

which is the condition of our finally reaching His blessedness. Christianity is not an idealism; it is an achievement' (Forrest, *Christ of History and of Experience*).

The Incarnate One entered thus into our whole human nature. He became man, archetypal, universal, representative man, free from all particularities and peculiarities of race or age or station. 'Man of the substance of His mother, born in the world,' gathering up into Himself all the characteristics of our common humanity, ideally and perfectly man, in perfect fellowship with the Father, in perfect sympathy with fallen man. He thus 'recapitulated humanity' (Strong, p. 276). Thus, only thus, could He reveal the present degradation, the future possibilities, the everlasting destiny of human nature. Thus, only thus, could He atone for sin by the sacrifice of Himself. And this He

did when, upon the Cross, He dealt with *Sin*, offering what man could not offer, the perfect penitence of the sinless One, thus restoring man's will into harmony with that of His Father; when, again, on the Cross He dealt with *Guilt*, demonstrating the righteousness of God in punishing sin and thus securing the sinner's forgiveness which he himself could not secure; when, on the Cross again, He dealt with *Sanctification*, through the outpoured Blood ('wherein is the life'), releasing the life which is the secret of man's cleansing and man's renewal, bringing home to us the gift of the Spirit whereby man is awakened to his true possibilities. For, though 'Pentecost could not be without Calvary,' and 'Calvary is the possibility of Pentecost,' yet 'Pentecost is the realization, in human spirits, of Calvary' (*Atonement and Personality*, p. 152).

Recent Biblical and Oriental Archaeology.

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

Who was Balaam?

BALAAM is a puzzling figure. He comes before us under different aspects which are not very easy to harmonize. He is (1) a diviner from Pethor, who, like the Aramæans, Bethuel and Laban, serves Yahweh of Israel; (2) an ally, apparently, of the Midianites in Moab in their contest with the Israelites (Nu 31⁸), who is identified with the diviner in Jos 13²²; and (3) the first king of Edom, who fixed his capital at Dinhabah (Gn 36³²).

His name has been compared with that of Balummê, the father of the Canaanite Sum-Hadad, who is mentioned in the Tel el-Amarna tablets (WINCKLER, II. 18). Winckler would identify Balummê with Pâlûma, who is described by the Egyptian king as living in the land of the Amorites, north of Palestine. Pâlûma, however, whose name should rather be read Pâlûwa, is the Amorite Pâluya referred to in another letter (WINCKLER, 47. 9). Balummê may be non-Semitic, since we find Pastummê with a similar termination among the Alasiyan names given in the Tel el-Amarna correspondence (WINCKLER, 26. 21), and the same termination is found in Hittite names. It is quite

possible that Balaam, abbreviated into Bela on the analogy of Milcom and Mōloch, may have been an attempt to give the foreign name a Semitic appearance.

Balaam, the diviner, came from Pethor, which was a Hittite city at the confluence of the Euphrates and Sajur. It is described as being 'by the river of the land of the children of Ammo,' the Ammi of the Tel el-Amarna tablets, which is also mentioned in two of the Hittite inscriptions of Hamath. It was one of the Hittite conquests of which the Tel el-Amarna letters contain a record. Now in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for March I have pointed out that in the Tel el-Amarna age the leaders of Hittite *condottieri* carved out principalities for themselves, like the Normans in the Middle Ages, not only in Syria but in Southern Palestine as well. Is it not possible, therefore, that Balaam, the son of Beor, was one of these Hittite chieftains who made his way into Edom, and there founded a kingdom? When the Exodus took place, the Edomites were still governed by native *alûphim* or 'dukes' (Ex 15¹⁵); when the Israelites were preparing to invade Canaan, Edom had passed under the rule of a king (Nu 20¹⁴). That the first king of Edom

should have perished in a war carried on by Israel against the Midianites in Moab has nothing improbable in it when we remember that the third king of Edom 'smote Midian in the field of Moab' (Gn 36³⁶), and that the sword of a successful leader of *condottieri* would naturally be at the service of his neighbours if they could pay him for it. At the time of the Exodus, the Midianites were already occupying a part of Moab (see Nu 22⁴⁻⁷).

Dr. Neubauer once suggested (I think in the *Academy*) that Dinhabah is a Semitized form of Dunip, the famous fortress-city of northern Syria, near Aleppo, and that it was so named by Balaam after the better-known city of the north. If this suggestion has any truth in it, it would be additional evidence in favour of the Hittite origin of the first Edomite king.

That Edom suddenly became formidable during the period which elapsed between the Exodus and the Israelitish invasion of Canaan, has already been inferred by Egyptologists. For the first and last time in Egyptian history Ramses III. made a campaign against 'the people of Seir,' and 'plundered their tents.' This was after the repulse of the Philistines and other invaders of Egypt from the Greek seas, and the capture of Hittite and Amorite princes who had penetrated into Canaan and even to the Egyptian frontier. One of them may very easily have found his way as far as the mountains of Seir. How a Hittite chieftain came

to be also a diviner still remains to be explained. Perhaps a key to the problem may be discovered in the words of Balaam (Nu 23⁷), that he had been brought 'from Aram, out of the mountains of the East.' The East was the home of magic and wisdom, and the highest praise accorded to Solomon was that his 'wisdom excelled the wisdom of all the east country (literally the children of the East) and all the wisdom of Egypt' (1 K 4³⁰).

Inter Alia.

Professor Schiaparelli has discovered the tomb of Nefert-ari, the favourite wife of Ramses II., in the Valley of the Tombs of the Queens, at Thebes. Though the mummy of the queen has disappeared, the tomb itself is in a good state of preservation, and the inscriptions on the walls are numerous and legible.

At Karnak M. Legrain has found a pit filled with statues of all ages, from one of the Sixth dynasty down to others of the Græco-Roman period. It is supposed that they were thrown into the pit when the pagan temples were closed by Theodosius. One of the statues is a portrait of Usertes III. of the Twelfth dynasty, and represents him with features which are Hyksos rather than Egyptian. It would seem, therefore, that a strain of Asiatic blood must have entered the royal house of Egypt long before the days of the Hyksos invasion.

Point and Illustration.

So wonderful, so supernatural, is the story of Madagascar, that it is difficult to believe it is true. It is more wonderful than the story of Japan. There is less of man and more of God in it. The whole range of Christian experience has been accomplished there. Its history is a miniature of the history of Christianity. As Mr. Matthews says,¹ there is no count in that terrible first chapter of the Epistle to the Romans that was not true of the conduct of the native Malagasy. Every item of St. Paul's catalogue of sufferings was repeated in the case of the missionaries. And the light and liberty that came at last came in all the flood of the convulsions of apostolic days.

¹ *Thirty Years in Madagascar*. By the Rev. T. T. Matthews. R.T.S., 1904. Price 6s.

Mr. Matthews has produced a great book. It is quite in touch with its great theme. He has spent thirty years in the island, and knows it well. Yet he has spared no pains to make his book attractive to the uninterested. The style is easy, the illustrations are many, lifelike, and appropriate. To read the book is to be at home in a strange land. Here is one of its scenes—

The Sheep's Rump.—I was six years in Madagascar before I had to perform the marriage ceremony for any of our people. We found the vast majority of the church members and adherents married, and those of the latter who were not could not be persuaded to follow the Christian mode of marriage. They said our agreement was too hard, it was till death. We might take our wives till death, because they were wise and good; but as their women were foolish and bad, they could not consent to take them until