

have been no need for amulets as a protection against her destructive power.¹

The original Sūsenyōs is identified by Littmann ('Princeton: Ethiopic Magic Scroll,' p. 41) with the martyr of that name found in the Ethiopic *Synaxarium* (see also Basset, *Les Apocr. Ethiopiens*, iv. 10). According to the account there given, Sūsenyōs lived in the time of Diocletian, and he is reported to have killed in Antioch his sister, who had caused the death of her daughter, and had had a son by Satan. In one of the MSS used by K. Fries ('The Ethiopic Legend of Socinius and Ursula,' in the *Transactions of the Congress of Orientalists*, held at Leyden in 1893), the sister of the Sūsenyōs in the *Synaxarium* is actually called Werzelyā. In the corresponding Greek and Slavonic legends her name is, however, Melintha (see M. Caster, *Folklore*, xi. 126 ff.); and there can be no doubt that Werzelyā in the amulet legend is the Ethiopic² Lilith, who plays among the Semites the same part as Lamia among the Greeks.

Another element which—as may be expected—is not unfrequently referred to in the magic scrolls is the power of King Solomon over demons, and there are also a number of other traits of a more or less significant character.

The largest number of topics embodied in Ethiopic amulets so far published is found in Budge's edition of *Lady Meux's MSS*, Nos. 2–5. Omitting the story of Sūsenyōs and Werzelyā, which is of course also found there, these topics may be briefly summarized as follows:—(1) The

¹ Unless the idea is that the death of Werzelyā only signifies the separation of her spirit from the body she was inhabiting.

² As for the origin of the name *Werzelyā*, Littmann thinks it probable that it is Cushite. Dr. Fries identified it with the Latin *Ursula*, but Basset has (probably with justice) pronounced against this.

story of a woman fiend whom our Lord and His disciples met in the neighbourhood of Tiberias, and who had the power to destroy travellers and children, and to do other kinds of mischief. By our Lord's command she was burnt, and her ashes were scattered to the four winds of heaven. Here we clearly have an element akin to that of Werzelyā. (2) A piece of rare occurrence is a prayer ascribed to the Prophet Jeremiah, who was by the gift of prophecy enabled to declare the power of the cross of Christ. (3) A conversation between King Solomon and the children of Kedar, who were workers in metal, devoured the flesh of men, and did other fearful things. Solomon obtains their secret, and overcomes them by the power of a series of Divine names specially revealed to him. (4) One of the amulets contains a reference to the 'twenty-seven lamps which were given to Enoch.' (5) In another amulet reference is made to Enoch, Elijah, Nabal, who opposed David, Uzza, who dared to look into the ark, and to the magical names which God gave to Moses. (6) A subject which appears to have been purposely embodied in order to lead the owner in a more decidedly Christian direction is found in the British Museum MS. Or. 4716 (Budge, p. lxi). It is a kind of litany, beginning with the invocation of the Holy Trinity, and then proceeding with addresses to Christ, in which a number of the events of His life are enumerated. The evils to be warded off are the tongue of the demon Bāryā, the tongues of men both of kinsfolk and strangers, fever, rheumatism, and other diseases.

Mercy and Truth.

BY THE VEN. G. R. WYNNE, D.D., ARCHDEACON OF AGHADOE, AND CANON OF ST. PATRICK'S, DUBLIN.

Two verses in St. Paul's writings which throw some light on each other seem to have been imperfectly understood by the translators of the A.V., and one of them scarcely better comprehended by the Revisers. They are Eph 2¹⁷ and Ro 15⁹. The A.V. in the former case reads, 'He came and preached peace to you which were afar off, and to them that were nigh.' The entire concealment of the second 'peace' of the Greek text is here not easily explicable. (Luther's version similarly sup-

presses the second 'peace'). The Vulgate brings out the sense exactly, 'Evangelizavit pacem vobis, qui longe fuistis, et pacem iis, qui prope.' The Revised Version, similarly, has, 'preached peace to you who were afar off, and peace to them that were nigh.' The repetition of the word *peace*, producing, as it does, an emphatic but rather rough sentence, must have been intended by the writer to call attention to some difference, such as in the form, the source, or the conditions of the gift, if

not of its intrinsic character ; or at least to indicate that the two classes, Jew and Gentile, were not simply joint recipients of one and the same thing at one and the same time. The fact that the gift is the same but the giving is duplicated makes us ask what is the difference suggested? If I say, 'He gave sapphires to his daughter Mary, and sapphires to his daughter Martha,' I am necessarily driven to ask, Why not say, 'He gave sapphires to his two daughters'?

There is no difference in the ultimate results, for we read in the context, 'He hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us, so making peace.' The inference from the rather peculiar and unique form of sentence seems to be that St. Paul sees a reason for distinguishing the giving while not distinguishing the gift. Now, in what way does he suggest a distinction?

The explanation of his words must be supplied either by our general sense of probability, by the analogy of other scriptures, or it may be found in some other reference by the same writer, if such exist, to the subject in hand. If he has in mind some important distinction which drives him to vary from the obvious and simple form as expressed in the (erroneous) A.V., 'He came and preached peace to you which were afar off, and to them that were nigh,' it may be that we shall find him referring to the subject in a clearer manner somewhere else in his writings. And this he has done in the second passage referred to at the beginning of this article. The reference is to Ro 15⁹. This passage seems also not to have been generally understood ; and among those who have not grasped the meaning intended by the Apostle must be placed the translators of the A.V., and, strangely, of the R.V. also. I give first the Greek and Vulgate. Δέγω γὰρ Χριστὸν διάκονον γεγονῆσθαι περιτομῆς ὑπὲρ ἀληθείας Θεοῦ, εἰς τὸ βεβαιῶσαι τὰς ἐπαγγελίας τῶν πατέρων, τὰ δὲ ἔθνη ὑπὲρ ἐλέους δοξάσαι τὸν Θεόν, καθὼς γέγραπται, κ.τ.λ.

Vulgate : 'Dico enim Christum Jesum ministrum fuisse circumcisionis propter veritatem Dei ad confirmandas promissiones patrum ; Gentes autem super misericordia honorare Deum, sicut scriptum est . . .' When we study these two together, we can find no fault whatever in the Latin rendering, which observes the niceties of the verse, quite lost in the A.V. The purpose of the Apostolic writer is to make a vigorous contrast between the manner

in which the Jew and the Gentile came into the full enjoyment of the peace of God, or of His salvation. The contrast is made by three means :

(1) By the use of the adversative or distinctive particle δὲ, 'but.' (2) By placing the subject or ground of the glorying of the Gentiles in the prominent position in the sentence, before the mention of the glorying itself ; and (3), by the placing of the word 'mercy' absolutely, and without a possessive pronoun to slightly diminish its striking force. Each of these methods of distinction is reproduced by the Vulgate, *each is missed by the Authorized Version*. We have 'Gentes autem' for τὰ δὲ ἔθνη, and 'super misericordia honorare Deum' for ὑπὲρ ἐλέους δοξάσαι τὸν Θεόν. It will be seen readily, when once attention is called to the matter, that the writer is doing his best to draw a clear distinction between the grounds on which the two parties obtained the inheritance of God's salvation or peace. (The Jew on account of primeval promise, the Gentile from pure mercy.) But all three—(1) the use of *but* ; (2) the place of the words, 'for (his) mercy' ; (3) the use of 'mercy' absolutely, and without a possessive—are missed by our translators. They have not had their minds arrested by any of the marks of contrast, and so they translate very weakly, as if it was simply a statement that the Gentiles come in with the circumcision for all these blessings ; and if you read the English sentence and add to it at the end a few words : 'And that the Gentiles might glorify God for His mercy, *as well as the Jews*,' you have a clear grasp of what the *translators* thought the sentence to mean. They thought that the Gentiles were to share with the Jews in thanking God for one and the same mercy. But this is precisely what the Apostle did *not* mean. The Vulgate clears up the matter, though the Greek is so simple that it really needs no clearing up, 'Gentes autem super misericordia honorare Deum.' '*But* the Gentiles for *mercy* should honour God.' (Observe the three points in which the Vulgate and A.V. differ.) The accent is strongly thrown on MERCY, as a ground of blessing in some way different from that provided for the Jew.

One certainly expected to find a correction of these three mistakes in the Revised Version ; but strangely enough, the words are identical in the two translations. The Revisers have not taken any notice. The contrast is missed in all three

points, and so we again have: 'And that the Gentiles might glorify God for His mercy,' instead of 'But that the Gentiles, on account of *mercy*, should glorify God.'

The public reader, at the desk or lectern, can in part correct and interpret by rightly placing his emphasis and reading the whole text as if the words TRUTH and PROMISES had been printed in larger type in the first part, and MERCY in the second. He can go further, as the present writer does, and substitute 'but' for 'and,' as well as missing out the word 'his.'

And now we find ourselves led back to the text in Ephesians which started this discussion, and which is illuminated, and provided with justification from St. Paul's habit of thought, by being brought into touch with the verses in Romans. The two passages combine in assuring the gift of God's peace to both Jew and Gentile, but with a

difference, not in the ultimate result, but in the method and ground in the character of God. Peace is for the circumcision—(mark the word, which points more than the word 'Jew' would have done, to the ancient covenant)—in performance of an old promise of God, for the glorification of His *Truth*; peace is for the Gentile, uncovenanted, in the splendid exercise of His *Mercy*.

Thus 'Mercy and Truth have met together'; issuing, each of them in the making and preaching and bringing of Peace to those who, the one in the covenant of promise, the other without, so sorely needed that He should come to the rescue—He, who is our Peace, and who, 'veniens, evangelizavit pacem vobis, qui longe fuistis, et pacem iis, qui prope.' And all is wound up by the happy assurance, 'Quoniam per Ipsum habemus accessum ambo in uno Spiritu ad Patrem.'

Literature.

CHRIST AND CIVILIZATION.

A VOLUME with the title of *Christ and Civilization* has been edited for the National Council of the Evangelical Free Churches by the Rev. John Brown Paton, D.D., Sir Percy William Bunting, M.A., and the Rev. Alfred Ernest Garvie, D.D., and may be had at the Memorial Hall, E.C. (10s. 6d. net). It is a handsome imposing volume of 550 pages. It contains twelve essays by twelve separate men belonging to the Free Churches, each of them chosen because he has studied some particular part of the history of the Christian Church and made himself master of it. The twelve essays together form a survey in historical order of the influence of the Christian religion upon the course of civilization.

The first essay is introductory. Its author is the Rev. John Scott Lidgett, M.A., D.D., Warden of the Bermondsey Settlement, and ex-President of the National Free Church Council. Dr. Scott Lidgett tells us what the modern social problem is, where to look for the solution of it, and what is the peculiar responsibility of the Christian Church in the presence of it. He finds the modern social problem in the city slum. Of course it is not

altogether there. The problem of the city slum is largely due to density of population. But there is a real problem due to sparsity of population. The crofter in some parts of Scotland has an existence of toil and hardship, for which he will never find the slum-dweller willing to barter with him. And again, in some parts of the country, where the 'bothy' system prevails, morality is more difficult than in the one-roomed dwellings of a congested city district. But Dr. Scott Lidgett knows only the city problem; and it is enough. In what direction, then, does he look for a solution of the problem of the slum?

Not in the direction of commercialism, and not in the direction of politics. He looks to brotherly co-operation and brotherly sacrifice on the part of the more fortunate. For the modern social problem, he says, is above all spiritual. In saying which, he at once strikes the keynote of the volume, and affirms the very purpose for which it has been written. But observe that Dr. Scott Lidgett does not look to the Church. He does not look to any Church, free or bond. It is there that we find the chief significance of the volume. We have had many books in recent years on the relation of the Church to the social problem. But what have they