

# 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 Expositor* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_expositor-series-1.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php)

shown to be a solution of what would otherwise be an inexplicable mystery. Apart from the Gospel St. Paul has proved, in harmony with the teaching of still earlier Jewish writers, that men suffer and die because of the sin of one who lived long ages before they were born. If this were the whole case, it would be difficult to harmonize with the justice of God. This difficulty the Gospel of eternal life removes. The pardon proclaimed by Christ for all men justifies the curse pronounced on all because of Adam's sin.

In the comparison of Adam and Christ, nothing has been said about the *Law*. In verse 20 we read that a *Law* (viz. that of Moses) *came in alongside, i.e.* between the curse and the blessing. Its immediate purpose was that the one *trespass* might be multiplied into many; its ultimate aim (verse 21) was the reign of *grace* leading up to *life eternal through Jesus Christ our Lord*. Thus the chapter concludes with its dominating thought.

The spiritual significance of the Law will come before us in another paper, in which I hope to expound the chief teaching of chapter vii. where the Law holds a conspicuous place.

JOSEPH AGAR BEET.

#### NOTE ON "ANCIENT HEBREW TRADITION."

DR. HOMMEL (on page 196 of his *Ancient Hebrew Tradition*, Eng. edn.) gives some extracts in translation from K. 3,500, a tablet in the British Museum. I do not know whether the general reader is convinced, by the other arguments brought forward to support the conjecture, that the Babylonian original of Genesis xiv. contained the name Malgu, or something like it. What support K. 3,500 could give to such a theory in any case passes my powers of imagination. If Baal-sameme, Baal-malagie, and Baal-

şapunu be gods of the "Westland," their names do not go far to establish the existence of the towns Sameme, Malagî, and Şapunu, still less to locate those towns near Sodom and Gomorrah.

Dr. Hommel somewhat doubtfully ascribed the tablet to Aššur-bel-kala or Aššurnasir-pal. He does not appear to have seen the original, but relied solely upon a copy by Pinches. Some time ago I was attracted by Dr. Bezold's description of it in the Museum Catalogue as "a prayer (?) of an Assyrian king for the destruction of his enemies." The column from which the extracts in the Catalogue were made contains the imprecations of the Assyrian king upon the violators of the treaty of which that column is the close. Last summer Dr. J. A. Craig called my attention to the fact that Dr. Hommel had used the tablet, and gave me to understand that the Munich Professor had gone widely astray in his understanding of the contents. As Dr. Craig intimated that he was about to publish the text, I gave no further heed to the question. Dr. H. Winckler's *Altorientalische Forschungen* (Bd. I. Heft. 1, Sec. Series) has just come to hand, and there, on page 10f., I see the much-abused tablet given in transcription and translation. It is most instructive to see how the doctors disagree.

The "prayer" part Dr. Winckler puts as Col. 1, and it appears to be all that Dr. Hommel had seen. Since Mr. Pinches sent his copy off, two large additional fragments have been joined, and the whole purport of the tablet is now beyond question.

It contains a copy or draft of the treaty between Esarhaddon and Baal, king of Tyre.

Dr. Winckler's text appears to me very fair, but perpetuates some errors in a way one does not expect from a second edition.

Lines 17-20 of his Col. 1 are written on the lower

edge of the tablet. The curious word given by Dr. Winckler after *duppi* in line 20 should be *a-di-e*, *i.e.* "compacts," "agreements," "treaty."

Line 20 is therefore the "colophon" or title of the document written at its foot, and should give a clue to the first line.

This Col. 1 of Dr. Winckler's is therefore really Col. 4 of the document.

With this clue from the colophon one expects the first line of the treaty to begin "(duppi adi)e ša Aššur-aḥ-iddin šar mât Aššur," etc.; and unless my eyes deceived me, that *is* what line 1 of Dr. Winckler's Col. 4 does contain. If so, his Shalmaneser disappears.

There are many small points of difference between Dr. Winckler's text and mine, which can hardly be discussed here. One only seems of general interest. The name which Dr. Hommel gave as *Milgi*, Dr. Winckler corrects to *Milgišu*, which is nearer the truth. It is really *Mi-il-ḡar-tu*, as anyone can see for himself now it is pointed out. Instead of some mysterious god of *Milgi-Malagî*, it is our old friend *Melqart*.

I may add that, naturally, neither *Sameme*, *Malagî*, *Şapunu* nor *Milgî* have the determinative prefix of city before them.

C. H. W. JOHNS.