

NOTES ON NEW DISCOVERIES.

By COL. C. R. CONDER, R.E.

MANY points in Bible history have been elucidated by exploration in Western Asia which are here collected, in the order of occurrence in the Bible.

Cush.—This has usually been regarded as a Semitic name meaning "dark." It applies not only to Egypt, but also to a region in Asia watered by the river Gihon (Gen. ii, 8). It has long been known that the Babylonians called Cappadocia *Kus*, and the new discoveries of Dr. O. Winckler at Pterium, on the north border of Cappadocia, show that the "great king" of the Hittites, who had his capital at this town, was called the "King of Kus." Cush was also connected with the Akkadians of Mesopotamia (Gen. x, 8), and the word itself is perhaps the Akkadian *Kus* for "Sunset" or "the West." This seems to indicate the racial connection of the Hittites and Akkadians, and we now know that the Hittite King Khattu-sil (contemporary with Rameses II) was allied by marriage to the Kassite king of Babylon Nazi-murutas. The Kassite language was the same as the Akkadian. Incidentally, this notice also shows that Brugsch's date for Rameses II (acceding about 1330 B.C.) is correct. The inclusion of Egyptian tribes as relatives of Cush (Gen. x, 6) appears to agree with the representations of the early conqueror, Narmer, on the Egyptian slate bas-reliefs of the Ist dynasty. He and his followers have been supposed to resemble the non-Semitic population of Asia Minor in appearance and dress, and because they used the double axe, which was a Hittite weapon and not used later in Egypt. Cush being thus connected with Cappadocia, it would seem that the "River Gihon" must be that still called the *Jihân* river (the classic Pyramus) which flows west at the foot of the Taurus, and falls into the Mediterranean east of Tarsus.

Hammurabi.—This great king—whose name is also found spelt Ammurapi—was identified by Sir H. Rawlinson with Amraphel

(Gen. xiv, 1). His date has been very variously given, but the calculation by Dr. Felix Peiser, based on the 1,920 years of Babylonian chronology (Berosus) before 331 B.C., appears to be the most satisfactory, giving 2251 B.C. for the foundation of Babylon, and 2139 B.C. for the accession of Hammurabi. This calculation is not only very close to the mean date (2232 B.C.) deduced by Rawlinson (for the foundation of Babylon) from the classical statements, but it also agrees with the date of the Assyrian conquest of Babylonia in 1012 B.C.

In this case the kingdom of Nabu-kudur-ušur I was divided on his death, in 1128 B.C., between his two sons. Some have supposed that the IInd dynasty of Babylon was contemporary with the first (in part at least), and Mr. L. W. King ("Egypt and Western Asia," p. 246) supposes that the rebel Anman, who fought against the son and grandson of Hammurabi, was the same person who became the first king of the IInd dynasty—a century later according to the Babylonian chronicle. This is, however, doubtful, since it would not agree with the statement of Nabu-nahid which makes Hammurabi accede about 2132 B.C. or a little earlier. The text found at Nippur (No. 83) seems, on close study of the signs used, to place Gulkisar 636 years before Bel-nadin-ablu of Babylonia. He would therefore accede in 1764-3 B.C., which agrees exactly with the Babylonian chronicle and shows the IInd dynasty to have preceded the third. These various calculations seem to support Peiser's date (2139 B.C.) for the accession of Hammurabi. He reigned 45 years, but unfortunately the Akkadian chronicle of the Ist dynasty is much injured for the first thirty years of his reign, before he defeated Elam. It was in this period that—if we accept his identity with Amraphel—he must have attacked Palestine. Some writers altogether deny that Hammurabi made any conquests west of the Euphrates, although it is known from the Akkadian chronicle that the first king of Babylon fought in Syria. It should, however, be noted that, in the great Code of Laws discovered at Susa in 1901 by De Morgan, Hammurabi describes himself as a "warrior in Karkar." This may refer to the place so named in Syria, close to Argana (now *Arjūm*) and Riblah, in the very centre of Syria, showing at least that Hammurabi, like his ancestor, invaded the lands west of the Euphrates. We may subsequently find some other copy of his chronicle giving us the history of his earlier years.

The Philistines.—This race is represented in Genesis (xx, 2, etc.) as ruled by kings bearing Semitic names, and in the Amarna letters in the fifteenth century B.C. we find Dagon-takala of Ascalon bearing a Semitic name, and writing in a Semitic language. The names of the kings of Philistia noticed by Sennacherib in 702 B.C. are also Semitic. According to the Septuagint the Capthorim, who were connected with the Philistines, came from Cappadocia, where we know (from the discoveries of Chantre) that a Semitic population existed, very early, side by side with Hittites. The Philistine god was Dagon, who was worshipped also by Hammurabi and by later Assyrians. These facts agree with the Old Testament as to the derivation of the Philistines, and should not be overlooked by those who suppose them to have come from Crete. The word Philistine ("emigrant") is itself Semitic, and it is remarkable that the researches of Mr. Evans at Knossos, in Crete, have not shown any indications of the presence of any Semitic population in that island. The literary arguments in favour of Cretan derivation for the Philistines are not satisfactory, while there is no monumental evidence to connect the Philistines with the Aryan nations of the West. The Keftiu were inhabitants of Phoenicia, according to the Decree of Canopus (238 B.C.), and the name *Pilistau* does not occur on the monument of Rameses III (1200 B.C.), which gives representations of the Aryan invaders of Palestine and Egypt. The word is actually *Pūrastau*, or *Pūlastau*, and, in type, dress and arms, this tribe resembles others in the same picture. It cannot be said therefore that the monumental evidence contradicts the Bible as regards the Philistines.

The discoveries in Crete seem to have led some students to overestimate the influence of the Aryan races on Syria in early times. The recent discoveries at Pterium point clearly to the existence in Syria, as early as the fifteenth century B.C., of two populations—the one Semitic, the other akin to Kassites and Akkadians. The Amorites (as is now very generally admitted) were Semitic, whereas the *Khar* were apparently non-Semitic, and akin to the Hittites. The Keftiu, represented in tombs near Abydos in Egypt, were probably the same as the *Khar*. Their art was certainly identical, and a bronze statuette from Latakia in Syria represents a people just like the Keftiu, who wear their black hair in long locks, or braids, on their shoulders. This way of dressing the hair is still sometimes found among Arabs, and occurs in the case of the Greco-Phoenician

priest's statue from Cyprus, and in another from Amrit, close to Tortosa. The Aryans, in 1200 B.C., appeared in Syria as enemies of both Hittites and Amorites, and are represented as a fair people with blue eyes and light hair. Chantre, on the other hand, found figurines with braided hair in the Hittite ruins of Cappadocia. The Keftiu, it is true, are connected with "islanders," but this may refer to Cyprus and Arvad quite as well as to Crete. The so-called "Ægæan" pottery found at Troy, Mycenæ and Knossos, also resembles that discovered at Pterium. It is much more advanced than the incised "Amorite" pottery found at Lachish, and compared with the foreign pottery of the Hyksos age in Egypt. A number of indications combine in suggesting that the Knossos remains are considerably later than has been thought, and may date from the later age (eighth century B.C.), when, as we know, Greek rulers had established themselves side by side with the Phoenicians in Cyprus.

Ḳadesh, Ḳedeshah.—These two classes of "consecrated" persons, male and female, are often mentioned (Gen. xxxviii, 21; Deut. xxiii, 18; 1 Kings xiv, 24; xv, 12; xxii, 46; Job xxxvi, 14). The Ḳedeshah, as a temple woman—like those of India—was found not only among Canaanites, but in Babylon, Carthage, and Sicily, among Semitic peoples. The Laws of Hammurabi throw some light on the subject. It is not stated whether a Ḳedeshah was married, but she was consecrated to a deity (Law 181), and her father provided a dowry, which was hers for life, but inherited by her brothers. If no dowry was provided, she had a share in her father's property in the proportion of one-third of a son's share. She ranked as an inferior priestess. Probably the votaries of Ashtoreth at Paphos, and Daphne, and Aphek in Lebanon (down to the fourth century A.D.) belonged to this class. The Ḳadesh seems to answer to the *Nir-sega*, or "consecrated chief," of the same laws (187, 192), classed with such priestesses. They were allowed to adopt children, and had thus apparently none of their own. In Deuteronomy (xxiii, 17) both classes are forbidden among Hebrews. The gift given to a Ḳedeshah may not be brought to the Temple (verse 18). The word "dog" in this passage (Hebrew *keleb*: following the Septuagint) should probably be rendered "priest," and refers to a *Ḳadesh*. In ancient Arabic *Kaleb* meant a "priest," and on the Taylor cylinder (702 B.C.) the *Kalbi* appear to be "priests" according to Sennacherib's scribe. The Hebrew named Caleb thus more probably means a "priest" rather than a "dog."

Incense.—Though mentioned early (Ex. xxv, 6, etc.), incense has been thought, by Wellhausen and others, to have only been used in later times. It is notable therefore that Gudea—whom the Babylonians supposed to have lived about 2800 B.C.—specially mentions incense in his account of the consecration of his great temple at Zirgul in Chaldea. The use of incense in Egypt, as early as the fifteenth century B.C., was already known.

The Familiar Spirit (Lev. xx, 6; 1 Sam. xxviii, 3; Isaiah xxix, 4).—In this case the English again follows the Septuagint, and much mediæval sorcery is based on the idea of a “ventriloquial” demon. The word *aub* has no appropriate Semitic derivation, and in Hebrew it only means a “bottle”—whence “bottle-imps” came to be invented. But it appears to be a loan word from Akkadian in both Canaanite and Assyrian. In Akkadian *ubi* is a charm; and thus the man or woman having a “familiar spirit” (*Baal-aub* or *Baalath-aub*) really means “master” (or “mistress”) of the spell.

The Ordeal of Jealousy (Num. v, 14).—This institution has been supposed to belong to a late legislation, but it is remarkable that a cognate ordeal existed in the time of Hammurabi about 2100 B.C. in Babylonia. In one of his Laws (No. 131) it is directed that a wife of whom the husband is jealous is to return to her house after “swearing by the name of a god.” If she was slandered by someone else (No. 132) she underwent the ordeal of plunging into the river.

Horses.—In the Pentateuch the horse appears to be used only in war (Ex. xv, 1; Deut. xx, 1, and probably Gen. xlix, 17), and war chariots were first used in Egypt about a century before the time of Moses, the Egyptian words for horse and chariot being borrowed from Semitic speech. As regards the “iron chariots” of Canaan (Judg. i, 19; iv., 3), we have Egyptian and Akkadian notices of chariots plated with metal, but in Gudea’s great text (already noticed) a chariot is noticed as drawn by an ass, and in the Laws of Hammurabi the ass is often noticed, but the horse never is; while in Egypt, under the XIIth dynasty, only the ass was known. It is yet uncertain when horses were first ridden instead of being driven. We have an Assyrian picture of a horse soldier as early as 734 B.C., and another, of a man hunting lions on a horse, belongs to the seventh century B.C., while a mounted man appears on a Lycian bas-relief of the fifth century B.C. The Scythians rode horses

(Jer. vi, 23), and the home of the horse was in Armenia. A Hittite monument at Mer'ash represents a man holding a horse, and the Hittite may have been the first to use horses and chariots in war.

Landmarks (Deut. xix, 14).—The Hebrews were forbidden to remove ancient landmarks, and it is generally agreed that these probably resembled the Kassite landmark monuments, of which some twenty examples are now known, belonging to the twelfth and eleventh centuries B.C. The stone declared, in its inscription, the boundaries of the land to which it referred, and the name and family of the landowner. It is evident that such a record would be of great importance in connection with the year of Jubilee (Lev. xxv, 10) when the land was restored to its original owner.

Iron (Deut. viii, 9; Num. xxxi, 22; 1 Sam. xvii, 7).—The notice of iron in the Pentateuch has sometimes been regarded as a sign of late date, but iron implements are found in Egypt as early as the time of the XIIth dynasty. The Akkadians knew iron, and iron knives occur at Tell Loh, probably as early as 2800 B.C. In Egypt it was known by its Semitic name in the fourteenth century B.C. In Palestine it appears to have been still used only for small weapons—such as Goliath's spear-head—even in David's time. The Lebanon produced iron, but the principal supply seems to have come from the mines of Asia Minor, the Chalybi being famous as iron miners in later times. At Lachish iron appears to occur perhaps as early as 1000 B.C.

Divorce (Deut. xxiv, 1).—We are not told what was to be written in the "bill of divorcement" given by a Hebrew to his wife. The Laws of Hammurabi probably illustrate this point (Nos. 137–140). If the wife had children, the dowry which she brought her husband was given to her, and when she had brought up her children she could marry again as she chose, receiving a "son's portion" of her first husband's estate on his death. If she had no children she had immediate possession of the *Tirkhatu*, or "reserve fund" paid to her father by the husband before marriage, as well as of her own dowry. If no such funds were available the husband paid over to her a *manah* of silver (about £8), or a third of this sum if he was a poor man of the lower classes. These arrangements were no doubt made valid, as in other cases, by a written tablet signed by witnesses; and, since in many respects Hebrew law and custom was the same as in Babylonia, it is probable that the *gett*,

or "bill of divorcement," was a document of this nature. Polygamy, among Hebrews and Babylonians alike, appears to have been strictly limited, and a second wife was only allowed when the first had no children, or (Law No. 141), when she neglected her husband who still refused to divorce her. Divorce was not due to adultery, since that was punished by death.

Book of Joshua.—The very interesting discovery of a Hebrew book of Joshua among the Samaritans at Shechem, in May 1907, is described by Dr. M. Gaster in the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* (July 1908, pp. 795-809). It appears that the Arabic version (published by Juynboll in 1848), which is discussed in my paper on "Samaritan Topography" (*Memoirs*, vol. "Special Papers," 1881, pp. 216-231), is a paraphrase of the Hebrew version, with a later addition treating of Samaritan history after the Captivity, and including legends of Alexander the Great, Baba the high priest, and the Romans. The Hebrew version stops at Chap. xxxix of the Arabic, which has fifty chapters. It includes, however, the legends about Joshua which were known from the Arabic. Some portions of the Hebrew follow almost verbatim the Massoretic text of the Bible "Book of Joshua." It is possible therefore that this work may have been composed in the seventh century A.D. at earliest—a time when the Samaritans appear to have been very prosperous under the first Arab khalifs of Damascus. It was already known that, about this time, the Samaritans borrowed legends from the Jews, which are to be found in the Babylonian Talmud. The new text is, however, also said to include details mentioned by Josephus which are not found in the Bible.

Samson's Friend (Judg. xiv, 20; xv, 2).—We are told that Samson's Philistine bride was given to his companion. This was probably regarded as illegal, since Hammurabi's laws lay down that if a man has paid *Tirkhatu*, or "bride price," as it is often called, and his friend succeeds in breaking off the marriage, the intended wife is not to be allowed to marry the friend in question.

Widows (Ruth i, 8).—In this passage we find one widow returning to her own people, and the other (Ruth) abiding with her husband's family. From the Babylonian Laws (Nos. 171-173, 177) it appears that the widow without children had freedom of choice. She could remain in her husband's house, enjoying the use of her dowry (*sheriktu*), and of any gift (*nudunnu*) made by her husband to

her, and confirmed by a tablet. Even if she had children she could marry whom she chose by surrendering the *nudunnu*.

Burning the Dead.—There is no doubt that the Hebrew custom—like the Babylonian—was burial, not cremation. Both nations regarded it as a great misfortune not to be buried (*see* Eccles. vi, 3), and the burning of a corpse was regarded with horror (Amos ii, 1). Saul and Jonathan were burned under exceptional circumstances, but the bones were preserved (1 Sam. xxxi, 12). The “burnings” mentioned in other passages (2 Chron. xxi, 19; Jer. xxxiv, 5) do not refer to cremation, but to the burning of objects at the tomb. The Jews still burn shawls and other objects, with incense, at the tomb of Joseph in Shechem, and of Simeon bar Yokhai at Meirûn in Galilee. Sir W. M. Ramsay discovered, in Phrygia, a text of Asbolus the younger, who left 3,000 denarii for the customary “burning of *Papoi*.” He belonged to the Jewish guild of Porphurataphoi, who observed the feast of unleavened bread in Phrygia. It is not known what *Papoi* means, though it might be connected with the Greek *Papai*, an exclamation of grief. We have on the other hand not only the discovery of burnt bodies of children in pottery urns, at Gezer and Taanach, but a similar case at Susa in Persia, where the charred body of a grown person has been found in a pottery urn coffin. In these cases the urn may have been baked after the body was placed in it, and the charred skeleton was thus preserved. Possibly this method was adopted in the case of Saul and Jonathan.

Bar.—This Aramaic word, instead of the Hebrew *ben*, “son,” occurs as early as the time of David in the dialect of Gilead (Barzillai, 2 Sam. xvii, 27, etc.), and the Moabite stone shows us that the dialect beyond Jordan, as early as 900 B.C., had considerable affinities to the Aramaic found in North Syria as early, at least, as 800 B.C. But with regard to the words “Kiss the Son” (*bar*) in the Psalm (ii, 12), it seems hardly probable that the English version is correct—though following the Septuagint—because the Hebrew *ben* for “son” occurs in another verse (7) of the same Psalm. Probably the meaning is really “ground” (Heb. *bar*), still used in Arabic for bare ground, and connected with *barriya*, “desert.” On the black obelisk of Shalmaneser II we see the envoy of Jehu (about 850 B.C.) kissing the ground before the Assyrian conqueror; and the reading “kiss the ground lest he be angry” seems natural. I have not seen this explanation suggested elsewhere.

Bow of Steel (2 Sam. xxii, 35) is more correctly to be rendered "of bronze." A bow of bronze, 2 feet long, was discovered by the French at Susa.

Mules (1 Kings i, 33) are never mentioned in the Pentateuch. The word in Genesis (xxxvi, 24) is correctly rendered "hot springs" in the revised version. Mules first appear in the latter days of David. They are represented as baggage animals on an Assyrian bas-relief of the seventh century B.C.

Almug or *Algum trees* (1 Kings x, 11; 2 Chron. ix, 10).—The suggestion that sandal wood is intended is rendered very doubtful by the fact that algum trees are also noticed (2 Chron. ii, 8) as coming "out of Lebanon." The meaning of the word is unknown, but the first syllable *Al* has often been supposed to mean a "tree." If the original documents used by the Hebrew historians were written in Cuneiform, the word may have been represented by the signs *GIZ-KU* for "precious wood," which in Semitic speech could be read either *al-mugu* or *al-gemu*, since the sign *KU* had both these sounds in Assyrian. In early Babylonian texts *GIZ-DAN*, or "strong wood," is often mentioned among precious materials. The general term "precious wood" might thus apply to the products of Arabia and of Lebanon alike.

Dagon (1 Chron. x, 10; see 1 Sam. v, 4).—It is often denied that this name applies to the Babylonian and Phœnician deity represented as a merman, with the head and body of a bearded man, and the tail of a fish; because in Semitic speech *dagon* signifies "corn." This etymology, according to Eusebius (*Praep. Evan.* i, 10), was given by the Phœnician Sanchoniathon. It is, however, recognised that *Dagon* is the same god called *Da-gan* in the Akkadian chronicle of the 1st dynasty of Babylon; and in Akkadian *Da* signifies "the upper part of a man," while *gan* may be compared with the Turkish *kān* for a "large fish." *Dagon* would thus be the same as *Oannes* (*u-khana*, "lord of the fish"), a form of the sea god *Ea*, who—according to the Babylonian legend given by Berosus—was a man with fish tail. He is represented, not only on Assyrian bas-reliefs, but on a seal found near Ashdod in 1875. When the statue of *Dagon* was broken only the "fishy part" (*dagon*) was left. In the Laws of Ammurabi *Dagon* is invoked as the deity of regions near the Euphrates, apparently as a water god. He also had a temple at Susa in the same age.

Sanballat.—The question whether Nehemiah should be supposed to have ruled Jerusalem under Artaxerxes II, rather than under Artaxerxes I, appears to be now definitely settled by the discovery of Aramaic papyri at Elephantine in Upper Egypt. Here we learn that Egyptian Jews wrote to the sons of Sanballat in the seventeenth year of Darius Nothos (408–7 B.C.), which would indicate that their father lived under Artaxerxes I. The son's names were Delaya and Shelemya, and Sanballat is spoken of as "Governor of Samaria." There seems, however, no reason to suppose that he was a Persian. His name suggests the Babylonian *Sin-ballat*, "the moon god has caused life."

Shegal (Psalm xlv, 9; Dan. v, 2, 3, 23).—This peculiar word for a foreign queen appears to have no appropriate Semitic derivation. It may perhaps have been a term borrowed from the Akkadian, in which tongue *sha* means "a bride," and *gal* is "great."

Sarsechim (Jer. xxxix, 3).—This word is a plural, and appears to be a title applying to two Babylonians, said to have been "princes of the king of Babylon." They were named Nergal-Sharezer and Samgar-Nebo. The latter was a *Rab-mugu*, or "chief counsellor," and the former was probably *not* a *Rab-saris* (or "chief eunuch"), this title having got in by a clerical error from verse 13, where it applies to another person—Nebushashban. It may be suggested that *Sarsech* represents a loan word from Akkadian, namely, *Sar-sak*, or "king's son," which agrees with their being princes.

NOTES ON THE GEOGRAPHY OF PALESTINE.

By THE REV. CALEB HAUSER, M.A.

I. A statement of Rules governing the changes which liquids and semi-vowels sometimes undergo may serve as an introduction to several identifications to be proposed below:—

Rule 1. The liquids *m*, *n*, *l*, and *r*, as *homogeneous* sounds, frequently interchange—most frequently in the degree of nearest relationship, *viz.*, the *m* and *n*, the *n* and *l*, the *l* and *r*.

Rule 2. The liquids may become *homorganic mutes*, *viz.* :

(a) The labial *m* changes to *b*.

(b) The linguadental *n* changes to *d*.