

He believed 'dry places' were the special abode of evil spirits when He said they were, in the well-known parable. So here in His reply to the high priest, He applied to Himself the words of Dn 7¹³, because by so applying them He was able to state, in a way which His hearers could not mistake, that He was the Messiah. And to hold that because our Lord said here that He would 'come with the clouds' He believed He would so return, and we must believe it too, is to forget that the words of our Lord's reply are not His own, but a quotation; it is to overlook the context in which they occur—that they are a reply to a question as to His Messiahship, not as to His Second Advent: it is to read our Lord's reply with Western literalism, which is certain to lead us astray in the study of the New Testament, an Oriental book, as well as in the study of the Old Testament.

If this view of our Lord's reply to the high priest is correct, it was not a prophecy but an emphatic assertion of His Messiahship, and if St. Mark's version of His reply, which omits the words ἀπ' ἄρου, is the true version, how, then, is it that the words are found in St. Matthew? Their presence in St. Matthew is most probably due to the fact that the writer or editor of St. Matthew's Gospel expected our Lord to return in His own lifetime. We know that our Lord's return within a few years was expected. It was a belief which lived on even when it appeared to be contradicted by the event (2 P 2⁹). Canon Winterbotham cautions us against this mode of explanation, and against 'throwing the blame upon' the Evangelist. But if we are to understand a writer we must remember

the mental atmosphere in which he wrote, for he is certain to be influenced by it. While the fact that the belief in our Lord's return in the near future persisted, though He did not so return, is sufficient answer to the argument that, if ἀπ' ἄρου were not a genuine part of our Lord's reply, it would not be found in St. Matthew as the event had proved it untrue. This argument, on which Canon Winterbotham lays stress, may be used in support of St. Mark's version of our Lord's reply: for had the words ἀπ' ἄρου been a part of our Lord's reply, then the strength and prevalence of the belief in His return in the near future would have prevented their omission in St. Mark. Nor is it true to say that to reject the words as no part of our Lord's reply is to doubt 'the substantial truth of the Gospels.' It is merely to question their accuracy in a matter of detail. There are additions in St. Matthew which are not generally accepted, e.g. the well-known addition in 5³². And must we accept as literally true one of St. Matthew's additions to the narrative of the Crucifixion—the strange story of the resurrection of the Saints, and their appearance in Jerusalem? We may thoroughly believe in the substantial truth of the Gospels, and yet believe that they contain inaccuracies in matters of detail. In conclusion we may say that if the view of our Lord's reply mentioned above is correct, if it was not a prophecy, but a statement of His Messiahship, it frees us from the belief that the Second Advent will consist in the literal coming of our Lord 'with the clouds,' a view of the Second Advent which raises grave, or rather insuperable, difficulties.

The Archaeology of the Book of Genesis.

BY THE REV. A. H. SAYCE, D.D., LL.D., D.LITT., PROFESSOR OF ASSYRIOLOGY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD.

Chapter x.

16-17. The tribal list (from 'Jebusite' to 'Hivite') breaks the connexion, which requires a continuation of the list of Canaanite states. But it is an appendix to 'Heth' derived from the lists in Gn 15^{20, 21}, Jos 24¹¹, etc., and may therefore have been originally a marginal note. The Jebusites were the inhabitants of Jerusalem at the

time of the Israelitish occupation (Jos 15⁶³, Jg 19¹⁰, 2 S 5⁶, Nu 13²⁹), who would seem to have been a mixture of Hittites and Amorites (Ezk 16³). The king of Uru-Salim, or Jerusalem, in the time of the Tel el-Amarna correspondence, was Ebed-Kheba, 'the servant of Kheba,' and since Kheba was a Hittite deity, while Ebed-Kheba's body-

guard consisted of Hittites from Kas,¹ we may conclude that he was one of those Hittite condottieri who established principalities for themselves in Canaan. Indeed, Professor Hommel suggests that 'the mighty king' to whom Ebed-Kheba says he owed his position was the Hittite king who has this title applied to him in one of the Tel el-Amarna letters. 'Uriah the Hittite' would have been a representative of the older population.

The Amorites of the Tel el-Amarna tablets had their seat from Mount Hermon northwards. Their princes Ebed-Asherah and his son Aziru profess to be faithful subjects of the Pharaoh, whose cities, however, they are accused of sacking in secret alliance with the Hittites. The Boghaz Keui tablets show that these accusations were well founded, and that eventually Aziru threw off all disguise and became a Hittite vassal like his successors who were appointed to their office as 'kings of the Amorites' by their Hittite overlord. The Hittite tablets further show that the Amorite rule extended southward on the eastern side of the Jordan. In the third millennium B.C. the Amorites had been so exclusively the dominant people in Syria and Canaan as to cause this part of the world to be known to the Babylonians as 'the land of the Amorites.' To the Babylonians, in fact, the Amurrû or Amorites represented the Western Semites; trading colonies of them were established in Babylonia, and the dynasty to which Khammu-rabi belonged was of 'Amorite' origin. In the standard Babylonian work on astronomy and astrology, which goes back to the Khammu-rabi age, 'the king of the Amorites' appears by the side of 'the king of the Hittites' as playing a part in the politics of Western Asia. Archæologically, these Amorites or Western Semites are represented in Canaan by the people of the Bronze age, who averaged from 5 ft. 7 in. to 6 ft. in height. They buried their dead in a contracted position; surrounded their cities with huge walls of brick, and raised 'high places,' consisting of monoliths, where children were sacrificed and their bones buried in jars. The Amorites of the Mosaic age, who occupied a particular district (or districts) in Syria, were, however, distinguished from the Amorites in the more general sense. They spoke a Semitic language, but the Egyptian artists depict them with fair skins, blue eyes and light hair, like the

¹ Sayce, *Archæology of the Cuneiform Inscriptions*, pp. 195, 196.

Libyans, and so attach them to the blond race. In the Tel el-Amarna tablets and the O.T. (Nu 13²⁰), moreover, they are assigned to a particular district. It would therefore seem that in the Mosaic age the name which originally denoted—at all events for the Babylonians—the Western Semites generally had become restricted to a particular portion of the population which either wholly or in part was not Semitic, though it had adopted the Semitic language of its neighbours. In many passages of the Pentateuch (e.g. Gn 14¹³ 48²²) 'Amorite' seems to be used in its early Babylonian sense; elsewhere (as here) it has the meaning which was attached to it in the Mosaic age.

The Girschite is probably to be identified with the Qarqish, who are named by Ramses II. among the subject populations that followed the standard of the Hittite king in his war against Egypt (see Jos 24¹¹). If so, the Girschites in Canaan will have been, like the Jebusites, a body of Hittites who had settled in that country. Qarqish, however, could be read Qalqish and identified with Cilicia.

Hivite may be a descriptive name meaning 'villager' rather than an ethnic one. On the other hand, there was a definite tribe of this name living in the Lebanon and extending from Mount Hermon to Hamath (Jos 11³, Jg 3³; in 2 S 24⁷ we must read 'Hittite' for 'Hivite'); that is to say, in the district which, as we learn from the Tel el-Amarna tablets, was occupied by the Amorites. 'Hivite,' however, is not found in the Egyptian or cuneiform texts, and since the territory assigned to the Hivites was not only Amorite but also that in which Kadesh, the southern capital of the Hittites, was situated, it appears probable that we should read 'Hittite' for 'Hivite' in both Jos 11³ and Jg 3³. Hivites are not mentioned in Gn 15^{20, 21}, while the Hivites of Gibeon (Jos 11¹⁹) were Canaanites, and the Hivites of Shechem (Gn 34²) were 'Amorites.'

With the Arkite we return to the Canaanite states. Arka (Irqat) and Zemar (Tsumur) occupy an important place in the Tel el-Amarna tablets, and the capture and destruction of Zemar by the Amorite prince Aziru is the subject of much correspondence. It is described as a strong mountain fortress not far from Gebal. The two cities are usually identified with the classical Arkê, now Tell Arka, and Simyra, now Sumra. Both Arkâ and Tsimirra are mentioned by Tiglah-

pileser iv., Tsimirra being the seat of an Assyrian governor in the time of Sennacherib, while the Irqanations were allies of Hadad-ezer in his war with Shalmaneser II., (853 B.C.) along with the Arvadites and Siânians. The latter are probably the Sinites of Genesis. Arvad, now Ruâd, was one of the most northern of the Phœnician sea-coast towns, and its fleet is referred to in the Tel el-Amarna tablets. Like Hamath (now Hamah, usually written Amatti, more rarely Khamatti, in the Assyrian inscriptions), it is included by Thothmes III. among his Syrian conquests. Both Hamath and Arvad played a considerable part in the later history of Syria; Arka and Zemar, however, sink into obscurity after the Mosaic age.

This, therefore, is the period which is indicated by their inclusion in the geographical table of Genesis, to the exclusion of cities like Tyre or Gebal, which afterwards rose to pre-eminence. Hamath, it will be observed, is included among the offspring of Canaan. The table must therefore have originally enumerated those Canaanitish states which formed the limits of the territory marked out for Israel, whose northern border was placed at Hamath (Nu 13²¹ 34⁸); Heth would represent Kadesh on the Orontes, the southern Hittite capital, while Arvad, Arka, Zemar, Sin, and Sidon would border on the western slopes of the Lebanon, the possession of which was claimed by the Israelites.

Contributions and Comments.

Psalm xxix 6.

'He maketh them also to skip like a calf; Lebanon and Sirion like a young unicorn.'

PSALM 29 is a most beautiful one. It describes in fine poetical language the effects of a thunderstorm in Palestine, and regards it as a manifestation of the power of the Almighty, as a symbol of God's work in nature. Now, although the general meaning of the Psalm is quite clear, various details are obscure.

What does the object *them* refer to in the word *wayarkidem*, 'and he maketh them to skip' (v. 6)? Lat. and Gk. and all versions take the object *them* as referring to cedars. But modern scholars regard this as out of harmony with breaking them in pieces, and therefore look upon the suffix as a copyist's error. V. 6 is then explained as meaning that Yahwe makes the mountain ranges of Sirion and Lebanon under the power of His earthquake to skip like a young bull.

On the other hand, if the object refers to cedars, why does the thunder shattering the cedars bring to the imagination of the poet the picture of a dancing bull?

Further, what is the meaning of v. 10, 'The Lord sat at the flood; yea, the Lord sitteth as king for ever'?

That the Psalm is a symbolical representation of Yahwe's character as a storm god has already been

indicated by scholars, who have pointed out that the words 'the voice of Yahwe' occur seven times in the Psalm—the sacred number of Semitic symbolism.

Now Assyrian symbolism helps us to explain not only the trend of thought underlying the Psalm, but also some of its obscure details.

The gods of the Babylonian-Assyrian pantheon are often represented on boundary stones and seal cylinders by symbols which call to mind their nature and attributes. For example, the symbol of Sin the Moon-god is a crescent; of Shamash the Sun-god, a sun-disc; and of Nusku the Fire-god, a lamp.

Ramman, the storm and thunder god of Babylonia, is represented in various ways. On the Bavian relief his symbol is a three-pronged lightning-fork (Jensen, *Hittiter*, 143, Anm. 1).

A somewhat similar symbol appears also on the Sargon stele and Nahr el-Kelb rock inscription. But Ramman was also a solar deity; for as *barku*, the god of lightning, it was natural for him to be connected with the sun, the great light of the heavens. His character as a solar deity was symbolized in two ways. He was regarded as the Lord of Justice—a term applied to Shamash, and his symbol was represented by a bull, for in ancient religions the bull symbolized the power residing in the sun. On the *Kudurru* of Melishihu (*Mémoires de la Délégation en Perse*, i., ii.) the forked