

is no finality. For each upward step reveals heights still above us. But it reveals also a power still further raising us. To expect and to experience this inward revelation of the power of God in our own spiritual life, is to find rest amid toil and conflict, a rest which is ceaseless and effective activity and constant victory.

In view of this teaching of the New Testament, I shall in another paper discuss the teaching of Wesley on Christian Perfection; and certain subordinate questions connected with the same subject.

JOSEPH AGAR BEET.

PROF. HOMMEL ON ARPHAXAD.

THE archæological problems of the present are so numerous and exact such careful and methodical treatment that one is disposed to regret the appearance of works like that of Prof. Sayce and (one may add by anticipation) Prof. Hommel, in which some attempt is made to give critical archæological treatment of Old Testament problems. If these zealous archæologists had confined themselves to incidental suggestions, or at most to academical dissertations on well-defined minute portions of the Old Testament literature, one could receive with gratitude such modest contributions to historical study. But one grieves at the loss of time inevitably caused by the popularization of uncritical arguments and harmful misunderstandings. Prof. Hommel's book will no doubt contain much that is of interest. But if he wishes to prove the antiquity of the document known by the symbol P by arguments such as he has produced in his recent letter to the *Academy* (Oct., 1896) on Arphaxad, he will find few scholars to agree with him. The present writer has no expectation of being able to contribute more than this one point to the discussion,

and he will put what he has to say briefly. Genesis x. 22 (P) runs thus in the Revised Version: "The sons of Shem, Elam, and Asshur, and Arpachshad, and Lud, and Aram." Arpachshad (אַרְפַּכְשָׁד)—a more correct spelling than Arphaxad—has hitherto been variously explained. Some (beginning with Bochart) identify the name with that of the province of Arrapachitis, the mountainous region of the upper part of the river Zâb, still called Albâk by the Kurds. In recent times it has been proposed to combine the name Arrapachitis with that of the Assyrian province Arabâ or Arabhâ, repeatedly mentioned in the inscriptions (*e.g.* by Tiglath Pileser in the clay tablet inscription from Nimrûd, *Keilinschr. Bibliothek*, ii. 13), but this view seems no longer to be safe after the criticisms of Winckler. All that we can say is that it is extremely plausible to hold that the province of Arabhâ should be mentioned next after Assyria. Other critics, however, including no less a scholar than Schrader (*Cuneiform Inscriptions*, by Whitehouse, i. 97), reply that this cannot be (1) because the final syllable, *shad*, is unaccounted for; and (2) because Abraham, the "Hebrew," who derives his origin from Arpachshad (Gen. xi. 10, P), migrates, according to the same authority (Gen. xi. 31, P), from Ur-Casdim, which "is undoubtedly to be looked for in South Babylonia," far away from Arabhâ. (The inscriptions thus far give no support to the view that there were Chaldæans in Armenia; Kittel, *Hist.*, i. 181, note 9, admits that he has been rash.) Hence Schrader and his fellow-critics profess to explain Arpachshad as *arp-casd*, "boundary (or territory) of Chaldæa"; there is, in fact, an Arabic word, *urfa*, meaning "boundary." It must be admitted that this is also very plausible. But just as the former school cannot account for *shad*, so the latter fails satisfactorily to account for *arp*; to look out for a word *arp* in the Arabic Lexicon is characteristic of the days when each critic "did that which was right in his own eyes," and is

hardly worthy of the age of Wright and Nöldeke. Now comes Prof. Hommel with a solution. He tells us that among the proper names in the document called P there are many which he and others can prove, by Assyriology and Egyptology, to be extremely ancient, and he regards the name Arpachshad as bearing the stamp of a time when there was close intercourse between Palestine and Egypt. Arpachshad is really *Ur-pa-Chesed*, i.e. Ur city of Chaldæa, and so we have conclusive evidence that the P document is not post-Exilic, but of a very early pre-Exilic origin. *Ur-pa-Chesed* is no doubt a hybrid word; *pa-*, as in *pa-kanana*, being Egyptian, and not Semitic. But this is just what proves the point. As the Egyptians at this early period borrowed from the Semites of Palestine (see Brugsch's *History of Egypt*), so the Semites doubtless borrowed from the Egyptians.

Now, if Prof. Hommel can show us that the names in P are to a larger extent primitive than we had thought, we shall be deeply obliged to him. But he must be cautious. His treatment of the names in the lists of the antediluvian patriarchs is to me, as an archæological critic, by no means satisfactory; he tries to prove far too much. And if his treatment of Arpachshad is a specimen of the chapters on proper names in his forthcoming book, he cannot expect much favour from critics. I have myself a liking for some of his earlier writings, but I shall be unable to spare time for a book which contains such learned trifling. I will now, to make amends, submit myself to his criticism and to that of the readers of the EXPOSITOR. Arpachshad appears to me to be a non-existent word; *i.e.* it is due to a scribe's error.

For ארפכשד read ארפך כשד, *i.e.* Arpach (and) Chesed. Shem had six, not five sons; Arpachshad is due to the combination of two names, one of which ended and the other began with the same letter. Both sides in the older

controversy are right. We can dispense neither with Arab̄a nor with Chaldæa. Arpachshad in v. 26 and in xi. 12 are, of course, the natural consequences of the initial error in x. 22. In both passages the correct reading is Chesed, *i.e.* Chaldæa. We are thus relieved from the necessity of appealing to Armenian for an explanation of *-shad*, to Arabic for the origin of *arp-*, and to Egyptian for that of *pa-*. It would be easy to start from the point we have now reached, and prove that, so far as x. 22 goes, the author of P must have written after the Exile (note the position of Elam at the head of the sons of Shem), but have been acquainted with geographical and other names of pre-Exilic origin. But time forbids me to enter upon this at present.

T. K. CHEYNE.

SURVEY OF LITERATURE ON THE NEW TESTAMENT.

INTRODUCTION.—Students of theology should cordially welcome a second edition of Principal Cave's *Introduction to Theology, its Principles, its Branches, its Results, and its Literature* (T. & T. Clark). The original edition of this Introduction to Theology was extremely valuable, especially for its lists of books in each department. To each work named a brief guiding criticism was added, by which any one could ascertain what book or books would best suit his purpose. These lists are in the present edition greatly enlarged and brought up to date. There are still strange omissions, neither Stephanus nor Sophocles being named among Greek Lexicons, neither Gloel nor Gunkel among works on the Holy Spirit. But Principal Cave does not profess to be exhaustive, and it will be very easy for the student to add his own favourites and to find his way, with the help of these lists, to the best literature on every subject connected with theology. Certainly Principal Cave's book is the best bibliographical guide the theological student possesses, and in other respects it is worth possessing.