

# 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](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php)

pdfs are named: [Volume]\_[Issue]\_[1<sup>st</sup> page of article].pdf

Lord is not only able to do all that we ask or think, but *above* all, in excess of all, beyond all. Higher than our highest thought, His power to do reaches. Higher than the highest thought of any of His creatures. Paul's discursive, soaring mind, in its wide and lofty flights, may see wonderful things, things which it is not lawful for him to utter, because they so much surpass our present imaginings that they might shake our faith, if not becloud our reason. John's eagle *eye*, purged by pain, strengthened by devout meditations in the solitude of Patmos, lighted up by Divine inspiration, may see apocalyptic splendours which dazzle us by their brightness and their glory. But neither Paul's nor John's thinking can equal the Divine power to do. He is able to do above all that either Paul or John can ask or think.

3. Nor is it a bare surpassing even, to which the apostle testifies, as if God's power rose just above our thinking, and scarcely more; overtopping, but barely overtopping it. God's power is thus not nearly matched by man's thinking. 'He is able to do *abundantly* above all that we ask or think.' But even this is not all. Paul has a yet stronger word by which he gives intensity to all the others. Abundantly is not enough for him; there is something even beyond abundance. 'God is able to

do *exceeding* abundantly.' Further than this language cannot go. He might repeat himself, but he could scarcely intensify, even by repetition, what he has here said: 'Exceeding abundantly above all we ask or think.'

Sir Robert Ball tells us that the sun could heat and light two thousand million worlds like ours. Suppose a man to be left eight million pounds, and of that eight million to spend a penny wisely, but to waste and throw away all the rest, you would say of all the extravagant people you had ever heard of, he was the most spendthrift and extravagant. Well, Sir Robert Ball tells us that if eight million pounds' worth of heat emanated from the sun, we would not be able to secure and make use of on this earth more than the value of a pennyworth. There are other planets which use it, of course, but when every allowance is made for what they consume, there cannot be a doubt that by far the greater quantity of the heat and light given out by the sun is apparently wasted. It isn't needed in this world. Yet God made the universe on this tremendously liberal scale. Nothing is too great or too good for the man He has made. He withholds nothing from us—not even His Son—that He may show His love for us.

## The Early Amorite King Humbaba.

BY PROFESSOR A. T. CLAY, PH.D., LITT.D., LL.D., YALE UNIVERSITY.

It is generally understood that in certain Aryan lands gods became men. Many scholars maintain that the same has occurred with the Semites. They have said that Nimrod, the patriarchs, and many other Biblical characters were originally deities; that Etana, Lugal Marda, Tammuz, Gilgamesh, and many other Babylonian rulers had also descended from the realms of mythology. Fortunately clay tablets, which are not as perishable as skins and papyrus, have recently furnished us with the material whereby some of these so-called deities are restored to their places in dynastic lists, and whereby it is possible to assert that it cannot be proved that gods ever became mortals in the Semitic world. The order must be exactly reversed. While anthropomorphic ideas are attributed to the deities, we have no instance of a Semitic god

becoming a man. Perhaps it will be found that even more of the gods of Persia and India, who became mortals, had originally been human beings.

Etana has recently been restored to his place as a ruler in the earliest known dynasty, where he is called a 'shepherd.' The unpublished text in the Pierpont Morgan Library Collection, which figures in what follows, calls him 'king.' Lugal Marda, Tammuz, Gilgamesh, and other rulers who had been deities, are now known to have been kings. From what follows, Humbaba, the despot with whom Gilgamesh fought, proves also to have been a human being, and to have been one of the earliest kings of the country later called Amurru, or the land of the Amorites. As a result there follow far-reaching and important conclusions as regards the early history and culture of this land.

The stronghold of Humbaba, with whom Gilgamesh fought as related in the epic bearing his name, has generally been located in the past in Elam; and it has also been generally held that the name is Elamitic. These conclusions have not rested upon the fact that cedar forests were known to have existed in Elam, for all the numerous references to cedars have been understood to refer to the Lebanon and Amanus ranges. The conclusions rested solely upon the slight resemblance of the name Humbaba to that of the Elamite god Humba, which is also written Humman, Humban, Umman, Umba, etc. The identification with this deity was also one of the reasons why emphasis was placed upon the Gilgamesh Epic being based upon a foundation of myth. A comparison of the name was made with Kombabos of the legend of Lucian concerning the building of the temple at Hieropolis, but the name continued to be identified with the Elamite god.<sup>1</sup> While others realized that the description of the cedars seemed to suggest the districts in the West, nevertheless the forests were considered to be in Elam.<sup>2</sup>

In the omen literature a word read *hu-pi-pi* occurs several times which has been regarded generally to be the name of an animal; and even has been translated 'hyena.'<sup>3</sup> The same word occurs as a personal name in the early period. This word, strange to say, has also been regarded as an Elamitic loan-word, but on the basis of the reduplication of the final consonant.<sup>4</sup>

A few years ago an Amorite Name Syllabary was published, which contained *Hu-pi-pi*.<sup>5</sup> The more recent discovery that in the Yale tablet of the old Babylonian version of the Gilgamesh Epic, the familiar name Humbaba is written exactly the same, showed that the correct reading of the word in the omen texts, and of the personal name, was not *Hu-pi-pi* but *Hu-wa-wa*, which reproduced the pronunciation of *Hu-ba-ba*. The name proved to be the same as that of Hobab, the brother-in-law of Moses (Nu 10<sup>29</sup>); and it is unquestionably the same as Kombabos of Lucian.<sup>6</sup> Furthermore, it naturally followed that the reference to the conflict

between Gilgamesh of Erech and Humbaba of the West was an allusion to an important historical event of the early period.<sup>7</sup> Additional light is now thrown upon the situation from an omen text in the Pierpont Morgan Library Collection.

It is a well-established idea that the definite historical allusions to which omens refer were originally supplied by actual events that followed the appearance of the prognosticating signs which the priests had observed. Following are a few of the omens referring to historical events.

'If the foetus is male and female (a monstrosity); it is the omen of Bau-ellit, who ruled the land; the king's country will be seized.'<sup>8</sup> It is now definitely known that this woman, Bau-ellit, overthrew the rule of Akshak, and established the fourth dynasty of Kish.

No less than eleven historical omens are known which bear upon Sargon's reign. In one of them the expression 'he possessed no foe nor rival,' meaning he had subdued the neighbouring lands, is fully borne out by many discoveries.

There are two well-known omens relating to Narâm-Sin, one referring to his overthrow of Apirak, and the other to his conquest of Magan. The former is summarized in the eighteenth line in the Morgan text, which reads: 'If the *tirani* is like a woolen rope; it is the omen of Narâm-Sin, who overthrew Apirak in arms.' This is fully confirmed by the chronicles of Babylonian kings.<sup>9</sup>

Another omen referring to the founder of a dynasty reads: 'If a sheep gives birth to an ox, etc., it is the omen of Ishbi-Urri, who did not have a rival.'<sup>10</sup> We now have historical data to show that this Amorite, from the city of Mari, overthrew the third dynasty of Ur, and became the founder of the Nisin dynasty.<sup>11</sup> These examples suffice to show that omens of this character unquestionably refer to historical events, and notably to great conquerors who overthrew dynasties, as well as to subjugating enemies.

The two omens referring to Huwawa have been known for some time; one reads: 'If a woman give birth to the face of Huwawa, the king and his sons will leave the city.'<sup>12</sup> The other is, 'If a sheep bear a lion, and it has the face of Huwawa, the prince will not have a rival; he will destroy

<sup>1</sup> Ungnad, *Das Gilgamesch-Epos*, p. 77.

<sup>2</sup> Gressmann, *ibid.* p. 111.

<sup>3</sup> Holma, *Namen der Körperteile*, p. 152.

<sup>4</sup> Weidner, *O.L.Z.* 17, p. 502.

<sup>5</sup> Chiera, *Lists of Personal Names*, p. 122.

<sup>6</sup> It is not improbable that Lucian's tradition contains a reflexion of the ancient Humbaba, who may have built or rebuilt the temple.

<sup>7</sup> Clay, *Empire of the Amorites*, p. 88.

<sup>8</sup> C. T. 28. 6 : 1 f.

<sup>9</sup> King, *Chronicles*, i. 32 ff.

<sup>10</sup> C. T. 27. 22 : 21.

<sup>11</sup> *Empire of the Amorites*, p. 107.

<sup>12</sup> C. T. 27. 3 : 17 = 4 : 9 = 6 : 4.

the land of the enemy.<sup>1</sup> In the omen text of the Pierpont Morgan Library Collection, this one is found in line 65: 'If the *tirani* is like the face of  $\text{Hum. Hum}$ , a usurper of the land will rule the world.' A fragment in the British Museum duplicates the first part of six consecutive lines of this text (*i.e.* 63 to 68), the third of which reads: 'If the *tirani* is like the face of  $\text{Hum-ba-ba}$ , etc.,'<sup>2</sup> showing that the ideogram  $\text{Hum. Hum}$  is to be read Humbaba. These omens can only be interpreted as meaning that Humbaba was a usurper, who, like Bau-ellit, Sargon, and Ishbi-Urra, overthrew a dynasty; conquered the lands; and was without a rival. The third interprets the other two; together they clearly indicate that Humbaba or Huwawa had been a mighty conqueror, and had doubtless subjugated Babylonia.

What the characteristic feature was which enabled the priests to associate the omen-sign with Huwawa is not clear. Jastrow has shown that Huwawa in omens is contrasted with *tigru*, 'dwarf.'<sup>3</sup> The character of Humbaba is described in the Gilgamesh Epic as a *dapini*, 'terrible one,' 'whose roar is a deluge, whose mouth is fire, whose breath is death.' The elders in their efforts to dissuade Gilgamesh from attempting to overthrow him, asked, 'Who has ever penetrated to his dwelling-place or capital in the heart of the cedar forest?' 'Who has ever opposed his weapon?' In short, the references to the despot seem to convey the idea that he was a powerful personage.

Gilgamesh also figures in the divination texts; among which the following has been found. 'If a woman give birth, and the (child) has the head of a snake: (it is) the omen of Nin-Gish-Zid-da who ravaged the land; (and it is) the omen of Gilgamesh who ruled the land, and who became "the king of hosts" in the land.'<sup>4</sup> It is clear from the Gilgamesh Epic, that Gilgamesh in the early part of his reign was subservient to another; and that he was able to overthrow his enemy.

The new chronological material bearing upon the early dynasties recently published, considered in connexion with all other data not known, gives us a fairly complete outline of historical events of

this early period.<sup>5</sup> Following Mesh-kin-gasher and Enmer-kar, the first two kings of the early Erech dynasty, were Lugal Marda, Tammuz, and Gilgamesh. During the reigns of these kings we learn of contact with a great power in the West.

The so-called 'Legend of the Zu bird' acquaints us with the fact that an enemy designated as Zu, 'the storm bird,' not the 'personification of some solar deity,' but an invader who lived in an inaccessible distant mountain, had robbed Enlil of Nippur of his supremacy as 'lord of lands.' Lugal Marda, 'a shepherd,' came to the rescue, and succeeded in restoring Enlil to his position; for which he is in time credited with the title of 'Enlil of Kullab, Lugal Marda.'<sup>6</sup> In pursuit of Zu, it was to the 'distant mountain Sâbu' that Lugal Marda went. Sâbu was in the Lebanon range.<sup>7</sup> In other words, the enemy Zu represented an Amorite or West Semitic power which doubtless had invaded Babylonia.<sup>8</sup> The so-called 'Legend of the Zu' was doubtless intended to commemorate the overthrow of this power by Lugal Marda.

Delitzsch years ago conjectured that the name Nimrod was from *Nu-Marad*, 'man of Marad.' More recently Kraeling suggested that the original form was *En-Marad*, standing for Lugal-Marad.<sup>9</sup> If this 'shepherd' king should prove to be Nimrod, his Old Testament title, 'the mighty hunter,' or 'ensnarer,' may have reference to the strategy he employed in overthrowing the 'Zu bird.'

Lugal Marda is the most powerful king of this period at present known; and he is credited with having ruled longer than any other of his dynasty. The fragment of an historical text, recently published, shows that he conquered Halma (Aleppo) and Tidnum in the West; and it can be assumed that he ruled that land. This would give sufficient reason why his name should have been preserved in the traditions of the West. It is the only name of the Babylonian rulers of the early period that is preserved in the Old Testament. Moreover, his own habitat may originally have been in that land,

<sup>5</sup> Poebel, *Historical Texts*, 88 ff.

<sup>6</sup> Given as the explanation of a star; cf. Rawlinson, v. 46. 1: 27.

<sup>7</sup> Jensen, *K.B.* vi. 1, p. 578; Zimmern, *K.A.T.*<sup>3</sup> p. 574, note 3.

<sup>8</sup> A city Su was identified with Mari (*C.T.* 25. 35, 24-27). On Su as an element in geographical names, cf. Delitzsch, *Paradies*, and *Empire of the Amorites*, p. 177.

<sup>9</sup> See Prince's article *J.A.O.S.* 41, 201.

<sup>1</sup> *C.T.* 27. 21: 8. See also *C.T.* 28. 14: 12. Cf. also *Hu-um-ba-bi-tu*, *C.T.* 27: 6=27. 4-8.

<sup>2</sup> Boissier, *Divination*, p. 91.

<sup>3</sup> Religion, *Babyloniens*, ii. 913 f.

<sup>4</sup> *C.T.* 27. 1: 8-9.

for his wife's name, although written in Sumerian, Nin-Sun,<sup>1</sup> was Semitic, namely, Rimat-Bêlit; and her father bore the Amorite name Semak-Ur (Semachoros), a name like the Old Testament Semak-Jahu (Semachiah).<sup>2</sup>

Tammuz followed Lugal Marda as king of Erech. Babylonia had suffered another upheaval; Nun-Gish-Zid-da, 'his father, had ravaged the land,' as we learn from the omen. Besides this fact he is known only as a deity, with his habitat at Lagash. Doubtless he was king of that city.

Tammuz was not originally 'the personification of the son of the spring-time'; or 'the personification of some kind of wood'; but he was a human being, the fourth king of the early Erech dynasty.<sup>3</sup>

While legends concerning Tammuz (also called Adonis, etc.) and Ashirta (also called Astarte, Ashtaroth, 'Athar, 'Atar, Ashtar, Ishtar, Venus, Aphrodite, etc.) are of widespread origin, they are pre-eminently identified with Syria and the city of Erech in Babylonia. They cluster especially about a vale near Aphaca (Aphék, Jos 13<sup>4</sup>), at present represented by the modern Afka, at the head of the wild romantic wooded gorge of the Adonis river, in the Lebanon region, midway between Byblos and Ba'albec. Here tradition says the mangled body of the hunter was buried. Here are to be found many ruined monuments of his worship; one is that of a great temple of Astarte which Constantine destroyed. Another of the memorials that have kept the legends alive is now to be seen at Ghineh, where reliefs of Tammuz and Ashirta are carved upon the rocks. Tammuz is there portrayed with a spear awaiting an animal; while Ashirta is seated near by in a sorrowful attitude.<sup>4</sup>

The mother of Tammuz was named Zertu (also written Sirdu), which seems also to be Semitic. The name Tammuz was reproduced by two Sumerian words or ideograms, which represented the pronunciation, namely, Dumu-Zi, meaning 'faithful son'; but this is no proof that Tammuz was a Sumerian. His father's name, Nin-Gish-Zid-da, is also in a Sumerian dress; but this very

probably also represents a Semitic name. His having ruled at Lagash would fully account for his name being written Sumerian.

The city *Ĥa-A*, whence Tammuz came, has not been located; but his connexions with the legends of Syria, and especially because of the passage concerning him in a lamentation hymn, which reads, 'at the sacred cedar, a distant place where he was born' (or 'where his mother bore him'), points to the West as his birthplace.<sup>5</sup> A number of passages show that he was worshipped at Hallab (Aleppo).<sup>6</sup> Certainly his connexion with Ashirta and the West would imply that he was a Semite rather than a Sumerian. Moreover, he very probably met a premature death by drowning, which can be gathered from several passages, while associating, in the Lebanon region, with his contemporary Ashirta, perhaps a queen of Sheba or a Cleopatra of that era, who had her seat of government at Hallab.

The chief seat of the cult of Ashirta or Ishtar in Babylonia was at Erech; but Hallab seems to have been her home. In a lamentation hymn we have this passage: 'The queen of Erech for her husband; the queen of Hallab for her husband (wails).' This and other couplets, referring to Ishtar or to Tammuz and Ishtar, show that these two cities were intimately identified with each other.<sup>7</sup> One of the earliest religious hymns known tells us she was from the land of Hallab.<sup>8</sup> In the Gilgamesh Epic when she proposes to Gilgamesh, she says: 'Come, Gilgamesh, be thou my spouse. Present me with thy offspring; be thou my husband, let me be thy wife; and I will set thee in a chariot, etc. . . . Into our house under the fragrance of the cedar tree, enter. And when thou enterest our house [they shall place thee upon] a throne; they shall kiss thy feet.' In refusing her advances, Gilgamesh asked her what she had done with Tammuz and her other husbands; whereupon she told the god Anu that Gilgamesh had upbraided her on account of her evil deeds; and she asked for vengeance. Certainly, there is sufficient evidence to show that the Babylonians not only looked upon her as having been a mortal, but also that the West was her habitat. Moreover, since

<sup>1</sup> Instead of following certain scholars in translating *ri-im-tum ša su-pu-ri* *Nin-Sun-na*, 'the wild cow of the stall, Nin-Sun,' this title of the mother-queen should be translated 'the beloved of the fortified city, Rimat-Bêlit.' For Sun = *rimtu*, cf. *S.A.I.* 6727.

<sup>2</sup> *Empire of the Amorites*, p. 84.

<sup>3</sup> Poebel, *Historical Texts*, p. 88.

<sup>4</sup> Frazer, *Adonis, Attis, and Osiris*, i. p. 29.

<sup>5</sup> *Empire of the Amorites*, p. 83.

<sup>6</sup> *C.T.* 15, 26 : 5.

<sup>7</sup> Scheil, *R.A.* 8. 162, 4-5; *C.T.* 15. 19 : 4-7; and *C.T.* 15. 26 : 5-6, etc.

<sup>8</sup> Barton, *Babylonian Inscriptions*, i. col. 13 : 6.

Lugal Marda and his queen Nin-Sun, Nin-Gish-Zid-da and his queen Zerta, Tammuz, Gilgamesh, and Humbaba, all the kings and queens of this period were worshipped as deities, the suggestion that Ashirta, also called Ishtar, the wife of Tammuz, had also been a mortal, seems to the writer to be a perfectly reasonable conjecture. That the worship of this deified woman should have become so widespread, was doubtless due to the peculiarity of her cult which appealed to the sensuality of man. Throughout Syria, including Phœnicia and Canaan, the unspeakable abominations of her licentious cult took deep root. It was not so in Babylonia and Assyria, especially in the early period; for the one city which stands out peculiarly in having temple prostitutes is Erech. It is this fact which prompted Sayce long ago to say that 'Erech was essentially a Semitic city.'<sup>1</sup> In short, in consideration of all that we know of Erech's contact with the West, it is not difficult to understand how her cult migrated to Babylonia from that region.

Gilgamesh was not connected with the family of Tammuz, but with that of the latter's predecessor. He was the son of Rimat-Bêlit, the wife of Lugal Marda, and of the high priest of Kullab, a part of Erech, perhaps the Semitic quarter of that city. We are led to believe from the Epic of Gilgamesh that in the early part of his career Erech was subservient to another throne. Moreover, from the omen already referred to, we learn that one named Humbaba, who had usurped the throne of the West, had conquered the lands.

<sup>1</sup> *Gifford Lectures*, 1903, p. 342.

About this time another personage named Enkidu appeared on the scene, and became the ally of Gilgamesh. He 'had been reared in the mountains.' When the expedition to the West was being planned, he said to Gilgamesh, 'Know, my friend, when I moved about with the cattle in the mountain, I penetrated to a distance of a double measure into the heart of the (cedar) forest, where Huwawa lived.' The name En-ki-Du, although written in Sumerian, was very probably Semitic, Ea-tâbu, or Ba'al-jôb;<sup>2</sup> and he was apparently another Western Semite. With his assistance Humbaba was overthrown, and Gilgamesh became 'king of hosts.' The epic bearing the name of Gilgamesh was originally written to commemorate that event.

If certain statements here presented are accepted as facts, namely, that Zu represents a power in the West; that the culture which existed at Hallab in the time of Tammuz, was Semitic; and that this ruler had relations with that city; that Humbaba, the contemporary of Gilgamesh (about 3900 B.C.), lived in the West land, and that he had humiliated Babylonia; then the thesis is unassailable that the history and culture of the country later designated as Amurru, 'the Land of the Amorites,' synchronize with the earliest known in Babylonia and Egypt. This being true, many prevailing theories concerning the Arabian origin of the Semites, Pan-Babylonism or the Babylonian origin of the Israel's culture and religion, etc., will need very considerable modification.

<sup>2</sup> Previously read Ea-bâni. The more ancient text reads Dú(g)=tâbu, instead of Dú=bânu.

## Contributions and Comments.

### 'In League with the Stones of the Field.'

SEVERAL explanations have been given of this phrase in Job 5<sup>23</sup>, which may be seen in the older commentators; for example, A. B. Davidson's early commentary on Job. Modern interpreters generally take the meaning to be that the stones keep out of his field. So Dillmann, Duhm, Budde, Volz, Driver and Gray. The expression is, it must be

granted, somewhat curious, and it is not strange that the text has been questioned. Hence for 'stones,' 'lords' and 'sons' have been suggested, partly in reliance on ancient tradition. Dr. Bell prefers 'sons of the field,' translating the couplet:

Having league with the children of the field,  
And the wild things being made thy friends.

He supposes that 'children of the field' is equivalent to 'the wild things,' the meaning being that the wild boar, the fox, etc., will no longer ravage