

legacy of recorded words and example, but as a living power through living men, carrying on without break His ministry of Redemption. In the biography of one who in his time did much for the Kingdom of God, there is at the close of it a touching expression of sadness at having to leave the world with so much misery in it (*Life of Lord Shaftesbury*, vol. iii. p. 513). We see why no

such thought could attach to the Ascension. St. Matthew, who does not record the actual event, is nevertheless the best interpreter of its meaning. His equivalent for the Ascension is: 'Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the age.' That is what the Ascension really means. It is rather the festival of Christ's presence in the world than of His departure from it.

Recent Biblical Archaeology.

I. BY PROFESSOR A. H. SAYCE, LL.D., OXFORD.

THE first-fruits of the important excavations carried on by M. de Morgan on the site of Susa have just appeared. Dr. Scheil has published the Semitic texts found among the ruins of the ancient Elamite capital (*Mémoires de la Délégation en Perse: Textes élamites-sémitiques*; première série, Paris: Leroux, 1900). It forms the second volume of the work in which M. de Morgan will give an account of his excavations, so far as they have yet gone, the first volume, which is about to appear, containing a detailed history of them, while the third volume will be devoted to the 'Anzanite' or native Elamite inscriptions which have been disinterred. That Semitic texts should be discovered at all at Susa is a surprise; what is a still greater surprise is that they go back to the very beginning of Elamite civilization. Our whole conception of early Elamite history has been revolutionized; and it turns out that the tenth chapter of Genesis is right, after all, in making Elam a son of Shem. Once more archæological discovery has confirmed the statement of an Old Testament writer, and this time in a most unexpected manner.

Susa, it would seem, was originally included in Babylonia. It was the capital of a district called Barahsi in the early inscriptions, which was distinct from the land of Elam properly so-called. In course of time, however, Barahsi was absorbed by Elam, and Susa or Shushan thus became an Elamite town.

The earliest rulers of Susa, whose records have come down to us, were high priests who acknowledged the sovereignty of the Babylonian kings. Naram-Sin (3800 B.C.) reigned over Elam just as

he reigned over Babylonia, and Susa was on the same footing in regard to the dominant state as was Tello or any other of the subject Babylonian cities. At first the high priests of Susa bore Semitic names, but a time came when the names became 'Anzanite,' though the inscriptions continue to be in the Semitic language of Babylonia.

The land of Anzan was from the first non-Semitic, and its inhabitants spoke an agglutinative language. At some period before 2300 B.C. its kings made themselves masters of Susa and Elam, which from henceforward came to be synonymous with Anzan. They even carried the war into Babylonia, and for a time that country had to submit to Elamite—or, more strictly speaking, Anzanite—supremacy. This is the period to which Chedor-laomer belongs. Babylonia, indeed, under Khammurabi or Ammurapi, succeeded in shaking off the Elamite yoke, but Elam remained independent, and the Semitic element which had once existed in it was absorbed or driven out. Naturally, however, the memories of the Semitic past long survived in the country; Semitic deities continued to be worshipped there, and it was remembered that the chief sanctuaries of Susa were of Semitic foundation.

Dr. Scheil's volume has been brought out with all that sumptuousness of type and paper which we are accustomed to expect in the publications of the French Government. The facsimiles of the inscriptions given in it leave nothing to be desired. They are headed by the long inscription of Manistusu (or, as Dr. Scheil prefers to read the name, Manistu-irba), the early king of Kiš, whose existence was first made known to us by the

American excavations at Niffer. It is engraved on an obelisk, and is in a very complete condition. The list of early Babylonian names contained in it, which have been alphabetically catalogued by the editor, is an important contribution to our knowledge of Chaldæan nomenclature.

A good many of the inscriptions belong to the kings of the Kassite dynasty whom they prove to have ruled, at all events for a time, over Susa as well as over Babylonia. Among them is an interesting record of a gift of land made to a worker in leather, who is described as a 'fugitive' from Khali-rab-*batû*. His name was Agab-takha, in which Dr. Scheil very ingeniously sees the word *takhû* described in a lexical tablet as signifying 'son' in some foreign language (apparently). In any case the record gives us for the first time the true pronunciation of the name of the country hitherto read Khani-rabbat, or Khani-gabbat, of which the capital at one time was the modern Malatiyeh. It is difficult not to connect the first part of the name with that of the Halys; 'the land of the greater Halys,' in fact, would have been a very appropriate designation for the eastern half of Cappadocia.

The district of Barahsi in which Susa was situated appears in later texts under the form of Parasi. This I should identify with the Parsuas of Sennacherib, which the Assyrian king places next to Anzan, and in which the name of Persia has long

since been recognized. It would seem, therefore, that the Aryan tribe of Persians must have derived their name from the district in which they settled, and did not bring it with them.

At the end of the volume Dr. Scheil has published some very curious texts found on clay tablets and discovered in the lower strata of the mounds of Susa, which present us with a wholly new system of cuneiform writing. The characters are partly hieroglyphic, and the numerical ciphers employed in them also differ from those in use in the ordinary cuneiform script. As Dr. Scheil remarks, they appear to represent a system of cuneiform which differs entirely from 'that which has given us the so-called Babylonian signs,' and is probably 'the result of an independent development.' Along with these tablets he also publishes a highly interesting cylinder inscribed with pictorial characters, as well as a small stone tablet from Lower Chaldæa, on which we find at last the hieroglyphic originals of the cuneiform signs. I believe that Dr. Scheil has identified rightly the larger part of these; two of them, however, which he doubtfully suggests may be *id* and *dhur*, seem to me to be rather *zak* and *gu*. Like him I would read the proper name, which is partially enclosed in a sort of cartouche, Ennun-takh. For the history of writing, the value of these discoveries need not be pointed out.

Cairo, Egypt, December 1900.

2. BY THE REV. P. A. GORDON CLARK, PERTH.

THE *Archæological Report* of the Egypt Exploration Fund for the year 1899-1900, just issued, shows how closely connected with each other were the countries of the ancient world, and how rapidly new light is being thrown upon obscure problems.

In the article 'Egypt,' in *H.D.B.*,¹ Mr. Crum, after stating the evidence of the affinity between the Egyptian and Semitic languages, adds (p. 656): 'One of the most distinctive features of the Semitic languages—the preponderance of trilateral roots—is, at any rate, not paralleled, even in the oldest Egyptian documents.' This non-parallelism, for which Mr. Crum offers some explanations, has now been practically removed. Dr. Sethe, who has just become Professor of Egyptology at Göttingen, has published an elaborate treatise on the Egyptian verb, in

¹ Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. i.

which he shows that in the earlier texts the vast majority of the roots of verbs are trilateral, that all were originally so, and became, as they appear in later texts, biliteral through the loss of a consonant. The parallelism between the languages is another proof in support of the contention of Benfey, himself a Göttingen professor, that the Egyptian language belonged originally to the Semitic family, and confirms the theory (Erman's *Life in Ancient Egypt*, p. 30, and Maspero's *Dawn of Civilization*, p. 45) that the Egyptians came originally from Asia, and imposed their language, etc., upon the natives, who adopted and modified it. This again draws closer the links which unite Chaldæa and the land of the Nile.

The Egyptians had various modes of writing, the best known being the hieroglyphic. Of this there was a cursive form known to us in two

scripts, the hieratic of the Middle Empire, and a very much older hieratic of the Early Empire, preserved in the Papyrus Prisse found in a tomb of the eleventh dynasty. Some forty-five of the hieroglyphic signs had acquired a kind of alphabetic character. The famous French Egyptologist, De Rouge, promulgated the theory that a Semitic people took twenty-one of these, in the form which they have in the ancient hieratic script, and adding another non-Egyptian sign, formed the first alphabet, generally called the Phœnician alphabet, from which that of Greece and Rome and our own were derived. It remained an open question what people did this, whether a race in South Arabia (Hommel's *Ancient Hebrew Tradition*, p. 77) or a Phœnician trading colony on the Delta, whose original home was Caphtor, usually identified with Crete. (See article 'Alphabet' in *H.D.B.*) Such was De Rouge's theory. In 1894 Mr. Evans, an Oxford archæologist, by comparing the symbols engraved on ancient stones worn by the women of Crete as charms, with others on the walls of Knossos, in Crete, discovered that two systems of writing, a hieroglyphic and a linear, existed in Crete and the early Ægean world. In a letter to the *Times* of 30th October last, Messrs. Evans and Hogarth gave an account of their discovery at Knossos of a palace, vases, the famous Labyrinth,

and masses of tablets. Mr. Evans in the *Archæological Report*, and Mr. Hogarth in the *Contemporary Review* for December, give a fuller description of these tablets. They are in two scripts. The hieroglyphics, however, have little, and the cursive has even less, resemblance to the Egyptian scripts of the same name. Evidently we have two developments from an earlier original. Now, if the original of the letters of the (so-called) Phœnician alphabet be compared with the scripts just discovered, it is found that 'two-thirds of the former correspond with actual types of one or other of the Cretan systems. It is not too much to say that De Rouge's theory must be definitely abandoned,' and that it was from the Cretan script the Phœnician alphabet was derived.

Egypt had, as is well known, not merely a connexion with Babylon and Crete, but with Rome. More than twenty years ago a colossal group was discovered at Alexandria. Maspero has now shown that it represented Anthony and Cleopatra, and that the statue of the queen is a real portrait. It is evident that the scientists have begun, not a moment too soon, to take care of the treasures on the banks of the Nile. On 31st October 1899 eleven columns of the hypostyle hall at Karnak fell, but measures have been taken to preserve the pillars that remain, and restore those that have fallen.

A New Theory as to the Date of the Epistle to the Galatians.

BY PROFESSOR W. M. RAMSAY, LL.D., D.C.L., ABERDEEN.

EARLY in the year 1900 Mr. Bartlet of Mansfield College, Oxford, in his excellent book on *The Apostolic Age*, assumed the theory (which he had stated and defended at length in the *Expositor*, 1899) that the Epistle to the Galatians was written by St. Paul after returning from his first missionary journey and immediately before the Apostolic Council described in Ac 15. Unfortunately he united this theory with certain unnecessary concomitants, which seem to have prevented it from finding serious consideration or fair discussion. (1) He supposed that St. Paul made a journey to

Jerusalem between the two which are described in Ac 9 and 11, 12; and that this journey, about which Luke is silent (and presumably ignorant), was the one which Paul describes in Gal 2¹⁻¹⁰. Such a complex hypothesis was not likely to find much favour. (2) Further, he leaned to the supposition that Galatians was written on the journey through Phœnicia to Jerusalem, as described in Ac 15³; and (3) he explained Paul's reference in Gal 4¹³ to his 'former visit,' either as not necessarily implying that there had been a second visit (which, though stated by many commentators,