

**DISCOVERY OF AN ASSYRIAN LIBRARY 3,500 YEARS OLD.**

*Professor Sayce's Description of It.*

The Victoria Institute of London held its annual meeting at Adelphi Terrace on July 1st. An immense audience crowded the Hall in every part, the President, Sir George Stokes, Bart., President of the Royal Society, took the chair. The proceedings were commenced by mentioning that the Emperor of Brazil had sent a message expressing special interest in the Institute's *Journal*, and desired to obtain it regularly for translation. The report for the past year was then read by Captain Francis Petrie, the honorary Secretary, by which it appeared that the number of home, foreign, and Colonial members had increased to over 1,300, and there had been an important advance in the practical work in the Institute in investigating philosophical and scientific questions, especially any questions used by those who unhappily sought to attack religion in the name of science.

The adoption of the report was moved by Sir Henry Barkley, G. C. B., F. R. S., and seconded Admiral Sir Leopold McClintock, F. R. S., after which it was announced that family matters, consequent on the death of his father, prevented Professor Sayce's presence, and he had chosen the Rev. Dr. Wright, author of "The Hittites," to read the Address. It gave an historical description of what has become known in regard to the conquests of Amenophis III., as shown by the archives of his palace, which have only lately been discovered, and which the Professor went last winter to investigate on the spot before writing the Address for the Victoria Institute. Of the tablets and inscriptions, he said:—"From them we learn that in the fifteenth century before our era,—a century before the Exodus,—active literary intercourse was going on throughout the civilized world of Western Asia, between Babylon and Egypt and the smaller states of Palestine, of Syria, of Mesopotamia, and even of Eastern Kappadokia. And this intercourse was carried on by means of the Babylonian language and the complicated Babylonian script. This implies that, all over the civilized East, there were libraries and schools where the Babylonian language and literature were taught and learned. Babylonian appeared to have been as much the language of diplomacy and cultivated society as French has become in modern times, with the difference that, whereas it does not take long to learn to read French, the cuneiform syllabary require years of hard labour and attention before it could be acquired. We can now understand the meaning of the name of the Canaanitish city which stood near Hebron, and which seems to have been one of the most important of the towns of Southern Palestine. Kirjath-Sopher, or "Book-town," must have been the seat of a famous library, consisting mainly, if not altogether, as the Tell-Amarna tablets inform us, of clay tablets inscribed with cuneiform characters. As the city also bore the name of Debir, or "Sanctuary," we may conclude that the tablets were stored in its chief temple, like the libraries of Assyria and Babylonia. It may be that they are still lying under the soil, awaiting the day when the spade of the excavator shall restore them to the light. The literary influence of Babylonia in the age before the Israelitish conquest of Palestine explains the occurrence of the names of Babylonian deities among the inhabitants of the West. Moses died on the summit of Mount Nebo, which received its name from the Babylonian god of literature, to whom the great temple of Borsippa was dedicated; and Sinai itself, the mountain "of Sin," testifies to a worship of the Babylonian Moon-

god, Sin, amid the solitudes of the desert. Moloch or Malik, was a Babylonian divinity like Rimmon, the Air god, after whom more than one locality in Palestine was named, and Anat, the wife, of Ann, the Sky-god, gave her name to the Palestinian Anab, as well as to Anathoth, the city of "Anat-goddesses."

In a careful reading of the tablets Canon Sayce came upon many ancient names and incidents known up to the present only from their appearance in the Bible. All these he carefully described, as well as several references in the tablets to the Hittites.

In regard to another point he said:—

"Ever since the progress of Egyptology made it clear that Ramesses II. was the Pharaoh of the oppression, it was difficult to understand how so long an interval of time as the whole period of the 18th Dynasty could lie between him and the 'new king' whose rise seems to have been followed almost immediately by the servitude and oppression of the Hebrews. The tablets of Tell-Amarna now show that the difficulty does not exist. Up to the death of Khu-en-Aten, the Semite had greater influence than the native in the land of Miraim."

Referring to those who have formed opinions as to the non-historical character of the Pentateuch, Professor Sayce said:—"The Tell-Amarna tablets have already overthrown the primary foundation on which much of this criticism has been built."

Professor Sayce closed his paper with a peroration of passing eloquence as to the duty of searching for the rich libraries that must lie buried beneath the sands of Syria and Palestine, a matter the importance of which has been urged in the Victoria Institute *Journal* more than once, especially in the last volume presented to all its supporters. A vote of thanks was passed to Professor Sayce for his splendid address, and to Dr. Wright for reading it. This was moved by the Lord Chancellor in a speech of great interest, in which he said there was nothing more interesting in the literary history of mankind than such discoveries as those alluded to in the address, which he considered a perfect mine of wealth. M. Navide, the Egyptian discoverer, expressed his admiration of the labours of Professor Sayce, and declared the discovery the greatest one of the present century.

**PARISH WORK.**

BY REV. M. M. MOORE.

Our reading of many parish papers shows that parish work, in all its branches as ordinarily done, has a very perplexing side to it. Unquestionably the permanent success of a parish depends largely upon the persons who do the work. In some parishes there is a current success, so to speak, because one man has put himself into every phase and feature of the work, and has himself done what others have left undone. That man is the Rector. He has made *himself* responsible (for the Lord nor the Church puts not upon him this table serving) for every detail of work. He has assumed the duties and management of all monetary matters, is a self-constituted finance committee of one, and where treasurers and secretaries fail, he rallies the women to his side, and becomes the corypheus, the leader of a work that constitutes no part of his ministry. He does the same with the details of Society or Guild work. He is designer and executor, head and feet, and all-round man. Of course there is success there, in such work as that, but we call it "current success." Parish reports an admiring public, relieved of its own tiresome work, and Church papers, all shout, See! But if the truth be told it is not parish success, it is *one man success*, and it is not success at all

in a healthy sense. The fact becomes evident when a change comes. When this artificial "parish" vigor is gone, there follows partial or entire collapse. The man who next follows, if he attends solely to his own business—the spiritualities of the parish—will soon be roused from his prayers and sermons by the clang and clatter of temporal duties half done, or not done at all, and perforce dragged down to the level of table serving. We believe heartily in the words of Bishop Tuttle: "A corner stone of civilization is *division and distribution of labor*. Then let us lay some duties, more that we do upon the laity. To a reasonable degree believe me, they will accept them, and try to discharge them. But when we impose those duties we must afterwards keep our hands off. They must have the responsibility of doing or not doing them!" It is pernicious clerical zeal that accepts or assumes the duties and responsibilities that, by Divine direction, rests upon the laity. It may elicit plaudits on all sides, and be exceeding pleasant to personal ambition to be able to show fine results for clerical business aptitude and financiering, but it is anything than charity to a parish to carry it on one's shoulders, in one's head, by one's hand and feet, that when it is left to itself matters begin to be at six and sevens. Parishes, like children, show the result of their training. And though the Rector must needs suffer many inconveniences, and much mortification, and not a little fault-finding—not always *sub rosa*—yet if he wants to raise and perfect the parish standard and character, rather than seek his own popularity, he can do no less than to point out and impose lawful duties, and then—"hands off," leaving to the laity, in the sight of God and to the Church, "the responsibility of doing or not doing."

**SELF-DENIAL.**

The word self-denial slips easily from our lips, and but seldom reaches deep into the motives of our lives.

Yet as prayer is the test of our faith toward God, so self-denial is the test of our love to man, and without these two, faith and love, there can be no earnestness in religion—we might say no religion at all.

And here, to guard against a mistake, let us look at the words of Christ: "If any man will come after Me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross daily, and follow Me."

While we deny ourselves we must follow Jesus. There is a self-denial which is not a following of Jesus.

Men often deny themselves in one respect in order to indulge themselves in another. The greatest drunkards often work the hardest, they deny themselves food and rest and warmth in order to have more to drink.

Again, self-denial for its own sake is not a following of Jesus. The priests of Baal cut themselves with stones; the Hindoos in India to this day torture themselves and go without food for days. But this is not self-denial of the cross of Jesus. He suffered; as the hymn says, He died to make us good. I cannot believe there would have been any merit in the sufferings and death of Christ Himself had there not been a world of guilty sinners to suffer for. In the matter of self-denial, as in everything else, the evil one has his counterfeit imitation of the work of Christ.

Let love then, the very spirit of the cross, be the guide of our self-denial, and we shall not go wrong. Let us bear pain and shame for love's sake, denying ourselves for others in small things that we may be accounted worthy of self-denial in greater things. Then, depend upon it, the burden of the cross will fall from us. We shall bear it as many thousand saints have born it, at first patiently, then willingly, then joyfully. The way of the cross shall be the road to heaven, the crown of thorns a crown of glory.—*Day of Rest.*