men, yet this was not by any means the only purpose of that mystery of humility on which we are now meditating. Does not the Incarnation with all its attendant circumstances bring home to us the vital truth that if such was the form and manner of the Lord's assumption of our humanity, communion with Him here and hereafter must be a blessed reality on which the loving and believing soul may rely with the most unchanging confidence?

If the dear Lord while here on earth verily did live in blessed union and communion with His chosen ones, as some of that holy number tell us plainly that He did live—if the Incarnation bore with it that boundless blessing to disciples and apostles, what is there to lead us to doubt that to those that love Him and pray for His abiding presence with them, the Incarnation bears the self-same privilege and blessing now, changed only as to manifestation and visibility, but not as to power and reality? There are times when we are permitted to feel this with a mysterious vividness. In hours of deep sorrow, when all earthly consolation is, and is felt to be, powerless and unavailing, are there not some at least who can remember a consciousness of a presence, a presence of consolation and sympathy, so vivid, that there could be One and One only of whom that presence was a revealing,—our loving, pitying, and Incarnate Lord? These things are not illusions. They are results of the mystery of the Incarnation, verifications of that eternal truth that our Creator is also our sympathizing High Priest, touched with the feeling of our infirmities, because He knows those infirmities in their inmost nature, not simply by virtue of His omniscience, but by the experiences of a sinless humanity.

These are serious yet comforting thoughts. They seem to help us to feel that our dear Lord's Incarnation is not merely a holy mystery which faith must apprehend, but that it carries to the soul convictions of the personal love of Christ toward each fellow-man which make it, what it seems now becoming more and more to us all, the, so to speak, practical doctrine of our own mysteriously moving and eventful times. The Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of man are the two great truths which, year by year, modern religious thought seems more distinctly apprehending and realizing; and that each of these great principles rests upon, as its basis, the Incarnation, may be regarded as an almost self-evident truth. The revelation of God as our Father was made to us through the Son of His love. Our revelation of the Brotherhood of man can only come through the beloved One, who made Himself our Elder Brother that He might die for us, and make us His brethren and His own for evermore.

Recent Biblical Archaeology.

By A. H. Sayce, LL.D., Professor of Assyriology, Oxford.

The New Babylonian Version of the Story of the Deluge.

Among the cuneiform tablets recently discovered in Babylonia, Dr. Scheil has found a fragment which contains a new version of the story of the Deluge, which he has published in the *Recueil de Travaux relatifs à la Philologie et à l'Archéologie égyptiennes et assyriennes*, xx. pp. 55-59. Out of the 439 lines which it originally contained only a few broken ones are preserved, but its importance lies in its antiquity. It was written by the scribe Ellit-Â in the reign of Ammi-zadoq, the fourth successor of Khammurabi or Ammurapi, the Amraphel of Genesis, and it therefore belongs to the age of Abraham.

The interest which this gives to it makes me believe that the following translation of its mutilated lines will not be unacceptable to the readers of The Expository Times. I have assumed that Dr. Scheil's copy is correct: he is a good copyist, and has had exceptional opportunities for mastering the difficulties of the early Babylonian script.

Of the first column little is left except the ends of the lines:—

1. 'He went not . . . many years.
2. . . . (the deeds) of mankind thou knowest (?).

3. . . . (like) cattle they multiply.
4. . . . the god will rain (destruction?).
5. . . . their cry.
6. . . . great.
7. . . . mankind.
8. . . . the light.
9. . . . grant (*bîna*) unto men.
10. . . . they love.
11. . . . may the god Rimmon slay.
12. Like the inundation of a river will we march.
13. . . . the water-springs (*naqbi*).
14. May he (*i.e.* Rimmon) go, may he devastate!
15. May he break up the water-springs (below)!
16. May he rain destruction (*sabêtum*) for me!
17. (On?) my . . . it has dripped.
18. . . . of the field, the herb of his land.'

Several lines are lost, and then we read in the second column :—

1. 'May he slay, may he slaughter . . .
2. At dawn may he rain destruction (upon them)!
3. At night may he break . . .
4. May he rain a deluge (upon them)!
5. As for the field he shall utterly destroy it, as for the city (he shall overthrow it)!
6. What Rimmon shall accomplish in the city (he shall also do in the field).
7. (Thus) he spake and departed with a cry (*nagigu*);
8. he made the cry ascend (to heaven).
9. They feared not . . . '

This is all that is left of the obverse; on the reverse we have portions of the seventh and eighth columns. Of the seventh column we have the following :—

1. 'Ea (?) opened his mouth,
2. He says unto me:
3. Wherefore hast thou caused men to die?
4. I will stretch forth my hand to (Adram-khasis).
5. The deluge whereof thou speakest (shall not destroy him).
6. Whoever he be, I (will save him?).
7. And he has begotten (offspring).
8. His work exists . . .
9. Let him rescue (his family?),
10. and he shall beget (children), and . . .
11. Let him go into (the ark?).
12. The oars (and) the bolts (*pirki*) (let him fashion).
13. Let him go . . . '

With the eighth column the tablet ends. Only the concluding lines are preserved :—

1. ' . . . What he did unto men.
2. Adram-khasis opened his mouth, and
3. says to his lord.
4. The second tablet of the series (beginning): When the man lay down.
5. (The number of lines) in the tablet is 439.
6. (Written) by Ellit-Â, a young scribe,
7. the 28th day of the month Sebat,
8. the year when Ammi-zaduga (Ammi-zadoq) the king,
9. the fortress of Ammi-zaduga
10. at the mouth of the Euphrates
11. constructed of brick.'

In the seventh column I have followed Dr. Scheil in making the god Ea the speaker; but if he has copied the cuneiform character correctly, it would rather represent the fire-god under the name of Urru (*W.A.I.* ii. 47. 61).

Dr Scheil believes that the tablet comes from Sippara, and that the legend inscribed on it is the version of the story that was current there. At all events, it has little in common with the version embodied in the epic of Gilgames. It belongs, in fact, to a different poem or epic. While the epic of Gilgames was known as the literary work which began with the words, 'They beheld the water-spring,' that which contained the new version of the account of the Deluge commenced with the words, 'When the man lay down.' It began, therefore, with the description of a dream, and the portion of it which is preserved seems to contain the revelations made by the gods in a dream to Adra-khasis. It is noteworthy that in the Gilgames version the fact that the revelation of Ea was conveyed to the Chaldæan Noah in a dream is mentioned only incidentally at the end of the story.

But while the new version is thus totally different from that discovered by Mr. George Smith, it has much in common with a fragment brought from Babylonia by Mr. Hormuzd Rassam, and containing what is known as 'the second version of the Deluge story.' In both the name of the Chaldæan Noah is Adra-khasis, not KHISZUD as in the Gilgames text, and a similar conversation is represented as taking place between Adra-khasis and Ea. Indeed, what we read in the newly found tablet seems to be the introduction to the more specific details in regard to the construction of the ark which are given in the 'second version.' The drama is made to begin in heaven: the angry god calls upon Rimmon, the god of storm and inundation, to destroy mankind, and it is only the intervention of Ea which prevents the one righteous man and his family from perishing in the general catastrophe. The drama is eventually revealed to Adra-khasis in a dream.

Note on the Name of Sisera.

MR. TOMKINS has long since suggested that Sisera is a name of Hittite origin formed like Khattu-sar, Khilip-sar, Pi-siris, etc. I would now suggest that it be further identified with the 'Sura-'sar of the Tel el-Amarna tablets. 'Sura-'sar was governor of the Canaanitish city of [Gim]ti-asna or Gath-ashan, the Kentu-asna of the list of Thothmes III. (see my note in the *Records of the Past*, new ser. v. p. 46), which lay between Taanach and Acre.[1] We seem to have another name compounded with *sar* in that of the god Sutu-sar, invoked by the Assyrian king, Samas-Rimmon (*W.A.I.* i. 29, 18), and who is associated with a god called Nebo-rabê in an inscription published by Dr. Scheil (*Z.A.* viii. p. 206). On a seal-cylinder, also published by Dr. Scheil (*Recueil de Travaux*, xix. p. 53), Nabo-rabê is said to be the father of 'the god Laz of Gimti' or Gath. The first element in Sutu-sar may be 'Sutu or 'Bedawi,' just as the first element in Khattu-sar is 'Hittite.'

Studies in Ancient Oriental History.[2]

PROFESSOR PRÁŠEK'S contributions to the study of ancient Oriental history are always welcome. He is one of the ablest and most learned of those who have devoted themselves to the subject. His criticism is always judicious, and he is always acquainted with the latest discoveries. His present contribution deals with questions which are interesting to the student, both of the Old Testament and of Herodotus.

The questions discussed in it are three:—What was the Kadytis of Herodotus, which was captured by Pharaoh Necho after he had 'overthrown the Syrians at Magdôlon'? Who was the priest-king Sethos, who, according to the Egyptian legend, destroyed the army of Sennacherib? And where was the city of Usu, which is mentioned in the cuneiform inscriptions?

The Bohemian Professor comes to the conclusion that the Kadytis, whose fall followed the victory of Necho, cannot be the Kadytis of another passage of Herodotus (iii. 5), which is shown by the geographical description given of it to have been Gaza. Ashdod had already been conquered by the Egyptian kings, and the Egyptian boundary accordingly fixed north of Gaza, while the victory over 'the Syrians at Magdôlon' can hardly be anything else than the overthrow of Josiah at Megiddo. Three months after the latter event we learn, from the Books of Kings, that Necho was at Riblah; Kadytis, therefore, must have lain between Megiddo and Riblah, in the position occupied by Kadesh on the Orontes, once the southern capital of the Hittites. The city, as is shown by a contract-tablet, the translation of which has been published by Mr. Pinches in the *Records of the Past* (new ser. iv. pp. 99–101), was still flourishing in the fortieth year of Nebuchadrezzar, when its governor was a Syrian of the name of Milki-idri.

Sethos Professor Prášek believes to be Tirhakah, masquerading in an Egyptian dress. Egyptian vanity turned the negro conqueror into a native Egyptian, though the legend was forced to admit that the military and ruling classes were hostile to him. Professor Prášek, like Dr. Winckler, revives the theory of George Smith, that the campaign of Sennacherib against Hezekiah, which ended in the loss of his army, was not the campaign of 701 B.C., but a second later one, of which no record has come down to us. The annals of Sennacherib cease with the year 691 B.C.; but two fragmentary texts published by George Smith indicate that he carried on a campaign in Arabia, which must be referred to the latter part of his reign, as no mention of it is made in the annals we possess. Now the Egyptian legend of Sethos calls Sennacherib king of 'the Arabians' as well as of the Assyrians. We may infer from this that the campaign in Arabia was connected with a second campaign in Palestine, which must have fallen between 690 and 681 B.C., the year of Sennacherib's death.

Moreover, it could have been only during this latter period that Tirhakah came to the help of Hezekiah, if Professor Prášek's chronology is correct, which makes Tirhakah reign from 690 to 665 B.C. The chronology is based on Manetho, as reported by Eusebius, or rather on a combination of the number of regnal years assigned to the kings of the Ethiopian dynasty by Africanus and

[1] The letter sent by 'Sura-'sar to the Egyptian king is now at Berlin (*W. and A.*, No. 145).

[2] *Forschungen zur Geschichte des Alterthums*, ii. By J. V. Prášek. Leipzig: Pfeiffer, 1898.

Eusebius. Africanus and Eusebius, however, do not agree with one another; and if we accept the twelve years given by Eusebius to each of the first two kings of the dynasty, we are bound also to accept the twenty years given to Tirhakah, as well as the statement that Tirhakah was followed by a certain Ammeris for eighteen (or twelve) years. But this would altogether upset the Professor's chronological scheme.

That Tirhakah's reign, however, was reckoned by the Egyptians themselves at twenty-six years we know from an Apis-stele (No. 190) found by Mariette in the Serapeum, according to which a bull, which lived for twenty-one years, was born in the twenty-sixth year of Tirhakah, and died in the twentieth year of Psammetichus. As the reign of Psammetichus was dated from 664 B.C., Tirhakah would thus have become the recognized Pharaoh of Egypt in 691, just ten years after the campaign of Sennacherib against Hezekiah in 701 B.C. But this is difficult to reconcile with the fact that Hezekiah died in B.C. 697, after a reign of twenty-nine years. Curiously enough, Professor Prášek ignores the biblical chronology altogether, although it is much better authenticated for this period of Jewish history than the chronology of the Ethiopian dynasty in Egypt, which is complicated by the fact that its founder, Sabako, did not reign more than twelve years, while his successor, to whom a reign of twelve years is assigned, bears a different name in Manetho and on the monuments, and, so far as the latter are concerned, is merely a titular king. It is quite possible that Tirhakah was the actual ruler of the country during the greater part of the time assigned to the reign of his predecessor.

As for the hypothetical second campaign of Sennacherib in Palestine, I confess that I can see neither proof nor reason for it. A campaign against the Aribi or Arabo did not imply a campaign against Judah as well, and there is absolutely nothing in the fragments brought to light by George Smith which would favour such a view. To make this quite plain, I will give here a translation of all that is left of them:—

1. '. . . by treading down the wall . . . the [gift] of their abundant tribute [I received] . . . the city of Kapâme, the city of . . . the stronghold which is in [the land of] . . . [the qu]een of the Arabs with [her] god[s] . . . precious stones [I carried away] . . . spices and ivory (?) . . . and the kings, the eyes . . . these cities. . . .'

2. 'To the goddess Dilbat of . . . the daughter of . . . who dwelt with Hazael, king of the Arabs . . . she delivered him (*i.e.* Hazael) into the hand of Sennacherib, my grandfather, and he overthrew him. Her dwelling-place was not with the men of Arabia, she had said; to Assyria she took the road.'

The last question discussed by Professor Prášek is the site of the city of Usu, which I identified with the Hosah of Jos 19[29] some years ago. This identification is approved of by him, and he further shows convincingly that Usu was the old name of Palætyrus, the town on the mainland opposite the 'rock' of Tyre, from which insular Tyre once derived its supply of water. It was the town of which Usous was the eponymous god, to whom the Phœnicians ascribed the invention of boats, and of clothes made from the skins of animals, but it passed out of remembrance after its destruction by the Assyrians. The whole discussion is a model of archæological reasoning. I may add that the form Sazu for the name of the city, given in the British Museum edition of the Tel el-Amarna tablets, is a mistake in copying; the original has Uzu.

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF GENESIS.

GENESIS iv. 9.

'And the Lord said unto Cain, Where is Abel thy brother? And he said, I know not: am I my brother's keeper?'

EXPOSITION.

'And the Lord said unto Cain, Where is Abel thy brother?'—As God asked Adam, Where art thou? He now asks Cain, Where is thy brother? As in the former case He interested Himself in the fallen man, so here in one man as compared to the other.—DELITZSCH.

IT seems that Cain at first went away, scarcely conscious of the greatness of his crime. He had asserted his rights, had suppressed the usurpation of his privileges by the younger son, and if he had used force it was his brother's fault for resisting him. So Jacob afterwards won the birthright by subtlety, and would have paid the same fearful penalty but