

# THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

---

## Notes of Recent Exposition.

THE Church Congress has come and gone. Its most notable utterance, from the theologian's point of view, was probably that of Canon Sanday on 'The Historical Method in Theology.' And as Dr. Sanday kindly sent us a copy of the address before delivery, our readers will be able to estimate its worth for themselves.

---

Mr. Headlam, who introduced the subject, spoke ably also. His most telling point was made when he started to answer the broad question, 'Is Christianity true?' There are two assumptions possible, he said. The one assumption is that Christianity is true, the other is that it is not. Both are contradictory to the historical method. Assume Christianity true, and you can prove it true with ease. Assume it false, and you come as easily to that conclusion.

---

Whereupon Mr. Headlam exposed a clever fallacy into which even Renan fell. In the name of the historical method the unbeliever demands that Christianity should be investigated as any other religion. The historical method assents. The unbeliever sets to work. In a moment it is seen that he is working on the assumption that Christianity *is* as any other religion. And he does not ask if its miracles are true, he proceeds to set them aside. 'When a writer begins by assuming

that a miracle is impossible, his investigations are just as valuable or as valueless as those of a person who assumes that it is true.' It is a point of utmost consequence. And Canon Sanday, whose paper joins on to Mr. Headlam's (though we have obliterated the joining), touched upon it too.

---

But there was another subject at the Congress of more immediate interest than this, though of less enduring consequence. Its title on the official programme is 'Progress of Life and Thought in the Church of England during the Victorian Era.' As a title it is comprehensive enough. Under 'Life and Thought' you are prepared to find everything that is new or old under the sun. And even 'the Church of England' and 'the Victorian Era' leave scope enough for conjecture. Yet this voracious title produced three of the most closely reasoned and fittingly expressed of all the papers at the Congress.

---

The first paper was read by Mr. H. O. Wakeman, of All Souls' College, Oxford. Its subject was the High Church. Mr. Wakeman did not call it the High Church. He called it the Tractarian movement. But he defined the Tractarian movement, as he intended to speak of it, as 'the High Church revival of this century in the Church of England, and not merely the movement in Oxford

which ended with the suppression of the *Tracts for the Times.*'

Mr. Wakeman was carefully chosen, and he justified his choice. He was chosen to speak for the High Church party in England, and he spoke with point and purpose. In the very first sentence of his paper he set himself right with his audience. 'The Tractarian movement,' he said, 'was in its beginning a protest against Erastianism, not against Evangelicalism.' There are two principles of religion, he said, and only two. The one teaches man to be content with the seen, and that is Erastianism. The other encourages him to find his true life in the realities of the unseen, and that is Tractarianism and Evangelicalism. 'It is by accident only that the two latter have been in such bitter conflict for part of the last sixty years, only because in the half lights in which we live High Churchmen have often seemed to the more ardent of Low Churchmen to be disloyal and superstitious both in their doctrines and practices; while High Churchmen have not always been preserved from the guilt of folly, or remembered the claims of charity.'

Nevertheless, Tractarianism is not Evangelicalism. Evangelicalism was not false, but it seemed to the early Tractarians at Oxford altogether inadequate. So far as it went, it was on the right lines; it did not go far enough. 'In their view of the doctrines of the Person and life of our Lord, of the Church, of the sacraments, in their application of these doctrines to the practical needs of man's soul, the Evangelicals had indeed got hold of part of the truth, but not of the whole truth. Depth of spiritual meaning and breadth of religious outlook were the principles which lay closest to the hearts of the Tractarian writers. And they found that they had to vindicate themselves, not only against the poverty of spiritual ideal contained in Erastianism, but also against the narrowness of religious view common to the popular Protestantism of the day.'

Thus Mr. Wakeman set himself right with his audience, and his subject on its feet. Then he mentioned three great gains which the High Church movement has given to England.

The first is a larger conception of the Church. The Church of England became a part of a great world-wide society; independent, spiritual, with rights of its own, and authority of its own; a society which it was the special work of Jesus Christ upon earth to found; a society to which alone was guaranteed by Him permanence and ultimate triumph, in which alone was certainly to be found the union with Him which was necessary to men if they would live His life in the world; a society by the extension of which He willed that the world should become Christian. This Church was found in the East and in the West. The religious horizon of English Churchmen was lifted just as their political horizon has been lifted by the new Imperial idea. And the whole rich heritage of theology, of liturgiology, of architecture, of art, which belonged to the Catholic Church at large, became the property of English Churchmen.

The first gain was a larger organization. The second is a larger life. 'The revival of worship, the increase in liturgical and ceremonial knowledge, the multiplication of services, the stress laid upon the sacramental principle in religion, the careful training of character through religious habit and discipline, the revival of the religious vocation for men and women, all helped immensely to widen the conception of religious duty and religious privilege.'

The second gain was a larger spiritual, the third is a widened intellectual life. Mr. Wakeman gives two illustrations. One is from biblical criticism. If the Tractarians found their doctrine of the Church in the Bible (and Mr. Wakeman says they did), then they found the true doctrine of the Bible in the Church. What the true doctrine of the Bible is, Mr. Wakeman

does not stay to tell us. He tells us only that the Bible deprived of the support of the Church, is as unable to bear the weight of the Christian revelation as the Church deprived of the support of the Bible would be. And then he says that it is because English Churchmen have found the right relation between the two that they have been able to deal with biblical criticism with fearlessness and reverence. The other illustration is from scientific and philosophic thought. If the Church of England had not in its High Church movement repudiated the theology of Calvin, it would never, Mr. Wakeman thinks, have been able to cope with the attacks of science and philosophy. But when the narrow basis on which Calvinism rests had been swept away, and the full teaching of the Incarnation brought home to men's consciences, then room was found for the physical evolution of the world and of man; then scientific thought and moral thought and Christian thought were able to work together.

That is Mr. Wakeman's paper. The *Record* says: 'The claims made in it were in part obvious, in part easily controvertible.' It may be so; they seem to us worth controverting. For our part one difficulty only arises, that Mr. Wakeman may have attributed a causal connexion to things whose connexion was only casual. For we cannot help remembering that Canon Liddon was a High Churchman and that Robertson Smith was not.

When Mr. Wakeman sat down, Mr. Llewelyn Davies rose up. Mr. Davies spoke for the Broad Church. The *Record* describes his paper as a panegyric upon Maurice and his work. It was so, the most whole-hearted panegyric we have ever read. But it was something more. It is surely of some significance that Mr. Davies' quarrel is not with the High Church but with the Low. He claims that the Broad Church is the father of the younger High Church party, and that the reader of *Lux Mundi*, the theological manifesto of that party, 'may trace the lead of Maurice in every one of the essays,' though his name is not once

mentioned in the volume. But for the Evangelicals and for Evangelical doctrines he has nothing but kindly expressed contempt.

'The chief characteristic of the converted was that they had accepted the Atonement, or believed that Jesus Christ had died for them; in other words, that Jesus Christ had borne upon the Cross the punishment due to their sins, and had thus made it possible for God to forgive them.' And then he adds: 'These doctrines may still be held and professed with their old vigour by some English Christians, perhaps by some clergymen of the Church of England; but I think it will be admitted that throughout English Christendom in general they are either openly repudiated, or tacitly ignored, or avowed with bated breath.'

Then Dr. H. C. G. Moule was called. He spoke for the Evangelicals. First he spoke of the name. It was not the oldest name the party had. The oldest name was Methodist. And not only John Wesley (*E.A.P.I.*, says Dr. Moule within parentheses, *Ecclesiae Anglicanae Presbyter Joannes*), not only John Wesley, but also William Grimshaw, Henry Venn, John Newton, Thomas Scott, and Charles Simeon were Methodists. But the master passion of all these men was evangelization; their preaching was the Evangelium; and there was no wonder that whether by friend or foe they came to be known as Evangelicals.

It is an older movement than the High Church or the Broad claims to be. Dr. Moule would place its beginning in 1729. For about that year the 'Holy Club' began to meet in Oxford. A few years later Whitefield and the Wesleys traversed the British Isles at a speed which, as we read Wesley's wonderful journal, seems almost to anticipate steam. Other men of the 'Club,' like Hervey, began to set themselves to pastoral toil for Christ. Far and wide like-minded men, quite unconnected with the 'Club,' rose up in their parishes full of faith and zeal. All England began at last to stir.

And what has Evangelicalism done? It has contributed all along one great doctrinal benefit. It has witnessed to the first truths of the New Testament, and given them the first place. 'I am not so blind as to say that nothing is true which is not distinctive of Evangelicalism. But I do humbly confess before God and my brethren that I believe what is distinctive of Evangelicalism to be distinctive of the gospel.' Secondly, the Evangelicals have kept alive the tradition of the friendship of the Church of England with 'her Sisters of the Reformation.' And lastly, the Evangelicals have been permitted to set an example, imperfect yet faithful, in the work of the evangelization of the world.

Professor Green, of Princeton, has been charged with heresy. The charge is made in the *New York Evangelist*. There it is stated that 'the hypothesis of Dr. Green assumes error, intentionally made and covered up, in the very warp and woof of the original text: errors which destroy its historical accuracy.' To that charge his colleague, Professor Duffield, replies in the issue of 9th September.

The alleged heresy arose over an attempt to meet the demands of archæology as to the antiquity of man upon the earth. Archbishop Usher fixed the creation of man 4004 years before the birth of Christ. But recent exploration has made it evident, and Professor Green is prepared to accept the evidence, that men lived in cities and had a respectable civilization 6000 years before the birth of Christ. Now Professor Green is not concerned to defend Archbishop Usher as he is resolute to defend Moses. But he asks how Usher's mistake was made. And finding that it was made by believing that when Moses says Enoch begat Methuselah, he means that Methuselah was Enoch's son, he boldly declares that that is not what Moses means—and finds himself a heretic.

Professor Green declares that when Moses says Enoch begat Methuselah he does not mean that

Methuselah was Enoch's son. For the word *begat* does not invariably refer to an immediate descendant. In the first chapter of Matthew it is stated at the eighth verse that Joram begat Uzziah. The complete fact is that Uzziah was the son of Amaziah, who was the son of Joash, who was the son of Ahaziah, who was the son of Joram. Thus it is said that Joram begat his great-great-grandson. Other examples might be given that are like. Why then, says Professor Green, might not Moses say that Enoch begat Methuselah although there were many a generation between them?

'In the study of the Acts of the Apostles, undoubtedly the most remarkable feature at the present time is the increased importance attached to the so-called Western Text.' So says Professor Ramsay in the *Sunday School Times* of 18th September. It has already been mentioned that the chief authority for the Western text is Codex Bezae of Cambridge, and that the Cambridge Press is about to publish a facsimile of that manuscript. It will prepare us for its reception to notice two significant passages in the Book of Acts which the Western text, in Professor Ramsay's judgment, has made clear.

The first is Acts 21<sup>15, 16</sup>. In the Authorized Version it reads: 'And after those days we took up our carriages, and went up to Jerusalem. There went with us also certain of the disciples of Cæsarea, and brought with them one Mnason of Cyprus, an old disciple, with whom we should lodge.' The Revisers have made some change. They prefer 'baggage' to the old-fashioned 'carriages' of A.V., and they call Mnason an 'early' instead of an 'old' disciple. More significantly they turn 'brought with them' into 'bringing *with them*' (the italics showing that the words are added to make out sense). But after all, Professor Ramsay seems justified in calling these verses 'obscure and enigmatical.' And he may be justified also in saying that the Bezan text has cleared up the passage 'completely and satisfactorily.'

Professor Ramsay is justified in calling the verses obscure and enigmatical. For they seem to say that certain disciples went with St. Paul from Cæsarea to Jerusalem; that they took Mnason with them; that they did so in order to lodge with him when they reached Jerusalem. But why should the disciples be so careful to provide a lodging in Jerusalem when it was certain that the Church would provide it for them? And why should St. Luke be for once so helpless and halting in saying it? And why after all should the English versions be an impossible translation of the Greek? For the Greek cannot mean 'bringing Mnason with them,' but 'bringing them to Mnason.'

But a sentence is found in the Western text which makes the matter clearer. Remembering that Codex Bezae is a bilingual, having the Greek on one side of the page, and the Latin on the other, we turn to the Greek page first. There (supplying in italics what is not in the Greek) we read: 'There went with us also *certain* of the disciples from Cæsarea to conduct us to *one* with whom we should lodge; and having reached a certain village we came to *the house of* Mnason of Cyprus, an early disciple.' We have at once both an unmistakable statement and an unchallengeable translation. But the Latin on the opposite page is yet more explicit, for it adds, 'and thence departing we came to Jerusalem, and the brethren received us with gladness.' Thus the Western text tells us that the journey from Cæsarea to Jerusalem occupied two days; that the night was spent in the house of Mnason, who lived in a certain village on the way, not in Cæsarea nor in Jerusalem; and that the Cæsarean brethren accompanied St. Paul to this village for the purpose of finding him a lodging there, and then, no doubt, went home again.

The other passage is Acts 28<sup>16</sup>. It has hitherto been understood that St. Paul, when he arrived in Rome, was given in charge to the commander, or one of the two commanders, of the pretorian guard,

and by him intrusted to a soldier. The statement is not explicitly made in the oldest text of the Acts. There it is simply said that 'Paul was suffered to abide by himself with the soldier that guarded him.' But it has been inferred from the apostle's own statement in Ph 1<sup>12, 13</sup>, 'My bonds became manifest in Christ throughout the whole pretorian guard.' And it has generally been accepted.

But there has always remained a difficulty and a ground for serious suspicion. Roman antiquities know nothing of a pretorian commander who had the charge of prisoners. By every evidence the commander of the pretorian guard was a judge, not a jailer. Before him St. Paul might be brought, and very probably would be brought, for judgment; he could have nothing to do with his imprisonment.

Now there is a reading in a few Western manuscripts which names another officer as St. Paul's jailer, not the pretorian guard. The manuscripts are of minor consequence, at least they have mostly been considered so. And they have not even the support of Codex Bezae, because of a lacuna in that MS. here. So, though they are supported by a corrector of a Syriac version, and an early Latin version, their reading has not been taken much account of. For not only are they themselves so insignificant, their reading is so unlikely. They name the officer *princeps peregrinorum castrorum*, or 'head of the strangers' quarters.' But no such officer is named in official Roman documents, or even found in inscriptions, till the end of the second century.

Yet these insignificant manuscripts Professor Ramsay believes to be right. However we may explain it, they have retained this name after it had dropped from the great uncials, and their name is found to be accurate. For Mommsen has been able to prove that such an officer, with such a title, existed, at least from the days of St. Paul. And this was his very office. He took charge of the

foreign prisoners, and when the day of trial came, led them before the pretorian commander. His name is not in official documents, because it was not an official name. It was a colloquial term, which it took two centuries to raise to the rank of Roman officialism. To the writer of the Acts, however, this is the name he would best be known by. It was the name on the lips of the Romans with whom St. Paul or St. Luke came in contact. 'Thus, at one stroke,' says Professor Ramsay, 'the accuracy of Acts is vindicated; the original form of the text, as written by St. Luke, is restored after it had been lost from the great manuscripts, and an addition has been made to our knowledge of Roman antiquities by the evidence of the Book of Acts.'

And one more gain has been gathered. Mommesen incidentally remarks that the words in Philipians must refer to the trial, not to the imprisonment of St. Paul. The apostle says that his 'bonds became manifest in Christ throughout the whole pretorian guard.' Then he was in the hands of that guard, and under the pretorian commander, when he wrote this letter to the Philipians. Therefore his long detention in prison was over, and his trial was now in progress.

The *Guardian* of 20th September contains a short review of Professor Hommel's new book, *The Ancient Hebrew Tradition*. The anonymous writer, identifying himself with the attitude of the *Guardian* itself on critical questions, is carefully neutral. Professor Hommel may have shaken Wellhausen's seat and he may not—it is for experts to determine. And so this is the one matter on which the reviewer has a decided opinion, that the book is not a book for general readers. 'It is well that we should warn our readers that its value can only be tested and appraised by experts. Coming, as this translation does, from the press of the S.P.C.K., and published under the direction of the Tract Committee, it might not unnaturally be expected that the work would be of a

popular character and appeal to the general reader. Such a notion, however, would be entirely wrong. The general reader will be able to make little or nothing of the book, and we trust that he will realise that it is not intended for him.'

Thus this richly laden and most precious volume has apparently lost its way. It was written for the 'general reader.' And, notwithstanding the *Guardian* reviewer, it contains matter which it would be easy and well for the 'general reader' to know. But, unfortunately, the author set a side issue in the front of it, and the publishers did everything in their power to give that side issue prominence. Indeed, the publishers gave the fatal impression that it was for that side issue alone they published the volume. Now the 'general reader' is unable to determine whether Wellhausen has been answered or not, and he is only moderately concerned to know. But he is greatly concerned to know the truth about Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; and it is nothing short of a calamity that Professor Hommel, who is so singularly able to bring the truth home, has been shipwrecked in his effort to do so.

Few are the experts who have spoken upon the book. Probably there are few who feel they have a right to speak. It is, therefore, with pleasure that we are able this month to add to their number. Professor Driver, who up to the present moment has published nothing upon it, favours us with the publication of a note he has written for the forthcoming edition of his *Introduction*. It will be found on another page.

In the new preface which Dr. Robertson Nicoll has written for the new edition of his early book, *The Incarnate Saviour* (T. & T. Clark, crown 8vo, 3s. 6d.), he asks the question, 'Did Christ come primarily to deliver a message to the world, or did He come in order that there might be a message to be delivered?' The question separates two schools of theology. But it is not in that regard

that Dr. Robertson Nicoll asks it. He finds that since the first edition of his book was published, writers on the life of Christ have been largely occupied in discovering a purer Christianity in the Gospels than is contained in the Epistles. He does not acknowledge the discovery. He does not admit that the Christianity of the Gospels is even different from that of the Epistles. But he willingly allows that there is a difference in form. For the teaching of the Gospels is the teaching of One who came to make the gospel; the teaching of the Epistles is the gospel after it is made.

It is admitted that between the teaching of St. Paul and the teaching of Our Lord there is a difference in form. There must be a difference in form; and for two reasons. The first reason is that Our Lord preached that the Kingdom was coming; St. Paul preached that it was come. Our Lord preached that the Kingdom of Heaven was at hand, and then, dying, opened Heaven for sin and for uncleanness. St. Paul preached that the grace of God, bringing salvation to all men, had appeared; for the great God and Our Saviour, Jesus Christ, had given Himself for us that He might redeem us from all iniquity.

The second reason is that St. Paul preached the gospel as he himself apprehended it.

A month or two ago some notes were written here on the structure of St. Paul's doctrine. An anonymous writer in the *London Quarterly Review* was commended because he had done wisely in building St. Paul's doctrine upon the facts of his life. For there is no other way of freeing St. Paul from the charge of dogmatic artificiality which is laid against him in contrast to the simplicity that is in Christ. Jesus made the gospel, and St. Paul preached it; there is much in that. But there is also much in this, that St. Paul preached the gospel along the lines of his own experience.

This elementary circumstance has not always been taken account of. Our best commentators

have not always recognised it. And it is one of the most welcome elements in the new volume of *The International Critical Commentary* that this has been clearly apprehended and happily used. Professor Marvin Vincent may not be the scholar and he may not be the exegete that Bishop Lightfoot was. But standing upon Bishop Lightfoot's shoulders and wielding this weapon with a freedom that even Lightfoot never knew, he has given us an edition of *Philippians* that takes its place beside its fellows in the very front rank of modern theological literature.

Take a passage to bear it out. There is a passage in the Epistle to the Philippians (it is 3<sup>8-10</sup>) which, according to Professor Ménégoz, contains the most precise statement that can be found of the Pauline doctrine of justification by faith. The expositors all agree. For up to that point the drift of the passage is unmistakable. But when that point is reached, what a sea of perplexity the anxious student is launched upon! It is not overshooting the mark to say that in all the range of the Pauline writings there is probably no passage that has been the occasion of so many exegetical absurdities as the tenth and eleventh verses of this chapter.

The apostle has said that he now counts all things to be loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Jesus Christ. He has repeated it, and more emphatically. He has said that he counts all things dung that he may win Christ and be found in Him. Then in the tenth verse he catches up the word 'knowledge' which has just been used, and he says that he counts all things but loss and dung, 'that I may know Him and the power of His resurrection and the fellowship of His sufferings, being conformed unto His death, if by any means I may attain unto the resurrection from the dead.'

Now all this is very puzzling. What does St. Paul mean by the power of Christ's resurrection? And why does he put that before the fellowship of

His sufferings? And how can he be made conformable unto Christ's death? And what drives him to end it all with the anti-climax of a faint hope that he himself may attain to the resurrection from the dead?

Lightfoot thinks that by 'the power of His resurrection' the apostle means several things: the assurance of immortality, the triumph over sin, the pledge of justification, the assertion of the dignity of the human body. But no one knows better than Lightfoot that St. Paul had no love for phrases that covered a multitude of meanings. If he has a characteristic, it is surely this, that he used his phrase just to express his meaning at the moment, and neither more than that nor less. Lightfoot knows that; and here, on the whole, he inclines to the belief that by 'the power of His resurrection' St. Paul meant the assurance of immortality. But that meaning is most strange here. For it is in the next verse that, according to Lightfoot himself, St. Paul speaks of his immortality, and then in words that express anything but assurance.

Why he puts 'the power of His resurrection' before 'the fellowship of His sufferings,' Lightfoot does not say. But he thinks the other way would have been better. His paraphrase is: 'That I may know Him: and when I speak of knowing Him, I mean that I may feel the power of His resurrection; but to feel this, it is first necessary that I should share His sufferings.' And as to the anti-climax at the end, he simply says that the apostle states not a positive assurance but a modest hope—'if so be that I may attain unto the resurrection from the dead.'

Now it is surely possible to find a natural meaning in all these statements of St. Paul, and to find their order natural also. Professor Vincent seems to find it. And he seems to find it by beginning where the apostle was sure himself to begin.

St. Paul began his gospel with the resurrection of Jesus from the dead. When he first heard that there were men who were preaching to the people the resurrection of Jesus from the dead, he was filled with wrath. For Jesus being crucified had come under the curse of the law. That *He* should be raised from the dead was for God to make His own law of none effect. Then Paul found that Jesus *had* been raised from the dead. And in finding that, he found that] so far as Jesus was concerned the law *was* made of none effect. Operating still upon others, it had no effect upon Him. For it had spent itself upon him. It had made Him anathema. It had cast Him out. It had no longer any dominion over Him. And so here was one Man back to earth again over whom the law had no hold.

But the law never had any hold over Jesus. He had not broken one of the least of its commandments. He had carried the sin of others. So in making Him to be sin, the law had lost its grip of sinners. Here was One back to earth again who was not only free from all condemnation Himself, but who was able to free all others who fled for refuge to Him. That was Paul's personal experience. That was the way he came to it. He came to know that there is no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus. And it was the resurrection of Jesus that had done it. That was the power of the resurrection to Paul.

But the power of the resurrection was not exhausted in freeing Paul from condemnation. Jesus is free from condemnation; and to be in Christ Jesus is to be free from condemnation assuredly. But Jesus is free from sin. And for me to be in Christ Jesus is for me to be free from sin.

That is the knowledge Paul means. 'That I may know Him,' he says. That I may know the power of His resurrection, first in freeing me from condemnation and then in freeing me from sin.

Now, freedom from sin is in union with Christ. The closer the union the greater the freedom. The more I am associated with Him the more I am like Him. I must be associated with Him in suffering—His sufferings as it were borne by me, as my sufferings are borne by Him. I must be associated with Him in death. I must die in the death he died: I feeling so keenly that my sin nailed Him to the tree that I am nailed to the tree with Him, nailed to the tree in Him, the nails which pierced His hands piercing mine, till I die in the death-cry with which he passed.

And then? Why, then I shall rise with Him. But that is so glorious that it is too much to boast of. It is too much to do more than faintly hope. For since the death I die in Christ is the death of sin, this resurrection from the dead is the emancipation from sin, it is the resurrection to the new and glorious life of sinless purity in Christ. 'If so be I may attain unto the resurrection from the dead.'

This is the point at which the expositors who have found so many perplexities already, find their greatest perplexity of all. For the apostle says suddenly: 'Not as though I had already obtained, or were now already perfect.' Obtained what? they ask, and they cannot find an answer. For he has been speaking, as it seems to them, of his future resurrection from the dead (about which, by the way, Paul never had any doubt, and would be ashamed to express a modest hope), and it is difficult to see why he should say he had not obtained that. Then looking down the page, they find him speak of a prize, and they think it must be that. So against all the connexion of thought, and all the rules of language, they project it into this verse. But the meaning is very simple. He has just expressed the modest hope that he may die unto sin and rise again into the glorious liberty of the sinless. Suddenly the thought occurs that the Philippians might think he is claiming the sinless state already. 'Not as though I had already reached it, or were now already perfect; but I press on.'

## Oriental Archaeology at the Congress of Orientalists.

BY A. H. SAYCE, LL.D., PROFESSOR OF ASSYRIOLOGY, OXFORD.

MUCH that is new and interesting has been brought forward at the recent Congress of Orientalists in Paris. The Aryan section was unusually active and largely attended, and Dr. Schechter was present in the Semitic section, ready to give an account of the manuscript treasures he has brought from Cairo. Of these two sections, however, I can speak only at second-hand. Moreover, it was in the Assyrian and Egyptian sections that the newest and most startling announcements were made. During the past year or two excavation and research have been busy in the East, and light is being thrown at last on the early history of civilization in Western Asia.

Foremost in interest to students of the Old Testament is a discovery made by Dr. Scheil among the cuneiform tablets recently brought from

Sippara to the Museum at Constantinople. One of them contains the same text of the story of the Deluge as that which was found by George Smith. But whereas the copy of it which he discovered was made for the library of Nineveh in the seventh century B.C., the newly-found tablet of Sippara was written in the reign of Ammi-zadok, the fourth successor of Khammurabi or Amraphel in the age of Abraham. Even then the text was already old. The Babylonian copy contains the word *khibi* or 'lacuna,' indicating that some of the characters on the tablet from which it has been copied had been rendered illegible by age. For the origin of the text we are therefore referred to a period considerably earlier than the second millennium before the Christian era. As this text agrees with the supposed combination of the two documents, Elo-