

archaeological discovery in favor of the contemporaneous origin of the history and its substantial accuracy. Of course it is only at a few points that the monuments touch the Bible history as yet. But the number is being increased almost every day, and so far as is goes, he claims it supports his contention.

Without attempting to give anything like an analysis of the book, which could do it no kind of justice, it may be sufficient to note the results which he claims to have ascertained. They are as follows :

1. That the Israelites who followed Moses into the wilderness were not barbarians.
2. The theory that the 14th chapter of Genesis, relating to the invasion of Palestine in Abraham's day by Chedorlaomer and his allies, was not written till the time of the Babylonian captivity, and is merely a free reproduction of the cuneiform record by some learned Rabbi, must be absolutely rejected.
3. That a laborious examination of existing monuments, inscriptions and the like, forces us to admit, as an historic fact, that the patriarch Abraham migrated from Ur about the year 1922 B.C., when an Arabian dynasty was ruling over Mesopotamia.
4. At the very early period when Jacob and Laban, who are proved to have been Aramaeans, are recorded in the Book of Genesis to have entered Mesopotamia, an important migration of Aramaeans is known to have taken place into the same country from their original home in the south-west.
5. The evidence of language afforded by a comparison of inscriptions permits us to assume confidently that a certain and not inconsiderable portion of the tradition on which Genesis is based had already been reduced to writing in the time of Moses.
6. Lastly, so far from the personal names which occur in considerable number in the so-called priestly code, and especially in the Book of Numbers, exhibiting any such characteristics as would indicate a Babylonish origin, they possess, on