

ARTICLE VI.

THE APOSTLE PAUL, A WITNESS FOR THE RESURRECTION
OF JESUS.

BY PROF. GEORGE P. FISHER, YALE COLLEGE.

WE propose to prove by the testimony of the Apostle Paul — by testimony which all admit to be his — that the apostles who attended Jesus during his life, bore witness to his resurrection very soon after that event is alleged to have occurred. The resurrection of Christ is the great miracle of Christianity, by which the divine mission of its founder is demonstrated.¹ Once establish this fact by irrefragable proof, and the other miracles of scripture are easy of credence; nay, they seem to be demanded. Such a transaction cannot stand by itself. There must go before it supernatural preparations. It is not a stray and solitary boulder cast upon the earth, but the key-stone of a mighty arch. Grant the Saviour's resurrection, and the Old Testament dispensation, with its series of divine interpositions, can be easily defended. Christianity, as a historical religion, is placed high above the reach of successful assault.

The attacks which have been made upon the genuineness of the books which compose the New Testament canon, have imposed the necessity of a new line of defence. Pantheism leaves no room for a miracle. Under that scheme of philosophy there is no personal Being whose will can interrupt the uniform course of nature; and hence the miracle is utterly precluded. The devotee of pantheism, when he comes on the ground of historical inquiry, is obliged by his creed to deny the supernatural, in the proper sense of that term, wherever it appears; and to find a naturalistic solution of the phenomena on which belief in the supernatural has been founded. Strauss, starting with his Hegelian premises,

¹ See Romans 1:4, et al.

endeavored to eliminate the supernatural from the gospel histories, by turning the miracles into myths emanating by degrees from the imagination of the early church, as it brooded over the Master's life and tragic fate, and unconsciously wove into his career events to correspond with the Old Testament description of the Messiah. Strauss had little to say of the book of Acts, which purports to be the production of a contemporary; and still less of the apostolic epistles. Even on the authorship of the gospels, and of the fourth gospel in particular, he was vacillating. He, therefore, left the greater part of his destructive work to be done by others. A systematic theory concerning the origin of Christianity and the New Testament writings, was imperatively required in order to carry out and support the speculations of Strauss. This has been attempted by the abler and more thoroughly learned men of the Tübingen school, of whom Baur stands at the head. It is no part of our present plan, to describe at length the views of this formidable antagonist of revealed religion. We simply need to say, that, while he does not scruple to impugn the credibility of the book of Acts, and even charges the author with intentional untruth — thus forsaking the mythical theory for the older infidelity, the *rationalismus vulgaris* — he fully admits the genuineness of the four Pauline epistles, — the Epistle to the Romans, that to the Galatians, and the two Epistles to the Corinthians. These, according to Baur, were written by Paul, and exhibit Christianity according to his conception of it, in contrast with the Judaizing ideas of Peter and the church at Jerusalem.

It is our belief that in these writings, whose genuineness is not disputed by the Tübingen sceptics — the Apocalypse and a part of Matthew should be added to complete the list — there is contained abundant and irrefutable proof of the supernatural facts of Christianity; that, on the basis of these Pauline epistles, the mythical hypothesis can be shown to be impossible and without foundation; and when it is once discovered that nothing is gained by casting the historical books and so many of the Epistles out of the canon, but that

the supernatural origin of Christianity remains untouched, the attempt is very likely to be abandoned.

In this Article we undertake to show that the apostles, Peter, James, and the others, testified at once to the resurrection of Christ, and that hence the supposition of a slowly growing myth is absurd; and this we shall do from certain statements in these Pauline epistles.

Before we pursue our special topic, however, we desire to offer a few remarks on the conversion of the Apostle Paul, and the bearing of this event on Christian evidences. Baur and Zeller do not scruple to pronounce the narrative in Acts unhistorical, and to make its motive the desire of Luke to place Paul on a level with Peter, and to give the former a full and legitimate title to the apostolic office. This notion is a part of the offensive and untenable theory concerning the design of the entire book, and is mere conjecture. The narrative, however, has always been exposed to sceptical objections of another kind. It is possible to say, and it has often been said, that the transaction was in the excited soul of the traveller to Damascus, and that the light and voice from heaven were only subjectively real. Instances are not wanting of sudden conversion, of a revolution of opinion and feeling, accomplished apparently in a moment, though in fact it had long been prepared for. In numerous cases, optical wonders have attended the change, which, though seemingly real, are known to be the product of imagination. Not to recall the lives of the Roman Catholic saints, all who have read the conversion of Col. Gardiner, will remember that he beheld, as he supposed, the face and person of Jesus. The infuriated Saul, it is said, had begun to be agitated by misgivings. Recollections of Gamaliel and his moderate teachings, of Stephen and his uplifted face and dying prayer, haunted him. At length, while on the journey to Damascus, his doubts became convictions, and a terrible distress of conscience ensued. Having in mind what he had heard of the exaltation and glory of Christ, he felt its truth. On a sudden, the sky is overcast; perhaps a thunderbolt falls near him, and the lightning flashes on his pathway. In his terror

and mental disturbance, the remonstrance of his conscience seems to him a cry from heaven, and he stands out no longer. That the grand life of Paul should spring from an illusion of this nature; that his clear understanding should be to that degree confused and bewildered, we cannot for a moment believe. Yet there are many so willing to avoid the miracle, that they grasp at this solution and find it plausible. Now the observation we have to make is this: the supposition of conscientious misgivings in the mind of Saul prior to his conversion, on which this ingenious theory is built, has no support from scripture, but is expressly contradicted. The idea that he was troubled by such misgivings has arisen from a wrong interpretation of the expression: *σκληρόν σοι πρὸς κέντρα λακτίζειν*, "it is hard for thee to kick against the pricks." This expression in Acts 9 : 5, together with the beginning of the next verse: *Τρέμων τε καὶ θαμβῶν ἐπεκύριε, τί με θέλεις ποιῆσαι ; καὶ ὁ κύριος πρὸς αὐτόν*, is acknowledged on all hands to be no part of the original text. In Paul's own account of the scene, however, in Acts 26 : 14, the words "it is hard for thee to kick against the pricks," do occur. But they do not, as used by the Saviour, refer to any struggles of conscience which Saul had experienced. The sense may be: 'it is vain for thee to withstand me, to set yourself against my power.' So, in substance, De Wette explains the phrase. Meyer gives this paraphrase: "it is a perilous beginning for thee, that thou should'st (as my persecutor) contend against my will." Whatever the precise meaning may be, it is certain that there is no allusion to any mental experience of Saul. We have his explicit and reiterated assertion that there was in his mind, no doubt, no wavering, no qualms of conscience. "I verily thought with myself that I ought to do many things contrary to the name of Jesus of Nazareth" (Acts 26 : 9). "Who was before a blasphemer, and a persecutor and injurious: but I obtained mercy because I did it ignorantly in unbelief." He speaks of his transition from enmity to Christ to submission as if it were effected suddenly, with no intermediate steps, by no gradual process. "But I certify you, brethren, that the

gospel which was preached of me is not after man: for I neither received it of man, neither was I taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ. For ye have heard of my conversation in time past in the Jews' religion, how that beyond measure I persecuted the church of God, and wasted it; and profited in the Jews' religion above many my equals in mine own nation, being more exceedingly zealous of the traditions of my fathers. But when it pleased God, who separated me from my mother's womb, and called me by his grace, to reveal his Son in me, that I might preach him among the heathen; immediately I conferred not with flesh and blood: neither went I up to Jerusalem to them which were apostles before me: but I went into Arabia, and returned again unto Damascus" (Gal. 1: 11—17).

We have every reason to believe that Paul's career as a persecutor of the church, was marked by the single-hearted, fiery energy which characterized the man. He did not halt, he did not doubt, until his steps were arrested on the road to Damascus. Before that, he was fully satisfied with himself, confident that he was serving God, convinced that Jesus was an impostor, and that his followers ought to be put to death. If this be so, the psychological solution of that remarkable change in the character of Saul, falls to the ground; and his conversion continues, a powerful argument for the supernatural origin of Christianity.

We proceed, now, to the proper subject of the present Article. In the first place, we call the attention of our readers to *the importance attached, by the apostle Paul, to the fact of the Saviour's resurrection.* In his judgment, as in ours, it was the grand, cardinal truth by which the claims of Christ were verified. Of the significance of this truth, he was fully aware. He knew and felt that everything hung upon it. It was not something to be lightly admitted. Give up that fact, and his own work in life was founded in illusion. In showing that such was his view of the Saviour's resurrection, we are restricted now to passages in the four epistles whose genuineness is unattacked; but these pro-

vide us with abundant evidence in support of our position. We refer the reader, at once, to the most emphatic and conclusive of these passages. Paul says (1 Cor. 15:14, 15) where he is arguing for the general resurrection, against sceptical objections: "*And if Christ be not risen, then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain. Yea, and we are found false witnesses of God; because we have testified of God that he raised up Christ.*" We adduce this passage to prove how clearly conscious Paul was, of the supreme importance of the resurrection of Christ. It lay at the foundation of his preaching and of his converts' faith, in the sense that both were vain without it. Moreover, if that great fact were disproved, he and his fellow-apostles were convicted of bearing false witness, and deserved to be regarded as liars. The resurrection of Jesus was the one, indisputable fact which formed the sole warrant for his proclamation, and their acceptance, of the gospel. He soberly affirms that the denial of this fundamental truth is equivalent to charging the apostolic witnesses with intentional falsehood. It is plain that the understanding of Paul was alive to the infinite significance of the fact in question. He did not accept this truth incautiously and hold it without reflection. On the contrary, he saw how much was involved in it. "The resurrection of Jesus," he says in effect, "is the premise on which the entire superstructure of Christianity reposes: my preaching is built upon it, and so is your faith; if we are not certain of that fact, we are certain of nothing; if we are mistaken there, we are false everywhere."

We turn now to another memorable passage (1 Cor. 15:3—9), in which Paul marshals in order the *proofs* of the resurrection of Jesus. The style of the passage, the manner in which reference is made to the testimony of numerous living witnesses, demonstrate that the apostle, so far from being credulous in regard to the resurrection, had considered that event with the sober, deliberate, judicial temper of an inquirer for truth. "For I delivered to you," he says, "first of all, that which I also received: how that Christ died for our sins, according to the scriptures; and that he was seen of Cephas; then of the

twelve ; after that, he was seen of above five hundred brethren at once ; of whom the greater part remain unto this present ; but some are fallen asleep. After that, he was seen of James ; then, of all the apostles. And, last of all, he was seen of me, also, as of one born out of due time." We say nothing, here, of the *contents* of the passage, and of the weight to be attached to the array of evidence here presented ; we simply call attention to the writer's mood of mind in relation to the subject. Who can doubt that the apostle regarded the Saviour's resurrection as an event of the highest moment ? that he felt the necessity of arguments and proofs to establish it ? that, in his investigations of the history of Jesus, he would give to this event the most earnest attention ? In respect to other circumstances in the Lord's history, which are not of so great moment, he might be less curious ; but upon this grand consummation, this victory over death, this crowning sign of Messiahship, the apostle was intensely inquisitive, as every one must confess, who candidly examines the verses just quoted.

We advance, now, to the second link in our argument : *Paul's intercourse with Peter and the other apostles at Jerusalem, was such, that had they not testified to the resurrection of Jesus, he could not have believed in that fact ; much less have referred to them as eye-witnesses.* Suppose that the other apostles knew nothing of the Lord's resurrection, and were silent on the subject in their preaching ; is it conceivable that Paul could have conversed with them without being made aware of the circumstance ? Is it possible that he had conferences with John and Peter and James, and yet did not discover that they were wholly ignorant of the leading fact on which his faith in the gospel rested ? Nay, is it possible to think that he conferred with them at all without allusion to this grand and engrossing topic of his ministry ? Could he, in his preaching, have made foremost an historical fact of which they knew and said nothing, and the radical difference not come out in conversations and interviews with them ? And after such conferences and interviews, could he continue to

refer to them as eye-witnesses of the risen Lord, if they did not claim to be such? We need not multiply these inquiries. The inference is irresistible that if Paul was, to any considerable extent, conversant with the other apostles, it must be true that they were in the habit of testifying to the Saviour's resurrection. Now we have, in the epistle to the Galatians, a narrative from his own pen, of his visits to Jerusalem. Having described his conversion, he says: "then, *after three years*, I went up to Jerusalem to see Peter, and abode with him fifteen days. But other of the apostles saw I none save James, the Lord's brother. Now the things which I write unto you, behold, before God, I lie not" (Gal. 1: 18—20). Again, he says (Gal. 2: 1): "Then, fourteen years after, I went up, again, to Jerusalem with Barnabas, and took Titus with me also;" and after describing his controversy with the judaizing Christians, he adds (v. 9): "And when James, Cephas, and John, who seemed to be pillars, perceived the grace that was given unto me, they gave to me and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship, that we should go unto the heathen, and they unto the circumcision. Only they would that we should remember the poor; the same which I also was forward to do." Then follows a mention of his controversy with Peter, at Antioch; the occasion of which was not a difference of principle, but a timid yielding, on the side of Peter, to the demand of the Judaizers. We have quoted only those parts of the passage which are essential to the end we have in view. A second journey of Paul to Jerusalem, intermediate between the two here recorded, is mentioned by Luke (Acts 11: 12); but of this we are not permitted to take notice, nor shall we pause to seek for the reason of the silence of Paul upon this second visit, in the passage before us.

Our first work shall be to fix the date of that first visit, when the apostle abode fifteen days with Peter. It was three years after Paul's conversion. According to Usher, Pearson, Hug, and Olshausen, this occurred A. D. 35. According to Eichhorn and De Wette, it took place in the year 37 or 38. The authorities first named, with the exception

of Hug, date the alleged ascension of Christ at the year 33. Meyer, the prince of living commentators, agrees with them in dating the conversion at the year 35; but he fixes the date of the ascension at 31. (Meyer's *Apostelgeschichte*, Einl. § 4.) Let the interval be made as long as any chronologist — even Wieseler, who would make it ten years — may desire; our argument, as we believe, is not shaken. But we cannot be accused of unfairness if, in agreement with Meyer, we make this interval four years. Add to these four years the three which intervened between the conversion and the first visit, and we reach the conclusion *that seven years after the alleged resurrection of Jesus, Paul spent a fortnight in company with Peter at Jerusalem.* In enumerating the witnesses to the resurrection (1 Cor. 15 : 5), the apostle says that the risen Jesus “*was seen of Cephas.*” It was Cephas with whom, so short a time after the final separation of the Saviour from his followers, Paul spent fifteen days. Is it credible that, during this protracted visit, Peter had nothing to say of the risen Saviour? that the subject was not broached? Or, admitting that it was broached, that Paul went away, knowing that Peter had no knowledge of the miracle, to spend his life in asserting its reality, and in appealing to Peter as an eye-witness?

We pass, now, to the next visit which Paul notices in the passage cited above: “*Then, fourteen years after, I went up, again, to Jerusalem.*” Fourteen years after what? With Jerome, Luther, Le Clerc, Lightfoot, Bengel, Meyer, and the most of the critics, we take the *terminus a quo* to be the first journey; so that this subsequent visit was seventeen years after the conversion, or twenty-one years after the date assigned for the Saviour's ascension. In this interview, the Apostle to the Gentiles had a conference with James, Peter, and John, the pillars of the church at Jerusalem, on the points of difference in doctrine and practice between the Jewish Christians and the disciples of Paul, and on the peculiarities of Paul's preaching. But there is not, in Paul's narrative, a hint that whereas he preached the resurrection of Jesus, they did not. No such mighty and radical difference in the two types of doc-

trine was developed. It is absurd to suppose that such a difference could have existed and been ignored in that conference. He must be an audacious sceptic indeed, who can think that Paul would have given the right hand of fellowship to men who disbelieved in the Lord's resurrection — the fact without which his preaching and his disciples' faith were pronounced by him to be vain. It appears to us that the force of moral and circumstantial evidence, in favor of the proposition that, at the time of this visit, John, James, and Peter were preachers of the resurrection of Jesus, is, to a candid mind, irresistible.

Our argument, briefly stated, is this : such was the intercourse of Paul with the original disciples, that no difference between him and them, on the great fact in question, could have existed, without being published and proclaimed by him, even if — which is not credible — his own faith could have subsisted in the absence of their testimony and in the face of their disbelief. If he believed in the resurrection and preached it, then they did ; and this very soon after the event was declared to have occurred.

To show that the apostles claimed to be eye-witnesses of the risen Lord, is the main end which we have aimed at. For if this be reached, if the foregoing points be justly taken, the case for Christianity is virtually won. It would be necessary, however, in order to complete the argument, to make it evident that, *in this belief, thus immediately proclaimed, the apostles were not deceived.* It is not contended that they were wilful impostors. Nor is it supposed that they were duped by others. Unless they were self-deceived, their testimony is to be credited. The mythical theory endeavors to make out an unconscious, involuntary, self-deception on the part of all of them. But the admission that the testimony was given *so soon as we know it actually was given*, cuts up the mythical hypothesis by the roots. That a myth of this sort could originate spontaneously, among the apostles themselves, in so very brief a time, seems incredible to one who is conversant with the nature of a myth and the conditions

requisite for its growth. But *the want of time* is not the only circumstance fatal to the notion of a myth. That the crucifixion of Jesus *must* have thrown the disciples into the despondency and bewilderment which the gospel histories attribute to them; that a grand event is historically required to account for the marvellous change which transformed them into fearless and enthusiastic preachers of Christ, confident in their faith, and going forth, at the hazard of life, to combat and conquer the world; that to him who denies the miracle, the enlightened, bold, joyous spirit suddenly gained by the apostles, as well as the rise and progress of the Christian church, are an insoluble enigma; so that the contrast in their position, at the Master's death and after his alleged reappearance, necessitates the supposition of a mighty occurrence to effect it; just as, when we see Napoleon a captive on an island in mid ocean, whom we lately saw the dictator of Europe, we are confounded until we hear of Waterloo: these are considerations whose force cannot be broken. They fall in with their express testimony; and in a mind not predisposed to disbelieve in a miracle however it may be supported by evidence, they produce conviction.

As we have alluded to the Tübingen critics, we will not omit to state the hypothesis which they advance to explain the apostles' united testimony to the resurrection of Jesus. For they agree with us that the apostles *believed* in it. Both Strauss and Baur feel it to be necessary to admit a *faith* of this kind in the disciples in order to explain the revolution of feeling which we have just mentioned, as well as to account for the rise of the church. Baur, in his "Christenthum," — the work which contains a summary of all his theories — contents himself with hinting that this faith was 'psychological' in its origin, as opposed to a conviction founded on fact.¹ Strauss, holding the same view, attempts to solve the problem of its origin. It is a strange tissue of conjectures which he offers us. The apostles had believed in the Messiahship of Jesus; by his death they were cast down, and their faith in him as Messiah, for the time,

¹ Vide "Das Christenthum," S. 39.

destroyed; thence arose the psychological necessity for combining with their former view the notion of a suffering and dying Messiah; this they found, though by a wrong interpretation, in Isaiah liii.; but if thus slain, he must still live and have entered into his messianic glory: out of this condition of glory, how could he refrain from giving to his disciples some knowledge of himself? And how could they, in the warmth of their joy over their insight into prophecy, help regarding these new emotions as an enlightenment proceeding from him,—yea, “*as his discourse with them?*” Finally, how natural that these feelings should, in certain individuals, especially women, rise into seeming visions; by others, on the contrary, even by entire assemblies, be taken as something objective, visible and audible. Sometimes, perhaps, the sight of an unknown person made the impression of being a revelation or reappearance of Christ,—a height of pious enthusiasm not without example: but if Christ had entered into the highest blessedness, he could not have left his body in the grave; and there was the Old Testament passage: “Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, neither shalt thou suffer thy holy one to see corruption;” there was also the promise of long life to the smitten servant of Jehovah, in Isaiah liii.; and so their previous faith that “Christ abideth forever,” the disciples retain by ascribing to him,—death, to be sure, but likewise a reawakening from the dead. But here a difficulty arises. How could they suppose Christ to have risen, and believe this two days after his interment while his body was in the tomb where it had been laid, as they could easily see by looking? But ‘criticism’ can quickly cut this knot. Strauss simply discredits the evangelists, who make the risen Jesus seen for the first time by the apostles in Jerusalem, and puts his first interview, or imaginary interview, with them in Galilee, where they could not go to the tomb and undeceive themselves. By doing this, and by denying the truth of Luke’s account of the Pentecost, the time when the apostles began to proclaim the Lord’s resurrection, is a little postponed. Still, it is a very, very short

¹ See “Das Leben Jesu,” B. II. S. 636 et seq.

time for a myth of this nature to be hatched. The materials for it are pitifully scanty. The holy enthusiasm of the terrified and scattered band of disciples, who "mourned and wept," is kindled in a wonderfully quick and mysterious manner. One or two passages in the Old Testament were enough; enough to revolutionize their conception of the Messiah, and to bring them, by a short process, to imagine him to have risen from the dead and to have had repeated conversations with them. With no intermediate event to occasion the change of feeling, an assembly of five hundred could be gathered, and wrought up to such a pitch of "holy enthusiasm" as to behold Christ among them, although he was not there! To be sure, the gospels speak of incredulity, on the part of some, and of the way in which Jesus removed it; but *criticism* can put all this to the account of later tradition and fable; *criticism* can cut up the narratives, and accept only of what favors its own end. And so, on this delusion of fancy, they organized the Christian church and made Christendom! Do speculations like these of Strauss deserve to be ranked among historical investigations? His theory requires us to suppose that the same disciples who believed Jesus to be the Messiah, and *asked for no miracles*, suddenly gained such a conception of the Messiah that they must needs ascribe to him a profusion of miracles which he never wrought!

Though restricted, in this discussion, to a narrow field of evidence, from a desire to accommodate ourselves to the concessions of adversaries, and to take them on their own ground, we have found, unless we deceive ourselves, even in this contracted space, a sufficient defence for historical Christianity and the miraculous dispensation of the New Testament. For when it is granted that John, Peter, James, and the others declared the Lord's resurrection to be a fact within their knowledge, the case is surrendered by most enlightened unbelievers at the present day. It is felt that the principal question is, whether they really gave the testimony which the Christian church has ascribed to them; or whether the gospel history, in its miraculous parts, is a myth of a much later growth.

Before we conclude, we digress, for a moment, for the purpose of exposing the untruth of Baur's theory concerning the origin of the canon and of Christianity in its mature form. Everything, in his view, turns on the difference between the two types of doctrine : that of the Judaizers, with whom he ranks the apostles at Jerusalem, and the more free system of Paul. According to Baur, the book of Acts and various other books contained in the New Testament, were composed to reconcile or smooth over this difference. It is necessary for him to make out that the Judaizers, of whom Paul so often complains, were emissaries or friends of the Jerusalem church, sent out to oppose him ; and that the apostle to the gentiles was at irreconcilable variance with Peter, James, and John. Now it is remarkable that this most important passage in Galatians ii., on which Baur builds so much — this locus classicus on the subject — demonstrates the very opposite of what he would establish by it. Paul expressly affirms (ver. 9), that Peter, James, and John, after inquiry and consideration, gave to him and Barnabas *the right hand of fellowship*, stipulating that in their mission among the gentiles they should remember the poor Christians at Jerusalem, and gather contributions for their relief. He distinctly says that his controversy with Peter, at Antioch, did not grow out of any difference of doctrine — their doctrine was the same — but out of an infidelity, on the part of Peter, to his own convictions and avowals. It is true that the tergiversation of Peter is said to have been occasioned by the coming of certain persons "from James," in deference to whom he separated himself from the gentiles ; but there is no more reason to think that they *were sent* to do this mischief, than that Peter himself came on the same errand. The cause of the visit of these Jerusalem Christians to Antioch, at that time, is entirely unknown ; but the context proves that there was no hostility in the mind of James, to Paul and his doctrine. The statements of this passage, we contend, demonstrate that no radical difference, such as Baur requires for his theory, existed. They demonstrate that James and his associates were in fellowship with Paul, instead of withstanding him as

a heretic. And this established, the fine theory of the Tübingen critics topples to the ground, being left without a foundation. It is to us a remarkable illustration of the shifts to which a theorist will resort, when pressed by a difficulty, that Baur tries to cast doubts on the sincerity of this solemn act of fellowship, and to make it of no account.

ARTICLE VII.

THE MODERN GREEK LANGUAGE.

BY PROF. JAMES E. BOISE, UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN.

THE researches of philologists have, within a few years, taken a much wider range than formerly. The mere mechanism of the two most cultivated languages of antiquity, however important this may be, is no longer the sole, or even the chief object of study with the classical scholar of the present day. The nations who spoke those languages, in all their wonderful history, as they progressed from barbarism to the foremost place in ancient civilization, and their connection with all contemporary nations are now a prominent object of study.

We would by no means disparage the nice but limited scholarship of a former age, when eminent men spent a life-time in the investigation of the minute test points in the Greek metres; just as a celebrated astronomer of this country has spent years (no doubt profitably) in correcting an error of one-tenth of a second in the predicted place of an asteroid which is invisible to the naked eye.¹ These minute investigations are a necessary part of all sciences, whose grand and benign results would otherwise be unattainable.

¹ Cf. *Tables of Victoria*, by F. Brunnow, published by the University of Michigan, 1859.