

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

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THE Advent of the Father is the title of a book which has been written by the Rev. Archibald Allan, M.A., minister of Channelkirk, and published by Messrs. MacLehose (6s. net). Are there other ministers of the Church of Scotland who are thinking the things which Mr. Allan has written? If there are, then difficult times are on us. But it may be that Mr. Allan is alone.

'The Advent of the Father' means the discovery of God's Fatherhood. Now it is quite appropriate for a minister of the Church of Scotland to advocate the Fatherhood of God in the wider sense. For in the great controversy of the last generation in Scotland that was the side taken by Crawford against Candlish. But Crawford would have stared aghast at the length to which Mr. Allan stretches the Fatherhood. For, according to him, God is the Father of all men and all things. He is the Father of a stick or a stone in the same sense—and a very literal sense it seems to be—as He is the Father of Dr. Crawford himself, or even of the Lord Jesus Christ.

Let us quote his words. 'Nature is a child even as Jesus, and is a child by the same Father; and Jesus, always acknowledging His kinship to her, builds His religion on the same Fatherhood as Nature has confessed, and draws

His life and power through the same umbilical cord.'

What is the meaning of this? Is Mr. Allan handling language with more than Oriental liberty? Or is he reducing Oriental metaphor to Western physical fact? Jesus, he says again, 'does not acknowledge any division between Mind and Matter. He addresses everyone and everything *as a person* [the italics are his own]. The child and the stone have the same Father, and the same relationship to Him through the same life of the Father. . . . He is not emitting mere rhetorical apostrophes when He addresses the Disease, the Stone, the Sea, the Mountain, and the Tree in the same personal language which He uses to His disciples. To Jesus they are all children of the same All-Father, all conscious enough of Him, but not so conscious of each other. For while the Father makes Himself visible to the babes and sucklings, and gives them their perfected praise, He lays His finger of repressive silence upon the stone and dooms it to dumbness. Otherwise, its crying out would quickly reveal to all the child it is.'

The references are not given, but they may be guessed. Christ said to the sea, 'Peace, be still'; He said to the tree, 'No fruit grow on thee henceforth'; and He told His disciples to say to the

mountain, 'Be thou removed.' Did He take the sea and the mountain and the tree as children of God? One reference, however, is more openly hinted at, and we may understand Mr. Allan better when we examine it.

'He lays His finger of repressive silence upon the stone and dooms it to dumbness. Otherwise, its crying out would quickly reveal to all the child it is.' The reference is evidently to the Triumphal Entry and the words, 'If these shall hold their peace the stones will cry out.' Now the first thing to notice is that Jesus does not here address the stones directly, but speaks of them in the third person. He does say that they will cry out, however. Why does He say that they will cry out? As 'emitting mere rhetorical apostrophes'? No, by no means, but as using a most familiar and intelligible figure of speech. The things of nature are always crying out, 'Hosanna to the Son of David.' But what is gained by turning the well-recognized metaphor into literal fact?

So far as we can see, Mr. Allan gains nothing. But he loses something. He loses the use of figurative language; and what is he to do without it? And he loses the sense of sin.

He loses the sense of sin. Certainly Mr. Allan's book is full of words and sentences about sin. But what do they come to? They come to this, that there is no sin against God. Jesus, he says in one place, and he puts the words in italics, '*never denounces any one for having sinned against the Being whom He accepted to be His true God and Father.*' That is to say, all sin is against man. If it is against Jesus, it is against Jesus as a man. That is why we say that he loses the sense of sin.

And that is why we have said that if Mr. Allan speaks for others there are difficult days before us. But we do not know that he speaks for any one but himself.

'You would not venture to preach at this time

of day a sermon on predestination.' So says the Principal of Hackney College. He was addressing students of theology in America, some of whom must have shaken their heads, or even uttered an emphatic denial. For in America they can preach predestination still. Dr. Forsyth spoke to students training for the American pulpit, but he was thinking of the pulpit at home. It is in this country that it is no longer possible to preach a sermon on predestination.

Why is it not possible? Is predestination not true? Dr. Forsyth does not say that it is not true. We fear he would say of the modern pulpit that it does not consider so much whether a doctrine is true as whether it is popular. Dr. Forsyth believes that the doctrine of predestination is true. He believes that we ought to preach it. And the very purpose of his touching the subject is to tell us how to preach predestination still.

Well, how are we to preach predestination? We are to begin by preaching about the soul. The modern preacher stops Dr. Forsyth at once, and asks where the people are who care to hear about the soul. And then Dr. Forsyth's own soul rises in indignation. 'You are there not simply to speak what people care to hear, but also to make them care for what you must speak.'

We begin, then, by preaching about the soul. We speak of the value of the soul—'its absolute value, its pearl of price for whose sake all other pearls are but a currency, and all other ends but means.' Now, in the New Testament times, when it was desired to emphasize the absolute value of a thing, they spoke of its *pre-existence*. Did not the Jews speak in this way about their Law and about their Temple? They did not desire to press the pre-existence of the Law or the Temple, but to urge their absolute value. So when we speak of the absolute value of the soul, we are encouraged to follow the New Testament example and speak of its pre-existence.

And the very next step is its predestination. For while Plato might speak of the soul as a separate substance and immortal in itself, no Hebrew could do that. In the thought of a Hebrew the immortality and perfection of the soul were given to it by God. Its destiny was there as the result of the will and the choice of God. Its destiny? The word is used. The destiny of the soul is not carried by the winds of chance and circumstance, it is in the keeping of God. It is a purpose and choice of God. It is the will of God for the soul. And that God, whose will it is, being from all eternity, it is a predestiny, and the doctrine of it is predestination.

And as to this matter of predestination, says Dr. Forsyth,—we are dealing with a page of his Yale Lectures on Preaching, to which he gives the characteristic title of *Positive Preaching and Modern Mind* (Hodder & Stoughton; 7s. 6d. net)—as to this matter of predestination, he says, there is a way of preaching it so that even to-day some will listen; so that some few will listen even with a rising soul and a swelling heart.

Dr. Edwin Abbott is the most industrious scholar of our day. He has issued another volume. It contains a series of Notes to 'Silanus the Christian,' and two detached essays. The one essay is on the title 'Son of Man,' the other on the 'Self-manifestations of Christ.' The book is called, somewhat unhappily, *Notes on New Testament Criticism* (A. & C. Black; 7s. 6d. net). Let us look at one of the Notes to 'Silanus.' It is a note on the title 'Alpha and Omega.'

In the article on ALPHA AND OMEGA in the *Dictionary of the Bible*, Professor R. H. Charles says that of the three occurrences of that phrase in the Bible (they are all in the Book of Revelation) one (Rev 1⁸) refers to God the Father, the other two (21⁶ 22¹³) to Christ. In the fuller article under the same title in the *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels*, Professor B. W. Bacon says that not only

in Rev 1⁸, but also in 21⁶, is the title applied to the Father, and only in 22¹³ is it applied to the Son. But in the Notes to Silanus, Professor Abbott holds that in all the three passages it is applied to the Son.

Now even Professor Swete refers Rev 1⁸ to God the Father, and that without a moment's hesitation. The translation of the verse, according to the Revised Version, which is nearly according to the Greek, is 'I am the Alpha and the Omega, saith the Lord God, which is and which was and which is to come, the Almighty.' Professor Swete says that the title 'the Alpha and the Omega' must refer to the Father on account of the words 'the Lord God' and 'the Almighty' which follow. Professor Abbott examines these words.

First 'the Almighty.' Is it only God the Father that can be spoken of as the Almighty? The word translated 'Almighty' (*παντοκράτωρ*) is used in the Septuagint as the translation either of *Shaddai* or of *Sabaoth*. Now *Shaddai* occurs, says Dr. Abbott, as a title inferior to *Jehovah* in Ex 6³, 'I appeared unto Abraham . . . as *God Almighty*' (*El Shaddai*). We may therefore 'put aside the supposition that John would derive his use of Almighty (*παντοκράτωρ*) from *Shaddai*—an inferior revelation.'

Dr. Abbott accordingly believes that St. John uses this word 'Almighty' as the equivalent of *Sabaoth*. The Greek word (*παντοκράτωρ*) is so used exactly one hundred times in the Septuagint. *Sabaoth* means 'Hosts,' and to the Early Christians the 'Hosts' were not armies on earth, but powers in the heavens. Now Christ is already declared in the Epistle to the Ephesians (1²¹) to be 'above every name.' Dr. Abbott believes that St. John deliberately gives this title, 'the Almighty,' to Christ in order to place Him above all principalities and powers, 'above all that are called Gods, whether good or bad.'

But how can St. John speak of Christ as 'the Lord God'? That is the other difficulty. The

objection is to 'Lord.' There is no difficulty in his calling Him 'God.' But in the New Testament it is customary to use 'Lord' *without* the article when it applies to the Father, and *with* the article when it applies to the Son—'Lord' for the Father, and 'the Lord' for the Son. Here it is without the article. Dr. Abbott's answer is that the usage is not invariable. In this very book, he says, 'the Lord' is used once at least of God the Father. He refers to Rev 21²², 'For the Lord God Almighty, and the Lamb, are the temple thereof.'

It is certainly in Dr. Abbott's favour that throughout the literature of the Church the title 'Alpha and Omega' is consistently used of Christ alone. Nor did the Early Christians stagger at the title Almighty here. On the contrary, it is probable that they saw a special point in the application of the title 'the Almighty' to Christ. For there was a word of similar sound and haughty meaning (*αὐτοκράτωρ*) which the Roman emperors applied to themselves. Domitian, who claimed to be 'Lord and God' might call himself *ὁ αὐτοκράτωρ*, the Absolute, if he would; Jesus Christ was *ὁ παντοκράτωρ*, the Almighty.

There is a green hill far away,
Without a city wall,
Where the dear Lord was crucified.

So the hymn says. But no traveller or explorer has ever found it. How is it that we have come to speak of Calvary as a hill? There is no hint in the New Testament that it was a hill. In Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John it is simply called a 'place.' Mr. Stewart Macalister, who discusses the subject in an article on 'The Garden Tomb' in the *Palestine Exploration Fund Quarterly Statement*, agrees with Sir Charles Wilson that, whatever its origin may have been, the idea that Calvary was a hill has been spread through the English-speaking world by means of this very hymn. And, although it is 'a charming child's poem,' he thinks that in the interests of truth it should be expunged from our hymn-books.

This is not the only hymn that Mr. Macalister would expunge. There is another which begins—

By cool Siloam's shady rill
How sweet the lily grows.

'In the whole vast range of English literature,' says Mr. Macalister, 'there is probably not to be found another sequence of ten words containing a greater number of inaccuracies.' But to return to Calvary.

Mr. Macalister does not believe that the crucifixion could have taken place on a hill. For that would have been contrary to the ordinary Roman practice. We have the direct testimony of Quintillian that when crucifixions took place the most frequented roads were chosen for the purpose. If that practice had been departed from in the case of Jesus, one or other of the Evangelists was sure to have remarked upon it. But that the ordinary Roman practice was not departed from is indicated by the words in Mt 27^{39, 40}, 'They that passed by reviled him . . . saying'—*saying*, not calling or shouting, as would have been necessary had the cross been erected on a hill over which ran no path.

Well, then, where did the crucifixion take place? And where was the tomb in which He was laid? Mr. Stewart Macalister cannot answer. He believes that no one else can. In this article he proves conclusively that the so-called 'Garden Tomb' of General Gordon will not do. There are certain conditions which must be met, and it does not meet one of them. He can point out five-and-twenty tombs round Jerusalem in every respect more suitable. No, the 'Skull Hill' is not 'the place of a skull,' and the 'Garden Tomb' is not the 'Holy Sepulchre.' Their site 'is lost and forgotten, and there is no reason to hope that it will ever be recovered.'

Is there anything in Jerahmeel? There is some amusement, no doubt, but is there anything else? The Jerahmeelite theory has been before

the world for eight or ten years. Its author is one of the most accomplished scholars of our day, a Professor in one of the great Universities, moreover, and a Canon of one of the Cathedrals. Yet we have hitherto looked in vain for a competent refutation of the theory, or even for any thorough examination of it.

But we have found it at last. The leading article in the *American Journal of Theology* for October is entitled 'Israel or Jerahmeel?' Its author is Professor Henry Preserved Smith of the Meadville Theological Seminary. There is probably no Old Testament scholar, in America or elsewhere, more competent to estimate the worth of 'Jerahmeel' than Professor Smith. His learning has been proved by the way in which he has edited the Books of Samuel for the 'International Critical Commentary.' And if he starts with a bias, it is a bias in Professor Cheyne's favour. For he himself has suffered on behalf of critical scholarship.

He calls his article, as we have said, 'Israel or Jerahmeel?' For that is the issue. Professor Cheyne's theory is not to be tacked on to any existing view of the history of Israel, critical or uncritical. If it is accepted, the land of Israel and the history of Israel vanish together. There are certain outstanding events related in the Old Testament upon which critics of all shades of opinion are in agreement. These events cover the whole period of the history of Israel, and together they form a consistent and connected narrative. What are they? In Professor Smith's words they are 'the sojourn of certain clans in Egypt; their exodus; a period of wandering in the borderland; the conquest of Canaan; the consolidation of the tribes into a kingdom by David; the division of the kingdom after the death of Solomon; the fall of the northern kingdom at the hands of Assyria; the destruction of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar of Babylon in 586 B.C.; the coherence of a remnant in Babylonia; the rebuilding of the Temple under the Persian power, and, later, the rehabilitation of Jerusalem.'

It is also believed by critics of every variety of attitude that the scene of this history was Palestine; that it was the land which lies between the Mediterranean on the west and the North Arabian desert on the east, bounded on the north by the well-defined Lebanon mountains, and on the south by the desert of Sinai. Its natural features can be located by every intelligent Sunday school scholar—the Sea of Galilee, the Jordan, the Dead Sea, the Great Plain. And its cities—'Jerusalem we know, and Samaria, Hebron also, and Bethlehem, while Dan and Beersheba, Bethel and Shechem are less familiar by only one degree.'

Professor Cheyne blots out both the history and the geography. The clans—this is Professor Smith's outline of his theory—the clans did not go down into Egypt; they went to a North Arabian kingdom called Mizrim or Muzri. The main scene of Israel's history was not Palestine as a whole, but only the southern end of Palestine, which is known as the Negeb. This district contained not only the twelve tribes of Israel, but also the various powers hostile to Israel. Even the alleged empires of Assyria and Babylonia were not the great powers of the Euphrates valley, but certain North Arabian kingdoms. The so-called exile was a sojourn in this region, and the return was a return thence. Even to a late date the interest in the Jews was confined to this district in the south, as may be seen in the Books of Judith and Enoch and by the allusions in the Psalms.

When Professor Smith first read this theory he seems to have wondered if it was a colossal mystification. Was the author trying to show up the frailties of the critics? Was it his desire to comfort the traditionalists by a *reductio ad absurdum*, as Whately refuted Strauss by his *Historic Doubts relative to Napoleon Buonaparte*? Perhaps it was just the author's little joke, a trifle thrown off in his leisure hour to show what can be done by way of paradox.

But he was undeceived. How could a series of

practical jokes find place in a work like the *Encyclopædia Biblica*? How could the five hundred pages of textual criticism contained in the *Critica Biblica* be a mere *jeu d'esprit*? Besides, 'to do the author justice, he nowhere betrays the slightest sense of humour.' And he must himself have long ago dispelled the notion that he did not mean to be taken seriously by his repeated appeals to Biblical students to consider him entirely sincere.

When Dr. Smith discovered that Professor Cheyne meant to be taken seriously he sat down to study his theory. Was it a new discovery? Most new discoveries are met by incredulity at first. Even if the new point of view had been brought out by an unknown writer, it would have been our duty to examine it. How much more when its advocate is a scholar whose published works, 'including those we are about to consider, show immense erudition, untiring industry, acute observation, and a sincere desire to advance the truth.'

What had Professor Smith to examine? First, a great number of articles in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*. Next the five published parts of the *Critica Biblica*. Then articles in various periodicals—in the *American Journal of Theology* for July 1901; in the *Nineteenth Century* for January 1902; and others of less importance. Finally, two large and important critical works—a commentary on the Book of Psalms, published in 1904, and a commentary on Genesis and part of Exodus, entitled *Traditions and Beliefs of Ancient Israel*, published in 1907.

Now the Jerahmeelite theory is first of all, and most of all, an attempt to reconstruct the Hebrew text of the Old Testament. For when the Hebrew text of the Old Testament is carefully studied (by Dr. Cheyne) it is found to be in a state of hopeful corruption. It came about in this way.

First, there was the original text. It dealt with peoples who dwelt in the south of Palestine and

the north of Arabia. This text was by and by annotated by a glossator, or rather by a succession of glossators, who inserted numerous notes in the margin of the manuscript. The object of the notes was to tell the reader that certain places and persons mentioned in the manuscript belonged to the tribes which dwelt in these parts—Jerahmeel, Ishmael, or Muzri, as the case might be. Then came a scribe, a most unintelligent scribe, who incorporated these notes into the text. Last of all, editors set to work upon it. They discovered proper names—especially Jerahmeel and Ishmael—where they seemed to have no right to be. But instead of casting them out, they made clever guesses at meanings which might underlie them, and—produced the present text of the Old Testament.

This, for example, was the original text of Josh 7²¹: 'I saw a goodly garment of Arabian Ishmael, and two hundred shekels of silver and gold.' The glossator was not sure that the reader would know where Arabian Ishmael was, so he inserted Jerahmeel in the margin. Later glossators added Ishmael and another Jerahmeel, that there might be no mistake. Then came the unintelligent scribe, and gathered all these marginal notes into the text. When the copy left his hands it read: 'I saw a goodly garment of Arabian Ishmael, Jerahmeel, and two hundred shekels of silver, Ishmael, and gold, Jerahmeel.' We can hardly wonder, says Professor Smith, that an editor who had this text before him should undertake its reconstruction. But how clever an editor he was. For after his labours were over, the text read: 'I saw a goodly garment of Shinar, and two hundred shekels of silver, and a wedge of gold.'

Again, 2 Sam 8² originally read: 'And David smote Muzri of the Jerahmeelites, and subdued the Zarephathites, and Muzri became David's slaves.' After the glossators had got their notes inserted in the text by the unintelligent scribe, this passage read: 'And David smote Muzri of the

Jerahmeelites, Jerahmeelites, and subdued the Zarephathites, Jerahmeelites, Ishmaelites, Jerahmeelites, and Muzri became David's slaves.' What is a clever editor going to make of that? What he made of it may be seen in the English Bible. In his desire to turn this accumulation of proper names into sense, he represented David as treating Moab with great cruelty. The Jerahmeelite theory, Dr. Cheyne rejoices to show, 'dissipates the description of David's barbarity into thin air.' It does. But, as Dr. Smith remarks, Professor Cheyne is the last man to defend his criticism on apologetic grounds, so this remark is irrelevant.

Take one example more. Take the familiar verse in the beginning of Genesis (2¹²): 'Where there is gold; and the gold of that land is good; there is bdellium and the onyx stone.' So it reads in the Hebrew text we now possess. How different was the original reading. Then it read: 'Ashhur-Ishmael [Sobah]; now that land is Tubal [Ishmael], Arabia of Ishmael.' That is to say, the verse was a geographical note to the word 'Havilah' which immediately precedes it. The geographical note was complicated by two glossators' notes (shown in square brackets), and then the clever editor worked upon it and brought out the excellent sense and interesting statement about gold and bdellium and the onyx stone.

And now to show what Jerahmeel comes to on a larger scale and in a way that touches our inheritance more severely, let us do as Dr. Smith has done, and place side by side the translation of one of the Psalms as made from the present Hebrew by Professor Briggs, and the translation of the same Psalm as made by Professor Cheyne from his original text. The Psalm is the ninety-third.

BRIGGS.	CHEYNE.
Yahweh doth reign in majesty,	Yahweh has laid low Jerahmeel,
Yahweh hath put on his apparel,	By his chiding he has ex- tinguished Ishmael,
Yahweh hath girded him- self with strength,	Yahweh has destroyed Asshur.

BRIGGS.	CHEYNE.
He hath adjusted the world that it cannot be moved.	He has also laid low Tubal and Maacath.
Thy throne is established from of old,	Cush and Edom are abolished,
From everlasting art Thou (Yahweh).	The Jerahmeelites thou hast made to vanish.
The streams have lifted up, Yahweh,	The Jerahmeelites are desolate,
The streams have lifted up their voice,	Consumed are the Arabians and the Ishmaelites.
The streams lift up their commemoration,	Yahweh has shown his glory on Jerahmeel.
More than the voices of many waters,	Thy purposes are abundantly fulfilled,
Magnificent more than the breakers of the sea,	The courts of thy house we shall enter,
Magnificent on high, Yah- weh.	O Yahweh, for endless days.
(Thy testimonies are ex- ceedingly steadfast,	
To thy house sanctity is becoming,	
Yahweh, for length of days.)	

But how did Professor Cheyne discover that the present text of the Old Testament is so amazingly corrupt? It was an inspiration. He began with Muzri.

Now Muzri is not found in the Bible (the present Bible) at all. But Professor Winckler, of Berlin, was working on certain Assyrian inscriptions and came to the conclusion that there was once, not only a country called Muzri in Northern Syria, but also one of the same name in Northern Arabia. Professor Cheyne got Muzri from Winckler. Then he discovered Jerahmeel.

Jerahmeel is in the Bible. It is mentioned in the First Book of Samuel and in the First Book of Chronicles as the name of a tribe or clan which belonged in some way or other to Judah and sojourned in the southern part of Palestine. The district in which the Jerahmeelites dwelt is called the Negeb. There are also two individuals mentioned in the Hebrew Bible who bore the name of Jerahmeel, and some Greek copies add a third.

With these two names in his hand Professor Cheyne produces the original Hebrew Bible. First of all, Muzri or Mizrim is very like Mizraim, which is the Hebrew for Egypt, so the name of Egypt almost disappears. And with the name of Egypt, there disappears the sojourn of the Israelites in Egypt, and the Exodus. But if the name of Egypt is changed, other names must be changed with it. And not only names, but sentences. In a moment the idea leaps to its birth. The present Hebrew text must be thoroughly worked over in order to get rid of all the references to Palestine generally and to the accepted history of Israel, and restore the true and original history and geography, which was a history of certain Jerahmeelite and Ishmaelite clans who dwelt in the Negeb.

The working out of the theory has not been without difficulty. For one thing it has been found necessary to locate in the south of Palestine, together with a portion of land in the north of Arabia, not only the twelve tribes of Israel, but also all the nations with whom they ever came in contact. Here dwelt the Philistines, the Ishmaelites, the Amalekites; here were the kingdoms of Muzri, of Asshur, of Jerahmeel. And much more than these. Here lived the Phœnicians; here was Elam; here was the Gog whose invasion was so vividly anticipated by Ezekiel; and here were Babylonia and Assyria. For the nations which carried the Israelites captive were not the great world-empires known by these names, but hitherto unknown tribes in the Negeb. It is, says Professor Smith, the very irony of fate that an Assyrian monument should have suggested the theory which has wiped the name of Assyria out of the Bible.

The theory, we say, is not without its difficulties. The only easy thing is the restoration of the true and original Hebrew text. Hitherto it has been understood that when a Hebrew word was suspected, any attempt to restore it to its original form must proceed by certain recognized rules. Professor Cheyne is not troubled with rules. If one word looks like another, then it is that other in disguise.

If it does not look like another, it is the other all the same. Kadesh-barnea is corrected first to Kadesh-jerahmeel, and then to Ashhur-jerahmeel; Mahaleel, a personal name, being obscure, is boldly changed to Jerahmeel. Amalek dwelt in the Jerahmeel region—it must be Jerahmeel in disguise. In the early tradition we find an Ararat of which we can make nothing, and so we substitute Jerahmeel. Nimrod's kingdom is said to have begun with Babel and Erech and other cities; but the underlying text probably mentioned Jerahmeel. The name of one of the pillars in front of Solomon's temple, which our text gives as Jachin, has long puzzled the critics; let us relieve them by changing it to Jerahmeel. We spoke of Havilah and the strange result of a geographical note on it. Havilah itself 'is certainly a popular corruption of Hamilah, *i.e.* Jerahmeel.'

Observe Professor Cheyne's 'certainly.' The method is as sure as it is easy. And it is as far-reaching. The streams which watered the garden of Eden are all to be found in the Negeb. There is some difficulty with the Deluge, as the Bedawin in that quarter are more concerned about the scarcity of water than its abundance. Jonah also is troublesome. The simplest way is to send him to Tarshish in a caravan. Is the whale still there? No doubt some separate legend containing it has been combined with the original Jonah story.

Is this the end? No. The religion of Israel has suffered greater eclipse than the history. Let us quote Professor Smith: 'The worship of the original writers was paid to a divine duad, the Baal and Ishtar of Ishmael, or to a triad whose names were Yahweh, Ashhur (or Ashtar), and Jerahmeel. Most commonly the duad was represented under the compound name Jerahmeel Yahweh. This was the glorious and fearful name which the Israelites were to fear. At the same time the god Jerahmeel was the Baal against whose worship the people were warned. He also bore the name Ishmael, and there was a myth concerning this divinity or his human manifestation, who

was said to have died and risen again. The Rimmon of Damascus and the Ramman of Babylonia both come from this Jerahmeel. Jacob called his altar Jerahmeel-God-of-Bethel. How widespread was the worship of this divinity we may conjecture when we note that his name underlies the names read in the Syrian or Phœnician inscriptions—Rekubel, Eshmun, Melek, Hamman, Baal, Ramman, Naaman, and others. One of his titles was Dôd, and another Son-of-Man. After this we are not surprised to find that the Spirit which at the beginning brooded on the cosmic egg was really Ishtar, and that the Ark and Tent popularly ascribed to Yahweh belonged by right to this goddess.'

'The Son of Man'—let us continue Dr. Smith

a little longer—'the Son of Man of the Book of Enoch has already been disclosed to us as Jerahmeel. The Elohim who appears so often in our Hebrew text is really the same divinity. So is Michael of the New Testament Apocalypse; so is the "Wisdom" of Proverbs, chap. 8, and the Logos (Memra) of late Jewish documents. Why Belial should be found in this company is not so clear, but his name resembles Jerahmeel at least as much as some of the others, and we have Professor Cheyne's vote in his favour. The cherubim, the angel of Yahweh, and the angels in general are so many forms of Jerahmeel, and we reach the climax when we discover that the number of the Beast in Rev 13¹⁸ has supplanted Asshur-Ishmael, the fuller name of the region called Jerahmeel or Ishmael.'

The Problem of Modernism

IN THE CHURCH AND OUT OF IT.

BY THE REV. C. T. CRUTTWELL, M.A., CANON OF PETERBOROUGH.

WHEN the re-birth of the human spirit took place four centuries and a half ago, forces were awakened which required many generations to display their full power. So rich and complex a process it is, of course, impossible to comprehend under one formula; but we shall not be far wrong if we fix on two elements as supreme: the desire for true knowledge in the intellectual sphere, and the desire for freedom in the practical. Of these, the former has to a great extent realized itself, and stands on a secure basis; the latter is still in process of fulfilment. Though in some quarters amply recognized, its inherent limits and its relation to knowledge are still imperfectly understood; so that its unchecked progress inspires alarm even among those who possess it, and deters those who do not possess it from encouraging its increase.

Both these forces belong to the spiritual order, which is as much as to say that they are uncontrollable and irresistible. Man does not dominate them: he is dominated by them. All he can do is to guide, limit, and to a certain outward extent repress them; but he cannot subdue them. In a sound

social organism the two forces co-operate: they act and react powerfully on one another. They are the leaven which ferments in the modern world, and permeates every portion of it.

We have recently witnessed an instructive and pathetic spectacle. An old man, justly venerated for his piety and singleness of heart, in his capacity of supreme head of the greatest religious community in the world, has issued an encyclical letter condemning in the severest terms what he calls modernism in religion, and declaring it to be absolutely subversive of the faith of Christ. He has done this deliberately, with the aid of advisers who have thoroughly mastered the demands of the modern spirit, after having been earnestly petitioned by eminent and loyal clergy to refrain, and though he knew that more than one Cardinal, many Bishops, and a large number of priests were in entire sympathy with the views he condemned. And this at a time when his Church is confronted with exceptional dangers from outside; when its forces, if ever, need to be united and concentrated with the fullest possible efficiency against the