

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

At the office of *The Sunday School Times* in Philadelphia have been published *The Ancestry of our English Bible* and *Light on the Old Testament from Babel*. Both volumes are pleasing to the eye, having covers of quite new and artistic design. Their appeal is not to the scholar, but to such painstaking readers of the Bible as the *Sunday School Times* itself may be supposed to address. Yet they are written with so much care, and they contain so many fresh and appropriate photographs, that the scholar also will be glad to have them at hand. The volume on the Ancestry of the English Bible has been written by Ira Maurice Price, Ph.D., Professor of the Semitic Languages and Literatures in the University of Chicago; the volume on the Archæology of the Old Testament by Albert T. Clay, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of Semitic Philology and Archæology in the University of Pennsylvania.

Professor Price describes the text of the Bible and its translations. He describes the text not for its own sake, but as the source of the translations. And he describes the translations, Greek, Latin, or Syriac, in order to prepare the way for the understanding of the versions that are in English. The English Bible is his goal—the Authorized Version of 1611, the Revised Version of 1881, 1885, and 1895, and especially the American 'Standard' Revision of 1901.

We have no intention of reviewing Professor Price's book or Professor Clay's. What we have just said may be as useful as the most elaborate review. Our purpose is to refer to a matter of archæological interest which Dr. Clay discusses for the first time in fulness, though it has frequently of late been touched by Professor Sayce and others. It is the discovery (or not) of the name of Jahweh on the monuments of Babylonia.

Has the name of Jahweh been discovered on the Babylonian monuments, or has it not? If it has, serious consequences follow. For then the name of the God of Israel was not first revealed to Moses in Midian, as most of us have been taught. And more than that, then Jahweh was not exclusively the God of Israel.

The names which have been found on the monuments are these—

Ja-w(p)i-ilu and *Ja-ah(?)-w(p)i-ilu*.

They do not at first sight look very like the name of the God of Israel. But they look better when the doubtful elements are resolved or rejected. These are the character *ah* in the second form of the name and the *p* in both forms. This *ah* is known as the breathing, and may be represented by the usual sign for the breathing (*Ja-w'i-ilu*), or disregarded altogether in the spelling. The *p* is quite as doubtful, but cannot be so easily dis-

regarded. So what we get is this variation, *Jawi-ilu* or *Japi-ilu*.

Now the *ilu* in these two words means 'god'; there is no doubt about that. It is the Assyrian form of the Hebrew 'el. What does the first part mean? If it is the name of a god Jahweh, then the whole name means 'Jahweh is God'; and its exact equivalent might be found in the Hebrew name Joel, which also, some say, means 'Jah (or Jahweh) is God.' But what about the *p*? If the *p* is there, then the name means 'God covers' or 'God protects,' and there is no Jahweh in it. And even if the *p* is not there, it is possible that the name of Jahweh is not in it. For it is possible that the first part of the word is a verb, and that the whole word means 'God exists' or 'God gives.'

But there is another and a serious obstacle in the way of translating *Jawi-ilu* 'Jahweh is God.' The name of Jahweh (if it is Jahweh) is written in full. And this is unprecedented. There is not a single instance in Hebrew literature, early or late, in which the name of Jahweh, when compounded with some other element in a personal name, is written in full. When it is the first element of the name it is contracted to *Jehō* or *Jō*, as in Jehoash or Joash. And wherever it is certainly found in Assyrian it is contracted also. Thus when the Assyrian scribe wished to reproduce the Hebrew name Jehoahaz, he wrote *Jau-ha-zi*. And the neo-Babylonian scribe got still nearer the Hebrew and wrote (*Jāhū* or *Jāhō*) for the first part of such names.

Whereupon Professor Clay comes to the conclusion that neither *Japi-ilu* nor even *Jawi-ilu* means 'Jahweh is God,' but that the first part is a verb, and is exactly parallel to other West Semitic names found on the monuments, *Judah-ilu*, 'God knows'; *Jarbi-ilu*, 'God heals'; *Jaqar-ilu*, 'God is precious'; *Jahzar-ilu*, 'God helps,' and the rest. Then *Jawi-ilu* means 'God exists,' or 'God lives,' or 'God has spoken'; and *Japi-ilu*, 'God protects.'

But the matter is not at an end. There is another form found on the monuments. It is *Ja-u-um-ilu*. To the 'lay reader' it is more unlikely than the other names, the *um* seeming to rule it out of account. But the *um* is nothing. It is merely the mimmatum that was characteristic of the early period of writing. Scholars who believe that *Jawi-ilu* means 'Jahweh is God' have hitherto taken little account of this form; because, they say, the shorter form *Jau* in it presupposes the longer form *Jawi*. But Dr. Clay finds its importance just in its shortness. The objection to *Jawi-ilu* is that in a proper name the element Jahweh (if it is Jahweh) is written in full, an occurrence unknown elsewhere. But here it is contracted. Here it is found in the very form which we know that the Assyrian scribes used when writing the Hebrew Jahweh in a name.

The question then is this. Was the name Jahweh known before the revelation to Moses in Midian? It turns upon two words. One is the name of Moses' mother Jochebed, of which Professor Clay says nothing. The other is this name *Jau-ilu*. This name is as old as the Hammurabi period, say as old as the time of Abraham. Professor Clay believes that *Jau-ilu* contains the name of Jahweh, the so-called God of Israel. He therefore believes that the name of Jahweh was known and used long before the time of Moses.

He can see nothing else for it. There are other names of that age which no one dreams of translating otherwise: *Bēl-ilu*, 'Bel is God'; *Marduk-ilu*, 'Marduk is God'; *Shamash-ilu*, 'Shamash is God.' And although this is the only example before the time of Moses of a proper name compounded with *Jau* or Jahweh on the Babylonian monuments (just as there is only one such name in the Hebrew Bible), yet the name seems to have been in existence. For upon tablets from Nippur belonging to the second or third century after Moses, Professor Clay has discovered names which contain this element of *Jau* in them. They are *Ja-u-ba-ni*, *Ja-u-a*, *Ja-a-u*, *Ja-ai-u*, and the feminine

name *Ja-a-u-tum*. Jau-bâni is particularly instructive. It means 'Jahweh is Creator.' And that *Jau* is a proper name is made evident by names like Ilu-bâni, Shamash-bâni. Ja-u-a also has its interest. It is exactly the Assyrian writing of the Hebrew name Jehu.

The latest volume of the 'Contemporary Science Series,' and the latest in that fascinating and now almost fashionable study of Psychology, is *The Psychology of Alcoholism*, by Dr. George B. Cutten (Scott; 5s.). Let us look at the tenth chapter. The title of the tenth chapter is 'Religious Conversion as a Cure.'

What business has the man of science with conversion? Hitherto he has been understood to have no business with it. He has been warned off. For when the ancient methods of preaching the gospel had become unprofitable—not the gospel itself, mind you, but the way of preaching it—and God sent us a new way, men clung to the obsolete and denounced the new. The old way was the way of philosophy; the new was the way of science. The old way was to prove the truth of the gospel, even of the resurrection of Jesus from the dead, by means of the argument from design. The new way seemed at first to need no gospel, or at least to leave no room for it, and blunderingly denied the very possibility of a resurrection from the dead; and it was sent back with much malediction to the father of lies, from whom it was understood to have come.

But science was no discovery of the devil, or even of Darwin; it was the gift of God. He was concerned about His gospel. It is the deepest consideration of God and of all the holy angels. It is the thing, so far as we know, that was most in the mind of God before the foundation of the world. And when one good method of preaching it had lost its novelty, He sent another. When men no longer responded to the reasoning about the imputation of Adam's sin, He sent the doctrine of hereditary transmission. Science is

not warned off now. It has made us feel as philosophy never was able to do, that 'by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin'; and it has made us see that, not in spite of, but through and by means of, this hereditary transmission, it is in the power of every man to work out his own salvation, while God works within him, to will and to do according to His good pleasure.

Dr. Cutten's tenth chapter is on 'Religious Conversion as a Cure for Alcoholism.' He believes that conversion is practically the only cure that has been discovered. He knows that there are inebriate asylums. He knows that there are patent medicines and specifics advertised in every paper. But when a meeting took place in 1901 of the New York Academy of Medicine to discuss the cure for drunkenness, he noticed that among these specialists, doctors of repute from every land, who had had considerable experience with alcoholism, no drug or medicine was once mentioned. The only cures that were spoken of or believed in were hypnotism and conversion.

Dr. Cutten is careful not to be discovered in the dress of the evangelist. He withholds his own opinion for a time. He quotes the opinions of others. He quotes the opinion of Dr. Starr. In the meeting already referred to, the report of which will be found in the *Medical Record*, vol. lix. p. 431 f., Dr. Starr said he 'was of opinion that any measure of a religious or of a social character that could be brought to bear on these individuals was well worthy of a trial, and he would confess that the only reformed drunkards of whom he had knowledge were those who had been saved, not through medical but through religious influence.' Then Dr. Cutten takes courage and says that though few would like to go to the length of excluding all other cures, certainly most persons would agree with Dr. Starr in positing religious conversion as the most effective cure of all.

Now we have heard this before, but with a sting in it. We have heard Professor James say, 'the

only radical remedy for dipsomania is religiomania.' Dr. Cutten's words have no sting in them. Science is daily drawing nearer. He speaks of religious conversion neither with familiarity nor with contempt. 'In dealing with the subject of religious conversion,' he says, 'its very nature compels us to treat it incompletely. However much we may believe in the divine element in conversion, and in the religious life generally, it must remain an unknown quantity, and can be judged only by the apparent effects upon the persons experiencing it.' And when he proceeds to give reasons for the success of it, he does not, like Gibbon, pretend to be giving all the reasons; he gives those that can be appreciated by science.

He gives three reasons. The first reason why conversion is more successful with drunkenness than any other cure is that it creates a real desire for reform. Without the desire to be cured the drunkard can never be cured. Inebriate institutions are now refusing to admit patients in whom this condition is not fulfilled.

The second reason is that after conversion the associations are changed. Many a man has by resolution become a total abstainer for a time. It has been only for a time, because the associations are still the same. 'Everything around him still calls on the alcoholic to drink. He has a hearty invitation from old friends, who are so pleased to see him again that they must show their pleasure by inviting him to have a social glass; the saloon which he passes daily, whose doorway is worn by his tread, seems to hold open its doors to him; the waiter at his club or lunch-room places wine-glasses before him, and inquires if he will have the same old brand; every person and thing, his whole past life, seem to conspire in one pressing invitation to him to drink.'

But when the 'alcoholic' is converted, he enters a new environment. 'He has an entirely new set of friends and acquaintances, who have proved their friendship for him, and with whom he spends

every moment; their words and lives are a constant source of encouragement and strength to him.'

The third reason why conversion is so efficacious a cure for alcoholism is that it provides an emotional substitute. Dr. Cutten quotes from Dr. Peabody: 'The drink habit is in a very large degree the perversion of one of the most universal of human desires, the thirst for exhilaration, recreation, and joy; and to remove the only available means for satisfying this normal craving without providing adequate substitutes, is like blocking the channel where a stream does harm without observing how many new fields the same stream is likely to devastate.' Dr. Cutten has heard of Chalmers' 'expulsive power of a new affection'; he counts it as scientific as it is evangelical. He has heard of St. Paul's recommendation to the Ephesians not to be drunk with wine, but to be filled with the Spirit.

'No event in the religious history of India compares with the advent of Christianity in the Western world.'

Here is a plain issue on a matter that is rapidly rising into importance. The old attitude of contempt towards the religions of the East is disappearing. Some knowledge of their actual contents is more generally met with, and, in consequence, less hardihood in misrepresenting them. But now the possibility is in sight of Western thinkers laying Brahmanism or Buddhism solemnly alongside Christianity and professing to be unable to choose between them. Here, then, is a plain issue, capable of a strictly scientific investigation and of being appreciated by both sides.

The statement is not quoted from a book of Christian apologetic. It is quoted from a volume (elsewhere noticed) entitled *Concepts of Philosophy*, written by the Professor of Philosophy in Princeton University. It is a statement, we say, which lies open to the ordinary rules of evidence. It is no

matter of opinion; it is no pretence of prophecy. It means that the advent of Christianity has been more to the world than the advent of any of the great religions of India.

When Christianity came, the religion of the Old Testament—what Professor Ormond calls the Jehovistic religion—was on the verge of collapse. It had come into contact with Hellenic thought. The influence of Greek philosophy was rapidly destroying Hebrew belief. Christianity came to forestall the atheism into which Europe would almost inevitably have fallen. It saved the worship of Jehovah from collapse, and it saved Europe from atheism.

Nothing of this kind happened in the East. 'The later Vedic hymns betray a kind of consternation in view of the scepticism with which the Vedic gods are beginning to be regarded. In the Upanishads the result has been accepted as inevitable, and the effort is being made to save religion, in spite of the death of the gods, by placing it on a speculative basis. Out of this develops the conception of Brahm and the cult founded upon it. But Brahmanism proved to be no evangel like Christianity. The Vedic gods were dead, and Brahmanism succeeded only in putting a metaphysical deity in their place, a deity that was too exclusive and too far removed to touch vitally the life or convictions of the people.'

But what about Buddhism? Professor Ormond acknowledges that, both historically and in view of its content, Buddhism claims comparison with Christianity. It is the only Indian religion, he says, that does so. He acknowledges that 'the central figures' of Buddhism and Christianity have many things in common. 'In fact,' he adds, 'in their ethical and sympathetic relations with life, in their personal abnegation, and in their exalted ideals, they have very much in common.'

Yet the gospel of Buddha is very unlike the gospel of Christ. Christ had behind Him a monotheistic religion that still had life in it,

though modified by rationalistic Greek influences. Buddha had behind him blank atheism. For he had rejected Brahm as he had rejected the older Vedic gods. Christ retained all the wealth of the Old Testament religion, and enormously enriched it, by transforming the conception of the living and transcendent Jehovah into that of the living Father in heaven. He inherited, therefore, and at the same time purified, the whole ethical and spiritual force of the Jehovistic tradition. Buddha had nothing behind him. And if he had accepted the past, he had no transcendent element to impart to it and make it live.

Again, 'the Founder of Christianity, conscious of His own close relation of sonship to the Heavenly Father, seeks to develop the same sense of sonship in His disciples. They are children and heirs of God, being joint heirs with Himself.' Professor Ormond thinks this one of the most dynamic of the concepts of Christianity. For 'a sharer in the divine life has all the resources of the divine life at his disposal, and will have as much strength, as much hope, as much fortitude and peace, as God and himself together.'

Buddha also can commend his doctrine by his excellent personal life. But it has no divine associations. It begins and ends with himself. Now, 'we may write self large,' says Professor Ormond; 'we may represent it in its ideal charm and attractiveness; it will never acquire a dynamic equal to that of a divine life whose resources are open to the human.'

Last of all, the life which the Founder of Christianity offers His disciples includes the future. Buddhism puts the emphasis mainly on the present. Its vision grows dim and its faith halting when it contemplates the other side of death.

What is the number of the Beast? The only real contribution to the question, since the Apostolic Age, was made by the late Dr. George

Matheson. I will tell you, he said, the number of the Beast. The Beast is Selfishness, and its number is Number One.

From almost the very beginning there has been uncertainty as to the number. The number usually given is 666. But at the end of the second century Irenæus had heard of the number 616. He did not accept it. But it has been accepted in our day, and even by men so far apart as Zahn and Holtzmann and Spitta. The Rev. Thomas Barns, who discusses the Beast and his number in *The Expositor* for March, sets forth the evidence very clearly. But he agrees with Irenæus that the number of the Beast was 666, and that the Beast itself was the Sun-god Titan.

The Sun-god Titan? Yes, that is the suggestion of Irenæus. And there is a double appropriateness in the suggestion. On the one hand, the Sun-god Titan stood for the worship of Mithras, and Mithraism was making rapid strides in the West, and must already have been recognized as the most deadly enemy of the gospel, at the time when the last touches (according to Mr. Barns) were being given to the Apocalypse. And, on the other hand, Titan stood for Nero. For Vespasian had converted the Colossus of Nero into a statue of the Sun-god. And as the workmen who were sent afterwards to erect the great Flavian amphitheatre went day by day to their work, they felt the frown of the Titan-Nero colossus upon them, for the amphitheatre was built immediately under it. Many of these workmen may have been Christians. If they spoke Greek, they would understand that the number of the Beast was the number of this frowning Titan above them: and if they were Jews, they would be able to read the same name in the form of Nero Cæsar (נרון קסר) in the Hebrew letters which make up the number.

So whatever the Beast may be to us,—and we may accept Dr. Matheson as our best expositor till there comes a better,—to the Christians of the days of the Emperor Commodus in Rome

(the place and the time, according to Mr. Barns, when this addition was made to the Apocalypse) it represented at once the tyranny of Nero and the dread superstition of Mithraism.

The Bampton Lectures have been suffering together with the landlords. On account of a diminishing revenue they are no longer delivered every year. And so they are not published every year. The Bampton Lecture of 1905 is published in 1907. The delay has its advantages. By delaying the publication till 1907 Dr. Bussell has been able to add many notes, doubling the size and the value of the book.

The title of the Bampton Lecture for 1905 is *Christian Theology and Social Progress* (Methuen; 10s. 6d. net). The lecturer is the Rev. F. W. Bussell, D.D., Rector of Sisland, in Norfolk, and formerly Vice-Principal of Brasenose College, Oxford. It is a large title. It covers everything. For the Bampton lecturers have to give themselves to the defence of the gospel, and in the defence of the gospel there is nothing that does not come within the range of *Christian Theology and Social Progress*.

The range is wide. In Dr. Bussell's own words, it is 'the relation of religious thought to human life viewed as a whole, to national and individual development.' He fears that 'the scope of these lectures may seem somewhat too ambitious.' But it is just this comprehensive treatment that had come to be demanded. The question had arisen whether Christianity was sufficient for every man and for every man in every relation of life. Special spheres of thought and activity had already been dealt with by specialists. The hand of some student of theology and philosophy and of science was required to bring the scattered contributions into one great comprehensive apology. Dr. Bussell has done that. We believe that the Bampton Lecture of 1905 will serve John Bampton's purpose as well as any Lecture that has been delivered.

Dr. Bussell's subject is the Gospel. At the outset he is met with the difficulty of selecting his audience. For there are two classes of men, and they approach the gospel quite differently. To the one class it is (if it is anything) a means of enlightenment. To the other it is a savour of life unto life. To which is he to make his appeal? He makes his appeal to both. He refuses to divide Christ between the disputants. He believes that if the disputants had been more anxious in the past to understand one another than to secure a victory, they would both have known more of the mind of Christ.

For the gospel does not belong to one class more than to another. 'One thing,' says Dr. Bussell, 'is absolutely certain, that the gospel puts no undue premium on intelligence. It is a simple and universal message. It is addressed to the average moral consciousness; and in outline is capable of compression into a very few lines of a catechism.'

But if it should not be possible for the modern apologist to appeal to the philosopher and the plain man alike (and Dr. Bussell is not sure that it is possible), then he does not hesitate to make his choice. For, he says, 'the Christian preacher must never forget, in his intellectual interest in the Faith, that his real audience is the sinful, the suffering, the distressed, the ignorant; and that the primary message of the gospel is comfort and forgiveness, a sense of sonship and acceptance; and in no case the resolution of all the problems of thought and of existence.'

It is well said. It was well to say it in Oxford. It has to be said all over the country now. It has been said recently with great attractiveness by one who is both a scholar and a preacher.

In the new volume of the *Christian World Pulpit* there is a sermon by the Rev. C. Silvester Horne, M.A. It was preached in Sedgley Congregational Church, under the auspices of the Congregational Union, on Wednesday the 17th of October last. Its text is 'Ye call me Master and Lord: and ye say well; for so I am' (Jn 13¹³). Its subject is the 'Lordship of Christ.'

In that sermon Mr. Horne says: 'Some time ago I made the discovery that there are three words which were constantly on the lips of Jesus—words so much alike in our language that I wondered I had not noticed them before—the last, the least, the lost.' And what does Mr. Horne find Jesus saying about the last, the least, and the lost? He finds Him saying that the last shall be first, that the least shall be greatest, that the lost shall be found. And he says that that is the Lordship of Jesus. He says that that is the miracle of Jesus. He actually made the last to be first, the least to be greatest, the lost to be found. 'The Lord Jesus Christ,' he says, 'is declared to be the Master of the world because of what He can do with other people's leavings.'

In Lincoln Cathedral, says Mr. Horne, the verger will show you many monuments, and then he will say, But the pride of the Cathedral is that window. Do you know the story of it? The great artist of windows in that age was making some windows in Lincoln Cathedral. As he made them he rejected many pieces of glass. Then a youth from London came and gathered the rejected pieces, and made that window. And when the artist saw what had been done with his leavings, That is the master, he said.