

THE PRESBYTERIAN AND REFORMED REVIEW

No. 2—April, 1890.

I.

THE RELATION OF CHRISTIAN ART TO THEOLOGY.

I.

THERE is a reasonable excuse for the many who see no connection between the development of art and that of theological ideas in the history of Christianity, and fail to perceive that art and literature were twin sisters in the service of religion, inspired by the same thoughts, but appealing, the one to the sentiment, the other to the intellect. For this connection was severed long since—fully four centuries ago—never to be fully renewed, and its existence can now be conceived only by an effort of the imagination conjuring up the ghost of departed realities that appeal no more to the common consciousness of the nineteenth century. In art, far more than in literature, the scene shifts as rapidly as the colors of a sunset: words retain their meaning, but a work of art has a different one for every generation. It is strangely difficult for us to grasp the meaning of the fact that through the general illiteracy of the people, works of religious art were the direct means of instruction in religious belief for nine-tenths of the body of Christians up to the time of the Reformation. And yet, what use has been made of this fact? In what history is the aid of the monuments called in systematically? In what work on the development of Christian theology is a place given to the paintings and sculptures which, through a period of over a thousand years, show more strikingly than words the beliefs of the people and their teachers, with all their slight, temporal and local variations? As a modern writer well says: “The faintest shadows that darkened, or the lightest breath that disturbed the

He contributes an article on Barth's explanation of the prefixed *nun* in noun formations, which appeared in the *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*, April, 1887. Of course, since he himself long ago made the same assumption, he agrees with Barth's identification of the formation by prefixed *nun* with that by prefixed *mem*; and denies, except for the *nomen patientis* (see p. 179), the derivation of such nouns from the Niphal. He goes further, however, and fully accepts, as well as confirms by additional examples, the theory, original with Barth, that the use of *nun* instead of *mem* is due to the influence of a labial in the root. In another paper he publishes a long list of such formations.

Haupt also prints the text of the twelfth tablet of the Babylonian Nimrod-epic with a commentary thereto. Quite appropriately, as it were to supplement the publication of the text, the same indefatigable worker prints his latest collation of the various fragments and copies of these legends. Among these tales is found, as is well known, the story of the flood. Is the rainbow mentioned therein? Did Istar "raise aloft the great bows which Anu had made?" Haupt formerly considered the sign used in the text "*nim* to be a chirographical error [for another and very similar character meaning 'bow'], occasioned perhaps by the preceding *zumbê*, 'flies,' for which *nim* is an ideogram;" and accordingly rendered the sign by "Kasati" (?), and translated it as "bows" (?) (KAT², S. 59 u. 63). In the glossary, however, he retracted this opinion (S. 517), and now in this collation he reaffirms his retraction on the same ground, viz., that two copies "clearly show *nim*, which is probably connected with the *nim* in the ideogram for flash of lightning."

Enough has been said to reveal the character of the new publication and to indicate the contributions which it has already made to Semitic learning.

Princeton.

JOHN D. DAVIS.

The following works may also be mentioned:

Sammlung von Assyrischen und Babylonischen Texten in Umschrift und Uebersetzung. In Verbindung mit Dr. L. Abel, Dr. C. Bezold, Dr. P. Jensen, Dr. F. E. Peiser, Dr. H. Winckler, herausgegeben von Eberhard Schrader. Band i. Mit chronologischen Beigaben und einer Karte von H. Kiepert. (Berlin: H. Reuther's Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1889.) This is the first volume of a cuneiform library which is to be published under the editorship in chief of Prof. Schrader, of Berlin. The object of the undertaking is to present in a connected whole, and in chronological order, a transcription and German translation of the cuneiform texts of Assyria and Babylonia. Prof. Schrader's well-known system of transliterations has been followed. This volume brings us down to the end of the reign of Ramman-nirari III, 783 B.C. Supplements contain the so-called synchronous history of Assyria and Babylonia by Drs. Peiser and Winckler, and the Eponymous Lists by Prof. Schrader. The map by Prof. Kiepert is historical, being based on the statements of the inscriptions, and is so colored as to denote as far as possible the extent of the Assyrian empire during any reign from Asurnatsirabal, 885 B.C., till Ramman-nirari III, inclusive. The usefulness of the work is increased by the clearness and fullness of the explanatory remarks in the preface. The use of the hyphen for connecting syllables, which in the original text are denoted by distinct signs, enables those who are acquainted with the Assyrian to judge in most cases as to the probability or certainty of a given transliteration. Translations which are looked upon as merely probable are denoted by a following interrogation point. These common signs are supplemented by foot-notes, giving various readings, corrections, other possible translations and illustrative remarks. The work may be recommended

as embodying the latest results of the researches of Assyriologists. It is full of matter interesting and instructive to the theologian as well as to the historian. Nothing yet published is equal to it in thoroughness and trustworthiness.—*Die Keilschrifttexte Asurbanipals, Königs von Assyrien* (668-626 v. Chr.). Nach dem in London copirten Grundtext mit Transscripten, Uebersetzung, Kommentar und vollständigem Glossar. Von Samuel Alden Smith. Heft iii: Unedirte Briefe, Depeschen, Omentexte, u. s. w. (Leipzig: Verlag von Eduard Pfeiffer, 1889.) This number completes the texts published by the author relating to the time of Asurbanipal. In addition to the matter spoken of on the title page, it contains twenty-eight pages of corrections and additional remarks by Theodore G. Pinches, and four pages by Carl Bezold. The author mars his preface by another of his unseemly attacks on Prof. Delitzsch. The general accuracy and reliability of his text are vouched for by Messrs. Pinches and Bezold. Most of his transliterations and translations will be accepted, no doubt, by Assyriologists. We would like to know how the author derives the form *mu-muk-ri-ish-ii* from the root *karah* (p. 49). We cannot understand, also, why he should translate *sha i-ra-na-ka-a-ni* by *which love thee* (welche dich lieben), as if the verb were from *raham*, *to love*, when in the note, several pages further on, he says that he does not understand this sentence; that the verb seems to be from *ramak*, *to pour out*; but that this does not seem to him to suit the connection here. In this, as in his other works, Mr. Smith, however, is well carrying out his theory that the interests of Assyriology will best be subserved at present by the publication of unedited texts with transliterations, translations, remarks and vocabularies.—*A Classified List of All Simple and Compound Cuneiform Ideographs Occurring in the Texts Hitherto Published*. With their Assyro-Babylonian equivalents, phonetic values, etc. Compiled by Rudolph E. Brünnow, Ph.D. (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1889.) The object of this book is to furnish the student with a convenient and trustworthy work of reference and to save him the labor and time which would be expended in the preparation of a sign list for himself. Such a book has long been needed, as every one knows who has attempted to master the almost innumerable meanings of the cuneiform signs. In view of the difficulties which necessarily accompany the preparation and publishing of such a work, we think that the author and publishers are alike deserving of great praise for its successful completion. There are few scholars who devote merely a portion of their time to Assyro-Babylonian studies to whom this syllabary will not be a *sine qua non* of pleasurable, profitable, or rapid, original reading of even the simpler inscriptions. One may judge of the magnitude of the undertaking from the fact that it gives 14,487 different signs and phonetic values. Usefulness for reference is enhanced by supplementary lists of non-Semitic and of Semitic phonetic values, and by a cuneiform index.—*Der Thontafelfund von El Amarna*. Heft i. Herausgegeben von Hugo Winckler. Nach den Originalen autographirt von Ludwig Abel. (Berlin: W. Spemann, 1889.) This is the first number of the Communications from the Oriental Collections of the Royal Museum at Berlin. It contains twenty-seven letters, which were written by the kings of Babylonia, Alashiya, Mitani and other countries to kings of Egypt during the fifteenth century B.C. The tablets on which these letters are written were found, in the spring of 1887-88, at El Amarna, in Middle Egypt. About 300 tablets have thus far been recovered, some of which were published by Prof. Sayce and Mr. Budge in the Proceedings of the S. B. A. for June, 1888. The letters published by Dr. Winckler are a part of those which were secured for the Berlin Museum through the liberality of Mr. J. Simon, of Berlin, and the unselfish efforts of Mr. Theodore Graf, of Vienna. Other letters from this collection, containing

the despatches from governors and satraps, will be published in the next number, while a third will contain the remainder. In this first number the two most peculiar letters are one from the king of Atsapi, and another, twelve pages long, from the king of Mitani, the introduction to which is written in Assyrian, but the rest in languages which have not yet been interpreted.

Allegheny.

ROBERT DICK WILSON.

VI.—GENERAL LITERATURE.

ESSAYS UPON HEREDITY AND KINDRED BIOLOGICAL PROBLEMS. By AUGUST WEISMANN. Translated by POULTON, etc. Pp. 455. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1889.

Weismann's attempt to solve an old problem has excited great interest in scientific circles, and furnishes a fine example of legitimate scientific speculation. When, over two centuries ago, the microscope revealed the spermatozoa, or male reproductive structures, the "animalculist" philosophers fancied that these quasi-animalcules are the real germs, which are to be merely nursed and reared by the eggs, and, consequently, that the offspring entirely came from the male parent. On the other hand, the "ovists" argued that the offspring proceed from the female; and their view seemed to be established by the discovery of parthenogenesis, where female animals produce multitudes of young without any contribution by the male. Later researches have established that there is normally a fusion of nuclear germ-substance derived from both parents; but still the problem remains why this is necessary or even beneficial, and how it is thus possible to transmit ancestral characteristics, and to give rise to variations, so that no two of the same family are identical, and also what is the relation of parthenogenesis to the usual course. This problem exercised Charles Darwin, whose theory of pangensis was more ingenious than convincing; and it has been subsequently attempted by many other biologists. These have all assumed without sufficient evidence that accidental or acquired peculiarities of parents may be inherited by their posterity, and may even give rise to a permanent variation of race. Thus it was taught that if a cat lost its tail by accident some of its kittens might be born without tails; a doctrine which, if true, ought under the regime of spring-traps to furnish a tailless variety of rat. By reëxamining the evidence, and by original experiments on mice, Weismann has proven that at least in ordinary cases acquired characters are not transmitted; he had more than a thousand mice, all produced from parents whose tails had been amputated, yet none of them had the tail wanting or even short. He has further startled the scientific world with a theory of heredity which, if true, will have wide influence; and of which he justly alleges that whether true or false it must at least be a necessary stage in the advancement of our knowledge. He holds that every animal or plant consists of two parts: (1) an inheritable part, derived from parents and transmissible to offspring; this part, which he terms the germ-plasm, is immortal, being received as living matter, and a portion of it transmitted in its living condition to form the germ of the young, and so on to remote generations; (2) an accessory part, constituting (in all except the lowest organisms) nearly the whole animal or plant, derived from the inherited plasm by the help of nutriment and growth, and not in any way transmissible to posterity. The body is, in fact,