

played. It was in the uncalendared days of his history, when man knew himself to be frail and weak, that 'men began to call upon the name of the Lord,' and grew to be sure that there was the voice of One who regarded and answered.

When the race was in its childhood, it was like a brood of nestlings in the nest. The nestlings know that they are fed from above. And so they look up and are fed. Man was born with instincts that compelled the upward glancing—and from above the hunger of his soul was met. Surely it is impossible to be mistaken here. It is true that silence falls upon this world of prayer at times: that generations are born, and marry, and beget sons and daughters, and die. But when the days of man's history can be calendared, chronicled, and compared, what we see is not only a national conviction of the power of prayer, but also a succession of men,—not only contemplative men, but men of action like Abraham, Moses, Samuel, David, Elijah, Isaiah, and Nehemiah,—who were all of them men of prayer—persistent, pleading prayer. Were these men fools? Were they duped when they believed that there was an answering Voice and a regarding Person? Was that an hallucination? We have had our own men of action who were also men of prayer—Alfred, Knox, Cromwell, Wesley, Gordon, and Gladstone. Were these the dupes of a Divinity that never was? It is impossible to believe it. And so the place

of prayer in the Christian life is the place of power that witnesses for God Himself. It is an argument that 'he is, and is the rewarder of them that diligently seek him.'

But prayer is also manward power. Principal Forsyth calls prayer 'the forge of personality,' and teaches that it is for religion what research is for science. By it we get into contact with realities. The soul is thereby brought into contact with its own nature; *i.e.* God. And on that account Dr. Forsyth enjoins men to use the Bible greatly in prayer. For it is the most original work on prayer; not prescribing but inspiring it; and so is corrective of the spirit of criticism which so easily besets and assaults men in these days.

The forge of personality! The metaphor is strange. But is not the experience that of wrestling Jacob? 'In his manhood he had power with God; yea, he had power over the angel and prevailed.' Who is willing to go into God's forge, and be beaten on God's anvil in order to have the iron enter into the soul; in order to obtain those qualities of endurance, resistance, toughness, and purity, which mean the redemption of our personality?

He takes my softened heart and beats it;
The sparks fly off at every blow.
He turns it o'er and o'er and heats it;
And lets it cool, and makes it glow:
And yet I whisper, 'As God will,'
And in His mighty hand hold still.

Recent Biblical Archaeology.

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

What we now know about the Hittites, and its bearing on the Hittites of Genesis.

IN a *Miscellany* which has just been presented to Dr. Mackay of Liverpool, Professor Garstang has given a short, but very comprehensive, *résumé* of the present position of 'Hittite Studies.' No one was so well qualified to write it as the excavator of Sakje-gözü and the author of the standard work on *The Land of the Hittites*, a second edition of

which is likely soon to appear. In my recent review of Professor Eduard Meyer's book (*Reich und Kultur der Chetiter*) I stated that my decipherment of the Hittite hieroglyphic inscriptions had forced me to the unexpected conclusion that they all—or nearly all—belonged, not to the earlier Hittite empire of Boghaz-Keui, but to a second Hittite empire established by the Moschians about B.C. 1200, of which Tyana was the capital. It is still a question what relation the Moschian language of the inscriptions bears to the language of the cuneiform texts of Boghaz-Keui and

Arzawa: they doubtless both belong to the same family of speech, but we shall probably find that the relation between them is pretty much that of French to Italian. At all events the Moschians will have formed part of the northern hordes who overthrew the first Hittite empire and occupied the land of the Amorites, according to the Egyptian annalists, and whose invasion of Egypt was defeated by Ramses III. They represent 'the Cilician empire' of the classical writer Solinus which was finally overthrown by the Assyrians.

The conclusion at which I have thus arrived on philological grounds has been also arrived at on archæological grounds by the excavators at Carchemish and had already been maintained by Professor Garstang on historical grounds in his *Land of the Hittites*. He was led to this conclusion by his archæological observations at Boghaz-Keui. It is very unfortunate that the excavations there fell into German hands by a series of accidents, for which Hamdy Bey, the Director of the Museum at Constantinople, was not responsible, instead of being conceded to Professor Garstang, as I had hoped and been promised that they would have been. No archæologist was attached to the German expedition: Professor Winckler was a philologist without any archæological training, and his companions were architects. The consequence was that while the results of the work were all that could be desired on the architectural side, we should have known nothing of the archæological history of the place had not Professor Garstang happened to be there for a few days and been allowed to superintend some of the work. Short as the time was, however, it enabled him to see that there were two periods of construction at Boghaz-Keui, and that a second and somewhat inferior city, with its own special style of art, had risen on what were probably the ruins of the first. To this second city belonged the arched gateways and sculptures and possibly the walls of the citadel. Professor Garstang supposed that the second city was a restoration by the native Hittites of the earlier city that had been destroyed by the Moschians; the inscriptions now make it clear that the Moschians themselves were the restorers.

Similar results have been obtained in Carchemish and its neighbourhood. Mr. Woolley (*Annals of Archaeology*, February 1914) divides the archæological history of the site into six periods, the first of which represents the Neolithic Age. Then come

the three periods of the Hittite or Bronze Age, characterized by an intrusive race who introduced the use of bronze, burial in stone cists and new types of pottery. Period II. is distinguished by tall vases on stems resembling champagne glasses, and, like the other pottery of the period, wheel-made, not hand-made as in the Neolithic Age. Period III. Mr. Woolley calls 'Transition,' and dates before B.C. 1750 (this should be corrected into B.C. 1950, as it was in the reign of the Babylonian king Samsu-ditana that the Hittites invaded Babylonia. The astrological tablets of two centuries earlier show that they were already formidable to the Babylonians). Seal-cylinders rudely imitated from those of Sumerian Babylonia have been found in the graves of this period. The pottery of the time is characterized by what is called 'ring-burnishing,' especially if it is black ware. The native Syrian painted pottery of the neolithic epoch had long since disappeared. The 'Middle Hittite' Period IV. followed on Period III.

With Period V. the Iron Age begins, which Mr. Woolley dates from B.C. 1100 to 718. (This should be corrected into B.C. 1200-718.) This is the period of Moschian influence and domination, to which the sculptures and hieroglyphic inscriptions discovered at Carchemish belong, as well as the characteristically 'Hittite' seals. Iron takes the place of bronze—the Moschians, it must be remembered, having descended from the iron-producing country of the Khalybes—and there is a wholesale change in the burial customs, the dead being cremated and the ashes deposited in urns, accompanied by weapons of iron and bronze fibulæ of Cyprian type. The old pottery makes way for Cypriote and Greek Island ware and its imitations, and Egyptian amulets and scarabs are found by the side of conoid seals of paste. Terracotta clay horses and similar objects are also found in the tombs.

Period V. or 'Late Hittite' is the period of Assyrian rule and extends to B.C. 605, the date of the battle of Carchemish, which gave Western Asia to Nebuchadrezzar. With Period VI. we arrive at the Persian and Hellenistic age.

As far back as the age of the Babylonian dynasty of Ur (B.C. 2500) there were already Assyro-Babylonian colonies in Cappadocia; silver, copper and lead mines were worked in the Taurus, and the roads of eastern Asia Minor were traversed by Babylonian *damgari* or commercial travellers.

Postmen passed to and fro along them carrying not only letters but even a species of cheque, written, however, not on paper but on clay. Babylonian culture, which was essentially literary, soon made its way among the Hittite tribes, who assimilated the theology of Babylonia to their own religious ideas and adopted the cuneiform script. But along with this they continued to use their own peculiar hieroglyphs, as I have found a hieroglyphic inscription on a sealing upon a Cappadonian tablet, now in the Royal Scottish Museum, the date of which is about B.C. 2400. When the Amorite dynasty established itself at Babylon in B.C. 2225, 'the king of the Hittites' was a formidable rival of the Babylonian monarch, and appears from time to time in the astrological tablets by the side of 'the king of the Amorites.' In fact, the fall of the Amorite dynasty seems to have been due to the Hittite invasion of Babylonia. At this time the Babylonian empire extended to the Mediterranean and embraced Syria and Palestine. Hence it is not surprising that an Egyptian stela, now in the Louvre, should mention Hittites in the extreme south of Palestine in the early years of the Twelfth Egyptian dynasty, as was first pointed out by Brugsch.

In agreement with our present archaeological

knowledge, the book of Genesis also states that there were Hittites in the same locality in the time of Abraham. They appear to have occupied Hebron much in the same way as their successors occupied the cities of Canaan in the Tel el-Amarna age. They were the ruling military caste, distinct from the Amorite natives or 'people of the land' (cp. Ezk 16^{3, 46}). This raises the question whether in our present text of Gn 23 a later copyist or editor has not misunderstood the document which lay before him, and omitted the copulative conjunction between the words 'children of Heth' and 'people of the land' or 'all that went in at the gate of the city' ¹ in vv. 7, 10, 18. This would explain the statement that Ephron 'dwelt among the children of Heth' (v. 10) which is otherwise unintelligible and upon which the words 'Ephron the Hittite' would have been a later gloss. It is noticeable that in making his bargain with Ephron Abraham is said to have spoken 'before the people of the land' only (v. 18); on the other hand, the transaction was not valid without the sanction of the Hittite magistrates and overlords. All this was in accordance with the Babylonian law and custom of the day.

¹ The final *waw* in 'irô (Assyrian *uru, erz*) is not the possessive pronoun but the old nominative termination.

Contributions and Comments.

John xi. 45.

THE average English reader understands this verse as if it said, 'Of the Jews who came to Mary and saw the miracle, many believed,' and as if it implied that some of them disbelieved. As a matter of fact, the verse says, 'Many of the Jews believed, that is to say, those who came to Mary and saw what Jesus did.' The Evangelist affirms without qualification concerning the Jews he has mentioned in v. 19, that they were many, and that in the end they believed.

It is, I think, possible to trace the steps whereby these men were gradually led up not from bitter enmity, but from aloofness and uncertainty to a definite faith. I venture to think it is an entire mistake to regard them, as some do, as the bitter enemies of our Lord, or to accuse them of 'sneers'

and 'crocodile tears.' One may regard them as being at first undecided what to think of our Lord, and afterwards becoming through this miracle, definite believers in Him.

Consider the position at Jerusalem. Day after day our Lord was teaching and preaching: He was also working miracles, and in all things He was displaying to the full the Divine love and power and wisdom. But the ruling classes rejected Him and hated Him. This fact, however, does not prove that there were not many of the Jews who kept silence, who did not commit themselves, as well as some who sincerely believed.

What then of the Jews mentioned in v. 19? It is most unlikely they were our Lord's bitter enemies. Men who were enemies to our Lord could hardly have been cordial and sympathetic to His devoted friends, such as Martha and Mary. Nor would