That this combination drew the attention of earlier students and seemed to them to require an explanation, we may conclude from the interpolated sentences in vv. 19, 21 'because they have shed innocent blood in their land and I will avenge their blood that I have not avenged' (reading לְפָנִי for לְפָנָיו). I need not give the reasons for holding these clauses to be an addition: I am content to offer a reason for their being added. Egypt and Edom share a common guilt.

This suggestion as to the origin of the verses raises the further question as to whether the section is original in Joel: but that is another matter.

ADAM C. WELCH.

THE HITTITE NAME ARAUNAH.

Some years ago I suggested in the Expository Times that the name of Araunah (2 Sam. xxiv) was Hittite. It is written in various ways—Awarnah (v. 16), Arawnah (vv. 20 sqq.), and Aranyah (v. 18), a sure sign of its foreign origin, while Araunah himself is called a Jebusite, that is to say, one of the Hittite inhabitants of Jerusalem. We now know from the trilingual (Hittite—Assyrian—Sumerian) vocabularies of Boghaz Keui that my suggestion was correct. We learn from them that arauanis was the Hittite word for 'nobleman' (Ass. ellum) and that the Biblical Araunah was consequently a title rather than a personal name. This explains the gloss in 2 Sam. xxiv 23, where Araunah is interpreted hammelech, 'the king'.

Jerusalem, as the Tel el-Amarna tablets first informed us, was of Babylonian foundation and accordingly bore the Babylonian name of Uru-Salim; 'City of Salem'. Its Amurrú or Amorite inhabitants were governed in later times by a Hittite military aristocracy whose 'king' or commander in the Tel el-Amarna age had the name of 'Servant of Kheba', Kheba or Khebe being the supreme goddess of Kizzuwadna who was known throughout the Hittite world as 'the queen of heaven'. In 'Amorite' the 'Servant of Kheba' would have been Ebed-Kheba.

No light has as yet been thrown upon the name Yebus, beyond the fact that -s is the suffix of the Hittite nominative. Cf. the city-names Ganis, Burus (Borissos), &c.

Aranyah for Araunah is an attempt to Hebraize the foreign name. It is therefore possible that the name of Uriyah 'the Hittite' has been similarly Hebraized, perhaps from some personal or gentilic name like the Hittite Ura; but it is more probable that it is a second (Semitic) name like that of Ahimelech (1 Sam. xxvi 6). Similar double names, Karian and Egyptian, are found in the Karian inscriptions of Egypt. On the other hand, Bath-Sheba may be a corruption of Bath-Kheba, since יְבֵשָׁה for הִבְשָׁה is philologically difficult to defend, and שָׁבַע 'seven'
would give no sense. In the Hittite texts the name of the goddess is
written Khebe which would be יְהַנִי in Hebrew. The Chronicler's
Ornan for Araunah is instructive in this respect.

A. H. Sayce.

"Ὁ ἀναπληρῶν τὸν τόπον τοῦ ἰδιώτου. Ἡ Cor. xiv 16.

Ἀναπληρῶν = 'to fill up', e.g. τὰ διαστήματα (Plut. ii 1020 A), τὴν
βουλὴν ὀλγανδροῦσαν (i 102 F), τὰς τάξεις ('ranks' i 394 C), τὴν [τοῦ
τεθνηκότος] τάξιν (ii 242 A), or 'to supplement', e.g. μουσικὴν τοῖς ἄλλωις
μαθήμασιν (ii 1142 D).

Τόπος is of course often used of a 'place', or 'part', or 'section'
of a book, e.g. εἰς τὸν περὶ εὐδαίμονίας τόπον (Plut. ii 1070 D), ἄντερ ἐμπίπτη
tὸ παραλείψθην εἰς τόπον προσήκοντα τῇ ἱστορίᾳ (ii 855 E : 'into a series
of occurrences within the scope of the history').

In Plutarch's 'Crassus' (554 C) we are told that owing to his immense
painstaking he was never unprepared to speak for an accused person,
καὶ Πομπηίον πολλάκις ὑκνώντος καὶ Καίσαρος ἐξαναστήναι καὶ
Κύρηνος ἑκεῖνος ἀνεπλήρου τὴν συνηγορίαν—i.e. had it not been for
Crassus the defence would have been lacking, but when those other
great men hesitated he filled up the threatened gap, lit. 'filled up the
pleading'.

In Ἡ Cor. xiv 16 instead of τὴν συνηγορίαν we have τὸν τόπον τοῦ
ἰδιώτου, 'the part (of the Service) assigned to the layman', and ἀναπληρῶν
is used in very much the same way: the Service is maimed
and incomplete if the layman's part is left empty instead of being
'filled up'.

G. H. Whitaker.

ORIGEN'S EXHORTATION TO MARTYRDOM AND
4 MACCABEES.

In Origen's Exhortation to Martyrdom (22–27) there is a long account
of the Maccabean martyrs which Origen (p. 23, 25 Koetschau) professes
to be a condensation of 2 Macc. vi 18–vii 42. Closer examination
shews several unacknowledged reminiscences of the long and rhetorical
version of the same subject in 4 Macc.

(1) Exh. 5, with its contrast between those who died for the Virtues
and the martyrs for Religion, should be compared with the opening
chapters of 4 Macc. Eleazar and the seven brethren are emphatically
martyrs for Religion ('our philosophy', 4 Macc. v 22, v 18, xv 12,
xvi 13, 17, &c.).

(2) Exh. 31 ad init. compare 4 Macc. vii 1–3. Compare also
Exh. 47, p. 43, 10 Koe. and 4 Macc. vii 5, xiii 6, Vita Plotini p. 30, 19
Volkmann.
A NEW NESTORIAN MONUMENT IN CHINA.

Some months ago my friend the Rev. A. C. Moule, Vicar of Trumpington, called my attention to the diagram of a Cross accompanied by a written inscription, published in the New China Review, August, 1920, p. 421. The Cross was cut on a block of carved stone, once apparently part of a larger construction, and now forming part of a balustrade in a Chinese convent at Ch'ai-ch'ang, a village some 25 miles WSW. of Peking. The letters were supposed to be 'Mongol', but as engraved were impossible to decipher. Now a rubbing has arrived, and the inscription turns out to be Syriac, a quotation from the Psalms. The lettering I should judge to be not later than the thirteenth century, and might be a good deal earlier, but it is hard to judge from a short inscription in which the characters may be intentionally archaistic.

This is Ὀ μονήσω σελήνα τοὶ ταῖς τειχὶς τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. 'Look unto Him and hope in Him', i.e. the Peshišta rendering of Ps. xxxiv 6.

The Cross is more ornamental than in the diagram, and rises out of an ornamental base something like a conventional Lotus.

Actual monuments of the later stages of Nestorian Christianity in China are so rare, that a special notice of this stone seems not inappropriate. Further information about it will be found in an article by Mr Moule in a forthcoming number of the New China Review.

F. C. Burkitt.