thesis of the missionary spirit, which is the spirit of Christ.
The partial god was not always successful. The abhorred deitics of opposing peoples, in the persons of their devotees, overcame him temporarily, and often for long periods. Prophets and philosophers arose to explain this sad phenomenon. The Zoroastrian, and others no doubt hefore his time, di' so by means of Dualism, holding the existenee of two opposing spiritual kingdoms, the one of light, the other of darkness. The kingdom of evil had its emanations equally with the kingdom of good, and these contended with one another for the mastery with varying success. That these emanations. were but new arrangements of the local gods is evident, for many Persian devils were Vedic gods, and vice versa. Even in the Hellenic system, wherein there was no well-defined dualism, and the trinities of which are spurious, there were contests great and small, petty jealousies and quarrels among the gods, teste Homer, and partiality, instead of being removed by this, became intensified. Nay, the coward in the battle of life deserted the worship of the better gods, such as the Mexican Quetzalcoatl, for that of such recognized evil ones as Tetzeatlipoca, that he might propitiate the devil and thus escape from his malicious activity. Now the Bible rejects the simple dualism of Zoroaster, yet plainly recognizes the existence of a kingdom of evil in revolt against that of God, and, in so far as this earth is concerned, at times triumphant over it.
Before the accession of Cyrus, Magism had triumphed over Mazdeism, and a new god, Zerouane Akherene, or uncreated time, was made supreme over Ormuzd and Ahriman alike. This is paralleled, although no collusion can be established between the Hebrew and Persion systems, by the attitude of Jehovah as supreme over Satan, the adversary, in the preface to the book of Job. Opposition to simple dualism also appears in Isaiah xlv, 7: "I form the light and create darkness: I make pence and create evil;" and in Amos iii., 6: "Shall there be evil in a city, and the Lord hath not done it." Nevertheless the seẹuel to the latter is, "Surely the Lord will do nothing," so that little can be built upon the text. Isaiah, how-

