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

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

to God: neither, if we eat not, are we the worse, nor, if we eat, are we the better.' These things are material and nought in themselves. They become what the mind of man makes them. All that vast power for good or for evil which Paul saw in the Sacrament was purely ideal, and lay in the spirit of the man who came to the Lord's Table, and in the degree to which he sympathized with the mind of the Saviour and with the life of the Brethren who sat along with him.

The Archaeology of the Book of Genesis.

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

Gen. iv. 1, 2. 'Now the man had known Ḥavvâh his wife' (cf. the similar construction in 1[2]). This implies that the knowledge had begun before the expulsion from Paradise, and not immediately after it, as commentators usually assume. It was the birth of Cain which took place after the expulsion. Cain, or Cainan (v.[9]), 'the smith,' answers to the Babylonian *ummânu*; while Abel, as was pointed out many years ago by Oppert, is the Bab. Abil, 'son,' which was borrowed also by the Sumerians under the form of *ibila*. The initial vowel is represented in the Heb. transcription by ה, as in הכל, *hêkal*, from Bab. *êkallu*, Sumerian *ê-gal*; cf. also the name of Abraham for Aba-ramu. The latter part of v.[1], explaining the name of Cain from the verb *qânâh*, is a late insertion, like most of the etymological notes in Genesis; it is inconsistent with the statement in 4[26], and is unaccompanied by a corresponding explanation of the name of Abel, the reason being that *hebel* in Heb. meant 'vanity,' which did not suit the character ascribed to Abel in the history.

רֹעֵה צֹאן, *ro'êh zôn*, 'shepherd of a flock,' is an Assyrianism, *rêu tsîni* in Ass. being used in contradistinction to *rêu alpê*, 'ox-herd'; *rêu itstsuri*, 'bird-keeper'; *rêu sattukki*, 'keeper of the daily sacrifice, etc.' 'Tiller of the ground' is a translation of the Ass. *ikkaru*, which is derived from the Sumerian *engar*, 'the ground,' and is ideographically expressed by UR-APIN, 'man of the ground'; that is to say, 'the peasant' or 'fellah,' as distinguished from the NU-GISSAR, or 'gardener,' as Adam had been in Paradise. The population of Babylonia consisted of agriculturists (*ikkari*) and artisans (*ummani*), the former inhabiting the country, and the latter the town, the whole body of them being collectively called *ummânu*. In contrast to them were the uncultured West Semitic nomads, whose home was in the desert on the west side of the Euphrates, but who tended the flocks of their Babylonian masters, and many of whom pitched their tents on the river-banks of Southern Babylonia. Wool was a staple industry of the Babylonians, and the flocks were all herded by the West Semitic Beduin. Hence the shepherd represented the West Semitic Beduin, while the peasant and artisan constituted the civilized population of Babylonia. In one sense they might be called brothers, since they alike spoke Semitic languages, and a certain portion of the Babylonian people belonged to the Semitic race.

In the story of Cain and Abel, therefore, we have a reflexion of the relations between the two adjoining populations as they were regarded from the Beduin point of view. The elder brother is naturally the Babylonian master, to whom the Beduin shepherd stood in somewhat of the relation of the wife to the husband (v.[7]); he possessed metal weapons of destruction (vv.[8, 22, 23]), was the builder of cities (v.[17]), and exchanged agriculture for the artisan's craft (vv.[12, 22]).[1]

3, 4. The Hebrew translated 'in process of time' would be *ina kît yumê* in Assyrian; but the original phrase was probably *ina yumê-su*, 'at that time,' as the reference is to the time when Cain and Abel were already respectively an agriculturist and a shepherd. The ground had already been cursed (3[17]); hence the fruit of it was not acceptable to Yahweh, who had cursed it. On the other hand, Yahweh was the God of the Sutu or West Semitic Beduin (4[26]), whose offering to Him was the best of their possessions—the firstlings, namely, of their

---

[1] The fact that the word *ummânu*, 'smith,' came to be applied (as in the story of the Deluge) to the whole body of the Babylonian population, so as to include 'the peasant' as well as 'the smith,' would explain how Kain, the first 'smith,' has absorbed the first *amel-ikkari* (Heb. *'ish hâ-adâmâh*), or 'agriculturist,' who, according to 9[20], was really Nukhum, or Noah (see notes on 5[29] and 9[20]).

flocks, together with their milk (reading חֵלֶב instead of חֵלֶב, a punctuation due to the regulations of the Levitical Law; Lv 3[16]).

'Yahweh regarded Abel and his offering, but Cain and his offering he did not regard.' The Assyrian equivalent of יִשַׁע is *isteni'a*, from *se'û*; but it is probable that *atû*, the synonym of *se'u*, was found in the original, since that is used in the sense which שָׁעָה אֶל has in this passage. Thus Esarhaddon says of Merodach: *ina pukhur akhêa rabûti tutta-nni*, 'among all my elder brothers thou hast regarded (*i.e.* chosen) me.' Yahweh's choice, it will be noticed, had nothing to do with the character of the brothers. A parallel passage is found in the Babylonian story of the Deluge (xi. 160–161), where the offering was of the fruits of the earth, like that of Cain: 'the gods smelt the savour, the gods smelt the sweet savour,' and consequently accepted both it and the offerer. The gods of the Babylonian agriculturist naturally preferred the fruits of Eden to the firstlings of the flock.

The ordinary Assyrian phrase was *dullukhu panû-su*, 'his countenance was troubled.'

7. A proverb is quoted in this verse of which we have the Babylonian original in the Legend of the Plague-god (K 2619. 6), [*Ur*]*ra rabitsu abulli-su*, 'the Plague-god is lying in wait at his door.' Here the Semitic Ḥaṭṭâth, used as a proper name without the article (like Tehôm, Gn 1[2]), takes the place of the Sumerian Urra (originally Gûrra). Ḥaṭṭâth is the Assyrian *khaṭitu*, or *khiṭitu*, 'sin,' as in the phrase: *summa khaṭitu izir ilu-su itti-su ittalak*, 'if he hates sin, his god walks with him.' Corresponding with Ḥaṭṭâth is Sêêth, also used as a proper name without the article, which takes the place of Haṭṭâth in the alternative form of the proverb: 'If thou doest well, is not Sêêth (watching at the door)?' The Babylonians, in fact, regarded the *rabitsu*, or 'lier in wait,' from two points of view; he was either the demon who lay in wait to enter and punish sin, or he was the 'guardian-bull,' who also was a *rabitsu*, in its secondary sense of 'watchman,' appointed to prevent evil from entering the house.[1] Thus in the Chedor-laomer texts we read : 'When the lier-in-wait welcomed [the enemy], the guardian-bull (*sêdu*) of Ê-Sarra departed (from it)' (*P.S.B.A.*, Dec. 1906, p. 241). The name of the *sêdu*, or

[1] In the Tel el-Amarna tablets the Egyptian commissioners are called *rabitsi*.

'protecting spirit of the house,' was also employed in a wider sense to include all the spirits, whether good or evil, who 'lay in wait at the door'; even Isum, the messenger of Urra, is called a *sêdu*. *Sêdu* is also written *sêtu*, like *satê* for *sadê* (Heb. *sâdeh*) in the Tel el-Amarna letters from Jerusalem. In the proverb as quoted in Genesis *sêdu*, *sêtu*, has been assimilated to *ḥaṭṭâth*, and so made to resemble *seîtu*, 'friend' (cf. שֵׂדֶה, Ec 2[8]). The original of the Heb. version would have been : *summa tiṭibbi, Sêtu abulla rabitsu ; û summa lâ tiṭibbi, Khaṭîtu (Urra) rabitsu abulla*. The meaning of the passage had been forgotten when the Septuagint translation was made.

The West Semitic Beduin kept the flocks of their Babylonian masters, to whom, therefore, they owed service. Hence, so far as mastership was concerned, the relationship was like that of the wife to her husband (3[16]), from which also the words 'unto thee shall be his desire' have been taken. But, however appropriate these latter words may be to the husband, they are quite out of place when the relations of two brothers are in question, and consequently cannot have been in the original text. Moreover, there is no subject to 'his' and 'him.' In place of the very inappropriate 'And unto thee shall be his desire,' we need 'He is thy younger brother.'

8. There is another omission of the original text in the verse which begins, 'And Cain said to Abel his brother . . .' The words, however, are lost. The insertion of the Septuagint, 'Let us go into the field,' probably represents the sense of the original, and may have been derived from it. If so, the words must have dropped out after the period when the Septuagint translation was made.

Sâdeh, 'the field,' is the Babylonian *siddu*, and was a technical term denoting the cultivated land on the bank of a Babylonian river or canal which was watered by means of shadufs. It was, therefore, the special property of the agriculturist Cain, in contradistinction to the *edinu*, or 'plain,' where the flocks were pastured by the shepherd Abel.

9. Cain disclaims all knowledge as to where his brother is, the *siddu* and the *edinu* being distinct. His own province is the *siddu*, and, as he leaves the *edinu* to his brother, he cannot guard him from assailants, either as the *sêdu* guards the agriculturist's house, or as the nomad shepherd guards his flock. The Bab. original of Cain's

reply would have been: *ul îdi ; natsir akhiya anaku ?*

10. In Assyrian it would be: *iqbi-ma : minâ tepus ? qûl damê akhi-ka itsarakh* (or *tsarikh*) *ana eli-ya ultu qaqqari*. The *v.l.* צעק must be substituted for the ungrammatical צעקים, ' *ẓoǎkîm* ' of the Massoretic text. It was the ' voice of the

blood ' that cried out, not the blood. Yahweh was the guardian of the West Semitic shepherds, though Cain disclaimed being so, and He would avenge their death. The blood of the murdered man called to Him from that ' irrigated soil ' from which the agriculturist took his name (*ikkaru*), and which he regarded as his own property.

Contributions and Comments.

The Coat without Seam.

DOES any English commentary or translation call attention to the fact, that in the description of the coat without seam (Jn 19²³) the words ἐκ τῶν ἄνωθεν, ' from the top,' may be connected with the preceding ἄραφος, *seamless*, instead of with the following ὑφαντός, *woven*, which has the addition δι' ὅλου, *throughout*? The coat was without seam from, *i.e.*, at the top, or the upper parts. No German book which I have been able to consult mentions this possibility. And yet it is followed not only by Cyprian and the Codex *c*: *de tunica autem quia de superiore parte non consutilis, sed per totum textilis fuerat*, but also by the Syriac translation, which is rendered by Gwilliam : ' tunica autem eius erat absque sutura a summo, contexta tota' (דלא חיטא מן לעל . וזקירתא כלה).[1] This explanation, which needs only the removal of a comma, seems to be recommended by the gloss of the lexicographer Hesychius (quoted already by Wettstein, 1752), who defines σύμπορπον as τὸν μὴ ῥαφαῖς συνειλημμένον κατὰ τοὺς ὤμους χιτῶνα, the coat which is not kept together by seams on the shoulders; and the description of the priest's dress by Josephus (*Ant.* III. vii. 4): ἔστι δὲ ὁ χιτὼν οὗτος οὐκ ἐκ δυοῖν περιτμημάτων ὥστε ῥαπτὸς ἐπὶ τῶν ὤμων εἶναι καὶ τῶν παρὰ πλευράν : this coat does not consist of two sheets, so that it would be *sewn together on the shoulders* and at the sides.' The expression of Josephus, (μὴ or οὐ) ῥαπτὸς ἐπὶ τῶν ὤμων is = ἄραφος ἐκ τῶν ἄνωθεν. There are editions of the Greek Testament which have no comma either before or after ἐκ τῶν ἄνωθεν, but I know of

none with a comma after ἄνωθεν.[2] In the *D.B.* I looked under ' Coat ' and ' Seam ' in vain for some elucidation about the ' seamless robe '; the *D.C.G.* makes the omission good under ' Coat,' giving a reference under ' Seam ' to this article.

EB. NESTLE.

Maulbronn.

The Aramaic Name of the Passover.

THE *D.B.* states in the art. ' Passover ' (iii. 688) : ' *Name.*—פֶּסַח, J.-Aram. פַּסְחָא, Syr. ܦܶܨܚܳܐ, and hence πάσχα.' A similar statement is repeated in *D.C.G.* ii. 324 : ' (Heb. פֶּסַח, *pesaḥ* ; Aram. פַּסְחָא, *pASḥa* ; in Greek, πάσχα,' etc. In the *E.B.* I do not find a reference to the Aramaic form, but in Preuschen's *New Dictionary of the Greek Testament* I meet the same statement—' Aram. פַּסְחָא.' It is not necessary to multiply references.

In reality the Aramaic form is פִּסְ(י)חָא, *pis-ḥā* ; see Dalman's *Grammar* (2nd ed., p. 138 ; correct in the Index under πάσχα, the wrong reference ' 126 '), or E. Kautzsch, *Grammatik des Biblisch-Aramäischen*, p. 10, who wrote twenty-five years ago : ' The Jewish tradition demands פִּסְחָא, with which also the Syriac *pes-chā* corresponds.' It is the same difference of pronunciation that we have in Miryam—Maryam ; Simson—Samson, etc.

When Dalman, *l.c.*, thinks the π of πάσχα due to assimilation with πάσχω, I cannot see why the

---

[1] James Murdock, in his literal translation from the Syriac Peshitto Version renders : ' And his tunic was without seam from the top, woven throughout.' In the Syriac Codex from Sinai the passage is missing.

[2] A similar difference of punctuation, to which the A.V. and R.V. do not call attention, is Rev 5¹ : ' A book written within and on the back, sealed with seven seals ' ; to which punctuation others prefer : ' A book written within, and on the back sealed with seven seals.'