

case the First Gospel was one of the 'many' secondary gospel writings to which he refers in his Prologue.

On the other hand, the view, that whilst Matt. had a Greek translation of the original book, Luke knew some of its contents, not directly but inter-

mediately, scattered through some of the works to which he refers in his preface, explains both the large amount of agreement between Matt. and Luke in sayings of Christ, and at the same time their disagreement in the phraseology, order, and setting of these sayings.

In the Study.

Was St. Peter ever in Rome?

THE report of Monsignor Duchesne's great scholarship has penetrated even to this country, and the translation of his *Early History of the Christian Church* (Murray; 9s. net), which has been made from the fourth edition of that work, will find a welcome. It is true that his name is more associated with the history of Church institutions. But it would be strange if the historian of Church institutions were incapable of writing a history of the Church. Certainly the history of the early Church can be written only by one who is intimately acquainted with its institutions.

The distinctive features of Mgr. Duchesne's History are simplicity of style, simplicity of purpose, and conscientious painstaking research. In some parts of the work every page testifies to the abundance of discovery in recent years of early Church literature and to Mgr. Duchesne's acquaintance with it. The period covered is from the Burning of Rome in 64 A.D. to the end of the third century. But there are four chapters of preparation, summarizing the history of events recorded in the New Testament.

Mgr. Duchesne's simplicity of purpose may be tested by his handling of the question whether St. Peter was ever in Rome. It is a question which Roman Catholics answer with a unanimous Yes. Mgr. Duchesne answers Yes. It is even possible that he would be distressed if he were told that his evidence left it open to Protestants to answer No. But he is not the man to twist the evidence in order to secure a verdict. What does it amount to?

In the first place, there is no information whatever as to anything St. Peter did in Rome. All that even tradition affirms is that in Rome he died

and left his chair. Mgr. Duchesne makes nothing of possible references in the Apocalypse or the Epistle to the Hebrews; and of the last chapter of the Fourth Gospel he says merely that it contains an extremely clear allusion to the way in which St. Peter met his death. In the first Epistle which bears his name a greeting is sent from the Church of Babylon, which Mgr. Duchesne has no doubt is the Church of Rome. But he is not sure that St. Peter wrote that First Epistle. He is sure, however, that the author, writing under Peter's name, would only write from a place where it was known Peter had stayed.

Outside the New Testament he comes first to Clement of Rome, who in his reference to Nero's persecution (1 Clem. 5, 6) connects Peter and Paul with the Danaïdes, the Dirces, and other victims who suffered as a result of the burning of Rome. There is Ignatius also, but his reference is quite indefinite. 'I do not command you,' he says to the Roman Christians, 'as Peter and Paul did: they were apostles, I am only a condemned criminal.' Upon which Mgr. Duchesne remarks, rather curiously for him: 'These words do not amount to the assertion, "Peter came to Rome," but supposing he did come, Ignatius would not have spoken otherwise; whereas if he had not, there would have been no point in Ignatius' argument.'

We have to go on now beyond the middle of the second century. And what we find is that St. Peter's visit to Rome is then an accepted fact. Dionysius of Corinth in Greece, Irenæus in Gaul, Clement and Origen in Alexandria, and Tertullian in Africa, all refer to it. In Rome itself, Caius, about 200 A.D., points out the tombs of St. Peter and St. Paul. 'By the third century, we find the Popes building on their title of successors of St.

Peter, and their right to the title is nowhere denied.'

That is the evidence.

Sun, Stand Thou Still.

That great question, how far the Septuagint and other early versions should be used for the translation of the Old Testament, which is touched upon in the 'Notes of Recent Exposition,' is discussed by Professor Geden in his *Introduction to the Hebrew Bible* (T. & T. Clark; 8s. 6d. net). More than that, in a lucid account of the versions themselves, Professor Geden enables English readers to take an interest in the matter, and even to give their opinion with some little confidence. He also discusses some of the passages which are affected by the readings of the versions.

One of these passages is that popular crux of interpretation, the standing still of the sun in Jos 10^{12, 13}. The Hebrew which is translated 'stand thou still' is literally 'be dumb.' And Dr. Geden has little doubt that the reference is to 'an eclipse of the sun, vividly and picturesquely represented as its *dumbness*, the occurrence of which struck terror into the hearts of Israel's enemies, and contributed mainly to their overthrow.'

The whole passage in the Revised Version is:

Sun, stand thou still upon Gibeon;
And thou, Moon, in the valley of Aijalon.
And the sun stood still, and the moon stayed,
Until the nation had avenged themselves of their enemies.

Professor Geden believes that the last line is a mistranslation. He thinks that the verb had originally been the same as in the first line. (In the present Hebrew there is only the difference of a letter between them.) Then the meaning would be 'and the sun stood still, and the moon stayed, until the nations their enemies became dumb (or were destroyed).' The Septuagint gives the glory directly to God (*ὡς ἠμύνατο ὁ Θεὸς τοὺς ἔχθρους αὐτῶν*), showing that there is at least room for reconsideration of the Hebrew.

Before the City.

The Sheriff of Perthshire is a student of the New Testament. He has written a volume on *St. Paul and his Mission to the Roman Empire*. (R. & R. Clark; 1s. 6d.). He has written it as

a layman should, without theological discussion or didactic meditation, simply as a story of human interest. And once or twice he takes his own view of things and even his own exegesis.

He takes his own exegesis of Ac 14¹³: 'Then the priest of Jupiter, which was before their city, brought oxen and garlands unto the gates, and would have done sacrifice with the people.' What is meant by 'which was before their city'? The R.V., with most of the expositors, makes it 'whose temple was before the city.' Sheriff Johnston says: 'The expression "Jupiter before the city," so puzzling to the ordinary reader, means Jupiter whose worship was established here before the city was built.'

The Hope that is in You.

MATERIALS FOR THE STUDY OF
I PETER III. 15.

'But sanctify the Lord God in your hearts: and be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in you with meekness and fear.'

I. THE MEANING.

Sanctify.—What is meant by sanctifying God (or Christ)? The expression occurs also in the Lord's Prayer (Mt 6⁹, Lk 11²), where the same verb is used of *hallowing* the name of God. The idea is found nowhere else in the New Testament, but in the O.T. it occurs in Lv 10³, Nu 20¹², Is 29²³, Ezk 36²³ 38²³. Just as to 'glorify' God means (in word and deed) to recognize His glorious perfections; as to 'magnify' Him means to recognize His greatness; as to 'justify' Him means to recognize His inherent justice; so to 'sanctify' Him means to recognize, in word and deed, His full holiness, and therefore to treat Him with due awe. This not only substitutes the fear of God for the fear of man (since they mutually exclude each other), but also enforces purity of life.¹

It is the simplest of truisms that God can receive no increase of holiness, least of all from those who must beg Him to forgive their sins; but to sanctify Him, or to hallow His Name, is to acknowledge Him, not merely in word, but habitually and practically—in thought, in feeling, in aim, in conduct—as 'being what He is, the

¹ Mason, in Ellicott's *N. T. Commentary*.

one supreme object of obedience, reverence, and devotion. They sanctify Him who give Him His due, who treat His claims as real and absolute, who look away from all other powers, from all imagined resources or grounds of confidence, to Him as the origin and centre of their existence, the One most high, most holy, and most lovable, and at the same time most 'awful' in His 'purity,' with a reverential awe which leaves no room for lower fear, because it involves an adoring and loving trust.¹

The Lord God.—The A.V. follows the Textus Receptus (Κύριον δὲ τὸν Θεόν), but the evidence is overwhelming for Χριστὸν instead of Θεόν, and all the editors adopt it. But what is the translation? Wyclif, following the Vulgate (Dominum Christum), has simply 'the Lord Christ,' and Rheims 'our² Lord Christ.' R.V. has 'Christ as Lord,' making Κύριον without the article as the predicate of the sentence. But Bigg points out that the sentence is a quotation from the Septuagint of Isaiah (8¹³), where the Κύριον is already without the article. He accordingly translates, 'sanctify the Lord, that is to say, the Christ.' The commentators mostly agree with Bigg. Mason translates 'sanctify the Lord the Christ'; Plumptre and Bennett more briefly 'the Lord Christ.' In any case, as Bigg says, 'the Christological import of the passage is not affected.' The Κύριον of the Septuagint corresponds to the 'Yahweh of Hosts' of the Hebrew, and the application of the name to Christ here amounts to a claim to Divine honour for Him.³

How significant is the application to Christ, by His own "first" Apostle, of words which the prophet had used with reference to the Holy One of Israel! If Christ can be, and is to be, thus sanctified, Christ must be literally Divine, One in being with the Most High; or else St. Peter is in effect exhorting us to break the first commandment.⁴

In your hearts.—This does not mean simply 'with your hearts,' or 'from your hearts' (i.e. inwardly, or, with all sincerity and devotion), but it signifies the local habitation where the Christ is to be thus recognized. That is to say: St.

Peter, like St. Paul (Eph 3¹⁷), acknowledges an *indwelling* of Christ in the hearts of the faithful; and this indwelling is not merely subjective, consisting of their constant recollection of Him, but real and objective: there He is, as in a shrine, and they must pay due reverence to His presence. The Apostle does, in fact, in those words 'in your hearts,' purposely call attention to the difference between Isaiah's use of the name Immanuel and the Christian meaning of it. To Isaiah, God dwelt in the midst of a people in its corporate capacity; St. Peter knew that, through the Incarnation, each individual Christian has God in him, united with him.⁵

And be ready.—R.V. 'being ready.' The evidence for the omission of 'and' is decisive. But there is no word in the Greek for 'be' or 'being,' and the insertion of any such word obscures the close connexion with the preceding injunction. The first effect of the abiding sense of Christ present as the object of holy fear in the heart will be a constant readiness to meet inquirers.⁶

Always.—At a moment's notice, emphasized afterwards by 'to every man that asketh you.'

To give an answer.—Gr. πρὸς ἀπολογία, lit. 'for apology,' R.V. 'to give answer.' 'To give an answer' is Tindale's translation, followed by all the English Versions, except Wyclif ('to do satisfaccion'; Purvey, 'to satisfaccion') and Rheims ('to satisfie') who follow the Vulgate *ad satisfactionem*. Of the modern versions Weymouth⁷ has 'to make your defence.' This is the meaning. The answer or apology is strictly a speech made by a prisoner in his defence, and so used of Paul's speech to the hostile Jewish mob at Jerusalem, Ac 22¹; also Ac 25¹⁶ (R.V., 'defence'); and of Paul's defence when tried at Rome, 2 Ti 4¹⁶. So Plato's *Apology* is in the form of a speech made by Socrates in his defence when tried for his life. Later on *Apologia* came to be the title of treatises written in defence of the Christian faith. Hence the science of Christian evidences is styled 'Apogetics.' This verse might serve for its motto.⁸

To every man that asketh you a reason.—Cook, 'to any one who asks for an account.' And Mason

¹ W. Bright, *Morality in Doctrine*, p. 306.

² 'Our' is a mistake, and is changed in Haydock's Version and in all modern Catholic Bibles into 'the.'

³ Masterman, *First Epistle of St. Peter*.

⁴ W. Bright, *Morality in Doctrine*, p. 399.

⁵ Mason, in Ellicott's *N.T. Commentary*.

⁶ Cook, in the *Speaker's Commentary*.

⁷ *The N.T. in Modern Speech*.

⁸ Bennett, in *The Century Bible*.

properly points out that 'ask' is equivalent to demand. It does not mean inquirers about Christian doctrine, but those who call Christians to account for their profession of the gospel hope. Mason thinks that St. Peter refers chiefly to being called into the law court to give account, and that he is probably thinking of our Lord's charge in Lk 12¹¹. Cook points out that the Greek words for 'answer' (*ἀπολογία*) and 'reason' (*λόγος*) are closely related. Lyman Abbott would bring the relation out by translating, 'Be always ready to give a justification to those who ask you to justify the hope that is in you,' or, 'to show a reasonableness of the hope that is in you to those that ask you a reason for it.'¹

Of.—'Of' is here used in the obsolete sense of 'about,' or 'concerning' (R.V.). The same prep. (*περί*) is translated 'of,' with the same meaning in Ac 5²⁴, 'they doubted of them, whereunto this would grow'; 15⁶, 'the apostles and the elders were gathered together to consider of this matter'; 1 Co 1¹¹, 'It hath been declared unto me of you.' Cf. the Rhemish translation of Mt 11⁷, 'Jesus began to say to the multitudes of John.'² The three chief modern versions (Weymouth, Twentieth Century, Lloyd) prefer 'for,' which goes better with 'reason.' But we can still say 'an account of the hope.'

The hope that is in you.—Mason takes the hope to be simply Christianity, but Bennett,³ more particularly, the expectation of the glorification of Christ, of deliverance from sin and suffering, and of admission to the perfect bliss of intimate fellowship with God; an expectation that took shape for a time in the picturesque imagery of an immediate second coming, but was more worthily realized in the future life. To outsiders, the Christian hope was at once the most attractive and the most absurd feature of the faith, and would therefore be a frequent subject of inquiry.

With meekness and fear.—A.V., following the Textus Receptus, omits 'but,' which is found in all the best MSS and ancient versions. Of two Greek words so rendered it is the more forcible that is used here (*ἀλλά*), R.V. 'yet.' Masterman paraphrases, 'but remember.' Meekness in relation to man, fear in relation to God. Meekness is the opposite of assertiveness. In Tit 3² it

is set over against a contentious spirit, in Gal 6³ against want of consideration for offenders, in 2 Ti 2²⁴ against harshness towards opponents. The fear, says Bishop Butler, is that reverential fear which the nature of religion requires and which is so far from being inconsistent with, that it will inspire, proper courage towards men.

II. THE USE.

I. CHRISTIANITY AS A RELIGION OF HOPE. Our apologia is always an account of the *hope* that is in us. It differs in this respect from all other religions. The religion of Confucius is a religion of memory and duty; the Confucianists reverence, if they do not worship, the memory of their ancestors, and attempt to walk in the same path; but there is no light shining on that path from the future world, and there is no hand stretched out to help and to sustain them from the upper world. The religion of Buddha is a religion of duty; but it is also a religion, if not of despair, of at least a close approximation to despair. Its only message to mankind is that there is no escape from the evil of the world except by escape from consciousness, by extinction; and there is no extinction except by the way of duty. That is not a very hopeful religion. And the religion of the old Stoics, the best of all the religions of ancient Greece and Rome, had in it no hope. It was a religion of courage; a religion of obligation; but the best that the Stoic could say was—'Endure bravely.' He threw no light on the problems of the future. Now and then a glimmer of light shines from ancient philosophy, as in the writings of Socrates; but, for the most part, the religions of paganism, though they may be religions of reverence and of duty and of fidelity and of conscience, are not religions of faith [or of hope].⁴

Not many weeks ago I was walking in New York with a brilliant Japanese friend. It was evening, and the moon was shining brightly. My friend called my attention to the fact that in the poetry of Buddhism, the literature of Buddhism, there is almost no reference to the sun, but always to the moon, and he explained the fact by pointing out that the spirit of Buddhism is essentially that of pessimism and sadness, and that naturally the cold, calm moon would be used in literature as a characteristic symbol. On the other hand, he called attention to the almost constant use of the sun as a symbol in Christian literature, and accounted for it by the fact that the inherent spirit of

¹ *Christian World Pulpit*, xxxviii. p. 200.

² *D.B.* iii. 585.

³ *The Century Bible*.

⁴ Lyman Abbott, in *Christian World Pulpit*, xxxviii. 200.

Christianity is that of hopefulness, energy, and courage; and the sun is the natural symbol of such ideas.¹

1. The Bible is a book of Hope. It never ignores the dark facts of man's history; but it never passes from the description of any of them without hinting at the hope and the promise of a remedy. The story of the Fall has the ray of hope which we call the Protevangelium thrown upon it (Gn 3¹⁵). The flood is followed by the Rainbow promise. Even after the crucifixion the disciples met together in an upper room and were glad. Again and again in the Epistles we come upon some rapturous outburst of hope, until it finds its glorious consummation in the Book of Revelation, and all the Universe rings with the Hallelujah Chorus.²

2. Our God is a God of hope. This is St. Paul's deliberate description of Him (Ro 15¹³). He means that He is the God of hope for man. And yet He knows what is in man.

O Lord, when Thou didst call me, didst Thou know
My heart disheartened thro' and thro',
Still hankering after Egypt full in view,
Where cucumbers and melons grow?
—'Yea, I knew.'²—

But, Lord, when Thou didst choose me, didst Thou know
How marred I was and withered too,
Nor rose for sweetness nor for virtue rue,
Timid and rash, hasty and slow?
—'Yea, I knew.'²—

My Lord, when Thou didst love me, didst Thou know
How weak my efforts were; how few,
Tepid to love and impotent to do,
Envious to reap while slack to sow?
—'Yea, I knew.'²—

Good Lord, Who knowest what I cannot know,
And dare not know, my false, my true,
My new, my old; Good Lord, arise and do,
If loving Thou hast known me so.
—'Yea, I knew.'³

3. The Unspeakable Gift was a gift to hope. 'The Son of Man is come to seek and to save that which was lost.' Nor is He unaware of the task. He sees a Zacchæus through and through, and He says, 'To-day is salvation come to this house.'

A policeman said to me one day, 'It is a very easy thing for you to have faith in folks, sir; but it is very hard for me.' 'Why so, my friend?' I asked. 'Well,' said he, 'you see

the best of folks and you see them at their best; you see them because they are good. But I see folks because they are bad. And when you see nothing but badness it is hard to have any faith in any goodness anywhere.' I sympathized deeply with that man and with thousands who are in like evil case. *It is hard.* But this triumphant hope of Jesus Christ is the hope of One Whose life and work is in relation to sin.⁴

He knows the worth of man as well as his want.

How can we bridge over those gulfs of social differences which sever us from one another, and which seem ever to grow deeper and wider? Alas, to-day it is in this world that Dives and Lazarus are hopelessly shut off from one another. To-day Lazarus cannot reach the rich man's gate—it is too far out in the suburbs; and as for the dogs, they are a great deal too delicately cared for to show the beggar any such delicate attention as that which is recorded concerning those of olden time. It is only in one way that deliverance can come—it is by making the man greater than his position, greater than all his surroundings, that you can bridge these gulfs—thus and thus only. Do we not all remember the words, true, alas! to-day as when they were written?—

But why do I talk of death?
That phantom of grisly boné:
I hardly fear his terrible shape,
It seems so like my own.
It seems so like my own
Because of the fasts I keep:
*O God! that bread should be so dear!
And flesh and blood so cheap!*

Jesus Christ alone has made man worth more than gain or pleasure: and Jesus Christ alone can keep man so.⁵

And He goes to work by the way of hope. 'He shall not cry nor lift up, nor cause his voice to be heard in the street. A bruised reed shall he not break, and the smoking flax shall he not quench.'—'Woman, where are thine accusers? Hath no man condemned thee? She said, No man, Lord. And Jesus said, Neither do I condemn thee: go thy way; from henceforth sin no more' (Jn 8^{10, 11}).

As Napoleon was conversing with his officers one day about the great men of antiquity, he turned to one of his suite and asked him: 'Can you tell me who Jesus Christ was?' The officer replied that he had not thought much of those things. 'Well,' said Napoleon, 'I will tell you. I think I understand something of human nature, and I tell you that the heroes of antiquity were men, and I am a man. Alexander, Cæsar, Charlemagne, and myself founded great empires; and upon what did the creations of our genius depend? *Upon force.* Jesus alone founded His empire upon love, and to-day millions would die for Him.'⁶

¹ Cuthbert Hall, in *Christian World Pulpit*, lxi. 348.

² See M. G. Pearse, *Short Talks for the Times*, p. 209.

³ Christina G. Rossetti.

⁴ M. G. Pearse, *Short Talks for the Times*, p. 218.

⁵ *Ibid.* p. 220.

⁶ *Ibid.* p. 223.

2. HOW DO WE MAKE THIS CHRISTIAN HOPE OURS? By sanctifying the Lord Christ in our hearts. In the beginning of the Epistle, St. Peter tells us that we have been begotten 'unto a living hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead' (1 P 1³). Whereupon he adds a practical 'wherefore.' 'Wherefore,' he says, 'gird up the loins of your mind; be sober, and hope to the end for the grace that is to be brought unto you at the revelation of Jesus Christ' (1¹³). And this hope is to take the form of holiness; 'Because it is written, Ye shall be holy; because I am holy' (1¹⁰). For the Christian hope, which springs from the resurrection of Christ, becomes ours by the revelation of Christ in our hearts. Now in this revelation we recognize the holiness of Christ, and we ourselves are made holy. Our hearts become fit temples for Christ to dwell in.

We have all of us, I dare say, witnessed the consecration of a church. We have seen the fabric growing from its foundation. We have seen the first stone laid with much ceremony, amidst many hopes and with many prayers. We have passed the place daily, or visited it from time to time, in the interval between that laying of the first stone, which was the dedication of the ground, and that solemn act of inauguration which was the consecration of the finished building. We have seen the walls rise, the arches gradually spring upwards, the roof framed and at last covered, the windows carefully shaped and then filled perhaps with bright colours. All this time the workmen busied themselves within, as they might have done in the construction of a common dwelling. No one thought it irreverent to enter with his head covered: the time for such scruples was not yet. At last the day of consecration arrived. A religious service, of unusual ceremony and devotion, set apart the building for ever to the sole use of God's worshippers, and invoked the perpetual blessing of God Himself upon all who should there assemble in that character to the end of time.¹

But when Christ comes to dwell in the heart He turns the temple into a sanctuary, a place of refuge. It becomes a sanctuary (1) against apprehended suffering; (2) against persecution; (3) against fear for the future of the Church and the faith.

Let us observe how impressively the Apostle adopts the language of the prophet, who had to cheer up faithful souls in Judah against the time when the waters, as he expressed it, of 'the great Assyrian river' were to spread like a flood over the land of the promised 'Immanuel.' What would then be the only refuge? The truth of which Immanuel's name was the condensation: 'With us is God.' It is not for His servants to be scared by what terrifies the worldly-minded and unfaithful. They must not be shaken like trees under the wind; such fear is for a king and a people who

are 'wearying out' the forbearance of their God. No; 'fear not ye what this people fear. The Lord of Hosts; Him shall ye sanctify; let Him be the one object of your fear, let Him be your "living Dread." Yes, fear to offend Him, and fear nothing else; and then He will be to you for a place of shelter, a sanctuary where you can be safe and at rest, 'hidden from the provoking of all men.' This is the point, that the 'one most holy and saving fear of His displeasure delivers us from all base and earthly fear, from all other fear in the world.' This is why, in other places of Scripture, the fear of man is described as a snare, and worldly fearfulness as a sin, implying as it does that the fear of the Lord is absent. The son of Sirach's 'woe to fearful hearts' is reaffirmed in the Apocalypse, which places 'the fearful' first in the list of the inevitably condemned.²

3. THE CHRISTIAN HOPE IS A HOPE FOR THE CHRISTIAN, AND IT IS A HOPE FOR THE WORLD.

1. For the Christian. It carries him back to the creation. The creation of a soul involves immense obligations on the part of the Creator. Accordingly it is the Creator Himself that becomes the Redeemer. And He may be trusted to fulfill in the Christian soul the promise of His first word. He abideth faithful; He cannot deny Himself. The tree of life in the midst of the first Paradise would mock God, as it stands in the first Book of the Bible, if it were not found again in the last Book. 'To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the tree of life which is in the Paradise of God' (Rev 2⁷).³

I pluck an acorn from the greensward, and I hold it to my ear; and this is what it says to me: 'By and by the birds will nest in me; by and by I will furnish shade for the cattle; by and by I will furnish warmth for the home in the pleasant fire; by and by I will be shelter from the storm to those that have gone under the roof; by and by I will be the great ribs of the great vessel, and the tempest will beat against me in vain while I carry men across the Atlantic.' 'O foolish little acorn! wilt thou be all this?' And the acorn says, 'Yes, God and I.' And so I look out into life, into history, into the story of Christ, and He says to me, 'You are to become a son of God.' And I say, 'I?' 'Yes,' He says, 'you, when I am within you, and you are working out My design and accomplishing My purpose.'⁴

2. For the world. (1) Because the God of hope is a God of love, of love for the world. And (2) because of the actual progress in the world which the gospel of hope has made.

4. WE ARE TO BE READY ALWAYS TO GIVE AN ACCOUNT OF THIS HOPE.

1. An answer is always possible. For (1) the

² W. Bright, *Morality in Doctrine*, p. 305.

³ See J. Newton, *The Problem of Personality*, p. 235.

⁴ Lyman Abbott, in *Christian World Pulpit*, xxxviii. 201.

¹ C. J. Vaughan, *Epiphany, Lent, and Easter*, p. 349.

Christian hope is not the suppression of reason. Momerie reminds us that even so wise a man as Bacon was once foolish enough to say, 'The more incredible anything is, the more honour I do God in believing it.' (2) Nor is our hope contrary to reason. It may contain much that the reason cannot comprehend, but in so far as it is true it can contain nothing that is positively contradicted by the reason. Accordingly (3) the revelation in the heart which follows the resurrection, although it is Divine and Supernatural, appeals to the reason and calls for its exercise. And (4) the Object of worship must be a reasonable Object.¹

2. An answer is a good thing. It yields two benefits. (1) It makes our convictions respected. There is persuasion in the forceful putting of a thought. The effect of words, as of soldiers, can be trebled by their manner of marshalling. And (2) it gives ourselves a firmer grasp of the hope. Our hope becomes resolute when we know with precision what it is and with definiteness why it is. If we are crossing a stream upon a bridge we contemplate with pleasure the broad courses of masonry on which it rests.²

There was an island, so runs the fable, in which it was reported that there was buried much gold. Many came and upturned the stones, and, though they never found the gold for which they looked, yet their searching for it prepared a barren soil for the reception of the seeds which the winds and the birds brought, and at last the hidden treasure appeared in olives and grapes. It is in the same way that the Bible and religion are understood to-day as they could not have been if the rationalistic critics of Germany had not worked. Though the Tübingen school have not succeeded in finding the explanation of Christianity for which they sought, they have succeeded in making a great historical field fruitful. Historical faith is to-day greatly indebted to historical scepticism.³

5. THE ANSWER MUST BE APPROPRIATE TO THE OCCASION. The modern answer must direct itself chiefly against the misuse of science. And it should consist of both attack and defence.

1. The attack. There are several points to which the attack may be directed.

(1) Science, even if it were infallible within its own sphere, leaves much unexplained. (a) About Nature. Science has to do with things as they are. She knows not how they came to be. That

is beyond her scope. And if you say God made them, she has no data even for a contradiction. Faith and hope say, 'Who knoweth not in all these that the hand of the Lord hath wrought this.' And if the supernatural is admitted at the beginning it must be admitted all through. (b) About man. Two things distinguish man from the rest of creation. He can think of God, and he can choose right or wrong. Science can only register the results of these gifts, she cannot account for them. And a science which suppresses what it cannot classify will not long command respect.⁴

(2) Faith in a personal God is more reasonable than materialism. A telegram is not due to the accidental arrangement of particles of matter. It requires machinery. And more wonderful than the machinery is the mind that planned it all. 'The materialistic position,' said Professor Huxley once, 'that there is nothing in the world but matter, force and necessity, is as utterly devoid of justification as the most baseless of theological dogmas.' And Clerk Maxwell said that he had carefully scrutinized all the agnostic hypotheses he knew of, and that they one and all needed a God to make them workable.⁵

(3) Science is here divided against itself. Haeckel and his followers are not the only scientists in the world. Haeckel himself tells us that Wundt is one of the ablest living psychologists in Germany. Yet Wundt abandoned the materialistic position after starting from it. Romanes, the author of *A Candid Examination of Theism* lived to write *Thoughts on Religion*.⁶

(4) Faith leads to nobler service. 'I have never yet,' says Mr. Vine, 'discovered a man who has been saved from moral degradation of any kind by materialistic teaching'; but he adds, 'It would be possible to crowd this great church with those who in this district would without hesitation affirm that the gospel of the grace of God has lifted and saved them.'⁶

2. The defence. There are many arguments.

(1) Man by his nature needs a religion of some kind.

The historian of the French Revolution of ninety years ago describes how, at a certain point in its mad career—when

¹ See A. W. Momerie, *Defects of Modern Christianity*, p. 324.

² See C. H. Parkhurst, *The Blind Man's Creed*, p. 30.

³ E. J. Hardy, *Doubt and Faith*, p. 22.

⁴ See Archbishop Thomson, *Life in the Light of God's Word*, p. 265.

⁵ See C. H. Vine, in *Christian World Pulpit*, lxxi. 7.

⁶ *Ibid.*, lxxi. 7.

all had been done that could by force be done to abolish Christianity; when the churches had been desecrated, and the priests massacred or expelled or driven into hiding—it occurred to the leaders that society could not go on without some kind of religion; and so they proceeded to persuade the National Convention to ‘decree’ (imagine that!) ‘the existence of the Supreme Being,’ and ‘the consolatory principle of the immortality of the soul,’ as ‘the basis of rational Republican Religion.’¹

(2) It must be a religion that recognizes the deepest fact of man’s being, his sense of guilt, and that endeavours to remove it.

(3) Christianity alone offers pardon and peace with sufficient means of bestowing them.

(4) Christianity alone gives power to stand.

(5) Christianity alone presents the encouragement of example, the example of One who was tempted in all points like as we are, yet without sin.²

6. THE CHRISTIAN ANSWER MUST BE MADE IN

¹ D. J. Vaughan, *Questions of the Day*, p. 177.

² See R. Leitch, *The Light of the Gentiles*, p. 146.

MEEKNESS AND IN FEAR. For (1) no answer is better than a bad answer; (2) an arrogant answer is bad; and (3) an irreverent answer is bad. That is to say, the Christian must fit himself for making his answer by knowing what his hope is, by having sufficient sympathy with man to make his answer acceptable, and by sufficient fear of God to make it true.

Bishop Blomfield used to tell a story of his having been once, late in life, at the University church at Cambridge, and of having seen a verger there whom he remembered when he was himself an undergraduate. The bishop said he was glad to see him looking so well at such a great age. ‘Oh yes, my lord,’ the man said, ‘I have much to be grateful for. I have heard every sermon which has been preached in this church for fifty years, and, thank God, I am a Christian still!’ Some of us Christianity repels rather than convinces when ‘put into a form that could be written out at examinations, or cross-examined in a court of law. After all the title is more than the title-deeds, and it is when we pierce beneath the surface that we get personal conviction and not the mere external authority of history or literature.’³

³ E. J. Hardy, *Doubt and Faith*, p. 30.

Recent Biblical Archaeology.

By STEPHEN LANGDON, M.A., Ph.D., Oxford.

Letters to Cassite Kings.⁴

THIS series contains two previous volumes of texts from the Cassite period, namely, vols. xiv. and xv., by Professor Clay, which include contracts, receipts, inventories of public property, lists of salaries for public officials, and various transactions of the state documents. Fortunately, nearly all of the 300 documents published by Clay could be dated. Clay’s contributions to the history of this period enable one to restore the great line of Cassite kings who succeeded *Burnaburiaš* as follows, *Kurigalzu*, *Nazi-maruttaš*, *Kadašman-Turgu*, *Kadašman-Enlil*, *Kudur-Enlil*, *Šagaraktišuriaš*, *Kaštaliašu*. Evidently serious troubles overtook the Babylonian state at the end of this period, for, so far as the archives of Nippur are concerned, Cassite documents cease to be found. Nabuna’id

(555–538) found the dedicatory cylinders of only two Cassite kings whose architectural works had survived, and both of these, *Burnaburiaš* and *Šagaraktišuriaš*,⁵ belong to the portion of the dynasty restored to us by the brilliant work of Clay. The Cassite dynasty numbered thirty-six rulers, who reigned, according to the Kings’ List, 576 years, of which the archives of Nippur and the accidental records of Nabuna’id mention but these eight as of great importance. One of them, *Burnaburiaš*, was already a familiar figure in history, being made famous by his letter to Amenophis III (?) of Egypt.

Dr. Radau now publishes 99 letters (some merely fragments) from the same period. Although such documents are never dated, yet it is *a priori* probable that, being from the same archives as the

⁴ *Letters to Cassite Kings*, by Hugo Radau, Babylonian Expedition of the University of Pennsylvania, Series A, vol. xvii. part 1.

⁵ *Burnaburiaš* rebuilt Ebarra of Larsa and *Šagaraktišuriaš* Eulmaš of Sippar.