

And the reason of its failure he finds in the absence of persistent prayer. The title of his book is therefore *The State of the Church*; and its sub-title is 'A Plea for more Prayer' (Nisbet; 2s. 6d.). The book is printed after the style of Mr. Murray's Commentary on the Hebrews, the emphatic words being given in clarendon type throughout the page. This is useful to catch the eye of the busy reviewer, but it has a way of interrupting the steady reader. Nevertheless the book should be read right through. It gathers momentum as it goes.

Dr. Oesterley and Mr. Box must be congratulated on the call for a second edition of their great work on *The Religion and Worship of the Synagogue* (Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons). They themselves rejoice. But chiefly, like true scholars, because they are thus offered the chance of making the book better than before. They have made it better. They have read the reviews of it (and some very searching reviews there were, such as that which appeared in the *Jewish Quarterly*); they have read the new literature; and they have considered and consulted much on the subjects of most controversy. Accordingly the new edition is described as revised and corrected throughout. A certain amount of new matter has been added. The sections dealing with the Pharisees and Reform Judaism have been entirely rewritten, and a new section on Zionism has been inserted. Besides all this, the section on the Dispersion has been much enlarged, and additional notes have been written dealing with the works of Philo and the Rabbinical Seminaries. Last of all, and not least of the improvements, the price is reduced to 7s. 6d. net.

The Rev. W. B. Norris, M.A., Rector of Warblington, has discovered *A Key to Life's Mystery*, and has been bold enough to make it public in a volume of six hundred pages. The key is really quite simple. Man is a creature of two moods, a good mood and a bad. And the key is: Encourage the good mood that is in you and discourage the bad. And in order that you may encourage the good mood and discourage the bad, Mr. Norris quotes for your use passages of prose and of poetry from a vast number of writers beginning with Homer and ending with Henry Drummond. Sometimes he quotes single sentences, sometimes whole scenes. Here you snatch an apothegm from Epictetus, there you work your way through a long chapter of John Inglesant.

And it has all been very acceptable. For this is the third edition of the book, rewritten and greatly enlarged (Simpkin; 7s. 6d. net).

Dr. J. Sparhawk Jones is an original preacher. You will find his style occasionally in England, but this steady, quiet, argumentative discourse is most unusual in America. A sentence may fill from twelve to twenty lines, a paragraph may cover three pages. And the expression is so appropriate and the thought so rich that the reader (we say nothing of the hearer) passes from one sermon into another as if unable to find enough of it. There is a certain orthodoxy in the volume—not orthodoxy that is cramping, but that is steady—which gives the reader a sense of permanent worth. The title of the book is *Saved by Hope* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press; \$1).

The Gift of Healing in the Church.

BY THE REV. W. F. COBB, D.D., RECTOR OF ST. ETHELBURGA'S, LONDON.

OUR earliest witness for the presence of the gift of healing in the Church is St. Paul. According to him, (1) the gift of healing was practised (1 Co 12); (2) it proceeded from the Spirit (v.^{9b}); (3) it was one of many extraordinary gifts (v.²); (4) it was not conferred on all (v.³⁰); (5) it was one of the greater gifts, and as such was to be sought for (v.³¹); (6) like the other gifts its primary object was the

common good (v.⁷); and (7) the high road to its attainment was the way of Love (v.³¹).

We are given also in the New Testament some typical stories of the exercise of this gift. Peter and John healed a lame man at the temple-door in the name of Jesus Christ (Ac 3⁶). Peter cured the paralyzed Æneas (Ac 9³⁴), and raised Tabitha from the dead (v.⁴⁰). Philip also healed many lamed

and paralyzed folk in Samaria, and exorcised many evil spirits (87). This was indeed a common occurrence in Jerusalem according to Ac 5¹⁶. Paul too healed a cripple at Lystra (14¹⁰), and healed and exorcised in Ephesus (19¹²).

These stories are related with an air of modesty and sense of proportion, and yet at the same time they seem almost inevitable in the circumstances. So wonderful was the new life that it was but natural it should have consequences out of the common even on the material plane. But there were limits to the gift. Raising from the dead was not impossible, but it was rare. Tabitha and Eutychus are the only cases, and the latter is probably not a case at all.

But though healing and exorcism were naturalized in the Apostolic Church, we feel that they are less at home than in the Gospel story. If the saying about doing greater works referred to so-called miracles, then the Apostles did not actualize it (Jn 14¹²), for the Lord's signs were greater than theirs. Yet the two groups have a family likeness. The most characteristic works of the Lord as of His disciples were prophecy, healing and exorcism, and in all three cases they were the final consequence of the spiritual life which was being opened up.

When we pass from the Apostolic to the Isapostolic Age the mist thickens. Those who speak have less to say, and they speak in a subdued tone. They speak sometimes from hearsay only, as, for example, do Irenæus (*Adv. Hær.*, ii. 32-34) and Eusebius (*H.E.*, iii. 39) of the power of raising from the dead. On the other hand, Irenæus in the same passage says that 'some do certainly and truly drive out devils, so that those who have thus been cleansed from evil spirits frequently believe, and join themselves to the Church. Others have foreknowledge of things to come; they see visions and utter prophetic expressions. Others, again, heal the sick by laying their hands upon them, and they are made whole.' He adds that these gifts of exorcism, clairvoyance, and healing are given not through incantations, but through calling on the name of the Lord Jesus Christ.

Justin Martyr tells the same tale in his second *Apology* addressed to the Roman Senate. 'Numberless demoniacs,' he says, 'throughout the whole world and in your city have many of our Christian men healed and are healing many, driving the devils out of the men, though they could not be cured by all the other exorcists, or by those who

use incantations and drugs' (§ 6; cf. also *Apol.*, § 30).

Again, arguing with Trypho, a Jew, he affirms that heathen when they became Christians received gifts, each as he was worthy. 'For one receives the spirit of understanding, another of counsel, another of strength, another of healing, another of foreknowledge, another of teaching, and another of the fear of God,' where healing and teaching take the place in the sevenfold gifts of wisdom and godliness (§ 39; cf. § 76).

Tertullian, too, is express as to the existence in his days of one branch of healing, namely, the casting out of evil spirits, and speaks of it as a fact admitted by the heathen themselves (*Apol.*, § 23, 37, 43; *de Idol.*, 11). In his Montanist days, however, he demands from his Catholic opponent apostolic and prophetic evidence that he had the power of forgiving sin, that is, he bids him raise the dead, or cure the feeble, as the Apostles did. He adds that a *pneumatic* Church alone has the power of forgiving sin, and (by implication) of healing the sick (*De Pud.*, c. 21). He speaks, however, as if this power of healing was not practised within his personal observation.

By the beginning of the third century, the gifts of healing, exorcism, and prophecy have lost the lusty vigour of their youth. Origen can speak only of them as leaving their 'traces among those who regulated their lives by the precepts of the gospel' (*Contra Celsum*, i. 2). In another passage, however, he tells us that the followers of Æsculapius maintained that they frequently saw their god healing and doing good and foretelling the future, while they called those people 'silly' who acknowledged the existence of Jesus and testified that He had given them a marvellous power to cure by the invocation of His name. Origen adds that 'we too have seen many persons freed from grievous calamities and from "ecstasies," and madness and countless other ills which could be cured neither by men nor devils' (*ibid.*, iii. 24).

The results of this brief inquiry into the subject of healing in the primitive Church are definite as far as they go, and may be summed up thus:—

(1) The charismatic ministry of healing was most abundantly evinced in the Person of Jesus Christ, and was joined in Him with many other gifts not found in His disciples.

(2) The further we travel from His period on

earth, the less strong and less frequent do the gifts of the Spirit show themselves.

(3) The most persistent of them are the gifts of healing, exorcism, and prophecy.

(4) As they die away, the greater is the emphasis laid on the moral superiority of Christians over heathens.

(5) The decay of the gifts moves *pari passu* with the naturalizing (or secularizing) of the Church.

(6) The charismatic ministry of healing was bestowed on lines other than official. The priest did not possess the gift as a priest, nor was it withheld from the layman because he was a layman.

There is no need to discuss in detail the manifestations of the gift of healing in the later Church, nor would it be easy. For the difficulty of the discussion is like the difficulty attending an inquiry into modern spiritualism. It is not the want of material for a judgment which causes now our perplexity. It is its abundance, and its inequality. Ecclesiastical 'miracles' of healing are there by the thousand, but it is a minority of them alone which stand the test of cross-examination. But there is enough to warrant the statement that what had now come to be called 'miraculous' healings were of not infrequent occurrence. Every man or woman of saintly character was expected to work miracles, and, therefore, it was natural that he should. Some would call miracles endemic in the mediæval Church. Perhaps they were. Perhaps the universal belief in their possibility afforded the conditions necessary for their becoming actual.

Hence we shall not be quick to reject the story of St. Augustine of Canterbury healing at Eboracum a man who was at once blind and paralyzed (Newman, *Lives of the English Saints*, iii. p. 381). It will sound to us quite natural that St. Walburga should have been sent by an inner impulse to the death-bed of the daughter of a neighbouring baron, and by her prayers continued through the night at the bedside should have brought the maiden back to life (*ibid.*, ii. 105).

St. Germanus is another example of healing power attending on sanctity. The sick came to him at Ravenna from all sides, and were healed. He brought back from apparent death the son of a court official, and cast the devil from another young man afflicted with 'falling sickness' (*ibid.*, ii. 418).

Similar cases of healing are found throughout Church history. It would be the very height of

unreason to dismiss them all as due to fraud, or credulity, or party-spirit. Whatever the proportion of non-fact to fact among them may be, there is truth in Pascal's remark that 'the existence of the false necessarily points to the existence of the true as their antecedent cause' (*Pensées*, ii. 235), even as the similarity of the stories about ghosts witnesses to their having a true cause behind them.

We are justified, therefore, in concluding that the gift of healing, which flourished in the early Church and then decayed, reappeared in later times amid much that was false, and though now labelled as miraculous bore witness to the fact that the same Power which healed in earlier days had never ceased His healing activity, but manifested it wherever He found a person fitted to be His instrument.

Some light may be thrown, perhaps, on the nature of the power of healing by a consideration of the numerous cases in which this power has been exercised through relics or other sacred objects. The belief that cures have been worked by means of relics, or at the tombs or shrines of saints, or by the use of some object associated with a saint, is found in every age of the Church; indeed, the relics of the saints seem to have been more efficacious than their living bodies. Moreover, as sanctity is unprovable, except so far as it finds expression in supernormal effects, the demand of the Roman Church authorities that proof of 'miracles' shall precede canonization is entirely reasonable. It is true that grave warnings are given against building on visions, voices, powers, and supernormal happenings, but this is only because experience has shown how narrow is the boundary line between delusion and the transcendental order of being next above us. But this caution does not contradict, it rather implies, belief in the possibility of the supernormal. Indeed, the belief of the Church has always been that if 'miracles' did not happen, it would be a miracle that they did not.

Examples of the cures in question are numerous. There are, for example, the apparently unquestionable cures effected at the shrine of St. Thomas of Canterbury immediately after his death. Take the witness of John of Salisbury. 'There,' he says, speaking of the shrine, 'great miracles are wrought. . . . For in the place of his passion, and in the place where he lay before the great altar previous to burial, and in the place where he was at last

buried, paralytics are cured, the blind see, the deaf hear, the dumb speak, the lame walk, lepers are cured . . . and (a thing unheard of from the days of our fathers) the dead are raised' (E. A. Abbott, *St. Thomas of Canterbury*, i. 227).

Benedict, a Canterbury monk and familiar with the archbishop, also tells us that on the third day after the martyrdom the news of it reached the wife of a Sussex knight, suffering from weakness and blindness. She then vowed herself to the saint, and immediately she began to recover, and on the sixth day she rose from her bed. The good monk winds up his account of this miracle with the pious remark: 'This beginning of signs did Jesus in Sussex of England, and manifested the glory of his martyr before the faces of his disciples who ate and drank with him before he was slain' (*Ibid.*, *loc. cit.*). If Benedict may transplant a second century remark for the benefit of the twelfth century, what is to hinder our doing the same for the twentieth?

We may take one other illustration of the use of material objects in the working of cures, in the famous case of Marguerite Périer, a boarder at Port Royal in 1656. She had been suffering there for eighteen months at the age of ten from a lachrymal fistula; the bone of the nose was diagnosed as carious, and purulent matter found its way thence into the throat. It happened, however, that an ecclesiastic who lived close by was in possession of an authentic spike from the Saviour's crown of thorns. He lent it to the nuns. They naturally paid due homage to the sacred relic, and an *exposition* took place in the Church. When Marguerite approached, one of the sisters, Sœur Flavie, noticing her swollen face, applied to it the holy thorn. That day the cure was complete. Three weeks afterwards, five physicians and two surgeons signed and published a certificate, stating their belief that such a cure 'was beyond the ordinary power of nature, and could not have taken place without a miracle.' 'Finally, in 1728, when Port Royal had been destroyed, and the very bones of its saints cast out of their graves, Pope Benedict XIII. quotes in his printed works, the case of Marguerite Périer as a proof that in the true Church the age of miracles had not gone by' (see R. H. Hutton, *Essays Theological and Literary*, 2nd ed. vol. i. pp. 33-35).

We have here, then, two cases out of thousands sufficiently convincing that inanimate objects so

called do actually assist in the curing of disease, whatever the explanation may be. Probably we shall find that it will help us materially to understand something of the true nature of the charismatic ministry of healing as exercised by persons in the flesh.

The fact being now beyond question that charismatic healing meets us in the lives of Christ and His Apostles, in the Early Church, and indeed in every age of the Christian Church, there now remains only to inquire into its nature and the method of its working.

In the first place, it seems to demand a certain receptiveness on the part of those who are its patients. In His own country Jesus could do no mighty work because of its unbelief (Mk 6⁶). On the other hand, He declared repeatedly that it was the faith of His patients which had made them whole. He insisted that all things are possible to him that has faith (Mk 9²³). He asks of the impotent man whether he had the will to become well (Jn 5⁶).

In accordance with these statements is the observation that an atmosphere of faith in a Church, people, or age is one in which the gift of healing is most likely to occur and to succeed.

A similar phenomenon is observable in other departments of life. A genius demands for his usefulness, and indeed for his appearance at all, a circle of appreciative friends who may at once stimulate, support, and concentrate his efforts. Witches flourished so long as witchcraft was believed in, and withered away in the chilling air of a rationalistic age. Great leaders of men rarely appear in democracies; they come to peoples who are willing to be led. They have no work to do where everybody is his own leader. Prophets rise when there is a hunger for the words of God, and poets are dumb when there is no ear that cares for their music.

So it is with the gift of healing. It can flourish only, like all living things, in a congenial soil. Why a rationalistic age is unable to supply that soil is not because it is pushing the claims of Reason, but because it is arrogant, that is, self-sufficient, that is, non-receptive. Before Faith can dwell in the soul, the soul must be emptied of its pride. For the faith through which cures are effected is more than assent to what is credible, more than belief, more than obedience to authority, more than passive receptiveness. It

is an active force. It is the life of God in the soul, and where that life is active there is purity, power, and health.

It should not, however, be hastily assumed that this indwelling faith can be called into activity only by affirmation of personal mind. To repeat continually: 'I am Love; I am Health; I am Righteousness; I am Abundance; I am Wisdom; I am Healing Power; I am Achievement because I am one with God,' is a form of auto-suggestion which does not necessarily do more than dispose the heart for the unspeakable gift of God. It may be true to say that 'disease, weakness, marks of old age, are only the resultant effects of thought'; that 'worry, folly, poverty, lust, decrepitude are simply the reflections of mind,' and yet that such an affirmation may be but a half-truth, for health, strength, peacefulness, wisdom, wealth, purity and vitality are the results of something besides thinking. They are such results, and they are not. They are, so far as right thinking has provided, the conditions under which such blessings as health and strength have been made possible. They are not, so far as it is a power not ourselves which performs the good work in us.

It seems necessary just now to insist on the importance of this distinction in view of the chronic inability of the average man to maintain the law of balance of allied opposites. He is apt to forget either the Transcendence of God or His Immanence. For some centuries he has neglected the latter. He is tempted to-day to ignore the former. Yet both truths are necessary both to sane thinking and to healthy living. That living thing we call Faith is the God indwelling in us. But the experience of ages is express. It says plainly that the indwelling power calls for the transcendent power to awake it, and that that transcendent power is something greater and deeper than any affirmation made by the personal self. God works not only *within* us, but also *upon* us. The Divine more often slumbers within, waiting quietly for the hour when the lower self shall have been sufficiently purified and braced as to be able to respond to the impulse directed upon it from without. It may be the shock of a great joy or a great sorrow, a great loss or a great gain, but it is not the shock itself which arouses the sleeping Deity within. It is the Transcendent God using the shock for the purpose of piercing

through the veil of habit, sloth, and ignorance which shut off all approach to the Holy of Holies within.

THE PLACE OF THE HEALER.

It is here that the Spiritual Healer has his place. He is not himself the Healer, but only the organ, or the agent, of the Great Healer. He is the channel through which the power of God flows to the person who needs it. What is more, his agency is a necessary factor in the work of healing, in virtue of what appears to be a cosmic law. For the Divine force in the universe remains latent until such time as it is focussed in some form through which it may work. This law holds good of God's healing power as of all His powers. Hence, though He is always ready and waiting to heal, He does not actually heal until an entrance is found for Him into the world of suffering through some finite agency. The province of the Spiritual Healer is to provide such an agency.

Thus in the act of healing two things are required. It has its active and its passive side, as all things have. The passive side is supplied by the faith of the sick person, which in its turn is closely bound up with the general faith of the community. When healing is in the air, more people are prepared and are fit to be healed.

The active side is supplied by the Divine life focussed in an individual who somehow is fitted to be its channel.

There is no *a priori* ground for limiting the channel of healing to an individual spirit still in the flesh. We have seen that all ages of the Church witness to the healing work of Christ in His Church militant. But they witness no less clearly to the fact that incarnate spirits take their part also. This seems to be the truth underlying all genuine instances of healing by means of relics. For neither of the two other explanations given seem to be adequate. One of these ascribes the cure to 'faith-healing.' But, as we have seen above, the faith of the sick man is but one of the two co-operant factors concerned. The second explanation refers, with Dr. Newman, to the power conferred on those material atoms which have formed part of the body of a saint. They have acquired something of the nature of Spirit itself. In this case, however, it is not the bone which works the cure, but the higher potency which has attached itself to the bone. But if

this be so, it is far simpler to say that the healing efficacy of the saint's spirit resides not so much in his discarded physical skeleton, as in his present higher body. In other words, where cures are effected by means of relics, or at such centres as Lourdes, or at one of the many holy wells, the most natural explanation is that which sees there the working of some excarnate spirit, angel, or other being who finds in the faith of the sufferer a suitable response.

It should be added that there seems no necessity for assuming that in all cases the name of the active healing spirit is that which we on this side give it. Whether the voices of Jeanne D'Arc's guides came from those known on earth by the names of Margaret and Catherine, or from some other beings, makes little difference. They were, anyhow, genuine spirit-voices, and they enabled Jeanne to do what they sent her to do. Similarly, we may assign cures to our Lady of Walsingham, or of Lourdes, or to St. Patrick, or St. James of Compostella, or to the Holy Coat, or a piece of the Cross, or to some relic, but all that we can be sure of is that *some* agent of the Christ is at work, and we shall give the glory to God, acknowledging that His power is not estopped by our mistake, if mistake there be.

CHARISMATIC HEALING AND SANCTITY.

We may ask next how far the power of charismatic healing depends on the sanctity of the healer. The question is somehow confused by the fact that sanctity is not of a uniform type. In the case of the Christ, as in that of the Buddha, the history says clearly that He was not an ascetic. Nor were His immediate disciples. On the other hand, mediæval sanctity was inseparable from asceticism. Yet in all three cases cures were performed. Perhaps the explanation lies in the fact that what is essential to sanctity is not so much asceticism as self-surrender to God, and that this very self-surrender is the necessary precondition of all the work of a spiritual healer. For it is God which worketh in him both to will and to do. He is always the Healer, and is always ready to heal. But where the will is set towards the separated self, His power cannot get through. Where, on the contrary, the will is set on Him as the Universal Self,—where, in other words, sanctity is,—there He can and does heal through His saint.

Closely allied with the truth that sanctity, as

above defined, is a condition to be fulfilled on the part of the healer, is the further truth that in some degree it is also required of the patient. We say 'in some degree,' because God blesses from the beginning, and does not wait for the end. Yet we ought to be on our guard against the temptation to divorce sickness from its cause. Its cause is in every case to be found in a wrong state of the will somewhere—if not in the sufferer, then in his ancestors, or relations, or friends, or others. He may be suffering from his own misdeeds, and while he clings to them he cannot be healed, nor should we expect or wish him to be healed. He may have begun to see the truth through his sufferings, and in that case he has begun to be ready for healing. He may have come to love the truth now made clear by suffering, and if so, he is now ripe for healing. He may, again, be suffering vicariously as a redeemer, and in that case there is no healing to be done, for release will come only when redemption is complete.

THE CHARISMA GENERAL OR PARTICULAR?

One final question remains, and that is, whether the gift of healing is to be regarded as the prerogative of a few, or whether it is to be looked for generally in the Church. St. Paul certainly implies that it was given to some only, when he asks: 'Have all gifts of healings?' We should, however, bear in mind that he has in view open and unmistakable manifestations of the working of the Spirit, that is, such workings as were so intense as to stand out as exceptional. He does not consider the case where all have some healing power, though the degree of it may be low, or where it is overshadowed by more striking gifts, as, *e.g.*, where a low degree of healing power is united with the gift of tongues to an eminent and remarkable extent.

The true answer to our question would seem to be that wherever there is Faith at all there is proportionate healing power, even though its possessor is unaware of its existence. For where faith is, God is; and where God is, there is healing power. But the possession of faith, in its more elementary stages, does not entitle a man to the special charisma of healing. This is a gift, and like all God's gifts is not given according to rule, or rather man's rule, for God follows the rule of the counsel of His own will. If we were to adopt a familiar phraseology and say that the gifts of

God descend in a sevenfold stream of light, and that the ruler, the healer, the man of action, the priest, the philosopher, the poet, and the initiate represent the several rays, then, varying St. Paul, we might say that to one it is given to be a healer, another a priest, another a poet, and so on. So that the gift of healing bears an exceptional character.

Yet, exceptional as it may seem to be, it is not to be regarded as lawless. Law, that is, Wisdom and Justice, runs through all things. We may be sure, therefore, that Wisdom and Justice lie behind the gift of healing, if only we had eyes to track them. There must be some answer somewhere to the question: 'Why has one man received the gift of healing, and not another?' Or, as the question should be put: 'Why has this particular man this particular gift? Has he done anything that I have not done, to win it or earn it?' Here we may guess, but we cannot know. Yet a guess may do good.

If for convenience we accept the sevenfold division of gifts just referred to, we may say that all the seven modes of activity are alike necessary

and valuable, but that the individual's own choice determines which shall be allotted to him. It may be that in the earlier stages of his eternal career some seemingly small exercises of his own free-will sent him off to this or that path of development; and that then he took his place for the æon on the path corresponding to his choice. We who see what comes out only say that he has the gift of healing, or of thinking, or of inspiring, or ruling, or acting, or what not. But He who sees the whole inner history of the man knows that he is where he is, and is gifted as he is, in obedience to a law, which is but Wisdom and Justice at work.

To conclude: Healing is a gift; it is given according to Law; it is to be exercised under Law; it may show itself as vital, magnetic, mental, or spiritual, but it is God's very power working in these different forms which is that which heals. He Himself makes the agent; it is He who supplies him with power. It is He too who brings together healer and patient, and creates the spark of health from their contact. To Him, therefore, be all the glory.

Contributions and Comments.

A Protest against that Chaotic Monstrosity 'Comparative Religion.'

TEN years ago I was a member of the Theological Board of Studies of the newly constituted teaching University of London. We were engaged in the delicate task of framing the course of theological discipline for the degrees in Divinity, and in that work we attained satisfactory results. We were about twenty in number, and included representatives of the Anglican Church, Wesleyan Methodists, Baptists, and Congregationalists. While the atmosphere without was rent with storms over the elementary education in religious knowledge of children under fourteen, we calmly deliberated without the slightest suspicion or mistrust, and solved all our problems respecting the theological instruction of our respective students for the Christian ministry.

We fortunately had a very able chairman, Principal Robertson of King's College, now Bishop

of Exeter. Among the subjects for the final B.D. examination it was agreed that an optional department should be admitted, mainly for the benefit of our missionary students, namely, that which is endowed with the evil name 'Comparative Religion.' The absurdity of the title was duly pointed out. Religion, it was argued, is not a science, but a concrete living reality. We can speak of a comparative science because a science is founded on observation and comparison and the resulting classification of phenomena and the determination of their relations. We can therefore talk of comparative grammar or comparative physiology, anatomy, or morphology, because in each case we are dealing with the collection and grouping of observed facts and the determination of their inter-relations. Comparative grammar of the Semitic languages involves merely an extension of the same processes that are applied to a single language such as Aramaic or Arabic. But one need not be a follower of Ritschl, who exposed