

κτίσις cannot be equal to ἀνθρώπινον κτίσμα. A person who knew as much Greek as St. Peter must have known that ἀνθρωπίνη κτίσις means 'a creation by man,' or (using the abstract for the concrete) a thing created or constituted by man; and he could not, therefore, write it when he meant 'a human creature,' unless he were hopelessly illogical.

The quotation I have given from LXX justifies the appreciation of κτίσις to political institutions, and therefore I conclude that A.V. is right in making this an echo of St. Paul's teaching in Rom. xiii. and Tit. iii. (or *vice versâ*).

W. F. M'MICHAEL.

Lee Vicarage, Ilfracombe.

Archaeological Commentary on Genesis.

BY THE REV. A. H. SAYCE, LL.D., PROFESSOR OF ASSYRIOLOGY, OXFORD.

XI. 1-9. The fact that the scene of the confusion of tongues is laid at Babylon, in the plain of Shinar, shows that we have once more to do with a Babylonian tradition. Moreover, the narrative knows that Babylonia is the land of brick and bitumen, not of stone, and that it was famous for its *ziggurâti*, or temple-towers; while the statement that the builders came from the East implies an acquaintance with the Babylonian account of the Deluge, which placed the descent from the ark in the land of Nizir, eastward of Babylonia. No cuneiform account, however, of the foundation of Babylon has as yet been found, and the Babylonian tradition must have been transplanted to another country and there undergone modification, since no one living in Babylonia could have been ignorant of the true etymology of the name of Babel. That was impressed upon both sight and memory every time the name was written in cuneiform characters. As the etymology in Genesis is a purely Hebraic one, from a root not found in Assyro-Babylonian, the country in which the account took its present shape will have been Canaan. It is noticeable that the city (and not the tower only) is represented as left unfinished; it would seem, therefore, that the tradition goes back to a time when Babylon lay in a desolate and deserted condition. This must have been before the rise of the Khammurabi dynasty, when it was made for the first time the capital of a united kingdom.

1. Compare the statement in the annals of Sargon of Akkad, that after his last campaign against 'the land of the Amorites,' he spent three years in subduing all the countries by the sea of 'the setting sun,' and 'united them all into one.'

2. This verse points to a Babylonian original. Ararat was to the north of Shinar; it was Nizir where the ship of the Chaldæan Noah rested, that lay to the east of it. The word *biq'âh* does not signify 'plain,' but 'cleft,' and is a translation of a common Sumerian name of Babylon, *E*, '(the city) of the cleft,' or 'water-channel.' This cleft was where the Arakhtu, or canal, of Babylon afterwards passed.

3. The verse is written from the point of view of one who lived in a country where there was stone.

4. This shows that the primary subject of the Babylonian story must have been the foundation of the city. In place of the Babylonian *ziggurât*, or 'temple-tower,' which was used for religious and astronomical purposes, we have the *migdol*, or fortress-tower, of Palestine and the Egyptian frontier, which was built for a totally different object.

5. The anthropomorphic expression must be a quotation from the Babylonian story. 'The sons of men' refers us to the 'daughters of men,' in vi. 2.

7. Another anthropomorphic expression of Babylonian origin, the plural being used as in i. 26.

8. The first dynasty of Babylon was that to which Khammurabi belonged. From this time forward, till its destruction by Sennacherib, Babylon was a great political and religious centre, so that the period when it lay unfinished and ruined must have been of earlier date.

9. Babel is the Sumerian Ka-dimirra, 'gate of God,' translated into Semitic Babylonian as Babil. The second element is sometimes explained as a plural. The belief that the etymology of the name was to be found in *bâlal* or *balbel*, 'to con-

found,' could have originated only among the Hebrews, since the root does not exist in Assyro-Babylonian. The Assyrian root *balálu* signifies 'to pour out,' or 'melt.' Another foreign population in Babylonia, however, the Kassites, discovered for it a similarly erroneous derivation, and in an inscription of Gandas, the first king of the Kassite dynasty, the name is written *Ba-ba-lu*, as if from the Babylonian verb *babálu*, 'to bring.'

11. With the age of Shem we may compare the Babylonian *ner* of six hundred years.

18. Reu is the Assyrian *rêu*, 'shepherd,' a title of the Babylonian kings.

20. Serug may be connected with the Babylonian *sarganu*, 'mighty,' whence the name of Sargon.

22. *Nakhur* is found in a Kappadokian cuneiform tablet, but the meaning of the word is unknown.

23. Terah is Tarkhu, the name of a god among the Hittites (as in the names of Tarkhu-lara, king of Gurgum, and Tarkhu-nazi, king of Malatijeh). It seems to be the same as Tarku or Tarqu (as in Tarkondêmos). Turgu, the Kassite Bel, has been compared. A cuneiform tablet states that Turku represented the god Rimmon or Hadad.

26. In a Babylonian contract-tablet, dated in the reign of Abil-Sin, the grandfather of Khammurabi, one of the witnesses is called 'the Amorite, the son of Abi-ramu,' or Abram. It must be remembered that the Babylonians included the Canaanites under the general name of 'Amorites.'

In a Minæan inscription, Haran is the name of a place. Lot would have meant 'hostage' in Babylonian.

27. Ur, Babylonian Uru, is now Muqayyar or Mugheir, on the western bank of the Euphrates, considerably to the south of Babylon. It was famous for its great temple of the moon-god, and at one time it was ruled by a dynasty of kings who claimed suzerainty over all Babylonia. This dynasty seems to have been overthrown by the 'first dynasty of Babylon,' to which Khammurabi belonged. The position of Ur, on the Arabian side of the Euphrates, would naturally attract to it Semitic settlers from the West, which was called Kisarra, 'the land of the hordes,' by the Sumerians. That such settlements of Semite foreigners from the West actually existed in Babylonia, in the age of Abraham, we now know from contract-tablets of the time of the Khammurabi dynasty. These show that there was a district just outside the gates of Sippara which

was called 'the district of the Amorites,' the land being assigned to natives of Syria and Palestine who had settled in Babylonia for purposes of trade. One of the contracts is dated in the reign of Ammi-zaduga, another in that of the father of Khammurabi. Under Ammi-zaduga, we find an 'Amorite' serving as a Babylonian official. We thus have monumental testimony to the fact that there were Hebrew-speaking settlers in Chaldæa in the Abrahamic age, and that an intimate intercourse existed between that country and Palestine.

29. The termination of Sarai is paralleled by that of Labai and other Canaanite names in the Tel el-Amarna tablets. The Babylonian form would be Sarrat, 'queen,' Heb. Sarah. In Babylonian, *sarrat* was 'queen,' *malikat*, 'princess'; while in Hebrew the converse was the case. The fact that the elder brother's wife was Sarai, while the wife of the younger brother was Milcah, indicates that here the usage of the Babylonian language is followed.

Iscah has no etymology either in Hebrew or in Babylonian, and the tautology shows that the passage is corrupt. As the same Babylonian character has the variant values of *mil* and *is*, each of which is used with much the same degree of frequency, it seems probable that Iscah is due to a misreading of a cuneiform text, which was subsequently corrected in the margin. The correction crept into the text and thus produced the present conflate reading, as well as the needless repetition that Milcah was the daughter of Haran, her father. Originally, therefore, the verse would have run: 'Milcah the daughter of Haran, the father of Iscah.'

31. The word *kharran* signified 'road' in Sumerian, and the city took its name from the fact that it stood on the high road from Babylonia to the West. Its great temple was dedicated to the moon-god like that of Ur, and was rebuilt and embellished from time to time by the Babylonian and Assyrian kings. Between Ur and Kharran the common worship of the moon-god must have formed a special bond of union, and the citizen of Ur would have found in Kharran a welcome, and all that he was accustomed to at home. That Terah should have settled in Kharran, therefore, was very natural. An inscription recently discovered at Sinjerli, north of the Gulf of Antioch, shows that among the Semites the moon-god of Kharran bore the title of the 'Baal of Kharran.'

Kharran was built on a tributary of the Belias (Assyrian, Balikh; modern, Belikh).

The Hebrew word rendered 'Chaldees' in the A.V. here and elsewhere is Kasdim, with whom the Chaldees had nothing to do. The Chaldeans were the Kaldâ of the monuments, a tribe who inhabited the salt-marshes at the mouths of the Tigris and Euphrates, where their capital at one time was Bit-Yagina. We first hear of them in the twelfth century B.C. One of their princes was Merodach-baladan, whose conquest of Babylon caused the name of Chaldean to be extended to its inhabitants. It is probable that Nebuchadrezzar was of Kaldâ origin.

XII. 5. A Babylonian would have said 'the land of the Amorites'; an Assyrian, 'the land of the Hittites.' It is only in the Tel el-Amarna tablets that we find 'land of Canaan,' as here. In these, even the king of Babylonia speaks of the land of Canaan.

6. Dr. W. Max Müller has pointed out that in the Egyptian papyrus of the *Travels of a Mohar* in Palestine in the reign of Ramses II., reference is made to 'the mountain of Sakama' or Shechem. In 'the terebinth of Moreh' we may see Martu, the Sumerian form of the name Amotite (see xlvi. 22). This would give a point to the note that the 'Canaanite' was then in the land.

8. Beth-el, called *Beth-sa-el* from a memorandum originally written in Babylonian, is mentioned by Thothmes III. (B.C. 1460) among his conquests in Palestine. Ai, the 'ruin,' was one of the many deserted towns of Canaan which had been destroyed in war.

15. Pharaoh is the Egyptian Per-âa, 'great house,' a title, like that of the 'Sublime Porte,' given to the Egyptian king on the earliest monuments. It was the name under which he would be spoken of to a foreigner. Thus the Assyrian king Sargon speaks of his having defeated 'Pir'u,' or 'Pharaoh, king of Egypt.' Egypt would have been under the rule of the Hyksos kings at the time of Abraham's visit; and an Asiatic would have been welcomed at their court, which was held at Zoan (Tanis), near the eastern frontier of the country. The capital at that period was thus one of the first places which a traveller from Canaan would reach.

16. The picture of the camel is not found, either in the hieroglyphs or on any Egyptian monument.

It was a Semitic and not an Egyptian animal, characteristic of the Arabs then as to-day. It was accordingly called 'the beast from the sea,' *i.e.* the Persian Gulf, by the Sumerians, and it is first mentioned in Egyptian literature, in a papyrus of the age of the nineteenth dynasty, under the Semitic name of *kamail* (*gamal*). That the camel, however, came at times into Egypt along with its Asiatic master is shown by the fact that Hekekyan Bey found the bones of dromedaries in the excavations he made at Memphis in 1851-54 for the Geological Society of London.

17. The Negeb or 'South' of Judah is called the Negbu in the list of places conquered in Palestine by Shishak.

XIII. 7. Perizzite, like Hivite, is a descriptive name meaning the 'fellahin' or agricultural population as opposed to that of the towns. The 'Canaanite' here denotes the town population, perhaps with a reference to the secondary signification of the word as 'merchant.'

10. The Jordan (Yordana) is mentioned in the lists of places conquered in Palestine by Ramses II. and Ramses III. Ramses III. adds to it 'the lake of Rethpana,' which must be the Dead Sea. Rethpana would correspond to a Hebrew Reshpon, a derivative from Resheph, the Canaanite god of fire and lightning, whose sons were the sparks, according to Job v. 7. The *kikkar* or 'plain' of the Jordan is mentioned by Ebed-tob, the king of Jerusalem, in one of the Tel el-Amarna tablets, where he says: 'The roads of the king [I have made] in the plain [*kikar*] and the mountains.'

The comparison with 'the garden of the Lord' is Babylonian, and refers us to ii. 8; the second comparison can have been made only by one who had himself travelled through the desert, and suddenly seen before him the irrigated fields of the Egyptian Delta green with their crops. The Zoar of this verse is not the Zoar of the Jordan valley (xiv. 2), but the Egyptian frontier-fortress Za'r, which guarded the country on the side of Asia. It is the place meant in the Minæan inscription of Abi-yada' referred to in the note on x. 25.

18. Note that the name of Hebron does not as yet exist. The Palestine lists of Thothmes III. do not contain it, though numerous places in the immediate neighbourhood are named, and it

is first found, under the form of Khibur, in the lists of Ramses III. Hebron means 'confederacy,' and it is possible that the name was derived from the Khabiri, 'confederates,' whom the Tel el-Amarna tablets describe as settled in the neighbourhood of Hebron, and as attacking the territory

of Ebed-tob, the vassal king of Jerusalem. The word *Khabiri*, 'confederates,' was borrowed by Assyrian from Canaan; thus in an Assyrian hymn we read: *istu pan khabiri-ya iptarsanni asi*, 'from the face of my confederates he has cast me off, even me.'

Recent Foreign Theology.

Strack's 'Grammar of Biblical Aramaic.'¹

THE favourable judgment passed upon the first edition of this work in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for May 1896 has been confirmed, and the hopes we then ventured to express have been more than realised. Nothing could better attest the want felt for such a text-book as Professor Strack's than the fact that, within less than a year, a second edition has been called for. In the latter the author has carefully revised the whole work, and supplied some elements which had to be omitted in the first edition, chiefly owing to the haste with which the original issue had to be sent to the press. For instance, a new introductory section is prefixed, which is of special value for its copious catalogue of the literature on the subject. An entirely new section (sec. 11) deals with the prepositions, and there are much fuller references than before to the inscriptions, as well as illustrations from Syriac forms and usages. The work, thus recast and supplemented, very appropriately exchanges the title of *Abriss* for that of *Grammatik*, and it is perfectly safe to predict that the ideal excellence of this handiest of text-books will gain for it a welcome even warmer than was accorded to the first edition.

Meyer's 'Entstehung.'²

THIS work needs but the briefest notice. For a long time to come it will be the subject of dis-

¹ *Grammatik des Biblischen Aramäisch, mit den nach Handschriften berichtigten Texten und einem Wörterbuch.* Von Professor D. H. L. Strack; 2te, grössentheils neuarbeitete Auflage. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs; Edinburgh and London: Williams & Norgate. M. 1. 80, gebunden, M. 2, 30.

² *Die Entstehung des Judenthums.* Von Ed. Meyer. Edinburgh and London: Williams & Norgate. Price 6s.

cussion by experts. On the present occasion we shall make no attempt to review its conclusions, but rather advise the readers of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES to follow closely all that is written about the book in these pages. In the March number (p. 268 ff.) Professor Kennedy states the aim, and estimates the value, of one part of the book; in the April issue (p. 320 ff.) we have presented the judgment of Professor Wellhausen; and in the present number we have the advantage of hearing Professor van Hoonacker, who has made a special study of the Return of Israel from the Exile. Meyer's book forms the subject of a review by Steuernagel in the current number of *Stud. u. Kritiken*, and in due time Professor Koster may be expected to deal with it in the *Th. Tijdschrift*. While, on some points, there may be an impression that the author has distinctly failed to establish his contention (for instance, regarding the genuineness of the alleged Persian documents), there are many elements of unquestionably permanent value in the work. What most of us will probably find to be the wise course is to maintain an attitude of judicious reserve with regard to a good many of Meyer's conclusions, in the hope that the ordeal of criticism which the book will have to endure from all quarters may remove some uncertainties, if it do not elicit the whole truth. In any case it is only the bare truth to say that to every Old Testament student, of whatever school, the *Entstehung* is absolutely indispensable.

The New 'Herzog.'³

THE issue of this great work proceeds steadily. Heft 19-20 has just appeared, completing the

³ *Realencyclopädie f. prot. Theol. u. Kirche.* Herausgegeben von Alb. Hauck. 2 Band. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs. M. 10, gebunden M. 12.