

673RD ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING,

HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOM B, THE CENTRAL HALL,
WESTMINSTER, S.W., ON MONDAY, FEBRUARY 23RD, 1925,
AT 4.30 P.M.

PROFESSOR T. G. PINCHES, LL.D., M.R.A.S., IN THE CHAIR.

The Minutes of the previous Meeting were read, confirmed and signed.

The CHAIRMAN announced that, owing to the regrettable absence of the author in America, the Hon. Secretary would read the paper by Professor Albert T. Clay, Ph.D., Litt.D., LL.D., on "The Early Civilization of Amurru—the Land of the Amorites—showing Amorite Influence on Biblical Literature."

*THE EARLY CIVILIZATION OF AMURRU—THE
LAND OF THE AMORITES—SHOWING AMORITE
INFLUENCE ON BIBLICAL LITERATURE.*

By PROFESSOR ALBERT T. CLAY, Ph.D., Litt.D., LL.D.

SYRIA, which name was introduced by the Greeks, and is thought originally to have been Assyria, extends from the Taurus range and its offshoot called the Amanus about 380 miles to the Egyptian frontier; and from the Mediterranean eastward sixty or more miles to the middle course of the Euphrates, and, farther south, one hundred miles more or less to the desert. These are the modern boundaries of Syria.

Mesopotamia is that irregular oval south of the mountains of Armenia, at present called by the Arabs the Jezireh, "Island," for it is nearly surrounded by the upper Euphrates and Tigris. It extends south to a point below Hit, where alluvial Babylonia begins. It does not, however, include the eastern part of this great oval, which was ancient Assyria, for this territory, together with the Babylonian alluvium, is now called Iraq. During the war, Iraq was incorrectly included in Mesopotamia.

Several very early names are known for parts of Syria and Mesopotamia, as Tidnum for the Lebanon region, Halma for the

district of Aleppo, Mari for the middle Euphrates district, etc. But the entire land west of Babylonia and Assyria, extending to the Mediterranean, was best known in ancient periods as Amurru, the land of the Amorites, though at times the boundaries of Amurru were contracted to a small portion of this vast territory; and even in Biblical literature, the land of the Amori, "the Amorite," ceased to have a definite geographical significance. In short, Amurru is in no sense an ethnic term,* but can only be regarded as a geographical name which these lands received at some time in their history when one of their many city kingdoms held the suzerainty over the entire land; just as Babel (Babylonia) and Asshur (Assyria) are names of lands, but were originally names of the cities Babel (Babylon) and Asshur. Amurru received its name from the city Mari, also called Maeri, Marru, Merra, etc., which was connected with the fuller form Amurru, the same as Moriah of the Hebrew and Amoriah of the Septuagint are connected.† The entire country may have received this name when the empire Amurru held sway over Babylonia, before the time of Sargon and Naram-Sin.

In the reconstruction of the ancient history of Amurru, a knowledge of the physical geography of the land is necessary; for in it one finds every range of climate from the snow-capped mountains to the plain, and even the sub-tropical valley. The cedar, oak, pine, and cypress are seen on the mountains, and the olive, fig, date, orange, and pistachio in the plain; rich pasture lands spread out over the steppe, and a bountiful fertility is found in the valley. The land supported the mountaineer, the miner, the farmer, the sailor, the shepherd, the merchant, etc.

The land is literally covered with thousands of tells, or ruin hills, representing the remains of bygone civilizations. Amurru with its wonderful natural products and pasture lands must have been settled by man before any other land in the Near East. Knowing such sites for cities as the land contains, where nature has not only furnished abundance of water and bountiful fertility, but a living for man for the gathering; and being familiar with such sites as Damascus, Aleppo, and many, many others, who, after doing a little thinking for himself, will let his horizon be

* Clay, *Empire of the Amorites* 58 ff.

† Clay, *ibidem*, 66 ff.; *J.A.O.S.*, XLI, p. 257; *Antiquity of the Amorites*. See also Langdon, *Babyloniaca*, VI, p. 55, Albright, *A.J.S.L.*, XLI, p. 49.

shortened to such an extent that he will continue to popularize the theory that this country received its Semitic inhabitants from the Arabian desert in the third millennium B.C. ? True, history tells us that there had been an influx of Arabs into this country, as there is at present ; but history also tells us that many other foreign peoples flowed into these lands in great numbers in all periods. The percolation of Arabs has unquestionably contributed in the development of this highly mongrel people ; but this land was settled in such a hoary antiquity by civilized man, who, we have reasons to believe, spoke a Semitic language in a very early period, that it were folly to account for its inhabitants by bringing them out of the desert in a comparatively late period.

Man made his appearance in Syria at a very early time, as is proved by the rudely chipped instruments which are found in various parts of the land, belonging to the palæolithic stage of culture, various types of which are the Chellean, and the late subdivision Acheulean.* As yet, perhaps owing largely to the comparatively little work done by the archæologist in the cave area of the land, there are no proofs that stone age man had arrived at a development as high as that of his contemporary in southern France.

It was discovered in the excavations at Gezer in southern Palestine that the site was originally occupied by a people short in stature, with thick skulls, and on the whole of a low type. The rocky heart of the mount, or its lowest stratum, was found full of caves, partially natural, and partially artificial. Macalister, who excavated the site, has given us considerable data on its primitive inhabitants.† Whether they were one of the ethnic groups whose names are preserved in the Old Testament as the Emim, Zuzim, Zamzummim, Rephaim, Horites, etc., is not known ; it, however, can be said that they were not the Nephilim, "giants." The early inhabitants, he tells us, were superseded by a Semitic people about 2500 B.C., and although an advance in civilization upon what had preceded was clearly observable, they also did not live in a very progressive manner, although influenced by their neighbours the Egyptians. I doubt, however, if it can be proved that they were a Semitic people.

* Macalister, *History of Civilization in Palestine*, p. 9.

† Macalister, *Excavations of Gezer*, 58 ff.

It is true that the excavations have shown that in southern Syria the cave dweller, even centuries after his neighbour the Egyptian had been using copper, was living in a very primitive and undeveloped state, and without the use of metal. But this unquestionably was due to the fact that the land was divided into isolated districts because of its geographic configuration, and that petty groups could live in limestone caves, which abound in the land, entirely unmolested, while the near neighbour was living on a much higher plane. We must remember that people living also in Babylonia amidst its highly developed civilization imported not only metal but flint instruments, which are found on the surface of many sites, doubtless because they were cheaper. These we find were used even up to a comparatively late period in Babylonian history. An archæologist informs me that he knew a man living in modern Egypt up to within a few years ago, who continued to use flint instruments to the time of his death.

Excavations have been conducted at other ancient sites in Palestine, such as Megiddo, Tacanach, and Beisan, but as yet they have not been carried down to virgin soil; and in consequence, we are still in the dark as regards the earliest civilization of southern Syria. Excavations are now being conducted in northern Syria, at Byblos; but although epoch-making results have been obtained, showing Egyptian occupation as early as the second dynasty, here also we must await the examination of the lowest strata.

The theory that Arabs first spilled over from the desert into Syria about 2500 B.C., and furnished it with its first Semites, which theory has been popularized in hundreds of books, has been largely based on the results obtained at Gezer. Because of what follows this can no longer be maintained.

Amurru, owing to its central position among other peoples, and its great resources and fertility, had been invaded hundreds of times, and occupied by many different races. Practically the only data concerning the physical character of its inhabitants are from the Gezer excavations, and from pictures on the monuments. On the basis of the Egyptian portraits of Syrians, some hold they were Indo-European; while others simply declare the type to be Armenoid, and to be represented by people living in the Lebanons at present. Among the inhabitants of Syria of to-day, not a few different types are recognized, but they are pre-eminently Armenoid. However, any one familiar with the

present inhabitant recognizes a prominent and distinct type that is called Syrian. And the so-called Jewish type can generally be distinguished from the Syrian, although it belongs also to the Armenoid group.

Macalister informs us that the Gezer excavations show that the so-called troglodyte or cave dweller was dolichocephalic; and the so-called Semitic inhabitant was largely mesocephalic, while a few were long-headed like the pre-Semitic inhabitants.* He says the earliest Semitic inhabitants were indistinguishable from the later, and that they closely resemble the modern fellahin of the vicinity. It seems to me that the data furnished by these explorations reveal nothing to prove that the inhabitants of Gezer were Semites. Assuming that Labaya and Yapakhi of the Amarna letters bore Semitic names, this is the earliest Semitic thing known about Gezer.

Of the physical characteristics of the ancient dweller in the Arabian peninsula we are profoundly ignorant. Anthropologists, however, find two distinct races living at present in Arabia; one, the Bedouin or desert Arab, and the other found in the southern fringe of the great peninsula, extending around also to the western shore.

A number of travellers in this southern fringe of the land, where "frankincense and gold" (Isa. lx, 6) were found, have furnished us light on the rich culture of its ancient civilized kingdoms, from about 1000 B.C., but, as stated, nothing is known concerning the ancient inhabitant. The physical anthropologist tells us that the modern dweller in these parts has genetic relationship with the great branch of Armenoid peoples of Mesopotamia and Asia Minor.† We can fully understand this when we consider that the sea easily connects these two sections of the Near East. Moreover, archæological research confirms this conclusion, for Amorite cultural influences are found to have been exerted on these rich lands in southern Arabia as early as 1000 B.C.

As already mentioned, nothing is known of the ancient Bedouin of Arabia proper, but the anthropologist tells us that the modern Bedouin Arab is long-headed, and racially different from the resident of southern Arabia and the Armenoid peoples

* *Excavation of Gezer*, 58 ff.

† Seligman, "The Physical Characters of the Arabs," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, XLVII, 217 ff.

of Mesopotamia and Asia Minor.* This fact presents an unsurmountable difficulty for those who hold the theory that the Amorite peoples and their culture had their origin in the Arabian desert.

Archæology and anthropology have therefore taught us that dolichocephalic man lived in the Arabian desert, in Africa, and in Egypt prior to the period of historic man, as well as in the caves of Gezer. And we know that he has filtered into Syria and Mesopotamia, as he is doing to-day. Archæology and anthropology have also taught us that historic man, who developed civilization in Egypt, Syria, Mesopotamia, and southern Arabia, was Homo Alpinus or Armenoid man, who had genetic relationship with European man.

There are not a few scholars, including Jewish, who have accepted the idea that the Bedouin is racially the brother of the Jew. But how anyone, knowing the physical characteristics of the Arab, even as a layman, and without the above decision of the anthropologist, can believe that the long-headed, oval-faced Bedouin is racially the brother of the Jew, with his round head, short stature, and Armenoid features, is more than I can understand. And the same applies also to the type referred to above as being typically Syrian.

The term Shemitic (Semitic) has been used for more than a century for the closely related languages known as Hebrew, Aramaic, Assyro-Babylonian, Arabic, and Ethiopic, but this designation can not refer to the races of the peoples using these languages any more than the term English can be applied to the races speaking, or trying to speak, the English language in New York City of to-day. In the light of these facts, what becomes of the extensively popularized theory that the Hebrews represent one of the "wild hordes from the Arabian wilderness" who entered Palestine under Joshua, whence began Hebrew history? The ultimate origin of the Hebrews, as well as of other civilized peoples within Amurru, who happened to speak Semitic languages, can at present be determined about as easily as the question as to who was the wife of Cain. And the same is true of the origin of the languages we call Semitic, for although the Bedouin, due to his isolated life in the desert, has preserved a pristine purity in his language unknown among other Semitic

* Seligman, *ibidem*

languages, this is no proof that the original Semitic language was first spoken in the Arabian desert.

We, however, need no longer to depend upon inference or reasoning to support the view that Semitic Amurru had a civilization as early as Babylonia or Egypt. Archæology has determined this to be fact. Inscriptions from these lands show that a Semitic culture not only existed in Amurru in the earliest historic age, but that the cultures of Babylonian and Egypt were influenced by it. But more than this ; we now know that Amorities ruled Babylonia in a very early period—yes, there are reasons for believing that the Amorities had arrived at a fair stage of culture in their land of wonderful fertility and resources, before they had acquired sufficient engineering skill to harness the Euphrates and the Tigris, and occupy the alluvium.*

The question as to whether these Amorites possessed religious or other traditions is naturally of interest to all students of the past. Certainly if the worship of Amorite deities was carried into Babylonia (see below), we have reasons to believe that their cults went with them. For our purpose here, however, let us inquire into the possible status of Amorite literature at a comparatively late date, say in the latter half of the third millennium B.C., when great temple libraries flourished in different cult centres of Babylonia.

As far as we know at the present time, the era of the Nisin-Larsa-Babylon dynasties is the greatest literary age known in Babylonian history. In preceding eras we find evidence of a high culture in the art, in the great masses of administrative records, in the building inscriptions, votive tablets, etc., but little has been found thus far of literary effort in comparison with that of this era. According to our present knowledge, all the temple school libraries discovered in Babylonia belong to this time. It is interesting to note here that it is now admitted by scholars that the country during this literary era was ruled by the Amorites. But more important than this, we know that the country was literally flooded with this people, as is shown by the thousands of names gathered from business contracts.

As is well known, cultures in this era were not peculiar to Babylonia and Egypt, for civilization in Crete already had a long antiquity, and we know that in Asia Minor what we call the Assyrian language and script were used in writing letters and

* Clay, *Empire of the Amorites*, 76 ff. ; *J.A.O.S.*, XLI, 241 ff.

business transactions.* In other words, we know that at this time on all sides of Amurru, nations possessed cultures of a high order. And although excavations in Amurru have practically only been begun, and although as yet we have not obtained any evidence of the work of the scribes belonging to this period, we have reasons for believing that the Amorites also had their literature. As we shall see, it is highly probable that many Semitic traditions were introduced into Babylonia at this time.

In recent years, the Pan-Sumerist has been crediting the Sumerians with having originated practically every semblance of things cultural for the Semitic Babylonians. True, we know that the Sumerians influenced Assyria, and perhaps ruled it prior to the Semites in the third millennium B.C., and that they also probably did the same in Amurru in an early period, for we find an inscription of an early Amorite king at Mari written in Sumerian, and also names of temples in Aleppo, Haran, Qarqar, etc., written in Sumerian signs; but these facts do not prove that peoples who spoke Semitic languages did not then and previously occupy these lands.

All inscriptions found at Nippur of this age are written in the Sumerian language, but that is because that language was the written language of the city. For while as far as I know, nothing at Nippur during this era was written in Semitic, the names of the majority of the people were Semitic. Kings bearing Semitic names are among the earliest known in Babylonia.† If the full story is ever known, I believe it will be found that kings bearing Semitic names ruled Amurru before the alluvium was settled.‡ Moreover, we know that many of the names written with Sumerian signs represent Semitic names. We also know that at least some of the literature handed down in Sumerian garb was in origin Semitic.

In the code of Hammurabi, who is now recognized as an Amorite, there are two passages which doubtless throw light on the subject. In one, Hammurabi says: "When Marduk sent me to rule the people, and to bring help to the country, I established law and justice in the language of the land, and promoted the welfare of the people." Like all other law codes, his was

* *Empire*, 131 ff.

† *Empire*, 76 ff.

‡ *J.A.O.S.*, XII, 241 ff.

based on what preceded. In another passage, he tells us he is the one "who put into execution the laws of Aleppo." As everyone knows, Aleppo is in northern Syria.

After the discovery of the Hammurabi Code, it was observed that Abraham's conduct in regard to his treatment of Hagar and his adoption of his steward Eleazar, which are not covered by the Mosaic Code, are in accord with the Code of Hammurabi. If the body of laws in the latter emanated from Aleppo, we can better understand the conduct of Abraham, for his ancestral home lies immediately west of that city.

In the Yale Babylonian Collection there is a tablet containing laws belonging to an earlier code, written in the Sumerian language; this, without any doubt, is a prototype of the Hammurabi Code. Its colophon tells us that it contains the laws of Nisaba and Khani, two Amorite deities.* It is because of these facts that I think we are not only justified in maintaining that codes of laws existed at this time in the West at such important centres as Aleppo, which we have reasons for believing flourished many centuries before the time of Abraham, but that the Amorites who flooded Babylonia prior to his day, carried them into Shinar. This being true, it is reasonable to maintain that the story of Abraham is not a fiction of the days of the Yahwist writer of the ninth century B.C., but is a tradition that has been handed down from an early period. There are other remnants of Amorite literature that have been handed down by the Hebrews, Babylonians, and Greeks.

It is generally recognized that the part of the Pentateuch known as the Yahwist narrative was written in the ninth century B.C., what is called the Elohist in the eighth, and the Priestly in the fifth century. This is the generally accepted view of scholars; but it should be added that there are those who have held that these are compilations which used versions and materials that belonged to a hoary past; and this is unquestionably correct. In showing the antiquity of Amorite or Hebrew literature, we need no other proof than finding such ideas expressed in Genesis as God and man walking together and holding intercourse, animals being endowed with the power of speech, God playing a visible part in the affairs of the world, making coats of skins to replace the fig-leaf aprons of our first parents, shutting the door of the ark, smelling the sweet odour

* Clay, *Miscellaneous Inscriptions*, 18 ff.

of the sacrifice, or coming down to view the Tower of Babel. These *naïvetés* certainly show that they are products of the human mind in an archaic simplicity, not of the age of Solomon; when the world came to hear his wisdom, and when the prophets had reached a plane in religion without parallel, as far as we know, up to this time. In short, this material unquestionably had been handed down from a very primitive era when human intelligence had not reached a very high stage. It is almost too preposterous for belief that scholars can convince themselves that certain parts of this material were produced when Israel was at the height of its success and prosperity as a nation, and that other parts had been obtained from the Babylonians during the exile, following the time of an Isaiah, or while other great prophets still lived.

Scholars in past decades have extensively popularized in hundreds of publications the idea that the religious traditions and culture of the Hebrews were borrowed from the Babylonians. This, I maintain, must be completely abandoned, as all the many discoveries of the past few years bearing on the subject clearly show that Israel's culture is not Babylonian in origin, but is a development from what had been handed down by Israel's predecessors. This, unbiassed critics must admit, is the natural order of affairs.

As is generally recognized, there are two creation stories in Genesis, the second beginning in the fourth verse of the second chapter, and also there are many passages in the poetical books of the Old Testament which reflect Israel's conception of the creation, showing it was their belief that Yahweh had a great conflict with the primeval being, Tehom ("the Deep"), also called Rahab, Leviathan, the Dragon, and the Serpent, after whose defeat the heavens and the earth were created. In spite of all the claims of Pan-Babylonists, this story as preserved in the Biblical version and in the Greek, contains absolutely nothing that is Babylonian. There is not a semblance of an idea that can be proved as such. This refers to the colouring of the narrative, the names, foreign words—in fact, everything.

Another well-known tradition that has been handed down by the Hebrew branch of the Amorites is that of the deluge. For a long time scholars have recognized two distinct versions of the flood in the Old Testament, which in details are repetitious and diversified. In Babylonian cuneiform, we also have several different versions of this same flood tradition, and there is an

epitome of one found at Nippur that was translated into Sumerian, due to the fact that this was the written language of the city at this time. Scholars agree that all of the versions go back to a common source.

One of the cuneiform versions, which mentions that it is a copy of a still earlier version, is dated in the eleventh year of Ammi-zaduga, king of Babylonia (about 1966 B.C.). This version I have shown contains many Hebrew words, and is a cuneiform version of an earlier Amorite or Hebrew version. This implies naturally that the tradition belongs to a time prior to that of Hammurabi or Abraham, which, of course, puts an end to the fruitless strife as to whether Moses first wrote the story, or whether it was produced by some Jewish writer, many centuries after the time of Moses.

In two works recently published entitled *A Hebrew Deluge Story in Cuneiform* and *The Origin of Biblical Traditions*,* I feel that I have conclusively shown that the creation and deluge stories as handed down by the Babylonians and Assyrians are versions of stories that have been brought by the Amorites from the West. This conclusion is based on serious studies of all the versions of these traditions during the past two decades. All references to climate in the different versions, the names of deities and persons found in them, as well as the linguistic characteristics of the versions, show that they go back to an Amorite origin. This conclusion has been reached after every shred of evidence that research has produced as having a bearing on the subject has been carefully weighed. Moreover, this conclusion need not surprise us in view of our knowledge of migrations between Amurru and Babylonia, and the fact that all, with the exception of the return of the Hebrews to their Zion in Palestine, were from Amurru down the Euphrates into that wonderful fertile alluvium, the Plain of Shinar, later called Babylonia, and not *vice versa*, for we know that religious traditions migrate with people.

Those who are obsessed with the idea that the early Amorites did not have a civilization and culture of their own, find no difficulty in believing that the names of the so-called Hebrew patriarchs before and after the flood, were obtained by translating or transforming the names of early Babylonian kings into

* Published by the Yale University Press and the Oxford University Press, 1922-3.

Hebrew. In hundreds of different works on the subject you will find it stated that the name of the second known pre-diluvian king of Babylonia, Alaparos, became Adam: that Amillaros, or Amelon, the third, became Enosh; that Amemnon, the fourth, became Cain, etc. It is even believed that the first and last consonants of the name of a king of Kish, [Me]-lam-K[ish] have been lost, whence the name Biblical Lamech. I have maintained that these philological gymnastics are a *reductio ad absurdum*, and that the names found in the Hebrew lists are quite independent of those found in the Babylonian lists.* I believe as investigations proceed, we shall find that the names of the pre-diluvians in the Hebrew will be identified with Syria and Mesopotamia, just as the three patriarchal names preceding Abraham, namely Nahor, Serug, and Terah, are now known to be the names of cities in the traditional home of the Hebrews about Haran in Aram.

Besides the Biblical outline histories of the world, there have already been recovered several from Babylonian libraries, which were written in the literary age already referred to, at the time of the Nisin-Larsa-Babylon dynasties, or shortly before Abraham lived. The number of patriarchs in the outline history preserved in Genesis is small in comparison with the number of kings in the Babylonian; and the Biblical outline itself is exceedingly brief in comparison with the history of Babylonia as already reconstructed from the monuments.

There can be no question but that the compiler of the Hebrew outline, in order to give a brief history from the Creation to Abraham, made use of only a few extracts from the traditions that had been handed down by the Amorites. And there are reasons for believing that the remnants used belonged to more than one such ancient outline, just as the story of the Creation and the deluge are also taken from more than one version, as the critical study of Genesis has definitely proved.

There is nothing in the Genesis outline that can be shown to be of Babylonian origin; and, on the other hand, the cuneiform stories are full of elements that are distinctly Amorite. Even the reference to Nimrod, the mighty hunter or ensnarer, was very probably a reference to one who was identified as a great hero of the West, probably representing one of those periods

* *The Origin of Biblical Traditions*, pp. 127 ff.

when Amurru figured in Babylonia. The story of Babel, although it makes use of a Babylonian conception of their temple towers, was written, not by a Babylonian, but by an Amorite, perhaps being an echo of the tradition that people from Amurru journeyed eastward into the great alluvium, as well as making use of the fact that in Babylon, as in Bagdad at present, many languages were spoken, in accounting for the many different tongues and peoples of the earth.*

It is now acknowledged by Egyptologists that Egyptian religious thought was influenced at an early time by that of Syria and Mesopotamia. Not only do we know that the religion of many Amorite deities migrated to Egypt, but it is now understood that among the literary influences upon Egypt the Amorite creation story, or the conflict between the god of Light and the primeval monster of the abyss, gave rise to the story of the gigantic Apop, the enemy of the sun-god, and that this thought reached Egypt after 2500 B.C.† It is highly probable that it was in the same general era when Amorites flooded Babylonia that this story, as well as that of the deluge, were also carried into that land.

With such data in our possession, even though we must depend for the present upon Babylonian and Egyptian light on the subject, we have reasons to believe that at the time when Amorites developed great temple libraries in Babylonia such existed also in Amurru; and that when excavations are conducted at such places as Aleppo, Haran, Mari, etc., we shall find traces of the early literature of the Amorites, which, unfortunately, is now lost, except as preserved in the Old Testament, or reflected in the literary remains of contemporary peoples who were influenced by them.

The cuneiform literature has revealed thousands of names and epithets of deities worshipped in Babylonia. Likewise the literature of the West—that of the Old Testament, the Amarna letters, and tablets found in Palestine, as well as other inscriptions found in Syria and elsewhere—has furnished us with hundreds of names and epithets of the deities of Amurru, most of whom are recognized as belonging to a people who used a Semitic language.

* *Origin of Biblical Traditions*, pp. 189 ff.

† *Empire of the Amorites*, p. 139, and *Origin of Biblical Traditions*, p. 40.

The foremost deity of the western land seems to have been El, which was one of the names of Israel's God. He was called *El-elyon*, "The most high El," *El-shaddai*, "Almighty El." In time the name El became the generic term for deity; yet it continued to appear as the name of one of the foremost West-Semitic gods even in the inscriptions of the first millennium B.C. Phœnician traditions connect El as well as Elohim with the city Byblos. The tradition of Sanchoniathon tells us that El "surrounded his habitation with a wall and founded Byblos, the first city of Phœnicia"; and that "after his death he was deified, and was instated in the planet which bears his name"; further, that "the auxiliaries of El, who is Kronos, were called Elohim, as it were, the allies of Kronos, being so called after Kronos."

Another great name of a West-Semitic deity is Yah. This early name of Israel's deity, and the fuller form Yahweh, as well as Yahw, or Yahwe, of the Elephantine papyri, are unquestionably different forms of the same name. Certainly, the Hebrews looked upon Yah, Yahweh, as well as Yahw, as representing the name of their deity. This has its parallel in the West in the variant name forms of other deities, as, for example, Ashirta, Ashtar, Attar, etc. And it is highly probable that the pronunciation of Yah, Yahw, and Yahweh is represented by the cuneiform Ya, Yau, and Yâwa.* It is due to the lack of excavations that the only early occurrences of the name in the inscriptions belonging to the West outside of the Old Testament is in Akhi-Yâwi and Yâwi-banda of the Tacanach tablets.

A third prominent deity of the Amorites, but one who was not worshipped by the Hebrews, was the weather god Hadad. Perhaps the earliest centre of his worship in the West was at Qarqar, near Aleppo, mentioned in the Code of Hammurabi. There were other very important Amorite gods, as Amurru or Uru, Ashirta, Sin, Shamash, Nebo, Dagon, etc.

Religion, as we have already stated, naturally migrates with a people. In consequence, wherever Amorites migrated the worship of their deities is found; and the worship of all these gods has been found in Babylonia. We know also that other gods—as Ba'alat, Sutekh, Resheph, Kadesh, 'Anat, etc.—were carried to Egypt; and others—as El, Shamash, Sin, Ramman, Ammi, etc.—were carried to Arabia.

* Clay, *Amurru, the Home of the Northern Semites*, pp. 202 ff.

At Eridu, perhaps the first city established in alluvial Babylonia, the name of the patron deity was Ea. The name was written ideographically En-Ki, meaning "Lord of the earth," and also E-A, probably because these two signs approached the pronunciation of the name, and because in Eridu, then on the seashore, this god of the springs of the earth became the god of the deep, for the two signs mean "House of water." It was suggested long ago that Ea and Yah were the same deity. The form of Yah, being composed only of weak consonants, does not offer conclusive proof of this, but as investigations progress, because of many considerations, it becomes more and more reasonable to believe that this identification is correct.

At Erech, the patron deity was El. In using the Sumerian script, his name was written by scribes with the cuneiform sign AN, which has such values as "heaven" and "deity." In time, An came to be pronounced even by the Semites. Worshippers of El also settled farther north, where they called their city Bab-El (Babylon), meaning "Gate of El," and others on the Diyala River, who named their place Dur-El (Der), "Fortress of El." In Babylonia El or Anu was the foremost deity.

Hadad, the storm-god, I believe, was the original name of the deity of Nippur, in which city the scribes, using Sumerian script, wrote the name with two cuneiform signs En-Lil, meaning "Lord of the storm," and this also came to be pronounced Enlil and Ellil.

It is not impossible that the Sumerians who conquered Babylonia and gave it a script and other elements of a high culture themselves had deities named An, Enki, and Enlil, as Pan-Sumerists contend, and that these gods became syncretised with the Semitic deities already worshipped in the land, but I doubt it.

A name-dictionary or syllabary found at Nippur shows that prior to the time the triad An, Enlil, and Ea came to be generally recognized, these names and the order in which they appeared, were El, Ea and Adad (Hadad). In other words, after Hadad, the name of the storm-deity at Nippur, was written En-Lil, "Lord of the storm," and became the god *par excellence* of the land, he displaced Ea and occupied the second place in the triad.

As already mentioned, in Babylonia and Assyria, there has been found more than one version of the creation and deluge

stories. We ascertain that in the version belonging to one city, the priests of that cult-centre had made their own patron deity the hero of the story ; while in the version emanating from another city, we find that its patron deity had been made the hero. Scholars have shown that the god Marduk of Babylon, and Ashur of the city Ashur, have been made to supersede other deities, as Ea and El.* As investigations proceed, we will doubtless find that the same thing was done at other cult centres. This, it seems to me, without any other consideration, reflects the idea that these traditions were not indigenous in Babylonia. But what is more to the point here, if the above identification with Yah is correct, these two Amorite deities El and Ea in Babylonia are the same as figures in the traditions handed down by the Hebrews, namely, El and Yah.

In Amurru, for example, in one of the two versions of the deluge story, the name of the deity is Yah, and the other Elohim. Doubtless the story we know of as the Yahwist, is based on a version which belonged to an ancient seat of Yah or Yahweh worship. Knowledge of what occurred in Babylonia makes me feel that some day, among the prominent tells already known in Syria or Mesopotamia the site of this ancient city may be identified. The story in which Elohim is used as the name of the deity probably was based on the version that belonged to the cult at Byblos.

If inscriptions are ever obtained from ancient Qarqar, near Aleppo, which apparently was an important seat of Hadad worship, we shall doubtless find versions of these traditions in which that deity took a more prominent part than is recorded in the Babylonian versions now known.

It is my belief that Genesis contains references to many different fragments of Amorite literature, representing different traditions that were current among the civilized peoples in Amurru. Doubtless, a major part of the traditions in Genesis were current among the Aramaean people to which the Hebrews belonged. Yet who will dogmatize as regards the ultimate origin, at least of some of them ?

If what we have presented in the Old Testament has been transmitted largely by the descendants of Abraham, the nomadic life they led, in contrast with that of such settled communities

* *Origin of Biblical Traditions*, pp. 99 ff.

as at Haran and Aleppo, would account for some of the archaic and naive expressions found in their traditions, even after they settled in Palestine, for although religious thought had reached a height unknown in any other religion, they seem to have clung to this heritage; and when in the ninth century the redactor compiled what we know as the Yahwist narrative, he made use of these remnants in showing how, after God had created man, and had placed him in a garden, he fell, when evil prevailed, and how God was then making Himself known through the prophets, in calling man to turn from his unrighteousness.

DISCUSSION.

Opening the discussion, the CHAIRMAN spoke of the importance of Professor Clay's paper, quite apart from any statements of a controversial nature which it might contain. Its main theme was that the Biblical accounts of the Creation and the Flood did not, as the pan-Babylonian scholars contend, originate in Babylonia, but in Palestine. The Chairman had noted down over thirty points suitable for discussion, but it was, naturally, impossible to deal with so many, so he would only refer to one point tending to confirm Professor Clay's theory, supplemented by the few notes which he had made when reading the paper at home. The notes tending to confirm the theory were derived from one of the lists of names of Babylonian gods, which were very numerous. He then continued:—

The list to which I refer has the names of two deities, *Šarrapu* and *Birdu*, which, according to the text, were derived from the language of *Mar*—that is, Amurrū, the land of the Amorites. These deities belonged to the Babylonian plain or steppe, called *edina*, and confirm the theory that the Paradise of our first parents, the Garden of Eden, was situated in Babylonia, on the shores of the Persian Gulf, which then extended much farther inland than at present. The Biblical account of the Creation and the Flood, though they may refer to Babylonia, originated, therefore, in the land of the Amorites. *Šarrapu*, "seraph," "the flaming one," therefore stood for the intense heat, and *Birdu*, Arabic, *bird*, "cold," for the great cold of the Babylonian plain, keeping the unauthorized away from the tree of life.

[Both these are indicated by means of the group $\text{𐎶𐎵} = \text{𐎶𐎵} = \text{𐎶𐎵}$,

the common renderings of which are D.P. *lama-édina*, "the genius of the plain," or *eden*, and when represented as standing for one divine personage only, they seem to have been called *ilu kilallan*, "the twofold god," otherwise *ilan*, dual of *ilu*, *Maš-tabba*, and *Minabi*, "twins," and "double." *Sarrapu*, miswritten, apparently, *Karapu* (*Cuneiform Texts from Babylonian Tablets*, xxv, 37, 20), is explained as one of the names of *Lugal-girra*, and *Birdu* as *Mešlam-ta-éa*, "he who came forth from the *mesu*-fruit," both of them names of Nergal, god of disease and plague, in *Mar* (Amurru).]

Concerning the *navetés* of Genesis, I would rather not express an opinion. Such things are not impossible even with intelligent and learned men, especially in those distant ages, and surrounded by the unlearned and simple-minded.

There is no doubt that Israel's culture was not Babylonian. The descendants of Abraham naturally soon lost the little Babylonian culture they had on entering Palestine, and adopted that of their newly acquired neighbours. Their religion was, in all probability, that of their father Abraham.

Professor Clay is probably right in saying that Tehom, "the Deep," also called Rahab, Leviathan, the Dragon, and the Serpent, are more Israelitish than Babylonian. Nevertheless, Babylonian cognate terms like *Tiamtu*, "the sea," and "the serpent-god destroying the abode of life" are met with. Eden is a loan-word from Babylonia, as is also, apparently, cherub.

I do not see why Moses should not have handed down the account of the Flood, as detailed in Genesis. As Eden was apparently the Babylonian plain, this great catastrophe may be a Western Semitic version of the Babylonian tradition. In support of its Amorite origin, it may be noted that the name of the pilot, Puzur-Šadi-rabi, "the secret of the Great Mountain," would perhaps be best transcribed as Puzur-Amurri, "the secret of the Amorite (god)."

Professor Clay is not alone in his opinion of "philological gymnastics." I, for one, have never at any time either accepted or believed in the possibility of Alaparos being Adam, notwithstanding the more correct Babylonian form Adapa. As to Melam-Kiš becoming Lamech, that is simply philological trickery comparable with the derivation of *haricot* from the Latin *faba*.

The paper is now open for discussion.

Mr. THEODORE ROBERTS thought there was an analogy between the earlier precocity of the negro boy, who was later surpassed by the white lad, and the fact that the Hamitic races—the Amorites, the Egyptians, and the Babylonians—were first to obtain a high degree of artificial civilization; for according to Professor Clay the latest investigations confirmed the Biblical genealogy of Gen. x, which derived the Amorite (verse 16), as well as Mizraim (Egypt) (verse 6) and Cush (from whom came Babel or Babylon) (Egypt) (verses 6-10), from Ham.

The statement in Moses' song that

“ When the Most High gave to the nations their inheritance,
 When he separated the children of men,
 He set the bounds of the peoples
 According to the number of the children of Israel ”

(Deut. xxxii, 8),

involved the supersession of the Amorite in Palestine by Israel; but God waited because, as He told Abram in a vision, “ the iniquity of the Amorite is not yet full ” (Gen. xv, 16). The awful corruption of those early days, as now laid bare by the archæologist, not only in Palestine and neighbouring countries, but in Crete, justified the stern command to the Israelites to destroy the Canaanites, as in no other way could the infection be stayed. He thought Jehovah's word to Jerusalem, “ The Amorite was thy father ” (Ezek. xvi, 3, 45), indicated moral or spiritual affinity and not physical descent.

Although the Amorite's “ height was like the height of the cedars, and he was strong as the oaks ” (Amos ii, 9), yet even the “ worm, Jacob,” took out of his hand, with sword and bow, the double portion he gave to Joseph (Gen. xlviii, 22; John iv, 5)—an earnest of the conquest that his descendants were to accomplish. He believed the Amorite typified the first man that was of the earth, earthy, who must be superseded by the second Man who is of Heaven (1 Cor. xv, 47), which, now realized in faith and the Spirit by us, would be completely fulfilled in this very world in the millennial reign of Christ.

Mr. WILLIAM DALE said he could not understand Professor Clay's reference to Arabs in 2500 B.C., nor could he agree with him that the Jew and the Bedouin were not brother nations. The form of the skull was not conclusive. Ishmael was of the race of Shem,

and his wife was fetched out of Egypt during the time of the Hyksos, a Semitic dynasty. The prophecies concerning him, that he should be a wild man and dwell in the midst of his brethren, were fulfilled in the race, and in the history of nations there were only two that had survived distinct and separate from the beginning, viz., the Jew and the Bedouin.

Mr. W. HOSIE said: We have been so often told by those whom Dr. Clay calls the Pan-Babylonists (*alias* the Wellhausen School of Higher Criticism) that their "results are assured," that "all scholars are agreed," that we rub our eyes in some astonishment when one like the Professor, whom the critics would presumably reckon as a scholar, pours contempt on some of their most cherished "results," such as the Babylonian origin of the Creation story of Gen. i (*see* p. 97). "In spite of all the claims of Pan-Babylonists, this story, as preserved in the Biblical version and in the Greek, *contains absolutely nothing* that is Babylonian. There is *not a semblance of an idea* that can be proved as such. This refers to the colouring of the narrative, the names, foreign words—in fact, *everything*" (my italics).

On p. 96, referring to those parts of the Pentateuch assigned (as the conservatives believe, very arbitrarily) to the Yahvist of the ninth century B.C., to the Elohist of the eighth, and the Priestly edition in the fifth century, he asserts as "unquestionably correct" that "these are compilations which used versions and materials that belonged to a hoary past." "It is almost too preposterous for belief," says (on p. 97) the learned Professor, "that scholars can convince themselves that certain parts of this material were produced when Israel was at the height of its success and prosperity as a nation," and that other parts were got from Babylon during the exile. But, while accepting these conclusions, we find his grounds less convincing. The early chapters of Genesis contain what, to the Professor, are mere *naïvetés* (!)—a word to him, apparently, the equivalent of "childish stories," fruit of a low stage of human intelligence. It would be more correct to say "before primitive simplicity had been spoiled by worldly wisdom and sin," and when heaven dwelt very near man in his infancy. There is nothing wrong in being *childlike*! Our Lord—who "knew all things"—refers to some of these very *naïvetés* as binding on us to-day, *e.g.*,

the institution of marriage (Gen. ii, 24), and to righteous Abel and to Noah, as making history for us. Paul, who can scarcely be described as *naïve*, believed that Satan, embodied in a serpent, did actually beguile Eve, and John the Apostle that Cain did kill Abel. "Let God be true and every man a liar!" Millions to-day believe the Son of God as the final authority, in spite of all His critics. Are the stories less beautiful and credible because they are simple? "Condescend to men of low estate" is a principle easily detected in the Divine Scriptures themselves.

As for the Professor's reference (on p. 97) to the creation story in Gen. i, I cannot find one of his "many passages in the poetical books of the Old Testament which reflect Israel's conception of the creation," &c. At any rate, I look in vain for a trace of such an idea as a conflict in Gen. i, 2. It simply says, "darkness was upon the face of the deep, and the Spirit of God *moved* upon the face of the waters." But *rah-ghaph* never has a thought of conflict, but to "brood over," "cherish," "flutter over" (Deut. xxxii, 11), as Gesenius says, "figuratively used of the Spirit of God, who brooded over the shapeless mass of the earth, cherishing and vivifying." Is it not, then, quite gratuitous to bring in this supposed conflict between Yahve and "Tehom" as preceding the creation of heaven and earth? There is no hint in the passage of any personification of "the deep," and the latter had already taken place (verse 1). The Professor's comments on the "philological gymnastics" of the critics (p. 99) are refreshing. There seems no limit to the credulity of the Pan-Babylonists!

Mr. W. E. LESLIE said: Like Professor Ramsey, Professor Clay has found that the Biblical records can more usefully be approached as a collection of historical records than as a series of exercises in literary criticism. He still, however, accepts some of the results of the literary school.

There are two interesting points on p. 97. It is suggested that the *naïvetés* of the early chapters of Genesis are the product of the human mind in an archaic simplicity. But may not these *naïvetés* preserve for us a record of the condescension of a God who condescended to the anthropomorphism of the Incarnation, in revealing Himself to the archaic simplicity of His creatures. With

regard to the alleged conflict between the Creator and Tehom, the Biblical references to Rahab, Leviathan, &c., are undoubtedly obscure, but has not Professor Clay read into them Semitic ideas which are derivative rather than determinative?

On pp. 101 and 102 the references to Semitic deities bearing the Divine names El and Jah may appear startling at first, but on reflection such usage appears to be analogous to the use of Allah by the Māhommedans, and to point to a primitive revelation.

Mr. G. B. MICHELL, O.B.E., writes: It is difficult to estimate the actual value of this extremely important paper, because the limitations of space precluded the author from giving the full evidence for the conclusions drawn in it. These items are, no doubt, set forth in the author's other works which are cited, but which, unfortunately, I am unable at present to consult.

The anthropological evidence given in pp. 90-93, though sufficient to show that the Amorite peoples and their culture did not derive their origin from the Arabian desert and, consequently, that the theory of Israel as originally a barbarous horde of Bedawin, and their religion due to the "thunder-god" of Sinai, is impossible, does not seem to affect the question of the relative priority of the Armenoid peoples among themselves. I shall be intensely interested to examine Professor Clay's proofs for his main thesis.

I was unaware that "there have been already recovered several (outline histories of the world) from Babylonian libraries, which were written in the literary age . . . at the time of the Nisin-Larsa-Babylonian dynasties." I was under the impression (from Langdon's *Babylonian Epic of Creation*, Oxford, 1923, p. 10) that, though an earlier Sumerian poem of a similar kind existed, which inspired the Semitic epic of creation, this latter was first written in the period of the First Babylonian Dynasty (B.C. 2170-1871, Fotheringham's revised calculation). Even of this, the only direct evidence of the existence of the great poem before the actual texts which contain the legend (which are late copies) is the inscription of Agum-kakrime (B.C. c. 1650), of which a copy has been found at Nineveh, describing the works of art with which Agum adorned the statues and sanctuaries of Marduk and Zarpanit. I do not question the value of these copies, but (1) the evidence for the existence of

the epic in the twenty-second century B.C. is only indirect, and (2) it is dependent upon copies, not originals.

The epic originally contained only six books. The earlier Sumerian poem to which I refer is a hymn to the names of Marduk, which now forms Book VII of Langdon's edition. It was finally attached to the epic in the late period, but it disagrees with the poem itself at many points. The proof of its prior independent existence depends upon a restoration of the defective note after line 125 in another copy.

If it is to this poem that Professor Clay refers, he must have other and more definite reasons for assigning it to the time of the Nîsin-Larsa-Babylonian dynasties (c. 2302-2067 B.C.).

May I point out that "the traditional home of the Hebrews" was not about Haran in Aram (p. 99), but Ur-Casdim—not, I believe, the great city of Ur which is now being investigated, but another Ur, which is distinguished from it by being specifically *Ur-Casdim*?

I quite agree that there is nothing in the Genesis outline that can be shown to be of Babylonian origin (p. 99), and that the Sumerians cannot be credited with having originated practically every semblance of things cultural for the Semitic Babylonians (p. 95). Contrary to the current opinion, I believe that the early Babylonian (or Assyrian) Semitic dialect became a stereotyped "classical language," used for public purposes, at a comparatively early date and, as a colloquial tongue, was largely replaced by Aramaic, whereas the Sumerian language continued in common use in Chaldæa until the Persian period, and perhaps later.

I am surprised that the learned author of this paper still holds to the antiquated theories of "doublets" in the Bible story—especially of the deluge (p. 97) and of the redaction of the Pentateuch in the ninth, eighth, and fifth centuries B.C. (p. 96).

The former hypothesis has been sufficiently refuted by Mr. Finn (*The Unity of the Pentateuch*), Dr. Bissell (*The Pentateuch, Its Origin and Structure*), and Professor Kyle (*The Problem of the Pentateuch*). With regard to the latter view, it is surely more reasonable to believe, and intrinsically more probable, that ancient sources would be incorporated into a connected narrative in the time of the brilliant civilizations in Egypt, Sinai and Palestine of the Egyptian XVIIIth dynasty, and by a known leader of the great qualities of Moses, than by unknown individuals in the disturbed and degenerate days of the

later kings and the exile. It may have suited the critics of a time when nothing was known of the conditions of Palestine in the fifteenth century B.C. to ascribe this redaction to the times of which some little was known, but there is no valid reason for retaining the latter view now.

I doubt very much that the anthropomorphic ideas described at the foot of p. 96 can be properly called "*naïveté's*" or "archaic simplicity." Such ideas may be produced by very sophisticated minds. In any case, the age of Solomôn was no further removed, except in point of time, from "a very primitive era," than that of Moses.

The study of the names "El" and "Yah" (pp. 101 ff.) is very interesting and, as regards "El," probably sound. But I am not at all convinced of the identification of "Yah" with "Ea" or "Yâwi" or "Jâwa."

I think the name was "Yahûh," both the aspirates being distinctly pronounced and radical. Both the forms "Jehovah" and "Yahweh" are equally incorrect and grammatically impossible.