

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

It has been for some time known that a new book was coming from Professor Hommel of Munich. It has now come. Published simultaneously in English and in German, it goes in this country by the title of *The Ancient Hebrew Tradition as Illustrated by the Monuments*. The translation is done by Messrs. Edmund McClure, M.A., and Leonard Crosslé. The publishers are the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.

It was known that the book was coming; it was also known that it was to be polemical against the Higher Criticism. It has come, and it is not less polemical than was expected. Immediately under the title are to be read the words: 'A Protest against the Modern School of Old Testament Criticism.' And, to take a single instance of flat antagonism, we have only entered as far as the tenth page when we read: 'It has yet to be proved that we have any right to assume that Deuteronomy first came into existence at the time in which it was discovered, *i.e.* in the latter half of the seventh century B.C., or, in other words, some 650 years after the death of Moses. From a single instance, namely, the passage in Deut. xxviii. 68, I am able to prove that Deuteronomy must have been known to the prophets at least as early as the time of Jotham and Menahem, about 740 B.C., and was not lost until later on, during the long reign of the idolatrous king Manasseh.'

Again, on p. 19, we have the irreconcilable statement: 'It is unquestionable that the Higher Critics have gone virtually bankrupt in their attempt to unravel, not only chapter by chapter, but verse by verse, and clause by clause, the web in which the different sources [of the Hexateuch] are entangled, arguing frequently from premises which are entirely false.'

Nevertheless, Professor Hommel is a Higher Critic himself and a Higher Critic still. Of Professor Justi he remarks that 'he does not mince matters,' and commends his attitude as 'far more honest than that of the temporising theologian who strives to throw dust either in the eyes of the public or in his own.' Professor Hommel himself does not mince matters, as we shall see. We shall even see that he is sometimes too honest for his translators.

Professor Hommel says that the critics have gone bankrupt in unravelling the web in which the different sources of the Hexateuch are entangled. But he admits the different sources. He admits the same four sources as the critics claim to discover. He describes them rapidly and graphically, and he disclaims all participation in the effort of Professor Green, of Princeton, 'to disprove the alleged existence of different sources.' He refuses even the measure of commendation

which that effort has received from Professor Sayce. And when he comes (on p. 277) to discuss the meaning of the name of Abraham, he can be—well, almost as ‘hair-splitting’ and ‘atom-dividing’ as the critics themselves, and assuredly quite as bold.

From the time of Abraham to the time of Joshua, says Professor Hommel, the Hebrews spoke a pure Arabic dialect. Arabic, in short, Professor Hommel argues (and we honestly think he proves his argument) was the native tongue of the Hebrews. But after Joshua conquered the Canaanites, one of the penalties which the Hebrews paid for not exterminating them was this, that they gradually learned the Canaanite tongue and adopted it for their own. Thus in the time of the Judges a complete change came over the language which the descendants of Abraham spoke, and a complete change came over the alphabet which they wrote. As long as the Hebrews spoke a pure Arabic dialect, they used the Minæan or South-Arabian script. When they adopted the Canaanite tongue they took over the so-called Phœnician or Canaanite script along with it.

Well, the name Abram is a purely Arabic name. It is a contracted form of Abi-ramu, which has been found in contract tablets of the Khammurabi epoch. It means ‘my father is high.’ The second *a* is long. In order to mark the length, the name was sometimes written with an *h*—*Abrahm*. This marking of a vowel’s length by the insertion of *h* was, however, peculiar to the Minæan or South-Arabian script. After the Hebrews adopted the language of the Canaanites and wrote the Phœnician script, the spelling ‘Abrahm’ was unintelligible to them. Whereupon some redactor (shall we say?), some early scribe, wrote the name in the fuller form of *Abraham*, and then suggested the story which is found in Gen. xvii. 5 to account for it. ‘Abraham,’ says Professor Hommel, ‘is a word which it is absolutely impossible to explain by any ascertained principle of Semitic name-

formation, and the passage in Gen. xvii. 5 is an interpolation intended to account for the alteration.’ It is true the English edition has ‘seems an interpolation.’ But that is a gentle concession of the translators to the susceptibilities of an English audience. ‘Is an interpolation’ is what Professor Hommel wrote.

But Professor Hommel’s critical acumen finds freest exercise in the fourteenth chapter of Genesis. ‘The fourteenth chapter of Genesis,’ says Professor Hommel, ‘is in many respects one of the most remarkable in the whole of the Old Testament.’ It is. But we did not know till he pointed it out how remarkable it really is.

The fourteenth chapter of Genesis contains an account of a campaign conducted by Chedorlaomer king of Elam and his allies against the kings of the Dead Sea Plain. Its significance does not lie in its homiletical fulness. No particular doctrinal lesson, says Professor Hommel, can be drawn from it. We cannot pretend that it bears any special message of consolation to afflicted souls. In short, it is of no more use for edifying than many another passage in the writings of the Old Covenant. Its interest lies in the fact that in this chapter we obtain a glimpse of the general history of the world in the twentieth century B.C. such as is nowhere else vouchsafed us in the Bible. ‘In it we catch sight of a political background instinct with life and movement, and full of the deepest human interest, the more important details of which are now being confirmed and amplified in a most surprising manner by modern research and excavations in the territory of Ancient Babylonia.’

It is manifest that Chedorlaomer’s campaign is of interest to the biblical narrator because of the way in which it touched the life of Abraham. The kings of the Five Cities gave battle to Chedorlaomer and his allies in the open field, and were defeated. Abraham’s nephew, Lot, who was then living in Sodom, was carried captive with the rest.

As soon as Abraham heard of it, he set out, with three allies and three hundred and eighteen of his own men, in pursuit of the enemy, now on their homeward march towards Babylonia. Falling upon them near Dan, he defeated them, drove them in disorderly flight as far as the neighbourhood of Damascus, and returned with his nephew and great store of booty.

Now it has sometimes been said, we are not concerned at present by whom, that there are two distinct narratives here. Both may be historical, or neither, but they are distinct. It was some late scribe, say of the days of Ezra, that joined them together and glorified 'our father Abraham' greatly thereby. Professor Hommel, of course, will have none of that. But he himself discovers two separate accounts of the one complete story—'two distinct recensions,' to use the translators' words. And he then arrives at a critical result that is absolutely new, and as surprising as anything that the Higher Criticism has ever done.

Professor Hommel tells us that he made the discovery of the two different recensions by a careful examination of the concluding verse of the chapter. That verse is so apparently innocent and united that we cannot at present see where its secret lies. It reads, according to the Revised Version, thus: 'Save only that which the young men have eaten, and the portion of the men which went with me; Aner, Eshcol, and Mamre, let them take their portion.' However, from some hint with which that verse furnished him, Professor Hommel reached the conclusion that in this fourteenth chapter of Genesis there are two distinct stories, of wholly different date, the one having the king of Sodom for its centre, the other Melchizedek of Salem.

One recension says it was the king of Sodom that came out to meet Abraham as he returned with the spoil; the other says it was Melchizedek. Now we have already been informed, in the tenth verse, that the king of Sodom fell in the battle.

For 'the vale of Siddim was full of slime pits that is, the ground was honeycombed with asphalt quarries]; and the kings of Sodom and Gomorrah fled, and they fell there, and they that remained fled to the mountain.' And Professor Hommel asks how the king of Sodom could come out to meet Abraham when he had already fallen in the rout. Moreover, the opening words of Abraham's reply (ver. 22) possess a special significance for Melchizedek, and none for the king of Sodom. For it is Melchizedek alone that employs the title *Elyon*, 'Highest.' Therefore Professor Hommel concludes that the Melchizedek recension is the earlier and only authentic recension.

And not only so, but in the Epistle to the Hebrews he discovers a phrase which he believes originally belonged to the Melchizedek recension, though it is lost to all our versions. The phrase is, 'without father, without mother' (Heb. vii. 3). That phrase was not suggested by Ps. cx. 4, 'Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek,' nor by the phrase, 'priest of the Most High God.' The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews (Professor Hommel does not say 'St. Paul,' that is another of the translators' little touches) must have found these words in the version which he used. For, just as he quotes 'Melchizedek,' and translates it 'King of Righteousness'; quotes 'King of Salem,' and translates it 'King of Peace'; so he must have quoted 'without father, without mother,' and then translated it in the words 'without genealogy, having neither beginning of days nor end of life, but made like unto the Son of God, abideth a priest continually.'

Whereupon Professor Hommel transcribes the passage as he believes it originally ran. This is his transcription. 'Only the words in *italics*,' he says, 'have been changed.'

Gen. xiv. 17. 'And *Melchizedek*, the king of *Salem*, went out to meet him, after his return from the slaughter of Chedor-la-'omer and the kings that were with him at the 'emek sharre, (gloss) the same is the King's vale.'

'18. And Melchizedek king of Salem brought forth bread and wine; and he was Priest of God Most High [and had not inherited the kingdom from his father or his mother].

'19. And he blessed him, and said, Blessed be Abram of El 'Elyôn, possessor of heaven and earth: (20) and blessed be El 'Elyôn, which hath delivered thine enemies into thy hands. And he (Abraham) gave him (=offered him) a tenth of all (i.e. of the whole booty).

'21. But *Melchizedek* said unto Abram, Give me the persons, and take the goods to thyself. . . . I have lifted up my hand to El 'Elyôn, possessor of heaven and earth, (23) that I will not take a thread nor a shoe-latchet, nor aught that is thine, lest thou shouldest say, thou hast enriched me: (24) save only that which the young men have eaten and the portion of the men which went with thee; Aner, Eshcol, and Mamre, let them take their portion.'

But neither the criticism nor the anti-criticism of Professor Hommel's book is half so much as the book itself. It is written to publish Professor Hommel's great discovery that the Hebrews are of Arabian origin. That does not mean that Abraham was not called from Ur (though the *Mesopotamian* sojourn of Abraham Professor Hommel frankly disbelieves and flatly says so). It does not mean that Ur was not 'of the Chaldees.' It means that Babylonia itself was Arabian when Abraham was called to go out of it.

The proofs of this position are numerous. Let one of them be mentioned. In Gen. ii, 10-14 we read the account of the geographical position of Paradise. We read that 'the Lord God planted a garden eastward, in Eden,' that is, in the *desert* (Babylonian *Edin*) over against Babylonia, and therefore in Arabia. Now of the four heads into which the river of Eden was parted, the Pishon and the Gihon have been shown by Eduard Glaser to be the two great central Arabian wadys, Er-Rumma and Dawâsir. Dr. Glaser has also made it probable that the land of

Havilah is the hinterland of Bahrein, once productive of gold and precious stones. Cush is a well-known biblical name for Central Arabia. As for the Hiddekel, it is no longer to be identified with the Tigris. Again Glaser has shown that it is far more probably the wady Sirhân or the Northern Arabian Jôf. This stream flows into the Euphrates. And so the system is complete, and the Paradise of the Hebrews lay between the Euphrates on the east and the land of Ashur (that is, east of Edom, and not Assyria) on the west. And the earliest narrator of the call of Abraham was an Arabian.

The second number (April 1897) of the new series of *The Christian Quarterly* has reached us. *The Christian Quarterly* is published in Columbia. Its motto (in Greek) is: 'Prove all things: hold fast that which is good.' Its editor is Dr. W. T. Moore, Dean of the Bible College of Missouri.

The Christian Quarterly has the usual parade of stately solemn articles. In this number, at least, they are not interesting. But when they are over, we reach the 'Exegetical Department,' and the exegetical department contains four very short and very lively papers.

To the first paper no author's name is appended, so that we are left to consider the editor the author. It is an answer to the question, 'Who are those whom God foreknew?' The well-known passage is quoted from the eighth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans. And after a few sentences the author lays down the gage of battle in these words: 'I have no hesitation in saying that the passage, when properly understood, makes no reference at all to anything involved in the controversy between Calvinists and Arminians. Indeed, the passage has no theological bearing whatever. It teaches one of the most precious, loving, tender, and practical lessons to be found anywhere in the Word of God.'

The Christians at Rome are enduring a great fight of afflictions. The apostle writes to en-

courage them to bear their trials. He assures them that all things are working together for good to them that love God, and in the end they will be more than conquerors through Him that loved them. He enumerates the reasons why they should not be cast down. There are seven great reasons in all.

1. They are no longer under the dominion of the flesh, therefore they need not be cast down though they should suffer in the flesh.

2. Nor even if death should be their lot. For they dwell in Christ, and the Spirit of Him that raised up Jesus from the dead shall raise up their mortal bodies also.

3. They are children of God: the Spirit is witness. If children, they are heirs of God and joint heirs with Christ. They are suffering with Him now, they shall be glorified together with Him hereafter.

4. And the present sufferings are not worthy to be compared with the glory that shall follow.

5. No doubt they are weak, but the Spirit helps their infirmities by making intercession for them.

6. This was God's way with His saints of old.

7. 'He that spared not His own Son, but delivered Him up for us all, how shall He not also with Him freely give us all things.'

Now of those seven encouragements it is the sixth that covers the passage before us. Dr. Moore translates the passage in this way: 'But we do know that, to them that love God, all things are working together for good—to those who have been called according to purpose. For whom He before approved, He also before marked out, conformable to the image of His Son, that He might be firstborn among many brethren; but whom He before marked out, the same He also called; and whom He called the same He also justified; and whom He justified the same He also made glorious.' Well, the whole transaction, the whole series of transactions, took place in the past. It is the past tense that is used throughout. It is even the aorist, which means that each transaction was completed in the past. If any of the state-

ments has to do with the present or the future, it can only be by way of example or encouragement. As facts, as deeds, they were done, and done with, in the past.

So the apostle is simply referring to God's way with the saints in former generations. Some of these saints and heroes are named in the eleventh chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews. They believed in God, and it was accounted to them for righteousness. In other words, they were acknowledged or approved. Then, being approved, they were called, justified, and at last brought to glory. 'This view,' ends our author, 'at once lifts the passage entirely out of the region of theological controversy, and makes it one of the most practical and comforting Scriptures to be found in the Bible. In the ascending scale of the apostle's great argument, this reference to God's faithfulness towards His ancient saints is placed next to the climax, and is therefore evidently regarded as a strong reason why the saints should in all succeeding generations have confidence in God's providential care, however great the trials may be to which they are exposed. For if God did not forsake the saints of the patriarchal and Jewish dispensations, or those whom He acknowledged under those dispensations, neither will He forsake those whom He acknowledges or approves under the Christian dispensation. And if He is for us, who can be against us? We are more than conquerors through Him that loved us and gave Himself for us.'

Two books have appeared together on the Revised Version. The one is for popular consumption, a *multum in parvo*, the Primer, you might call it, of the Revised Version. The other is the Student's Guide.

The author of the 'Primer' is Mr. Frank Ballard. It appeared last year in successive issues of *Light and Leading*. Now Mr. Allenson publishes it at the price of one shilling. Its title is *Which Bible to Read, Authorized or Revised?*

The author of the Student's Guide is the Bishop of Durham. It first saw the light some years ago in *The Expositor*. But *The Expositor* articles have been revised and enlarged, and it is issued in attractive form by Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton at the price of five shillings. Its title is *Some Lessons of the Revised Version of the New Testament*.

Both books are undisguisedly in love with the Revised Version, though perhaps Mr. Ballard shows the more pronounced and passionate affection. That is what we may look for now. All that is ever likely to be said against the Revision has been said already—was said, indeed, within a year or so of its appearance. It was the literature for the most part of surprise. The surprise is over now. Henceforth it will be the literature of appreciation, once or twice perhaps even of repentance.

Mr. Ballard offers innumerable little reasons why we ought to read the Revised Version rather than the other, dividing his reasons into twelve chapters. As the book does not call for criticism or even review, it will be enough to notice one of these reasons. And the choice will be made of one which Mr. Ballard has misplaced.

Under the heading 'Meanings of Words' we read: 'In Deut. xviii. 10 A.V. "witch" is wrong, for the Hebrew noun is masculine. R.V. "sorcerer" is therefore justified.' This ought to have been found in the next chapter under the heading 'Archaisms.' For in older English, down even to the time of the Authorized translation, 'witch' was used indifferently for either man or woman. In Coverdale's rendering of Dan. ii. 2 we read: 'Then the kynge cōmaunded to call together all y^e soythsayers, charmers, witches, and Caldees, for to shewe the kynge his dreame.' Again, Wyclif translates Acts viii. 9: 'But there was a man in that citee, whos name was Symount, a witche.' And at the very beginning of his *Exposition of 2 Peter*, Thomas Adams describes the same Simon Magus as 'a sorcerer, a witch, little other than a devil.' Finally, in his *Grace*

Abounding, Bunyan tells us: 'It began therefore to be rumoured up and down among the people, that I was a Witch, a Jesuit, a Highwayman, and the like.' Yet in missing the mark this once Mr. Ballard is not to be greatly blamed, for his admired Revisers have similarly missed it once and again.

The most fruitful chapter in Bishop Westcott's volume is the fifth. He calls it 'Light upon the Christian Life.' More ambitiously it might be called 'The Sum of Saving Knowledge.' From the death in sin to the abundant entrance, Bishop Westcott carries the pilgrim forward step by step, and every step he illustrates by the better renderings of the Revision. It is a study in biblical theology most unexpectedly connected and complete.

First, there is the plucking of the brand from the burning. Here we are reminded that the Greek distinguishes, 'ye were saved,' 'ye have been saved,' and 'ye are (*i.e.* are being) saved.' The Greek distinguishes, and so should the English. Thus in Rom. viii. 24 we now read: 'By hope were we saved,' not 'we are saved by hope,' for the thought of the apostle goes back to the critical moment when the glorious prospect of the gospel made itself felt in the heart of the believer with transforming power. But in Eph. ii. 5, 8 St. Paul insists on the present efficacy of the past divine work. First he says: 'God . . . when we were dead . . . quickened us together with Christ'—that is the decisive fact; then he adds: 'By grace have ye been saved,' for that is the continuous action of the one vivifying change. And yet more significant is the use of the present. 'When we read in the Authorized Version,' says Bishop Westcott, '"the preaching of the Cross . . . is unto us which are saved . . . the power of God" (1 Cor. i. 18), it is almost impossible not to regard salvation as complete; but the very aim of the apostle is to press home upon his readers the thought of a progressive work wrought out under the living power of the gospel: "The word of the Cross is to

them that *are perishing* foolishness; but unto us which *are being saved* it is the power of God."

Sometimes, Dr. Westcott admits, the strict rendering in English of the particular Greek tense 'demands some patient reflexion.' Notwithstanding he would have it strictly rendered. For even Acts ii. 47: 'The Lord added to them day by day those that were being saved,' though it 'lacks neatness,' and though Dr. Hort has said quite frankly (in his *Ecclesia*, p. 45) that it is not satisfactory, yet is greatly to be preferred to the false suggestion of the Authorized Version 'such as should be saved.'

That is the sinner's rescue. Next watch the precision with which the work is attributed to Christ. In Eph. v. 2 it is: 'Christ also *loved* you, and *gave* Himself up for us,' not as in A.V.: 'Christ also *hath loved* us, and *hath given* Himself for us.' For the apostle means to say that Christ's work was absolutely accomplished in Himself. So 'He is our peace, who *made* both one, and *brake* down the middle wall of partition' (Eph. ii. 14). And just as Christ accomplished His work for us once for all, so the change in the believer is accomplished once for all. 'Such were some of you: but ye *were* (not *are*) washed, but ye *were* sanctified, but ye *were* justified in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, and in the Spirit of our God' (1 Cor. vi. 11).

But, if Christ accomplished His work for us wholly and once for all in the past, the result of it abides unchangeable in its virtue for ever. All the experiences of His earthly life remain as a present power for our salvation. Thus we read in Heb. iv. 15: 'We have a High Priest . . . that hath been in all points tempted like as we are'; the temptation is not only a past fact (as the A.V. 'was tempted'), it is even now an effectual reality.

Return now to the Christian. As Christ's work is first of all historic and complete, a past fact accomplished 'in a past time,' so the Christian's redemption is a historic fact in his life. 'As many

of you,' says St. Paul, 'as *were* baptized into Christ *did* put on Christ' (Gal. iii. 27). Again he says, 'In one spirit *were* we all baptized into one body' (1 Cor. xii. 13). Whence we have the many passages which describe the Christian's death to sin. It is a past fact as the Saviour's death is past. 'We thus judge, that One died for all, therefore all died' (2 Cor. v. 14). 'Ye died, and your life is hid with Christ in God' (Col. iii. 3). 'If we died with Him, we shall also live with Him' (2 Tim. ii. 11).

Whereupon we reach that wonderful Pauline phrase, '*in* Christ.' If we died with Him, were buried with Him, rose with Him, we are *in* Him. Now this residence in Christ, this Christ who is our home, this charter of life and union and strength, this little particle *in* has often been obscured by the Authorized Version to the serious loss of the English reader. When, for example, we read in Rom. vi. 23: 'The gift of God is eternal life, through Jesus Christ our Lord,' we recognise a general description of the work of Christ, of what He has wrought for us, standing apart from us. But all is filled with a new meaning when the original is closely rendered: 'The free gift of God is eternal life *in* Christ Jesus our Lord.' For life is not an endowment apart from Christ; it is Himself, and enjoyed *in* Him.

But now the relation of the believer to Christ, which has thus been historically established, has to be realised and maintained. Christ has done it, done it all. But the believer makes his own what the Saviour has won for him. So when the Authorized Version in Acts iii. 19 gives us: 'Repent ye, and be converted,' it leads us to miss the thought of the man's own willing action. 'Repent ye, and turn again,' brings out the apostle's meaning. The believer does not do the work of Christ. The believer can do nothing 'of himself.' But he makes his own what Christ has done. It is vividly expressed in Col. iii. 3-5: 'Ye died . . . mortify therefore.' The one death in Christ makes each subsequent victory possible.

Well, that is the way, and to much more purpose and wealth than that, in which Bishop Westcott writes his 'Pilgrim's Progress.' He follows the mere Greek tense. He only translates it accurately.

A great controversy has shaken America over the Book of Jonah: Dr. Lyman Abbott raised it. Delivering a course of lectures on 'The Bible as Literature,' he came, on 24th January, upon the Books of Jonah, Esther, and Daniel. He said it was a matter of no spiritual concern whether a great fish swallowed Jonah or not. 'No man is worse for not believing that; no man is better for believing it. Nothing whatever in your life or mine depends upon the opinions which we entertain upon that subject.' Then Dr. Abbott told the story of Jonah 'in simple language,' and as he concluded his sermon, he said, 'That is the story. I have tried to tell it as simply as I could. I am sorry that you laughed when I spoke of Jonah composing a psalm in the belly of the fish. I do not wish to raise a laugh respecting any statement in the Hebrew Scriptures or in the Scriptures of any religion. Nevertheless, I cannot but think that the fact that that statement caused amusement shows the incongruity which lies in the very nature of the narrative.'

The newspaper reporter was present. Next day the following paragraph appeared in 'one of the metropolitan papers,' and was widely telegraphed throughout the country:—

'Rev. Dr. Lyman Abbott has been delivering a series of Sunday-night lectures on the Bible at Plymouth Church, where Beecher once held sway. "Jonah and the Whale" was his subject to-night, and there was as much laughter and amusement over his remarks as if a variety performance was in progress. He started off by saying that the story of Jonah and the whale was a fiction, and that there was no obligation on any one to believe it. It was a parable on the same line as that of the

Prodigal Son. Dr. Abbott had no doubt that a person named Jonah once existed, but his adventures after being thrown from the ship had come to be regarded as the "Pickwick Paper" of the Bible. Unrestrained laughter followed this and some other humorous references.'

The newspaper report was not only widely telegraphed, it was considerably 'improved' as it went, one or more reports having it that 'guffaws of laughter shook the building.' The storm rose rapidly. The Manhattan Association of Congregational Ministers (of which Dr. Abbott is not a member, although he is a Congregationalist) promptly met and passed a resolution, in which they declared their 'emphatic dissent from such handling of the Holy Scriptures,' and deplored the probable effect of such teachings. And Mr. Moody, the evangelist, preached a sermon, in which he said that if you deny the story of Jonah and the whale, you must deny the resurrection of Jesus Christ.

The storm increased in violence. *The Advance*, of Chicago, a Congregational paper, wrote a leading article on the subject, and drew some 'lessons.' Taking the preacher's own view of the story, that it is a parable, What, asked *The Advance*, does this parable teach Dr. Lyman Abbott himself? First, that it is easier to 'slash into Jonah and the whale than to stand up against the real sins of the day.' Secondly, a parabolic lesson in methods of keeping the peace; for when the sailors threw Jonah overboard, the storm ceased and they got on to their destination. Thirdly, that difficulties about Jonah and the like are found only on board the ships that have set sail to go to Joppa, not on those that are going out to save the lost Ninevehs of the world. And, finally, that as Jonah was made better by being swallowed by the whale, three days and three nights of some similar experience would be better than three years in a theological school where 'criticism is standing diet.'