by force, clearly it is a Kingdom which suffereth violence. Taking the passage just as it stands in
the A.V. and the R.V. we have only one thought expressed; whereas the meaning appears to be,
(i) The Kingdom of God is a forceful Kingdom; and (ii) Men of force strongly enter it and secure
its blessings. Divine earnestness and urgency call for corresponding earnestness and urgency on the
part of all who would enter into this Kingdom. Calling to mind what it has had to meet and
overcome we see that it would not have succeeded to the extent it has succeeded unless there had
been at its back a Divine urgency. This force, too, justifies our confident expectation of its
ultimate victory over all opposing forces of evil. We are not surprised that it reached, uplifted, and
saved some of the most degraded in the past, and that it is still God's power to men's salvation.
The New Testament gives us sufficient instances which show clearly that only men of force,
determination, earnestness can break away from sin and secure the blessings of the Kingdom.
The hesitating, the vacillating, the half-hearted, the insincere Christ sent empty away; the victory
was gained by earnestness and enthusiasm. Then, as now, self-denial had to be practised, and sacri­
fices had to be made; and then, as now, individuals knew that every kingdom worth entering
makes such demands.

M. J. Birks.
Wolverhampton.

The Child's Song of its Shepherd.

TRANSLATED BY DR. R. H. THOMAS,
BALTIMORE, U.S.A.

SINCE I'm Jesus' little lamb,
Joyful evermore I am;
In my Shepherd's love confiding,
He for all my wants providing,
Loves me every day the same,
Knows me, calls me by my name.

Under His protecting care
I go in and out, and share
Pastures green of unknown sweetness;
Want I know not, but completeness.
And when faint with thirst He brings
His lamb unto the water-springs.

Who so happy then as I,
Little lamb with Shepherd by?
When these happy days are ended,
Glad, by angel bands attended,
Go I to my Shepherd's breast,
In His arms at home, and blest. 1

1 I have just seen your note as to a possible translation of
a hymn in German, in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, p. 305,
and thought I might send you the above, done by my brother
some years ago, and printed in Echoes and Pictures (Headley
Brothers). - MARY SNOWDEN BRAITHWAITE, Kendal.

The Archaeology of the Book of Genesis.


Chapter iv.

II, 12. The 'voice' crying from the ground
becomes a curse, in accordance with Babylonian
belief. Thus in the religious texts the gubu la jðhu,
'the evil voice,' is described as arrat limuttim ana
amilii, 'a curse of evil upon a man.' The original
may perhaps be restored as follows: u anumma
arratu ana katam itið (ox ittaskan), istu qaqqari sa
ipte pí-sa ana laqi damel ahhika istu idika. The
metaphor recurs in the Epic of the Creation (iv. 97),
where it is said that Tiamat 'opened her mouth to
swallow (? it.'

The punishment inflicted upon Cain is Baby-
lonian, and not Israelite. The Mosaic Law re­
ognized the Beduin law of blood-revenge, which
is extended to all mankind in Gn 9:4-6. But one
of the marked contrasts between the Mosaic Law
and the Code of Khammu-rabi is that in the latter
the nomadic law of blood-revenge is replaced by
the State-administered justice of a civilized com­
munity. Except in two special instances, the
individual is forbidden to take the law into his
own hands, and the exact penalty for each offence
is prescribed by the imperial authority. The rule of ‘blood for blood’ is no longer allowed, and homicide is not necessarily punishable with death. In the account, therefore, of Abel’s murder the law applied to Cain is Babylonian, though the point of view of the story is West Semitic.

The punishment was that the earth should ‘not again give unto thee its produce’; it was to become what in modern Egypt is called sherâqî, that is, sterile from want of water through failure of the inundation. In other words, Cain was to cease to be an agriculturist, and turn to something else for support. Moreover, as he could no longer obtain food from the Babylonian soil, it was necessary for him to migrate elsewhere, and so become a colonist and a ‘wanderer’ in the land. The Hebrew nâ wâ-nâdîh, however, ‘a wanderer and fugitive,’ is much stronger than the sequel of the story justifies; so far from being so, Cain not only ‘dwelt in the land of Nod, but built a city there, and hence was much less of a wanderer than his shepherd brother had been. Nâdîh, therefore, would seem to be derived from an etymological play on the name of Nod; while in Am 4:8 the verb yâa is used of a migration from one city to another in consequence of famine. The original probably had tûsî ina irtsitim, ‘thou shalt depart from the land,’ where the Hebrew translator (as in 26) gave ina its usual signification of ‘in,’ and so was led to believe that the passage contained an explanation of the name of Nod. The Septuagint, however, reads ‘groaning and trembling,’ which may represent a better text.

13. The Septuagint translators, not understanding the context, naturally considered that to be merely ‘groaning and trembling upon the earth’ was not a sufficient punishment for murder, and therefore rendered: ‘My crime is too great to be forgiven.’ This is a very possible translation of the Hebrew phrase, and would explain Cain’s fear that every one who met him would slay him. But the Assyrian equivalent is in favour of the translation of the A.V. Thus in the Legend of the Deluge (xi. 184–185) we read: bel khitî emid khitâ-su, bel qillati emid sîlat-su, ‘on the sinner lay his sin, on the evil-doer lay his evil’; and though annu (Heb. ānû) usually signifies ‘sin,’ with emêdu, the synonym of nâsû (Heb. nâsî), it means ‘punishment,’ as in the common phrase annu emêdi-su, ‘they inflicted punishment upon him.’ The original was probably: hab të annu elî sa inûndîanni.

14. Yahu (Yahweh), as we have learnt from the contract tablets of the Khammu-rabi and Kassite periods, was a god of the West Semites in Babylonia; in expelling Cain from Babylonia, therefore, Yahweh was excluding him ‘from his face.’ At a later date, it will be remembered, it was only in Babylonia that Nimrod hunted ‘in the face of Yahweh’ (Gn 10:9). Eastward of Eden the population was non-Semitic.

The ‘ground’ from which Cain was expelled was the cultivated soil of Babylonia, not ground in any other part of the world. The use of the word here shows its technical Babylonian sense and indicates its Babylonian origin. The original probably had the ideograph ÂPIN rather than a phonetically written word.

If he leaves his own domain, Cain fears that ‘every one who meets’ him will slay him. We pass here from Babylonian law to the Beduin law of blood-revenge. But according to this latter law it was only the relations and tribesmen of the murdered man who were called upon to take vengeance, and Cain was about to quit their neighbourhood. Why, then, should he fear that ‘every one’ who finds him will slay him? The writer seems to have had in his mind the fact that in leaving his own territory he was passing into a strange, and therefore a hostile one. If, moreover, we turn the words back into Assyrian, the difficulty disappears. The original would have been: sa imtsî-nî īduhannî, ‘whoever finds me will slay me,’ where sa may signify either ‘some one’ or ‘every one.’ The Hebrew translator has taken it in the second sense.

15. ilê, lâkên, ‘therefore,’ has no protasis. It is explained by the fact that the words which follow are quoted from an old poem (v. 24), so that the meaning of the verse is: ‘Therefore (it is said that) sevenfold is the avenging of the Smith’ upon every one who slays him.’ It was accordingly the old poem which caused the introduction into the text of Cain’s fear that he would be slain. In the original form of the story any reference to his being killed would have been absent, and the narrative would have been consistent with itself. But the poem mentioned the sevenfold avenging of the Smith, which could mean only either that the Smith had been murdered, or that an attempt had been made to murder him.

‘Yahweh set a sign for Cain.’ The Heb. ôth, ‘sign’ (not ‘mark’), is borrowed from the Bab.
ittu, a ‘sign’ of divine origin. The verb sāmu, ‘to set’ or ‘fix,’ was also used by the Babylonians in a technical sense, and the gods were regarded as sāmu simta, ‘fixing (a man’s) destiny.’ The Bab. original was: Yahu ana Ummana itta isim, ‘he set a sign for the Smith,’ i.e. gave him a sign that no one who met him would slay him. So in the Epic of the Creation before Merodach is sent to combat Tiamât, the gods isimu simatus, ‘fixed his destiny,’ that he was to be victor, by the sign of the disappearance and re-creation of a robe through the mere power of the god’s word.

The Kenites ¹ or ‘Smiths’ were possessed of metal weapons which in the early days of history enabled them to overcome their more poorly-armed neolithic neighbours, and doubtless also to slay the latter with comparatively little risk of being slain in return. Like the ‘tinkers’ of mediaeval Europe, and even later days, they formed a sort of secret society which moved from place to place, and jealously kept their knowledge of metallurgy to themselves (cf. 1 S 13:20-22). In the history of Cain and Abel an explanation of the origin of their wandering habits has been added to the West Semitic story of the early relations between the Beduin shepherds and the Babylonian agriculturists. An account is given at the same time of the settlement of Cain, the Smith, in this land of copper and other metals, represents the beginning of the Semitic migration. Though Babylonia was the earliest seat of metallurgic culture in Western Asia—the first home of the ‘Gurguru’ or ‘Coppersmith’—its alluvial soil did not produce stone, much less metal, which had to be imported from abroad. The result of this was, that in spite of its early metallurgic culture, Babylonia remained in the Copper Age down to the last; while Assyria was using bronze in the sixteenth century B.C., Babylonia still employed copper instead of bronze as late as the age of Cyrus.² And the copper came to it originally from the lands ‘on the east of Eden.’

If the scrip tio plena is right in the name of יֶדַע, the corresponding Assyrian form would be Namadu or Nimidu, with medial m; but the Septuagint has Ναίδ. No similar name is found in the cuneiform inscriptions as belonging to the district in which Nod was situated, unless it be that of the town Naditu. The Semitic population which occupied it was known to the Assyrians as Namar. But the geographical nomenclature of the West Semites, preserved in the Old Testament, differs a good deal from that of the cuneiform texts; e.g. Shinar for Babylonia, Kasdim for the Babylonians, like a good many of the proper names, Noah, for instance, instead of Utu-napistim, or (as we shall see) Enoch for Enwe-dhur-anki. In several cases the names are descriptive. Hence Nod, or rather Naïd, may be simply יֶד, nêdh, ‘a mountainous heap’; the Sumerian kur, ‘mountain’—the name given to the mountainous region east of Babylonia—also had the value of nad, which is not Sumerian, and may therefore be the same word as the Hebrew יֵד. In this case, the insertion of the vowel in יֵד would have been due to its association with Cain’s ‘migration.’ On the other hand, יֵד may stand for יֵד, nadda signified ‘waste-land’ in Assyrian, and bit nadda, ‘the house of desolation,’ was an old phrase. The name of the city Naditu is the feminine of nadda.

¹ See article Kenites in Hastings’ Dictionary of the Bible.

² See my Archaeology of the Cuneiform Inscriptions, pp. 55-57.
17. On the west side of the Euphrates, between the river Khabur and Northern Babylonia, lay the district of Khana, which was inhabited by Semitic settlers. As I have already pointed out in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, this must have been called Khanak by the Semites in early Babylonian times, the Sumerian affix ki being attached to the name, as in Zimana-k Kharkhamuna-ki, Kazura-ki; Nana-ki, Tama-ku, etc. A contract dated in the reign of Isar-lim or Israel, king of Khana-ki, 'in the year when he built the gate of the palace in the city of the land of Kasdaim,' has been published by Professor Thureau-Dangin (Tablettes chaldennes in Mites, No. 85). The tablet belongs to the Khammu-rabi period, and as the proper names in it are of a West Semitic stamp, we may infer that the population was West-Semitic rather than Babylonian. The name of Khanak would remind the West Semite of his own khanuku (Enoch), 'priest.'

The Cainite genealogy is a variant of the Sethite genealogy which corresponds with the ten antediluvian kings of Babylonia as given by the native historian Berossus. Among these the cuneiform inscriptions have made us acquainted with Utu-napistim Khasis-adra and his father Ubara-Tutu, and Enwe-dhur-anki (Euedoranchus), 'the priest' of Sippara. Since Berossus makes Euedoranchus belong to Pantibibla or Booktown, the Chaldean writer must have derived the name of Sipar or Sippara from sipru, 'a book.'

The following is a comparative table of the three lists, Cainite, Sethite, and Babylonian:—

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Adam, 'Man.'</td>
<td>Adam, 'Man.'</td>
<td>Adam, 'Man.'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Seth, i.e. Sutu, 'the Beduin.'</td>
<td>Seth, i.e. Sutu, 'the Beduin.'</td>
<td>Seth, i.e. Sutu, 'the Beduin.'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Enos, 'Man.'</td>
<td>Enos, 'Man.'</td>
<td>Enos, 'Man.'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Cain, 'the Smith.'</td>
<td>Cainan, 'the Smith.'</td>
<td>Cainan, 'the Smith.'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Enoch, 'the Priest.'</td>
<td>Mahalaleel.</td>
<td>Mahalaleel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Mehuysael . . .</td>
<td>Enoch, 'the Priest.'</td>
<td>Enoch, 'the Priest.'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Methusael, 'Man of the god'</td>
<td>Methuselah, 'Man of the Moon-god.'</td>
<td>Methuselah, 'Man of the Moon-god.'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Lamech, 'Litation priest.'</td>
<td>Lamech.</td>
<td>Lamech.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here there are two noteworthy facts. (1) The two first names in the Babylonian list have been added to it when Babylon became the capital of the kingdom and empire under Khammu-rabi. The original list began with Amelon, and belonged to Sippar. The Sethite genealogy has imitated the Babylonian list, and so equalized the number of antediluvian patriarchs with that of the Babylonian kings, and it has done so by following the Babylonian system in combining two accounts of the first man which were of different origin. But the West Semitic Beduin (Seth or Sutu) naturally takes the place in it of the citizen of Babylon. The Cainite genealogy, therefore, which omits the Babylonian addition, reproduces an older tradition. (2) The order of the names in the Sethite genealogy agrees throughout with that in the Babylonian list, whereas the order in the Cainite genealogy differs from it in the case of that portion of the list which represents the traditions of Sippar. This may be due either to the order in the Babylonian list having been altered when the first two names were added to it, or to the fact that as the first Smith built a city which was identified with Khanak, it was necessary to suppose that Enoch was his son (see also note on 528).

From these two facts it follows (1) that the Sethite genealogy was copied from the Babylonian list after it had taken its final form subsequently to the age of Khammu-rabi; (2) that the Cainite genealogy was derived from another and earlier version of the list; and (3) that the Hebrew translator was not only acquainted with the meaning of the names in the Babylonian list but was also perfectly aware of the nature of the addition to it of the first two names.

18. The variation in the spelling of the foreign name 'Irad (ירד) or Jared (ירד 529) is instructive, and may be due to a play on ירד, 'city.' Nothing
has yet been found in the cuneiform documents which throws light on the names of either Irad or Daonus, though Irad might correspond to the Assyrian ardu, 'minister.' The Septuagint reads in Irad as א. Megalarus (or Megalalus) is also unexplained; but it shows that Mahalaleel (מַהֲלָלֵא, 512), which has been assimilated to the Heb. מַהֲלָלֵא, 'praise,' is more correct than מַהֲלָלֵא and מַהֲלָלֵא, Meḥuyael, Meḥiyael, though א is nearer the original than א. The Septuagint has introduced מַהֲלָלֵא from 512. The original name may have been Makhkhu-Illilla, 'priest of Ellil.'

Methusael is a transcription of the Babylonian Mutu-sa-ilu, 'Man of the god,' Methuselah being Mutu-sa-Arkhu, 'Man of the Moon-god.' The change of א into א in the Hebrew transcription of Babylonian names was first pointed out by Professor Hommel. The West Semitic names in the contracts of the Khammu-rabi and earlier periods show that at that time the name of a specific deity was commonly replaced by א when it was the last element in a proper name, by א or א, 'the Name,' when it was the first element.

Lamech, as it stands, has no Semitic etymology. It is, however, another instance of the substitution of א for א, and represents the Babylonian ramikzu or ramku, 'a priest,' literally 'the offerer of libations.' Ramku is possibly the origin of the Sumerian Lamga, 'the Smith,' a title given to the Moon-god (W.A.J. ii. 47, 66).

---

**Entre Nous.**

The Great Texts of the Bible.

The two spring volumes are now published. They are *Genesis to Numbers* and *Acts with Romans i.–viii.* (T. & T. Clark; 10s. each).

**Driver's 'Genesis.'**

Professor Driver has issued *Addenda II.* to his Commentary on Genesis. It is an eight-page pamphlet, and may be had from the publishers (Methuen), bound up with the Additions to the seventh edition. It will also be included in the next edition of the Commentary.

The chief matters discussed in *Addenda II.* are Professor Eerdmans's theory of the composition of Genesis; Mr. Wiener's researches into the use of the Divine names; recent discoveries of the use of the name Yahweh (or one like it) in Babylonian; and Professor Hilprecht's Deluge fragment.

The Christian Doctrine of Man.

Professor Wheeler Robinson has done us a most valuable service in publishing a volume at the present time on the Christian Doctrine of Man. For we are urged from all sides to preach, and even to pray, more psychologically, and we do not know how to do it. Superficial magazine articles, well sprinkled with words like 'subconscious,' are plentiful but pernicious. We need a scholar's work, and we need it in something like completeness. The value of the last long chapter on 'The Christian Doctrine of Man in relation to Current Thought' could scarcely be overestimated (T. & T. Clark; 6s. net).

A Cyclopedia of Illustrations.

In estimating the prospectus of this work,' say its editors (in rather quaint language and spelling), 'a well-known clergyman exprest the judgment that a book of fresh illustrations should be made as often at least as once in ten years.' So here is the decennial issue. Its editors are Mr. Robert Scott and Mr. William C. Stiles (Funk & Wagnalls; 21s. net).

Neglect of Duty.

John D. Rockefeller had for some months an expert greenhouse superintendent named Potts, who knew a good deal about greenhouse management. A recent visitor at the Rockefeller house missed Potts, and inquired for him. Then, according to the *Saturday Evening Post,* this conversation took place. 'Oh, Potts!' said Mr.