

the tone of the book is in every way admirable. Either for private study or in the hands of a capable teacher, Mr. Holborn's little work is calculated to render excellent service as presenting an interesting and reliable view of what believing criticism has to say of the history and value of the Pentateuch.

J. A. SELBIE.

Maryculter, Aberdeen.

Ezekiel xiii. 18-21.

In Frazer's *Golden Bough* (i. 277) the custom of stealing or hunting the soul is referred to. It might be caught in a scarf. 'In Fiji, if a criminal refused to confess, the chief sent for a scarf with which "to catch away the soul of the rogue."'

Or it might be taken in a snare. 'The sorcerers of Danger Island used to set snares for souls. The snares were made of stout cinet, about fifteen to thirty feet long, with loops on either side of different sizes to suit different sizes of souls; for fat souls there were large loops, for thin souls there were small ones.'

Is it possible to see a connexion with this practice in Ezk xiii. 18-21? 'Woe to the women that . . . make kerchiefs for the head of persons of every stature to hunt souls! . . . Behold, I am against your pillows, wherewith ye there hunt the souls to make them fly [margin, 'as birds'], and I will tear them from your arms; and I will let the souls go, even the souls ye hunt [as birds]. Your kerchiefs also will I tear, and deliver my people out of your hand, and they shall be no more in your hand to be hunted.'

In the *Dictionary of the Bible*, 'bands or fillets' is given for 'pillow.'—H. M.

THE practices described in the *Golden Bough* appear to belong to a different category from those referred to in Ezk 13¹⁸⁻²¹. The latter passage contains expressions that are obscure, but its general meaning is plain. The prophet is inveighing against women in Israel who falsely claimed the gift of prophecy and who practised divination. They wore, and made those who came to consult them wear, amulets and fillets, which were supposed to possess virtues analogous to the phylacteries and the prayer-tallith of later times, so that the wearers of them were introduced into the magical circle. By such arts and pretensions these sorceresses hunted for human victims, as the fowler seeks to ensnare birds. But there is no thought of the literal 'hunting of souls' described by Dr. Frazer. In all probability the Hebrew term *nēphāshōth*, here rendered 'souls,' means nothing more than 'persons,' a sense it bears elsewhere in Ezekiel (cf. 17¹⁷ 18⁴ 22²⁷) and in other passages of the O.T. (Gn 31⁶, Ex 12⁴ 16¹⁶, Nu 19¹⁸, Lv 18²⁰ 20²⁵ 27², 2 K 12⁵, Pr 11³⁰ 14²⁵). The promise of Ezk 13²⁰ ('I will let the souls go,' etc.) finds a parallel in Ps 124⁷ ('Our soul is escaped as a bird out of the snare of the fowlers,' A.V. and R.V.), where, similarly, the word *naphshēnū*, rendered 'our soul,' means, by a Hebrew idiom, simply 'we.' J. A. SELBIE.

Maryculter, Aberdeen.

Recent Biblical and Oriental Archaeology.

I WOULD draw the attention of Old Testament scholars to an article in the April number of the *Princeton Theological Review* by Professor R. D. Wilson, in which an examination is made, from a purely philological point of view, of the close relationship alleged to exist between the languages, traditions, and religions of Babylonia and Israel. The article is naturally named after the famous lectures of Professor Delitzsch, 'Babylon and Israel.' Professor Wilson is a good Hebraist, though his knowledge of Assyrian seems to me to be too much derived from the study of a dictionary; his examination of the relationship of the vocabularies of the two languages is, however,

searching and scholarly, and it is the first time that it has been made with anything like the same amount of thoroughness. The results at which he arrives will be a surprise to many, and are summed up in the closing words of his article. He concludes that there was nothing but 'a long line of opposition between the religions and the policy of the Hebrews and Babylonians, which extends from the time when Abraham was called out of Ur of the Chaldees, to leave his country and his kindred, until, in the Apocalypse and the later Jewish literature, Babylon became the height and front of the offending against the kingdom of the God of Israel. All through that extended and extensive literature

of the ancient Hebrews, all through those long annals of the Assyrians and Babylonians, wherever the Hebrews and the Assyrio-Babylonians were brought into contact, it was by way of opposition.'

There was a time when such conclusions would have been as much a surprise to me as they will be to many of my Assyriological colleagues, but I have been prepared for them by a study of the laws of Khammurabi. I had expected to find points of similarity and dependence between the laws of the great Babylonian legislator and those of the Pentateuch, and numerous German publications had assured me that such was the case. But instead of this I can find little except difference and contrast; what has struck me has been, not the agreement, but the unlikeness between the Codes of Babylonia and Moses—the one is addressed to the civilized citizens of a settled monarchy, the other to nomad tribes.

Professor Wilson's examination of the lexicon has shown that this unlikeness extends through all the departments of religious and social life. Even the words for 'priest' are not the same in Hebrew and Assyrian, nor is there a 𐤎 , 'or pilgrim festival, among the Babylonians, a word and a thing so familiar to the Hebrews and the Arabs.' Where resemblances in detail have been pointed out between Babylonia and Israel, they sometimes prove to have been really between Israel and the alien Western Semites who were settled in Babylonia and its neighbourhood. That is notably the case with the name Yahum-ilu or Joel, which I was the first to notice in the pages of this periodical, and which, so far as I can see, has nothing to do with names compounded with Yapi, as has recently been maintained.

On the other hand, Professor Wilson's philological evidence must not be pressed too far. Hebrew was 'the language of Canaan,' and for centuries Canaan was permeated with Babylonian influence and culture. The earlier chapters of Genesis look back to the banks of the Euphrates; the Sabbath, in both name and institution, was of Babylonian origin, however special and peculiar may have been its development in Israel, and there was much in the Hebrew ritual and theological conceptions which can be traced to a Babylonian source. With all this, however, the contrast and dissimilarity between Israel and the great centre of Western Asiatic civilization is truly astonishing; the fundamental ideas may be the

same, but among the Hebrews they have not only been worked out on different lines, but not unfrequently in what can be explained only as a spirit of intentional opposition.

The immense masses of literature which are being furnished by the libraries of Babylonia are at length providing us with the means of comparison necessary for placing the study of the Pentateuch and of Old Testament history on a scientific footing. What the contract tablets have done for the age of the Captivity, and the Tel el-Amarna tablets for that of Moses, thousands of early Babylonian documents are now doing for that of Abraham. It is to the contracts and other legal documents of that age that we must look to illustrate and supplement the Code of Khammurabi, and scholars will therefore welcome a useful little book just published by Dr. S. Daiches: *Altbabylonische Rechtsurkunden aus der Zeit der Hammurabi-Dynastie* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1903). The tablets with which it deals are full of instruction. We find women buying and selling like men; indeed, most of the sellers mentioned in the contracts translated by Dr. Daiches are not men but women. On the other hand, the majority of the slaves seem to have been female, perhaps on account of their slighter monetary value, the female slave fetching on an average not more than about five shekels, while the male slave was worth half a mina or thirty shekels. Hired servants were exclusively men. Slaves, however, were clearly not very numerous in the Babylonia of the Abrahamic period, and we learn from the laws of Khammurabi that children of a slave by a free man became free themselves, along with their mother, after their father's death. Even the children of a male slave by a free woman had a right to freedom.

Not the least interesting part of the contracts are the numerous West-Semitic names contained in them. They prove how large a portion of the population of Babylonia must have consisted of Western Semites in the time of a dynasty which was itself West-Semitic; and they also prove that these Western Semites enjoyed all the rights and privileges of the native Babylonians. Among the names we find Yatarum, the biblical Jethro; Yabuzatum, the feminine of Jebus; Amurum, 'the Amorite'; and Yapium, which, as Dr. Daiches remarks, prevents us from seeing the Hebrew Yahweh in the first element of Yapi-ilu. One of the characteristics

of these West-Semitic names is to replace the special name of the tribal or national god by *ilu*, 'the god,' in the second half of a compound, and by Samu or Sumu, the biblical Shem, 'the Name,' in the first half of the compound. Thus the first two kings of Khammurabi's dynasty were Samu-ilu, 'the Name is god,' and Sumu-la-ilu. The significance of the latter name is not clear; Professor Hommel makes it: 'Is Sumu not a god?' which is not very satisfactory. Dr. Daiches proposes to read Sumu-lail, where *lail* would be a participle, but this too has its difficulties.

Another point of interest in the contracts is the evidence they afford that the legal Sumerian terms found in them were not used ideographically, but had been adopted by the Semites like Latin and French terms in our own law. Thus the Sumerian *muni*, 'his name,' is in one place provided with the

Semitic mimation *im*, showing that it was pronounced as a single Semitic word *munim*, and elsewhere we have the Sumerian verb, *gagâ*, interchanging with *gigi*. The number of Semitized Sumerian words in Assyrian has long since made it clear that the Babylonian vocabulary was as much a mixed one as that of modern Egyptian Arabic, and the long contact of the Western Semites with Babylonia, not to speak of the fact that Canaan was once a province of the Babylonian Empire, would incline us to expect that such borrowings have made their way also into what we call Hebrew. Hence it is not surprising that the name by which the 'city' was known in Canaan should have been of Sumerian origin, the Hebrew עִיר being the Babylonian *uru*, which itself is borrowed from the Sumerian *eri*.

A. H. SAYCE.

Queen's College, Oxford.

The Invitation to the Thirsty.

BY THE REV JAMES E. SOMERVILLE, B.D., MENTONE.

THE beautiful invitation uttered by the Lord in the court of the temple on the occasion of His visit to Jerusalem, at the Feast of Tabernacles,¹ has been well called the grandest of all the utterances of Jesus. The offer of the living water which He had made to the solitary Samaritan at the well, near the beginning of His ministry, is now, near the close of His ministry, thrown open to the thronging crowds of Jewish worshippers in the temple. The invitation to the 'weary and heavy laden' is recorded by St. Matthew alone. To St. John we are indebted for preserving this precious word addressed to the thirsty of every age and clime.

Every one must be conscious of embarrassment, however, in the effort to understand these verses. For, in the first place, in our translation there is an awkward change of subject in the middle. And then there are the words, 'he that believeth on me, as saith the scripture, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water.' Where in the Old Testament is such a saying to be found? In vain is it searched for. Some have imagined that the words have somehow dropped out of the book, and been lost. Others less extravagant would read 'he that believeth as the scripture said,' and understand the

¹ Jn 7³⁷⁻³⁸.

meaning to be that the faith must be conformable with Scripture. The great majority of interpreters, however, understand the words to mean that out of the believer flow rivers of living water. The difficulty is that no passage in the Old Testament says such a thing, or anything like it. Commentators refer to a number of passages where water is spoken about, and they try to twist them into some such meaning. But the effort is pitiful. Meyer says 'there is no exactly corresponding passage in Scripture, it is merely a free quotation, harmonizing in thought with various passages, especially Is 44³ 55¹ 58¹¹ (compare also Ezk 47¹ Zec 13¹ 14⁸). All I have to say is, if that is exegesis, alas for those who are dependent on exegetes. To attempt to find in any of these passages or all combined a prediction that out of the believer in Christ shall flow rivers of living water is to attempt the impossible, and to play fast and loose with the word of God. Perhaps someone will suggest Is 58¹¹, the promise to the kind and charitable as a solution, where it is said, 'Thou shalt be like a watered garden, and like a spring of water whose waters fail not.' But that verse says the very opposite. A watered garden does not send out water, but retains the water for its own needs. And if the thought be supposed