
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

heredity. The new development of Mendelism leaves no room for freedom or spontaneity. And the doctrine of development, or of nurture versus nature, as set forth in these subtile pages forms a splendid vindication of the possibility of freedom, and of the worth of the individual. It at once provides for the unity of the universe, for the worth of the individual, and for the reality of ideals.

JAMES IVERACH.

Aberdeen.

The Archaeology of the Book of Genesis.

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

Chapter viii.

18–22. The corresponding passage in the Babylonian story (where the account of the descent of Utu-napistim himself from the ship has dropped out of the text) is:

I sent (them) forth to the four winds; I offered sacrifice;
I built an altar upon the peak of the mountain;
seven by seven I placed the libation vases;
below them I spread reeds, cedar-wood, and myrtle.
The gods smelled the savour,
the gods smelled the sweet savour,
the gods gathered like flies over the sacrifice.

The literal translation of the line, 'the gods smelled the sweet (*literally* 'the good') savour,' leaves no doubt that the Hebrew translator had the same cuneiform text that we have before him; but, as elsewhere, the polytheism of the Babylonian story becomes monotheistic. As in the Babylonian version, moreover, so in the Hebrew account we have first the animal sacrifice, and then the burnt-offering, which in Babylonia consisted of sweet-smelling woods placed under the sacrificed animal, but here, in accordance with the Mosaic ritual, becomes the *'ôlâh*, or 'burnt (animal) offering.' In accordance also with the Mosaic ritual, 'clean' animals and fowl are selected for the sacrifice, which explains why the clean animals were introduced into the ark (7^2). As they take the place of the libation vases in the Babylonian narrative, we have further an explanation of the statement that these clean animals were taken 'by sevens.'

In the Babylonian poem the gathering of the gods round the sacrifice is followed by Istar's denunciation of Ellil for having caused the deluge, and of the gods who had acted as his ministers; by the anger of Ellil at finding that Utu-napistim had escaped destruction; and by his acceptance of the 'wise' words of Ea that henceforward the individual alone should be responsible for his own sins: 'Lay on the sinner (alone) his sin; lay on the transgressor his transgression; be merciful that he be not cut off, be long-suffering that he be not [destroyed].' All this is necessarily omitted by the Hebrew monotheist, who passes on to the acceptance by Ellil of the counsel of Ea, which was, on the one hand, that the individual, and not 'every thing living,' should suffer for the individual's sins; and, on the other hand, that the punishment inflicted on man for his sins should be confined to man—lions, hyænas, famine, or plague—and not extended, as in the case of the deluge, to the ground. Accordingly, in v.^{21}, 'Yahweh says to his heart' that the curse inflicted on 'the ground' by the disobedience of Adam and the murder of Cain is finally removed from it, and that He 'will not again smite any more every thing living.' For the meaning of this last passage—that the individual should henceforth bear his own sin—we have to turn to the Babylonian story, the Hebrew writer not having explained it. The Hebrew code which admitted the principle of blood-revenge, and the participation of the community in the guilt of its members, differed from the code of Khammu-rabi, which assumed that the individual was responsible to the law for his actions.

In the Babylonian story there is nothing corresponding with v.^{22}. עֹד, *'ôdh*, is the Ass. *adû*, 'the time of all the days of the earth,' and is used as in *adî Nannari*, 'the time of the Moon,' *i.e.* as long as the moon exists. *Yishbôthû* is the Ass. *sabâtu*, 'to keep Sabbath'; a phrase quoted from an early bilingual poem is *sabâtu sa abubi*, 'the keeping sabbath' or 'cessation of the deluge'; see note on

2^3. God's work of creation ended with the Sabbath; but the promise made by Yahweh after the deluge was that the ordinary revolutions of nature should never keep Sabbath again.

Chapter ix.

1. In the Babylonian story, as here, the blessing of Utu-napistim (in which his wife is included) follows the promise of Ellil never again to send a deluge upon the earth. The blessing involves the translation of Utu-napistim and his wife to the Babylonian Paradise; in Genesis this is transferred to the other Adra-khaśiś, or 'Very Wise,' Enoch (see note on 5^{24}). The words of the blessing are taken from 1^{28-30}, with those slight variations which distinguish the Biblical writer from the author of the Assyro-Babylonian Epic of the Creation, who repeats the same passage time after time without alteration. We have here, in fact, a result of the difference between prose and verse, and the freedom the Biblical writer allows himself when quoting an earlier passage of his own work illustrates the similar freedom he allowed himself when translating from a cuneiform original (see note, 8^{6-12}). As the words of the blessing are taken from 1^{28-30}, the sons of Noah are necessarily included in it.

3. 'Namely, that liveth' is an explanatory gloss upon *remesh*, the Ass. *nammassû*, which is used here as if it were *nammastu* (see note on 8^{17}).

In $1^{29.30}$ only 'the green herb' was given as food to man and beast, since no flesh-meat was eaten in Paradise; the expulsion of man from the garden of Eden not only forced him to 'eat bread' 'in the sweat of his face,' but also to have recourse to animal food. Permission to eat the latter is now formally granted, nothing being said about 'clean' and 'unclean' meats. On the contrary, 'all' that has life among the lower animals may be the food of man; the restrictions of the Mosaic Law have not yet come into operation.

4. Blood alone is forbidden to be eaten, for the blood is life (see Lv 17^{11}). That the blood was life was a Babylonian belief, and Berossus tells us that the first men were formed of the earth and the blood of the gods. Zimmern has detected a reference to this myth in a mutilated cuneiform text (C.T. vi.; Bu. 91–5–9, 269; see Jensen, *Assyrisch-babylonische Mythen und Epen*, p. 275). The conception that the blood was the life goes back to a different origin from that which identified life with the divine breath (Gn 2^7), though both beliefs were Babylonian, as they were also Hebrew. The Tel el-Amarna writers, for example, call the Pharaoh *sari napisti-ya*, 'the breath of my life.' But the identification of life with the breath was connected with Ea, 'the god of the good wind'; while its identification with the blood was connected with Ellil, or Bel of Nippur, who was said to have cut off 'the heads of himself and the other gods' in order to form a man with blood (see Eusebius, *Chron. Arm.*, ed. Mai, p. 10). Both 'the god of the good wind' and the god who thus formed man from his own blood were subsequently identified with Bel-Merodach when the latter became the creator of the world. In Assyrian the verse would have been *sêru* (or *bisru*) *sa inasu damu ul takulu*.

5, 6. Here we have the principle of blood-revenge, which is embodied in the Mosaic Law, and extends to beast as well as to man (see, *e.g.*, Ex 21^{28}). The recognition of this principle is one of the great points of difference between the Mosaic Code and the Babylonian Code of Khammu-rabi, where its place is taken, as in modern codes, by the doctrine of the supreme authority of the civil law which overrides public feuds and private revenge, and fixes the penalty for every offence. There are no traces of a Babylonian original in v.^{5}. In v.^{6}, however, we again have them, the Assyrian form of the verse being *tabiku damê nisi nisu damê-su itbuk, assum ina tsalam ilâni episu teniseti*. We find the phrase *damê tappê-su ittabak*, 'has he poured out the blood of his companion?' in *W.A.I.* v. 51, 52.

8–17. The covenant of which the rainbow was a 'token' is not referred to in the Babylonian story of the Deluge contained in the Epic of Gilgames. It must have been found, however, in one of the versions of the story current in Babylonian literature, since an early hymn (*W.A.I.* ii. 19. 2, 8) mentions the *qastu sa abubi*, 'bow of the deluge,' where the word used for 'bow' is not the usual Assyrian word *tilpânu*, but one which corresponds with the Heb. *qesheth*. It is possible that 'the story of the bow,' 'lifted up in heaven' by Anu the sky-god, with which Merodach was armed when he fought against Tiamât, was also the rainbow. It will be remembered that in the Biblical narrative *tehôm* or Tiamât plays a leading part in bringing about the flood. 'Every living creature' (vv.$^{12.15}$) is the Ass.

sikin napisti (*kalama*). In v.[11] we have 'the waters of the deluge' as in 7[10]; in v.[16] this is replaced by the Assyrianism לְמַבּוּל הַמָּיִם, which is a literal rendering of the Ass. *mê sa bubbuli*. We may see in the two expressions alternative translations of the same original.

Let us now see how the results of the foregoing analysis harmonize with the current theory which divides the Biblical narrative between an 'Elohist' and a 'Yahwist.' The 'Elohist' agrees with the Babylonian story in the following points:—(1) Noah is the tenth from the first man; (2) the Deluge is due to the sins of mankind; (3) all living things are involved in the calamity except such as are preserved in the ark; (4) the deity reveals to Noah the approach of the Deluge and instructs him how to build the ark; (5) the deity prescribes the dimensions of the ark, which is divided into rooms and storeys and pitched within and without; (6) Noah takes his family into the ark with him; (7) the ark has a window; (8) the ark rests on one of the Armenian mountains; (9) after the subsidence of the Deluge, Noah offers sacrifice on the mountain, and God declares that He will not again destroy the world by a flood.

The 'Yahwist' agrees with the Babylonian story in the following points:—(1) The Deluge is a punishment for sin; (2) it destroys all living things except those that were in the ark; (3) the period of seven days is known to him; (4) the Deluge is caused by a downpour of rain; (5) birds are sent from the ark three times in order to ascertain if the earth is dry; (6) two of these birds are the dove and the raven; (7) Noah builds an altar and offers sacrifice after the Deluge, and Yahweh 'smelled the sweet savour.' In other passages the 'Yahwist' shows that he is acquainted with the Babylonian story by changing or contradicting its statements; thus the swallow is omitted in the account of the sending out of the birds, and Yahweh closes the door of the ark instead of Noah himself. Throughout the 'Yahwistic' portions of the narrative, in fact, we have the same evidences of tacit contradiction of the polytheism inherent in the Babylonian story that we have found in Gn 1, which, however, is said to belong to the 'Elohist.' It is in these 'Yahwistic' portions, moreover, that the actual words of the cuneiform text are the most frequently reproduced.

The logical conclusions to be drawn from these facts are given in my *Early History of the Hebrews*. I have there said (p. 125): 'It will be noticed that the coincidences between the Babylonian and Hebrew narratives are quite as much in details as in general outlines, and these coincidences cover the Hebrew narrative as a whole. It is not with the Elohist or with the Yahwist alone that the Babylonian poet agrees, but with the supposed combination of their two documents as we now find it in the Book of Genesis. If the documentary hypothesis were right, there would be only two ways of accounting for this fact. Either the Babylonian poet (who lived in the Abrahamic age) had before him the present "redacted" text of Genesis, or else the Elohist and Yahwist must have copied the Babylonian story upon the mutual understanding that the one should insert what the other omitted. There is no third alternative. In order to explain the phenomena of the Hebrew text we must therefore have recourse to some other hypothesis than that which finds in it the work of an "Elohist" and a "Yahwist."'

The detailed comparison of it with the version of the Babylonian story contained in the Epic of Gilgames has shown that—

(1) Behind the Biblical account lie the Babylonian versions of the story.

(2) One of these, which has been translated into Hebrew, is the version which we have in the Epic of Gilgames.

(3) This is shown not only by the translations, but still more by the omissions and tacit contradictions of the Babylonian account on the part of the Hebrew translator.

(4) Another account in Babylonian cuneiform, which has also been translated, was written in Palestine, or at all events from the point of view of an inhabitant of Palestine.

(5) The translations are free, and characterized by explanatory amplifications which remind us of the Mishna.

(6) Alternative translations of the Babylonian original occur, producing at times a 'conflate' text or the insertion of a word or words in the wrong place.

(7) In certain passages we find the language of the Tel el-Amarna tablets (e.g. *sâru napisti*, *tsukhru*, etc.).

(8) The narrative, as we have it, is a consecutive whole which corresponds with the Babylonian account, and displays throughout one spirit and aim.

(9) The inconsistencies discoverable in it are due to intentional alteration of the Babylonian account.

(10) The text has undergone but little change since the Septuagint translation was made.

Contributions and Comments.

'Conflict in Prayer.'

Too cold in prayer, we miss the promise given
Of Victory, which wrestling saints attain;
Which Abraham secured on Mamre's plain;
Which Jacob at Penuel won from God.
Our slothful, careless souls, in slumber nod,
When there awaits their energies such gain
As God delights to give! Why then refrain
From passionate prayer which triumphs over Heaven?

WILLIAM OLNEY, *Deacon.*

Metropolitan Tabernacle, London.

The Denial of St. Peter.

No fair estimate of a historical character can be founded upon mere assumption. Now, though the fact of St. Peter's denial is recorded by all the Evangelists, his motives are explained by none. Why should it be confidently assumed that his reason was a cowardly fear of arrest and punishment, especially when we know him to have affirmed, not long before, that he would welcome such a fate by his Master's side? Many human heroes have won the love of faithful friends. Jesus must surely, contrary to our beliefs, have been a poor judge of human character, or He must have deliberately selected His disciples from the weakest men of Palestine, if the bravest of them all, the man whom He honoured with the surname of 'Rock,' was so weak and waterish at the critical hour. St. Peter's resolution to go with our Lord to prison and to judgment was not of an extraordinary nature. If the companionship of Jesus was at all inspiring, it is exactly what we should have expected from one who had already left all to follow Him. We have proof enough that he intended to be true to his promise. His action with the sword in the garden, his refusal to follow the other disciples in their flight, his arrival at the courtyard of the high priest's house, all show that he had not forgotten his words: 'Though all forsake thee, yet will not I.' There is surely more reason for assuming that his denial was due to his desire to remain by Christ's side than to a mere cowardly fear of imprisonment.

The facts recorded by the Evangelists bear out this hypothesis. No Gospel conveys the slightest hint of any intention on the part of the Sanhedrin to apprehend the disciples with their Master. The members of the band sent out by the priest were sufficiently numerous and well armed to have encircled the Galileans and to have made their escape impossible, had this course been deemed advisable by their officers. Apparently their orders were to seize the Leader alone since they required the services of Judas to identify Him by a kiss. When asked their designs they mentioned no other name save that of Jesus of Nazareth. Christ Himself interpreted their answer as an assurance of His followers' safety, nor did they demur at His request, 'If therefore ye seek me, let these go their way.' St. Peter made himself sufficiently conspicuous in the garden. His attack upon Malchus was a challenge to the high priest's minions to arrest him. His action could scarcely have been overlooked unless they had received strict injunctions to leave every one but Jesus unmolested. Such a command is quite intelligible considering what we know of the perplexity of the rulers and their fear of any action likely to arouse strife among the populace (Mk 14^{11} and Lk 22^{53}).

We notice that the companion of St. Peter had some pass to admit him to the high priest's house. If this 'other disciple' was, as we think most probable, Judas, the circumstance is in no way remarkable and throws no light upon the present question. If, however, this companion was St. John, the fact that the disciples were in no danger of capture seems proved beyond question. The