

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Journal of the Transactions of the Victoria Institute* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jtvi-01.php

JOURNAL OF
THE TRANSACTIONS
OF
The Victoria Institute,
OR,
Philosophical Society of Great Britain.

EDITED BY THE SECRETARY.

VOL. XXXIII.



LONDON :

(Published by the Institute, 8, Adelphi Terrace, Charing Cross, W.C.)

DAVID NUTT, LONG ACRE.

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

1901.

ORDINARY MEETING.*

THE PRESIDENT, SIR G. G. STOKES, BART., LL.D.,
F.R.S., IN THE CHAIR.

The Minutes of the last Meeting were read and confirmed, and the following elections took place :—

MEMBERS:—Rev. H. G. Rosedale, B.D., London; Rev. J. S. Tucker, M.A., Trent College.

ASSOCIATES :—E. Gordon Hull, Esq., M.A., M.D., London; H. Hargreaves Bolton, Esq., J.P., Lancashire; Professor J. Logan Lobley, F.G.S., London; Robert Kydd, Esq., Mech. Eng., Glasgow.

The President stated that he had conveyed to Mrs. Petrie the vote of condolence on the death of the late Hon. Secretary passed by the Special General Meeting on the 5th November last.

The SECRETARY (Prof. HULL, LL.D., F.R.S.).—Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, I think it is only right that at this first meeting of Members of the Institute since my election as Secretary, I should take the opportunity of expressing to you, Mr. President, gentlemen of the Council, and lady and gentlemen Members, my deep appreciation of your kindness, and also of the honour you have done me, by electing me Secretary of the Institute, particularly as following so able a man as the late Secretary, Captain Petrie.

I assure you I count it a very high honour, and I may say that after the experience of about six months of office I have found the work of the Institute increasingly interesting, and such as falls within my own views and expectations.

I hope you will have no reason to regret your choice, and I will say that I shall do everything in my power, as long as I hold this office, to advance the interests of the Institute and those high principles for which it was founded.

* Monday, 3rd December, 1900.

I may also say that I have derived very great satisfaction from the services of your clerk, Mr. Montague, and I take this opportunity of bearing testimony to his unwearied diligence in his duties, his great conscientiousness, his intelligence, and, above all, for his remarkable memory, to which I am often indebted, and which often saves me much trouble and research.

I am directed to say that the Council at this meeting have passed a vote to increase his salary from the beginning of next year (Hear, hear.)

Again I thank you for your kindness. (Applause.)

The PRESIDENT.—The last resolution contained a request that I should communicate that resolution to Mrs. Petrie. I have done so. She expressed the hope that it might appear in the forthcoming volume of our Transactions, but it was too late, because the sheets were already in the hands of the binder.

The following Paper was then read by the Author:—

“The Proceedings of the Congress for the History of Religions, Paris,” by Theophilus G. Pinches, Esq., M.R.A.S.

*A SHORT ACCOUNT OF THE CONGRÈS INTERNATIONAL D'HISTOIRE DES RELIGIONS, held at Paris from the 3rd to the 8th of September, 1900. By THEOPHILUS G. PINCHES, LL.D., M.R.A.S.**

TO all those who took part in the delightful little Congress of Religious History held this year in Paris, though he may not have paid much attention to the matter before, the thought must have come that this was the outcome—modest in its way, but of infinite value—of the great “World’s Parliament of Religions,” held at Chicago on the occasion of the great International Exhibition held in that progressive American city in 1893. But it was not only an outcome—it was also a contrast. The unique assemblage gathered together in the capital of Illinois consisted largely of the representatives of the principal religions of the world, who seem to have hailed the opportunity thus presented of placing their religious views before mankind, each claiming

* Read, Monday, 3rd December, 1900.

to be in the possession of the true road to everlasting life, and some of them showing, as was to be expected, a certain amount of intolerance, or at least of the spirit of self-righteousness, as when the Japanese Kinza Hirai denounced the iniquities of Christian nations amid wild applause from those assembled, and the Rev. Jenkin-Jones, accepting the situation, "flung his arm around him, in the fervour of the moment." It was to all appearance a happy family which had assembled there. In our little Congress for the study of the history of religion held at Paris, however, the members were principally laymen, who had come together to study, calmly and dispassionately, the great subject of the origin, development, and the infinitely varied form of religious belief, both the old and the new, the refined and the coarse, monotheism and polytheism, in every land, and age, and nation. The idea was excellent; the members of the Congress threw themselves into the work with a will, and the result was a beginning such as must have gratified the originators of the Congress as it did the members, showing that a real want in this branch of science had been met.

To all appearance it was felt that here was an opportunity to take part in something very analogous to the great religious parliament of Chicago without any of the possible disputes which the statement of personal and sectarian religious opinions and beliefs would necessarily entail, for nothing could be pleasanter to the student and the scholar who interested himself in the thoughts and opinions of others as to the origin and nature of the Deity, and the way in which He had been and should be worshipped, than this, in which every kind of theological discussion was rigorously excluded, and disputes, other than purely scientific ones, were utterly impossible. It was an assemblage in which scientifically provable facts were discussed, and theories and opinions set aside, and the feeling of brotherhood, upon which so much stress had been laid in speaking of the Chicago religious parliament, was present in much greater reality than, probably, ever before.

The Congress was divided into eight sections, as follows:—

- A. The Religions of non-civilized peoples and of pre-Columbian America.
- B. The Religions of the Far East.
- C. The Religions of Egypt.

- D. The Semitic Religions (Assyro-Chaldea, Western Asia, Judaism, Islamism).
- E. The Religions of India and Iran.
- F. The Religions of Greece and Rome.
- G. The Religions of the Germans, the Celts, and the Slavs.
- H. Christianity.

The following were set forth as the subjects to be touched upon:—

SECTION A.—*Non-civilized peoples and pre-Columbian America.*

Totemism, the functions of sacrifice. The condition of souls after death.

The table of the movable festivals in central pre-Columbian America, with special reference to those of the Mayas.

The figured representations of Mexican divinities and divinities of central America, especially those of the Codices and the monuments.

SECTION B.—*China, Japan, Indo-China; Mongols, Finns.*

The relations of the religions of China with the state (state-religions, policy of the Government with regard to Buddhism, Taoism, Islamism, and Christianity).

The moral of Choang-tse.

The historical evolution of Buddhism in China, Corea, and Japan (propagation, the various schools, relations with civil life, present condition).

The organization, doctrines, and ritual of the Buddhist sects at present in Japan.

The distribution of Pali Buddhism and Chinese Buddhism in Indo-China.

SECTION C.—*Egypt.*

The funeral rites at the Thinite periods, as revealed by the most recent discoveries (Petrie, Amélineau, Morgan). The differences which they show compared with the rites of later times, and that which has reference to their practice in the unerary texts as far as they are at present known (Book of the Dead; Pyramid-Texts; Book of Hades; Embalmment-tual).

Phtah of Memphis. His primitive character, theological

and political development, relation with the gods Sokaris, Osiris, Nopher-tumu, Im-hotep, and Sokhit. What he is with relation to the Apis-bull. How and why the Greeks identified him with their Hephæstes.

The cults and popular religions of Egypt, more especially those of Thebes. The animal-gods, the bird-gods (the swallow, the duck, the heron, etc.), the serpent-gods (Ramuit, Maritsokhu). The votive offerings after convalescence or benefits received; amulets against serpents, crocodiles, and the evil eye.

Why the god Khnumu, especially he of Elephantine, became popular in later times, and how his person and worship spread during the Roman period and formed the Chnuphis-Kneph of the gnostic sects and the hermetic or magical writings.

SECTION D.—*Semitic Religions.*

How are we to reconcile the Chaldean belief in the eternity of the world with the account of the creation of the heaven, the earth, the gods, and the stars? What were their exact ideas as to the primordial abyss and chaos giving birth to the universe? What was the relation of these beliefs with the Jewish tradition of a creative divinity having no beginning?

What were the Chaldean conceptions as to the end of the existing universe?

Which were the divinities originally Sumerian, and which of them have been assimilated with the Semitic divinities, by a proceeding analogous to that which was employed in the assimilation of the Roman gods with those of Greece?

Did there exist in Chaldea a belief in the survival of the soul after death, and its pre-existence before birth?

As to totemism in Arab paganism. The gods of Yemen.

Antiquities bearing upon the religion of the Israelites before Ezra and Nehemiah.

The tombs, places of worship, and of pilgrimage in Palestine and the neighbouring districts.

The reaction of Christianity upon Judaism.

The value of the Talmud for the history of the religious ideas of the Jews, and the history of nascent Christianity.

The influence exercised by conquered Persia upon conquering Islamism, etc.

The origin of Babism.

Musulman associations and propaganda in Africa.

SECTION E.—*Persia and Iran.*

Has the theory called “naturism” its justification in the Vedic hymns?

Was the liturgy of the Brahmans and the Sutras before or after the hymns of the *Rig-Veda*?

The relation of the northern Buddhist Scriptures with corresponding works in Pali.

The origin and history of religious iconography in India.

Ancestor-worship in Hindooism.

The institution of pilgrimages in Hindooism.

Try to find the exact relations between the religion of the Persians at the time of the Achæmenides and the Avestic worship adopted by the Sassanides.

Determine critically which are the most ancient parts of the Gathas and the Avasta (*i.e.*, those of the period before the Sassanians).

SECTION F.—*Greece and Rome.*

What are the surest methods to apply to the study of the Greek religions?

The Homeric poems.

The worship of Apollo at Delphos.

The contributions of recent archæological discoveries to a knowledge of the Etruscan religion.

The diffusion of Oriental paganism in the provinces of the Roman empire (Africa, Spain, Portugal, Gaul, Britain, the Rhein and Danube provinces).

The survival and adaptation of Italian pagan myths, etc., in Italy and Greece.

SECTION G.—*German, Celtic, and Slavonic.*

Celtic eschatology.

The origins of the Celtic church in Ireland, Scotland, Wales, and Gaul.

The origin of the Germanic divinities Woden, Donar, Tiu, etc. Do they belong to the Indo-Germanic pantheon, or are they the development of demons in their nature?

The original or derived character of the principal myths of the Edda.

The god of thunder among the German and Slav nations.

What are the existing pagan monuments of Slavonic paganism in Northern Germany?

What indications of Slavonic paganism exist in the place-names of Northern Germany?

SECTION H.—*Christianity.*

The earlier centuries: Can Essenism be considered as one of the factors of Christianity as it was at first?

What contributions to a knowledge of the evolution of the ideas and rites of primitive Christianity have new Christian texts, discovered within the last thirty years, furnished?

What part had Greece and Judea in the elaboration of ancient Christian eschatology?

What is our real knowledge to-day of the origin and history of Gnosticism?

Is it possible to reconcile the system of Basilides (according to Irene) and the parallel system of Hypolitus?

The middle ages: The Asiatic (Greek, Latin, Arab, Jewish, and Byzantine) sources from which the theologians of the West drew in the middle ages.

The relations of Byzance with pagan Russia in the eleventh century, and particularly concerning the foundation of the first Christian churches in Russia.

Modern times: The influence of Kant's and Hegel's philosophies upon historical criticism as applied to the origins of Christianity.

As will be seen from this *résumé*, the Congress had set itself no light task, and there is every reason to believe that those who had offered to write papers did not realise what was expected of them. Indeed, I doubt whether some of the questions were capable of being answered, but no doubt the originators of the Congress wished to provide material for many years to come, and if this was the case, they have succeeded. Of course I am not capable of speaking with regard to all the points, but this is certainly the case in my own speciality. In the first question of the Semitic section we are asked how we are to reconcile the Chaldean belief in the eternity of the world with the account of the creation of the heavens, the earth, the gods, and the stars? We have, however, it seems to me, first to prove that the Chaldeans really had a belief in the eternity of the world before we try to

reconcile that belief with the account of the creation. Then, again, in the third part of the first paragraph, ought it not to be proved that the ancient Jews believed that God had no beginning, before we go on to compare that belief with the beliefs of the ancient Babylonians? In saying this I take it that the admitted existence of God before the creation of the universe does not prove that the Jews of early times believed that He had no beginning. Upon the premises themselves interesting papers might be written.

And so it happened that, in the combined Semitic and Egyptian sections, no serious attempt was made to carry out the programme placed before the Congress. In all probability the writers of papers gave such material as they had available, not having time to work up the special papers which would be necessary in most cases to treat properly the subjects of a very special nature set out for their examination. In any case, this was the difficulty which I myself experienced, but I was fortunate enough to find, in the course of writing the paper which I thought of giving, references to one of the points touched upon, namely, the beliefs of the ancient Chaldeans (they would be better described as Babylonians) as to the fate and destination of the soul after death, and I felt that this circumstance gave my paper compliance, as it were, with the aims of the Congress as set forth in the circular giving the programme of the work which it had to do.

The opening session was held at the Exhibition, in the Congress Palace—a building the severity of whose lines was emblematic of the work performed therein. There M. Albert Réville, the renowned President of the Religious Science Section of the *École des Hautes Études*, President of the Congress, set forth, in an eloquent speech, the nature and special interest of the science of religion, indicating the place which it ought to occupy in the body corporate of contemporary science. The representative of the Minister of Public Instruction then welcomed the members of the Congress in the name of the Minister, and Mr. Paul Carus, secretary of the Religious Parliament Extension, Chicago, the official delegate of the United States, also saluted the Congress in the name of his fellow-countrymen, and brought the good wishes of “the Religious Parliament Extension,” the outcome of the Chicago Parliament of Religions, to which reference has already been made.

In the second general sitting at the Sorbonne, September

4th, M. A. Sabatier read a paper upon "Biblical Criticism and the Science of Religion," in which he treated the subject very exhaustively. He began by showing how Biblical criticism had been at first dogmatic, aiming at a reconciliation of the texts which seemed to contradict each other. Compelled to apply philology to the study of the text, criticism freed itself from dogma, and became rationalist. Finally it simply took a historical character, not seeking a sense according with established doctrine, or with modern ideas, but seeking to replace the documents in the surroundings among which they had their birth.

These statements were illustrated by examples giving the results acquired by the criticisms referred to. These were, the composition of the Pentateuch, the nature and the signification of the Apocalypse, the genesis of the primitive Catholic Church, and the formation of the Gospels. He strove to show how Biblical criticism, making clear the intimate relations between the religions of the Bible and the world around, naturally resulted in the science of religion in general. Such criticism exercised, therefore, a pacific action, setting forth, as it did, what was valid and historically necessary in all forms of religion.

To many among my audience this will naturally seem to be a matter of opinion. There can be no doubt that Biblical criticism is of great value, but the question perforce arises whether this has conduced to a pacific (*irénique*) result. And it is equally doubtful whether it will do so in the future. That it may help to show what is valuable and historically necessary is possible, and even probable; but will the various Christian sects accept this, and is it not likely to lead to further religious disputes? The *odium theologicum*, as we know well, has passed into a proverb.

Exceedingly interesting was M. Jean Réville's report upon the present state of the teaching of religious history in Europe and America. This study was a favourite one in England, where, however, it has no professors, and though studied in Germany, it is not in reality officially recognised. Though it has made considerable progress during the last quarter of a century, it is still far from occupying its proper place. The lecturer distinguished three types of teaching with regard to the science of the history of religion, namely, teaching of a theological nature born in the theological faculties of Holland; the strictly historical type which saw the light in France; and, lastly, the varied American type,

having a moral, social, philosophical, or educational end in view, together with historical instruction. It might be an advantage, according to circumstances and surroundings, to develop the teaching of this new science in one of these three directions, but the important thing was that it should be recognized in university circles as a necessary element for a healthy understanding of human evolution in the past, and even for the psychological, moral, and social problems of the present, for at the present time the struggle for life is carried on between men of every race and every form of religious belief.

This, naturally, was placing the objects of the Congress upon a very high level indeed, and though it may not have come to all who heard the lecture with all the force which it deserved, it must have been recognized by many as a noteworthy utterance. Indeed, it is one which all ought to keep in mind, for it has a practical bearing on the everyday life of hundreds and thousands who have now, or who will have in the future, dealings with those of other religions and of other nationalities. If all who travel in other lands understood rightly the thoughts and feelings of those of other races and religions with whom they came into contact, there would not only be a better understanding and sympathy between them, but the possessor of this knowledge would be in a better position to discuss with such persons the things whereon they differed and agreed, and whenever such might be the case, he would assuredly have a much greater power for good, and setting aside in this connection the chances of conversion, would at least find greater respect, if nothing more.

At the next general meeting, September 6th, at the Sorbonne, a paper upon Islam and Parseism, by Professor Goldzieher, was read. The author showed, by examples drawn from the Hadith, the most ancient Mohammedan tradition, that it was not only Judaism and Christianity which exercised their influence on the historical formation of the religion of Mohammed, but that we must also recognise the influence exercised by the religion of the Persians, namely, Mazdeism. The subject was an interesting one, especially proceeding as it did from such a scholar as Professor Goldzieher.

Count Goblet d'Alviella spoke of the historical relations between religion and morals. Religion has acted, from its beginning, as a force tending strongly to social consolidation.

It acted by developing the spirit of sacrifice, by enforcing the principle of authority, by evoking the fear of vengeance hereafter, by inculcating (through the taboo) respect for property, by sanctioning customs (worship of ancestors, etc.), by guaranteeing oaths. The progress of morals, in its turn, forces religious and theological traditions to modify themselves, and finishes by obliging men to place ethics above rites and ceremonies. The idea of retribution, whether in this world or in the next, has contributed much to the strengthening of morals. Here, again, however, religious ritualism has, at a later date, fettered the upward rising towards a higher moral state. But religion contains other motives than fear and interest, namely, love of God, and the desire for communion with divine activity having good for its object. Thus there are continuous and successive action and reaction. The feeling of duty regenerates the feeling of religion, which, again, strengthens the feeling of duty.

M. Marillier, one of the Secretaries of the Congress, then read a paper upon "The Relations between Folklore and the Science of Religion." In a series of well-chosen examples, he showed how much the survival of ancient beliefs or practices in the popular traditions of our civilized countries, and how much the methodical study of the religious beliefs of non-civilised peoples at the present time, explain the origin and evolution of historical religions, and what precious elements they furnish for religious psychology.

The fourth general sitting was held on the 8th of September, at the Sorbonne. The only paper recorded as being read is that of M. Fournier de Flaix, who, with running comments, gave an account of the statistics of the religions in the year 1900, from the censuses, the estimates given by missionaries, the works of economists, and consular agents. These offered a basis for comparison with the statements published in former years, and some of the estimates made were sufficiently noteworthy. In all probability statistics had never been listened to more patiently than on this occasion.

After announcing the works presented to the Congress, the various resolutions passed in the different sections were read. They were as follows:—

M. Marillier to draw up a report upon the terms in use in the history of religions, and especially those used by non-civilized peoples.

The Buddhist churches in Japan to unite in the creation

of a journal in which bibliographical notices would be published of the principal works dealing with the Buddhist religion appearing in Japan and in the Japanese language.

A group of savants to draw up an inventory of Arab Christian literature, Judeo-Arabic literature, and non-Mussulman literature in general.

The reading, by Professor Réville, President of the Congress, of a remarkable paper from the pen of Mr. Conybeare, of Oxford, gave rise to the resolution that the attention of learned men and historians should be directed more and more to the liturgies, rites, and practices of the Christian Churches of the East, beyond the influence of Greece and Rome, so as to complete our present knowledge of ancient Christianity, which is founded almost exclusively upon documents of Græco-Roman origin. (The paper in question, which refers to sacrifices in the early Christian Churches, will be noticed in its place.)

Upon the motion of M. Camerlynck, of Amiens, the Congress agreed to the following resolution :—

That at the next Congress attention be drawn to the relations which may have existed, at the commencement, between Buddhism and Christianity.

Certain other resolutions, namely,

That the Philosophy of Religion should be included within the scope of the Congress ;

That future Congresses should apply themselves to the task of resolving the problem as to the order in which the various religions have appeared upon the earth ; and

That the Congress, in view of the religious elements in Dante, should contribute to the constitution of a Dante Society,
were rejected.

The question of periodicity was then considered, and it was decided that the Congress should meet every four years. In consequence of this, the proposal of the secretaries of the British group of the International School at the Paris Exhibition, that the Congress should be held in Glasgow in 1901, in connection with the Glasgow Exhibition, and that of the Organizing Committee of the Universal Exhibition to be held at Liège in 1903, that the Congress should reunite there in that year, were declined. It was decided that the present commission should continue in power, and constitute an international commission, which should choose the city where the Congress should next be held, and procure, in that

city, the formation of a national committee which should organize the same.

The fifth and last General Meeting of the Congress was held at the Exhibition, in the Congress-Hall, on the 8th of September. On that occasion Mr. Carus read a notice sent by Professor Bonney upon the Parliament of Religions held at Chicago on the occasion of the International Exhibition held there in 1893, to which reference has already been made. In this communication the great value of such a reunion as that at Chicago was emphasized, forming an apt illustration of what Count Goblet d'Alviella had said in his paper upon the historical relations between religion and morals. In this "Parliament" a Roman Catholic Cardinal took a leading part, and the meetings were closed with the Lord's Prayer, led on one occasion by Rabbi Dr. Hirsch, and on another by Mr. Mozoomdar, of the Brahma-Somaj. It must be admitted that Dr. Bonney has good reason to be satisfied with the great assembly over which he presided, for out of the "Parliament of Religions" the Congress for the History of Religions of this and future years has undoubtedly grown.

After this, Count Angelo de Gubernatis spoke at great length, in French, upon the future of the science of religion. He rendered homage to what France and French historians had done in this work, and referred to the *Révue de l'Histoire des Religions*, in its forty volumes. He showed how study renders all religions worthy of respect. He referred to the part of popular inspiration in the various religions, that of artists and poets, who have made them live, and emphasized the fact that, to understand them well, it is needful not only to analyze and dissect them, but to have, at the same time, such religious feeling as will permit one to seize and to reconstruct them as they were when they had a living reality. It is, it is true, possible at the present time to approach the study of the comparative history of religion, but this comparison can only be of use for the popular and spontaneous elements of the subject. The ritual element instituted by the churches, and the moral elements furnished in general by individuals, are too diversified to be easily made the subject of fruitful comparison. He insisted upon the importance of folklore seriously studied as an aid to the comparative study of religions, and strongly recommended his colleagues to work quietly and to seize the inherent logic of religious history, which is a popular logic.

The abstract which I have had to use for the above is evidently far from being satisfactory, and the subject and argument of the latter part of it at least seems weak. As a matter of fact, Count Gubernatis introduced some ideas into his long address which were, it seemed to me, worthy of being noted, but which are not included in the *procès-verbaux*. One of these was a practical illustration as to the way in which, in the heathen past, a single goddess became, in consequence of being viewed in two different aspects and worshipped at two different places, two distinct goddesses. This he illustrated by the veneration given in Catholic countries to the Virgin Mary, who, though regarded by all educated persons as a single personage, became, in the eyes of the lower classes, a different personality for each aspect under which she was venerated. Nevertheless, the learned professor spoke of the Catholic Church with every respect.

After thanks to the Count de Gubernatis, the President, Professor Réville, spoke of the work of the Congress and its success, congratulating the members upon the excellent spirit which they had caused to reign over all their deliberations. They were going to separate, he said, with that feeling of human fraternity which unites conscientious men above diversities of opinion or of confession. The Congress for the History of Religions had thus created a precedent which would determine the character of all future Congresses. M. Jules Oppert then congratulated the President of the Congress in his turn, attributing to him the merit of this success.

Of the papers read in the sections only very summary reports have been published, so that, not having been able to hear them all, I am not in a position to give a very full account of them. This, however, is in all probability not a thing to be regretted, as, to say the truth, I do not feel by any means competent to report lectures upon so complex a subject. The feeling of bewilderment which I had after listening to a paper at one of the general meetings upon, I believe, certain aspects of Brahmanism, I can hardly describe. It was so interlarded with Indian words, expressions, and technical terms as to be quite incomprehensible to me, and in all probability many others who heard it were in similar case to myself.

The following were among the principal papers read:—

SECTIONS A and G united.—*Germans, Celts, Slavs, non-civilised races.*

A long and very remarkable paper by M. Wenceslas Sieroszewski upon the religion, the beliefs, the rites, and the customs of the Yacoutas, and particularly upon Shamanism and the practice of sorcery.

Count Goblet d'Alviella, the President of the Section, read a paper upon the employment of the comparative method in the study of religious phenomena, with a view of determining where it has its application, and where the strictly historical method alone is permissible.

A paper by M. Raoul de la Grasserie was read upon the social part played by sacrifice, to which M. Marillier added some observations tending to complete the study of the subject.

A paper by M. de la Grasserie upon Totemism in its relation with the formation of the clan, Zoolatry, and Metensomatose (? transmigration of the body).

M. de Zmigrodski read a paper upon the history of primitive religion referring to the sun and fire, being an explanation at the same time historical and philosophical of a diagram on cloth 12 metres long bearing 1,500 figures (different forms of the swastica or solar wheel). The theories put forward in connection with this did not find general acceptance.

Professor Oltramare, of the University of Geneva, then read a communication upon the application of the law of evolution with regard to religion. Religions, as he showed, were subject to change, but these changes are not reducible to uniform laws.

M. L. Pineau read a paper upon the song of Hagbard and Signe, and the Myth of Jupiter and Danaë, the origin of which he regarded as a solar myth. The connection of the two legends was admitted, but not the explanation.

M. W. Bugiel read a communication upon the demonology of the people of Poland.

Mr. Carus spoke of the influence of science upon religion.

Captain Bertrand spoke of the transformation which has taken place, under the influence of Christian missions, in the religion of the ba-Rotsi and the ba-Ssouta.

Two papers were then read by M. Prato, the first upon the ancient religious beliefs of Mexico and Peru, and their relations with those of the ancient world; and the second upon the worship of Ptah, the Egyptian god of fire, compared with that of Hephæstes and Vulcan.

(It will be remembered that this latter point was one of those set down for discussion in the Egyptian Section, in which, one would imagine, it ought to have been read. There may, however, have been some special reason for the course adopted.)

The last paper of this section mentioned in the *procès-verbaux* is one by the indefatigable M. de la Grasserie, which was read by the Secretary of the Section, M. Marillier. It was upon non-sexuality and sexuality in divinities.

SECTIONS B and E united.—*The Far East, India, and Iran.*

M. V. Henry read a study of the relations between Buddhism and positivism, insisting particularly upon the differences between them. He was followed by Mr. J. A. Cree, who referred to the attitude of Auguste Comte with regard to Buddhism. A further contribution to the study of the same religion was the paper by Mr. Ryavon Fujishima, professor at Kyoto, upon the crisis recently experienced by Buddhism in Japan, and its present state. This gave M. Fournier de Flaix an opportunity to ask the author for information upon the religious statistics of Japan. The answer was to the effect that the constant interchanging (*pénétration réciproque*) between the sects belonging to Buddhism and Shintoism rendered a religious census almost impossible.

The next paper was by M. Minas Tcheraz, upon some very curious legends concerning Alexander the Great, written down at the mouth of old Armenian story-tellers.

At the next sitting of the combined sections the interesting question of Bâbism came under discussion, in consequence of the reading of a paper by Mr. Arkélian, who had studied its doctrines in Persia at first hand. More information was asked for concerning the present forms of worship and the literature of the Bâbis.

(It will probably be remembered that the great interest of this new religion is that it has grown up within quite recent

years, and that we have here a faith of which all the stages of its development are known.)

After this Buddhism was again the subject of discussion, opened by a very original paper by Mr. Chikazumi upon its evolution in Japan. M. Levi then spoke of the expansion of this faith, and the continually increasing relations between the different churches and the different countries professing the Buddhist faith.

This was followed by a very learned paper by M. Chavannes upon the origins, naturist on one side, animist on the other, of the old religion of China, establishing a relation of historical filiation between the divine pair "god of the sun and ancestor," and the divine pair "goddess of the earth and god of heaven." Count Gubernatis referred to the analogies in the Italian cult of Terminus (Jupiter as god of boundaries) associated with the Lares and Manes. M. G. Oppert said that there were analogies in the worship of the aborigines of India.

At the next meeting (September 7th) M. G. Oppert gave an account of the ideas and worship attached to the Câlâgrâma, a kind of ammonite found in Gandaki, which had become an emblem of Vishnu, and which had probably been originally an emblem of feminine energy.

This was followed by an expression of opinion by the Svami Vivekanandra upon the development of the Hindu religion from its commencement, and was of great interest as containing the views of a native of the country and a professor of the faith under discussion. He accorded greater influence to animism and the worship of ancestors than to naturism, and distinguished, besides, as important factors, two other elements, the one philosophic, and the other magic. He defended Indian tradition against the theories of Western Indianists.

After this, Buddhism again held the field, and M. A. Fourcher presented a copy of his *Étude sur l'Iconographie Bouddhique de l'Inde*, in which he gave a summary of the results of the inquiry which he had made in the course of a mission in India. To this M. S. Lévy added some picturesque accounts of his recent journey to Nepal and described the state of Buddhism in that country, where its disappearance is at present only a question of years. With regard to this M. Sénart, the President, remarked that this disappearance of Buddhism was no more caused in ancient times by religious persecutions than it is to-day.

SECTIONS D and C united.—*Semitic religions and the religions of Egypt.*

As it was the Semitic Section in which I had inscribed myself, it was here that I found my home during the time the Congress lasted, and as I heard most of the papers read, I am able to describe what happened more from my own notes and observations. Of this united section of the religions of Egypt and the Semitic races, M. Ed. Naville, one of the Hon. Corresponding Members of this Institute, was elected president, and Professors Goldzieher, of Budapesth, Montet, of Geneva, vice-presidents. In consequence of the very comprehensive nature of the subject from such diverse elements being united, the papers read were of very varying nature, and some of them were of considerable importance.

The variations of certain dogmas of Islamism were first commented upon by M. Clément Huart, after which M. Maurice Vernes read a paper upon the sanctuaries of the Canaanitish region which were frequented concurrently by the Israelites and the inhabitants of the neighbouring regions. The paper gave rise to a considerable amount of discussion, in which MM. Huart, Derembourg, Capart, Mayer-Lambert, Montet, and Offord took part.

Countess Martinengo Cesaresco then read a paper entitled "The Hebrew Conception of Animals," in English, in which, among other points, the belief that they could speak (as instanced by Balaam's ass) was referred to.

At the second meeting of the section, M. Capart, of the Egyptian Museum at Brussels, read a paper entitled, "The Festival of Striking the Anu." This he explained as the festival commemorating the defeat of the people so called, and there was a long disquisition as to the identity of this ancient nationality.

A short paper of some interest was then read by Professor Naville for Mr. Offord, upon Apollo-Alasiotas and Apollo-Reseph, in which the suggestion was made that the place-name Alasia is the Alasia of the Tel-el-Amarna tablets, and therefore in Syria, and if that be the case, the place in question cannot be identified with the island of Cyprus (the received identification). Another point of the paper was the possible connection of the word Apollo in this case with the *Aplu* of the Assyro-Babylonian inscriptions, *aplu kenu* being the translation of the name *Dumuzi*[*da*], "everlasting

offspring" or "son," the Tammuz of the Bible, and the Adonis of Greek mythology. With regard to the latter statement, I have nothing to say against it, and as for the former, it certainly seems to me to be very reasonable, though Professor Sayce, I believe, does not agree with it.

At the next sitting came my own communication, upon the religion of the Babylonians 2,000 years before Christ. This was a paper based upon the proper names of men found in the numerous inscriptions of the time of the first dynasty of Babylon (that to which Hammurabi or Amraphel belonged), and was therefore similar to one that I read in April, 1894, before the Victoria Institute, which, however, referred to a period about 1,500 years later. In this paper concerning the earlier period, I was able to make a reference to one of the points set down for discussion in the programme of the Congress, and to show that the Babylonians of that period not only believed in a life beyond the grave, but that they also thought that, after they had departed this life, they went to dwell with the deity whom they had worshipped on the earth, just as the Chaldean Noah, Pir-napištim, in the Babylonian story of the Flood, announced it as being his intention to do. The identification of the gods with each other was likewise touched upon, together with the deification of cities, rivers, etc. The discussion which took place showed that the scholars present were interested in the subject. An attempt to identify the goddess Ištar with the sun-god Šamaš fell to the ground, and the scholar proposing it had to give way to convincing argument.

After a thesis by M. Dussaud, "History and Religion of the Nosairis," a Mussulman sect which flourished in the twelfth century and which still exists upon the Syrian coast, Dr. Garnaud read a paper in which he spoke at great length upon prophesying and ventriloquism. That the prophets of the Old Testament were at the same time ventriloquists was strongly opposed by MM. Israel Levy and Klein, whilst Dr. Oppert made the jocular remark that the prophets did not speak "du ventre," but from the mouth.

At the fourth session of the Egypto-Semitic Section Mr. Schmidt, of Cornell University, read a communication upon the evolution of religious life before Mohanmed, which I did not, unfortunately, hear. He was followed by M. Philippe Berger, the well-known Phœnician scholar, upon the conquest of Palestine according to the Tel-el-Amarna tablets. He was of opinion that these documents tended

to show that the Hebrews took possession of the country in a series of partial and successive invasions, of which that led by Moses was but the last phase. There is, in all probability, nothing against this theory, except that no mention of it occurs anywhere in the Bible. Surely, if the Hebrews, on their arrival, had found in the promised land friends who had gone before, they would have spoken of the joy of meeting again those who had valiantly fought to prepare the way for the last remnant of the captivity of Egypt.

The last paper was merely mentioned at the meeting, the conversation being rather too general to allow of a really good summary being made on the spur of the moment. It was by Professor Ira M. Price, of the Chicago University, and treated shortly of the religion of the state of Lagash according to one of the great cylinders of the *patesi* Gudea. A great deal of interesting material exists for an examination of the religion of Babylonia during this period, and I hope to turn my attention to it before long, examining, as I have done for the later periods, the personal names.

SECTION E.—*Religions of Greece and Rome.*

The president of this section was M. Cumont.

After the secretary of the section, M. J. Toutain, had spoken of the proper method to study Greek mythology, the Abbé Fourrière offered some curious comparisons between the Greek legend of Asclepius and the history of the prophet Elias, to which M. Audollent and the president made objections.

At the second session of the section the thing principally spoken of was the worship of Mithra, concerning the bas-reliefs illustrating which M. Toutain read some notes. Of these he proposed a methodic classification, and sought to obtain from them information concerning the legend of Mithra and the character of Mithraism, which was at the same time naturalistic, astronomical, and moral.

This was followed by a paper by the Abbé Fourrière, who, in a special study, sought to set forth the relations which, according to him, must have existed between Mithraism, Greek mythology, and Biblical history.

The president of the section, M. Cumont, then read a note upon the Zeus Stratiotes of Mithridates, in which he com-

municated the results of a recent journey which he had made in Pontus. Zeus Stratios is a divinity of the natives of that district.

At the third sitting of this section the connection between Greek mythology and Biblical history again came to the fore, and it was again a communication from the Abbé Fourrière, who wished to show, in a note upon the signification of the number 50, a connection between Greek mythology and the history of the prophet Elijah and the tribe of Dan.

Next came the turn of pagan ideas in Christianity, the first being a communication upon the pagan religious beliefs found in the Divine Comedy of Dante, and the second some remarks by M. A. Audollent, of Clermont-Ferrand, who demonstrated the survival of pagan ideas in the Latin literature of Christian Africa in the 6th century, especially in the works of the poets Luxorius and Dracontius. As to the cause of this, it was probably due to the school of the Arians, or because it was a neutral ground with regard to the Vandals.

A kindred subject was that of the paper read by M. Toutain, entitled "La Solidarité entre le Culte de la Madonne et le Culte d'Astarte," by M. Hugo de Lomnitz. He added to this a short account of the results of the excavations carried on at Mont-Saint-Bernard, from which it was manifest that the original Gaulish worship on that spot had been followed by a Roman cult, which, in its turn, had given place to the Christian cult, represented by that celebrated hospice.

The last paper read in the section was by M. Derenbourg, and was of less general interest. It treated of the words *Taurobole* and *Criobole*, in which he explained the ending *bole* as a Græcised form of the word Baal or Bel. These two words signified therefore respectively "bull" and "ram of Baal." A recent Himyaritic inscription, he said, gave the word *Shur-Baalam*, meaning "bull of Baal."

SECTION H.—*Christianity.*

This section sat under the presidency of M. Sabatier, and takes up more space in the *compte-rendu* than any of the sections. I do not intend, therefore, to speak of all the papers read, as that might make this portion of my report of

inordinate length. I shall only refer to those which seem to be the most interesting to English readers.

Averroism occupied the first place, the opening paper of this section being "Averroism and Averroists of the Thirteenth Century," according to the *De Unitate Intellectus contra Averroistas* of St. Thomas of Aquinas, by M. Picavet. He showed that the Averroists, from the thirteenth century onwards, opposed reason to faith. M. Alphandéry followed with a paper entitled, "Was there a popular Averroism in the Thirteenth Century?"—a question which he answered in the negative.

The next paper was by Mr. Conybeare, of Oxford, upon the sacrifice of animals in the Oriental churches, notably that of the Armenians, and how these sacrifices persisted to an exceedingly late date in certain parts of Christendom. In the discussion which followed, references were made to the relation of these sacrifices with love-feasts and the Eucharist, and the outcome of the matter was the passing of a resolution recommending the study by scholars of those aspects of Christianity in the East which had escaped the action of Græco-Roman civilization.

At the second meeting of this section the opening paper was by M. Piepenbring, who read and made abstracts of a long paper upon the fundamental principles of the teaching of Jesus, in four parts—the authority of the Old Testament according to Jesus; His ideas of the Kingdom of God; His conception of the Messiah; and the way in which Jesus represents the Heavenly Father. An interesting discussion followed, the consensus of opinion being that M. Piepenbring had enclosed the Saviour too closely in the current Jewish Apocalyptic element, without taking account of other influences (prophetism, etc.); and of having spoken too strongly against the exaggerated spiritualization of the teaching of Jesus in a modern sense, falling into an excess the other way.

Rabbi Klein, of Stockholm, then communicated a long paper in German relative to the influence of Essenism on Christianity. This was summed up by the acting president, M. Bonet-Maury, in French. Herr Klein emphasized the continued existence, in Israel, of a small Church within the large one—a society of "pious folk" (*anavim, ebionim*), of which he finds traces even in the ninth century before Christ. He distinguished between the Essenians by race and those forming a community of initiated.

Continuing his paper the next day, Rabbi Klein tried to show that Christ borrowed from Essenism, as the author had determined it, the principles of his gospel.

In the discussion which followed, Professor Albert Réville showed that true Essenism is an extreme manifestation of the Pharisee principle—that of the separation of the pure and the impure. It could not therefore have inspired the gospel of Christ.

Mr. Fries, of Stockholm, then commenced the reading of his paper upon “The Conceptions of Jesus as to the Resurrection of the Dead,” which he finished at the next sitting (the fourth) of this section. He showed that according to Christ, the just, on dying, entered immediately and integrally into eternal life.

In the discussion which followed Professor Oppert contested that there had never been in Mosaic Judaism, apart from Jewish mythology, any doctrine whatever as to the lot of man after death.

It was at the final sitting that M. Camerlynck, of Amiens, asked that the relations between Christianity and Buddhism should be studied more closely, leading to the resolution to that effect already referred to. The remarks made led M. A. Réville to set forth some of the most striking analogies between the two religions, but he insisted upon the radical differences of tendency which separates them, the one having as its ideal the constantly increasing expansion of life into life eternal, and the other tending to annihilation as being the supreme happiness of the soul.

The last paper of this section was that of Professor Jean Réville, one of the Secretaries of the Congress, who spoke of the testimony brought by the *Book of the Shepherd* of Hermas (from 125 to 140 A.D.) as to the history of the first Christian community at Rome. This was a mundane community, comprising rich people in its numbers, and but little tormented with doctrinal preoccupations, though the worries of discipline already manifested themselves in it. There was not yet a monarchic episcopacy at Rome in their days.

I have tried to produce a fairly complete statement of the work done at the First Congress for the History of Religions held at Paris in September last, and though I have not been able to give as much information at first hand as I should have liked, I trust that it will not on that account have lost much of its interest. The principal thing wanting about it

will probably be some want of spontaneity—the reason being that it is based on the *Comptes-rendus* sent out a few days before the date fixed for reading. Nevertheless, I trust that it will have been found interesting to most of my hearers. In conclusion, I have only to add that this Congress was in every way a success, and that it has taken its place among the most important periodical learned assemblages of the time. It is difficult, from what has been published, to give a complete account of the full value of its work—that will only be done when its transactions have been given to the world. If I have enabled you to gather a faint idea of its importance, I shall be content. Of one thing, however, there can be no doubt, and that is, that it promises to be the most effective means of finding out the general ideas of mankind respecting man's Maker, and man's relations with Him.

DISCUSSION.

The PRESIDENT.—I think the Members of the Institute will feel that they are under a great obligation to Mr. Pinches for this interesting report of what was spread over a considerable number of days in Paris. Of course a great variety of subjects came before the Congress, as may be gathered from this communication.

I will now invite any Members of the Institute, who wish to do so, to ask questions or make remarks with respect to certain special points.

Mr. MARTIN L. ROUSE.—The exceedingly comprehensive account we have just listened to has, I doubt not, fallen on very interested ears, though it is very difficult to retain in one's mind so great comprehensiveness.

Now the points that struck me most were those which referred to Mr. Pinches' favourite subject, Assyriology and Oriental research, and I should like, first of all, to ask him the exact form of that title of Apollo?

Mr. PINCHES.—“Alasiotas.”

Mr. ROUSE.—And who was the gentleman who discovered that that meant Apollo of Alasiya?

Mr. PINCHES.—It was a suggestion of Mr. Offord's.

Mr. ROUSE.—Those who have not yet read the full translation into English of the Tell-Amarna tablets made by Colonel Conder should not fail to do so at the earliest opportunity. Among the fascinating letters in that compilation are several written by a king of Alasiya, a country hitherto unheard of in secular history, but bearing a name very like that of a group of islands mentioned by the prophet Ezekiel (xxvii, 7), namely, Elishah, and being like them a maritime region, for only ships are mentioned as the means of conveying the products exchanged between it and Egypt, and a region within or near to the Greek settlements of Asia Minor, for its neighbours were the northern Hittites and the Lukki—*i.e.*, either the Lycians or the Ligyans. Again, the name Elishah occurs only once besides in the Bible, namely, in Genesis x, where it is given to one of the sons of Javan the son of Japheth; and wherever Greece is mentioned throughout the sacred volume it is by the name Javan, as, for instance, where it is stated (in Daniel viii and xi) to be an empire that is to overthrow that of Persia.

Now the Greeks fixed as their earliest ancestor one Japetos, a son of Heaven and Earth, whose name is evidently only a modification of Japheth. Again, as Gladstone tells us, the two names under which Homer groups the rank and file of the Greek army at Troy were *Argeioi* and *Jaones* (Homer, pp. 101 and 103); and as the awkwardly concurring vowel sounds in *Argeioi* had once been severed by the digamma (for the Latins wrote it *Argivi*), so in all likelihood had they been in *Jaones*—an unstable form, which drifted into *Iones*, but must originally have been *Javones*; and we learn from Æschylus, in his dramas *The Persians* (lines 178, 563) that this nation knew the Greeks at large as *Jaones*—that is, *Javones*. It would not therefore be surprising to discover that the Greeks drew one of the titles of their ancient and favourite god Apollo from Alasiyah, or Elishah, which, taking its name from the head of one of their earliest tribes, must have been one of their earliest settlements. In the flourishing days of Tyre's commerce we had read in the book of Ezekiel that the land of Elishah exported to that city fine fabrics in blue and purple. And now we read on the Tell-Amarna tablets

that, eight or nine centuries earlier, Elishah (or Alasiyah) exported copper and bronze to Egypt.

As regards the 'Abiri* and their invasion of Canaan recounted in the Tell-Amarna letters from Jerusalem and probably in some from other southern towns also, I am convinced that they were really the Hebrews. They are, as Conder points out, called a "tribe" and a "race" (*Tell-Amarna Tab.*, pp. 144 and 147), and so could not have been merely confederates, as was at first thought. They are stated to have completely overrun the southern hill country and among other captures to have taken and destroyed the Ajalon of Joshua x (pp. 145 and 149). Addressing the King of Egypt as suzerain of Southern Canaan, the King of Jerusalem laments, "The land of the king my lord has been ruined, and *all the rulers have been slain within this same year*" (p. 147); and again, "The lands of the city of Jerusalem are *deserted*," and "*no man is my subject*" (pp. 149 and 147). And finally he writes, "We are leaving the city of Jerusalem—the chiefs of the garrison have left, without an order—through the wastings of this fellow whom I fear" (p. 151). Moreover, as this letter is written on a different kind of clay from the rest, it was almost certainly written during the flight, and perhaps in that last refuge which the divine record tells of—the cave of Makkedah (p. 150; and Josh. x, 16).

This king also writes that the city Beth Baalatn had rebelled to the chief of the 'Abiri (p. 143); and we know that Baalah or Baale, otherwise called Kirjath-Jearim, was one of the four cities of the Gibeonites, the only ones that voluntarily submitted to Joshua (*cf.* Josh. ix, 17, and xv, 60; 1 Sam. vii, 1; 2 Sam. vi, 2; and 1 Chron. xiii, 5, 6). The only general of the 'Abiri clearly mentioned on the tablets bears a Hebrew name—Ilimelec. He was doubtless one of Joshua's captains in charge of a special raid; for the great Hebrew leader did not always command in person (*see* Josh. x, 15-18). And, lastly, a contemporary letter from Suardata, of Keilah, states that his enemy has *put to shame thirty temples of the gods* (p. 155), a deed which superstition would have prevented all but the worshippers of Jehovah from performing.

* The name, says Conder, always begins, not with *h*, but with the guttural *ain* (p. 141).

As for the objection that the Exodus is usually assigned to the reign of Meneptah, 150 years later than that of Amenophis IV, to whom these letters were written, an inscription of Meneptah proves that the Israelites were already in his time settled in Canaan; for, speaking of an expedition that he made along the Canaanite coast, he says, "Ashkelon has been led away captive, Gezer has been taken, Inoam has been annihilated, and Isri'il has been laid waste and its seed destroyed" (Hommel, *Hebrew Tradition*, p. 266).

It is remarkable that from the time of the division of the kingdom of Israel the *tribe of Dan* is not once named in its history; but, on the other hand, Ezekiel speaks of a certain Dan as trading in the fairs of Tyre in company with Javan, as though these were kindred peoples (xxvii, 19).* Again, in the times of Jonathan and Simon Maccabeus messages passed between the Jews and the Lacedæmonians, or Spartans, stating that they were brethren, being equally descended from Abraham. The letters that bore them were full of the friendliest expressions; and the first sent by the Jews says that since they discovered it they had not ceased to remember them at their festivals, in their sacrifices and in their prayers, as they would hardly have done if the Spartans had been related to them only as closely as the Midianites or the Edomites; therefore we may conclude that the Spartans were children of Jacob also—part or all of a banished tribe of Israel which had settled in the land of Javan (1 Macc. xii and xiv; cf. Josephus Ant. xii, 10, and xiii, 8).

Now Greek tradition tells us that certain descendants of Hercules, with the help of the Dorians, about two generations after the Trojan War, conquered the Peloponnesus, establishing the dynasties and predominances there found in the earliest times of regular history, which begins with the first Olympiad in B.C. 776. Again, besides the Grecian Hercules there was an Egyptian, an Indian, and a Phœnician Hercules; and it must be from the last-named that the two mighty rocks which guard the Straits of Gibraltar took their appellation, since to the Greeks in Homer's time, about 800 B.C., the region beyond Italy was all

* The Hebrew *v'Dan v'Javan* = and Dan and Javan, is rendered by the R.V., Vedan and Javan; but the name of no tribe in the least resembling Vedan is on record east of Liguria.

misty and fabulous, whereas the Phœnicians were familiar with those straits 1,000 years before our era. Again, Samson the Danite, by his gigantic strength, his rending of a lion with his mere hands, and his pulling down by the sheer force of his shoulders the pillars that upheld the Philistine theatre, was the prototype of the Phœnician and the Greek Hercules combined. What then more likely than that if the Danites went to settle in Greece they should bring the story of their hero with them and call themselves his children, suffering him then or thereafter to take a Grecian name and to have his feats augmented by many a Grecian fable. That they did settle there is confirmed by Homer, who applies the term *Danaoi* sometimes to the Greek army at large, sometimes to the inhabitants of Argolis, a state just north of Lacedæmon in the Peloponnesus, and having the brother of the King of Sparta for its ruler.

There is another proof that the story of Samson had spread round the Mediterranean in the annual custom of sending foxes into the circus at Rome with torches tied to their backs, a custom which Ovid can explain only by saying that an obscure country boy had once set corn-fields on fire in a somewhat similar way (*Fæsti* IV, 681 *et seq.*).

The Rev. F. A. WALKER, D.D.—I think it will be agreed by all present that so many religions have been touched on, and so many centuries referred to, and so many different nations, that we scarcely know which to remark on first, Mr. Pinches' paper has been so prolific of interest in every respect.

With regard to the last subject, I think Mr. Pinches is quite right in saying that Dan disappeared almost altogether after the time of Solomon. It is a notable fact that in the Book of the Revelation, when all the sons of the patriarch Jacob have been named, apparently the name of Dan nowhere occurs.

Then the last speaker referred to some relation between the Spartans and the Maccabees. There is some mysterious connection between the Spartans and the Eastern Nations. Cræsus, King of Lydia, was in the habit of consulting the oracles of Greece that were held in best repute. The Dorian Hexapolis, situate on the coast of Western Asia, would further facilitate intercourse between the Spartan and Oriental, and perhaps we are only partially acquainted with the various points of contact. As an instance, when visiting the ruins of Sardis, I learned that a part of

the ancient citadel was termed Gerousia (assembly of elders). Now the Spartans were the only people of Greece that possessed a representative body of that name.

Mr. Pinches touched on bas-reliefs in connection with oriental religions in Western Europe. A very curious circumstance fell under my notice thirty years ago, showing how orientalism had been introduced into the west of the Roman Empire. I was in a subterranean portion of an old castle in Newcastle-on-Tyne, where I noticed a bas-relief enclosing an effigy of the Persian god, Mithral leaning against a column; and it could only have been placed there through some Roman legionary, having served at the two opposite ends of the empire, first towards the rising, and subsequently towards the setting sun, at the then boundary of the Roman power between England and Scotland.

It is very remarkable how far the Roman Empire extended and how far the soldiers were affected by Eastern religions. The old man who showed me round the dungeon made the remark, "The Romans were never at a loss for the want of a god or two."

Then as to the mixture of Mosaic ritual together with the Eucharist and the Armenian churches practising sacrifice in their worship. I can readily believe that, as I have been told of the modern star worshippers of Babylon practising an amalgamation (1) of heathen rites along with (2) the Mosaic ordinance of dipping the live bird in the blood of the slain and letting it go free, and (3) of Christian Holy Communion.

About Babism, the modern sect of the Persians, I may, perhaps, direct your attention to a work on the subject of religious sects in Persia including views on Babism, written, I think, by Brown in Persia. Our Lord is said by one authority to have borrowed the principles of His gospel from Essenism. I cannot, while not holding with that, accept the suggestion that Essenism is allied with the principles of the Pharisees; for the Essenes were religious and simple in their lives. At any rate, they were never objects of our Lord's blame, while the Pharisees and Sadducees were.

Then as to the question of the identification of deities, two volumes* were published by a Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford,

* *Cults of the Greek States.*

L. R. Farnell, M.A., dwelling a good deal on that subject, with the different titles and names of the gods or goddesses. I think that is pushed a little too far. I can agree with Hercules being identified with Samson of the Scriptures, but I do not see how you can identify Apollo, god of the sun, with Adonis, as doomed to spend six months in the shades of the nether regions, the Tammuz of Ezekiel's vision wept for by Jewish women, and whom the poet Milton commemorates in the mention of the river of Syria, that ran red to the sea—really owing to the soil washed out of the mountains in its course, but according to the legendary account with the blood of Tammuz yearly slain. It is very likely that there are many points of contact between Hercules and Samson, and not only in one city, but in many, of Greece was there a local Heracles with minor differences of detail as regards the particular surnames and diversities of ritual.

Mr. PINCHES.—I have not much to say in reply.

My object, this evening, was to place before you an account of what took place at the Congress for the History of Religions, and I have put down, as concisely as I could, the opinions of other people who, unfortunately, are not here to reply.

With regard to the question whether Elishah of the Old Testament is the Alasiya of the Tel-el-Amarna Tablets, that I am inclined to leave undecided. There is a great likeness between the two words, no doubt. The definition that is generally accepted by Assyriologists is that the Alasiya of the Tel-el-Amarna Tablets is the island of Cyprus. That, of course, is very possible, but some hold it to be not proven.

Mention was made by Mr. Rouse of the word *Javan* being used for *Greece* by the Persians. In the Assyrio-Babylonian inscriptions the common word for Greece is Yawannu. Professor Sayce thought he had found another form in the Tel-el-Amarna Tablets; but it requires more proof.

I am in doubt, referring to another point raised by Mr. Rouse, whether the Ḫabiri are the Hebrews or not, and I am equally in doubt whether it means the confederates. It is supposed to be represented by the characters *sa-gas*, and in that case it is written ideographically. In this case it would be more logical to apply it to a number of wandering tribes than to the Hebrews. But still it is necessary to admit that it is not certain that *sagas* is the equivalent of *Ḫabari*.

There are many other points that might be referred to, but as it is late and they are many, I think I may leave them for the present, as some of them will be touched upon in all probability later on, and I can only say, with regard to the long and interesting notes that Dr. Walker made, I wish I had half his knowledge so as to be able to make a few comments upon them. (Applause.)

The vote of thanks having been duly carried, the meeting adjourned.