

# THE UNION SEMINARY MAGAZINE

---

NO. 3—JAN.-FEB., 1895.

---

## I.—LITERARY.

---

### REPLY TO BISHOP SPALDING ON CATHOLICISM AND APAISM.

Another periodical ground-swell of public feeling against the Catholic Church is on the rise. It has happened before in this country ; it has happened in other countries—not only in those which are recognized as Protestant, but in those which are recognized as Catholic. It has happened in Mexico ; it has happened in France ; it has happened in Italy ; it has happened in Germany ; it has happened in England. A great English statesman in a once celebrated pamphlet called out by the Vatican Council said\* : “To quiet-minded Roman Catholics, it must be a subject of infinite annoyance, that their religion is, on this ground more than any other, the subject of criticism ; more than any other, the occasion of conflicts with the State and of civil disquietude.” “All other Christian bodies are content with freedom in their own religious domain. Orientals, Lutherans, Calvinists, Presbyterians, Episcopalians, Non-Conformists, one and all, in the present day, contentedly and cheerfully accept the benefits of civil order ; never pretend that the State is not its own master ; master no religious claims to temporal possessions or advantages ; and consequently never are in perilous collision with the State. Nay, more, even so I believe it is with the mass of Roman Catholics individually. But not so with the leaders of their church, or with those who take pride in following the leaders.” “The

---

\*Gladstone on the Vatican Decrees, pp. 9-10-11.

## OTHER WITNESSES FROM THE DUST.

PROF. W. W. MOORE.

For special reasons, which need not now be stated, we will not at present continue our discussion of the interesting questions raised by the Tel el Amarna Tablets concerning the Patriarchal and Mosaic periods of Hebrew history. We will return to them in future numbers of this series, but for the present we will proceed at once to the exhumed records which relate to the period of the Kings. These are the most numerous of all the historical inscriptions recovered from the ruins of Nineveh, as well as in some respects the most important.

For a period of about three hundred years, extending from the days of Ahab and Elijah to the time of Cyrus the Great, the Biblical and the cuneiform records run side by side, supplementing, explaining, and confirming one another in the most remarkable manner.

The first Assyrian monarch who describes his relations to the Israelites is Shalmaneser II (858-823 B. C.), whose palace at Nimroud was unearthed by Layard in 1845. In his inscriptions he states that at the battle of Karkar he overthrew a great coalition of Western kings, among whom he mentions Ahab of Israel as having contributed to the opposing confederacy 2,000 chariots and 10,000 men. Some years later he marches again to the shores of the Mediterranean and there receives the tribute of a great number of vassal princes, among whom he names Jehu, king of Israel. On the famous black marble obelisk containing this inscription the tribute-bearers of Jehu, with their strongly marked Jewish features, may still be seen sculptured in bas relief.

We will not at present attempt to speak in detail of Tiglath-Pileser II and his copious records, of the tribute he exacted from Uzziah of Judah and Menahem of Israel, of the fatal folly of Ahaz in disregarding the counsel of Isaiah and appealing to Tiglath-Pileser for help against the Northern coalition, of the Assyrian's campaign against Damascus and Samaria of the conspiracy by which Pekah was slain and Hoshea established as king in his stead, of the fall of Damascus and the great "levee" held there by Tiglath-Pileser and his men-

tion of Ahaz as one of the subject princes who were present to do homage to the conqueror. "The words of the Bible are brief: King Ahaz went to Damascus to meet Tiglath-Pileser, King of Assyria (2 Kings XVI, 10). The very baldness of the notice in the sacred record makes the confirmation of it by the Assyrian inscription the more striking; and the two narratives, constructed without any reference to each other, and without any mutual design, fit each other with all the exactness of a lock and key." It is a curious fact that in the cuneiform inscriptions Ahaz is called *Jehoahaz*, which means "the possession of Jehovah," and this seems to have been his full name, but the sacred writers, apparently feeling that it would be a profanation thus to associate the name of Jehovah with a man who was a notorious apostate and idolater, invariably drop that part of his name and call him simply *Ahaz*.

There is a very remarkable illustration of the accuracy of the Biblical records in their brief account of the fall of Samaria—all the more striking because the place has proved to be a pitfall for uninspired writers like Josephus. In the earlier part of the account (2 Kings XVII.) the beginning of the siege is ascribed to Shalmaneser IV., but (in verse 6) where the fall of the city is described it is only said that "the king of Assyria took Samaria," the name of the king not being given. Josephus, supposing not unaturally that the last king mentioned was the one referred to, states in his history of this event, that *Shalmaneser* took the city and deported the people. But the contemporary cuneiform records have now informed us that Shalmaneser died during the progress of the siege and was succeeded by *Sargon*, and that it was he who captured the city and carried away the people. In the eighteenth chapter of 2 Kings there is another reference to this same event, and that too is characterized by the same rigid accuracy of statement: "It came to pass in the fourth year of King Hezekiah, which was the seventh year of Hoshea son of Elah King of Israel, that Sualmaneser King of Assyria came up against Samaria, and besieged it, And at the end of three years they took it"—not "*he* took it" but "*they* took it." Merely by the use of the plural form here the sacred writer avoids the mistake into which later historians have fallen. The very minuteness of this point makes it a singularly striking testimony to the superior trustworthiness of the Old Testament narratives.

The only explicit reference in the Bible to this Sargon who made an end of the kingdom of Israel occurs in a parenthesis in the book of Isaiah: "In the year that Tartan came to Ashdod (when Sargon King of Assyria sent him), and fought against Ashdod, and took it" (Iss. XX., I). As no such king was mentioned by any other writer, sacred or profane, for twenty-five hundred years, it was once freely asserted by the hostile critics that no such king ever existed, and that Isaiah had made a blunder. Now, however, the records of Sargon himself have risen from the dead to confute the cavil and confirm the Scripture. His was the first of the great palaces disintombed by the explorers in 1845, and one of his inscriptions describes the very expedition to Ashdod alluded to by the prophet in the passage just cited.

However unfamiliar the name of Sargon may have been before the discovery of his own ample records, that of his son and successor, Sennacherib, has been a household word for centuries. Not only are the references to him in the historical scriptures numerous and intensely interesting, but that unexampled disaster which befell him before Jerusalem, and by which he lost 185,000 men in a single night, has been celebrated in lofty phrase, not by inspired poets alone, but by uninspired singers as well. The familiar lines of Lord Byron occur to the mind at once:

"The Assyrian came down like the wolf on the fold,  
And his cohorts were gleaming in purple and gold;  
And the sheen of their spears was like stars on the sea,  
When the blue wave rolls nightly on deep Gallilee.

Like the leaves of the forest when Summer is green,  
That host with their banners at sunset were seen;  
Like the leaves of the forest when Autumn hath blown,  
That host on the morrow lay withered and strewn.

For the Angel of Death spread his wings on the blast,  
And breathed in the face of the foe as he pass'd!  
And the eyes of the sleepers wax'd deadly and chill,  
And their hearts but once heaved, and forever grew still."

We now have in the cuneiform records Sennacherib's own account of this campaign. He naturally glosses over the destruction of his army. It was not the custom of these oriental kings to record national humiliations. And he transfers the payment of Judah's tribute from the beginning of the campaign, when Hezekiah was vainly trying to buy off the

siege of Jerusalem, to the end, in order to put the best face on his unfortunate expedition and "round off his account with a description of his spoils." Perhaps it will interest my readers to have some extracts from this account in Sennacherib's own words :

"In the course of my campaigns I approached and captured Beth-Dagon, Joppt, Bene-berak and Azur, the cities of Zedekiah [king of Ashkelon], which did not at once submit to my yoke, and I carried away their spoil. The priests the chief men, and the common people of Ekron, who had thrown into chains their king Padi, because he was faithful to his oaths to Assyria, and had given him up to Hezekiah, the Jew, who imprisoned him like an enemy in a dark dungeon, feared in their hearts. . . . I marched against the city of Ekron, and put to death the priests and the chief men who had committed the sin (of rebellion), and I hung up their bodies on stakes all round the city. . . . I had Padi, their king, brought out from the midst of Jerusalem, and I seated him on the throne of royalty over them, and I laid upon him the tribute due to my majesty. But as for Hezekiah of Judah, who had not submitted to my yoke, forty-six of his strong cities, together with innumerable fortresses and small towns which depended on them, by overthrowing the walls and open attack, by battle, engines and battering-rams, I besieged, I captured. I brought out from the midst of them and counted as a spoil 200,150 persons, great and small, male and female, horses, mules, asses, camels, oxen and sheep without number. Hezekiah himself I shut up like a bird in a cage in Jerusalem, his royal city. I built a line of forts against him, and I kept back his heel from going out of the great gate of his city. I cut off his cities which I had spoiled from the midst of his land gave them to Metinti, king of Ashdod; Padi, king of Akron, and Zilbaal king of Gaza, and I made his country small. In addition to their former tribute and yearly gifts I added other tribute, and the homage due to my majesty, and I laid it upon them. The fear of the greatness of my majesty overwhelmed him, even Hezekiah, and he sent after me to Nineveh, my royal city, by way of gift and tribute, the Arabs and his body-guard whom he had brought for the defence of Jerusalem, his royal city, and had furnished them with pay, along with thirty talents of gold, eight hundred talents of pure silver, carbuncles and other precious stones, a couch of ivory, an elephant's hide, an elephant's tusk, rare woods, whatever their names, a vast treasure, as well as the eunuchs of his palace, dancing men and dancing women; and he sent his ambassador to offer homage."

While Sennacherib thus tries to draw the veil of silence over the final catastrophe, he cannot conceal the fact that he failed to capture Jerusalem and to punish Hezekiah, as he had punished other rebel kings. Moreover, although Sennacherib lived for twenty years after his sudden withdrawal from Palestine, he never again ventured to undertake a campaign in the West. Still further corroboration of the Biblical narrative is

afforded by the Egyptian tradition. Two centuries after the event, the priests of Egypt told Herodotus how, when Sennacherib invaded their land, and his army lay encamped one night near Pelusium, a multitude of field mice came into the camp and gnawed the quivers, bow-strings, and leather shield-straps of the Assyrians, so that next morning, being practically disarmed, they were routed with great slaughter. "Now since the mouse was a symbol of sudden destruction, and even of the plague, this story of Herodotus seems to be merely a picturesque form of a tradition that pestilence broke out in the Assyrian camp."

"So Sennacherib king of Assyria departed, and went and returned, and dwelt at Ninneveh. And it came to pass, as he was worshipping in the house of Nisroch his god, that Adrameleck and Sharezer, his sons, smote him with the sword; and they escaped into the land of Armenia. And Esarhaddon, his son, reigned in his stead." Thus we read in 2 Kings XIX. 36-37. The parallel record in the cuneiform document known as the Babylonian Chronicle reads as follows: "Sennacherib king of Assyria was murdered by his own son in an insurrection on the twentieth day of the month Tebet."

From the annals of Esarhaddon, the son and successor of Sennacherib, we get a striking vindication of another aspersed passage of Holy Writ. In 2 Chron. II, 33, it is stated that the king of Assyria bound Manasseh with fetters and carried him to Babylon. "Surely," said the critics, "this is a mistake. The capital of Assyria was not Babylon but Nineveh. Why then should a king of *Assyria* carry his captives to *Babylon*?" But again we have the same old story. The terra-cotta books tell us that Esarhaddon, the contemporary of Manasseh, reversing the policy of his father Sennacherib, who had destroyed Babylon, rebuilt that ruined city, and even resided there from time to time. There is nothing remarkable, therefore, in the fact that he should have carried thither a political prisoner.

### ROMISH TOLERANCE.

Dr. R. F. Dabney has summed up the policy of the Romish Church in all ages, in the motto, "By this *craft* we have our wealth."

On the third of December last, at Union Theological Seminary, New York, the Rev. Professor Briggs assisted the Rev.

Father Alexander Doyle, of the Paulist Fathers, to promulgate the astounding intelligence that this Church is set against intolerance. Now, it is not surprising that Rome should be tolerant of Dr. Brigg, for, having cut away his rudder and replaced it with the narrow oar-blade of his own personality, is he not ready, with all his followers, to follow Cardinal Newman into this same vortex? Is he not already half a Romanist in doctrine? No doubt the recent touching appeal of Pope Leo for church unity may have sounded to him very like the call of a "master." But to us it recalls far more vividly the protest of a British chief against the devastating legions of old Rome, "they make a desolation and call it peace." When the whole world kisses the—great toe of an infallible Pope, the church will be a unit, indeed. A cardinal's hat would fit Father Briggs head admirably.

Neither is it very surprising that Father Doyle is willing to be "a span in the bridge" over which it is possible for Union Seminary to cross into church unity. Most Protestant divines would be willing to sacrifice themselves in the same way to help a brother out of said unity.

But the object of supreme wonder is, that "it goes without saying that all of our religious misunderstandings, and most of our religious antipathies arise from the fact that we *do not know each other well enough.*" Is the brother in earnest? Does Rome invite the investigating scrutiny of the world? Does she wish *all* of her methods to be known; or is it only Father Doyle who so wishes? Has the Pope then, ceased to be infallible, that one of his minions dares openly to reverse his policy and that of all his predecessors, and turn the light of day into the ferret paths of the priesthood? Or had not Father Doyle best beware lest his craft so put on the aspect of ingenuousness that his brethren fail to recognize him? or, perhaps, his present Infallible Highness has decided that his past Infallible Highness was mistaken and it really would be well to experiment with religious tolerance; that religious tolerance may not after all be "incompatible with the claims of the Pope," as Roman Catholics have heretofore held, and as all intelligent men, who have inquired at all, must see.

But since the Father has invited us to quench our suspicion of Rome, together with our ignorance of her methods, let us run over some of the facts in relation to them, and see how our love for her will rise and flow. No need to go back to the day when

papal bulls sounded like thunder in the ears of monarchs, and Pope-driven emperors wielded the inquisition almost to the extermination of whole provinces of their subjects, to show that her very claims of temporal authority means intolerance. We need not cross to Italy or Spain to see that when she has full sway she does not tolerate education, or free thinking, or the Word of God; that her boasted male and female schools are meant to teach little else than popery and needle-work; that her learning and christianity are purely esoteric, and the greatest benefit the masses have from religion is the joy of supporting it. Besides, these are surely not the things that Father Doyle would have us know.

About the time that Dr. Briggs and the Paulist were extolling Pope Leo's fatherly propensities and Romish tolerance, at Union Seminary, New York, we, at Union Seminary, Virginia, were listening to the Rev. Leandro Garza Mora, as he told of hardships, persecutions, extortions, and martyrdoms endured within this decade by Protestants in Mexico at the hands of tolerant Rome, and scarcely now restrained by the government. His mother's Bible taken from her; property confiscated; public worship interrupted and broken up; preachers stoned to death; and a whole people kept in ignorance and superstition lest they read the Bible. Are these the things that Father Doyle wishes us to know and admire?

When the nunneries in the border cities were closed, palpable proofs were left of the grossest abuse of their office by priests and confessors, and in less than a summer a large per cent of their occupants were living in shame in the City of Mexico. To such an extent have the intercessory prayers of the priests become a strictly money value, that a friend of the writer greatly astonished a poor wretch for whom he had promised to pray, by refusing the offered stipend. "What," he said, "are you going to pray for me for nothing?" Are these the things the father wants us to ponder upon?

But a Roman official calls our attention to the fact that such is not the policy in the United States. And why is it not? for the same reason that a bull dog does not trot away with a bear in his mouth. He keeps a tight hold where he fastens on, however, and we know that whatever inconsistencies may be charged upon the Church of Rome, no historian has ever accused her of releasing voluntarily her control of anything in any province whatever; and it can be shown that Rome's



policy in the United States, has been and is, perfectly consistent with her course in other countries and times. What is this double-meaning chatter about unity; this rebuking of a young Canadian priest who was rash enough to speak out in public the intolerance which had been drilled into him in private; but the blandishing smile which conceals her real intent?

A short time before the Pope became infallible, one of his official servants declared that if it ever came into the power of the Pope, and it would, he would seize and wield temporal as well as spiritual control of the United States. And so assiduously has this power been sought, that the Roman Catholics rate as a distinctive political element which is largely courted by politicians, and that they actually control the police force in many of our cities. How many steps to the balance of power? Another said that if the children between certain ages were given him to influence he would ask no more, and would give America to the Pope speedily. And how these patient sappers have worked! delving and honeycombing under our public school system, till here a little and there a little falls into their hands, till they have been able to pervert public funds and public influence to their support; until the suspicion is justified that they intend to make good by force and fraud the claim of the Pope to be rightful regulator of all such affairs, even in this land of free thought and action. He would do more than control education and keep the conscience. He would muzzle the press; few papers now dare much against him. He would levy taxes; as already stated, he now fingers tax money. The forcible detention of free citizens has ever been dared, and fraudulent retention of private property—but these were done secretly. Even Father Doyle would scarcely want us to know more of them.

And yet in the light of all past history and living events, men who cannot see a claw in a velvet paw agree with Roman Catholic Cardinals that the above suspicion is unreasoning. Would that there were less reason for such suspicion! But study of Romish methods inclines us to think, Dr. Briggs and Father Doyle to the contrary notwithstanding, that Roman tolerance is a thin transparent veil, and that to love Rome well, one must not know her better, but, as the Romanists do, close the eyes and put a seal on the lips, and follow blindly and dumbly, if she leads to perdition.

J. C. L.