

## Recent Biblical Archaeology.

BY A. H. SAYCE, LL.D., PROFESSOR OF ASSYRIOLOGY, OXFORD.

*Early Babylonian History* is the name of a large and handsomely printed volume which has just been written by the Rev. Hugo Radau, and published at the Oxford University Press. It is an elaborate and exhaustive review of all the materials we possess at present for a knowledge of early Babylonian history 'down to the end of the Fourth Dynasty of Ur'—that is to say, down to the time when Babylonia passed under the rule of a foreign line of kings, of whom Khammurabi or Amraphel was the most celebrated. It will be a surprise to many readers, not excluding Orientalists, that the materials are plentiful enough to occupy a volume of 452 pages. Dr. Radau has given the texts, usually in transliteration, along with translations of them, as well as philological and explanatory notes, which prove him to be a good Sumerian scholar. He has succeeded in identifying several early Babylonian characters, the later equivalents of which were doubtful, and in throwing light on a good many Sumerian words and grammatical constructions. He has also made use of a valuable collection of early Babylonian tablets belonging to Dr. E. A. Hoffmann, which are here described and published for the first time.

For the student of early Oriental history the book is indispensable. Nowhere else can he find so complete a collection of materials, lucidly arranged and brought up to date. The value of the work is increased by the admirable indices and tables of contents with which it is furnished. Even where the reader is inclined to differ from the conclusions arrived at in it, he will find all the data for forming an opinion lying ready to hand.

That differences of opinion should exist where the materials are still imperfect is inevitable. I fail, for instance, to see the evidence for a 'Fourth' dynasty of Ur. That the titles of a king should vary in different inscriptions is of frequent occurrence in both ancient and modern history, and no conclusions can safely be built upon the fact. The queen of England is sometimes called also Empress of India or Queen of Great Britain and Ireland; but that is no reason for dividing her

into two personages. That there were two Babylonian sovereigns of Ur who bore the name of Dungi may be admitted; that there was a third is not yet proved.

Nor do I believe that the kings who write their names and inscriptions in Sumerian were Semites. Where the king was of Semitic origin, like Naram-Sin, his name is—at all events, occasionally—written in a way which leaves no doubt of his Semitic descent. The Semitic loan-words introduced into the Sumerian texts are always spelt phonetically, and the very meagre list of them, as compared with the Sumerian loan-words introduced into Semitic-Babylonian, shows that the language of the Semitic settlers could not have had much influence on the language of the court. As for the so-called Semitic idioms supposed to exist in the Sumerian inscriptions, I have long ago pointed out that we have just as much reason for believing that they are of Sumerian origin, like the distinction between a present and an aorist tense in Assyrian, as the converse. We know too little about early Semitic syntax to dogmatise on the subject, and the large number of words borrowed from Sumerian by the Semites raises the presumption that Sumerian idioms were borrowed at the same time. We now know that the influence of Sumerian culture extended, in primitive times, not only over Babylonia, but in Arabia and Canaan as well.

Dr. Radau seems to adopt the theory which identifies the biblical Shinar with Sumer, and derives them both from the name of the city of Gir-su, read backwards (Su-gir). But this is impossible. The name of the god Nin-girsu, we are told (*W.A.I.* iii. 66, 3 f., 14 b) was pronounced Ingurisa in Assyrian, thus excluding the reading Su-gir, and the discovery of the name of Sankhar or Shinar in the Tel el-Amarna tablets has made me give up the connection between Shinar and Sumer to which I first gave currency thirty years ago. Nor can I agree with Dr. Radau in seeing the name of Yahweh in that of Libus-Eaum, the granddaughter of Naram-Sin; it is rather the name of the Babylonian god Ea. 'Armaim,' by the way, in one of Naram-Sin's inscriptions is

Aram, not Armenia, as Dr. Radau translates it. Kimas, again, is northern and not central Arabia. As for the so-called land of 'Gis-ban,' which plays so large a part in the early Babylonian texts, Dr. Radau has evidently changed his opinion about it while writing his book, the result being an inconsistent transliteration of the name. 'Gis-ban' is certainly wrong, and, personally, I believe that Mr. Pinches is right in reading Ukh and identifying the place with Opis. That the name has been found on bricks from Jokha does not prove much, and we have the positive testimony of a tablet to the fact that Ukh and Upi or Opis were one and the same.

We must not part from Dr. Radau's work without mentioning the very full and interesting account contained in it of the early Babylonian calendar and its months.

THE fifth volume of the *Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatischen Gesellschaft* (1900, 1) begins with three interesting articles by Dr. W. Max Müller on the primitive home of the Philistines, which, he suggests, was the southern coast of Asia Minor; on the period of their settlement on the coast of Palestine, which is assigned to the age of Ramses

III. (about 1200 B.C.); and on a hieratic papyrus obtained by M. Golénischeff in Egypt, of which a translation is given. The papyrus describes a voyage undertaken by an Egyptian in the time of the high-priest Her-Hor, in order to obtain wood from the Lebanon for the temple of Amon at Thebes. The Egyptian was detained for several months in the harbour of Dor, which at that time was in the possession of the Zakkar, a Philistine tribe, and the papyrus gives an account of the difficulties and sufferings he underwent there. Zakkar pirates seem to have been in command of the sea, and Egyptian influence in Canaan was at an end. In *seren*, the title of the Philistine chiefs, Dr. Max Müller sees a word of Asianic origin, related to the Greek *ῥύπαννος*, and he points out a curious parallelism between a passage in the papyrus describing a sort of prophetic ecstasy into which one of the subjects of the king of Dor fell, and the reference to the Israelitish prophets in the time of Saul (1 S 19<sup>28</sup>). Dr. Max Müller's further speculations, which would make David and Solomon vassals of the Egyptians, by whose help the Hebrews shook off the Philistine yoke, are not likely to convince anyone except their author.

## Contributions and Comments.

### To a Butterfly.

WHITE glimpse of faith, fluttering from the  
unseen

On to the dark; winged page of dawn to e'en,  
That without voice thine own small doom may  
bear

In the white livery that the angels wear.

Faith is no longer faith when grasped, nor thou  
A vision more, that in thy radiance now  
From bed of marigold dost meekly rise  
And journey on to be eve's sacrifice.

SARAH ROBERTSON MATHESON.

### A Rhetorical Figure in the Old Testament.

A SUPPLEMENTARY NOTE.

IN addition to various communications expressing warm approval of my article last month on 'A Rhetorical Figure in the O.T.', I have received one in which *inter alia* I am referred further to Pr 8<sup>10</sup> and 17<sup>12</sup>. The writer, moreover, lays stress upon the fact that the rhetorical usage in question has been known to theologians for centuries, and hence suggests that my citation of Arabic parallels is somewhat consequential, and a thing with which there was no need to trouble the readers of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES. But I may be allowed simply to remind these readers what an important part is played in the Wellhausen school by *all*