

# THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

---

## Notes of Recent Exposition.

ABOUT the end of this month there will be published the first volume of a **DICTIONARY OF CHRIST AND THE GOSPELS**. It is edited by the Editor of *The Expository Times* and the *Dictionary of the Bible*, with the assistance of the Rev. John A. Selbie, D.D., and the Rev. John C. Lambert, D.D. It is to consist of two volumes.

The idea of editing a Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels came to the Editor of the *Dictionary of the Bible* as the last volume of that Dictionary was passing through the press. The *Dictionary of the Bible* seemed at first to contain everything that was necessary. It contained some things, such as a series of most important articles in Biblical Theology, which could not be found in any other Dictionary. But, as the work drew to a close, the Editor felt that there was still one subject which, in consideration of its importance, might almost be said to have been neglected. That subject was Christ.

It is true there were many articles on Christ. There was especially Dr. Sanday's great article. There were articles also on the Incarnation, on various aspects of the Life and Teaching, on the Cross, Resurrection, and Ascension. There were as many articles, perhaps, as any Dictionary of the Bible could be expected to contain. Still, the

Editor felt that no justice had been done to Christ.

He felt it as a preacher. Is not Christ the subject of all our preaching? Yet how many are the things about Christ which belong to the province of the preacher, and upon which all Dictionaries of the Bible are silent. We have to preach about **ABIDING** in Christ; about Christ being from **ABOVE** and we from **BELOW**; about the power of **ABSOLUTION** conferred upon the Church of Christ; even about the question whether, and in what sense, Christ used **ACCOMMODATION** in His intercourse with His contemporaries; about the extent of Christ's **ACTIVITY**; about His teaching on **AFFLICTION**; about His **AGONY**; about the **AMAZEMENT** of the people at His wonderful works, and His own **Amazement** at their wonderful unbelief; about His encouragement and discouragement of **AMBITION**; about His **ANNOUNCEMENTS OF DEATH**; about the **ANNUNCIATION**; about the **APPARITION** which came to the disciples on the Sea of Galilee, and all the thoughts they had of the nearness of a spirit world; about the **APPRECIATION** of Christ in the Gospels, throughout the history of the Church, and in our own day; even about **ARBITRATION**, and how He both declined and encouraged it; about **ABGAR**, **ARISTEAS**, and **ARISTION**; about His **ARREST**; about His attitude to **ASCETICISM**; about the **ATTRACTION** of Christ;

about His ATTRIBUTES; about the AUTHORITY OF CHRIST, and AUTHORITY IN RELIGION; about the AVE MARIA; about the AWE which was felt even by those who came into incidental contact with Him.

These are in the first letter of the alphabet. Running on, we come upon BABE, BACK TO CHRIST, BANQUET, BAPTISM OF CHRIST, BEAM AND MOTE, BEAUTY, BEGETTING, BEGGAR, BELIEF, BELOVED, BENEDICTION, BENEDICTUS, BENEFAC- TOR, BENEVOLENCE, BETRAYAL, BETROTHAL, BIER, BILL, BINDING AND LOOSING, BIRTH OF CHRIST, BLINDNESS, BLOOD AND WATER, BOSOM, BOY, BOYHOOD, BOYHOOD OF JESUS, BREATHING, BROTHERHOOD, BUFFETING, BUILDING, BUSINESS.

These topics are all new. Take one letter more. Some of the new topics in C are of particular importance. We find CALENDAR, CALLING, CARE, CELIBACY, CENSUS, CERTAINTY, CHANCE, CHAR- ACTER, CHARACTER OF CHRIST, CHIEF PRIEST, CHILDHOOD, CHOICE, CHOSEN ONE, CHRIST IN ART, CHRISTIANITY, CIRCUMSTANTIALITY, CLAIM, CLAIMS OF CHRIST, COMING TO CHRIST, COM- MANDMENTS, COMMISSION, COMMON LIFE, COM- PLACENCY, CONDEMNATION, CONFESSION OF SIN, CONSCIOUSNESS, CONSIDERATENESS, CONSOLA- TION, COSMOPOLITANISM, COURTESY, COWARDICE, CHRIST AS CREATOR, CRITICISM, CROSS-BEARING, CROWD, CROWN OF THORNS, CRUCIFIXION, CRY, CURES.

We have to preach upon these things. Yet no Dictionary of the Bible contains them. No Dictionary of the Bible could possibly contain them all. It simply means that, indispensable as a good Dictionary of the Bible is, it is not enough for the preacher. The DICTIONARY OF CHRIST AND THE GOSPELS is first of all a preacher's dictionary.

Its authors are preachers. First, they are scholars. For without scholarship the work would be worthless. But they are scholars who know how much more it needs to be a preacher.

The articles are all new. Even when their titles are the same as the titles of articles in the *Dictionary of the Bible*, they are new. They are written by new men, and with a new purpose. Some of them are confined in their scope to the Gospels. Within these limits they are accordingly fuller than the corresponding articles in the *Dictionary of the Bible*. Others have a wider range. They are not limited even to the Bible, but gather together whatever touches Christ in all the history and experience of the Church.

There is a sermon in a recent issue of *The Jewish World* by the Very Rev. the Chief Rabbi. Its text is Jos 1<sup>8</sup>, 'This book of the law shall not depart out of thy mouth, but thou shalt meditate therein day and night, that thou mayest observe to do according to all that is written therein: for then thou shalt make thy way prosperous, and then thou shalt have good success.' Its subject is the Bible.

By 'the Bible' the Chief Rabbi means the Old Testament. And our interest in the sermon is to see how a modern Jew, whose whole Bible is the Old Testament, is going to face the modern criticism of the Old Testament and tell an inquisitive audience 'to observe to do all that is written therein.'

The first thing that the Chief Rabbi recommends to his hearers is to read the Bible. It is sound advice and safe. The next thing is to read it in the original. It is not less sound advice, and it is probably not less safe. But why in the original? It is not that the Chief Rabbi is unwilling to admit 'the great merits of the Revised Version of the Bible and the Apocrypha.' He admits that it 'corrects many faults, amends many mistransla- tions, of the so-called Anglican Version prepared by King James's translators, without impairing the antique charm of the English Bible, without putting out of tune the music so dear to our ears.'

But even the Revised Version is 'disfigured by errors due to dogmatic preconceptions.' The Rabbis have felt this so much that they have prepared a special appendix for the use of Jews. And the Chief Rabbi urges his hearers, if they use the Revised Version, never to use it without the appendix. But they are better not to use it. They are better to read their Bible in Hebrew. And why? Because the words of his text are, '*This* book of the law shall not depart out of thy mouth.' The Chief Rabbi emphasizes the word *this*. He understands that '*this* book' means the Old Testament 'in the sacred tongue in which it was composed.'

So the first thing is that they should read the Bible; and the next that they should read it in the original. The third thing is that they should read it 'day and night.'

Again the advice is good. But how are his hearers to understand it? Literally? Taken literally, says Dr. Adler, it is 'an injunction suited for a Rabbi dwelling in some secluded Polish village.' It cannot be taken literally. It cannot have been intended to be taken literally. For it was given to Joshua. Now, Joshua was 'Sovereign, Commander-in-chief, the highest Magistrate.' His occupations absorbed his time. Joshua could not possibly have meditated in the Law day and night. How was it intended to be taken, then? How are the Chief Rabbi's hearers to understand it?

'Dear congregants,' says the Chief Rabbi, 'if in your commercial dealings you bear yourselves honourably before the world, abhorring all trickery and chicanery, recoiling from words of falsehood, from the unjust measure and the unjust weight, despising the gains of oppression and of usury, you meditate upon the Law day and night.'

Thus far, the Chief Rabbi's advice is excellent and easy. He then comes to the Higher Criticism.

The question is whether 'science and the advance of high criticism' (as the Chief Rabbi calls it) has dethroned the Old Testament, so that it 'need no longer command our unbounded admiration and whole-hearted allegiance.' The question presses upon Jews even more than it does upon Gentiles. For the Jews, when they become critics, usually become very advanced critics, and the Old Testament is their Bible. It is a matter that threatens their existence as Jews, and the Chief Rabbi knows it. What is his advice to his hearers now? His advice to them is to read Professor George Adam Smith's *Preaching of the Old Testament*.

There never was a Chief Rabbi who found himself in greater trouble, or got out of it more courageously. He does not hide from his hearers that Professor George Adam Smith is a critic. 'A critic of no mean repute,' he calls him. He does not hide from them the character of the book. He quotes from it. And although, of course, he does not quote it all; although he does not quote some passages which are somewhat troublesome in it; still he quotes it just where its strength and purpose lie. He quotes especially the eloquent words it contains about the God of the Old Testament. 'It is because God stands near unto men, and is interested in all their life, that the doctrine of the Old Testament is so practical, so incisive, so homely. Its very style is due to its sense of God. The jealous Deity who forbade His votaries to express their thoughts of Him in any form of material life, however full of His beauty and His power, or in any work of their hands, however wrought with love and cunning, poured Himself into this literature, into its grammar, its metaphor, its poetry, till in every part it quivers and shines with His spirit, and we can indeed say it is His Likeness and His Image.' The Chief Rabbi quotes that, and turning to his hearers he says, 'Let me then earnestly ask you that the Bible be reinstated, re-established in its rightful place in your affections.'

The third Congress of 'Liberal and Progressive Christianity' was held last year in Geneva. Its *Acts* have recently been published (Geneva: Georg et Cie).

So far as this country's representatives can be identified, 'Liberal and Progressive Christianity' means Unitarianism. But this is not so everywhere. In Hungary perhaps it is so, and perhaps in the United States, but not in France, in Germany, nor in Switzerland itself. It means repudiation everywhere, but not repudiation of the doctrine of the Trinity. What it means everywhere is repudiation of the doctrines of Calvin.

And its third meeting took place in Geneva! Could the crowd forget it? Could the exultant speakers forbear to refer to it? They did not forbear. 'And to-day,' says one of the speakers, 'we meet in Geneva! It is a unique, startling, and in some respects dramatic event. In no city of the world could our meeting be more indicative of the change that is going on in human thought. In this city Calvin gave to the Augustinian theology a new lease of life. His powerful genius impressed it upon nearly all the Reformed Churches. It took his name, and Calvinism dominated the most energetic sections of the Protestant world. And to-day Calvinism, in Calvin's own city, is a negligible quantity. From the pulpit of the cathedral where he preached, Dr. Minot Savage is to speak to us of a Truth and a Cause which to Calvin would have been detestable. Truly Servetus might say, "I am at last avenged!" Our meeting in Geneva is enough to make Calvin turn in his grave.'

This is repudiation enough. And there was repudiation of Calvinism in all the speeches that were made. But the tone was sometimes different. 'It is especially significant,' said the general secretary, the Rev. Charles W. Wendt , 'that we have been invited to assemble in this venerable city of Geneva, the lighthouse of Protestant faith, the centre and hearth of the Protestant Reformation

among French-speaking peoples. From this ancient seat of Calvin have radiated personal and doctrinal influences which have powerfully affected the character and destinies of modern nations like France, Holland, Britain, and the United States. It is sometimes charged upon Calvinism that it has become a spent force in Christendom. The modern mind seeks other solutions of the great problems of God and Man, Life and Eternity. But we, however widely we may have departed from the dogmas and methods of the great reformer, would ever speak with appreciation of that wondrous system of thought and powerful personality, which, as one has said, "put iron in the blood" of its own and succeeding generations, promoted the spirit of civil and religious liberty, gave intellectual basis and moral vigour to the faith of French and English-speaking nations, and raised up heroic witnesses in all lands for truth and freedom. As spiritual descendants of John Calvin, as the children of Huguenot, Presbyterian, Covenanter, Puritan, and other Reforming ancestors, we shall tread with peculiar reverence the streets associated with such heroic figures in the history of our religion.'

The *Acts* have been published under the direction of Professor Edouard Montet, the President of the Congress. They contain many valuable papers. Among the rest they contain a survey of 'Recent English Study of the Origins of Christianity,' by Professor Estlin Carpenter, of Oxford.

Professor Carpenter used his five-and-twenty minutes well. He confines himself to the Gospels. His task is easier than it might have been. For 'the two great dictionaries of the Bible—one edited by Dr. Hastings, the other by Professor Cheyne and Dr. Sutherland Black, the completion of which falls within this century—have occupied so large an amount of the activity of our scholars, that the independent product of the last few years is not very large.' These dictionaries themselves are enough to estimate the progress of study by. And 'it is hardly possible,' says Professor Car-

penner, 'to overestimate the general progress which these two works register.'

The editors of the *Encyclopædia Biblica* were obliged, it is true, to go abroad for a sufficiently advanced writer on the Gospels. But Dr. Sanday, who writes the article on JESUS CHRIST in the *Dictionary of the Bible*, has frankly stated that the New Testament must be approached like any other book; and with that Professor Carpenter is content. 'We must not expect,' he says, 'to advance too quickly; and if Mr. Conybeare takes one view of the Baptismal formula in Mt 28<sup>19</sup>, and Dr. Chase another, we are confident that to both these eminent scholars the matter is simply and solely (to use Dr. Chase's words) "a matter of evidence."'

Professor Carpenter just mentions Mr. Burkitt's edition of the Curetonian version of the Four Gospels (*Évangélion Da Mepharreshe*), and the discussions on the Sayings of Jesus, and comes to the *Historical New Testament* of 'the brilliant Scotch divine, Dr. Moffatt.' In that book the Fourth Gospel is placed between 95 and 115 A.D.; the Pastoral Epistles (on a Pauline nucleus), James and Jude, follow in the first quarter of the second century; 2 Peter is dated anywhere between 130 and 170 A.D. 'There is no timidity here,' says Dr. Carpenter admiringly; 'but,' he adds, 'the writer happily combines with his science a warm glow of religious life.'

Professor Carpenter mentions the *Century Bible*. The volumes on the Gospels are among the most cautious in that series, yet even they are not wholly indifferent to the modern treatment of the problems of eschatology. 'The devout and clear-eyed scholar, Professor A. S. Peake, is fully aware of the significance of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and Mr. Anderson Scott does not shrink from applying the researches of Bousset and Gunkel to the Apocalypse.'

He compares Professor Swete's *St. Mark* with

the *Earliest Gospel* of Professor Menzies, and returns to Dr. Sanday's article on JESUS CHRIST in the *Dictionary of the Bible*. The editors of Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible*, so late as the enlarged edition of 1893, were content to reprint the article on JESUS CHRIST by the late Dr. Thomson, Archbishop of York, 'who had remarked that the Temptation was "the trial of One who could not possibly have fallen."' Very different, says Dr. Carpenter, is the treatment by Professor Sanday, who writes: 'It is impossible for us to understand it in the sense of understanding how what we call temptation could affect the Son of God: it could not have touched Him at all unless He had been also, and no less really, Son of Man.'

Professor Carpenter ends with a glowing expression of admiration for the 'uncompromising lucidity' of Canon Cheyne's book called *Bible Problems*. 'Professor Cheyne treads with surer foot than another of our compatriots, Mr. J. M. Robertson, who thinks that the whole of the Gospel narrative can be reduced to shreds and patches of uncertainty because it assuredly contains mythical elements. Of the historic reality of Jesus, the uniqueness of His personality, and the immense worth of His act of absolute self-sacrifice, Professor Cheyne has no doubt. But this only renders it more incumbent on the disciple to disengage these abiding truths from their temporary form.'

There have been so many books on the Religion of Israel since the issue of the Extra Volume of the *Dictionary of the Bible* with Professor Kautzsch's article, that a new book with that title is likely to be read only if its author is already known. Mr. W. E. Addis is known already. He has reached the front rank of scholarship. And, more to the present purpose, he has had a spiritual experience so remarkable that he may write what he will, and those who know him will read what he writes. He calls this book simply *Hebrew Religion* (Williams & Norgate; 5s.).

We shall not review it now. We shall touch one topic in it. Let that topic be the Suffering Servant of Jehovah.

It is a much more important matter than the authorship of Isaiah. Two authors? Twenty authors? In itself it matters not at all. There are some few things of consequence which come out of it. But no mere literary question can compare in interest with such a question as this—Who is the Suffering Servant of the Book of Isaiah? For this question touches things that are spiritual; it brings the Jew and the Gentile together; it concerns our knowledge of the Lord Jesus Christ.

Now Mr. Addis, who is a scholar and a devout one, has no hesitation in saying that the Suffering Servant of Isaiah is the nation of Israel. This is his first point, and it is important. The Servant is not first of all a person, nor is he the personification of an elect few of the nation: not any godly well-trying remnant, but the nation of Israel as a whole.

But how can Israel as a nation be the Servant of Jehovah, in whom His soul delights? Has not Isaiah himself pointed out how poor and unworthy have been the achievements of Israel in the past? 'Who is blind, but my servant? or deaf, as my messenger that I send?' (42<sup>19</sup>). 'Thou hast not called upon me, O Jacob; thou hast been weary of me, O Israel' (43<sup>22</sup>). 'Thou hast wearied me with thine iniquities' (43<sup>24</sup>).

This is all true, and this is the actual Israel. But it is not the actual nation of Israel that the prophet has in his mind's eye. It is the ideal Israel, the Israel of the Lord's own choice; it is the Israel not of the prophet's nor of any time's poor performance, but the Israel which was the perpetual recipient of revelation and the messenger of salvation to the whole human race. There was a 'pattern in the mount,' a mission in the mind of Jehovah, and Israel was the Servant in pro-

portion as he had been formed after that pattern, in proportion as he might be considered faithful to that mission.

Does Mr. Addis mean that the Servant of the Lord had never an actual existence? He does not mean that. He has two touches yet to give to his picture. In the first place, Israel has been purged of his sins. He has been scattered among the nations. As a nation he has died, but he has died to live again. The dispersion has been his own purification, and at the same time the occasion of the fulfilment of his mission. For by his suffering he has learned meekness and forbearance. He has learned to welcome the least spark of religious truth among the Gentiles, and to foster it. 'He shall bring forth judgment to the Gentiles. A bruised reed shall he not break: the flickering flame he shall not quench' (42<sup>1-3</sup>). Was he despised and rejected of men? That was his sanctification, his fulfilment of the ideal in the mind of the Lord. And it was also the very means by which he won the heathen back to God. For they found that the sufferings which he bore should have fallen on themselves, and they cried at last, 'Yea, but surely he hath borne our griefs; the discipline of our peace was upon him, and by his stripes we are healed.'

That is the first thing. The other is that 'the words of the Second Isaiah transcend his own thoughts'; that 'the picture of the Suffering Servant was not realized, nor could be, till God the Son took our nature upon Him and was manifested at the end of the ages to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself.'

'And behold, there talked with him two men, which were Moses and Elias; who appeared in glory, and spake of his decease which he should accomplish at Jerusalem' (Lk 9<sup>30, 31</sup>). Why His decease? And why should He accomplish it? Both the words which St. Luke makes use of are unusual.

They spake of His decease. Our translators got the word from the version of the New Testament, which was published at Rheims in 1582. It is one of the puzzles of the Authorized Version that it went so often to the Rhemish translation, and so often for the worse. For Tindale had used 'departing,' and he had been followed by all the translators till then. It is still more puzzling that the Revisers did not return to Tindale. They offer 'departure' in the margin. Perhaps the majority preferred 'departure,' but not the two-thirds majority that was necessary to get it into the text.

Even Wyclif's 'going out' is better than decease. For decease means death. It never meant anything but death. And death is not the meaning of the word which St. Luke makes use of. The meaning includes what we call death. But besides death it certainly includes some things that preceded death, and some momentous things that followed it.

St. Luke's word is 'exodus.' Now the word 'exodus,' says Bengel, is a very weighty word. It involves His passion, cross, death, resurrection, and ascension. And that St. Luke deliberately chose this word to carry all that meaning is the more certain to us when we observe that he does not say, as our versions make him say, that Moses and Elijah 'spake of' the exodus. He says they 'narrated' it (not *ἔλεγον περὶ τῆς ἐξόδου αὐτοῦ*, but *ἔλεγον τὴν ἐξοδὸν αὐτοῦ*). The exodus was not merely the death. It had steps, the steps of a narrative in it. Moses and Elijah narrated the exodus which He was about to fulfil in Jerusalem.

It is true that the same word is used again in the New Testament, and that again it is translated 'decease.' 'I will endeavour,' says St. Peter in his Second Epistle (or some one in his name), 'that ye may be able after my decease (*μετὰ τὴν ἐμὴν ἐξοδὸν*) to have these things always in remembrance' (2 P 1<sup>15</sup>). But St. Peter was aware now of the exodus which Jesus fulfilled at Jeru-

salem. He had no need any more to question with himself what the rising from the dead should mean. He had profited by it. His own departure was no longer mere death.

And it may be just a little point in the controversy about the authenticity of the Second Epistle of Peter. For, as Dr. Burn pointed out in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES (xiv. 444), there is also in the First Epistle of Peter (of which few question the authenticity) a carefully chosen and most unusual word for death. 'That we,' says St. Peter, 'having died unto sins' (*ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις ἀπογενόμενοι*, 1 P 2<sup>24</sup>). Dr. Burn calls the word translated 'died' a 'mystical' word. And he says 'it means literally "departing," exactly analogous to the word "exodus" used in the Lord's conversation with Moses and Elijah about His "death," and in the Second Epistle of St. Peter (1<sup>15</sup>) with reference to the "death" of the apostle.'

But if the late Dr. George Matheson was right, 'decease' is more than inadequate, it is a most misleading rendering. For in the Exodus which Moses and Elijah narrated, death was the one feature that was passed over in silence.

What were Moses and Elijah there for? They were there, says Dr. Matheson, to carry the thoughts of Jesus away from death. They were there to centre His eye on something apart from death. Why did the choice of God fall upon Moses and Elijah? Because they were representative men? Because the one represented the Law, the other the Prophets? Not so. It was because both Moses and Elijah were separated from the association with death. Moses was without a sepulchre; Elijah was without a shroud. Now the occasion demanded these men. For, says Dr. Matheson (you will find his exposition in the second volume of his *Studies of the Portrait of Christ*), the vision to be presented to Jesus was a vision, not of death, but of resurrection.

It was not a vision of death. 'Death mean-

time was to be kept in the background; its time was coming, but it was not yet. The eye of Jesus was to be held aloft. When a sailor is ascending the mast, his chance lies in looking up; if he looks down he will totter. Jesus had begun to climb His cross; He was preparing for Jerusalem. But to climb successfully it was essential that He should look up, not down. His eye must be filled with beauty ere He gazes on the spectacle of gloom. The Transfiguration was the strain of music which accompanied and sustained the march to death.'

And now we may see why Jesus had to 'accomplish' His departure. St. Luke's word is simply 'fulfil' (*πληροῦν*). It had been written of Him; and He must fulfil the Scripture. But what had been written of Him? That He must die? It is appointed unto all men to die. In dying there is neither merit nor medicine. The merit is in the *exodus*, in the passion, cross, death, resurrection, and ascension. And so, when He took the

disciples aside, it was not merely to tell them that He must die. It was to show them that He was to be delivered into the hands of the Gentiles, thereby being foully betrayed by His own nation; that He was to be evilly entreated by them; and that after He was put to death He was to rise again on the third day.

It was the fulfilment of the Scripture. And it was more. It was the fulfilment of all the purpose of God from eternity, a purpose most particularly needed since sin entered into the world. For since sin entered into the world death was no exodus. The last thought connected with it was that of an exodus. It was an end rather than a beginning. It was darkness rather than light. It was bondage rather than liberty. But the very purpose of God in the exodus of Jesus was to make death henceforth an exodus for all men. He fulfilled His exodus at Jerusalem; and thereby, as Dr. Matheson has it, 'He led the children of Israel across a second Red Sea.'

## The New Testament

IN THE LIGHT OF RECENTLY DISCOVERED TEXTS OF THE GRÆCO-ROMAN WORLD.<sup>1</sup>

BY PROFESSOR DR. THEOL. ADOLF DEISSMANN, OF THE UNIVERSITY OF HEIDELBERG.

### I. The Problem.

THE nature of the problem before us—the illustration of the New Testament by recently discovered texts of the Græco-Roman world—requires perhaps a word of explanation, chiefly because it is not self-evident from the title of our investigation precisely which texts are meant. It will, however, be at once apparent that a study is proposed of the sources from which we are able to reconstruct the historical background of the New Testament and, consequently, of Primitive Christianity.

The historical background of Primitive Christianity is the ancient world, the ancient world in

the widest sense of the term, Eastern as well as Western. Not alone the Eastern, and certainly not alone the Western world, but the one, great, civilized world around the Mediterranean, which under the Roman Empire displays a unified structure, so far as the Hellenizing and Romanizing of the East and the Orientalizing of the West had worked in the direction of unity.

Any one who wishes to reconstruct this great background to the transformation that took place in the world's religion, will have recourse particularly to the literatures of the imperial age, and to the literatures of the previous epoch, so far as they were living forces influencing the spirit of that age. Two groups of literary remains have especially to

<sup>1</sup> Translated from the Author's MS. by Lionel R. M. Strachan, M.A., English Lecturer in the University of Heidelberg.