

# 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

# THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

---

## Notes of Recent Exposition.

THERE is an article in the *Examiner* for 7th May on 'The Indian Missionary.' It is a reply to Dr. Oldfield, whose article was referred to in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for May. The writer of the article is Professor Armitage of the United College, Bradford.

---

Professor Armitage also has been in India. He spent last winter there. He did not spend it wholly among Hindus as Dr. Oldfield did. He spent it partly among Anglo-Indians, and even among English missionaries. It is natural that his experience should differ from Dr. Oldfield's. But he gives reasons for holding that it is the truer experience of the two.

---

Professor Armitage does not dispute Dr. Oldfield's good faith. Dr. Oldfield, he says, is an earnest Christian man. He is careful to point out that Dr. Oldfield has no fault to find with the Gospel which the missionaries bring to India, only with the missionaries who bring it. But he holds that if Dr. Oldfield had not confined himself to Hindus, he would have had a better opinion of the Indian missionary. He himself has seen the Indian missionary at work, and he has never seen work better done.

---

He gives an example of an Indian missionary. He does not take him from the missionaries sent

out by his own Church. He goes to the Rajputana mission, to Jaipur the 'City of Victory.' The missionary is a Scotsman and a Presbyterian.

---

This missionary has been in Jaipur for thirty years. His name is not given, and we do not know it. 'He knows every turn and corner of the great city outside whose walls he lives, and is a familiar figure to these straight strong Rajputs, with their swords at their sides and their disparted beards. They proudly claim that they are descended from the sun, and their Maharajah heraldically proclaims his place in the solar dynasty. He is a devout and scrupulous Hindu, and the city is full of temples and priestly men. Now what will this city of priests and heroes have to say to our Scotsman? He makes no attempt to win his way among them by forswearing beef, any more than he makes it by forswearing the friendship of the Anglo-Indian community. He does not exchange his tweed coat for a flowing robe; whilst it is well known that of an evening he puts on his flannels and eagerly pursues the bounding tennis-ball. Will every heart in the city close against him then? Will the feudal nobility, will the ascetic Brahmin, seek his counsel, or will they turn from him in their hour of need?'

---

When Professor Armitage entered the mis-

sonary's house, he found a Rajput there. He was a Thakur, a member of the hereditary Rajput nobility, and he had come down from his feudal castle among the hills to talk with his old friend, and to reproach him for not having come to spend a week with him among the hills this spring.

Next day Professor Armitage and the missionary entered the city together. 'Come away here to see this Brahmin who has lost his son, a fine young fellow who was doing excellently at the University.' The Hindu met them and gave them an affectionate welcome. The missionary expressed his sympathy with the bereaved father. 'My own life is finished,' said the Brahmin, 'it is in the grave with my son; but, oh, why is the world so full of darkness?' 'Wait, I have a word for you.' 'Speak, Guru.' 'There was a sheep that would ever break the fold, and when it bore a lamb it taught the lamb to wander afield also. The shepherd was grieved and sought in many ways to stay it, until at length he took the lamb and bound it fast to his own seat. And then the sheep wandered no more.' With quick searching eyes the Brahmin looked into the Guru's face, and then said with deep sincerity, 'True, I have been a sad wanderer. Is that, then, the reason why my lamb has been bound to His seat?' And then this stranger prophet unfolded the story of a love that wins man even whilst it sharply disciplines him.

Professor Armitage was taken to other scenes. And when he came home he told his tale. And he says, 'Doubtless the English preacher offends the Hindu in certain particulars, but it is surely a shallow solution of the difficulty to ask that he shall avoid offence by transforming at once himself and his message. Dr. Oldfield has once more repeated the assertion that India will first open its heart to prophets who come eating locusts and wild honey, and that it will never do so to gluttonous men and winebibbers, the friends of publicans and sinners. So said the critic in the

East long ago, but history has disproved his word. India needs something far larger than the ascetic has to offer, and there can be no doubt as to the success of Christianity there. It may come slowly, and certainly the end is yet far off; but India is moved to-day by the call of Christ as she has not been moved for two millenniums. I believe that in all her apparent repudiation of Christ she is wistfully asking if He was not that Prophet who was for to come.'

There is another reply to Dr. Oldfield. It is more deliberate and sustained. It is in the *Christian World* of 23rd April. The writer of it is Dr. Walter Adeney, the newly elected Principal of Lancashire College.

Professor Armitage answers Dr. Oldfield out of his own experience in India. Principal Adeney answers him out of the testimony of Jesus Christ.

There are two charges which Dr. Oldfield brings against the Indian missionary. The first is that he does not recognize the good there is in Hinduism; the second, that he presents too low an ideal of character or saintliness in his own life.

The first charge Dr. Adeney partly admits the force of. Such force as there is in it, however, is passing away. 'In the colleges with which I am connected,' he says, 'a sympathetic study of the religions of India forms part of the normal curriculum.'

The second charge he meets with a flat denial. The missionary is not less a saint that he plays tennis. He is not less a spiritual guide that he is 'a jolly fellow to talk to, courteous, kindly, gentlemanly.'

It may be true that that is not the Hindu ideal of saintliness. The Indian missionary is not sent out to make the Hindus saints after their own

ideal but after the ideal of Christ. And the question is, Does the Indian missionary live after the example of Christ? It is not, Does he live after the example of an Indian fakir? Dr. Oldfield answers that question himself, answers it in the missionary's favour, and apparently without the least suspicion that he is doing so.

'I found,' says Dr. Oldfield, 'a deep-seated belief that the practice of Christian missionaries was so much lower in the matter of actual cleanliness and humaneness in eating and drinking and bathing, that it was felt it would be an actual *degradation* for a Hindu to become a Christian.' What is the cleanliness referred to? It is washing before eating. Now, says Dr. Adeney, there is a curious coincidence here. Dr. Oldfield repeatedly contrasts the practice of Christ and His apostles with the practice of modern missionaries. Has he forgotten that one of the charges made against our Lord and His disciples was that they used to eat with unwashed hands? Dr. Oldfield quotes with approval the statement of a Hindu that 'your Christ and your Paul used to fast.' Dr. Adeney can forgive the Hindu, though it does not show that the Hindus know the Christian Scriptures so well as Dr. Oldfield claims; Dr. Oldfield he cannot forgive.

The newest, perhaps the only really new thing, in Professor Delitzsch's famous lectures *Babel und Bibel* is the assertion that the early Babylonians, or at least some of them, were monotheists. If that is a fact, it affects our attitude to the revelation that is in the Bible as seriously as does the Code of Hammurabi. What proof does Professor Delitzsch produce?

In his lecture—the statement occurred in the first lecture of the two delivered before the Emperor—he produced no proof at all. And the moment the lecture was published Professor Jensen challenged it. 'This would, of course,' said Professor Jensen, 'be one of the most momentous

discoveries that has ever been made in the history of religion, and it is, therefore, extremely regrettable that Delitzsch conceals from us his authority. Nothing of the kind is to be gathered from the texts to which I have had access—that I think I can confidently affirm—and we urgently request him, therefore, as soon as possible, to publish word for word the passage which robs Israel of its greatest glory, in the brilliancy of which it has hitherto shone—that it alone of all nations succeeded in attaining to a pure monotheism.'

Did Professor Delitzsch publish it? No. It was published already. In the year 1895 Dr. Pinches (then of the British Museum) had published, in the *Journal of the Transactions of the Victoria Institute*, a New Babylonian cuneiform tablet. The tablet is in fragments. But one of the surviving pieces informs us that all the great gods in the Babylonian Pantheon are to be regarded as one with, or as one in, the god Marduk. When Marduk, says the tablet, is to be thought of as the Possessor of Power, he is called Ninib; when he is the Lord of Battle he is Nergâl; when he is Possessor of Lordship he is Bêl; when he is Lord of Business he is Nebo; when he is Illuminator of Night he is Sin; when Lord of all that is just he is Šamaš; and when God of Rain he is called Addu.

Professor Jensen seems to have missed that tablet. He ought not to have missed it, says Professor Delitzsch. And Mr. Johns, who edits the English edition of Dr. Delitzsch's lectures (*Babel and Bible*, 5s., Williams & Norgate), says that in any case it was not wise for even one of the foremost Assyriologists to assume that he knew all that there was behind Dr. Delitzsch's assertions.

Is the matter settled then? By no means. Professor Jensen has replied to Dr. Delitzsch in a new pamphlet. Dr. Delitzsch calls it 'wrong from beginning to end.' And Mr. Johns speaks

of the humiliating position in which Professor Jensen has placed himself. The end is not yet.

'I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed: it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel' (Gn 3<sup>15</sup>). We call that the PROTEVANGELIUM, the Earliest Gospel. But its loudest note is not the note of the gospel. The note of the gospel is 'peace on earth.' But in this passage it is the trumpet calling to battle that we hear.

We call it the earliest gospel because of the words 'It shall bruise thy head.' And the gospel is in these words. Before the gospel comes, however, there is the conflict. To every man upon this earth comes the call to battle. 'I will put enmity.' And even the gospel that is in the words, 'It shall bruise thy head,' does not take away from any man the necessity of entering into this affray and facing this foe. The gospel gives the assurance of victory; it does not prevent the strife.

'I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed.' There is a gospel in the very strife itself. For to begin no battle is to leave the victory with the Serpent. To open no world-wide conflict is to leave the world to the Prince of the world. To put no enmity between the seed of the Serpent and the seed of the Woman is to see no difference at last between them.

'I will put enmity.' It is the summons to a world-wide conflict. How did this conflict arise, and what is the necessity for it?

God made three orders of existence. He made the sun and the moon and the earth, plants and animals, of matter only. He made men of matter and of spirit. He made the angels of spirit alone. He made all these for obedience. But while He made the sun for unthinking and unswerving

obedience, He made men and angels for the obedience that is called love.

He made the sun for simple obedience. At any moment of the day or night you can tell where the sun is. It knows no variableness nor shadow of turning. It does no iniquity, neither is guile found in all its path.

He made men and angels for obedience also. But not for the unthinking obedience of the sun and the moon. If you can tell at any moment where the sun is, there is no praise to the sun for that. God made men and angels for the obedience that is called love.

Now there cannot be love where there is no freedom. There cannot be love where there is no choice. If men and angels are to love God and not merely obey Him, then they must be free to hate God. The love that is not open to hate is not love. Love to be love must see and choose, and the choice must be freer than the air.

He made both angels and men free to stand and free to fall. Some angels fell, we are told, and all men.

What led to the fall of the angels? We can scarcely tell. Shakespeare says it was ambition—

Cromwell, I charge thee, fling away ambition:  
By that sin fell the angels.

What led to the fall of man we know. But here a great difference is seen. When the angels fell it appears that they fell singly. When man fell he fell as man. 'In Adam all died.'

For a moment the advantage seems all on the side of the angels. But it is for a moment only. For if the angels who fell, fell singly, they fell to rise no more. If man fell in Adam, then in another Adam man may rise again.

And that seems to be because there is no angel nature. That there is such a thing as human

nature we know. One touch of nature makes the whole world kin. But it seems that there is no angel nature. When our Lord was answering the Sadducees' foolish old question about the woman who had had seven husbands, 'Ye do err,' He said, 'not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God; for in heaven they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but *they are as the angels.*' So the angels marry not, nor are given in marriage. There is no kinship among the angels. There is no angel nature.

If therefore the angels fall, they fall singly. But they fall to rise no more. For what angel or what man can atone for his sins to God? And since there is no angel nature there is no one that can take upon him the nature of angels and in that nature atone for the angels' sin.

We do not understand that. We scarcely can believe it. We scarcely can believe it because we are men. We think there must be hope for the Devil yet.

Auld Nickie-ben!  
O wad ye tak a thought and men'!  
Ye aiblins might—I dinna ken—  
Still hae a stake—  
I'm wae to think upo' yon den,  
Even for your sake.

But that is human. It is not devilish. When once an angel falls, when once an angel becomes a devil, it does not seem that he can rise again.

It is not so with man. There is what we call human nature. Into that human nature one may come to lift it up again. When he comes he must be a man, and face a man's temptations and win a man's victory. He must also be man, representative man, son of man, and able to atone for the sins of the race. When He comes He takes not hold of angels (for there is nothing there to take hold of), but He takes hold of the seed of Abraham which is the seed of the woman.

He came in Jesus of Nazareth. 'On the

morrow John seeth Jesus coming unto him, and saith, Behold, the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world.' Jesus of Nazareth has come as man's representative and redeemer to atone for the sins of the world.

But first, He is Jesus of Nazareth. He is a man. Before He begins His work of atonement, before He takes upon Him the redemption of the world, He must fight His own man's battle. To every man upon this earth this battle comes. It comes to Jesus also. Therefore before the public ministry begins, before He begins to heal the sick or raise the dead or preach the gospel to the poor, the Spirit driveth Him into the wilderness to be tempted of the Devil.

That is the place of the Temptation in the Wilderness, as we understand it. Jesus is a man, and He must face the foe whom every man has to face. He must fight the battle which every man has to fight. And He must win. If He does not win, how can He atone for the sins of the world? If as a man He does not win His own man's battle, why, then, He has His own sins to reckon with, and how can He even come forward as the Redeemer of the race? Jesus must fight and Jesus must win, just as we all have to fight but not one of us has won. That is the place of the Temptation.

And that, as we understand it, is why the Temptation in the Wilderness is recorded. It is every man's Temptation. It may be spread over our life; it could not have been spread over the life of Jesus, otherwise He could not have begun His atonement till His life was at an end; but it is the same Temptation that comes to every man.

It is the temptation that came to Eve. Point for point the temptation of Eve and the temptation of Jesus correspond. Eve's temptations were three; so were the temptations of Jesus. Eve's temptations assailed the body, the mind, and the spirit; so did the temptations of Jesus.

The first temptation was a bodily temptation. 'She saw that the tree was good for food.' 'If thou art the Son of God command this stone that it be made bread.'

There is the difference, certainly, that Eve was not hungry, while Jesus was. The sin of Eve was the greater that she sinned not through the cravings of hunger, but merely through the longing for forbidden, or it might be daintier, food. But though the temptation was more intense for Jesus, it did not differ from Eve's essentially. It was the desire for food. It was the desire to satisfy a bodily appetite. And it does not matter how imperious that appetite may be, it is not to be satisfied unlawfully. Eve saw that she had the opportunity of satisfying it, Jesus saw that He had the power. Eve was tempted to satisfy it by using an opportunity which God had not given her, Jesus by using a power which had been given Him for another purpose. It does not matter essentially whether it is to avoid starvation or merely for greater luxury, we sin with Eve if we seize an opportunity or take advantage of our position to do that for our body or outward estate which God has commanded us not to do.

The second temptation was to the mind. 'And that it was a delight to the eyes'—thus the temptation came to Eve. 'He showed Him all the kingdoms of the world in a moment of time'—thus it came to Jesus.

Now the temptation to the mind does not come to everyone. It does not come to those who are absorbed with the things of the body. The three temptations came to Eve because Eve is typical of the whole human race. And the three temptations came to Jesus, because He is typical also, and because He resisted them all.

The temptation to the mind is higher, it is a nobler temptation, than the temptation to the body. There are those to whom the fragrance and beauty of the apple makes irresistible appeal,

who would never be driven to do wrong merely in order to have it to eat.

It is a subtler temptation also. We are willing to starve that we may hear good music or give ourselves a scientific education. And we cannot perceive that we are falling before a temptation. But music or science may be pursued for purely selfish ends. In their pursuit too some nearer duty may be neglected. And the fall is often obvious enough: a doubtful companionship, such as music sometimes introduces us to, or a denial of God such as science sometimes leads us to.

But the temptation to Jesus was nobler, we do not doubt, and more subtle than the temptation to the mind has ever come to any other man. He saw the kingdoms of the world at a glance and the glory of them. He was offered them as His own.

Now He desired to have the kingdoms of the world as His own. He had come to make them His own. All the difference seemed to be that the Devil offered them at once without the agony of winning them—the agony to Him or to us.

He was offered them without the agony to Himself. Some think that He did not know yet what that agony was. He did not know that He was to be despised and rejected of men. He did not know that He was to lose the sense of the Father's well-pleasing. He did not know what the Garden was to be nor what the Cross. They say so. But how can they tell? One thing is sure. He knew enough to make this a keen temptation.

But He was also offered the kingdoms of the world without the agony to us. That temptation was yet more terrible. For when the Cross was past the agony to us was but beginning. And He felt our agony more keenly than He felt His own. What a long-drawn agony it has been. Two thousand years of woe! and still the redemption is not complete. To be offered the

homage of the human heart, to be offered its love—such love as it would have been where there was no choice left—to end the poverty and the sickness and the blindness and the leprosy and the death, not by an occasional laying on of the hands in a Galilæan village, but in one world-embracing word of healing; to end the sin without waiting for the slow movements of conscience and the slow dawns of faith—it was a sore temptation. But it must not be. To deliver from the consequence of sin without the sorrow for it, to accept the homage of the heart of man without its free choice of love, was to leave the Serpent master still. The world is very fair to look upon as He sees it in a moment of time from that mountain top; but it cannot be His until He has suffered for it, and until it has suffered with Him.

The third temptation was a temptation to the spirit. Eve saw 'that the tree was to be desired to make one wise.' Jesus was invited to cast Himself down from the pinnacle of the temple, trusting in God and in the promise that no harm should befall Him.

The 'wisdom' which Eve was promised was spiritual wisdom. It was the wisdom of God. 'Ye shall be as gods,' said the Serpent, 'knowing good and evil.' And this wisdom became hers when she had eaten. 'Behold the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil.' It was such wisdom as God has. And God is a Spirit. It was spiritual wisdom.

Man is both spiritual and material. As a spiritual being he has certain spiritual experiences. But as long as the spirit is in touch with the body its experiences are limited in their range. God is a Spirit, and His experience knows no bounds. When man attempts to pass the bounds of human experience and enter the experience of God, he sins.

Eve was so tempted and fell. Jesus also was so tempted, but He resisted the temptation. As

God He can throw Himself from the pinnacle of the temple with impunity, just as He can walk upon the water. And the Devil reminds Him that He is God. But this is His temptation as a man. As a man He cannot, as a man He has no right, to tempt God by casting Himself down.

To Eve and to Jesus it was the temptation to an enlargement of experience beyond that which is given to man. And it lay, as it always does, in the direction of the knowledge of evil. There are those who, like Eve, still enter into evil not from the mere love of evil or the mere spirit of rebellion, but in order to taste that which they have not tasted yet. They wish to know 'what it is like.' There are men and women who can trace their drunkard's lifelong misery to this very source.

To Eve the sharpness of the temptation lay in the promise of larger spiritual experience. Let us not say it was vulgar curiosity. The promise was that she would be as God, that she would know what God knows. Perhaps she even felt that it would bring her into closer sympathy with God—the sympathy of a larger common experience.

To Jesus this also was the sharpness of the temptation. He was God, but He was being tempted as a man. It was not merely, as in the first temptation, that He was invited to use His power as Redeemer for His own human advantage. It was that He was invited to enter into the experience of God, to enter into the fulness of knowledge which belongs to God, to prove Himself, and to feel in perfect sympathy with the whole range of experience of the Father.

It seemed like trust: it would have been presumption. We sometimes enter into temptation saying that we will trust in God to deliver us. It is not trust; it is presumption. And God does not deliver us. No one ever yet entered into temptation, untempted by God, and came forth scathless.



Jesus was tempted of the Devil and resisted all the temptations. What it cost Him we cannot tell. We know it cost Him much. Angels came and ministered unto Him. He needed their ministrations. But He won His battle as a man. No one could convict Him of sin. He is ready now to be the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world.

And when He begins His work of Redemption, He can use His powers as the Son of God. The Devil's temptation, 'If thou art the Son of God,' is no temptation longer. He opens His works of wonder, He heals the sick, He preaches the gospel to the poor, He accepts the cup and drinks it, He cries 'It is finished.'

His Temptation in the Wilderness was the temptation of a man. His atonement for sin was the atonement of the Son of man, man's representative; the atonement of the race in Him. This is the essential thing in the Cross. He took hold of our nature; in our nature He suffered and died. Our nature suffered and died in Him. This is the essential thing, that He made the atonement as Man, that man made the atonement when He made it. After the Temptation in the Wilderness the Devil left Him for a season. When he came back he did not come back to a man. He came back to the race of man, represented and gathered into one in Christ. He came back not to seek to throw one human being as he had thrown so many human beings before. He came to fight for his kingdom and his power.

And it did seem as if the Devil had won this time. As the fight closed in, Jesus Himself said, 'This is your hour and the power of darkness.' The Devil had the whole world on his side in the struggle. The religious leaders were especially active. And the end came—death and darkness. It did seem as if the Devil had won this time, and this was the greater battle to win.

But, 'except a corn of wheat fall into the

earth and die, it abideth alone.' Without death Jesus was sinless. In death he gathered many to His sinlessness. Death and the Devil got hold of Him but lost their hold of us. It was the Devil's greatest triumph. It was his greatest defeat.

One thing remains. We must accept Him. The kingdom of heaven is open, but it is open to all *believers*. He could not have this fair world without the agony; we cannot have Him without it. For it is love that is wanted. Nothing is wanted but love. It is the love of the heart that makes Paradise. And love must be free. There is no compulsion. Sin must be felt and repented of; a Saviour must be seen and made welcome. By faith we must become one with Him as He has become one with us.

Is it lawful to say, 'Maker of heaven and earth'? Is it lawful in the face of modern science? Lord Kelvin has found that it is not.

At the first of a course of lectures on 'Christian Apologetics' in University College, London, Lord Reay presided, and Lord Kelvin moved a vote of thanks. In supporting his vote, he said that as to the origin of life, science neither affirmed nor denied creative power; and then he added, more plainly, that there lay nothing between absolute scientific belief in creative power and the acceptance of the theory of a fortuitous concourse of atoms. And as for this matter of 'fortuitous concourse,' was there anything, he asked, so absurd as to believe that a number of atoms, by falling together of their own accord, could make a crystal, a sprig of moss, a microbe, or a living animal?

Whereupon the *Times* has had to 'open its columns.' The attack is led by the Director of Kew Gardens. 'He wipes out by a stroke of his pen the whole position won for us by Darwin.'

And not only so, but, says Sir William Thiselton Dyer, he is inconsistent with himself; and he quotes some words from Lord Kelvin's address before the British Association in 1871, that when a problem cannot be solved naturally 'we must not invoke an abnormal act of creative power.'

Lord Kelvin also writes to the *Times*. He is not clear about the 'crystal.' That might come about by fortuitous concurrence, and he thinks he should have left it out. But he stands by the rest. 'Forty years ago,' he says, 'I asked Liebig, walking somewhere in the country, if he believed that the grass and flowers which he saw around us grew by mere chemical forces. He answered, "No; no more than I could believe that a book of botany describing them could grow by mere chemical forces." Every action of human free will is a miracle to physical and chemical and mathematical science.'

'It is rather to the champions of unyielding tradition than to the negative critics that one must resort for daring and desperate conjecture.' So says Dr. J. H. Weatherall in the *Inquirer* for 9th May. He is reviewing a new book by Colonel Conder. The title of the book is *The First Bible* (Blackwood, 5s.). But Dr. Weatherall speaks of it as the 'Bible-on-Bricks.'

Colonel Conder's theory is that the earliest writing of the Hebrews was cuneiform. For cuneiform, as the Tel el-Amarna tablets have made clear, was used all over Western Asia in the fifteenth century B.C. The so-called 'tables of stone,' on which the Ten Commandments were written,

were in reality bricks, some six inches square, covered with cuneiform characters. The first edition of Genesis might be contained on about seventy of these bricks.

If writing was so early, and if the earliest Bible was written at so early a date, it could not, says Colonel Conder, have been written in alphabetic characters. For the alphabet was borrowed from the Phœnicians in the early days of the Monarchy. After its introduction the two scripts existed side by side, as the hieroglyphic and hieratic did in Egypt. Then about the time of Hezekiah the cuneiform was transliterated into the alphabetic script. And it was in the process of this transliteration that the duplicate names occurred which critics have foolishly ascribed to different authors.

For example. Jahweh and Elohim are not names for God used by different writers, they are simply different ways in which blundering scribes transferred God's name from cuneiform to alphabetic Hebrew. So with Jethro and Reuel, Ishbaal and Ishbosheth, and many more. And all the critical theories based upon these duplicate names fall to the ground.

It is a daring theory. And it has its difficulties. The chief difficulty is the lack of evidence. Dr. Weatherall desires to see a few of these cuneiform bricks. He would prefer the couple containing the Ten Commandments. But especially is it to be noted that evidence for the existence of the two scripts side by side is altogether absent; while as far back as we can go—that is to the Siloam Inscription and the Moabite Stone—it is alphabetic writing that is in use.