Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:

https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology

https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb

PayPal https://paypal.me/robbradshaw

A table of contents for *The Expository Times* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[Issue]_[1st page of article].pdf

die, you remain to live, but which of us goeth the better way, the gods only know.' Evangelist has heard from St. Paul (Phil 1^{23}) which of the two went the better way. 'He that shall die there, although his death will be unnatural, and his pain perhaps great, he will yet have the better of his fellow.' The words remind us of the famous Scottish story of the same period, which tells how Peden, at the grave of Richard Cameron, cried, 'Oh, to be wi' Ritchie!'

One of the reasons for this preference is striking—'He will be arrived at the Celestial City soonest.' Evangelist's appearances are curiously connected with cities—the City of Destruction, the Town of Morality, Vanity Fair, and the Celestial City. He is a man of the city, though we always meet with him in the open. He knows the evils of the city, and he knows them all the better by contrast with that ideal city, the true and eternal Utopia, in which his soul has its citizenship and home. Those who would further pursue the suggestions of this view of Evangelist should read the poem entitled 'The City,' in Dr. Bonar's *Hymns of Faith and Hope*.

The Purchase of the Cave of Machpelah.

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

What follows is another specimen of the archæological analysis of the earlier books of the Old Testament upon which I am at present engaged. The method and results are already known to readers of The Expository Times from the analyses of the fourteenth chapter of Genesis and the genealogy of Abraham which have been published in this journal. I will now take the twenty-third chapter of Genesis and examine it verse by verse.

2. We gather from Jos 14^{15} and Jg 1^{10} that the name of Hebron was of recent origin when the Israelites entered Canaan. This is in accordance with the archæological testimony. The name first appears on the Egyptian monuments under the form of Khibur in the geographical lists of Ramses III. at Medinet Habu. Khibur is a fairly close transliteration of the cuneiform Khabiri-KI or 'Khabiri-town,' the name applied to the settlement of the Khabiri or 'Confederates' in Southern Palestine by the king of Jerusalem in the Tel el-Amarna letters (Winckler, 185. 11). The place was previously known as Kirjath-Arba', 'the city of Arba','—'a great man among the Anakim.' Arba' would signify 'four,' but as this is an impossible name for a chieftain we must see in Arba' a contracted form of Arb-'am, like Bela' (Gn 36^{32}) for Bala'am. The loss of the final *m* points to transcription from a cuneiform original, the *m* being mistaken for the mimmation, and accordingly dropped. For Mamre, see note below on v.[19]. The addition of the words, 'in the land of Canaan,' would indicate that the gloss was intended for readers who did not live in Palestine. Abraham is represented as having 'come' to Kirjath-Arba' (apparently from Beersheba), so that he was not there with Sarah at the time of her death. This would naturally imply that Kirjath-Arba' was Sarah's place of residence, and that her husband was temporarily absent from it when she fell ill.

3. The name of the Hittites is here assimilated to the Hebrew *Khath*, 'terror,' and they are accordingly called the Benê-Khêth, or 'Sons of Heth,' thus transforming them into a Semitic tribe. The painted pottery discovered in the pre-Israelitish strata of Lachish and Gezer has been shown by Mr. J. L. Myres (*Journ. of the Anthropological Institute*, xxxiii. pp. 367 ff.) to be of Hittite origin, and derived from the district north of the Halys, where the *sandarakê* or red ochre which distinguishes it was found. It was from this Hittite region also that bronze made its way into Assyria and Palestine, where Mr. Macalister has discovered examples of it in the early Amorite strata at Gezer. In agreement with the archæological facts, a stela in the Louvre (C. 1), commemorating the first two kings of the Twelfth Dynasty, describes the Egyptian troops as destroying 'the palaces of the Hittites' in the south of Palestine. The determinative attached to the name of the Hittites is not that of 'country,' but of 'going,' showing that (like the writer in Genesis) the Egyptian scribe has assimilated the name of the foreign people to an otherwise unknown word (perhaps Hittite) which signified 'to go.' How Hittite bands came

to settle in the far south of Canaan has been explained by the Tel el-Amarna tablets, which show that in the age of the Eighteenth Dynasty the whole country was overrun by bodies of Hittite mercenaries, many of whom seized portions of it, and founded petty dynasties in Syria and Palestine. The Khabiri themselves were one of these bodies who had followed their leaders, Labbawa and Arzawaya, from Uan, west of Aleppo, and Arzawa or Cappadocia. The trader who imported the polychrome pottery was the companion of the soldier who introduced a knowledge of bronze weapons to the Canaanite population, and Mariette may have been right in believing that Hittite adventurers were to be found in the train of the Hyksos invaders of Egypt (cf. Nu 13^{22}).

In the age of Abraham Kirjath-Arba' was a Hittite town, and the field of Machpelah belonged to them. On the other hand, the oak-grove of Mamre, 'which is in Hebron' (Gn 13^{18}), was Amorite, and in Gn 35^{27} is identified with Hebron. This, however, is a late gloss, as is indicated by the article prefixed to Arba' which is thus supposed to be the numeral 'four.' Mamre was an Amorite (Gn 14^{13}) who gave his name to an oak-grove on his property; similar local names derived from the names of proprietors of property occur plentifully in the Babylonian legal documents of the Khammu-rabi era. As an oak-grove is not likely to have been situated in the middle of an Oriental town, we must look for the estate of Mamre rather outside than inside Hebron, and regard the words of Gn 13^{18} as used loosely in the sense of 'in the territory of Hebron.' The Septuagint (v.^{2}) places Kirjath-Arba' 'in the valley' of Hebron. See, further, note on v.^{19}.

4. 'A foreigner and tenant am I,' Babylonian *akhû u ubaru anaku*; for תושב, 'tenant,' see Lev 22^{10}.

אחזת־קבר is the Babylonian *akhzat qabri*. In the Babylonia of the Khammu-rabi age the Amorite or Canaanite was able to acquire property and enjoy all the rights of the native landed proprietor. As Canaan was a Babylonian province, the Babylonian immigrant would have enjoyed the same privileges there.

6. The Canaanite *adôni* appears in cuneiform as *adunu*, which is found on a seal-cylinder of 'Amorite' origin, as a West Semitic name in the Khammu-rabi contracts, and in the Cappadocian tablets from Kara Eyuk, near Kaisariyeh. But the word was never adopted into the language of Babylonia itself. *Nĕsî elohim* is a literal translation of the Babylonian *issak ilâni*, 'viceroy of the deified king.' The kings of the Khammu-rabi dynasty received the title of *ilu*, 'god,' which became the plural *ilâni* in Canaan, as we learn from the Tel el-Amarna tablets. *Issak* was the Semitic equivalent of the Sumerian *pateśi*, originally 'high priest,' and then 'vice-gerent' of the god or deified sovereign. Down to the end of the Khammu-rabi dynasty the governors of the Babylonian provinces and subject cities had the title of *pateśi* or *issak*; it was only with the accession of the Kassite dynasty (1780 B.C.) that the deified king and the *pateśi* in the sense of a governor of a province disappeared from history. The old use of *elohim* to denote the king is found in Ex 22^{28}; cp. Ps 138^{1}, but *not* Ps 82^{1}. The whole phrase, 'thou art the king's governor among us,' presupposes a Babylonian: *issak ilâni ina libbi-ni atta*. The rest of the verse shows no trace of a Babylonian original.

8. מתי מלפני, Ass. *miti-ya ultu lapani-ya*.

Ephron and Zohar are Semitic, not Hittite, names. But we learn from the Tel el-Amarna tablets that the son of a Hittite settler in Canaan received a Canaanite name; thus the son of Labbawa was Mut-bahlum, *i.e.* Mut-baal. Similarly Canaanites and other foreign settlers in Egypt received Egyptian names, along with their children. With Ephron we may perhaps compare Eparrimutsa on a Babylonian seal-cylinder (*P.S.B.A.* Nov. 1897); Zohar is the Babylonian Zukharu, 'small,' met with in documents of the Khammu-rabi age.

9. 'Which is in the end of his field,' Ass. *sa ina SAK eqli-su*, a common expression in the legal documents of the Khammu-rabi age. The Semitic equivalent of SAK is doubtful; Delitzsch believes it to be *pûtu*. The Hebrew שדה is the Babylonian *siddu*. In Babylonian the word meant 'river-bank,' but in Palestine, where there were no great rivers upon which the fertility of the country depended, it signified a 'field' in general. In the legal documents of Babylonia it denotes the 'side' of a piece of land, as distinguished from the SAK or 'end.'

The last part of the verse is the Babylonian *ana kaśpi gamirti iddinanni ina libbi-kunu ana akhzat qabri*. *Kaśpu*, originally 'silver,' was a word borrowed from Babylonian; the legal phrase was *kaśpu gamirtu*, 'the full price'; *mal kaśpi* signified 'the whole of the sum.' In the Cappadocian

tablets (which belong to the Khammu-rabi era) *mala* is the common word for 'property.'

Machpelah is 'the double' cave. Mr. Macalister's excavations at Gezer have shown that the Amorites of the metal age utilized the caves of their Neolithic predecessors for burial purposes, especially, it would seem, if the cave was a double one. The hillside at Hebron is full of sepulchral chambers, some of which may have originally been natural caverns. Such, at all events, was the case at Bêt-Jibrîn (Marisa).

10. The expression is a somewhat curious one here; does it mean, 'Now Ephron, in spite of his Canaanitish name, was resident among the Hittites'? Or does the writer merely imply that Ephron was present at the time? This is the sense in which the Septuagint understood the phrase.

The language of the verse shows no traces of a Babylonian original. The last clause would be in Assyrian: *ina abulli ali*, 'in the gate of the city.' As in Babylonia, so too in Canaan, the city gate was the place of assembly and of witnessing legal contracts.

12. In this verse, as in v.[7], 'the land' is the territory of Kirjath-Arba.'

13. כסף השדה is the Babylonian *kaśpu sa eqli*. *Laqû* (לקח) is also the Babylonian technical term for 'taking' money.

15. The reading is corrupt, since it was not ארץ, 'a land,' but השדה, 'the field,' which was to be sold. In the early Babylonian contracts, however, the piece of land that was to be rented or sold is sometimes described as *irtsitu*. But we ought to have here the equivalent of *sim eqli*, 'the price of the field.' The Septuagint translates 'for I have heard, land is worth 400 didrachmæ of silver!' The *siqlu* or 'shekel' was borrowed from Babylonia along with its name, which was derived from the verb *saqâlu*, 'to weigh.' *Siqli kaśpi*, 'shekels of silver,' was the technical Babylonian term.

16. The verb שקל, in the sense of 'weighing' or 'paying' money, was also borrowed from Babylonia.

'Current money with the merchant' is the Babylonian *kaśap damqari*.[1] The *damqaru*, or 'merchant,' was also known as *ebiru*, 'the Hebrew,' borrowed by Sumerian under the form of *ibira*. He was an important personage in early Babylonian times, and while the Babylonian merchant made his way to Canaan, the Amorite merchant travelled to Babylonia. We learn from the Tel el-Amarna tablets that the merchant enjoyed the protection of an international law. The word *ebiru*, 'he who crosses' the river, may imply that a considerable proportion of the *commis-voyageurs* were West Semites. It will be noticed that the Hebrew writer transfers the meaning of the technical Babylonian *ebiru* from the person to the object he carried. The original phrase would have been *kaśap ebiri*, with *damqari* as a gloss.

17, 18. The Hebrew text is a translation of a Babylonian deed of sale of land in the form in which it was drawn up in the Khammu-rabi epoch, but not in the later neo-Babylonian age. The fact is important in its bearing on the date of the narrative. *Yâqâm* is a literal rendering of the technical Babylonian *elû*, as in *nawir sa itti Ikun-bî-Sin i-il-a-amma khibi*, 'the contract which was made sure to Ikun-pi-Sin is lost.' So, too, in neo-Babylonian legal documents: *uantim sa* (*kaśpi*) *sa X sa ina mukhkhi Y e-li-u-h*, 'the contract for the money of X is made sure to Y,' *pût . . . sa ina mukhkhi X il-la-a-h*, 'a guarantee against (various disabilities) which may attach to (the slave) X, (see Delitzsch: *Assyrisches Handwörterbuch*, *s.v.*).

The repetition of the word 'field' is characteristic of the Khammu-rabi deeds of sale of land, the article in השדה—which, it will be observed, is omitted when the word is first mentioned—taking the place of the Babylonian demonstrative pronoun. Equally characteristic is the description of the locality at the head of the document, followed by a description of the field itself. If there were trees, Babylonian law required them to be specified, as they went along with the land that was sold. Since the trees in the field sold by Ephron were at its edges, it was all the more necessary to state the fact, in order to prevent them from being claimed by the adjoining proprietors. At the end of the document the witnesses were named, also in accordance with Babylonian law. In neo-Babylonian times they had always to be individuals, each of whom affixed his seal or nail-mark to the deed. In the Khammu-rabi age, however, the place of the individual witnesses could be taken by the official body of a town, or perhaps by a meeting of the ordinary citizens themselves called its *Kar*, and the parties to a deed frequently swore by the name of a city as well as by the name of a god or king. The witnesses were originally the *sîbutu* or 'elders,'

[1] Tablets of the Khammu-rabi age also use the expression *káspu makhir*, 'current' or 'market money.'

and the place of meeting was a temple or one of the city gates.

The Babylonian deed of sale is, however, given by the Hebrew writer in an abbreviated form. The dimensions of the field are not stated, though this was not always done even in Babylonian documents; the boundaries of the estate on its four sides are not defined, as the law required; and there is no date. It is evident, therefore, that what we have in Genesis is a translation of the abstract written on the outer envelope of the deed; though, even so, the date ought to have been added. The names of the individual witnesses recorded in the deed may not have been written on the envelope. The original wording would have been: [*x* ŠAR] *eqil Eparranim* [*mar Tsukharim*] *sa ina Makpiltim sa ina pân* (or *bût*) *Mamrê eqlu suatu khurrum sa ina libbi-su u etsi sa ina eqli ina pât gimri-su* [*ita . . . ita . . .* SAK-BI I-KAM . . . SAK-BI II-KAM . . .] *itti Aburamim ana milqîtim illia-mma* [*ana sîma gamra kaśpam isqul*, etc., *suma ilâni . . . itmû*] *pân . . . Khattâ* [*pân . . . arkhu . . . yûmu . . . sanat . . .*], ['So many *śar* of] the field of Ephron [the son of Zohar], which is in Machpelah, which is in front of Mamre, this field, the cave which is in it and the trees which are in the field, on all its sides [being bounded on one side by . . . , on the other side by . . . , at one end by . . . , and at the other end by . . .], has been made sure to Abram for a possession, and [he has paid the full price in silver, etc. By the names of the gods . . . and the deified king they have sworn.] In the presence of . . . the Hittite, [of . . . The . . . th day of the month . . . , the year . . .].' The bracketed words indicate what has been omitted by the Hebrew transcriber. The description of the boundaries of the field, and the legal formulæ which followed *illiamma* would not have been on the envelope of the deed, and, moreover, as they were always in Sumerian, would not have been understood by the Hebrew writer. That all mention of the oath made in the name of the Babylonian gods and deified king should have been omitted is natural. The names of the individual witnesses are summed up in the comprehensive statement that they were all Hittites, the writer ceasing at this point to translate, and returning to his narrative. For the same reason the date is not given. It must be remembered that Canaan was at this time a province of Babylonia, where Babylonian law was enforced and legal documents drawn up in the Babylonian language and script. The contrast between the Babylonian mode of conveying a title in land and the Israelitish, as described in Ru 4^{7-8}, is excessive.

19. The preposition אֵת seems out of place in describing burial in a rock-chamber. But the body of the dead was placed on a couch cut out of the rock-wall of the tomb, corresponding with the *loculus* of a later date.

The field was in front of Mamre, not Kirjath-Arba'; that is to say, in front of the property belonging to the Amorite, who, according to Gn 14, had been an ally of Abram. The gloss, therefore, —'the same is Hebron in the land of Canaan'— must be understood as referring to the territory of Hebron, rather than to the city itself. The country was in the possession of the Semitic Amorites; the town had been occupied by Hittites, as Canaanitish towns were in the habit of being in the Tel el-Amarna age. History repeats itself in the East. See above, note on v.[3].

20. The narrator here gives, in short, as part of his narrative, a *résumé* of the contents of the deed translated in vv.[17. 18].

It follows from this analysis that (1) the chapter embodies the translation of a deed of sale of the Khammu-rabi era, as well as of a Babylonian title applied to Abraham and characteristic of the same date.

But that (2), apart from words like 'shekel,' which had been borrowed from Babylonia, the rest of the chapter shows no trace of a cuneiform original.

Hence (3) it must be a free composition of the Hebrew writer, behind which, however, lie early Babylonian documents upon which the narrative is based.

(4) In one of these documents Abram or Aburamu appears as the *pateśi*, or representative of the deified king of Babylonia, and thus in much the same character and position as in chap. 14; in the other document he was the purchaser of an estate in a deed of sale drawn up in accordance with the formulæ of Babylonian law in the Khammu-rabi age. After about 1800 B.C. both the title and the form of the deed would have been different; the *pateśi* passed away with the fall of the Babylonian empire in the West, and the legal formulæ underwent change.

The form of the name Abraham instead of

Abram is due to the striving for uniformity in the text, which in other respects also distinguishes the Hebrew narrator or his editors. Professor Hommel is doubtless right in believing that the ה of 'Abraham' has merely a graphic origin. Since the publication of his *Ancient Hebrew Tradition*, his theory has been strikingly verified by the form assumed by the Semitic אַ in the names of certain Hyksos kings found on Egyptian scarabs, where it is sometimes represented by *h*. Thus ʿAnati-el is written ʿA-n-t-h-l, and Yaʿqub-el (Jacob-el) appears as I-ʿa-q-b-h-l as well as I-ʿa-q-b-ʿa-l. Abu-ramu or Abram is the name of an 'Amorite' in a Babylonian contract of the Khammu-rabu period; we also find Śamu-ramu and Śumu-ramu ('Shem is exalted') along with the feminine Śamu-ramat, written Śammu-ramat in later Assyrian. The latter name is that of the classical Semiramis, who thus claims a similar etymological ancestry to Abraham. The Greek legends relating to her make me think that she was the wife of Khammu-rabi. The names are all West Semitic, not Babylonian.

Literature.

ABSOLUTE IDEALISM.

AN OUTLINE OF THE IDEALISTIC CONSTRUCTION OF EXPERIENCE. By J. B. Baillie, M.A., D.Phil., Regius Professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of Aberdeen, Author of *Hegel's Logic*. (London: *Macmillan*.)

READERS of Professor Baillie's book on *Hegel's Logic* eagerly looked forward to further work from his pen. For that book revealed the advent of a strong man, not only a thinker of great worth, but a man who could take pains to understand and set forth the thoughts of others. Though Wallace and Mactaggart and others had tried to expound Hegel, yet there was room for the work on Hegel's Logic, and students found that Professor Baillie had come nearer to the meaning of the secret of Hegel than almost anybody else. In the work before us, he sets forth his own view of the Idealistic Construction of Experience, and a masterly view it is.

There is no lack of books on this topic. Gifford Lectures like those of Wallace, the Cairds, Royce, Haldane, Laurie, and Ward, and other treatises which we need not name, deal with idealism in some of its aspects and applications, yet the book of Professor Baillie has a place and character of its own. It covers the whole field; and though he calls it an outline, it is an outline which leaves no question untouched, and no sphere of knowledge unexplored. It may be well to state the problem in the words of the author. 'A complete idealistic explanation of experience ought to show—(1) that each phase of experience embodies in a specific way the one spiritual principle animating all; (2) that each is distinct from every other simply by the way in which it embodies the principle; (3) that each is connected with the others, and so with the whole in virtue of its realizing that principle with a certain degree of completeness; (4) that the whole of experience is a necessary evolution of the one principle of experience through various forms, logically connected as a series of stages manifesting a single principle from beginning to end.' It is a large order, and Professor Baillie has striven with great ability, and with much success, to carry it out. The spiritual principle is, briefly, that 'subject and object constitute the life of experience, and develop *pari passu* from the very first, and in developing give rise to all the wealth of human experience in its various forms.'

Beginning with the twofold character of Kant's Idealism, the emphasis laid by him on universal experience, and on the individual subject, and the results of both, he dwells on the need of further reconciliation. Is the solution to be found in pragmatism? this deals to a criticism of pragmatism, brief and incisive, and to a statement of his own position, which, briefly, is that the unity to be sought is to be found in an absolute single experience. 'If the unity at work in all finite individual experience, of whatever kind is a comprehensive universal unity, and if the unity of all experience is the ground of all forms of "objectivity" in finite experience, then to explain the nature of universality in knowledge or in morality or anywhere, and to explain the ground