

# 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

Eusebius. Africanus and Eusebius, however, do not agree with one another; and if we accept the twelve years given by Eusebius to each of the first two kings of the dynasty, we are bound also to accept the twenty years given to Tirhakah, as well as the statement that Tirhakah was followed by a certain Ammeris for eighteen (or twelve) years. But this would altogether upset the Professor's chronological scheme.

That Tirhakah's reign, however, was reckoned by the Egyptians themselves at twenty-six years we know from an Apis-stele (No. 190) found by Mariette in the Serapeum, according to which a bull, which lived for twenty-one years, was born in the twenty-sixth year of Tirhakah, and died in the twentieth year of Psammetichus. As the reign of Psammetichus was dated from 664 B.C., Tirhakah would thus have become the recognized Pharaoh of Egypt in 691, just ten years after the campaign of Sennacherib against Hezekiah in 701 B.C. But this is difficult to reconcile with the fact that Hezekiah died in B.C. 697, after a reign of twenty-nine years. Curiously enough, Professor Prášek ignores the biblical chronology altogether, although it is much better authenticated for this period of Jewish history than the chronology of the Ethiopian dynasty in Egypt, which is complicated by the fact that its founder, Sabako, did not reign more than twelve years, while his successor, to whom a reign of twelve years is assigned, bears a different name in Manetho and on the monuments, and, so far as the latter are concerned, is merely a titular king. It is quite possible that Tirhakah was the actual ruler of the country during the greater part of the time assigned to the reign of his predecessor.

As for the hypothetical second campaign of

Sennacherib in Palestine, I confess that I can see neither proof nor reason for it. A campaign against the Aribi or Arabo did not imply a campaign against Judah as well, and there is absolutely nothing in the fragments brought to light by George Smith which would favour such a view. To make this quite plain, I will give here a translation of all that is left of them:—

1. ' . . . by treading down the wall . . . the [gift] of their abundant tribute [I received] . . . the city of Kapâme, the city of . . . the stronghold which is in [the land of] . . . [the queen of the Arabs with [her] god[s] . . . precious stones [I carried away] . . . spices and ivory (?) . . . and the kings, the eyes . . . these cities. . . .'

2. 'To the goddess Dilbat of . . . the daughter of . . . who dwelt with Hazael, king of the Arabs . . . she delivered him (*i.e.* Hazael) into the hand of Sennacherib, my grandfather, and he overthrew him. Her dwelling-place was not with the men of Arabia, she had said; to Assyria she took the road.'

The last question discussed by Professor Prášek is the site of the city of Usu, which I identified with the Hosah of Jos 19<sup>20</sup> some years ago. This identification is approved of by him, and he further shows convincingly that Usu was the old name of Palætyrus, the town on the mainland opposite the 'rock' of Tyre, from which insular Tyre once derived its supply of water. It was the town of which Usous was the eponymous god, to whom the Phœnicians ascribed the invention of boats, and of clothes made from the skins of animals, but it passed out of remembrance after its destruction by the Assyrians. The whole discussion is a model of archæological reasoning. I may add that the form Sazu for the name of the city, given in the British Museum edition of the Tel el-Amarna tablets, is a mistake in copying; the original has Uzu.

## The Great Text Commentary.

### THE GREAT TEXTS OF GENESIS.

GENESIS iv. 9.

'And the Lord said unto Cain, Where is Abel thy brother? And he said, I know not: am I my brother's keeper?'

EXPOSITION.

'And the Lord said unto Cain, Where is Abel thy brother?'—As God asked Adam, Where art thou? He

now asks Cain, Where is thy brother? As in the former case He interested Himself in the fallen man, so here in the man as compared to the other.—DELITZSCH.

It seems that Cain at first went away, scarcely conscious of the greatness of his crime. He had asserted his rights, had suppressed the usurpation of his privileges by the younger son, and if he had used force it was his brother's fault for resisting him. So Jacob afterwards won the birthright by subtlety, and would have paid the same fearful penalty but

for timely flight, and rich presents afterwards. But Cain could not quiet his conscience, remorse tracked his footsteps; and when in the household Abel came not, and the question was asked, Where is Abel? the voice of God repeated it in his own heart, Where is Abel *thy* brother?—brother still, and offspring of the same womb, even if too prosperous. But the strong-willed man resists. What has he to do with Abel? Is he 'his brother's keeper?'—PAYNE-SMITH.

'I know not: am I my brother's keeper?'—Cain's answer shows what terrible progress sin had made since the fall of our first parents; in their case there was timid anxious flight and excuses, here a bold lie, and unloving defiance.—DELITZSCH.

## METHODS OF TREATMENT.

### I.

#### The Story of Cain and Abel.

*By the Rev. Professor H. E. Ryle, D.D.*

The religious teaching conveyed by the story of Cain and Abel relates to the subjects of sin, man's fallen nature, and the attitude of the Almighty towards the sinner.

1. As to sin, it teaches that the propensity to it is transmitted from one generation to another. The sin of Adam and Eve is followed by that of Cain; disobedience to God by violation of human brotherhood. The rejection of God's love leads to the renunciation of human affection. There was no love to God, no willingness to listen to the Divine voice, in Cain. The occasion of the sacrifice is the temptation by which his character is tested. Self-will, pride, jealousy, are the steps by which the thought of deliberate murder is reached. Cain becomes the archetype of sin, and the antithesis of the character of Christ (cf. 1 Jn 3<sup>15,16</sup>). According to Israelite theology he personified the action of sin in human society. Hatred against fellow-men is the fruit of rebellion against God (1 Jn 3<sup>11,12</sup>). Worship offers no safeguard against temptation. An act of sacrifice had no restraining influence over the murderous intention. Here we find an anticipation of the condemnation pronounced on those who sought to honour God with the lip though the heart was far from Him (cf. Is 29<sup>13</sup>, Mk 7<sup>6</sup>).

2. As regards human nature, the picture of Cain and Abel portrays the opposition subsisting from the first between good and evil, faith and self-will, obedience and lawlessness. Two brothers, brought up in the same family, engaged in the same act of worship, become the types, the one of sin, the

other of righteousness (cf. Heb 11<sup>4</sup>). The approach to God in the rite of sacrifice was in Abel's case no mere outward form, but the true expression of his heart's desire to draw near to God. This was true 'righteousness'; and thus 'the blood of righteous Abel' stands at the head of the roll of martyrs (Mt 23<sup>35</sup>). Thus 'righteous Abel' became a type of the true Israel, of the prophets who witnessed for Jehovah against their countrymen, and, in the highest sense, 'of the Suffering Servant, who was Himself a sacrifice for sin. For as the preference shown to Abel's sacrifice evoked Cain's murderous resolve, so the manifestation of perfect purity and innocence 'convicted the world in respect of sin.' Abel's death strikes a prophetic note of warning. It proclaims the great opposition of which we find the climax in Jn 1<sup>11</sup>: 'He came unto His own, and they that were His own received Him not.' And we turn instinctively to another message of encouragement amid suffering, 'If ye were of the world, the world would love its own,' etc (cf. whole passage, Jn 15<sup>18-24</sup>).

Again, the story teaches that God left not Himself without witness, even with those who had estranged themselves from Him. The words spoken to Cain were the Divine witness, reminding us of the spiritual office of conscience, to the heart given up to sin. If Cain hears rebuke, he receives also both exhortation and promise. But he is a free agent, under no compulsion to obey God. His sin is the outcome of the abuse of that free-will, the Divine gift of which he has received by inheritance from the first parents.

Not least the narrative teaches the interdependency of the human race, the obligations we are under the one to the other.

3. As regards God, the narrative presents Him as long-suffering towards the sinner, as well as compassionate towards the innocent sufferer. He who arraigns Cain for the crime, had, before its commission, warned him of his fault, and urged him to well-doing. Nothing is hid from Him. It is not for the faithlessly offered sacrifice, but for the unseen passion of Cain's heart that God calls him to reason. The sin is no sooner committed than it comes under judgment. The punishment is heavier than that of Adam and Eve. But the judgment is tempered with compassion. He is assured of protection from blood-revenge. The favour of a token for good is granted to the first

murderer; and symbolism is consecrated, in its earliest use, to hold a pledge of Divine love before the sinner's eyes.

## II.

### The Obligations of Human Brotherhood.

*By the Rev. H. P. Liddon, D.D., D.C.L.*

This is the earliest utterance which expresses the relation of indifference or hostility between man and man which was one of the results of the Fall. Adam could not transmit that righteousness which he had forfeited by his sin, and man, left to the animal instinct of uncontrolled nature, became estranged from God and his fellow-man. As his higher intelligence was obscured, his affections were contracted. Self-preservation and assertion absorbed the energies due to the honour of his Maker and the care of his brethren. Had Adam never fallen, all the members of the human family might have been united in affection. But the withdrawal of supernatural grace at the Fall meant the insurgence of selfish passion, and the blood of Abel and question of Cain mark the new relations between man and man.

1. Cain's question represents the spirit of the old heathen world. Every nation, tribe, class lived for itself. Self-interest was the only bond which kept them together. Even religion, which by love of a common Father in heaven, should unite those divided by race or prejudice—even religion, when it had degenerated into polytheism, accentuated the divisions of the human family. Every country had its own religion, and a national god was not responsible for—if indeed he could do anything—beyond the frontiers of his worshippers. So Benhadad's advisers urged an engagement with the forces of Israel in the plain, since they imagined that the power of the God of Israel was confined to the hills; and this difficulty of conceiving of a deity with more than a local or national sway led the heathen philosopher Celsus to say that a man must be mad who could suppose that Greeks and barbarians, Europeans and Asiatics and Africans, could ever be united in the same religion. Thus paganism did nothing to restore fellowship among men. The only efforts made to bring men together in the ancient world were made by conquest, and not based on the duty of man to man. The ancient world was a world without love. It made

much of liberality, but it lacked charity. Men gave generously to the State, to their birthplace, their friends, or fellow-citizens. They constructed public works or distributed corn. But when Christian charity thinks of the recipient, pagan liberality thought of the giver, of political end or ambitions. Charity is at bottom self-denying—liberality was self-seeking. Large sums were distributed, but very little done for the sick or destitute, unless some great calamity called forth exceptional efforts.

2. It was the Mosaic law which first said, 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself'; and 'the stranger which dwelleth among you shall be as one born among you. Thou shalt love him as thyself.' The picture of a good man in the Psalms generally insists on this side of human duty. Job is called 'a father of the poor.' The Proverbs tell us that he that hath mercy on the poor honoureth God. The Prophets contain passages quite foreign to the spirit of paganism. Thus Isaiah says, 'Is not this the fast that I have chosen? to loose the bands of wickedness, to undo the heavy burdens, and to let the oppressed go free, and that ye break every yoke? Is it not to deal thy bread to the hungry, and that thou bring the poor that are cast out to thy house? when thou seest the naked, that thou cover him; and that thou hide not thyself from thine own flesh?' But a narrow feeling of nationality set in after the Captivity. The later Jew answered the question, Who is my neighbour? in the narrowest sense. He even excluded the Samaritan. Charity became formal and restricted. The Talmud said that alms should neither be given to, nor accepted from, the heathen, since they were not entitled to kindness or compassion.

3. If our Lord had not come among us, the obligations of human brotherhood would have been repudiated to the end. He might have said, 'Am I the keeper of a corrupt and rebellious race?' He might have chosen to remain in the glory which He had with the Father before the world was. But He came to be born, to obey, to suffer and die; to take on Himself all the humiliations and sorrows, crimes and degradations, of man's fallen estate. He made Himself the Keeper and Saviour of humanity. Sinners see in Him their representative and propitiation before the awful purity of God, and His blood has a significance which they cannot mistake. Abel's blood recalls the word of the murderer; the blood of

Jesus is that of the Shepherd of souls, dying of His free-will, not only for His brethren, but for His enemies.

And this event is the turning-point in the history of the moral education of the human race. Beneath His cross we understand, at length, how He would have construed Cain's phrase 'my brother.' They are everywhere our brethren, because He, our Elder Brother, died for all. Not only the respectable and the civilized, but the outcast and the savage, all have been objects of that world-embracing guardianship, and in some sense each of us, like the Divine Redeemer, is his brother's keeper.

#### ILLUSTRATIONS.

THIS is the very gospel of selfishness, and a murderer is its first preacher. Nowadays it is preached in various forms, not by murderers, but by those who seek the good of their kind. The gospel of selfishness is, that man must take care of his own interests; and out of that universal self-seeking, provided it be wise and restrained, will come the well-being of all. The gospel of God is of a different tone—'Holy Father, keep through Thine own name those whom Thou hast given Me, that they may be one as we are. . . . And for their sakes I sanctify Myself [offer Myself] that they also might be sanctified through the truth.' Christ regarded men as given into His hand for safe keeping. And to make them holy and at peace with God, He consecrated, or, as we read, sanctified Himself upon the cross; and so departed, leaving them this new commandment, binding them for ever, that as He had loved them, so they were to love one another.—W. THOMSON.

THAT there is an almost shoreless sea of misery around us, which rolls up its dark waves to our very doors; that thousands live and die in the dim borderland of destitution; that little children wail and starve and perish, and soak and blacken soul and sense, in our streets; that there are hundreds and thousands of the unemployed, not all of whom, as some would persuade us, are lazy impostors; that the demon of drink still causes among us daily horrors which would disgrace Dahomey or Ashantee, and rakes into his coffers millions of pounds which are wet with tears and red with blood: these are facts patent to every eye. Now, God will work no miracle to mend these miseries. If we neglect them, they will be left uncured; but He will hold us responsible for the neglect. It is vain for us to ask, 'Am I my brother's keeper?'—F. W. FARRAR.

A WRITER in one of the English reviews relates that during a conversation with George Eliot, not long before her death, a vase toppled over on the mantelpiece. The

great writer quickly and unconsciously put out her hand to stop its fall. 'I hope,' said she, replacing it, 'that the time will come when we shall instinctively hold up the man or woman who begins to fall as naturally and unconsciously as we arrest a falling piece of furniture or an ornament.'

'Two things a master commits to his servant's care,' saith one—'the child and the child's clothes.' It will be a poor excuse for the servant to say at his master's return, 'Sir, here are all the child's clothes neat and clean, but the child is lost.' Much so with the account that many will give to God of their souls and bodies at the great day.—FLAVEL.

IT is in the destroying the image of God that lies the essence of murder: that is the peculiar characteristic of the crime which makes it the horrible thing that it is. And if that be so, then it follows that whoever destroys the image of God in the soul of another is marked with the brand of Cain. The image of God is stamped upon every soul born into the world. That image is, since the Fall, marred and defaced, it is true; but still it is there. The work of God the Holy Ghost is the restoration of that image, the bringing it out more and more brightly, clearly, and distinctly. Ah! then the question, looked at from this point of view, becomes invested with a meaning of terrible importance—Where is Abel, thy brother? What have I done to help forward that work of the restoration of the image of God in the soul of my brother? Have I done anything to hinder that work, or to obscure that image.—W. C. INGRAM.

THEN Christ sought out an artizan,  
A low-browed, stunted, haggard man,  
And a motherless girl whose fingers thin  
Pushed from her faintly want and sin.  
These led He in the midst of them,  
And as they drew back their garments' hem  
For fear of defilement, 'Lo! here,' said He,  
'The images ye have made of Me.'—LOWELL.

#### Sermons for Reference.

- Alford (H.), Sermons, 1.  
Bersier (E.), Sermons, i. 3.  
Brooks (G.), Five Hundred Outlines, 277.  
Cumming (J.), Church before the Flood, 186.  
Dover (T. B.), Lent Manual, 5.  
Farrar (F. W.), Sermons (Contemp. Pub.), 1.  
Goodwin (H.), Parish Sermons, iv. 272.  
Hathaway (E. P.), Ten Commandments and Lord's Prayer, 83.  
Ingram (W. C.), Happiness in the Spiritual Life, 228.  
Liddon (H. P.), Sermons, ii. 1.  
Melvill (H.), Sermons on Less Prominent Facts, 286.  
Sinclair (W.), Christ and Our Times, 297.  
Spurgeon (C. H.), Sermons, vol. xxiv. No. 1399.  
Thomson (W.), Life in the Light of God's Word, 200.