

know from the works of Cyprian, who died A.D. 258. The custom of incubation—that is, of sleeping in temples (*e.g.*, of Æsculapius), in order that the god may visit the sleeper in his dreams—was continued in Christianity, and in some Eastern Churches (*e.g.*, in the Georgian) still survives, or, at least, survived till yesterday. A lower or middle-class Italian seldom dreams a dream without at once consulting one of the many dream-books, and buying a lottery ticket of the number which corresponds to the objects he dreamed about. Many factors contributed powerfully in Peter's case to establish such a psychological attitude towards the dead Jesus as must generate apparitions, and the assurance that he was not dead, but alive in heaven. He was the earliest of the disciples to leave all and follow Jesus. He had discerned in him the hope of Israel—the man sent from God to restore the glorious kingdom of David. That hope had been rudely dashed. He had seen his master betrayed and arrested; and, when he was himself taxed with being a Galilean and a follower of Jesus, his courage had failed him, and he had with emphasis denied all knowledge of him. Then he had fled back to Galilee, probably without waiting even to see how the trial before the Roman procurator would end, and certainly before the death agony on the cross supervened. In the solitudes of the lake of Gennesaret, where he had resumed his vocation as a fisherman, keen remorse must have assailed him for his desertion of his leader. The influence of his leader's personality must quickly have reasserted itself over him in a region full of personal souvenirs, and in which he had originally fallen under its spell. In such conditions Peter could not admit that his hopes and expectations had been

in vain, and they revived. In the present day we see even men of science duped by the legerdemain of such charlatans as Eusapia Palladino, Home, and Madame Blavatsky. Some day or other the entire vulgar mechanism of trickery is exposed; yet the once convinced, the true believers, will seldom own to themselves or others that they were duped. Rather than do so, they will frame the most roundabout hypotheses, to save themselves from an admission so humiliating. I do not suggest that Jesus was a charlatan, or Peter a goose; nevertheless, the same law held good in his case, for man is ever the same. Accordingly, when Jesus appeared in visions to Peter, as to a man of such a temperament he could not fail to do, the old messianic hope, the old confidence in the kingdom of God about to be set up afresh, revived in his breast. Thus the true resurrection was that which ensued in the hearts of Peter and his companions. They saw Jesus still alive, surrounded with glory in heaven, and knew instantly that the joyous consummation was only delayed a little until the Messiah, like Daniel's Son of Man, should come back in glory on the clouds of heaven. The admission made by Luke in Acts, that Jesus appeared to none but the faithful, establishes the subjective character of the apparitions. The terms, moreover, used in describing the risen Jesus belong to the stock phraseology of apparitions. Thus in Acts i. 3 the Greek word *optanô* is used, a technical term for *seeing* a ghost; and the noun *optasia*, formed from this verb, is used in Acts xxvi. 19 to describe Paul's vision on the way to Damascus. This vision was, in Paul's mind, co-ordinate with, and of the same real quality and importance as, the visions vouchsafed to Peter, to the

apostles, to the five hundred, and to James, the Lord's brother.

Starting from Paul's statement, the only one at all near in point of time to the events themselves, let us try to understand the legend of the resurrection and of the empty tomb, as it insinuated itself, with ever fresh growths of legendary detail, into evangelical tradition. In Mark we have the tale in its earliest and simplest form. He merely relates that Jesus was buried on Friday afternoon, in a tomb hewn out of rock, against the door of which a stone was rolled; that certain women, who had followed him from Galilee, visited the tomb early on the Sunday morning, bringing spices in order to anoint the body; that they found the stone rolled away and the tomb empty. Such is the theme, which in the other evangelists receives ever fresh accretions of miraculous detail.

From Paul himself we merely learn that Christ, having *died for our sins according to the Scriptures, was buried, and raised [or resuscitated] on the third day, equally according to the Scriptures.* *[probably an interpolation]*

The scripture which dictated a resurrection on the third day was probably Hosea vi. 1, 2: "*Come, and let us return unto the Lord: for he hath torn, and he will heal us; he hath smitten, and he will bind us up. After two days will he revive us: on the third day he will raise us up, and we shall live before him.*"

The true explanation of this passage is, of course, to be sought in the immediate circumstances and conditions under which Hosea penned them, for they limited his outlook and determined his ideas. The messianic exegetes of the early Church rummaged the Old Testament for passages which even remotely seemed to echo events in a future Messiah's career.

as Milton.

Note.

(*mirac.*)

These they took out of their context, misunderstood and even garbled, in order to fit them out as prophecies of Christ. Not seldom the passages thus mangled and misinterpreted generated new details in the evangelical tradition, as we have noticed above, p. 81.

Now, Paul does not say that Jesus was raised in the flesh, and his maxim that corruption cannot inherit incorruption precludes such an idea. He probably believed that Jesus was equipped at the resurrection with an ethereal or, to use the jargon of modern spiritualists, with an astral body; with the uncorrupted body which Adam wore before the fall; with a tunic of incorruption, left behind him in heaven when, descending to earth, he put on sinful flesh, and *was found in semblance and form as a man.*

Exactly how, when, and where arose the Marcan tradition that Jesus's dead body was resuscitated we do not know. But there were many influences at work in the lands that were the cradle of Christianity to suggest it. Josephus (*Antiq.*, xviii. 1, 3) attests that the Pharisees believed that the souls of the just have power to revive and live again, and (*B. J.*, iii. 8, 5) that in the revolution of ages they are sent afresh into pure bodies. We are therefore not surprised that Herod Agrippa, as we read in Mark vi. 14, supposed, when he first heard the fame of Jesus, that he was *John the Baptist raised from the dead*, while his entourage declared him to be Elijah similarly resuscitated. It was believed all over the East a little later on that the slain Nero was still alive and soon to return. Whenever the promised Messiah should appear, the dead, it was believed, would also arise out of their tombs. It was an age, moreover, in which the dead still had to be carefully tended, housed, and regularly

furnished with food and drink. Adjoining Syria and Palestine, and through seaborne commerce in daily contact with Rome and Antioch, lay Egypt, where from time immemorial the bodies of the dead had been mummified, to keep them from corruption, in view of a bodily resurrection; and Egypt was full of Greeks and Jews, who had in such matters learned to feel and believe as the ancient Egyptians felt and believed. The Christian belief in a resurrection of the flesh is an ancient Egyptian belief, inherited through various channels. In this connection we may refer to the picture of the resurrection of the righteous found in the book of Enoch. It is summarised by Dr. Charles, in his *Critical History of the Doctrine of a Future Life in Israel, in Judaism, and in Christianity* (p. 188), as follows:—

The righteous.....rise with their bodies; they eat of the tree of life, and thereby enjoy patriarchal lives, in the messianic kingdom on a purified earth, with Jerusalem as its centre. All the Gentiles become righteous, and worship God. In this messianic kingdom, in which there is, however, no Messiah, but the immediate presence of God with men, the felicity of the blessed is of a very sensuous character. The powers of nature are increased indefinitely. Thus the righteous will beget 1,000 children; of all the seed that is sown, each measure will bear 10,000 grains; and each vine will have 10,000 branches, and each branch 10,000 twigs, and each twig 10,000 clusters, and each cluster 10,000 grapes, and each grape twenty-five measures of wine.

“The allowance is liberal,” comments Dr. Charles, who adds as follows:—

We must not, however, neglect the ethical side of

this felicity. Thus "light and joy and peace and wisdom" will be bestowed upon them; and "they will all live, and never again sin either through heedlessness or through pride"; and "their lives will grow old in peace, and the years of their joy will be many in happiness, and the peace of their age all the days of their life."

Such, or nearly such, was the vision of the impending kingdom of God which floated before the fancy of Jesus at the last supper, when he promised his disciples that he would not again drink with them of the fruit of the vine until he should drink it with them newly made in the kingdom of God.

Note | The legend, however, that it was on the third day or after three days that Jesus was raised from the dead, was not generated by prophecy alone; for it was a popular belief that the spirit or soul of a man remains by his corpse for a period of three days—a belief glanced at in the legend of the raising of Lazarus. "*Lord, by this time he stinketh: for he hath been dead four days,*" says Martha, his sister, to Jesus, as soon as the latter orders the stone to be lifted off the tomb. We see that the task of restoring life to the dead was accounted hopeless after the lapse of three days, because by that time corruption had begun its work. Thus Psalm xvi. 10 was generally accepted as a prophecy of the resurrection: "*Thou wilt not leave my soul in Hades, nor allow thy holy one to see corruption*"; but for this to be applicable to Jesus it was essential that he should rise again not later than the third day.

Who buried Jesus? Paul, in his Epistle, 1 Cor. xv. 4, merely says that he was buried. In a speech, however, which either Luke (Acts xiii. 27-31) or Paul's travelling companion sets in his mouth at Antioch of

Pisidia, it is declared that "*they that dwell in Jerusalem and their rulers, who, though they found no cause of death, yet asked of Pilate that he should be slain, when they had fulfilled all things that were written of him, took him down from the tree and laid him in a tomb.*" = Note!

It was, then, the unbelieving Jews who buried Jesus, according to this form of the story; and it may well be Paul's own, since in the context we meet with the thoroughly Pauline thought that the text of Psalm ii. 7, "*Thou art my son, this day have I begotten thee,*" is a prophecy, not of the descent of the Spirit and affiliation of Jesus at baptism (see above, p. 172), but of the resurrection, when the Father by the power of the Spirit raised him from the dead, and constituted him Messiah and Son of God. But in his Gospel Luke has followed Mark in a wholly different story, according to which Joseph of Arimathea *boldly went in unto Pilate and asked for the body of Jesus*. Pilate was surprised that death should have supervened so soon; but, having through a centurion assured himself of the fact, gave the body up to Joseph. The latter wrapped it in a linen cloth bought for the purpose, *laid it in a tomb hewn out of the rock, and rolled a stone against the door*.

The Abbé Loisy suggests that Jesus was more probably thrown into the common pit reserved for crucified malefactors, and that the episode of his burial by Joseph was invented by his followers at a later day to save him from the reproach of a dishonourable interment. The words ascribed in Acts xiii. 29 to Paul certainly favour the Abbé's view, and Joseph, if he was a *councillor of honourable estate*—that is, a member of the Sanhedrin—may possibly be identifiable with *them that dwell in Jerusalem and their*

rulers. Luke, however (xxiii. 50), is careful to assure us that as *a good man and righteous he had not consented to the plan and deed* of his fellow counsellors; and Mark, in adding that he was *expecting the kingdom of God*, hints plainly that he was favourable to Jesus. The Pauline speech, however, cited from Acts expressly identifies those who clamoured for the death of the innocent Messiah with those who took him down from the cross and buried him. Here, then, we have an echo of an earlier tradition, which, since it absolutely contradicts the miraculous story of the empty tomb accepted by the Church, is surely older than it and more genuine.

The tale which follows in Mark was designed to confute the incredulous Jews who denied that Jesus rose from the dead. Mark knows of no one who saw him actually emerge from the tomb; but the same women, *Mary Magdalene, Mary the mother (in some old texts daughter) of James*, who had, together with Salome, watched Joseph and seen where he laid Jesus, are paraded in the immediate sequel both as witnesses of the empty tomb and as recipients of the message of a young man, *clad in a white robe, sitting to the right hand of it.* He addresses them thus: "*Be not surprised; ye seek Jesus the Nazarene, the Crucified. He is not here. Behold the place where they laid him. But go ye and say to the other disciples and to Peter that he goeth before you into Galilee. There shall ye see him, as he told you.*"

The story-teller, however, has to invent some reason why the women should have been present at the tomb just in time to find it empty. What could bring them there? They went, we are told, with spices in order to anoint the corpse. Matthew, on the

contrary, attributes their visit to the mere desire to see the tomb or the body. If the fourth Gospel (xix. 39) is to be credited, Nicodemus and Joseph together had already bound up the body on Friday evening in linen swathes, using 100 litres of myrrh and aloes to anoint the same. It is difficult to understand why the women needed to anoint afresh on Sunday morning a corpse already anointed on Friday in so regal a manner. A hundred litres was nearly equal to a modern hundredweight, a litre being equal to twelve ounces!

Mark's story is full of improbability and self-contradiction. If Joseph rolled against the door of the tomb a stone so large that the three women together despaired of moving it, and that, according to an ancient reading in Luke, it took twenty men together to roll along, he must have done so with a view to the definite and lasting interment of Jesus. When the women reach the tomb on Sunday morning they exclaim, "*Who will roll away for us the stone from the door of the tomb?*" And yet they had seen Joseph (unaided, so it would seem) deposit the stone there on Friday afternoon. Why, then, did they not bring men with them to open the tomb? Why not have informed Joseph, as they watched him bury Jesus, that they intended to come back later on and anoint the corpse? And why wait so long to anoint him? It is not usual, especially in the East, where decay is so rapid, to wait so long. Even if they had to wait until the Sabbath was over—that is, until sunset on Saturday—to buy their spices, why delay another twelve hours before going to the tomb? Evidently the story of the anointing is a clumsy device on the part of the evangelist to get them there

at dawn on Sunday, and not before. And why on Sunday? The tradition which fixed for the rising of the Christ from the dead the moment of sunrise on the day of the sun must surely have been generated by the same symbolism which dictated to Luke or his source the hymn of Zacharias, which speaks of

.....the tender mercy of our God,
Whereby the dayspring from on high shall visit us,
To shine upon them that sit in darkness and in the shadow of death.

The resurrection of Jesus was, as we have seen, the birth of Christ, according to the old belief underlying the passage (Acts xiii. 33) already cited. If Christ so risen was the daystar, when else could he appropriately be born except at the moment of dawn on the Sunday? Guided by the same symbolism, the Church of Rome at a later day deliberately fixed the feast of his physical birth on December 25th, the Mithraic Feast of the birth of the unconquered sun, *dies natalis invicti solis*, as the old pagan calendars term it. The large body of oriental Christians known as Manicheans actually saw in the sun the outward and visible symbol of Christ, and gave corresponding homage to the heavenly body. Augustine of Hippo tells a story of a dispute between an orthodox lady and a Manichean. While it was raging a ray of sunlight penetrated the shutter of their window, and glinted across the floor of the room in which they sat. The orthodox lady instantly jumped up, and, dancing over it, cried, "Behold, I stamp upon your God."

But let us return to Mark's tale. In it the youth in white is the conventional angel. Matthew, however, knew of a slightly variant text which made of him Christ himself. Of this more anon. In spite of this figure's exhortation to the women not to be

astonished, "*they went out and fled from the tomb,*" beside themselves with fear and trembling, and, so the story ends, "*said nothing to anyone, because they were afraid.*" The message then seems not to have been delivered after all to Peter and the apostles. Nor is it evident how it could be, since they had fled away to Galilee two days before—for that they so fled is a legitimate inference from the words set in the mouth of Jesus in Mark xiv. 27. The last supper was ended, and, having sung a "*hymn, they went forth into the Mount of Olives. And Jesus said to them, Ye shall all be scandalised, for it is written: I will smite the shepherd, and the sheep shall be scattered. But after I have been raised, I will go before you into Galilee.*"

The word *proaxô*, rendered *I will go before*, means not that Jesus started before the disciples, but only that he got there first. The words were perhaps ascribed to Jesus *après coup*, after the event; whether they were or not, nothing short of the actual flight explains their presence in the tradition.

Such was the story as Mark found it to tell. It was designed, firstly, to refute the Jews who denied that Jesus had risen at all from the dead; secondly, to establish that he had risen in the flesh—an idea which, as we have pointed out, was foreign to Paul, but not to the beliefs and outlook of that age. And, thirdly, in the absence of the apostles, this tale provides witnesses to the empty tomb in the persons of the women, who, having followed Jesus all the way from Galilee, might be deemed to be trustworthy.

Let us compare with Mark the story of Matthew, and see how quickly a legend of this kind was amplified and embellished, in answer to objections supposed to be raised by Jewish opponents.

Matthew, then, drops out Mark's statement that Joseph of Arimathea was a member of the Sanhedrin, because he wishes us to suppose that that Jewish council had been unanimous in demanding the death of Jesus; and he ignores Pilate's sending of a centurion to see if Jesus were really dead, for he contemplates an ampler mission of Roman soldiers to the tomb. He is careful to tell us that Joseph chose a *clean* linen cloth to wrap the body in, and that the tomb in which he laid it was *his own new tomb*. So Luke here adds the touch that *never yet had man lain* in the tomb chosen by Joseph. Such elements in the narrative have no chance to be historical, but are due to the same symbolising fancy which leads Mark and Luke to note that in his messianic entry into Jerusalem Jesus, the new Adam of Paul, rode on the back of an ass *whereon no man ever yet sat*. The genuine tradition of Jesus having been cast by his enemies into the common pit reserved for malefactors still survived among the Jews, and the most effective way of meeting it was to assert an honourable interment in a new tomb.

In Mark, then, the tradition has merely got as far as the story of a tomb which three devout women found empty, and of an angel sitting by it, commissioned to reveal to them that Jesus was risen. The growth of the legend could not stop here, and friends and foes alike united to extend it. Jewish critics, real or imaginary, objected that an empty tomb proved little enough, for might not the disciples of Jesus have come by night and stolen the body? Matthew supposes that the Jews foresaw this contingency, and so went in a body to Pilate, recalled to him Jesus's prediction that after three days he would

rise again, and petitioned him that "*the sepulchre be made sure until the third day, lest haply his disciples come and steal him away, and say unto the people, He is risen from the dead.*" Pilate accordingly gives them a guard, and they seal the stone. In order to anoint the body the tomb would have to be opened, but this could not be if it was sealed and soldiers set to prevent it. Matthew accordingly pretends that the women came merely from curiosity *to see the sepulchre*, and ignores the flimsy pretext provided by Mark in explanation of their movements—namely, that they desired to anoint Jesus; but in Matthew they arrive at an impossible hour—namely, "*late on the sabbath day, as it began to dawn towards the first day of the week.*" The writer imagines that the sabbath ended at dawn on Sunday morning, so evincing extraordinary ignorance of Jewish reckoning.

However, they arrive in time to witness a conventional earthquake, of the kind defined by Professor Sanday to be "a natural event opportunely timed"; and they see an angel of the Lord descend from heaven, roll away the stone, and sit upon it! In his description of the angel's appearance Matthew betters Mark: "*His appearance was as lightning, and his raiment white as snow.*" The watchers quake, and are dead with fear; but to the women the angel addresses the same exhortation not to fear, etc., as in Mark. Instead, however, of "*saying nothing to any man*" because of their panic, as in Mark, the women in Matthew "*ran to bring the disciples word.*" According to one form of Mark's tradition, the *young man* in white raiment of Mark was Jesus himself, and Matthew tacks this form of the story on to the other, without perceiving it to be a mere doublet. For, so he relates,

|| note.

M.

as the women "*departed quickly from the tomb with fear and great joy, Jesus met them, saying, All hail. They came and took hold of his feet and worshipped him. Then saith Jesus unto them, Fear not: go tell my brethren to depart into Galilee, and there shall they see me.*" Note that the words here assigned to Jesus are in Mark assigned to the young man in white. But—the Jewish unbeliever may be supposed to have objected, when he was told about the guard of Roman soldiers and the sealed tomb—why, if they witnessed the earthquake and other wonderful circumstances of the resurrection, is their testimony not invoked by the Christians? Why do the latter rely exclusively on a handful of scared and ecstatic women? The soldiers were there to see that the disciples did not come and steal the body; nevertheless, this calumny about the stealing "*was spread abroad among the Jews until this day*"—that is, until the time when this last chapter of Matthew was penned. If so, why was the evidence of the soldiers themselves never appealed to by the faithful in refutation of the calumny? If the Christians had their independent testimony to the resurrection, why not use it? Here is another objection which the incredulous Jews may have raised. In order to combat it Matthew invents a fresh episode, and adds it to his story. Some of the soldiers, he tells us, did return to the city, and told the chief priests of all that had happened; and they, having conferred with the elders, paid a large sum in hush-money to the soldiers, saying, "*Say ye, His disciples came by night, and stole him away while we slept. So they took the money, and did as they were taught.*"

This Gospel closes with an apparition of Jesus to the eleven disciples on a mountain in Galilee, where he

Note

1. Guy regard-
ing this
probable story

had arranged to meet them. It is interesting to notice how, in relating this episode, Matthew preserves to us a memory of the doubts entertained about the resurrection among the apostles themselves: "*When they saw him, they worshipped, but some doubted.*" We would like to know if they were ever cured of their doubts. It may, anyhow, be inferred from this passage that the belief in the resurrection did not triumph in a day, or even in a week, and that at the first there were companions of Jesus who were sceptical. Even among Paul's congregation at Corinth, twenty-five years after the crucifixion, there were some who questioned if there be any resurrection of the dead. "*How say some among you that there is no resurrection of the dead?*" he writes in 1 Corinthians xv. 12. But it is not clear whether their doubt extended to the resurrection of Christ, although Paul contends that logically it must do so. In other early documents we hear of similar doubts—*e.g.*, in the Acts of Paul and Thekla, where Demas and Hermogenes, companions of Paul, assert that men find their true resurrection in their children. Hegesippus, an early Christian writer of Palestine, recorded that James, the ascetic and brother of Jesus, made a vow neither to eat nor drink until he had a vision of him risen from the dead. Rigorous fasting is a recognised means of inducing visions, and, as such, is practised among the American Indians and other primitive religionists all over the world.

The tradition which is reported in the last verses of Matthew's Gospel has foreshortened history and cramped into one last scene on an unknown hilltop in Galilee apparitions which, as we know from Paul, were numerous and widely diffused. The same

Note.
not

evangelist masses together, in a single sermon on a mountain, precepts delivered by Jesus all through his ministry. In the last scene Jesus, seen in a vision on the same or on some other hilltop, delivers, like the second Moses that Matthew conceives him to be, a last address to his followers. It is, naturally enough, inspired by conceptions of Christ and of his mission which the Church only formed long afterwards—partly under Pauline influence, partly under the assumption, which it did not take a long time for his followers to make, that he was the Son of Man described in Daniel vii. 13. The post-resurrection discourse of Jesus, in Matthew xxviii. 18 foll., is as follows: "*All authority hath been given unto me in heaven and on earth. Go ye, therefore, and make disciples of all the nations in my name [so Eusebius], teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I commanded you: and lo, I am with you always, even unto the consummation of the world.*" So, in the Septuagint version of Daniel, we read of the Son of Man "*beheld in the night vision*" that there "*was given him authority and kingly honour, and all the nations of the earth, race by race, and all glory worshipping him: and his authority is an agelong authority which shall not be taken away.*"

This is not the same Jesus who, in Matthew x. 5-7, forbade his disciples to "*travel in the path of the Gentiles or enter a city of the Samaritans,*" but charged them rather "*to visit the lost sheep of the house of Israel, and to go and preach, saying that the kingdom of heaven is at hand.*" Nor are the disciples in this last scene those who, a generation later, are still bitterly opposing Paul's plan of admitting into the kingdom of promise the uncircumcised Gentiles. It is the Church herself that here addresses us in the

person of the risen Christ. The aims and aspirations of Christians towards the close of the first century are here attributed to the risen Jesus; and the contrast with the real Jesus is yet greater, if we substitute for the words *in my name*, or *and they shall believe in me*, read here by Eusebius and the Syrian Aphraates, the later interpolation: "*baptising them in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.*" It was, indeed, Jesus of Nazareth that died and was buried; but he that rose again was the universalist and divine figure of orthodox Christology, ordaining sacraments and *credenda* altogether alien to the real man of Nazareth.

I will not weary my readers with an equally detailed examination of the forms which the legend of the resurrection assumes in Luke and in the fourth Gospel. I have already pointed out (p. 101) that the former, in open contradiction of Matthew and Mark, makes the city of Jerusalem the scene of the visions of the apostles. He takes from Mark nothing but the tale of the empty tomb and the women, and that he handles in the very free manner in which he always treats his source where it is in conflict with later developments of tradition. The author of the fourth Gospel follows Luke, and, guided by symbolism, or anxious to magnify Jesus, amplifies the legend with sundry new details and episodes. Nor did the mythoplastic imagination of believers rest content with the accounts furnished by the four canonical Gospels. Still ranker growths of legend lie before us in the so-called Gospel of Peter and in the Acts of Pilate.

The former of these two documents was probably composed between 100 and 130, and is, therefore, nearly contemporaneous with the supplementary chapter xxi., added by some editor to the fourth

Gospel. The author of it, who pretends that he is St. Peter, in the same way as the author of the fourth Gospel pretends to be an apostle and eye-witness, used Matthew and Mark; but it is probable that the copy of Mark which was in his hands did not end, where ours does, with the words "*for they were afraid,*" but went on to describe the flight of the apostles back to Galilee and a vision they there had of the risen Jesus.

The most noticeable extension of the resurrection myth made by Peter—as we will term the author of this apocryph—is a picture of the actual resurrection of Jesus from the tomb. The earlier tradition was felt to be faulty and imperfect, in so far as it did not narrate the actual exodus of Jesus from his tomb. Following, therefore, the clue afforded by Matthew, Peter makes the Roman guards witnesses of this event, and even associates the elders of the Jews with them, as follows:—

Now, on the night when the Lord's day was drawing on, as the soldiers kept guard by two and two in a watch, there was a great voice in heaven, and they saw the heavens opened, and two men descend thence with much light and approach the tomb. And the stone which had been laid at the door rolled away of itself and made way in part, and the tomb was opened, and both the young men entered it. The soldiers, therefore, when they saw it, awakened the centurions and the elders (for they were also there keeping watch); and as they told the things that they had seen, again they see three men coming forth from the tomb, two of them supporting the other, and a cross following them; and the head of the two reached to heaven, but that of him who was led by them over-

passed the heavens. And they heard a voice from the heavens, saying, Didst thou preach to them that sleep? And a response was heard from the cross, Yea.

The risen body is of marvellous dimensions, and the tale resembles a legend current among certain Christians of Palestine and related by Epiphanius, that a figure of the risen Jesus was seen in that land so gigantic that when they measured it against a neighbouring mountain it overtopped the same. The talking cross often reappears in early hagiological stories, and it was currently believed in many Eastern churches that Jesus took his cross up into heaven with him, having first deposited therein his soul, as if for safe custody. This last must appear to modern Christians an unnecessary precaution; but they forget that Justin Martyr, in the first half of the second century, believed that when Jesus died the demons of the air were on the watch to waylay his spirit or soul in its heavenward ascent, and would probably have succeeded, had he not prudently entrusted it to the hands of God, "*crying* [as Luke says] *with a loud voice, Father, unto thy hands I commit my spirit.*"

But although Peter, in the passage above cited, excels the New Testament accounts in love of the miraculous, he transmits other more sober details which have more chance to be historical, since they so utterly contradict the later story (preferred by Luke and John), that the first appearances of the risen Jesus to disciples were in Jerusalem. He attests, for example, that Peter, with his fellows, hid themselves when Jesus died, because the Jews were seeking for them as malefactors who were minded to burn the temple. On the last day of the unleavened bread, the feast being at an end, the twelve withdrew to their

homes, which were in Galilee, weeping and full of sorrow for that which had happened. Simon Peter, in particular, and Andrew, his brother, took their nets and went to the sea; and there was with them Levi or Matthew, the son of Alphæus.

Here the fragment breaks off, just at the point, evidently, where Jesus was about to appear in a vision to them. Such a vision is described in the appendix to the fourth Gospel, ch. xxi., which begins as follows: "*After these things Jesus manifested himself again to the disciples at the Sea of Galilee. Simon Peter and Thomas called Didymus and Nathaniel of Cana in Galilee, and the sons of Zebedee, and two others of his disciples, were there together, and Simon Peter said to them, I go a fishing. They say unto him, We also come with thee. They went out and entered into the boat.*"

There follows in John an apparition of Jesus while they are fishing. In the preceding chapter (xx.) of this Gospel apparitions in Jerusalem to Mary Magdalene and to the disciples have been narrated. It would seem as if the older tradition of the apostles' flight into Galilee was too persistent to be wholly neglected, and as if some early editor of the fourth Gospel, by way of completing it, added ch. xxi. It is impossible to say whence this editor took his story; the compiler of the Peter Gospel, however, probably took his information from a lost conclusion of Mark, for the fragment closely follows that evangelist in its last paragraphs, as is seen if we juxtapose the two texts:—

MARK xvi. 4-8.

And looking up, they see that the stone is rolled back: for it was exceeding great. And entering into the tomb, they saw a

PETER GOSPEL, xi.

So they went and found the tomb open, and they came near and stooped down to look in there; and they see there a young

young man sitting on the right hand, arrayed in a white robe; and they were amazed. And he said to them, Be not amazed. Ye seek Jesus, the Nazarene, who has been crucified. He is risen. He is not here. Behold the place where they laid him. But go, tell his disciples and Peter, He goeth before you into Galilee: there shall ye see him, as he said unto you. And they went out, and fled from the tomb; for trembling and stupor had come upon them; and they said nothing to anyone; for they were afraid.

man sitting in the midst of the tomb, fair and clothed with a robe exceeding bright, who said to them, Wherefore have ye come? Whom seek ye? Him who was crucified? He is risen and gone. But if ye believe not, stoop down and look in and see the place where he lay, for he is not here; for he is risen and gone thither whence he was sent. Then the women fled, being afraid.

xii.

Now it was the last day of unleavened bread, and many went out of the city, returning to their houses, the feast being at an end. And we, the twelve disciples of the Lord, wept and were in sorrow; and everyone retired to his home, sorrowing for what had happened. But I, Simon Peter, and Andrew my brother took our nets and went to the sea; and there was with us Levi, the son of Alphæus, whom the Lord....

We see how closely pseudo-Peter follows Mark as far as the words "*for they were afraid*," with which his text as we have it ends; and this makes it very probable that the sequel, ch. xii., is matter derived from the same source. The end of Mark may very well have been mutilated by someone who disliked its subject-matter, and preferred to believe that all the apparitions of Jesus took place in the holy city to apostles and faithful ones who, being full of faith and undismayed by the tragic end of their Messiah, had never fled back to Galilee at all. The evangelist Luke satisfies the conditions, and it is not impossible that, if the Gospel of Mark was really mutilated, as most scholars opine that it was, he was the offender; and that all our copies have come down from the

single one which he thus mutilated. This supposition accords with the animus against Mark which Professor Harnack detects in his writings.

The account of the resurrection in the *Acta Pilati* deserves more attention than it has received, for it adheres closely to the story as we have it in Matthew and Mark, altogether discarding the story of the apparitions in Jerusalem related in the third and fourth Gospels. No more than one apparition is attested in Galilee, on the top of a mountain of which the name is variously given in the MSS. as Mamilch, Mambêch, Malêk, Mofêk, or Monfê.

CHAPTER XVI.

BAPTISM

THE church-goer of to-day, whose horizon is limited by the Book of Common Prayer, finds it hard to understand that the Church was not always such as he sees it—namely, an organised body of which all members hold certain cut-and-dried opinions embodied in written creeds; in which bishops and clergy conduct services and administer sacraments according to prescribed forms; of which every member is initiated at birth by a rite of baptism, and sealed or confirmed, at twelve to sixteen years of age, by imposition of the episcopal hand.

In the first age charity and fervour took the place of creeds and organisation. The words, "*Yea, I come quickly. Amen; come, Lord Jesus,*" form the closing message of the book of Revelation, written about A.D. 93, and are the last in the New Testament. They express the ethos of the earliest believers. For a community intoxicated with such a belief there were needed, not bishops and priests, but apostles and prophets; and these they had. In the first age we barely hear of bishops or overseers, and that only in contexts which imply that they were not distinguished from the presbyters or elders in the faith. Bishops, or overseers—for such is the meaning of the word—were officers appointed to watch over and administer the funds contributed by the richer

converts for the support of widows and orphans, and to represent the particular congregation in its relations with the outside world. Their prestige waxed as that of the primitive prophets and teachers waned; and they soon aspired to be guardians of doctrine no less than to keep the bag or alms-chest, as Judas Iscariot is reputed to have done for the circle of Jesus, so becoming the first Christian bishop, though not the last of them to betray his master.

If we examine the oldest ritual texts of the Christians, we find that their rite of initiation was made up of three chief steps. On the eighth day after birth a child was taken to the porch, or *narthex*, of the church, and the priest or elder—in some churches making the sign of the cross on its brow, in others not—gave it a Christian name—that is, a name not taken from the pagan mythology; he also offered up a brief prayer that it might be rightly and religiously trained by its parents, and be vouchsafed health and strength to grow up until it should reach the right and fitting age to receive baptism and gain admission into the Church. This rite, which among Gentile converts replaced Jewish circumcision, and which corresponds to the old custom of fating children—*i.e.*, to their dedication to the household gods and fairies—is entitled the rite of sealing, or of giving to a child a name. Thus consecrated, a child might die with impunity: the malignant spirits which haunt the air could not snatch its soul.

This rite was followed, on the fortieth day, by that of *churching* the child. The stain of birth and parturition was now supposed to have vanished from mother and child alike. Consequently, she also was now allowed to enter the church, which her presence no longer soiled; she carried her baby up to the steps

of the altar, and the priest, laying his hands on their heads, offered up one or two more prayers similar in purport to the one already used in the rite of name-giving. This rite corresponded to the presentation of Jesus in the temple, described in the second chapter of Luke; and the prayers recited commemorated that incident.

Years are now to elapse before the rite of baptism proper is undergone. The child is, in a loose sense, a catechumen. It will rest with him to choose the fitting moment for his full initiation. Probably puberty will be reached and left behind long before that moment arrives. Tertullian, in his treatise on baptism, exhorts the faithful to get over the business of marriage and propagation of children before they incur the awful responsibilities of baptism. This was about A.D. 200. He complains that a custom was growing up of admitting girls and boys to baptism, merely because they clamoured for it. Those, however, who favoured their admission never contemplated the baptism of speechless and unconscious babies, for they quoted the text (Matthew vii. 7): "*Ask, and it shall be given you; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened to you: for everyone that asketh receiveth; and he that seeketh findeth; and to him that knocketh it shall be opened.*" Tertullian replies that people must be of an age not merely to ask, but to understand what they ask for. He dwells on the *pondus sacramenti*—the weighty character of this sacrament—and asks: "*Quid innocens aetas festinat ad remissionem peccatorum?*"—"Why should innocent children be in a hurry to have their sins remitted?" A century and a half later, when Augustine, a boy of fourteen, clamoured in illness to be baptised, his very

conservative mother, Veronica, bade him wait till he was older and had acquired a deeper sense of responsibility. Her counsel prevailed, and he waited until he was perhaps married, and anyhow past thirty, for that, as the age at which Jesus was baptised, was regarded as the most suitable by the old-fashioned pietists of the fourth century. Many, however, put baptism off until the deathbed, like Augustine's friend Verecundus, who esteemed marriage incompatible with the state of grace. But there was held to be a risk in deferring it so late; for some who did so were, after all, unable to receive it, because their tongues were paralysed and unable to make the responses, or their minds wandering and unable to grasp the meaning of the words. Gregory of Nazianzen and other preachers of that age constantly warn their flocks of such dangers, and the former goes so far as to recommend baptism for children who have reached their third birthday; for, he says, at that age they can speak clearly, so as to make the responses and understand what is said. Here we note a change of attitude since the age of Tertullian; and a very few generations after Gregory infants were regularly baptised in the Greek Church on the fortieth day. This change was, no doubt, due to the solicitations of mothers, anxious that their children should, as soon as possible, undergo a rite which protected them from the demons which specially beset infancy, and from the possible prejudice of malign constellations; for the power of the stars over an individual ceased abruptly at the moment of baptism.

The rite of baptism proper fell into two halves—the washing with water for remission of sins, corresponding to the baptism of John the Baptist, and the rite of receiving the holy spirit by imposition of

hands, to which was added later on anointing with holy oil. Jesus himself was supposed in Jordan to have received the sevenfold grace of the spirit, and to have handed it on, in the form of the Consoling Spirit or Paraclete, to his disciples. They, by imposition of hands, passed the gift on to the faithful at large. Many of the medieval dissenters, known as the *Cathari* or *Puritans*, retained this second half alone of the baptismal rite, and called it *consolamentum*, or the rite of consoling. Except in the case of their leaders or bishops, they put it off until the deathbed, so adhering to an early custom. In the high society of the Middle Ages the old rite of adult baptism seems to have lived on, only laicised, in the initiatory rite of chivalry. For the young squire who aspired to knighthood was first stripped and immersed in a bath of purification. Emerging therefrom, he was clad in a white tunic, a red robe, and a white coif. A rigorous fast of twenty-four hours followed, and he passed the night in church, praying alone or in company with a priest and his sponsors. The next morning he went to confession, and then received the sacrament.

The surviving documents of the third and fourth century enable us to picture to ourselves the rite as it was in those ages. The candidate waited for the season of the Epiphany or Easter feast, the one of which commemorated the baptism, the other the death, of Jesus. He needed two sponsors to bear witness that he was a person of sober and virtuous life, led on to enter the Church, not by hope of gain or temporal advantages, but by spiritual inward call; not under compulsion, but of his own free will. Armed with such credentials, he approached the bishop, and inscribed his name seven weeks or so before the feast-

day. He was then handed over to an exorcist, who, laying hands on his head, blew in his face, and so rid him of evil spirits. Then for weeks he attended the lectures of a catechist, who instructed him in the monotheistic views of the world and creation, and in Christian doctrine and practice. Thus prepared, the candidate became a *competens*, or asker for baptism. Hence our word "competent," in the sense of a duly qualified person. More than one collection of such lectures survives. Throughout the period of preparation the catechumen had to give himself up to fasting and prayer. On the eve of Easter Sunday, or on the day of Epiphany, the candidate was stripped stark naked, and led down by the deacon, or if a woman by the deaconess, into the font, generally a shallow basin through which ran living water. In the Greek and Roman Churches he turned first to the west, and thrice solemnly renounced Satan and his angels and works. Then, turning to the east, he thrice vowed to side henceforth with Christ. The priest then poured three handfulls of water over his head, and perhaps immersed him thrice as well. Such triple affusion or immersion was customary in ancient lustrations, as many ancient authors testify. Thus Aristotle, in his book *On the Heavens*, i., p. 268, wrote thus: "Having received, as it were, from heaven the number three, we use it in the holy rites of religion." And an old scholiast, Acro, explains the phrase "*thrice purely*," used by Horace, by saying that "those who would expiate their sins must dip themselves thrice." And an old Greek writer, Eratosthenes (c. 240 B.C.), remarks that "the gods vouchsafe moral improvement to those who have thrice wiped themselves clean." It is evident, then, that the Christians adopted it from the pagans; but they interpreted

it symbolically, discerning in it, in the Eastern Churches, a commemoration of the three days passed by Jesus in the tomb; in the West, an act of homage to the triple name of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, in which, except in a few outlying Churches, like the early Armenian and Celtic, baptism soon came to be administered. The candidate repeated some form of creed, dictated to him by the priest, who recited appropriate prayers, in which it was particularly mentioned that the candidate had come of his own free will, and under no compulsion, to baptism. His inward call and impulse was an essential condition.

Confirmation, or reception of the spirit, generally followed as a completion of the baptism with water. The bishop and deacon smeared, with consecrated oil, the candidate's organs of sense, as well as certain other parts of his person; the bishop's hand was laid on his head, and, in response to proper invocations, the holy or pure spirit was supposed to enter into him. Meanwhile, he was robed in white, in token that he was liberated from Satan, and a crown set on his head. This he wore for eight days, when he returned to the church, where the priest, with fresh prayers, lifted it off.

The earliest rubrics enjoin the use of live or running water in baptism, for the orientals think it important that in lustrations the water should incessantly run past and off the body, so as to carry away the physical contamination of sin. Still and stagnant water did not suffice. In the third century still water stored in a receptacle was permitted, but not until it had been consecrated, the evil spirit being expelled and the pure induced by adjurations and invocations of the name of Christ or of the Trinity.

For the pure spirit, like the impure, was conceived of as an attenuated form of matter, like vapour or smoke, and was held to be dissolved in the water like salt, or, as we should say, held in suspension. The oil used in confirmation or sealing was, in the same way, a solution of holy spirit. The object of anointing the organs of sense was probably to block them against the evil spirit; hence the use of the word *to seal*. For, in the East, a jar of wine is kept good by floating a little oil on the top of it, in the neck or narrow spout; and this use of oil may have suggested the rites of anointing, common to pagan and Christian alike. Salt was exorcised in the same way as water and oil, and occasionally mixed with the eucharistic bread. In ancient sacrifice it was similarly used. All these uses were borrowed direct from earlier religions.

We have dwelt on the tendency shown in the early centuries to put off baptism. It was greatly due to the belief that mortal sin, committed after baptism, could no longer be expiated. Such a sinner put himself outside the Church, which could never again receive him into its bosom. For him there was no second repentance, no hope of salvation: he was eternally lost. This Draconian view of baptism prevailed already in the first century, and is inculcated in the Epistle to the Hebrews, vi. 4-8 and x. 26-27, in the former of which passages we read this:—
“ For as touching those who have once been illuminated (i.e., baptised) and have tasted the heavenly gift, and been made partakers of the Holy Ghost, and have tasted the goodness of God’s word and the powers of the age to come, but have then fallen away, it is impossible to renew them again unto repentance. Like a field which, in

spite of the copious rains of heaven, brings forth not herbs useful for them that tilled it, but only thorns and thistles, so these sinners receive no blessing from God, but are rejected and nigh unto a curse; whose end is to be burned." And in the second passage: "*For if we sin wilfully after we have received the knowledge of the truth, there is left no sacrifice for sins, but only a certain awful expectation of judgment, and a fierceness of fire which shall devour the adversaries."*

Such puritanism was too much for human frailty. The baptised, in spite of it, must often have relapsed into idolatry, homicide, fornication, and other sins; and nearly as often have repented. Something had to be done in order to reclaim them and restore them to the Church. Rome, as always, made the change—in this case most necessary, if the Church was to continue to exist. Pope Calixtus, therefore, invented, about 218 A.D., a rite of *Exhomologesis*—*i.e.*, of outright confession—which is yet to be found in some old service-books; *e.g.*, in those of the Armenian Church. It was a repetition of the rite of baptism, of which all the formalities were repeated except the use of water. But this "medicine of repentance," as the rubrics which still exist prescribe, could be used only once. If the Christian relapsed a second time, then he was really lost. Old-fashioned believers, like Tertullian and Hippolytus, railed against this innovation, which yet later generations found insufficient. Re-admission but once was not enough for sinners, and it was found necessary to permit it a second and third and fourth time; and finally it became the existing sacrament of penitence, which is inspired by the very convenient and roomy doctrine that, no matter how often and how wilfully a man sins, he can

always, by confession and penance, expiate his guilt and be reconciled to the Church.

Such was baptism in the primitive Church. So far as water—and, later on, holy oil—entered into the rite, it was analogous to the magical purificatory rites of other religions; but, in other respects, it was the expression of a lofty ideal, and in profound contrast with the later travesty of itself known as child-baptism. In the early Church the baptised formed, as it were, an aristocracy of picked individuals, who had voluntarily renounced the world and, like the sages in the Platonic Republic, dedicated themselves to the higher life. The professional clergy could not, under such conditions, stand out in relief against the laity as they did later on. The beginnings of clerical orders are obscure; but it would seem as if, at the first, priestly ordination, which was by laying on of hands, was no other than that rite of sealing with the spirit which constitutes the second half of the baptismal rite. The idea of one man transmitting to others a special spiritual value through his finger-tips laid on their heads is common to many primitive religions; and the belief which underlies Christian confirmation and ordination meets us in other religions. In the old Hebrew religion of sacrifice an animal was devoted by the priest laying his hands on its head before its life-blood was shed on the altar. More than one idea was at work in such imposition of hands. The sins of the people might be translated or transferred to the victim, which would then, like the scapegoat, be turned adrift in the desert, or sold to the nation's enemies. Or, instead of sin, it might be a spirit of wisdom or holiness which was so communicated. Thus, in Deuteronomy xxxiv. 9, Moses laid his hands

upon Joshua and imparted to him the spirit of wisdom. Such imposition might also serve just to identify the parties with one another. In Acts viii. 17 the apostles Peter and John lay their hands on converts, who instantly receive the holy spirit. In Acts xix. 6 the same rite induces, together with the spirit, speaking with tongues and prophesying. In Mithraic bas-reliefs Mithras lays his left hand on the head of a human figure representing the sun. In savage religions a most dangerous supernatural influence, or *mana*, is turned upon and into one who incautiously touches a chieftain charged therewith.

The holy spirit could also be communicated by blowing, and so in John xx. 22 Jesus *breathed on* the disciples and said: "*Receive ye the holy spirit: whose soever sins ye forgive, are forgiven unto them; whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained.*" In the Hermetic papyrus, edited by the late Professor Dieterich (Leipzig, 1903—*Eine Mithrasliturgie*), the votary addresses the sun-god thus: "O Sun, Lord of heaven and earth, god of gods, thy breath is powerful, powerful also thy might." And also thus: "May I be in mind born again, may I be hallowed and the holy spirit breathe in me."

Similar in origin is the priest's use of the extended hand in blessing a congregation. Examples of such a use of the hand meet us again and again in our anthropological studies and in folk-lore. The use of extended hand and pointed finger to-day in Italy to ward off the evil eye—a compendious name for all devilish influences—has come down from a remote antiquity. In many museums we have preserved models of hands with the fingers extended in the same way as an orthodox priest to-day extends them.

These were amulets to keep off demons. Ovid, in his *Fasti*, describes how the ancient head of a household scared away the demons of the unburied dead from his house by pointing his joined fingers and thumb at them, while someone else rattled the brass cauldrons. The gesture of the Christian priest has the same pedigree. He nominally blesses the congregation. In reality, he is pointing off the demons, as a Neapolitan with his finger or coral hand points off the evil eye.

In ancient Lycia there was a local cult of Zeus Sebazios, whom the Jewish colonists of that part of Asia Minor identified with the god of Sabaoth on account of the similarity of title. This cult spread westwards in the Roman epoch, and with it the ritual use, perhaps for healing purposes, of votive arms and hand. The arm is given from the elbow downwards, and the hand and fingers exactly reproduce the gesture made by a Greek orthodox priest in the act of blessing. It is supposed that it was through Jewish channels that this gesture came into the Christian Church. In the Middle Ages metal reliquaries, to contain the remains of saints, were made exactly on this device; and these may have been used to point off or avert demonic agencies and influence. The cornelian stone in a bishop's ring had the same meaning, for the cornelian stone is a great prophylactic against demons. I have traced back this belief among Christians as early as about A.D. 430. The ring in itself has a magical use of the same kind, and one of the three great relics kissed by Christian pilgrims to Jerusalem in the fourth century was the ring with which King Solomon controlled the demons and forced them to help him build his temple. The other

two relics were the true cross and the column of scourging. The latter is now shown in the church of St. Pudenziana at Rome. It is made of green travertine; but when St. Chrysostom saw it in Jerusalem about A.D. 400 it was made of wood.

One other circumstance is noteworthy in connection with the degeneration of the primitive baptism into the lifeless and superstitious *opus operatum* which, except among the Baptist sects, it is to-day. It degenerated exactly as the modern orthodox Christology grew up. We have seen how, in the synoptic Gospels, the descent of the spirit upon Jesus is regarded as the moment of his becoming the Messiah and Son of God. Presently the legend of the miraculous birth was diffused, and paved the way for a new apprehension of divine sonship, according to which he was Son of God and Messiah from the moment in which the holy spirit impregnated his mother. This new point of view, of course, emptied the story of his baptism of all sense and meaning; for if he was God incarnate from the first moment when he was conceived, what was added to him by the illumination in Jordan? He did not need it, and it merely overloaded him.

Thus Archelaus, Bishop of Kharkhar, a champion of Eastern orthodoxy, about A.D. 300, in an imaginary dialogue with Mani, who deified Jesus to the extent of denying his humanity altogether, says: "Tell me on whom it was that the holy Spirit descended as a dove? Who is it, too, that is baptised by John? If he was already perfect, if he was already Son of God, if he was already the power of God, it was impossible for the Spirit to enter him; as impossible as it would be

for kingship to enter kingship." "Among men born of women," he continues, "Jesus was as inferior to John, who baptised him, as he was superior to him in the kingdom of heaven."

In other words, Jesus was a mere man born of men until the descent of the spirit constituted him the Elect Son of God and first-born in the kingdom of heaven. The dialogue assumes that he was really the son of Joseph, and Mani attributes this view uncontradicted to his orthodox opponent. "To me," says Mani, "it seems more reverent to suppose that the Son of God did not need anything to facilitate his advent upon earth; that he could have done without the dove and the baptism, without a mother and brethren, perhaps even without a father, who, according to you, was Joseph."

The new Christology, however, accustomed men to regard the working of the spirit, not as an inward development of the mind and heart, but as a process mechanical and external to the self, like any of the natural processes by which the organism is built up in the womb. This is what is meant by the Latin phrase *opus operatum*—*i.e.*, a *work performed*, without the conscious co-operation of the individual's self. But if the spirit worked thus in the case of Jesus Christ, why not in the case of his followers? Why wait until a child could speak, act, and think for itself, in order to baptise it? Why not perform the rite immediately after birth? Thus the baptism of Jesus and the baptism of believers lost their primitive meaning *pari passu*, and together. The former came to be regarded as a mere pantomime which signified no spiritual advance, growth, or promotion of Jesus. The latter became a bit of idle magic, a washing with

water bewitched and a greasing with oil enchanted. No room was left for the idea of a convert self-regenerated and renewed through active repentance of sin and profession of faith. It is marvellous to hear modern divines railing against the Jews for their superstitious retention of the rite of circumcision, and, at the same time, insisting for new-born babes upon a rite every whit as superstitious, and even physically useless, which circumcision probably is not.

One other point merits notice. Jesus himself insisted, not on baptism, but on faith in the kingdom about to be revealed. His immediate followers, however, continued the baptism of John, and, according to traditional Jewish custom, insisted upon it as a first step in the moral reformation which prepared men for the kingdom. Soon it was found that impostors and heretics could baptise in the name of Jesus, or in that of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, just as much as the Catholics; in the same way as already during Jesus's lifetime others than his followers had been found to exploit his name. But, if the sacraments thus carried the Church, instead of the Church the sacraments, how were heretics and impostors to be kept out of it? The Roman Church in the second century, as against the Eastern communions, made the question doubly acute by deciding that the baptism of heretics was valid so long as it was administered even with the shorter formula "in the name of Jesus Christ." The difficulty was got over finally by augmenting the power and authority of the bishops, the visible heads of the congregations, and by commissioning them to exclude heretics from church union even though they were correctly baptised. Thus the importance originally attached

to continuity of baptism came to be attached to continuity of bishops; and each orthodox Church tried to trace back the succession or *diadoché* of its bishops to an apostle. By way of checking still further the infiltration of heretics, the rite of laying hands on the baptised, or confirming them with the gift of the spirit, was reserved to the bishops alone; and the episcopate itself was at a later time still further hedged round by the rule that presbyters should not consecrate a bishop, but only fellow-bishops.

CHAPTER XVII.

MARCION

DARWIN, in his autobiography, penned no more memorable passage than the following :

I had gradually come by this time—*i.e.*, 1836 to 1839—to see that the Old Testament was no more to be trusted than the sacred books of the Hindoos. The question then continually rose before my mind, and would not be banished, Is it credible that, if God were now to make a revelation to the Hindoos, he would permit it to be connected with the belief in Vishnu, Siva, etc., as Christianity is connected with the Old Testament? This appeared to me utterly incredible.

Darwin's life was given up to more important researches; yet, if he had had leisure for incursions into the domain of Church history, how pleased he would have been to find that, in the opinions he here broaches, he had been anticipated in the second century by one Marcion, a converted pagan and the greatest anti-Semite of antiquity!

It is unlikely that the latter approached the new religion by the path of Jewish proselytism. He seems, rather, like most of those to whom Paul turned in his later missionary work, to have passed direct from paganism to Pauline Christianity. Marcion went through no intermediate stage of initiation in Jewish monotheism, of disciplined respect for the Jewish scriptures; no such training obscured

for him the abrupt contrast between the Sermon on the Mount and the dispensation of Jahveh.

This contrast seemed to him so absolute that he denied any affinity of the spirit whom the Jews adored, and who inspired their scriptures, with the god who appeared on earth in the guise of Jesus. The former was a just god, indeed, visiting the sins of the fathers on their children; a jealous god, devoid of compassion for those who infringed his harsh law and barbaric prescriptions. He was also the author of Nature; for Nature's laws, like Jahveh's, are of iron—pitiless against the weak, and often contradictory of themselves. Alike in the history of Jahveh, as it is pictured in the Old Testament, and in nature, "red in tooth and claw with ravine," we have all shades of conduct, ranging from bare justice and resentment to arbitrary malice, from tenacious obstinacy to crass stupidity, but all alike falling short of real goodness.¹

The ancient Stoics, anxious to rehabilitate and purify the popular religion, had applied the method of allegory to the poems of Homer, which were the old Greek Bible. Whatever was offensive, immoral, or scandalous in the Court of Olympus was interpreted to mean something else than the texts, if literally interpreted, conveyed to the reader's mind. In this way the immoralities of the ancient gods were explained away, and the pious enabled to preserve their respect for texts traditionally holy. The Hellenised Jews of Alexandria followed, in respect of their own scriptures, the example set them by philosophers whose wisdom they had assimilated; and in the Greek version of the Bible executed in the third

¹ I quote from Harnack's *History of Dogma*, bk. i., ch. 5.

and second centuries before Christ not a few of the worst anthropomorphic traits of Jahveh were already glosed over and effaced. As early as 150 B.C. an Alexandrine Jew, named Aristobulus, issued for Gentile reading a commentary on the Pentateuch, in which he at once sought to prove that the Greek philosophers, Pythagoras, Socrates, and Plato, even Homer and Hesiod, had plagiarised the best of their wisdom from Moses, and also explained away such passages as attributed to the Jewish God hands and arms, face and feet, and represented him as coming down and walking about in the Garden of Eden. Philo, a contemporary of Jesus, followed Aristobulus in discarding the literal interpretation of Jahveh's record, especially where it conflicted with the higher notions of divine agency which Greek philosophers had thought out. He even went so far as to condemn as mythical sundry of the more disgraceful episodes in the history of Jahveh and of his prime favourites, the Jewish Patriarchs. In the second and following centuries such allegorisation was the recognised Christian method of Biblical exegesis; and Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Eusebius, Ambrose of Milan, and other Fathers of the Church, appropriated in their commentaries, without acknowledgment, page after page of the Philonean lucubrations.

Yet, after all, the method was a subterfuge, and in reading Philo we are aware of the disquietude of a mind which has already transcended, in religious and moral development, the standpoint of religious books inherited from a relatively barbarous past. Marcion was too honest—shall we not say too sensible?—to tolerate such a subterfuge. How, he asked, can the God who in Exodus demands eye for eye and tooth for

tooth be he who, incarnate in Jesus, bids us turn the other cheek to the smiter, love our enemies, and pray for them that persecute us? How can the God who in Deuteronomy addresses his chosen race in the words, "*Thou shalt lend unto many nations, and thou shalt not borrow,*" be he who declared, through Jesus, that "*Blessed are the poor, for theirs is the Kingdom of God*"; he from whom we have the precept: "*To one who asks of thee give; and from one who would borrow of thee, turn not away*"?

Marcion, in a book which, to the eternal scandal of the orthodox, he composed and called *Antitheses*, drew out the numerous contrasts and contradictions between the gospel of Jesus and the conduct of Jahveh, whom he denominated the just God in opposition to the good God who inspired Jesus, and whose sole attributes are love and mercy. He did not, of course, question the literal truth of the early chapters of Genesis, in which the creation of man and of the world is described; for, like the rest of the early Christians, he was not competent to distinguish history from fable. To Jahveh, however, as creator, he gave the name of Demiurge, and held that he made not only man's body, but, it would seem, his soul as well. The one and the other were hopelessly evil, and alien to the good God; but the latter's grace and mercy were all the more signally revealed when he set himself to rescue from the burdens of the Jewish law and the abominations of idolatry a human race in whose creation he had taken no part. In his benevolent work of salvation the good God ignored, said Marcion, the self-righteous Pharisaic Jew who, having kept the law, imagined himself to be justified; and addressed himself to the sinful Gentiles, who the more readily

accepted his message because they were humble. He came not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance.

In writing and preaching Marcion was thus at pains to take Jesus out of his Hebrew frame, to detach him from all Jewish associations, and to represent him as having been from the first the universalist teacher which, according to Paul, he became when God raised him from the dead. To those who objected that the twelve apostles kept the law, and represented their Master also as having insisted upon its observance, Marcion replied that the apostles were backsliders, and had falsified the record. He seems to have been acquainted with works of the apostles, possibly genuine, which were more uncompromising in their Judaism than any of the documents which have survived to us. In answer to those who objected that Jesus was born of Jewish parentage, and had been divinely recognised as the Jewish Messiah when John baptised him, Marcion denied all three of these facts. Jesus, he taught, was never born, never baptised, nor ever became the Jewish Messiah foretold by the Hebrew prophets. The latter, in accordance with those prophecies, was, he said, yet to appear and play a purely Jewish *rôle*. It was necessary for Marcion to have a written Gospel for his converts; so he took that of Luke, the companion of Paul, but not without mutilating it and cutting out the stories of the birth and baptism. It was comparatively safe and easy for him to eliminate the legends of Christ's birth and childhood; for, as we have said above, these were no part of the earliest body of evangelical tradition. In trying to suppress, also, the narrative of John's baptism of Jesus, Marcion anticipated the orthodoxy

Note || of later generations, which found in that narrative nothing but an awkward tradition needing to be explained away. From the Epistles of Paul, which he was the first to collect together in one book, *important* Marcion excised many passages which violated his ideal of Jesus. At the expense of his theory, however, he admitted the fact of the crucifixion, forgetting that a divinely appointed being, who had dropped straight out of heaven, could hardly undergo crucifixion in the flesh. His Gnostic contemporaries, who denied Jesus to have been born, more consistently held that he was never crucified either; but on this point the teaching of Paul was for Marcion authoritative, and he did not see his way to resist it.

I have dwelt so long on the arguments of Marcion because they are curiously apposite in the present day. The Manicheans, after the extinction of Marcion's Church, continued to diffuse his *Antitheses*; and as late as the end of the thirteenth century thousands of Cathars, as they were called, perished at the stake all over Europe for affirming that the Old Testament was inspired by an evil Demiurge. The Church burned them, but was, nevertheless, so put to shame by their arguments as to withdraw the book as much as possible from the hands of the laity. The so-called reformers of the sixteenth century, having divorced themselves from the unity of the Catholic Church, and being in quest of some authority upon which to base their teaching and discipline, tried to substitute the Bible for the Pope; and thousands of misguided people still imagine that the ends of piety are served by thrusting barbarous translations of the Pentateuch into the hands of savages. Educated Anglicans, however, are visibly uncomfortable about it, and begin

to realise that it is hardly appropriate for their white-robed choirs of small boys to be chanting daily such vindictive imprecations as Psalm 137, to take a single example, contains :—

O daughter of Babylon, that art to be destroyed;
 Happy shall be he, that rewardeth thee,
 As thou hast served us.
 Happy shall he be, that taketh and dasheth thy
 little ones
 Against the rock.¹

And what is to be said of such advice as the book of the Proverbs of Solomon supplies (ch. xxiv. 17) ?—

If thy enemy falleth, exult not over him. And when he is overthrown, be not puffed up, Lest the Lord see it, and it displease him, And he turn away his wrath from him.

What are divines to do? The old methods of allegory are discredited and out of date; and modern Hebrew scholarship, Assyriological research, and the comparative study of religion render it impossible any longer to deny that the compilers of the Pentateuch borrowed their tales from older pagan sources; that before the age of Saul and David the narratives of the Old Testament are almost wholly legendary; and, lastly, that the Hebrew religion of taboo and sacrifice was in any essential manner distinguishable from or superior to similar cults among pagans both ancient and modern.

The Darwinian idea of evolution, so long decried and denied, is at the eleventh hour caught at by these distressed theologians as supplying a way out of their difficulties; and we hear proclaimed from many a

¹ Verses 8 and 9, according to the Revised Version.

pulpit a new and strange doctrine—that the Bible is the record of a progressive revelation.

Let us examine this conception. It implies that a being, denominated God, omnipotent and morally perfect, desiring to reveal his nature to mankind, was obliged to do so piecemeal and by slow degrees. Had he flashed upon mankind all at once his full-orbed perfection, it would merely have dazzled their eyes, confounded their faculty of comprehension, and contributed nothing to their moral advance. So he began with humanity, as parents to-day begin with their children, by instructing them in myths and legends, and by initiating them in barbarous rites and cults, such as animal sacrifice, which hinted at and foreshadowed, but did not yet accurately embody, the truer sacramental worship of the Catholic Church. Nor is the talk of progressive revelation confined to one set of religionists; and just as the Catholic pretends that the sacrifice of the Mass is the ultimate stage of religious evolution, so the Calvinist considers it to consist in a belief in Predestination. As taught by the High Church clergy of the Anglican communion, this new conception is a quiet way of discarding much in the Bible that is notoriously at variance with modern ideals of propriety, and of substituting for the authority of the scriptures that of a miracle-working caste. Often in the pulpit, however, old and pious commonplaces about God's Book continue to be repeated which in private conversation are relegated to the intellectual lumber-room. The few among the clergy who have seriously attempted to think it out have begun to discern the logical outcome of their new conception, which is this, that, if the cosmogonic and theological notions of Genesis and Exodus are to

be regarded as an early step or stage in a divine but progressive revelation, then no less must be admitted in respect of the old Assyrian and Egyptian religions, the indebtedness to which of the Pentateuch is apparent to modern scholars. Nor can the claim to be similarly imperfect revelations be denied to the religious systems of Persia, India, Greece, and Rome. Thus the title of revealed religion must in the end be accorded to every cult, however savage, that human awe has ever generated; and, instead of there being one chosen people, the Jews, to whom the divine being vouchsafed a knowledge of himself, there have been many. It is idle to pretend that the Pentateuch has a moral standard and value which the works of Confucius or of the Buddhists have not. If we admit lections in church and chapel from the Pentateuch, then why not from other equally worthy sources? I will not deny that much of the Bible is as superior in literary and moral respects to the Zend Avesta as a play of Shakespeare to an ill-written cookery book; I realise that Christianity triumphed over Mithraism, its rival of the second and third centuries, because the latter was weighted with too many myths immoral and inane. But if the Bible triumphed long ago over other sacred literatures just because of its intrinsic superiority, is not that fact a good reason to-day for cancelling in daily worship all passages redolent of the earliest and most barbarous stage of progressive revelation? The evil result of singing and reading out such literature in church and chapel must have impressed every student of the history of religion in Europe. For the persecutor has ever found in the precepts of Jahveh an armoury of cruel texts, justifying by reason of their supposed divine

authority the worst excesses of religious fanaticism. The bibliolatry of the reformed Churches was even less humane in its results than the sacerdotalism of Rome.

It is not clear, then, that the theory of a progressive revelation as applied by the clergy is anything more than a lame excuse for adhering to old, but false, weights and measures. It also rests on a fallacy. The full truth, it argues, could not from the first be revealed to man, and God was obliged, if we may use a phrase from mechanics, carefully to dose his revelation. But how many crude conceptions, culled either from the Old Testament or from the New, especially from Paul, and enshrined long ago in catechisms, liturgies, and articles of religion, continue to be thrust upon children, congregations, and curates under the high-sounding title of religious education and divinity? Do we, then, live in the first and barbarous stages of human development, that this should be? Where is the English bishop who has the courage to urge a better way? The one idea of the English higher clergy is rather to keep the Church together; and as this aim entails much quiet suppression of the truth, they sit on their bench in the House of Lords timorous and tongue-tied. The crescent moon is no less bright than the full orb of fourteen nights; but do the fables of the Garden of Eden, of the talking serpent, of the vindictive God punishing his own creatures because they desire knowledge, of Noah and his Ark, give us any light at all? Are they more respectable than the myth of Prometheus chained to the rock by Zeus because he revealed the use of fire to mankind? And yet it is on such fables that the doctrine of human redemption, as formulated by Paul and promulgated in catechisms, reposes. And how is it possible for any

educated person of to-day to acquiesce in the hypothesis of a chosen people, acceptable above all others to the creator of heaven and earth? And will not anyone who studies candidly the historical books of the Old Testament exclaim with Marcion "Like creator, like people"? What claim had the Jews to be taken at their own estimate? Did the ancient Assyrians and Egyptians, the Greeks and the Romans, contribute less than they to our science and civilisation? And, after all, is not the very idea of one people being chosen above others, as it is presented in the Old Testament, utterly mythological—on a level with the story of the patronage of Aeneas and the house of Augustus by Venus, or of the Argives by Hera, the spouse of Zeus?

The adversaries of Marcion complained that by separating Jesus from history, by taking his portrait out of its Jewish frame, he effaced all his lineaments and left but an empty shadow. For nine-tenths of early Christian literature consist of a laborious demonstration that Jesus was the promised Messiah foretold by the Jewish prophets; and Marcion, by denying both premise and conclusion, at a single stroke made all this literature idle and superfluous. But does the modern divine do less when he accepts, as he must accept, the results of modern Hebrew scholarship? For this interprets the text of Isaiah and the rest of the prophets by the circumstances and outlook of the ages in which they wrote, and dismisses almost contemptuously the old view that they wrote with their eyes fixed on events which were only to transpire seven or eight hundred years later. If we discard the Jewish idea of a Messiah, as belonging to a lower and exploded stage of progressive revelation, or—what is the same thing—of religious evolution,

what meaning is left to the terms Christ and Christians? Is their retention more than make-believe? Our forefathers could honestly call themselves Christians, because they shared with the Jews the old conception of Messiahship; but that conception to-day has been consigned to the lumber-room.

Let us pass on to another aspect of the teaching of Marcion. He was not content to deny that Jahveh was the good God who reveals himself in Jesus. He equally denied the visible, sensible world to be the work of this good God. Here again he touched on a problem which more and more exercises the mind of our own generation, rendering impossible the old facile optimism of Catholic Christianity. The question forces itself on us: Can we, apart from man and the higher animals, especially the mammals, in some of which we discern the rudiments of a conscience, detect anywhere in nature the workings of a mind actuated by love and mercy? Our race has been able to establish a foothold on this earth late in its geological development. But our tenure is frail and precarious; and our origins were as much the result of accident as the emergence of any other form of life. Our mother earth in her frequent convulsions has no respect for our cities and centres of civilisation; and we can easily imagine a cosmic catastrophe, such as a sudden increase or decrease in the solar temperature or the impact of a foreign body, solid or gaseous, on the solar system, which would in a moment carry death and desolation all over our globe. How, moreover, can we reconcile with the conception of a Providence, of a Creator who watches over us as a parent over his children, the great volume of human suffering and disease? We daily see children born

maimed, crippled, or tainted with hereditary disease and madness. It is poor comfort to read that God is a jealous god, who visits the sins of the fathers upon the children to the third and fourth generation. It is all too true that they are so visited, but the intelligent and all-powerful being who should be responsible for the infliction of so much suffering upon innocent beings, would be wickeder than the wickedest of our human criminals—would, indeed, be the evil Demiurge that Marcion declared the God of the Jews to be.

Nor is it on the moral side only that the old monotheism is impossible. What sense can we attach to the words in which the Roman Church placed on record, in the so-called Apostles' Creed, its rejection of Marcion's dualism? I mean the words: "I believe in God the Father Almighty, maker of heaven and of earth." The little ones, of course, figure to themselves a stupendously exaggerated man taking matter in quasi-human hands, and fashioning it into this and that. Paul compared the Creator to a potter working clay into vessels, and used the simile in order to demonstrate what is to our minds a wholly unmoral—we would rather say immoral—conception of Deity. God, he declares (Romans ix. 18), "*hath mercy on whom he will, and whom he will he hardeneth.*" The obvious answer is that those who are fashioned to wickedness by their Creator cannot be blamed, for they cannot help being wicked; and this thought arose in Paul's mind, for he continues thus: "*Thou wilt say then unto me, Why doth he still find fault? For who can oppose his will?*" Paul answers the imaginary objector as follows: "*Nay, but, O man, who art thou that bandiest words with God? Shall the thing formed say to him who formed it, Why didst thou*

make me thus? Or hath not the potter a right over the clay, from the same lump to make one part a vessel unto honour, and another unto dishonour?"

This idea of an arch-potter or omnipotent agent making the universe will not bear examination. Inside the universe of our experience we can with our hands, and perhaps using tools as well, divert already-existing properties of matter, or contrive new combinations, new actions and reactions, at which unassisted nature would never arrive, but which we require for our needs. But the matter we thus work up into new forms was never formless, and the contemplation of our activity does not really assist us to explain how the universe arose. We merely pay ourselves with words when we talk about the necessity of a First Cause. Inside our experience—that is to say, inside the world—one object or agent or material state causes another; but every such relation of causality is between part and part of the universe, and not between it and a being that is not the universe. I avoid saying a being that is outside the universe, for here again we use a category or way of looking at the matter under discussion which is inadequate. Objects inside our universe or inside our experience (which is the same thing) are outside, as they are also beside, one another. But outside the universe there can be nothing. In other words, space and spatial relations are real, and hold good, inside the universe or inside experience alone. If we think it out, we shall find that no categories under which we can envisage material reality are applicable to the universe as a whole, and we fall into contradictions so soon as we try to apply them. Thus the world as a whole is neither in space nor not in space, neither

limited nor unlimited, neither caused nor uncaused, perhaps neither in time nor not in time. It is as difficult to invent formulæ that adequately represent it as to invent similar ones for the mind. The least insufficient way of describing it is to say that it is the known or knowable; and John Stuart Mill was not far wrong in defining matter to be the permanent possibility of sensation. Its *esse* is *percipi*; its reality lies in its being perceived.

To the untutored person this sounds the rankest nonsense, and he will ask: "What, then, becomes of reality when men are asleep or all of them dead?" He has never asked himself the question: "What becomes of colours or sounds or tastes or smells in the absence of a self which sees, hears, tastes, and smells?" The permanence and continuity which we attribute to matter are qualities rather of the knower than of the known, of the percipient than of the perceived. Nor is the difficulty raised about sleep so insoluble as it at first sight seems to be. Our individual selves are continuous across intervals of sleep, for we wake up the same persons we were before, and to the same world. In other words, the self or spirit has not slept, but merely not manifested itself for a time through sensible agencies or percepts to those who kept awake. Death, viewed from a psychological standpoint, is the same fact as sleep. "But," the champion of common sense will object, "where and how was my world before I was born?" I should reply: "Exactly where and as it is when you are asleep. As a self and percipient of a real world, you neither sleep nor die. On the contrary, your judgments have all a universal range; and when you say, 'This earth is round,' or 'The three

angles of a triangle are equal to two right angles,' you do not think it necessary to add, 'so long as I am awake,' or 'since I was born.'"

The untutored man, who undertakes, like Dr. Johnson, to refute Bishop Berkeley with the arms of mere common sense, is firmly persuaded that the universe persists as a system in space and time and a complex of contrasts of colour, sound, and so forth, no matter whether he perceives it or not. He is, in a sense, right. But he is also clearly wrong, so far as he makes abstraction of mind and of the work mind has done in construing to him his sensations, in selecting them, and arranging them into an order or cosmos. Mind, the objectifying or world-making faculty of thought, is ever at work in each of us; and to it, as the home and centre of all relations and contrasts, belong, if at all, substance and reality, rather than to the material objects whose entire nature consists of sensible contrasts and relations which are before a self, but not of it. In truth, however, mind and matter, subject and object, can as little exist apart, and have as little meaning in abstraction from each other, as concave and convex. They are two aspects of the one whole. The unity of the world, its common objectivity for you and me, is a mere reflection of the ultimate unity amid diversity of our minds; and as in the speculative sphere we lay down judgments that purport to be universal, so in the moral sphere the conscience at each step enacts rules that hold, not for him who enacts them alone, but for all; for that is what we mean by an action being right and a motive good. It is the expression of a common supersensuous self, which lies at the root of all civil institutions, and enshrines itself in law, written or unwritten. If,

then, there be a God, our moral judgments, *pace* St. Paul, are as binding on him as on us. If he offends our elementary feelings of justice and mercy, then he is no God for us, but an evil demon.

Some metaphysicians have spoken of the universal mind which is realising itself in each of us as God. But God is usually conceived as a personal being, and the universal mind, or objectifying, creative thought, which works in us and through us is not a person, as each of us is, but something higher and vaster than all persons. We can perhaps say that the universe consists of a society of spirits, of which some may be more developed than others. More than this we cannot venture to affirm; and there is anyhow no need to suppose that there is one mind immeasurably transcending all the rest. The vulgar conception of a supreme God and Father is a naïve transference to the beyond of the patriarchal sovereignty of an earthly king. We see the animals below us on various rungs of the ladder of mental and moral development, and we cannot without presumption suppose ourselves to have reached the highest. There is, from this point of view, more to be said in favour of polytheism than is usually supposed; and more of ultimate truth may underlie the Catholic cult of saints than underlies the cold abstractions of Mohammedan theology. The Christians themselves soon found it impossible to acquiesce in a God who is single and solitary, and invented three or four gods. Their only mistake philosophically is that they have not myriads. So far as our experience goes, spirits do not communicate with one another, except through material symbols; but it is no necessity of thought that this should be so. The association of spirits with material bodies, without

which they would, so far as we know, co-exist unperceived one by the other, as might men deaf, dumb, and blind, and devoid of a sense even of touch, is perhaps a condition of soul-development; but it is also the evident cause of all those physical pains and discomforts which militate so profoundly against the idea of a monarchical providence, of a creative God both omnipotent and merciful.

We cannot, then, accept to-day the clause of the so-called Apostles' Creed in which the Church of Rome, about the middle of the second century, embodied its protest against Marcion: "*I believe in one God the Father, maker of heaven and earth.*" The visitor to the Vatican, as he traverses the long gallery which leads to the library and collection of sculptures, sees let into the wall, side by side with hundreds of inscriptions, mostly taken from the catacombs, a stone slab, on which are figured in deep incision a girl's upraised hands and forearms, from the elbows downwards. These divide into three columns of unequal breadth the following pathetic inscription: "Procope, lebo [*read* levo] manus contra deum qui me innocentem puellam sustulit quæ vixit annos xx. pos. Proclus." It is the grave-stone of a maiden who thus addresses her betrothed lover: "O Procopius, I raise my hands against God, who has snatched away me, an innocent girl. She lived twenty years." The mourning parent Proclus who raised this monument to his child felt with Marcion that the name of father ill suits a God who tramples on our affections, denies our dearest instincts, and has established in nature a kingdom almost wholly devoid of mercy and truth.

CHAPTER XVIII.

DEVELOPMENT

THOSE who to-day read the New Testament critically, and they are few, are aware of a deep chasm separating it, not only from modern ideas and civilisation, but even from the Churches around them. Differences hardly less profound divide the orthodoxy of the fourth century from the messianic Judaism of the first age. The question, accordingly, arose before the mind of John Henry Newman whether there is not an actual discontinuity between the dogmas of Catholicism and the faith revealed to the saints; and, in order to surmount the difficulty, he invoked the idea of development. The creeds and decisions of the Councils are, he argued, a mere unfolding and rendering explicit of the still unprecise and undefined data revealed to the apostles, and more or less completely enshrined in the Bible; and, in a work entitled *The Development of Christian Doctrine*, he tried to find in the New Testament the germs of later doctrines and customs—of the Trinity, the motherhood of God, the consubstantiality of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, of infant baptism, of Purgatory, and so forth.

Such a task seemed possible to Newman, partly because in his day criticism was unborn, partly because he could assume, without risk of contradiction, that the Fourth Gospel was the work of an apostle, and a faithful representation of the personality and teaching of Jesus; nor, in his day, did anyone,

in England at least, dream of challenging the Pauline conceptions of the Messiah.

But to-day it is being made every day clearer and more certain that the writings of the New Testament themselves represent an evolution of ideas, beliefs, and traditions which took, in the case of the earliest of the documents some thirty, of the latest nearly a hundred, years.

During this period a hundred influences were at work to mould and amplify the primitive tradition of Jesus; and the four Gospels of our New Testament, and others of which we have but a few fragments, like the Gospel of the Hebrews, of the pseudo-Peter, of the Egyptians, were the result of the process. In our earliest surviving sources, the Gospel of Mark and the non-Marcian document, we can already trace such influences; and the former especially is seen on examination to be a selection from floating popular traditions, made by some credulous person with a bias for miracles. In his scholarly work, *Les Légendes Hagiographiques*, Father Hippolyte Delehaye, S.J. (Brussels, 1905), has a chapter entitled "The Dossier of a Saint," in which he shows how the brief and true account given by Eusebius of a martyr named Procopius, who suffered under Diocletian, was added to and recast by the professional compilers of Acts of Saints until it was no longer recognisable. All the stages by which the acts of this saint were exaggerated and falsified lie before us in the different manuscripts; and, if we had not got Eusebius' succinct and sober narrative of his trial and execution, we could hardly venture to affirm that Procopius was a historical personage at all, and not rather a creation of the mythoplastic imagination of hagiographers. The

paragraph in which Father Delehayé sums up the difficulties which beset Bollandist editors anxious to winnow out the grain of truth in the Lives of Saints from the chaff of legend is so thoroughly applicable to students of the life of Jesus that I venture to translate it. It is as follows :—

It is often a very arduous task to establish the title of a saint of the early centuries to the honours of public cult. Even when historical documents are not completely wanting, they have often undergone such alterations, through the combined efforts of legend and hagiographer, that we cannot make use of them without extreme precautions. Nor is our task accomplished when, by a rare bit of luck, the cause of the saint reposes on a relatively well-furnished *dossier*; for it is still incumbent on us to know how to class the pieces which compose it, to interpret them at their just value, to weigh the testimonies, to try to establish the degree of credence which each of them merits. Here we have a task both lengthy and of infinite delicacy, in the discharge of which many a pitfall awaits the novice in criticism who is insufficiently familiarised with hagiography.

Neither Jesus nor his disciples came before their public with cut-and-dried creeds, in the faithful reception of which lay a man's chance of salvation. One all-constraining belief alone possessed them—namely, that a mighty upheaval was at hand, that the divine father, in his omnipotence, was about to bring this age to an end and inaugurate for the Jews a new era of salvation. Luke (xix. 11), following a true tradition, assures us that, as Jesus with his disciples drew "*nigh to Jerusalem,*" in order to keep the Passover in the course of which he was destined to perish, "*they supposed that*

the Kingdom of God was immediately to appear." Jesus had already, perhaps, gained the conviction that he was the Messiah, the man sent from God to inaugurate the new era, to part the sheep from the goats in the final judgment, to choose the elect from among the living, and to welcome, as they rose from their graves, the saints who slept. As Jesus conceived of the new kingdom, it was primarily a deliverance of Israel; yet not all Jews were to participate therein, but only those who had harkened to his own and to John the Baptist's summons to repentance. Thus although the promises had been made to Jews alone, yet the latter really lost their birthright so soon as moral qualifications began to be insisted upon by the judge. It was in this limitation of the future blessedness to those who had repented, and so won forgiveness of their sins, that lay the possibility and hope—nay, the necessity—of admitting the Gentiles. Their interests, however, almost certainly lay beyond Jesus's horizon. He was neither for nor against them, and just did not consider them at all. He can only be said to have made room for their admission in so far as his ideal state was to include those Jews alone who listened to his warnings, repented of their sins, and made their own in all purity of heart his ideal of a heavenly father who is merciful and loving.

So long as Jesus was alive the hopes of his followers must have been focussed on the new era about to be miraculously brought into being, rather than on him and his personality. He was to preside over it, indeed, when it came, to fill the chief throne, round which would be grouped the lesser thrones of his twelve apostles judging the twelve tribes of Israel; but he was the Messiah in promise only during the

preliminary stage in which he was proclaiming its advent and preparing men morally for its membership. Some students, like the late Dr. Martineau, have argued that Jesus never regarded himself as the Messiah nor wished his followers to acknowledge him as such; but the evidence to the contrary is overwhelming. He was sentenced by Pilate in his quality as King of the Jews, or Messiah; and, without the prior conviction that he was such, his disciples could never have recovered from the shock of his death and have transformed their old faith in him into the new conviction that the divine father had raised him up into heaven, whence he was to come again and inaugurate the new kingdom.

Jesus, as he went up to Jerusalem, may well have had misgivings, for he must have been well aware that he had to face in Pontius Pilate a notoriously stern and merciless administrator, little inclined to be just or merciful towards Messiahs and messianic movements, but rather discerning in them a danger to the Roman Empire. Jesus's own attitude to the Roman authority was purely negative: "*Give unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's, and to God the things which are God's.*" He was not for taking up arms against it, as Judas the Galilean had done. There was no need to do so, for would not Jehovah, in good time, quietly brush it aside?

His death took his disciples by surprise, for they had not in the least foreseen it, or they could not have "*supposed that the kingdom was immediately to appear.*" Tradition, it is true, soon ascribed to Jesus himself discourses in which his death and resurrection after three days were elaborately foretold; but the evangelist, even while he reports these conversations,

hints at the real truth when he adds (Mark ix. 10) that "*they kept the saying to themselves, questioning among themselves what the rising again from the dead should mean.*" It was only when his death overtook them, and visions of a Messiah cut off in his prime, and forsaken by themselves in the hour of need, began to haunt their remorseful imaginations, that they discovered his passion and death to be necessary moments in the scheme of Israel's salvation, duly foretold by Isaiah and the rest of the prophets. Even at the last supper, as we have seen above (p. 268), Jesus did not foresee his death. His visionary expectations of the advent of the kingdom had then reached their climax. He had been acclaimed Messiah by the multitude as he entered the holy city. Could Providence tarry any longer? He was so certain that the glorious consummation was imminent as to assure his disciples that this was the last time he would drink with them under the old conditions "*of the fruit of the vine. I will no more drink*" thereof, he says, "*until the day when I drink it new in the Kingdom of God.*" He does not know that his death is to intervene between then and now. When, therefore, the blow fell, it became incumbent on his followers either to resign their hope and abandon the movement for which they had given up all, or to modify the messianic scheme and make room in it for the crucifixion and death of their Messiah. They quickly took the latter course. New prophecies were invoked, of a kind to prove that the disgraceful death on the cross, which the unbelieving of their compatriots cast in their teeth, was foreordained of God, as a necessary episode in the working out of the scheme of Israel's salvation. The Messiah had all along been pre-

destined to die and be raised from the dead to the right hand of the father, thence to return in glory and set up on a rejuvenated earth his eternal kingdom.

The minds of believers were already busy in this direction, when the persecutor Paul joined forces with them—a host in himself; for he soon discovered a new significance in the Christ's death, that of an expiatory and final sacrifice for the sins of mankind. Philo had long before taught that the just man is a ransom for the many, so that Paul merely made application to Jesus of an idea already current. Nevertheless, it was a stroke of genius; for it enlisted in behalf of the new messianic movement old sacrificial beliefs common to Jew and Gentile alike, and prepared Christians to regard as of providential design the subsequent destruction by Titus of the Jewish temple, with its pomp of burnt-offerings. Henceforth the crucifixion was nothing to be ashamed of; Paul openly gloried in it, and the author of the Fourth Gospel regarded it as the final glorification of Jesus. It is obvious, then, that Jesus himself had no idea of founding a new religion, much less of founding, like Mahomet, a book religion. He was devoured with the expectation of a divine kingdom, which he believed was to be miraculously set up on this earth before his own and his disciples' eyes, even within the lifetime of the generation that listened to him. His one desire was to gain over men's minds to this belief, and persuade them to repent and lead a new life before it was too late. He did not profess to reveal new rules and precepts for men's guidance in this present life, viewed as permanent and assured; for his own conviction, like that of his apostles and followers, was that which Paul expresses in the words:

“But this I say, brethren, the time is shortened.....the fashion of this world passeth away” (1 Corinthians vii. 29, 31). The end was to come *“like a thief in the night,”* and the most one could do was *“to watch and pray.”* Marriage, family ties, property, law, police—nay, life itself—were all to be sacrificed and abandoned if, and in so far as, they stood in the way of the soul’s preparation for the great event impending. To his own apostles Jesus said (Matthew x. 23): *“Verily I say unto you, ye shall not have gone through the cities of Israel before the son of man come.”*

After the death of Jesus his disciples continued to proclaim that he must soon and suddenly return on clouds of glory from heaven and restore the kingdom to Israel. Following in his steps, they insisted on the necessity of repentance and moral preparation for the new era. This was the wedding-garment without which men would be excluded from the marriage-feast. But weeks turned into months, months into years, years into generations; yet nothing happened. Meanwhile there was born of the waiting the church or *ecclesia*, organised under presbyters or bishops, fenced off from the world with catechumenate and baptism, fed with eucharist and agapé, endowed throughout its members with gifts and graces of the holy spirit.

And it is not perhaps untrue to say that the death of Jesus engendered Christology; for his personality occupied a larger space in men’s minds, and had more significance attached to it in the scheme of salvation, after his death than before it. In his earthly career he had been herald rather than agent. He had come in weakness and humility, but now was to come in

glory and power. The legend of his Davidic pedigree was now added to the tradition, and also, though much later on, that of his miraculous birth. It also devolved on the teachers of the Church to demonstrate from the Old Testament prophecies that his death was part of a pre-arranged scheme, and that he was himself a pre-existent heavenly being temporarily revealed in our sinful flesh, then withdrawn to heaven, thence to re-appear in glory at the consummation or end of the age. Paul further discovered him to be the heavenly Adam and the Wisdom and Power of God — conceptions which figure largely in the Sapiential books and in the theosophy of Philo. In the so-called Pastoral Epistles he is declared to be the mediator between God and man—an idea equally found in Philo; and this train of speculation was crowned towards the end of the century by the declaration that he was the Logos or Word of God, which, as Philo says, comes down from heaven to earth and ascends thither again. Later on the thinkers of the Church derived from the same Alexandrine source both the name and the idea of a divine Trinity, for Philo taught that the divine being or nature is a three-in-one and one-in-three, and two of the persons with which he fills up his formula—namely, the king and father, and the son or Logos—are identical with those which Christian orthodoxy put forward in this scheme. It is plain that the Christians originated few ideas. The dregs of old Greek, especially Platonic, philosophy, filtered down to them through Philo and other Greek Jews of Alexandria; and they dressed up the homely Jewish Messiah in one figment after another, and finally concocted about him such empty rigmaroles

of *a priori* notions as we have in the so-called creed of Athanasius.

We have already considered, in the preceding chapter, whether the conception of an omnipotent, and at the same time benevolent, God and Creator of the universe is either a probable or possible one. Let us now ask ourselves how much of the traditional fabric of Christianity is left standing to-day; how much of it, if any, an intelligent man can accept.

Properly speaking, you need to have gone through the phase of being a Jew and of believing the Jews to be the chosen race before you can embrace the messianic hope, and believe that Jesus was the embodiment of that hope. Now, why the Jews, rather than the Greeks or Romans, should be regarded as the one chosen people of a benevolent God, I fail to see. As much as anyone, I admit the Olympic grandeur of much of their ancient literature; and I recognise that their tribal deity, in spite of his bloodthirsty, capricious character and unrelenting cruelty to other tribes than his favourite Israel, was at least superior to the pagan Jupiter or Zeus, in so far as he was not a libidinous being, continually indulging in disgraceful liaisons. Of him there was no *chronique scandaleuse*, and even to his angels was denied what was the first privilege of pagan deities. Nevertheless, the sacrificial cults and taboos of the Jews were no better and no worse than those of other half-savage religions.

We may, then, admit the greater austerity of Hebrew theology; but what contributions to culture, art, poetry, philosophy, history, law, and political science had the Jews ever made comparable to those made by Greeks and Romans? To the mind of the late Mr. Darwin, as we saw—and he was a man who, more

than most, looked at things as they really are—it was an initial and insuperable objection to Christianity that it has taken the Jews at their own measure, and granted as a postulate that they were, until the Christian era, the chosen people of God. The very idea, then, of a chosen people belongs to a forgotten mythology; and so do other cardinal notions on which Christianity reposes, such as the fall of man, original sin, and redemption. We are beginning to recognise that it is truer to speak of the rise of man than of his fall, and of original virtue than of original sin. We begin to realise that, if anyone needed redemption, it was Jahveh, and not Adam, nor even Satan, if, at least, the sole offence of the latter was that he deemed it, as Milton says,

Better to reign in hell than serve in heaven.

Thus the entire circle of ideas entertained by Christ and Paul are alien and strange to us to-day, and have lost all actuality and living interest. None, except a few ignorant ranters, believe to-day that the kingdom of God is imminent, and that any day Christ may appear on the clouds of heaven and set up the last assize, after which he will drive those who never believed in him down into hell, and establish on this earth an eternal reign of peace and prosperity for his elect ones. Jesus himself is seen to have lived and died for an illusion, which Paul and the apostles shared; and of this illusion the Church is the offspring, though for centuries she has striven to deny her true parentage. Jesus never claimed to found a religion, nor was he responsible for the emergence of the Church, save by accident and indirectly.

It barely needs to be remarked that the world-scheme of Jesus and his followers was other than our

own, and purely mythological. Who to-day believes in a God who has a right and a left hand? Yet our clergy profess to believe in so many words that Jesus, when he rose from the dead and ascended into heaven, sat down at the right hand of God. So we read in Acts that Stephen, the first martyr, "*being full of the Holy Ghost, looked up steadfastly into heaven, and saw the glory of God, and Jesus standing on the right hand of God.*" And in the appendix of Mark we read that "*the Lord Jesus was received up into heaven, and sat down at the right hand of God.*"

Heaven, in the imagination of these writers, was an Olympus, suspended far above a flat and fixed earth, of which the nether parts were sometimes given up to the dead, like the classic Tartarus. Paul reckoned that there were several heavens, and was himself "*caught up even to the third*" of them, "*whether in the body or out of the body*" he "*knew not.*" He no doubt, like the authors of the Slavonic book of Enoch, of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, and of many other Jewish apocryphs of that age, shared the old Persian belief that there were seven heavens, in the highest of which sat the Almighty on a great white throne, surrounded by winged cherubim. Luke draws us a picture of the Christ's ascent into heaven in Acts i. 9: "*When he had said these things, as they were looking, he was taken up; and a cloud received him out of their sight.*"

The Irish mathematician, Sir William Rowan Hamilton, once allowed himself to be drawn into the speculation of how far out into space Jesus could proceed in a certain time if he was rising at the moderate rate which the above passage contemplates. When his calculations revealed to him that he would

as yet not have reached the nearest of the fixed stars, he began, as a good Christian, to recoil from his speculation, and relegated the matter to faith, as a mystery beyond the reach of human reason.

From a religion which claims to be a final revelation we surely expect some teaching that we can lay hold of about the soul, about spirit, about immortality. But its founder had none. He looked forward to a miraculous epoch of material prosperity on this earth, in a land where the lost sheep of the house of Israel were to pasture once more under the immediate protection and guidance of Jehovah. This blessed era was to dawn at once, and the just among the dead were to rise from their graves and participate in the flesh with those who should be still alive when it opened. The Church has tried, lamely enough, to interpret these millennial beliefs of the first age with reference to a life which awaits us all beyond the grave; but any such idea was foreign to the mind of Jesus. He was probably incapable of conceiving of a purely spiritual existence in detachment from the body; and if he ever asked himself, as he probably never did, about the nature of spirit, he must, like others of his age, have decided it to be an attenuated form of matter, similar to the wind, of which we perceive the effects and hear the sound, though in itself it remains intangible and invisible. Small blame to Jesus, if he was no philosopher. What is really amazing at the present day is that bishops and deans should be quarrelling over the question whether this Galilean prophet was omniscient or not. The Bishop of Birmingham, Dr. Gore, has written a learned treatise on the point, and gingerly concludes that he was not omniscient, because he was not *au courant*

with the latest results of higher criticism; but he insists that Jesus was anyhow infallible, like a modern pope.

It only remains to address a warning to those who desire to make a speedy end of orthodox Christianity, in the belief that, if they could make a *tabula rasa* of the European mind, something much better would instantly take its place. I would advise such dreamers to enter a museum of anthropology, like the Pitt Rivers collection in Oxford, and survey the hideous goblins and ghouls still worshipped by savage races all over the globe. Let them only visit Perugia, and inspect the collection of ancient, medieval, and modern Italian fetiches collected there by a Professor Giuseppe Bellucci. There is no difference between those of the present and those of past ages. Perhaps we ought to be grateful to the Catholic Church in Latin countries for having established cults so respectable as those of the Virgin and the saints; for it is certain that, in default of them, the Latin peasant would relapse into a fetichism as old as the hills around him. You can turn Spanish and Italian peasants into anti-clericals, but you seldom turn them into Rationalists. They may give up Christianity; but they only believe all the more firmly in the evil eye, and in all the debasing practices which attend the belief. In the same way the Irish peasant, if you robbed him of his Catholicism, would at once lapse into the cult of hob-goblins; for this, in spite of the effort made during centuries by the Church to eradicate it, lies everywhere a very little way below the surface, and belongs to the inmost convolutions of his brain.

This is not to say that in our own land, where real emancipation is more possible, we ought to

compromise with falsehood, and go into the Church and recite creeds which we no longer believe, merely because it is held respectable to do so. Those who cannot accept a creed literally do best to avoid it altogether; and I believe that the intellectual atmosphere of Oxford and of England at large would to-day be clearer and more wholesome, if men like Jowett and Stanley had, like Newman, boldly left the Church, given up their orders, and followed wherever clear thinking might have led them. There could not then have been related of Jowett such a *bon mot* as this, that when he publicly recited the creed in Balliol College chapel he surreptitiously interpolated the words *used to* before the word *believe*, and began thus: "I *used to* believe," etc.

There is too often a want of candour about the discourses and works of our orthodox English clergy which leaves on our minds a disagreeable impression. They ought to write as scholars and men of learning, but their tone is that of apologists. They lack thoroughness and sincerity, and are for ever pulling up their horses just as they seem about to leap. The result is that, instead of clearing their fences, they are left floundering in the muddy ditch of deanery and prebend. When Anglican bishops meet together in council they talk and write as if religious life was impossible unless it be based on a quiet, but wholesale, suppression of truth. They certainly deserve the stinging rebuke which Mommsen inflicted when, in his discussion of the census of Quirinius (see p. 191), in his work, *Res Gestæ D. Augusti* (Berlin, pub. 1883, p. 176), he expressed a fear lest his historical researches should be exploited, for their own ends, by *homines theologi vel non theologi sed ad instar*

theologorum, ex vinculis sermocinantes—that is, “by men who are theologians, or who, without being even that, yet, after the manner of theologians, chatter from their chains.” And the chains are quite imaginary, for such a reign of terror as the present reactionary pope has created in the Catholic Church is inconceivable in the Anglican. I used to know a dog over whose head his master needed only to make a few passes, as if he were tying him up to a fence, and nothing, not even his master’s call, could induce him to move. He believed he was tied up, without being so. The docility of those who, at ordination, pledge themselves to a number of propositions which had a meaning and application four hundred years ago, but have lost it now, is only to be paralleled by this example of canine scholasticism.

ADDITIONAL NOTES AND CORRECTIONS

P. 38.—*The task of a purely Jewish Messiah.*

It is worth while to compare the histories of later Jewish Messiahs with that of Jesus, and to remark how constant and unvarying in character continued to be the expectations and aspirations of this downtrodden race—the earliest, perhaps, of all races to develop a national self-consciousness and patriotism. As an example of such invariability, we may select the career of one of the latest of the Messiahs, Sabatai Levi, who was born A.D. 1625, and, to the utter confusion of his adherents, turned Mohammedan in 1666. A good sketch of his career is to be read in a contemporary work entitled *Théâtre de la Turquie*, written by Michel Felure, and printed in Paris in 1682. Sabatai first established a reputation as a teacher and prophet among the Jews of Salonica and Stamboul. Thence he went to Smyrna and Jerusalem. While he was in the holy city, a maiden of Galata had a vision of an angel clad with light and girt with a flaming sword, who warned her that the true Messiah was come, that he would shortly manifest himself on the banks of the Jordan, that all must get ready to receive him, and repair to the sacred stream to meet him. The Rabbis credited her vision, and numbers of Jews before long forsook house and home and chattels, and embarked for the Holy Land, where a German Rabbi of Gaza, Nathan Benjamin, had already assumed the rôle of precursor and prophet of the new Messiah. When Sabatai reached Gaza, Nathan at once recognised him and proclaimed him to be the Messiah, though he himself for a time protested that he was not. His protests only renewed the enthusiasm of his followers, who, seeing in them nothing but a proof of his humility, threw themselves at his feet and hailed him king of the Jews. Sabatai returned to Smyrna, whither, after two or three months, followed him emissaries of Nathan, bearing a letter fallen from heaven, in which God himself approved of the new Messiah's claims, and commanded all Israel to welcome him. This letter was read in the synagogue of Smyrna, and excited such enthusiasm that Sabatai gave way, and no longer declined the homage of his compatriots. Thenceforth he dressed in robes of silk and gold, and carried a sceptre in his hand; his walks abroad became royal progresses in which crowds of Jews escorted him, laying down carpets

on the earth for his feet to tread. In all the Jewries of Turkey his miracles were talked of; and the further it was from Smyrna, the more marvellous were the tales told of him. The very children fell into ecstasies and raved of his prodigies. Some of his followers declared that he partook of food but once a week; others that he had never held relations with women, though, as a matter of fact, he had been married for years. A single word from his lips availed to open a prison gate and set at liberty a Jew confined therein; and one day, when he was preaching in the synagogue, a Jewish doctor of healing beheld him transfigured and suffused with light. So brilliant was the glory that the doctor was struck dumb for a while, and was unable to reply to the question addressed him by the Messiah. It concerned the interpretation of a passage of the Jewish Scriptures; and, when the doctor explained it of the new Messiah, the latter promised him a post of authority so soon as he should take possession of his new kingdom.

Sabatai next betook himself to Stamboul, in order to proclaim his kingdom there. He arrived February 6th, 1666; but the magnificent reception designed for him was a failure; for the Turks arrested, flogged, and cast him into prison. Brought before the Grand Vizier and questioned by him, Sabatai denied afresh that he was the Messiah, and alleged that the honour had been thrust upon him. Nevertheless, when he was subsequently imprisoned in the castles of the Dardanelles, far away from Stamboul, Jews of both sexes and all ages flocked from all over Turkey, bringing him gifts of money and eager to do homage to him as their king. Michel Felure even gives the text of a letter which purported to have been addressed by Sabatai in prison to his followers, and which runs thus: "The only and first-born Son of God, Sabatai Levi, the Messiah and Saviour of Israel, to the beloved people of God, peace! Forasmuch as ye have been made worthy to behold the great day looked forward to by Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, for the salvation and redemption of Israel and the fulfilment of the promises which God made to your fathers by the prophets as touching his beloved son, let your sadness and bitterness of heart be turned into joy, and your fasting into feasting and rejoicings; because ye shall no more weep, my dear children of Israel, since God has vouchsafed to you consolation unspeakable. . . . Abate your fears, for ye shall have dominion over all nations; and I will set you in possession, not only of all that is seen on earth, but of all that the sea encloses in her abysses. All is reserved for your consolation."

The ministers of synagogues all over Turkey began to insist on fasts and public prayers in preparation for the advent of a Messiah thus recognised in Stamboul and Smyrna; and Felure asserts that in Aleppo, where he was living at the time, the Jews would go three or

four days together without food, even babes at the breast being made to fast; while the fervour of some reached such a pitch that they cast themselves naked into the rivers, though it was midwinter. Felure also attests that Sabatai sent briefs of investiture with kingdoms and thrones to certain of his followers, assigning in particular the realm of Portugal to the Jewish doctor of Smyrna already mentioned. But a bitter disillusioning was in store for the believers. In July, 1666, the Sultan haled Sabatai before him at Adrianople; and when he denied afresh that he was the Messiah or had ever announced himself as such, he was offered the alternative of death or conversion to Islamism. He chose the latter; and Felure testifies to the despair with which the apostasy of their Messiah filled the Jews of Turkey.

The story of Sabatai has much in common with that of Jesus. An angel of light predicts the Messiah to a maiden, and that Messiah is to appear on the Jordan. The faithful forsake all in order to meet him and baptise themselves. He has his precursor and prophet. He begins by refusing the honour thrust upon him, but ends by accepting it. He is accredited by a message direct from heaven. Crowds escort him and strew his path with carpets. He gets credit for working miracles, for extraordinary fasting and asceticism. The very children in arms acclaim him. He is transfigured, like Jesus, and shines with glory. He promises "thrones" to his disciples in his future kingdom. He claims to be the Son of God, and addresses his followers in terms which at first sight seem to be borrowed from the canticles of the first chapter of Luke, but may quite as well be imitated from the very source which probably inspired Luke—namely, the prayer-book of the old Jewish Synagogue. The more we bear in mind the stability of the religious beliefs and conditions of the East, the less we shall suspect the good Michel Felure of having coloured his picture of Sabatai Levi with pigments taken from his own Christian paintbox.

P. 157.—*A day of rest for man and beast.*

Let me not, from my use of these words, be supposed to approve of that hypocritical invention of Puritan ignorance called "the Sabbath"—a day of enforced misery and tedium for young and old; the only day on which the poor have leisure for recreation, for hearing music, for games, for visiting museums and galleries of art, and yet the one day on which all this is made impossible for them. This inhuman confusion of Sunday with the Jewish Sabbath is impossible in Mediterranean lands, where the name Sabbath survives as the designation of the Saturday. In the early Church the Sunday was a day of feasting and recreation, not of sour misery and debauchery, as it is in Scotland. The Puritan Sunday is responsible for the worst and most degrading

features of the English public-house and Scotch whisky-hell. Nor are the minor taboos of the British Sunday less curious than those of any South-Sea Islander. I have known persons who would listen on it to the melodies of Moody and Sankey, but not of Schumann or Schubert; would knit, but not use a sewing-machine; would play patience, but not whist; draughts, but not dominoes; bagatelle, but not billiards; who would fish, but not shoot; bicycle, but not row; row, but not play cricket or football; would devour the unedifying legends of the Jewish Patriarchs, but not read the *Times* or one of Thackeray's novels; would freely talk scandal, but not join in a political or ethical discussion.

P. 188.—*An old Greek manuscript in the Vatican Library.*

I refer not to any codex of the Gospels, but to a MS. of the Dialogue of Timothy and Aquila, edited by myself for the Clarendon Press.

P. 231.—“*Ruffinus*” or “*Rufinus.*”

P. 231.—*The rays of light from heaven entering Mary's ears.*

An old Jesuit missionary in Siam, Guy Tachard, in his book *Second Voyage au Royaume de Siam*, printed in Paris in 1689, repeats, p. 253, a similar story about the birth of Buddha from a Buddhist source, as follows: “A young girl had withdrawn into a lonely forest to await the advent of God, and there led the most austere of lives, avoiding all human intercourse. One day, when she was engaged in prayer, she conceived in a most wonderful way, without losing her virginity; for the sun, by the ministry of his rays, formed the body of a child in her womb during the fervour of her prayer. Some time afterwards she was amazed to find herself big with child; and although she was sure of her virtue, yet, being ashamed of her condition, she plunged deeper into the forest in order to avoid the eyes of mankind. She reached at last a great lake between Siam and Cambodia, where she was delivered without pain or travail of the most beautiful babe in the world. As she had no milk to suckle it with, she entered the lake to lay it on the leaves of a plant which floated on the water's surface. However, nature provided for the safety of the child, who was the God, long awaited, of the universe. For his mother having laid him on the bud of a flower, the flower spread its petals of itself to receive him, and then closed upon him as if to form his cradle.” The text proceeds to relate how certain kings, jealous at hearing the common folk say that the true King of Kings was born, sought for the child in order to slay it; but a good hermit fled with it into the kingdom of Cambodia. Even if this legend has been coloured by Christian influence, its ready acceptance by the Siamese shows how easily such

tales of virgin births can grow up, and how engrained they are in the human mind.

P. 238.—*Only known to himself.*

So, in Revelation xix. 11, "*he that sat on the white horse, called Faithful and True,*" also had a name written which no one knew except himself. The same conceit of a secret name, "*which no one knoweth but he that receiveth it,*" is met with in ch. ii. 17 of the same book. The King of Siam had a proper name of his own which none but the highest mandarins might utter, or even know, so sacred and mysterious was it. No Hindoo woman to-day will disclose, if asked it, the name of her husband. The Valentinian heretics believed that the name descended on Jesus in the form of the dove at his baptism.

P. 239.—*His name was used by exorcists otherwise strangers to him.*

Note here the story in Acts xix. 13 of "*the strolling Jews, exorcists who presumed to name over them which had the evil spirits the name of the Lord Jesus, saying, I adjure you by Jesus whom Paul preacheth.*" There follows the anecdote of the seven sons of Sceva, a Jew and chief priest, who did the same. "*And the evil spirit answered and said unto them, Jesus I know, and Paul I know; but who are ye? And the man in whom the evil spirit was leaped on them, and mastered both of them, and prevailed against them, so that they fled out of that house naked and wounded.*"

P. 242.—*M. Salomon Reinach.*

Read "M. Theodore Reinach."

P. 248.—*Executed in heaven.*

We should notice in connection with magical knots the story told in Acts of the prophet Agabus, who "signified by the Spirit" (ch. xi. 28) "that there should be a great famine over all the world, which came to pass in the days of Claudius." The same prophet, in Acts xxi. 11, came down from Judæa to Cæsarea, and, "*taking Paul's girdle, he bound his own feet and hands, and said, Thus saith the Holy Spirit, So shall the Jews at Jerusalem bind the man that owneth this girdle.*" In the preceding chapter Paul had said to the elders of Miletus: "*And now, behold, I go bound by the Spirit unto Jerusalem.*"

It is difficult not to suppose a connection between the behaviour of Agabus, engaged in prophesying by virtue of the spirit within him, and "the widely-spread habit of tying up the limbs of a medium," described by Mr. Andrew Lang in his book, *The Origins of Religion*, essay ix. (on "Savage Spiritualism") and essay x. (on "Ancient Spiritualism"). He shows from Eusebius's work on *Evangelic Preparation*, v. 9, that the medium of the ancient Greek was swathed or

tied up when the "control," the god or spirit, was to speak through him. Presumably Agabus chose Paul's girdle by way of interesting the spirit in its owner. Mr. Lang notes that the Australian Blacks, the Eskimo, the Dènè Hareskins, the Davenport Brothers, and the Neo-Platonists of antiquity have all been equally convinced of the need to tie up a medium's hands and feet when the god is about to take possession of him. When Paul declared at Ephesus that he was *bound by the Spirit*, Agabus's prophecy was not yet delivered. Paul, therefore, at that time was only bound in the ordinary way in which things and persons bewitched or laid under a spell are said to be bound.

P. 296.—*The spirit or soul of a man remains by his corpse for a period of three days.*

This belief is quaintly illustrated in a story told by Damascius (about A.D. 450) in his life of Isidore. The Huns, under Attila, fought in the Campagna against the armies of Rome. The battle was so fierce and prolonged that no combatants were left alive on either side. But the fray did not then cease, for the spirits of the slain proceeded to fall on one another; and for three days and nights a ghostly battle raged over the waste plain on which their bodies were stretched unburied. And there were those, says Damascius, who were witnesses of the phantom warfare, and heard the war-cries of the dead as they continued, with unabated fury, to rain blows upon one another.

INDEX OF SUBJECTS

(A double asterisk signifies that the reference is to the Additional Notes.)

- ABYSSINIAN Christians**, their superstition about names, 236
Adoptionism of Ebionite, of early Spanish, Armenian, and other Churches, 174, 178
****Agabus**, Christian prophet, why bound, 367-68
Agapeti, technical term for the spiritually married, 217
Allegory used by Stoics in interpreting Homer, 330
 — by Aristobulus and Philo in interpreting Old Testament, 331
Altar, its taboo sanctifies gift or victim laid on it, 259
Anahite, her feast became the Virgin's in Armenia, 229
Anglican clergy, their timidity, 338, 361
Antichrist identified in the East with Nero, 193
Anti-Semitism of Marcion, 329
Aphraates on spiritual wives, 219
 — his Christology, 184
Apollonius of Tyana, his exorcisms, 143
Apostles of Jesus upheld the Law for Gentile converts, 7
Apostles, call of the Four naïvely described by Mark, 29
Apostles' Creed levelled at Marcion, 341, 346
Aquinas, St. Thomas, on Incubi and Succubi, 234
Aramaic, the original language of the Gospel traditions, 59
Archelaus of Kharkhar on natural birth and baptism of Jesus, 325
Arianism, evil significance of its defeat, 185
Aristides Rhetor, his visions, 290
 — on binding and loosing of the god Dionysus, 245
Aristobulus allegorised the Old Testament, 331
Armenian dissenters, 262
Athanasius, the so-called Creed of, 356
****Attila**, legend of in Damascius's life of Isidore, 368
Augustine on infant baptism, 315
BAPTISM of Jesus, in non-Marcian document, 132
 — its significance in the earliest Gospel, 165 *fol.*
 — in the Acts of Archelaus, 325
 — age of Jesus at, 177
 — Jesus spiritually anointed and elected therein, 180, 325
 — ancient form of, 317
 — postponed for dread of post-baptismal sin, 323 *fol.*
Baptismal crown worn for eight days, 319
Basilidians feasted the baptism of Christ, 175
Bath Kol, or voice from heaven, in Talmud, 167
 — Bishop Lightfoot upon it, 168
 — Philo upon it, 168
Batiffol, Abbé Pierre, on Encratites, 225
Bellucci, Professor, his collection of Italian fetishes, 360
Berkeley's philosophy, 344
Bibliolatry, mischievous effects of, 338
Binding and loosing, a magical conception, 245 *fol.*

- **Binding of Agabus, an early Christian medium, 367-68
 Birth of Jesus denied by Docetes, 226 *fol.*
 Bishops, their origin, 313; their succession, 328
 Blessing, use of hand in, the same as in exorcisms, 323
 Blood, conceived of as the life, 257; ghosts consume blood, 257; why shed for remission of sin, 265
 Blood-brotherhoods, 258
 Breathing as a mode of transmitting the holy spirit, 323
- CATECHUMENATE, rite of, 314
 Cathar rite of *Consolamentum* a survival of death-bed baptism, 317
 Cathars continued the tradition of Marcion, 334
 Cause, idea of, applies only within the world of experience, 342
 Celtic Church, spiritual wives in, 219
 Chivalry influenced by early Christian encratism, 222
 Chosen People, idea of a, mythological, 339; involved in Christianity, 356
 Christianity a mere development of Judaism, 356; assumes the Jews to be the chosen people, 329, 357
 Christmas feast, its history, 176
 Christology and dogmatic definitions originated with death of Jesus, 354 *fol.*
 Chrysostom, John, on the argument from prophecy, 209; deprecated spiritual wives, 224
 Church or *ecclesia*, idea of it absent in Non-Marcian document, 135
 — as virgin bride of Christ, 220, 223
 — the, born of the waiting for the Second Advent of Christ, 354
 Churching a child on fortieth day from birth, rite of, 314
Codex Amoris of Andrew, 222
- Conception through the ears, *see* Virgin
 ** — of Buddha through rays of sunlight by a virgin mother, 366
 Confirmation, or sealing with the Spirit, 319
 Conjugal relations incompatible with baptism, 316
 Consecration by holy names, 243
 Cosmogony of early Church, 357
 Crucifixion in Plato and in Philo, 130
 Cyprian of Carthage prohibits spiritual wives, 217
 Cyrenius or Quirinius, his census, 191
- DANAE, Justin Martyr illustrates from her case the virgin birth, 196
 Dante and Beatrice, 219
 Darkness at hour of crucifixion paralleled from pagan sources, 284 *fol.*
 Darwin, Charles, on Jewish origin of Christianity, 329
 Davidic pedigree of Jesus, accepted by Paul, but repudiated by Jesus himself, 187
 Delehaye, Hippolyte, on hagiographic legends, 348, 349
 Delphic spirit, why unclean, according to Origen, 234
 Demiurge, or author of nature, evil, 341; Paul's comparison with a potter, 341
 Demons recognise Jesus, 30
 — ignored in Fourth Gospel and by Philo, 69
 — Mohammed, like Jesus, accused of being possessed by, 70, 148
 — of disease, 143
 Development of Christological ideas in the New Testament, 348
 Docetism, 226
 Dositheus, his list of the seventy disciples, 90
 Doublets in Mark, 51 *fol.*
 Dove symbolises the spirit in Philo, 167
 — was white according to Lactantius, 171

- Dragon in the Jordan trampled on by Jesus at baptism, 172
- Dreams and visions, importance anciently attached to them, 289
- EARS, conception by Virgin through, 230 *fol.*
 — in Plutarch, 230
 — in Philo, 231
 — in Ephrem, 231
 — in Ruffinus, 231
- Ebionites believed in baptismal regeneration of Jesus, 172
 — denied the legend of the birth, 206
 — their Gospel, 206
- Ecclesia*, a spiritual unity, 254
- Eclipse of sun at crucifixion, 284
- Enoch, Book of, its picture of Messianic kingdom, 295
- Ephrem on Virgin's conception through her ears, of the *Logos*, 231
- Epiphanius on the two Marias, the spiritual wife and real wife of Joseph, 225
- Epiphany feast, its history, 176
- Essene sacrament, 271
- Essenes abjured marriage, 211
- Eucharist of Paul, 251 *fol.*
 — how it became a fetish, 265 *fol.*
 — account of in the Synoptic Gospels taken from Paul, 267, 277
- Eusebius on the seventy disciples, 89
- Evil eye, 324
- Evocatio*, rite of, 237
- Evolution, idea of, applied to revelation, 335
- FAITH-HEALING in Gospels, 63 *fol.*, 146
- Family ties sacrificed by Jesus, 154, 160 *fol.*
- Farrar's *Life of Christ*, 140
- Fascinatio* exemplified in Jesus's cursing of a fig-tree, 249
- Fish, how symbolic of Christ, 173
- Fleshly resurrection of Jesus ignored by Paul, 294
- Frazer, Dr., his *Golden Bough* cited, 238, 248, 250
- GALATIANS, Epistle to, 16
- Gentiles, how they came to be admitted in Christianity, 350
- God, idea of eating hi min Paul, 275, 278
- Gore, Bishop, on mind of Christ, 359
- Gospels compilations, 22, 27, 58
- Gregory of Nazianzen on fit age for baptism, 316
 — of Nyssa on spiritual wives, 217
- Greville, George, on Irvingite gift of tongues, 93
- Grotta Ferrata Monastery, sculpture at, of baptism, 173
- HAMILTON, Sir William Rowan, on ascension of Jesus, 358
- Hands, laying on of, origin of rite, 322
- Harnack, Professor, on Luke, 103
 — his reconstruction of the non-Marcan document, 107 *fol.*
- Hebrews, the Gospel of, on baptism of Christ, 171
- Hegesippus on James's vision of the risen Christ, 305
- Hermas, Shepherd of, on spiritual wives, 217
- Herod Antipas, 37
- Herodotus on oaths, 258
- Hillel called by the Bath Kol, 168
- Hippolytus on Messianic movements in Pontus and in Asia, 216
- Horoscopes and baptism, 316
- IDOL-OFFERED flesh infected with diabolic spirit, 260
- Ignatius on the Virgin Birth, 205
 — of Antioch on the eucharist, 261
- Immaculate conception of Mary, history of the doctrine, 229
- Immanence of Christ, early doctrine of, 254, 275
- Incubation in temples, 291

- Infant baptism, unknown in early Church, 315
 Inquisition, Roman, 279
 Irving, Edward, his speaking with tongues, 93
- JEROME** on spiritual wives, 214
 Jerusalem, early Church of, presided over by relatives of Jesus, 206
 Jesus, tenuity of the tradition about him, 1, 139
 — reserved his kingdom for Jews, 5, 13
 — why condemned to death, 45
 — sublimated in Matthew and Luke, 62
 — accused by his own family of being possessed, 71 *fol.*
 — how much junior to John the Baptist, 142
 — reborn in baptism, 172 *fol.*
 — his age at baptism, 177
 — his gradual deification, 180
 — by whom buried, 297
 — his death, its influence on growth of Christology, 352 *fol.*
 Johannine Gospel denies by implication both Davidic origin and virgin birth of Jesus, 189
 — — its exaggerations, 229
 John the Baptist, senior to Jesus, 142
 John's Gospel a romance, 20, 62
 — — denies intercourse of Jesus with evil spirits, 69
 — — its exaggerations, 77
 — — its appendix, 78
 Jonah, the sign of, 34 *n.*, 128
 Josephus on demons, 143
 — on resurrection of the just, 294
 Jowett, Benjamin, his opinion of the Gospels, 1
 Judaisers and Paul, 8
 Judas Thomas, Acts of, their teaching on marriage, 225
 — — twin brother of Jesus, 207, 255
 — of Galilee, his revolt, 192
 Justin Martyr on Virgin Birth, 180, 196
 Justin Martyr regarded Jesus as an archangel, 226
 — — on the demons which would waylay the soul of Jesus, 309
- KEYS** of heaven and hell, a magical conception, 248
 King of the Jews, Jesus condemned as such to be crucified, 45
 — — the claim of Jesus to be, not offensive to Jews, 46
 Kingdom of God conceived of by Jesus and his followers as a restoration of Israel in Palestine, 38; also by Philo, 40
 — — not to be brought about by force, 161
 — — believed to be imminent by Jesus and his Apostles, 350, 354
 Kinship, Arab's idea of, 255
 — strengthened by common food, 256
 Koran, resembles primitive Christianity in not deifying Jesus, 185
- LACTANTIUS** on the dove, 171
 — his protest against deification of Jesus, 183
 — illustrated the Virgin Birth from mares, 196
 Law, Jewish, not to be imposed on Messianic converts from among the Gentiles, 7
 Logos, Old Testament epiphanies of, 226
 Loisy, Abbé, on burial of Jesus, 297
 Luke, how he used his sources, 23, 61 *fol.*, 84 *fol.*, 105
 — invents the call of the seventy *de suo*, 86
 — a picturesque story-teller, 102
 — Ad. Harnack's estimate of him, 102
 Luke's narrative of birth of Jesus, how originated, 190 *fol.*, 200 *fol.*
- MAGI**, visit of to Nero, 193
 Magic, homœopathic, 263, 275

- Magical character of early Eucharist, 265, 275
 — attributes of Eucharist in Paul, 261, 275
 Marcion regarded Jahveh as an immoral Demiurge, 330
 — rejected allegorisation of the Old Testament, 331
 — his Antitheses, 332
 — denied birth and baptism of Jesus, 333
 — denied Jesus to be Jewish Messiah, 339
 — denied the goodness of the author of nature, 341
 Marett, Mr., on use of names of power, 244
 Mariolatry, 75
 Mark's Gospel, its author knew nothing of the legend of the Virgin Birth, 186
 — — used by Matthew and Luke, 21; summarised, 28 *fol.*; and characterised, 32
 — — a compilation, 56
 — — contains many doublets, 51 *fol.*
 — — supplied their historical plan to Matthew and Luke, 60
 Martineau, Dr., on Messiahship of Jesus, 351
 Mary conceived of as the spiritual wife of Joseph, 224
 — conceived through her ears, 330
 Matthew, how he used his sources, 23, 61 *fol.*
 — eliminates human traits of Jesus reported by Mark, 61, 64 *fol.*
 — exaggerates or invents miracles, 76, 79
 — probable date and authorship of his Gospel, 136
 Matthew's pedigree of Jesus affirmed the paternity of Joseph, 188
 — Gospel on birth of Jesus in Bethlehem, 192
 **Messiah, the, Sabatai Levi, in the seventeenth century, 363 *fol.*
 Messianic expectations banished marriage and family, 215
 — character of Jesus concealed according to Mark, 30 *fol.*, 170
 — — patent from the outset according to Luke, 83
 — — evidence about it of non-Marcian Document, 134
 Millennial beliefs, interpreted by Church in reference to a future life, 150, 359
 Minucius Felix attests the mere humanity of Jesus, 181
 — on morals of early Church, 210
 Mohammed, 18, 38
 — unlike Jesus, created a book religion, 353
 — his spittle sacred, 148
 Mohammedan theology, its empty abstractions, 345
 Mommsen, Theodor, on orthodox theologians, 361
 Monophysites, their Docetic view of Christ's flesh, 232
 Monotheism, its self-contradictions, 340 *fol.*
 Mother, child, and dragon in Revelation, 204
 Muratori on spiritual wives, 214
 NAME, magical use of, 235
 — equivalent to personality, 235
 — of Jesus, magically used in exorcisms, 239 *fol.*
 — of Father, Son, and Spirit interpolated in Matthew xxviii., 19
 Name-giving on eighth day after birth, 314
 Names, holy, localised in sanctuaries, 243
 Nero, belief in his return after death, 294
 Newman, John Henry, on development of doctrine, 347
 Nile, of blessing the, in January, 175
 Non-Marcian Document overlaps Mark, 57

- Non-Marcian Document consisted chiefly of sayings of Jesus, 107
 ——— to be reconstructed out of Matthew and Luke, 107
 ——— does not mention death or resurrection of Jesus, 127
 ——— a Galilean document, 131
 ——— absence of miracles in, 133
 ——— anterior to all Church organisation, 135
 ——— were the sayings it contains authentic? 137
- OATHS ratified by mutual sucking of blood, 258
- Oil, sealing with, origin of rite, 320
- Oliphant, Laurence, on spiritual wives, 220
- Opus operatum*, its meaning, 326
- Ordination, origin of, 322
- Orphic legends of descent into hell coloured Christian creed, 286
- Ovid on demons, 324
- PARABLES used by Jesus to conceal his meaning, 33 *fol.*
- Parthenos*, or virgin, in Isaiah vii. 14, its meaning
- Paul, his negative attitude towards Jesus, 2
 — his ecstasies, 3
 — an epileptic, 4
 — his conversion, 4 *fol.*
 — his universalist ideal of Jesus as the Messiah, 6, 18
 — flouted the genuine Apostles, 8 *fol.*
 — ignored Jesus's teaching, 9
 — on virgins or spiritual wives, 212
 — believed in blood sacrifice as only mode of atonement, 274
 — and Thekla, Acts of, on virgins, 215, 254
- Pearl, why Jesus was the, 232
- Pedigrees of Jesus, their origin, 188
- Penitence, history of the rite of, 321
- Peter, his relations with Paul, 11, 14
 — Gospel, its account of the resurrection, 308
 — authentic details in it as to flight of the Apostles at the crucifixion, 309 *fol.*
 — shared with Luke a lost source, 281, 283
- Peter's vision of the risen Jesus, 291
- Philo on virgin births, 199, 211, 231
 — his allegorising of the Old Testament, 331
 — his idea of the Trinity, 355
 — his Messianic aspirations, 40, 150
 — rejected popular belief in demons, 69
 — urged on converts the necessity of sacrificing family ties, 154, 156, 158
 — on symbolism of dove, 167
- Pilate, Acts of, ignores the virgin birth of Jesus, 208
 — Philo's description of him, 280
 — his treatment of Messiahs, 351
- Pitt Rivers Museum, 360
- Plagiarism not held disgraceful by authors of New Testament, 22
- Pliny the Elder on use of spittle, 144
- Plutarch on virgin births, 195
 — on conception through the ears, 230
- Porphyry on evil spirits connected with flesh eating, 257
- Priesthood, emergence of, in the Church, 322
- Procopius, Martyr, his *Dossier*, 348
- Progressive revelation, the idea of, criticised, 336 *fol.*
- Prophetic *gnosis* in Matthew, 80
- Proselytes abandoned family ties, 155
 — in Asia Minor, 4
- Protevangel, its narrative of the Virgin Birth, 202

- RA, his secret name stolen by Isis, 238
- Rationalism of early Christianity, 159
- Regeneration of Jesus at baptism, 172 *fol.*, 175
- Resurrection, Paul's account of it, 16 *fol.*
- it transformed Jesus into Son of God and universal Saviour, according to Paul, 18, 178
- subjective character of it, 44
- not alluded to in Non-Marcian Document, 127
- Luke's account of it criticised, 100
- gradual growth of belief in, 287
- originated in Peter's vision, 289
- of the flesh, an old Egyptian belief, 295
- why timed on Sunday at dawn, 300
- ** — after three days, 368
- of Jesus, belief in not universal in the earliest Church, 305
- Rings, use of in exorcisms, 324
- Risen Christ, appearances of merely subjective, 292
- SABBATH diffused by Jews, 157
- ** — of the Puritans, 365-66
- Sacrifice and kinship, 256
- Sacrifices, Jewish, their cessation, 353
- Sacrificial idea of Jesus's death, discovered by Paul, 353
- Salt, use of in baptism, 320
- Sanday, Professor, on Virgin Birth, 186, 200
- Sayce, Professor, on magical use of names, 248
- Scourging, columns of, 325
- Second coming, belief in its immediacy, 45, 151
- — coloured the teaching of Jesus, 154
- — was it contemplated at the last supper?, 269
- Sermon on the Mount, 152 *fol.*
- — preached in view of approaching end of the world, 162
- Seventy, call of the, an incident invented by Luke, 86
- Sleep, how far analogous to death, 343
- Solomon's ring as a Christian relic in Jerusalem in fourth century, 324
- Son of Man, 39
- Spirit, Holy, his place in the legend of Virgin Birth, 210
- holy, its odour, 100
- — its luminosity at Christ's baptism, 171
- Spiritual wives, institution of in the Church generated legend of Virgin Mary, 224
- Spittle, use of, in healing, 148
- Star of the Magi, 193
- in the East, paralleled, 169, 193
- State, negative attitude of Jesus towards, 153, 351
- Strangled meats, meaning of rule against eating, 258
- Suneisaktai*, technical term for spiritual wives, 218
- Surrogate, use of term in magic, 263, 275
- Swete, Rev. Professor, on Mark iii. 21, 72
- TABLE of devils parallel to the Table of the Lord, 261, 276, 277
- Taboos on names, 236
- Tacitus on oaths of Armenians and Iberians, 259
- Tarsus, Paul's native city, 4
- Teaching of the Apostles*, its account of eucharistic meal, 273
- Tertullian on infant baptism, 315
- on magic use of names, 242
- on the veiling of virgins, 233
- Tertullian's idea of the conception of Jesus by the Virgin, 230
- Testaments of Patriarchs quoted, 169
- Therapeutæ of Philo, 211
- their holy meal, 272

- Thiasoi*, or trade-guilds of Roman Empire, their common meals, 273
- Three days, resurrection after, how to be explained, 293, 296
- Thyestean banquets alleged against Christians and Jews, 259
- Timothy and Aquila, Dialogue of, 286
- Tomb, empty, story of in Mark, 299; in Matthew, 302
- Tongues, gift of, in Paul and Luke, 92 *fol.*
- Trial of Jesus, narratives of, distorted by hatred of Jews, 279 *fol.*
- Trine immersion, a pagan rite variously explained from three days' entombment of Jesus or from Trinity, 319
- Trinity, idea of, in Philo, 355
- VATICAN Museum, monument therein of Proclus, 346
- Veil of Temple rent, meaning of, 285, 287
- Vespasian heals the blind and lame in Alexandria, 144
- Victor, Henry, Professor, his *Atharva Veda* cited, 247
- Virgil on mares conceiving by the breeze, 196
- Virgil's prediction of a virgin birth, 198
- Virgin Birth unknown to the author of Mark's Gospel, 186, 206
- — — rejected by early Christians, 180
- — — illustrated by Lactantius from mares, 196
- ** — — — of Buddha, 366
- — — of Julius Cæsar, 196
- — — Justin Martyr upon, 196
- — — in Philo, 194
- — — of Plato, 194
- — — a *via media* between the Docetes and Ebionites, 228
- — — Mary, relative lateness of her feasts, 229
- Virgins' ears to be protected against assaults of demons, 233
- Virgins or spiritual wives in Corinthian Church, 211
- — — in the Shepherd of Hermas, 217
- — — in the Greek Churches, 218
- — — in Carthaginian Church, 217
- — — in early Celtic Church, 219
- — — among Cathars, 219
- WATER, living, use of in baptisms, 319
- Wellhausen's appreciation of Mark's Gospel, 46
- ZEUS Sebazios, 324
- Zoroaster, his legend parallel to story of Christ's baptism, 177

