

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

it rings true to the Word of God. Fourthly, it emphasizes the immediate acceptance of Christ. And fifthly, it is preaching that is preached with the confident expectation that results will follow.

Pass to Bishop Thoburn, of Delaware. The speaker, says Bishop Thoburn, should realize that he represents Jesus Christ, not figuratively, but in actual fact. He should choose no topic that would not be worthy of his Master. He should take pains to be intelligible. He should illustrate his preaching all the year round by mighty works in simple garb. He should avoid reading his sermons, *if possible*. The italics are the Bishop's own. He should not make his pulpit quite so necessary to him as a shell is to a turtle.

But what do the women say? Are they preachers, these three women? We think not. They would be easier with the preacher. One of them repeats the anecdote that a lady once said to an eloquent preacher, 'Dr. C., when I see you out of the pulpit I think you ought never to go into it; and when I see you in the pulpit I think you ought never to come out of it.' Another assures us that the preacher believes Miss B. when she tells him that the sermon was 'so beautiful'; but it did not teach her the beauty of holiness. And the third preaches to preachers from the text, 'Let preachers learn first to show piety at home.' (1 Ti 5⁴).

The 'Record.'

With the first day of May the *Record* appears with many features that are new, though the number of them is not so great that we are no longer able to recognize 'the Church's oldest newspaper.'

First of all there are two contributed articles on the Licensing Bill, the one by Sir Thomas P. Whittaker, M.P., the other ('A Brewer's View') by Edwyn Barclay, Esq. Then, passing the familiar London Letter, we have another feature of which the title at least is new, 'Last Sunday's Sermon.' Next, the Report of the R.T.S. Annual Meeting. After that a contributed article of the familiar and solid kind, on 'Mr. Tomlinson's Reply to the Five Bishops.' Whereupon we come to a letter to the Editor, on which there is a Leading Article, a letter signed by 102 names, almost all of them known even beyond the borders of the Church of England, a letter of thanksgiving for what the *Record* has been in the past, of confidence also for the future. There are other letters as usual. And on the next page there is found the first of a series of articles on 'Stewards of the Lord,' this first article being written by the Bishop of Durham. Principal Griffith Thomas continues his column 'In Conference.' The reviews are henceforth to be signed. The first review in this number is on Bennett's *Post-Exilic Prophets*; it is signed by Dr. Sinker. And we have not seen a more conscientious review of that book anywhere, or a more encouraging. For hitherto the *Record* has given small entertainment to that study of the Old Testament which is miscalled Higher Criticism. But here Dr. Sinker, one of the most conservative of scholars, recognizes, just because he is a scholar, the worth of this new book to the minister of the Word, and has no hard words for its criticism.

These are not all the new features of the new *Record*. But these are enough to show that the chief organ of evangelical Christianity in the Church of England is fit for a place beside the few great religious weeklies of the world.

The Archaeology of the Book of Genesis.

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

Paradise and the Fall (Gn 2⁴⁻³).

ii. 4. The beginning of this verse is the rendering of the Babylonian formula prefixed or appended to a list of persons or things. Thus the list of the names of the kings whose names are explained in *W.A.I.* v. 44. 20, has: *annutum sarrê sa arki abubi ana akhames la sadhru*, 'these are the kings

after the deluge whose names are not written in successive order.' The Heb. תולדות, *tôl dôth*, answers to the Assyrian *tâlidât*, and refers us to the fourth line of the Assyrian Epic, where it is said that Tiamât 'was the begetter (*muallidat*) of them all.' The verse thus presupposes an evolu-

tionary cosmogony similar to that of the Introduction to the Epic, and is a translation of an Assyrian *annâti tâlidât samâmi u irtsiti ina bânê-sin ina yûmi sa ilâni Yâû irtsita u samâma epus.* The phrase *ina yûmi* (-su, etc.) 'in (that) day,' *ina yûmi (sa)* 'in the day (that),' is characteristically Assyrian in the sense of 'at that time,' 'at the time when.' The omission of the article before 'earth' and 'heavens,' thus turning them into the equivalent of proper names, also points to an Assyrian prototype; see note on i. 24. The sentence, 'In the day when the Lord God made earth and heavens' is parallel to the beginning of the Epic: 'At the time when above unnamed were the heavens.'

Jahweh.—Yau or Yahu as the name of a West Semitic deity was already known in Babylonia in the Khammu-rabi age, when we find in a contract tablet the name of Yaum-ilu (the later Jo-el), 'Yahu is God' (see THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, ix. (1898), p. 522). The name continued to be used there throughout the Kassite period (1780–1200 B.C.), since legal documents discovered at Nippur contain the names Yaû-bani, 'Yahu has created me,' Yaua or Jehu, Yaû-irtsitu, 'Yahu is the Earth-goddess,' Yavu, Ya-â-û, Ya-a-u, and Ya-e-a, as well as the feminine Yaûtum, corresponding with the Hebrew יהוה, *Jahweh*, as Yaû does with יהו and יה (see A. T. Clay, *Documents from the Temple of Nippur*, xv. (1906), Series A). Yaûtum, though feminine in form, is used as a masculine as well as a feminine name, thus explaining how יהוה while continuing feminine in form could yet denote a male deity. Cp. also the Ashtar-Chemosh of the Moabite Stone, where the goddess Ashtar or Istar has been identified with the god Chemosh, the supreme divinity of the Moabites.

The union of 'Yahweh' and 'Elohim' in this chapter and the next has long been a puzzle. The usual explanation that it is an editorial combination intended to identify the Elohim of the first chapter with the Yahweh of the succeeding ones does not explain why it should have been employed more than once, or if it were employed more than once why it should be suddenly discarded at the end of the third chapter. Assyrian, however, is read from left to right instead of from right to left like Hebrew, and since in an Assyrian text the name of Yahu must have been preceded by the ideograph of 'God,' which in Canaan was

pronounced *ilâni* (see note on i. 1), it is possible that the combination Yahweh-Elohim is due to reading the original cuneiform text in the Hebrew direction (from right to left). If Dr. Lindl's explanation of the Hebrew form (Amraphel) of the name of Khammu-rabi is right, it would have resulted from the same cause, *ilu* Ammurapi being read Ammurapi-ilu.

It must also be remembered that Yau is made the equivalent of Ilu, not only in the name of the Hamathite king, which is written indifferently Yau-bihdi and Ilu-bihdi by Sargon, but also in the lexical tablets (83, 1–18, 1332, *Obv.* ii. 1), where *ilu* is explained by Yau. Yau, in fact, was so well known to the Babylonians as to have received a native etymology from *yau*, 'myself' (*ibid.* and K 2040, 17–22, where the divine names [Bâ]-ru and Bîru are given as the equivalents not only of 'the god Yau,' but also of the pronoun *yau*).

5. 'And no plant of the field had as yet been in the earth,' etc. The 'and' has no construction, there being nothing in the previous verse, which is merely the title of a cosmogony, that can be connected by a copulative conjunction with what follows. After the title we ought to have an account of the generative process to which the title relates. It is obvious, therefore, that this account has been omitted, though the conjunction which originally bound v.⁵ to it has been allowed to remain. The reason of the omission is also obvious. It was opposed to the whole teaching of chapter 1, according to which there was no evolutionary generation but a series of special acts of creation. It was not opposed, however, to the statement of the title that Yahweh-Elohim 'made earth and heavens' any more than the Sumerian poem of the Creation, which similarly ascribed the creation to Merodach (or Ea), was opposed to it. The present creation alone was the work of the personal Creator, but this had been preceded by an evolutionary process, described in the Introduction to the Epic, which represented the 'generations' of the existing heaven and earth, and to which the Creator Himself owed His origin. Between the title, 'These are the generations of the heavens and the earth when they were created,' with the introductory statement, 'On the day when Yahweh-Elohim made earth and heavens,' and the beginning of the fifth verse, the whole story of the 'generations' has dropped out.

The reeds and marsh plants of the Epic are here

replaced by the 'plant' and 'herb of the field,' since the earlier history of the generating process has been passed over and we are now at the point where the existing earth has already appeared and is fit for cultivation by man. The Heb. שררה is the Babylonian *siddu*, the technical name of the 'bank' of the Tigris and Euphrates, which, like the bank of the Nile in Egypt, originally constituted the cultivated part of Babylonia. Thence it was extended to denote the whole of the cultivated 'field' or *tsêru*, called *edinna* or *edin* in Sumerian. The Hebrew phrase is translated from a Babylonian *u gimir sammê sa siddi la yutsâ ina irtsiti û gimir isbi sa siddi la isikha* (or, perhaps, *û sammû sa siddi kalama*, etc.). *Yutsâ ina irtsiti* here has the idiomatic meaning 'sprang from the earth'; the Hebrew writer, however, has given *ina* its more usual signification of 'in,' the earth, as in Gn. 1¹¹, being conceived of as a fruitful mother in whose womb lay the seeds of vegetation. This misapprehension of the meaning of the Assyrian idiom (which would be natural in Palestine, where the rain alone caused the vegetation to spring out of the ground) has destroyed the sense of the words that follow, since, as the 'inundation' took the place of rain, the want of rain was no reason why 'the plant of the field' should not have been already 'in the earth.' But it could not spring 'out of the earth' until the flood-waters had been drained away from the surface and the soil made fit for the reception of rain and cultivation. *Isikha* is the verb to which שיה is the corresponding substantive.

The Heb. הַמְטִיר, *himtir*, 'had caused (it) to rain,' answers to *yusaznanû (samûtu)*, '(Samas) will cause (the clouds) to rain' in the Babylonian Deluge story. The Babylonian original of the line would have been *ki Yaû ilâni la yusaznina (samûtu) eli irtsiti û adamu yânu ana kharâri (?) qaqqara*. 'The earth' or 'land' will be the land of Babylonia which was irrigated by the inundation of the Tigris and Euphrates, the winter rains not coming until the most important part of the agricultural work of the year had been performed.

6. Mist.—This 'inundation' (E.V. 'mist') was called *êdû*, which was borrowed from the Sumerian *ede*, 'flood,' and is here transliterated אַד, 'êd. *Saqû* was the technical term for 'irrigating' the Babylonian plain; we have the causative of it in one of Sargon's inscriptions, *ki gibis êdê . . . susqû*, 'irrigate with plenty of flood-water.' The Baby-

lonian original of the verse was *û êdû ina irtsiti itelâ-ma yusasqû kullat (or kal) pân qaqqari*, where the Hebrew translator has misunderstood the preposition *ina*, which after *elû*, 'to ascend,' means 'from,' not 'in.' The waters of the annual inundation mounted up from above the land and irrigated the whole of it, without rain being necessary, as in Palestine.

7. The Heb. יָצַר, *yâzar*, is the same word as the Assyrian *êsturu*, which signifies 'to mould' an image or bas-relief. A fragmentary Babylonian legend relating to the hero Atarpi (?) describes (col. iv. ll. 3-14) how at the bidding of the creator-god Ea, the goddess Mami took clay (*dhidhdhi*) and after kneading it moulded out of it seven figures of men and seven of women, laying a brick between them. Thus, the story adds, *utsurate sa nisi-ma yutsar Mami*, 'Mami moulded the forms of mankind,' where the goddess is transformed into a male deity, the masculine form of the verb being used throughout. Similarly, in the Epic of Gilgames, the goddess Aruru is said to have created Ea-bani by 'washing her hands, pinching off clay and throwing it upon the ground.' In the Sumerian poem of the Creation, Aruru is associated with Merodach (or Ea) in making 'the seed of mankind'; in the Hebrew narrative all trace of the goddess—the *alittu* or 'begetter,' as the Babylonians called her—has necessarily disappeared. Perhaps the Assyrian prototype of the Hebrew verse was *Yaû ilâni epira sa qaqqari isbat-ma yutsar adama*.

Adamu has been found by M. Thureau-Dangin as a proper name in the legal tablets of the age of Sargon of Akkad (*Tablettes chaldéennes inédites*, p. 7, 1897), and the word is explained in the lexical tablets as the equivalent of *amelu* 'man.' It was borrowed from the Sumerian *adam*, 'mankind'; thus in the Sumerian poem of the Creation we have (l. 9) *eri nu-dim a-dam nu-mun-ya*, 'a city was not built, man (Ass. *nammassu*) stood not upright,' and a dating of King Rim-Anum, quoted by Scheil (*Rec. de Travaux*, xx. p. 65), is *mu Rim-Anum lugal . . . bi-ki u adam-bi*, 'the year when Rim-Anum (conquered) the land of . . . bi and its inhabitants.' In the traditions of Eridu the first man, who had been created by Ea, was named Adâmu. The name was at first read Ada-pa, but from a lexical tablet (*Z.A.* ix. p. 163. 6) which states that the character *pa* was pronounced *mu* when signifying 'man,' we learn that the true pronunciation was A-da-mu.

The **Breath of Life** corresponds with the Babylonian *baladh napisti; yuballidh napisti-su* is 'he gave life to his soul.' *Napistu* is used to denote 'a living creature' as well as 'life' or 'soul.'

The verse reminds us of the Egyptian representation of a god presenting the symbol of life to his

worshipper. In the Tel el-Amarna pictures the rays of the solar disc, the visible symbol of the omnipresent deity, are frequently made to end in the symbol which descends to the nose of the king or queen. At Abydos it is Anubis and Horus who present the symbol to the nostrils of Ramses II.

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF ST. LUKE.

LUKE XXIII. 34.

'And Jesus said, Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do.'—R.V.

EXPOSITION.

THESE are the first of the seven words from the Cross, of which three (vv. 34. 43. 46.) are recorded by St. Luke only, and three (Jn 19²⁷. 28. 30.) by St. John only. The last cry also began with the word 'Father.' The seven words are—

Lk 23³⁴. The prayer for the murderers.

Lk 23⁴³. The promise to the penitent.

Jn 19²⁷. The provision for the mother.

Mt 27⁴⁶, Mk 15³⁴. Eli, Eli, lama sabachthani?

Jn 19²⁸. The sole expression of human agony.

Jn 19³⁰. 'It is finished.'

Lk 23⁴⁶. 'Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit.'

Thus they refer to His enemies, to penitents, to His mother and disciple, to the agony of His soul, to the anguish of His body, to His work, and to His Heavenly Father.—FARRAR.

'And Jesus said.'—The prayer of v. 34 is wanting in some MSS. This omission is probably the result of accident; for the oldest translations, as well as the great majority of MSS, guarantee its authenticity; and the appeal of the thief for the grace of Jesus, a few moments later, cannot be well explained, except by the impression produced on him by the hearing of this filial invocation.—GODET.

FEW verses of the Gospels bear in themselves a surer witness to the truth of what they record than this first of the words from the Cross; but it need not, therefore, have belonged originally to the book in which it is now included. We cannot doubt that it comes from an extraneous source. Nevertheless, like 22⁴³, Mt 16²⁶, it has exceptional claims to be permanently retained, with the necessary safeguards, in its accustomed place.—WESTCOTT AND HORT.

'Father, forgive them.'—Is 53¹², 'He bare the sins of many, and made intercession for the transgressors.' These words were probably uttered at the terrible moment when the Sufferer was outstretched upon the cross and the nails were being driven through the palms of the hands.—FARRAR.

'For they know not what they do.'—The persons for whom this prayer is offered cannot be the Roman soldiers, who are blindly executing the orders which they have received; it is certainly the Jews, who, by rejecting and slaying their Messiah, are smiting themselves with a mortal blow (Jn 2¹⁹). It is therefore literally true, that in acting thus *they know not what they do*. The prayer of Jesus was granted in the forty years' respite during which they were permitted, before perishing, to hear the apostolic preaching. The wrath of God might have been discharged upon them at the very moment.—GODET.

THE SERMON.

Our Lord's Knowledge of Sin.

By the Rev. W. Robertson Nicoll, LL.D.

The dying Christ on His Cross ruled in the midst of His enemies. He was still Lord even when the darkest and most malignant passions were set free to do their worst. In His last agony His eyes were wide open. He saw all things as they really were. He saw beyond them and above them, and was kept in perfect peace.

His first thought even then was the ignorance of His enemies. When our love and pains are slighted, we think first of what the despisers know. We recall, and think they must recall, our deeds of patience and sacrifice. There is a double bitterness in our grief as these are remembered. Our Lord might well have thought of what His crucifiers knew, for assuredly they knew much. Judas knew that Christ was innocent. The high priests knew that they had compassed His murder by suborning perjury. The people knew that He had been their kindest and mightiest Friend. Pilate knew that he had found no fault in Him. They all knew, and yet they did not know; their ignorance was greater than their knowledge. When Stephen prayed for his murderers in the Spirit of Christ, he