

The Princeton Theological Review

OCTOBER, 1920

"MISERABLE-SINNER CHRISTIANITY" IN THE HANDS OF THE RATIONALISTS

III. WINDISCH AND THE END

The assault on the Reformation conception of the Christian life could not end on so ambiguous a note as that struck by Pfeleiderer. On the contrary, what may very properly be spoken of as the last word said in furtherance of it, was the most direct that had been said since Wernle's own, and in many respects the most forceful and telling of all. We are referring, of course, to Hans Windisch's at once brilliant and ponderous volume on *Baptism and Sin in the Oldest Christianity up to Origen*,¹ which was published in 1908. We have already pointed out the relation of the book to Wernle's published twelve years before. It came into the controversy which Wernle had provoked, very distinctly at the end, when the debate was languishing, and indeed, from the point of view of Wernle's contentions, when the battle was lost. It had much the appearance accordingly of a last vigorous attack, seeking to wring a victory out of defeat. And assuredly little was left unsaid by Windisch that could be said to rescue and save a lost cause.

What Windisch undertakes to do, to speak now of the formal contents of his volume, is to take up Wernle's proposition that to Paul Christians are in their actual nature sinless men, to justify it by a really thorough exegetical survey of the Pauline material, and then to place it in its histor-

¹ *Taufe und Sünde im ältesten Christentum bis auf Origines. Ein Beitrag zur altchristlichen Dogmengeschichte*, 1908. The book, published when he was twenty-seven years old, was Windisch's first book; at least it was preceded only by his Doctor's dissertation on *The Theodicy of Justin*, 1906.

THE NAME JOSEPH

A good example of the difficulties which the critics, who reject the testimony of the documents of the Old Testament, encounter in their efforts to rewrite history is found in Professor Barton's recent discussion¹ of the name Joseph. Despite the marked difference between the "Table of Nations" (Gen. x) and the "narratives of the patriarchs"—the strikingly individual and personal character of the latter—he argues that we are "on safe historical ground, if we assume that at least a part of the patriarchal narratives consists of tribal history narrated as the experiences of individual men".² After arguing this briefly in behalf of the Leah and Rachel "clans," he proceeds:³

"Similarly, the name Joseph seems to have been attached to the tribes of Ephraim and Manasseh after the settlement in Canaan. The name itself has had an interesting history. A Babylonian business document of the time of the first dynasty of Babylon (2225-1926 B.C.) had for one of its witnesses *Yashub-ilu*,⁴ or Joseph-el. Thothmes III, who conquered Palestine and Syria between 1478 and 1447 B.C., records as one of the places which he conquered in Palestine *Wa-sha-p'-ra*,⁵ which Eduard Meyer many years ago recognized as Joseph-el. This equivalence is doubted by W. Max Müller, but is, so far as I can see, possible. How did the name of a Babylonian man become attached to a Palestinian city? There was at the time of the first dynasty frequent intercourse between Mesopotamia and Palestine. Documentary evidence of this will be cited below in connection with Abraham. Is it too much to imagine

¹ *The Religion of Israel* (1918), p. 27 f. For a review of this book, see pp. 673 f.

² P. 25.

³ P. 27 f.

⁴ "Cuniform Texts, etc., in the British Museum, II, no. 23, l. 15."

⁵ "Mittheilung der Vorderasiatische Gesellschaft, 1907, p. 28. Müller thinks it equivalent to *Yesheb-el*, "God dwells." The Babylonian might also be so interpreted. The phonetic equivalence between Babylonian and Hebrew points rather to *Joseph-el*, and the Babylonian form may account for the Egyptian spelling, which forms the basis of Müller's doubt."

that Joseph-el migrated, and that his name became attached to a Palestinian city? Not only have we in our own country many places named for men, but modern Palestine affords an example of a village that lost during the nineteenth century its name, *Karyet el-'Ineb*, and substituted for it the name of a famous sheik, *Abu Ghosh*.⁶ If in some such way Joseph-el made its way into Palestine, becoming the name of a city and Rachel tribes afterwards settled in the region, the shortened form of the name, Joseph, might naturally become the name of their supposed ancestor.

"The principle of interpretation gained from Genesis 10 compels us to suppose that the name Joseph came in in some such way, for in the historical period no tribe of Joseph appears. If the investigator is forced to this conclusion, how are the vivid narratives of the personal fortunes of Joseph to be accounted for?"

We are not concerned to discuss all the points which emerge in this argument as quoted. Our main interest centers about Dr. Barton's assertion that *Yashub-ilu* or Joseph-el is the name of "a Babylonian man" who may conceivably have migrated to Palestine and given his name to a Palestinian city and that we are compelled to suppose "that the name Joseph came in in some such way" and not in the way which the Old Testament relates, as the significant name given by Rachel to her first born son.

There are two points to be considered: Was *Yashub-ilu* a Babylonian man? Is there any warrant for connecting him with Joseph?

WAS YASHUB-ILU A BABYLONIAN?

By the words "Babylonian man" we understand, native Babylonian. This seems clearly to be Dr. Barton's meaning. For he speaks of the "frequent intercourse between Mesopotamia and Palestine" at this period and of Joseph-el as *migrating* and his name becoming "attached to a Palestinian city."⁷

⁶ "See Baedeker's *Palästina*, Leipzig, 1910, p. 16."

⁷ On the other hand on p. 40 he tells us that the patriarchal narratives "portray certain tribal and historical facts, which they have

In considering this question it should be noted in the first place that the occurrence of the name *Yashub-ilu* on a Babylonian tablet found at or near Sippar in Northern Babylonia and belonging apparently—it is undated—to the time of the First Dynasty of Babylon (cir. 2000 B.C.) does not prove that the bearer of the name was a native Babylonian. On documents of all periods we find the names of many foreigners. And on those of the First Dynasty so many West Semitic⁸ names occur, even among the names of the kings themselves, that scholars have been inclined to speak of an "Amorite invasion" and of this dynasty as an Amorite (i.e. West Semitic) dynasty.⁹ Consequently, the fact that his name appears on a Babylonian tablet does not prove *Yashub-ilu* to be a "Babylonian man."

It is to be noted in the second place that this *Yashub-ilu* is not a witness, as Dr. Barton states, but a slave. The document records the "gift" (*niditi*) of 3 tracts of land (aggregating about 100 acres), 26 slaves (13 male and 13 female; the women, two of whom are stated to have children, being probably the wives of the men), 8 cows, 4 oxen, and 60 sheep. The name of the donor is partly effaced; the recip-

grouped around the names of certain famous Amorites who once migrated into Palestine and gave their names to certain of its localities." If this "Babylonian man" or another of whom he is a type is really a "famous Amorite," Dr. Barton is certainly using language in a loose and confusing way.

⁸ "Masses of foreign names are found in all periods, the study of which is so important for the correct understanding of the movements of people, due to persecution or captivity, or to the fact that at the time the ruling dynasty was foreign. The tablets of the Hammurabi era contain many West Semitic names of the Arabic, Aramaic and Hebrew types" (A. T. Clay, on "Names (Babylonian)" in Hastings' *Encyc. of Religion and Ethics*). Chiera remarks, "We are not surprised to find on the same tablet names written in Akkadian [i.e., Semitic Babylonian], Sumerian or even in foreign languages" (Publications of the Bab. Section of the Univ. of Penna. Museum XI, 1, p. 15.).

⁹ The general name given to these foreigners seems to have been, as Ranke points out, "children of the Westland" (*mârê Amurru*). Sayce regards the Amorites (*Amurrû*) as "the dominant people in western Asia" in the time of Abraham (*Internat. Standard Bible Encyclopaedia*, p. 119a).

ient of the gift is not stated. *Yashub-ilu* is the name of the 9th of the male slaves.¹⁰ In view of the fact that slaves in Babylonia (as in Israel) might be foreigners sold into slavery (as Joseph to the Midianites) or captured in war, as well as natives of the country, the fact that the *Yashub-ilu* named on this document is a slave—this is all we know about him except his name—leaves it still an open question whether or not he was a native Babylonian.

We turn then to the name itself, *Yashub-ilu*, as the only remaining factor in the investigation. It is of especial interest not merely in view of the meagre and inconclusive information we have thus far obtained, but also because of its definite and almost decisive bearing upon the question under discussion. The most noticeable thing about it is that, except for the *ilu* (Heb. *el*, God), it is identical with *Jashub*¹¹ the name given in the Old Testament to one of the sons of Issachar;¹² and that it resembles in form the names *Jagur**, *Janum**, *Janoah** (*Yanuh*), *Jair* (or *Jaor*, Heb. יעיר), *Jalon*, *Jadon*; cf., *Jair* (יאר), *Jabin*, *Jachin*, *Jakim* and *Jarib*.¹³ Most, perhaps all, of these names are quite probably to be regarded as imperfects (or jussives) of the *Ayin Waw* or *Ayin Yodh* verb. Thus *Jakim* means "he will lift up, or establish," *Jarib*, "he will contend." *Joseph*, "may be add," is from a *Pe Waw* verb (note the

¹⁰ The wife of *Yashub-ilu* is perhaps the *Akiyatum*, whose name is given 7th in the list of women, at least her name shows indication of being a West Semitic name. If so, the names are not given in corresponding order in the two lists.

¹¹ Or *Yashub*. The consonantal *y* (as in *yet*) is not correctly reproduced by *j* (*dzh*) of the modern English. *Jashub* (AV orthography) should be pronounced *Yashub*. All the Hebrew or West Semitic proper names cited in this discussion begin (unless otherwise stated) with *y*. But where the form familiar to the English reader is given, e.g., *Jacob*, *Igal*, *Joseph*, *Ibhar*, etc., the usual spelling is retained.

¹² Numb. xxvi. 24; Ezra x. 29; 1 Chron. vii. 1 has *Yashib* as the *Kethubbh*. In Gen. xlvi. 13 the name is given as *Job* (יוב); but this reading is not supported by the LXX.

¹³ Names marked with asterisk (*) are place names, which sometimes do not differ essentially from personal names and may even be identical with them.

form (יהוסף) Japhet, "may he enlarge," from a *Lamedh Hê*, as is also Jephunneh. Similar examples for the strong verb (including the gutturals) are Jacob, Jephthah, Igal, Ibhar, Isaac (יצחק), Izhar, Jamlech, Japhlet.

Names containing the imperfect of the verb may appear without a subject expressed, as in the instances just cited, or with such a subject. In the latter case they are usually theophoric (containing a divine name, which is usually God (*el*) or Jehovah). The subject may follow as in the case of *Yashub-ilu*: cf. Israel, Ishmael, Irpeel*, Jeziel, Jezreel, Ezekiel, Jahaziah, Josiah, Ishaiah, Ishmaiah. Or the subject may precede as in Eliakim, Eliashib, Jehoiachin, Jehoiakim. It is probable that the shorter names are frequently, perhaps generally, to be regarded as shortened forms of the theophoric. Thus we find Josiphiah, "may Jehovah add," and Joseph, "may he add," Izhariah and Izhar, Jiphthah-el* and Jiphthah* (in the Hebrew, the same as Jephthah). This justifies us in regarding *Yashub-ilu* or *Jashub-el* as merely the longer, theophoric, form of *Jashub*. Sometimes, however, the subject is not a theophoric name. Jeroboam probably means "the people increases," cf. the names Jeshobeam, "the people will return,"¹⁴ and the significant name Shear-jashub "a remnant shall return." The last two names contain the word *Jashub* in combination¹⁵ and confirm the view that *Jashub* may be merely short for *Jashub-el*.

¹⁴-*am* (עם) which was formerly interpreted as the common word for "people," may also mean "uncle," or "kinsman." That in certain of the Old Testament names containing this element it should be so rendered seems not improbable. But it is certain that in some at least, e.g., the significant names Ammi, Lo-ammi, the meaning "people" is the correct one. And while this name might be rendered "(my) kinsman will be gracious," the old rendering "the people will return" or "let the people return" seems preferable.

¹⁵The name Jeshobi-lehem apparently also contains the element *Jashub*. But its form and meaning are not at all certain. *Jushab-hesed* may be a Hophal from this root, "may loving-kindness be renewed." Compare the name Judah, "may he be praised," which is clearly treated in Gen. xxix. 35, xlix. 8 as a Hophal form. For the uncontracted form יהורה we have a parallel in the writing of Jehoseph for Joseph, cited above.

In view of the claim that *Yashub-ilu* is the name of a Babylonian, this close resemblance between this name and other West Semitic or Old Testament names is certainly noteworthy. But this is not the only striking thing about it. Equally remarkable is the marked difference between it and genuine Babylonian names. The clearest mark of differentiation is, perhaps, the fact that the word *yashub* begins with a consonantal *y*. This is distinctive because in the Babylonian, unlike the other principal Semitic languages (Arabic, Aramaic, Hebrew), the rule that the syllable must begin with a consonant is not strictly observed. This is due to the fact that in Babylonian the semi-vowels (*w* and *y*) and most of the gutturals are much weaker than in these other languages, and tend to disappear. The tendency of *aleph* to quiesce and of *waw* and *yodh* to contract or be dropped is of course familiar to every student of Hebrew. But in Hebrew this tendency—with one exception, the conjunction *waw* (and)—never affects the general rule just referred to, that a syllable cannot begin with a vowel. In forms like אֶקַּט (I will kill), יֶקַּט (he will kill) the *aleph* and *yodh* retain their full consonantal force; and *waw* at the beginning of the word is changed to *yodh* (e.g., *washab* becomes *yashab*). In Babylonian, on the other hand, this is not the case. The *w*¹⁶ and *y* (and all but the strongest of the gutturals) regularly contract or are dropped at the beginning of the word, which consequently begins with a vowel. Thus *yik̄tol* (Heb.; from *yak̄tul*) would appear in Babylonian as *ik̄tul*, the *yi* (*ya*) becoming *i*; and in the case of the *Ayin-Waw* verb the Babylonian equivalent of *yashub* would be *ishub*, as is proved by such forms as *idûk*, *ikûn*, *imût*, *itûr*, etc.¹⁷ Other examples might be cited, but this loss

¹⁶ In the case of the *w* we can trace this process to a considerable extent. In documents of this period (the First Dynasty), we frequently find words beginning with *waw*: e.g., in the Code of Hammurabi we find *wardum* (later *ardu*), *warkum* (later *arku*), *kima abim walidim* (later *alidi*), etc.

¹⁷ It should be noted that the tense-system differs in Babylonian considerably from that of the other Semitic languages. The West Semitic

of the initial consonant and the frequent and regular occurrence of words beginning with the vowel is so characteristic of Babylonian that it does not require extended proof. Hence, one of the noticeable peculiarities of the El Amarna Letters, written in Babylonian by Syrian and Palestinian rulers and officials who probably spoke Canaanite and whose mastery of the Babylonian language was far from perfect, is the occurrence of a number of verbal forms which begin with *y*—forms like *yikṭul* or *yakṭul* instead of *ikṭul*. Such forms are recognized as due to West Semitic (Canaanite) influence and some of them may be explained as genuine Canaanite.¹⁸ Consequently, the fact that the name *Yashub-ilu* begins with a consonantal *y* at once arrests attention.

It is not surprising then that Ranke, one of the pioneers in the study of Babylonian personal names, in giving a sample list of names contained on cuneiform tablets of this period, which while of Semitic origin "differ essentially from the genuine Babylonian names,"¹⁹ included several beginning with *ya*, *Yashubum* being one of the number.²⁰ That names of this type are not Babylonian, but West Semitic, is now

perfect (*kaṭal*) was not used, the intransitive forms (*kaṭil* and *kaṭul*) being used only in a stative or permansive sense, and instead of one these with the preformative (as in Hebrew *yikṭol*) the Babylonian developed two (*ikṭul* and *ikṭal*) using the one as a preterite and the other as a present or future. Consequently, while *ikṭul* in Babylonian corresponds in form most closely to *yikṭol* the two being probably originally the same, in meaning it has come to be used as a preterite. Thus to Nathanael (*Nathan* + *el*, God has given, or gives) corresponds *Iddina* (= ידן) + *ilu* in Babylonia.

¹⁸ Cf. Ebeling, *Das Verbum der El-Amarna-Briefe*, p. 46 f.

¹⁹ *Early Babylonian Personal Names* (1905), p. 24 ff.

²⁰ *Yashubum* Ranke regards as "abbreviated from a name like *Yashub-ilu*" (he cites the tablet referred to by Dr. Barton). He also mentions *yashub* as a verbal form characteristic of this non-Babylonian group of names, and in the more detailed discussion which follows he gives *Yashubum* among the "parallels" to these names which can be found "in the Aramaic and Canaanitish provinces," referring to *Baal-yashub*, son of *Yakin-lu*, king of Arvad, mentioned in Assurbanipal's Annals, and the names *Shubna-ilu* and *Shubunu-Yama* (p. 30), the former a name found in the early, the latter in the late, period, all of which contain the same root.

generally admitted. Chiera²¹ has recently published a tablet containing a long list of personal names, which he designates as Amorite (i.e., West Semitic, as distinguished from Babylonian) and a number of which he has identified with names occurring in the Old Testament. It is noteworthy that about 75 of these names begin with *ya*.²²

Let us now look at the second part of the name *Yashub-ilu*. We have seen that *el*, i.e., *ilu*, frequently occurs as an element in Old Testament names. Consequently, the fact that we find it in the name under discussion may be regarded as favoring the view that the name *Yashub-ilu* is West Semitic. This is true. But the fact that *ilu* is often found in genuine Babylonian names, and is quite frequent in names of this period, of course makes it impossible to attach importance to this, save as it is confirmed by other evidence. It is, therefore, important to notice that another theophoric element which is more distinctively West Semitic than *ilu*—the name of the god Dagan,²³ which is met with quite frequently in West Semitic names—occurs in combination with the element *yashub*. We find the name *Yashub-dagan* on

²¹ *Lists of Personal Names from the Temple School of Nippur* (1916), published as Vol. XI, No. 2, of the Publications of the Babylonian Section of the University of Penna. Museum, cf. especially p. 111 ff. and 118 ff.

²² The tablet, a large one originally, is badly mutilated, only fragments remaining. According to Chiera it must have contained about 400 names.

²³ Ranke in speaking of names of this character remarks: "The names of Babylonian deities are very rarely found in this group of names. In their place we find only Dagan and, once, Ishtara." This statement made some 15 years ago and intended apparently to refer primarily to the group of names just referred to needs to be somewhat modified. Thus Adad (Hadad) is found in West Semitic names (cf. p. 654). With regard to Dagan it should be noted that his name appears very early in Babylonia: in a name on the obelisk of Manishtu-su, in the date list of Dungi, in the names of Idin-Dagan and Isme-Dagan of the dynasty of Isin, in the prologue to the Code of Hammurabi, etc. But that he was originally a West Semitic deity, the same as Dagon, is quite generally recognized, e.g., by Clay, Ed. Meyer, Ranke, Tallquist, Langdon, Chiera.

two tablets of this period.²⁴ On the first of these *Yashub-dagan* is named first in a list of 15 men and women, one or two of whom are apparently designated as Amorites. At the close there is a reference to 15 garments of some kind; the document is probably the record of a gift or votive offering. The other tablet comes from Ḫana and is dated in the reign of the Kassite king, Kashtiliash. It records the sale of a field in Tirka, the capital of Ḫana, and mentions *Yashmah-dagan, son of Yashub-dagan*, as one of the numerous witnesses. A number of the names on this tablet are clearly West Semitic, viz., *Abihel* (Heb., Abihail), *Binammi* (Benammi Gen. xix. 36), *Yarib-adad*, *Yakun-adad*, *Yakun-ammu*, *Yakum*, *Yasu-adad*, *Izrah-dagan*, *Yadih-el*; probably also *Ibal-dagan*, *Ibalum*. It has long been recognized on the testimony of names like these that Ḫana must have had a very large West Semitic element in its population.²⁵ And to find a name containing this element among other West Semitic names at Ḫana favors our contention that it is non-Babylonian.

The same applies to the name *Yashubum* which, as has been pointed out, is probably the hypocoristic or abbreviated form "of a name like *Yashub-ilu*." It occurs on two tablets of the First Dynasty.²⁶ One of these tablets deals with the sale of real estate; and *Yashubum*, son of *Iziashar* (probably a West Semitic name), is one of the witnesses of the transaction. The other tablet deals with a gift of land with water rights; and *Yashubum*, is named as the donor. The father of one of the witnesses is named *Ḫabdum*, which is clearly a West Semitic name (cf. the name *Ebed*, עֶבֶד).

Besides the imperfect, *yashub*, we also find the imperative, *shub*, as an element in personal names. It occurs in the name *Shubna-ilu* (cf. the Biblical name Shubael). It is noteworthy that this man whose name appears here as a

²⁴ Cf. Thureau-Dangin, *Letters et Contrats de l'époque de la Première Dynastie Babylonienne*, Nos. 109 and 238.

²⁵ Cf. A. T. Clay, *History of the Amorites* (1919).

²⁶ Cf. *Cuneiform Texts from Babylonian Tablets*, IV 49b and 16 resp.

witness is stated to have a brother *Yadaḥ-ilu* and that their father is called *Yakub-ilu*, both of them West Semitic names. The name *Shubiya* is also found. Ranke regards it as the diminutive of *Yashubum* and compares it with the Hebrew name *Shobai*.²⁷

As to the *meaning* of the Hebrew name *Jashub*, it is obvious that it comes from the root שׁוּב, "to turn back, return." In this name it is probably used in the sense of "return (to show favor)," cf. Gen. xviii. 10: He (God, or Jehovah) will (or, may he) again be gracious. Or it may be better to connect it with *Jeshobeam* (the people will return [unto their God]) and render, "may he return." The verb is of frequent occurrence in Hebrew and is also used in Arabic and Aramaic. The root apparently does not occur in Babylonian. The same idea, however, is expressed by the root *târu* which occurs in several different forms and combinations, *Itâr*, *Itûr*, *Ituram*, *Litûr*, etc., and by the root *rânu*, in such forms as *Rîm*, *Rimanni*, *Turâm*, etc. This makes it still more difficult to regard the name *Yashub-ilu* as a Babylonian name. No satisfactory etymology can be given for it. Dr. Barton cites Müller's rendering of *Wa-sha-p'-ra*²⁸ "God dwells" and says, "The Babylonian might also be so interpreted." But he does not favor this explanation, which is rendered precarious by the fact that the Babylonian verb *ashābu* ("to dwell"; Heb. יִשַׁב) has no such form as *yashub* and further is of rare occurrence as an element in Babylonian proper names. Yet Dr. Barton does not tell us what *Yashub-ilu* would mean as a Babylonian name.

Since, then, we are almost wholly dependent upon the name for any clue which is to be gathered as to the nationality of *Yashub-ilu*, it is significant that the data at our disposal show about as clearly as could be expected under the circumstances that the bearer of this name was a non-Babylonian. It is of course impossible to be certain about

²⁷ Cf. Ranke, *Personal Names*, pp. 30 and 151.

²⁸ -*ra* would then be understood as the Egyptian equivalent of *ilu*, *Ra* being the name of one of the chief gods of Egypt.

this. We find instances where the children of foreigners have Babylonian names. Thus *Yakub-ilu* (Jacob-el?) of the time of Hammurabi had a son *Sin-eribam*. And it is of course possible that a native Babylonian might for one of many reasons give a non-Babylonian name to his child. But in the absence of definite evidence to the contrary, the fact that the name can be shown to be a foreign name should be accepted as proof that the bearer of the name cannot correctly be called a "Babylonian man."

JOSEPH AND YASHUB-ILU

We pass on now to consider whether there is any connection between Joseph and *Yashub-ilu*.

Joseph, according to the narrative in Genesis xxx, means "may he add" (Hiphil jussive from אָסַף)—"And she called his name Joseph; and she said, The Lord shall add to me another son." As in the case of several other names in this passage the appropriateness of the name is due in part at least to the similarity in sound between the two verbs אָסַף "to collect" (and hence, "to take away") and אָסַף "to add"—"and she said God hath taken away (*'asaph*) my reproach: And she called his name Joseph (*yoseph*, may he add) saying," etc. That the name Joseph also occurred in a longer form is shown, as has been stated above, by the name Josiphiah "Jehovah will add" found in Ezra viii. 10. The critics will doubtless assure us—they have often done so—that this account of the naming of the patriarch is purely fictitious. Dr. Barton finds, it is true, much in the story of Joseph which is corroborated by external (Egyptian) sources. But this does not lead him to accept the Old Testament account of the historic Joseph, much less to accept the name incident. Yet this incident accords strikingly with the facts at our disposal. The desire for a numerous progeny was characteristic of the ancient Semites. It finds expression for example in the prayers of the Babylonian and Assyrian kings. Thus Nebuchadnezzar repeatedly asks for the blessing of fruitfulness: "May I be satisfied with, have

abundance of, children (descendants)" or similar expressions. Conversely a most grievous curse is the one which invokes "childlessness" upon a man. Such a curse Hammurabi invokes in the conclusion of his "Code" upon any king among his successors who shall fail to observe it. In these respects the Hebrews and Babylonians had very similar views.

Hence it is natural that among the Babylonians and Assyrians we have many names which express this desire in one form or another. The one most familiar to Bible students is Sennacherib (*Sin-ahê-eriba*). If this means, "O God Sin, multiply brethren," then *Eribam* or *Erba*, "increase (for me)"—the shorter form of this and similar names—may be regarded as a close equivalent of the name Joseph. If, however, *eriba* is a preterite instead of an imperative—both explanations seem to be certainly possible—Sennacherib would mean "Sin has multiplied brethren," cf. the Hebrew name Eliasaph, "God has added" (אֱלִיָּסָפ). In that case names such as *Ribam-ilu*, "give me increase, O god" *Rib-Nunu*, "give increase, O Nunu," *Lirib-Marduk*, "may Marduk (Merodach) give increase," which are clear examples of the wish form of the name in Babylonian, would be more strictly parallel to the name Joseph. In view of the peculiar circumstances in which, according to the Old Testament narrative, Rachel stood, the appropriateness of the name is perfectly obvious. And such archaeological facts as the ones just stated, are strong evidence of its correctness.

It should be noticed, however, that while Joseph is perfectly intelligible as a Hebrew name, and, as far as its meaning is concerned, strictly analogous to names found in Babylonian and Assyrian documents, it is just as difficult to account for it as a Babylonian name as we found it to be in the case of *Yashub*. Its form is just as characteristically West Semitic, and does not relate itself readily to any Babylonian root with which it might correspond etymologically and which would be appropriate as a personal name.

We have seen that *Yashub-ilu* is almost identical with

Jashub and that Jashub and Joseph are given in the Old Testament to entirely distinct persons, the one to a son of Issachar (and to several others also), the other to a half brother of Issachar (Joseph the son of Rachel), and that both show every indication, both in form and meaning, of being genuine Hebrew names and can only with difficulty if at all be accounted for as Babylonian words. It remains only to consider the question whether there is any connection between them. This may be confidently answered in the negative. Not merely does *Yashub-ilu* correspond so closely with Jashub that it may justly be accepted as practically the same word; it differs so much from Joseph that it cannot be proved that there is any connection between them. It must of course be recognized that *Yashub-ilu* can equally well be read *Yashup-ilu* (the word is spelled syllabically *Ya-shu-ub/p* in Babylonian, and the last sign can be read either *ub* or *up*) and also that a Babylonian *sh* might appear in Hebrew as *s*. Thus, in the name Shalmaneser (שלמנאסר, *Shulman-asharidu*) we have an example of *sh* rendered once by *sh* and once by *s* (ס); and despite the fact that in Babylonian the *sh* was stronger than in Assyrian, this change would be quite possible. But even then, it would be necessary, in view of the marked difference in the vowels, to assume that the name Joseph has been greatly "corrupted" if *Yoseph* is to be identified with *Yashup*. Over against this difficult hypothetical identification we have the simple explanation of the two names given above—an explanation which lies upon the surface of Scripture and which is confirmed by recently discovered facts.

Joseph and Jashub are both West Semitic names. The fact that the one has a strict analogy in Babylonian names of the First Dynasty and that the other appears as an element in several different names of the same period may justly be regarded as a confirmation of the Old Testament record. It certainly does not furnish any basis for the critic's conjectural rewriting of that record.

We have not forgotten of course that Dr. Barton nowhere

commits himself to the view that Joseph is to be identified with *Yashub-ilu*. In the passage quoted we find such expressions as: "possible," "might also be so interpreted," "Is it too much to imagine that," "If in some such way . . . might naturally become." But it is none the less clear that, like many others, Dr. Barton prefers a difficult hypothesis which conflicts with Scripture to a simple explanation which is in harmony with it. It is this attitude of patronizing superior wisdom assumed by the critics which is especially offensive to those who revere the Bible as the Word of God. And to find such views as the one we have been discussing, views which often lack any adequate basis and sometimes are in direct conflict with ascertained facts, put forth in a book intended for the "undergraduate" who is described as one who "wishes to know the truth as fully and frankly as it can be known" is distressing.

Princeton.

OSWALD T. ALLIS.