

ARTICLE IV.

THE FATHERS AND FOUNDERS OF THE LUTHERAN CHURCH.¹

BY REV. B. SEARS, PRESIDENT OF BROWN UNIVERSITY, PROVIDENCE, R. I.

THE author of these interesting biographies gave ample evidence of his fitness for the task in his admirable *Life of Flacius Illyricus*, noticed in a former Number of this Journal. The present volume is a collection of gems, abounding in the rarest knowledge, drawn freshly from original sources. To the theologian of historical tastes, to the pastor and to the scholar, we can scarcely conceive of more delightful reading than is furnished by this volume. To make good this assertion, we cannot do better than to select a few of these lives and endeavor to give the spirit of them as far as our brief space will allow.

THE LIFE OF JUSTUS JONAS, FROM CONTEMPORARY SOURCES. By Theodore Pressel.²

It is a welcome sight to see such a pleasing personage as Justus Jonas moving about with the two great Reformers, Luther and Melancthon. His bright, clear intellect, his genial temper and spirit, his pure and untarnished character, his legal knowledge and great skill in practical affairs, his firmness united with a spirit of toleration, his flowing eloquence in the pulpit, and his easy and clear style as a writer and translator of Luther's works, combine to render him an attractive figure in the group of Reformers. He is a sort of Mercury by the side of Jupiter and Apollo, and other lesser divinities. While at Erfurt, a few years after Luther had gone to Wittenberg, first as student, and afterwards as professor of law, and as rector, he was an active and influential member of the society of poets or humorists, of which Mucianus was the head, and the poet Eoban Hess the chief ornament. Rarely, if ever, had a young man risen so rapidly to distinction in the university. When Göde, the last professor of the canonical law at Wittenberg, who resisted Luther and the Reformation, died, the Elector applied to Mucianus to recommend an eminent scholar as his successor. The latter had an interview with Jonas on the subject with a satisfactory result, and replied: "We have secured Jonas. He is just such a person as ought to be the successor of Göde. He is so at home in theology, so skilled in the law, so faultless in character, that

¹ Die Väter und Begründer der Lutherischen Kirche. VIII (Supplement) Theil. J. Jonas, C. Cruciger, P. Speratus, L. Spengler, N. v. Amsdorf, P. Eber, M. Chemnitz, D. Chytraeus. Von Dr. Theodor Pressel. Elberfeld. 1862.

² Justus Jonas nach gleichzeitigen Quellen. Von Dr. Theodor Pressel. 1862.

he cannot be sufficiently praised. His preaching is so attractive that the churches are crowded with hearers; his lectures are so prized that the students throng to listen to them. He is well known to the venerable Stau-pitz, and is highly esteemed by Luther. I thought of Erasmus; but he can only write; Jonas has the gift of speech. I recommend him as the best man for the place." During these negotiations, Luther arrived at Erfurt, April 6, 1521, on his way to the celebrated Diet of Worms, and Jonas joined him, and remained with him all the time he was at Worms. Notwithstanding the attempt of Erasmus, who had been his particular friend and correspondent, to dissuade him from going to Wittenberg, where "Luther's bold course was producing a tumult and drawing the attention of scholars away from classical studies to controversial theology," Jonas, who had, by daily intercourse, become warmly attached to Luther during those memorable days at Worms, accompanied him back to Eisenach where he parted with him, he himself going to Wittenberg, while the hero of the day went around by Mora, to be captured in a friendly way and conveyed to Wartburg. Jonas was pleased with everything at Wittenburg except that his professorship required him to teach the canon law. Melanchthon, to aid him in his difficulty, wrote to Spalatin, the Elector's minister: "Yesterday our Jonas was installed. There is, however, one obstacle remaining, and it is our business in every possible way to retain this pious and learned man. But this will be impossible, if he must teach the papal law. You must see that we do not lose such a man for so trivial a cause. If for any reason we allow him to be drawn away from us, we shall act as if we had neither our reason nor our eyes. The university could not obtain an abler man." Two days after, Luther showed how highly he valued him by writing to him and dedicating to him his reply to Latomus. He exhorted Jonas, in teaching the canon law, to help the students "to unlearn what it taught." The new professor was allowed to teach theology, and was honored with the degrees of Licentiate and Doctor of Divinity the same year, to the great gratification of Luther and his old friend Mucianus, of Gotha.

Jonas remained at Wittenberg twenty years, as an efficient laborer and faithful associate of Luther and Melanchthon, himself holding the third rank among the Reformers in that place. He was then sent to Halle, the residence of Albert, Archbishop of Mainz, to conduct the Reformation which had appeared there in spite of the Archbishop's authority, and remained there eight years, till after the victory of Charles V. over the Protestants. The last few years of his life he was somewhat of a wanderer. Instead of giving any account of his life and labors at Wittenberg, we will give Melanchthon's summary of the talents characteristic of the different men then prominent in that university. "Pomeranus is a *grammaticus*, who lays himself out on the words of the text; I am a *dialecticus*, looking at the connection of the text, and seeing what Christian truth may be drawn out of it and inferred from it; Jonas is an *orator*, who can clearly and splendidly pronounce and unfold the text; Luther is *omnia in omnibus*."

Jonas was not less distinguished as a writer than as a speaker. He wrote the Latin and German with equal ease and elegance. Melanchthon acknowledged that he was far surpassed by Jonas in the graces of German style. Luther alone excelled him in the vernacular tongue. This talent he employed more in translating the writings of the two great Reformers, from the Latin into the German or from the German into Latin, than in original composition. The translations of Luther's Theses, of his treatise of the Free Will against Erasmus, of Melanchthon's *Loci*, and the Augsburg Confession are from his pen.

Of his call to Halle, in 1541, he says, in a letter to his friend Myconius, informing him of the change: "A wonderful providence of God! Three days before my departure from Wittenberg, I had no thought of such a thing." No other man, that could be spared from the University even temporarily, was deemed competent by Luther to undertake the management of the Reformation in the city where the primate of Germany resided. On his unexpected arrival, the people were overjoyed, the City Council alarmed, and the Cardinal enraged. The people, under his wise and skilful control, prevailed; the Council yielded; and the first ecclesiastic of Germany found it more agreeable to leave the town and take up his residence in Mainz, the proper seat of his power.

The heroic courage of Jonas excited universal admiration in the Evangelical party. Among the many letters of encouragement which he received, must be mentioned that of his intimate friend Myconius, written upon a bed of severe illness, in which he said: "I shall not die, but live to proclaim the works of the Lord, and among others, that you, my learned and very dear Doctor Jonas, have been sent into the very midst of the camp of our fiercest enemies, to drive off the plunderer and to restore to Christ his captives. . . . Go on, Lord Jesus, triumphing over the proud old foe; and you, my dear Jonas, go on fighting the battles of the Lord." The latter replied: "After I had, by invitation of the whole Council and the people of Halle, preached the gospel two weeks in that place, the Coadjutor, John Albert, sent me a message, commanding me to leave the city in all haste. I replied, with due respect, that I and the people of Halle would be obedient in all civil matters; but in matters of conscience, affecting so many thousand souls; "we must obey God rather than man."

At first, Jonas was sent to Halle to perform a temporary service; but it soon became apparent to him and to the people, that the state of affairs there was so complicated and delicate that it would be unsafe to leave them in any less skilful hands. He, therefore, obtained permission of the Elector to remain there three years, retaining his place in Wittenberg. He acted as preacher and superintendent at Halle, supported by his friends Poach, from Wittenberg, as arch-deacon, and Schumann, of Naumburg, as deacon. His first work was to introduce the Reformation into the principal churches of Halle, which was affected not without much opposition; his

next task was to reform and elevate the schools, which had sunk very low. He succeeded in placing over them E. Sylvius, a man of decided ability and learning. Meanwhile the three years' leave of absence expired, and in 1544 his return to Wittenberg was desired. But the city of Halle was very desirous of retaining permanently the man to whom it owed so much, and Jonas himself was reluctant to leave a field of action in which he had been so highly blessed. And yet, so attached was he to his friends and old home in Wittenberg that it was hard for him to entertain the thought of separating himself entirely from them. At the instance of Luther, the Elector granted him permission to remain at Halle without giving up his connection with Wittenberg. With what pleasure Luther contemplated the course of events is evident from a letter addressed to the people of Halle, May 7, 1545: "I have conferred with my dear friend, Dr. Jonas, very freely, especially on the state of the church among you. I learned that it prospers under the blessing of God, that its members live in a Christian manner, and that its teachers are of one heart and of one mind, and that the City Council also favors the gospel."

Cardinal Albert, archbishop of Mainz, died in 1545. His Coadjutor, John Albert, was elected as his successor in the sees of Magdeburg and Halberstadt. But the city of Halle would not acknowledge his authority. After a long controversy, the parties agreed to refer the matter in dispute to the Elector of Saxony for decision, and the decision was given in favor of the city. Before the full benefits of this decision were realized, however, Halle for a time fell into the hands of the Catholics, by the defeat of the Protestants at Mühlberg.

It was with Jonas that Luther and his three sons remained as guests the three days of his last visit to Halle, on his way to Eisleben, where he died three weeks after his arrival. Jonas was his companion all this time, not leaving him for an hour, and receiving the last word (*ja*, yes) from his dying lips, in reply to the question whether he died in the faith which he had preached. He delivered the funeral discourse the next day in Eisleben, and was appointed by the Elector to follow the body to Wittenberg. In the troubles that were afterwards experienced by all the Protestants, Jonas was twice driven from Halle, and twice restored, and finally left it for good in the year 1551, and accepted a call as superintendent and court preacher to Coburg. Here he remained in honor and usefulness for two years, when, on the death of his friend, the old Duke, he resigned, spent a short time in Jena, and then settled as superintendent at Eisfeld, where he continued to his death, in 1555:

CASPAR CRUCIGER, FROM CONTEMPORARY SOURCES. By Theodore Pressel, 1862.

NICHOLAUS VON AMSDORF, FROM CONTEMPORARY SOURCES. By Theodore Pressel. 1862.¹

Next after Luther, Melanchthon, and Jonas, may be mentioned Cruciger and Amsdorf, as the most important of the circle of Reformers at Wittenberg. These two men were as unlike each other as the two chief reformers were. Cruciger represented Melanchthon as Amsdorf did Luther. While they all lived in harmony at Wittenberg, the closest attachment of Cruciger was to Melanchthon, and of Amsdorf to Luther.

Cruciger, of Bohemian descent, was born and educated at Leipsic. He studied Greek under the celebrated Richard Crocus, of England, then professor in Leipsic, and the scarcely less celebrated Mosellanus, who died so young and so much lamented. The latter was warmly attached to his young pupil, and "commended his abilities and diligence to the whole university." The earliest of Cruciger's letters preserved, speaks highly of the learning and zeal of his teacher and friend Mosellanus. Camerarius, speaking of Cruciger as his fellow-student at Leipsic, says: "As a boy, he showed such powers of mind that he acquired easily what we learned with great labor." He was present at the Leipsic Disputation in 1519. During the pestilence in Leipsic, in 1521, Cruciger's parents, whose sympathies were with the Reformers, seized the favorable opportunity to remove to Wittenberg, where the son was matriculated with Ratzemberger, the biographer of Luther, Medler, Veit Dieterich, and Spengler, all special friends of Luther. In Wittenberg Cruciger prosecuted the study of the Latin, Greek, and Hebrew languages, with a view to theology, and was the first man at the university who studied those languages with exclusive reference to theology. Others were classical scholars or jurists at first, and afterwards became theologians on espousing the doctrines of the Reformation. Of the other studies pursued in the university, he excelled in mathematics and botany. Even when at his meals, his Euclid lay upon the table before him, in order that he might lose no time. So mature was he in his studies, that, though he was but twenty years of age, Luther and Melanchthon desired that he might be a teacher in the university; but he was called to Magdeburg as a teacher, where his services were more needed by Amsdorf, now the reforming preacher in this place. Nothing will better show the estimation in which he was held than the letter of Melanchthon to him in 1525, after his return from Magdeburg, whither he had gone to aid him in organizing his school: "As I have, my dear Caspar, lived with you in the most confidential manner, ever since I first knew you, I cannot but give you a token of my love and attachment, now that you are

¹ Caspar Cruciger nach gleichzeitigen Quellen. Nicolaus von Amsdorf nach gleichzeitigen Quellen.

absent. . . . Nothing would please me more than to live with you, that we might share our studies, our conversations, our walks, and our recreations with one another." Cruciger remained three years in Magdeburg, instructing in the gymnasium and preaching every Sabbath. His school increased to such a degree that he was obliged to remove to a larger building; and his clear, and warm-hearted preaching was so attractive that the large church was crowded. At length, in 1528, Luther and his other friends felt the need of his aid at Wittenberg, on account of the swelling numbers of the students, and the frequent absence of Luther, Melanchthon, and Jonas, to attend public colloquies or imperial diets. He was appointed preacher in place of Pomeranus who was temporarily absent in Holstein, and, at the same time, supplied the place of Melanchthon as teacher in the university, who was then engaged in making the ecclesiastical Visitation in Thuringia. In 1530, he was dean of the philosophical faculty; in 1533, he was made Licentiate, and soon after Doctor of Divinity, and Rector of the university, an office which he repeatedly filled, especially in the stormy period of 1546-1548, signalized by the death of Luther, the capture of Wittenberg and of the Elector. There were times when Cruciger was nearly the only active teacher of theology in Wittenberg. Said Luther, in a letter to Melanchthon, in 1539: "Theology is now almost without a teacher. You are absent; Pomeranus and I are sick; Jonas is on a journey, and Cruciger is now the only teacher of theology." From the specimens of his lectures on interpretation, theology, and the history of Christian doctrines, it appears that his learning was very extensive, that his judgment was excellent, and his manner clear and attractive. Indeed, he resembled Melanchthon in all these respects, except that he was not so perfect a classical scholar, but was a much better Hebraist.

On the death of George, Duke of Saxony, in 1539, Cruciger and Myconius were selected to introduce the Reformation into the city and university of Leipsic. All the eminent men of Wittenberg took part in this great undertaking. Cruciger performed his work so well that the city of Leipsic insisted on his being permanently settled there, and nothing but the protest of Luther, who could not spare him, prevailed on the Elector to resist the application. He continued through his whole life a noble, firm but pure and amiable friend of reform, respected and beloved by all. His learning, candor, and judgment gave weight to his opinions, while his pure style and lucid order gave a charm to his writings. His life and character furnish a beautiful example of the value of the union of learning and religion in a public servant of the church. His death was as peaceful as his life was pure.

Amsdorf is almost the exact opposite of Cruciger. Though fully equal to him in ability, if not in learning, he resembled Luther in his faults rather than in his virtues, while Cruciger resembled Melanchthon rather in his strength than in his weaknesses. Amsdorf was straightforward and sincere in his character, powerful in his logic, undaunted, unflinching, unaccommo-

dating, unamiable in his opposition to what he received as truth. He was gloomy and morose; and was as belligerent and crabbed, though not so hot-headed and waspish, as Flacius Illyricus. Luther could differ materially with Melancthon, and yet prize him highly. If at times he became impatient and severe, his generous nature would come over him again, and there was nobody like his dear Philip. Not so Amsdorf. When dark suspicions came over him, no generous sentiment mitigated them, no elevation of mind that could recognize merit different from his own. In his adhesion to the letter of all Luther's teachings, he lost the broad scriptural views of truth, which stretch far beyond the narrow enclosures of Luther's theology. Amsdorf was of the same age with Luther, being born in 1483. When the university of Wittenberg was founded, in 1502, he was one of the first students, owing, perhaps to the fact that he was a relation of Staupitz. In 1504, he was made master of arts, and became a teacher in the philosophical faculty. In 1507 and 1508 he took the degrees of baccalaureus, sententarius, and formatus, and was dean of the philosophical faculty. In 1511 he was made Licentiate and Doctor of Divinity. In 1513 and after, he was rector of the university. Soon after Luther's call to Wittenberg, in 1508, they appear to have been friends. He warmly espoused Luther's cause on the publication of the Thesis and the strifes that grew out of it, and accompanied Luther to the Leipsic Disputation in 1519. "Eck," he remarks in a letter to Spalatin, Aug. 1, 1519, "says everything that comes into his mind, without distinction, judgment, or sense; and pronounces the words which he has learned by heart with great pomp and show." "He is not to be compared with Luther in doctrine or in art, in speech or in memory, any more than gravel or mud is with fine gold, though he excels in one thing—in bawling louder." Scheurl, who was the friend both of Eck and Amsdorf and the other Wittenberg theologians, said, in a letter to the first: "I follow with most others, the views of my friend Amsdorf, who holds firmly, honestly, and invariably to Luther's doctrine."

In 1521, Amsdorf, Schurf, and Jonas accompanied Luther to Worms, returned with him; but Amsdorf was the only one of them who was with him when he was captured by two noblemen near Waltershausen and taken to Wartburg. Amsdorf knew what was to take place, though he did not know where it was to be done. When, in November of the same year, Luther, in the garb of a nobleman, left his Patmos, and came to Wittenberg to quell the religious tumult there created by the Zwickau prophets, he went directly to Amsdorf's house, with whom he had corresponded ever since their adventure at Waltershausen. From this time on, Amsdorf appears as an active promoter of the Reformation, writing with much vigor and preaching with great power. A broad theatre of action was open before him, when, in 1524, at Luther's recommendation, he was called to Magdeburg by the City Council, where he became superintendent, and labored with great energy and success for seventeen years.

During the whole of this period, Amsdorf was in constant communica-

tion with Luther, and exerted a great influence over him. No other person had such power over the latter, and Amsdorf was not the man to suppress anything that was in his heart, or to avoid a collision because great names supported what he deemed error. Few men ventured to say so plainly to Luther what they thought of some of his questionable views. But as Amsdorf complained, not of his severity but of his indulgence, perhaps he was not unwilling to listen to complaints with which he felt a secret sympathy. Erasmus imputed to Amsdorf's influence Luther's attack upon his doctrine of the free will.

It is to be regretted that on a subject where Luther was so sensitive and self-willed (or conscientious) as on the doctrine of the real presence in the Lord's Supper, his intolerance, and even cruelty, should have been spurred on by the still more ardent and intolerant zeal of Amsdorf. He was the man to stand by Luther in public conventions, or to take his place when the latter was absent.

Amsdorf was finally called from Magdeburg to be bishop of Naumburg, in 1542. As Julius Pflug, the Catholic bishop, irregularly elected by the Catholic party, was set aside by the Elector of Saxony to make room for Amsdorf, not only the Catholics, as such, but the nobility of Misnia, who felt themselves insulted in the person of Pflug, one of their number, opposed Amsdorf and all his measures in every possible way. This imprudent step, against which Melanchthon warned the Elector, but to which Luther urged him, was one of the causes of the fatal Schmalcald war. Amsdorf's position was an unhappy one; but instead of yielding to opposition he threw himself into it with all his power. Meanwhile Luther, who kept up a lively correspondence with the new bishop, endeavored to comfort him in his perpetual troubles, while Amsdorf in turn imparted his own irritation to Luther, and was thus the means of increasing the asperity of his intercourse with the Papists and Zuinglians. "Amsdorf," says his biographers "belongs to that class of persons who do not yield to adversity, but are hardened by it to steel. The conflicts through which he passed in Naumburg embittered his spirit and increased his suspicious temper, which was already sufficiently strong. His mind became more and more gloomy. Every instance of gentleness towards the Catholics or the Swiss Reformers, was interpreted as apostasy from the truth and a denial of Christ. He was especially suspicious of Melanchthon and his school, and was the cause, in part, of the bitterness of Luther's 'Short Confession of the Supper,' published near the end of his life, in 1544. He censured severely the articles on the free will and on the Supper, in the Confession of Cologne, drawn up by Bucer and approved by Melanchthon." The differences between the disciples of Luther and Melanchthon broke out openly after Luther's death. Hence Amsdorf and Flacius assailed Melanchthon and his followers as apostates, because they did not regard all Luther's peculiar opinions as pure gospel. A more wretched period of bitter and unchristian controversy can scarcely be found than that which now followed. So unhappy are the effects when

theologians contend for human authority instead of the authority of Christ. We abstain purposely from giving any account of the wrangling and endless recriminations that grew out of the controversies about the Leipsic Interim, the *Adiaphora*, *Majorism*, and *Synergism*. We prefer to draw a veil over the weaknesses and miseries which beclouded the last days of a man otherwise upright and true, though somewhat rough and hard in his nature.

PAUL EBER, FROM CONTEMPORARY SOURCES. By Theodore Pressel. 1862.

Of the remaining lives comprehended in this volume we single out one as especially worthy of notice. In Paul Eber we have a good specimen of the disciples and immediate successors of the Reformers, whose history carries us forward beyond the times of Luther and Melancthon. Although he was the particular friend of the latter, he was always true to the former, and is remarkable for his attachment to the doctrines in which both agreed, rather than for holding exclusively to the peculiar views of either. While his friendship made him inclined to sympathize with Melancthon at first, his candor and independent thought restored the equilibrium in the end, and made him one of the most judicious, if not of the most profound, of the Lutheran theologians.

There is an old picture by Cranach, formerly in the Parochial Church at Wittenberg, representing the vineyard of Christ. On the left are the Papists laying waste the vineyard. On the right are the Reformers and their associates working in the vineyard. Luther is swinging the mattock and breaking up the soil; Melancthon is bringing water from the fountain; Pomeranus and Cruciger are driving props into the ground for the vines; another is cutting off clusters of grapes, and a third is carrying them in a basket to the wine-press. Through the open gate are seen the pope, cardinals, bishops, and abbots proudly demanding their pay. Kneeling near the gate, is a man with his family, humbly asking for admission. In his person he is small, feeble, and hump-backed, but has eyes full of fire. This is Paul Eber near his own monument.

He was born in Kitzengen, near Wuresburg on the Mayn in 1511, and was the son of a tailor. He was sent to school in his native place, where he made such rapid progress that, at the age of twelve, he was sent to Ansbach to enjoy the advantages of superior instruction. Returning from this school he met with the accident which made him a cripple for life. He was thrown from a horse and dragged, with his foot in the stirrup, for a mile. This delayed his studies for a full year. Too weak for labor, and too poor to support himself at school, he, by a fortunate accident, was admitted, in 1525, into the newly opened Protestant school at Nürnberg, where, for six years, he received a careful classical training under such

¹ Paul Eber nach gleichzeitigen Quellen

teachers as Camerarius and Eoban Hess. He was placed upon one of the foundations by the liberality of the City Council, and was, furthermore, aided by the principal of the school and by others. It is not strange, therefore, that he called Nürenberg his "second native city."

When he had finished his preparatory studies, he was again in trouble. He says: "I had an incredible desire to fly to Wittenberg as soon as possible; and yet my father could not furnish me a single penny." His passion for study overcame his timidity, and he applied to the authorities of Kitzengen for a scholarship which was in their gift, and to one of the Council of Nürenberg for some little aid. Supported by the best of testimonials, he was successful in both applications, and was liberally provided for. He entered the university in the spring of 1532, when it was in its most flourishing condition. The fire of the first love burned in the hearts of both teachers and pupils; and of all who sat at the feet of the great masters of wisdom, few had a more receptive mind and heart, or brought with them a better preparation than Eber, now a little over twenty years of age. Camerarius, no doubt, recommended him warmly to his friend Melanchthon. Certainly he was at once received into the friendship of the latter, which grew more and more cordial to the end, and in the breast of the pupil survived the death of the teacher.

After four years' study at Wittenberg, Eber received his degree in 1536, and was admitted as tutor or repetent, whose office it was, not to give independent instructions, but to conduct the reviews of the professors' lectures and to aid students who needed private instructions. In this capacity, aided and directed by Melanchthon, he went through nearly all the studies taught by the philosophical faculty, that is, all but the professional studies. How admirably this intermediate position, between student and professor, for five years, prepared him for his future work, can easily be understood by those who know the value of mature scholarship for a teacher. In a letter to Baumgarten, Melanchthon said: "Eber has been of great use to us, not only in the instruction of the youth, but in other affairs which are imposed upon us much more than is customary in other universities. I was, therefore, very anxious to retain him here." July 15, 1541, five years before Luther's death, Eber could say, in a letter: "Yesterday, I learned from the rector that the academic senate had appointed me to a vacant professorship, and that the Elector had confirmed the nomination. As I did not seek this place so could I not decline it without exposing myself to the suspicion of refusing it because the salary was smaller than that of the other professorships. And yet I must hear that others took it hard that I (on account of being Melanchthon's favorite) should be preferred to them, though I would gladly give place to them, as I do not consider myself suitably qualified to conduct the declamations." Meanwhile Melanchthon looked out a wife, Helen Küffner of Leipsic, for his young friend, and the choice proved to be excellent. To meet the increased expense of house-keeping, Eber took private pupils, boarding and

lodging them in his own house, with all the joys and sorrows usually attending such a course. He could not accommodate all the applicants. He sometimes waited long for his pay. Two died in his house; the one in 1545, the other in 1568. His care over the young men under his tuition was so tender, and his influence so good that they often treated him as a father ever after. At first he was only professor extraordinary in 1544 he was made a regular, or ordinary professor. Luther prized him very highly. On one occasion, when the Leipzig theological faculty invited the Wittenberg theologians to be present at the ceremony of conferring of a doctor's degree, Luther replied that it would be impossible for him to attend, but that Cruciger and Eber would represent the Wittenberg faculty; "two men who will be welcome to you on account of their ability and talents for business as well as on account of old acquaintanceship." Warning his friends Melancthon, Pomeranus, Cruciger, Major, and Eber against the dangers that should arise after his death, he turned to Eber at the close, and said: "Your name is Paul; see that you be a Paul; and after his example manfully teach and defend his doctrine." How deeply he felt Luther's death appears from the fact that he observed the day on which it occurred every year afterwards.

Luther had scarcely gone to his rest when Wittenberg was threatened by the emperor and finally overwhelmed with troubles. "In the midst of great waters," said Eber, in a letter to Sabinus, "we are struggling to perform our duties to the church and the school." But for a whole year, from November, 1546 to November, 1547, the university was suspended. Melancthon fled to Zerbst, and most of his associates followed his example. Only Cruciger, Pomeranus, and Eber remained. Soon the thunderbolt of war fell upon them. In a letter of Eber to Melancthon, dated April 25, 1547, he said: "Yesterday between four and five o'clock P. M., our cavalry were put to flight at Mühlberg. In the early part of the evening they reached our city. The two young princes and Otto of Brunswick have returned, but we have not yet received our pious and broken-hearted Elector. Many give out that he is taken prisoner. I congratulate you and your colleagues that you are removed from these scenes of danger. It was unwise in me not to escape when I could." Eber took his family to Kitzen- gen that they might be among his friends in case anything should befall him. Finally the university was re-opened, and Eber gave notice, Oct. 23, 1547, that he should resume his instruction. He now taught mathematics, astronomy, and natural history. In botany he said he should notice all the plants that grew in the vicinity of Wittenberg. He visited the mountains of Misnia in order to "observe in the mines the wonderful works of nature." He also gave lectures in mental philosophy and history.

In December, 1556, John Forster, Cruciger's successor, died, and the university nominated Eber in his place, in the following words: "For the professorship of Dr. Forster, who succeeded Cruciger as teacher of theology and of Hebrew, and as preacher in the Electoral church on Sundays and Wednesdays, we propose Master Paul Eber, who has been in the univer-

sity more than twenty years, and is favorably known, both at home and abroad, for his piety, learning, and intelligence." He commenced as professor of theology, with lectures on the original text of Isaiah. "You know," said he at the opening of the course, "that I have hitherto been occupied, with no little diligence, in teaching the languages and the elements of the sciences. I would prefer, on account of my weakness both of body and mind, to continue in the same studies; but there are reasons why I should yield to the will of the Prince and the Senate." As a theologian, he took his ground in the following solemn manner: "I declare myself to be a member of the true church, of which this our church is certainly a part. Therefore I will not depart from our confession of faith, nor introduce new doctrines, nor sow dissensions, but, with God's assistance, I will maintain the pure doctrines according to the writings of the prophets and apostles." All his future life showed the sincerity of these words. A few months afterwards, Pomeranus died, having been pastor in Wittenberg thirty-six years, and Eber was appointed his successor, as preacher in the city church, and superintendent of the electorate of Saxony. As there was, at this time, only one Doctor of Divinity, George Major, the others having been removed by death, Melanchthon prevailed (though not without difficulty) on Eber to receive that degree, which, at the same time, was given to Crell, Major's son-in-law. It was only six months after this, in January, 1560, that Eber was called to stand at the death-bed of Melanchthon, his dearest earthly friend. Ever after this event, he seems to have longed to follow his friend to his final rest.

We have Eber before us, henceforth, in the three capacities of preacher, professor, and superintendent. Now, for the first time, are all his talents put in requisition. From this time forth we find him acting a leading part as a teacher and as an ecclesiastic. Besides preaching in the city church, he for a time took upon himself the Latin service, which Melanchthon had held on Sunday mornings for the benefit of foreigners. He prepared his discourses carefully. In the specimens given us by two of his hearers, who acted as reporters, we observe perfect clearness and transparency of thought, pure and terse popular language, and a direct practical aim. His office as pastor was very laborious in the years of the plague, especially in 1566. "It is a miserable sight," he observes, "to see a strong man cut down at once, or go through the slow tortures of a poison coming gradually to the surface and bloating the whole body. Still more terrible is the contagion which makes separation from the diseased a stern necessity. The ties of blood and friendship make it necessary to attend to the sufferer, but the public safety makes it necessary for those who do so to avoid the company of all others." He could not visit his sick parishioners without shutting himself out from all the rest. One of the preachers was obliged to attend exclusively to the sick, and confine himself with them. The epidemic raged most in the huts of the poor, requiring all Eber's energy to see that they were provided with the means of subsistence. We may mention, before

leaving this general topic, that he is the author of several beautiful Lutheran hymns, which have been much used in the church.

Notwithstanding his parochial duties, Eber entered, as professor of theology, upon the task of giving exegetical lectures upon the Old Testament and the historical books of the New, with the same ardor which he had formerly shown in the ancient languages and the sciences. He was accustomed to give a grammatical and historical interpretation of the scriptures as the only sure foundation of Christian doctrines. This, he maintained, was the only way of weeding out the errors of the scholastic theology. He speaks of the concord that existed among the professors of theology as adding much to their strength and comfort; but there was a drawback in their small numbers, being only three, and in the advancing age and declining health of two of them. He says in a letter, Nov. 10, 1564: "Dr. Major, with whom I am now connected by family ties, my son Paul having married his daughter Mary, is in the sixty-third year of his age and suffers from catarrh and from giddiness. I entered upon my fifty-fourth year last Wednesday. Dr. Paul Crell, the third, is but little over thirty. He studied fifteen years under Melanchthon and other professors, and is well versed, not only in theology, but in *tota philosophia, lingua Latina, Graeca, et Hebraica.*" Under these three professors, the number of theological students had not declined since Melanchthon's death. In general, law students were becoming far more numerous than theological students in all Germany. The latter belonged to the poorer classes. Therefore Eber applied to the cities to furnish higher stipends for them, saying that ten or twelve guilders should be added to the forty, on account of the increased expense of living. He commended the majority of the beneficiaries of the Margrave George Frederic, but appended to his account some amusing comments upon others. "Some enter the university too young, before they are well grounded in the grammar of the languages; some, from their youth and from the influence of companions, lead too gay a life. Still it is hoped that they will yield to good counsels." One, John Seranus, is too fond of music and neglects his studies, but having been remonstrated with, has promised reform. Of one it is said that he has an overweening opinion of his knowledge. A third is not very diligent; he spends much time in fencing, and is in debt. A fourth is too attentive to a very good young lady, to whom he is prematurely engaged.

As superintendent of a large district, Eber was fully aware of his great responsibilities. With unremitting diligence and fidelity did he, as inspector and visitor of the churches and schools, provide churches with pastors, and watch over the faithful application of church funds to their legitimate objects. He complained bitterly, in a letter to a secretary in Anspach, in 1563, of the plunder of church property, "as though the devout of former times had established a fund for the recreation and amusement of the churches." "In stripping the servants of the church of their stipends, the people will in the end see how little blessing

would ensue." With great respect and gratitude did those who were under him submit to his wise measures, well knowing that none of their just interests would suffer in his hands. To prevent troubles and dissensions, and to maintain sound doctrine in a loving, peaceful way, was his constant aim, and he was so successful that, while divisions and strifes were rife all around, his province was preserved in a happy state of union. From his register it appears that from 1558 to 1567, he ordained 925 persons, some of whom had studied not less than eighteen years at the university.

Application was made to him from all quarters for pastors and school teachers. He writes to a friend, August 22, 1565: "Among the difficulties of my office, this is not the least, that I am beset with requests to recommend preachers for the greatest variety of places. While I do a service to one church, I am blamed by others who do not wish to part with their pastors. Sometimes a man is not pleased with his new position, or he does not make good the place of his predecessor. In either case I come in for a share of the blame. But as destitute churches ought to be provided with able and good preachers, I cannot refuse to aid them in getting a supply." As early as 1560, he writes thus: "With the small number of the students of theology, who are almost universally poor, we are often obliged to avail ourselves of the services of those who would be benefitted by a more protracted course of study, not only in respect to knowledge, but in respect to maturity and experience. But the same poverty which drives them to the study of theology, not having the means of studying the other professions, forces them to close their studies prematurely." Again he writes in 1566: "Within a few years, many excellent, experienced, and learned preachers have been called away by death. It has been estimated that the plague has, within a circuit of fifty miles from Halle, including the territories of Magdeburg, the Hartz, Thuringia, Misnia, Mansfeld, Anhalt, and the Mark Brandenburg, carried off not less than three hundred and fifty preachers and pastors. This university and the universities of Leipsic and Jena have been decimated in the same way; and, moreover, many of the theological students are called to supply the places of the deceased. Thus the remaining students are very young, or are bound to various services on account of the stipends which they receive. It is therefore necessary to educate more men for the ministry, and to encourage those of fine promise by a more liberal patronage."

We do not propose to follow Eber in the controversies into which he was drawn, against his will, with theologians abroad on the Eucharist. He was a Lutheran of moderate views and of a most tolerant spirit; and all that he wrote tended to charity and peace. It is truly refreshing to find such "a rose among the thorns," such "a Daniel among the lions."

ARTICLE V.

EGYPTOLOGY, ORIENTAL ARCHAEOLOGY AND TRAVEL.

BY JOSEPH P. THOMPSON, D.D., NEW YORK.

MR. FORSTER pursues his theory of the Sinaitic inscriptions with a confidence and enthusiasm worthy of better success. His "Voice of Israel from the Rocks of Sinai," though it passed to a second edition in 1852, found little favor with oriental and biblical scholars; — curiosity was soon satisfied from an inspection of its plates, and it was left to slumber upon the shelves of libraries. The ambition to prove too much, and the confident boast of great philological and historical discoveries, prejudiced the reader against even the moderate claims to original merit that might be conceded to Mr. Forster in his specialty. Not content with ascribing the Sinaitic inscriptions to the Israelites in their wanderings, he claimed to have discovered in those inscriptions, and upon sundry monuments of Egypt, vestiges of patriarchal tradition, conveyed in alphabetic characters of "the one primeval language," whose long-lost powers were now happily restored. This pretension was met with a scepticism little short of ridicule; and after a brief controversy with his reviewers, Mr. Forster seemed to have subsided into the oblivion of the primeval chaos. But with the ardor of thorough conviction, he resolved to lay before the scholars of Europe the means of testing his interpretations and theories in detail, by *fac similes* of the inscriptions upon which they are based. The British government, ever ready to second the explorations of scholars and scientific men, sanctioned a mission of two gentlemen, Rev. Pierce Butler, and his brother, the late Captain Henry T. Butler, to make further researches, and to collect fresh materials in the peninsula of Sinai. These commissioners took moulded casts of numerous inscriptions, — a process adopted also by M. Lottin de Laval, under the patronage of the Imperial government of France, — and from these, photographs and glypographs were taken for the work before us.¹ "The hieroglyphic tablets and the cursive inscriptions, accordingly, are all given as they stand upon the living rocks; on a greatly diminished scale indeed, but line for line, letter for letter, point for point. The fidelity of our materials, therefore," adds Mr. Forster, "is beyond the reach of scepticism. This is one grand step towards the discovery of their contents."

Since Niebuhr first brought to the knowledge of European scholars the

¹ Sinai Photographed; or, Contemporary Records of Israel in the Wilderness; with an Appendix. By Rev. Charles Forster, B.D., Six-preacher of Canterbury Cathedral, and Rector of Stisted, Essex. London: Richard Bentley. Imperial quarto. pp. 352. With many illustrations.

existence of the hieroglyphic tablets and other monuments upon the summit of Sarbut-el-Khadem, the theories of their origin have been almost as numerous as the archaeologists who have gone thither to inspect them. There is scarcely anything in Egypt itself more impressive than these sepulchral monuments, on the table-top of a steep and rugged mountain seven hundred feet high, in the rocky wilderness of the Sinaitic peninsula, pointing by their hieroglyphics to an Egyptian origin, yet remote from any known settlement, post, or garrison of ancient Egypt, and suggesting the presence of capital, of labor, and of skill in their immediate vicinity. Though the monuments are not numerous nor large, — being chiefly rows of upright slabs, eight or ten feet high, and the fallen walls and columns of a small temple, the whole covering an area of one hundred and sixty feet by seventy, — yet the isolation of these remains, the elevation at which they are found, the evidences of skill in the handling of materials and the execution of the sculptures, show that either some deep religious motive or some weighty social or official reason, prompted this difficult and costly memorial. Niebuhr suggested that Sarbut-el-Khadem was a cemetery, and associated it conjecturally with the graves of Iust described in Numbers xi. 34.¹ Laborde, following the clue furnished by traces of copper mines in the vicinity, conjectured that this was a central mining station, and that the official miner set apart this almost inaccessible cemetery in imitation of the mountain tombs of the upper Nile.² Others have suggested an Egyptian colony, and yet others pilgrimages to this as a sacred mountain, to account for these anomalous remains. But all conjecture will be at random until the reading of the hieroglyphics shall furnish some definite data. Hence the great importance of the inscriptions reproduced in Mr. Forster's volume as a contribution to "experimental philology."

His own theory of the Sarbut cemetery is that it was the burial-place of the magnates of the Israelites, "the heads of tribes, the princes of the people, the elders of Israel, who perished in the awful plague of Kibroth-Hattaavah" which he labors to identify with Sarbut-el-Khadem. Upon this identification our author reasons in a circle — first arguing the identity of Sarbut-el-Khadem with Kibroth-Hattaavah from the Israelitish character of the cemetery and its inscriptions, and then arguing that these are Israelitish because found near the memorable encampment of Kibroth-Hattaavah. Still he adduces some few doubtful geographical and philological proofs of the identity here claimed. Following the maps of Ortelius and Goldschmidt, of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, he infers that the traditional geography of the Middle Ages had located the *Sepulchra Concupiscentiae* in juxtaposition to Sarbut-el-Khadem. Kibroth-Hattaavah lay midway between Taberah and Hazeroth. The latter is proximately identified by Rob-

¹ Voyage en Arabie, Tom. I. p. 189. "Ne seroient-ce pas ici les sépulchres de la convoitise."

² Journey through Arabia Petraea, Eng. ed., p. 88.

inson, Burckhardt, Stanley, and others, with *Ain-el-Hüdhera* at the eastern extremity of the great sandy tract Debbet-et-Ramleh. Mr. Forster attempts also to identify Taberah with the Wadi Bêrah, which he interprets "The valley of the wrath of God." This Taberah was "a remote outskirt" of the great encampment at Kibroth-Hattaavah, which "lay along the plain for twelve miles, or a day's journey in length," — for so Mr. Forster interprets Numbers xi. 31. So far the geographical proofs, which are far from conclusive. They proceed, moreover, upon the assumption that mount Serbal was the true Sinai — an assumption necessary in order to bring the Israelites by the route of El-Khadem, and within the time specified in Numbers for the march from Sinai to Kibroth-Hattaavah. Upon this point Mr. Forster adds little to the well-known arguments of Lepsius,¹ Stewart,² and others in behalf of Serbal.

Mr. Forster's philological proofs of the identity of Sarbut-el-Khadem with Kibroth-Hattaavah rest upon his alleged interpretation of the inscriptions. These are of two kinds — hieroglyphic and cursive. With regard to the former he observes that, though they wear a general resemblance to the hieroglyphic tablets of Egypt, they are nevertheless marked by "the absence of the usual Egyptian symbols of Apis, and of most if not of all the Egyptian deities," and also by "the presence of symbols altogether unknown to the native monuments of Egypt"; and hence he infers that they were the works of a people so far under Egyptian influence as to adopt the monumental style of that country, yet not imbued with the spirit of Egyptian life and worship. "A crane-like bird, resembling a goose, with slender body and long legs, is the *leading* hieroglyphic symbol in the tablets of Sarbut-el-Khadem"; and this Mr. Forster claims to have identified with "the *salus*, or long-winged and long-legged fowl of the miracle," — the red-legged crane frequently seen on the upper Nile and in the desert. Taking this symbol as the key to the hieroglyphics, he makes a crude translation into such phrases as the following:

"Casts to the ground, propelling, the rapid-blowing wind the *nuhams*" (Arabic for the Heb. *salus* 'quails,' of our version). "The bow arrests the birds on the wing congregated; a sudden death; greedily lusting after flesh, die the gluttons"; and so on through a detailed description of the effects of this sudden greediness of flesh upon the stomachs and the marrow of the gluttons.

With respect to the cursive inscriptions, Mr. Forster maintains that "while the letters are mostly our present Hebrew, the language is the old Arabic or Egyptian"; that this was "the primeval language, an idiom indisputably coeval with the primitive division of tongues at Babel, always preserved buried in the Arabic lexicons, but from the rise of Mahomet lost to the Arabic writers;" and that this archaic idiom now "proves itself the master-key to the hitherto undecipherable Sinaitic inscriptions which,

¹ Letters from Egypt.

² Tent and Khan.

to the Arabic lexicon, uniformly yield senses simple, serious, and scriptural; senses tallying throughout with the Mosaic history, and elucidative of the events and miracles of the Exode." Following out this theory, Mr. Forster gives page after page of these rude cursive inscriptions, reduces them to Arabic equivalents, and finds in them the narrative of the crossing of the Red Sea, of the plague of Kibroth Hattaavah, of the water procured from the rock, — in a word, a record of all the salient points in the history of Israel in the desert.

Concerning Mr. Forster's reading of these mysterious writings we may observe that, while it carries with it a certain air of plausibility, the interpretation seems to be forced into accordance with a preconceived theory, rather than the theory deduced from the deciphering of the signs. Some of the characters at once suggest letters of the Hebrew alphabet; but Mr. Forster tortures others into Hebrew signs to which they bear hardly a remote resemblance. We have not found it possible, even with the aid of a powerful lens, to bring out in his photographs certain outlines which he professes to have deciphered and which he restores in full upon the printed page. Much of this deciphering is the merest guess work. In the sentences which he constructs from his arbitrary alphabet, Mr. Forster supplies the connections with the same facility. He bends everything to his theory with an enthusiasm which borders upon the ludicrous. Thus seizing upon the conjecture of Rev. Moses Margoliouth,¹ that the phrase "they were of them that were written" (Num. xi. 27) should be read, "they were among the inscriptions," Mr. Forster exclaims, with exultation: "The case is simply one of *alibi*. They [Eldad and Medad] went not out unto the tabernacle because they were elsewhere occupied in executing or directing the execution of those records of the Exode, graven with an iron pen, and lead, in the rocks forever"! Then leaping to his conclusion, he adds: "*This mention of the Sinaitic inscription by Moses himself*, in the book of Numbers, may continue to be questioned, but never can be refuted. The text is so simple, and the meaning so clear, when once elucidated from the phenomena to which it so plainly refers, that no hypercriticism can eventually succeed in replunging the question into that obscurity in which it was so long inevitably involved, solely from the absence of the only lights that could clear it." It is worse than useless to criticise an author who is capable of setting forth such reasoning in such verbiage.

As yet no palaeographer of eminence has accepted Mr. Forster's enchoirial alphabet of these Sinaitic inscriptions, or followed his interpretation. Prof. Beer regarded the alphabet as unique, though having marked affinities with the Cufic; the language he believed to be that of the Nabathæans, and the inscriptions memorials of religious pilgrims, in about the fourth century of our era. Prof. Tuch regards the dialect of the inscriptions as Arabic, — which corresponds with Forster's view — and he attrib-

¹ Pilgrimage to the Land of my Fathers.

utes them to the ancient *Tawarak* of the peninsula. He attaches no Christian meaning to the sign of the cross, so frequent in the inscriptions, and which Forster makes the Hebrew *Tau*. Upon the whole, then, we may still say with Dr. Robinson, that the origin of these monuments, "is a point wrapped in the darkness of time, which the hand of modern science has not yet unveiled."¹ It is well, for the further investigation of this curious topic, that Mr. Forster has laid before the scientific world the ample and exact transcripts of Sinaitic inscriptions which illustrate his elegant volume.

M. W. Pleyte of Utrecht, in a recent brochure, attempts to carry us back of the Exode to Egyptian sources of the religious belief of the Israelites.² From Phœnician and Grecian traditions he derives the early founding of Phœnician colonies in the Delta of Egypt, — traces of which he thinks exist in the monumental mythology of Egypt itself. The statement of Herodotus that the Phœnician *Astarté* was worshipped at Memphis as a foreign Venus, is fully confirmed by recent discoveries. [See *Bib. Sac.*, Vol. xix. p. 840.] The invaders of Egypt known as the Shepherds or the Hyksôs, he regards as Palestino-Phœnicians, descendants of whom M. Mariette announces that he has discovered upon the borders of Lake Menzaleh. [See below, upon the Suez canal.] With these invaders he associates, upon the authority of Arabic traditions the Pharanite Arabs or Amalekites, and from a comparison of traditions he derives "the historical fact that an Asiatic tribe once dwelt in the valley of Lower Egypt, and that it was composed of a *mélange* of Phœnico-Palestino-Arabs, among whom, in all probability, were the Israelites."

The chief divinity of the Hyksôs was *Set*, who was worshipped originally as the good god. This divinity M. Pleyte seeks to identify with the *Seth* of the Hebrew genealogies; and he makes the religion of the Jews a *mélange* of the religions of Phœnicia, Arabia, and Egypt, with which successively they came in contact: "Originating in Chaldea, they worshipped *El* or *El-Schedej*, the god of fertile fields, the god of nomades. In Phœnicia they adopted the god *Melech*, and rendered homage to *Baal*. In Egypt they found the Egypto-Asiatic worship of *Set* or *Sutech*." Then after a severe conflict with the sensuous element in these various religions, *Jehovism* was established as the national religion of the Jews. In all this there was simply "a natural and regular development of intelligence, the fruit of a progressive civilization."

M. Pleyte's pamphlet is another indication of the tendency of modern scepticism to eliminate the supernatural element of the Pentateuch by discrediting its historical individuality, and reducing it to the level of oriental traditions. It is to this point, therefore, — the substantial truth of the

¹ *Researches*, I. 79. Forster styles "Dr. Robinson the American rationalist." But Dr. Robinson had dismissed his former book, as "too visionary to require notice."

² *La Religion des pre-Israelites. Recherches sur le Dieu Seth.* Par W. Pleyte. Avec X planches d'après les monuments. Utrecht: T. De Bruyn.

Pentateuch as a record, — that its defenders must turn their attention, if they would vindicate its claims as a revelation. In this course of investigation biblical scholars are not idle.

Professor Rawlinson of Oxford, to whom we are already indebted for the elucidation both of Herodotus and of the Old Testament from the monumental records of Egypt, Assyria, and Babylon, has issued the first volume of his long-promised history of Chaldea, Assyria, Babylon, Media, and Persia.¹ This volume treats in full of the first monarchy, Chaldea, and in part of the second, or Assyrian. The author's plan embraces under each a general view of the country, its climate and productions, its people, their language and writing, arts and sciences, manners, customs, and religion, with a concluding sketch of the history and chronology of the nation, in a consecutive form. The author attempts to accomplish for the five ancient monarchies of middle western Asia, "what Movers and Kenrick have accomplished for Phenicia, and Wilkinson for ancient Egypt." Assuming that the cuneiform inscriptions have been successfully deciphered, and that the various ancient remains are assigned on sufficient grounds to certain peoples and epochs, he seeks "to unite with our previous knowledge of the five nations, whether derived from biblical or classical sources, the new information obtained from modern discovery."

Some of the conclusions at which Professor Rawlinson arrives are of special interest to biblical scholars. In his third chapter he argues in reply to Niebuhr, Bunsen, Max Müller, and others, that the Chaldeans were not an Aramaic or Semitic race, but *Hamites*. In the first place he combines the traditions of the Greeks and the Armenians to the effect that there were Ethiopians in Asia, along the coast of the Southern ocean, and adds to these certain affinities between the mythology of Chaldea and that of Egypt. But to this he adds a new and weighty argument from language.

"The conclusions thus recommended to us by the consentient primitive traditions of so many races, have lately received most important and unexpected confirmation from the results of linguistic research. After the most remarkable of the Mesopotamian mounds had yielded their treasures and supplied the historical student with numerous and copious documents bearing upon the history of the great Assyrian and Babylonian empires, it was determined to explore Chaldea Proper, where mounds of less pretension, but still of considerable height, marked the sites of a number of ancient cities. The excavations conducted at these places, especially at Niffer, Senkereh, Warka, and Mugheir, were eminently successful. Among their other unexpected results was the discovery, in the most ancient remains, of a new form of speech, differing greatly from the later Babylonian language, and presenting analogies with the early language of Susiana, as well

¹ The Five Great Monarchies of the Ancient Eastern World. By George Rawlinson, M. A., Camden Professor of Ancient History in the University of Oxford. London: John Murray.

as with that of the second column of the Achaemenian inscriptions. In grammatical structure this ancient tongue resembles dialects of the Turanian family, but its vocabulary is pronounced to be 'decidedly Cushite or Ethiopian;' and the modern languages to which it approaches the nearest are the Mahra of Southern Arabia and the Galla of Abyssinia. Thus comparative philology is found to confirm the old traditions. An eastern Ethiopian, instead of being the invention of bewildered ignorance, is proved to be a reality which henceforth it will be the extreme of scepticism to question, and the primitive race which bore sway in Chaldea Proper is demonstrated to have belonged to this ethnic type." (pp. 64, 65.)

From this conclusion Professor Rawlinson proceeds to the question of primitive origin, which he determines as follows :

"When the early inhabitants of Chaldea are pronounced to have belonged to the same race with the dwellers upon the upper Nile, the question naturally arises: Which were the primitive people, and which the colonists? Is the country at the head of the Persian gulf to be regarded as the original abode of the Cushite race, whence it spread eastward and westward, on the one hand, to Susiana, Persia Proper, Carmania, Gedrosia, and India itself; on the other, to Arabia and the east coast of Africa? or are we to suppose that the migration proceeded in one direction only; that the Cushites, having occupied the country immediately to the south of Egypt, sent their colonies along the south coast of Arabia, whence they crept on into the Persian gulf, occupying Chaldea and Susiana, and thence spreading into Mekran, Kerman, and the regions bordering upon the Indus? Plausible reasons may be adduced in support of either hypothesis. The situation of Babylonia, and its proximity to that mountain region where man must have first 'increased and multiplied' after the flood, are in favor of its being the original centre from which the other Cushite races were derived. The biblical genealogy of the sons of Ham points, however, the other way; for it derives Nimrod from Cush, not Cush from Nimrod. Indeed this document seems to follow the Hamites from Africa — emphatically 'the land of Ham' — in one line along southern Arabia to Shinar or Babylonia, in another from Egypt through Canaan into Syria. The antiquity of civilization in the valley of the Nile, which preceded by many centuries that even of primitive Chaldaea, is another argument in favor of the migration having been from west to east; and the monuments and traditions of the Chaldaeans themselves are thought to present some curious indications of an East African origin. On the whole, therefore, it is most probable that the race designated in scripture by the hero-founder Nimrod, and among the Greeks by the eponym of Belus, passed from East Africa, by way of Arabia, to the valley of the Euphrates, shortly before the opening of the historical period." (pp. 67, 68.)

The data derived from monuments and from the archaic cuneiform inscriptions, are not yet sufficiently numerous or determined to be accepted as a final authority. But there is much in these discoveries to stimulate inquiry,

and to awaken the expectation that the ethnological chart given in the tenth chapter of Genesis will be substantially confirmed from contemporary sources. Prof. Rawlinson expresses his own conviction that "the Mosaical narration conveys the exact truth — a truth alike in accordance with the earliest classical traditions, and with the latest results of modern comparative philology." He assigns to the establishment of a Cushite kingdom in Lower Babylonia a date of at least 2300 B. C. The great men of this empire were *Nimrod*, its founder (afterward worshipped as *Bil-Nipru*), *Uruk* the builder, whose reign was the era of the great temples, and *Kudur-Lagamer*, the Elamitic conqueror, who marched an army from the Persian gulf to Palestine.

With regard, however, to this latter monarch, Sir Henry Rawlinson now recedes from the identification of the *Kudur-mapala* of the monuments with the Chedor-laomer of Abraham's expedition, and proposes an entirely different reading. Such varying conjectures, while creditable to the candor of cuneiform scholars, do not inspire confidence in their accuracy; and until the interpretation of these monuments is reduced to a science, we must receive even the most plausible conjectures *cum grano salis*.

The ethnic character of the ancient Assyrians is less in doubt than that of the Chaldaeans. The documentary records of their language are copious, and both Bunsen and Max Müller agree with Rawlinson that this was Semitic. But Ernest Renan regards it as a mixture of Semitic and Hamitic elements not yet definitely determined.¹ Our author regards Chaldea as "the great parent and original inventress of Asiatic civilization;" and since the settlement of Chaldea is traced to Egypt, we have in the early monuments of these kindred nations a striking witness for the genius and power of "the seed of Ham," which the politico-theological criticism of our times has pronounced "accursed." We shall await with interest the completion of Professor Rawlinson's valuable work. The Messrs. Appleton have announced their intention to republish it, in a style uniform with their edition of the author's Herodotus.

The sojourn of the Israelites in Judea, and the crossing of the Red sea, may possibly receive some fresh illustration from the explorations of the engineers of the Suez canal. That stupendous project already appears feasible, and the work steadily advances. Indeed, M. Ferdinand de Lesseps estimates that a little more than one year's labor will open the canal to commerce. The alimentary canal is now opened from the Nile to lake Timsah the interior port of the grand canal. This feeder, while connecting Egypt with the commerce of the East, is designed also to convey sweet water to Suez by a separate branch, and to irrigate and fructify the desert through which it passes. Its bed lies mainly in what M. Lesseps regards as the Goshen of the Scriptures. M. Lebeau, in his *Historie du Bas Empire*, following the Arabic geographer Abulfeda, says:

¹ Renan; *Histoire Générale des Langues Semitiques*, p. 214. 3d ed.

"The coast at Faramah (a town a little to the east of Pelusium on the Mediterranean) was only seventy miles distant from the Red sea. This space was a very smooth plain, slightly elevated above the level of the two seas. Amrou formed the design of uniting them by a canal, which he would have filled with the waters of the Nile; but Omar having opposed it, from fear of opening an entrance into Arabia for the ships of the Christians, Amrou turned his thoughts in another direction. There was an ancient canal, called Trajanus Amnis, which Adrian caused to be brought from the Nile near Babylon in Egypt, as far as Pharbaethus, now Belbeis. He met at this place with another canal, commenced by Nechos and continued by Darius Hystaspes, and the two together discharged themselves into a lagoon of salt water, at the outlet of which Ptolemy Philadelphus caused a large trench to be made, which conducted the waters as far as the town of Arsinoë, or Cleopatris, at that part of the gulf where Suez now is.

"The whole of this canal, being filled up with sand, had become useless at the time of the famous Cleopatra. Amrou was not deterred by the ancient prejudice, which, supposing the waters of the Red sea to be higher than the soil of Egypt, created a fear of opening a passage for them; and he made it navigable for the transport of the corn of Egypt into Arabia. It is that which is now called Khalig, which passes through Cairo, but it only goes as far as the lagoon called the Lake of Sheib. The remainder, as far as the Red sea, is entirely filled up, although some traces of it are still distinguishable."

This ancient route is re-opened, and the Wadi Tomilat promises again to become a Goshen. The analogy of the great plains of Chaldea, once teeming with fertility and with population, now an arid waste, simply for want of the old system of irrigating canals, will serve to illustrate the decline of that large eastern section of the delta of Egypt, once famous as the best of the land. Lesseps conjectures from topographical and geological surveys, in connection with early traditions, that the Red sea formerly extended to the lakes Amers (Bitter Lakes), and even to Timsah. He assumes as well identified, Rameses, Succoth (now called by the natives "the sea of tents"), Etam (from neighboring tribes called *Etames*), and Pi-hairoth (now called "the bay of reeds"). Ras El Wady, "the head of the valley" Tomilat, he regards as the Pithom of the Bible. This valley debouches into Timsah; and Lesseps conjectures that Moses crossed, at low tide, between the extremities of lakes Timsah and Amers.

On the shores of lake Menzaleh is a population of some fifteen thousand fishermen, in a degraded servile condition, who are of a widely different type from the inhabitants of the valley of the Nile. Mons. de Lesseps supposes them to be of Assyrian origin. In the vicinity of *Tsane*, near the western shore of the lake, — the reputed site of the ancient Tanis or Avaris, — Mons. Mariette has discovered a line of sphinxes,¹ having a marked

¹ For a description of these sphinxes see *Revue Archéologique* for 1861.

Semitic physiognomy, whose features resemble those of the neighboring fishermen. It is conjectured that the Semitic invaders of Egypt who erected the monuments, still survive in this degraded caste. An inscription on Karnak records that *Seti*, a predecessor of *Sesostris the Great*, coming from Canaan to Egypt, halted at *Zin* (Gr. *Pelusium*, Ar. *Tineh*, so-called from the ooze or slime of the Nile); thence he advanced to *Magdol* (*Magdolum*, the *Migdol* of the Bible (?)) whose ruins lie between *Pelusium* and *Kantara*); next, he came to a city, traces of which are found not far from *Kantara*, and at last halted at *Hereopolis* (which some identify with *Rameses*, but *Brugsch* with *Pithom*). The inscription further states that there was here a canal from west to east, which was filled with crocodiles — a tradition preserved to this day in the name *Timsah*. Thus the re-opening of the eastern portion of the Nile delta to commerce and fertility, may bring us new illustrations of *Goshen* and the *Exode*.

The topography of *Jerusalem* is still the topic of essays, reviews, and even of volumes. Just as *Dr. Robinson* had closed his labors, we received the work of *Berggren* (pp. 444) with the title, *Bibel und Josephus über Jerusalem und das Heilige Grab wider Robinson und neuere Sionspilger* — a work written with elaborate research expressly to controvert the leading positions of our distinguished and lamented countryman. Part I. treats of the topography of *Jerusalem*, its walls, gates, towers, hills, valleys, pools, etc., as derived from *Josephus* and the holy scriptures. Part II. discusses at length the genuineness of the present sites of *Calvary* and the sepulchre upon topographical, historical, traditional, and archaeological grounds. Part III. is a systematic arrangement of extracts from the “*Antiquities*” and the “*Wars*” of *Josephus* relating to *Jerusalem*. This will be found very convenient for reference. Part IV. classifies the references in the *Old and New Testaments* to localities in ancient *Jerusalem*.

The strength of the book lies in its first part — the determination of disputed localities by the authority of *Josephus* and the Hebrew scriptures. The author resolutely denies that the substructions of the present citadel can be a portion of the tower of *Hippicus* — as held by *Schultz*, *Robinson*, and indeed by most modern topographers; yet he too maintains that *Hippicus* stood somewhere near the *Jaffa gate*.

“Indeed, as it is certain that no part of the disputed northwestern tower in the present citadel is or can be an antique remnant of the old tower of *Hippicus*, — provided that *Josephus* did not deceive himself as regards his description of the enormous dimensions of the stones in the substructure and the foundation of the three towers, — so it is certain, and sooner or later it will be settled forever, that if the old tower of *Hippicus* did not stand in the very place where the citadel stands to-day, yet it must unquestionably and incontrovertably have stood in the immediate neighborhood of the citadel, though perhaps somewhat to the north of it.”

Robinson argues that as *Josephus* wrote from memory, his dimensions of

Hippicus cannot be taken as exact; but the solidity of its foundation was its marked feature. Yet Josephus describes other towers with this same feature, having different dimensions. Berggren argues that the ell of Josephus was the medium ell of six handbreadths, of which four hundred make a stadium; and, applying this measure to the several walls and towers, he reaches the following conclusion.

“If Josephus, in what relates to the number of the towers and their distance from each other on each of the three walls, is to be understood as I have pointed out above, and by careful analysis have shown to be probable, then must we allow to the wall of Agrippa a considerably greater circuit and northerly direction than hitherto, and even make it include the traditional sepulchres of the kings, whilst the pyramidal tombs of queen Helena and her son must be placed three stadia north of the king's graves. Accordingly we must allow the lower city or Akra to stretch across the Tyropeon, having on the other side of the valley an eastern and northeastern section, which includes Antonia; and therefore a very differently shaped and constituted lower city from the Akra of Dr. Robinson.”

That Zion stretched further north than the Jaffa gate, and that Akra lay wholly or in part to the east of the Damascus gate valley, are conclusions that are becoming more and more pronounced both in Germany and in England. Perhaps nothing but a thorough excavation of the modern city from the debris of centuries will settle the question.

ARTICLE VI.

COLENSO ON THE PENTATEUCH.¹

[In our April Number we inserted an Article from Professor Bartlett on the Historic Character of the Pentateuch. In our next Number we shall publish an Article from the same author on the Authorship of the Pentateuch. The following is Professor Bartlett's Notice of the work which has occasioned this discussion.]

DR. COLENSO has issued two parts of his discussion, and a third is promised.

Part I. has attracted much attention, for several reasons. It comes from a bishop of the church of England. It is bold in its statements. The positions are all palpable. Some of the points, moreover, are adroitly put, at least for immediate effect. The volume would have been more effective for the purpose in view, had a considerable portion of it been sup-

¹ The Pentateuch and Book of Joshua critically examined. By the Right Rev. John William Colenso, D.D., Bishop of Natal. Part. I. 239 pp.; Part II. 303 pp. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1863.