

An Hour with the Editor

THE ROMAN EMPERORS

It is a strange coincidence that the end of the Roman Empire followed close upon the formal proclamation by Theodosius of the Nicæan form of Christianity as the state religion. While Constantine had admitted the new religion to the first place among all the faiths of Rome, and had himself just before his death formally accepted it, the rivalry between the Athanasians and the Arians made it impossible for any one to say just what Christianity officially was. Dispute waxed warm over the relative positions of God the Father and God the Son, the difference between the two branches of the Church being substantially the same as that now existing between the Unitarians and the orthodox denominations. Theodosius was not baptized until he had reigned for a year, and only underwent the ceremony then at the importunity of the bishops, who pointed out to him that his recent illness and the fact that he was about to set out against the Goths combined to form an unanswerable reason why he should conform to the ordinances of the Church. Accordingly on February 28, 380, he was baptized. Immediately after the ceremony he issued the following edict:

"It is our pleasure that all the nations that are governed by our clemency and moderation should steadfastly adhere to the religion which was taught by St. Peter to the Romans; which faithful tradition has preserved, and which is now professed by the Pontiff Damasus and by Peter, Bishop of Alexandria, a man of apostolic holiness. According to the discipline of the Apostles and the doctrine of the Gospel let us believe the sole deity of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost; under and equal majesty and a pious Trinity. We authorize the followers of this doctrine to assume the title of Catholic Christians; and as we judge that all others are extravagant madmen, we brand them with the infamous name of Heretics; and declare that their conventicles shall no longer usurp the respectable appellation of churches. Besides the condemnation of divine justice, they must expect to suffer the severe penalties which our authority, guided by heavenly wisdom, shall think proper to inflict upon them."

It is related that Theodosius was induced to accept the Nicæan doctrine by the following incident: He had proclaimed his eldest son Arcadius to be Augustus, and shortly thereafter, when the two were seated on their thrones, the Bishop of Iconium approached. He saluted Theodosius with proper respect, but treated Arcadius as he would any other child. Indignant, Theodosius commanded the guards to remove the Bishop, who, as he was being thrust out of the door, turned and said: "Such is the treatment, O Emperor, that the King of Heaven will extend to all who refuse to acknowledge the equal majesty of His Son." Theodosius was immensely impressed. He embraced the Bishop, and from that time forward his mind was diverted from toleration of the Arian creed.

Reference has been made to the expedition which Theodosius led against Maximus in Gaul, an expedition that proved very successful so far as the overthrow of that rebel was concerned, but very disastrous to Rome, because of the slaughter of so many of her best soldiers. Chiefly, however, was it pregnant with fate for the Empire, because with it, as a leader of a division, was Alaric the Goth, who thus was afforded an opportunity to observe the fields which awaited the conquest of a courageous man. He returned when the overthrow of Maximus was accomplished, but began forthwith to form his plans, which had so potent an effect upon the history of the world. Theodosius placed Valentinian, son of the first emperor of that name, upon the throne of the West, but that youth did not long survive his elevation. Nor did Theodosius, for within four months of his great victory over Maximus he died. He left the Empire to his two sons; Arcadius, the elder, was given the East, and Honorius was given the West. Neither of these princes was a man of any force of character and their reigns were disastrous.

There is running through history a strange spirit of romance. For a long time the Emperors had disregarded the city of Rome itself. The capital of the West was Milan and of the East Constantinople, and during the reigns of Constantine and his successors, the latter had been the seat of the chief power, the West having been looked upon as under the general suzerainty of the East. When Honorius became Emperor, he removed his capital from Milan to Rome. This was in 395. Fifteen years later Alaric marched into the city and effaced the Empire of the West. The imperial dignity returned to the city, in which it was born, only to die.

Honorius was a weak king, but he had a minister of great talent in Stilicho, who filled the position of adviser to Arcadius as well. Stilicho is one of the finest figures in the history of his time, a soldier of great skill, a diplomat of shrewdness, and a man of probity. If any man could have stayed the decline of the Empire, he could have done so; but this great political fabric was weakened by decay within and by the pressure of foes from without. We have seen how the Goths were permitted to settle in what we now call the Balkan Peninsula, and how they were induced to serve in the Roman army. It soon became apparent to these people that the Roman themselves had become effete. The more vigorous class of the citizens had suffered so severely on battlefields either against the Bar-

barians or in civil wars, that they were greatly reduced in numbers; the luxurious and licentious habits of a large element of the population had unfitted the youth for the trials of war campaigns. On the other hand, the Goths had preserved the ruggedness which they brought with them from beyond the confines of the Empire, and they only needed a leader to assert their supremacy over the feeble race to whom they had become subject. They found such a leader in Alaric.

The ostensible reason of the revolt of the Goths was the diminution of the annual subsidy payable to them by the Emperor of the East, but this was only the occasion, not the cause, of their uprising. This is to be sought in their natural restlessness under the yoke of Rome. Hardly was Theodosius buried when they exhibited their determination to resume their ancient warlike character and policies, and they planned for the capture of Constantinople itself. Rufinus, the minister of Arcadius, was able to divert them from that purpose, but only by giving his tacit assent to their invasion of Greece, a part of the Empire which for many years had been free from the ravages of war. Alaric thereupon led his force southwards, pillaging as he went and laying the whole country desolate. (The fact that the people made practically no resistance did not save them from rapine, and for months the whole land was a scene of desolation and woe. Stilicho set out from Rome with a force with which he expected to be able to hem Alaric within the narrow limits of the Peloponnese, but that crafty warrior made good his escape and returned laden with booty to Illyrium, of which province he was appointed governor by the timid Arcadius, who hoped by this means to save his own throne. Alaric was content. He had been to Italy with Theodosius and knew the triumphs that awaited a daring leader in that direction, and so he rested in content in his new office for six years, preparing meanwhile for his invasion of the West.

TALES OF ANCIENT CIVILIZATIONS

Some of the Exploits of Tiglath-pileser of Assyria

The Assyrians were cast in a heavier mould than their contemporaries the Egyptians. They came of an old Semitic strain and were first and foremost a race of warriors. The pictures and statues preserved to us show that in figure they were tall and straight, broad shouldered, and small at the hips, with a wonderful muscular development. The head was small and well-shaped, the features large, especially the eyes, masses of curling black hair covered the head, and a beard was worn as a rule, and allowed to grow its full length. History tells us that these Assyrians were stiff-necked and proud, and rather prided themselves on the cold aloofness of their manner, and their pitilessness toward their enemies.

Tiglath-pileser is the first of the Assyrian kings of whom we have anything like a definite record. He came to the throne about 1100 B.C., and inherited from his father, Assur-shishi, a prosperous kingdom and a well-organized army. In person he was taller than most men, of prodigious strength and courage, and an indomitable ambition. There were no difficulties too great for him to overcome in his wars to subdue the neighboring country. He ascended mountains, cut roads through the solid rock, built bridges and penetrated through the densest forests where no man had ever ventured before. "My master Assur," runs the panegyrics on the stela, "commanded me to attack their proud summits, which no king has ever visited. I assembled my chariots and my foot-soldiers, and I passed between the Idni and the Aia, by a difficult country, across cloud-capped mountains whose peaks were as the point of a dagger, and unfavorable to the progress of my chariots; I therefore left my chariots in reserve, and I climbed these steep mountains. The community of the Kurkhi assembled its numerous troops, and in order to give me battle they entrenched themselves upon Azubtagish, on the slopes of the mountain, an incommensurable position. I came into conflict with them and I vanquished them."

We will give an account of only one of Tiglath-pileser's expeditions; from it the reader may gain an idea as to how the battles of old Assyria were fought.

Tiglath-pileser was not only attracted to Nairi, in Asia Minor, by his love of conquest, but by his desire for acquiring the rich mines of that country, and when its petty kings received word that the great warrior-king of the Assyrians was on the march to cross the Euphrates, though they had been quarreling among themselves, they waived their own difficulties and united to repel the invader. Therefore, when Tiglath-pileser and his army had made a safe journey across the river, the twenty-three kings of Nairi, and the sixty chiefs of the same neighborhood, with their numerous fierce following, attacked him without warning. It was a terrible battle. Though the Assyrians were surprised, they made a swift rally, and "like the whirlwind of Ramman," bore down upon the savage host. For only a little while could the massed bands of the Nairi kings' armies withstand the charge. They fell before the arrows and spears of the invaders, and the blood from the battle-field ran down in streams to the river, which, encircled, swept upon its way. The chiefs who had withdrawn after the first onslaught, now felt it expedient to throw down their

arms, and surrender. Their domain extended as far as the "Upper Sea," which some say was the Black, and others the Caspian sea. Tiglath-pileser accepted their submission and spared the lives of most of them, though some were offered as sacrifices to the god Shamash. Furthermore, they were commanded to pay a tax of 1200 stallions and 2000 bulls. Only one of the chiefs had refused to submit to him, and had held out with his army until the bitter end, and him the victorious king sent as a captive to Assur, where he was forced to kneel to the Assyrian gods, after which he too was given his freedom.

When the news of his great victory reached the ears of the kings of other countries, the Delta, for instance, where the Egyptian Pharaoh feared for his own safety upon the throne, they sent to Tiglath-pileser wonderful gifts of gold and merchandise, and rare animals such as these old-time monarchs loved to have about them. Furthermore, he was almost embarrassed with the multitude of beautiful princesses and slaves sent to grace his harem.

In the course of his marching Tiglath-pileser reached the shores of the Mediterranean, being the first Oriental sovereign who for many centuries had penetrated so far west. The "Sea of the Setting Sun" it was called in those days, and Tiglath-pileser procured a boat and, going out upon the waters with a few of his men, was able, to his great delight, to kill a porpoise. He traveled as far as the Nahr-el-Kelb, where his stela with the altar in front of it has been found.

Besides the wars which Tiglath-pileser waged so successfully, winning for himself the title of greatest of warrior kings, he was famous as a hunter, and his delight in the chase was only second to his love of war. The following is an extract descriptive of this sport of kings from Maspero's History of Egypt, Vol. VI., p. 178:

"They set out on these hunting expeditions with quite a small army of charioteers and infantry, and were often away several days at a time, provided urgent business did not require their presence in the palace. They started their quarry with the help of large dogs, and followed it over hill and dale until they got within bow shot; if it was but slightly wounded and turned on them, they gave it the finishing stroke with their lances without dismounting. Occasionally, however, they were obliged to follow their prey into places where horses could not easily penetrate; then a hand-to-hand conflict was inevitable. The lion would rise on his hind quarters and endeavor to lay its pursuer low with a stroke of its mighty paw, but only to fall pierced to the heart by his sword or lance. This kind of encounter demanded great presence of mind and steadiness of hand; the Assyrians were, therefore, trained to it from their youth up, and no hunter was permitted to engage in these terrible encounters without long preliminary practice. Seeing the lion as they so frequently did, and at such close quarters, they came to know it quite as well as the Egyptians. . . . The 'rimu,' or urur, was, perhaps, even a more formidable animal to encounter than any of the felidae, owing to the irresistible fury of its attack. No one would dare, except in case of dire necessity, meet him on foot. The loose flowing robes which the king and the nobles never put aside—not even in such perilous pastimes as these, were ill-fitted for the quick movements required to avoid the attack of such an animal, and those who were unlucky enough to quit their chariot ran a terrible risk of being gored or trodden underfoot in the encounter. It was the custom, therefore, to attack the beast by arrows, and to keep it at a distance. If the animal were able to come up with its pursuer, the latter endeavored to seize it by the horn at the moment when it lowered its head, and to drive his dagger into its neck. If the blow were adroitly given, it severed the spinal cord, and the beast fell in a heap as if struck by lightning. A victory over such animal was an occasion for great rejoicing, and solemn thanks were offered to Assur and Ishtar, the patrons of the chase, at the evening sacrifice."

"THE LETTER KILLETH"

If we could sum up the disputes, dissensions, heart-burnings, persecutions and blood-sheddings that have taken place because of different understandings of certain expressions in the Bible, the total would be an appalling one. And yet no living person has ever seen, and there is no person who can be said with certainty to have seen, the original text of any one of the Books in the whole Sacred Canon and to have copied it. Tradition has it that the Pentateuch, or the first five Books of the Old Testament were written either during or shortly after the time of Moses, and with some of the later Books were preserved until about eight hundred years after the death of this great leader, when they were destroyed, and were re-written under the direction of Ezra, partly from memory and partly from fragments of the ancient writings that had been preserved. But be this as it may, there is no doubt that the Old Testament, as we now have it, was in existence at the time of Christ and had been looked upon as sacred for a long period previously. By this it is not meant, as some may suppose, that our English version is a literal translation of the ancient Hebrew version, for there is by no means literal similarity between all the ancient manuscripts. The identity is in spirit and substance. The verbal variations are of no very great importance, for the rules laid down among the Jews for

the preservation of ancient manuscripts were such as to secure accuracy. For this reason although there are extant no Hebrew manuscripts of the Old Testament written more than a thousand years ago, no one disputes the close fidelity of what we have to the originals, which were destroyed. Nevertheless, it is practically impossible for a series of documents to have been preserved through all the vicissitudes that befell the Jewish people two thousand years and upwards without some deviations from the original having crept in; wherefore it seems unreasonable to insist upon the verbal accuracy of any of the Hebrew manuscripts, and to make the acceptance of this verbal infallibility a test of faith.

Concerning the New Testament there is even greater uncertainty, for there were no rules to secure accuracy in regard to them. Of New Testament manuscripts there are known to be 3209. These do not all include the whole New Testament, and indeed very few of them do so. They are for the most part either different versions of some of the Books, or more generally of the parts of one or more of the Books. What is supposed to be the oldest of them all is a papyrus leaf containing a part of Matthew's Gospel, which is thought to be at least a century older than any other manuscript. Eusebius, who in the year 301 compiled fifty copies of the Bible for the use of the churches, is authority for the statement that all the original manuscripts of the New Testament were destroyed during the persecution of Diocletian. Eusebius quotes Paphia, who lived in 140, as saying that a presbyter told him that Peter dictated "instruction according as required, but without giving exactly our Lord's words." This has been supposed to refer to what is known as Mark's Gospel. A very great deal of uncertainty surrounds the Gospel by John; but it is foreign to the purpose of this article to pursue the inquiry in that direction, for our only point is to show the exceedingly great improbability that we have translations of the originals of any of the Books exactly as they were written.

Insistence upon literal infallibility for either the Old or the New Testament is of comparatively recent date. When Eusebius, better known as St. Jerome, his full name having been Eusebius Hieronymus, had completed his translation of the Scripture, which came to be known as the Vulgate and was accepted as authoritative for a thousand years, he was attacked as heretical and revolutionary, and his work was said to be impious and calculated to undermine the Church. A similar reception greeted Wyclif's translation into English, and that of Tyndal met with the same treatment. The Bishop of London burnt every copy of the latter that he could buy. Tyndal using the money to pay for printing other copies, and this destruction was not due to any hostility to the Bible, but simply to the prejudice against new translations. There are many people who today feel that way towards the King James version, which is that commonly used in English-speaking countries. The Revised Version, published some years ago, has never attained any popularity, although there is no doubt that it exhibits the best scholarship that has ever been applied to translation and the greatest industry that has ever been employed in the collection of manuscripts. The Revised New Testament was issued in 1881; the Revised Old Testament in 1885. Since then the American Committee on Revision has been continuing its labors, and other revisions have appeared in France, Germany, Norway, Sweden and Denmark.

In reading the King James version it is to be borne in mind that the meaning of English words has greatly changed since his time. Take, for example, the word often rendered "judgment." Modern scholarship thinks this ought to be translated "justice." Mark the difference this would make. In Psalm XXXVII, we read, "The Lord loveth judgment," which suggests a deity who delights in sitting in judgment upon mankind. Translate the sentence to mean "the word loveth justice," and we have quite a different idea. One of the most notable changes is in the translation of that passage in Job which begins, "I know that my Redeemer liveth," and closes with the words, "yet in my flesh shall I see God." The Revised version says: "Yet without my flesh shall I see God." Certainly we have here a very wide distinction. Another example may be given. We read in the King James version, "Now faith is the substance of things hoped for." Modern scholarship makes this read, "the assurance of things hoped for," a meaning very much more in keeping with Christ's teaching than the other. To say that by faith we can make sure what we hope for is much more intelligible than to say that faith is the substance of things we hope for.

These brief observations show the unwisdom and the danger of laying stress upon any word in the Sacred Canon. The progress of Christianity has suffered more, perhaps, from this than from any other cause, for it has led to disunion, and disunion is the parent of weakness and a stumbling block to seekers after truth.

THE MINERAL KINGDOM

As far as is known the basic form of all matter is mineral. That which we call life seems to be sustained by emanations from the Sun operating through what is called the ether. Whether life had its origin in these emanations no one is able to say. The the-

ory accepted by astronomers and geologists at present is that all visible matter was at one time in a nebulous condition. It was "without form and void" and darkness was upon it, for it was inert. Scientific investigation justifies the assumption that the visible, orderly Universe was once invisible and chaotic. It is not necessary here to push the explanation further and suggest how by motion the invisible became visible; it is sufficient to say that the condition in which all things were in the visible beginning was mineral. If the nebulae which are now seen in the sky are what they appear to be, they consist of minerals in an infinitely minute state of minute subdivision, constantly in motion, and hence luminous. They are really in a condition just one remove from the gaseous, such a state as water vapor is when it is first to be seen issuing from a teakettle. The earth was in that condition once, but in the course of countless ages some of the metals have become solid; others remain liquid or gaseous. The air and water are minerals, the former in a gaseous state and the latter in a fluid state. If the temperature were so low that the ice would never melt, residents of the earth, if there could be any under such circumstances, would regard ice as much a mineral as we regard a piece of marble. A degree of cold is possible and can be produced artificially that will convert air into a liquid. Theoretically a degree of cold is possible that will convert air into a solid. On the other hand as a relatively moderate heat will convert quicksilver, which is a metal, into a liquid, so a little higher temperature will convert it into a gas. These illustrations support the statement that everything that is not a plant or an animal is a mineral.

In ordinary conversation we use the word "mineral" in a very narrow sense. The word really means anything that is not organic, that is that is without organs of any kind. Colloquially we confine it to metallic ores. Thus we hear men say that a certain rock has or has not mineral in it, or that a certain area is mineralized. But every rock is mineral, and every area is mineralized. Another inexact expression in common use is "metalliferous rock." All rock is metalliferous. A piece of chalk is metalliferous, and by the necessary treatment it can be resolved into the metals of which it is composed. At least three metals go to make up a piece of chalk. Calcium, carbon and oxygen. Calcium is a laboratory product; every one has seen carbon in crystalline form in the diamond; no one has ever seen oxygen in solid form, but we know it can be liquefied, and its solidification is therefore theoretically possible. Solid oxygen is as much a mineral as solid quicksilver is, and so is carbon when it has been freed from association with oxygen. Everything material has a metallic base, and given the necessary conditions could be converted into a metal. Of course when we speak of metalliferous rock we mean that it carries metals that can be used in a metallic form.

Most metals are grey; the great exceptions are gold and silver. It is open to doubt if even an expert could distinguish with certainty between a minute particle of iron and one of calcium, or magnesium or of the metals that are not found in nature in metallic form. Nature seems to have set gold and silver in a class by themselves. Their beauty is incomparable among metals. Few metals are found in a metallic state. The only ones that are so found at all commonly are gold, silver, platinum and copper. All the others, with perhaps a few rare exceptions, are in combination with other substances, one of the elements that is found in every compound being oxygen. The various elements so compounded are not simply mechanically mixed, but are chemically combined. They cannot be mechanically separated. These combination of elements constitute the rocks and the soil which form the earth's surface and extend beneath it as far as investigation, direct and indirect, has been able to go. We seem justified in assuming that when the earth first took its present form it was a mass of mineral; in some of it solid, some liquid and some gaseous.

Speaking in non-scientific terms, all rocks may be said to be classified under two heads, the crystalline and the non-crystalline, or those that exhibit in their structure the action of heat, and those that exhibit the action of water. There is an intermediate class which exhibits the action of both water and heat. A familiar example of the first named class is granite; a familiar example of the second is slate. An example of the intermediary stage is found in schist. Geologists class rocks under three heads, the igneous, the sedimentary and the metamorphic, the first being those whose present form is due to the action of heat, the second those whose form results from the action of water, and the third the intermediate group. A fourth class has been suggested, to be called Surficial, which is a class that has been commonly included in the sedimentary, the latter term being confined by those who employ the new one to rocks formed from deposits in running water exclusively. All rocks were originally igneous, the sedimentary being due to the erosion or disintegration by some other process of the igneous, and the metamorphic being the result of the application of heat to the sedimentary. Soil is due to the erosion or disintegration of rocks and their oxidation in a disintegrated state. With these definitions in mind we shall proceed in subsequent articles to deal with a few of the leading features of the mineral kingdom, premising that we have purposely made the definitions non-scientific; but they are sufficiently accurate for practical purposes.