

the doctrine of the Kingdom of God, and to the progress of spiritual thought. This passage touches the high-water mark of prophecy. Our Lord Jesus at the Last Supper made Jeremiah's words His own, and pointed to His sacrifice as the seal of the prophesied New Covenant.

The prophet Jeremiah had read first in his own heart the great secret that in the New Covenant promise he conveys to his fellow-men. The mission from God, which for twenty years he had struggled with and borne as a harsh yoke, he has at last accepted, becoming to the depths of his nature a consecrated man and resting on the will of God,

(for himself and for his people, as holy and good. The Jeremiah who said, 'O Jehovah, Thou hast befooled me!' and who cursed the day of his birth, is long since dead; the new man has been raised up in him, who 'waits to see the end of the LORD' and finds mercy shining through the darkest judgments. When Jeremiah foretells 'the days coming,' in which Jehovah 'will put His law in men's inward parts, and in their hearts will write it,' that joyful day had dawned already for himself; in his own breast he found a mirror where he read the possibilities and purposes of God's redeeming grace toward all His people.

The Pilgrim's Progress.

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

Faithful and Talkative.

IN these dialogues, Faithful is true to his name. His intelligence is not very wide, but his faithfulness to the principles he holds is absolute. Had he visited the Interpreter's House and the House Beautiful, his intelligence would have been a better match for his faithfulness. Nay, had he kept his eyes open for the study of his fellow-men, and his heart open to the human interest of life, he would have been a better judge of character. It is significant that Faithful knew nothing of his fellow-townsmen, and that Christian knew much of him. Faithful had kept aloof from men who differed from him, a course in which exclusiveness is apt to become a subtle and unconscious form of self-indulgence with such temperaments as his. The nemesis of all self-indulgence is unpreparedness, and the case we are studying is no exception. At first he is too friendly with Talkative, and at the last he is too rude to him.

We see something of the same kind in regard to doctrine. In Faithful's speeches a very complete and satisfactory statement of Protestant Christian doctrine might be compiled. Indeed, it would seem as though the author had deliberately chosen this part for setting forth something in the nature of a manifesto regarding the dogmatic side, while he was obviously constructing a very memorable and classical plea for the practical side of Christianity.

All this is good, and characteristic of Faithful. Yet not less characteristic is that fantastic paragraph regarding the chewing of the cud and the parting of the hoof. It is true that Bunyan himself had at one time (as he tells us in *Grace Abounding*) been much exercised with that most unnecessary discussion. It is true that Dante takes, quite seriously, another view of the same allegorical division (*Purgatorio*, 16, l. 98), departing in this from the still more famous allegorizing of Aquinas (*Summa*, I.-II. q. cii. a6). Yet by this time Bunyan is evidently doubtful, and he makes his Christian chary of committing himself to Faithful's interpretation. In point of fact, all such interpretation is the merest absurdity. But faithful people whose outlook on the world is narrow are apt to take the most fanciful ideas with a great solemnity, making up by their excess of ingenuity for their want of humour.

The most interesting part of this passage is its description of Faithful's practical dealing with Talkative. So characteristic is this that the word 'faithfulness' has come to bear a certain grim suggestion of reproof in the religious language of this country. At first, before he suspects Talkative, we are inclined to credit him with having learned a lesson in politeness. His first word to Faithful is 'friend,' while the word with which he first greeted Christian was 'No!' The pleasant address, however, is afterwards exchanged for a very different

manner. The hectoring and rude style of these rebukes tempts us to think that Faithful, like some other good people, has a certain reserved store of the unregenerate life, which he regards as legitimate for the rebuking of unrighteousness. The distinction between a faithful rebuke and a railing accusation is sometimes subtler than any but the initiated can quite understand. There is such a thing as the abuse of faithfulness. Cheever tells a Persian legend of Abraham driving an idolater forth with blows from his tent into the wilderness. To God's question, the patriarch explains the reason of this cruelty, and receives this reply: 'Have I borne with him these ninety-and-eight years, and nourished him and clothed him, notwithstanding his rebellion against me; and couldst not thou, who art thyself a sinner, bear with him one night?' It is difficult not to side with Talkative a little when Faithful turns upon him. The parts are reversed, and Faithful becomes Talkative now with a vengeance. And yet, after all, Talkative is fair game, and it is satisfying to see him thus paid in his own coin—evidently the only way of silencing him. Bunyan's sidenote at the close of the interview is, 'A good riddance.'

Christian and Talkative.

Throughout the dialogue Christian keeps back and lets Faithful manage the affair. But when he is appealed to by the bewildered Faithful, he does not hesitate to express his mind with the utmost freedom. His conversation sparkles with remarkable passages, which show at once the wisdom and thoroughness of his dealing with his own soul, and the breadth and human nature which have characterized his study of men around him. The fact that Talkative 'makes good men ashamed' is one such saying. We are told in Proverbs that 'When righteous men do rejoice there is great glory' (Pr 28¹²), and he who looks for the signs of glory or of shame on the faces of righteous men has found an excellent criterion of character. Again, the picture of the man who, on the first appearance of a tender conscience in his sons, calls them fools and blockheads, is the work of a shrewd observer. More than two centuries later Stevenson made his Weir of Hermiston meet his son Archie's tender conscience with the retort, 'Ye're splairging.'

But the choicest sentence of all that passed between Faithful and Christian is that in which the former says: 'Like a Christian you make your

reports of men.' This, in the midst of so tremendous a Philippic, is certainly daring. That his plain words are also just ones is not in itself a justification. The sin of evil-speaking does not refer only to false accusation. There is a way of speaking the truth which is quite as unchristian as lying. If the only, or the main reason for the retailing of truths derogatory to our neighbour's character be the gratification of that unclean and morbid interest in evil which is so discouraging to all honest believers in human nature, or if it be the indirect flattery of oneself by the implied contrast with another, then truth may serve the purposes of hell as well as lies. But there is another side to this question besides these. Bishop Butler, in his sermon upon the Government of the Tongue,—perhaps the wisest discourse ever uttered on this subject,—leads up to his conclusion by the plea that 'it is in reality of as great importance to the good of society that the characters of bad men should be known as that the characters of good men should. People who are given to scandal and detraction may indeed make an ill use of this observation; but truths which are of service towards regulating our conduct are not to be disowned, or even concealed, because a bad use may be made of them.' Now it is unquestionable that there are times when society, or some individual member of it, requires to be protected from some dangerous hypocrisy which is gaining too easy credence. Mere kindness and good humour are not enough for such occasions. A habit of universal appreciation, unstiffened by any criticism, is not only insipid, it is unreal and therefore dangerous in a world where the only safety in all cases ultimately lies in reality. A Christian is not essentially a pleasant person, nor is fair speech the essential Christian virtue. Truth in the inward parts is *the* Christian virtue, and he is the best Christian who knows best, both in its gentleness and its severity, the art of 'speaking the truth in love.'

Nay, further, it is Christian who, on the departure of Talkative, says, 'Let him go.' It is a tragic world, in no part more tragic than in the moral and spiritual responsibility of one man for another. To such responsibility there is in every case a limit, and out of his wide experience Christian knew this limit when he crossed it. With deepening awe and sadness all faithful men see a certain number of their fellows going off from more straight-spoken to more comforting

preachers. Jesus Christ Himself watched with wistful eyes the departure of the young ruler whom He loved as He looked upon him, but He did nothing further to hinder his departure. After a certain point, men who have deliberately rejected the judgment of good men must be left to the judgment of God. It is about such men that John Bunyan, in his *Barren Fig-Tree*, quotes *Ezk 14*⁷, 'I will answer him by myself,' and adds: 'Thou art too hard for the Church; she knows not how to deal with thee. Well, I will deal with that man myself.'

We do not need to be so outrageously and grotesquely unreal as this Talkative to have a share in his fault. Our greatest danger will be unconsidered speech, which will often degenerate into unkind speech, where unkindness was wholly unnecessary and could serve no ultimate end of love. There is a story of Erasmus Darwin, who was afflicted with a stammer, being asked on one occasion, 'Don't you find it very inconvenient stammering, Dr. Darwin?' The answer was, 'No, sir, because I have time to think before I speak, and don't ask impertinent questions.' To which may be added the beautiful words of Dr. Peyton (*Memorabilia of Jesus*, p. 331): 'You must often have thought of two silences—the silence of the stars above you, and the silence of the graves around you. And here we are, chattering, speaking, brawling between these stillnesses. Our true speech is to work well, to love much, to do great good. Be true to your home and family, loyal to your God and Saviour, friendly to all men around you. And somehow this speech blends wonderfully with the silences.'

Wilderness and City.

With one of his touches of unconscious poetry, Bunyan mentions casually that 'now they went through a wilderness.' The reader comes to suspect some sort of connexion between the story and its scenery, lending even to such details as this a certain touch of allegorical significance. There is little doubt that this wilderness was suggested to the author by the mood which his last-composed passage had induced. The effect of all this talking was that inevitable sense of dreariness that falls upon the spirit after any excess of speech. This speech had been more than ordinarily barren, and every sensitive spirit will recognize the truth of John Bunyan's instinct

in making those who have been in company with 'Talkative find themselves in a wilderness. The trail of boredom which Talkative leaves behind him in the world is more marked when he is among spiritual men. The dreariness of his empty talk seems to take the sense of reality out of even the spiritual things which they most firmly believe.

But they are drawing near to a city, and are soon to catch their first glimpse of its towers and palaces. The city, seen from the wilderness, is always one of the most exhilarating of imaginations. To hear once again the hum and stir of life, and to mingle with our fellows in the crowded streets, seems in itself so fascinating an expectation that the eye gleams, and the blood flows quicker for it. The colour and brightness of crowds, the adventure of a thousand changing encounters, the manifold vitality and companionship, all 'call us by the ear and eye.'

Alas for the disillusion of the city! From rural simplicities, where sin and goodness alike were more primitive, men have, not knowing what they did, massed themselves together in cities, and created a new type of human existence. This has brought a change upon every relation between man and man, a still subtler change upon the very consciousness of the individual self. New and desperate problems have arisen, both moral and social. The work of man's hands has mastered him, and he frankly confesses that he does not understand it. The cities which he has built have turned upon him like Frankenstein's monster, and overwhelmed him in conditions which it will take many a year to reduce to anything like rightness or beauty. The city, seen from the wilderness, has given the world most of its Utopias. But as men have entered the gates, successive generations have sadly found the $\epsilon\upsilon$ change to $\omicron\upsilon$ —the 'fair city' to the 'nowhere' of dreams from which men have wakened.

Evangelist.

Just at this point they again meet Evangelist, while still feeling the dreariness of the unreality behind them, and when just about to face the more formidable unrealities that awaited their approach. They recognize him emphatically as a friend, although one of them at least had had a former meeting whose bitterness he had not forgotten. These men do not judge their acquaintance by

mere pleasantness. All men are to them friends or enemies, according as they help or hinder their spirit and progress. No wonder if he be hailed as a friend who had set them both in the way.

This meeting with Evangelist is of great significance. It is not recorded in the first edition, but the maturer thoughts of the author gives to Evangelist a wider and more prominent sphere of work. This expansion of Evangelism from the call to repentance and the start of pilgrimage, to the larger task of 'the cure of souls,' is well worth noting. His work is not merely initiatory, as at the City of Destruction, nor negative, as at Mount Sinai. It is the pastoral and positive work of one who is ever ready and watchful over the souls of his converts. And yet it is but occasional. Bunyan's Evangelist is not continually interfering, nor undertaking the responsibilities of the whole life of the pilgrims. He has been busy with other duties, and among other souls. A touch now and then, a meeting at critical moments and then a parting, are the ways of Evangelist with his friends. He hears their story, speaks his words, and vanishes; and in this there is much wisdom for those who desire their spiritual guides to do for them the whole work of pilgrimages, a desire which has made the lives of some ministers an impossible and discouraging attempt to do more than can be done, and which has been responsible for much unjust criticism of the clerical profession.

The interview with Evangelist is a heart-searching time, as all meetings with old friends are, when men review earnestly the events of the interval since last they met. This is a cheerful as well as a pathetic interview. Not only are they cheered by Evangelist, he is cheered by them. It is sometimes forgotten that the director of the souls of others has also a soul of his own—a soul which may be very much in need of cheer at times. This is a lonely man, who is glad of their friendship and goes away brighter for it. In his blessing on their helpers, we see how companionable is the man's view of life, and how generous and genuine his interest in their welfare. We are brought back here to the old strain, the value of encouragement. Shortly after the death of John Ruskin, the following appeared in a South African newspaper:—'Ruskin's great defect, it has been often remarked, is that he does not encourage enough. . . . A beautiful writer on art, its meaning and its lessons, but in matters social and political he has hardly a

word of praise. He says much that is true in the condemnation of the faults and follies of men, but it is spoiled from want of a little praise. And he himself, in later years, has admitted this. "Ah, if I had known all this when I began to write," he says, in a pathetic statement referring to multitudes of letters he had received from various correspondents, "how differently I would have written. I see now that I might have touched very different strings, and have awakened better music."

Evangelist's exhortations remind us strongly of Bunyan's *Heavenly Footman*, part of which was quoted in a previous article. His language savours of the Heavenly Footman—soldier and sinner both. The soldier reminds them that they are not yet out of the gunshot of the devil; the sinner warns them to let nothing that is on this side of the other world get within them. And, besides these two, the man speaks. He is right glad of this thing, for his own sake as well as for theirs. He has felt his responsibility for souls in a way that only one who has identified himself with them can feel it, and is relieved and glad on account of their success.

Offor sees in this exchange of the wilderness for the city a possible allusion to Bunyan's being set apart for the work of the ministry in 1656, as that event is narrated in *Grace Abounding*, and reminds us that 'the second address of Evangelist peculiarly relates to the miseries endured by Nonconformist ministers in the reign of Charles II.' 'Evangelist's address,' he says, 'would make a good outline for an ordination sermon.' But that second address, warning them of *Vanity Fair*, is of wider application. Every man who has, in his communicant's class prepared young men and women for their first communion, has some searching and peculiar memories as he reads this passage. He remembers the earnest faces, that were soon to enter a world of which they were ignorant as yet. He remembers the change from those days of sincerity and eagerness to the gradually increasing carelessness that grew as the world engrossed and dazzled them. He will warn his next class with a passionate urgency which they may not comprehend at this time, but whose meaning the world will afterwards interpret for them.

The prophecy of Faithful's death is full of the sound confidence which Christ gives to believers. Among the last words of Socrates were these: 'And now it is time that we have done. I go to

die, you remain to live, but which of us goeth the better way, the gods only know.' Evangelist has heard from St. Paul (Phil 1²³) which of the two went the better way. 'He that shall die there, although his death will be unnatural, and his pain perhaps great, he will yet have the better of his fellow.' The words remind us of the famous Scottish story of the same period, which tells how Peden, at the grave of Richard Cameron, cried, 'Oh, to be wi' Ritchie!'

One of the reasons for this preference is striking—'He will be arrived at the Celestial

City soonest.' Evangelist's appearances are curiously connected with cities—the City of Destruction, the Town of Morality, Vanity Fair, and the Celestial City. He is a man of the city, though we always meet with him in the open. He knows the evils of the city, and he knows them all the better by contrast with that ideal city, the true and eternal Utopia, in which his soul has its citizenship and home. Those who would further pursue the suggestions of this view of Evangelist should read the poem entitled 'The City,' in Dr. Bonar's *Hymns of Faith and Hope*.

The Purchase of the Cave of Machpelah.

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

WHAT follows is another specimen of the archaeological analysis of the earlier books of the Old Testament upon which I am at present engaged. The method and results are already known to readers of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES from the analyses of the fourteenth chapter of Genesis and the genealogy of Abraham which have been published in this journal. I will now take the twenty-third chapter of Genesis and examine it verse by verse.

2. We gather from Jos 14¹⁵ and Jg 1¹⁰ that the name of Hebron was of recent origin when the Israelites entered Canaan. This is in accordance with the archaeological testimony. The name first appears on the Egyptian monuments under the form of Khibur in the geographical lists of Ramses III. at Medinet Habu. Khibur is a fairly close transliteration of the cuneiform Khabiri-ki or 'Khabiri-town,' the name applied to the settlement of the Khabiri or 'Confederates' in Southern Palestine by the king of Jerusalem in the Tel el-Amarna letters (Winckler, 185. 11). The place was previously known as Kirjath-Arba', 'the city of Arba',—'a great man among the Anakim.' Arba' would signify 'four,' but as this is an impossible name for a chieftain we must see in Arba' a contracted form of Arb'am, like Bela' (Gn 36³²) for Bala'am. The loss of the final *m* points to transcription from a cuneiform original, the *m* being mistaken for the mimmatum, and accordingly dropped. For Mamre, see note below on v.¹⁰. The addition of the words, 'in the land of Canaan,' would indicate that the gloss was intended for readers who did not

live in Palestine. Abraham is represented as having 'come' to Kirjath-Arba' (apparently from Beersheba), so that he was not there with Sarah at the time of her death. This would naturally imply that Kirjath-Arba' was Sarah's place of residence, and that her husband was temporarily absent from it when she fell ill.

3. The name of the Hittites is here assimilated to the Hebrew *Khath*, 'terror,' and they are accordingly called the Benê-Khêth, or 'Sons of Heth,' thus transforming them into a Semitic tribe. The painted pottery discovered in the pre-Israelitish strata of Lachish and Gezer has been shown by Mr. J. L. Myres (*Journ. of the Anthropological Institute*, xxxiii. pp. 367 ff.) to be of Hittite origin, and derived from the district north of the Halys, where the *sandarakhê* or red ochre which distinguishes it was found. It was from this Hittite region also that bronze made its way into Assyria and Palestine, where Mr. Macalister has discovered examples of it in the early Amorite strata at Gezer. In agreement with the archaeological facts, a stela in the Louvre (C. 1), commemorating the first two kings of the Twelfth Dynasty, describes the Egyptian troops as destroying 'the palaces of the Hittites' in the south of Palestine. The determinative attached to the name of the Hittites is not that of 'country,' but of 'going,' showing that (like the writer in Genesis) the Egyptian scribe has assimilated the name of the foreign people to an otherwise unknown word (perhaps Hittite) which signified 'to go.' How Hittite bands came