

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

force himself, or the title of his book, with the point of interrogation coming curiously into the middle of it—*New(?) Theology* (Stock; 5s.)—is more complimentary than Bishop Gore. The whole purpose is to show that the New Theology is neither new nor true. But Dr. Wilberforce declares that the sermons were delivered as answers to questions put to him by members of his congregation who desired to know what the New Theology meant.

Mr. Fisher Unwin has published an abridgement of Seignobos's *Histoire de la Civilisation*. Why did he not publish a complete translation? The abridgement is good so far as it goes. It has evidently been made with skill and care. But it is too general, too superficial; it never gets down into the heart of things; it never entertains us with any of the little nothings that make up life. It is all nice green grass: there are no flowers or walks or shady corners; and even green grass is wearisome if everywhere. We do not say that a *History of Ancient Civilization* (5s. net) could not be written within this compass. We believe the author of this abridgement could have done it, and we wish he had done so instead of abridging Seignobos.

Messrs. Watts have published a selection from Sir A. C. Lyall's *Asiatic Studies* (6d.). The selection is taken partly from the volume of 1882, and partly from that of 1899.

The R.P.A. Annual for 1908 (Watts; 6d. net) contains articles by the Hon. John Collier (on Huxley), Mr. Joseph McCabe (on Evolution), Mr.

R. Blatchford (on himself), and others. It is not at all a dangerous periodical, and it gives the best possible account of the things which it enters into the heart of a rationalist to conceive.

Professor Kirsopp Lake, of Leiden, is a most loyal as well as courageous scholar. He succeeded Van Manen, but refused to enter into his traditions. He defends the authorship of the Pauline Epistles, as any Oxford-trained scholar might be expected to do.

His new book is an investigation of *The Historical Evidence for the Resurrection of Jesus Christ* (Williams & Norgate; 5s.). We must observe its limits. For Professor Lake frankly admits that his results, 'though moderately conservative in the region of literary criticism, are nevertheless an entire abandonment of the central doctrine of Christianity—the unique and miraculous character of the resurrection.' And no one need be dismayed or even surprised at that. Belief in the resurrection of Christ from the dead has never been, and was never meant to be, established upon the historical evidence alone. The historical evidence may be a help, and it may be a hindrance. That will depend to a considerable extent upon what Professor James calls a man's philosophy of life. We should have been glad if a scholar of Professor Lake's training had come to a different conclusion, but, we say, we are not in the least dismayed. And we are able sincerely to thank him for the thoroughness of his investigation, and for the entire absence of the words that wound, or even of that superiority of tone which is more common and more offensive than wounding words.

The Archaeology of the Book of Genesis.

BY THE REV. A. H. SAYCE, D.D., LITT.D., PROFESSOR OF ASSYRIOLOGY, OXFORD.

Genesis i. 4-12.

4. With the light came the power of seeing, and what God saw was that the light was 'good.' We have a similar idea in the Sumerian poem of the Creation which emanated from Eridu, where the creator, after making mankind, 'the cattle of the field,' and the rivers of Babylonia, 'declared them

by name to be good'¹ (see my *Religions of Ancient Egypt and Babylonia*, pp. 380-1).

5. 'Now the darkness he had called night.' The darkness had existed from the first, and, consequently, from the mere fact of its existence, must

¹ *Sum-sina dhabis imbi.*

have had a name. The writer emphasizes the fact that this name had been given by the one Supreme Creator, and that the darkness accordingly was no self-evolved entity. With the naming of the day and night, which by that very fact came into existence, there necessarily came evening and morning and a 'first day.' The Assyrian order of the words would have been, 'morning and evening.' The Hebrew custom of reckoning from evening to evening was a relic of desert life, as it is to this day among the Arabs. It presupposes a lunar and not a solar calendar.

6. The Firmament.—As the creation of light corresponds with the evolution of the gods of light in the Assyrian Epic, so the creation of the 'firmament' corresponds with the next stage in the Assyrian story, the formation of the sky out of the body of Tiamât. All reference to the war in heaven is rigidly excluded, but the statement that the 'firmament' separated the upper from the lower 'waters' shows that the legend was known and intentionally ignored. In the Assyrian Epic we read that Merodach after the conquest of the dragon 'cut her in two like a flat fish—

of one half he made the overshadowing heavens:
he stretched the skin,¹ he set a watch,
bidding them see that her waters should not gush forth.'

Then 'he crossed the sky,' and examined the lower waters of the mundane deep, over which the god Ea presided and which were obedient to law. Here the Assyrian writer was hampered by the belief that the lower waters, being the domain of Ea, could not have been derived from the body of Tiamât, and so does not tell us what became of the other half of it: we learn, however, from the fragments of Berossus that the Babylonian form of the myth made Merodach create the heavens out of one half of the body, and the earth out of the other, which is probably a confused version of the statement that the one half formed the waters above the firmament, and the other half the waters below it which are upon the earth. In the Phœnician mythology the blood of the sky—that is, the rain—when mutilated by his son El, became the water of the springs and rivers. In any case, the 'waters' appear in the Hebrew narrative without anything being said as to their origin, though it is implied that they belonged to the *tehom* or 'deep.' The 'firmament' takes the place of the skin of Tiamât, which was stretched

¹ Or according to another reading, 'he drew the bolt.'

overhead so as to form the heavens, like the upper slice of a flat salted fish.

In the Babylonian story the visible sky had not as yet existed. This was not the case, however, in the cosmology of Genesis, where 'the heavens' had already been created. There is thus another inconsistency in the Biblical narrative due to its preserving the framework of the old Assyro-Babylonian cosmology while rejecting everything in it that savoured of polytheism. The 'heavens' necessarily included the firmament or visible sky, and went back to a Babylonian origin. Babylonian cosmology taught that there were several heavens, the highest of which was 'the heaven of Anu,' to which the gods retreated when the windows of the visible heaven were opened at the time of the Deluge.

8. Heaven.—The visible sky is called 'heavens,'—*i.e.* 'heaven,' like the plural *Elohim* for 'God,'—not 'the heavens,' which had already been created 'in the beginning' before there was any division of day from night.

9. 'The waters under the heaven.' These are the waters of the Ap'su or mundane deep, which is called 'the seat of Ea' in the Assyrian Epic. The Hebrew 'let the waters be collected into one place' is a translation of the Assyrian 'their waters were embosomed (*or* collected) together,' where *istenis* signifies 'in one place.' But whereas in the Assyrian Epic the waters were those of the primeval deep before the work of creation had begun, the Hebrew writer is careful to specify that the gathering of them together was the work of the Creator, not a process of evolution on the part of a semi-mythical monster. At the same time he preserves the cosmological theory which had originated at Eridu, according to which the dry land had risen out of the primeval sea. In the Sumerian poem of the Creation we read:

All the land was sea,
Then in the midst of the sea was a current.

Merodach (*originally* Ea) tied a palisade of reeds together
in front of the waters,
he formed dust and mixed it with the palisade,

and so the land was reclaimed from the waters. It will be noticed that even in this cosmology the silt that formed round the palisade was made by the Creator and not evolved out of the deep itself. The materialism of the Epic which made Tiamât 'the begetter' of everything was more thoroughgoing.

10. The 'one place' of the waters is here defined as a place by themselves distinct from the land, in opposition to the Epic which makes it the body or womb of Tiamât.

11. Once more the Epic is contradicted which states that the gathering of the waters into one place was not followed by the appearance of reed or marsh plant. On the other hand, the Sumerian poem ascribes the creation of 'grass, marsh plant, reed and rush,' as well as 'the green herb of the field,' to the demiurge after the earth had been formed.

The verse is written from a Palestinian and not a Babylonian point of view, there being no reference to the reeds and marsh plants, which would have occupied the first place in a Babylonian account of the vegetable creation. מִן, *min*, is borrowed from the Assyrian *minu*.

12. Since the herbs and trees were brought forth by the earth, there was no fresh creation by a special act of the Creator, and consequently no fresh day required for it. Hence the appearance of the land and the growth of vegetation are alike assigned to the same day.

The Pilgrim's Progress.

BY THE REV. JOHN KELMAN, M.A., D.D., EDINBURGH.

The Heart of Demas.

'COME and see,' says Demas. And why is he in so great an eagerness to get pilgrims to come and see? No doubt, in part, because his heart is in the mine, and he is keen for business. Yet behind that there lurks another reason. His conscience is not yet quite dead within him, and it is of great consequence to him to give it just this sop. The conduct of Christians is eagerly watched by a crowd of uneasy consciences. If they can but be induced to conform, then the questions and responsibilities which vex them are set at rest. The conforming Christian undertakes the burden of the dying consciences of souls almost lost, and sometimes robs them of their last hope.

The temptation of seeing—that ancient and modern temptation of 'the lust of the eyes'—is the subtlest of all temptations. Were there no connexion between eye and hand, it would be as innocent as it looks. Obviously (so says the tempter) there can neither be responsibility nor danger in simply looking on. But when sight has kindled imagination and desire, the man is no longer master of himself; and in the act of looking on he has thrown down his best defences. Marbot, the general of Napoleon, tells in his *Memoirs* of two clerks in the French War Office who had sold certain documents to the enemy. They were shot, and died cursing their betrayer, 'who, they said, had sought them out in their

garrets, and seduced them by the sight of a heap of gold, which he kept on increasing as long as they had any hesitation.' 'The love of money is the root of all evil,' said an old peasant in the north of Scotland, 'but they are right bonny flowers that grow from that root.'

It is in the light of all this subtle and pathetic weakness of human nature that such characters as that of Demas must be judged. He knows the fascination of the eyes, and the still more subtle fascination of what Bishop Blougram calls 'The dangerous edge of things,' and he deliberately trades upon these. He knows the danger, yet he will invite men to it, with all the air of careful respectability which some agent of a gambling-table company might assume, though but yesterday he had seen a suicide. His justification is that that way is 'not very dangerous, except to those who are careless.' He knows how large a percentage of men who look will go in, and how large a percentage of those who go in will come to ruin. Yet, like advocates of doubtful and dangerous things before and since, he imagines that he can refuse responsibility for their carelessness. It is their own affair. 'See thou to that,' said the chief priests to Judas.

Yet such a man hardly deceives himself. The facts are patent. George Herbert's lines are commonplace, so evident is the truth of them:

Man calleth thee his wealth, who made thee rich;
And while he digs out thee, falls in the ditch;