

ARTICLE VII.  
CRITICAL NOTES.

CUNEIFORM INSCRIPTIONS AND THE DELUGE.

FRANÇOIS LENORMANT was, perhaps, the best Assyrian scholar in France. In his *Beginnings of History*, he compares the inspired record of events in Genesis with the traditions of the East. He takes up "The creation of man," "The first sin," "The kerubim and revolving sword," "The fratricide and the foundation of the first city," "The Sethites and the Qainites," "The ten antediluvian patriarchs," "The children of God and the daughters of men," and, last of all, "The Deluge." He illustrates each topic with a wealth of traditions from many nations, but especially from the former inhabitants of the valleys of the Tigris and Euphrates, as their traditions have been preserved for us in the cuneiform inscriptions.

It is not the object of this paper to review the book; but only to offer a few suggestions on a single point in connection with the Deluge.

M. Lenormant gives the Chaldean account of that event from Berosus as follows (p. 387): "Cronos (*Ea*) announced to Xisuthros (*Khasisatra*) that on the fifteenth of the month Daisios (*Sivan*) all mankind would perish by a deluge. He then commanded him to take the beginning, the middle, and the end of all that had been written, and bury it in Sippara (*Sepharvaim*), the city of the Sun; after that, to build a ship, and go on board with his family and dearest friends; . . . . to place in it provisions for food and drink, and to introduce into it animals, both fowls and quadrupeds; lastly, to get everything ready for navigation."

Here is nothing inconsistent with the Mosaic narrative, so far as the construction of the vessel is concerned. It may have been built on the dry land, all ready to be floated by the waters of the rising flood. But when he comes to the cuneiform narrative, with which the late George Smith made us acquainted in his *Chaldean Account of Genesis* (pp. 278-315), twenty-seventh line, which George Smith had rendered (p. 280) "And on the deep, cover it, even with a roof," he translates, "[Launch it] also upon the ocean, and cover it with a roof" (B. of H., 393). So, while Noah was commanded to build the Ark on dry ground,—for that is implied in Gen. vii. 17: "The waters increased and bare up the ark, and it was lifted up above the earth," as if up to that time it had rested on the ground,—M. Lenormant affirms that Khasisatra was himself to launch his vessel upon the ocean. He says (p. 407): "The biblical narrative bears the stamp of an inland nation, ignorant of navigation. In Genesis, the name of the ark (*Tebah*) signifies chest, and not vessel; and there is nothing said about launching it

on the water, no mention of the sea, of navigation, or any pilot. . . . . In the Epopée of Uruk, on the other hand, every thing indicates that it was composed among a maritime people. Each circumstance reflects the manners and customs of the dwellers on the shores of the Persian Gulf. Khasisatra goes on board a vessel, distinctly named by its appropriate appellation. This ship is launched, and makes a trial trip to test it. All its chinks are caulked with bitumen, and it is placed under the care of a pilot."

Now, while it is very true that the Chaldean account expresses the ideas of a sea-going community,—and Isaiah (xliii. 14) speaks of "the Chaldeans whose cry is in the ships,"—as, *e. g.*, the name of the vessel, and the having on board a pilot; the question arises, Does the inscription affirm that the ship was launched and made a trial trip before the deluge came?

To aid in answering this inquiry, the writer ventures to call attention to several facts: (1) Our author, by putting the words "[Launch it]" in brackets, confesses that the inscription furnishes no authority for their insertion; for there the inscription is broken off, and is only so much blank space.

(2) What is to be launched? The lines immediately preceding describe a monstrous structure, 600 cubits in length by 60 in breadth and height. Taking 21 inches as the length of the cubit,—the standard adopted in Smith's Bible Dictionary (see article Noah),—we have a huge structure 1,050 feet in length by 105 in width and depth. The Great Eastern is 680 feet long, Perowne says, 83 wide and 58 deep (Smith's Bible Dictionary *l. c.*); and the Bishop of Ely, 87 feet 6 inches broad and 52 feet 6 inches deep (Speaker's Commentary on Gen. vi. 15). We all know what great and protracted trouble its builder had in launching that. And here is a structure vastly exceeding it in size, and less capable of sustaining great pressure; and the question is, Was any Khasisatra in all Chaldea adequate to the undertaking? Or did there exist mechanical appliances equal to the occasion? The lifting up of that stone in Baalbek 64 feet in length by 13 in height was child's play in comparison. Now, the statement that the vessel was so large might not have startled the original readers of the inscription; for they had no personal knowledge of a vessel so immense, and they might have thought that the waters of a great flood, gradually rising around a vessel of any size, would ultimately float it. But the idea of *launching* a structure of such vast dimensions in the same way that they launched their little coasters must have struck them as preposterous; if, indeed, they ever heard of it. The idea lacks the first element of verisimilitude.

(3) Again, our author translates (p. 395): "I sailed in it on the sixth day. I divided its stories on the seventh. I divided the interior compartments on the eighth." Now, it is true that *urtakkiû* (Iphtaal, from *Kakabu* = he rode or sailed) may be rendered in that way; but what clue does the context give to the meaning? Do any navigators make trial trips in their ships before the cabin is separated from the hold? or the deck laid over all? And yet, according to M. Lenormant, that would be the case here, in a structure that needed much more than smaller ships to be strengthened in that way.

(4) Nor is this the only difficulty; for, according to our author, this immense vessel goes on its trial trip before it is caulked; as Khasisatra goes on to say: "The gaps of the waters in its interior I securely stopped. I saw the fissures, and what was needed I supplied. Three *sars*<sup>1</sup> of bitumen I poured on the outside, and three *sars* of bitumen I poured on the inside."—Beginnings of History, pp. 395 and 578.

Ten thousand eight hundred measures of bitumen could hardly have been used in caulking the vessel *after* she had started on a trial trip. Manifestly Khasisatra only took up his quarters in the unfinished craft, while he went on to finish it. He mounted preparatory to riding. He went on board in order to sail; for caulkers would not use such an immense quantity of a substitute for oakum on a hull under water.

There is no difficulty about the word which our author renders "ocean," and George Smith translates "deep." In the inscription it is *absi*, the genitive, or as an Arabic scholar would say, the *meksur*, of *absu* = the abyss; if, indeed, it is not the original form of that word. In Greek, ἀβυσσος may mean a pit so vast that it is called bottomless. Thus Satan is shut up in the abyss (Rev. xx. 1, 2) and (vs. 7) comes out of it after a thousand years. Still, though the Greek has both meanings (see Isa. xlv. 27, "the deep," and Rev. ix. 1, "the bottomless pit"), there has not yet been found an inscription where the word *absu* has any other meaning than "the sea," or "the deep." Taking it, then, in this established meaning, this line may have read: "As it will be or float on the deep, cover it with a roof"; that is, since it will be exposed for an indefinite period on a shoreless sea, let it be roofed in for the protection of its inmates.

It is said: "All this is only negative evidence. There is no positive proof to the contrary." That is not so certain. Our author renders the forty-eighth line of the inscription (pp. 394 and 577), *Ina qagqari eqir u*, "On the keel I will fix." George Smith translates: "In the lower part of the ship has shut up."<sup>2</sup> Is not the next word the same as the Hebrew עָצַר, "I will enclose"? But the main question relates to *qagqari*. The first syllable of this is broken off in the inscription; but, as the work is repeated in line fifty-one, there is no question about it here. It is the genitive of *qagqaru*. Let us learn its meaning from other passages in the inscriptions. In George Smith's History of Assurbanipal (p. 194, line 5) it is rendered "ground" in the sentence, "He kissed the ground." This would make our sentence read, "On the ground I will enclose it"; and in that case Khasisatra would do precisely as Noah did,—build his vessel on dry land. But is not this rendering exceptional? Read again (History of Assurbanipal, pp. 224, 243, and 249, a.): "Sixty *kaspu* (parasangs) of *ground* (*qagqaru*) I marched over." Again (pp. 270, 99), we read: "Eight *kaspu* of *ground* (*qagqaru*) my army

<sup>1</sup> The *sar* does not appear among the measures given by Prof. A. H. Sayce, in Records of the Past, Part I., p. 158; but 60 units = 1 *soas*; 10 *soases* = 1 *ner*, and 6 *ners* = 1 *sar*; making a *sar* = 3,600 units, whatever they might be.—Rawlinson's Ancient Monarchies, I. p. 103, and Loftus' Chaldea and Susiana, p. 256.

<sup>2</sup> Chaldean Account of Genesis, p. 281.

marched," etc. So, also (268, 77, and 294, *k.*), we read: "One hundred *kaspu* of ground (*qaggaru*) from Nineveh," etc. I omit other places where there is a slight difference in the spelling. In like manner Sennacherib (George Smith's History of Sennacherib, p. 148, l. 60) speaks of carrying along trenches one and a half *kaspu* of ground (*qaggaru*) from the midst of the river Khusuur (*hodie* Khausser, opposite Mosul), and (p. 135, l. 53) also of the earth or soil (*qaggar*, singular construct of *qaggaru*) of the city of Babylon.

It is very true that M. Lenormant may have had some good reason for setting aside the common meaning and substituting "keel," and George Smith seems to have felt that there was a reason for rendering it "lower part"; but, in his ignorance of what that reason was, the present writer sees no cause for departing from the ordinary meaning of the word, "earth," or "ground," and so rendering the passage, "On the ground I will enclose the ship." Khasisatra uses a verb which carpenters to-day use for putting up and covering in the frame of a structure, and tells us he did this on the ground, as though he too, like Noah, expected the waters to come and float his vessel where he built it. Thus, on this point also, "the epopee of Uruk" is in perfect accord with the Mosaic doctrine, and we have another corroboration of the word of God; not inserting into the inscription anything which is not there, but only allowing it to utter freely its testimony for the truth. Surely the word of God has nothing to fear from the most thorough and careful investigation; and though, even if Khasisatra had been told to launch his cumbrous craft, the word of the Lord had stood as unquestionably the more reasonable narrative; yet it is a satisfaction to find that in this matter, also, the two accounts are in harmony.

THOMAS LAURIE.

#### PRIVATE INTERPRETATION.

Τούτο πρῶτον γινώσκοντες ὅτι πᾶσα προφητεία γραφῆς ἰδίας ἐπιλύσεως ὅν γίνεται.— 2 Pet. i. 20.

This passage has perplexed, not only the ordinary readers of the Bible, but our best biblical scholars. It seems to have been conceded without a question that *ἐπιλύσις* must be taken to mean *interpretation*; and then the emphasis has very naturally fallen upon the qualifying word *ἰδία*. What, then, does the passage teach? Is it that the individual must not ascertain for himself the meaning of the Scriptures? Then, surely, he may not ascertain it for others, and the office of the expounder is gone. Can we escape from this by making the church the expounder? That is one way; but it is not the Protestant idea. Can we not evade the difficulty by referring the scope of the declaration back to the prophet who first wrote a given text under guidance of the Spirit? This explanation has its defenders; and they find an imagined support in 1 Pet. i. 11, 12. But this passage is limited to a certain class of the prophetic teachings; while in the case before us all limitation is excluded. And it may be further objected that it is not easy to see the pertinence of this meaning to the apostle's argument.

Accordingly, this view has not attracted a large following. And it must be said that the advocates, both of this explanation and of that which refers the teaching of the passage to the readers of the Bible, have had the candor to admit that they are not satisfied with either the one or the other. The object of this article is to suggest and support, tentatively, a somewhat different translation of the passage; and one that, if it be accepted, will agree well with the scope of the paragraph and conflict with no convictions of those who reverence the Scriptures.

The noun *ἐπίλυσις* occurs nowhere else in the New Testament. The compound verb *ἐπίλυω*, from which it is derived, occurs but twice. The uncompounded verb *λύω*, on the other hand, occurs more than forty times, and the noun *λύσις*, once. The difference in meaning between *λύω* and *ἐπίλυω* in classic Greek is not always sufficient to be expressed in a translation. It is scarcely more in some instances than the difference between the English "loose" and "unloose." It would not be strange if the same were found to be true in the New Testament use. *Λύω*, as seen in the future and aorist, is identical with the English "loose"; the *fons et origo* of the word, and has the same meaning. It is repeatedly retained in the New Testament; the translation being only a transliteration, as in the case of the loosing of the colt on which the Saviour was to make his triumphal entry into Jerusalem. There, as seen in eight instances, to loose is simply to untie or release the animal from the fastening that held him (Matt. xxi. 2; Mark xi. 2, 4, 5; Luke xix. 30-33; also Luke xiii. 15).

Similar are the examples in which the word is applied to the untying of sandals (Mark i. 7, Luke iii. 16, John i. 27, Acts vii. 33, Acts xiii. 25); to the loosing of the marriage-bond (1 Cor. vii. 27, where we have both *λύω* and *λύσις*); to the loosing of the tongue in the case of one who had an impediment in his speech (*μογιλάλος*) (Mark vii. 35); to the loosing of Lazarus from the close drapery in which he had been wrapped for the sepulchre (John xi. 44); to the loosing of the apocalyptic seals (Rev. v. 2, 5); to the loosing of the four angels (Rev. ix. 14, 15); to the loosing of Satan (Rev. xx. 3, 7); to the loosing of the bond with which Satan had bound the woman who was "bowed together, and could in no wise lift herself up," (Luke xiii. 12, 16); perhaps, also, the "loosing of the works of the devil" (1 John iii. 8), of which we seem to have an example in Luke xiii. 12-16. We may refer, also, to the loosing of the bonds of death (Acts ii. 24); to the loosing of the synagogue-assembly by dismissal (Acts xiii. 43); and to the loosing on earth and in heaven (Matt. xvi. 19 and xviii. 18).

Then follow, in the destructive sense, the loosing, by the violence of the waves, of the stern of the ship in which Paul was carried to Malta (Acts xxvii. 41); the loosing of the middle wall of partition (Eph. ii. 14); the loosing of the temple (John ii. 19); and the loosing of the solid elements of the globe "with fervent heat" (2 Pet. iii. 10-12). This loosing in the destructive sense is simply the mechanical or chemical loosening of the interdependent parts or elements. We have, thus, substantially two ideas:

the first or predominant one is to release from a bond, by untying or severing it; the second may be represented by the untwisting and separating of the fibres of the bond itself, loosing the hold which they have upon each other. In the case of the temple, or the wall, the solid masonry was held together by the pressure of the superincumbent weight, and the careful overlapping of the stones, so that each one bound those below it and kept them in their place. The blows of the battering-ram near the foundation loosed this bond of gravity; and this loosening of stone from stone was the destruction of the temple.

We come now to the figurative uses of *λύω* as applied to the Scriptures. The first instance occurs in the sermon on the mount, Matt. v. 19: "Think not that I am come to loose down (*καταλύσαι*) the law or the prophets; I came not to loose down, but to fulfil. . . . Whosoever, therefore, shall loose (*λύσῃ*, not *καταλύσῃ*) one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, shall be called least in the kingdom of heaven."

There may be more ways than one in which a person may loose the commandments, as regards their hold upon his own conduct and that of others; *e. g.*, by his sophistries; by his studied contempt; by his practical neglect. Of course, we are not to understand this in any such sense as the *καταλύσαι* of verse 17. We shall look far before we find a better word than that which the Saviour adopted. Let us transliterate here, rather than attempt to translate. If it should seem to any that the antithetic portion of verse 19,— "but whosoever shall do and teach them,"— favors a more limited rendering of *λύσῃ*, as by "break" or "transgress," a second thought may suggest that he who has not only disobeyed a given law, but made light of it and sought by every means to weaken its power in society, can in no way more effectually undo this work than by setting himself to "do and teach" that very law. The antithesis between his performance in the one case and in the other is perfect.

The reasoning would be similar in regard to John v. 18 and vii. 23. In the one case there is the charge of loosing the sabbath, *i. e.*, the law or institution of the sabbath; and, in the other, the Saviour argues that in the well-known practice of the Jews the act of circumcision was performed on the sabbath, "that the law of Moses may not be loosed." The hold of the law in either case must not be relaxed. The primary meaning of *λύω* covers the whole ground in all these examples.

A more striking case we have in John x. 35. The connection is as follows: "The Jews answered him, saying, For a good work we stone thee not; but for blasphemy; and because that thou, being a man, makest thyself God. Jesus answered them, Is it not written in your law, I said, Ye are gods? If he called them gods unto whom the word of God came (and the Scripture cannot be loosed,— *καὶ οὐ δύναται λυθῆναι ἡ γραφή*), say ye of him, whom the Father hath sanctified, and sent into the world, Thou blasphemest; because I said, I am the Son of God?" The obvious import of *λυθῆναι* here is something different from what is expressed by our word "broken,"— cannot be "done away" (Robinson's Lexicon). This is stronger than

“broken,” and nearer the truth. But to keep the original word makes the case stronger than either. The Scripture cannot be loosed; it must hold strong in every fibre; let there be no untwisting of the cable by a single backward turn.

We notice, next, the prepositions that *λίω* inclines to be associated with.

It does not take into composition with itself, either in the New Testament or classic use, any of the following prepositions: *ἀμφί, εἰς ἐν, μετά, περί, πρός, ἰπέρ*. We have in the New Testament *ἀναλίω* twice; *ἐκλίω*, to loosen out, to unstring as a bow, and hence to be weary or to faint, in six instances; but in by far the greatest number of examples, *ἀπολίω*, to loose from, and *καταλίω*, to loose down or to destroy. *Ἀπολίω* differs from *λίω*, in its sense of unbind or release, only in having a more distinct reference to that from which the release is made. *Καταλίω*, on the other hand, corresponds with *λίω*, as used in the destructive sense. And it is not a little remarkable that the numerical ratio of their use is very nearly the same. The ratio of *λίω* in the sense of release to *λίω* in the destructive sense, is as seven to thirty, or thereabouts; and ratio of *ἀπολίω* to *καταλίω*, as sixty-eight to seventeen.

*Ἐπιλίω* is of much less frequent use; occurring but twice. As *ἀπολίω* signifies to loose from, so *ἐπιλίω* signifies to let loose upon, as to let loose the dogs upon the game. But the remote object is not always apparent; and it cannot always be told what, if anything, is contributed by the preposition to modify the meaning of the simple verb. Thus, in Mark iv. 34, where it is said, “Without a parable spake he not unto them; but privately to his own disciples he expounded (*ἐπέλυεν*) all things”; we can intelligently ascribe nothing more to the *ἐπί* than a slightly intensive force. Our Lord had been teaching the multitude in parables, as they were able to bear it. With them it would not do to travel along the highway of gospel instruction too fast. They could get from his parables all that they were in a condition to use. To the disciples, on the other hand, he loosed the deeper meaning from the picture; unbound the truth from the framework of narrative or object-lesson, and translated vague impressions into clear precepts and transparent duties. We can get no better idea of this *ἐπιλυσις* than by placing side by side the parable of the tares and the wheat and the explanation of it that was afterwards given. What a losing, or setting free of great truths from the objects to which they had been bound: “He that sowed the good seed is the Son of man; the field is the world; the good seed are the children of the kingdom, and the tares are the children of the wicked one”!

The next *ἐπιλυσις* differs enough from this to show that each must be a law to itself. It appears in the speech of the Ephesian town-clerk to the mob that Demetrius and his fellow-craftsmen had gathered. After reminding them that, if they had a case at law, there was no difficulty in obtaining a hearing before the proper tribunal; he added that, if they had something different from that to be settled, something that could not come before an established court of law, it should be loosed (*ἐπιλυθῆσεται*) from the perplexity or uncertainty that held it in the lawful assembly; Acts xix. 39. The

method of procedure in this *ἐπίλυσις* is plain. There must be a statement of the case, a discussion, and a vote. Thus it would be, according to the old version, "determined"; according to the new version, "settled"; according to the Greek idea, loosed or released from uncertainty.<sup>1</sup>

The third *ἐπίλυσις* is that to which all this discussion has been tending. "No prophecy of Scripture is of any private unloosing," *ἰδίας ἐπιλύσεως*. 2 Pet. i. 20. We have obtained from the present discussion a large liberty to find such an "unloosing" as the obvious drift of the apostle's thought demands. As in the two instances last considered, so in this, the passage must be a law to itself. What, then, is the trend of thought? "We did not follow cunningly devised fables, when we made known to you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ; but were eye-witnesses of his majesty. For he received from God the Father honor and glory, when there was borne such a voice to him by the majestic glory, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased. And this voice we ourselves heard borne out of heaven, when we were with him in the holy mount. And we have the word of prophecy made more sure; whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a lamp shining in a dark place, until the day dawn, and the day-star arise in your hearts: knowing this first, that no prophecy of Scripture is of any private unloosing. For no prophecy ever came by the will of man: but men spake from God, being borne on by the Holy Ghost."

Let us take into account the elevated pathway along which the thought of the sacred writer was travelling, the grand and uplifting sublimity of his theme, the unfaltering assurance and earnestness of his testimony as one of the eye-witnesses that saw the glory of his transfigured Lord in the holy mount, and heard the voice borne out from heaven; and then take in the tone and spirit of the transition to the confirmed and permanent word of prophecy, that shines upon our darkness as an ever-burning lamp; and see how he grounds here that which is the central and practical aim of his paragraph, the appeal to our hearts, *ὃ καλῶς ποιεῖτε προσέχοντες (τὸν νοῦν)*, . . . .

<sup>1</sup> An instance or two from Eusebius sustains our view, and will have the more weight from the similarity of his style to that of the New Testament. We have abundant reason, from personal examination of the point, for accepting the opinion of the late Professor Sophocles, whose knowledge of mediæval Greek was of an exceptional order, that, at the time of Eusebius, the Byzantine period of the Greek language had not fairly set in, and there is scarcely any change in the meaning of words, as used by him, when compared with the usage of New Testament times.

In Eusebius' Church History, book v. chap. 23, there occur in the same sentence both the noun *ἐπίλυσις* and the verb *ἐπιλύω*, and each is so used that it would be impossible to translate them by "interpretation," or any equivalent word. He is speaking of the difference between the practice of the Asiatic churches and those of the rest of the world in regard to the closing of the fast of Lent; the one *releasing* the fast on the fourteenth day of the moon, without regard to the sabbath; and the other always *making the release* on the day of our Lord's resurrection, or Sunday. He uses the plural, *ἐπιλύσεις*, just as he uses the plural, *τῶν ἁσπιῶν*, of the fast, to accommodate it to the plural, *ταῖς ἐκκλησιαῖς*. The expression is *τὰς τῶν ἁσπιῶν ἐπιλύσεις ποιῆσθαι*. The other expression is *τὰς νηστείας ἐπιλύσθαι*.

τοῦτο πρῶτον γινώσκοντες ὅτι πᾶσα προφητεία γραφῆς ἰδίας ἐπιλύσεως οὐ γίνεται.

Does the apostle really mean to push this last declaration to the front rank as a first truth, *τοῦτο πρῶτον*, first in its outstanding clearness and dignity and importance? Then, surely, we should do our best to understand it. Does it agree with the spirit and argument of this appeal to understand it thus: "You do well to apply your mind earnestly to the Scriptures, because it is a first principle that the individual is not to interpret them for himself"? Or thus: "You do well," etc., "because it is a first principle that the prophet did not originally understand his own prophecy"? We think not.

What shall be said, then, of the appeal, as exhibited in the following paraphrase?

"You do well to apply your minds with all diligence to the word of prophecy, made more sure by the divinely attested Messiahship and teaching of our Lord, as to a lamp shining in a dark place, till the day dawn and the day-star arise in your hearts; recognizing this as a first truth, that no prophecy of Scripture is to be loosed, as regards its divine authority [by any weakening presupposition or prejudice, or by discounting its value in any way]; for no prophecy ever came by the will of man; but men spake from God, being impelled by the Holy Ghost."

This gives a close parallel between this *ἐπιλύσις* of Peter and the *λύσις* of our Lord in John x. 35. The one declares that the Scripture *cannot* be loosed; the other says it is a first truth that it *is not to be* loosed.

The view that has been unfolded and defended in this article is presented for the consideration of Christian scholars, with the hope that, if it be found to be open to objections that the writer has not anticipated, it may lead to the suggestion of something that all can accept.

OWEN STREET.

#### SOLOMON SPAULDING AND THE BOOK OF MORMON.

The theory of the origin of the Book of Mormon in the traditional manuscript of Solomon Spaulding will probably have to be relinquished. That manuscript is doubtless now in the possession of Mr. L. L. Rice, of Honolulu, Hawaiian Islands, formerly an anti-slavery editor in Ohio, and for many years State printer at Columbus. During a recent visit to Honolulu, I suggested to Mr. Rice that he might have valuable anti-slavery documents in his possession which he would be willing to contribute to the rich collection already in the Oberlin College Library. In pursuance of this suggestion Mr. Rice began looking over his old pamphlets and papers, and at length came upon an old, worn, and faded manuscript of about 175 pages, small quarto, purporting to be a history of the migrations and conflicts of the ancient Indian tribes which occupied the territory now belonging to the states of New York, Ohio, and Kentucky. On the last page of this manuscript is a certificate and signature giving the names of several persons known to the signer, who have assured him that, to their personal knowledge, the manuscript was the writing of Solomon Spaulding. Mr. Rice has no recollection how or when this manuscript came into his

possession. It was enveloped in a coarse piece of wrapping paper and endorsed in Mr. Rice's handwriting, "A manuscript story."

There seems no reason to doubt that this is the long-lost story. Mr. Rice, myself, and others compared it with the Book of Mormon, and could detect no resemblance between the two, in general or in detail. There seems to be no name or incident common to the two. The solemn style of the Book of Mormon, in imitation of the English Scriptures, does not appear in the manuscript. The only resemblance is in the fact that both profess to set forth the history of lost tribes. Some other explanation of the origin of the Book of Mormon must be found, if any explanation is required.

JAMES H. FAIRCHILD.

#### MAURICE ON REGENERATION.

In his notice of F. D. Maurice in the *Nineteenth Century*, Mr. Shorthouse, author of the novel "John Inglesant," emphasizes the keynote of that singular man's teaching, as others have done. It is this: Men are natural saints; "not children of God by election or adoption; not disciples or followers by choice or opinion; but children by natural birth, elect in virtue of the common humanity, by which alone every human being is the son of God."

This is a step in advance even of the old Unitarianism, to which Maurice was born. His membership and ministry in the English Episcopal Church never disinfected him of it. Unitarianism of old required development of character, action, and education, in order to piety. Maurice's theory requires nothing but natural birth. The Unitarians said, Men are born to be saints, though they actually grow up profligates, thieves, murderers. Maurice said, This is not denial enough of old Christian doctrine; we are all born saints—actual saints—anyway.

A modified and tentative form of this absurdity is heard now and then in orthodox pulpits. All men are children of God, it is said, but those who become Christians are more so. They are distinguished, or prominent, as such; that is all. The well-known difference between natural descent (indicated by the words, "child," "children") and "spiritual adoption" by the new birth, as an entire moral change, is ignored. Both ideas are indeed figurative; for God is not the father of men, good and bad alike, by natural propagation, but by creation; and everybody can see that spiritual adoption is a purely figurative name of a religious reality. Both therefore are distinct from Maurice's "natural" birth-relation to God. Literally, there is no such relation. It is God's creative power that is exercised in our natural birth, and it creates us natural persons, not saints. It is even unthinkable how the creation of a personal nature, physical and mental, could of itself possibly produce a character, or moral rectitude. This must needs be the result of moral influence exerted upon the soul, acting after creation, giving direction to free will. All this Maurice's figment leaves out. And so it leaves out new birth, etc., sanctification by the agency of the Spirit, etc., etc., and reduces Christian experience to nature, or—evolution! It is

true, Maurice's hypothesis came before Spencer's, but it naturally falls in with it. Both can interpret all that Scripture says of God's producing holy character in the soul as an example of derivative production through differentiation by created agencies, or evolved ones, without such supernatural action of the Holy Ghost as all Christians accept; possibly both could give a twist to the phrases, "new creature," "new creation," to bring them into accord with the evolution philosophy.

But Paul had quite different ideas. The natural man, the common humanity, which is the result of natural birth, is with him entirely unlike the spiritual man. In his sense of a child of God, *i. e.*, in holy character, the natural man, physical and psychical, is never such by birth. The physical man, indeed, all men see cannot be such; but Paul also says that the psychical man cannot be. In 1 Cor. ii. 14: "Now the natural man (margin, unspiritual, Gr., psychical,) receiveth not the things of the spirit of God, for they are foolishness unto him, and he cannot know them because they are spiritually discerned," or judged. Would it not be well for to cease speaking of any man as a child of God until he is converted? It is not birth that makes one such, but the new birth, if we are to believe the New Testament.

GEORGE F. MAGOUN.

#### ST. JEROME'S PROLOGUE TO GALATIANS.

In the December number of the Andover Review, Professor George F. Moore positively asserted that "a Prologue to Galatians" had not been discovered among the voluminous works of St. Jerome, and spoke of such a prologue as an "amazing invention" of one of our Editorial Board. It is but right that we should inform our younger readers that the prologue in question is by no means unfamiliar to men of learning, being, in fact, the source of our knowledge of some of the most interesting personal details of the great father's life. It is in this prologue, if we remember correctly, that St. Jerome laments that prolonged study of Hebrew has imparted an unwonted asperity to his style. Those who desire to read St. Jerome's Prologue to Galatians for themselves can find it in Migne's Edition, Paris, 1845, Vol. VII., pp. 307-8.