

# 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 Churchman* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_churchman\\_os.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php)

opposition. It is nothing less than a claim for confiscation. All the sacrifices of Churchmen in the past, all that they have done for generations in order to secure the education of the people at large in the principles of the Church, all that they are contributing now, is to go for nothing, and its material results, in the existing schools, are to be confiscated in the interests of the undenominational, or, it might be, secular, education which is preferred by Nonconformists. We venture to say that a more inequitable—if we thought it becoming to use Dr. Clifford's vocabulary, we might say a more iniquitous—demand could not well be put forward. But it cannot be too clearly realized that it has been put forward, and it renders plain the position which should be henceforth adopted by Churchmen. It is vain to expect that any concessions will be made by Nonconformists which can settle this controversy. They demand from Churchmen the sacrifice of everything they care for in the religious side of elementary education, and they will be satisfied with nothing less. That being the case, Churchmen can have nothing further to say in this matter. We believe that the Education Acts have done us no more than bare justice, and nothing remains for us but to stand by them.

---

### Notices of Books.

---

*The Amen of the Unlearned. A Lay Commentary.* By M. C. E. London: Elliot Stock. Pp. x+227. 5s.

The anonymous papers collected here appeared originally in the *Spectator*. Mr. St. Loe Strachey, the editor of that journal, has written a brief introduction, in which he observes that the author makes a free but reverent attempt to draw forth the inner meanings of the Bible, and to awaken feeling in regard to the essentials of the religion of Christ. To a certain extent the book deserves the praise it has received from admiring critics. It is gracefully written, reflects exactly a particular phase of cultured thought, and a few of the essays are extremely suggestive, such as those entitled "St. Luke as Artist," and "Friendship in the Bible." That on "Byways of the Bible" brings to light the beauty of some of the less familiar incidents of Holy Scripture, and "Good Breeding in the New Testament" is a pleasant discourse on manners. The writer is most at home in dealing with subjects like these, being better fitted to discuss æstheticism and the amenities of social life than to expound theology. When we find an important passage in Romans quoted as from the Epistle to the Hebrews, without any reference to its connection, and evidently misunderstood, we naturally feel suspicious. St. Paul's

preaching before Felix happens to be the topic of another of the essays, where an allusion to "the judgment seat of Christ" leads to the remark that in St. Paul's mouth this may have implied a speedy second coming, "but to Felix it must have meant, as it means to us in the present day, a judgment by the standard of Christ's teaching. Possibly even the Apostle himself meant his words to be taken metaphorically." We need not dwell upon the futility of trying to explain away the truth of a future judgment, but would merely point out that Felix knew nothing about Christ's teaching, and would not have trembled at metaphors. It is, indeed, a glaring anachronism to attribute to this ignorant heathen the ideas of a twentieth-century latitudinarian.

Elsewhere the writer says that our Lord's authority was never so widely accepted as in these doubt-racked days. Immediately afterwards it is added that belief in a future life is far less widespread than it was, and "almost all the faithful cry out at times, openly or secretly, 'How long dost Thou make us to doubt?'" We do not think that this is the language of "almost all the faithful" in regard to the revelation of a future life. The author proceeds to argue that eschatology is not the whole of Christ's teaching, nor even a large part of it, and that when men believed implicitly in heaven and hell, they did not, as men do now, accept the authority of our Lord in other matters. There never was a time, we are told, when questions of right and wrong entered so largely into the discussion of affairs of State. Cruelties and persecutions, the sight of which was "almost enjoyed during the so-called ages of faith," would now revolt the roughest crowd in London. The consciences, if not the speculations, of men are being rapidly Christianized, and Christendom is entering on a more excellent way than "dull acquiescence in an unchallenged probability." Plausible reasoning like this admits of more than one answer. It may be replied that the consideration of right and wrong in affairs of State is no new thing. Charlemagne and Alfred are standing examples of just rulers, and the general policy of the reign of Elizabeth will bear comparison with that of the reign of Victoria. What a London mob might do under given circumstances would be difficult to say. It has little opportunity, as things are, of giving free vent to its passions, being kept under by the forces of law and order. But the chief defect in the writer's argument is the insular and narrow view taken of "Christendom," which means here English society, more especially that section of it which consists of contributors and subscribers to the *Spectator*. We venture to suggest that Christendom includes the whole of the professing Christian world. Is a scrupulous regard for right and wrong the predominant characteristic of continental statesmanship, or are the nations of the Continent remarkable for their love of righteousness and justice? The howling mobs of Kischineff and other places which lately revelled in cruelties equal to those of the Middle Ages are as much a part of Christendom as a London crowd. The Roman Church has not renounced the duty of persecuting heretics. In France the spirit that manifested itself in the Revolution of the eighteenth century and the

Commune of thirty years ago is by no means extinct, but has infected the populations of other countries as well. The history of the past may easily be repeated, and there is no security that it will not be. It cannot be said, taking Christendom as a whole, that intolerance is on the decline, though in some cases its action may be restrained by laws and Governments. Also it may be noted that there is a steady growth of distinct hostility to Christianity itself, which is largely due to the breaking down of old beliefs. The destruction of faith in a future life may be a pretty occupation for the study, but it becomes a serious thing when carried into practice in the street by a mob that has cast away all thought of a hereafter, and is determined to have what it can get now. It means anarchy in the State as well as anarchy in religion. Christianity, of which belief in a future life and a judgment to come forms an essential part, cannot be overthrown without overthrowing the social order built upon it, and everything that tends to undermine the former contributes to the ruin of the latter. That the negation of a hereafter does not concern the well-being of a Christian State is an assumption refuted by the history of Europe.

*Encyclopædia Biblica.* Vol. IV. : Q—Z. Edited by T. K. CHEYNE, D.D., and J. S. BLACK, LL.D. London : A. and C. Black, 1908. Price 20s. net.

With the issue of the present volume the "Encyclopædia Biblica" is at length completed. It is in every way a remarkable work, and few publications of a theological character have in recent years compelled more attention. The "Publishers' Note" issued with the completed work contains so many interesting details that we may be forgiven if we pause a brief while to consider its contents. Thus, we are told that the work, though containing 5,444 columns of print—equivalent to between sixty and seventy volumes like those of Freeman's "Lectures on History"—may now be purchased, not only in four-volume form, but in a single volume, scarcely more than three inches thick, thanks to the thin Bible paper on which it is printed. No less than ninety-six specialists have been at work upon the book. Of these, exactly a third wrote in a foreign language (German, French, or Dutch), a fact which entailed a great amount of translation work ; and, finally, every article was revised by a staff of specialist editors to insure scrupulous accuracy generally, and to maintain a perfect correspondence between the parts. The result is that, as a *work of reference*, the book is strikingly successful. The system of abbreviations and of cross-references is admirably conceived and executed, and the typographical character of the work such as to place it in the very front rank of dictionaries. In fact, no book can in these particulars compete with it.

The publishers point with pride to the "unsectarian character" of the book. If, indeed, to be able to count among its contributors Christians, Jews, Unitarians, Agnostics, be a matter for congratulation, no doubt their satisfaction is amply justified.

"The 'Encyclopædia' is not a dogmatic text-book for children." It assuredly is not. In one aspect we may safely affirm that it is not a

dictionary of the Bible at all, but rather a congeries of articles, some long, some short, some illuminating, some the reverse, but all more or less coloured by the various speculative theories that do duty for solid fact in certain theological high places. "Encyclopædia Biblica" is more justly to be termed a dictionary of speculative criticism on the Bible than a Bible dictionary.

The amount of guess-work with which many of its articles are charged can hardly be estimated, unless a reader takes the trouble to study with "critical" exactness such performances as Schmiedel's "Gospels," Van Manen's "Romans," or Cheyne's "Saul." Such dazzling speculations may perhaps be justified by the analogy of a work like Dr. Frazer's "The Golden Bough"; but there is this marked difference between the two works when contrasted and compared: Dr. Frazer admits that he is offering to us a series of hypotheses to serve as light bridges connecting—if only for a time—certain scientific data; nor does he claim for these hypotheses anything more than that, as connecting links, they may serve to give to the facts put forward a significance which, without some such interpretative help, they would else lack. But the writers of many—all too many—of the articles in "Encyclopædia Biblica" practise no such critical self-restraint. Half the theories indulged in are set forth as the latest "results" of a critical process; in brief—and this is particularly noticeable in Professor Cheyne's own contributions—the facts are utilized to lend a "local colour" to the theories, rather than as the criterion whereby those theories may be rigorously tested. Readers may urge with justice that the object of an "Encyclopædia" is to supply them with ascertained and ascertainable evidence, not to produce doubtful (and often conflicting) hypotheses, in defiance, it would sometimes seem, not of tradition only, but of the very evidence in question.

It would not be possible to discuss this matter fully in the space at our disposal; but we should like to call attention to Professor Cheyne's latest novelty in the shape of criticism. It is this: Casting about, at an evil moment, for something "fresh" in the "critical" line, he lighted on the word "Jerahmeel." The word, harmless enough in itself, seems to have exercised a malign fascination upon him. He can no more get rid of it than poor Mr. Dick could rid his manuscripts of allusions to King Charles's head. Jerahmeel (mentioned in the Old Testament as (1) a great-grandson of Judah, (2) a Levite in David's time, (3) a son of Hammelech; while the Jerahmeelites are mentioned twice, both times in 1 Samuel) becomes in the Professor's hands the key to unlocking pretty nearly every problem in Old Testament history (many of the problems and difficulties being purely the result of his own inventiveness). The Proteus-like character of the name Jerahmeel is revealed, according to the critic, not once nor twice, but in hundreds of places. Thus, Jericho, Bathsheba, Uriah the Hittite (=Jerahmeel the Rehobothite), all conceal the mystic name. The Book of the Wars of Jehovah becomes in his hands the list of Jerahmeel; Bethlehem=Beth-Jerahmeel; the Valley of Rephaim=the Valley of Jerahmeel; and even Asshur is a synonym for the word. This is a mere random gathering from the Professor's basket of novelties; but readers will readily find hundreds of other choice specimens—they may be

had everywhere, and for the asking. We might instance, as examples of perverse exegesis, Cheyne's view of Gen. iii. (col. 4397), of the Sodom and Gomorrah incident (col. 4668, § 3), the temptation of Jesus (col. 4962, §§ 7, 14), Ur of the Chaldees (col. 5233, § 5). But we forbear. Enough has been said already to show that, to say the least, much of the "Encyclopædia" must be used with extreme caution, despite its international character and its vaunted unsectarian bias.

In order, however, that readers may not suppose that the entire work is built up on such purely fanciful or idle material as the above would seem to indicate, let us instance such admirable articles as "Weights and Measures," by Mr. G. F. Hill; "Tiglath Pileser," by Mr. Pinches; the various Egyptological and Assyriological papers; and the thorough and exhaustive treatise on "Wisdom Literature," by Professor Toy. We do not think it unfair to say generally that articles involving no doctrinal significance are good and trustworthy; but that wherever some point of Christian doctrine or tradition is affected by the critical position adopted, there the article is almost certain to be biassed, and therefore untrustworthy. It is not, we think, good criticism or a sign of enlightenment to dispute every belief, doctrinal or historical, simply because it is old or has been accepted. Even the old is sometimes true. There is much that is new in the "Encyclopædia"—of that there is no doubt; we could wish that there were less of what is new, and more of what is true.

Let us conclude, however, with a word of unstinted praise: The maps and the illustrations in this book are everything that the most exacting could desire.

*"Christian Science" contrasted with Christian Faith and with Itself. Sermons preached in the Nave of Norwich Cathedral.* By WILLIAM LEFROY, D.D., Dean of Norwich. London: S.P.C.K. Pp. xxvi, 169.

Dr. Lefroy's searching examination of the pretensions of the Christian Scientists ought to be widely circulated. His book contains six sermons on the subject, prefaced by a long and valuable introduction. An account of the origin of the system, given in the words of its foundress, is followed by copious extracts from Mrs. Baker Eddy's writings, so that the reader is enabled to gain an exact notion of the principles on which "Christian Science" professes to be based. As the Dean of Norwich points out, it purports to be a new system of religion no less than a new system of healing. The denial of the existence of matter lies at the root of the theory, and the consequences of this denial as regards the nature of man and the person and work of Christ are forcibly demonstrated. Various other questions arising out of Mrs. Eddy's teaching are considered in detail, amongst which may be mentioned the perversions of Scripture common in the circle of her followers, and the true character and purpose of our Lord's miracles. Dr. Lefroy has performed a public service by exposing a widespread delusion, in addition to providing his readers with an armoury of effective answers to the arguments of its votaries.