

\$2.90
Sub. Jan 9.

THE LIBRARY
THE UNIVERSITY
OF TEXAS

4
Per
U58 S

THE UNION SEMINARY REVIEW

VOL. XXXIX.

OCTOBER, 1927.

No. 1.

THE FUTURE OF THE REFORMED CHURCH.

*An Address on the Occasion of the Fiftieth Anniversary of the
Pan-Presbyterian Alliance, St. Giles Cathedral,
July 6, 1927, Edinburgh, Scotland.*

BY REV. HARRIS E. KIRK, D. D.,
Pastor of Franklin Street Presbyterian Church, Baltimore, Md.

2 Cor. 3:12: "Seeing then we have such hope, we use great plainness of speech."

Every man who preaches the gospel in our generation must have reasons within himself; he must develop a philosophy for going on in the face of whatever he has to meet. We do a great deal of talking to ourselves, and it is out of the heart then that I must speak. I ask you to consider with me the future of the reformed faith, for this has long been the burden of my thoughts. I have, like you, been compelled to ask whether the reformed religion as we hold it has a mission in such a world as ours; I can do no better then than to disclose some of these reflections to you, and I am turning first of all to the Pauline principle of my text. It is indeed a great gain to believe that one is right; that because what one believes about Christ and the gospel is true, he may preach it without misgiving and with the whole heart. So thoroughly had Paul considered the relation of Christianity to the old faith, he could speak frankly of it to others. Believing that all things had been fulfilled in Christ, that a new and final stage of spiritual history had begun; that the Advent was the end of all legalistic

122327

IS NOT DESTRUCTIVE CRITICISM IN A DECLINE?

BY REV. PARKE P. FLOURNOY, D. D.,
Washington, D. C.

(Dr. Flournoy wishes to retain rights in this article, as part of it may appear later as a chapter in a new book which he is now preparing, "New Light On the Bible".)

Our Saviour concluded His Sermon on the Mount with a picture as startling as if painted with a brush of fire. It depicted a man building his house on the sand (Matt. 7:6, 7), the fall of which was "great".

Within a century past there has been rising in our world a building of enormous dimensions, erected by most skillful hands, but now beginning to show signs of instability as if destined to fall with a crash which all the world shall hear, for it will be great indeed, though the process of its demolition may be slow, and its final fall delayed by many props used by hands as skillful as those which have accomplished its erection and embellishment. Many of them, no doubt, were sincere, well-meaning, good men, but wrought, not knowing what they were doing and what would be its probable results in the future, of which we are now sadly aware. But many well-qualified engineers have made a scientific examination of the foundation of this grand edifice, some of them having been its most distinguished builders. Their investigations cannot be adequately presented here, for lack of space, but I will refer the reader to an article in the "Biblical Review" of October, 1925, by Bishop H. M. DuBose, entitled "A Constructive Bible Science", and will quote a few sentences from it; and then, from "A Hebrew Story in Cuneiform" from the Pierpont Morgan Library, and from "Amurru, The Home of the Northern Semites"—both by the late lamented A. T. Clay, Professor of Semitic Philology and Archaeology of Yale University.

Referring to the assertion that the priests of the exile, with Ezra as their chief, were the authors of certain portions of Genesis, Bishop DuBose says: "The absurdity of a P'source'

in Genesis has been demonstrated by Professor Löhr and others. The truly logical and vital relation between the two [*i. e.*, Genesis and the following books of the Pentateuch] is not an exilic or near exilic 'source', but their origin in a common environment and a common authorship. Exodus contains and concludes the account of the construction of the tabernacle, with its altars and furniture; as it also reports the institution of the priesthood. Leviticus follows as the code manual of priestly administrations . . . and the general ritual worship. Exodus may be described as the reservoir . . . and Leviticus becomes the outlet. One is meaningless without the other. The transmission from Leviticus to Numbers is also logical and categorical."

Of the individuality of the Pentateuchal books Dr. BuBose says, "This individuality not only embodies the stages of the unity and development of Pentateuchal history, but it separates Deuteronomy naturally and according to internal claims by thirty-eight years from the Sinaitic writings, and sees it as a recapitulation and digest of the history and laws contained in Genesis and the three Sinaitic and near-Sinaitic books. This is what Möller calls the *Rückbeziehungen* ("leaning back") of Deuteronomy upon the other four books of Moses . . . This conclusion has suggested a new title for the Mosaic literature, namely, 'The Tetrateuch and Deuteronomy'."

"Wilhelm Möller . . . has shown that there is no matter of significance in Deuteronomy that was not deduced from the books of the 'Tetrateuch', and that in these Tetrateuchal books—Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus and Numbers—there is no important fact of Abrahamitic tradition or theocratic history and ideal that is not represented in compressed statement in Deuteronomy." . . . "Professor Max Löhr, once, next to Wellhausen, the chief prop of higher criticism in Germany, in a book recently issued (*Unter Schurgen, &c.*), a copy of which he graciously sent to my hand, has derided this hypothesis out of name and habitation. In a work which has already been cited in this paper, Wilhelm Möller, himself also once an *Anhänger* of the Wellhausen school, satirises the

'source' letters E. J. P., etc., as being like posters of hateful art attached to the polished posters of a noble wall. Not a few other scholars of the same former affiliation are testifying in a similar way." This is little more than a glimpse. Let the reader, if possible, peruse the whole article.

Now, it is well to turn to archaeology and see a few sentences from the two books mentioned above written by a very great archaeologist who has dealt with Biblical questions, Albert Tobias Clay.

He emphasizes one matter which has not been mentioned in this paper, though it is the corner-stone of the building whose foundation we have been considering. That corner-stone is the assumption that the scholars called Babylonists have made; namely, that the Pentateuch was of Babylonian origin. Brief quotations will be given from these two books of Professor Clay.

The Pierpont Morgan Flood Tablet and Its Revelations.

The Gilgamesh Epic, from which the parallels to the account of the flood in the Bible have been given, is by no means the earliest of the legendary accounts of that great cataclysm. The archaeologist, Professor A. T. Clay, of Yale University, has found from a very ancient and injured tablet in the Pierpont Morgan library evidence which satisfies him of the existence of a Deluge Epic some two thousand years before that of Gilgamesh was written. Many critics in Germany, subserviently followed by others in England and America, have maintained what is called the "Pan-Babylonian" theory that the narratives in Genesis were borrowed from Babylonian legends, coming with Abraham, or with the returning Babylonian exiles many centuries later. Professor Clay, in his book¹ about this tablet, in Pierpont Morgan's collection, has shown the folly of this notion. In his Foreword (p. VI), he tells us:

¹A Hebrew Deluge Story in Cuneiform, New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, London: Oxford Univ. Press.

"Twelve years ago the writer took issue with this general position, holding that the traditions of the Hebrews were indigenous in the land of the Amorites; and that, contrary to the prevailing views, this land was not dependent for its population on Arabs who migrated from Arabia a little before and after the time of Abraham, but upon an indigenous people, the antiquity of whose culture is as high as that known in Egypt or Babylonia: and also that the Semites who later moved into the lower Euphrates valley mainly came from this quarter and brought with them their culture. He has also consistently maintained that such familiar Biblical characters as the "Patriarchs and others, instead of being the creations of fiction writers, were historical personages"; [he speaks of "the two millenniums of Amorite history prior to Abraham"], and continues, "The writer's thesis in brief is that the Arabian origin of the Semites living in ancient Syria and Babylonia, including the Hebrews, is baseless; but that the antiquity of the Amorite civilization is very great; and also the assertion that the culture and religion of Israel were borrowed from Babylonia is without any foundation; for they were indigenous; and that the Semites who emigrated to Babylonia with their culture were mainly from Amurru. In the judgment of the writer the material presented in this little monograph, as well as his recently published *Empire of the Amorites*, will require a very extensive readjustment of many views bearing upon the subject, as well as the abandonment of many others. Moreover, it also has bearings of a far-reaching character on many other Old Testament problems."

"Amurru, called 'The land of the Amorites', it might be added, is a geographical term that was used in ancient times for the great stretch of territory between Babylonia and the Mediterranean.

"This country has always represented ethnologically a great mixture. Linguistically, as far as is known, a Semitic language has always prevailed in it. The Amorite or Hebrew language, being the oldest of which we have knowledge, was

followed by the Aramaic, and later by the Arabic, which now prevails.”

In his first chapter Professor Clay gives us a description of the Morgan fragment.

“This fragment of a large tablet was published in text, transliteration and translation nearly twenty-five years ago, before it had come into the possession of the Pierpont Morgan Library Collection of Babylonian Inscriptions; in the meantime many other translations have appeared” [*i. e.*, versions of what is] “known as the Ea and Atra-hasis legend (in the British Museum).”

. . . “It [this fragment] is a part of an old version of what should be called the Atra-hasis Epic, which is a very ancient Hebrew or Amorite Deluge Story, and that the so-called Ea and Atra-hasis Legend of the Assyrian period, which has also been translated by a number of scholars, is a late redaction of it. The later version, or redaction, was put into a magical setting for incantation purposes.”

“The only dated version written in cuneiform is the one in the Pierpont Morgan Collection.” It was copied from a still earlier inscription by a junior scribe named Azag-Aya, on the 28th day of Shebet, in the 11th year of Ammizaduga (1966 B. C.), which date is about 1,300 years earlier than the time of the Library of Ashurbanipal (668-626) B. C., to which the late redaction of it, now in the British Museum, belonged.

The original from which the scribe copied had already been injured in the twelfth line, which is indicated by the word *hibis*, “broken”. How much earlier the previous text was written cannot be surmised. “These discoveries show that there is no need to find the origin of the Biblical stories in Babylonia, because of the theory that the West in the early period did not have an indigenous literature, and did not have a civilization. The present version and other data presented in the discussion in another chapter forever disprove this hypothesis and require its abandonment.”

“The discoveries made since 1909, when the present writer

first contested this position, clearly show that we have reasons for believing that the civilization of the Western Semites synchronizes with the earliest that has been found in Babylonia and Egypt. . . .

There is another very important fact which the old version has revealed, and that is the recurrence of *I-lu*, 'God', in the title of the series, as well as in the text, for the foremost Deity's name. . . . In the text here published we learn that the Western Semites, in this early period, called the Godhead *I-lu*, or *El*, 'God', the same as in the Old Testament." *Ea* was not a Sumerian god, but the second in the Amorite triad, *Ilu*, *Ea* and *Adad*. *Adad*, the storm god, is the *Hadad* of *Amurru*, the third of the early triad. . . . It is generally conceded that he is an Amorite god, and that he had been adopted as a member of the Babylonian pantheon, p. 32.

"In consideration of all available data, it is reasonable to conjecture that this Amorite Deluge story, which preserves the names of the foremost original triad, goes back to a time as early as 4000 B. C. There are reasons for believing that it is a very ancient legend, probably written two thousand years earlier (see below)."

This old version contains nothing to suggest the idea that it had originally been written in Sumerian. On the contrary, it is of Amorite origin. Not only are the hero and the deities Amorite, but also certain words, which were not common in Akkadian. Professor Clay tells of some of these words, and it is best to use his own words in speaking of them:

"The writer has previously maintained, simply on a basis of the names found in the *Gilgamesh* Epic story, that it is largely from a Hebrew or Amorite original. Let us inquire whether a study of the language used in its composition will betray its original source.

The first Hebrew word to be noted in the *Gilgamesh* Epic story is *nisirtu*, 'secret' (E. 9).² This word, as far as known

²*E* is the *Gilgamesh* Epic.

to the writer, was not in current use in Akkadian; but the Hebrew word meaning 'hidden thing' from this root is known in the Old Testament (see Isa. 48:6, etc.)

The word for part of the boat called *la-an* (E. 60), which was the 'hull' or 'bottom', is from the root *lun* 'to lodge', doubtless, because there is where the people lodged."

The word for "the roof" of the boat, namely *sa-a-si* (E. 60), is Amorite.

The word *giru*, used for the outside wall of the ship (E. 66), is not Akkadian, but is Hebrew.

The word *sussullu*, "basket" (E. 68), was not used in Akkadian, but is found in Hebrew (see Jer. 6:9).

The root of *u-pa-az-zi-ru* (E. 70) is the common Hebrew *basar*, "to gather, gather in, enclose". The root of the word *e-si-en-si*, "loaded it" (E. 81), is found in all the Semitic languages except the Akkadian dialect. . . .

In *hi-hi-i* is to be seen the common Hebrew word *pehah*, "governor", which was not in common use in Akkadian.

There are other Hebrew words discussed in the notes beneath the translations. . . .

"If the Ut-napis-tim story was originally written in Sumerian, or even in Akkadian, certainly it becomes necessary to explain how these foreign Hebrew words, even in this late version of the Assyrian period, came to be used in the Epic."

"It is the writer's opinion that no other conclusion can be aimed at but that this deluge story, which probably embraces some elements indigenous to Babylonia, was mainly an Amorite legend which the Semites from Amurru brought with them from the West." . . .

It is important to remember that the Pierpont Morgan fragment is a part of a version of a much older Epic. This fact, *i. e.*, that it is a translation, is indicated by a word used by the copyist of it, at a certain place, "hibis", "broken", showing that he was copying from an older tablet which was illegible (broken) at that point.

List of Flood Story Fragments:

A, Early Version of Atra-hasis Epic; B, Late Redaction of

Atra-hasis Epic; C, Assyrian Fragment; D, Deluge Story in Sumerian; E, Gilgamesh Epic; F, Babylonian Epic; G, Berossus Version of Atra-hasis Epic.

It seems unnecessary to present Dr. Clay's treatment of this tablet more fully than has been done above. This list of "Flood Story Fragments", however, must impress us with the fact that these polytheistic records indicate, notwithstanding their variations and monstrosities, that there lies behind them a great fact in the world's history—The Flood, of which the Bible tells us.