

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

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.'¹ 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.

¹ *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;² 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 Hambaba, 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.

² 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 5²³, 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

the fields and vineyards. Buttenwieser follows Kohler in reading 'lords of the field,' that is, the elves or gnomes who belong to the same class as the satyrs.

I quote from my own comment in the *Century Bible* to lead up to the communication which it is the object of this note to bring before the reader :

'There runs through much of the Old Testament a deep sense of the sympathy between man and nature, which often finds expression in the prophetic descriptions of the happy future. Here the thought is poetically expressed that he need not fear famine (verse 22), for the stones will keep out of his field. It can surely hardly be meant that the very stones will bring forth corn and fruit, we might in that case compare Matt. iii. 9, iv. 3.'

I have received the following from the Rev. T. J. Chapman of the Rectory, Alcester :

'In your commentary on Job, *Century Bible*, I note your remarks on v. 23. It may interest you that a certain sheep station near Longreach in Queensland was the stoniest of all the stations I visited there. They varied in size up to that of a big turnip. When I remarked upon this peculiarity, the manager said the stones helped to grow the best grass anywhere, because they retained the heat after sundown and acted as a forcing-house on the grass.'

I do not know whether this confirms the general text or suggests the right interpretation, but I thought it sufficiently interesting to ask Mr. Chapman's permission to communicate it to the readers of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

ARTHUR S. PEAKE.

Manchester.

St. Matt. xxv. 36 ; 2 Tim. i. 16-18.

IN Mt 25³¹⁻⁴⁶ we have a description of the Judgment Day; and in the list of deeds of mercy for which the righteous are rewarded is the visitation of those in prison: 'I was in prison and ye came unto me.' There is surely a very distinct and unmistakable reference to this passage in 2 Ti 1¹⁶⁻¹⁸, where St. Paul mentions the kindness of Onesiphorus, who visited him in prison: 'He oft refreshed me and was not ashamed of my chain: but, when he was in Rome, he sought me out very diligently and found me. The Lord grant unto

him that he may find mercy of the Lord *in that day.*' In none of the commentaries which I have at hand is there the faintest allusion to what seems to me the remarkable and interesting fact that in this epistle there should be such a definite reference to the Gospel of St. Matthew. The date of 2nd Timothy is, I presume, A.D. 66 or 67, and evidently at that time the First Gospel was in current use.

JOHN WILLCOCK.

Lerwick.

Concerning the Name 'Paraclete.'

FOUND only (of Holy Writ) in the writings ascribed to St. John, the word 'paraclete' is rendered 'Advocate' in the First Epistle, but 'Comforter' in the Gospel. Yet *παράκλητος* is the exact equivalent of *advocatus*, and, like it, is a word of passive meaning, and it is never used in the classics or in Rabbinical writings except as meaning 'advocate'—that is to say, as meaning a third person called in to speak for a second person before a first.

The paraclete is one of three, not of two: one of these sits to hear a cause pleaded, one stands on trial before that first; and there is also this third party who is called in to answer for that second party and act the part of his advocate.

This being so, it seems scarcely permissible to accept (unless for devotional reading) the rendering 'Comforter' as satisfying and giving truly the sense of the Scripture in question.

The suggestion here diffidently offered would permit the student as such to read 'Advocate' for *παράκλητος* in the Gospel as in the Epistle. He would conceive of Christ Jesus in the days of His flesh as God's advocate with men—he would think of God as sending in Christ's name 'Another Advocate' to plead for Christ with the Church and the disciple (and, by the Church and the disciple, with the world and men). Our Lord did, in the days of His flesh, do the work of an advocate for the Father—giving men the truth about God, showing men the things of God, revealing God as He is in truth. He advocated God's cause and His claim on men; He vindicated God's ways with men and pled for belief in His Fatherhood, His impartiality, His nearness and forgivingness. He fulfilled that word, 'Let us reason together . . . let us plead together.' To the last, till we lost