

emigrate, because they know nothing of the country to which they are urged to go, nor of the nature of the journey to it. The sea with all its wonders is, in the first place, a great terror to them; but suppose the voyage over, still their minds can find nothing to rest upon. The face of the country, the climate, the society, the way of living, the work which they may be called upon to do, all are strange and incomprehensible; and whatever their distress may be at home, still they would rather endure it than wrench themselves from all that they know to venture upon a new world, in which there is not a single object animate or inanimate, from which they can expect a friendly welcome. I never can blame the shrinking from emigration under such circumstances; yet we know that where there is more knowledge, where we feel we understand what we are going to, distant and new countries are not so appalling; there are many who go to them every day with more of hope and pleasure than of fear and regret.—T. ARNOLD.

Strangers.—In this world all men are *sojourners* or *pilgrims*, because all men are fast passing towards the futurity beyond it. But all men are not *strangers* here. There is a large class of men to whom the world is perfectly congenial; who feel nothing strange, nothing unnatural in anything about it; who, in the pursuit and the enjoyment of 'the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eye, and the pride of life,' are quite in their element, and just where they wish to be. Now it would be absurd to talk of such men being *strangers* in a world distinguished as the property and the domain of these three instruments of pleasure, beyond which, in one or other of their forms, they never have a wish. They may be strangers among those who are 'not of the world'; they would be strangers in heaven, where such will only find their congenial country; but upon earth they are in the very place and are surrounded by the very scenes, and can find the very society with which they could be satisfied for ever. And they are *pilgrims*, not because they wish it, but because they must. The laws of nature compel them to advance. There is a fatal and invincible necessity which carries them on, through life and away from it. But so far as feeling is concerned, they have nothing of the character

of the pilgrim about them; the very idea of pilgrimage, if ever it happens to be excited, falls heavily on the heart; every symptom of their progression seems like a punishment; they would rather remain where they are; they desire no better country; this, through which they pass with a most painful rapidity, is sufficient for *them*.—T. BINNEY.

My work is here, but not my rest,
And not my home,
And not the wealth I would invest
For life to come;
I have my treasures hid above,
And usury of faith and love.

And if to-night mine inn be good,
I shall be glad;
But if to-morrow's fare be rude,
And lodging bad,
It shall be so much easier then
To strike my tent, and on again.

But never backward may I look,
Or feel regret
That I the way of sin forsook,
And heavenward set
My face to find the life in God,
And comfort of His staff and rod.

W. C. SMITH.

Sermons for Reference.

- Arnold (T.), *Sermons*, v. 231.
Binney (T.), *Practical Power of Faith*, 137, 155.
Candlish (R.), *Sermons*, 235.
Church (R. W.), *Village Sermons*, i. 268.
Macleod (D.), *Christ and Society*, 213.
Newman (J. H.), *Parochial Sermons*, vi. 174.
Pott (A. W.), *Sermons for Festivals and Fasts*, 585.
Spurgeon (C. H.), *Gospel for the People*, No. 37.
Stephens (T.), *Welshmen in English Pulpits*, 340.

Recent Biblical Archaeology.

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

PROFESSOR HOMMEL'S learning and fertility of suggestion are inexhaustible. He has just done Oriental archaeology a service by reprinting, with the necessary alterations and additions, his articles on Babylonian astronomy and South Arabian geography, which were buried in ephemeral periodicals. The new book bears the title of *Aufsätze und Abhandlungen* (Franz, Munich). I am particularly glad that his valuable account of

'the Astronomy of the ancient Chaldeans' should be at last placed before us in an accessible form; it is by far the best work on the subject, and will serve to correct a good many misstatements which have been put forward by Assyriologists who unfortunately were not astronomers. The articles on the origin of the Zodiac and the Babylonian map of the world by which it is supplemented, are full of interest, and settle once for all the question as

to the origin of the zodiacal signs. The larger number of the fixed ones can now be identified, thanks mainly to Hommel's researches, and the claim of Babylonia to be the mother of astronomy is abundantly vindicated.

More interesting, perhaps, to the biblical scholar will be the article on the four rivers of Paradise, and the essays accompanying the articles on the Minæan inscriptions. I must, however, avow at the outset that I do not believe in Professor Hommel's attempt to find the four rivers of Eden in northern and central Arabia; his arguments are, as ever, exceedingly ingenious and marked by extensive learning, but they are not convincing. Nor do I share his conversion to Winckler's revival of the old theory of Dr. Beke, who found the Mizraim of the Old Testament in North-Western Arabia instead of Egypt. That there was a Mutsur, or 'Border-land,' in the Arabia of the Assyrian period I do not deny, and one or two passages in the Assyrian inscriptions may possibly refer to it, but in most cases the name most naturally signifies Egypt. That the dual Mizraim should have been substituted for an original Mazor in verse after verse of the Old Testament seems to me most unlikely, and Professor Hommel's endeavour to explain chap. 19 of Isaiah as referring originally to the land of Midian will, I am sure, eventually be given up by himself. That Jareb, too, in Hosea, is Aribi, 'the Arabs,' is possible, but we should have expected Ereb.

While, however, I cannot subscribe to Professor Hommel's new geographical theories, I readily acknowledge that they are full of suggestiveness and striking points of view. Above all, he has done well in insisting on the importance of the South Arabian inscriptions geographically and historically as well as philologically and religiously. The Assyriologist certainly cannot afford to neglect them, and Jensen's sneer fully deserves the severe words which Hommel uses in regard to it. More and more we are coming to see that South Arabia played an important part in the early history of Oriental civilization, and the genealogy of Shem as given in chap. 10 of Genesis is being completely confirmed by the progress of archæological discovery. Shem appears, under the form of 'Sumu or 'Samu, as the patron-god of the Arabian dynasty, to which Khammurabi (Amraphel) belonged; and the proper names found in the cuneiform texts make it clear that linguistically 'Arabian' and

'West Semitic' or Hebrew were at the time synonymous. The West Semitic population was mainly settled on the western bank of the Euphrates—the Arphaxad of Genesis,—but offshoots had made their way to the city of Asshur, on the Tigris, and, as de Morgan's excavations have recently demonstrated, to Elam also. Babylonia was not included in the family of Shem; its original inhabitants were non-Semitic, and in later days it was occupied by a mixed race. Moreover, in the Mosaic age, to which I agree with Hommel in holding that the greater part of the Pentateuch must belong, Babylonia was in the hands of the Kassites, the Cush of Gn 10⁸, where the name has been confounded with the Egyptian Kash (as in the Tel el-Amarna tablets).

One of the most interesting facts brought to light by Professor Hommel has a close connexion with the name of Shem. With the help of the Minæan texts he has proved (1) that the early religion of the West Semites was the cult of the moon and stars, and (2) that at the head of the pantheon came a triad consisting of the evening star (Istar or Athtar), the moon-god and the angel or messenger of the latter, followed by a sun-goddess who was probably either the wife or the daughter of the principal god. West Semitic worship thus stood in marked contrast to that of Babylonia east of the Euphrates, where the sun-god was a male deity and took precedence of the moon. The solar cult of Canaan, where the supreme Baal was similarly the sun, was the result of Babylonian influence in those primitive days when the art and civilization of Babylonia were brought by Sargon of Akkad to the shores of the Mediterranean.

The moon-god was addressed under different titles. One of them was 'Amm or 'Ammi, 'my uncle,' the national god of Ammon, who appears in the South Arabian inscriptions of Katabân along with Athtar, Anbây, the Nabium or Nebo of Babylonia, and the sun-goddess. In Hadramaut the moon-god has the Babylonian name of Sin, Ḥaul, which, as Professor Hommel shows, is the Phoenix, the ḥôl of the Book of Job, taking the place of Anbây. In most parts of Southern Arabia, however, the proper name of the moon-god is replaced by an epithet, or else by the colourless *Sumhâ*, 'his name.' The name of Samu-el proves that the same periphrasis was known also to the Hebrews, and indicates at how early a period the

disinclination to pronounce the name of the national deity, which found expression among the post-exilic Jews, was already felt by the Western Semites. It is more especially in the compound names of Southern Arabia that *Sumhâ* is substituted for the name of the god, and it is therefore worth noting that it is in the same class of names that 'Sumu (and 'Samu) is found in the cuneiform texts of the Khammurabi period. Sumu or Shem is, in fact, the moon-god who was originally the supreme Baal of the Semites of Arabia and the West. It was only where Babylonian influence prevailed that his place was taken by the sun.

Professor Hommel's brilliant discovery throws a new and important light on the early religion of the Semitic peoples. As he justly remarks in a lecture delivered before the Society of Jewish History and Literature at Berlin in 1899, it entirely subverts the theory of Wellhausen and Robertson Smith, who saw in the fetichism of uncivilized Bedâwin the primitive religion of the Semite, and declared the worship of 'the host of heaven' to be an importation from Babylonia of very late date. But the evidence of the South Arabian inscriptions is clear and decisive; so far from being a late Babylonian importation, it goes back to the earliest days of Semitic history. Long before the age of the oldest written monuments the moon-god was the supreme object of Semitic worship.

The cult of the moon-god at Ur and Harran can now be explained. Both cities lay outside the limits of Babylonia proper, and were inhabited by a population which largely consisted of Western Semites. Here was the Arphaxad of Genesis, and here the culture of Sumerian Babylonia first influenced the Semites of the Western deserts. It is noticeable that one of the few relics we possess of the theological literature of Ur—a hymn to the moon-god—is strikingly monotheistic in tone. It might, indeed, almost have been written by the monotheist Abram. I have already pointed out in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES that the divine name of Yahum or Yahveh is found on a Babylonian tablet of the age of Khammurabi, and Professor Hommel has since collected other examples of the name from tablets of the same period. He

now suggests that Yahum, too, was once an epithet of the primeval moon-god, like 'Ammi and Wadd (Hadad) and Ḥaubas.

However this may be, the primitive triad of gods which he has discovered reminds us of the triad which stood at the head of the Babylonian pantheon. Here, however, there was no female goddess attached to it; the Sumerian goddess was a more independent being than the Semitic, and did not so readily allow herself to be absorbed by the god. But in the Kabeiri of Samothrace we have, I think, a close parallel to the West Semitic group of divinities. Of the four Kabeiri, or 'great gods,' Axieros, Axiokersos, Axiokersê, and Kasmilos, Axiokersê was a goddess, a mere reflection of Axiokersos, while Kasmilos, or Kadmilos (that is to say, Kadmi-el, or Kadmos) corresponded with Anbây the 'angel,' and was accordingly identified by the Greeks with their Hermês. As I pointed out some years ago in the *Academy*, the existence of a West Semitic deity Kadmos is certified by a cuneiform lexical tablet (K 2100, Rev 4⁹), where the equivalents of 'god' in different Asiatic languages are given, and Qadmu is included among them. This disposes finally of all attempts to find a Greek etymology for Kadmos. Qadmu bears the same relation to Qadmi-el or Qadmu-el that Yahum does to Yahum-ilu (Joel), and Qadmu-el, I believe, is found in Gn 22²¹, where it should be substituted for the senseless Qemu-el. The same correction will be necessary in Nu 34²⁴ and 1 Ch 27¹⁷. Qemu-el, or rather Qadmu-el, is described as the father of Aram. Kasmilos the Kabeiros was made by some legends, which perhaps had an Egyptian origin, the father of the three other Kabeiri, instead of their brother. Axio-kersos, it may be added, was identified with Hades, Axio-kersê with Persephonê, and Axieros with Dêmêtêr. The male Athtar of the Minæan inscriptions thus becomes a goddess, as was also the case not only with the Istar of Babylonia but with the Ashtoreth of Phœnicia, and Samothrace, it must be remembered, came within the Phœnician 'sphere of influence.' That the moon-god of night should pass into the Greek Hades is very intelligible in connexion with the performance of the Kabeiric mysteries.