
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

(Tübingen: Mohr; London: Williams and Norgate. M.4).

In two volumes, and under the title of *Où en est l'Histoire des Religions?* we are offered a new introduction to Comparative Religion. The first volume deals with the non-Christian religions, and is now published; the second volume, which is expected to be ready in December, will deal with Judaism and Christianity. That is so, although it seems to imply that Judaism is a Christian religion. The different chapters have been written by different men, among whom we notice Professor de la Vallée Poussin of Brussels, who writes on the religions of India, and Baron Carra de Vaux, whose subject is Muhammadanism. The choice of these men alone shows that the work is meant to be reliable. Popular it may be, but not in the old and almost obsolete use of that word. No Frenchman can ever be unpopular, but some Frenchmen can also be thoroughly scientific and verifiable. These authors have evidently been chosen with considerable care, and every one of them for the particular department of which he has made himself master. After each chapter there is a full account given of the special literature of the subject.

But the most attractive part of this first volume is the introduction. The introduction is the work of M. J. Bricout, Editor of the *Revue du Clergé français*. Now it is a significant thing that the editor of such a review should consider it necessary to edit a volume like this. He has evidently discovered that the time has come when the clergy of France must one and all not only know that there is such a thing as the study of Religion, but also study it. That he himself has studied the whole subject to some purpose the introduction very plainly declares. The work is published in Paris by Messrs. Letouzey et Ané. (2 vols., Fr.12).

Under the title of *Conférences de Saint-Étienne*, a small volume has been published containing a survey of recent Palestinian digging and discussion. Lagrange writes on the Biblical Sites, Dhorme on the Aryans before Cyrus, Abel on the Capture of Jerusalem by the Arabs, Génier on Napoleon in Syria, Créchet on De Vogüé, Germer-Durand on Palestinian Sculpture, and Dom Zéphyrin Biever on the Country bordering on the Sea of Galilee (Paris: Lecoffre [J. Gabalda et C^ie^]. M.3.50).

A volume of lectures on the borderland between Religion and Ethics by Dr. Erich Schaeder, Professor of Theology in Kiel, has been published under the title of *Religiös-sittliche Gegenwartsfragen* (Leipzig: Deichert. M.4). The titles of the lectures are: Jesus and Great Men; Christ and Nature; and so on.

We may note here, although they do not strictly belong to this department, other two small volumes issued by the same publishers, both dealing with the historical existence of Jesus. One of the volumes is by Dr. Jeremias; its title is *Hat Jesus Christus gelebt?* (M.1). The author of the other is Herr K. Dunkmann, Direktor des Kgl. Prediger-Seminars in Wittenberg; the title is *Der historische Jesus, der mythologische Christus, und Jesus der Christ* (M.2).

Dr. Max Green of Philadelphia has had his recent book on the Jews translated into German, under the title of *Die Judenfrage und der Schlüssel zu ihrer Lösung*. The translator is Elizabeth Delitzsch (Hinrichs. M.1.75).

The Archaeology of the Book of Genesis.

By the Rev. A. H. Sayce, D.D., LL.D., D.Litt., Professor of Assyriology, Oxford.

Chapter iv.

19. The two wives of Lamech are the Babylonian Uddatu, 'Daylight,' and Tsillatu, the 'Shadow' of Night. Disciples of the 'Astral Theory' will doubtless see in this a proof that Lamech was one of the heavenly bodies, but it would be just as easy to conjecture that the duties of the 'libation priest' had to be performed during the night as well as during the day.

20, 21. Jabal corresponds with *ibila*, as Hebel does with *abil* (see note on v.[2]), and is therefore merely a variant of the latter. Hence, like Abel, he is a representative and 'father' of the nomad

Beduin with their flocks and herds.[1] Jubal is an example of those jingling variations of a name of which the Arab is still so fond (see note on 1^{2}). The statement that Jubal was the 'father' of musicians must be a note added by the Hebrew translator, since it depends on the association of his name with the peculiarly Heb. *yôbêl*, 'jubilee.' The harp and pipe (A.V. 'organ') were used in the ritual mourning for Tammuz: the pipe was known to the Beduin, but the harp belonged rather to civilized life. It is possible that Jubal has been substituted for an original 'Nukhum the agriculturist' (see note on 5^{29}).

22. In 'Tubal the Smith,' Tubal is another example of Arab fondness for a jingle, Jubal and Tubal being parallel to Abil and Qabil, *i.e.* Cain and Abel, in the modern legends of Damascus. Judging from Arabic analogies, the original name of Tubal would have begun with a dental. In Assyrian, *tublu* means 'the choicest' or 'best'; the gods, for example, are said to have 'predetermined the creation of mankind, their choicest (work).'

Naamah was the West Semitic title of Istar, transcribed Nemanoun by the Greeks (Plut. *De Is. et Osir.* 13), which re-appears in Astro-nomê and Astynomê, *i.e.* Istar-na'amah. That Naamah was Istar was known to the Rabbis, who accordingly make her a demon of the night, a wife of the planet Mars, and a mother of the demon of lust (see Lenormant, *Origines de l'Histoire*, i. pp. 201, 202). Since Istar was the evening star, she could well be described as a daughter of the 'Shadow' of Night. The Babylonians made her the daughter, sometimes of the Moon-god, sometimes of Anu the Sky, and therefore the sister of the Moon-god, who was known as 'the Smith' (see note on v.[18]).

The three sons of Lamech answer to the three sons of Adam on the one side, and of Noah on the other. Jabal and Abel are variants of the same name; Jubal is related to Abel, as Seth 'the Beduin' is to Abel the shepherd; and as Cain 'the Smith' stands apart from Abel and Seth, so Tubal 'the Smith' is born of a different mother from his two brothers. It is the same tradition in a new form, in which the invention of metallurgy instead of the building of a city is ascribed to 'the Smith.' Since Ummanum in the Babylonian antediluvian list means 'artisan' in general, and not 'smith' specifically, the list justified the assignment to Cain of the origination of civilization in general, and not of metallurgy in particular, and the account of Tubal Cain will consequently not have been derived from it. Hence the Lamech of the Cainite genealogy cannot be taken from the same cuneiform document as the Lamech of the Sethite genealogy, and this cuneiform document did not conclude, like the latter, with Utu-napistim or Noah. We can thus restore the original cuneiform document, which would have resembled the dynastic tablets and have contained merely 'the dynasty of Sippara,' followed by the first king of the dynasty of Surippak. The variant story of the three sons of the first man (in which the origin of metallurgy was described) was accordingly transferred by the Hebrew writer (*not* translator) from the first man (Amelum) of the dynasty of Sippara, to whom it had never been attached in the Babylonian records, to the first man of the dynasty of Surippak. Hence we have the story in its West Semitic form associated, first of all, with Adam, the first man of the dynasty of Babylon in the post-Khammu-rabi list; and secondly, in what was probably its Babylonian form, with Lamech. The fact that Jabal and his brothers were sons of the first man throws light on the names of their mothers.

The words, 'a hammerer of every artificer in copper and iron,' are senseless. The Septuagint has boldly changed the text, and so obtained the intelligible 'he was a smith, an artificer in bronze and iron.' But *loṭêsh*, 'hammerer,' and *ḥorêsh*, 'artificer,' are merely alternative renderings of the Assyrian *nappakhu*. The original was either *restû sa* (or *abu*) *kal nappakhi erî u parzilli* (or simply *nappakhu erî u parzilli*). In Hebrew there is only one word, *nĕḥosheth*, for both 'copper' and 'bronze.' This has been explained by Mr. Macalister's excavations at Gezer, which have shown that in Palestine the Bronze Age goes back to a very remote date—to a period, in fact, preceding the introduction of bronze into Egypt in the time of the Twelfth Dynasty. Bronze came to Palestine, and thence to Egypt, from Asia Minor, which, so far as we know at present, was the earliest seat of its manufacture. From hence, in the Khammu-rabi age, it made its way to Assyria. But it never obtained a footing in Babylonia, where the use of copper went back to prehistoric times, and continued down to

[1] Yabliya, it is worth noting, was the chief god of the West Semitic Shuhites on the western bank of the Euphrates (Bu. 88-5-12. 5, and my article in the *Proceedings S.B.A.*, Jan. 1899, pp. 24-25).

the Persian era. Bronze was, however, naturally known there, and there were accordingly different words for copper and bronze—*erû*, from the Sumerian *urudu*, being 'copper,' and *śiparru* (Sumerian *zabar*) being 'bronze' (see my *Archæology of the Cuneiform Inscriptions*, p. 55, *seq*). The use of iron cannot be dated much earlier than 1600 B.C.

23, 24. The old poem, of which an extract is given here, seems to have been of West Semitic origin, like the saying about Nimrod (10[9]), but the metrical form of Hebrew poetry, with its elaborate parallelism, is now known to have been of Babylonian origin. The A.V. is probably right in holding that the names of Adah and Zillah were not mentioned in it. 'I slew a man at the wounding of me, and a boy at the smiting of me'; Ass. *amela aduk ana makhâtsi-ya* (or *mikhtsi-ya*) *û lîda ana tarâki-ya*. *Ana* is used like לְ here in the Tel el-Amarna tablets.

'Since seven times was Cain (the Smith) avenged, and Lamech (the Priest) seventy and seven.' Seven was a sacred number among the Babylonians, from whom the belief spread to the Western Semites; and a common Babylonian phrase is *adi śibi*, 'up to seven times.' So in the Penitential Psalms the penitent is made to say, 'Seven times seven are my transgressions.' The doctrine of blood-revenge, however, refers us to the West Semitic Beduin rather than to the Babylonians (see note on vv.[11. 12]). But slaying a man who had wounded the slayer, or a boy who had smitten him, was not blood-revenge; nor was Cain avenged, since no one had murdered him. It was Abel who ought to have been avenged. The 'marginal note,' therefore, appended to the verse of the old poem does not harmonize with it, and implies either that the poem was misunderstood, or that our present text is not the original one. Or is it, not a marginal note, but another fragment of the same or another poem, the Hebrew rendering of which has been wrongly punctuated? The Assyrian would be *kî adi śibi Ummanu yutir gimilla*, which would mean 'since Ummanu avenged himself seven times.' 'Vengeance has been exacted for Cain' would be *kî ilu gimilla sa Ummani yutir adi śibi*. If the Hebrew has been translated from a Babylonian original, that original must have been the first of these phrases rather than the second. Cain and Lamech would thus have been avenging injuries done to themselves. This looks as if, in the Babylonian version of the narrative, 'the Smith' used the weapons he had forged in order to defend himself against Beduin raiders. Lamech would then have been defending his wives against hostile attack, and would consequently have been justified in boasting to them of his prowess. The priest would have proved himself a better warrior even than the smith. The mutilated Babylonian poem which is known as the 'Creation Legend of Kutha' contained something similar, and described how army after army of *ummâni* was sent forth from 'the field of Akkad,' after 'the sons of the seer' had been summoned, and seven times seven lambs sacrificed—only to be annihilated by the foe.

The original of the verses quoted from the Poem of Lamech may therefore be thus restored:

Simiâ qûli, assât Ramki, uzna sukunâ,
Assum (*or* kî) amela aduk ana mikhtsi-ya, û lîda ana tarâki-ya;
Assum (*or* kî) adi śibi Ummânu yutira gimilla,
Û Ramku adi śibâ û śibi.

'Hear my voice! O wives of Ramku, give ear!
Since a man have I slain for my wounding, and a youth for my smiting;
Since Ummânu took sevenfold vengeance,
And Ramku seventy and sevenfold.'

25. The name is given by Eve (not as in 5[3] by Adam), and so is not assumed to be already existing as in the case of Cain and Abel (vv.[1. 2]). Hence that Eve should give a reason for the name is natural. The explanation of it, however, is merely a Hebrew popular etymology. In Nu 24[17] the Moabites are called 'the children of Sheth,' in a passage that had already ceased to be understood in the age of Jeremiah (if the Massoretic text is to be trusted). Jeremiah (48[45]) quotes it, changing קרקר, 'destroying,' and שת, which were no longer intelligible, into קָדְקֹד, 'head,' and שְׁאוֹן, 'tumult.' Sheth, however, is the Assyro-Babylonian Śutu, the name given to the West Semitic nomads on the western side of the Euphrates and borrowed at a very early date by the Egyptians, by whom it was applied to the Beduin of the Sinaitic Peninsula and Western Asia generally. Moab was a son of Śutu, as Ammon was of 'Ammi (Gn 19[38]). Sheth, consequently, will have exactly replaced Abel, the representative of the West Semitic shepherds.

The Septuagint supplies the word 'saying,' which has dropped out of the Heb. text. *Zera' aḥêd*, 'one seed,' for 'a son,' is an Assyrianism (*estin ziru*).

26. For Enosh, 'Man,' the duplicate of Adam,

see above, note on v.[17]. 'Then'—*i.e.* at the time of the birth of Enosh—'men were first named after Yahweh.' (The Septuagint has derived חולל from יהל, and so translated 'he hoped' instead of 'began.') The statement is in accordance with monumental facts. Already in the age of Khammu-rabi the Babylonian legal documents show that Śutu or West Semitic names were compounded with that of Yahum (Yahweh); *e.g.* Ya(h)um-ilu, the later Joel. In the Kassite period (from 1800 B.C.) such names are fairly common in Babylonia, and the feminine Yaûtum, the exact correspondent of יהוה, is employed along with Yâum or Yâu. In the lexical tablets Yâu is given as a synonym of *ilu*, 'god.' See note on 2[4]. Śumu-Yâu, 'The Name (Shem) is Yahweh,' would have been a name analogous to Śumu-ilu (Samuel), 'The Name is God,' or other similar compounds, which we actually find in the legal documents of the Khammu-rabi age.

The latter part of the verse is an extract from a work which may be called 'The Book of Origins,' and of which the Assyrian title would have been 'Enuma'; see note on 6[1]. Besides 6[1], other extracts from the book are to be found in 9[20] and 10[10].

Contributions and Comments.

The Christian Doctrine of Man.[1]

Professor Wheeler Robinson's book is a comprehensive and masterly survey of the main problems of Christian anthropology from the most modern historical and psychological standpoint. The Biblical data on the subject are first of all passed in review, every term used being carefully examined. Then there is traced the working up of this material into the creeds and dogmas of the historic Church. Finally we have an estimate of the degree in which the Christian doctrine of man has been influenced by modern science and philosophy and the social movement.

Many matters of the deepest interest come to light in the course of the discussion. It is shown, for example, that to the Hebrew consciousness personality was an indissoluble unity of soul and body, rather than a mere union between the two, and that nowhere in the whole Bible is any taint of evil attributed to the flesh itself, as the physical basis of life. The dim, unethical conception of 'corporate personality,' so well illustrated in early Hebrew thought, is traced in its development till it changes into the full consciousness of individual relationship to God, with the demand for a future life to satisfy its claims. An illuminating section is devoted to the teaching of Jesus on the nature of man, his sinfulness, his infinite worth to God, and his capacity for fellowship with the Father, through the service of his brethren. In the discussion of the Pauline anthropology, the apostle is cleared, in a very interesting way, from some serious misconceptions which have persistently clung to his teaching on the subject of original sin, and the relation between sin and death.

With the post-Biblical period comes the influence of Greek thought on Christianity, characterized by a metaphysical dualism, and an emphasis on immortality rather than resurrection. Here, too, emerges the great figure of Augustine, whose championship of the sovereignty of divine grace was of the utmost importance to the development of Christian thought, even though it led to the exaggeration of that sovereignty in the Calvinistic doctrines of election and reprobation. In the modern period the eschatological background of Christianity is replaced by one of cosmic evolution, while at the same time the power and authority of the Church, as the promulgator of infallible dogma, are sensibly relaxed. But it is shown that neither of these changes seriously affects the fundamental Christian doctrines, or the experiences on which they are based. Science has not been able to challenge the higher moral consciousness of the freedom of the will, with its attendant sense of guilt, and has made enormous positive contributions to the enrichment of Christian thought. The most recent philosophy has powerfully vindicated our faith in the spiritual value of personality, and its necessary persistence into another sphere. Even the social emphasis of to-day has not suc-

[1] *The Christian Doctrine of Man.* By the Rev. H. Wheeler Robinson, M.A., Tutor in Rawdon College, Sometime Senior Kennicott Scholar in the University of Oxford. (T. & T. Clark; 6s. net.)