

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

all had been done that could by force be done to abolish Christianity; when the churches had been desecrated, and the priests massacred or expelled or driven into hiding—it occurred to the leaders that society could not go on without some kind of religion; and so they proceeded to persuade the National Convention to ‘decree’ (imagine that!) ‘the existence of the Supreme Being,’ and ‘the consolatory principle of the immortality of the soul,’ as ‘the basis of rational Republican Religion.’¹

(2) It must be a religion that recognizes the deepest fact of man’s being, his sense of guilt, and that endeavours to remove it.

(3) Christianity alone offers pardon and peace with sufficient means of bestowing them.

(4) Christianity alone gives power to stand.

(5) Christianity alone presents the encouragement of example, the example of One who was tempted in all points like as we are, yet without sin.²

6. THE CHRISTIAN ANSWER MUST BE MADE IN

¹ D. J. Vaughan, *Questions of the Day*, p. 177.

² See R. Leitch, *The Light of the Gentiles*, p. 146.

MEEKNESS AND IN FEAR. For (1) no answer is better than a bad answer; (2) an arrogant answer is bad; and (3) an irreverent answer is bad. That is to say, the Christian must fit himself for making his answer by knowing what his hope is, by having sufficient sympathy with man to make his answer acceptable, and by sufficient fear of God to make it true.

Bishop Blomfield used to tell a story of his having been once, late in life, at the University church at Cambridge, and of having seen a verger there whom he remembered when he was himself an undergraduate. The bishop said he was glad to see him looking so well at such a great age. ‘Oh yes, my lord,’ the man said, ‘I have much to be grateful for. I have heard every sermon which has been preached in this church for fifty years, and, thank God, I am a Christian still!’ Some of us Christianity repels rather than convinces when ‘put into a form that could be written out at examinations, or cross-examined in a court of law. After all the title is more than the title-deeds, and it is when we pierce beneath the surface that we get personal conviction and not the mere external authority of history or literature.’³

³ E. J. Hardy, *Doubt and Faith*, p. 30.

Recent Biblical Archaeology.

By STEPHEN LANGDON, M.A., Ph.D., Oxford.

Letters to Cassite Kings.⁴

THIS series contains two previous volumes of texts from the Cassite period, namely, vols. xiv. and xv., by Professor Clay, which include contracts, receipts, inventories of public property, lists of salaries for public officials, and various transactions of the state documents. Fortunately, nearly all of the 300 documents published by Clay could be dated. Clay’s contributions to the history of this period enable one to restore the great line of Cassite kings who succeeded *Burnaburiaš* as follows, *Kurigalzu*, *Nazi-maruttaš*, *Kadašman-Turgu*, *Kadašman-Enlil*, *Kudur-Enlil*, *Šagaraktišuriaš*, *Kaštaliašu*. Evidently serious troubles overtook the Babylonian state at the end of this period, for, so far as the archives of Nippur are concerned, Cassite documents cease to be found. Nabuna’id

(555–538) found the dedicatory cylinders of only two Cassite kings whose architectural works had survived, and both of these, *Burnaburiaš* and *Šagaraktišuriaš*,⁵ belong to the portion of the dynasty restored to us by the brilliant work of Clay. The Cassite dynasty numbered thirty-six rulers, who reigned, according to the Kings’ List, 576 years, of which the archives of Nippur and the accidental records of Nabuna’id mention but these eight as of great importance. One of them, *Burnaburiaš*, was already a familiar figure in history, being made famous by his letter to Amenophis III (?) of Egypt.

Dr. Radau now publishes 99 letters (some merely fragments) from the same period. Although such documents are never dated, yet it is *a priori* probable that, being from the same archives as the

⁴ *Letters to Cassite Kings*, by Hugo Radau, Babylonian Expedition of the University of Pennsylvania, Series A, vol. xvii. part 1.

⁵ *Burnaburiaš* rebuilt Ebarra of Larsa and *Šagaraktišuriaš* Eulmaš of Sippar.

texts published by Clay, they belong to the same period, when the affairs of the Cassite dynasty were prosperous. Moreover, many prominent officials in the business records appear as writers or recipients of letters in these new texts. We may therefore concede at once the main point at issue and assign the entire series to the period from *Burnaburiaš* to *Kaštiliaš*, or about 136 years. Radau, building upon the chronological notices of Nabuna'id dates this period 1450-1309, which is a half-century earlier than the dates assigned by Thureau-Dangin, Schnabel, Weisbach, Peiser, and others. The problem of Cassite chronology is notoriously complicated by contemporaneous Egyptian and Assyrian references, as well as by conflicting statements of the Babylonian records.¹ Radau starts with the now generally conceded date of Berossus for Hammurabi, 2130 B.C., and reckons 700 years to the end of the reign of Burnaburiaš, according to the Larsa cylinder of Nabuna'id, thus obtaining about 1423 (Radau) for the end of the reign of Barnaburiaš. Hilprecht has found a tablet from the 27th year of this (?) king which would fix his year of accession at 1450. Radau maintains, against the explicit statement of the Synchronous History, that Karaindaš reigned after Burnaburiaš, and that Kurigalzu, whom the Nippur archives (*ex silentio*) and the Synchronous History make the son² and direct successor of Burnaburiaš, was the son of Karaindaš. Karahardaš, son of *Muballīqat-Šerua* in the Synchronous History, he identifies with Kadašmanharbe, son of the same in Chronicle P. This identification I accept, and would reservedly admit the comparative accuracy of Nabuna'id.³ Following Radau also in the statement of the Sippar cylinder of Nabuna'id, who places Šagaraktišuriaš 800 years before his reconstruction of Eulmaš, and reckoning from about 540, one obtains 1340 for the approximate date of the accession of this king, making his date

¹ Schnabel's discussion in *M. V. G.*, 1908, I, 'Studien zur babyl.-assy. Chronologie,' appears to be wilfully subjective and often based upon absolute misstatements. For example, the Synchronous History does not say that Ašurbanipal revenged the murder of Karaindaš, but simply that he revenged him (p. 14).

² Radau explains *maru* as 'descendant,' which is of course possible.

³ I cannot accept Radau's reconstruction of the relationship of these kings. Following the Synchronous History I would give the dynasty thus: *Karaindaš*—1455; *Burnaburiaš* (brother of K.), 1455-1430; *Karahardaš* (son of K.), slain by the Cassites; *Kurigalzu* (son of B.), 1430-1405.

1340-1327 [Radau, 1331-1318]. I am inclined to accept this reconstruction with our author.

The letters fall into two classes, (a) those bearing the address *ana bēli-ia*, 'to my lord,' and (b) letters addressed to officials named in the letter. Naturally, a very important question is propounded by the address 'to my lord.' Does this mean the king? If so, why should the royal correspondence be found at Nippur? To be sure, we knew already from the business documents that a large portion of them concerned the *ekal* and the *bitānu* which Clay had identified with the temple. Radau is clearly right in maintaining that *ekal* means 'palace,' 'royal residence' and both he and Clay are equally wrong in regard to *bitānu*; Clay translated 'our house,' and Radau propounded the impossible explanation *é-a-nu*, 'temple of Anu'; both, however, find a reference to the temple. *E-a-nu*, *E-nu* is certainly the Hebrew מִצְדָּה, 'palace,' and a synonym of *ekallu*.⁴ The author has brought convincing internal evidence that these letters [1-74] were addressed to the king, one of which actually begins with an honorific hymn, 'To my lord adorned in befitting splendour, offspring of God, who seeketh not punishment, hero,⁵ strong and wise, etc.'⁶ One, in fact, is written by a king, whom Radau identifies with Šagaraktišuriaš. We can, therefore, entirely agree with the author on this point. He has proven beyond any doubt that Nippur was a favourite seat of the Cassite dynasty, and it is probably due to their cultivated taste that such an important literary collection was found there, just as the great library of Nineveh is due to the good taste of the famous Ašurbanipal, whose scribes copied many tablets at Nippur.

The author indulges, however, in what seems to me some impossible conjectures, and uses a passage of the Chronicle P (p. 75) to prove that *Kurigalzu's* chief residence was not Babylon, but Nippur.⁷ In

⁴ Clay finds occasional reference to a *bit ili*, which is of course the temple, but Radau's texts contain reference to the *ekallu* and *bitānu* only. 'Temple Archives,' a term applied by Hilprecht, Clay, and Radau to the mound whence came most of their finds, is probably false, and to be replaced by 'Palace Archives.' *ekallu* is occasionally used for 'temple' in the royal inscriptions of the late period; cf. R. i. 51, No. 1, col. 1. 15.

⁵ Read *ḫarradi* not *guradi*, also *zeru ša ili* in l. 1, scarcely *zeru ištū šamē*.

⁶ No. 24.

⁷ In this connexion be it openly stated that Delitzsch's copy of Ch. P., iii. 9, does not warrant in any way the ingenious transliteration on p. 75, n. 1.

the remarkable letter; No. 24, the king's father is called *Nazi-Enlil*. Radau identifies him with *Nazibugaš*, the usurper slain by Ašur-uballiš, and makes the king of No. 24 a pretender and contestant for the throne against Kurigalzu. I cannot see why an identification with Nazimaruttaš is more improbable than with Nazibugaš. The king of No. 24 would then be *Kadašman-Turgu*.

The texts are an invaluable addition to the literature of the period, and yield rich philological material. The author has edited several with notes, which show wide reading and a fairly adequate grasp of the vast field of Assyriology. He often goes into the field of religion to expose his theory of a 'Trinity in unity,' namely, 'Father, Son, Mother,' but I fear he will find few adherents to his thesis, at least in its present form. Yet his radical views contain some truth; there is no doubt that the Babylonians developed the idea of a 'Son of God,' who became the active principle of creation. They furthermore personified the 'Word' of God as the virgin mother Ištar, a fact which seems to be unnoticed by Radau. Especially ingenious, and it seems to me sound, is his reading of *KA-DI* (p. 19) as *gusir*, identifying this divinity with Ninib of Dir. He is clearly right against Thureau-Dangin and myself in maintaining that ^{the} *KA-DI* is a male divinity, not a female. I accept also his reading *gusirra* for *gu-nu-ra*, which is of course only a variant of *gusir*. He has likewise shown from letter No. 89 that the temple of Dir was called *Etarkulkalama*.

On the philological side, which after all is the department in which these texts are especially important, the author has made thankful contributions. Of extraordinary value is the phrase No. 40, 8, *mê a-a-u-ti*, 'these waters,' showing that *a-a-u*, *iau* can be used as a demonstrative pronoun both in the singular and the plural. So in *ul iau amêlu*, 'not is this a human,' in *Gilgamesh, Epic*, x. col. iv. 17.¹ This same text [No. 40] proves that Hebrew חָרְבּ, late summer, is connected with Babylonian *harbu*, *harpu*, 'stubble ground,' 'harvested field' (Johns), so to be explained against Radau (p. 130), since the Sumerian word is *šel-gidda*, 'plucked harvest.'

¹ The fem. pl. *ašiti* for *ašati*, in R. iv. 60*, 10. It is probable that this demonstrative *au*, *iau*, etc., is identical with the interrogative adjective (Delitzsch, *Handwörterbuch*, 47b). It is likely that Heb., Arab., and Syr. *hu*, *hi*, etc. are directly connected with Babylonian *au*, *iau*, which is the basis of the Semitic prefix for imperfects, *ia*.

It is the unpleasant task of a reviewer to emphasize the mistakes of an author, and before adding my philological notes, I would express again my great indebtedness to this book. So important did it seem to me that I put aside my own immediate work to read the book, finding it necessary to know the contents.

The author has proposed a new explanation for the Aramaic phonetic reading of *Ninib*, אַנְיִב, which he would divide into *en-usātu*, 'lord of help,' or healing.² This seems to me hopelessly impossible, since it is based upon the supposition that Semitic *usātu*, 'support,' is connected with the Sumerian loan-word *asu*, 'doctor,' 'healer' [p. ix]; besides, none of the titles of Ninib emphasize him as 'god of healing.'

Page 9. I quite agree with Radau that *Enlil* was sometimes pronounced *bêl*. Marduk is frequently called *Enlil of the gods* and ^{the} *EN*, i.e., ^{the} *Bêl* is used directly for Enlil in *B.M.*, 81-7-1, 9, line 4 [*P.S.B.A.*, 1889]. *bêlu* means 'Enlil' in Reissner's *Sumerisch-Babylonische Hymnen*, 80, 14.³

P. 20. The reference is Sp. I, 131, not 331.

P. 26. *ittannašunuti* is probably for *iddan*, etc., from *nadānu*; cf. p. 57, rev. 7; *šinnu* means 'hull of a ship,' 'body of a chariot' (*Z.A.* xvii. 193; Johns, *A.D.D.* ii. 117). Radau's text shows that the original was *ušinu* and a loan-word. The *ušinu* of stone and gold must have been little relics or ornaments like the *makurru*, 'boat of silver' (*J.A.O.S.*, 27, 299).

P. 35. The derivation of *itū*, 'side' from חָרַב, 'to see,' is at least questionable.

P. 37. *Šupparsakku* is certainly a loan-word, and can have no Semitic derivation.

P. 39. II. R. 35a, 18, 'Ištar of Eridu' (?). It is doubtful whether a divinity is intended by this passage, in a list of words for 'chamber,' 'cell,' etc.

P. 46, l. 3. *Pindu* is the same word as *igin-zu* = *pindu* (*S.A.I.*, 2645), to be derived from עָרַב, 'to know,' as the Sumerian root *zu* indicates.

² Hrozný, *Revue Sémitique*, 1908, 'Ninib und Sumer,' read *en-namaštu*, 'lord of flocks.'

³ The German excavators found the Aramaic letters NB upon bricks in the outer wall of Babylon, which have been explained as an abbreviation for *Nimitti-Bêl*, the commonly accepted name for the outer wall of the ancient city. If this identification and reading be correct, then *enlil* must be rendered by *bêl* in Semitic in this case, since the name is written without exception *Nimitti-^{the}enlil*.

The Sumerian form *gi-in-zu* is exclamatory 'oh know!' hence all the words *abbāna*, *uka*, *la māšil*, etc. (*S. A. I.* 2636-51), are Semitic interjections for 'surely,' 'verily,' 'certainly,' etc.; *pindu* = *waddu*, *windū*, 'the knower,' evidently also an interjection.

P. 47, 5. *Epir ummānā paššur niši*, 'food of the artisans,' 'platter of the people.' Radau's interpretation is perfectly correct. A parallel passage is *S. B. H.*, 101, 15. Ištar is the *paššur ubarti ipteru mati*; *ubartu* means 'underworld' [*S. B. H.*, 118, 53], and *paššur* is explained by Sumerian *banšur*, hence Ištar, 'the platter for the dead,' as goddess who presides over the cult of the dead; see also my *Sumerian-Babylonian Psalms*, p. 11. *ipteru mati*, explained by *kagub kanagga* and *kagub = patānu*, hence *ipteru*, 'certainly' = *ipru*, 'hourishment'; cf. *Babyloniaca*, ii. 207.

P. 49, No. 24, 18. Read *ša sar-ra in ga-ti . . . iddinu*, 'which the king gave into my hand.'

Note 1. *Girra* and *gir* in proper names is *girū*, 'opponent.' Ranke, *Personal Names*, 229. Radau's explanation, *gir* = Sum. *gim* is quite impossible.

Note 3. Read *uku-nita* (*Babyloniaca*, i. 289)

P. 52, l. 4. Read *ša-a-lu-tu-nu* (?).

P. 87. The explanation of *sakanakku* from Semitic *ša* and *kanāku*, 'to seal,' would have to be paralleled by other compositions with *ša*, or otherwise satisfactorily explained (by syns. or Sumerian equivalents).

P. 98, 12. Read *allu*, perhaps 'pick-axe.'

P. 104, 34. The text and context induce *li-ki-ik* (!).

Note 1. *aššu* for *aššum* would be strange if not impossible.

P. 105, 6. *Adu*, 'court,' is the same loan-word as *aduru* (*Babyloniaca*, ii. 105).

P. 111, 91. Read *tušrib-sunuti* (?), 'thou shalt cause them to be replaced,' from *רַב* [conjectural].

P. 119, 16. 'On the second I will commence to gather taxes.' *Kam* can be used only after ordinals, correct also p. 98, 12.

P. 122, 6. *Rukku*, 'empty,' not 'far away.'

P. 123, 10, etc. Read *gusuru*, 'beams'; there is, so far as I know, no reason for identifying ^{Sam} *PUHUD-SAR* or ^{Sam} *Ē + AŠ-SAR* with a possible (?) ^{Sam} *PUHUD*.

P. 128, n. 2. Cf. *ūmi mahāri*, Hrozný, *Briefe aus Ta'aneh*, No. 5, 14.

P. 132, 20. Read *lipašir* (?), 'that he may open, free,' etc.

P. 24. The text has *kū*, for *ki-a-am* (?).

P. 26. *Maṭū* cannot mean 'wail,' 'complain,' contrary to Jensen, but 'lack strength,' 'be in dejection.' I would translate, 'that the irrigation fail not.' The meaning of *maṭū* and Sum. *lal* = 'fail,' 'be wanting,' is sure (with Delitzsch). Cf. *maṭū* = *šihru* (K, 2040, 5); *umtafi* (ii. 2), 'becomes less' (*Ham. Code*, 16, 73).

P. 149. *Sin-kara-bi-eš-me*, perhaps for *Iiti-sin-karbi-eš-me* (!).

The Life of Faith.

BY PROFESSOR THE REV. W. W. HOLDSWORTH, M.A., HANDSWORTH.

Spiritual Life and Spiritual Communion.

WE have seen that the life of faith begins with that submission of spirit which lays the heart open to the presence and power of Christ, perfecting in the believer that which He begins when He makes His first appeal to their impotent spirits. We have seen that that act of surrender is followed by a corresponding act on the part of Christ; that He commits Himself to the spirit that has realized 'the obedience of faith.' We may now

go on to consider the resultant life, and while this theme may be said to be the central teaching of all St. John's writing, we shall find it put before us in clearest and most continuous form in those chapters of the Fourth Gospel which give us the last discourses of our Lord before His passion, when life imminent had begun to cast the shadow of death. The section of the Fourth Gospel which begins with the fifteenth chapter is pre-eminently