

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

expositions of the truth of the Gospel the needful words, which teach us "what manner of persons we ought to be in all holy conversation and godliness."

T. D. BERNARD.

ART. IV.—THE CHALDEANS OF THE BOOK OF DANIEL.

THE use of the word *Kasdim*, "Chaldeans," in the Book of Daniel, to denote a certain class of the "wise men" of Babylon, has been looked upon by some authorities as an evidence of the late date of that book. Professor Schrader remarks: "The signification 'wise men' that we meet with in the Book of Daniel is foreign to Assyrio-Babylonian usage, and did not arise till after the fall of the Babylonian Empire. This is in itself a clear indication of the post-exilic date of the Book of Daniel."¹ Still stronger are the following statements from Professor Sayce in his interesting work on "The Higher Criticism": "Besides the proper names, there is another evidence of late date. The 'Chaldeans' are coupled with the 'magicians,' the 'astrologers,' and the 'sorcerers,' just as they are in Horace or other classical writers of a similar age."² Again: "After the fall of the Babylonian Empire the word 'Chaldean' gradually assumed a new meaning. The people of the West ceased to be acquainted with the Babylonians through their political power or their commercial relations. The only 'Chaldeans' known to them were the wandering astrologers and fortune-tellers, who professed to predict the future, or practise magic by the help of ancient 'Chaldean books.' 'Chaldeans' consequently became synonymous with fortune-tellers; and fortune-tellers, moreover, who—like the gipsies or 'Egyptians' of to-day—were not considered of a very respectable character. The term lost its national or territorial signification, and became the equivalent of 'sorcerer' and 'magician.' It is in this sense that the term *Kasdim* is used in the Book of Daniel. It is a sense which was unknown in the age of Nebuchadnezzar or of Cyrus." . . . "In the eyes of the Assyriologist, the use of the word *Kasdim* in the Book of Daniel would alone be sufficient to indicate the date of the work with unerring certainty."³ The above opinions are endorsed by Professor Driver in the Cambridge Bible for schools and colleges.⁴

¹ "The Cuneiform Inscriptions and the Old Testament," vol. ii., p. 125.

² "The Higher Criticism," p. 533. Horace is a slip for Juvenal.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 534, 535.

⁴ See The Introduction to Daniel, pp. xlix, l.

Now, it will be seen on reflection that the objections of these eminent critics are twofold. In the first place, they affirm that the use of the term 'Chaldean' to denote a class of the "wise men" of Babylon is contrary to Assyrio-Babylonian usage. In the second place, they assert that in the Book of Daniel the term is used in a sense belonging to a later age—viz., as an equivalent of "sorcerer" and "magician."

With regard to the first of these objections, it was certainly natural at the outset to expect that in the Babylonian Contract Tablets of the age of Nebuchadnezzar, which introduce us to the everyday life of the people, we should meet with the word *Kaldu*, the equivalent of the Hebrew *Kasdim*, used in the sense, say, of "astrologer." When, then, the determinative *amēlu*, "man," was found followed by the signs GAL-DU, it was natural to treat those signs syllabically, and to read *amēlu Gal-du*, "a Chaldean" or "astrologer," the "K" being softened into a "G" in accordance with Babylonian usage. It has, however, been satisfactorily shown that the two signs in question are here used ideographically, seeing that on the Contract Tablets *amēlu* GAL-DU interchanges with *amēlu* GAL *ba-ni-e*, which is a proof that DU has here its ideographic value, *bānū*, "a builder." But if we thus regard DU as an ideogram, then, in order to get any rational sense, it is clear that we must treat the sign GAL in the same manner, and give to it its ideographic value, *rabū*, "chief." Hence *amēlu* GAL-DU must be read *amēlu rab bané*, "chief" or "superintendent of the builders."

It is therefore true that the word *Kaldu*, in its secondary sense of "astrologer," is entirely wanting from the very numerous Contract Tablets of the age of Nebuchadnezzar. But there is another fact, equally true, and very much overlooked by the higher critics—viz., the fact that this same word in its primary ethnic sense is never found in the monuments of the New Babylonian Empire. For instance, the Chaldean Kings of the dynasty of Nabopolassar never style themselves *shar mat Kaldi*, "King of the land of Chaldea," as they so well might do. And, on the other hand, whilst men call themselves on the Contract Tablets *amēlu Mitsirai*, "an Egyptian," *amēlu Assurai*, "an Assyrian," we never meet with anyone who calls himself *amēlu Kaldi*, "a Chaldean."

On this point Professor Schrader remarks: "It is worthy of notice that the name *Kaldu*, 'Chaldean,' has hitherto been found only on Assyrian monuments"; and again: "Up to the present time we possess accounts of the Chaldeans (*i.e.*, the Kaldi) only from Assyrian sources."¹ To which it might

¹ "The Cuneiform Inscriptions and the Old Testament," vol. i., p. 118.

be added that the Assyrians used the word only in its ethnic sense. The fact, then, is that the word *Kaldu*, *Kasdim*, *Χαλδαῖος*, in its primary ethnic sense, is only used by outsiders. But if this be so, and if the word in its ethnic meaning is entirely wanting in the monuments of the New Empire, what right have we to expect to find it in the secondary sense of "astrologer," seeing that this latter must be derived from the former?¹

Why the word *Kaldu* was thus tabooed by the Babylonians is a crux not easy to explain. Possibly Babylonian vanity had something to do with it. It may be that the name "Chaldean" was offensive to them, as savouring too much of the conquest of Babylon by the foreigner, so that whilst a man might be a Chaldean by race, yet if he aspired to become a ruler of Babylon he must call himself a Babylonian. The prophet Ezekiel, who lived in Northern Babylonia in the days of the New Empire, has a passage in his book which bears on this subject.² Speaking of the overtures made by the kingdom of Judah to idolatrous Babylon, he writes thus: "She saw men pourtrayed upon the walls, the images of the Chaldeans (*Kasdim*) pourtrayed with vermilion, girded with girdles upon their loins, exceeding in dyed attire upon their heads, all of them princes to look upon, after the likeness of the Babylonians, the land of whose nativity is Chaldea."³ The language is remarkable. The prophet is speaking of the ruling caste; they are Babylonians by virtue of conquest, but Chaldea is where they spring from. The outside world knows them as Chaldeans, but they call themselves Babylonians, and that is the light in which the people of the great city love to view them. Agreeably to this, on the Second Dynastic Tablet, as we have seen, a dynasty of Chaldean Kings is called "*the dynasty of Babylon*."

The word "Chaldean" being thus unknown on contemporary Babylonian documents, either in the ethnic or the

¹ Aulus Gellius, *circa* A.D. 130, speaking of the term "*Chaldæi*" as the right name for astrologers and fortune-tellers, calls it (i. 9) *vocabulum gentilitium*, "a name taken from a race." The geographer Strabo, who lived till A.D. 25, has also a very interesting passage, which shows that even in his day there were still some relics of the Chaldean nation in their old haunts, as well as Chaldean "wise men" living in Babylon (xvi. 1, § 6). "A quarter," he tells us, "was set apart in Babylon for the native philosophers, called 'Chaldeans,' who are chiefly engaged in the study of astronomy." . . . "There is also a tribe of the Chaldeans, and a district of Babylonia inhabited by them which borders on the country of the Arabs and on the Persian Gulf."

² Referred to in my last paper. See the CHURCHMAN for November, 1903, pp. 64, 65.

³ Ezek. xxiii. 14, 15.

class sense, and only used by outsiders, the question may perhaps be asked, How came Daniel to use it? The answer is, He *was* an outsider; and not only an outsider, but, through the force of circumstances, and through the nature of the visions vouchsafed to him, a man of very cosmopolitan tendencies. Though living in Babylon, and perfectly conversant with Babylonian usages and modes of thought, as his book shows, yet he neither writes in the Babylonian language, nor does he feel bound to confine himself to terms used in the official documents and commercial contracts. This it is which explains the use in his book of certain Persian words which are not to be found in the contemporary Contract Tablets. Business documents, we know, are drawn up in set forms, which change little from age to age. But the Book of Daniel is far removed from these; moreover, it is written, not by a Babylonian, but by an outsider—a Jew. If, then, to return to the point before us, the Jewish prophets, Jeremiah and Ezekiel, speak of the conquering race as “Chaldeans,” what is there to prevent Daniel doing the same? Nay, rather, we should expect that he would do the same. This, then, explains the ethnic sense in which the word “Chaldeans” is used in chaps. v. 30 and ix. 1, and possibly in i. 4. But how are we to account for the class sense which meets us in chaps. iii. and v., where “the Chaldeans” appear as a section of the “wise men”?

In order to answer this question, I take up the second objection of the critics, viz., the assertion that in this book the term is used as an equivalent of “sorcerer,” “magician,” “fortune-teller”—*i.e.*, in a sense belonging to a later age. This is the view so strongly advocated by Professor Sayce, and at first sight it seems a not unreasonable one; for, just as a man is known by the company he keeps, so the term “Chaldean,” being found in this book along with such terms as “magicians,” “enchanters,” “sorcerers,” “soothsayers,” might well be taken as a synonym, and looked on as bearing the same sense which it has in the “Satires of Juvenal.”¹ But though it is true that our “Chaldeans” seem to be in bad company, yet it must be remembered that Babylon was

¹ See Satire VI., 553:

“Chaldæis sed major erit fiducia; quicquid
Dixerit astrologus, credent a fonte relatum
Hammonis, quoniam Delphi oracula cessant
Et genus humanum damnat caligo futuri.”

Also Satire X., 93, referring to the Emperor Tiberius:

“Principis angustâ Caprearum in rupe sedentis
Cum græge Chaldæo.”

ever "a cage of every unclean and hateful bird"¹ centuries before the age of Juvenal. A King of Babylon, and especially such a religious King as Nebuchadnezzar, would be sure to have his Court crowded with persons whom the philosophers of a later age deemed impostors, but who were looked upon then as "wise men." In the Book of Daniel we meet, not with mere groups of synonymous words all denoting impostors, but with lists of these "wise men" of Babylon, more or less complete, several times repeated, and, with one exception, in a fixed order. That order is, first, "wise men," the generic term; then "magicians," "enchanters," "sorcerers," "Chaldeans," "soothsayers."² Now, it is not a little remarkable that the class which occupies the last place but one in this order should yet be brought forward with such marked prominence by the writer of this book. In chap. ii. 4, "The Chaldeans," who in the list of ver. 2 were mentioned last, are the first to answer the troubled monarch. Further, they not only take the place of spokesmen, but venture to remonstrate with the enraged King in words which show considerable courage and self-respect. There is nothing of cringing in their manner. The question then arises, *Who are these Chaldeans* on whom the attention of the reader is thus fixed? Professor Sayce, in order to answer that question, carries us down through the centuries to the age of Horace, or rather of Juvenal—*i.e.*, to the latter half of the first century after Christ. But why descend the stream of time so far, and why visit countries so remote from the scene of the Book of Daniel? Juvenal's "Chaldeans," we know, are wandering soothsayers, fortune-tellers, but the Chaldeans of the Book of Daniel are not found roaming over the world, content to play the part of parasites at the Court of some weak-minded prince. On the contrary, we find them stationed at Babylon, where they evidently hold a most influential posi-

¹ Rev. xviii. 2. Compare Isa. xlvi. 9, 13.

² If in algebraical fashion we write down the order thus: (a) "wise men," (b) "magicians," (c) "enchanters," (d) "sorcerers," (e) "Chaldeans," (f) "soothsayers," then we have in:

- i. 20, - b c - - -
- ii. 2, - b c d e -
- ii. 10, - b c - e -
- ii. 27, a c b - - f
- iv. 7, - b c - e f
- v. 7, - - c - e f
- v. 11, - b c - e f
- v. 15, a - c - - -

Thus it will be seen that in one case only—*viz.*, ii. 27—is the established order broken. Let it also be noticed that with the coming of the Medo-Persian kingdom the "wise men" disappear from the scene.

tion, and speak as persons who respect themselves and are accustomed to be treated with respect by others. It is perfectly useless, then, to look to Juvenal for light on this question; but there is one who can throw considerable light upon it, one who lived and wrote about a century after the time of Daniel, one who had visited Babylon and gained his knowledge on the spot. The chatty old historian, Herodotus, in his description of that famous city, when speaking of the temple-tower of the god Bel, uses the following expression: "As the Chaldeans being priests of the god say." Again, writing of the sacrifices, he says: "On the great altar the Chaldeans burn the frankincense." Also, a little later in the same chapter: "As the Chaldeans said, and I did not see it myself, but I say what is said by the Chaldeans."¹ Referring to the above extracts, Professor Driver remarks that the term "Chaldeans," in the sense of "wise men," is first found in Herodotus. "It dates," so he assures us, "from a time when Chaldean had become synonymous with Babylonian in general." But this is incorrect. Herodotus does *not* use these terms synonymously. When he is talking about the temple of Bel, he speaks of the "Chaldeans," because, as he tells us, they were the priests of the god and acted as his informers and guides. But when he goes on to discuss the strange manners and customs of the people of Babylon, we hear nothing of the "Chaldeans," but only of the "Babylonians." Then, as to Herodotus being the first writer to use the term "Chaldeans" in this class sense, the thing cannot well be otherwise, seeing that he is the father of Greek history, and the first Greek writer who appears to have visited Babylon, which visit, happily for us, but unhappily for the higher critics, took place, as I have said, within about a century of the time of Daniel.²

The "Chaldeans," then, according to Herodotus, are the priests of the god Bel, and Bel-Merodach, as the India House Inscription so plainly testifies, is the favourite divinity of Nebuchadnezzar.³ Here, then, we have at once an explana-

¹ See Herodotus, Bk. I., §§ 181, 183. Professor Rogers, in his "History of Babylonia and Assyria" (second edition, vol. i., p. 264, London, 1901), has the following remark: "There is good reason for believing that Herodotus had really visited Babylon, for the topographical details which he gives bear frequently the stamp of an eye-witness."

² Herodotus was born about 484 B.C. His visit to Babylon was probably prior to 447 B.C., when he left Halicarnassus to live at Athens. His testimony, therefore, amounts to this: that a priesthood of "Chaldeans" was in existence at Babylon within about ninety years after the fall of the Babylonian Empire. Quite apart from the Book of Daniel it would be a justifiable inference that such a priesthood had its rise while that Empire was still standing.

³ See "Records of the Past," New Series, vol. iii., pp. 104-123.

tion of the prominent part taken by the "Chaldeans" in Daniel, chap. ii. These men come forward and speak with courage and spirit before the angry King, because their class stands highest in the royal favour: they are the priests of his god.

But this is not all; let us ask the further question: *Why are they called "Chaldeans"?* Not as being magicians or fortune-tellers, not in the sense which the word has in the pages of Juvenal; but, as the history of Herodotus shows, they are called "Chaldeans" to distinguish them from the Babylonians. In other words, they are called "Chaldeans" because they *are* Chaldeans, men of the same race as the rulers of the New-Babylonian Empire. Even a century later than the time of Daniel they are known to be of a different stock from the ordinary Babylonians. Here, then, is a further explanation of the freedom with which they address the King; they are men of the same race as the monarch himself.

It appears, then, that *throughout the Book of Daniel the term "Chaldeans" is used in an ethnic sense.* In two places, chaps. v. 30 and ix. 1, the sense is *purely* ethnic, as in the Books of Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel. But in chap. ii. 2, 4, 5, 10, and also in chap. v. 7, 11, *a class sense is combined with the ethnic*, "the Chaldeans" there spoken of being the priests of the god Bel, and probably this is also the case in chap. iii. 8.

It is possible also to throw a yet further light on this Chaldean priesthood of the god Bel, and to form some conjecture as to its origin. Diodorus Siculus, who flourished in the first century B.C., speaking of Belesys, whom he makes to be the founder of the New Babylonian Empire, calls him "*the most distinguished of the priests, whom the Babylonians call Chaldeans.*"¹ That some dependence may be placed on this statement by a late writer appears from an inscription of Nabopolassar, the father of Nebuchadnezzar and actual founder of the New Empire, in which he gives a remarkable account of the active part taken by himself and his two sons in the ceremonies at the rebuilding of the temple of Bel-Merodach. The passage runs as follows:

"Unto Merodach, my lord, I bowed my neck; I arrayed myself in my gown, the robe of my royalty. Bricks and

¹ Diodorus Siculus, ii. 24. Compare also ii. 29: "It seems to me to be not unsuitable to give a brief account of the Chaldeans in Babylon and of their antiquity, that I may leave nothing unsaid worthy of mention. The Chaldeans, then, as belonging to the most ancient of the Babylonians, occupy a position in the State similar to that of the priests in Egypt." He further states that they "form a caste, possessing a fixed traditional law, in which successive generations are brought up."

mortar I carried on my head, a workman's hat I wore; and Nebuchadnezzar, the first-born, the chief son, beloved of my heart, I caused to carry mortar and gifts of wine and oil along with my workmen. Nabû-shum-lisher, his own brother, the offspring of my body, the junior, my darling, I caused to drag a truck with ropes;¹ a workman's hat I placed upon him. To Merodach, my lord, I presented him as a gift."²

The spirit of the above inscription and the zest with which the King describes the part taken by himself and his sons in the ceremonial is a strong confirmation of the truth of Diodorus's statement as to the priestly origin of the founder of the New Empire. Winckler³ supposes that in presenting his younger son as a gift to Merodach, Nabopolassar intended to make him King of Babylon, while his elder brother Nebuchadnezzar was designed to occupy the position of suzerain and ruler of the whole Empire. But it seems more natural to take the simpler view that the King, having been a priest himself, was bent on consecrating his younger son to the priesthood. However, whether this be so or not, we may venture to assert, on the strength of the above inscription, that there could hardly be a more likely person than the founder of the New Empire to have instituted at Babylon a priesthood composed exclusively of men of the same race as himself. But if we attribute to Nabopolassar the institution of "the Chaldeans," then the comparatively recent origin of this body may perhaps be the reason why they stand last but one on the list of "wise men" in the Book of Daniel.

There now remains but one other point to clear up. When I began to write this paper, it seemed to me a wellnigh hopeless task to endeavour to identify "the Chaldeans" of the Book of Daniel on the contemporary tablets, and I was content, therefore, to rely on the testimony of Herodotus, which is in itself amply sufficient. A kindly Providence, however, has guided my eye to a tablet which *does* seem to furnish a fairly clear identification. In that valuable work, "Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek," Band IV., one hundred Contract Tablets of the New Babylonian Empire are transliterated and translated into German, thirty-one of this number belonging to the reign of Nebuchadnezzar. Throughout these tablets we shall search in vain for the term *Kaldu*, used either of a country and nation or of a priestly class. But there is one tablet of the seventeenth year of Nebuchadnezzar in which

¹ Literally, "I caused to seize rope and truck." See bas-relief, No. 55, in the Nineveh Gallery of the British Museum, where men are seen drawing loaded trucks by ropes over the shoulder.

² "Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek," III., ii., pp. 4, 6.

"Alt orientalische Forschungen," II., ii., p. 193, *et seq.*

repeated mention is made of the chief State of the *Kaldî*, "the Country of the Sea." This tablet is altogether of such importance as bearing on the question before us that I have no hesitation in giving it in full. It runs thus :

"These are the judges, before whom Shâpik-zîr, the son of Zîrutu and Balâtu, the son of Nasikatum the female slave¹ of the Secretary of the Country of the Sea, went to law over a house, with regard to the house and the tablet which Zîrutu the father of Shâpik-zîr had sealed and given unto Balâtu. (They [viz., the judges] made Balâtu and Shâpik-zîr change places. They assigned the house to Shâpik-zîr and they took the tablet and gave it to Shâpik-zîr) :

"Nabû-iîir-napshati, the Prefect of the Country of the Sea.

"Nabû-shuzziz-anni, the Deputy-Prefect² of the Country of the Sea.

"Marduk-erba, the Burgomaster of Uruk.

"Imbî-ilî, the Priest of Ûr.

"Bel-uballiṭ, the son of Marduk-shum-ibnî, the Prefect of that place.

"Aplâ, the son of Shûzubu, the son of Babûtu.

"Mushezib-Bel, the son of Nâdin-akhi, the son of Babûtu.

"Mushezib-Marduk, the son of Nâdin-akhi, the son of Shana-shîshu.

"Bânîa, the son of Aplâ, the Priest of the House of *Shadû-rabû*.

"Shamash-ibnî, the Priest of *Shadû-rabû*.

"Babylon, sixth of Nisan, seventeenth year of Nebuchadnezzar, King of Babylon."

The above tablet mentions three chief officials of the Country of the Sea—that district which in somewhat earlier days had formed the centre and nucleus of Chaldean power. The throne of Babylon being now in the hands of the Chaldeans, we may affirm with certainty that these three officials are men of Chaldean race, and very probably of noble birth. The first mentioned of the three—viz., the Secretary of the Country of the Sea—has an interest in the case, one of the parties being either his grandson, or, at least, the son of a dependent. The other two—viz., the Prefect of the Country of the Sea and the Deputy-Prefect—sit as judges. Amongst the other judges are some men of importance—to

¹ Perhaps for "female slave" we ought to read "daughter."

² Literally, "the Second."

wit, the Burgomaster of Uruk, the Priest and the Prefect of Ur; but by far the most interesting are the last two—Bânîa, the Priest of the House or Temple of *Shadû-rabû*, and Shamash-ibnî, the Priest of *Shadû-rabû*. Who is *Shadû-rabû*? *Shadû-rabû*, "the Great Mountain," is a name given to Bel-Merodach, the patron god of Babylon.¹ Therefore these two men are priests of the god Bel; and the connection in which we meet with them on this tablet is suggestive that they, too, are Chaldeans, and ancestors possibly of some of those Chaldean priests whom Herodotus met with at Babylon. Further, the company in which we find these two priests is a voucher for their social position. Neither Bânîa nor Shamash-ibnî would be at all flattered to find themselves classed with wandering fortune-tellers. In these men, then, we seem to see representatives of that proud, high-spirited, jealous, aristocratic class, the "Chaldeans" of the Book of Daniel. We need not, therefore, be troubled over these "Chaldeans"; their presence in that book does not affect its authenticity. Even so long ago as the year 1877 the position of these men was truly gauged; witness the following passage from the able pen of A. J. Delattre, with which I close this article:

"Parmi les diverses catégories de sages auxquels Nabuchodonosor demande l'explication de ses songes, il en est une que le livre de Daniel distingue par la denomination spéciale de *Casdim*, 'Chaldéens.' Un tel emploi du mot *Casdim* serait étrange si tous les Babyloniens de ce temps avaient été Chaldéens. Il se justifie sans peine si l'on admet avec nous que les Chaldéens étaient une classe particulière et d'origine étrangère dans le peuple babylonien. Dès lors, en effet, il était assez naturel d'appliquer la denomination de Chaldéen à un collège de prêtres recrutés exclusivement parmi les hommes de cette classe. Ces docteurs chaldéens—nous les voyons encore par le livre de Daniel—avaient le pas sur leurs confrères. Lorsque Nabuchodonosor, furieux de ce que les sages consultés par lui sont impuissantes à deviner le songe qu'il a eu, menace de les massacrer tous, ce sont les Chaldéens qui s'efforcent de calmer le monarque, et qui portent la parole au nom de tous. On a fait à propos d'un emploi si remar-

¹ The Assyrians gave the same name to their national god, Assur. See the Taylor Cylinder, Col. I. 10. Dr. Pinches has pointed out that the Hebrew Shaddai, "Almighty" (Gen. xvii. 1), is very possibly connected with the Babylonian word *shadû*. See Pinches, "Old Testament," pp. 248, 249. Was it this name and attribute of the Deity that was impressed on the mind of Nebuchadnezzar when he saw the stone cut out of the mountain become itself a great mountain, and fill the whole earth? Granted that the word *šûr*, Heb. *tsûr*, used in Dan. ii. 35, 45, is different, yet we must admit that the ideas are the same.

quable du mot *Casdim* des insinuations peu favorables au caractère du livre de Daniel, tandis qu'il fallait trouver en cela même une marque de son originalité." ¹

CHARLES BOUTFLOWER.

ART. V.—CHRISTIANITY AND ISLAM.²

OF all the missions, whether to Jew or Gentile, in which the Christian Church has been engaged from her infancy until the present hour, those to Mohammedan peoples may be regarded as at the same time the most important and the most difficult. They are the most important; for whereas other missions are attempts to evangelize the adherents of older religions in countries or among races in which the Cross has never yet prevailed, Mohammedan missions seek to win converts from a younger religion, which claims to have superseded Christianity, and which has actually in large tracts of territory displaced it from the position of influence and authority which it once held. They are the most difficult; for this very claim, and the partial success which has attested it, oppose a formidable bar to the acceptance of the Christian faith by the Moslem mind; and the elements of monotheistic truth in the creed of Islam give a strength to that creed which is not to be found in polytheistic Hinduism or agnostic Buddhism, or in the superstitions and devil-worship of less educated and less civilized tribes.

We may urge upon a Jew that his form of religion was, according to the Divine purpose and according to predictions recorded in his own Scriptures, destined to be transformed into the Christianity of which it was the parent, and that its survival at the present day is an anachronism. We may instruct the votaries of heathen religions that their beliefs are the conceptions of earlier and darker ages, which the pure light of Christian truth has come into the world to dissipate. But no such line of argument can be adopted in controversy with the adherents of Islam. They, on the contrary, will tell us that Mohammed was directly inspired by God to complete that revelation of Himself which before had been only imperfectly made to Jews and Christians. They will tell us that Christianity and the teaching of Jesus Christ, while they had their place in the Divine plan for the religious development of the world, and were a stage in

¹ See the *Revue des Questions Historiques*, tom. xxi., pp. 536-551.

² An address delivered at St. Anne and St. Agnes' Church, Gresham Street, London, on Wednesday, November 25, 1903.