

PROFESSOR SAYCE'S "EARLY HISTORY OF
THE HEBREWS."

IN his latest volume Prof. Sayce brings forth out of the treasures of his knowledge things "new and old." Much that is said in the *Early History of the Hebrews* will be familiar to those who are acquainted with *The Higher Criticism and the Verdict of the Monuments and Patriarchal Palestine*. But archæological research is very active just now; and even since these recent works appeared new facts have come to light of which Prof. Sayce makes full use. It is, however, in its method that the new work mainly differs from its predecessors. The *Higher Criticism and the Monuments* in particular was a criticism of a view of the history and literature of Israel with which Prof. Sayce disagreed; only indirectly could the reader discover his own. *Patriarchal Palestine* covered only a portion of the period which forms the subject of the new work. *The Early History of the Hebrews* narrates the history of the Hebrews, as Prof. Sayce conceives it, from Abraham to Solomon. It is not merely critical of an opposing conception of the history: it is constructive. As such it will be warmly welcomed by those who least admit its accuracy. For the weakness of the opponents of the higher criticism has been that they have hitherto mainly confined themselves to criticism of those from whom they differed; they have abstained from constructive effort; they have not attempted to retell the history themselves. It has, therefore, been impossible to discover how they would solve the problems with the "critical" solution of which they were dissatisfied; whether, indeed, they could write a history of Israel without criticism of the Biblical sources, and if not, whether their criticism would prove itself not

only different from but superior to that of the prevalent school. In Prof. Sayce's *History* we may see how the difficulties are encountered by one of the ablest and most distinguished opponents of the "critical school." The purpose of the present article is to examine Prof. Sayce's principles of historical investigation and the legitimacy of his applications of them as they are to be found in his latest work.

In his preface, the author claims for his *History* a certain uniqueness—that it "is the first attempt to write one from a purely archæological point of view." It is difficult to discover the precise meaning of this claim. It does not mean that the history is based exclusively on archæological material to the neglect of the Biblical literature. Such a claim would be self-condemnatory. For sound historical method demands a thorough examination of all available evidence, whether that evidence have been preserved in its original form on stone or brick or papyrus, or have come down to us written in MSS. Evidence of the former class is no more above criticism than the latter; it may be frequently more valuable, because more frequently contemporary with the events described, but that is all. As a matter of fact Prof. Sayce makes the fullest use throughout his work of the Biblical as well as of the archæological material.

But neither can Prof. Sayce mean that his is the first history to make use of the archæological material. The same material (apart from what has only been discovered since the works in question were published) has been used, for example, by Meyer in his *Geschichte des Alterthums*, and by McCurdy in *History, Prophecy and the Monuments*. True, neither of these works is exclusively a *History of the Hebrews*; but the title is a matter of indifference; Prof. Sayce's history also, in spite of its title, is not exclusively a history of the Hebrews; it is governed by the

maxim laid down in the preface, "for the oriental archæologist Hebrew history has ceased to stand alone."

But again, there is nothing that is peculiar to the oriental archæologist in this attitude to history; all historians equally recognise that the history of no single people can be written as though they were isolated from all other peoples. Consequently the standard histories of the Hebrews have taken account also, so far as existing materials permit, of the history of other nations at times when they were brought into contact with the Hebrews. In this respect, then, the claims to uniqueness for the new history is not made good. It is when we compare the work which we are at present discussing with other special histories of the Hebrews that we begin to discern a difference, which the author inaccurately claims as a uniqueness, in Prof. Sayce's *Early History of the Hebrews*. Rather more than half of this volume is devoted to the periods of the Patriarchs and of the Exodus. If we turn to such a standard work as Wellhausen's *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte* we find there no history of the patriarchal age; the history commences with the Exodus and that is but briefly described. Whence arises this difference? From the terms of Prof. Sayce's preface it might be supposed that a whole mass of archæological material relating to the Hebrews had been neglected by Wellhausen, because it conflicted with certain "subjective assumptions." This is not the case. Archæology has as yet supplied no single fact about the Hebrews in general, or about any Hebrew person in particular, prior to the Exodus. Even that event is not archæologically attested. In reading Prof. Sayce's book, therefore, it is essential to bear in mind that no single statement about the Hebrews previous to or at the time of the Exodus is based on archæological evidence; the evidence is derived from the Biblical literature alone. All the statements that are based on archæology refer to other

peoples. Thus the difference between Prof. Sayce's and previous histories of Israel does not arise from the use of different material, but from a different use of the same material. And the value of his history so far as it relates to the Hebrews in the earliest periods stands or falls according as the narratives in Genesis and Exodus are history or legend; for it is from them alone and not from the archæological sources that he derives his information. Consequently the chief point we have to consider is how far Prof. Sayce makes good his right to use these narratives as he does.

We shall best reach this main object by considering first some of Prof. Sayce's arguments in connection with the archæological data. For they are frequently fallacious, and go to prove Prof. Sayce an imperfect logician, and, consequently, a dangerous guide in inference even when trustworthy as a witness to fact. To begin with one or two simple instances. In the priestly account of Abraham's purchase of the cave of Machpelah (Gen. xxiii.), the inhabitants of Hebron are described as Hittites, although in Judges i. 10, the population is clearly described as Canaanites. Now no one questions that the main seat of the Hittites was in Northern Syria. The Biblical references in general as well as the monumental evidence imply this. But the priestly writer again and again refers to the Hittites as resident also at Hebron in the extreme south of Canaan.¹ Is the writer accurate in this respect, and may we safely on his authority accept it as a fact that Hittites, properly so termed, were resident in Hebron in the "time of Abraham"? or is he loosely using "Hittite" as a general term for the pre-Israelitish inhabitants of the land? If the latter view, which has been adopted by

¹ In addition to Gen. xxiii. cf. xxv. 9, 10, xlix. 29 f. and xxvi. 34 f., xxvii. 46, in the light of xxxv. 27.

some writers,¹ be correct, the usage in question forms one of numerous indications that the priestly narrator refers to times very remote from his own. We are not, however, here concerned to defend the correctness of this latter view; but merely to examine whether Prof. Sayce succeeds in refuting it and "confirming" the accuracy of the priestly writer. Here, then, is an instance of his utterly inconclusive reasoning. "Thothmes III., who conquered Syria for the eighteenth Egyptian dynasty, tells us that he received tribute from 'the king of the greater Hittite land.' There was then a lesser Hittite land; and as 'the greater Hittite land' was in the north it is reasonable to look for the lesser land in the south" (pp. 55 f.). Why in the south? Why not as well in the east or in the further north? This piece of evidence is absolutely irrelevant. It proves nothing, it does not even raise any presumption, in favour of the conclusion that Hebron was inhabited by Hittites in the time of Thothmes III. But suppose it did, what then? We should simply know that Hittites were resident in Hebron some 800 years after the time of Abraham; for the date of Thothmes III. is *c.* 1500 B.C., of Khammu-rabi, with whom Prof. Sayce makes Abraham contemporary, *c.* 2300 B.C. The remainder of the very scanty evidence that the Hittites were ever resident in the south of Palestine is drawn from still later sources, and need not therefore detain us. But this is a typical example of Prof. Sayce's frequent practice of combining indiscriminately evidence derived from centuries quite remote from one another. How precarious such an historical method is, how insecure a support such an use of archæological data can afford to the traditional view of Hebrew history, may be realized by reflecting that by the same method of argument we could

¹ *e.g.* Budde, *Urgeschichte*, p. 347.

prove that at the present day large parts of Spain are in the possession of the Moors, that half of France is subject to England, and that Scotland and England own allegiance to different sovereigns.

Another instance of extraordinarily loose and illogical reasoning is found on page 480: "Archæology has vindicated the authenticity of the letters that passed between Solomon and the Tyrian king (2 Chron. ii. 3, 11)." Such is the statement; and the proof is as follows: "Similar letters were written in Babylonia in the age of Abraham, and the tablets of Tel el-Amarna have demonstrated how frequent they were in the ancient East. As in Babylonia and Assyria, so, too, in Palestine, they would have been preserved among the archives of the royal library." When analysed, this will be seen to consist of two cases of the undistributed middle from which it is not generally supposed that sound conclusions can be formed. Thus the former of the two implicit syllogisms is this: Many people in the ancient East wrote letters to one another; Solomon and Hiram lived in the ancient East; ∴ Solomon and Hiram wrote letters to one another. From such a syllogism nothing follows. Archæology, therefore, does not even prove that Hiram and Solomon ever wrote to one another; much less does it prove the authenticity of the particular letters recorded by the chronicler. Again, it does not follow from the fact that there were priest-kings in Babylon (p. 219) that high priests must have ruled in early Israel, and consequently archæology does not invalidate the hypothesis that the high priests, as described in the Pentateuch, were a late institution in Israel.

A more complicated instance of fallacious argument is the discussion of Genesis xiv. In the preface Prof. Sayce writes: "Chedorlaomer and Melchizedek had long ago been banished to mythland, and criticism could not admit that archæological discovery had restored them to actual

history" (p. ix.). With regard to this two remarks need to be made. (1) It is inaccurate to say that Chedorlaomer had been banished to mythland. The standard monograph on Genesis xiv. from the critical standpoint is Nöldeke's essay entitled, *Die Ungeschichtlichkeit der Erzählung Gen. xiv.*¹; in this he argued, for instance, that two of the *Canaanite* kings (Bera and Birsha) were unhistorical, the names being purely fictitious. But he distinctly refused to dismiss Chedorlaomer as unhistorical. Having drawn attention to the fact that in Genesis xiv. 5, 9, 17 Chedorlaomer king of Elam appears as the leader of the invading kings, he continues as follows: "On the ground that we know nothing of such an extended dominion of the inhabitants of Elymais we can of course base no argument whatever against this statement; for that we know far too little of the oldest history of hither Asia" (p. 159). Meyer, writing fifteen years later, definitely accepts Chedorlaomer as an historical personage and his expedition as an historical event. It will be well to quote Meyer's view at length, since it remains, after all that Prof. Sayce has been able to adduce, as tenable a position as it was before; that is to say, no known facts invalidate it. There may or there may not be more of history in Genesis xiv. than Meyer admits; but at present archæology has not shown that there is. This, then, is Meyer's account²: "The details of the narrative [in Gen. xiv.] are completely unhistorical: not only are Abraham, and the high priest Melkişedeq who gives him his blessing, no historical persons, the towns also which Kedorla'omer is said to have conquered in Palestine—Sodom, Gomorra, Seboim, etc., and the so-called Rephaim, Zuzim, and Emities never existed. But the name Kudurlagamar is genuinely Elamitic . . . and the Elamite dominion in Syria is

¹ In *Untersuchungen zur Kritik des AT.* (1869).

² *Geschichte des Alterthums* (1884), I. pp. 156 f.

attested by an inscription of Kudurmabuk already mentioned. It appears, then, that the Jew who inserted the narrative of Genesis xiv. in the Pentateuch had acquired in Babylon accurate information touching the most ancient history of the country, and, led on by a motive unknown to us, inserted Abraham in the history of Kudurlagamar." These two representative "critical" historians, then, although they consider the narrative as a whole to be unhistorical, do not banish Chedorlaomer to mythland. It cannot be supposed, therefore, that Prof. Sayce will affect the judgment of these writers or those who have followed them by merely proving directly on archæological grounds what they had previously surmised to be historical fact. The recent discovery of actual monumental reference to Chedorlaomer confirms their judgment that the Chedorlaomer and his allies were actual kings; it cannot affect their judgment that many other details in the chapter are unhistorical.

(2) It is quite wide of the mark to say that archæology has restored Melchizedek to history. No monumental reference to Melchizedek has yet been discovered. All that is known of him is derived from the Biblical source. Melchizedek has been "restored (by archæology) to history" in the same way that the authenticity of the letters of Hiram and Solomon have been "vindicated"—by bad logic, but not by archæological evidence. Once again let it be said that no attempt is here being made to prove that Melchizedek was not an actual person, but only to show that Melchizedek can at present only be introduced into history by an historian who abandons an exclusively archæological point of view, and can vindicate on independent grounds the historical character of this section of Genesis xiv.

Such constant reference is made to Genesis xiv., and it is so constantly claimed that archæology has here upset the "critics," that it may be well to state succinctly how

matters at present stand. This chapter records (1) The names of four kings of the East, (2) the names of five Palestinian kings, (3) an invasion of Palestine by the four kings of the East, (4) the defeat by them of the Palestinian kings, (5) the subsequent defeat of the kings of the East by Abraham, and (6) the return of Abraham after his victory and his meeting with Melchizedek. With regard to (2), (3), (4), (5) and (6), archæology has up to the present time supplied no single fact. The possibility of the historical character of (1) which archæology has since fully "confirmed," and (3), which it has not yet "confirmed," was admitted by Nöldeke thirty years ago, and the probability of the same by Meyer fifteen years ago, although these two writers belong to that section of critics who have expressed themselves most sceptically with regard to the historicity of Genesis xiv. in general, and far more sceptically than many other "critics" (*e.g.* Dillmann). Archæology has already justified to a large extent the discrimination of these critics. It has not indeed yet confirmed quite all that the "critics" admitted to be historical; but it has not shown anything to be historical which they judged un-historical. When Meyer wrote in 1884, the name Chedor-laomer had not yet been discovered on the monuments; he saw however that it was genuinely Elamitic. The name has since been discovered. The identification of Arioch of Ellasar with Eriaku of Larsa was long since admitted; that of Amraphel of Shinar with Khammu-rabi of Babylon, though not quite beyond dispute, is probable, and is generally accepted; and quite recently on fragments discovered by Mr. Pinches, which refer to Khammu-rabi, Eriaku and Kudur-laghamar, has been found also the name of Tudghula, the equivalent of the Tidal of Genesis xiv. 1). The *recent* advance of archæology then has shown this—that all the four names in Genesis xiv. 1 are genuine, and that all four persons were contemporaries. The remaining

points which Meyer inferred, and which still lack direct archaeological confirmation, are these—(1) the alliance of Chedorlaomer and Khammu-rabi, and (2) the invasion of Palestine by Chedorlaomer and the allies. At present archæology only knows of Chedorlaomer and Khammu-rabi (Amraphel) as foes; our only evidence that they were ever allies is Biblical. It is sufficiently probable that they were; there is no difficulty in supposing that two kings once allied became foes; but if our standpoint were “purely archæological,” we could not *know* even this. Again, archæology knows of invasions of Palestine by Sargon I. and other Babylonian kings, but not of an invasion by Chedorlaomer. This particular Biblical statement is only “confirmed” by a combination of bad logic and archæology, not by the latter alone. For we have just as little right to argue that because other Elamite or Babylonian kings invaded Palestine, Chedorlaomer *must* have done so also, as that because many kings of England invaded France, any particular one must have done the same. The inference, always unsound, would frequently be false.

It *must* then be understood that the whole of Prof. Sayce's narrative on pages 24–25 is based solely and simply on the Biblical narrative; there is no shred of archæological support for it. Further, the support which he seeks *from analogy* for the statements in Genesis about Melchizedek (pp. 28, 29) are derived from statements about Ebed-tob, who lived 900 years after the time of Khammu-rabi (Amraphel), and therefore, according to Prof. Sayce, 900 years after Abraham and Melchizedek.

Limits of space prevents the discussion of more than one further instance of Prof. Sayce's fallacious use of archæological material. It will be best to select his treatment of another subject to which he gives prominence by referring to it in his preface—the Babylonian and Hebrew Flood stories (p. vi. f.). With regard to these Prof. Sayce says

(p. 122) : "Nowhere does there seem to be clearer evidence of the documentary hypothesis than in the story of the Deluge," and he himself discussed the stories in question in his *Higher Criticism and the Monuments* (pp. 107 ff.) as one who accepted the usual "critical" analysis into a Jehovistic and an Elohist narrative. But now he assures us that even here "the analysis of the Hexateuchal critics fails to stand the test of archæological discovery." The assertion is bold; it is confidently made; but it is entirely without justification. Once again, whether the critical analysis be or be not correct, archæology certainly does not condemn it. What appears to Prof. Sayce proof that the literary analysis cannot be real is the fact that "it is not with the Elohist or with the Yahvist alone that the Babylonian poet agrees, but with the supposed combination of these two documents as we now find it in the book of Genesis" (p. 125). From this fact, which was fully recognised by Prof. Sayce five years ago and was then not held by him to be incompatible with the analysis of the compound Hebrew narrative into two distinct accounts, he now draws the following conclusion:—"If the documentary hypothesis were right, there would only be two ways of accounting for this fact. Either the Babylonian poet had before him the present 'redacted' text of Genesis, or else the Elohist and Yahvist must have copied the Babylonian story upon the mutual understanding that the one should insert what the other omitted.¹ There is no third alternative." These impossible alternatives are *not* the only ones. The following alternative is one which is compatible with the documentary hypothesis, and is in conflict with no single tittle of archæological evidence. As different stories of the Deluge were current in Babylon, so different stories were

¹ It should be pointed out, since the sentence quoted above might give the contrary impression, that some of the coincidences with the Babylonian story occur in duplicate in Genesis. Thus the attribution of the Deluge to the sins of men occurs in Genesis vi. 11-13 (P), and Genesis vi. 5-8 (J).

current in Palestine; they were derived from Babylon, and many details of the Babylonian stories were retained, though at the same time other details took on a Palestinian colouring or were modified for religious reasons. Different Palestinian forms of the story differed in the details of the original which survived in them and in the particular modifications which they underwent. Two such Palestinian stories, which had in all probability previously assumed literary form, were combined by the final editor of the Pentateuch. This is of course merely one alternative, but it is sufficient to prove that archæology does not shut us up to a choice between two impossible alternatives or else to an abandonment of the literary analysis of the Pentateuch.

The thoroughly unsound conclusion drawn by Prof. Sayce in the body of the book is in no way rendered more justifiable by the interesting discovery to which he alludes in the preface. Dr. Scheil's discovery on tablets from Sippara, dating from about 2000 B.C., of fragments of a Flood story, confirms the conclusion which had generally been accepted before, viz. that the Babylonian Flood story was centuries older than the actual date of the texts (7th century, B.C.) discovered by George Smith. It does little more. Since Prof. Sayce's preface was written Dr. Scheil has published¹ the fragments with a translation. From the colophon it appears that the whole story occupied 439 lines; of these, fragments of about 40 lines are all that have been discovered. To judge from Dr. Scheil's French translation, they do not justify any detailed conclusions whatever: so far from agreeing (as Prof. Sayce asserts) with Smith's text they *differ* from it materially; and certainly they do not disprove the literary analysis of the compound Biblical narrative.

We must now turn directly to Prof. Sayce's use of the Biblical sources of his history.

¹ In *Revue Biblique*, January, 1898, pp. 1-5.

In the first place he sets himself here, as in other recent works, in direct opposition to the "higher criticism." "Over against the facts of archæology," he tells us, "stand the subjective assumptions of a certain school." And, again, "Between the results of oriental archæology and those which are the logical end of the so-called 'higher criticism' no reconciliation is possible, and the latter must therefore be cleared out of the way before the archæologist can begin his work." This is very brave declamation, and its vagueness makes one hope that after all Prof. Sayce is not so thorough-going an opponent as he appears.¹ He does not define the "certain school" whose assumptions are incompatible with the facts of archæology, and it is only with the "logical end" of the higher criticism that archæological results are irreconcilable. Possibly what appears to Prof. Sayce the "logical end" of criticism is a mere bugbear, being in reality as illogical, and therefore as unreal, as we have seen many of his deductions from archæology to be.

It would be wearisome and unprofitable to discuss in detail and at length Prof. Sayce's polemic against criticism in this volume; for it is stale, and has already been refuted. And, moreover, our present purpose is to examine his own method, not his attitude towards those of others. But we must express our surprise that he repeats again and again such unwarrantable statements as that "the dates [assigned by critics to the various strata of the Hexateuch] are largely, if not altogether, dependent on the assumption that Hebrew literature is not older than the age of David" (p. 104), or that the rendering "the baton of the marshal" was adopted in preference to the "stylus of

¹ Since writing the above an article by Prof. Sayce has appeared in the *Exp. Times* (April, 1898, pp. 308 f.), in which he allows that "the philological analysis" of Gen. xxvii. has been justified. "We must therefore regard xxvii. 1-45 as an interpolation."

the scribe" (Judg. v. 14) in order to avoid the evidence of the latter rendering that writing was known in the age of Deborah (cf. p. 121). The assumption that literature was of late origin in Israel was not the starting point of the criticism of the Hexateuch; never during the past century of active criticism has it played a considerable part in the argument as to date; and in the standard critical writings of to-day (such, for example, as Dr. Driver's *Introduction*) it plays no part at all. Again, the rendering, "the baton of the marshal," was adopted on the exegetical ground that this instrument would be more serviceable in war than the "scribe's stylus," not for the reason which Prof. Sayce asserts. The Revisers have adopted it. Were they then as a company such devoted adherents to the Higher Criticism? It would be news to learn that they were.¹

"The late dates assigned to the medley of documents which have been discovered in the Hexateuch are sufficient," Prof. Sayce assures us, "to render the Hexateuch historically valueless for the Mosaic age, and still more for the age before the Exodus" (p. 104). Perhaps he is not far from right. It is certainly difficult to discriminate the kernel of history amid the legendary overgrowth of centuries. According to the critical view large sections of the Hexateuch belong to the 9th century; but comparatively little can be attributed with assurance to a greater antiquity. But has Prof. Sayce any better right than the "critics" to use the Hexateuch as an historically valuable document for the patriarchal and Mosaic ages? What is his own view of the Pentateuch? "No one can study the Pentateuch in the light of other ancient works without perceiving that it is a compilation, and that its author, or authors, has made

¹ On the foregoing and similar instances of Prof. Sayce's polemic I need speak at less length than would be otherwise necessary. They have been fully discussed, and their inaccuracy and futility exposed, by Prof. Driver in the *Guardian*, Nov. 13, 1895, March 11 and April 8, 1896, and the *Contemp. Review*, March, 1894.

use of a large variety of older materials" (p. 129). Prof. Sayce and the critics are at one then in regarding the Pentateuch as a compilation.

Now as to dates and the historical character of various parts. On archæological grounds Prof. Sayce refers some parts of the Hexateuch to pre-Mosaic times (p. 130); but his arguments are, as we have seen, frequently quite inconclusive; he has not proved, nor has archæology shown, that the account of the Deluge as it stands in Genesis is immediately derivative from Babylon, nor that the story of Chedorlaomer's campaign and defeat by Abraham must have been derived from a cuneiform tablet. The same may be said of his statement that "the story of Joseph seems to have been taken from a hieratic papyrus." One especially of the authors of the Joseph story in Genesis shows a very considerable acquaintance with Egypt, just as do some other Hebrew writers, as for example Amos (ix. 5), and especially Isaiah (xix.). But, as Prof. Sayce pointed out in an earlier work, the story of Joseph, in spite of the familiarity with Egypt which it displays, cannot be coeval with the events it records. "Even the use of the title Pharaoh indicates at once the Hebraic character of the history of Joseph, and the fact that its composition in the form in which we possess it cannot have been coeval with the events it records. Pharaoh is the Egyptian Per-âa. . . . But in native and contemporaneous documents the title does not stand alone. Not only the Pharaoh himself, but his subjects also, employed the personal name that belonged to him." ¹ Archæology therefore forbids us to follow Prof. Sayce in the view which he now adopts. He has adduced no new facts to justify him in abandoning his earlier position, which was based on archæology. In common with the "critics," Prof. Sayce regards the list of

¹ *Higher Criticism and the Monuments*, p. 228.

Edomite kings in Genesis xxxvi. as genuine; but, as he points out (p. 132), it did not find its way into the Pentateuch until a time when "there reigned a king over the children of Israel," *i.e.* until at least three or four centuries after the time of Moses. But not merely has the Pentateuch suffered from the accretion of ancient material. The original composition of large parts of it belongs to periods long subsequent to the Mosaic. For example, part of Genesis x. belongs to the 7th century B.C., or is still later (pp. 131 f.). Some of the narratives about Abraham, "at all events in the first instance, must have resembled the traditions and poems orally recited in Arab lands" (p. 132). "Archæological proof of" their "historical character can never be forthcoming" (p. 133). Numerous passages are pronounced interpolations, amongst others Exodus iv. 20 (p. 165); Exodus xxxiii. 1-5 (p. 202 n. 1); Numbers xv. (p. 207 n. 1, 217 n.); xiii. 21 (p. 216 n. 1).

Not only are many of the narratives of the Pentateuch post-Mosaic; so also is much of the legislation. "We are not to suppose that this legislation has descended to us from the age of Moses without addition and change. Such a belief would be contrary to the history of other religious law-books, or indeed to historical probability" (p. 203). And this, finally, is Prof. Sayce's general judgment on the Pentateuch: "The work has passed through many editions; it is full of interpolations, lengthy and otherwise; and it has probably received its final shape at the hands of Ezra" (p. 134; cf. p. 200 top). According to Prof. Sayce's own standard, a work of the time of Ezra is valueless for the Mosaic and pre-Mosaic ages; it is only the parts which he can prove to be ancient, then, that he has a right to use for the history of those times. The parts which he even attempts to prove ancient are not very extensive, and his proof, as we have seen, is frequently illogical. He gives

us in general no means of distinguishing the original Mosaic elements in the legislation, nor the interpolations from the original Mosaic narratives.

But not only does the worthlessness of the Pentateuch for the early history of the Hebrews follow from Prof. Sayce's view of its date; he quite freely passes direct judgments on it that involve the same conclusion. For instance, he pronounces the very precise chronology of the Pentateuch "worthless" (pp. 142 ff.), and endorses Colenso's conclusion that the numbers attributed to the Israelites at the Exodus are impossible (p. 210); but with that all the numbers contained in (the P sections of) the Book of Numbers also fall to the ground. The "camels" of Exodus ix. 3 are on archæological grounds pronounced unhistorical (p. 169 n. 2). "The conquest of Havoth-jair" recorded in Numbers xxxii. 41 f. "must have taken place long after the death of Moses" (p. 227 n. 1).

His judgments on the Biblical sources for the rest of his history are similar. From the Books of Joshua and Judges we see that "the extent of his [Joshua's] work has been greatly magnified in the imagination of later ages" (p. 246; cf. p. 256 bottom). The compilation of the Book of Judges is subsequent to the first half of the 8th century (p. 281 n. 1; cf. p. 309, 323 n. 2, 329 f.). The books of Samuel are a compilation (p. 365) of narratives sometimes mutually exclusive (p. 372).

To sum up: Prof. Sayce, like every other historian of Israel, has at his command two classes of sources. The one which may be termed archæological consists of inscriptions. These contain no direct references to the Hebrews prior to the Exodus, and only very few and slight references to them prior to the time with which Prof. Sayce's history closes. The other class of sources consists of the Biblical records. These have come down to us in late

compilations. The work of literary analysis, however, has, to the satisfaction of the great majority of scholars, disentangled from these miscellaneous compilations several distinct sources. Internal evidence has then shown that some of these sources are ancient; and in such a narrative as that to which 2 Samuel ix-xx. belongs a historical source of the highest value has thus been restored to us. But Prof. Sayce refuses to accept this analysis. In so doing he has cut the ground from under his own feet. He is left with sources that are on his own showing self-contradictory and full of late interpolations; and at the same time he is without any sufficient means of discriminating late and early sections except archæology comes to his help. His attempt to prove by such help that sections such as the Joseph story or Genesis xiv. are contemporary records has failed. His presumption that the text of the Hexateuch is ancient where it cannot be shown to be modern (p. 134) is illegitimate; for everything in a late compilation can only be legitimately and safely used as late till it is shown to be early. By denying the possibility of literary analysis, Prof. Sayce has deprived himself of the right to regard as ancient any but the particular sections which he can fully prove to be ancient by archæological proof. The sections the antiquity of which he has even attempted thus to prove are comparatively few and small. The sections which, without any attempt to prove them ancient, he has used as ancient and trustworthy are very numerous and extensive. Thus, in spite of its confident tone and its many brilliant speculations, which give the book an interest and power of stimulus which all will gratefully recognise, as a history it can only be pronounced thoroughly unsound; its use of the archæological data is frequently illogical, its use of the Biblical writings without justification. The "logical end" of Prof. Sayce's

method, of his belief that the Pentateuch and other Hebrew books are late compilations, *combined* with his disbelief in the possibility of literary analysis, is, in the present deficiency of archæological evidence, a complete scepticism relative to the Hebrews before the 8th century B.C.

G. BUCHANAN GRAY.

Addendum.—The view of Meyer with regard to the origin of Genesis xiv., referred to on p. 345, has just been reaffirmed by an archæologist. The distinguished Assyriologist, Dr. Hugo Winckler, in his recently published and important essay, *Muṣri, Meluhḥa, Ma'in* (*Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatischen Gesellschaft*, 1898, 1), cites that chapter as a product of Jewish literary activity in exile and as based on Babylonian records (p. 40). On the usage of Pharaoh referred to above on p. 351, compare p. 3 of Dr. Winckler's essay.