

then by his higher ; first by the flesh, and then by the world. The Devil will come by and by, as one writer has sententiously remarked. It is interesting to contrast these with Christian's temptations in the Valley. Each man has to bear

his own burden of temptation, fixed for him by the peculiarities of his disposition. Christian is tempted through his imagination ; Faithful, having little imagination, is tempted through his flesh and his pride.

## The Archaeological Analysis of the Book of Genesis.

BY PROFESSOR A. H. SAYCE, D.D., LL.D., OXFORD.

### The Genealogy of Abraham.

IN what follows I must be understood as contributing some more preliminary material to the archæological examination of the Pentateuch, of which my article on the Fourteenth Chapter of Genesis was intended to be a specimen. The ancestry of Abraham may not, at first sight, seem a very promising subject for such a purpose ; the facts, however, which I am now able to lay before the readers of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES will show that Oriental Archæology can find abundant matter of interest and importance even in passages which the commentators have been content to ignore. The facts support two of the conclusions which I have already drawn from the application of the methods of inductive science to the Old Testament ; in the first place, some, at any rate, of the materials used in the Book of Genesis go back to the age of Khammu-rabi ; and, secondly, they contain real history.

The thousands of contract and other early Babylonian tablets now in the museums of Europe and America have shown that some centuries before the birth of Abraham a dynasty of kings was reigning over Babylonia, whose capital was at 'Ur of the Chaldees' (about 2500 B.C.). They were Babylonians of the Semitic race, and their empire extended from Susa in Elam to the Lebanon, and included the later Assyria and Mesopotamia. Eventually, however, Elam revolted ; the native tribes seized Susa, defeated the Babylonian king Ibê-Sin, and captured him in battle. The Babylonian empire fell, and Babylonia itself was given over to foreign invasion and civil war. 'Amorites' who traced their descent to Šamu or Šumu, the Hebrew Shem, occupied Northern Babylonia, and founded a dynasty, the second king of which

took possession of Babylon, and in the fifth year of his reign surrounded it with a great wall. Babylon became henceforth the capital of a kingdom which had to struggle against various native princes, who still held out in certain parts of the country. Meanwhile Elamite armies marched out of Susa (once the seat of a Babylonian satrap) and raided Babylonia ; finally, Babylon itself was taken, and its Amorite ruler compelled to become an Elamite vassal, while Southern Babylonia was placed under an Elamite prince, whose capital was at Larša. In the train of the Amorite dynasty had come numerous bodies of 'Amorites' from Canaan, Syria, and the district of Harran, and these were settled in Sippara, Ur, and other cities, where colonies of Amorite traders had already existed long before. The ruling dynasty was possibly connected with Harran, since two of its kings bore names compounded with that of the moon-god Sin, to whom the temple at Harran was dedicated. The moon-god was also worshipped at Ur, but here he was known, not as Sin, but as Nannar.

Let us now examine 'the generations of Shem' as given in the eleventh chapter of Genesis. Two years after the Flood, Arphaxad was born to him. Arphaxad is Arap-Kisadi, 'the border' or 'borderer of the Kisad,' *i.e.* the bank of the Euphrates and Tigris as opposed to the Edin or 'plain.' Arphaxad will thus represent Mesopotamia, into which the survivors of the Deluge descended from 'the mountain of Nizir,' now Jebel Judi. The son of Arphaxad was Salah, in which I see the Babylonian *salkhu*, 'the outwork' or 'outer wall' of a Babylonian city. Salah begat Eber, and here I can announce a discovery I have lately made, which at last clears up the origin of the name of the Hebrews.

While numerous words were borrowed from Sum-

erian by both Semitic Babylonians and 'Amorites,' or, as we should call them, Hebrews, there were other words which were borrowed by the Sumerians from their Semitic neighbours. One of these was *ibila*, from the Semitic *abil*, 'a son,' which Oppert is now known to have been right in identifying with the Biblical Abel<sup>1</sup>; another was *ibira*, which is given as the equivalent of the Semitic Babylonian *damqarum*, 'a commercial traveller' (*W.A.I.* ii. 7. 34, v. 39. 38.), and is expressed by a compound ideograph consisting of the sign for 'word' or 'speech,' and the ideograph KIB, the signification of which has hitherto evaded discovery. A text I have lately copied, however, shows that it means 'to travel,' 'pass by.'<sup>2</sup> *Ibira* will thus have been borrowed from the Semitic *ebiru*, and have denoted the 'commercial traveller' or 'trader' who crossed the Euphrates from its western to its eastern bank. The contract tablets have informed us that a considerable number of these *damqari* or 'traders' were 'Amorites.' Many of them acted for the landed proprietors or trading firms of Babylonia, and even for royal personages. That the Canaanite should already have been a commercial intermediary is an interesting fact.

The son of Eber was Peleg. Peleg is the Babylonian *palgu*, 'a canal,' a technical term which was borrowed by the western Semites of Canaan who had no canals, and the writer of Genesis (10<sup>25</sup>) accordingly adds the note that 'in his days the land (of Babylonia) was canalized.' Eber—the *damqaru* or commercial traveller on the western side of the Euphrates—had another son, Joktan, the forefather of the tribes of South-Eastern Arabia, who traced their descent to Shem like the Amurrû or 'Amorites,' and whose proper names have been shown by modern research to be the same as

<sup>1</sup> Initial *h* similarly appears in *hêkâl*, 'palace,' from Assy. *êkallu*, Sumerian *ê-gal*, and *har*, 'mountain,' from Sum. *ar*. So on Hyksos scarabs *h* is represented by *h-l*, and Professor Hommel was consequently justified in explaining the *h* of Abraham and similar names as merely a graphic variant of *aleph*.

<sup>2</sup> The original picture from which the ideograph is derived represents a cross-road with a wall or gate at two of the ends. In an omen-tablet I published in the *Transactions of the Society of Biblical Archaeology*, 1876, p. 308, KIB is the interpretation of a figure which consists of the ideograph for 'walking' placed between the two lines of a road, and in a Sumerian hymn translated by Dr. Pinches in the *Babylonian and Oriental Record* (ii. 3), 1888, p. 60, we read (line 11) *ê-gub-na azagga kib-kibbi ni-purpur*, 'as for his shining house, the holy one passing away overtakes it.'

those of the Israelites on the one side, and of the Amorite dynasty of Khammu-rabi in Babylonia on the other. According to *W.A.I.* ii. 60. 30, Qatnu was the god of the city of Qatan, with which Joktan may have been connected. At any rate, since Khammu-rabi (Amraphel) was a contemporary of Abraham, Peleg and Joktan five generations before would have been contemporaries of Sumu-abi ('Shem is my father'), the founder of the dynasty.

Peleg, we are told, begat Reu 'the shepherd,' which reminds us that the flocks of the Babylonians were pastured in great measure on the western side of the Euphrates, and that the shepherds were to a large extent Arabs, and not native Babylonians. After Reu, however, we are transported to the neighbourhood of Harran. His son was Serug, which is obviously the city of *Šarugi* near Harran (K 2017, col. i. 11; also mentioned in K 13394). 'The man of *Šarugi*,' would have been Nahor. Names answering to Nahor are found only in connexion with Harran, near which was a place called Til-Nakhiri, 'the mound of Nakhir,' though the word *nakhur* occurs in a Cappadocian tablet. (For the names Nakhiri and Nakharaû, see Johns, *Assyrian Deeds and Documents*, iii. p. 127.) Along with Nakhiri we have also names compounded with that of the Hittite god Tarku, which became Tarkhu, the Biblical Terah, at Harran. Thus, in a tablet published by Mr. Johns (No. 79), Nakhiri is a witness in a transaction involving the slave of Tarkhu-(ismeani?).

In the genealogy, Serug, Nahor, Terah, we therefore have the record of a family, which, like so many other 'Amorites' in the age of the First Dynasty of Babylon, migrated from the neighbourhood of Harran to the Babylonian city of Ur, which may have had special relations with Harran through their common worship of the moon-god. It is even possible that the return of Terah to Harran was occasioned by the conquest of Ur by the invading Elamites in the fourteenth year of Khammu-rabi's father, when, we are told, 'the people of Ur were slain by the sword.' It was no time for the 'Amorite' traders to remain in so dangerous a locality. Terah's family had come from Harran, and to Harran accordingly they returned. It is, consequently, with good reason that the ancestor of the Hebrews is called in Dt 26<sup>5</sup> 'a travelling Aramæan.' He was, in fact, a *damqaru sa Šarugi*, 'a commis-voyageur from Serug.'

### The Dilmun of the Cuneiform Inscriptions.

The geographical position of Dilmun (more correctly Tilmun or Tilwun), an Arabian district adjoining the Persian Gulf, has been misconceived owing to an erroneous translation by Delitzsch of a passage referring to it in the inscriptions of Sargon. Delitzsch has been followed by Winckler, the result of the mistranslation being a series of geographical difficulties which have proved insurmountable. Dilmun has been supposed to be an island, which Rawlinson identified with Bahrein on account of an inscription which had been found there, while Delitzsch was forced by the length of the Assyrian *kasbu* to make it some islet which has long since been absorbed by the growth of the silt at the head of the Persian Gulf. Dilmun, however, is occasionally mentioned in the early Babylonian tablets. It was conquered by Sargon of Akkad, and messengers and others came from it to the Babylonian cities. As they did not come by water, it must have formed part of the mainland. That it lay to the south-west of Babylonia is also made clear by the inscriptions, and Sargon (of Assyria) speaks of the Kaldâ territory of Bit-Yakin in the marshes at the mouth of the Euphrates as 'extending to Dilmun' (*adi pât. Dilmuni*).

The passage on which the misconception of the geographical position of the country has rested is the following (Sarg. *Ann.* 369-370, *Khors.* 144): *Upêri sar Dilmuni sa malak xxx. kasbu ina qabal tamdim nipikh Samsi kima nûni sitkunu narbatsu*, 'Upêri, king of Dilmun, whose place of retreat was made, like that of a fish, at a distance of 30 *kasbu* in the middle of the sea,' where the relative has been supposed to refer, not to the king, but to the land of Dilmun, regardless of the comparison with a fish. What the passage really means is that Upêri fled to an island in the Persian Gulf, which was situated at a distance of 30 *kasbu* from the coast of Dilmun, and may, therefore, easily have been the island of Bahrein, where a cuneiform inscription informs us that Nebo was worshipped under his Dilmunite name of Enzag (see Rawlinson in *J.R.A.S.* xii. 2, new ser. 1880).

In early cuneiform texts Dilmun, Melukhkha, and Magan are enumerated together, the order of the names being reversed by Gudea (D iv. 2-12), who gives it as Magan, Melukhkha, Gubin, and

Dilmun. Melukhkha, 'the salt desert,' represented Arabia Petraea, and has long since been recognized as the equivalent of the Biblical Havilah. In Magan (Semitic Makannu) the Sinaitic Peninsula and the adjoining land of Midian, with its old port of Makna, have equally been long since recognized. Assur-bani-pal, it is true, uses Magan as a synonym of Egypt, but this is because the Sinaitic Peninsula was an ancient province of Egypt, and was the first part of it to be approached in a campaign from the east.

Dilmun, Melukhkha, and Magan thus represented to the early Babylonians Northern Arabia, proceeding from east to west. Dilmun adjoined Babylonia on the south-west, and stretched along the western coast of the Persian Gulf, where the port of Gerrha was a great emporium of trade. In the passage quoted above from the *Annals* of Sargon I believe, as I stated some years ago in the *Proc. S.B.A.* 1896, p. 174, that the Assyrian scribe has mistaken 'the king of Upêri in Dilmun' (*sar Upêri sa Dilmun*) for 'Upêri, king of Dilmun' (*Upêri sar sa Dilmun*), and that Upêri is really the Ophir of the Old Testament and the port from which the king of Dilmun fled before Sargon to an island in the sea.

After Dilmun came Melukhkha, the Gubin of Gudea being otherwise unknown. Like Havilah, Melukhkha extended to the frontier of Egypt, and adjoined Magan, which denoted North-Western Arabia, just as Dilmun denoted the north-eastern side of the country. Dilmun (with its port Upêri), Melukhkha, and Magan would thus correspond with the Ophir, Havilah, and Jobab of Gn 10<sup>29</sup>, which follow Sheba or Southern Arabia. The inhabitants of the three districts traced their origin from Shem, and formed a continuous line, which connected the 'Aramæan' tribes of Southern Babylonia with the 'Amorites' of the west.

I need only add that the correct pronunciation of Dilmun is shown by variants to have been Tilmun or Tilwun, and consequently the island of Tylos, in the Persian Gulf, may have retained a reminiscence of the name as Oppert suggested. We find the final nunnation in other West-Semitic names of the Khammu-rabi period, as I have pointed out in the *Records of the Past*, new ser. iii. p. xvi; thus we have Inun-Ea, 'the eye of Ea'; Ilun-ka-Adadu, 'thy god is Hadad'; and even Abêsun for Abêsukh and Abêsu.