

make shift with the only formula we have ; but as to the core of truth, which that formula aspires to utter, there can be no possible doubt. We must surely be judged, and judged by Christ. Our temporal action has eternal consequences ; we must render account to our Creator for what we have done, and for what we have become.

¶ Are you sure there is a heaven ? Sure there is a hell ? Sure that men are dropping before your faces through the pavements of these streets into eternal fire, or sure that

they are not ? Sure that at your own death you are going to be delivered from all sorrow, to be endowed with all virtue, to be gifted with all felicity, and raised into perpetual companionship with a King, compared to whom the kings of the earth are as grasshoppers, and the nations as the dust of His feet ? Are you sure of this ? or, if not sure, do any of us so much as care to make it sure ? and, if not, how can anything that we do be right—how can anything we think be wise ? what honour can there be in the arts that amuse us, or what profit in the possessions that please ?<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Ruskin, *Sesame and Lilies* (*Works*, xviii. 155).

## Recent Biblical and Oriental Archaeology.

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

PROFESSOR R. W. ROGERS' *Cuneiform Parallels to the Old Testament* (New York : Eaton & Mains, 1912) has been long expected, and now that it has appeared it more than fulfils our expectations. It is just the book that was wanted both by scholars and by Old Testament readers. It will take the place occupied twenty years ago by Schrader's *Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament*, which has never been filled since. Professor Rogers has spared no pains to bring his work up to date, and to give all the information 'the ordinary man' wants. Like all his other work, moreover, his book is distinguished not only by sound historical knowledge, but also by sound historical judgment and common sense, which are too frequently lacking in modern books on the same subject.

He has followed Schrader's example in giving the transliterated cuneiform text together with a translation of it. The two, in fact, cannot well be separated owing to the nature of the cuneiform script, the reading of which depends so largely on the meaning we assign to it. Unlike Schrader, however, he has added Assyro-Babylonian parallels to other Old Testament subjects besides history and geography, hymns and prayers as well as liturgical and doctrinal texts and mythological poems being included in his work. On the other hand, he has not traced in detail the relationship between his cuneiform extracts and the Old Testament passages which they illustrate or explain. I hope he is reserving this for a second volume ; there is no one better qualified for such a task, and it would meet with a general welcome.

The earlier part of the book is occupied with the Mythological Texts—the story of the Creation, the myth of the first man Adamu (not Adapa, as Professor Rogers continues to write the name, after the Germans), the Babylonian accounts of the Deluge, and other old legends of the same kind. Then we have selections from the multitudinous hymns and psalms and prayers of ancient Babylonia, which include the Babylonian 'Negative Confession' and fragments of the 'Wisdom Literature' ; this is followed by some Liturgical and Doctrinal texts, among them being one relating to the Scape-goat, while the latter half of the book is occupied with history, and concludes with a translation of the very important Code of Khammu-rabi. The book is so good that the best compliment I can pay to it is to indicate some of the passages in it where we do not see alike, or where I think his rendering can be improved. There was no such kingdom, for instance, as 'Patin.' The Assyrian characters should be read Khatinâ, 'the Hittites,' who were a fragment of the old Hittite empire left stranded on the Gulf of Antioch : the name of the kingdom was Unqi. The idea that the Yaudâ over whom Azariah was king in the time of Tiglath-pileser iv. belonged to northern Syria must be given up ; it rested on an erroneous reading of Scheil in the Tel el-Amarna tablets. King's view again is certainly wrong, that the reading of his Chronicle, which makes Sargon of Akkad cross 'the sea of the East,' is to be preferred to the reading of the older version of the Babylonian monarch's annals, 'the sea of the

West': the Chronicle is its own witness against itself, as it goes on to state that the result of crossing the sea was the subjection of 'the country of the West in its full extent.' Is Khallab in the Prologue of the Laws of Khammu-rabi really Aleppo? There was a Khallab in Babylonia, and it is more natural to suppose that this is the city intended, rather than a distant Syrian town whose name is elsewhere written Khal-ma-na in the cuneiform texts. Budu-yaman, finally, in the fragmentary annals of Nebuchadnezzar, should be corrected into Puṭu-yavan, 'Phut of the Ionians.' Cyrene is meant, of which Laarchus or Polyarchus was king, though all that is left of his name in the cuneiform tablet is the last syllable—*ká*. It was from Cyrene that the Egyptian Pharaoh Amasis drew at the time part of his troops.

In his transliteration and translation of the interesting letter discovered by Dr. Bliss at Lachish, Professor Rogers has followed Dr. Knudtzon. Knudtzon's readings, however, are not altogether

correct, as I found on a re-examination of the cuneiform original; the impossible name 'Pabi,' for example, has no existence. The following is my translation of the tablet:—

'[To . . .] the officer thus says [Ilu?]-abi: At thy feet I prostrate myself. Verily thou knowest that Dan-Hadad and Zimrida have made conspiracy (?) together, and Dan-Hadad says to Zimrida: "Send Isyara to me, O my father, [and] give me [3?] shields (?) and 3 slings and 3 falchions. I am gone out against the country of the king, and it has acted against me, but now I will get it back. As regards the scheme, he who has devised the scheme is Ilu-abu; send him therefore unto me. And [now] I am despatching Rabi-ilu; [my messenger?] will convey to him . . . these words."

Professor Rogers has enriched his book with well-chosen photographs, and has added to it a useful index. It is admirably printed: I have been able to discover only two misprints, '756' for 576 on p. 101, and שבייר for שניר on p. 303.

## The Doctrine of the Incarnation in the Creeds.

BY THE REV. A. E. GARVIE, M.A., D.D., PRINCIPAL OF NEW COLLEGE, LONDON.

### V.

(1) It may appear a rashness even to madness, if in closing I venture to suggest a few considerations towards a better metaphysic. (i.) We must start with the historical fact, as literary and historical criticism to-day shows that fact to be. What is doubtful must not be determinative of our Christology; but our construction must rest on the certain. I have already indicated what will fall out of our view, and what must be brought into it. The historical reality of the moral character, the religious consciousness and the mediatorial function of Christ is the datum to be dealt with. (ii.) These historical facts must be interpreted primarily in the interests of personal faith. We must not ignore the fact that the motive of the Ancient Creeds was religious. Athanasius' conception of the Christian salvation necessitated the assertion of the *ἁμοούσιον*. But it is to be feared that in subsequent controversies, not only did lower worldly motives enter, but even where these were absent, a merely intellectual interest

in definition of Christian truth asserted itself. While we need not go as far as Ritschl and his school in limiting Christian doctrine to what faith can immediately apprehend—and many recognize that faith includes an exercise of the intellect in appropriating divine truth, in making its own in distinct, consistent thinking the meaning of all its objects—yet not a speculative curiosity must guide our inquiries, but a personal moral and religious necessity to know God in Christ so as to trust fully, love freely, and serve faithfully. (iii.) For the interpretation of the historical facts in the interests of personal faith we are to-day not worse but better equipped with the metaphysical formulæ. It would be strange, indeed, if the twentieth Christian century were in this respect at a disadvantage in comparison with the fourth and fifth. Modern philosophy has a closer affinity to, because it stands in a greater dependence on, Christian truth than did ancient philosophy.

(2) We must first of all in attempting any re-