
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

either in rationality or in personality—but in this great truth of the unity of all life and the brotherhood of all men.

Now the ideal principle in a perfect brotherhood is surely 'From every one according to his ability: to every one according to his needs.' Some who think this maxim rather dangerous would substitute the word 'services' for 'needs.' But in an ideal condition of things no one would be pauperized by being merely a receiver of the bounty of others, for all would be givers as well as receivers, each giving of the kind that he has, and receiving of the kind of which he is in want. Such a state would, of course, be consistent with great inequalities. Some will give more, and some will receive more. But if all are one, and realize their unity, this will neither matter nor be felt to matter. Any other principle like that of 'reward' for services it is impossible satisfactorily to apply, as Dr. Rashdall has cleverly shown (*Theory of Good and Evil*, vol. i. chap. viii.). Rashdall abandons as hopeless the maxim 'to every man according to his merit,' and adopts what he calls the principle of 'equality of consideration'—meaning thereby that the distribution of the goods of life should be according to the needs of men as these are socially determined.

And in the ideal commonwealth each one would receive eagerly in order that he might the better give. Should a gift to the uttermost be asked of a man—even the gift of his blood, as in the case of the present European war—the principle of the solidarity of life will inspire him as no abstract principle of equality could. He will see that he is given innumerable blessings for which he never laboured, and is called to sufferings not always on his own behalf, but often for the sake of others, filling up in this way what is lacking in the sufferings of Christ.

A community inspired by the principle of unity—unity with one another and with God in Christ—will express itself through a State. That is to say, it will not be anarchist. Justice, however, will be swallowed up in love. This love will not take the form of charity, giving to your neighbours something for which he gives you no return. For all will have something to give, and love will express itself in such a system of exchange as will bless all with mutual benefits.[1]

Finally, love will be not the product of such a State, but its condition. A non-competitive society is possible or ultimately successful only when the human heart has ceased to feel the competitive spirit. To merge possessions is not necessarily to merge souls. And so the hope of the future can lie only in the greater prevalence of the spirit that desires to give rather than to get. Experience leads us to expect little from a mere social instinct or 'group-mind.' But love will prevail, we believe, when there is a greater realization by all men of their essential union with each other in God through our Lord Jesus Christ.

[1] In the same way, Ruskin, following Plato, maintained that wealth is an instrument of 'life,' and is to be shared co-operatively, as in a household.

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 ix.

18. Since Shem corresponds with Samu or Sumu, the ancestral god of the 'Amorite' or West Semitic kings of Babylonia, while Japhet is Iapetos, a Cilician deity (Steph. Byz. *sub voce* Ἄδανα), it would seem to follow that in Ham also we ought to find the name of a deity. As 'father of Canaan,' the deity would be Canaanite. Ham, however, was also the father of Mizraim or Egypt, with which in the O.T. the name is sometimes synonymous, but there is nothing in the Egyptian pantheon with which the name can be compared. It is, therefore, possible that the Canaanite Ham has been identified with Qem, a name given to Egypt in the inscriptions, since in proper names Egyptian *q* may represent Assyro-Babylonian *kh* (ח) when the latter stands for West Semitic *ghain*. In this case the identification would have resulted from the use of the cuneiform script. In the

Mosaic age Canaan was a province of Egypt, and hence geographically connected with it.

20. 'Noah was the first husbandman.' Here we have an account of the origin of agriculture, for which see notes on 4^{1} and 5^{29}. The transference of the reputation of being the first UR-ENGAR, or 'man of the soil,' from Adam or Cain to Noah seems to be due to the fact that the account of the origin of agriculture was combined with an account of the origin of grape-wine. The vine was native to the Armenian highlands, from which it was carried to Babylonia (in Sumerian times) and Canaan. In the Armenian highlands, therefore, the first grape-wine will have been made. The Assyrian form of the verse would have been *ina yumi-su ina ris sanâti* (?) *Nukhum-*[*ilu* ?] *amel ikkari ibsu-ma eris karani.* In Assyro-Babylonian *karanu* was 'vine,' *kurunnu*, 'wine'; the Heb. *kerem*, 'vineyard,' is borrowed from *karanu*. *Tîrôsh* is the Ass. *sêras*, 'new wine.' The Sumerian word for 'wine' is *gestin*, later *wüdün*. Assyrian also had the word *înu*, the Heb. *yayîn*, which like the Greek οἶνον, Lat. *vinum*, has been borrowed from a language of Asia Minor; cf. Armenian *gini*.[1]

21. Noah not only cultivated grapes, but discovered how to make them into wine. Perhaps there was a Babylonian legend on the subject, since Pliny (*N.H.* xxx. 51; cf. xxxvii. 52) states that 'the Assyrian king' Horus invented a cure for drunkenness. The Assyrian *sikaru* was 'date-wine,' corresponding with our 'beer,' whence the verb *sakâru*, 'to be drunken.' The Assyrian form of the verse would have been *kurunna isti-mma isakkir û* (*ur-su iptekhi*) *ina libbi biti-su. Ina libbi*, 'within,' is literally 'in the midst'; the Hebrew writer substitutes 'tent' for 'house' as elsewhere. The house of the nomad Israelite was his tent. The text, however, has 'her' instead of 'his tent,' as if there had been a previous reference to a harîm.

The feeling expressed in this verse in regard to nakedness is the same as that in 2^{25} 3^{7}. From the account given of Ea-bani in the Epic of Gilgames, we may gather that it was shared by the Babylonians. It affords a contrast to the feeling of the Egyptians and Greeks on the same matter. There is a curious parallelism between the sin of Adam, the first agriculturist before the Deluge, and that of Noah, the first agriculturist after the Deluge. Adam eat the fruit of a tree which was perhaps the vine, and so discovered that he was naked; Noah drank the wine and 'uncovered himself.' The curse, however, fell upon his offspring, not upon himself.

24. *Yêda'*, 'he knew,' is here used in the same way as *idi* in the Tel el-Amarna tablets. Though Ham is here called Noah's younger son, he is elsewhere always placed between Shem and Japhet, usually after Shem, but after Japhet in chap. 10. It is possible that there was a double tradition, one giving Noah three sons (like the three sons of Adam), the other giving him only two (like Cain and Abel). These two would have been Shem (Śamu) and Ham (Khammu), where we should have the same verbal jingle as in Jubal, Jabal, Tubal. If Ham represents the Babylonian Khammu, it would have been derived from a cuneiform text, since the initial letter in Khammu represents a West Semitic *ghain*, the name being the Heb. [ע]מ.

25–27. The double 'he said' indicates that we have quotations from two different poems, or from different parts of the same poem. Hence the parallelism is not the same; in the one case Canaan is cursed, in the other case it is 'the god of Shem' that is blessed. There is no reason for thinking that the name of Canaan has been substituted for that of Ham, or the name of Ham for that of Canaan; Ham was 'the father of Canaan,' and in Hebrew belief the sins of the father were visited upon the children. Consequently the Hebrew writer had no difficulty in believing that the curse embodied in the words of the old poem was the result of the action of Ham.

The description of Canaan was literally true of it in the Mosaic age. It had been a province of Babylonia; it was now nominally a province of Egypt, from whose hands it was being wrested by the Hittites from Asia Minor. Its cities and native princes were subject to the governors placed over them by the Babylonian or Egyptian or Hittite king, and thus servants 'of servants.'

The fall of the eighteenth Egyptian dynasty brought with it the loss of the Egyptian empire in Asia, which passed from them to the Hittites, and though it was partially recovered by Seti I. and Ramses II., it was again lost under Meneptah, the son and successor of Ramses II. Only those verses of the old poem are quoted which refer to the Babylonian and Hittite dominations; that

[1] *Kurunnu* must have been borrowed from the same quarter, since it is the Greek κάρουνον (Lat. *carenum*), the name of a sweet wine made in Asia Minor.

referring to the Egyptian domination has been omitted, since Egypt was regarded by the Hebrew writer as a brother of Canaan. But we may gather that there was such a reference from the statement in the first quotation that Canaan should be subject to 'his brethren.' The reference would have come between vv.[26] and [27].

Yahweh is here stated to be 'the god of Shem'; see note on Gn 4[26]. The founder of the dynasty to which Khammu-rabi, 'king of the land of the Amorites,' belonged was Śamu-abi, 'Shem is my father.' As Ham was the father of Canaan, so Shem was the father of the Babylonian king.

The play upon the name of Japhet—'God shall make wide (the road) for Japhet'—is made to harmonize with the political situation at the time. In the Tel el-Amarna tablets we see the Hittites descending from Asia Minor upon Syria and Canaan, and the recently discovered tablets of Boghaz Keui complete the picture of the formation of their empire in Semitic lands. In the age of Ramses II. they were paramount in Aram, where they dwelt 'in the tents of Shem,' and Canaan had for some time been their 'servant.' Since the days when they invaded Babylonia and helped to overthrow the dynasty of Khammu-rabi, the road into the region of Shem had indeed been 'made wide' for them.

In these fragments of an old poem or poems there are no traces of a Babylonian original.

28. Cf. the title of the list of early Babylonian kings in the tablet which interprets their names, *annutum sarrê sa arki abubi*, 'these are the kings who were after the deluge.' As Noah was not a 'king'—the first king being Nimrod—he 'lived' only, and did not 'reign.'

Contributions and Comments.

'Danaïds and Dirces' in the Epistle of Clement to Corinth.

ALL students of the Apostolic Fathers are familiar with the perplexing statement near the beginning of chap. vi. in the Epistle of Clement of Rome.

διὰ ζῆλος διωχθεῖσαι γυναῖκες Δαναΐδες καὶ Δίρκαι αἰκίσματα δεινὰ καὶ ἀνόσια παθοῦσαι, ἐπὶ τὸν τῆς πίστεως βέβαιον δρόμον κατήντησαν, καὶ ἔλαβον γέρας γενναῖον, αἱ ἀσθενεῖς τῷ σώματι.

'It was by reason of jealousy that women being persecuted, after having suffered horrible and unholy outrages as Danaids and Dirces, attained to the sure course of faith and won a noble reward, weak though they were in body.'

'Attained to the sure course' is not a very obvious expression, and the exact meaning of it is not clear. Apparently it means the point in the race at which victory becomes sure, namely, the goal, or somewhere near the goal. The precise signification of the phrase is not of importance for understanding the sentence as a whole, but one would like to see what suggested the expression to Clement.

The difficulty of the passage, however, lies earlier in the sentence. What is the meaning of *Δαναΐδες καὶ Δίρκαι* as designating Christian women who suffered in the Neronian persecution? The words may be taken either with *διωχθεῖσαι* or with *παθοῦσαι*, and the meaning is much the same whichever construction we adopt.

The common explanation is that it refers to the monstrous practice, specially common under Nero and Domitian, of turning the punishment of criminals into dramatic scenes for the entertainment of the cruel by making the condemned person play the part of some sufferer in mythology. Lightfoot (*Clement of Rome*, ii. p. 32) gives illustrations. 'Thus one offender would represent Hercules burnt in the flames on Œta (Tertull. *Apol.* 15, *qui vivus ardebat Herculem induerat*); another, Ixion tortured on the wheel (*de Pudic.* 22, *puta in axe jam incendio adstructo*). We read also of criminals who, having been exhibited in the character of Orpheus (Martial. *Spec.* 21), or of Daedalus (*ib.* 8), or of Atys (Tertull. *Apol.* 15), were finally torn to pieces by wild beasts. The story of Dirce, tied by the hair and dragged along by the bull, would be very appropriate for this treatment; but all attempts to make anything of the legend of the Danaids entirely fail.' Renan, who again and again adopts this explanation as the right one (*L'Antechrist*, pp. 167, 169, 173, 182, 187), admits that *Il est difficile de dire en quoi la*