to God: neither, if we eat not, are we the worse, nor, if we eat, are we the better.' These things are material and nought in themselves. They become what the mind of man makes them. All that vast power for good or for evil which Paul

saw in the Sacrament was purely ideal, and lay in the spirit of the man who came to the Lord's Table, and in the degree to which he sympathized with the mind of the Saviour and with the life of the Brethren who sat along with him.

---

The Archaeology of the Book of Genesis.


Gen. iv. 1, 2. 'Now the man had known Hāvāh his wife' (cf. the similar construction in v. 2). This implies that the knowledge had begun before the expulsion from Paradise, and not immediately after it, as commentators usually assume. It was the birth of Cain which took place after the expulsion. Cain, or Ca'ainan (v. 2), 'the smith,' answers to the Babylonian ummu'nu; while Abel, as was pointed out many years ago by Oppert, is the Bab. Abīl, 'son,' which was borrowed also by the Sumerians under the form of ībīta. The initial vowel is represented in the Heb. transcription by נ, as in בּנֵי, hēkal, from Bab. īkallū, Sumerian bgal; cf. also the name of Abraham for Aba-ramu. The latter part of v. 1, explaining the name of Cain from the verb qāndāh, is a late insertion, like most of the etymological notes in Genesis; it is inconsistent with the statement in 4:20, and is unaccompanied by a corresponding explanation of the name of Abel, the reason being that hebel in Heb. meant 'vanity,' which did not suit the character ascribed to Abel in the history.

The same, ro'eh zôn, 'shepherd of a flock,' is an Assyrianism, ṛēu šanai in Ass. being used in contradistinction to ṛēu alph, 'ox-herd'; ṛēu irstsuri, 'bird-keeper'; ṛēu sattukhi, 'keeper of the daily sacrifice, etc. 'Tiller of the ground' is a translation of the Ass. ḫkkāru, which is derived from the Sumerian engar, 'the ground,' and is ideographically expressed by ur-apin, 'man of the ground'; that is to say, 'the peasant' or 'fellah,' as distinguished from the nu-gissar, or 'gardener,' as Adam had been in Paradise. The population of Babylonia consisted of agriculturists (ikkāri) and artisans (ummanī), the former inhabiting the country, and the latter the town, the whole body of them being collectively called ummanu. In contrast to them were the uncultured West Semitic nomads, whose home was in the desert on the west side of the Euphrates, but who tended the flocks of their Babylonian masters, and many of whom pitched their tents on the river-banks of Southern Babylonia. Wool was a staple industry of the Babylonians, and the flocks were all herded by the West Semitic Beduin. Hence the shepherd represented the West Semitic Beduin, while the peasant and artisan constituted the civilized population of Babylonia. In one sense they might be called brothers, since they alike spoke Semitic languages, and a certain portion of the Babylonian people belonged to the Semitic race.

In the story of Cain and Abel, therefore, we have a reflexion of the relations between the two adjoining populations as they were regarded from the Beduin point of view. The elder brother is naturally the Babylonian master, to whom the Beduin shepherd stood in somewhat of the relation of the wife to the husband (v. 7); he possessed metal weapons of destruction (vv. 8, 22, 9), was the builder of cities (v. 17), and exchanged agriculture for the artisan's craft (vv. 12, 22).

3, 4. The Hebrew translated 'in process of time' would be ina li'it yumē in Assyrian; but the original phrase was probably ina yumē-su, 'at that time,' as the reference is to the time when Cain and Abel were already respectively an agriculturist and a shepherd. The ground had already been cursed (3:17); hence the fruit of it was not acceptable to Yahweh, who had cursed it. On the other hand, Yahweh was the God of the Sutu or West Semitic Beduin (4:26), whose offering to Him was the best of their possessions—the firstlings, namely, of their

---

1 The fact that the word ummanu, 'smith,' came to be applied (as in the story of the Deluge) to the whole body of the Babylonian population, so as to include 'the peasant' as well as 'the smith,' would explain how Cain, the first 'smith,' has absorbed the first amel-ikkāri (Heb. 'ish ḫa-adāmâh), or 'agriculturist,' who, according to 9:20, was really Nukhum, or Noah (see notes on 5:20 and 5:20).
flocks, together with their milk (reading בָּן instead of בָּן, a punctuation due to the regulations of the Levitical Law; Lv 3:10).

'Yahweh regarded Abel and his offering, but Cain and his offering he did not regard.' The Assyrian equivalent of בָּן is אַטָּא, from־ם; but it is probable that אַטָּא, the synonym of־ם, was found in the original, since that is used in the sense which בָּן has in this passage. Thus Esarhaddon says of Merodach: ina yakhur akhha rabı̂ṭti hutta-mni, 'among all my elder brothers thou hast regarded (i.e. chosen) me.' Yahweh's choice, it will be noticed, had nothing to do with the character of the brothers. A parallel passage is found in the Babylonian story of the Deluge (xi. 160–161), where the offering was of the fruits of the earth, like that of Cain: 'the gods smelt the savour, the gods smelt the sweet savour,' and consequently accepted both it and the offerer. The gods of the Babylonian agriculturist naturally preferred the fruits of Eden to the firstlings of the flock.

The ordinary Assyrian phrase was _damage and *pant'su, 'his countenance was troubled.'

7. A proverb is quoted in this verse of which we have the Babylonian original in the Legend of the Plague-god (K 2619. 6), [Ur]ra rabı̂tsu abull-su, 'the Plague-god is lying in wait at his door.' Here the Semitic Ḥattāth, used as a proper name without the article (like Tehôm, Gn 1:2), takes the place of the Sumerian Ura (originally Gûra). Ḥattāth is the Assyrian khaḫitu, or khîhitu, 'sin,' as in the phrase: summa khaḫitu isir ilu-su itti-su ittalak, 'if he hates sin, his god walks with him.' Corresponding with Ḥattāth is Sēeth, also used as a proper name without the article, which takes the place of Ḥattāth in the alternative form of the proverb: 'If thou doest well, is not Sēeth (watching at the door) ?' The Babylonians, in fact, regarded the rabı̂tsu, or 'lier in wait,' from two points of view: he was either the demon who lay in wait to enter and punish sin, or he was the 'guardian-bull,' who also was a rabı̂tsu, in its secondary sense of 'watchman,' appointed to prevent evil from entering the house.1 Thus in the Chedor-lomer texts we read: 'When the liar-in-wait welcomed [the enemy], the guardian-bull (ṣēdu) of Ḫ-Sara departed (from it)' (P.S.B.A., Dec. 1906, p. 241). The name of the ṣēdu, or 'protecting spirit of the house,' was also employed in a wider sense to include all the spirits, whether good or evil, who 'lay in wait at the door'; even Isum, the messenger of Urra, is called a ṣēdu. ṣēdu is also written ṣētu, like ṣet for ṣēd (Heb. sâdeh) in the Tel el-Amarna letters from Jerusalem. In the proverb as quoted in Genesis ṣēdu, ṣētu, has been assimilated to ḥaṭṭāth, and so made to resemble ṣēdu, 'friend' (cf. ṣēd, Ec 2:9). The original of the Heb. version would have been: summa ṣētu, ṣētu abulla raβı̂tsu; ṣētu abulla. The meaning of the passage had been forgotten when the Septuagint translation was made.

The West Semitic Beduin kept the flocks of their Babylonian masters, to whom, therefore, they owed service. Hence, so far as mastership was concerned, the relationship was like that of the wife to her husband (3:10), from which also the words 'unto thee shall be his desire' have been taken. But, however appropriate these latter words may be to the husband, they are quite out of place when the relations of two brothers are in question, and consequently cannot have been in the original text. Moreover, there is no subject to 'his' and 'him.' In place of the very inappropriate 'And unto thee shall be his desire,' we need 'He is thy younger brother.'

8. There is another omission of the original text in the verse which begins, 'And Cain said to Abel his brother...' The words, however, are lost. The insertion of the Septuagint, 'Let us go into the field,' probably represents the sense of the original, and may have been derived from it. If so, the words must have dropped out after the period when the Septuagint translation was made.

Ṣâdeh, 'the field,' is the Babylonian Ṣâdîtu, and was a technical term denoting the cultivated land on the bank of a Babylonian river or canal which was watered by means of shadufs. It was, therefore, the special property of the agriculturist Cain, in contradistinction to the Ṣînîtu, or 'plain,' where the flocks were pastured by the shepherd Abel.

9. Cain disclaims all knowledge as to where his brother is, the Ṣâdîtu and the Ṣînîtu being distinct. His own province is the Ṣâdîtu, and, as he leaves the Ṣînîtu to his brother, he cannot guard him from assailants, either as the ṣēdu guards the agriculturist's house, or as the nomad shepherd guards his flock. The Bab. original of Cain's

---

1 [In the Tel el-Amarna tablets the Egyptian commissioners are called rabı̂tsu.]

2 [In the Tel el-Amarna tablets the Egyptian commissioners are called rabı̂tsu.]}
reply would have been: ul ūdi; natšir akhiya anakū?

10. In Assyrian it would be: iqi-mi, minā tēpus tū gāl damē akhi-ka itarākh (or isarākh) ana eli-ya ušu qaqqari. The v.l. pyû must be substituted for the ungrammatical ṣparû, ‘qoḏkim’ of the Massoretic text. It was the ‘voice of the blood’ that cried out, not the blood. Yahweh was the guardian of the West Semitic shepherds, though Cain disclaimed being so, and He would avenge their death. The blood of the murdered man called to Him from that ‘irrigated soil’ from which the agriculturist took his name (ikkaru), and which he regarded as his own property.

---

Contributions and Comments.

The Coat without Seam.

Does any English commentary or translation call attention to the fact, that in the description of the coat without seam (Jn 19:23) the words ἐκ τῶν ἄνωθεν, ‘from the top,’ may be connected with the preceding ἀγαφός, seamless, instead of with the following ἄφαντος, woven, which has the addition ἃθ' ἄλοι, throughout? The coat was without seam from, i.e., at the top, or the upper parts. No German book which I have been able to consult mentions this possibility. And yet it is followed not only by Cyprian and the Codex : de tunica autem quia de superiori parte non consutilis, sed per totum textilis fuerat, but also by the Syriac translation, which is rendered by Gwilliam: ‘tunica autem eius erat absque sutura a summo, contexta tota’ (..ttf ūn ṣnḫrw ẖw, n ᵍš mn ᵍš ẖmr n ᵁr).1 This explanation, which needs only the removal of a comma, seems to be recommended by the gloss of the lexicographer Hesychius (quoted already by Wettstein, 1752), who defines σύμπορον as τῶν μῆρας συνεδριάμενον κατὰ τοὺς ὅμοιον χίτων, the coat which is not kept together by seams on the shoulders; and the description of the priest’s dress by Josephus (Ant. iii. vii. 4): ἃτοι δὲ ἔχον οἷον σύμπορον οὐκ ἐκ δυο ἀντικρήματων ὀστεῖ ἄπαυτος ἕτεκ τῶν ὅμοιον ἔλαινα καὶ τῶν παρά πλευράν: this coat does not consist of two sheets, so that it would be sutured on the shoulders and at the sides. The expression of Josephus, (μῆρι οὗ ἀρτών ἀπαύτως ἐκ τῶν ὅμοιον ἐκ τῶν ἄνωθεν, there are editions of the Greek Testament which have no comma either before or after ἐκ τῶν ἄνωθεν, but I know of one with a comma after ἄνωθεν.2 In the D.B. I looked under ‘Coat’ and ‘Seam’ in vain for some elucidation about the ‘seamless robe’; the D.C.G. makes the omission good under ‘Coat,’ giving a reference under ‘Seam’ to this article.

E. B. Nestle.

The Aramaic Name of the Passover.

The D.B. states in the art. ‘Passover’ (iii. 688): ‘Name.—חֵסָר יָב, J.-Aram. קַסֶּר, Syr. מְסָרָה, and hence πᾶσαχ.’ A similar statement is repeated in D.C.G. ii. 324: ‘(Heb. יב, pesaḥ; Aram. נמי, pašu; in Greek, πάσχα,’ etc. In the E.B. I do not find a reference to the Aramaic form, but in Preuschen’s New Dictionary of the Greek Testament I meet the same statement—‘Aram. נמי. It is not necessary to multiply references.

In reality the Aramaic form is נמי, pis-hā; see Dalman’s Grammar (2nd ed., p. 138; correct in the Index under πᾶσαχ, the wrong reference ‘126’), or E. Kautzsch, Grammatik des Biblisch-Aramäischen, p. 10, who wrote twenty-five years ago: ‘The Jewish tradition demands נמי, with which also the Syriac pes-chā corresponds.’ It is the same difference of pronunciation that we have in Miryam—Maryam; Simson—Samson, etc.

When Dalman, l.c., thinks the π of πᾶσαχ due to assimilation with πᾶσχα, I cannot see why the

1 James Murdock, in his literal translation from the Syriac Peshitto Version renders: ‘And his tunic was without seam from the top, woven throughout.’ In the Syriac Codex from Sinai the passage is missing.

2 A similar difference of pronunciation, to which the A.V. and R.Y. do not call attention, is Rev 5: ‘A book written within and on the back, sealed with seven seals’; to which punctuation others prefer: ‘A book written within, and on the back sealed with seven seals.’