

men is God's fatherly love. We must love all men, even our enemies. Our love to men must be ministering, benevolent, correcting, and forgiving. But we must not make love a plea for the neglect of other duties. We must show fidelity in all human relationships. We must do justly as well as love mercy.

We have been able to give only a very brief

summary of the contents of this volume. We hope, however, that many of our readers will be induced to study it for themselves. We might also take the liberty of urging them to read along with it Professor Bruce's work on *The Kingdom of God*, which contains some things lacking in Wendt, and which corrects, by anticipation, some of his erroneous conclusions.

The Fourteenth Chapter of Genesis.

BY THE REV. A. H. SAYCE, LL.D., PROFESSOR OF ASSYRIOLOGY, OXFORD.

IN an article I contributed a short while ago to THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, I referred to the fourteenth chapter of Genesis as a crucial instance in which the exaggerated scepticism of the so-called "Higher Criticism" has been confuted by the recent discoveries of Oriental archæology. At the very moment when the critic was proclaiming in the most positive tones the unhistorical character of a narrative which even Von Bohlen had allowed to be authentic, the spade of the excavator and the patient skill of the decipherer were vindicating its trustworthiness in the most complete and unexpected manner. The history of the campaign of Chedorlaomer and his allies against Palestine, which we have been told was but a projection into the distant past of the western campaigns of the Assyrian kings, has been shown to be in exact accordance with the testimony of the ancient monuments, while the account of Melchizedek, king of Salem, which the critics were unanimous in pronouncing to be mythical, has also received an unexpected confirmation from the same source.

The chief argument urged against the credibility of Chedorlaomer's campaign was the difficulty of believing that military expeditions could have been sent from Babylonia to Palestine at so early a period as that assigned to Abraham. By the side of this chief argument other arguments were but subsidiary, such as, that the political situation presupposed in the narrative of Genesis is inconsistent with all that we knew about early Babylonian history; that a Babylonian conquest of Canaan at such a date is incredible; or that the names of the Canaanitish kings are etymological plays upon the catastrophe which subsequently overwhelmed the

cities of the plain. So far as the historical arguments are concerned, the cuneiform inscriptions show that it is the critic, and not the Book of Genesis, that has been at fault.

Syria and Palestine had been invaded by the armies of Babylonia long before the age to which the lifetime of Abraham can be referred. The founder of the first Semitic empire in Chaldæa was a certain Sargon of Accad in northern Babylonia, who was not only a great conqueror, but also a great patron of learning. He established a famous library in the city of Accad, and it was under his auspices that the standard Babylonian works on astrology and terrestrial omens were compiled. Nabonidos, the last king of independent Babylonia, who was a zealous antiquary, and the pioneer of modern excavators, tells us that Naram-Sin, the son and successor of Sargon, reigned 3200 years before himself, or about 3750 B.C., and the early monuments discovered in Babylonia go to show that this date cannot be far from the truth. Now, a copy has been preserved to us of the annals of the reign of Sargon and of the first portion of his son's reign, which were drawn up, it would seem, while Naram-Sin was still upon the throne, and from these we learn that Sargon not only led his armies to the shores of the Mediterranean, but actually reduced Syria and Palestine—"the land of the Amorites," as it was termed by the Babylonians—to the condition of a conquered province. Three times did he march against the Amorite land and subdue it, and on a fourth occasion "he passed over the (countries) of the sea of the setting sun, and he spent three years in conquering (all countries) in the west. He united all these lands so as to form but one empire. He erected images of

himself in the west. He made the spoil pass over into the countries of the sea."

It would seem from the last sentence that Sargon made his way even into the island of Cyprus. Support for such a conclusion may be found in the fact that General di Cesnola procured there a Babylonian cylinder of early type, on which the owner entitles himself "a servant of the deified Naram-Sin," and the cylinder-seals of native workmanship found in the prehistoric graves of Cyprus are plainly imitations of those of archaic Babylonia. But however this may be, the words of the Babylonian text which I have quoted leave no room for doubt that Sargon established his power in the countries of "the setting sun," and on the shores of the Mediterranean. That this power was handed on to his son, Naram-Sin, is further clear from the fact that no more expeditions against the land of "the Amorites" are recorded, while Naram-Sin's second campaign was directed against the king of Magan, the name under which Midian and the Sinaitic Peninsula were known. The Babylonian troops could have marched thus far to the south only if Palestine had been secure in their rear.

A break of 1500 years occurs before we again hear of Babylonian princes in Palestine and Syria. A tablet recently discovered by Mr. Pinches gives the name and titles of Ammi-satana, a monarch of the first dynasty of Babylon, and among his titles is that of "king" of the land of "the Amorites." According to the Babylonian scribes, Ammi-satana, who belonged to the first dynasty which ruled over an united kingdom and made Babylon a capital, reigned from 2240 to 2215 B.C., and though the date may be about seventy years too high, it is quite early enough for our fourteenth chapter of Genesis.

How Ammi-satana came to be king of Syria as well as of Babylonia is explained by certain bricks found among the ruins of the temple of the sun-god at Larsa, the modern Senkereh. On these Eri-Aku, king of Larsa, calls himself the son of an Elamite, Kudur-Mabug, to whom he gives the title of "father of the land of the Amorites." What the title precisely means I cannot say; all that is plain is that Kudur-Mabug stood in a close relation to the Amorite regions of the west.

The name of Eri-Aku, "the servant of the moon-god," was transformed by his Semitic subjects into Rim-Sin. The fact that his father was an Elamite

indicates that a part at least of Babylonia was at the time dependent on Elam. The kingdom of Larsa must have been under an Elamite suzerain; in no other way can we understand how its king came to be of Elamite descent, unrelated to the older rulers of the State. We learn, moreover, that he was supported on his throne by the forces of the Elamite sovereign. When Khammurabi, the contemporary ruler of Babylon in the north, at length succeeded in overthrowing Eri-Aku and uniting all Babylonia under a single head, he had to face not only the king of Larsa, but the king of Elam as well. Babylonian unity implied the overthrow of Elamite supremacy. Kudur-Mabug, however, was not himself the king of Elam. Had he been so, the title would have been conferred on him by his son. He was simply "the prince of Yavutbal," a frontier province, the relation of which to Elam seems to have been pretty much that of Wales to England. The actual king of Elam may have been a near relative of Kudur-Mabug; he was not Kudur-Mabug himself.

The name Kudur-Mabug signified, in the Elamite language, "the servant of the god Mabug." It was thus parallel to the name of Kudur-Nankhundi, "the servant of the goddess Nankhundi," borne by a king of Elam who made a raid into Babylonia and sacked the temple of Erech in 2285 B.C., not long after the death of Khammurabi. Nankhundi corresponded to the Semitic Ashtoreth, and, along with the god Lagamar, occupied a foremost place among the deities of Elam.

Such, then, are the facts which have been revealed to us by the decipherment of the cuneiform inscriptions. The yoke of Babylonia had been laid upon Canaan and Syria as far back as the remote days of Sargon of Accad, and in the very age to which Abraham belongs—if we are to give any credence to the statements of Scripture—an Elamite prince, whose son was a Chaldæan king, was called the "father" of that western land, while a Babylonian monarch, a few years later, claimed to be its "king." So far from its being incredible that Babylonian armies should have marched into Palestine, and that Babylonian princes should have received tribute from Canaan in the time of Abraham, we find that Canaan had been included in a Babylonian empire centuries before, and that the arms of a Babylonian monarch had been carried even to the borders of Midian. What, then, becomes of the theory that the history of

Chedorlaomer's campaign was but a reflection into the past of the "historical" campaigns of the Assyrian kings?

But more than this, the political situation presupposed by the fourteenth chapter of Genesis is precisely the same as that which the contemporaneous monuments of Babylonia assure us was actually the case. Not only according to the Book of Genesis, but also according to the monuments, Babylonia was divided into more than one kingdom, and acknowledged the supremacy of Elam. When the Babylonian kings go forth to war, according to the narrative in Genesis, it is under the command of an Elamite monarch, and it is Chedorlaomer, and not the Babylonian kings, whom the Canaanites "served." This is in exact accordance with the fact that Kudur-Mabug, and not Eri-Aku, was "the father" of the land of the Amorites, and that it is only later, when the Elamite domination had been shaken off, that a Babylonian prince became its "king."

So close a correspondence between the condition of Babylonia as described in Genesis, and that in which it was at the beginning of Khammurabi's reign, suggests the question whether the age of Chedorlaomer is not also the age of Khammurabi. The question has long since been answered in the affirmative by the Assyriologists, on the strength of the more than accidental resemblance between one of the proper names recorded in Genesis and that of the son of Kudur-Mabug. Eri-Aku is letter for letter the Arioch of Scripture, and the Ellasar of Arioch can be no other than the Larsa of Eri-Aku. A scribe's carelessness could easily transform *al-Larsa*, "the city of Larsa," into the Ellasar of the Hebrew text.

Chedorlaomer would be Kudur-Lagamar in cuneiform writing. It is a name of the same character as Kudur-Mabug and Kudur-Nankhundi, Lagamar being, as we have seen, one of the chief Elamite gods. Shinar is the cuneiform Sumer, or southern Babylonia, and attempts have been made to find in the name of Khammurabi that of Amraphel. But the attempts have not been successful, and it is questionable whether the kingdom over which Amraphel ruled was really that of which Khammurabi was king. It is true, that in the later books of the Old Testament Shinar denotes the whole of Babylonia, and that Babylon accordingly is included in it; but in the fourteenth chapter of Genesis, otherwise so correct in its Babylonian

colouring, we should expect to find the term used in its proper sense. In this case, Amraphel of Shinar will be a king whose monuments have not as yet been met with, and the seat of whose government was in the south, and not northward in Babylon.

On "Tidal, king of nations," no light has been thrown by archæology. Tidal appears in the Septuagint as Thorgal, which is probably a better reading than that of the Hebrew text; and Sir Henry Rawlinson has conjectured that *Goyyim*, "nations," is a corrupt reading for *Gutium*, the name under which Kurdistan, as well as what was afterwards the kingdom of Assyria, was known to the Babylonians. But Tiadal, or Tadal, also appears on the Egyptian monuments as a Hittite name, and the Que or Guans inhabited the northern part of Syria.

The account of Chedorlaomer's campaign contains two indications that it has been derived from a cuneiform document. Although Chedorlaomer is the leader of the expedition, it is, nevertheless, Amraphel, king of Shinar, who is first named at the beginning of the narrative. The narrative, in fact, is dated in his reign, a clear proof that it must be quoted from the Babylonian annals. The two Babylonian princes take precedence of their Elamite lord, as could be the case only if the story had been told by a Babylonian writer.

The other indication is the form of the names Zuzim and Ham. We learn from Deut. ii. 20 that the names ought to be *Zamzummim* and *Ammon*. The forms met with in Genesis are inexplicable as long as we remain on Hebrew ground. But if once we grant that the Hebrew narrative has been copied from a cuneiform original, everything becomes intelligible. In the cuneiform system of writing, the same characters serve to express indifferently the sounds of *m* and *w*. The same group of characters might consequently be transcribed into Hebrew as either *זוזים* or *זוזים*, and the choice depended on the knowledge or caprice of the transcriber. Similarly the Hebrew *hē* and *'ayin* would be represented in cuneiform by the same characters, and it would again depend upon the transcriber whether he should write *הה* or *עפ*. This accounts for the substitution of Ham for Ammi or Ammon in Gen. xiv. 5; without the assumption of a Babylonian document, such a mode of writing the name is quite inexplicable.

Oriental archæology, working on the ancient

monuments of Babylonia, has thus not only demonstrated the historical character of Chedorlaomer's campaign; it has also made it probable that the history of the campaign was faithfully transcribed from Babylonian records which were contemporaneous with the event. Can it go further, and indicate a possible period when this transcription was made?

Until recently it was supposed that the only period when a Palestinian writer would have had access to the cuneiform annals of Babylonia was that of the Captivity. But the discovery of the cuneiform tablets of Tel el-Amarna has thrown a new light on the matter. They have shown that in the fifteenth century before our era, when Canaan was an Egyptian province, it was, nevertheless, under the dominating influence of Babylonian culture. The early kings of Babylon had been followed by a foreign dynasty, that of the Kassites, by whom Babylonia was governed for 576 years. But the power of Babylonia continued to be felt in Canaan, and Babylonian armies were still at times to be seen on the shores of the Mediterranean. The deep and lasting influence of Babylonian culture on the populations of the west is a sure sign of their long political subjection to Babylonian authority. Even in the days when Canaan obeyed the Egyptian Pharaoh, the disaffected Amorites of the north sought the help of Babylonian arms, and the oracle of the god of Jerusalem declared that the conquests of the Babylonians should still continue. The literature of the country was Babylonian; the cities of Canaan were filled with the clay literature of Babylonia; and the complicated cuneiform syllabary was taught and learned by the Canaanite scribes. Even the deities of Babylonia were introduced into the west; Ashtoreth, the Babylonian Istar, almost supplanted the native Asherah, and temples, towns, and high places took their names from the Chaldæan deities, Anu and Anat, Rimmon and Nebo, Moloch (Malik) and Sin.

This was a time when those who were interested in the earlier history of Canaan had every opportunity of searching in the records of Babylonia for references to it. It was a time when it was possible for the kinsfolk of "Abram the Hebrew" to transcribe from the clay books of Babylonia a narrative of the events in which he had borne a part. It is therefore no longer necessary to descend to the age of the Exile in order to find a period when a

Hebrew writer could consult the literature of Babylonia, and read the characters in which it was written; the century before the Exodus was one in which the literature and culture of Babylonia were brought to Canaan, and it was not needful to go to the banks of the Euphrates to study and assimilate them. Oriental archæology has nothing to say against the supposition that the history of Chedorlaomer's campaign, such as we have it in the Book of Genesis, may have been transcribed from the cuneiform records into "the language of Canaan" in the fifteenth century before the birth of Christ.

While the first part of the fourteenth chapter of Genesis is Babylonian in character, the second part of the chapter is purely Palestinian. Here, therefore, it might have been thought that Oriental archæology could shed no light, at least so long as the soil of Palestine remains unexcavated. But the same Tel el-Amarna tablets, which have revolutionised our conceptions of ancient history in so many respects, have afforded us a strange and startling commentary on the history of Melchizedek. Melchizedek has, as it were, stepped forth from behind the veil of mystery which enshrouded him, and has become an intelligible figure of history. The criticism which treated him as a myth has again been proved to have been too hasty, and its scepticism to have been unfounded.

Among the correspondents of the Egyptian Pharaohs, whose letters, written in the cuneiform characters of Babylon, have been found at Tel el-Amarna, is a veritable successor of the priest-king Melchizedek. Ebed-Tob, the king of Uru-Salim or Jerusalem, was indeed a vassal of Egypt, but he was a vassal who boasts that, unlike the other Egyptian governors in Canaan, he did not owe his position to the Egyptian monarch, nor was his royal dignity inherited; it was neither his father nor his mother, but an oracle of the god—"the mighty king"—whom he worshipped that had conferred it upon him. He was king, in short, in virtue of his office as priest of the god of Jerusalem. This god bore the name of Salim, the god of "Peace." The royal priest, accordingly, who ruled in Uru-Salim, "the city of Salim," might be called "the king of Salim" with even more truth than "king of Jerusalem." Like the descendant of David whom Isaiah beheld in prophetic vision (vii. 6) he was a "Prince of Peace."

Here, then, we have an explanation of the meeting between Melchizedek and "Abram the Hebrew."

Abram had defeated the invading host which had come from the banks of the Euphrates, and he had driven the conqueror from the soil of Canaan. He had restored peace to a country of which, as the Tel el-Amarna tablets assure us, Jerusalem was already an important capital and a sacred sanctuary. Its king, the priest of the god of Peace, naturally went forth to greet him on his return from the overthrow of the foreigner, and to bless him in the name of the deity whose priest he was. It was equally natural that Abram should dedicate a portion of the spoils he had won to a God in whose presence wars and enmities had an end.

But the description given of himself by Ebed-Tob, in his letters to the Egyptian monarch, also explains the suddenness, as it were, with which Melchizedek is introduced upon the scene. His father is unmentioned; as the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews says (vii. 3), he comes before us "without father, without mother, without descent." Like Ebed-Tob, it was not from his father or his mother that he inherited his royal office; he had been appointed to it by the deity whom he worshipped, and he was king because he was also priest.

The words he used in blessing Abram find their parallel in certain Aramaic inscriptions I discovered in the south of Egypt three years ago. These are in Aramaic letters of the sixth century before our era, and are cut on the sandstone rocks some four miles to the north of Silsileh, on the western bank of the Nile. They were engraved there by Semitic travellers in the close neighbourhood of a great boulder,—a Beth-el as it would have been termed in Canaan,—which we may gather from the Greek *graffiti* around it was accounted sacred. The inscriptions are as follows: "Blessed of Horus be Ezer-yobed the Shagabite;" "Blessed of Horus be Gamlan Sartsan;" "Blessed of Khnum be Abd-Nebo;" "Blessed of Khnum be Ag . . .;" "Blessed of Isis be Hagah." The formula is precisely the same as that which we find in Gen. xiv. 19 ברוך אברם לאל, but it is one which is hardly known outside the pages of the Old Testament. Among the numerous Phœnician and Aramaic inscriptions we possess, we find it in two only, and they are both of them from the land of Egypt. The formula, in fact, seems to be purely Canaanite, and it is possible that the inscriptions I copied near Silsileh may have been inscribed by some of the idolatrous companions of Jeremiah.

The forms of the letters would well agree with such a date.

In the Tel el-Amarna tablets, as in the later Assyrian texts, the name of Jerusalem is written Uru-Salim. The meaning of the first element in the compound is given us in a lexical tablet from the library of Nineveh, where it is stated that *uru* was the equivalent of the Assyrian *alu*, "city." It was one of those Canaanite words with which the Babylonian occupation of Syria and Palestine had made the Chaldæan scribes familiar, and of which, therefore, they have given explanations. The Hebrew form of the name has changed the first *waw* into *yod* in accordance with a well-known phonetic rule of the later Hebrew language.

Though Uru-Salim, "the city of Salem," was the full and proper name of the sacred city of southern Palestine, the Egyptian monuments furnish us with evidence that the shortened form Salem was also used. On the walls of the Ramesseum at Thebes, among the Palestinian cities conquered by Ramses II., the Pharaoh of the Oppression, in the eighth year of his reign, appears the name of Shalem; and about a century later, Ramses III. of the twentieth dynasty, in enumerating the places in the south of Canaan which had been captured by him, mentions "the highland district of Salem" along with Hadashah or "Newlands" (Josh. xv. 37), Shimshana or Ir-shemesh (Josh. xix. 41), Karmana or Carmel of Judah, Migdal (Josh. xix. 37), Aphaqa (Josh. xv. 53), "the Spring of Khibur" or Hebron, and Beth-Anoth. We see, then, that long before the Israelitish conquest of Palestine, Jerusalem was already an important city, and a famous sanctuary. We further see that it was known by the name of Salem as well as by that of Jerusalem, and that its king was also a priest, who derived his royal dignity from an oracle of the deity, and not by right of inheritance. In every point, accordingly, the history of Melchizedek in the fourteenth chapter of Genesis receives confirmation, and the very statements, which seemed to the critic to throw doubt on its credibility, turn out to be the strongest witnesses in its favour. The fact suggests certain reflections which it would carry us too far to discuss now. One of them, however, cannot be left unnoticed. It is that just as the earlier part of the fourteenth chapter of Genesis may be shown to have been derived from a Babylonian document, so the probability is strong that the latter part of the chapter was taken from a written Canaanitish

source. How else could the account, which is given us of Melchizedek, be so strikingly in accordance with what we now know to be the facts of history? The letters written by Ebed-Tob make it clear that there were books and archives, readers and writers, in Jerusalem before the time of the Exodus, and we have no reason for thinking that the clay books were destroyed, or the literary continuity of the city interrupted. Jerusalem was never overthrown by the Israelites, and when it

was at last captured by David, its own population was allowed to remain undisturbed (Josh. xv. 63; Judg. i. 21; 2 Sam. xxiv. 18, 22). Why, then, may we not believe that its ancient annals were still accessible when the materials of the Book of Genesis were compiled, and that not in the case of Jerusalem only, but also in that of other Canaanitish cities the biblical writer, or writers, had ancient documentary authority, for the history which has been handed down?

The Notion of Divine Covenants in the Bible.

BY THE REV. PROFESSOR CANDLISH, D.D., GLASGOW.

THE notion of a covenant between God and man is one that is frequently presented in Scripture, and has been very largely made use of in theology. Indeed, a school of Christian divines have made this idea the basis or principle of arrangement of their whole system of doctrine, and many others, without making it so entirely dominant, have made very considerable use of it. The federal theology, or theology of the covenants, has played an important part in the history of Christian thought since the Reformation; and if it was at one time extravagantly admired and insisted upon, has more recently been unduly disparaged. Since it was founded, not on a mere philosophical idea, but on what is in terms a biblical phrase, it may be of some use and interest to consider how far it has Scripture warrant.

In order to this it is necessary to inquire—

I. What is the true biblical notion of a divine covenant?

II. Is there reason for applying this notion to God's dealing with man from the beginning?

III. Is it a mere figure of speech, or a real and valuable category of thought?

The first and third of these questions are the most important, and deserve fuller consideration; the second needs to be noticed only because, unless it can be answered in the affirmative, the conception of divine covenants, even though it may be true and valuable as a mode of viewing God's work of grace and salvation, cannot give us a complete scheme of doctrine since it would not include the topics of the fall of man and its consequences. It is the inclusion of this that forms the special

characteristic of the federal theology, and this question, though one of detail, cannot be entirely overlooked.

I.

What is the biblical notion of a divine covenant?

The word covenant in the English Old Testament is uniformly the translation of the Hebrew *בְּרִית*, which is probably derived from a verb meaning to cut, and denotes a solemn agreement, having got that meaning from the ancient custom of ratifying important engagements by killing an animal in sacrifice, after which the parties sometimes passed between divided parts of the victim (Jer. xxxiv. 18, 19), and sometimes partook of a common meal (Gen. xxxi. 54). The phrase commonly used for making a covenant is literally "to cut a covenant," like the Greek *ὄρκια τέμνειν*, and the Latin *icere foedus*. So the expression in Ps. l. 5, "Those that have made a covenant with me by sacrifice," is literally "cutters of my covenant upon sacrifice."

This word is used in the Old Testament for agreements of various kinds among men, as well as for transactions between God and man. Thus it is applied to the agreements between Abraham and Abimelech (Gen. xxi. 27), Isaac and Abimelech (Gen. xxvi. 28), Jacob and Laban (Gen. xxxi. 44), Israel and the Gibeonites (Josh. ix. 6 foll.); to the friendly alliance between Jonathan and David (1 Sam. xviii. 3); to the treaty between Ahab and Ben-hadad (1 Kings xx. 34); to the league between Jehoiada and the rulers to make Joash king (2 Kings xi. 4); to the compact between David and the elders (1 Chron. xi. 3); to the treaty between