

and to him are all things.' To saved man the profit, but to God the praise. 'We are his workmanship.'<sup>1</sup>

2. Barnabas was also full of faith. It was because he was full of faith that he was full of the Holy Ghost; and the inspiration of the Holy Ghost gave illumination and force to his faith. His faith not only enabled him to grasp the gospel for himself with confidence, and to appropriate its sanctifying influences, but imparted the assurance of the gospel's success. He expected to witness its triumphant progress, and what he expected, he realized. After the statement, 'he was full of the Holy Ghost and of faith,' it is significantly added, 'and much people was added unto the Lord.' Often success is not achieved because it is not expected.

We have all heard about the student who was in the habit of preaching out of doors, and who went to Mr. Spurgeon one day to say that, although he had been preaching a long time, there were no conversions. 'What!' said Mr. Spurgeon, 'and do you expect that every time you stand up to speak, the Lord is going to save souls through your preaching?' 'Oh no!' he answered, 'not that.' 'Then,' said Mr. Spurgeon, 'that is the reason why you do not get it.' Ah! Mr. Spurgeon had him. And it is just want of faith that prevents success on the part of many a would-be soul-winner.<sup>2</sup>

3. But Barnabas, though full of the Holy Ghost and of faith, had his frailties, and made some mistakes. None are perfect, not even those in whom the grace of God is most conspicuous. Barnabas had the faults of his virtues. His gentleness and willingness to see good in all sometimes betrayed him into compliance with error, and leniency towards unfaithfulness. He was good, but sometimes weak, lacking the sterner stuff of

<sup>1</sup> J. Davies, *The Kingdom without Observation*, 160.

<sup>2</sup> J. G. Stewart, *Talks about Soul-Winning*, 82.

which heroes are made. He is a warning to us, as evidencing how the highest gifts and graces are corrupted in our sinful nature, if we are not diligent to walk step by step, according to the light of God's commandments. Be our mind as heavenly as it may be, most loving, most holy, most zealous, most energetic, most peaceful, yet if we look off from Him for a moment, and look towards ourselves, at once these excellent tempers fall into some extreme or mistake. Charity becomes over-easiness, holiness is tainted with spiritual pride, zeal degenerates into fierceness, activity eats up the spirit of prayer, hope is heightened into presumption. We cannot guide ourselves. God's revealed word is our sovereign rule of conduct; and therefore, among other reasons, is faith so principal a grace, for it is the directing power which receives the commands of Christ, and applies them to the heart.

But Barnabas overcame at last. And at his death he seemed more than ever the steadfast Apostle of Jesus. According to tradition, he ended his life where he began it—at Cyprus. One day he went into the synagogue of Salamis, and began, as was his wont, to preach Christ to the assembly. Certain Jews who had come over from Syria to the island to stir up the people against him, laid their hands on him, and confined him in the synagogue until night, when they dragged him forth, stoned him to death, and then tried to burn his body to ashes. But his body is said to have resisted the power of the flames, though it did not that of the stones, and St. Mark buried it. Such a man takes rank as a leader among 'the glorious company of the apostles' and 'the noble army of martyrs.'<sup>3</sup>

<sup>3</sup> *Church Pulpit Year Book*, ii. (1905) 155.

## Canaan and the Babylonian Civilization.

BY PROFESSOR ED. KÖNIG, PH.D., D.D., BONN.

FRIEDRICH DELITZSCH, in his *Babel und Bibel* (1902, p. 28), says: 'When the twelve tribes of Israel entered Canaan, they came into a region completely under the sway of Babylonian civilization.' Many scholars have given to this statement their tacit or even explicit approval. For instance, we find such repetitions of Delitzsch's assertion as the following: 'The religion of the Canaanites

was the ancient Oriental one,' *i.e.* Babylonian.<sup>1</sup> Moreover, from this assumption it is frequently inferred that the Israelites became acquainted with and adopted the Babylonian legends and myths after their entrance into Canaan.<sup>2</sup> I may be

<sup>1</sup> H. Winckler, *Religionsgesch. und geschichtl. Orient*, 1906, p. 33.

<sup>2</sup> Gunkel, *Kom. zur Genesis*, 1909, p. 73.

allowed, therefore, to investigate the correctness of the above statement of Delitzsch's. I shall not merely repeat what I have recently published in this connexion,<sup>1</sup> for I have abundance of additional material capable of justifying the judgment I have already pronounced.

Those who are acquainted with the history of the excavations which have been undertaken of recent years in the East will readily admit that Delitzsch's pronouncement is not without a certain justification. It will be remembered that the texts discovered at Tell el-Amârna in Middle Egypt in 1888-89 contain a correspondence carried on between Egyptian vassals in Canaan and the Pharaohs, in the Babylonian language and written in the cuneiform character. We know further that a very similar cuneiform letter was discovered by Flinders Petrie at Tell el-Hesi (the ancient Lachish in S.W. Canaan) in 1890, and that, moreover, in the 'third city.' Finally, it is known that at Tell el-Amârna, for instance, there existed the Babylonian myth of the marriage of Ereshkigal, the goddess of the under-world, with Nergal, the god of war and pestilence. But the features of this text indicate that it was written not in Canaan but in Babylonia.<sup>2</sup> Further connexions between Canaan and Babylonian civilization are mentioned in my *Gesch.* (p. 276 f.); and additional information may be found in a valuable article by Paton,<sup>3</sup> in which, however, some of the important points of agreement mentioned by him between the Canaanitish and Babylonian civilizations are doubtful.

The latter remark applies, for instance, to סִינִי, the identity of which with the Bab. moon-god *Sin* is disputed by P. Haupt (*Z.D.M.G.* 1909, p. 508), who correlates סִינִי with סִינָה, 'thorn-bush,' which is, however, very improbable. In my opinion, we must rather start from the word סִין, which in Ex 16<sup>1</sup> 17<sup>1</sup>, etc., signifies a tract of desert. There is little likelihood in the supposition that this has been derived from the name of the moon-god. Far more probable is the connexion of the name *Sin* with the Aramaic *sejân* and the Syriac *sâin*, 'mire,' or 'slime.' At a time when the coast of

the Sinai peninsula was still at a low level<sup>4</sup> and this strip of coast extended as far as Jebel Mûsâ, this tract of land may easily have been in a marshy condition, and so Mount Sinai might have come to be known as the Mountain of *Sin*.

That *Rammân* was from the first a purely Babylonian god (Paton) is not proved by the fact that the verb *ramânu*,<sup>5</sup> 'to thunder,' exists in the Bab. language alone, for in the Semitic tongues there are many nouns whose corresponding verbs are not to be found; cf. לָמַן, which was certainly not an adopted word among the Hebrews. The god *Rammân* was not specifically Babylonian, the name being the Assyrian equivalent of Adad.<sup>6</sup>

The idea that the word *Bêthlehem* contains the name of the god *Lachmu*, known from the opening of the Creation Epic, is extremely doubtful. *Bêth* also occurs in combination with many other words which do not designate any god, as, for instance, in *Bêth-Diblathayim*. As this place derived its name from the cultivation of figs in the surrounding districts, in like manner *Bêthlehem* may have received its name from לֶחֶם, 'bread,' i.e. the corn of that neighbourhood. Are we to suppose that even David worshipped *Lachmu* in *Bêthlehem*? (Paton, p. 184). If *lehem* is to be understood in the sense of bread or food, *Bêthlehem* may also have been a place in (הַפְּרָתָה).

But even if all the instances adduced by Paton pointed to the influence of Bab. civilization on Canaan, it is very important that attention should also be paid to the other side of the matter. The question which must be decided is, to what extent was pre-Israelitish Canaan a region under the sway of Babylonian civilization? What Delitzsch neglected to do must be done here. In addressing myself to this task I have noted a considerable number of differences between the Canaanitish and Bab. systems of civilization. I believe that I shall be able to demonstrate these in a thorough and convincing manner by treating of only three of the differences which are mentioned in my *Geschichte*.

(1) One of these is found in the fact that, judging from Phœnician inscriptions, the Canaanite-

<sup>1</sup> *Gesch. der alltest. Religion kritisch dargestellt*, 1912, pp. 275-282.

<sup>2</sup> A. Jeremias, *Das alte Testament im Lichte des alten Orients*, 1906, p. 169.

<sup>3</sup> L. B. Paton, art. 'Canaanites,' in *E.R.E.* iii. p. 183 f.

<sup>4</sup> Konrad Furrer, in *Theol. Literaturzeitung*, 1907, p. 257.

<sup>5</sup> In Paton's art. wrongly printed *ramânu*.

<sup>6</sup> Jastrow, in *Hastings' D.B.*, extra vol. p. 544.

Phœnicians did not use the same names for the months as did the Babylonians.<sup>1</sup> In these inscriptions we find the following names of months: *Zib* (?), *Ethanîm* (month of continuously full streams), and *Bûl* ('downpour,' i.e. autumnal rains).<sup>2</sup> The following names of months occur also in the earlier Hebrew writings: *Abîb* ('ear of corn,' i.e. the month of the formation of these, about April), *Zîw* ('brilliance,' corresponding approximately to our May), *Ethanîm* (about October), and *Bûl* (about November).<sup>3</sup> We find the following Bab. words in use for the first time after the Exile: Nisan, Iyyar, Siwan; Tammuz, Ab, Elûl; Tishri, Marcheshwan, Kislew; Tebeth, Shebat, Adar.<sup>4</sup> It may be objected that the last-mentioned month-names were not always used even among the Babylonians. Certainly from the earliest times other names of the months are found in the Assyro-Babylonian documents, as, for example, *Kanûn*, which was known as *Arach samna* (lit. 'eighth month,' equivalent to Marcheshwan) in the New Babylonian Empire (from 625 B.C. onwards). Early Assyrian month-names are also met with in the expression *attuhur ilâni* (*K.I.B.* i. p. 8) and in *Kuşallu* (i. p. 46). In addition there occur in the so-called Cappadocian documents the month-names *Kuşallu*, *Absharanu* (iv. p. 50), *Shazuratim* (p. 52) and *Zizuim* (p. 54). Not one of these names is identical with the Canaanitish designations which are given below in footnote<sup>2</sup>. Moreover, in a letter from the Bab. king Kallimasin to Pharaoh, the month-names *Dûuzu* (the above-mentioned late Heb. *Tammuz*) and *Abu* are used.<sup>5</sup> These are, then, earlier names which are not found amongst those used by the Canaanites. Therefore my contention with regard to the differences of the month-names which are found among the Canaanite-Phœnicians on the one

hand, and among the Babylonians on the other, retains its full weight.

(2) Other differences between the Canaanitish and the Babylonian civilizations are to be met with in the related spheres of speech and writing.

In the first place the difference in *speech* which distinguished the Canaanite-Phœnicians from the Babylonians and Assyrians is not removed but rather, on the contrary, emphasized by the Amârna letters and the cuneiform inscriptions discovered at Ta'annek. This cannot be denied even by those scholars who have forgotten to note this circumstance, for the Amârna texts contain numerous Canaanitish glosses to Bab. expressions, as, for example, 'abadat, 'she perished,' in explanation of *chalakat* (Letter 181, line 51).<sup>6</sup> Further, as regards the Ta'annek texts, F. Hrozny, Sellin's Assyriological collaborator, writes as follows (*Tell Ta'annek*, p. 116): 'The form of the word *narâm* ('love') is of interest. It has no terminal vowel. This phenomenon, which can be explained only by the influence of the Canaanitish language, may be frequently noted in the letters.' That Bab. influence on the speech of Canaan first made itself strongly felt in later times may be demonstrated by a fact which has been overlooked in recent discussions of this question. 'Eleven' is expressed in Hebrew sometimes by 'ahad 'asar (fem. 'ahath 'esrê) and sometimes by 'astê 'asar (fem. 'astê 'esrê). This word 'astê was not found among the Canaanites and Phœnicians. What, then, was its origin? Until about forty years ago this was unknown. The most important of the earlier explanations, which appear very curious to us now, are set forth in my *Histor.-krit. Lehrgebäude*, ii. p. 212. As Sayce mentions in his *Assyrian Grammar* (1872, pp. 16, 131, 135), J. Oppert was the first to derive this word 'astê from the Bab. and Assyr. word for 'one,' namely *îsten*, and 'eleven' is there expressed by *îsten-êsrît* (Delitzsch, *Assyr. Gram.* § 75). It will at once be seen that 'astê was not an 'ancient dialectical form,'<sup>7</sup> if a complete survey be made of the passages where it is found. We find 'eleven' represented by 'ahad 'asar in Gn 32<sup>23</sup> 37<sup>9</sup>, Dt 1<sup>2</sup>; 'ahath 'esrê occurs in

<sup>1</sup> I was the first to draw attention to this difference in a pamphlet, *Babylonisierungversuche betreffs der Patriarchen*, etc., 2nd ed., 1903, p. 5f.

<sup>2</sup> The following are the Phœnician names of months which have been discovered up to the present:—

מרתם, מרתם, סרוח, פעלח, כרר, כפע, חיר, ויב, ובחשם, כל, אתם (M. Lidzbarski, *Handbuch der nordsem. Epigraphik*, 1898, p. 412).

<sup>3</sup> For significance of *Bûl* see my *Heb. Wörterbuch*.

<sup>4</sup> The complete list from the later Hebrew writings and the Apocrypha are to be found in my treatise 'Kalenderfragen im althebräischen Schriftum' (*Z.D.M.G.* 1906, pp. 605-644), p. 614.

<sup>5</sup> 'Amârna-texts' in *K.I.B.* v. Letter 3, Revers. lines 8, 10, 12.

<sup>6</sup> The glosses have now been collected and explained by F. Böhl, *Die Sprache der Amârnabriefe*, 1909, pp. 80-85.

<sup>7</sup> Brockelmann, *Vergleich. Grammatik der semit. Sprachen*, i. p. 490.

Jos 15<sup>51</sup>, 1 K 6<sup>88</sup>, 2 K 9<sup>29</sup> 23<sup>86</sup> 24<sup>18</sup>, Jer 52<sup>1</sup>, Ezk 30<sup>20</sup> 31<sup>1</sup>, 2 Ch 36<sup>5, 11</sup>. On the other hand, 'aššē 'asar is found in Nu 7<sup>72</sup> 29<sup>20</sup>, Dt 1<sup>3</sup>, Zec 1<sup>7</sup>, 1 Ch 12<sup>13</sup> 24<sup>13</sup> 25<sup>18</sup> 27<sup>14</sup>; and 'aššē 'esrē in Ex 26<sup>7f.</sup> 36<sup>14f.</sup>, 2 K 25<sup>2</sup>, Jer 1<sup>3</sup> 39<sup>2</sup> 52<sup>5</sup>, Ezk 26<sup>1</sup> 40<sup>49</sup>. We thus arrive at the following important result: the forms of the numeral 'eleven' which are formed with 'aššē (essentially identical with the Bab. *išten*) are found only in parts of Jeremiah and Ezekiel and in exilic (2 K 25<sup>2</sup>) or post-exilic (Zec 1<sup>7</sup>, where for the first time a Bab. month-name occurs) passages; and four times in Chronicles. The remaining places where 'aššē occurs (Ex 26<sup>7f.</sup> 36<sup>14f.</sup>, Nu 7<sup>72</sup> 29<sup>20</sup>, Dt 1<sup>3</sup>) were already recognized to be of later origin by other characteristics (cf. the author's *Einleit. in das A.T.* p. 226 f.), and this opinion has been confirmed by the discovery of the form 'aššē. Thus it is not till the time of direct contact between Canaan and the New Babylonian Empire (from 625 B.C.) that this evidence of the latter's influence upon the 'language of Canaan' (Is 19<sup>18</sup>) can be observed. In like manner Bab. influence can be detected in Ezekiel's language,<sup>1</sup> and from the time of Jeremiah the first unmistakable proof of it is found in the fact that the Hebrews began their year in spring (Jer 36<sup>22</sup>), as did the Babylonians in the later period at least.

Whether there was complete uniformity between the form of *writing* employed by the Canaanites and the Babylonians respectively is still a hotly disputed question. It is known that in addition to the Amarna and the twelve Ta'annek texts several other cuneiform documents have been discovered during the excavations in Palestine. The American excavators in Samaria have also been successful in finding some of these, as stated by Professor Lyon in the *Sunday School Times* (1911). But it is rash to conclude that in ancient Canaan the cuneiform alone was used. Three circumstances will make this clear.

(a) From the extant documents it would appear that the Canaanites employed the cuneiform script only when using the Bab. language. But they possessed a language of their own, and it is probable, therefore, that they utilized written characters of their own when using it.

(b) According to the latest researches the age of the Phœnician characters is much greater than has been supposed during the last decade. The

<sup>1</sup> Cf. my *Geschichte*, p. 405.

Phœnician or Old Semitic alphabet is most probably a simplified form of the signs used by the Egyptians, the inventors of alphabetical writing,<sup>2</sup> and not, as Delitzsch and others<sup>3</sup> maintain, to be derived from the Bab. cuneiform; and there are good reasons for holding that it passed through a considerable period of development. In his brilliant article 'Recent Theories on the Origin of the Alphabet,'<sup>4</sup> Hirschfeld rightly agrees on this point with the conclusions of Professor A. S. Zerbe in his exhaustive work on *The Antiquity of Hebrew Writing and Literature*, 1911 (p. 154 f.). This view is supported, for instance, by the fact that the S. Semitic script is not a direct development from the alphabet of the Mesha inscription, but has arisen from another division of the group of early Semitic or Phœnician scripts, and this development opens for us a view into times long before Mesha.<sup>5</sup> Besides, the Phœnician alphabet was adopted by the Greeks between 1200 and 1000 B.C. (Zerbe, p. 136). Another factor of interest in this connexion is the great age of an inscription discovered by Flinders Petrie in the neighbourhood of Sinai, which, because of the primitive form of its characters, he dates about 1500 B.C. (*apud* Zerbe, p. 152 f.).

(c) Finally, the writing materials which, according to recent researches, were used by the Phœnicians at an early stage make the use of cuneiform script improbable. Thus in the account of his residence in the Phœnician Byblos (*c.* 1100 B.C.), the Egyptian Wen-Amon<sup>6</sup> mentions five hundred papyrus rolls which were imported into Phœnicia from Egypt, and we know that the use of cuneiform on papyrus was practically impossible.<sup>7</sup>

It is evident, therefore, that in all probability Bab. influence on Canaan at an early period, so far at least as the written language is concerned, was a very limited one.

(3) Other differences between the Canaanite-Phœnician civilization and that of Babylonia are to be met with in the conception of the gods, the creation of the world, the origin of man, and the cultus. Without surveying the whole of this wide

<sup>2</sup> Ed. Meyer, *Gesch. des Altertums*, 1909, i. 2, § 203.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Benzinger, *Heb. Archäologie*, 1907, p. 174.

<sup>4</sup> *J.R.A.S.* 1911, pp. 963 f. and 965.

<sup>5</sup> Prätorius, 'Das kanaan. und das südsem. Alphabet,' *Z.D.M.G.* 1909, p. 191.

<sup>6</sup> Translated by Breasted, *Ancient Records*, iv. p. 280.

<sup>7</sup> Kittel, *Die Kultur Palästinas vom 16-13 Jahrhundert*, 1911, p. 28.

and still partially obscure region, I may mention here the following points which have not been given their due weight in recent works on Canaan and Babylonia.

In contrast to the Babylonians, the favourite word used by the Phœnicians to express the idea of 'deity' is the plural form 'alônîm (cf. the treatment of *ilâni*, in my *Gesch.* p. 130). Moreover, the goddess called by the Babylonians 'Ištar' was known among the Canaanites under the feminine form 'Astart.<sup>1</sup> On the other hand, the god *Milk* or *Melk*, 'king,' was not known to the Babylonians and Assyrians.<sup>2</sup> The differences between the two civilizations may be further illustrated by the names of many Babylonian deities who are absent from the Canaanitish pantheon, as, for instance, *Marduk*.—There are many discrepancies as regards the conception of the Creation. According to the Phœnicians, if the statements of Philo Byblios (Eusebius, *Praep. Ev.* i. 10) may be trusted, air was the first element, whilst amongst the Babylonians the priority was accorded to water. Moreover, the expressions used by the two peoples in their cosmogonies are not the same. The Phœnician *Môt* is not the same as the Babylonian *Tiâmatsu*. *Môt* probably signifies the 'primeval slime' supposed to have existed at the beginning of the world, similar to the fertile mud deposited annually by the overflow of the Nile in Egypt, and which was personified by the inhabitants as *Mout*. In the Phœnician cosmogony the gods do not appear, whilst their emergence forms one of the most remarkable

<sup>1</sup> I K 11<sup>b</sup>, etc.; Bloch, *Phœn. Glossar*, p. 51.

<sup>2</sup> The 'purely Tyrian god' (*ilu*), *Mi-il-kar-ti*, 'Lord of the city,' is mentioned in an interesting cuneiform inscription (*K.A.T.*<sup>3</sup> 1903, p. 357).

incidents in the Babylonian Creation-myth.<sup>3</sup>—The word *nešib* (or some similar form), 'pillar,' which occurs seven times in the Phœnician inscriptions,<sup>4</sup> was not used by the Babylonians; moreover, in my opinion, 'pillars' did not play such a large part in the ceremonial worship of the Assyrians and Babylonians as they did in that of the Canaanites. Many pillars have been found at Tell eš-Šâfi, and later at Gezer, Ta'annek, and other places;<sup>5</sup> and I believe that some of these are primitive altars (*Gesch.* p. 85). The word 'pillar,' however, is found neither in the Index of *K.A.T.*<sup>3</sup> nor in Zimmern's article 'Babylonians and Assyrians' in Hastings' *E.R.E.* ii. p. 317 f.—Finally, it may be mentioned that in Babylonia laymen were not forbidden to eat the flesh of sacrificial victims, as they were among the Phœnicians and Israelites. According to Bar 6<sup>28</sup>, the Babylonian priests used to sell the flesh.<sup>6</sup>

The present article may be considered more of an outline sketch than a complete picture, but it will suffice to show clearly that the assertion quoted at the beginning to the effect that Canaan was 'completely under the sway of Babylonian civilization' is not borne out by the historical facts. This obviously furnishes weighty arguments against the theory of borrowing which many scholars have recently advanced in connexion with several parts of Genesis—a theory which is exposed to many other objections, as has been shown in my *Gesch.* pp. 44, 143 f., 145 f., 281.

<sup>3</sup> Lagrange, *Études sur les religions sémitiques*,<sup>2</sup> 1905, pp. 405-407.

<sup>4</sup> Bloch, p. 45.

<sup>5</sup> Vincent, *Canaan d'après l'exploration récente*, 1907, pp. 102-108.

<sup>6</sup> J. Jeremias, art. 'Ritual' in *Encyc. Bibl.* iv. col. 4117.

## In the Study.

### Virginibus Puerisque.

Again.

BY THE REV. W. VENIS ROBINSON, B.A.

'Do it again.'—Pr 19<sup>19</sup>.

MR. ALLENSON has published a volume of addresses to children by the Rev. W. Venis Robinson, B.A., of Falmouth, with the title *Angel Voices from*

*Earth and Heaven* (2s. 6d. net). Here is one of the addresses.

Wilfrid was a little boy three years old. One day he was riding on father's foot. Up and down he went, again and again. Then father stopped just for a rest. And Wilfrid's voice was heard clear and strong.

'Again!'