

And of this, finally, we have had an illustration, and it prepares us for the studies which shall follow,—that for every one who in this world has wronged another there is but one way back to self-respect, to peace, to God, and it, by kneeling in perfect humility before the face, alive or dead, of that one whom he has wronged.

And there again we enter that Valley of the Spirit, at the head of which and against a wonderful sky, stands for ever, the Cross of Calvary.

JOHN A. HUTTON.

WHO WAS NIMROD ?

I. NIMROD AND AGADE.

THE tenth chapter of Genesis, the table of peoples, contains two apparently independent notices on the Kushites. According to the documentary hypothesis the first notice (v. 7) belongs to P, the second (vv. 8-12) to J. At any rate it is very probable that the pericope vv. 7-12 has not been written *uno tenore*. The author of the table of peoples loosely combined two traditions. On the one hand he knew the Arabian and African Kushites enumerated in v. 7. On the other he knew that Kush had begotten Nimrod. The text does not bear any trace of an attempt to bring the latter in connexion with the genealogy of the former. I believe the author intentionally avoided identifying the two bearers of the name Kush. And provisionally I leave v. 7 out of consideration when inquiring into the identity of that Kush who begot Nimrod.

It is clear that vv. 8-12 deal with the beginnings of the Babylonian and Assyrian powers. Let us regard these verses in the light of the cuneiform inscriptions. The latter tell us that the Assyrians and Neo-Babylonians regarded Sharrukin or Sargon of Agade or Akkad (about 2700 B.C., if not

earlier) as the real founder of the Babylonian empire. For that reason it is to be asked, whether the Biblical notices on Nimrod do not contain a reminder of the Akkadian conquests.

Besides Genesis x. there is no passage in the Old Testament where the name of Nimrod occurs but Micah v. 5. There Assyria is named "the land of Nimrod." Now the time of Micah partly coincides with that of Sargon of Assyria. Since 722 B.C. Sargon and the Sargonides reigned for more than a century at Nineveh (cf. Gen. x. 11 f.). Is it a mere accident that in this very time the name of Nimrod reappears in Hebrew literature? Is it not better to think that the prophet knew the connexion between the figure of Nimrod and the Akkadian conquerors?

Add to this that the beginning of Nimrod's realm, according to Genesis x. 10, was formed by Babel, Erech, Akkad and Kalne in the land of Shinar. Apparently Akkad is here the city of Akkad (Agade), which has given its name to the dynasty of Sharru-kîn. It may be objected that in Genesis x. 10 Babel appears in the first place and Akkad only in the third. But this precedence of Babel is to be explained by the greater general importance of that city. After the rise of the first dynasty of Babel (2225-1925 B.C.) it could easily happen, especially in an oral tradition, that Babel and Akkad interchanged places. Then, in a more ancient form of the tradition, the succession was: 1. Akkad, the main residence of Sharru-kîn and his successors; 2. Erech, the capital of the Sumerian ruler Lugal-zaggisi, whose empire was destroyed by Sharru-kîn; ¹ 3. Babel, which in the kingdom of the latter occupied an important place; ² 4. Kalne, about which nothing certain can be said. ³ In accordance

¹ V. Scheil, *Comptes rendus* (Acad. des Inscr. et Belles-Lettres), 1911, p. 613 ff. Cf. A. Poebel, *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* (=OLZ), 1912, col. 482.

² L. W. King, *Chronicles concerning early Babylonian Kings*, vol. ii., p. 8.

³ J. Skinner, *Genesis* (1912), p. 210. O. Procksch, *Die Genesis*, p. 74 f.

with the historical connexion, which seems probable to the present author, we may ask whether Kalne is perhaps identical with such an ancient political centre as Upi or Lagash.

II. NIMROD AND KISH.

As we have an indirect evidence that the Biblical Nimrod has something to do with the dynasty of Agade, we may now make an attempt to identify Kush, the father of Nimrod. Very probably he is to be taken for a personification of the ancient city of Kish in Northern Babylonia. As to the historical connexion between Kish and Agade we lack information in many respects. But at all events it must have been a close one. In the present demonstration the following points are to be emphasised. 1. In the list of kings, published by Scheil in 1911, the North-Babylonian dynasties of Kish and Agade are separated one from the other only by the reign of the South-Babylonian king Lugal-zaggisi, which is said to have lasted twenty-five years.⁴ 2. According to a notice in the same list Sharru-kin, before founding the dynasty of Agade, was gardener and butler to the temple of Zamama,⁵ who is known to have been the city-god of Kish. 3. The city of Kish was rebuilt by Sharru-kin.⁶ 4. In the inscriptions of the Philadelphia University Museum, mentioned by Poebel,⁷ Sharru-kin is titled *lugal kiš* as well as *lugal agade*⁸; the latter title means "king of Agade" and the former probably emphasises an ideal relation to the historical kingdom of Kish. 5. Rimush and Man-ishtusu, the next successors of Sharru-kin, regularly called themselves *lugal kiš*.⁸ 6. The fourth king of Agade, Narâm-

⁴ Scheil, l.c., pp. 610-615.

⁵ Ib., p. 615 f.

⁶ Poebel, l.c., col. 484.

⁷ Ib., col. 481 f.

⁸ F. Thureau-Dangin, *Die sumerischen und akkadischen Königsinschriften* (= SAKI), p. 160 ff.

Sin,⁹ is regarded by Poebel¹⁰ as a son of Sharru-kin and by the present author¹¹ as a son of Man-ishtusu. In either case he was the son of a man who called himself *lugal kiš*. *Cum grano salis* we may say that a king of Kish was the father of Narâm-Sin.

In a posthumous work the late Hugo Winckler¹² has drawn attention to the fact that the above-mentioned city-god of Kish has a place of honour even in the inscriptions of the Hittite kings of the thirteenth century B.C. Since the name of this god was still honoured in Asia Minor about 1,500 years after the age of Sharru-kin, it is not at all improbable that the inhabitants of Syria and Palestine in the time of the Hebrew conquest remembered the name of his city. The only difficulty lies in the different vowels of the names Kish and Kush. It may be supposed that the name of Kish since olden times was pronounced Kush by the Western Semites.¹³

In connexion herewith the question may be put: For what reason did the author of the table of peoples put *vv.* 8 ff. next to *v.* 7? Was the similarity of the names his only reason? Or did he perhaps know that there existed a very ancient historical connexion between the city of Kish and the Kushites enumerated in *v.* 7? The latter hypothesis is supported by a Babylonian tradition, according to which the kingdom of Kish was founded in the legendary times immediately after the Deluge.¹⁴ Now it is remarkable that in the Biblical table of peoples Kush, being the first son of Ham (Gen. x. 6), stands equally near to the time of the Flood.

⁹ Narâm-Sin possibly was the fifth, but more probably the fourth king of Agade. Cf. *OLZ*, 1913, col. 148, the second note.

¹⁰ *L.c.*, col. 483.

¹¹ *OLZ*, 1913, col. 148.

¹² H. Winckler, *Vorderasien im zweiten Jahrtausend*, p. 70 ff.

¹³ Cf. the Jewish pronunciation of the Assyrian name Sharru-kin (*Is.* xx. 1).

¹⁴ Poebel, *OLZ*, 1912, col. 484 f.

From this coincidence it may be inferred that the author of the table of peoples, when joining *vs.* 8 ff. to *v.* 6 f., wanted to express the reminiscence of an ancient historical connexion. I believe that it was not his purpose to identify the two bearers of the name Kush, but to emphasise that ancient connexion.

III. NIMROD AND NARÂM-SIN.

The question may now be put : Can we paraphrase the statement "Kush begot Nimrod" (Gen. x. 8) in this way : "The kingdom of Kish begot the empire of Akkad" ? I believe we can from an historical point of view. Etymologically, however, the names Nimrod and Agade bear no relation to each other. We may then set out to examine the names of the individual Akkadian kings. The names Sharru-kîn, Rimush and Man-ishtusu afford us no aid. But between the names Nimrod and Narâm-Sin there may be found some connexion, if it be permitted to call the Arabian language into assistance. That language has to mediate between Akkadian and Hebrew.

In the period of the Akkadian empire the genitive form of Narâm-Sin was Narâmi-Sin.¹⁵ But South-Semitic people would understand the latter form as the genitive of *narâmisun*, the *pluralis fractus* of such a form as *narmusun*.¹⁶ The Arabian form *narmusun* would correspond to the Hebrew *nirmos*. And *nirmos* is not too far removed from *nimrod*, if we suppose that the name became the object of an etymological play on the roots רמס (*ramas*) and מרד (*marad* or *maradh*). *Nirmos* might be understood as "a trampler" (of his fellowmen) and *Nimrod* as "a rebel" (against God).¹⁷

¹⁵ Poebel, *OLZ*, 1913, col. 297.

¹⁶ Or perhaps *narâmisum*, *narmusum*. But the difference between final *m* and *n* is of little importance. As to the alternative use of the singular and the plural of certain proper names, cf. F. Hommel, *Enzyklopaëdie des Islam*, 7^e Lieferung, p. 394b, and Gesenius-Buhl, *Handwörterbuch* 15th edition, p. 612b.

¹⁷ A. Dillmann, *Die Genesis*, 5th edition, p. 183.

By the Akkadian conquerors the nations were "trampled down." And Narâm-Sin was addressed as a god in contemporary inscriptions.¹⁸

But do we indeed have a reason to believe that the tradition concerning the Akkadian empire was delivered to the Hebrews in connexion with the name of Narâm-Sin and by intervention of South-Semitic people ? I think we have. Contemporary and later inscriptions record the successful expedition of Narâm-Sin against the land of Magan, which was probably a portion of Eastern Arabia.¹⁹ On the other hand the Old Testament tells us that Peleg, an ancestor of Terah and Abraham¹ (Gen. xi. 16-26), was the brother of Yoktan (Gen. x. 25), whose descendants were settled in a portion of Southern or rather South-Eastern Arabia (Gen. x. 30).²⁰ It is not unlikely that the descendants of Peleg at some time sojourned in the neighbourhood of their cousins, the Yoktanites. In these regions they may have heard of Narâm-Sin's "trampling down" the people of Magan and his "rebellion" against God.

It even seems possible to me that they were witnesses of the facts. If Abraham was a contemporary of Hammurapi (2123-2080 B.C.), as we have abundant reason to believe, it may be supposed that the separation between Peleg and Yoktan took place in the time of the Akkadian empire. If we accept the statement that Terah lived 205 years (Gen. xi. 32), the result is that he was born at no later date than 2300 B.C. Now it is true that the genealogy in Genesis xi. 16-24 mentions only three members between Peleg and Terah. But I am convinced that this genealogy is very incomplete, and that the statements in *vv.* 18, 20, 22, 24 may be explained in this way : Peleg was thirty years old

¹⁸ Thureau-Dangin, *SAKI*, p. 168, k. l. m. n.

¹⁹ King, *A History of Sumer and Akkad*, p. 241 f.

²⁰ Skinner, *l.c.*, p. 221. Procksch, *l.c.*, p. 82.

when he begot that son, by whom he became an ancestor of Reu, etc.²¹ On this theory it is not at all unlikely that the separation between Peleg and Yoktan happened in the 27th century B.C., and that the Palgides (as we may call the descendants of Peleg), moving northward, passed by regions which had been laid waste by Narâm-Sin.

IV. NIMROD AND ASSHUR.

The result of the above inquiry is, that the statement "Kush begot Nimrod" (Gen. x. 8) may be paraphrased in this way: "The kingdom of Kish begot the empire of Narâm-Sin." We may ask, whether it is not better to say: "A king of Kish begot the king Narâm-Sin." Both paraphrases are in accordance with historical facts. And indeed I believe that the figure of Nimrod originally corresponded to the person of Narâm-Sin. But in course of time the conception of Nimrod must have been enlarged. Genesis x. 11 f. presents such a perspective, that we are led to conceive of Nimrod as a personification of Narâm-Sin's dynasty.

In the verses just mentioned we are told that Nimrod afterwards left his Akkadian country and emigrated to Assyria. The translation "he went to Asshur" is postulated by the context²² and is in agreement with the designation of Assyria as "the land of Nimrod" (Micah v. 5). This expression supposes that Nimrod had found in Assyria his new country. And it clearly appears from Genesis x. 11b, 12, that he established himself permanently in this new world. It was not a mere expedition against Assyria, but it was an emigration *in optima forma*. In agreement with the results above reached Nimrod's going to Asshur is to be understood in this way, that the Akkadian power was transferred from Babylonia to Assyria. What does that

²¹ Cf. the omission of three generations in Matthew i. 8.

²² Skinner, l.c., p. 210 f. Procksch, l.c., p. 75.

mean ? Was the relation between Akkad and Assyria similar to that which the Romans held to exist between Ilion and Latium ? Did the last members of the dynasty of Agade, when their dominion succumbed to the blows of a Southern enemy,²³ emigrate to the North and establish a new monarchy in Assyria ? Was this the way by which the title of a *lugal kiš* came to the land of Asshur ? Have we here the deeper grounds of the Assyrian claim to the dominion over the world ?

We are told by Esarhaddon (681-668 B.C.) that a certain Bêl-ibni, a son of Adasi, was the founder of the Assyrian monarchy and the ancestor of the Sargonides.²⁴ There is some reason to believe that this Bêl-ibni in a later tradition was confounded with another Bêl-ibni, a Babylonian king, who belonged to the dynasty of Isin²⁵ and probably reigned 2197-2173 B.C. The confusion might be explained by the supposition that Bêl-ibni, the son of Adasi, actually was of Babylonian origin. So we may ask whether he was a descendant of the Akkadian kings. Possibly he was a grandson of Shudurkib,²⁶ the last king of Agade (about 2525 B.C., if not earlier).

In the next centuries the Assyrian state seems to have become subject to Mitannic influences. Leaving Bêl-ibni, the son of Adasi, out of consideration, the most ancient figures we know in Assyrian history are two sacerdotal rulers, whose names, Ushpia and Kikia, have a Mitannic aspect. From the texts mentioning them it is clear that they lived before the reign of Ilu-shuma, king of Assyria, and his contemporary Su-abu (2225-2211), who founded the first dynasty of Babel.²⁷ On the other hand there is no reason

²³ Scheil, l.c., p. 615 f.

²⁴ King, *Chronicles*, vol. i., p. 66.

²⁵ King, ib. p. 62 ff., compared with his *History*, p. 312, the second note.

²⁶ Pognon, *Comptes rendus* (Acad. des Insér. et Belles-Lettres), 1912, p. 416 f.

²⁷ King, *Chronicles*, vol. i., pp. 120 ff. 136, 140 f., and vol. ii., p. 14.

to believe that Ushpia and Kikia lived as early as the middle of the third millennium B.C. If the Akkadian immigration supposed by the present author really took place, it should probably be placed before the days of Ushpia and Kikia.

C. VAN GELDEREN.

THE TWO GREAT REFUSALS.

MARK x. 17-27 ; MATTHEW. xix. 16-26 ; LUKE xviii. 18-27.

JESUS had been beyond Jordan, and would seem to have been about to set out on His fateful last visit to Jerusalem. A man, whose age we may place perhaps at thirty to thirty-five years, and, according to Luke, one of "the Rulers of the Jews," heard that Jesus was about to leave the district. At the last moment he came running to Jesus and threw himself on his knees before Him. His mind was troubled by a question that he had in vain tried to solve. How much he knew of Jesus and His teaching we cannot tell, but he addressed Him in terms of affectionate appreciation, saying, "Good Master, what shall I do that I may inherit Eternal Life ?"

His position as a Ruler and his wealth—for he had great possessions—left him longing for that which neither social standing nor wealth can give : he was awake to the cry of the soul and wanted it answered.

Jesus repudiates—perhaps we may say He even resents—the title "Good." "Why," He asks, "why callest thou me Good ?"

Does not the repudiation stagger us ? Does not the title seem to us most fitting ? Do not we find the echo of it in our own hearts, as we think of Him ? And so do we not feel puzzled that Jesus called it in question ?

Well ! we are not the first to feel the difficulty of the