

# 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](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php)

pdfs are named: [Volume]\_[Issue]\_[1<sup>st</sup> page of article].pdf

WHEN all that is corrupt, corrupting, corruptible has been laid aside in the 'putting off' and the 'putting on' of the great transition—when nothing is but the holy and the beautiful and the loving—when the world itself is lightened by God and the Lamb, and all its false and lying lights are extinguished and annihilated by that lustre 'above the brightness of the sun'—then 'they that shall be counted worthy' shall grow apace in all knowledge and in all virtue—'old things shall have passed away, and all things shall have become new.' 'That they may behold My glory' is, in other words, 'that they may behold My face in righteousness, and be satisfied, when they awake, with My likeness.'—C. J. VAUGHAN.

LET me be with Thee where Thou art,  
My Saviour, my eternal rest;  
Then only will this longing heart  
Be fully and forever blest.

Let me be with Thee where Thou art,  
Thy unveil'd glory to behold;  
Then only will this wandering heart  
Cease to be treacherous, faithless, cold.

Let me be with Thee where Thou art,  
Where spotless saints Thy name adore;  
Then only will this sinful heart  
Be evil and defiled no more.

Let me be with Thee where Thou art,  
Where none can die, where none remove;  
Where neither death nor life will part  
Me from Thy presence and Thy love.

#### Sermons for Reference.

- Brown (C. J.), Word of Life, 318.  
Benson (R. M.), Final Passover II. ii. 523, 528.  
Carpenter (W. B.), Charter of Christ, 55.  
Cox (S.), Expository Essays and Discourses, 106.  
Davies (D.), Talks with Men, Women, and Children, v. 162, vi. 289.  
Duncan (J.), In the Pulpit, 198.  
Goodwin (H.), Hulsean Lectures, 1856, 45.  
M'Cheyne (R.), Memoir and Sermons, 419.  
Matheson (G.), Moments on the Mount, 77.  
Murray (A.), School of Prayer, 214.  
Price (A. C.), Fifty Sermons, viii. 297, ix. 217.  
Spurgeon (C. H.), Evening by Evening.  
" " Sermons, vol. xl. No. 2376.  
Stewart (J.), Outlines of Discourses.  
Tinling (J. F. B.), Facts and Similes.  
Vaughan (C. J.), Authorized or Revised? 39  
Vaux (J. E.), Sermon Notes, i. 74.  
Woodford (J. R.), Sermons on Old Testament Texts, i. 253.

## Requests and Replies.

I have been reading with interest the volumes on 'Nippur' by Dr. Peters, Director of the American Expedition to Babylonia in 1888-90. He considers that the excavations have brought to light remains of buildings as early as 6000 or 7000 B.C., and inscriptions of about 4000 B.C. Are these very early dates (which Dr. Peters confesses are 'conjectural') generally accepted by Assyriologists as proven, as against the usual Bible chronology? Is Nippur identified with any city mentioned in the Old Testament? Where can the latest and most reliable information on the subject be obtained?—A. W. W.

As far as I have been able to ascertain, the early dates given by Peters, and by Hilprecht in his *Babylonian Expedition of the University of Pennsylvania*, are generally accepted by Assyriologists. Prominent among the dissentients, in all probability, should be mentioned Lehmann, who, as he contends that Sargon of Agadé (owing to a mistake on the part of Nabonidus and his scribes) ought to be placed 1000 years later (2800 B.C., instead of 3800 B.C.), would also say that the foundation of the city of Niffer took place at a proportionately

late date, *i.e.* 6000 B.C., instead of 8000 B.C. I think that Lehmann is wrong in attributing error to Nabonidus or to his scribes, and I am inclined to accept the high dates proposed by Peters and Hilprecht, but more written chronological material is needed before we can say that those high dates are placed beyond a doubt. At present we cannot do otherwise than accept them as being probably correct in the main.

I notice that your correspondent speaks, in the usual way, of Bible chronology, by which, I take it, he means Bishop Usher's. As so many people seem actually to pin their faith to the dates given in the margin of our reference Bibles, the cause of religion and science would, it seems to me, be served at one and the same time, if we could induce the authorities to omit from the Bible *all the marginal dates prior to the time of Abraham*. Any chronology whatever of this earliest period is so uncertain that it does not deserve a place in any authoritative publication. Scientific men, as a rule, disregard it, and religious people, having

early learned to regard it as 'Gospel true,' experience, on finding that it is, in all probability, incorrect, a shock so rude that their faith is almost certain to suffer by it.

I suppose that the best book to recommend to your correspondent is that of Hilprecht, quoted above. There are three parts, costing about a guinea each.

THEOPHILUS G. PINCHES.

*British Museum.*

In the article 'The Chronicles a Targum,' by Rev. W. E. Barnes, B.D., Fellow of Peterhouse, Cambridge, in *The Expository Times* of April 1897, he quotes 2 Kings xxiii. 29, 'King Josiah went to meet him (Neco),' and finds his argument for the inaccuracy of the narrative in 2 Chron. xxxv. 20-24, upon the word 'meet,' which he says does not mean or imply a hostile meeting, and therefore there is a variation and want of harmony. From what does he quote? Neither Authorized nor Revised Version uses this language. In both it is, 'King Josiah went against him.' If he quotes from some other version, or gives a translation of his own, it is only right to say so, and give the authority for the change from the usual text.

At the close of his article he explains the discrepancy between 2 Sam. xxi. 19 and 1 Chron. xx. 5 by saying, 'Goliath' is not a proper name at all, and for 'Goliath the Gittite' we should read 'The Gittite champion.' But in 1 Sam. xvii. 4, 23, it reads, 'a champion named Goliath.' 'The champion, the Philistine of Gath, Goliath by name.' Language could hardly be clearer. Now we rely upon such students for accuracy and candour. We ought not to feel we need to examine their quotations in order to be sure they are quoting rightly. The whole article, and many others of a similar kind, give a plain student of the English Bible great want of confidence in the results and methods of much of so-called critical study.—A. Patterson.

*Chicago.*

I HAVE to thank the courtesy of the Editor for allowing me to see Mr. Patterson's criticism on my article before it was published.

1. In the first place, I do not plead guilty to inaccuracy in translating 2 K 23<sup>29</sup>, 'King Josiah went to meet him (Neco).' The phrase 'went to meet' is represented in Hebrew by the colourless word *hālākh*, 'to go,' combined with the colourless expression, *likrath*, 'to meet.' Taken singly, neither word suggests hostility, as a glance at a concordance will show Mr. Patterson. Taken together, the two colourless words remain colourless, as my quotation of 2 K 16<sup>10</sup> (the same phrase in Hebrew) is sufficient to prove. It would have been inaccurate to follow R.V. in leaving A.V. unaltered.

I might further point out that a better account can be given of the words 'when he saw him,' if we agree that Josiah was slain at an audience, than if we suppose that he fell in battle. People do not go to battle to *see* one another.

2. In the second point, Mr. Patterson (he must forgive me for saying so) is inaccurate himself. I did *not* say, '*Goliath* is not a proper name at all.' I wrote, 'A consideration of verses 4 and 23, the only places in which the word *Goliath* occurs in 1 S 17, together with the fact that the champion is usually called simply "the Philistine," *makes it probable* that "*Goliath*" is not a proper name at all.' I still believe that this suggestion (for it is only a suggestion) is worthy of consideration as a probable solution of a difficulty. Mr. Patterson's statement, 'Language could hardly be clearer,' does not apply to the Hebrew of 1 S 17<sup>23</sup>. Literally rendered it is, *Behold, there cometh up the champion, Goliath the Philistine* (or *the Goliath of the Philistines*) [was] *his name* (or *designation*).<sup>1</sup>

W. E. BARNES.

*Cambridge.*

<sup>1</sup> The Israelites heard him spoken of as '*Goliath*,' just as they heard the king of Egypt spoken of as '*Pharaoh*,' and as they heard the Assyrian commander-in-chief spoken of as '*Tartan*,' and as they heard the Queen of Ethiopia spoken of as '*Candace*.'