

# 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

the forgiveness of those who crucified Him, that in His dying He proved not only His fidelity to God, but His sympathy with, and compassion for, man. The whole New Testament records the experience of men who had found forgiveness in Christ and Christ crucified. The interpretation given above offers us a reason for this assurance. In Christ's consciousness the moral affinity of God and man was realized in a moral community of judgment of sin, and what is forgiveness but the restoration of man's moral community with God, disturbed by sin? Christ by His Spirit reproduces that consciousness in believers, for in Him they die unto sin, and live unto God, and so the broken fellowship is renewed. When in penitence they accept and approve God's judgment, then and only then can they in faith receive the grace wherein they stand as sons redeemed by the Son of God.

4. Any statement must be incomplete, and yet the Christian thinker must do his utmost to get as near completeness as he can. While we must recognize the necessity of the death of Christ as penal substitution and satisfaction, not in the sense that He felt Himself guilty, or was punishment by God, but in the sense that in submitting unto death He not only shared with man the consequences of sin, but accepted and approved the moral order of God which appointed these consequences, yet the value of the death of Christ transcends that necessity. It is not Christ's suffering with which God is well pleased; it is those sufferings as the necessary sacrifice of a love

such as His for a race such as ours in a world of sin, pain, and death. It is the perfect love, compassionate to man and obedient to God, that has in itself a value so absolute, revealing and realizing eternal perfection, that it once for all in human history gives the promise and the pledge that God's purpose, challenged by sin, will be fulfilled. God is justified in His permission and tolerance of sin in the world, in His judgments that have ever fallen short of the extinction of sinners, by introducing into human history the Cross that judges in forgiving sin, because He has therein brought into the human race a standard, a motive, and a power of holy love, which are a morally and spiritually recreative activity of God for the effective transformation of sinners into sons and saints. The sinful, sorrowing, dying world without the Cross would make belief in God as holy love well-nigh impossible; the Cross in such a world makes faith in the eternal perfection of God not only possible, but certain and confident. As moral achievement, no less than moral endurance, it justifies God's forgiveness of the race which Christ represents, and justifies man's faith in the God whom Christ reveals. Its absolute value more than compensates for the detraction from the world's moral value due to sin. There is active, no less than passive, obedience; there is merit no less than satisfaction. In the Cross not only is every barrier to the holy love of God to mankind removed; it is the channel for the full flow of that holy love.

## Recent Foreign Theology.

### A Hebrew Deluge Story in Cuneiform.<sup>1</sup>

PROFESSOR CLAY is one of the best and most accurate copyists of cuneiform texts, and he has a *flair* for discovering the most interesting among them. His new work is based on certain tablets in the Pierpont Morgan collection, one of which is an ancient version of the story of the Deluge. This, he points out, is an early form of the story as given in two broken tablets in the British Museum,

<sup>1</sup> *A Hebrew Deluge Story in Cuneiform*, by Albert T. Clay. Oxford University Press, 1922.

which is known to Assyriologists as the 'Ea and Atrakhasis' version, and he gives revised translations of both of them. He has added to them the fragments of some other versions—a little fragment of thirteen lines written probably in the Kassite period, the Deluge story preserved in the fragments of Berossus, the fragment of a Sumerian version in the Philadelphia Museum, and another fragment dated in the eleventh year of Ammi-zadok (B.C. 1966) which is now in the Pierpont Morgan collection. As I stated in my *Higher Criticism* thirty years ago, there were many different versions of the story current in Babylonia, and

the standard Assyrian one embodied in the Epic of Gilgames is a combination of at least two of them.

Professor Clay, however, is not content with giving the text and translation of the Babylonian versions with full notes and commentary; he is the protagonist of the theory which would derive Babylonian culture from the Amorites or Western Semites instead of the contrary, and he endeavours to show that there are 'Amorite' and non-Babylonian words and other elements in the Pierpont Morgan version of the legend of the Flood which justify him in calling it a Hebrew story. I confess that here I cannot follow him; his evidence for 'Amorite' words and expressions seems to me to rest either upon more or less arbitrary interpretations or upon the assumption that because a word has not yet been met with in Babylonian literature, or occurs in it but seldom, it must therefore come from a foreign source. Nor can I follow him in rejecting the North Arabian origin of that portion of the Semitic-speaking populations which have the physical characteristics of the dolichocephalic Beduin. How, for instance, would he explain the fact that the Semitic *âlu* 'city' originally signified a tent (Heb. *ohel*), while the Hebrew *îr* is borrowed from Sumerian?

Nevertheless, the arguments with which he enforces his theory are suggestive and stimulating, and there is an element of truth at the bottom of them. If the Amorite peoples of Western Asia

first received their culture from Babylonia they afterwards repaid it. Amorite dynasties held sway in early Babylonia and brought back to it a civilization and literature which they had modified and improved.

The book is full of new and interesting matter and abounds in points which suggest further notes. Thus in the quotation from Ælian the statement that the father of Etana-Gilgames was 'a man of low degree' is explained by our finding in the Babylonian annals that Arwium, the predecessor of Etana, was 'the son of a plebeian.' *Dap(i)nu*, again (p. 37), was a royal title, and we may therefore conclude that the object of Etana's flight to heaven on the back of an eagle was to obtain possession of the royal insignia stored up there and thus establish himself as 'a mighty one' upon earth.

Professor Clay translates *ummu khubur*, the title given to Tiamat, 'the Deep,' in the Creation Epic, as 'mother of the assembly'; I should prefer to see in Khubur the name of the river of death which the dead had to cross and which was located in the north. Tiamat is called *Tiumê wê muqribat*, 'the Deep which collects the waters,' in one of the Assur tablets (*Keilschrifttexte aus Assur verschiedenen Inhalts*, p. 40, l. 22).

I have discovered only one error in this beautifully printed volume—'Erechian' instead of 'Eridian,' p. 41.

A. H. SAYCE.

Oxford.

## In the Study.

### *Virginibus Puerisque.*

A Field Preacher.

'Look at the flowers of the field.'—Mt 6<sup>28</sup>.

Isn't it a pity that we hear so very little in the Bible of what Jesus did when He was a small boy like you? It would have been fine to know who called in for Him on a morning on the way to school; and how He managed to do all His lessons, and yet help the little ones at night; and how He did at games. I'm sure that they picked Him at once when they were choosing sides, for He would always play His best, and never be selfish, would think always of the side. We don't hear much

of that, only of what He was and did when He grew up, and became a man and a minister. And yet we do know something of Him as a little chap. You very little bodies have a game that you call 'Houses.' You aren't just you. Oh no, you're Lady this, and Sir Somebody that, and you do the most wonderful things. And I think that, as a wee man, Jesus must have played too at 'pretending'—funerals and marriages, and all the rest of it. And perhaps they had great frolics of an evening at that home in Nazareth, with the workshop for a glorious playroom. At all events, Jesus seems to know about patches on boys' clothes, had seen His mother turn them round and