
A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

Now, had St. Paul acted on the same principles in this case, he would not have gone up to Jerusalem. For in the first starting he was hindered from going the way proposed; then he had warnings of bonds and imprisonment from those who were clearly speaking under the Holy Spirit's influence; then he was told by disciples, "through the Spirit, that he should not go up to Jerusalem." So that we are bound to conclude that he failed in two of the principles laid down. He had not laid aside his own will, and he had not used his reason properly. Had he done so he must have concluded that, as the Holy Spirit said "he should not go up," he must have been mistaken in thinking that he was under the Spirit's guidance in going. For the Holy Spirit cannot contradict Himself. Either He had not spoken to St. Paul or He had not spoken by the disciples.

If, then, these things be so, we have a warning in St. Paul; but we have clear indications of how surely the Holy Spirit will guide us if we will truly place ourselves in His hands.

Pre-Mosaic Literature and the Bible.—II.

By the Rev. W. T. PILTER.

Babylonia.

OUR third source of pre-Mosaic literature is Babylonia (including Assyria and Elam). There are many thousands of monuments, clay tablets for the most part, and either originals or copies of originals of the ante-Mosaic period now in the museums of Europe (including Constantinople) and the United States. Very many of these are as yet unpublished and even unread, though the character of the tablets, the name of the King regnant which they bear, or other evidence shows their approximate dates.

Among these monuments there are some thousands belonging to what is known by Assyriologists as the First Babylonian Dynasty, the most famous King of which was the sixth,

Hammurabi, who is generally identified with the "Amraphel King of Shinar" of Gen. xiv. Now, if that identification is correct, the narrative of the chapter bears within it plain evidence not only that it is a historical record, but also that it must have been written down not very long after the events occurred. It may have been by Abraham himself, or, as Professor Hommel thinks, by the scribe of "Melchizedek king of Salem," in whose archives it might well have been preserved. But the points to be remembered about the narrative, as a literary document, are, first, that it reflects in a surprising way the history of the time and places as modern discovery has brought them before us; and, secondly, that there are details in the narrative which make it very probable that it was put into writing not much later than the thirtieth year of Hammurabi's reign, when Hammurabi had conquered Elam and Chedorlaomer (or his successor) occupied a secondary place—in fact, below Arioch—as he does in verse 1; probably also Amraphel himself had not yet become the suzerain of the land of Canaan.

Of one or two very important cuneiform remains of that first Babylonian dynasty I shall have more to say presently, but before speaking of them I wish to call attention to Babylonian inscriptions of a yet greater antiquity.

There are many of these—thousands, indeed, of pre-Abrahamic written monuments which have come down to us. A large number of these belong to the reign of Gudea (about 2500 B.C.) and some of his successors, covering a period of about 200 years, but there are a few which go back, if the conclusions of Assyriologists are to be depended on, to about 2,000 years before Gudea, notably the records of E-annadu, King or Governor of Shirpurla, or Lagash (the modern Tell Loh), which are somewhat considerable, and are assigned to about 4500 B.C. Even then the cuneiform script, although semipictorial on the tablets, had advanced considerably beyond the stage of picture-writing. There are remains also of a limestone *stela* of the same personage, giving an account of his military exploits, sculptured with battle scenes and vultures (hence called the "stela of the vultures").

Now, if the date assigned to these monuments is approximately correct, they must give us a glimpse of Western Asia appreciably nearer to the Noachian Deluge; there are only a few inscriptions which are believed to be somewhat older. Here I would recall the opinion expressed some thirty years or so ago by an eminent Assyriologist (I believe it was the late George Smith, but as I cannot turn to the words in print, it may only be that I heard him speak them on some public occasion). He said that if writing was practised in the antediluvian period, as he believed it might have been, and upon clay tablets, then, considering the character of the material, we might legitimately hope some day to actually discover pre-Noachian records. To that opinion I will only add that, judging from Biblical references to the civilization of that far-off age, notably in Gen. iv. 17-22, and to the mechanical and economic knowledge which the building and arrangements of the ark seem to presuppose, the antediluvian world must have attained to a high level of culture and industrial efficiency.

With this brief account of pre-Abrahamic monuments, which is given for the sake of rounding off the outline of pre-Mosaic literature, I come back, in conclusion, to speak of certain Babylonian inscriptions of the Abrahamic era, and their significance for the student of the Old Testament.

It might possibly be supposed that the Babylonian story of the Creation should here be dealt with, but hereon it may be sufficient now to say that we possess no cuneiform record of that story which dates earlier than the time of Ashshurbanipal (seventh century B.C.). Much of the matter incorporated in his tablets is probably handed down from an earlier—a very much earlier— time, but as to that we are left to inference: we posses no earlier literary remains. With regard to the story of the Flood, however, we possess two small fragments which date from the Abrahamic period—that is, to the First Babylonian Dynasty. These we must discuss.

One of them was published in 1902 by Dr. Bruno Meissner. Its date is not preserved, but it is evidently of the period men-

tioned. It differs, however, so much from the Deluge tablet of Ashshurbanipal's days that Dr. Meissner says that "only seldom can we venture to fill in the gaps of this narrative" by means of the later tablets. To illustrate the character of the story, one passage from it may be given. In reply to Gilgamos, the hero, who bewails the death of his great friend, whom he cannot find, though day and night he seeks him, the heavenly (?) guide, Sabitu, whom Meissner describes as "the Sibyl," tells Gilgamos to eat and drink and enjoy the company of wife and child, for there is no hope of escaping death nor of finding everlasting life: "When the gods created man they laid death upon him, and retained life in their own hands." Babylonian legends and myths have often been claimed as the original source of the first pages of the Book of Genesis; it will not be necessary to point out that Moses was scarcely more likely to have gone to such a source as that just quoted for his diluvial history than for his theology.

The other early fragment of a Babylonian account of the Flood was published by Prof. V. Scheil in 1898. It dates from the reign of Ammi-zaduga, fourth successor of Hammurabi on the throne of Babylon. It originally contained 439 lines arranged in eight columns; parts of four columns only are preserved. In the first column we are told that the god Adad was greatly offended with mankind, upon whom he must rain destruction; in Col. ii. that the god will pursue men till he has utterly exterminated them and destroyed their habitation from the earth; in Col. vii. that the god Ea intervened and asked why all the children of men whom he had created should be brought to nought. "That he would have a remnant at least saved; a ship must therefore be made, and let Pir-napishtim (the Babylonian Noah) take the oar and lead away." Col. viii. finishes by telling us that Adramhasis (which is understood to be another name of Pir-napishtim) began to speak to his lord. The tablet (which evidently contained only an incomplete copy of the story) closes with the name of the copyist of it, the title, and its date in the reign of Ammi-zaduga.

From this we see that the substance of this Babylonian story of the Flood is that in great anger a god (Adad or Rammanu, the storm-god) would utterly destroy man and his dwelling-place, but that another god (Ea) intervened, and saved a few men in a ship led by a chosen man Pir-napishtim. So far as this can be compared with the Bible account of the Deluge, it corresponds to Gen. vi. 5-8, and 13, 14. Now, according to the modern critics, Gen. vi. 1-8 belongs to "J," and verses 13, 14 to "P." If this be so, then the source (or sources) of *both* "P" and "J" must go back to Babylonian remains of the age of Abraham. This result must give a shock to sceptical criticism; is it more shocking to add that we are content that Moses himself should have received documentary "sources" from the same age; and, furthermore, as Moses is a historical personage, while "J" and "P" are not known outside the suppositions of the critics, we may reasonably accept him and neglect them.

Our last point is with reference to Hammurabi's code of laws.

As I pointed out in these columns a few months after the official publication of that code[1] by its first decipherer, Professor Scheil, the importance of that discovery for Biblical criticism was (and is) very great, for it showed that the literary assumption of the "higher critics"—that in the days of Moses the writing down of a code of law was impossible—was no longer tenable, seeing that in Babylonia in the days of Abraham that "impossibility" was an accomplished fact. I would now add two further observations.

The first is that, while cuneiform remains had previously taught us that Hammurabi and some of his immediate successors were lords of the land of Canaan, we now know, by a comparison of the code with the laws by which, according to the Scripture narrative, the patriarchs of Israel, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, were ruled (such as the laws of marriage, of secondary wives like Hagar, of dowry, and of inheritance), those laws were none other than those of Hammurabi's code. Thus the patriarchal history of the Book of Genesis faithfully reflects the legal conditions

[1] THE CHURCHMAN, May, 1903, p. 444.

prevailing in Canaan at that period. This fact strikingly confirms the truth of the narratives, and as strikingly shows the vanity of the hypothesis of the Wellhausen school—that the early Scripture history was, if not entirely fictitious, yet quite legendary, and written in the later days of Israel.

My second observation on this subject is that, as might have been expected, Hammurabi's law entirely lost its influence upon the children of Israel during their long sojourn in the land of Goshen, and the Old Semitic customary law of the Beduin tribes who surrounded them in their new home, and who were of the same Semitic race as themselves, took its place.[1] Hence the stage of culture of Israel at the Exodus, which is so plainly reflected in the Scripture narrative, is, substantially, that of half-nomad tribes; and hence, as Professor Grimme has proved, when the Twelve Tribes emerged a nascent nation in Sinai, their civil laws—as what is called the "Book of the Covenant," in particular the first half of it (Exod. xxi.-xxii. 18), clearly shows—were Old Semitic laws.

This remarkable accordance of the latest results of modern archæological investigation with the traditional belief in the historical accuracy of the Bible, together with all the accordances, confirmations and illumination of that belief which have been pointed out or suggested in these two papers, may well encourage those who believe that the historical truth and trustworthiness of the Old as well as of the New Testament are of vital necessity to "the faith which was once for all delivered unto the saints."

[1] The merit of proving this point, as well as the preceding, and doing so in much detail, is due to H. Grimme, Professor of Semitic Languages in the University of Freiburg, Switzerland, in his brochure entitled "Das Gesetz Hammurabis und Moses" (Cologne, 1903). A translation of that brochure, with additional chapters of my own on Pentateuchal archæology, will shortly be published by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.