gn 14 'Melchizedek, king of Salem,' says Dr. Cheyne, 'is surely a late editor's attempt to make sense of a badly written text'; and he thinks that 'Melchizedek' is a corruption of *melek ziklag*, 'king of Ziklag,' while Salem is a transposition of Leshem. 'Now Leshem and Ziklag,' he continues, 'are both corruptions of Halusah. It was, according to the first narrator, the priest-king of the sacred city of Halusah who came out to meet Abram, and blessed him, and to whom Abram (the hero of the Jerahmeelite tribe) paid tithes.' The text of Ps 110 is also probably corrupt. Instead of 'Thou art a priest for ever after the order of

Melchizedek,' Dr. Cheyne would read 'I establish thee for ever because of my covenant of loving-kindness.' Thus the name Melchizedek goes out of the Old Testament, and the use made of it in the Epistle to the Hebrews is, in Dr. Cheyne's words, 'mere temporary rhetoric.'

But Professor Schmiedel is more critical than Dr. Cheyne. It may be that it is more keenly felt when the subject is the New Testament. In his long article on MINISTRY, he touches on the gift of tongues at Pentecost. He denies the gift, and he denies that, whatever occurred, it occurred at Pentecost. His reasons are two. First, Pentecost is the feast of the giving of the Law at Sinai; but the giving of the Law at Sinai is described by Philo 'in terms quite similar to those used in the description of the miracle in Acts.' The narrative and the date were therefore probably derived from Philo. Second, our Lord's disciples were not in Jerusalem at that time. After His departure they betook themselves to Galilee, and 'it would have been very singular if they had, within a few weeks, again left house and home for a place where the greatest danger threatened them without any, apparent motive or necessity for such a migration.' That they established themselves in Jerusalem, rests only on the presupposition of Luke, 'which cannot be accepted.'

Most critical of all, however, is Professor van Manen. Professor Schmiedel accepts some of the Pauline Epistles, not only the four great Epistles—Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians, Galatians,—but also Philippians and 1 Thessalonians. But Professor van Manen rejects them all. 'We possess,' says Dr. van Manen shortly, 'no epistles of Paul, the writings which bear his name are pseud-epigrapha.'

Much as the *Encyclopædia Biblica* is occupied, and deliberately occupied with criticism, it is impossible to say that its strength lies in that. Rather does it lie in the articles on antiquities and geography and the like, which do actually reflect the scholarship of to-day, and will not soon be out of date.