

The Open Court

A MONTHLY MAGAZINE

Devoted to the Science of Religion, the Religion of Science, and the
Extension of the Religious Parliament Idea

Editor: DR. PAUL CARUS.
Assistant Editor: T. J. McCORMACK.

Associates: } E. C. HEGLER.
 } MARY CARUS.

VOL. XVII. (NO. 3)

MARCH, 1903.

NO. 562

CONTENTS:

<i>Frontispiece.</i> FRIEDRICH DELITZSCH, German Assyriologist.	
<i>The Struggle for Babel and Bible.</i> Introductory.—Eduard Koenig.—A Prominent Theologian's View.—M. Halévy's Opinion.—A Roman Catholic Verdict.—Cornill on "Babel and Bible."—The German Emperor in His New Rôle as a Theologian.—The Emperor William's Letter. THOMAS J. McCORMACK	129
<i>The Emperor's Orthodoxy.</i> EDITOR	146
<i>The Caaba.</i> Illustrated. EDITOR	151
<i>Critique of the Concept of Temperature.</i> (Concluded.) DR. ERNST MACH, University of Vienna	154
<i>John Wesley Powell.</i> A Biography. IV. The Explorer. (Illustrated.) MRS. M. D. LINCOLN (BESSIE BEECH), Washington, D. C.	162
<i>The French Colonies in China.</i> C. PFOUNDÉS	175
<i>New Books on Shakespeare</i>	176
<i>A Pompeïian Mosaic.</i> CARL MICHELSEN	180
<i>Mr. Michelsen's Pompeïian Mosaic.</i> Editorial Comments	184
<i>From the Adi Granth.</i> A Poem. E. MARTINENGO-CESARESCO	185
<i>Articles on the Origin of Christianity</i>	187
<i>Book Reviews and Notes</i>	188

CHICAGO

The Open Court Publishing Company

LONDON: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co., Ltd.

Per copy, 10 cents (sixpence). Yearly, \$1.00 (in the U. P. U., 5s. 6d.).

Copyright, 1903, by The Open Court Publishing Co. Entered at the Chicago Post Office as Second-Class Matter.



The Open Court

A MONTHLY MAGAZINE

Devoted to the Science of Religion, the Religion of Science, and the
Extension of the Religious Parliament Idea

Editor: DR. PAUL CARUS.
Assistant Editor: T. J. McCORMACK.

Associates: { E. C. HEGLER.
MARY CARUS.

VOL. XVII. (NO. 3)

MARCH, 1903.

NO. 562

CONTENTS:

<i>Frontispiece.</i> FRIEDRICH DELITZSCH, German Assyriologist.	
<i>The Struggle for Babel and Bible.</i> Introductory.—Eduard Koenig.—A Prominent Theologian's View.—M. Halévy's Opinion.—A Roman Catholic Verdict.—Cornill on "Babel and Bible."—The German Emperor in His New Rôle as a Theologian.—The Emperor William's Letter. THOMAS J. McCORMACK	129
<i>The Emperor's Orthodoxy.</i> EDITOR	146
<i>The Caaba.</i> Illustrated. EDITOR	151
<i>Critique of the Concept of Temperature.</i> (Concluded.) DR. ERNST MACH, University of Vienna	154
<i>John Wesley Powell.</i> A Biography. IV. The Explorer. (Illustrated.) MRS. M. D. LINCOLN (BESSIE BEECH), Washington, D. C.	162
<i>The French Colonies in China.</i> C. PFOUNDÉS	175
<i>New Books on Shakespeare</i>	176
<i>A Pompeiian Mosaic.</i> CARL MICHELSEN	180
<i>Mr. Michelsen's Pompeiian Mosaic.</i> Editorial Comments	184
<i>From the Adi Granth.</i> A Poem. E. MARTINENGO-CESARESCO	185
<i>Articles on the Origin of Christianity</i>	187
<i>Book Reviews and Notes</i>	188

CHICAGO

The Open Court Publishing Company

LONDON: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co., Ltd.

Per copy, 10 cents (sixpence). Yearly, \$1.00 (in the U. P. U., 5s. 6d.).

IMPORTANT PUBLICATION!

The Science of Mechanics

A Critical and Historical Account of Its Development

THE SCIENCE OF MECHANICS. A Critical and Historical Account of Its Development. By **Dr. Ernst Mach**, Professor of the History and Theory of Inductive Science in the University of Vienna. Translated by **Thomas J. McCormack**. *Second Enlarged Edition*. 259 Cuts. Pages, xx, 605. Cloth, Gilt Top, Marginal Analyses. Exhaustive Index. Price, \$2.00 net (9s. 6d. net).

Comments on the First Edition.

"Mach's *Mechanics* is unique. It is not a text-book, but forms a useful supplement to the ordinary text-book. The latter is usually a skeleton outline, full of mathematical symbols and other abstractions. Mach's book has 'muscle and clothing,' and being written from the historical standpoint, introduces the leading contributors in succession, tells what they did and how they did it, and often what manner of men they were. Thus it is that the pages glow, as it were, with a certain humanism, quite delightful in a scientific book. . . . The book is handsomely printed, and deserves a warm reception from all interested in the progress of science."—*The Physical Review*, New York and London.

"Those who are curious to learn how the principles of mechanics have been evolved, from what source they take their origin, and how far they can be deemed of positive and permanent value, will find Dr. Mach's able treatise entrancingly interesting. . . . The book is a remarkable one in many respects, while the mixture of history with the latest scientific principles and absolute mathematical deductions makes it exceedingly attractive."—*Mechanical World*, Manchester and London, England.

"The book as a whole is unique, and is a valuable addition to any library of science or philosophy. . . . Reproductions of quaint old portraits and vignettes give piquancy to the pages. The numerous marginal titles form a complete epitome of the work; and there is that invaluable adjunct, a good index. Altogether the publishers are to be congratulated upon producing a technical work that is thoroughly attractive in its make-up."—Prof. D. W. Hering, in *Science*.


"A masterly book. . . . To any one who feels that he does not know as much as he ought to about physics, we can commend it most heartily as a scholarly and able treatise . . . both interesting and profitable."—A. M. Wellington, in *Engineering News*, New York.

"Sets forth the elements of its subject with a lucidity, clearness, and force unknown in the mathematical text-books . . . is admirably fitted to serve students as an introduction on historical lines to the principles of mechanical science."—*Canadian Mining and Mechanical Review*, Ottawa, Can.

"There can be but one opinion as to the value of Mach's work in this translation. No instructor in physics should be without a copy of it."—*Henry Crew*, Professor of Physics in the Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.

THE OPEN COURT PUBLISHING CO., CHICAGO, 324 Dearborn St.

LONDON: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co., Ltd.



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2009 with funding from
CARLI: Consortium of Academic and Research Libraries in Illinois



DR. FRIEDRICH DELITZSCH.

German Assyriologist.

Frontispiece to The Open Court.

THE OPEN COURT

A MONTHLY MAGAZINE

Devoted to the Science of Religion, the Religion of Science, and
the Extension of the Religious Parliament Idea.

VOL. XVII. (NO. 3.)

MARCH, 1903.

NO. 562

Copyright by The Open Court Publishing Co., 1903.

THE STRUGGLE FOR BABEL AND BIBLE.

BY THOMAS J. MCCORMACK.

CORDIAL as the reception extended by the American public to Delitzsch's book *Babel and Bible* has been, it is only remotely comparable to the favor bestowed upon it by the reading public of Germany. Edition after edition of the book has been issued; every month polemical tracts have appeared in confutation of it,¹ and now the climax has been reached by the publication of a letter by the German Emperor himself, expressly denying his supposed acquiescence in Delitzsch's views, attacking the critical attitude of Assyriologists generally toward purely religious doctrines, and saying, for his government and the Oriental Society, "we carry on excavations and publish the results in behalf of science and history, but not to confirm or attack religious hypotheses with Professor Delitzsch, the theologian, who has run away with the historian."

This letter, which was written after long and earnest solicitation "in order to restore the confidence of the clergy and laity," is "the sensation of the hour" in Germany, and the cable report of its appearance just reaches us as we go to press. We shall quote the Emperor's views in full at the end of the present article.

INTRODUCTORY.

Delitzsch's *Babel and Bible* was originally a lecture on the significance of Assyriological research for our knowledge of the Old Testament; it was twice delivered before the German emperor, then published in pamphlet form, and subsequently translated into English, appearing first in *The Open Court* and afterwards separately as

¹ The most pretentious of these, a book by Prof. Eduard König of Bonn, with the counter-title *Bible and Babel*, reached in last December its sixth edition.

a book.¹ If we except reprints of strictures made in Germany, there was little adverse criticism of the book. The American and English press generally welcomed it as "giving exactly what was wanted." But not so in Germany. While the daily press was almost fulsome in its praise, the theological showed unmistakable signs of irritation,—nay, even grew lachrymose in its expressions of pain and regret at Delitzsch's deliverances: It was only too apparent from their attitude that the theologians were vividly conscious of the fact that, in thus presenting in popular form the splendid results of Assyriological research, Dr. Delitzsch had, so to speak, let the Old Testament cat out of the bag. Not that substantially the same material had not been published before in more ponderous form, and so was not absolutely inaccessible to the public; but it had never before been presented so popularly by so prominent an exponent and under so favorable auspices. It appeared at the right time, took the public by storm, and became part of the common knowledge of the great general educated public of Germany. It was no longer reserved for theologians to dole out in homœopathic doses and in properly colored glasses the knowledge which the excavations in Mesopotamia furnished of the early religious development of the near Orient. The interest in the subject being aroused by Delitzsch's book, that knowledge will now be sought by every inquiring person.

It is remarkable that the attitude of many Protestant theologians towards the new light shed on the Old Testament by Assyriological inquiry is very similar to that taken from time immemorial by the Catholic Church with regard to the interpretation of the Bible generally. The latter Church holds that the history and composition of the Bible are of so intricate and delicate a nature, that no uneducated layman can possibly be competent to interpret it; this is the peculiar privilege of the educated and inspired Church, which if it is to dispatch its task well must be *a priori* infallible. And so certain Protestant theologians would now have it with us, as regards our ability to interpret the Bible in the light of Assyriology: these are matters that do not appertain to the "lay" province; the "lay" judgment is unfortunately ignorant of what constitutes the religious essence of the Old Testament and hence of what at all hazards must be saved.

But the attitude invariably follows the need. Alfred Jeremias, in a recently published and interesting pamphlet bearing the same

¹ *Babel and Bible*. By Dr. Friedrich Delitzsch. Translated from the German by Thomas J. McCormack. Chicago: The Open Court Pub. Co. Pp. 66. Price, boards, 50 cents net (2s. 6d. net).

title as our present article, viz., *Im Kampfe um Babel und Bibel*,¹ thoroughly reviews the situation and calls attention from another point of view to this very topic. Confuting the expressions of fear that Assyriological science is shaking the foundations of the sanctuary of Holy Scriptures, he remarks that it is strange the situation has been so completely reversed with years. In the first periods of Assyriological research, the inscriptions on the excavated monuments were stridently adduced as evidence in corroboration of the traditional views of the Bible. It was triumphantly proclaimed that now (Luke xix. 40) the very bricks of Babylon cried out in confirmation of the Holy Scriptures, and the world should hold its peace. Exact copies of the writings of Moses and the children of Israel during their sojourn in the desert were supposedly recovered from Nabatæan inscriptions; the historical existence of Abraham was confirmed by a brick; and the wall was actually discovered on which Belshazzar saw written the fateful words, *Mene mene tekel upharsin!*

But in Herr Jeremias's opinion the use of Assyriology as a weapon of destructive criticism for the overthrow of the traditional Bible is just as wicked as the preceding specimens of its application are stupid. One very advanced critic, cited by Jeremias, goes so far even as to wish for the time when the bricks of Babylon shall *compel* a more truthful view of the Old Testament, shall shatter in shards the doctrine of inspiration, and pave the way for a deeper, more spiritual and more "pious" conception. Verily, Babel *has* "laid her mailed fist on the Old Testament."

But we need have no fear. Orthodoxy and piety may yet lie down in harmonious union with Assyriology; and Herr Jeremias, who takes both the strictly religious and the strictly scientific view, well expresses the terms of the compromise as follows: "In so far as the Old Testament as a document of God's education of the human race may lay claim to being a *fides divina*, it stands in no need of corroboration by any auxiliary science. Here Babel can never promote the comprehension of the Old Testament, nor put it to hazard in any way, be the philological and scientific imbroglio what it may. Any ten of the marked passages of Luther's Bible are sufficient to demonstrate² how superior the spirit of the Old Testament is to that of Babylon. But the Old Testament has also its human side,—a side so stupendously interesting that no literature

¹ Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung. 1903. Pp., 38.

²The most significant passages of the Bible are printed in Luther's translation in bold-faced type.

of antiquity can be mentioned with it in the same breath. Much of this remained obscure so long as the historical and cultural framework in which the life of Israel was enacted was veiled. But now the world around about Canaan is flooded with light; we can contemplate the people of the Old Testament in their relationship with the political and cultural conditions out of which it evolved and which have exerted a determining influence upon its destinies. In this domain cuneiform research can perform important services for the comprehension of the Bible. But the imperishable jewel which Israel possesses will shine only more brilliantly under this illumination, and likewise the *fides humana* upon which this unique book of literature rests its claims will stand triumphantly the ordeal of fire to which it has been subjected."

There has been little criticism of Delitzsch's book from the side of the Assyriologists proper. There are many points on which all Assyriological inquirers do not agree, and the few of these moot topics which are made to figure to advantage in Delitzsch's lecture are discussed in the extracts from current criticisms which we shall give below. Upon the whole, it is the universal verdict of the Assyriologists that Delitzsch's lecture "gives, so far as the monuments are concerned, those facts that may be regarded as indubitably established results of cuneiform inquiry." And the advantage in the bout will doubtless also remain with Delitzsch. For in purely technical and Assyriological matters, it is with him, as opposed to most of his theological critics, a case of Krupp guns against "halberds and blunderbusses."

EDUARD KOENIG.

The preceding remark leads us to the mention of the most prominent of all the anti-Delitzsch productions,—the *Bible and Babel* of Prof. Eduard Koenig of Bonn, referred to above. The title is a felicitous one, and from the great reputation of its author and the favor accorded it by the public, it certainly ranks as the accredited expression of the opposition and is a work of much merit. But the criticism which Jeremias advances against it, as against most of the other works of the theologians, is that it discusses technical Assyriological questions which only special students of this field are competent to handle, and so fails to establish the very points on which it stands. For example, König quotes as one of his main authorities the late C. P. Tiele, of Leyden, a celebrated Biblical scholar, and author of a widely-known history of

Babylon. But, says Jeremias, Tiele was himself not an Assyriologist, and, besides, his history having been written sixteen years ago cannot be used to refute opinions concerning inscriptions discovered and deciphered since then. The same stricture is in a measure also applicable to the case of E. A. Wallis Budge, likewise cited by König as a great Assyriologist.

We cannot enter into the details of Jeremias's discussion of König's technical philological mistakes, but we must in justice say that Jeremias sides with König on theological points, especially in the rejection of Delitzsch's broad assertion that "entire cycles of Biblical stories have been brought to light in the Babylonian texts, in much purer and more primitive form than they exist in the Bible itself?"

* * *

We shall now proceed to give a few extracts from reviews and letters showing the points about which the battle is raging.

A PROMINENT THEOLOGIAN'S VIEW.

A very prominent German theologian writes to us personally in connection with our publication of Dr. Delitzsch's *Babel and Bible*.

Our correspondent says: "You are to be commended for having made the American public acquainted with Delitzsch's *Babel and Bible*, for the little book contains an extraordinary amount of stimulating and instructive matter, and it has been cleverly constructed, so as to appeal at once to the great reading public. Yet while there is no direct polemical attack made in it against the Bible, you will nevertheless understand that we theologians have witnessed the appearance of this essay and the great sensation which it has made with solicitude, nay even with distress; for the impression which it is inevitably destined to make on the unprepared reader is one that we could never wish to see."

M. HALÉVY'S OPINION.

M. Halévy, the French coryphæus of oriental research, is unstinted in his praise of the general character and excellence of Dr. Delitzsch's lecture, but he is unable to refrain from a few gentle, ironical remarks regarding the strained piety which marks its concluding words, the Chauvinism which exalts the German explorations and slurs those made by other countries, and lastly, the patent purpose for which the lecture was said to have been

written, namely, to obtain subsidies from the German government for the further prosecution of the Mesopotamian excavations by German scholars. He adds: "Sincerity nevertheless compels me to point out certain inept, inaccurate, and redundant statements which disfigure this otherwise beautiful lecture. The meaning of Numbers vi. 26 (page 29 *Babel and Bible*), is perfectly clear in itself and parallel to the passage in Job xxii. 26. The Babylonian form of expression adds absolutely nothing new. There is not a vestige of a proof that the Ur of Kasdim, the home of Abraham, is identical with the city of Ur of Babylonia (page 4); the appellation Kasdim designates in the Pentateuch 'territory which is exclusively Aramean'; Babylonia is called there 'the land of Sincâr.' To make a princess of Aryan blood and blond complexion out of the wife of Sardanapalus, of whom we have only an old and hastily executed sketch; to call the converted Jew Jean Astruc 'zealously orthodox' (page 41); to attribute to the Koran the beautiful legends of the Talmud, and to pass over almost in silence the magnificent results of the French excavations in Assyria and Babylonia, is carrying cleverness to an unjustified extreme. The picture (page 48) of the First Sin, borrowed from Ménant, and the comparison of the destruction of Rahab, a name for Egypt (Psalms lxxiv. 13, lxxxix. 11; Job xxvi. 12), with the splitting in twain of the body of the chaotic goddess Tiamat by Marduk, who made of it the earth and the heavens, will not stand before examination. In the first picture, the man and the woman who are seated opposite each other on the two sides of the tree are extending toward each other their hands and are not gathering the fruit that hangs upon the lower branches of the tree near their feet. And furthermore, the undulating line behind the woman is not beyond all doubt a serpent. The same predisposition to rest content with superficial appearances shows itself in the interpretation which is put upon Figure 58, page 64, which has no points of resemblance with the chariot of Ezekiel.

"Must it be repeated for the tenth time that the institution of Sunday rest is nowhere mentioned in cuneiform literature? The abstinences prescribed for the 7th, 14th, 19th (an awkward date omitted by the lecturer), 21st, and 28th days of the second Elud, which is an exceptional month, have nothing whatever to do with the Jewish Sabbath?

"Absolutely fantastical also is the attribution of the head of a *patesi* or priest-king preserved in the Berlin Museum to the imaginary and undiscoverable race of Sumerians who, although the

originators of the great Babylonian civilisation, are said to have been unable to count beyond 60! This error is an old one; the number 6 could never have formed a primitive multiple; the first series obtained by actual counting, which is based on the fingers of the hand, finds its natural termination at the number 5; Delitzsch has confounded instinctive *counting* with the *artificial* or *scientific mode of computation* by 60's, which has its advantages. We must deplore indeed the sad lot of these great allophylian creators of the most ancient civilisation who have left as a witness of their vanished glory only a single head of stone, fac-similes of which can be found by the hundreds in real flesh and blood in the ghettos of Podolia and Morocco.

“But the acme is reached in the following. Delitzsch affirmed in his *Paradise* that the name Yahveh came from the Sumerian *Y* and the consonants *hvh*. He now declares,—and this is the culmination of his lecture,—that he has found on three Babylonian tablets names belonging to *Canaanites established in Babylon*, and composed of the element Yahveh (page 61). Now, the spelling of the second form, *ya-u-um-il* (written *an*), signifies in good Babylonian ‘Yaum [with mimmatation for *iau* = *iam-mu*, Okeanos, god of the sea] is god.’ The first form, written *ia-ah-pi-il*, exhibits a general Semitic name *Yahpěël* (Êl covers, protects, יהִפֵּעַל analogous to יהִצִּיל). The possible reading *Yahveh-ill* would be equivalent to the Aramean יהִוּעַל, ‘God exists,’ and would not necessarily signify ‘Yahveh is god.’ In no case could a name like Yahveh-êl be Canaanite-Phœnician; for these people express the verb *to be* by כִּין and not by הוּה.

“With so alluring a subject and before an audience chosen from among the highest intellects of the nation, it would have been more prudent to limit oneself to established facts, and not to offer ephemeral conjectures which can serve no other purpose than to dazzle superficial and inquisitive minds.”

A ROMAN CATHOLIC VERDICT.

The Catholic News of New York, a journal “recommended by the Catholic hierarchy and the clergy as a model family paper,” takes a very disimpassioned view of the situation. Imperturbably calm and restful in the consciousness of the Church’s wary attitude toward the Bible and Biblical inspiration, it sees in the researches of the Assyriologists merely a powerful dissolvent of the Protestant faith, in no wise endangering the only true Christianity. The

Protestants based their faith on a "free Bible," and they are now having, against their will, their own medicine thrust down their heretical gullets. *The Catholic News* can scarcely conceal its delight. It says: "The school of which Professor Delitzsch is a distinguished member is by no means preoccupied about establishing the veracity of the Bible. The general purport of this lecture is to indicate that the Bible has borrowed almost all its religious and moral elements from the pagan Assyrians and Babylonians, and that it is a merely human compilation. The success which has attended the propagation of this view is to be seen in the total disintegration of all Protestant belief. It is the climax of irony that the sects which broke away from the Catholic Church with the cry, 'A free Bible; the Bible is the sole rule of faith,' are to-day giving up all supernatural belief because they have lost faith in the inspiration of the Bible, consequent upon the attacks of the higher criticism. Meanwhile the Catholic Church stands undisturbed on her old platform. The Catholic repeats the profession of St. Augustine: 'I would not accept the Bible except on the authority of the Church.' He is confident that in the long run, when all facts have been garnered and after hasty theories shall have been tried and found wanting, the light thrown by science on all the complications of the Biblical question will serve to corroborate the authoritative teaching of the Catholic Church, whose more than human prudence is nowhere more conspicuous than in her few guarded but comprehensive declarations concerning the fact and the nature of inspiration. Students who may not have time to study larger volumes dealing with Assyriology will find this little book a handy one to consult for the interpretation given to many archæological discoveries by the representatives of the higher criticism."

CORNILL ON "BABEL AND BIBLE."

Dr. Carl Heinrich Cornill, Professor of Old Testament History in the University of Breslau, and well-known to the English-reading public through his *History of the People of Israel* and *The Prophets of Israel*, devoted nearly three pages of the *Deutsche Literatur-Zeitung* to an examination of Dr. Delitzsch's position. As Dr. Cornill is himself one of the leading higher critics of the Old Testament, his view of the controversy will be read with interest. He remarks in the opening lines of his review that Dr. Delitzsch belongs to the standard-bearers of German Assyriology and that he would not have been the son of his celebrated father had he not in

his Assyriological researches devoted his main attention to the Old Testament. He calls attention, however, to the statement made by Nöldeke in an old review of one of Delitzsch's books, that his labors "but too frequently gave the impression of an *ex parte* advocacy of Assyrian studies the importance of which for the Hebrew language Delitzsch altogether overrates, whilst disproportionately minimising other aids to this study, especially Arabic"; that persons unacquainted with Assyriology, therefore, were not warranted in "accepting as definitively established all the interpretations which Delitzsch put forward, especially since other Assyriologists frequently differed from him," and also because Delitzsch "often propounded untenable views" on non-Assyriological problems.

Taking the strictures of Nöldeke as the basis of his remarks, Cornill says that Delitzsch's last book is an "extravagant glorification of Babel at the cost of Bible," against which professional theological scholars must make emphatic protest. He continues:

"*Babel and Bible* offers nothing essentially new to Old Testament scholars. There is doubtless not a single professor of Old Testament research in any German university that has not already told all these things to his students in his lectures on Genesis. And Delitzsch does not gainsay this. He maintains only that the world at large has as yet heard very little of the silent labors of the Assyriologists and that it is now time for this knowledge to burst the barriers of the scholars' study and enter the broad path of life.

"If this is to be interpreted as an aspersion upon us scholars, it may be answered that we have never treated this knowledge as an esoteric doctrine, and that any one who desired any information about it had ample opportunity to obtain such, and further that there are matters and problems in science concerning which excessive discretion is the lesser evil. Now, in the exercise of this necessary discretion Delitzsch has been extremely chary. The impression that the lecture is apt to make on unprofessional readers is that the Bible and its religion is to a certain extent a mere offshoot of Babylonian heathendom which we have 'in purer and more original form' in Babel; and this impression is intensified by the fact that Delitzsch by his own statements actually expects from the results of the Assyrio-Babylonian excavations the advent of a new epoch in the *interpretation* as well as in the understanding of the Old Testament. I shall consider Delitzsch's statements under this point of view.

"The Babylonians also had their *shabattu*, he says, and 'there can therefore be scarcely the shadow of a doubt that in the last re-

sort we are indebted to this ancient nation on the banks of the Euphrates and the Tigris for the plenitude of blessings that flows from our day of Sabbath or Sunday rest.' What now was this Babylonian *shabattu*? Not the seventh day of each week, for the Babylonians regarded the seventh, fourteenth, nineteenth, twenty-first, and twenty-eighth calendar days of every month as days in which no work could be done; and for what reason? For fear of the wrath of the gods. These were the days that the Romans called *dies atri*, and are we now to believe that these *dies atri* of the Babylonians, which were inseparably linked with the dates of the calendar, are our Biblical Sabbath? Never! The Sabbath as the 'day of the Lord,' the view that on one day in every week we should cast aside all the trials and tribulations of our earthly life and live for God alone and be happy in communion with Him, is exclusively the property of the Bible, and for the 'plenitude of blessings' contained in it the world is indebted, not to Babel, but to Bible.

"We have long known that the Biblical story of the Creation (Genesis i.) reposed on a Babylonian foundation; but the only genuinely religious and imperishable fact of this history the almighty God, creator of heaven and earth, who speaks and it comes to pass, who commands and it is so, the holy personal God who created man in his own image and entrusted him with the duties attendant upon morality and a religious life, was given to the world, not by Babel, but by Bible.

"And how is it with the story of Paradise and the Fall of Man (Genesis ii. and iii.)? Delitzsch reproduces on page 48 the well-known ancient Babylonian clay cylinder which is said to contain a pictorial representation of this story. Assyriologists of the standing of Oppert, Ménant, Halévy, and Tiele vigorously contest this interpretation, even explaining the figures on the cylinder as two men, and are absolutely unable to recognise a serpent in the undulatory line in this picture. No Babylonian text corresponding to Genesis iii. has yet been discovered, and if the reader of page 38 of Delitzsch's book imagines that the clay tablet there mentioned containing 'the Babylonian legend of how it came to pass that the first man forfeited the boon of immortality' is the Biblical story of Genesis iii., 'in much purer and more primitive form,' I have only to say that he is sorely mistaken. But even granting that such is the case and that it has been proved that the Babylonians had a story according to which the first woman, tempted by the serpent, ate of the forbidden fruit and thereby brought sin and death into

the world, it will be distinctly seen from the picture that, leaving everything else out of account, the Babylonian pair are *clothed*, and that therefore what is perhaps the profoundest and most significant feature of the story of Genesis iii. belongs to Bible, and not to Babel.

“The conception of angels is without doubt ‘characteristically Babylonian.’ But whether they are also such in the Biblical sense as so grandly expressed in Psalms xci, verses 11 and 12, and in the utterance of Jesus, Matthew xviii. 10, is another question. In the Biblical representations Babylonian angels and eunuchs surround only the throne of the great king. And before Delitzsch wrote (page 55) his remarks concerning the demons and the devils which he says were possible only for the ancient Persian dualism, and were so destined to be committed forever and aye to the obscurity of the Babylonian hills from which they rose, he should have recalled to mind the important rôle which these concepts played in the religious life of Jesus, so that we might be justified in saying that there are ‘still many Babylonian traits clinging even to the religious thoughts’ of Jesus. But these concepts in the Bible are no Parsee importation; for the Bible can think of Satan and his angels under no other form than that of creatures of God who had fallen through their own sins and who stand thus on the most essential point in the sharpest imaginable contrast with the afore-mentioned Persian dualism. And does Delitzsch mean to say, when he affirms that the 5th, 6th, and 7th commandments occur ‘in precisely the same order’ in the Babylonian records, that Moses, or whoever else composed the Decalogue, sought advice from Babel, in the face of the fact that the order of the treasures which man seeks to protect, namely, life, family, and property, could not possibly be more natural and obvious, and that the humane Babylonian commandments have also their parallel in the Egyptian *Book of the Dead*?

“And how do matters stand with the Biblical problems concerning which we are led to believe that Babel only can explain Bible? Delitzsch sees in the Bible Amraphel of Genesis xiv, the great Babylonian king Hammurabi, the founder of the old Babylonian kingdom. I shall not gainsay that this identification is possible; and since Amraphel was ‘the contemporary of Abraham’ we shall certainly be glad to reckon the period of Abraham by that of Hammurabi. But if we consult the Assyriologists we shall find that in fixing the chronological place of the fifty-five years of the reign of this king they vary between 2394–2339 B. C. and 1923–

1868 B. C., with all the intermediate possibilities. From the point of view of method, therefore, is it not better to follow the plan of the Assyriologist Hommel, who, convinced of the correctness of the equation Amraphel=Hammurabi, as of the historical authenticity of the events narrated in Genesis xiv., starts, contrariwise, from the Bible and moulds the Babylonian chronology until it accords with the Biblical?

“Delitzsch’s statements (page 61) concerning the three clay tablets containing the name of Yahveh are quite new. I cannot revive here, much less resolve, the question of the original monotheism of the Semites, or at least of ‘the old Canaanite races which settled in Babylonia 2500 years before Christ, and to whom Hammurabi himself belonged’; but I have to confess that I cherish the gravest doubts concerning the correctness of the meaning of these tablets, or at any rate of the interpretation of the names *Ya-ah-ve-ilu* and *Ya-hu-um-ilu*. Of names containing the proper names of a god, and asserting additionally that this god is God, there are no instances whatever among the thousands of Semitic proper names which we know. Even the well-known Biblical *Joel* does not mean ‘Yahveh is God.’ But even granting that these old ‘Canaanites’ did possess the theophorous name *Yahu*, is this any proof that they also possessed the Biblical concept of Yahveh? How does it happen that of these ‘monotheistic’ kings one is called *Sinmu-ballit*, which means ‘Sin gives life,’ and another is *Samsu-iluna*, which means ‘the sun is our god.’

“There are also other evidences in *Babel and Bible* that Delitzsch’s statements must be accepted with reserve. We read on page 50: ‘In the Book of Job (xxiv. 18), which appears to be extremely conversant with Babylonian modes of thought, we find comparisons drawn (xxiv. 18 et seq.) between the arid, waterless desert which is reserved for those that have sinned, and the garden with fresh, clear water which is reserved for the pious.’ I believe that I also am tolerably well acquainted with the Book of Job, and I was consequently not a little astonished at reading these words, for as a matter of fact there is absolutely nothing of the kind in Job xxiv. 18, and if Delitzsch possibly introduced this meaning into the passage conjecturally, it was entirely inadmissible on his part to deal with it as with something that had been absolutely established.

“Again, the passage on pages 51–52 concerning Mahomet’s Paradise,—namely: ‘Two and seventy of these Paradisian maidens may every god-fearing man choose unto himself, in addition to the

wives that he possessed on earth, provided he cares to have them (and the good man will always cherish desire for the good),’ —is not to be found at all in the Koran, but has been taken from E. W. Lane’s *Customs and Manners*, part I., page 59, of the German translation.

“We are delighted and proud that Germany also is at last taking an independent part in the excavations in the valley of the Euphrates. But in entering upon this undertaking it is only fulfilling a national obligation of honor toward the educated world, and no one could entertain greater sympathy with these labors or wish them greater success than we theological investigators of the Old Testament, for we know the light which will be shed from that source upon the object of our studies. But we are far from believing that *a new interpretation* of the Old Testament will ever be brought to pass by these investigations, nay we are firmly convinced that in the struggle between Babel and Bible the Bible will ultimately come out victorious. Gunkel spoke for us all when he said :

“ ‘How incomparably superior the Hebrew legend is to the Babylonian! Should we not really be delighted at having found in this Babylonian parallel a criterion for estimating the real sublimity of the conception of God in Israel,—a conception of so much intrinsic power that it can purge and recast in such a manner material so repellent and outlandish? And this also we may say, that the Babylonian legend strongly impresses us by its barbaric character, whereas the Hebrew legend is far nearer and more human to us. Even granting that we have been accustomed from childhood to the Hebrew legends, we yet learn from this example that in our whole world of ideas we owe far more to these Hebrews than to the Babylonians.’ ”

THE GERMAN EMPEROR IN HIS NEW RÔLE AS A THEOLOGIAN.

From the foregoing review of the comment aroused by Delitzsch’s *Babel and Bible* it may be vividly imagined that the doubts in Germany grew exceedingly rife concerning the Emperor’s orthodoxy. The Emperor personally assisted Dr. Delitzsch in showing his stereopticon views to the court, and he also subscribed to the funds for sending Dr. Delitzsch again to Assyria. The situation appeared tottering, but it did not reach its appalling stage until on Dr. Delitzsch’s return, when the Emperor invited him not only to discuss in private his new discoveries, but also to lecture pub-

licly before him on the New Testament. It was then at the instance of the influential churchman Dr. Dryander that the Emperor was persuaded, as guardian of State and Church, to restore the shaken equilibrium of the German Faith, and to write a public declaration of his personal creed. This he has delivered in the form of a pastoral letter on the real ways of conducting research in science and religion, and has incidentally put in a word for his own messianic function as Emperor of Germany, himself forming the end of a long line of divine incarnations beginning with Hammurabi and Moses, and running through Charlemagne, Shakespeare, Goethe, and Kant, and finding its apogee in his grandfather, Emperor William the Great, who was only an "instrument in the Lord's hand."

Being versatile almost to the danger-point, the Emperor will be excused if the reader finds his utterances at times incoherent, —though some of the inexactitude of his remarks may doubtless be due to the translation, which was evidently hurriedly made. But the Emperor is after all an old hand at theology, and our readers will remember the sermons with which Sunday after Sunday he punished the crew of the imperial yacht Hohenzollern when cruising in the Northern waters some summers ago.

We print below extracts from the Emperor's letter, as cabled to this country. The extracts are from the *Chicago Tribune* and the *New York Herald*.

THE EMPEROR'S LETTER.

"During an evening's entertainment with us Professor Delitzsch had the opportunity to fully confer and debate with her majesty, the empress, and Dr. Dryander, while I listened and remained passive. Unfortunately he abandoned the standpoints of the strict historian and Assyriologist, going into religious and theological conclusions which were quite nebulous or bold.

"When he came to speak of the New Testament, it became clear at once that he developed such quite divergent views regarding the person of our Saviour that I had to express the diametrically opposite view. He does not recognise the divinity of Christ as a deduction therefrom and asserts that the Old Testament contains no revelation about him as the Messiah.

"Here the Assyriologist and the historical investigator ceases and the theologian begins, with all his light and shadow sides. In this province I can only urgently advise him to proceed cautiously,

step by step, and at any rate to ventilate his theses only in the theological books and in the circle of his colleagues. Spare us, the laymen, and, above all, the Oriental society, from hearing of them.

“We carry on excavations and publish the results in behalf of science and history, but not to confirm or attack religious hypotheses with Professor Delitzsch, the theologian, who has run away with the historian.”

CRITICISM FOR DR. DELITZSCH.

The Emperor then goes on to express regret at the fact that Professor Delitzsch did not adhere to his original purpose of translating and interpreting the inscriptions excavated by the society, as illustrating the relations between Babylonian customs, morals, historical events, and traditions, etc., and the Israelites, “which would have been in the highest degree interesting for laymen,” and adds:

“He approached the question of revelation in a polemical tone, more or less denying it or reducing it to purely human matters. That was a grave error, for thereby he touched on the innermost, holiest possession of many of his hearers, which shook and even shattered the foundations of their faith. It is a deed that only the greatest genius should venture to attempt and for which the mere study of Assyriology did not justify him.”

KAISER'S IDEA OF REVELATION.

The Emperor then gives his personal views regarding the revelation, saying:

“I distinguish between two different kinds of revelation,—one progressive, and, as it were, historical; the other purely religious, as preparing the way for the future Messiah.

“Regarding the former, it must be said for me, it does not admit of a doubt, not even the slightest, that God reveals himself continuously in the race of man created by him. He breathed into man the breath of his life and follows with fatherly love and interest the development of the human race. In order to lead it forward and develop it, he reveals himself in this or that great sage, whether priest or king, whether among the heathen, the Jews, or the Christians. Hammurabi was one. So was Moses, Abraham, Homer, Charlemagne, Luther, Shakespeare, Goethe, Kant, and Emperor William the Great. These he sought out and endowed with his grace to accomplish splendid, imperishable results for

their people, in their intellectual and physical provinces, according to his will. How often my grandfather pointed out that he was only an instrument in the Lord's hands.

REVELATION AND THE JEWS.

“The second form of revelation, the more religious, is that which leads to the manifestation of our Lord. It was introduced with Abraham, slow but forward looking and omniscient, for humanity was lost without it. Now begins the most astonishing activity of God's revelation. Abraham's race and the peoples developing from it regard faith in one God as their holiest possession, and, it follows, hold fast to it with ironlike consistency. Split up during their Egyptian captivity, the divided elements were again welded together by Moses, ever trying to hold fast to their monotheism. It was the direct intervention of God that caused the rejuvenation of this people, thus proved through centuries, till the Messiah, heralded by prophets and psalmists, finally appeared, the greatest revelation of God in the world, for he appeared in the son himself. Christ is God, God in human form. He redeemed us and inspires, entices us to follow him. We feel his fire burning in us. His sympathy strengthens us. His discontent destroys us. But also his intercession saves us. Conscious of victory, building solely upon his world, we go through labor, ridicule, sorrow, misery, and death, for we have in him God's revealed word, and he never lies.

OLD TESTAMENT PARTLY HUMAN.

“That is my view of these matters. It is to me self-evident that the Old Testament contains many sections which are of a purely human and historical nature, and are not God's revealed word. These are merely historical descriptions of incidents of all kinds which happen in the political, religious, moral, and intellectual life of this people.

“The legislative act on Sinai, for example, can be only regarded as symbolically inspired by God. When Moses had to re-burnish well known paragraphs of the law, perhaps derived from the code of Hammurabi, in order to incorporate and bind them into the loose, weak fabric of his people, here the historian can perhaps construe from the sense or wording a connection with the laws of Hammurabi, the friend of Abraham. That is perhaps logically correct. But that will never disguise the fact that God in-

cited Moses thereto and in so far revealed himself to the people of Israel.

“I believe in the one and only God. We may need a form in order to teach his existence, especially for our children. This has hitherto been the Old Testament. The present version of this will be possibly and substantially modified under the influence of research through inscriptions and excavations. That does not matter. Neither does it matter that much of the nimbus of the chosen people will thereby disappear. The kernel of the contents of the Old Testament will remain always the same,—God and his works. Religion has never been the result of science, but the pouring out of the heart and being of man from intercourse with God.”