

atic for the Protestant mind that if we are compelled to reject the view of salvation and of Church polity that grew up with Catholicism, and made it what it was as a system, we cannot be forbidden to examine patristic and mediæval Theology and Christology from the point of view of history, and to ask how far they will bear the light of the New Testament, as charged with the only authentic view of the gospel.

Seeberg, whose *Outline* (to be distinguished from the much larger *Manual*) of the *History of Dogma* has just reached its second edition, is one of the most industrious and attractive workers in this field. His book is easier reading, perhaps, than Loofs' extraordinarily able *Leitfaden*, though it does not make the same impression of general power; and one feels that he has a much better outfit of genial insight into the spiritual movements of the past than, say, Krüger. Notwithstanding the inevitable compression of matter, the book is written with delightful lucidity. Each great divine is allowed so far as possible to expound his own system in his own words; thus we are kept in unbroken touch with the original sources. The bibliography is especially full and sound and fresh.

One or two of the more excellent features may be named. Augustine, who seems to draw out the best in so many historians, has received a most informing and satisfactory exposition. Seeberg is known to be a high authority on the theology of Duns Scotus, and one gains a more impressive conception of the great scholastic's mind in these pages than in nine out of ten delineations. Indeed, a line of true spiritual descent is here drawn from Augustine to Scotus and from Scotus to Luther. 'In Duns,' we are told, 'Hellenic intellectualism is replaced by Voluntarism. This goes back to Augustine, and prepares the way for the modern

era.' The treatment of Luther's theology, as we might expect, is one of the best things in the book, and there is a paragraph on the doctrine of his pre-Reformation days for which we are particularly grateful. Perhaps the doctrine of the Reformed Church is characterized by a touch less sure and exact. The old mistake of calling Zwingli's view of the Lord's Supper a merely figurative one crops up again. Why Zwingli should be denied permission to change his mind like other people it is difficult to say; at all events, what is certain is that after the Marburg Conference of 1529 Bullinger was in a position to report that 'the two parties were at one with each other in all the Articles, except as regards the *degree* of the presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Sacrament.' The two Reformers, indeed, moved so near to one another as to agree upon the following statement: 'That the sacrament of the altar is the sacrament of the true Body and Blood of Christ, and that the spiritual partaking of that true Body and Blood is especially (or, pre-eminently) needful for every Christian.' This ought to be sufficient to protect the Reformer of Zürich from a charge which has been often made, but I will undertake to say has never yet been proved. Apart from this, however, it is difficult to detect a fault; and any one who desires to have by him a brief, interesting, and entirely faithful account of such things as the theology of the *Formula Concordia*, the system of Calvin, or the chief doctrinal decisions of the Council of Trent, may be assured that Seeberg's book will meet his wishes. All that is needed to make it completely serviceable to the student is an index, which could be furnished without much trouble.

H. R. MACKINTOSH.

Edinburgh.

The Archaeology of Genesis xiv.

BY PROFESSOR A. H. SAYCE, D.D., LL.D., OXFORD.

SOME years ago I wrote an archæological Commentary on the Book of Genesis for the EXPOSITORY TIMES, the object of which was to illustrate or explain the historical portions of the book from the discoveries and researches of Oriental archæology. It was all that could be attempted at that

time. But the progress of Oriental archæology has been so rapid during the last few years, and excavation has been so active in the East, that a good deal more than illustration is now possible. In some instances we are now in a position to do what Professor W. M. Ramsay has done with such

signal success in the case of the Book of Acts, to analyse and interpret the Hebrew text, not from a linguistic, but from an archæological point of view. This is what I propose to do with the fourteenth chapter of Genesis, which touches on the history of Babylonia at a period when it is becoming known to us with an extraordinary fulness of detail.

1. Chedor-laomer of Elam was suzerain and leader in the two campaigns, as we learn from vv.^{4, 5, 8}; the narrative, nevertheless, is dated in the reign of the king of Babylon, and the names of the two Babylonian princes are made to precede that of the king of Elam. It must, therefore, have been derived from the Babylonian annals or from a Babylonian official document, where the years were always dated by the chief events in the reign of a king. Amraphel, as is now known, is the Khammu-rabi of the inscriptions, called Ammu-rabi and Khammuram in contract tablets, and Ammu-rabi by the Assyrians. The final *l* in the Hebrew form may be explained, with Lindl, from the title of *ilu*, 'god,' given to the great king both by himself and by others; or, with Hommel, from a misreading of the cuneiform character representing the final syllable of the name, which has the value of *pil* as well as of *bi*. Khammu-rabi and his dynasty were of West-Semitic origin, like Abraham, and, as the Babylonians could not pronounce the West-Semitic and Arabic *y*, they wrote the name of the god 'Ammu or 'Ammi sometimes Khammu, sometimes Ammi. The fact that the *⌘* of the Babylonian script is reproduced in the Hebrew transcription of the name, proves that it has been copied from a cuneiform document by a writer who was not acquainted with its real pronunciation, the sound for which it stands being a common one in his own language. Shinar is the Hebrew name of the kingdom of Northern Babylonia, of which Babylon was the capital, and appears as Sankhar in the Tel el-Amarna letters, Sanghar in the Egyptian annals of Thothmes III. (for the year 1470 B.C.).

The identity of Arioch of Ellasar with Eri-Aku of Larša was already recognized by Rawlinson, George Smith, and Lenormant in the early days of Assyriology. Eri-Aku is a Sumerian name, 'Servant of the god Aku,' who is identified by the Semitic-Babylonian scribes with Sin, the Moon-god. *Eri* is an abbreviated form of *erim* or *eriv*, and the *א* of the Hebrew Arioch indicates that the

final semi-consonant was pronounced. Hence the king was known as Rim-Sin to a portion of his Semitic subjects, *erim* (*eriv*) being assimilated to the Semitic *rim* or *riw*, 'a wild bull.' In some late Babylonian texts discovered by Dr. Pinches, and belonging to the Spartali Collection, the name is written, in the rebus fashion so dear to the Babylonian scribes, Eri-Ê-kua, 'servant of Ê-kua' (the shrine of Merodach), and Eri-Ea-ku, 'the servant of Ea-ku.' Eri-Aku was the son of an Elamite prince, Kudur-Mabug, who was 'governor of the land of the Amorites,' as Canaan was called by the Babylonians; and after the conquest of Babylonia by the Elamites, in the reign of Khammu-rabi's father, he was made vassal king of Southern Babylonia, with Larša for his capital, while Khammu-rabi, who must have been a boy at the time, was allowed to remain at Babylon. It was not until the thirtieth year of Khammu-rabi's reign that the war of independence began, which was followed in the succeeding year by the conquest of Eri-Aku, and in the year after by that of the Manda or 'Nations.' From this time forward Khammu-rabi reigned over an empire which extended to the Mediterranean, and set about the compilation of a code of laws. Ellasar is probably for al-Larša, 'the city of Larša.'

The tablets discovered by Dr. Pinches make Eri-Aku and Tudghula or Tid'al the contemporaries of a king of Elam called Kudur-mar, which Dr. Pinches gave reasons for believing should be read Kudur-laomer. I have lately found proof in the lexical tablets that the actual reading is Kudur-Laghamar, 'the servant (?) of the god Laghamar,' the Hebrew transliteration of which would be לעמר. The spelling, however, is remarkable, since Lagamar (also written Lagameri and Lagamal) was an Elamite deity whose name was borrowed from the Semitic-Babylonian La-gamilu, 'not sparing'; and though *g* becomes *gh* in Sumerian, it does not do so in Semitic-Babylonian.¹ Hence the Hebrew לעמר must have been copied from a cuneiform document in which the name of the Elamite king was written in the same curious way as in the Spartali tablets.

Tudghula, *i.e.* תדעל, was a vassal ally of Kudur-Laghamar; and since the allies whom the latter called to his help, and at whose head he marched,

¹ Malaghum, however, for מלאח, is given as the word for 'god' in Canaan, where *n* (or *y*) takes the place of *g*. Is this the OT מלאח-יהוה?

are called the Umman Manda or 'Nations,' we may conclude that it was of these that Tudghula was king. The Umman Manda were the mountain tribes to the north of Elam, among whom the Kassî were the most prominent. The Heb. *Goyyim* is a good translation of the Babylonian name.

2. The names of the Canaanite princes are West-Semitic or 'Amorite' names of the age of Khammu-rabi, and are found in the contracts of that period. Bera' is Bin-Ragh (less probably Abi-Ragh), like Sumu-Ragh, Abdi-Ragh ('servant of Ra'); Birsha' is a compound of *bur* (if the reading is right) and *shu'a* (cuneiform Sukh, as in Abi-Sukh, the name of the grandson of Khammu-rabi, Babylonized into Ebisum; Shinab is Sin-abi, with which the name of Khammu-rabi's father, Sin-muballidh, should be compared, and which reappears at a much later period, under the form of Sanibu, as the name of a king of Ammon in the time of Esarhaddon; while Shemeber is either Sumu-ibri or, as I personally think more probable, Sumu-abi, the final *ṛ* being due to a corrupt reading. At all events, the *pasîq* which follows Shinab indicates that there is something wrong with the text. Sumu or Samu (Shem) seems to have been the patron god of the Khammu-rabi dynasty; the names of the first two kings of the dynasty are compounded with it, the first of them being Sumu-abi. It will be noticed that the Canaanite names are correctly transcribed with the *y* that belongs to them by the Hebrew copyist.

Canaan had been annexed to the Babylonian empire as far back as the age of Sargon of Akkad and his son Naram-Sin (B.C. 3800). From that time onward the Babylonian kings continued to lay claim to it. The rulers of Lagas (B.C. 4000-2700) imported limestone and cedar from the Lebanon, and the kings of the dynasty of Ur made campaigns there, while a cadastral survey of the country, drawn up in the age of Dungi of that dynasty, makes mention of Uru-Malik (Urimelech), 'the governor of the land of the Amorites,' who himself bears a West-Semitic name. Large numbers of Canaanites were settled in Babylonia, and the fact that the father of Eriṽ-Aku was 'governor of the land of the Amorites' shows that the Elamites took over the suzerainty of Canaan along with their conquest of Babylonia. When the Elamite dominion was shaken off, Khammu-rabi resumed the title of 'king of the land of the Amorites,' which, indeed, is the only title he bears in an in-

scription he dedicated to the goddess Asirti or Asherah. Naphtha or bitumen was particularly sought after by the Babylonians; the possession of the naphtha springs of Siddim was therefore of special importance to them, and they were not likely to tolerate any remission of tribute on the part of the cities which stood there.

5, 6. The invading army took the high-road on the east side of the Jordan, past Tel 'Ashtereh (Ashtoreth-Qarnaim), near which a monument of Ramses II., now called the *Sakhrat 'Ayyûb*, has been found by Dr. Schumacher. David later took the same route in his war with the Syrians: see EXPOSITORY TIMES, Feb. 1906, p. 215. The city of Astartê is mentioned in the Tel el-Amarna tablets (W. 142, 137), as well as in the geographical lists of Thothmes III.

From Dt 2²⁰ we learn that Ham is Ammon or Ammi and Zuzim Zamzummim. The Hebrew copyist has simply transcribed the cuneiform original as in the name of Amraphel, not recognizing the West Semitic equivalents. The Babylonian Ammi represents אַמּ, אַמּ, and אַמּ, while Zamzummim would be written *Za-av-za-va-[â]*, which in Hebrew letters would be אַמּ אַמּ אַמּ אַמּ. It is noticeable that on the Hyksos scarabs of Egypt אַל 'god,' is written *h-l*.

The Septuagint has 'terebinth (אֲלֵן) of Paran' for El-Paran; but the edge of the desert is not the most likely place for a pine to grow. The Massoretic אַל 'ram' or 'stag,' is still more improbable. In a Babylonian document we should expect *alu* or *al*, 'city,'—*adi al-Paranni*,—a reading which would be supported by the Septuagint (which implies the absence of *god*). The geographical list of Shishak at Karnak mentions 'the spring of Paran' (*a-n P-r-n*) immediately after Raphia and Laban (Dt 1¹). 'The Wilderness' here is equivalent to the Babylonian Melukkhka, 'the Salt-land.'

7. The Amalekites here and elsewhere are the Bedâwîn, called *Šutu* by the Babylonians and Egyptians, 'children of Sheth' in Nu 24¹⁷. The use of the gentilic 'Amorites' in this verse and v.¹³ is that of the Babylonians in the Khammu-rabi period, meaning 'natives of Canaan.' It should be noticed that the Amurrû or Amorites were still 'dwelling' at Hazezon-tamar when the narrative was written: they had not yet become Canaanites. No explanation, moreover, is given of Hazezon-tamar; the name had not yet been

changed to En-gedi, as was the case when 2 Ch 22² and Jos 15⁶² were written.

10. The Canaanite forces fell into the naphtha pits, and perished there, while flying from the invaders. The Septuagint has preserved the second כִּלְךְ, which has fallen out in the ordinary Massoretic text. The syntax of הַנְּשָׂאִים הָרָה הֵנָּה is Babylonian.¹

11. The Septuagint has 'cavalry' or 'chariotry' here and in vv. 16, 21, probably reading רֶכֶב instead of רֶכֶשׁ,—though the latter might signify 'mules' or 'dromedaries,'—since in v. 12 it has 'goods' for the latter word. 'Chariotry' is more probable than 'goods' if we are to insist on the full sense of 'all,' since there is no mention of a capture and sack of Sodom and Gomorrah; indeed, the complete sack of the place is excluded by the appointment of a fresh king there (v. 17). The mention 'victuals' also indicates that it was merely the spoil of the camp that fell into the hands of the Babylonians. On the other hand, though chariots were afterwards a speciality of the Canaanites, we do not know that they had been introduced in the Abrahamic age; carts were known in Babylonia as early as the days when the primitive picture-writing was invented, but there are so few references to horses in the tablets of the Khammu-rabi period that they may have been drawn by oxen. And רֶכֶשׁ would answer to the Babylonian *unutu*, 'the baggage of an army.'

12. 'Abram's brother's son' will be a gloss, since (1) it is inserted in the Hebrew text in the wrong place; (2) according to vv. 14, 16, it was Abram's brother who was captured. Lot must therefore have been fighting along with the Canaanites of Sodom, as Abram did with the Canaanites of Hebron, like the Hittite and other immigrant leaders in the Tel el-Amarna age. The parallelism of v. 12 with v. 11 indicates that it is a note added by the Hebrew writer to explain why Abram intervened in the war.

13. The origin of the gentilic עֲבָרִי is still unexplained. The usual explanation which derives it from עֵבֶר, 'on the other side' of the Euphrates, or, according to Hommel, of the Canal (Peleg), is supported by the fact that the district west of the Euphrates in the neighbourhood of the Belikh was called Ebir-nâri, 'Beyond the River,' by the Assyrians (K. 1050), and that in an inscription of Esar-haddon, Ebir-nâri denotes Phœnicia. But

¹ *Sittati ana saddi ipparsidu.*

there is no evidence that the expression was employed before the Late Assyrian period, and another explanation of the name is possible. *Ubara* in Sumerian signified 'client,' the allied *ebur* being a 'priest.' The word was borrowed by Semitic Babylonian under the form of *ubaru* and assimilated to *ibru*, 'friend' (Heb. חֵבֵר). The 'Amorites' of Ur, Sippara, and other Babylonian cities may therefore have been known as the 'Clientes.' An early Babylonian tablet speaks of 'bronze from Ibru' (Thureau Dangin, *Tablettes chaldéennes inédites*, No. 10).

14. In the Babylonia of Khammu-rabi conscription existed, and each landowner was required to furnish a certain number of recruits for service in war. We gather from one of the tablets found at Taanach that this was also the case in Canaan. The Sept. reading, 'numbered,' 'mustered,' is preferable to the Massoretic, where the variant reading יִדְק would give the technical Assyrian word *idqi*, 'he mustered (troops).' From v. 24 we learn that Abram's militia was accompanied by a body of confederate 'Amorites.'

15. Here again the Sept. 'fell upon' is to be preferred. The prisoners and booty were, as usual, following the main body of the army, and, as it would seem, with only a small escort, when they were overtaken at Dan, and surprised in a night attack. The main body of the Babylonian troops appears to have already been north of Damascus. Hobah may be the Ubi of the Tel el-Amarna tablets, the Aup of the Egyptian inscriptions. According to Jg 18²⁹ we ought to have Laish instead of Dan; and the statement in Judges is supported by the geographical list of Thothmes III. if the identification of Liusa (No. 31) with Laish is correct. The name of Dan could not have been substituted for that of Laish in a Hebrew document until the time of the grandson of Moses.

16. 'Women and people' would be the Sumerian order of words; Semitic-Babylonian would require 'men and women.'

17, 18. We learn from the Tel el-Amarna tablets that Jerusalem was the leading city in southern Canaan in the pre-Israelitish age, and that it possessed a considerable territory. From the present passage it follows that the territory extended as far as the naphtha springs of Siddim. The new prince of Sodom was bringing the customary gifts, and receiving the confirmation of his title from his

over-lord the *patesi* of Jerusalem; the *patesis*, who were primarily 'high priests,' being the governors of the provinces, districts, and chief cities of the Babylonian empire. The Babylonian system of government was retained in a modified form in Canaan even under Egyptian rule, as we find Ebed-Kheba, the king of Jerusalem, continuing to be an Egyptian governor, and owing his position not to inheritance, but to the appointment of 'the mighty king.'

Jerusalem seems to have been of Babylonian foundation, since the name Uru-Šalim, 'the city of Šalim,' is Babylonian. *Uru* was borrowed from Sumerian; so, too, was the West-Semitic עיר, which, however, was taken from the dialectal Sumerian form *eri*. Hence, had the city been originally Canaanite, its name would have been Eri-Šalim instead of Uru-Šalim. The god Šalim-mu is named on a seal now in the Hermitage at St. Petersburg. The ideograph denoting Šalim also represented *sulmu* (שלום), and both Šalim and *sulmu* were adopted by Sumerian under the form of *Šilim*. The West-Semitic form of the divine name was שלם (so in an inscription from Sidon, Clermont-Ganneau, *Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études* cxiii. ii. pp. 40, 48), Σελμανίς at Shêkh Barakât; the Assyrians made it Sulmânu, from *sulmu*. In Uru-Šalim, *uru*, 'city,' might be dropped, as indeed it usually was in reading Assyrian; hence the Salem of this chapter and of the geographical lists of Ramses II.

Abram passed Jerusalem on his way back to Hebron; consequently the route he had followed had been on the west side of the Jordan.

Melchi-zedeq is a name of the Khammu-rabi period. The tenth king of the dynasty was Ammi-zaduq, and the governor of Canaan mentioned in the cadastral survey of Dungi's time was Uru-(AN)Malik, where Malik (Moloch) has the determinative of divinity. Like most other Babylonian governors of the time, Melchi-zedeq (better Malik-zaduq) was *patesi*, or 'high priest'; even in Assyria the 'high priest' of Assur preceded the king. The offering of bread and wine indicated submission to the conqueror on the part of the Babylonian governor. Similarly, Ebed-Kheba reports that Gezer, Ashkelon, and Lachish had 'given food, oil, and other necessaries' to the rebels, who, he says, were fighting against the Egyptian king (WINCKLER, 180. 15, 16).

אֱלִיָּן is the translation of the Babylonian

Ilu Tsiru, 'the Supreme God,' a title given to Bel (and also Beltis), as well as to In-Aristi, whose temple is described by Ebed-Kheba as being 'in the mountain (*or* land) of Jerusalem.' An early hymn used in the ritual of Sin, the moon-god, at Ur, also declares him to be 'supreme' in heaven and earth.

19. The phrase לִּירוּךְ is found in Aramaic *graffiti*, which I have copied in Upper Egypt. The translation of קנה by 'possessor' may be defended on the ground that the Hebrew writer wished to avoid rendering the Babn. *bil* by בעל on account of the heathenish associations of the latter word; but the idea of 'purchaser' contained in קנה is so unsuitable that the Sept. translation 'creator' is preferable here and elsewhere. In the Babn. inscriptions Bel is 'the creator of heaven and earth.'

20. The Babylonian would have been *libbi Ili Tsiri linakkh*, 'may the heart of the Most High God be at rest.' The prayer had to be accompanied by an offering. The tithe (*esrû*) was a Babylonian institution, and was paid to the god. As it was also exacted upon booty taken in war, the nominative to 'gave' must be Abram, 'him' being the god. 'All' will include both the spoil of the enemy and the property of Sodom which had been recovered.

21. This property would have consisted of both 'the men and women' and the chariots and horses (adopting the Sept. reading).

22. 'Yahveh' is probably the insertion of the Hebrew writer. However, that the name of Yeho was known among the 'Amorites' in Babylonia in the time of Khammu-rabi is shown by the occurrence of the name Yaum-ilu (Joel) in a letter of that period (EXPOSITORY TIMES, ix. p. 522).

The phrase 'to lift up the hand to' a god (*gâti nasû*) had its origin in Babylonia, where the act was part of the ceremonial of the temple ritual.

24. 'The young men' = Abram's militia, the word being used like *marû*, 'young men,' in the Chedor-laomer (Spartali) tablets. A portion of the spoil belonged to their commander, who was responsible for the levy of the militia, and he could do with it as he liked, without giving any of it to his followers. The other portion of the spoil belonged to his three Amorite allies, who shared it with him in proportion to the size and importance of their respective contingents. 'The men which went

with me' is a literal translation of the Babn. *sa illiku idā-a*, 'my allies.' It would appear that the three Amorites laid claim to part of the spoil of the Sodomite camp which had been retaken from the Babylonians, as well as to part of the Babylonian spoil itself, and that it was the spoil only of Sodom and not of Gomorrah and the other cities of Siddim that was recovered. The names of the Amorite princes are not certain, with the exception of that of Mamre, who gave his name to a grove of trees (Bab. *allānu*) near Hebron. Aner is given as Anan in the Sept. (עֲנַן with the Babn. mimmation in some Heb. MSS), and Eshcol looks as if it had been assimilated to the name of the valley of Eshcol. Possibly the name was Ashbél; possibly Mil-ki-li (Malchiel), the name of a governor in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem in the Tel el-Amarna period, since the usual value of the first character in the cuneiform spelling of the name is *is*. But we should in this case have expected 𐤎 rather than 𐤗 (at all events if the translation belongs to the Assyrian age), as in Iscah for Milcah (Gn 11²⁹). The Amorite names in the letter of the Egyptian Pharaoh to 'the prince of Amurra' (W. 50) do not appear to be Semitic any more than 'Mamre'; but this is not the case with the 'Amorite' names found in the Babylonian documents of the Khammu-rabi age.

The results of this archæological analysis of Genesis 14 are as follow:—

(1) Cuneiform documents of the Khammu-rabi age lie behind the Hebrew text.

(2) The documents were Babylonian. This, however, does not preclude their having been written in Canaan, since the official titles of the years were sent by the home government to the Canaanite as to the other governors. One of these notices, announcing the official title of one of the years in the reign of Samsu-iluna, the son and successor of Khammu-rabi, has been found in the Lebanon, and is now in the American College at Beyrût.

(3) The Hebrew text is a translation, or paraphrase, of a cuneiform original. This is proved by the spelling of Amraphel, Ham, and Zuzim, and the rendering of Uru-Šalim by Salem; possibly also by the last syllable of Amraphel and the first syllable of Eshcol. A paraphrase is less likely than a free translation, since all those who

received a Babylonian education were accustomed to translating, more or less literally, from Sumerian. The Canaanite or Hebrew glosses found in the Tel el-Amarna tablets also point to translation in the proper sense of the word.

(4) The whole chapter belongs to the same period of history and literature.

(5) The narrative from beginning to end is historical, and is probably ultimately based on official annals.

(6) The Babylonian proper names have been handed down with remarkable correctness, indicating (α) that the same care was taken in Canaan in copying older documents as in Babylonia and Assyria; (β) that the Hebrew translator was conscientious; (γ) that the Hebrew text is on the whole to be trusted.

(7) The spelling of the name of Amraphel is not official Babylonian, that of Chedor-laomer agrees with the curious spelling of the Spartali tablets.

(8) The differences between the Septuagint and the Massoretic texts—the Septuagint readings being usually preferable to the Massoretic on archæological grounds—show that there has been 'corruption' of the Hebrew text since it was first definitely fixed.

(9) We are therefore justified in believing that still greater differences would be discoverable could we get back to any earlier text, such as it was before the Pentateuch had been reduced to its present form by 'Ezra and the men of the great Synagogue,' who would have done for it what Peisisstratus is said to have done for Homer; see 2 Es 14^{21, 22}. In this particular chapter, however, the differences, according to (6), would not have been material.

(10) The Hebrew translation was made after the conquest of Laish by the Danites in the lifetime of the grandson of Moses, but before Hazezon-tamar had become En-gedi.

(11) As the use of the so-called Phœnician alphabet in Palestine and Phœnicia cannot be traced archæologically beyond the age of David or Samuel, the Hebrew translation of the cuneiform original may have been made then. Von Hummelauer has pointed out that Dt 12-26¹⁶ represents 'the (*not* a) book of the kingdom' (1 S 10²⁵) written by Samuel (Bardenhewer's *Biblische Studien*, vi. 1, 2). That the official records of Israel perished in the destruction of Shiloh by

the Philistines (Jer 7¹² 26⁶), is shown by the loss of the names of the high priests between Phinehas and Eli, the list in 1 Ch 6⁴⁻¹⁵ 50-53 being taken from the genealogy of Ezra (Ezr 7¹⁻⁵) combined with some other genealogy. With the new *régime* under Samuel we may therefore conjecture that

the new alphabet, and probably also the use of the native language, were introduced among the Israelites as they seem to have been at Tyre under Abibal and Hiram I. Samuel himself bears a name of the Khammu-rabi period, Šamu-ilu.

A. H. SAYCE.

The Pilgrim's Progress.

BY THE REV. JOHN KELMAN, JUN., M.A., EDINBURGH.

Prudence.

IN Prudence we meet with a very different questioner indeed. Clever, knowing the world and the heart of man, she searches into Christian's character in a fashion that gives us the assurance that he is dealing now with a practised cross-examiner. He is not facing here mere outward questions of conduct or speech. The inquisition is running its search deep into the secret motives of the life, its imaginations, and desires.

This examination is significant, for, on the one hand, the Church of Christ ought to have a place for Prudence, and a large place. Any public society so influential as the Church still is, can only be a public danger and menace to society if it allows itself to become, through a mistaken charity, the cloak and guarantee for dangerous men. On the other hand, the function of Prudence is not solely exclusive. It is a huge mistake to imagine that moral perfection is expected in Church members, or is the guarantee of their worthiness to be such. Bunyan knew well to the end the evil of his own heart. Once, we are told, when in the disguise of a waggoner he was overtaken by a constable, the latter asked him if he knew 'that devil of a fellow, Bunyan.' 'Know him!' Bunyan said. 'You might call him a devil if you knew him as well as I once did.' The true worthiness lies in the heart, far below the surface of the outward life. It would be difficult to find a more perfect definition of it than that which is contained in these sentences of John Knox's Communion Service: 'For the ende of our comming thither is not to make Protestation, that we are upright or just in our lyves; but contrarywise, we come to seeke our Lyfe and Perfection in Jesus Christ.'

'Let us consider, then, that this Sacrament is a singular *Medicine* for all poore sicke creatures; a comfortable *Helpe* to weake soules; and that our Lord reqyreth none other worthinesse on our part, but that we unfeignedly acknowledge our naughtinesse and imperfection.'

It is a curious fact and a touching one, that Protestantism cannot escape the need which created the confessional in the Church of Rome. Something deep as human nature itself—the loneliness of sin, or the desire to face the worst—drives men to confession in all Churches and outside of them. Only it is well to remember that while confession to a friend gives a relief which is legitimate and has warrant in Scripture, yet the practice is a delicate one and beset with dangers. There are only very few among even our most trusted friends whose natures are wise and fine enough for the office of confessor. Again, the act of confession must never be allowed in itself to satisfy the sinful conscience; indeed, when it ceases to humiliate a man and to give him real pain and shame, it has become dangerous, and should at once be stopped. The luxury of confession may develop easily into the disease of confession, than which there is no more unwholesome and morbid condition of the human spirit.

The list of questions addressed to him is extraordinarily well chosen:—(1) His longing after the past evil life. What she really asks is whether he thinks of it, and he is able to answer that he does so only with shame and detestation—a declaration which, made honestly, shows a very considerable and, indeed, unusual reach of attainment in the spiritual life.

(2) Carnal cogitations, however, still linger in memory and imagination. They are, indeed, his