

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

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[Issue]_[1st page of article].pdf

Hebrew Gihôn, the 'Stream,' is not known in Assyrian, and though there was a Sumerian word *gikhan*, meaning perhaps some kind of reed, which was borrowed by the Semitic Babylonians under the form of *gikhinnu*, it was never used of any of the Babylonian rivers. I would suggest, therefore, that the Hebrew *gikhôn* has been substituted for 'Sakhan in the passage of Genesis either by the original writer or by a copyist. The Gihon, we are told, 'compasseth the whole land of Cush' or the Kassi, the name under which the Babylonians were known in the age of the Tel el-Amarna tablets. What portion of the Euphrates, or which of the canals that flowed into it, was understood by the Babylonians under the name of 'Sakhan we do not at present know. I should mention that among the early Babylonian names collected by

Dr. Pinches are some compounded with the names of the deified rivers of the country; thus we have Mur-id-Edina, 'the man of the River of the Plain (Eden)'; Ibku-Idigla, 'the Tigris has given abundance.'

Ari.

Dr. Weissbach, in his *Babylonische Miscellen* (No. XI.), has published a syllabary from which we learn that the ideograph BUR-BUR, besides representing Uri or Ur, Assyrian Akkadû, and Tilla, Assyrian Urdhû or Ararat, also represented Ari, Assyrian Amurrû. Amurrû, the land of the Amorites, denoted Syria and Palestine, more especially the mountainous part of them, and in Ari I see a Sumerian (?) reproduction of the Canaanitish *har*, 'mountain.' Cp. Dt 1⁷. 19. 20. 24.

Bishop Lightfoot and Professor Ramsay on Early Calendars.

BY THE REV. M. A. POWER, S.J., EDINBURGH.

PROFESSOR RAMSAY does me the honour of agreeing with me as to the date of the martyrdom of Polycarp, 155 A.D. I thought that some months ago he showed leanings to 166 A.D. By incurring the censure of Dr. Ramsay, I may be thought to have removed myself 'out of the ranks of regular progressive scholarship.' I do not think I have—but this is only an hypothesis of mine, and Dr. Ramsay is a little hard on my hypotheses. He calls on me to prove my theory of the 'great Sabbath' to the satisfaction of the 'authorities on that branch of study.' To begin with, I should be thankful to learn who these 'authorities' are. Will the Professor name one? For years I have been looking for them among Jews and Christians, and my diligent search has not yet been rewarded. There is no lack of writers on the technicalities of the Jewish Calendar. They range from the Mishnah and Maimonides to Cyrus Adler and Poznański, and from Clement of Alexandria to Dr. Margoliouth. Professor Ramsay will surely not expect me to mention Lightfoot in this connexion, nor yet the great 'authority' known as the *Jewish Encyclopedia*, which, in the article

'Calendar,' wisely or unwisely, shrinks from making the least reference to the difficulty of difficulties about the week-days eligible for the Passover. Of each and all of the scores of 'authorities' I have consulted, the Professor might write as he writes of my view on the 'great Sabbath': 'Mr. Power's theory must rank at present as one among many theories.' Quite so. The call for evidence where only hypothesis is accessible is like the cry of the child for the moon. Moonshine is all that he will ever get out of that luminary, and hypothesis is all that Dr. Ramsay can require from me or anybody else. If evidence were to be had, it would surely have been forthcoming from abler students than myself. I make no claim to have overleaped the misty bounds of hypothesis and to have passed into the cloudless region of evidence; and I am confident that Dr. Ramsay is equally modest. But in the use of my poor hypothesis, I have tried to follow an authority in logical methods, J. S. Mill. I have applied my view to ascertained facts, and it has not been found in conflict with them. Had it been otherwise, I should have frankly abandoned it. Had it been proved to be the only

rational explanation of the facts, I should have re-named my hypothesis and called it a 'proof,' without provoking the displeasure of Dr. Ramsay, I hope. But presuming that the Professor has looked up my references, is it quite fair, I ask, to level all distinctions of rank between hypothesis and hypothesis, and to call each of them 'one of many,' *sine addito*? Of two guesses, one may have something to recommend it,—the other, nothing. Will Dr. Ramsay criticise my criticism of Lightfoot's dogmatic utterance on the 'great Sabbath'? This is a pre-Christian Jewish phrase, and what in the name of Jewish liturgy has Lightfoot's Christian Easter to do with it? Before opening fire on my unoffending hypothesis, the Professor should have read the generous words from a well-known pen in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for June: 'It is by good guesses that progress is made, and we are content to take the misses with the hits.'

Worse than my respectful refusal to comply with the impossible request for evidence is my 'extraordinarily erroneous statement' regarding the number of days in the Asian month, Dius. 'A student of the Asian Calendar'—can that be myself?—is rated because he was ignorant that Dius contained 31 days. I am ignorant of it still. No Asian month of any Asian Calendar contained more than 30 days. I would ask Dr. Ramsay to avert his gaze for a moment from the object of his admiration and mine, the illustrious Bishop of Durham, and to turn to the pages of Fathers Strassmaier and Epping, S.J., on the Babylonian Calendar, Burnaby on the Mohammedan Calendar, the Jew Lindo on the Jewish Calendar, and the old Jesuit Petavius on all Calendars, Eastern and Western, in the great work *De Doctrina Temporum*, which Lightfoot would have done well to consult before committing himself to the 'extraordinarily erroneous statement,' commended by Dr. Ramsay as a 'fact,' that an Asian month was composed of 31 days. The alleged fact, we are further told, has been proved by Lightfoot 'in a perfectly convincing way.' After long and reverent study of Lightfoot, I must protest against a style of panegyric which is little better than a travesty of logic. If Dr. Ramsay will devote a little study to the works above named, together with Wolf's standard *Handbuch der Astr.*, he will find (1) that in all civilizations of the East the length of a lunation was determined with extraordinary accuracy, and

(2) that no early observers or calendar-makers so far departed from their scientific calculations as to give a month so large a number of days, that its relation with a lunation would be thereby seriously disturbed.

The very grave mistake made by Lightfoot, and copied too faithfully by Dr. Ramsay, is easily explained. I now repeat that through neglect of the elementary principle of the 'Brought Forward' day, explained in my last article (THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, April), Lightfoot has been led to attribute 31 days to Dius. His 'perfectly convincing way' may be put thus—

$$A + A + B + \Gamma + \Delta + \dots \Lambda (\text{τριακάς}) = 31 \text{ days.}$$

This is so, if we count the two *alphas* as falling fully within the numerical range of Dius. That they never so fell is clear from all the known calendars of Asia, especially the Babylonian and Jewish. On all principles of analogy, the above equation must be revised in this form—

$$[A. \textit{Brought Forward.}]$$

$$A + B + \Gamma + \Delta + \dots \Lambda (\text{τριακάς}) = 30 \text{ days.}$$

That Lightfoot has serious misgivings about the correctness of his own conclusion touching the alleged 31 days, is evidenced by a passage which shows that he was acquainted with the repugnance of Easterns to the number 31 as applied to a month. On lunar principles they were quite right. But how does the Bishop explain their objection? I am sorry to say in a most unconvincing and unscientific way, to which I invite Dr. Ramsay's attention. It would seem that the Asians had recourse to some tricky method of defrauding Dius of the 31st day. 'It seems to have been a superstition in these parts that the last day of the month should be *τριακάς*, the 30th.' The theory of 'superstition' to account for a universal and fairly scientific process amongst Eastern astronomers is, I submit, utterly unworthy of the reputation of a great scholar. The *deus ex machinâ*, awarding a 31st day, stands confessed. The extra day, which was unknown to the Asians proper, though introduced afterwards by Asian Romanizers, is the somewhat discreditable creation of Lightfoot, and the champion who espouses his cause here, has taken on himself a heavy responsibility. When lecturing me on the necessity of giving proofs, Dr. Ramsay might cast an eye on another offender, who is perhaps in sorer need than I. Yet the 31st day is roundly stated by the Professor to be 'the

fact from which Mr. Power must start.' I really must decline the advice with thanks. The facts attached to all lunar reckonings in the East are more to me than the bare word of Lightfoot. I must again remind Dr. Ramsay that I am speaking of an Asian month in an Asian Calendar, and not of Græco-Roman inscriptions, nor of the special pleadings of Galen the Pergamene for Roman reform, nor of Romanizing influences which, after conquering continents, found it a fairly easy task to capture calendars, by the introduction of their solar methods, and their 31st day, and their lordly practice of adorning the old Asian months with titles such as 'Cæsar' and 'Tiberius.' This was well known before Dr. Ramsay came across the *Mittheilungen*, etc., for 1899.

That the Asian months were in places forced to take something like a Roman mould at the time of Christ and after, I do not deny, but I ask for proofs that the transformation was abruptly or completely effected. We know from the pages of Lecky how England stood out against the Gregorian reform, as Russia does still. Was the East less conservative? The Asian Calendar died hard. Josephus, who lived after Christ, always regarded Xanthicus, the month in which Polycarp died, as a strictly lunar month. How far the Romans failed to tamper with the calendary methods of Asia, is admitted by no less an 'authority' than Lightfoot himself: 'They [the Asiatic and Ephesine months] are a strict reproduction of the Julian Calendar, even to the retention of a month of 28 days, but with these exceptions: (1) the Epheso-Asiatic months commence 8 days before the corresponding Julian months; thus *Dius*, corresponding to October, commences September 23rd; *Xanthicus*, corresponding to March, commences February 21st; and so with the others. (2) The year commences not in mid-winter, but about the time of the autumnal equinox. (3) The months bear different names.'

This is a strange kind of 'strict reproduction.' One might as well say that, with the aid of a little letter-change and the free application of Grimm's Law, the name *Gaius* is a 'strict reproduction' of *Cæsar*.

Not more successful is Lightfoot's attempt to prove from inscriptions that the Asian Calendar, in the early Christian era, was entirely superseded

by the Julian. I simply ask Dr. Ramsay to say if the Lightfoot hypothesis is proved from Böckh's *Corpus* or from any other source. I note, in passing, that the stone-cutter who wrote *Εἰουλίωv* (June) is corrected by Lightfoot and made to write *Εἰουλίωv* (July). This will be a somewhat severe shock to Dr. Ramsay's belief in inscriptions, and what will the Jewish scholar, Dr. Steinschneider, say to it?

Something must be added about Lightfoot's appeal to Galen, the scientific champion of the superiority of the Roman methods of calculation. Galen has a strong case in favour of sun *versus* moon, and conducts it with marked ability. See the passage in *Medicorum Græc. Opp.*, vol. xvii. pars i. p. 21, ed. Kühn (1828). Lightfoot makes Galen say that 'all the Asiatic cities' prefer the sun to the moon as the ruler of months, but, like Wieseler and Kühn, he has misgivings about the reading *Ἀσιανῶv*, which is perhaps a corruption. Finally, siding with Ussher, he adopts it in preference to *ἀρχαίων*, as 'doubtless correct,' against Kühn, whose textual authority is as good as Lightfoot's. Then he goes on: 'It will be observed that Galen leaves no room for exceptions, when he classes all the Asiatic cities among those who use the solar calendar.' Is this reasoning, based on a passage that may be corrupt, 'perfectly convincing'? With some touch of compunction, Lightfoot proceeds to qualify his sweeping assertion: 'It seems tolerably certain that they had altogether discarded the lunar calendar. The term "Asiatics," however, must at all events comprise Proconsular Asia, whether we allow it a wider range or not. Ephesus and Smyrna would therefore be included not less than his [Galen's] native Pergamon.' Is this reasoning conclusive, I ask? It is strange that Galen, the loyal provincial, should be to the pains of indicating the grave disadvantages attendant on lunar methods and the immense benefits of the solar style of Imperial Rome, if he was preaching to a Proconsulate already converted to the latter. It is, I submit, unsafe to generalize from the words of Galen, especially as his *Ἀσιανῶv*, if he ever wrote it, appears as *Ἀσιανῶv ἡμετέρων* in *op. cit.* p. 23. And will Dr. Ramsay give us the 'many other nations' who, according to Galen, had discarded lunar for solar reckoning? The great physician protests too much. The substitution of sun for moon was a Roman feat, but it was not effected in a day. As the Romans captured the

Jewish horology, so they annexed the Asian menology, but they took their time about it. Xanthicus survived to Polycarp's day.

I am blamed for saying that the calendar he died under was not de-Asianized or Romanized

then. My assertion is such that 'no person is likely to spend time in refuting it.' Perhaps not; for time is precious, and, in Dr. Ramsay's eyes, I am no better than the folks in Juvenal—

Nos viles pulli, nati infelicibus ovis.

At the Literary Table.

THE ATONEMENT.

THE CHRISTIAN IDEA OF ATONEMENT. The Angus Lectures for 1903. By T. Vincent Tymms, D.D. (St. And.), Principal of Rawdon College. (*Macmillan*. 7s. 6d.)

THE greatest books do not make the greatest sensation. This is the greatest modern book on the Atonement, but we know that it will be quietly received and quietly make its impression.

Dr. Vincent Tymms has been preparing all his life to write this book. He has read what other men have written on the Atonement. And he has kept himself acquainted with the thought which touches the Atonement on every side and from any distance. There is no quoting of recent books on the Atonement, no reference to authorities, or otherwise, in science. Dr. Tymms' knowledge of all the literature, scientific and theological, is seen in the ease with which he plants his foot on theological and scientific foundations, never stepping on a treacherous stone and never rejecting a steady one.

The doctrine of the Fall is probably the greatest difficulty at present to the dilettante in theology and science. Dr. Tymms says: 'The religious significance of the story does not depend upon any particular view of man's origin, because it represents a process which must have been experienced by the human race to bring it into the position it occupies to-day. Whether man reached the height from which a moral fall was possible by a momentary act of creation, which endowed him with adequate faculties and knowledge, or whether he reached it as the issue of immeasurable ages of evolution, the time arrived when he became capable of religious thought and feelings, and conceived the idea of One above, to whom he owed allegiance.'

But Dr. Tymms shows how great his book is, in

the place he assigns to Love. That word is the key to the Atonement. For in the Atonement the deepest difficulty is its date. It is not *Cur Deus Homo?* nor *Quomodo?* Not why did God become man, nor how did He make the Atonement? It is the time chosen for the Incarnation and the Cross. If God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself, why did He not appear in Christ till 'these last days'? The answer is in the nature of Love. All was done that we might love—the Creation, the daily providence, Calvary. But love cannot be hurried. Even God must wait on love. He did what He could. 'Judge, I pray you, betwixt me and my vineyard. What could have been done more to my vineyard that I have not done to it?' The husbandmen had to receive the messengers whom the Lord of the Vineyard sent to receive the fruits, and beat them and send them away empty, *before the Son could be sent.*

The clever debater answers, You are but pushing the difficulty back, not resolving it. Why was man made with a nature that depended on so shy a thing as Love? But there is an easy answer to that. It is because of the greatness of man. Man with a lower endowment than the highest is impossible, impossible for God to make, impossible for man to conceive. 'We love,' says John. It is the greatest saying ever uttered of us. 'We love because He first loved us,' is its only explanation. And how could He love us, exercising His own great heart on us, without endowing us with the capacity to return it?

Sing Christina Rossetti's chant of Love. If it is not in your hymnal, your hymnal lacks the purest expression of worship—

Love is all happiness, love is all beauty,
Love is the crown of flaxen heads and hoary;
Love is the only everlasting duty;
And love is chronicled in endless story,
And kindles endless glory.