

victim in the primitive cult. The formal trial of a victim is to be otherwise explained, as a primitive process of degrading a discredited priest-king.<sup>1</sup> In the case of the Khonds, who had no harlots<sup>2</sup> and few concubines, intercourse on the part of a destined male victim with either the wives or the daughters of the inhabitants was welcomed as a clear boon,<sup>3</sup> though he often had allotted to him a victim wife; and the same idea seems to have underlain the treatment of the doomed God-man in ancient Mexico.<sup>4</sup> What is certain is that no such principle could have been avowed in the Christian legend, arising as it did in a cultus of asceticism. But in the character of the Messiah as one who associated with publicans and sinners; in his association with women; and in the obstinate legend which, apart from the text, made Mary Magdalene—a visibly mythical character<sup>5</sup>—figure as a former harlot, we may have another such survival as has been surmised to underlie the tradition of “Jesus Barabbas”; and the common belief of the early Church that the ministry of Jesus lasted for only one year<sup>6</sup> may have a similar basis in the old usage. Further, as Mr. Frazer has suggested, the story of the triumphal entry into Jerusalem may preserve a tradition of a mock-royal procession for the destined victim. Even the legend of the riding on two asses, which, as has been elsewhere shown,<sup>7</sup> preserves an ancient zodiacal symbol, and at the same time a myth concerning Dionysos, might have anciently figured in the procession of a God-victim of

<sup>1</sup> Grant Allen, *Evol. of Idea of God*, pp. 235, 311, 385.

<sup>2</sup> The female victims seem at times to have had promiscuous relations. See Reclus, *Primitive Folk*, as above cited.

<sup>3</sup> Macpherson, *Memorials*, p. 116.

<sup>4</sup> See below, Part III. A study of these cases will suggest that in a primitive tribal state, when annual voluntary victims were otherwise hard to get, men may very well have been got to accept the rôle on condition of a year's quasi-regal licence. Savages notoriously set present pleasure far before future pain in their thought. And out of such a *religious* kingship may have *separately* arisen both the function of the priest-king as seen in Greece and Rome, and the phenomenon of the mock-king of the Saccæa. On this view the improbability of the annual slaying of the acting king, urged by Mr. Lang (p. 102) against Mr. Frazer, does not arise; while the theory fundamentally stands.

<sup>5</sup> Cp. *Christianity and Mythology*, pp. 321–5.

<sup>6</sup> Cp. Baur, *Church History*, Eng. tr. i, 41, note.

<sup>7</sup> *Christianity and Mythology*, pp. 336–9.

the Dionysiak type. As the zodiacal symbol stands for the autumn equinox, and the crucifixion is placed at the spring-equinox, these details would be chronologically separate; but Tammuz, like Dionysos, seems to have had two feasts;<sup>1</sup> and in any case the legend was free to include different ritual episodes. Finally, the explanation of the ascription of the title of "Nazarite" to Jesus—a perplexing detail which led the redactors to frame the myth of his birth at Nazareth<sup>2</sup>—may be that the Jewish victim, like the Khond, wore his hair unshorn. It would be natural that he should; the institution of the *nazir*, a word which means "dedicated," being an inheritance from the ancient times of common human sacrifice, and being associated with the myth of Samson, in which the shorn Sun-God is as it were sacrificed to himself.

We have now followed our historic clues far enough to warrant a constructive theory. Indeed it frames itself when we colligate our main data. As thus:—

1. In the slaying of the Kronian victim at Rhodes we have an ancient Semitic<sup>3</sup> human sacrifice maintained into the historic period, by the expedient of taking as annual victim a criminal already condemned to death.

2. In Semitic mythology, Kronos, "whom the Phœnicians call Israel," sacrifices his son Ieoud, "the only," after putting upon him royal robes.

3. The feast of Kronos is the Saturnalia, in which elsewhere a mock-king plays a prominent part; and as Kronos was among the Semites identified with Moloch—"King,"<sup>4</sup> the victim would be ostensibly either a king or a king's son. A trial and degradation were likely accessories.

4. Supposing the victim in the Rhodian Saturnalia to figure as Ieoud, he would be *ipso facto* Barabbas, "the son of the father"; and in the terms of the case he was a

<sup>1</sup> Jastrow, *Religion of Babylonia and Assyria*, p. 484.

<sup>2</sup> *Christianity and Mythology*, pp. 335-342

<sup>3</sup> As to the Phœnician origins of Rhodian religion cp. Duncker, *Gesch. des Alterthums*, 2te Aufl. iii, 163, 229, 380, 384; Meyer, *Gesch. des Alt.* i, §§ 191, 192; Busolt, *Griech. Gesch.* 1885, i, 172.

<sup>4</sup> Selden, *De Diis Syris*, Syntag. i, c. 6; Duncker, *Gesch. des Alterthums*, 2te Aufl. iii, 331, note; Smith, *Rel. of Semites*, p. 355; Tiele, *Outlines*, p. 209. Cp. J. Spencer, *De legibus Hebræorum*, l. ii, c. 10.

condemned criminal. At the same time, in terms of the myth, he would figure in royal robes.

5. In any case, the myth being Semitic, it is morally certain that among the many cases of human sacrifice in the Græco-Semitic world the Rhodian rite was not unique. And as the name "Ieoud," besides signifying "the only," was virtually identical with the Greek and Hebrew names for Judah (son of "Israel") and Jew (*Yehuda, Ioudaios*), it was extremely likely, among the Jews of the Dispersion, to be regarded as having special application to their race, which in their sacred books actually figured as the Only-Begotten Son of the Father-God, and as having undergone special suffering.

6. That the Rhodian rite, Semitic in origin, was at some points specially coincident with Jewish conceptions of sacrifice, is proved by the detail of leading the prisoner outside the city gates. This is expressly laid down in the Epistle to the Hebrews,<sup>1</sup> as a ritual condition of the sacrificial death of Jesus.

The case, of course, is not staked on any assumption that the Rhodian rite was the exact historical antecedent of the Jesuist rite as preserved in the gospels. That the Jews had much traffic with Rhodes may be gathered from Josephus' account of Herod's relations with the place;<sup>2</sup> but we are not committed to the view that the Jews had any hand in the Rhodian sacrifice ritual, or that the gospel myth followed that. So far as the records go, the coincidence is incomplete, since (1) the Rhodian Saturnalia was a June or July festival, and thus disparate from the Passover; and (2) there is no hint of a triple execution. But it suffices firstly that we have here a clear case of a variant from a type to which the Christian crucifixion-ritual belongs; and, secondly, that the Rhodian rite further points to the decisive development which we have yet to trace in the case of the gospel story. For Porphyry incidentally mentions that the Rhodian sacrifice, after

<sup>1</sup> Ch. xiii, 12. Cp. Robertson Smith, as cited, pp. 352-6.

<sup>2</sup> *Wars*, i, 14, § 3; 20, § 1; 21, § 11.

having subsisted long, had latterly been modified (*μετέβληθη*). As to the precise nature of the modification we have no further knowledge; but we are entitled to conclude that it was *either a simple rite of mock-sacrifice or a mystery-drama*. Both stages, indeed, would be natural, the step to the latter being dependent on the connection of the rite with a eucharist. But the essential point is that in this case—the memory of which is preserved, like so many items in our knowledge of ancient life, by an incidental sentence in a treatise to which the subject was barely relevant—we have exactly the kind of transition from actual human sacrifice to a conventional rite of mock sacrifice which our theory implies. And seeing that the actual sacrifice was once normal in the Semitic world, there can be little doubt that the cases and modes of modification were many.

Meantime, the bearing of such a development on our total problem is obvious. We have traced on the one hand a Semitic and probably Israelitish tradition of an annually (or periodically) sacrificed victim, “Jesus the Son of the Father,” and seen reason to surmise the contact of dispersed Jews with such a rite in Hellenistic eastern towns. On the other hand we have traced a Jewish bread and wine eucharist, which we find emerging in documentary knowledge in the pre-Christian eucharist of the “Teaching of the Twelve Apostles,” with the name of Jesus attached to a strictly Judaic personage of quasi-divine status, *not* crucified or otherwise sacrificed. Of these forms of doctrine and rite there took place a fusion, forming the historic Christian cultus. Of such a fusion, the most likely and most intelligible means would be the mystery-drama, whose existence has now to be demonstrated. But first we have to note certain historic possibilities on which the fusion might partly depend.

#### § 14.—*Possible Historical Elements.*

One concrete feature in the crucifixion myth remains to be accounted for—the scourging. Mr. Lang presses this

feature of the Sacæa as an argument against the view that the victim died as representing a God.<sup>1</sup> In reality, the assumption that sacrificed victims were never scourged is no better founded than the assertion that they were never hanged. The human victims in the Thargelia at Athens were ostensibly whipped before being sacrificed.<sup>2</sup> Scourging, besides, actually took the place of human sacrifice, by tradition, in certain Greek cults; the scourging (which at times was fatal) being accepted as a sacrificial act.<sup>3</sup> The deity specially connected with such acts of scourging was Artemis, concerning the Asiatic savageries of whose cultus we have the disgusted testimony of Plutarch;<sup>4</sup> and it is noteworthy that the Rhodian victim had been slain near the temple of Aristobula<sup>5</sup>—a name of Artemis,<sup>6</sup> who is thus in late as in early times connected with human sacrifice.<sup>7</sup> It is therefore not unlikely that when the Rhodian rite was modified to the extent of abandoning the sacrifice of life, scourging was substituted as a means of obtaining at least the sacrifice of blood; and when the rite reached the stage of a mystery-drama, that detail would naturally be preserved.

It is to be remembered, however, that the original principle of such scourging may be independent of any act of substitution. It is partly indicated in the Khond doctrine in connection with the rite of slow burning—that the more tears the victim shed the more abundant would be the rain. Here indeed there is a plain conflict between two sacrificial principles, that of the symbolism of the victim's acts and that of his willingness. But both principles are known to

<sup>1</sup> *Magic and Religion*, p. 131.

<sup>2</sup> Tzetzes, *Chil.* v. 733-4.

<sup>3</sup> The bloody scourging of young Spartans at the altar of Artemis (Pausanias, iii, 16; Philostratus, *Life of Apollonius*, vi, 20; Cicero, *Tusculans*, ii, 14; Lucian, *De Gymnast.* c. 38; Plutarch, *Lycurgus*, c. 17) is one of the best known cases. As to the principle of human sacrifice behind the scourging cp. K. O. Müller, *Dorians*, B. ii, c. ix, § 6. Cicero and Lucian tell of the occasional fatal results.

<sup>4</sup> *De Superstitione*, 10.

<sup>5</sup> Porphyry, as cited.

<sup>6</sup> The title "of good counsel" suggests the better side of the Goddess, yet we find that the temple built by Themistokles to Aristobula at Melite was "at the place where at the present day the public executioner casts out the bodies of executed criminals and the clothes and ropes of men who have hanged themselves." Plutarch, *Themistokles* 22.

<sup>7</sup> Herodotus, iv, 103.

have existed, some of the Khonds and the Aztecs attaching importance to the tears shed by the victims, while the Carthaginians sought to drown the cries of their children, and the mothers were forbidden to weep.<sup>1</sup> In the case of the original human sacrifice on the Jewish Day of Atonement, as we have seen,<sup>2</sup> there was a ritual act of weeping, and perhaps one of scourging; and we have no ground for doubting that scourging could take place.

But there was a ritual need for blood as well as tears. It is noted that in the human sacrifices of Polynesia the victims were rarely much mutilated, but were always made to bleed much;<sup>3</sup> and a perfect obsession of blood pervades the whole Judaic religion, down to the end of the New Testament. In the "hanging unto the Lord" of the sons of Saul, indeed, there was ostensibly no bloodshed; but Joshua is declared to have "smitten" the five kings before he hanged them. The "sin-offering" too was one of blood; and a blood sacrifice was the normal one in all nations. Scourging would yield the blood without making the victim incapable of enduring the hanging or crucifixion; and in the gospel record that the doomed God sweated as it were drops of blood<sup>4</sup> we may have a further concession to the idea. Finally, there is the possibility that, as in the case of the victims in the Athenian Thargelia, who wore necklaces of figs and were whipped with fig-rods before being put to death, the scourging belonged to the conception of the scape-goat, who thus as well as by banishment bore the people's sins.<sup>5</sup>

In these various ways, then, we can comprehend the gradual evolution of a ritual with which could be associated on the one hand a belief in a national deliverer, and on the other hand a general doctrine of salvation and immortality. The idea of the resurrection of the slain *God* is extremely ancient: we have it in the myths of Osiris and

<sup>1</sup> Plutarch, *De Superstitione*, 13.

<sup>2</sup> Above, p. 151.

<sup>3</sup> Moerenhout, *Voyage aux Iles du Grand Ocean*, i, 508.

<sup>4</sup> On this cp. *Christianity and Mythology*, p. 393.

<sup>5</sup> Cp. Mr. Frazer's view (iii, 122-7) that the scourging was supposed to expel evil influences from the victim. Concerning the properties of the wild fig tree cp. Macrobius, *Saturnalia*, i, 11—a myth of misinterpretation.

of the descent of Ishtar into Hades to rescue Tammuz; and in the Syro-Greek form of the cult, the resurrection of Adonis was a chief feature of the great annual ritual. So with the other cults already mentioned. From the God, the concept of resurrection was extended to the worshippers, this long before the Christian era. It needed only that the doctrines of divine sacrifice, resurrection, and salvation, temporal or eternal, should be thus blended in a mystery ritual with the institution of a eucharist or holy sacrament, to constitute the foundation of the religion of Jesus the Christ as we have it in the gospels.

That a mystery-drama actually existed, and was the basis of the gospel narrative, will be shown in the next section. But in passing it may be well to note that certain features of the crucifixion myth, though fairly explicable on the lines above sketched, may be due to contemporary analogies from other rites or from actual occurrences. The posture of the victim in the traditional crucifix, which we shall see some reason for ascribing to a ritual in which the worshipper embraces a cross, may on the other hand derive from the Perso-Scythian usage of slaying a "messenger" to the God, flaying him, and stuffing his skin with the arms outstretched.<sup>1</sup> This sacrifice, indeed, has obvious analogies to that of the "ambassador" in the old Jewish rite above traced;<sup>2</sup> and in both cases the idea of the cross-form may derive from the fact that in the gesture-language and picture-writing of savages, which are probably primeval, that is the recognised attitude and symbol of the ambassador or "go-between."<sup>3</sup> Or the cross-form may connect with some other principle involved in the Semitic representation of the Sun-God with arms outstretched,<sup>4</sup> which perhaps underlies the myth of the outstretching of the arms of Moses.

Yet again, the repetition of the offer of a drink to the

<sup>1</sup> Below, ch. ii, § 14.

<sup>2</sup> Above, pp. 150-1.

<sup>3</sup> I have before me an extracted magazine article, undated, in which the symbol is reproduced and so explained.

<sup>4</sup> See the figures reproduced by Gesenius, *Script. Ling. Phœn. Monumenta*, 1837, Pt. III, Tab. 21, 24 (inscriptions translated i, 197, 211), and in the *Transactions of the Royal Asiatic Society*, III, Pt. iii, pl. 23.

victim, or the mention of gall in that connection, might be motivated by the example of the mysteries of Demeter, in which there figured a drink of gall.<sup>1</sup> Whatever were the original meaning of that detail, it might be added to that of a narcotic used as above explained. It has been elsewhere shown, too, that such a detail as the crown of thorns might conceivably stand for the nimbus of the Sun-God, or for the crown placed upon the heads of sacrificial victims in general,<sup>2</sup> or for the crown which was worn by human victims in such a sacrificial procession as is to be inferred from Herodotus' story of Herakles in Egypt, or for the actual crowns of thorns which were in vogue for religious purposes in the district of Abydos, or for some other ritual practice which is sought to be explained by the myth of the mock-crown of Herakles.<sup>3</sup> No limit can well be set to the possibility of such analogies from pagan religious practice.

<sup>1</sup> Such symbolical explanations may in certain cases be substituted for those offered by Mr. Frazer, whose Virgilian "golden bough," to start with, is shown by Mr. Lang to be very imperfectly identified with the bough of the tree in the Arician grove. Mr. Lang, who is apt to be severe on loose conjectures, for his own part "hazards a guess" that "of old, suppliants approached gods or kings with boughs in their hands," and that the Virgilian bough is such a propitiation to Persephone (*Magic and Religion*, pp. 207-8). Though the "gold" might plausibly be thus explained, it does not follow that the wool-wreathed boughs of suppliant groups, which played the part of our white flags (*Æschylus, Supplices*, 22-3, 190-2, etc.), were normally used in approaching kings, or all Gods. In Polynesia boughs were indeed presented to certain Gods (Ellis, i, 343), and were *carried before* chiefs, serving also as peace symbols or "white flags" (Turner, *Nineteen Years in Polynesia*, 1861, p. 314). But, on the other hand, boughs in the ancient world had a special connection with Gods and Goddesses of vegetation (Cp. Grant Allen, *Evol. of Idea of God*, p. 384), who were first and last Gods of the Underworld (Cp. *Æsch. Supplices*, 154-161). It was doubtless in this connection that a branch became in Egypt a symbol of time and of eternity (Tiele, *Eg. Rel.*, p. 154). The explanation of the Virgilian bough, then, probably lies in that direction. "It is not known" says Mr. Lang, "whether Virgil invented his bough, or took it from his rich store of antiquarian learning" (*Id.* p. 207). It is extremely unlikely that he should have invented it. But he might very well know that in one of the paintings of Polygnotus at Delphi (Pausanias, x, 30) Orpheus is represented as touching with his hand a branch of the willow-tree, which in Homer (*Odyssey*, x, 509-510) grows with the poplar in the grove of Persephone. Orpheus had been in Hades and returned. May not the bough then have had this general symbolical significance, and hence figure as a passport to the underworld?

<sup>2</sup> Even the Cimbri, whose priestesses cut the throats of their devoted human victims, crowned them beforehand (Strabo, vii, 2, § 3).

<sup>3</sup> *Christianity and Mythology*, pp. 397-9. See also pp. 396, 400-413, as to the clues for the cross-motive.

Actual or alleged history, too, may have given rise to some details in a mystery-ritual such as we are considering. In the gospel story as it now stands, though not as an original and dramatic detail in it, we find one remarkable coincidence with a passage in Josephus. The historian tells<sup>1</sup> that during the passover feast, while Jerusalem was being besieged, "the eastern gate of the inner sanctuary, which was of brass and very solid, which in the evening was with difficulty shut by twenty men, and which was supported by iron-bound bars and posts reaching far down, let into the floor of solid stone, was seen about the sixth hour of the night to have opened of its own accord"; and that this was felt by the wise to be an omen of ruin. In the synoptics it is told that after the robbers taunted Jesus, "from the sixth hour darkness was over the land till the ninth hour," whereupon Jesus uttered his cry of Eli, Eli, and immediately afterwards, "having again cried with a loud voice, gave up his spirit. And lo, the veil of the temple was rent in two from top to bottom." The three hours of darkness, it would appear, are alleged in order to give time for the passover meal, by way of assimilating the synoptic account to the Johannine. In the second gospel—in an apparently interpolated passage—Jesus is crucified at "the third hour": in the fourth, "it was Preparation of the Passover: it was about the sixth hour" when Jesus is *sent* to be crucified; and on that view his death would be consummated when the Passover sacrament was, the gospel, however, giving no further details. The space of silent suffering in the synoptics, from the sixth hour to the ninth, makes the stories finally correspond as to the hours, though not as to the day. In the third gospel, however, the reading is confused by the placing of the sentence: "And the sun was darkened and the veil of the temple was rent in the midst," *after* the mention of the three hours' darkness and *before* the Lord's death. Thus while the actual time of the veil-rending is left in the vague, the passage can be read as saying that

<sup>1</sup> *Wars*, B. vi, c. v, § 3.

the veil was rent when the darkness began, at the sixth hour.

In any case, whether or not the darkness of three hours is a late modification of the synoptic text (on which view the *death* may be held to have been originally placed at the sixth hour, and the rending of the temple veil at the same moment), the story in Josephus is extremely likely to have been the motive of the veil-rending myth in the Gospels. It actually did lead to the insertion of a gloss in an early text—perhaps originally Syriac—of the third gospel, where the stone placed at the mouth of the Lord's tomb is alleged to be such that twenty men could hardly roll it away; and in the existing old Syriac texts, significantly enough, it is the "front of the *gate*" of the sanctuary or temple that is rent in the gospel story—not the veil.<sup>1</sup> And the parallel does not end here. The story of the rising of the saints, so awkwardly interpolated in the first Gospel and in that only, is no less clearly an adaptation of the story of Josephus, in the same passage, to the effect that at the feast of Pentecost the priests when serving by night in the inner temple felt a quaking, and heard a great noise, and then a sound as of a multitude saying: "Let us remove hence." The whole series of portents in Josephus, as it happens, winds up with the story of Jesus the son of Ananus, who had so long "with a loud voice" cried "Woe to Jerusalem," and at last was slain by a stone from an engine, crying "Woe to myself also" as he gave up the ghost.

In view of such a remarkable suggestion to the early Jesuists, it seems unnecessary even to ask whether the myth of the veil-rending may be a variant popularly current at the same time with those given by Josephus. In all likelihood the interpolators of the Greek gospel modified both episodes in order either to escape contradiction or to make them more suitable symbolically.<sup>2</sup> That they were inter-

<sup>1</sup> Dr. F. H. Chase, *The Syro-Latin Text of the Gospels*, 1895, pp. 62-67, 95. Jerome, again, tells that in the Gospel according to the Hebrews it is not the veil of the temple that is rent but the lintel stone that falls. *Comm. in Matt.* xxvii, 51; *Ad Hedyb.* viii.

<sup>2</sup> On either view, it remains arguable that the Syriac Gospels here represent an earlier text than the present Greek.

polated after the transcription of the mystery-play we shall see when we consider that as such ; but for the present we have to recognise that if the transcribed narrative could be thus influenced, the play itself might be.

The scourging and crucifixion of Antigonus, again, must have made a profound impression on the Jews ;<sup>1</sup> and it is a historic fact that the similar slaying of the last of the Incas was kept in memory for the Peruvians by a drama annually acted.<sup>2</sup> It may be that the superscription "This is the King of the Jews," and even the detail of scourging,<sup>3</sup> came proximately from the story of Antigonus ; though on the other hand it is not unlikely that Antony should have executed Antigonus on the lines of the sacrifice of the mock-king. But it is noteworthy that where the existing mystery-drama, which was doubtless a Gentile development from a much simpler form, introduces historical characters, it does so on the clear lines of sacrificial principle set forth in the ritual of the Khonds, where already the symbol of the cross is prominent in the fashion of slaying the victim. Though the Gentile hostility to the Jews<sup>4</sup> would dictate the special implication of the Jewish priests and people, and of King Herod as in the third gospel, the total effect is to make it clear that the guilt of the sacrifice rests on no one official, but is finally taken by the whole people upon them. Even the quotation put in the mouth of the dying God-Man, "My God, My God, why hast thou forsaken me?"<sup>5</sup> has the effect of implying that he had hitherto suffered voluntarily. Thus does the ritual which was to grow into a world religion preserve in its consummated quasi-historical form the primeval principle that "one man should die for the people" by the people's will ; and, as we have seen, not even in extending the benefit of the sacrifice to "all mankind" does the great historic religion outgo the religious psychology of the ancient Dravidians.

When this is realised it will be seen to be unnecessary to suppose that any abnormal personality had arisen to give

<sup>1</sup> Cp. Strabo, in Josephus, *Antiq.* xv, 1, § 2.

<sup>2</sup> Below, Part IV, § 9.

<sup>3</sup> See above, p. 117, as to the scourgings mentioned by Josephus.

<sup>4</sup> Cp. *Christianity and Mythology*, p. 385.

<sup>5</sup> Psalm xxii, 1.

the cult its form or impetus. In view, however, of the evidence, fortuitously preserved in the Talmud, that one Jesus ben Pandira was stoned and hanged on a tree at Lydda on the eve of the Passover in the reign of Alexander Jannæus about 100 B.C.,<sup>1</sup> we are not entitled to say that a real act of sacerdotal vengeance did not enter into the making of the movement. The evidence is obscure; and the personality of the hanged Jesus, who is said to have been a sorcerer and a false teacher, becomes elusive and quasi-mythical even in the Talmud; but even such evidence gives better ground for a historical assumption than the supernaturalist narrative of the gospels. In any case, there is no reason to ascribe any special doctrinal teaching whatever to Jesus ben Pandira. He remains but a name, with a mention of his death by "hanging on a tree," a quasi-sacrifice, at the time of the sacrificial rite which had anciently been one of man-slaying and child-slaying. Leaving the case on that side undetermined, we turn to a problem which admits of solution.

§ 15.—*The Gospel Mystery-Play.*

It is not disputed that one of the most marked features of the popular religions of antiquity, in Greece, Egypt, and Greek-speaking Asia, was the dramatic representation of the central episodes in the stories of the suffering and dying Gods and Goddesses.<sup>2</sup> Herodotus has been charged with pretending to knowledge that he did not possess; but there is no reason to doubt his assertion<sup>3</sup> that on the artificial circular lake at Sais the Egyptians were wont to give by night—presumably once a year—representations of the sufferings of a certain one whom he will not name, which representations they called mysteries. The certain one in question we know must have been the God Osiris;<sup>4</sup> and that the sufferings and death of Osiris were dramatically represented, modern Egyptology has freshly established

<sup>1</sup> *Christianity and Mythology*, pp. 308, 321, 395, 402, 413.

<sup>2</sup> Cp. Lactantius, *Div. Inst.* v, 19 (20).

<sup>3</sup> B. i, c. 171.

<sup>4</sup> Cp. Plutarch, *Isis and Osiris*, cc. 25, 35, 39.

from hieroglyphic documents.<sup>1</sup> We know, too, from the concluding rubric of the "Lamentations of Isis and Nephthys" for Osiris that those Goddesses were personated in the ritual by two beautiful women.<sup>2</sup>

In the worships of Adonis and of Attis there was certainly a dramatic representation of the dead God by effigy, and of his resurrection;<sup>3</sup> and in the mysteries of Mithra, as given among the Greeks, we know there was included a representation of the burial of a stone effigy of the God, in a rock tomb, and of his resurrection.<sup>4</sup> So, in the great cult of Dionysos, with whose worship were connected the beginnings of tragedy among the Greeks, there was a symbolic representation of the dismemberment of the young God by the Titans, this being part of the sacrament of his body and blood; and in the special centres of the worship of Herakles, or at least at one of them, Tarsus, there was annually erected in his worship a funeral pyre, on which his effigy was burned.<sup>5</sup> Among the Greeks, again, a dramatic representation of the myth of the loss of Persephone, the mourning of her mother Demeter, and her restoration, was the central attraction in the Eleusinian mysteries.

Of all of those mysteries the mythological explanation is doubtless the same: they mostly originated in primitive sacrificial rituals to represent the annual death of vegetation, and to charm it into returning; and in the cult of Mithra, who, like Herakles, is specifically a Sun-God, there may have been an adaptation from the rites of the Vegetation-

<sup>1</sup> Budge, *Papyrus of Ani*, Introd., cxv-cxvi, citing Ledrain, *Monuments Egyptiens*, pl. xxv. Cp. Brugsch, "Das Osiris-Mysterium von Tentyra," in *Zeitschrift für Aegyptische Sprache*, 1881; Grant Allen, *Evolution of the Idea of God*, 1897, p. 399; and art. by Chabas, in *Révue Archéologique*, 15 Mai, 1857, p. 76.

<sup>2</sup> *Records of the Past*, 1st series, vol. ii, p. 119. Cp. Brugsch, *Religion und Mythologie der alten Aegypter*, 1885-88, p. 623 ff.; and Chabas, *Révue Archéologique*, 15 Juillet, 1857, pp. 207-8.

<sup>3</sup> The main authorities are given by Mr. Frazer, *G. B.* 2nd ed. ii, 116, 131. Cp. Foucart, *Des Associations religieuses chez les Grecs*, 1873, p. 82.

<sup>4</sup> Below, Part III, § 7. Cp. Firmicus Maternus, *De Errone*, c. 22 (23); and see *Christianity and Mythology*, p. 417, note, as to the significance of the passage, which Mr. Frazer, as I think, misapplies to the cult of Attis.

<sup>5</sup> Robertson Smith, *Religion of the Semites*, p. 353. As to the resurrection of Herakles, see pp. 449-450.

Gods. In the later stages the magic which had been supposed to revive vegetation is applied to securing the life of the initiate in the next world. We are not here concerned, however, with the origin of the usage. For our purpose it suffices us to know that such rites were rites of "salvation," and that they were the most popular in ancient religion.

As Christism first became popular by the development or adaptation of myths and ritual usages like those of the popular pagan systems, notably the Birth-myth, the Holy Supper, and the Resurrection, it might be expected that it should imitate paganism in the matter of dramatic mysteries. The mere Supper ritual, indeed, is itself dramatic, the celebrant personating the God as Attis was personated by his priest;<sup>1</sup> and in the remarkable expression in the Pauline epistle to the Galatians (iii, 1)—"before whose eyes Jesus Christ was openly set forth crucified"—we have probably a record of an early fashion of imaging the crucifixion.<sup>2</sup> In the same document (vi, 17) is the phrase, "I bear in my body the marks of the Lord Jesus"; and various other expressions in the epistles, describing the devotee as mystically crucified and as having become one with the crucified Lord, suggest that in the early stages of the cult it dramatically adopted the apparently dramatic teaching of the Egyptian Book of the Dead, wherein the saved and Osirified soul declares: "I clasp the sycamore tree; I myself am joined unto the sycamore tree, and its arms are opened unto me graciously";<sup>3</sup> and again: "I

<sup>1</sup> This usage seems to have been normal in Egypt (see Tiele, *Egyptian Religion*, p. 107) and common in primitive cults (J. G. Müller, *Amerikanische Urreligionen*, pp. 77, 493, 597).

<sup>2</sup> Cp. 1 Cor. xi, 26, A.V. and margin. The expression in Galatians suggests either a *pictorial* setting forth or an effigy. Cp. Canon Cook's Comm. *in loc.*; and note the bearing of the doubtful passage in a rubric to ch. cxlviii of the Book of the Dead (Budge's tr. p. 263), apparently describing a eucharist in presence of painted figures of the Gods. Such a eucharist would approximate to the Roman Lectisternium.

<sup>3</sup> Book of the Dead, ch. lxiv, Budge's tr. p. 115. Cp. the rubric to ch. clxv (p. 296) describing a figure with the arms outstretched; and see also the account of the pillar, p. 46, as to which compare *Christianity and Mythology*, p. 410, and Tiele, *Egyptian Religion*, Eng. tr. pp. 46, 187. It will be remembered that in France in the sixteenth century, among the wilder Jansenists, "une des dévotions les plus appréciées consistait à se faire crucifier

have become a divine being by the side of the *birth-chamber* of Osiris ; I am brought forth with him, I renew my youth."<sup>1</sup> In the fifth century, we know, mystery plays were performed either in or in connection with the churches;<sup>2</sup> and the identity between the birth-story and several pagan dramatic rituals is too close to be missed.<sup>3</sup> But apart from the parallels above indicated the dramatic *origination* of the story of the Christ's Supper, Passion, Betrayal, Trial, and Crucifixion, as it now stands, has yet to be established. The proof, however, I submit, lies, and has always lain, before men's eyes in the actual Gospel narrative. It is the prepossessions set up by age-long belief that have prevented alike believers and unbelievers from seeing as much.

Let the reader carefully peruse the story of the series of episodes as they are given in their least sophisticated form, in the gospels of Matthew and Mark. From Matthew xxvi, 17, or 20, it will be noted, the narrative is simply a presentment of a *dramatic action and dialogue* ; and the events are huddled one upon another exactly as happens in all drama that is not framed with a special concern for plausibility. In many plays of Shakespeare, notably in *Measure for Measure*,<sup>4</sup> there occurs such a compression of incidents in time, the reason being precisely the nature of drama, which, whether or not it holds theoretically by the unities, must for practical reasons minimise change of scene and develop action rapidly. Even in the *Hedda Gabler* of Ibsen, the chief master of modern drama, this exigency of the conditions leads the dramatist in the last act to the startling step of making the friends of the suicide sit down to prepare his manuscripts for the press within a few minutes of his death. To realise fully the theatrical character of the Gospel story, it is necessary to keep in view this characteristic compression of the action in time, as well

comme le Christ" (A. Réville, *Prolegomènes de l'histoire de religion*, 3e édit. p. 173).

<sup>1</sup> Book of the Dead, ch. lxix, p. 125. Cp. p. 82, and p. 261 note.

<sup>2</sup> See *Christianity and Mythology*, p. 230.

<sup>3</sup> *Id.* Part II, §§ 11, 12, 13.

<sup>4</sup> See the author's essay, *The Upshot of Hamlet*.

as the purely dramatic content. The point is not merely that the compression of events proves the narrative to be pure fiction, but that they are compressed for a reason—the reason being that they are presented in a drama.

As the story stands, Jesus partakes with his disciples of the Passover, an evening meal; and after a very brief dialogue they sing a hymn, and proceed in the darkness to the mount of Olives. Not a word is said of what happened or was said on the way: the scene is simply changed to the mount; and there begin a new dialogue and action. A slight change of scene—again effected with no hint of any talk on the way—is made to Gethsemane; and here the scanty details as to the separation from “his disciples,” and the going apart with the three, indicate with a brevity obviously dramatic the arrangement by which Judas—who was thus far with the party—would on the stage be enabled to withdraw. Had the story been first composed for writing, such an episode would necessarily have been described; and something would naturally have been said of the talk on the way from the supper-chamber to the mount. What we are reading is the bare transcript of a primitive play, in which the writer has not here attempted to insert more than has been shown on the scene.

In the Passion scene, this dramatic origination of the action is again twice emphasised. Thrice over Jesus prays while his disciples sleep. There is thus no one present or awake to record his words—an incongruity which could not well have entered into a narrative originally composed for writing, where it would have been a gratuitous invention, but which *on the stage* would not be a difficulty at all, since there the prayer would be heard and accepted by the audience, like the asides in an inartistic modern play. No less striking is the revelation made in verses 45 and 46, where in two successive sentences, with no pause between, Jesus tells the sleeping three to sleep on and to arise. What has happened is either a slight disarrangement of the dialogue or the omission of an exit and an entrance. Verse 44 runs: “And he left them *again*, and went away, and prayed a third time, saying again the same words.” If

verse 45, from the second clause onwards, were inserted before verse 44—where, as the text stands, Jesus says nothing—and verse 46 introduced with the descriptive phrase immediately after verse 44, the incongruity would be removed. Only in transcription from a dramatic text could it have arisen.

Then, without the slightest account of what he had been doing in the interim, Judas enters the scene exactly as he would on the stage, with his multitude, “while he [Jesus] yet spake.” With an impossible continuity, the action goes on through the night, a thing quite unnecessary in any save a dramatic fiction, where unity of time—that is, the limitation of the action within twenty-four hours, or little more, as prescribed by Aristotle<sup>1</sup>—was for the ancients a ruling principle. Jesus is taken in the darkness to the house of the high priest, “where the scribes and the elders were gathered together.” The disciples meanwhile had “left him and fled,” and not a word is said as to what they did in the interim; though any account of the episode, in the terms of the tradition concerning them, must have come through them.

But it is needless to insist on the absolutely unhistorical character of a narrative which makes the whole judicial process take place in the middle of the night, a time when, as Renan notes, an Eastern city is as if dead. The point is that the invention is of a kind obviously conditioned by a dramatic purpose. In the dead of night the authorities proceed to hunt up “false witnesses” throughout Jerusalem, because the witnesses must be produced in the trial scene as closely as possible on that of the capture; and the process goes on till two give the requisite testimony. Then Jesus is questioned, condemned, buffeted, and (presumably) led away; and Peter, remaining on the scene, denies his lord and is convicted of treason by the crowing of the cock. Of what happens to the doomed God-Man in this interval there is not a hint; though it is just here that a non-dramatic narrative would naturally follow him most closely.

<sup>1</sup> *Poetics*, v.

Morning has thus come, and "*when morning was come*" the priests and elders, who thus have had no rest, "take counsel" afresh to put Jesus to death, and lead him away, bound, to Pilate. But this evidently happens off the scene, since we have the interlude in which Judas brings back his thirty pieces of silver, is repudiated by the priests, and goes away to hang himself. The story of the potter's field is obviously a later writer's interpolation in the narrative. An original narrator, telling a story in a natural way, would have given details about Judas: the interpolator characteristically wants to explain that "Then was fulfilled that which was spoken by Jeremiah the prophet."

As usual, not a word is said of the details of the transit from place to place: the scene simply changes all at once to the presence of the Governor; and here, with not a single touch of description such as an original narrator might naturally give, we plunge straight into dialogue. Always we are witnessing drama, of which the spectators needed no description, and of which the subsequent transcriber reproduces simply the action and the words, save in so far as he is absolutely forced to insert a brief explanation of the Barabbas episode. The rest of the trial scene, and the scene of the mock crowning and robing, are strictly dramatic, giving nothing but words and action. In the account of the trial before Herod, which is found only in Luke, the method of narration is significantly different, being descriptive and non-dramatic, as the work of an amplifying later narrator would naturally be. The words of Herod are not given; and the interpolation was doubtless the work of a late Gentile, bent on making Jewish and not Roman soldiers guilty of mocking the Lord.<sup>1</sup> In the first two Gospels, even the episode of the laying hold of Simon of Cyrene, to make him bear the cross, might have been introduced at this point on the stage, without involving the attempt—impossible in drama—to present the procession to the place of crucifixion. Of that procession Matthew and Mark offer no description: they simply adhere

<sup>1</sup> Such a scene *may* have been enacted in one version of the mystery-play; but it is not *transcribed* in Luke as the earlier play is in Matthew.

to the drama, leaving to the later narrative of Luke the embellishment of the mourning crowd of daughters of Jerusalem, and the speech of Jesus to them on the way. Even Luke, however, offers no description of the march; and even his added episode might have been brought into a dramatic action, either at the close of the crowning-scene or at the beginning of that of the crucifixion.

Here, as before, the action is strictly dramatic, save for the episode of the Scriptural explanation of the casting of lots, which may or may not have been a late addition to the action. No word is said of the *aspect* of Jesus, a point on which an original narrator, if writing to be read, or telling of what he had seen, would almost certainly have said something. In a drama, of course, no such details were needed: the suffering God-man was there on the stage, seen by all the spectators. The same account holds good of all the remaining scenes in the Gospel story, with a few exceptions. The three hours of darkness and silence could not be enacted, though there might be a shorter interval; and the rending of the temple veil, which could not take place on the scene, is to be presumed a late addition to the transcribed narrative; but a machinery of commotion may very well have been employed, and the wild story of the opening of the graves of the saints may actually derive from such a performance, though the absurdity of the 53rd verse is wholly documentary. Such a story would naturally be dropped from later gospels because of its sheer extravagance; but such a scruple would not affect the early dramatists. Even the episode of the appeal of the priests and Pharisees to Pilate to keep a guard on the tomb, though it might be a later interpolation, could quite well have been a dramatic scene, as it presents the Jews "gathered together unto Pilate, saying....."

The resurrection scene, like that of the crucifixion, is wholly "staged." The two Maries, who sat before the sepulchre when Joseph closed it, appear again late on the Sabbath day, having presumably been driven away by the guard before. Nothing is said of what has gone on among the disciples; nothing of the communion of the mourning

women : the whole narrative is rigidly limited to the strictly consecutive dramatic action, as it would be represented on the stage. Even the final appearance in Galilee is set forth in the same fashion, and the Gospel even as it stands ends abruptly with the words of the risen Lord. When the mystery-play was first transcribed, it may have ended at Matt. xxviii, 10, verses 11-15 having strong marks of late addition. But it may quite well have included verses 16-20, with the obvious exception of the clause about the Trinity, which is certainly late. In any case, it ended on a speech.

Why should such a document so end, if it were the work of a narrator setting down what he knew or had heard? Why should he not round off his narrative in the normal manner? The "higher criticism" has recognised that the story of the betrayal and the rest do not belong to the earlier matter of the gospels. The analysis of the school of Weiss, as presented by Mr. A. J. Jolley,<sup>1</sup> makes the "Primitive Gospel" end with the scene of the anointing. I hold that scene to have been also dramatic, and to have been first framed as a prologue to the Mystery-Play;<sup>2</sup> but the essential point is that all that portion which I have above treated as the Mystery-Play is an addition to a previously existing document. Not that the play was not older than the document, but that its transcription is later. And this theory, I submit, gives the explanation as to the abruptness of the conclusion. Where the play ended the narrative ends. Only in the later third Gospel do we find the close, and some other episodes, such as the Herod trial and the account of Joseph of Arimathea, treated in the narrative spirit—in the manner, that is, of a narrative framed for reading. In Luke's conclusion there is still a certain scenic suggestion; but it is a distant imitation of the concrete theatricality of the earlier version; description is freely interspersed; speeches are freely lengthened; and the story is rounded off as an adaptive writer would naturally treat it.

<sup>1</sup> *The Synoptic Problem for English Readers*, Macmillan, 1893.

<sup>2</sup> Cp. *Christianity and Mythology*, pp. 363-6.

In the earlier gospels such a treatment has not been ventured on. There are but a few doctrinary and explanatory interpolations; the descriptive element is kept nearly at the possible minimum; the scenic action is adhered to even where interpolated description would clearly be appropriate for narrative purposes; the transcriber even stumbles over his text to the extent of joining two speeches which should have an entrance and an exit between them; and when the last scene ends the Gospel ends. The transcriber has been able to add to the previous Gospel the matter of the mystery play; and there he loyally stops. His work has been done in good faith, up to his lights; and he does not presume to speak of matters of which he knows nothing. Later doctrinaires, with a dogma to support, might tamper with the document: he sticks to his copy. Doubtless the addition was made by Gentile hands. In the play the apostles are unfavourably presented, and the episode of the treason of Peter is probably a Gentile invention made to discredit the Judaizing party, who held by a Petrine tradition, though on the other hand the Gospel text about the rock is presumably a late invention in the interest of the Roman See.

In this connection there arises the question whether the specifically dramatic "Acts of Pilate," as contained in the non-canonical "Gospel of Nicodemus," may not likewise represent an original drama. Broadly speaking, it seems to do so, and it may conceivably proceed upon a dramatic text independently of the Synoptics. On the ground, not of its dramatic form but of the occasional relative brevity and the general consistency of its narrative, it has even been argued<sup>1</sup> that its matter is earlier than the version of the story in any of the gospels. With that problem we are not here concerned; but it is relevant to note that the dramatic action of the non-canonical gospel is not earlier but later than that preserved in the canonical. In the "Acts of Pilate" the trial scene is composed by reducing to drama a whole series of episodes from the previous

<sup>1</sup> By C. B. Waite, in his *History of the Christian Religion to the year 200*, 3rd ed. Chicago, 1881, pp. 198-212.

gospel history, the various persons miraculously cured by Jesus coming forward to give evidence on his behalf. Even the story of the water-wine miracle is embodied from the fourth gospel. This expansion is manifestly a late device, and has the effect of making the already impossible trial scene newly extravagant. And while the trial in the "Acts" is in passages more strictly dramatic than in the gospel, those very passages tell of redaction, not of priority. Thus Pilate is made to utter in his address the explanation concerning the usage of releasing a prisoner, and volunteers allusion to Barabbas, where the gospel gives those details by way of narrative. It is clear that the natural and original form of the drama Pilate would not so speak: the speech is a sophistication.

Whether or not, then, the "Acts" proceeded on a separate dramatic text, it does not preserve the earlier version. That it does not give the absurd detail about the risen saints visiting the holy city after the resurrection, is merely a fresh proof that the first gospel is at that point interpolated. The mere fact that the "Acts" gives names to personages who are without names in the canonical gospels—as, the two thieves and the soldier who pierced the Lord's side—tells of lateness. What the document does signify is the apparent extension of the mystery play beyond the limits of that embodied in the first gospel, and under the same pressure of Gentile motive, the whole effect of the extension being to throw a greater guilt of perversity on the Jews and to put Pilate in a favourable light. That the play in the "Acts" came from a source to which the Syrian sacrificial tradition was alien is further suggested by the fact that it places the act of mock-crowning at Golgotha, not in the Praetorium, and that for the scarlet robe it substitutes a linen cloth; while a formal sentence of scourging is passed by Pilate. Finally, the resurrection does not happen upon the scene, but is related by the mouths of the Roman soldiers, as if the dramatist or compiler were bent on producing new and stronger evidence in proof of the event.

On any view, however, the dramatic form of the "Acts"

serves to strengthen the presumption that dramatic representations of the death of Jesus were early current, and thus to support the foregoing interpretation of the gospel story. That interpretation, it is submitted, fits the whole case, and at once explains what otherwise is inexplicable, the peculiar character of what is clearly an unhistorical narrative. Assume the story to be either a tradition reduced to writing long after the event, or the work of a deliberate inventor desirous of giving some detail to a story of which he had received the barest mention. Either way, why should that impossible huddling of the action, that crowding of so many decisive events into one night, have been resorted to? It does not help the story as a narrative for reading; it makes it, on the contrary, so improbable that only the hebetude of reverence can prevent anyone from seeing its untruth. The solution is instant and decisive when we realise that what we are reading is the bare transcription of a mystery-play, framed on the principle of "unity of time."

As has been remarked, it is not to be supposed that the play as it stands in the gospel is primordial; rather it is a piece of technical elaboration, albeit older than the play in the "Acts of Pilate," for if we divide it by its scenes or places we have the classic five acts:—first, the Supper; second, the Passion and Betrayal, both occurring on the mount; third, the trial at the high-priest's house; fourth, the trial before Pilate; fifth, the Crucifixion. If we suppose this to have been one continuous play, the resurrection may have been a separate action, with five scenes—the removal of the body by Joseph; the burial; the placing of the guard of soldiers; the coming of the women and the address of the angel; and the appearance of the risen Lord. But similarly the early action may have been divided: the anointing scene, the visit of Judas to the priests, the visit of the disciples to the "certain man" in whose house the Supper was to be eaten—all these may have been dramatically presented in the first instance. The scene of the Transfiguration, too, has every appearance of having been a dramatic representation in the manner of the pagan mysteries. But the theory of the dramatic origin

of the coherent yet impossible story of the Supper, Passion, Betrayal, the two Trials, and the Crucifixion, does not depend on any decisive apportionment of the scenes. It is borne out at every point by every detail of the structure of the story as we have it in transcription; and when this is once recognised, our conception of the manner of the origin of the Gospels is at this point at least placed on a new, we might say a scientific, basis.

§ 16.—*The Mystery-Play and the Cultus.*

In all probability the performance of the mystery-play was suspended when it was reduced to writing as part of the Gospel. The suspension may have occurred either during a time of local persecution or by the deliberate decision of the churches, in the second century. But such a deliberate decision is extremely likely to have been taken when the cult, having broken away from Judaism, was also concerned to break away from the paganism in contact with which the play would first arise. How far away from Jerusalem that may have been we can hardly divine. Greek drama certainly came much closer to Jewish life than has been recognised in the histories. Not only were theatres built by Herod, as Josephus testifies, at Damascus and Jericho,<sup>1</sup> but ruins of two theatres exist at Gadara,<sup>2</sup> described by Josephus as a Greek town,<sup>3</sup> and known to have produced a number of notable Hellenistic writers.<sup>4</sup> But the presumption from what we know of Christian origins is that the cult developed rather in the larger than in the smaller Hellenistic cities; and it would need a fairly strong group to produce such a mystery-play. It may indeed never have been performed in full save at important centres, such as Antioch or Alexandria; and when once the cult was at all widely established such a state of things would be inexpedient on many grounds. The reduction of the play to narrative form put all the churches on a level, and

<sup>1</sup> *Wars*, i, 21, § 11; *Antiq.* xvii, 6, § 3.

<sup>2</sup> Schürer, *Jewish People in time of Christ*, Div. II, Eng. tr. i, 27, 100, n.

<sup>3</sup> *Antiq.* xvii, 11, § 4; *Wars*, ii, 6, § 3.      <sup>4</sup> Schürer, as cited, i, 27, 103.

would remove a stumbling-block from the way of the ascetic Christists who objected to all dramatic shows as such.

But the manner of the transcription happily preserves for us the knowledge of the fact that it was such a show to begin with. And if we suppose it to have grown up in a Gentile environment, say in Alexandria, on the nucleus of the eucharist, after the model of an actual sacrifice in which a "Jesus Barabbas" was annually offered up, we shall be so far within the warrant of the evidence. Whether the official stoning and hanging of an actual Jesus on a charge of sorcery and blasphemy in the days of Alexander Jannæus had served as a fresh point of departure, is a question that cannot at present be decided. All that is clear is that the gospel story is unhistorical. The placing of the action of the mystery-play in Jerusalem would be the natural course for Gentiles who were seeking to counteract the Judaizing party in a cult which founded on a slain Jewish Jesus; since the more clearly Jerusalem and Jewry were saddled with what had come to be regarded as an act of historic guilt, the clearer would be the grounds for a breach with Judaism.

To locate the first performance of the play in its present shape is beyond the possibilities of the case as the evidence stands. The detail of the two Maries suggests Egypt, where the cult of Osiris had just such a scene of quasi-maternal mourning; and the Egyptian ideas in the Apocalypse, such as those of the "lake of fire" and "the second death,"<sup>1</sup> further point to Alexandrian sources for early Jesuism; but the eucharist and burial and resurrection are apparently Mithraistic, as are various details in the Apocalypse;<sup>2</sup> and the Osirian ritual, like

<sup>1</sup> Cp. Rev. xxi, 8; Book of the Dead, cc. 24, 86, 98, 125, 126, etc. The "Amen" Logos is also Egyptian (Rev. iii, 14; B.D. c. 165).

<sup>2</sup> Thus the Logos as "faithful and true" and righteous judge and *warrior* (Rev. xix, 11) points to Mithra; and though Thoth had seven assistants, the sacred "sevens" of the Apocalypse and the whole imagery of the Lamb seem specially Mithraic. Still the "Lamb slain" figured notably in the worship of Amun, being laid on the image of the God Amun and ritually mourned for, while the image of the Sun-God stood by (Herodotus, ii, 42). And the warrior Logos may stand for Horos-Munt (Tiele, *Egyptian Religion*, p. 124).

the Mithraic, would be known in many lands. We can but say that the death-ritual of the Christian creed is framed in a pagan environment, and that, like the myth of the Virgin-birth,<sup>1</sup> it embodies some of the most widespread ideas of pagan religion. In strict truth, the two aspects in which the historic Christ is typically presented to his worshippers, those of his infancy and his death, are typically pagan.

But indeed there is not a conception associated with the Christ that is not common to some or all of the Saviour cults of antiquity. The title of Saviour, latterly confined to him, was in Judaism given to Yahweh,<sup>2</sup> and among the Greeks to Zeus,<sup>3</sup> to Helios,<sup>4</sup> to Artemis,<sup>5</sup> to Dionysos,<sup>6</sup> to Herakles,<sup>7</sup> to the Dioscuri,<sup>8</sup> to Cybele,<sup>9</sup> to Æsculapius;<sup>10</sup> and it is the essential conception of the God Osiris. So too, Osiris taketh away sin, and is judge of the dead, and of the last judgment; and Dionysos, also Lord of the Underworld, and primarily a God of feasting ("the Son of Man cometh eating and drinking"), comes to be conceived as the Soul of the World, and as the inspirer of chastity and self-purification. From the Mysteries of Dionysos and Isis comes the proclamation of the easy "yoke"; and the Christ not only works the Dionysiak miracle,<sup>11</sup> but calls himself "the true vine."<sup>12</sup> Like the Christ, and like Adonis and Attis, Osiris and Dionysos suffer and die to rise again; and to become one with them is the mystical passion of their worshippers. All alike in their mysteries give immortality; and from Mithraism the Christ takes the symbolic keys of heaven and hell,<sup>13</sup> even as he assumes the function of the Virgin-born Mithra-Saoshyant, the destroyer of the Evil One.<sup>14</sup> Like Mithra, Merodach,<sup>15</sup> and the Egyptian Khonsu,<sup>16</sup> he is the Mediator; like Khonsu,

<sup>1</sup> Cp. *Christianity and Mythology*, pp. 317-319.

<sup>2</sup> Ps. clvi, 21; Isa. xliii, 4, 11, etc.; Hos. xiii, 4, etc. etc.

<sup>3</sup> Athenæus, xv, 17, 47, 48; Pausanias, ii, 37; Pindar, *Ol.* v, 33.

<sup>4</sup> Paus. viii, 31.

<sup>5</sup> *Id.* i, 44; ii, 31.

<sup>6</sup> *Id.* ii, 31, 37.

<sup>7</sup> Preller, *Gr. Myth.* ii, 274, n.

<sup>8</sup> *Orphica, Ad Musæum*, 21.

<sup>9</sup> *Id. In Rheam*, xiv, 11; xxvii, 12.

<sup>10</sup> *Id. In Æsculap.* lxvii, 8.

<sup>11</sup> *Christianity and Mythology*, pp. 356, 425.

<sup>12</sup> John, v, i.

<sup>13</sup> Below, Part III, § 12.

<sup>14</sup> *Id.* § 10.

<sup>15</sup> Cp. H. Zimmern, *Vater Sohn und Fürsprecher*, 1896, pp. 11-12.

<sup>16</sup> Maspero, *Hist. ancienne des peuples de l'orient*, 4e édit. pp. 286-8.

Horus, and Merodach, he is one of a trinity;<sup>1</sup> like Horus, he is grouped with a divine Mother; like Khonsu, he is joined with the Logos;<sup>2</sup> and like Merodach, he is associated with a Holy Spirit, one of whose symbols is fire.<sup>3</sup> In fundamentals, in short, Christism is but paganism reshaped: it is only the economic and the doctrinal evolution of the system—the first determined by Jewish practice and Roman environment,<sup>4</sup> and the second by Greek thought<sup>5</sup>—that constitute new phenomena in religious history.

§ 17.—*Further Pagan Adaptations.*

One likely result of the non-performance of the mystery-play as such would be a modification of the sacramental meal. When the crucifixion was represented in sequel to the supreme annual eucharist, the bread and wine of the weekly Supper were somewhat definitely presented as symbols, whereas the merely priestly representation of the God by the ministrant in the simple eucharist would emphasise the declaration "this is my body." As to what may have ritually occurred in this connection either shortly before or after the period of the mystery-play we can but speculate, as aforesaid; but we have seen that the ritual eating of a lamb did take place in the post-Pauline period, as in the mysteries of Mithra and Dionysos; and there is reason to infer that for similar reasons there was long and commonly practised among Christists the usage of eating a baked image of a child at the Easter communion.<sup>6</sup> That is the only satisfactory explanation of the constant pagan charge against the Christians of eating an actual child—a charge met by the Fathers in terms which

<sup>1</sup> Le Page Renouf, *Hibbert Lectures*, p. 83.

<sup>2</sup> Tiele, *Egyptian Religion*, pp. 154, 178.

<sup>3</sup> Cp. "The Babylonian Father, Son, and Paraclete," by Chilperic, in *Free Review*, Jan., 1897; Zimmern, as last cited.

<sup>4</sup> Cp. *A Short History of Christianity*, ch. ii. and iii.

<sup>5</sup> Cp. Hatch, *Infl. of Greek Ideas and Usages upon the Christian Church*.

<sup>6</sup> See the evidence for this view given in *Christianity and Mythology*, pp. 211-226; and cp. Frazer, *Golden Bough*, ii, 343 sq., and Grant Allen, *Evolution of the Idea of God*, pp. 344-5.

convey that there was *something* to conceal.<sup>1</sup> As it was made and repelled long after the gospels were current with the mystery-play added, there would be no reason for the attitude of mystery unless the ritual included some symbolism not described in the books. Given that this symbol was bread shaped in a human form, Christism was exactly duplicating one of the practices of the man-sacrificing Mexicans, who at the time of the Spanish conquest employed such a symbol in some of their sacraments alongside of still surviving rites of man-eating, and constant human sacrifice.<sup>2</sup>

When, however, the Christian cult was officially established, there needed no such primary symbolism to secure for the habitual sacrament the reverence of the faithful. The general belief that the sacred bread became the flesh of the God, and as such had miraculous virtue, could be maintained on the strength of the bare priestly blessing; and though the consecrated wafer is itself copied from pagan practice,<sup>3</sup> it is finally a symbol of a symbol. For the same reason, the church was able to put down a tendency which can be traced in the second and third centuries, and even later, to set up a new sacramental symbol for the Christ, to wit, the Fish.<sup>4</sup> This peculiar symbolism was superficially traced to the fact that the Greek word *Ιχθυσ*, *Fish*, is got from the initial letters of the phrase *Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς Θεοῦ Υἱὸς Σοτήρ*, *Jesus Christ, God's Son, Saviour*. But such a solution is incredible: the anagram is framed after the symbol, not before it; and the true explanation must be that whereas the divine lamb had long been identified with the zodiacal sign *Aries*, in

<sup>1</sup> Cp. Hatch, as cited, pp. 292-305.

<sup>2</sup> Below, Part IV, § 6.

<sup>3</sup> Cp. Lea, *History of Sacerdotal Celibacy*, 2nd ed. p. 44. To begin with, the early sacramental bread was certainly in round cakes or rolls (Bingham, B. xv, c. ii, §§ 5, 6), as were the *paniculi* of the pagan sacrifices. Originally it was taken from the oblations offered by the people, and was therefore not unleavened. It was only after such oblations had practically ceased that the Church began to supply the sacred bread in the form of wafers, for economy's sake, and, these being necessarily unleavened, argued that they ought to be so.

<sup>4</sup> Tertullian, *De Baptismo*, 1; Augustine, *De Civ. Dei*, xviii. 23. Cp. Lundy, *Monumental Christianity*, 1876, pp. 130-140, as to the Christian and pre-Christian symbolisms. The Messiah is already identified with *Dag*, the Fish, in the Talmud.

which the Sun enters at the vernal equinox, the time of the crucifixion, the precession of the equinoxes had for some time made the sun's zodiacal place at that season not the constellation *Aries* but the constellation *Pisces*.<sup>1</sup> Either for the same reason, or in virtue of the simpler myth according to which the Sun was a fish who every evening plunged in the sea, Horus had long been "the Fish" in Egypt; and in some planispheres he was represented as fish-tailed, and holding a cross in his hand. It was he, and not Jesus, who figured for the Gnostics as the Divine Fish;<sup>2</sup> and it was probably through the Gnostics that the symbol entered the Christian system. And though the Egyptian precedent was inconvenient, and the symbol recalled both the Philistine Fish-God Dagon and the Babylonian Oannes, many Christists would be the more led to such a change of symbol because the lamb symbol was awkwardly common to both Judaism and Mithraism; and because in particular the phrase of the Judaistic Apocalypse, "washed in the blood of the Lamb," pointed very inconveniently to the Mithraic rite of the *criobolium*, which with the *taurobolium* was a highly popular pagan rite of "purification."<sup>3</sup> The catacomb banquet scenes in which fishes figure as the food<sup>4</sup> are probably due to this motive; and the story of the sacred meal of fish in the fourth gospel was probably shaped in part under the same pressure, though the idea of a banquet of seven was also Mithraic.<sup>5</sup>

A State Church, however, was able to dispense with such tactics, though it saw fit to discourage the use of the lamb symbol. That, nevertheless, survived with the equally pagan symbol of the Easter egg, which has no place in the sacred books, but was taken by the Gnostics from the lore of the Orphicists. The bread symbol, finally attenuated to the wafer, served as the supreme or official sanctity.

<sup>1</sup> See below, Part III, § 6, and compare Gubernatis, *Lecture sopra la mitologia vedica*, 1874, pp. 216-232, as to the wide bearings of the Fish myth.

<sup>2</sup> See the Gnostic Seal (Brit. Mus. No. 231) engraved in Mr. Gerald Massey's *Natural Genesis*, 1883, i, 454; and compare the planispheres in that vol. and vol. ii of his *Book of the Beginnings*, 1881.

<sup>3</sup> Below, Part III, § 6.

<sup>4</sup> Northcote and Brownlow, *Roma Sotteranea*, 1879, ii, 67-71.

<sup>5</sup> *Christianity and Mythology*, p. 419.

Yet in this remotely symbolical fashion the historical Church has sedulously preserved the immemorial principle, common to paganism and Judaism, of a constantly repeated sacrifice; and by that doctrine the Church of Rome stands to this day, the Church of England leaning strongly towards it.<sup>1</sup> Hierologically speaking, they are quite justified; the eucharist is a sacrificial meal or nothing; and those who recoil from the sacrificial principle, if they would be equally consistent, have by rights but one course before them, that of relegating the Christian cultus to the status of those of paganism.

But in the way of such a course there stands the agelong prepossession in favour of the Gospel Jesus as a personality and as a teacher. In these his moral aspects, men think, he stands apart from the Christs, mythic or otherwise, of the Gentile world, and is worthy of a perpetual attention. In these aspects, then, finally, must the Christian God-Man be comparatively studied.

§ 18.—*Synopsis and Conclusion: Genealogy of Human Sacrifice and Sacrament.*

Meantime it may be helpful to draw up a tentative genealogical scheme of the history of the sacrificial idea as we have sketched it up to Christianity, and further to reduce this to diagram form. We set out with the dim primeval life in which

A. All "victims," whether animal or human, are not strictly sacrificed but communally *eaten*, the "Gods" and the "dead" being held to share in the feast, as a feast. Dead relatives are similarly eaten, and parents filially slain and eaten, to preserve their qualities in the family or tribe. On such habits would follow the sacrifices of human beings at funerals,<sup>2</sup> held by Mr. Spencer to be primordial forms of sacrifice proper.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See *The Eucharistic Sacrifice*, by A. G. Mortimer. Longmans, 1901.

<sup>2</sup> As to the vogue of these, see Letourneau, *Sociology*, Eng. tr. pp. 226, 231, 232, 234-5, 237, 240, 242-4, 246, 291-3. Cp. Grant Allen, *Evolution of the Idea of God*, pp. 248, 282, 319.

<sup>3</sup> *Principles of Sociology*, i, § 141. So also Mr. Jevons, *Introd. to the*

Thence would differentiate—

- B. *Offerings* to the Gods. These would include burnt-offerings, fruits and libations, especially first fruits, and latterly incense,<sup>1</sup> corn, and wine; and with them would correlate
- B'. *Totem-Sacrifices*, in which the victim would be eaten either as (a) the God or as (b) a mode of union with the God-ancestor or totem species; and
- B''. *Human Sacrifices* as such, normally of captives, which would be eaten (a) along with the God as thank-offering or as food for the slain dead, or (b) as propitiatory or "sin" offerings, or (c) as vegetation-charms and life-charms, or else (d) buried in morsels as vegetation-charms, or (e) as sanctifying foundations of houses or villages.<sup>2</sup>

*Hist. of Relig.*, pp. 161, 199-200; and Mr. Lang, *Myth, Ritual, and Religion*, 2nd ed. i, 257, 263. Both Mr. Jevons and Mr. Lang, however, seem to distinguish inconsistently between a "savage" and a "barbaric" stage; and both at this point arbitrarily exclude propitiatory (or sympathetic-magical) sacrifices, dealing only with the honorific and piacular. Mr. Jevons treats the slaughter of persons at the grave of a "savage chieftain" as "early"—that is, as prior to human sacrifice to the Gods. But tolerably "low" savages in South America sacrificed captives on Asiatic lines (J. G. Müller, *Amerik. Urrelig.*, pp. 58, 143, 282-3); and Mr. Jevons (p. 201, *note*) cites high testimonies to the moral character of the Australian aborigines, whom for the purposes of this argument Mr. Lang treats as low or backward. Again, Mr. Jevons (p. 161) ascribes human sacrifice among the Americans and Polynesians to lack of domestic animals, though the Polynesians have pigs and poultry; while Mr. Lang lays stress on its absence among the Australians, who had no domesticated animals at all. Letourneau (*Sociology*, p. 210) suggests lack of animals as the reason for the common cannibalism of the Maoris; but this view is negated by the case of the Australians. We seem rather led to regard human sacrifice as a specialty of the general Polynesian race, to which the Australians do not appear to belong. New Zealand is pronounced by Letourneau (*L'Evolution Religieuse*, 1892, pp. 140-1) "the most archaic of the Polynesian archipelagos, from the point of view of civilisation"; and Ellis (*Polynesian Researches*, 2nd ed. iii, 348) heard of no human sacrifices among them, despite their cannibalism; but such sacrifices had certainly taken place in the past, the victims being sometimes eaten, sometimes not. (White, *Ancient History of the Maori*, Wellington, 1887, i, 12.)

<sup>1</sup> This is found in the East among Turanians, Dravidians, and Semites; in the West among the races reached by early Semitic culture; and in America, in the form of tobacco. The principle seems to have been the same as that of the burnt-offering—that the God was reached by odours.

<sup>2</sup> Presumably by way of feeding, and so propitiating, the earth deities. But cf. Grant Allen, *Evol. of Idea of God*, p. 249, for another theory—that the victim was to be a protecting God.

In virtue of the general functioning of the priest there would thus arise the general conception of

C. Priest-blessed *ritual sacrifices*, eaten as sacraments, including

C'. The totem-sacrifice, in which the God eats himself, as animal or as symbol, in a sacramental communion with his worshippers ; and

C". Human sacrifices, in which the victim (*a*) represented the God, or (*b*) had a special efficacy as being a king or a king's son, or (*c*) a first-born or only son. In the case of Goddesses, the sacrifice might be a virgin ; and this concept would react on the conception of the God in an ascetic movement, making him either double-sexed or virtually sexless. For the sacrifice, nevertheless, the victim must latterly be as a rule a criminal. These various victims might or might not be eaten.

There is thus evolved (1) the general conception of a peculiarly efficacious *Eucharist or sacramental meal* in which is eaten, symbolically or otherwise, a sacrificed animal or human being, normally regarded as representing the God, though the God eats thereof. Latterly men often assume that the animal so sacrificed is thus treated as being an enemy of the God, where the nature of the animal admits of such an interpretation. Finally, after public human sacrifices are abolished or made difficult, there is found (2) the practice of a *Mystery-Drama*, symbolical of the act of human sacrifice, in which the victim is sympathetically regarded as an unjustly slain God.

Such practices competing successfully with the official or public rites and sacrifices, they in turn elicit a priesthood which raises them to official ritual form. Thus there arises

D. The priest-administered eucharist, of which the mean or norm is *Bread and wine = Body and Blood*, but which may retain the form of

D'. The symbolical animal, or a dough image thereof, or

D". A baked image of the God-Man or Child.

# The Genealogy of the Sacrificial Sacrament.

## A. Primal Savage

No sacrifice proper; but all "victims", animal and human, collectively eaten, the "Gods" and the "dead" being held to share. Main enemies and dead relatives, also slain aged relatives, so eaten by the tribe or horde.

B<sup>2</sup>

Slaves and relatives slain at graves. Hence human sacrifices as such, normally of captives, eaten with food as thank-offering, or as propitiations, or as charms, or buried as charms.

B.

Food placed for dead on graves and elsewhere. Hence offerings to the Gods, including not only flesh, blood, etc., but hair; also fruits or libations, incense, first fruits, and latterly corn and wine.

B<sup>1</sup>

Animals slain at graves. Hence with Totem-sacrifices, in which the animal victim is eaten as God, or as mode of union with Totem-God-ancestor, or slain as charm or propitiation.

## Priest-blessed ritual sacrifices, eaten as sacraments

C<sup>2</sup>

Human sacrifices, victim (a) representing the God, or (b) officiating as a King or King's son, or (c) as a first-born or only son. (Virgins slain for Goddesses. Ideas blended in Gods of double sex, or of no sex - life). Such victims not necessarily eaten. In many cases, criminals sacrificed.

C<sup>1</sup>

Symbolic sacrifice, of animal, or typical food, or model of Totem-sacrifice, wherein, in a private dramatic Mystery, open only to initiates, the God, represented by his priest, eats himself (as animal, eaten raw, or as bread and wine, or baked image) in communion with his worshippers.

After suppression of human sacrifice, priest-administered Eucharist of a cultus, associated with Mystery-Drama, wherein Bread and Wine partaken of as Body and Blood.

D<sup>2</sup>

Bread image of the God - Man or God - Child with wine.

D<sup>1</sup>

Either the symbolical animal or its image in dough, or simple bread, with wine or water.

E<sup>2</sup>

Symbolic bread representing Sun - God -ked wafer - and standing for both Body and Blood. Late Catholic usage.

E<sup>1</sup>

Bread - round cakes - with water; Mithraic, Manichean and heretical Christian usage.

F

Early Catholic and present Protestant rite  
Holy Supper  
Simple bread and wine

In virtue, however, of the symbolical principle, and of the priestly function, the thing eaten, though still called the host (= *hostia*, victim), may be reduced to a single symbol, which stands for the living body, including its blood. Such is the "communion in one kind" or consecrated wafer of the Catholic Church, repudiated by Protestants, who revert to the "communion in two kinds" or bread *and* wine of the sacred books. The Catholic practice is practically on a par with some of the usages of the pre-Christian Mexicans; while the Protestant reverts to the Mithraic and Dionysiak usages which were imitated by the early Church.

Thus is an appallingly long-drawn evolution summed up for the modern world in a symbol which to the uninstructed eye tells nothing of the dreadful truth, and presents a fable in its place. If to die as a human sacrifice for human beings be to deserve the highest human reverence, the true Christs of the world are to be numbered not by units but by millions. Every inhabited land on this globe has during whole ages drunk their annually shed blood. According to one calculation, made in the last century, the annual death-roll from human sacrifice and female infanticide in one section of British India alone was fifteen hundred.<sup>1</sup> Taking the sacrifices at only a fifteenth of the total, we are led to an estimate for past history beside which every Christian reckoning of the "army of martyrs" becomes insignificant. Of these miserable victims of insane religion, the vast majority were "innocent" even by the code that sacrificed them; and of the rest, in comparison with those who slew them, who shall now predicate "guilt"? Thus have nameless men and women done, millions of times, what is credited to the fabulous Jesus of the Christian gospels; they have verily laid down their lives for the sin of many; and while the imaginary sacrifice has been made the pretext of a historic religion during two thousand years, the real sacrifices are uncommemorated save as infinitesimals in the records of anthropology. Twenty literatures

<sup>1</sup> *Calcutta Review*, vol. x, Dec. 1848, p. 340.

vociferously proclaim the myth, and rivers of tears have been shed at the recital of it, while the monstrous and inexpugnable truth draws at most a shudder from the student, when his conceptual knowledge becomes for him at moments a lightning-flash of concrete vision through the measureless vista of the human past. In a world which thus still distributes its sympathies, a rational judgment on the historic evolution is not to be looked for save among the few. Delusion as to the course of religious history must long follow in the wake of the delusion which made the history possible.

## CHAPTER II.—THE TEACHING GOD

### § 1.—*Primary and Secondary Ideas.*

THOUGH the secondary Gods are not always sacrificed, they are nearly always in some measure teachers; and here, of course, they are developed from earlier forms. A general conception of the God as teacher belongs to early religion, inasmuch as he is held to have given the moral laws which are associated with his cult; and where his worship is specially bound up with rites of agriculture he is conceived as having taught men that and other arts. Thus Oannes the Fish-God (identified with Ea)<sup>1</sup> taught the Babylonians agriculture and the building of cities, writing, laws, cosmology, religion, the sciences, and the arts, including the measurement of lands—in a word, everything appertaining to civilisation.<sup>2</sup> On a less comprehensive scale, in Egyptian myth, Osiris taught the Egyptians the art of agriculture, and gave them laws, and guidance as to worship;<sup>3</sup> Janus and Saturn did as much for the Italians;<sup>4</sup> Huitzilopochtli no less for the Aztecs;<sup>5</sup> and Apollo, though in one myth he has to learn divination from Pan<sup>6</sup> as he learns music from Hermes, in another gives laws to the Hyperboreans<sup>7</sup> and thereafter speaks oracles at Delphi for the Greeks. Dionysos similarly had a teacher in Silenus, but himself taught men in particular the culture of the vine; and Demeter, who must needs introduce some of the arts of agriculture,<sup>8</sup> is also a lawgiver<sup>9</sup> for both Greeks and Romans.<sup>10</sup> Isis in turn divides with Osiris the honours of agriculture, she

<sup>1</sup> Lenormant, *Chaldean Magic*, p. 157; Sayce, *Hibbert Lectures*, pp. 133-4.

<sup>2</sup> Berosus, *ap. Alex. Polyhistor*. Cp. Sayce, pp. 368-370.

<sup>3</sup> Plutarch, *Isis and Osiris*, 13.

<sup>4</sup> Macrobius, *Saturnalia*, i, 7.

<sup>5</sup> J. G. Müller, *Amerikanische Urreligionen*, ed. 1867, p. 597.

<sup>6</sup> Apollodorus, i, 4, § 1.

<sup>7</sup> Pindar, *Ol.* iii, 24 sq., etc.

<sup>8</sup> Virgil, *Georg.* i, 147-8; Ovid, *Fasti*, iv, 401-2.

<sup>9</sup> Callimachus, *Hymn to Demeter*, 19-22; Diodorus, i, 14.

<sup>10</sup> Virgil, *Aeneid*, iv, 58.

having shown men how to make use of wheat and barley; and she too gives men laws, and even leechcraft.<sup>1</sup> The Goddesses, indeed, are as commonly as the Gods credited with introducing culture. Athene teaches all crafts;<sup>2</sup> Cybele like Isis is a teacher of healing;<sup>3</sup> and the Gallic Minerva (Belisama) was reputed the giver of arts and crafts.<sup>4</sup> Similarly the Gallic Apollo (Grannos or Mabon) was held to drive away disease;<sup>5</sup> as also the Teutonic Odin.<sup>6</sup> This idea of the Gods as the givers of healing is indeed common to the whole Aryan race; and in the religion of India medicine was held to come immediately from them like the Veda itself.<sup>7</sup> So in Hawaii there is found a tradition that "many generations back a man called Koreamoku obtained all their medicinal herbs from the gods, who also taught him the use of them; that after his death he was deified, and a wooden image of him placed in the large temple at Kairna, to which offerings of hogs, fish, and cocoa nuts were frequently presented.....Two friends and disciples of Koreamoku continued to practise the art after the death of their master, and were also deified after death."<sup>8</sup> Elsewhere, again, "From the gods the priests pretended to have received the knowledge of the healing art";<sup>9</sup> while in Tahiti there was a God of physic and two of surgery, as well as the usual guild-Gods of the different avocations.<sup>10</sup>

The universality of the idea is best realised when we turn to the Gods of the more primitive peoples. We have seen how the Dravidian Khonds ascribe to Boora and Tari the raising of men from savagery and ignorance to comfort by means of instruction, and to Boora a moralising purpose as against the sacrificial cult. In the higher mythology of Peru, again, the Sun sent Manco Capac and Mama Ocello to teach savage men true religion, morality, agriculture, arts, and sciences; while on another view Pachacamac,

<sup>1</sup> Diodorus, i, 14, 25.

<sup>2</sup> *Iliad*, xv, 412.

<sup>3</sup> *Id.* iii, 58.

<sup>4</sup> Cæsar, *Bel. Gallic.* vi, 17.

<sup>5</sup> *Id.* *ib.*

<sup>6</sup> Grimm, *Teutonic Mythology*, Eng. tr. i, 149.

<sup>7</sup> Weber, *History of Indian Literature*, Eng. tr. p. 265.

<sup>8</sup> Ellis, *Polynesian Researches*, 2nd ed., 1831, iv, 335-6.

<sup>9</sup> *Id.* iii, 36-37.

<sup>10</sup> *Id.* i, 333.

finding the first breed hopeless, turned them into tiger cats or apes, and made a new set, whom he taught arts and handicrafts. This idea of teaching or reformation pervades the whole cosmogony of the Incarial period.<sup>1</sup> So with the Gods of pre-Christian Mexico: the national deity of each tribe or nation is nearly always specified as the giver of its laws, and at times as the inventor of fire and clothing,<sup>2</sup> and in at least one case he is the writer of the sacred books.<sup>3</sup>

Where this conception is not prominent in a primitive religion, the explanation appears to be that the enlightening power of the Gods operates by way of inspiring the priests. Thus in the Tonga Islands, where there seems to have been little trace of a general culture-myth, inspiration of the priest by his God was held to be common;<sup>4</sup> and even the God Tangaloa, "God of artificers and the arts," appropriately had for his priests only carpenters.<sup>5</sup> When inspired, the priest as a matter of course spoke in the first person, as being the God for the time being.<sup>6</sup> Similar inspiration, however, was held to come from the divine spirits of deceased nobles;<sup>7</sup> and it is thus intelligible that the general development of this species of "trance mediumship" should keep in the background the thought of any special Teaching God.

With the growth of culture and literature and sacerdotalism, however, the notion of a God who inspires priests or oracles is developed into or superseded by that of a God who especially represents the principle of counsel or wisdom or revelation; and in the polytheistic systems we have accordingly such deities as the Assyrian Nabu or Nebo,<sup>8</sup> the wise, the all-knowing, the wisdom of the Gods, patron of

<sup>1</sup> J. G. Müller, *Amerikanische Urreligionen*, pp. 304, 319, 330.

<sup>2</sup> *Id.* pp. 594, 587, 594-5-7.

<sup>3</sup> *Id.* p. 587. The God in question was Huemac, national deity of the Toltecs, latterly known as Quetzalcoatl. Below, Part IV, § 7.

<sup>4</sup> Mariner's *Account of the Tonga Islands*, 3rd ed. 1827, i, 104, 190, 290; ii, 115, etc.

<sup>5</sup> *Id.* ii, 108.

<sup>6</sup> *Id.* ii, 87. So in Polynesia generally. Cp. Ellis, i, 375, etc.

<sup>7</sup> Mariner, ii, 108.

<sup>8</sup> Jastrow, *Religions of Babylonia and Assyria*, pp. 124, 129-30, 229, 344, 348, etc.; Sayce, *Hibbert Lectures*, pp. 50, 98, 112-115, 120-1; Tiele, *Hist. comp. des anc. relig.* trad. fr. 1882, p. 202.

writing and literature, and son and interpreter of Merodach, who in turn is the interpreter of the will of his father Ea, the earlier God of wisdom; the Indian Agni, in his secondary character of messenger or "Mouth of the Gods";<sup>1</sup> and the Egyptian Thoth, who, originally the Moon-God and therefore the *Measurer*, becomes as such the representative of the principle of instruction and the writer of the sacred books.<sup>2</sup> In this latter capacity he has an obvious advantage over Maat, the Goddess of Law and Truth, and at once the daughter and the mother of Ra.<sup>3</sup> Thus, while every Egyptian God proper is *neb maat*, "lord of law," Thoth is in particular the *Logos*, Reason, or Word; and so becomes the sustainer of Osiris against his enemies.<sup>4</sup>

This latter conception is seen entering Greek mythology at three stages, first in the myth of (1) Hermes, who is Logos in the sense of being simply Wind-God and so the messenger of the Gods;<sup>5</sup> later, in the ennobled worship of (2) Apollo and Athene, of whom the former is the mouth of Zeus and revealer of his counsel, hence the typical God of oracles, and the latter, grouped with her brother and father in a triad,<sup>6</sup> is also her father's wisdom;<sup>7</sup> and still later, in the period of developing theosophy, in the myth of (3) Metis, essentially the personified Reason and Intelligence of Zeus.<sup>8</sup>

In a more sophisticated form, the idea of the God as lawgiver is met with in the myth of Zeus and Minos,<sup>9</sup> the Cretan institutor—himself a purely mythical figure, like Moses, and, like him, presumably a deity of an earlier

<sup>1</sup> Max Müller, *Physical Religion*, 1891, p. 168; *Infra*, Part III, § 4.

<sup>2</sup> Tiele, *Egyptian Religion*, pp. 62-3, 178; Le Page Renouf, *Hibbert Lectures*, 2nd ed., p. 116; *Book of the Dead*, ch. lxxviii.

<sup>3</sup> Renouf, pp. 119-122.

<sup>4</sup> *Book of the Dead*, cc. xviii, xx; Tiele, *Egyptian Religion*, p. 63.

<sup>5</sup> According to Tiele (*Outlines of the History of the Ancient Religions*, Eng. tr. p. 211) it was as Wind-God that Hermes became God of music and (*horresco referens*) of eloquence.

<sup>6</sup> Athene is probably in origin one with Tanith (Tiele, as cited, p. 210), and with Anaitis (*Id. Egyptian Religion*, pp. 135-6), who was bracketed with Mithra, and so brought near to Ahura-Mazda. See below, Part III, § 5.

<sup>7</sup> *Iliad*, v, 875 sq. viii, 5 sq.; Hesiod, *Theog.* 896; *Odyssey*, xvi, 260.

<sup>8</sup> Cp. Preller, *Griechische Mythologie*, 2nd ed. i, 150 and refs.

<sup>9</sup> Plato, *Minos*; Strabo, x, 4, § 8; xvi, 2, § 38.

age;<sup>1</sup> and again in the legend of King Numa and his Egeria.<sup>2</sup> Such myths may conceivably rise either as an inference from the ordinary phenomenon of the seer or sorcerer or priest who claims to have sought and to have been inspired by the God, or as the attempts of a late theosophy to remove anthropomorphism from the popular lore. On the latter view, they are paralleled by the attempts of the Evemerists to explain the Teaching God as a myth set up by the fame of a human teacher. Thus Uranos is figured as a mortal who first gathered men in cities, gave them laws and agriculture, and taught them to observe the stars, the movements of the sun, and the division of months and the year; whence his final deification.<sup>3</sup>

### § 2.—*The Logos.*

All such doctrines, it is probable, were represented in the later Babylonian religion; and the idea of the Logos is probably early in Mazdeism;<sup>4</sup> but in any case it was from the outside that it was pressed upon Judaism, to the extent, as we have seen,<sup>5</sup> of making a personality out of that Word of God which originally "came" to the prophets in the sense that his spirit was held to have entered into them. The whole evolution is noticeably parallel to that of the principles of law and government in States, from the stage in which the king or chief is judge and as such "God" to that in which he is surrounded by graded orders of priests and councillors, jurists and administrators. The Logos is in a manner the heavenly Grand Vizier.<sup>6</sup>

It is impossible, however, to fix a date for the origin of

<sup>1</sup> Preller, as cited, ii, 118, sq.

<sup>2</sup> Plutarch, *Numa*, cc. 4, 13, 15.

<sup>3</sup> Diodorus, iii, 56.

<sup>4</sup> See below, Part III, §§ 4, 5, 9. The first known use of the term *Logos* as=orderly causation is by Herakleitos (in Hippolytus, *Refut. Hæres.* ix, 9 [4]). Cp. Ritter and Preller, *Hist. Philos.* ed. 2a, n. 31, 38, 41, 42). Thus the idea arises in Ionia, in the sphere of the Babylonian culture. *Logos* is translated "truth" by Fairbanks, *First Philos. of Greece*, p. 25. Cp. Zeller, as there cited. But Prof. Jülicher (*Encyc. Bib.* art. *Logos*) adheres to the usual interpretation. For a full exposition of that see Drummond, *Philo Judæus*, 1888, i, 32-47, following Heinze.

<sup>5</sup> Above, pp. 85, 89, 92, 171.

<sup>6</sup> Above, p. 85.

the special dogma of the Logos. To take it as a Greek invention is to ignore the very problem of origins. An eminent Sanskritist assures us in one passage not only that the doctrine of the Logos is "exclusively Aryan," but that "whoever uses such words as *Logos*, the Word, *Monogenês*, the Only-begotten, *Prototokos*, the First-born, *Hyios tou theou*, the Son of God, has borrowed the very germs of his religious thoughts from Greek philosophy";<sup>1</sup> while in another passage he admits that the conceptions of the Word as found in the Psalms<sup>2</sup> and of the Angel as found in the Pentateuch "are purely Jewish, uninfluenced as yet by any Greek thought."<sup>3</sup> Other eminent Sanskritists, again, have shown that the River-Goddess Sarasvatî is in the later Brahmanic mythology "identified with Vâch" or Vâk [=Speech] "and becomes under different names the spouse of Brahma and the goddess of wisdom and eloquence, and is invoked as a Muse"; while in the Mahâbhârata she is called the "mother of the Vedas."<sup>4</sup> Elsewhere the personified Vâch enters into the Rishis or sages as inspiration.<sup>5</sup> Again, "When the Brahmarshis were performing austerities prior to the creation of the universe 'a voice derived from Brahma entered into the ears of them all: the celestial Sarasvatî was then produced from the heavens!'"<sup>6</sup>

As among the Greek and the Jews, so among the Hindus the doctrine of the sacred or creative Word is various. In the Satapatha Brâhmana, Prajapati (who is "composed of Seven Males") first of all things created the Veda, which became the foundation on which he "created the waters from the world in the form of speech. Speech belonged to him. It was created. It pervaded all this." In the same document the cosmic egg is the primordial source: "From it the Veda was first created—the triple essence. Hence men say, 'the Veda is the first-born of this whole creation.

<sup>1</sup> Max Müller, *Theosophy, or Psychological Religion*, 1893, pref. p. x.

<sup>2</sup> Ps. xxxiii, 6; cvii, 20; cxlvii, 18.

<sup>3</sup> Work cited, p. 405. Cp. Nicolas, *Des doctrines religieuses des Juifs*, p. 190 sq.

<sup>4</sup> Muir, *Ancient Sanskrit Texts*, 3rd ed. v, 342. Cp. Gubernatis, *Lettura sopra la mitologia vedica*, 1874, pp. 132-3.

<sup>5</sup> Muir, iii, 105.

<sup>6</sup> *Id.* first cit.

.....They say of a learned man that he is like Agni, for the Veda is Agni's mouth."<sup>1</sup> The personified Vâch, Sarasvatî, River-Goddess and Goddess of Speech, is doubtless the later evolution,<sup>2</sup> just as is the Græco-Jewish *Sophia*; but there can be no question that the conception of the Veda as the Word, the first-created thing or first-born Being, is fully present in the Brâhmanas. In the Taittiriya Brâhmana, "Vâch (speech) is an imperishable thing..... the mother of the Vedas, and the centre point of immortality";<sup>3</sup> being thus identified with Sarasvatî as aforesaid; but this does not affect the dogma, set forth by Sankara, that "from the eternal Word the world is produced."<sup>4</sup> Again, in the Satapatha Brâhmana "Speech is the Rig-Veda, mind the Yajur Veda, breath the Sâma Veda."<sup>5</sup> In the Taittiriya, it is true, the Veda is created after the Soma;<sup>6</sup> but such a variation, we shall see, occurs also in Jewish lore. And among the Vedantists, finally, "the 'word' (*śabda*) is 'God' (*Brahma*)."<sup>7</sup> As regards, again, the more philosophical side of the *Logos* doctrine, the conception of an all-pervading and primordial Reason (Tao or Tau), we find it most explicitly and coherently set forth in China by Lao-Tsze, with a doctrine of a unity and trinity of forms of existence,<sup>8</sup> in the sixth century before our era.<sup>9</sup>

Are we then to suppose that such speculation originated with the Ionian Greeks, was passed on by them to the Jews, and by Jews or Greeks or both to the Persians, and thence to the Brahmans and the Chinese? Such a hypothesis is visibly unmanageable. The Pythagorean derivation of Plato's doctrine of the *Logos* is tolerably clear; and its

<sup>1</sup> *Id.* iv, 22-23.

<sup>2</sup> Oldenberg, *Die Religion des Veda*, 1894, p. 63.

<sup>3</sup> Muir, iii, 10. As to the various meanings of Vâch see i, 325, n.

<sup>4</sup> *Id.* iii, 104-5.

<sup>5</sup> *Id.* iii, 1.

<sup>6</sup> *Id.* iii, 8.

<sup>7</sup> Ballantyne, *Christianity contrasted with Hindu Philosophy*, 1859, p. 193.

<sup>8</sup> Compare the *Tau Têh King*, cc. 1, 14, 42, with Plato's *Parmenides* and *Philebus*.

<sup>9</sup> Pauthier, *Chine Moderne*, p. 351, sq. Cp. Chalmers, *The Speculations of Lau-Tsze*, p. xi. The Chinese translation of the New Testament uses *Tau* for the *Logos* in John i, 1. *Id.* p. xii. Cp. ch. xxv of the *Tau Têh King* (Chalmers, p. 19). And Lao-Tsze not only lays down (ch. 63) the Golden Rule, but has a set of six maxims closely resembling the Beatitudes (ch. 22).

connection with the planetary lore of the eight heavenly powers, as well as with the lore of numbers and proportion,<sup>1</sup> tells of a source such as only the Chaldean or Egyptian schools of astrology and astronomy can be supposed to represent in the early Greek sphere. Babylonian religion contains the principle of the Logos in its most definite primary form, the doctrine of the Divine Name, which is the germ of the Platonic doctrine of ideas no less than of the Philonic and Johannine theology. We even find it in a form approximated-to in the Pentateuch (where the "name" of Yahweh is "in" the promised "Angel" leader),<sup>2</sup> and made familiar later by the Jewish *Toledoth Jeschu* as well as by the modified Christian formula—the teaching, namely, that the mystic name of the Supreme God is known to him alone, and is revealed by him solely to his son, who has thus virtually all power in heaven and on earth.<sup>3</sup>

“This idea, which prevailed equally in Egypt and in Western Asia, is purely animistic. To pronounce a name is to call up and conjure the being who bears it. The name possesses personality.....To name a thing is to create it: that is why creation is often represented as accomplished by the word.”<sup>4</sup>

Further, we know from Damascius—whose list of Babylonian God-names is made good by the remains actually discovered in recent times—that Tauthê, Mother of the Gods, first bore a son, Moymis, who was “the intelligible world.”<sup>5</sup> Here is the very formula of Philo. If then the Jews had the Logos idea before their contact with the Greeks and the Mazdeans,<sup>6</sup> the reasonable presumption is that they had it from a source from which the Mazdeans and Ionian Greeks could also have it—the Babylonian lore, in which were accumulated the current fancies of thousands of years of

<sup>1</sup> Cp. Cæsar Morgan, *Investigation of the Trinity of Plato and of Philo Judæus* (1795), ed. 1853, pp. 1, 3, 5.

<sup>2</sup> Exod. xxiii, 20–23. In the Talmud, this angel, though he is represented in the pseudo-history by Joshua, is declared to be the Metatron, who in turn is identified with the Logos. Above, p. 155, and below, Part III, § 8.

<sup>3</sup> Tiele, *Hist. comparée des anc. religions*, p. 175.

<sup>4</sup> *Id. ib.*      <sup>5</sup> *Id.* p. 183; Cory's *Ancient Fragments*, ed. 1876, p. 92.

<sup>6</sup> Cp. Nicolas, as cited above.

Asiatic speculation, including that of the ancient civilisation from which was derived that of the Chinese. And when we find the Brahmanic philosophy, like the Babylonian and Greek, making all things originate from a watery abyss,<sup>1</sup> and again from the cosmic egg,<sup>2</sup> we have at least cause to surmise that the Babylonian and Indian systems draw from one central source. It is true that the Indian lore seems best to combine the ideas of origination through the Word and through Water; and that the word *Saras* means not only Water but Voice, whence *Sarasvati*=not only "the watery" but also "the vocal" or "the sounding."<sup>3</sup> But while this is visibly more homogeneous than the late Hebrew evolution of a creative *Sophia* who equates with the creative *Logos* without any adaptation to the primordial abyss of waters (or "Ocean Stream" as in Homer) on which the "Spirit" had creatively moved, on the other hand the relative lateness<sup>4</sup> of the evolution of *Vâch* and *Sarasvati* leaves open the presumption that a foreign influence has been at work. *Agni*, also, the Fire-God, is finally identified with the Word; he, too, in the Vedas, is the Son of the Water and messenger of the Gods;<sup>5</sup> and his worship connects visibly with the fire-worship not only of the Mazdeans but of the Babylonians, for whom also *Gibil* and *Nusku* (or *Gibil-Nusku*) the Fire-Gods are sons of the Creator, *Gibil* in particular being "the first-born of heaven (*Anu*) and the image of his father," while *Ea*, the Water-God, is the lord of life, and also the father of the Fire-God, who in turn is the messenger and counsellor of the Gods, clothed with their attributes.<sup>6</sup> The blended

<sup>1</sup> Muir, i, 24. Cp. Sayce, *Hibbert Lectures*, p. 371.      <sup>2</sup> Muir, iv. 22-23.

<sup>3</sup> Gubernatis, *Letture sopra la mitologia vedica*, pp. 132-3.

<sup>4</sup> Relative, that is, to such a God-idea as that of *Indra* (Oldenberg as cited above). But the *Brâhmanas* are yet "the oldest rituals we have, the oldest linguistic explanations, the oldest traditional narratives, and the oldest philosophical speculations" (Weber, *Hi-t. of Indian Literature*, p. 12).

<sup>5</sup> Max Müller, *Physical Religion*, pp. 151, 168; Gubernatis, p. 120. *Agni* is also born of stone, wood, herbs, and the skies. Müller, p. 146. Cp. Gubernatis, p. 109, sq. This is simple naturalism. But he is joined with *Matarisvan*, for whose name there is no Aryan etymology (Müller, p. 152). A Central-Asiatic influence must be inferred. Cp. Tiele, *Outlines*, pp. 109-110, 115.

<sup>6</sup> Jastrow, *Religion of Babylonia and Assyria*, pp. 275-280.

characteristics of Sarasvatī, finally, are found in the Babylonian Goddess Sarpanitum, who, as finally blended with Erua, the daughter of Ea, was at once "lady of the deep," "voice of the deep," and "the possessor of knowledge concealed from men"—attributes all deriving from the fact that "wisdom and the life-giving principle were two ideas associated in the Babylonian mind with water."<sup>1</sup> In these various notions, surely, we have the true "germs" alike of the Hindu, the Heraklitean, and the Platonic concepts of the Word or Reason; of the conception of Hermes as Logos and Messenger of the Gods; of Apollo as his father's wisdom; of the Hindu, of the Hebrew and of the Greek formulas of "First-born" and "Only-begotten"; and so alike of the later Judaic and the Christian theosophy.

The further research is carried into the affiliation of the cults and creeds of Asia Minor and Syria, the more clearly does it appear that all relate to the great central mass of theosophy accumulated in Babylonia, which was still a culture force in the earlier centuries of the Christian era.<sup>2</sup> That system had inferribly given to the Christian Gnostics their astrology and magic; their doctrine of the immortality of souls (not bodies); their *Sophia*; their conception of a Saviour, Knowledge-Giver, and Mediator;<sup>3</sup> it is sufficiently unlikely, then, that it had failed to evolve as did Brahmanism the concept of the Logos. The rational presumption is that it gave that concept to Greek and Jew alike.

But the Jewish evolution was apparently piecemeal. Different ideas and doctrines, such as that of Metis, Thoth, Thoth-Khonsu, the combined *Logos* and Sun-God;<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Id.* pp. 122-3. Cognate names to Sarasvatī are found in the Bactrian Haraqiti and the Persian Harauvati. Tiele, last cit. p. 115.

<sup>2</sup> A collection of Babylonian hymns of the times of the Seleucids and Arsacids, bringing the life of the system down to 86 B.C., has been published by the Berlin Museum. Anz, *Zur Frage nach dem Ursprung des Gnosticismus* (in Gebhardt and Harnack's *Texte und Untersuchungen*, Bd. 15, Leipzig, 1897), p. 60. And three priestly schools are recorded to have survived in Babylonia—at Sippar, Uruk, and Babel-Borsippa—in the times of Strabo (ii. xvi, c. i, § 1) and Pliny (*Hist. Nat.* xi, 30). Cp. Anz, pp. 61-3, as to the later religious developments.

<sup>3</sup> Anz, as cited, pp. 55 (as to general derivation), 90-3 (as to Ishtar-Sophia), 93-8 (as to Marduk the Saviour and Mediator).

<sup>4</sup> Tiele, *Egypt. Relig.* pp. 154, 178.

Vohumano, the "Good Mind," combined with Mithra;<sup>1</sup> and the Platonic *Logos*, probably motived the separate evolution in Judaic literature of the personifications of *Sophia* or Wisdom,<sup>2</sup> the "Good Spirit,"<sup>3</sup> and the later *Logos*; this though Judaism was ostensibly bound to resist the multiplication of personalities thus set up, and was further predisposed to a male as against a female principle; the original "Holy Spirit," properly feminine, having in general been kept very much in the background, doubtless in fear of the old developments of goddess-worship, in which the symbol of the dove, taken by the Christists as standing for chastity, had really represented sexuality and fecundity.<sup>4</sup> Accordingly we have Philo, at the traditional beginning of the Christian era, accumulating round the *Logos* the various aspects of the earlier Word and *Sophia*, and fitfully adding to them those of divine Sonship and Messiahship, and even the creative function of Demourgos, thus at times reducing Yahweh to a somewhat remote abstraction.

### § 3.—*Derivations of the Christian Logos.*

It is significant of the difficulty of winning a hearing for an important new truth in hierology that, a hundred years after the elaborate development of the *Logos* doctrine in Philo Judæus was fully demonstrated, the fact is no part of ordinary knowledge even among scholars, if they be not theologians.<sup>5</sup> Bryant, who first among English writers made the complete demonstration, held that Philo derived his ideas from association with the Christians. That is obviously a delusion; but there can be no question about the actuality of the parallel between the Philonic and the Johannine and other Christian forms of the doctrine; and it may be that a list of Philo's dicta as drawn up by the

<sup>1</sup> See below, Pt. III, §§ 5, 9.

<sup>2</sup> Cp. Prov. iii, etc., Wisdom of Solomon, i, 6; vii, 22, etc.; Ecclesiasticus, *passim*.

<sup>3</sup> Nehemiah, ix, 20.

<sup>4</sup> Cp. Gubernatis, *Lecture sopra la mitologia vedica*, pp. 144-5; Lang, *Myth, Ritual, and Religion*, 2nd ed., ii, 271.

<sup>5</sup> See above, p. 140, note.

unsuspecting Byrant<sup>1</sup> will be more acceptable than one of those compiled by later scholars.

*Attributes of the Logos in the writings of Philo Judæus.*<sup>2</sup>

1. Son of God. *De Agricultura*, 12; *De confusione linguarum*, 14; *De Profugis*, 20.
2. Second divinity. *De Legum Allegoriarum*, ii, 21; *Frag. in Euseb. Præp. Evang.* viii, 13.
3. First-begotten Son of God. *De Agric.* 12; *De Somniis*, i, 37; *De Conf. ling.* 14, 18; *Quod Deus immutab.* 6.
4. Image of God. *De Mundi Opific.* 8; *De Somniis*, i, 41; *De Conf. ling.* 14, 18, 20, 28; *De Profug.* 19; *De Monarchia*, ii, 5.
5. Superior to angels. *Frag. in Euseb. Præp. Evang.* viii, 13; *De Conf. ling.* 28.
6. Superior to all things. *De Leg. Alleg.* iii, 31, 60, 61.
7. Instrument by whom the world was created. *De Mundi Opif.* vi; *De Cherubim*, 35; *De Monarchia*, ii, 5; *De Profug.* 18; *De leg. alleg.* iii, 31.
8. Vice-gerent of God, on whom all depends. *De Agricult.* xii; *De Somniis*, i, 41; *De Profug.* 20.
9. Light of the World. *De Somniis*, i, 13, 15, 18.
10. Alone can see God. *De Conf. ling.* 20.
11. Resides in God. *De Profug.* 18, 19.
12. Most ancient of God's works. *De Profug.* 19; *De leg. alleg.* iii, 60, 61.
13. Esteemed the same as God. *De Somniis*, i, 12, 23, 41; ii, 36.
14. Eternal. *De Plantat. Noe*, 5.
15. Beholds all things. *De leg. allegor.* iii, 59.
16. Maintains the world. *De Mose*, iii, 14; *De Profug.* 20; *De Somniis*, i, 47.
17. Nearest to God, without any separation. *De Prof.* 19.
18. Free from all taint of Sin. *De Profug.* 20, 21; *De Somniis*, i, 23.
19. Presides over the imperfect and the weak. *De leg. allegor.* iii, 61, 62.
20. Fountain of Wisdom. *De Profug.* 18, 25.
21. A messenger sent from God. *De Agric.* 12; *Quis*

<sup>1</sup> *The Sentiments of Philo Judæus concerning the ΛΟΓΟΣ*, 1797, p. 106, sq.

<sup>2</sup> I have added a number of references to those given by Bryant.

- rerum divin. haeres*, 42; *De Abrahamo*, 36; *De Prof.* 1.
22. Advocate (Paraclete) for Man. *Quis rer. div. haeres*, 42. *De Mose*, iii, 14.
  23. Orderer and disposer of all things. *Quis rer. div. haer.* 46, 48.
  24. Shepherd of God's flock. *De Agric.* 12.
  25. Governor of the World. *De Profug.* 20.
  26. Physician who heals all evil. *De leg. alleg.* iii, 62.
  27. The Seal of God. *De Prof.* 2; *De Plant. Noe*, 5.
  28. Sure refuge of those who seek him. *De Somniis*, i, 15; *De Profug.* i, 18, 19, 21.
  29. Gives heavenly food to all who seek it. *De leg. allegor.* iii, 56, 58-62; *De Profug.* 25; *Quis rerum divin. haeres*, 39.
  30. On men's forsaking their sins gives spiritual freedom. *De Somniis*, i, 15; *De Congressu quærendæ erud. gratia*, 19, 30.
  31. Frees men from all corruption. *De Congressu* 30; *De Prof.* 18, 21; *Quis rer. div. haeres*, 38. (Is the water of everlasting life. *De Prof.* 18.)
  32. Not only Son of God, but well-beloved child. [Ref. to *De leg. alleg.* iii, 64, where, however, ἀγαπητου τεκνου does not refer to the Logos.]
  33. Means of man's spiritual happiness. *Quis rerum divin. haeres*, 42.
  34. Admits to the assembly of the perfect. *De Sacrificiis*, 2, 3 (*De Profug.* 18).
  35. Raises the just to the presence of the Creator. *Ibid.*
  36. The true high priest. *De Somniis*, i, 37; *De leg. allegor.* iii, 26; *De Profug.* 20.
  37. Word, High Priest, and Mediator. *Quis rer. div. haeres*, 42; *De Somniis*, i, 37; *De Mose*, iii, 14.

Much discussion has taken place over the question whether Philo really conceived his Logos as a person<sup>1</sup>—a problem of which the futility may be realised after asking whether Christians to-day conceive of the Holy Ghost as a person. That Philo should be inconsistent; that he should successively make his Logos a deity, a spoken utterance, a

<sup>1</sup> E.g., Principal Drummond's *Philo Judæus*, 1888, ii, 222-273; Cæsar Morgan, *Investig. of the Trinity of Plato and of Philo*, 1795 (ed. 1853, p. 63 sq.).

creative power, an instrument, an aspect of the deity, a far-seeing spirit, a refuge, the first-born son of the deity, a high priest and mediator, the covenant,<sup>1</sup> the co-ordinating law of the universe, an eternal entity, the first-created thing, an angel,<sup>2</sup> the sun,<sup>3</sup> the chief of the angels,<sup>4</sup> a body of doctrine, the Scriptures, Moses,<sup>5</sup> an abstraction of wisdom, the soul of the world<sup>6</sup>—all this belonged to his mental habit and that of the students of his age. It was impossible for such minds to be consistent or even momentarily clear: all thought was for them a shapeless cloud of words and verbal images. But where the born verbalisers fluctuated through a hundred forms of phrase, simpler minds inevitably reduced abstractions to personalities *sans phrase*.<sup>7</sup> In the Book of Enoch the Messiah is identified, apparently long before Philo, with a First-Created power who has the characteristics of the Logos.<sup>8</sup> For most neologising Jews, in short, the Logos passed into personal status just as did Vohumano, “the Good Mind,” for the Mazdeans, because the perpetual naming of an abstraction in religious lore or ritual sets up for the believer an idea of separate personality or nothing. The personalisers were but doing what their simpler ancestors had done before when they gave personality to natural objects, winds, rivers, diseases, thunder, and lightning. They did so because they could not help it; and Philo, with his superior verbal resources, psychologises helplessly all the while on the primitive plane.

It is thus quite misleading to say that in his writings “from first to last the Logos is the thought of God, dwelling subjectively in the infinite mind, planted out and made objective in the universe.”<sup>9</sup> Supposing such a formula to have real significance for any one to-day—supposing it to be compatible with a theistic proposition of personality—it could have no meaning for Philo, who would

<sup>1</sup> *De Somniis*, i, 36.

<sup>2</sup> *Id.* i, 41.

<sup>3</sup> *Id.* i, 15; *De Profug.* i.

<sup>4</sup> *De conf. ling.* 28.

<sup>5</sup> *De Congressu*, 30.

<sup>6</sup> *De Profug.* 20.

<sup>7</sup> See below, Pt. III, § 5.

<sup>8</sup> Enoch, xlvi, 2, 3, 4; xlix, 2, 3, 4; li, 3; lii, 4. Cp. Reichardt, *Relation of the Jewish Christians to the Jews*, p. 29, as to the same identification in the paraphrase of Jonathan.

<sup>9</sup> Drummond, *Philo Judæus*, ii, 273.

not have written as he did if he could so have formulated; though the triplication of Thought and God and Infinite Mind may be said to be a good deal in his spirit. What we learn from such a verbal construction is that if a modern academic cannot propound a Logos-Idea without self-contradiction, much less could an Alexandrian Jew. And the historical conclusion remains clear, that the Christian doctrine of the Logos is simply a deposition in dogmatic form, round the nucleus of a sacramental cult, of the vaporous haze of thought set up in the Jewish world by Yahwistic speculation on Gentile notions.<sup>1</sup>

It was the presence of the Jesuist nucleus that wrought the solidification. For Philo there was no bar to a multiplication of *Logoi*; and besides making *Logoi* of both Moses and Aaron<sup>2</sup> he has a multitude of lesser *Logoi* who figure endlessly as thoughts, words, angels, laws, forces, and reasons.<sup>3</sup> His Bible withheld him from deifying the actual priest or emperor; Moses was for him definitely reduced to human status; and to the prophets he pays remarkably little attention, merely citing one occasionally as a "companion of Moses."<sup>4</sup> Finally, he appears in several treatises to be, like the writer of the fifty-first psalm,<sup>5</sup> ethically indifferent to sacrifice<sup>6</sup>—so much so that it would be

<sup>1</sup> For a thorough discussion of the close connections between Philo, Justin Martyr, and the New Testament books as regards the notion of the Logos, see *Supernatural Religion*, Rationalist Press ed. pp. 444, 450, 454 sqq. Cp. Hausrath, *History of the N. T. Times: Times of the Apostles*, Eng. tr. 1895, i, 171-189; Nicolas, *Des Doctrines religieuses des Juifs*, 1860, p. 178, sq.; and Schürer, *Jewish People in time of Christ*, Eng. tr. Div. II, iii, 374-6.

<sup>2</sup> *De leg. alleg.* iii, 15, 33.

<sup>3</sup> *De Somniis*, i, 12, 13, 19, 23, 31, 34; *De Sacrificiis*, 13; *De Conf. Ling.*, 17; *De Posterit. Caini*, 25-26. Principal Drummond decides that "the *Logoi* have nothing personal about them" (ii, 225)—another unwarranted specification. There is nothing to show that Philo ever asked himself what he understood by personality. It is essential to an understanding of him to realise that his philosophy derives from a stage of speculation more akin to animism than to science.

<sup>4</sup> *De conf. ling.* c. 14. Cp. *De Inebrietate*, c. 8. Philo's relation to the Scriptures is certainly not that of the traditional instructed Jew. His reading is in the main limited to the Pentateuch.

<sup>5</sup> Ps. li, 16-17. Vv. 18-19 are obviously from another hand.

<sup>6</sup> E.g., *De Plant. Noe*, c. 39; *De Mose*, iii, 10; *De Sacrificantibus*, 3, 8; *Quis haeres rer. div.* 16; *De Leg. ad Caium*, 39. In the last-cited passage he makes Herod Agrippa wholly ignore the annual sacrifice of atonement,

difficult to believe that the same hand wholly wrote these and others in which he accepts a modified form of the principle of atonement,<sup>1</sup> were it not for the numerous proofs in every treatise that his philosophy is always in a state of flux. In one passage he adumbrates a combination of the ideas of the mediatorial Logos and the national Messiah;<sup>2</sup> but a mind so fixed as his on allegory and symbol and abstraction was totally unprepared to make a definite Logos out of a sacrificed demigod, even had he lived to see the new Jesuist movement. It is the merest truism, therefore, to say that in his lore the Logos idea never comes to dogmatic birth. Jesuism precipitated it on the eucharistic sacrifice, thus excluding further vacillations; but the idea of the *Sophia*, which, following the book of the *Wisdom of Jesus ben Sirach*, he also manipulates,<sup>3</sup> and which was no less potentially adaptable, never came to dogmatic birth at all, save in Gnostic teachings which the Church was finally able to suppress.

speaking only of the offering of incense; in the treatise *De Humanitate* regard is had mainly to the Deuteronomic code, where atonement is not mentioned; and in the *De Sacrificantibus* and *Quis Haeres* all sacrifice is as such made light of.

<sup>1</sup> Thus, in the treatise *De Victimis*, the ordinary view of sacrifice is taken for the most part, the citations on that head being solely from Leviticus. Even there, indeed (c. 14), repentance is expressly set forth as the condition of salvation, and sacrifice as a mere symbol of repentance. So also in *De congressu quaer. erud. gratia*, c. 14, sacrifices are reduced to ideas; even supplication is declared unnecessary; good works and contrition are all. So also in the *De leg. alleg.* cc. 30, 57, 61. Cp. *De Abrahamo*, cc. 1, 3, 4, 5; *De Migratione Abr.* cc. 1, 5. Yet in the *De Abrahamo* (cc. 33-35) the act of child sacrifice is treated as not unnatural. Again in the *De Confusione Linguarum* (c. 20) the "ransom and price for the salvation of the soul" is not sacrifice; and in *De Sacrificiis* (c. 36) and *Quis haeres rer. divin.* (c. 24) the function of the Levites as ransomed sacrifices is mystically interpreted.

<sup>2</sup> *De Execrationibus*, c. 9.

<sup>3</sup> E.g., "The mind . . . shall leave both its father, the God of the universe, and the Mother of all things, namely, the Virtue and Wisdom of God" (*De leg. alleg.* ii, 14). Again "the Creator . . . is also the Father of his Creation, and the Mother was the Knowledge of the Creator with whom God uniting . . . became the Father of Creation. And this Knowledge having received the seed of God . . . brought forth her only and well-beloved Son . . . this world" (*De Inebrietate*, c. 8. There follows a quotation from "some one of the beings of the divine company" which points to Prov. viii, 32-3, but differs from both the Septuagint and the Hebrew). Yet again "the abrupt rock [pierced by Moses] is the Wisdom of God" (*De leg. alleg.* ii, 21). And yet again *Sophia* the daughter of God "is both male and a Father" (*De Profug.* c. 9. Cp. 20).

On the other hand, Philo's doctrine of the Holy Spirit<sup>1</sup> (which in his theosophy remains as indeterminate as his notion of the *Logos*, and is much less stressed than either that or the notion of the *Sophia*, with both of which it vaguely blends) did find dogmatic acceptance in the formula of the Christian Trinity. The *Sophia* would have been on many grounds more suitable, supplying as she would the normal demand for a Mother Goddess; and the male Spirit, as a matter of fact, has always remained an extremely dim conception, availing very little for the Christian cult. But the formation of a Trinity was forced upon Christism by many of its theosophic precedents;<sup>2</sup> and the admission of a Goddess was vetoed by the ascetic principle which was in the ascendant when the doctrine was formulated: so many and various are the forces which determine the growth of a syncretic system in a religiously crowded environment.

Such are the chances of social selection. Had not the ascetic principle been thus temporarily active, and had not the craving for a secondary Teaching-God been for the time satisfied by identifying the Sacrificed God with the *Logos*, an identification of Mary with both *Sophia* and the Spirit (originally feminine) would have been an equally natural and an equally facile proceeding, the preparation having been sufficiently made on Judaic lines. As it was, the exaltation of Mary, when it came about afterwards as a result of the stressing of the metaphysical aspects of the Son, was undertaken too late for the grafting of a dogmatic *Sophia* on the new sacred books; and the still later attempt at a new Gospel in the thirteenth century was crushed by the preponderating power of the Papacy. But it is none the less clear that the doctrine of the *Logos* is a product of the same process of primitive psychology as produces deities of any order.

<sup>1</sup> *De Gigantibus*, cc. 5, 6, 7. Like the other personifications in the Judæo-Christian creed, this in all its aspects—as Wind, Fire, Dove, Generator, Inspirer, Uniter—is common to older eastern mythologies. Cp. *Gubernatis, Mitologia vedica*, p. 142 sq.

<sup>2</sup> It is partly developed in Philo, *De leg. alleg.* i, 13; *De Sacrificiis*, 14; *Quis rer. div.* 44, 45; *De Congressu*, 2; *De Abrahamo*, 24. Cp. Reichardt, as cited, pp. 54–57, concerning other Judaic precedents.

§ 4.—*The Search for a Historical Jesus.*

Thus far there is no difficulty in tracing a purely speculative process: the doctrine of the Logos is indeed the first stumbling-block of those who seek to reconcile the fourth gospel with the synoptics as a biographical document. And the very abstractness of the conception moves men at the first brush to turn with the more confidence to the concrete teachings put in the God's mouth in the other books. But if they continue critically to reflect, they find one cause after another to regard this concreteness as illusory.<sup>1</sup> Many of the utterances of the God, when weighed, are seen to be of the same order as those of the fourth gospel: hence the many vindications of that document; and vigilant attention to the differences of content in the synoptics sets up insoluble doubts as to their authority. Long ago it was pointed out, with no very clear view of the inference to be drawn, that the Sermon on the Mount is a patchwork from previous Jewish literature.<sup>2</sup> And at length the pressure of criticism has forced the more intelligent professional students of the New Testament to admit the insecurity of the old assumptions, and to attempt a restatement of the case for belief in the historicity of Jesus. The present state of the argument can perhaps be best set forth by way of criticism of the most important of these attempts, the second section of the article "Gospels" in the new *Encyclopædia Biblica*, written by Professor Schmiedel, of Zurich. It is a masterpiece of critical arrangement and expert knowledge, demanding the attention of every serious student; so that our time could not be better spent.

Passing in review all the main attempts to resolve the Gospels into a few mutually interactive primary "sources," Professor Schmiedel comes to the conclusion that no such attempt will hold good. This verdict disposes of an amount

<sup>1</sup> See *Christianity and Mythology*, Part III, Div. ii.

<sup>2</sup> Cp. C. C. Hennell, *Inquiry Concerning the Origin of Christianity* (1838 and later), ch. xvii.

of laborious research grievous to think of. For a full hundred years, German theologians by the score have been struggling with this problem, toiling devotedly, trying hypothesis upon hypothesis, refining upon refinements, always hoping to get to, or sure of having reached, a solid textual and historical foundation, even as they so long sought for one in the quicksands of the Pentateuch. At length, in the name of professional exegesis, Professor Schmiedel sounds the retreat. There are no true "sources," no really primary and trustworthy documents in the Gospel amalgam! There are only nine<sup>1</sup> "entirely credible" texts! One thinks of Mr. Meredith's figure of the hosts upon hosts of charging waves, whose achievement is only

"To throw that thin white line upon the shore!"

And what are the entirely credible texts? With due care and respect let us enumerate the forlorn handful of unwounded survivors:—

1. Mk. x, 17 ff. ("Why callest thou me good?" etc.).
2. Mt. xii, 31 ff. (blasphemy against the Son of Man pardonable).
3. Mk. iii, 21 ("He is beside himself").
4. Mk. xiii, 32 ("of that day and hour knoweth no man," etc.).
5. Mk. xv, 24; Mt. xxvii, 48 ("My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?").
6. Mk. viii, 12 ("No sign shall be given to this generation").
7. Mk. vi, 5 ("he was able to do no mighty work").
8. Mk. viii, 14-21 (rebuke to the disciples concerning bread and leaven).
9. Mt. xi, 5; Lk. vii, 22. (Passage to be taken in the sense of *spiritual* healing, since it ends with mention of preaching—not a miracle at all.)

It will be seen on what principles Professor Schmiedel

<sup>1</sup> At first the Professor specifies five as "the foundation pillars for a truly scientific life of Jesus," but he afterwards adds four. It is noteworthy that seven of the nine occur in Mark, six of them there only; and only three in Matthew. Those of us who hold that Mark is late, and not early—a redaction of the other gospels and not of an "Ur-Marcus"—can best appreciate the significance of such facts.

proceeds. Where Jesus speaks simply as a man, making no pretence to divinity, to miraculous powers, to prophecy, or to a Messianic mission, and where he is represented as failing to impress his relatives and neighbours with any sense of his superiority—there the record is entirely credible. From this position Dr. Schmiedel makes a leap to the conclusion that the entirely credible—that is, the possible—is the demonstratively historical. Let us take his own words (§ 139) :—

“ These.....passages.....might be called the foundation-pillars for a truly scientific life of Jesus. Should the idea suggest itself that they have been sought out with partial intent, as proofs of the human as against the divine character of Jesus, the fact at all events cannot be set aside that they exist in the Bible and demand our attention. In reality, however, they prove not only that in the person of Jesus we have to do with a completely human being, and that the divine is to be sought in him only in the form in which it is capable of being found in a man; *they also prove that he really did exist*, and that the Gospels contain at least *some absolutely trustworthy facts* concerning him. If passages of this kind were wholly wanting in them it would be impossible to prove to a sceptic that any historical value whatever was to be assigned to the Gospels: he would be in a position to declare the picture of Jesus contained in them to be purely a work of phantasy, and could remove the person of Jesus from the field of history.”

This will shock the believer without satisfying the scientific naturalist. The proposition in the words I have italicised, I submit, is absolutely untenable. On this point may be staked the whole dispute as to the actuality of the Gospel Jesus. The merely credible is *not* the trustworthy, the proved: if to be credited with plausible utterances be a proof of the actuality of a personage in literature, then we must believe in the historic actuality of half the characters in fiction.

§ 5.—*The Critical Problem.*

The problem is one that has been before now debated on other issues; and it may be well here to take up these by way of illumination and test. Grote, putting in scientific form a thesis sometimes more summarily phrased by "the plain man," insisted that

"The utmost which we accomplish by means of the semi-historical theory is that after leaving out from the mythical narrative all that is miraculous or high-coloured or extravagant, we arrive at a series of creditable [=credible] incidents—incidents which *may perhaps* have really occurred, and against which no intrinsic presumption can be raised. This is exactly the character of a well-written modern novel.....To raise plausible fiction to the superior dignity of truth, some positive testimony or positive ground of inference must be shown.....A man who tells us that on the day of the battle of Plataea rain fell on the spot of ground where the city of New York now stands, will neither deserve nor obtain credit, because he can have no means of positive knowledge; though the statement is not in the slightest degree improbable. On the other hand, statements in themselves very improbable may well deserve belief, provided they be supported by sufficient positive evidence. Thus the canal dug by Xerxes across the promontory of Mount Athos, and the sailing of the Persian fleet through it, is a fact which I believe because it is well-attested—notwithstanding its remarkable improbability, which so far misled Juvenal as to induce him to single out the narrative as a glaring example of Grecian mendacity."<sup>1</sup>

To this contention it is objected by Sir A. C. Lyall that "if we may only receive as credible those ancient narratives which *could not possibly* turn out to be very plausible fiction, we shall be hard pushed for the trustworthy authentication of much early history, religious and secular. Secondly, the example of the supposed assertion as to simultaneous rainfall at Plataea and in Massachusetts (*sic*) is hardly fair.

Grote, *History of Greece*, ch. xvi, ed. 1888, i, 382.

A man's assertion of an isolated fact of which he could not possibly have any positive knowledge, either directly or by hearsay, is a very different thing from affirming credible facts which might reasonably, and according to the known habits of the people who relate the facts, have been handed down by tradition from the persons who witnessed them to those who related them."<sup>1</sup> To this very reasonable argument the answer is that it does not meet Grote's case; and that when we have assented to it the problem remains as before. In regard to many credible facts which *might* conceivably have been handed down by tradition we are still bound to say that, when related concerning supernatural personages, they are not tolerable evidence of anything done by a real person whose history formed the nucleus of the myth. The proposition as to rain in the site of New York on the day of Plataea is an illustration, not a universal parallel. The fact remains that there is no common-sense ground for crediting any one "credible" assertion made concerning an ostensibly mythical character when we cannot on independent grounds show how the credible story came to be attached to the fable.

Sir Alfred Lyall's argument overlooks the demurrer that *all* particular or specific tradition of a quasi-historical kind is untrustworthy when not corroborated by other evidence, inasmuch as (1) such tradition usually goes hand in hand with obvious supernaturalist fable, and (2) many such traditions have been disproved by solid evidence. The question is not whether something traditionally asserted to have been said or done by a demigod *may* not actually have been said or done by a man of the same or another name, but whether, in the absence of other evidence, we are ever entitled to believe and assert that it was. To Grote's negative answer there is no valid demurrer. The strength of Sir A. C. Lyall's general claim, that Gods or God-myths have been built up on bases of actual deeds and events, lies in the concrete proof that this has occurred in modern times; but no such demonstration can enable us to distinguish

<sup>1</sup> Sir A. C. Lyall, *Asiatic Studies* (1st series), 2nd ed. 1884, p. 31.

between the merely possible and the true in ancient tradition.<sup>1</sup> It is conceivable that the Feridun of the Shah Nameh is constructed on a nucleus of reality, to which was added a mass of detail taken from sheer mythology, as myths were heaped upon the story of Cyrus. But in the latter case we have a means of discrimination; in the former we have none; and when we find the very name of Feridun to be a modification of an old God-name,<sup>1</sup> we have no right of historical belief left.

For the rest, it is beside the case to argue that much accepted history will be cancelled if we accept only narratives which "could not possibly turn out to be plausible fiction." Grote never argued that history proper, the record of a time by those who lived in it, is to be so tried; and he constantly accepts narratives which might conceivably be plausible fictions—nay, he occasionally accepts tales which appear to some of us to be fictions. It is when we are dealing with myths that he denies our power to discriminate: in history proper he undertakes—at times too confidently—to discriminate. Broadly speaking, he is entitled so to proceed insofar as he deals with cases on their merits. Some early historical narratives allege facts which could well be known to the narrator or to the community in general, and may be fairly taken as true; some are obviously fanciful, unplausible, ill-vouched; and in many cases they are to be doubted even when free from supernaturalism. Historiography consists in a rational selection.

It is true that there are some cases wholly or partly on the borderland between the possible and the incredible, where we may fairly surmise a nucleus of fact; but in regard to these Grote's warning should be always kept in mind. Professor Huxley, who has invented the word "agnostic" to cover, among other things, the practice of saying that miracles are "not impossible," is notably accommodating in his attitude to narratives of the possible. Concerning the story of Saul's visit to the witch of Endor,

<sup>1</sup> Cp. Max Müller, *Biographical Essays*, 1884, pp. 287-8.

he observes that it does not "matter very much whether the story is historically true," but that it is "quite consistent with probability"; and he then adds: "*That is to say, I see no reason whatever to doubt.....that Saul made such a visit.*"<sup>1</sup> The leap here is clearly illicit. There is certainly "reason to doubt" the whole story so long as it cannot be shown to have been reduced to writing near the time of Saul. "History" is full of discredited "probabilities" of the same kind: the story of Bruce and the spider is a type. The very fact that kings and commoners in ancient Israel did normally consult witches is as much a reason for admitting that the story could easily be invented as for allowing that it could easily have happened; and the details of the apparition, to which Professor Huxley oddly extends a measure of his credence, give good ground for suspecting the entire episode to be fiction.

All such cases, in fine, must be tried on their documentary as well as their *à priori* merits; and, returning to our special problem, we note that the "credible" sayings put in the mouth of the Gospel Jesus are in no way certified by their credibility, but are on the contrary put in complete suspicion by their surroundings. Here is Professor Schmiedel's case, reduced to logical form: There are in the Gospels hundreds of unlikely sayings ascribed to Jesus; there are nine which are likely; then the nine not only establish his historic reality but give a basis for surmise that many of the *unlikely* are also historical! The answer is (1) that it must be a desperately bad fiction in which not five per cent of the speeches and episodes are "credible." On Dr. Schmiedel's view, if only the ancients had ascribed ten reasonable sayings as well as twelve more or less unlikely labours to Herakles he would be entitled to rank as a historic character. On the other hand (2) the very fact that the figure of the Gospel Jesus *won belief* much more in virtue of the hundreds of improbabilities and falsities in the Gospels than in virtue of the "credible"

<sup>1</sup> *Essays*, iv, 291-2 ("Science and Hebrew Tradition;" Essay on "The Evolution of Theology").

texts, quashes the plea for his actuality based on these texts. The true inference is, not that such texts, being unnecessary, must be genuine and not invented, but that since a substantially false or unlikely biography could win ready credence in the period in question there is no reason to surmise a nucleus of actuality which was never demanded, and that the credible texts stand merely for the proportion of plausibility that might reasonably be looked for in any conglomerate of sayings and statements round a fictitious personage. Paul or the forgers, it is evident, believed in a crucified Jesus as to whom they had *no* biographical record, whether of sayings or doings. Scores of unlikely utterances, it is admitted, were credited to Jesus after Paul's time. Why were they so credited? Plainly because certain men or certain sects desired to give their views the sanction of the God-Man's authority. What then does it signify if besides these sayings there are fathered on him a few that are relatively reasonable? And, knowing as we do that the Ebionites, who attributed to him unlikely sayings, nevertheless regarded him as a mere man, what does it signify if sometimes in the Gospel he is so represented? Yet again, what plausibility remains in the cry on the cross, "Why hast thou forsaken me?" when we remember that it is a quotation from the Psalms, and that the whole cult proceeded on the doctrine that "the Christ must needs suffer"?

It may seem ungracious thus to press the argument against a professed theologian who has already come within sight of "the great surrender" to reason. Schmiedel has indeed gone further in his loyalty to the critical principle than do many professed rationalists. It is only a question of time, however, when his view shall be tested as he has tested other men's, and the process may as well begin here and now.

#### § 6.—*Collapse of the Constructive Case.*

First, then, he has not recognised (1) the primary reason for doubting the genuineness of every detail of teaching

set forth in the Gospels, namely, the total ignorance of those teachings shown in the Pauline epistles. He takes as genuine the plainly interpolated passage in 1 Cor. xi as to the institution of the Eucharist, then concludes<sup>1</sup> that "the details of the life of Jesus had *so little interest* for Paul that" he fails to quote him when he effectively might. To reason thus is to ignore a far greater difficulty than many which the exegete admits to be insuperable. (2) He makes his arguments at some points<sup>2</sup> turn on the assumption of the general certainty of the whole narrative as to Jesus being a teacher with disciples, who established his cult; whereas the existence of the disciples is no better proved than many of the data already surrendered. (3) He is evidently biassed to his illicit inference (that Jesus really existed) by other inferences which, on his own showing, he was not entitled to draw. For instance, he decides<sup>3</sup> that Jesus probably accomplished faith-healing as distinguished from miracles, because "this power is so strongly attested throughout the first and second centuries that, *in view of the spiritual greatness of Jesus and the imposing character of his personality*, it would be indeed difficult to deny it to him." What then proved the spiritual greatness and the imposing character of Jesus? The nine credible texts? Clearly they amount to no such proof, even if they were genuine: a thousand rabbis might have uttered them. What, again, is the value of the "strong attestation" of the first and second centuries in the face of the silence of Paul, ostensibly the first witness? The first and second centuries, that is to say the Gospels (which certainly did not exist within thirty years of the date alleged for Jesus' death), and the people who believed them, equally attest the prodigies which Professor Schmiedel rejects. Is a witness who solemnly affirms twenty impossibilities to be believed whenever he happens to assert something that *might* be true, while a more important witness, who in the terms of the case ought to have heard of it if it happened, had evidently never heard of it at all?

<sup>1</sup> § 147.<sup>2</sup> §§ 138 a, f: 144 a: 145 f.<sup>3</sup> § 144.

Such reasoning, we may say without hesitation, cannot stand: it is negated by the tests on which Schmiedel has proceeded as against the source-finders; and the latter might very well turn upon him with a confident *tu quoque*. Take, for instance, the passage<sup>1</sup> in which he presses the point of the obvious untrustworthiness of the reports of Jesus' discourses, and yet lets pass the assumption that these reports may be genuine condensations:—

“Even if the public ministry of Jesus had lasted for a few months only, he must have uttered a thousand-fold more than all that has been recorded in the Gospels. His longest discourse would, if delivered in the form in which it has come down to us, not have taken more than some five minutes in the delivery. However self-evident, this has been constantly overlooked by the critics. They are constantly assuming that we possess the several words of Jesus that have been reported approximately in the same fulness in which they were spoken.”

In the parables and in one or two other utterances, the Professor admits, the reports are more extended:—

“In what remains, however, it can hardly be sufficiently emphasised that we possess only an excessively meagre *précis* of what Jesus said, namely, only so much as not only made an immediate impression when first heard but also continued to survive the ordeal of frequent repetition.....In this process not only was an extraordinary number of utterances completely lost, but a large number of the sayings of Jesus now received for the first time that consecutive and pointed form which made them seem worthy of further repetition. *Without doubt* Jesus must very often have repeated himself, but what he *assuredly* often repeated in many variations has been preserved to us only in a single form.”

Here again the believer will be perturbed, while the scientific critic will not be propitiated. If there are only nine texts that credibly indicate the existence of a man Jesus who taught anything, how can we possibly know

<sup>1</sup> § 145 a.

“without doubt” that (1) he often repeated himself, and that (2) the existing reports are abbreviations of any spoken discourses whatever? The longest of all, the “Sermon on the Mount,” is demonstrably a pen-made compilation from Hebrew literature; and Professor Schmiedel’s previous argument has fully conceded that many of the reports, *condensed in appearance as they are*, are inventions. That is to say, a brief account of an alleged speech is *not* to be presumed an epitome of a real speech. The Gospel discourses are short, not because they are records of remembered passages from long speeches, but because the framers had no critical consciousness, and were not accustomed to composing long documents. When we come to the fourth Gospel we find longer discourses, in the actuality of which Professor Schmiedel does not believe. But if one gospel-maker could invent long discourses, his less literary predecessors could invent short. Once more, if the synoptic discourses are records of commonly remembered passages from Jesuine discourses, how comes it that Paul never cites a word of them? To miss that crux is to make as great an oversight as that of the critics who regarded the so-called Sermon on the Mount as the full report of a real sermon. The fact is that the higher criticism of the New Testament has thus far missed the way just as the higher criticism of the Old so long did, by taking for granted the general truth of the tradition.<sup>1</sup> It sought to found on the hollow fiction of the Exodus and the Mosaic legislation of the desert, when one intelligent glance at the Book of Judges might have shown that the tabernacle of the desert was a myth. In a similar way it clings to the conception of a preaching and cult-founding Jesus, when an intelligent perusal of the epistles of Paul<sup>2</sup> can suffice to show that the preaching Jesus was created after his time.

<sup>1</sup> An emphatic exception, certainly, must be made as regards the Pauline epistles, which by Professor van Manen and others are now rejected as entirely spurious.

<sup>2</sup> For the purpose of this argument, it matters not whether any of these epistles be genuine or not, since in any case they are early; and forgers would have used gospel sayings if they had them to use. The point is that even interpolations upon the originals yield but one gospel datum.

It does not indeed follow that "his time" was what the tradition represents. The reasonable inference from his doctrine is that his Jesus was already a mere tradition, a remote figure said to have been crucified, but no longer historically traceable. If then Paul's Jesus, as is conceivable, be merely a nominal memory of the slain Jesus ben Pandira of the Talmud (about 100 B.C.), Paul himself may belong to an earlier period than that traditionally assigned to him. Certainly his apparently genuine epistles in themselves give no decisive chronological clue. But such a shifting of his date would not finally help the case for "Jesus of Nazareth." Escape the argument from the silence of Paul by putting Paul a generation or more earlier, and you are faced by the fresh incredibility of a second crucified Jesus, a second sacrificed Son of God, vouched for by records for the most part visibly false, and containing but a fraction of plausible narrative. The only conclusion open is that the teaching Jesus of the gospels is wholly a construction of the propagandists of the cult, even as is the wonder-working God.

#### § 7.—*Parallel Problems.*

The natural impulse to reject this view with violence may be somewhat modified when it is remembered that it does but place the Christ on a historic level with all the other Teaching Gods of antiquity. All the leading Gods, as we have seen, were in some measure regarded as teachers; and for none of them do we surmise a historic original in the sense of a real teacher and lawgiver. But it is not only the so-called Gods who are thus dislimned by criticism; the sub-divine or religion-founding and God-proclaiming institutors are found to be no less fabulous, down to the historic period, than the Gods they were held to have served. Menu, Lycurgus, Numa, Moses—a whole series of revered founders of codes and creeds—are as such dismissed by criticism to the realm of fable; for even those

hierologists who still speak of Moses as a historic person,<sup>1</sup> and treat the Exodus as a historic event, concede to Kuenen that the liberator wrote nothing, and can no more be supposed to have invented the Ten Commandments than did Romulus or Numa the Twelve Tables.

Difficulty, indeed, is still made over the alleged personality of Zarathustra; but few who closely consider the evidence will say that it supports the claim.<sup>2</sup> If Zarathustra was a historical character, the proposition is not to be proved by the documents; and those who hold to the affirmative do so on the strength not of the records but of the tradition, and of the presumption in favour of a personal influence behind a notable development. It is the same with the personalities of Orpheus and Musæus: wherever the tradition tells of a founder of doctrines or mysteries, criticism on search finds myth; and if we leave open the bare surmise that there *was* an Orpheus who taught something, it must be with the avowal that we know nothing of what he specially taught. If we take the whole series of traditional teachers down to the Christian era, we find them to be more or less clearly the products of the same tendency as led to the conception of Teaching Gods—the habit of supposing that every thing held to be good came from a specifically divine or supernormal source.

Conservative opinion will naturally rally round the remaining non-Christian cases that are either admitted or still claimed to be historical—in particular, those of Mohammed and Buddha. What a man has admittedly done, it may be argued, may have been earlier done by other men. If Mohammed founded a new religion, why not Zoroaster; if Buddha gave a vitally new and potent teaching, why may not a Jesus have done so? The case may very well be tried over those points.

First let us note wherein consists the clear historicity of Mohammed. (1) He is far down within the historic period. (2) His religion rose to far-spread power and

<sup>1</sup> So the late Professor Tiele, *Outlines*, p. 85.

<sup>2</sup> See below, Part III, § 3.

notoriety within a generation of his death—a far swifter development than that of Christism, so often described as miraculous. (3) He actually left written documents; and though these were certainly redacted they have none of the well-known marks of late fabrication. (4) In virtue of the relation of Islam to Christianity, which had a body of sacred books and claimed a monopoly of truth, a fierce critical light played upon the new cult from the first days of its expansion beyond Arabia. (5) The accounts of the life of Mohammed are normally biographical, and, though not quite certainly true in detail, at no point typically mythical, save as regards the tales of marvels at his birth and in his infancy, wherein the record conforms to the normal mythopœic practice of antiquity, seen in the biographies of Plato and Confucius as well as in those of Jesus, Moses, and the Gods and demi-gods in general. Apart from these embellishments, and the tales of his intercourse with angels, he is born and lives and dies normally at known dates; works no miracles; makes no claims to divinity; is traceable long before his period of notoriety; is, in short, recognisable as a historic type of masterful fanatic. In every one of these respects his record differentiates sharply from those of Buddha and Jesus.

Absolute date, of course, is not a decisive consideration: we believe in the historicity of certain Jews B.C., and disbelieve in the legend of William Tell, who is placed thirteen hundred years later. But when we consider the environments in which Jesus and Buddha are supposed to have lived, it becomes clear that the possibilities of fable round such names are boundless. Of neither is it now pretended that he left a written word; for neither do critical scholars now claim that his immediate associates have left written accounts of him; in regard to both it is admitted that many sayings are falsely ascribed to them. Instead, then, of letting the supposed historicity of Buddha plead for that of Jesus, we are led to ask whether the one is not as problematic as the other.

§ 8.—*The Problem of Buddhist Origins.*

At the first critical glance into Buddhistic origins, the student becomes aware of a dilemma. The Buddha, we are told, delivered a teaching which, though it did not directly repudiate, yet ignored and treated as valueless the belief in deities; and the movement he set up was thus practically atheistic; yet the legends of his own birth, and many of the narratives concerning his life, are in terms of the supernaturalist beliefs of both earlier and later times. As regards the birth legends, they are found to quadrate in large measure with those of the God Krishna, and at the same time to point to many of the myths of the Vedas;<sup>1</sup> so that, whatever may have been the origin of the Buddhist movement, it must have been heavily overgrown with supernaturalism when the life of the Founder was thus written.

The conservative student naturally answers that though such overlaying and perversion of the Master's teaching did take place, he remains none the less a real person; and that the proof lies in the many narratives which represent him as speaking like any other mortal teacher. A critical study of the teaching, however, only doubles the dilemma. The accomplished and devoted English scholar who has done so much during the past thirty years to make known the documents of Buddhism to the western world, has no misgivings as to either the historicity of Gotama or his personal establishment of the Buddhist movement in the fashion set forth by the narratives; but the expositor's own scholarly candour puts before us a dozen grounds for doubt. Every cause for scepticism that exists in the cases of Jesus and Moses exists here, with differences of degree. Firstly, the Buddha wrote nothing. Secondly, none of his disciples or contemporaries wrote of him. Thirdly, some of the documents that seem nearest in time to the alleged period of Gotama, such as the Dialogues,

<sup>1</sup> See Senart, *Essai sur la légende de Buddha*, 2e édit. 1882.

are thoroughly factitious, and strike a student as the reverse of trustworthy; while others are admittedly literary creations, ascribing to the Buddha extemporaneous verses of a highly finished quality. Fourthly, much of the teaching put in his mouth is of a nature known to be current before his period.

As to the nature of his teachings the obscurity is equally great. It is not merely that they contain inconsistencies such as may be fallen into by any teacher: they are so disparate, so discursive, so various in their tone, purpose, and point of view, that a very short critical study reveals difference of source, time, and aim; and when we contemplate their metaphysic, their minuteness, their demand for leisurely attention and assimilation, we are at a loss to conceive how they could have set up a far-reaching popular movement in any country at any time. As little do we realise why they should have set up any religious society whatever. And the ordinary histories make the assertion without explaining the case.

On the other hand, much of the earliest literature exhibits all the marks of doctrinary myth—this by the implicit admission of the scholars who stand critically but confidently for the historicity of the teaching Buddha:

“The books [of the Sutta Pitaka] profess to give, not merely the belief itself, but the belief *as the Buddha uttered it*, with an account of the time when, and the place at which, he uttered it. The Buddha's new method of salvation, his new doctrine of what salvation was, did not present itself to the consciousness of the early Buddhist community as an idea, a doctrine, standing alone, and merely on its own merits. In their minds it was indissolubly bound up with the memory of the revered and striking personality of him who had proclaimed it.”<sup>1</sup>

Thus it lies on the face of the case that any narrative could find acceptance which was put in circumstantial form; and that for any doctrine whatever a narrative frame

<sup>1</sup> Rhys Davids and Oldenberg, *Vinaya Texts*, Pt. I, Introd. p. xvii (“Sacred Books of the East,” vol. xiii).

was invented as a matter of course. After the Dhamma, or collection of short scriptures in verse, had come into vogue,

“The members of the Order were no longer contented to learn, and to understand the meaning of, the various Rules of the Pātimokkha [part of the Vinaya or Rules of the Order]. A desire sprang up to have, for each one of them also, a historical basis; to know the story of how the Buddha himself came to lay down the Rule to his disciples. And it was only the Brother who was properly acquainted with all this, who was accounted a real ‘Doctor of the Law.’”<sup>1</sup>

Now, the Dhamma-pada is believed to be wholly compiled from previous books; and some of its best doctrines are avowedly ancient, as thus: “Hatred does not cease by hatred at any time: hatred ceases by love: *this is an old rule.*”<sup>2</sup> Here, then, we have the cult *making its Teaching-God* on the ordinary lines, describing him as supernaturally born, calling him the “Blessed One,” and visibly creating for the traditional Teacher a flatly fictitious biography. At this early stage, then, Buddhism is seen making its Buddha; and in the act, instead of yielding support by analogy to the belief in the historic Jesus, it vividly suggests a similar process of construction in the case of Christism. We are thus far merely left asking what primitive Buddhism really was.

### § 9.—*Buddhism and Buddhas.*

Our English guide, than whom no man knows more of Buddhism, gives us a definition: “There can be little doubt but that the doctrines of the Four Noble Truths and of the Noble Eightfold Path, the ‘Foundation of the Kingdom of Righteousness,’ were not only the teaching of Gotama himself, but were the central and most essential part of it.”<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Ib.* p. xviii, proceeding on the Kullavagga, ix, 5, 1.

<sup>2</sup> *Dhamma-pada*, i, 5. Max Müller’s trans. S.B.E. x. Professor Rhys Davids indeed translates the last clause “this is always its nature” (*Buddhism*, p. 128); but he notes (p. 126) other cases of avowed quotation; and the collection is visibly a far-reaching compilation. See p. 20, *note*.

<sup>3</sup> Rhys Davids, *General Introduction to the Buddhist Suttas*, vol. xi of “Sacred Books of the East” series, p. xxi.

The teachings in question are too well known to need quotation here: they are simply a formal and symmetrical statement of the rules of self-repression by which the Buddhist is to attain the inward peace of Nirvana, or deliverance from blind desires. Let us then assume that these teachings are for Buddhism primordial: what is there to prove that they are the utterances of one Gotama, "the Sakya sage"; and that his proclamation of them set up an "Order" of disciples?

The Order, by all accounts, was one of Mendicants. Either there were, or there were not, such Orders in existence before the Buddhist. If not, we are to suppose that one man, by the simple proclamation of a certain set of quietist principles, calling for self-restraint without any painful self-mortification, induced numbers of men and women, many of them instructed, to take up a new way of life in a country not much given to changes or experiments, and through this host of disciples instituted an Order that was to set a great mark on the history of religion. The unlikeliness of such a sudden growth will be generally granted; and indeed it is fully conceded—though this is rarely mentioned in the more popular accounts of Buddhism—that a *Sangha* or Society of the kind was no new phenomenon in Buddha's day.<sup>1</sup> There seem to have been many; and the Buddhist Order avowedly copied their practices:—

"According to Buddhist tradition—and we see no sufficient reason for doubting the correctness of the account—the monks of other, that is, non-Buddhistic sects, used to meet together at the middle and at the close of every half-month, and were accustomed then to proclaim their new teaching in public. At such times.....the different sects found an opportunity of increasing their numbers and their influence. The Buddhists also adopted the custom of these periodical meetings, but confined themselves to meeting twice in each month."<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Cp. Prof. Davids' trans. of *Dialogues of the Buddha*, 1899, p. 57, p. 61, note, pp. 64, 66, 77, 78, 102, 105, 220-1. It appears that even the Buddhist yellow robe was common to other Orders (*Id.* pp. 77, 78).

<sup>2</sup> Rhys Davids and Oldenberg, *Introd. to Vinaya Texts*, Pt. ii, p. x, proceeding on the *Mahāvagga*, ii, 1, and ii, 4, 2.

Our authorities argue indeed that the penitential practice of the Buddhist meetings "seems<sup>1</sup> to have been an original invention of *the Buddhists themselves*"; but here we have on the one hand an avowal that the Buddhists "invented" notable usages not prescribed by the traditional Founder, and on the other hand a failure to demonstrate that the Buddhist practice was not pre-Buddhistic.<sup>2</sup> On the face of the case, the claim is distinctly improbable, in view of the other data. For the rest, the Jainist movement admittedly dates from the same period; mendicant sages are recognised in the Buddhist books as common phenomena before Buddha;<sup>3</sup> and the same kinds of rules of conduct seem to have been general, save that the Buddhist was not so painfully ascetic as some others.

The Buddhist movement, then, was one on anciently familiar lines. What is more, the title of "the Buddha," which means "the enlightened," so far from making claim to a new departure, was an implicit acknowledgment of continuance in established ideals.

"In the Pâli and Sanskrit texts the word Buddha is always used as a title, not as a name. The historical Buddha is represented to have taught that he was only one of a long series of Buddhas who appear at intervals in the world, and who *all teach the same system*. After the death of each Buddha his religion flourishes for a time and then decays, till it is at last completely forgotten, and wickedness and violence rule over the earth. Gradually then the world improves; until at last a new Buddha appears who again preaches the lost Dharma or Truth.....The names of twenty-four of these Buddhas who appeared previous to Gotama have been handed down to us.....The *Buddhavansa* or 'History of the Buddhas'.....gives the lives of all the previous Buddhas before commencing the account of Gotama himself; and the Pâli commentary on the

<sup>1</sup> This modifies Koeppen's "ohne Zweifel" (*Die Religion des Buddha*, 1857-9, i, 366).

<sup>2</sup> Koeppen (i, 367, *note*) says that "Die Beichte trat an die Stelle des bramanischen Opfers." But sacrifice had been already superseded in the teaching of some Brahmanists. *Below*, p. 252.

<sup>3</sup> *Dialogues of the Buddha*, pp. 214-221.

Jātakas gives certain details regarding each of the twenty-four.<sup>1</sup>

The number and the names may very well be, as our historian argues, late inventions; but there can be no question as to the fact of the belief. An early tradition avows that, after "the" Buddha had made sixty converts in three months, sent them in different directions to preach and teach, and again converted the whole population of Rajagriha, the capital of King Bimbisāra, he encountered a period of hostility, in which his disciples were ridiculed as preachers of a doctrine of depopulation. Appealed to by them for counsel, he advised them "to say that the Buddha was only trying to preach righteousness, as former Buddhas had done."<sup>2</sup> Even in the late Commentary of Buddhaghosa on the Dialogues of Gotama, "the Blessed One" is represented as exhorting his disciples to be earnest, because "hard is it to meet with a Buddha in the world."<sup>3</sup> So in the Dhamma-pada we have the text: "A Buddha is not easily found. Wherever such a sage is born, the race prospers."<sup>4</sup> And the name Bhagavā, "the Blessed One," is equally impersonal, the Buddhist traditions themselves telling of Gotama's discussions with "Bhagavā, Alāra, and Udraka."<sup>5</sup> Finally, in the fourth century of our era, "there was certainly near to Srāvasti a sect of Buddhists who rejected Gotama, reverencing only *the three previous Buddhas*, and especially Kāsyapa, whose body they believed to be buried under one of the dāgabās at which they, *as well as the orthodox*, worshipped, while another was said to be built over the spot where he had died."<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Davids, *Buddhism*, pp. 179-180. Cp. Weber, *History of Indian Literature*, pp. 27, 167, 284-5, as to the Brahmanic connections of the word.

<sup>2</sup> Davids, *Buddhism*, pp. 55, 61-2, 63-4, and refs.

<sup>3</sup> *Id.* American Lectures, p. 111; cp. *Dialogues of the Buddha*, 1899, p. 78.

<sup>4</sup> *Dhamma-pada*, xiv, 193 (Max Müller's trans. S. B. E. x). "The awakened" is used in both the singular and the plural throughout the chapter.

<sup>5</sup> Davids, *Buddhism*, p. 34, citing Beal, *Romantic Legend of Buddha*, pp. 152-177.

<sup>6</sup> Davids, *Buddhism*, p. 181. Professor Davids avows that the sayings ascribed to Kāsyapa Buddha in the Amagandha Sutta are "quite in the manner and spirit of all the teaching ascribed to Gotama himself."

There were probably current, then, at and before the time of Gotama's alleged teaching, any number of teachings credited to "the Buddha" and "the Blessed One"; and these might include many afterwards ascribed to Gotama. Given, then, an absolute absence of evidence for the transcription of any teachings of Gotama in his lifetime, on what grounds are we to believe that they were *with knowledge* ascribed to a man of that name, whose life answered to the non-supernatural details given in the legends? Nay, seeing that even the name Gotama is a common one,<sup>1</sup> and that there was admittedly *another* Gotama known to the early Buddhists who also founded an Order,<sup>2</sup> what proof is there that sayings and doings of different Gotamas may not have been ascribed to one person? On the view, again, that the Four Noble Truths and the Noble Eightfold Path are the oldest doctrines of the Buddhist movement, and were formulated by one Gotama, what reason is there to believe that the movement either (a) arose or (b) made any progress on the simple basis of those teachings? Baur, believing in the historicity of the gospel Jesus, yet makes the avowal: "How soon would everything true and important that was taught by Christianity have been relegated to the series of long-faded sayings of the noble humanitarians and thinking sages of antiquity, had not its teachings become words of eternal life in the mouth of its Founder?"<sup>3</sup> Similarly may we not ask, How, in much-believing India, could any large organised movement develop on the simple nucleus of a teaching of self-control, which differed from the common practice of Hindu asceticism only in its renunciation of positive self-maceration? Nay, supposing a sage to have framed an eightfold path of "Right Belief, Right Aims, Right Speech, Right Actions, Right *means of Livelihood*, Right Endeavour, Right Mindfulness, Right Meditation,"

<sup>1</sup> Davids, *Buddhism*, p. 27, note. Cp. Bühler's *Introd. to Inst. of Gotama in Sacred Laws of the Aryas* (S. B. E. II), Pt. i, 2d ed., pp. 1-li. "Siddhartha" is admittedly a dubious name.

<sup>2</sup> *Dialogues*, p. 222.

<sup>3</sup> *Das Christenthum und die christliche Kirche der drei ersten Jahrhunderte*, 1853, pp. 35-36. (Eng. tr. i, 38.)

how should he intelligibly proceed to establish his way by forming an Order of *Mendicants*?<sup>1</sup> Our guide himself explains that these "classified statements of moral truth" were "addressed to Brahmans skilled in the dialectics of the time"; and they certainly have that aspect. But why should they be offered as a primary code for a new mendicant Order?

It will doubtless be answered that such à priori objection is unwarranted; that we must take the evidence as we find it and recognise as the primary teaching of the founder of Buddhism the doctrines repeatedly ascribed to him in the oldest documents. But when we inquire historically into the oldest documents and their authenticity we learn from our leading instructors that the received tradition of the First Buddhist Council which "collected the sayings of the Master" is proved to be late and untrustworthy by an early Sutta, which gives all the story of the heresy that is historically stated as the *motive* for the Council, but says nothing of such a Council taking place. "The author of the Mahāparinibhāna-Sutta," says Dr. Oldenberg, "did not know anything of the First Council"; and Professor Rhys Davids agrees.<sup>2</sup> And this very Sutta ("The Book of the Great Decease") is open to suspicion of lateness inasmuch as it makes the Blessed One figure at the head of a great movement in his lifetime, travelling sometimes with five hundred and sometimes with twelve hundred and fifty disciples. What is more, it represents him as giving forth a kind of teaching hard to reconcile with other doctrine ascribed to him as typical; for in the very first chapter of the Sutta (§ 4) he is made to lay it down as one of the conditions of the permanent prosperity of a certain tribe of Vaggians that they "honour and esteem and revere and support the Vaggian shrines in town or country, and allow not the proper offerings and rites, as formerly given and

<sup>1</sup> It may be argued that he was giving the preference to mendicancy as a means of livelihood over the *wrong* means, such as fortune-telling and astrology, said in the *Dialogues of the Buddha* (Davids' trans., 1899, pp. 16-25) to be practised by "some recluses and Brahmans." But on this view the "rightness" is merely negative.

<sup>2</sup> *Introd. to the Buddhist Suttas*, S.B.E. xi.

performed, to fall into desuetude."<sup>1</sup> It may well be said of such a teacher that, so far from having opposed Hinduism and "destroyed a system of iniquity and oppression and fraud," he "lived and died a Hindu."<sup>2</sup> But does such doctrine correlate with the denial of the permanence of the Gods, and of the value of prayers and sacrifices, also ascribed to the Buddha by tradition and documents?

The traditional First Council, then, which figures as the first historical authority for the existence of the Buddha's teachings, is later (if it ever took place at all) than a Sutta which ascribes to him a teaching wholly different in spirit and aim from those commonly held to be typical and essential in his doctrine. And if the First Council thus goes by the board, of what value is the late tradition that the Council of Vesāli was held a hundred years after the Buddha's death? Our authorities argue that since the "Ten Points" said to have been there vehemently discussed are not mentioned in the earlier sections of the Mahāvagga, these must be prior to the Council; and that as the Pātimokkha is visibly older still, the last-named section of the Vinaya must be very old indeed.<sup>3</sup> The answer is (1) that the Council of Vesāli<sup>4</sup> may have been centuries later than the date traditionally assigned to it, and (2) that the Vinaya texts in general, if relatively old, have nothing of the character of an innovating propaganda, nothing of the nature of an appeal which would create a new Order, but rather correspond to the late code of rules framed for monastic orders in Christendom a thousand years after the foundation of the Christian cult. The fact that they are all ascribed to the Founder is but one more evidence of the total lack of the critical or historical sense among the members.

<sup>1</sup> Last cit. pp. 3-4.

<sup>2</sup> Davids, *Buddhism*, p. 83; *American Lectures*, p. 116. Cp. the *Buddhism* (pp. 138, 149, 165, etc.) for many instances in which the Buddha is made to speak of "the Gods" as a believer in them.

<sup>3</sup> Rhys Davids and Oldenberg, *Vinaya Texts*, i, Introd. p. xvii. Cp. *Buddhism*, p. 163.

<sup>4</sup> As to this cp. Koeppen, *Die Religion des Buddha*, i, 155-6.

§ 10.—*The Cruces.*

Looking, then, for a foothold among the shifting sands of Buddhist tradition, we note the following clashing records:—

1. The Buddha is represented alike in ostensibly early and in late tradition as speaking of "the Gods" with full belief in their existence.<sup>1</sup>

2. He is represented on the one hand as discouraging sacrifices,<sup>2</sup> and on the other hand as prescribing for a whole tribe a strict adherence to ancient rites.<sup>3</sup>

3. King Asoka, who figured as a good Buddhist in the early vigour of the movement (about 250 B.C.), habitually called himself "the delight of the Gods," as did his contemporary the "pious Buddhist king of Ceylon."<sup>4</sup>

4. The Buddha is represented as throwing his Order open to all classes, and at the same time as making the name "Brahman" a term of honour for his Arahats or saints. Brahmans, too, are said to have been among his most distinguished disciples; and the Dialogues represent his conversations with them.

5. Much teaching that certainly did not come from Buddha is admittedly ascribed to him, the principle being that he delivered the whole canon.

6. Much philosophic matter set forth as his teaching is nearly identical with much of the Sankhya system, of which at least the germs are admittedly pre-Buddhistic.<sup>5</sup>

The last two circumstances are fully acknowledged by

<sup>1</sup> Rhys Davids, *Buddhism*, 18th ed. pp. 35, 55-56, 79, 99, 149, 154; *American Lectures on Buddhism*, 1896, pp. 121, 138, 165; *Dialogues of the Buddha*, tr. 1899, p. 79, etc.

<sup>2</sup> Davids, *Buddhism*, p. 61; *Dialogues*, Sutta v.

<sup>3</sup> Yet Oldenberg goes so far as to see (*wir dürfen sagen*) a true utterance of Buddha in the dialogue on sacrifices, when the other dialogue, giving the contrary view, has equal authority (*Der Buddha*, 3te Aufl. p. 196).

<sup>4</sup> Davids, *Buddhism*, p. 84. So, among the later princes of the Andhras, who were great patrons of the Buddhists, we have one called Vedisiri, "he whose glory is the Veda," and another Yanasiri, "he whose glory is the sacrifice" (Bühler, *Introd. to the Apastamba in "Sacred Laws of the Aryas"* (S.B.E. II. Pt. i, 2nd ed. p. xxxix.). On the other hand, however, the Andhras are spoken of in the *Aitareya-brāhmana* as degraded and barbarous.

<sup>5</sup> Davids, *American Lectures*, pp. 24-29.

our Buddhist scholars. Professor Oldenberg writes: "I have essentially modified my previous scepticism in regard to the connection of the two systems, and seen reason to place Buddhism considerably closer to the Sankhya than my former researches suggested."<sup>1</sup> And Professor Rhys Davids, enumerating the long list of advantages claimed by the Buddha for the life of a recluse in one of the Dialogues, concedes that "it is perfectly true that of these thirteen consecutive propositions, or groups of propositions, it is only the last, No. 13, which is exclusively Buddhist,"<sup>2</sup> the exception being the realisation of the Four Truths, the destruction of the Asavas [lusts, errors, and ignorance], and attainment of Arahatship." Professor Davids goes on to make the claim: "But the things omitted, the union of the whole of those included into one system, the order in which the ideas are arranged.....all this is also distinctively Buddhist." This claim, however, does not affect the significance of the admission, and is itself provocative of a new pressure of criticism. For if the exclusively Buddhist section be the last of all, is not the fair presumption this, that the Buddhist formula here has merely been added to an existing doctrine, appropriated by Buddhists? Among the specified rules of conduct admitted to be not exclusively Buddhist are many which go far to constitute the content of the "Eightfold Path," which is thus obviously but a separate classification of precepts or ideals common to other schools.

The same question arises again over the admission<sup>3</sup> that "the Eightfold path is not mentioned in our Sutta" (the *Sāmmaṇa-Phala*); and that as regards three of the four lines of ethical precept to be traced in the teaching under notice, Buddhism in the first "goes very little beyond the current ethics of the day"; in the second and third proceeds mainly on the practice of pre-Buddhistic recluses and Orders; and only in the fourth—specifying the

<sup>1</sup> *Der Buddha, sein Leben, seine Lehre, seine Gemeinde*, 3te Aufl., 1897, Excurs, p. 441.

<sup>2</sup> *Dialogues of the Buddha*, as cited, p. 59.

<sup>3</sup> *Id.* p. 62.

Buddhistic program for Arahatsip—takes up a special stand.<sup>1</sup> But on analysis it is found that this excepted doctrine is at most only verbally special to Buddhism, since the other schools also certainly professed to put down lust of life and physical pleasure, error, and ignorance; and it is not pretended that the word "Arahat" was a Buddhist monopoly. The further we go, the stronger becomes the stress of doubt. Where we are not certainly dealing with pre-Buddhistic doctrine under the form of dialogues held by the Buddha, we are reading, as in so many passages of the Dhamma-pada, sayings of a literary construction, often in verse, which in their present form come from Buddhistic writers long after the alleged period of Gotama, though they too may derive from remote antiquity. Among these, even as happens in the later sections of the Christian gospels, are some of the noblest ethical teachings of Buddhist literature.

What doctrines, then, were special to Buddhism? Not Karma: that was common property, shared-in by Buddhism.<sup>2</sup> Not in the superiority of a right mind to sacrifice: that was a primary doctrine of the Jainas, and admittedly pre-Buddhistic both within and without the pale of Brahmanism.<sup>3</sup> Not in seeking a way of Salvation independently of the Vedas: that had been done by many teachers, in various sects.<sup>4</sup> Not in the doctrine that defilement comes not from unclean meats but from evil deeds and words and thoughts: that is given by the Buddhist writers as pre-Buddhistic, "being one of the few passages in which sayings of *previous Buddhas* are recorded."<sup>5</sup> Not in the search for peace through self-control and renunciation: that was the quest of a myriad recluses, the goal of all previous Buddhas. Not in the view that there is a wisdom higher than that attained by mere austerities: that too is pre-Buddhistic.<sup>6</sup> Not in the doctrine that non-Brahmans could join an order and attain religious blessedness: the other Orders were

<sup>1</sup> *Id.* p. 63.

<sup>2</sup> *Dialogues*, pp. 72, 105; *Buddhism*, pp. 99-100.

<sup>3</sup> *Dialogues*, pp. 164-5.

<sup>4</sup> Oldenberg, *Der Buddha*, 3te Aufl. p. 76.

<sup>5</sup> *Dialogues*, p. 104.

<sup>6</sup> *Id.* p. 211.

equally open to men of low social status or even slaves;<sup>1</sup> and indeed the rigid ideal of caste separateness was not yet established in the days or in the sphere of early Buddhism;<sup>2</sup> for though Brahman claims had long been exorbitantly high, it appears that there were many Brahmans who rationally waived them, and as regards ascetics they were not raised, or at least not pressed.<sup>3</sup> In Buddhist practice, too, as in that of the early Christians, runaway slaves were not received into the Order.<sup>4</sup> As little was the admission of women to the Order a Buddhist innovation: that too was practised by the Jainas; and even the tradition makes the Buddha accept it reluctantly, in the twenty-fifth year of his preaching.<sup>5</sup> There seems, in short, to be nothing on the face of the doctrine to account for the special expansion of the Buddhist movement.<sup>6</sup>

### § 11.—*Sociological Clues.*

Seeking for sociological explanations, we first turn to the economic conditions. As was to be expected, there are clear traces of an economic pressure that drove men into the Order. In the *Milinda Prashnaya* ("Questions of Menander"), Nagasena, the founder of the Madhyamika school of northern Buddhism, in answer to a question from Milinda, the Greek King of Sagala in the Punjab,<sup>7</sup> as to whether all members join the Order for the high end of renunciation, is represented as answering: "Certainly not, sire. Some for these reasons; but some have left the

<sup>1</sup> *Id.* pp. 77, 103.

<sup>2</sup> *Id.* pp. 101, 103, 107, 285-7. Prof. Davids cites Fick, *Sociale Gliederung im nordöstlichen Indien*, pp. 50, 51.

<sup>3</sup> Oldenberg, *Der Buddha*, pp. 71, 175.

<sup>4</sup> Davids, *Dialogues*, p. 103, citing *Vinaya Texts*, S.B.E. i, 199.

<sup>5</sup> Koeppen, *Die Religion des Buddha und ihre Entstehung*, 1857, i, 104; Rhys Davids, *Buddhism*, p. 66.

<sup>6</sup> Cp. Senart, *Essai*, pp. 447-451.

<sup>7</sup> Professor Davids admits (Introd. to vol. cited, p. xx) that it is told alike of Milinda and of Buddha that many cities sought their ashes, and agreed finally to divide their relics and raise to them monuments—another light on the Buddha legend. As to the identification of Menander, whose coins are extant, with Milinda, see Weber, *History of Indian Literature*, Eng. tr. p. 306, note.

world in terror at the tyranny of kings. Some have joined us to be safe from being robbed; some harassed by debt; and some perhaps to gain a livelihood."<sup>1</sup> Nagasena himself, again, is made to say that he joined as a mere boy, seeking to be taught.<sup>2</sup> This account would in all likelihood hold good of the social conditions before the Greek invasion; and on the face of the case there is no difficulty in understanding that any Order which secured men a measure of peace and security would find adherents, even as did the monasteries and monkish orders of the Middle Ages in Europe. But the same pressure would send applicants to other Orders as well as the Buddhist; and we have still to ask why it was that the Buddhist was specially sought, and became specially powerful, as well as how it began.

To begin with, there are strong reasons for regarding the Jainas and Buddhists alike as having been originally either simple sects, or sections of one sect, of Brahmanism; and as this view is held by two leading authorities, Weber and Jacobi, and is, as we have seen, now partially yielded to by Oldenberg, we may reasonably try it as a working hypothesis. Weber goes so far as to assert categorically (1) that Brahmanic speculation anciently sundered on two main lines, one finding the First Cause in indiscrete matter, the other finding it in spirit; (2) that the latter theory gradually became the orthodox one; and (3) that "from among the adherents of the former view, which came by degrees to be regarded as heterodox, there arose, as thought developed, enemies still more dangerous to orthodoxy, who.....before long threw themselves into practical questions also, and eventually became the founders of the form of belief known to us as Buddhism."<sup>3</sup> On this view (which, it will be seen, implicitly modifies all the ordinary assumptions as to the origin of Buddhism in one man's teaching), the quasi-atheistic element in Buddhism is primordial; and the popular development is a mere sequel of a movement

<sup>1</sup> *The Questions of King Milinda* (S.B.E. xxxv), ii, 1, § 5. Trans. i, 50.

<sup>2</sup> There would be others, seeking light rather than shelter. Cp. Oldenberg, *Buddha*, p. 74.

<sup>3</sup> *History of Indian Literature*, Eng. tr. p. 27. Cp. pp. 284-5.

originally, as it were, academic. In Weber's opinion, the Jainas in turn are only one of the oldest sects<sup>1</sup> of Buddhism; Buddha being for him a real personage who propounded to the people without distinction of caste a teaching in which there was "absolutely nothing new," but which had previously "been the possession of a few anchorites" and had "never before been freely and publicly proclaimed to all." Hence "the enormous success that attended his doctrine: the oppressed all turned to him as their redeemer."<sup>2</sup>

Jacobi on the other hand, pointing to the ancient protest of the Brahmanic writer Vasishtha<sup>3</sup> against the neglect of the Veda by ascetics, concludes that "the germ of dissenting sects like those of the Buddhists and the Jainas were contained in the institute of the fourth Asrama (grade), and that the latter was the model of the heretical sects; therefore Buddhism and Jainism may be regarded as religions developed out of Brahmanism, not by a sudden reformation, but prepared by a religious movement going on for a long time."<sup>4</sup> For this view of the two sects as merely cognate there are various grounds—for instance this, that while both Buddhists and Jainas have adopted the five vows of the Brahmanic ascetics, the Buddhists opposed the Brahmanic doctrine of the Atman or personal soul, and the Jainas accepted it with modifications, holding that all parts of the elements as well as animals and plants have souls. This and various other details suggest rather an original independence than a splitting-off. And Jacobi confidently claims<sup>5</sup> that "we know for certain that Buddha at least addressed himself chiefly to the members of the aristocracy, and that the Jainas originally preferred the Kshatriyas [the warrior caste] to the Brahmans."<sup>6</sup>

Thus far, it will be seen, both forms of the theory accept broadly the tradition as to Buddha's preaching, though that tradition, as apart from the incidental revelations in the

<sup>1</sup> *Indische Studien*, xvi, 210; *History of Indian Literature*, pp. 296-7, note.

<sup>2</sup> *History*, pp. 289-290.

<sup>3</sup> [Ch. x, 4, Bühler's trans.]

<sup>4</sup> Hermann Jacobi, *Introd. to Jaina Sutras* (S.B.E. xxii), Pt. i, p. xxxiii. Cp. Senart, *Essai*, p. 453.

<sup>5</sup> Here following Oldenberg, *Der Buddha*, 3te Aufl. pp. 176-9.

<sup>6</sup> Jacobi, as cited, p. xiii.

documents, says nothing of an acceptance of a Brahmanic basis by Buddha for his Order; and Weber leaves his conception far from clear, inasmuch as he speaks at one time of a body of heretics as "the founders" of Buddhism, and at another of Buddha as "one of its representatives," and as the first to publish broadcast doctrines previously confined to "a few anchorites." And when we come to compare the legend of Buddha with the Jaina legend of Mahāvira, our difficulty deepens. The Jaina legends refer the preaching of Mahāvira "exclusively to the same district which Buddhism also recognises as its holy land"; and in Weber's opinion they "display so close an affinity to the accounts of Buddha's ministry that we cannot but recognise in the two groups of narratives merely varying forms of common reminiscences."<sup>1</sup> But, *if* reminiscences, why are they to be held as being primarily Buddhistic? And why, above all, are they to be certificated as reminiscences? The Jainas, says Jacobi, "have reproduced the whole history of Krishna, with small variations, in relating the life of the twenty-second Tīrthakara, Arishtanemi, who was a famous Yadava."<sup>2</sup> In the same way the Buddhists have put much of the history of Krishna into their stories of Buddha. Such adaptation is, in fact, a normal religious practice, common to many races and cults.<sup>3</sup>

A somewhat better reason than any Weber gives for regarding the Jaina legends as the later is that according to them Mahāvira did twelve years' penances as against Buddha's six, was convinced of their necessity, and persevered in some of them after becoming a Tīrthakara or prophet.<sup>4</sup> Such a comparison is avowedly post-Buddhistic. But such a detail might be added to an established legend just as the Buddhists undoubtedly added to theirs. Granting, however, that the Jainas *may* represent a secession from the Buddhist movement—their greater asceticism

<sup>1</sup> Weber, *History*, p. 296, note.

<sup>2</sup> Jacobi, as cited, p. xxxi, note. Cp. Senart, p. 453.

<sup>3</sup> Senart notes (*Essai*, Introd. pp. xxi-xxii) that the numerous sects of Buddhists follow the same myth types in their legends, despite their other differences, many of which date very far back.

<sup>4</sup> Jacobi, as cited, pp. xvii-xviii.

(involving a measure of uncleanness<sup>1</sup>) being on the lines of the schism said by the Buddhist tradition to have been set up by the Gotama's cousin Dewadatta,<sup>2</sup> identified by Jacobi with Mahāvīra—we have really no sound ground for believing that on either side we are dealing with facts in the life of any sect-founder. The Buddhist legend runs that Ajātasatru, son of the Buddhist rajah Bimbisāra, was induced by Dewadatta to kill his father, Dewadatta at the same time causing three attempts to be made on the life of Buddha. Such a tale is on all fours with the efforts of the early Christians to make out that certain rival cults, such as that of "Simon Magus," were set up by way of schism from Christianity, when in reality those cults were the elder.<sup>3</sup> Jacobi puts it that Ajātasatru killed his father and warred on his grandfather, who was uncle of Mahāvīra and patron of the Jainas, thereafter siding with their rivals the Buddhists, whom he had formerly persecuted as friends of his father's.<sup>4</sup> Here we have apparently one more attempt to draw a truth of history from a bare tradition; and on the principles followed in this inquiry there is no scientific warrant for such extraction. But there is on the other hand a clear scientific value in the suggestion that *monarchic or other political forces* may have determined the success of a particular Order at a particular time.<sup>5</sup>

### § 12.—*Buddhism and Asoka.*

When Buddhism first emerges in what may be termed the light of history, it is as an established system highly favoured by the great king Asoka, about 250 B.C. It is

<sup>1</sup> Jacobi, as cited, p. xxvi.

<sup>2</sup> Rhys Davids, *Buddhism*, pp. 75-6.

<sup>3</sup> Cp. the author's *Christianity and Mythology*, pp. 401, 473, and *Short History of Christianity*, pp. 33-4.

<sup>4</sup> As cited, p. xiv.

<sup>5</sup> Jacobi's view to this effect was accepted by Max Müller: "Take away the previous growth of Brahmanism, and Buddha's work would have been impossible. Buddhism might in fact have remained a mere sect of Brahmanism, unless political circumstances had given it an importance and separate existence which other rival sects did not attain" (*Natural Religion*, p. 555, citing Jacobi as above).

made clear by his edicts that only a small number of scriptures, whose titles are only partially identifiable with known extant writings, were then recognised as preserving the spoken discourses of the Buddha.<sup>1</sup> And among those named is "The Terrors of the Future," which "seems to be a description of the different worlds of purgatory, one of which is described in the *Pettavatthu*, the 7th Book of the 5th Division of the 2nd Pitaka." So that thus early in the known history of the Order it figures as holding in Buddha's name one of the common superstitions which Buddha is supposed to have repudiated. And Asoka, as we have seen, called himself "the delight of the Gods," as did his friend the contemporary Buddhist king of Ceylon.

The first sociological problem is to account for the favour shown by such kings to such an Order. Constantine, we know, raised up Christianity to be the State cultus because of its obvious political uses as a far-reaching organisation, easily attachable to his interest. Had the kings of Magadha a similar motive? Chandragupta, according to both Greek and Hindu accounts,<sup>2</sup> began his career as a robber-chief in the time of Alexander, whose camp he had visited on the banks of the Hyphasis, as a defeated rebel; and after seizing the throne of Nanda, the murdered rajah of Magadha, about 315 B.C., he defeated Seleukos, the Greek governor of the Indus provinces, driving the Greek power out of India. If then "it is clear that it was just when Chandragupta and his low-caste followers from the Punjab came into power.....that the Buddhists, the party of reform, the party who made light of caste distinctions, began to rise rapidly in numbers and influence,"<sup>3</sup> it is quite intelligible that the upstart dynasty found in the moral and didactic influence of such an Order a useful political support,

<sup>1</sup> Cp. Rhys Davids, *Buddhism*, pp. 224-6.

<sup>2</sup> Cp. Elphinstone, *History of India*, Cowell's ed. 1889, pp. 152-4; Rhys Davids, *Buddhism*, pp. 220-1.

<sup>3</sup> Rhys Davids, *Buddhism*, p. 221. Cp. Jacobi, as cited, p. xiv:—"With the extension of the limits of the empire of Magadha a new field was opened to both religions [Jainism and Buddhism], over which they spread with great activity. It was probably this auspicious political conjunction to which Jainism and Buddhism chiefly owed their success, while many similar sects attained only a local and temporary importance."

as Ajātasatru may have done earlier, supposing him to have attained power by killing his father. The record that Ajātasatru, after favouring the Buddhists, captured Srāvasti, their headquarters, and totally destroyed Kapilavastu, their sacred place,<sup>1</sup> tells further of friction and complications, all presumably of a political character. Usurpers in such cases would be apt to have arrayed against them the influence of the Brahmans; and the midway position of the Buddhists, who at once paid respect to Brahmanism and departed from its caste principles, would place them in a certain imperfect measure of harmony with the illegitimate monarch.<sup>2</sup>

But there is a further reason for ascribing to Chandragupta a decisive influence on Buddhism in its relation to Brahmanism. If Weber is right, the peoples of the Punjab "never submitted to the Brahmanical order of things, but always retained their ancient Vedic standpoint, free and independent, without either priestly domination or system of caste. For this reason, too, they were the objects of a cordial hatred on the part of their kinsmen, who had wandered further on; and on this account also Buddhism gained an easy entrance among them."<sup>3</sup> But if Chandragupta with his Punjabis accepted Buddhism they would be strengthening the tendency existent in Buddhism to ignore caste; and, again, we have it from the same authority that "Buddha's teaching was mainly fostered in the district of Magadha, which, as an extreme border province, was perhaps never completely Brahmanised;<sup>4</sup> so that the native inhabitants always retained a kind of influence, and now gladly seized the opportunity to rid themselves of the Brahmanical hierarchy and the system of caste."<sup>5</sup> This

<sup>1</sup> *Id.* p. 77.

<sup>2</sup> Mr. Lillie, while recognising the success of Buddhism before Asoka (*Buddhism in Christendom*, p. 188), raises a needless difficulty by supposing it to have "struggled on in obscurity and perhaps in secrecy" till his advent (*Id.* p. 215). The latter view is excluded by the former.

<sup>3</sup> *History of Indian Literature*, p. 4.

<sup>4</sup> This view of the matter is not considered by Mr. Lillie, who insists (*Buddhism in Christendom*, pp. 187-8) that Asoka's stones declare Brahmanism to have been the official creed all over India before his reign.

<sup>5</sup> Weber, *History*, pp. 286-7.

view, it will be observed, diverges essentially from the other proposition, above cited, that Buddha in person undermined the principle of caste in a fashion "altogether novel and unwonted." If caste had never at all been recognised in the Punjab, and had never triumphed in Magadha, there would be nothing very novel there in the teaching that personal salvation did not depend on it. For such a teaching, Oldenberg avows, there was not only no necessity in that age and environment, but there was no inclination. "Any thought of any reformation of social conditions (*Staatsleben*), any notion of the founding of an earthly ideal kingdom, a pious Utopia, was wholly alien to these [early Buddhistic] circles. Anything like a movement of social change was unknown in India." In short, the conception of Buddha as a kind of popular liberator is rejected by one of the leading scholars who still stand for the historicity of Buddha.<sup>1</sup> And though Brahmanists of Sankhya leanings were presumably not great sticklers for caste to begin with, it may well have been the anti-caste bias of the Punjabis that first gave the Buddhist Order a marked leaning of that kind, and supplied the basis for the belief that the Founder had been a Kshatriya. Such a state of things, too, would perfectly account for the fact that the Buddhist scriptures were, and remain, composed not in Sanskrit but in the popular idiom.<sup>2</sup> It only needed that a beginning should be made, to stamp a given language as the sacred tongue of Buddhism.

What Ajâtasatru presumably began and Chandragupta some generations later carried further, the grandson of the latter, Asoka, consummated. He found the Buddhist Order flourishing, and fully established it through his extensive kingdom; not, however, in direct opposition to Brahmanism, with which the now firmly seated dynasty would naturally make terms of mutual accommodation. For him, it seems clear, Buddhism was an organisation rather than a religion. It was compatible with Brahmanism while capable of being

<sup>1</sup> Oldenberg, *Der Buddha*, pp. 173-5.

<sup>2</sup> Weber, *History of Indian Literature*, p. 179.

used to keep Brahmanism in check; and the "delight of the Gods" was not concerned with its atheistic philosophy. "Reverence towards Brahmans and members of the Order" was impartially prescribed in his edicts; and he repeatedly stipulates for an equal toleration of all sects, and an abstention all round from detraction of others.<sup>1</sup> He was thus a Buddhist only in the sense that he made use of all organisations alike. Nor is there any clear warrant for the conclusion that "Buddhism in the time of Asoka was still comparatively pure," because in the edicts "we hear nothing of metaphysical beings or hypothetical deities, nothing of ritual, or ceremonies, or charms."<sup>2</sup> Edicts were not the natural place for such allusions; but the mention of the treatise on "The Terrors of the Future" is surely significant enough.<sup>3</sup> The Mahāvansa tells that under the sun of royal favour "heretics assumed the yellow robe in order to share in its advantages: whenever they had opinions of their own they gave them forth as doctrines of the Buddha."<sup>4</sup> In that case they were doing exactly what other Buddhists had done before them; and it is certain that most of what Buddhists accept as Buddha's teaching was penned long after Asoka's time.

We thus reach a critical conception of Buddhist origins. The Teaching Buddha, considered as the wondrous sage who in his lifetime creates by his own influence a great movement and establishes a great Order, shrinks in the light of criticism to the vanishing point. The Order, probably originating among rationalistic Brahmans, becomes intelligible simply as a monastic or mendicant sect on the ordinary Brahmanical bases, but tolerant on the subject of caste to start with, and tending to diverge from Brahmanism in doctrine and practice in the ratio of its numerical success, especially as regards its rejection of caste dis-

<sup>1</sup> Cp. Max Müller, *Introduction to the Science of Religion*, ed. 1882, pp. 5-6, 23; Davids, *Buddhism*, p. 223.

<sup>2</sup> Davids, last cit.

<sup>3</sup> One of the other treatise-titles in Asoka's list appears in Max Müller's version as "The Supernatural Powers of the Masters," where Prof. Davids reads it "The State of the Just."

<sup>4</sup> Cited by Davids, p. 224.

tinctions—a course obviously conducive to its expansion. On these lines, however, it could take many Brahmans with it; and inasmuch as it was primarily an Order living under rules, rather than a school of doctrine, it could all along include ordinary believers in the Gods as well as rationalists who turned their backs on official and popular Brahmanism because of its systematic exploitation of superstition.

But to an energetic rationalism in such an Order there was a fatal obstacle in the central principle or datum of the cult—the obtrusion of the supernatural Buddha as the source of all true wisdom. The very thinkers who framed the dialogues and discourses in which the Buddha most rationally teaches by argument were there building up the belief in a supernatural being in whom they themselves cannot have believed. To change the familiar phrase, they literally builded worse than they knew. On the popular craving for a Teaching God they relied for securing the popularity of their Order; and they thus frustrated the higher aims of their doctrine, inasmuch as superstition always drives out judgment. By the admission of Professor Rhys Davids, the Northern Buddhists took a step “far removed from Gotama’s doctrines,” “the step from polytheism to monotheism.” But, on the other hand, they built up, on Brahmanic lines, a new Buddhistic polytheism, according to which there are five Dhyâni Buddhas, mystical and divine beings, living in bliss; with five Bodhisatvas, or Buddhas Elect, destined to be born; and five Mânushi or human Buddhas, of whom Gotama is the fourth; the fifth, Maitreya, the Buddha of love, being still to come; and for all such creations we have the sufficient explanation that the dreamers “craved after Buddhist gods to fill the place of the dead gods of the Hindu pantheon.” And the northern Buddhism, finally, is as completely given over to polytheistic superstition as the southern.<sup>1</sup>

It may, indeed, have been the higher intelligence of the rationalising Buddhists that secured the special success of

<sup>1</sup> *Buddhism*, pp. 199–211.

their Order as compared with that of the Jainas, whose bias to systematic self-mortification, as well as their greater superstition, accounts for the unintellectual character of their literature. The less ascetic Buddhists would at once be better able to propitiate kings and better able to attract recruits. Among them would circulate such maxims as that in the Dhamma-pada:—

“Not nakedness, not platted hair, not dirt, not fasting, or lying on the earth, not rubbing with dust, not sitting motionless, can purify a mortal who has not overcome desires. He who, *though dressed in fine apparel*, exercises tranquillity, is quiet, subdued, restrained, chaste, and has ceased to find fault with all other beings, he indeed is a Brāhmana, an ascetic, a friar (*bhikshu*).”<sup>1</sup>

But behind such sane maxims stood forever the fabulous figure of the Buddha, the giver of all the wisdom in his Order, and the imposer of all its artificial rules. Instead of the mass of myths concerning him being a late accretion to a body of high ethical teaching purporting to come from a normal human being, it is now seen to be probable that, as is contended by M. Senart, the mythical figure was there first, and the ethical teaching grew up fortuitously around it, even as the Gospel teachings in all likelihood grew up round the name of a sacrificed Jesus who for his earlier worshippers was merely a name. To this, our initial problem, we now finally return, prepared to appreciate aright the issues.

### 13.—*The Buddha Myth.*

In the introduction to M. Senart's *Essai sur la légende de Buddha*, the most comprehensive and scientific attempt of the kind yet made, the central problem is thus posited:

“Either the historical data are the primary nucleus and as it were the central source, the legendary elements representing an ulterior action, in part

<sup>1</sup> *Dhamma-pada*, x, 141, 142, Max Müller's trans. Cp. Rhys Davids, *Buddhism*, p. 155.

accessory, without necessary cohesion ; or, inversely, the mythological traits form a whole connected by a higher and anterior unity with the personage on whom they are here grafted, the historical data, if there are really any, being associated with them only in virtue of a secondary adaptation. It is at the first point of view that the inquiry has stood up to the present time. There has been drawn the practical conclusion that it suffices to suppress all the incredible details, what is left being taken for accredited history. I seek to show that for this first point of view we ought decidedly to substitute the second."<sup>1</sup>

The conclusion to which the present argument points is exactly this, adhered to, however, more strictly than is the case in M. Senart's admirably learned treatise. For while he thus seems to imply that the supernatural element is the beginning of Buddhism as such, he finally assumes that there actually was a "founder." Certainly he sufficiently attenuates his conception :

"A sect has a founder, Buddhism like every other. I do not pretend to demonstrate that Sakyamuni never existed. The question is perfectly distinct from the object of this treatise. It follows, certainly, from the foregoing researches that hitherto the sacred personage has been given too much historical consistence, that the tissue of fables grouped around his name has been too facilely transformed, by arbitrary piecings, into a species of more or less unpalatable history. Scepticism acquires from our analyses, in some regards, a greater precision : still, it does not follow that we should indefinitely extend its limits. In this epic and dogmatic biography, indeed, there remain very few elements which sustain a close examination ; but to say this is not to say that among them there has not entered some authentic reminiscence. The distinction is certainly very difficult. Where we are not in a position to show for a tradition its exact counterpart in other cycles, a decision is an extremely delicate process. All that is suspicious ought not necessarily to be eliminated : it is right that whatever is rigorously admissible ought

<sup>1</sup> É. Senart, *Essai sur la légende de Buddha*, 2e édit. 1882, pp. xi-xii.

to be retained. There is no alleged deity—not Vishnu, or Krishna, or Herakles—for whom we might not construct a sufficiently reasonable biography by proceeding as has hitherto been done in regard to the legend of Buddha.

“Under these reserves, I willingly recognise that there remain a certain number of elements which we have no absolute reason for thinking apocryphal: they may represent real historical reminiscences: to that, for my part, I have no objection. It is possible that the founder of Buddhism may have come from a tribe of Sakyas, though the pretended history of that race is certainly quite fictitious. It is possible that he may have come of a royal line, that he may have been born in a city called Kapilavastu, though this name arouses grave suspicions, opening the door to either mythological or allegorical interpretations, and the existence of such a town is very feebly certified. The name Gotama is certainly historic and well-known, but it is a borrowed name which tells us little. Much trouble has been taken to explain how this strictly Brahmanic patronymic might have passed to a family of Kshatriyas [the warrior caste]. Apart from Buddha, it is above all closely associated with his supposed aunt, the legendary Prajapati.....I do not speak of his genealogy: it has certainly no value, being borrowed whole from epic heroes, in particular from Rama. On the other hand, it may well be that the teacher of the Buddhists entered on his religious career at the age of thirty-nine<sup>1</sup>.....”

And so on. Let us pause at the last clause to remember how the Jesus of the gospels “began to be about thirty years of age” when he began *his* teaching career, and to ask on what rational ground we can suppose such a detail to have been biographically preserved when the surrounding narrative yields no sign of biography whatever? There is in fact no single detail in the legend that has any claim to critical acceptance; and the position of the latest conservatives, as Oldenberg, is finally only a general *petitio principii*. India, admits that candid scholar, always was, as it is, “a land of types,” wherein the lack of freedom stunts the free

<sup>1</sup> *Id.* pp. 441-3.

growth of individuality ; and in the portraits of the Buddha and all his leading disciples we have simply the same type repeated. Yet, he contends, " a figure such as his certainly cannot be fundamentally misconceived (*fundamental miss-verstanden worden ist eine Gestalt wie die seine gewiss nicht*)."<sup>1</sup> Critical logic will not permit such an à priori reinstatement of a conception in which every element has given way before analysis. It is but an unconscious resort to the old fallacy of meeting the indictment of a spurious document with the formula, " Who else could have written it ?"<sup>2</sup>

We recur to the old issue—the thesis that " every sect must have had a founder." Plainly this is significant in the sense only that someone must have begun the formation of any given group. It is clearly not true in the sense that every sect originates in the new teaching of a remarkable personage. And we have seen reason to infer that there was a group of heretical or deviating Brahmanists, for whom " a Buddha " was " an enlightened one," one of many, before the quasi-historical Buddha had even so far emerged into personality as the slain Jesus of the Pauline epistles. Brahmanic doctrine, Brahmanic asceticism and vows, and Brahmanic mendicancy—these are the foundations of the Order: the personal giver of that rule and teaching, the Teaching God, comes later, even as the Jesus who institutes the Holy Supper comes after the eucharist is an established rite. Every critical scholar, without exception, admits that a vast amount of doctrine ascribed to Buddha was concocted long after his alleged period. It cannot then be proved that any part of the doctrine is not a fictitious ascription ; and there is not a single tenable test whereby any can be discriminated as genuine. Nor is there any more psychological difficulty in supposing the whole to be doctrinal myth than in conceiving how the later Brahmanists could put their discourses in the mouth of Krishna.

<sup>1</sup> *Der Buddha*, 3te Aufl. pp. 159–160, 180.

<sup>2</sup> Cp. Baur's answer to Rückert, *Paulus*, Kap. iv, note 2 (p. 417). And now Baur's own assumptions as to Paul are rejected by the school of van Manen.

An obviously sufficient conceptual nucleus for "the" Buddha lay in the admittedly general Brahmanic notion of "Buddhas." There is even a tradition that at the time when Sakyamuni came many men ran through the world saying "I am Buddha! I am Buddha!"<sup>1</sup> This may be either a Buddhist way of putting aside the claims of other Buddhas or a simple avowal of their commonness. But a real Buddha would be a much less likely "founder" than one found solely in tradition. Any fabulous Buddha as such could figure for any group as its founder to begin with: to him would be ascribed the common ethical code and rules of the group: the clothing of the phantom with the mythic history of Vishnu-Purusha or Krishna, the "Bhagavat" of earlier creeds, followed as a matter of course, on the usual lines. M. Senart "holds it for established that the legend as a whole was fixed as early as the time of Asoka."<sup>2</sup> The quasi-biographical colour further given to mythical details is on all fours with that of the legends of Joseph, Moses, Joshua, and Jesus, all late products of secondary mythology, in periods which systematically reduced God-legends to the biographic level. As we have seen, the fabrication of narrative-frames for the teachings ascribed to the Buddha was early an established Buddhist exercise. And this accumulation of quasi-biographical detail, as we have also seen, goes on long after the whole cycle of prior supernaturalist myth has been embodied. It is after Jesus has been deified that he is provided with a mother and a putative father and brothers; and it is in the latest gospel of all that we have some of the most circumstantial details of his life and deportment.

On these grounds, then, it is here submitted that the traditional figure of the Buddha, in its most plausibly rationalised form, is as unhistoric as the figure of the Gospel Jesus has been separately shown to be. Each figure simply stands for the mythopœic action of the religious mind in a period in which Primary-God-making

<sup>1</sup> Senart, *Essai*, p. 448.

<sup>2</sup> *Essai*, Introd. pp. xxii-xxiii, and p. 451.

had given way to Secondary-God-making, and in particular to the craving for a Teaching God who should originate religious and moral ideas as the other Gods had been held to originate agriculture, art, medicine, normal law, and civilisation. And if by many the thought be still found disenchanting, they might do well to reflect that there is a side to the conception that is not devoid of comfort.

Buddhism, like Christianity, is from the point of view of its traditional origins a "failure." Buddhism, indeed, notably in the case of Burmah, has done more to mould the life of a whole people towards its ostensibly highest ethic than Christianity ever did; but Buddhism, being at best a gospel of monasticism, quietism, and mechanical routine, collapsed utterly in India, the land of its rise; and its normal practice savours little of moral or intellectual superiority to any of the creeds around it.<sup>1</sup> Brahmanism, which seems to have ultimately wrought its overthrow, set up in its place a revived and developed popular polytheism, on the plane of the most ignorant demotic life. Christianity, in turn, professedly the religion of peace and love, is as a system utterly without influence in suppressing war, or inter-racial malignity, or even social division. The vital curative forces as against those evils are visibly independent of Christianity. And here emerges the element of comfort.

On our Naturalistic view of the rise of the religions of the Secondary or Teaching Gods, it is sheer human aspiration that has shaped all the Christs and all their doctrines; and one of the very causes of the total miscarriage is just that persistence in crediting the human aspiration to Gods and Demigods, and representing as superhuman oracles the words of human reason. Unobtrusive men took that course hoping for the best, seeking a short cut to moral influence; but they erred grievously. So to disguise and denaturalise wise thoughts and humane principles was to keep undeveloped the very reasoning faculty which could best

<sup>1</sup> Cp. Koeppen, *Die Religion des Buddha*, i, 565; Davids, *Buddhism*, pp. 210, 246-250.

appreciate them. Men taught to bow ethically to a Divine Teacher are not taught ethically to think: any aspiration so evoked in them is factitious, vestural, verbal, or at best emotionally superinduced, not reached by authentic thought and experience. When, haply, the nameless thinkers who in all ages have realised and distilled the wisdom given out as divine are recognised in their work for what they were, and their successors succeed in persuading the many to realise for themselves the humanness of all doctrine, the nations may perchance become capable of working out for themselves better gospels than the best of those which turned to naught in their hands while they held them as revelations from the skies.

§ 14.—*The Problem of Manichæus.*

On the fringes of the historical problem of Buddhism there lies one which is worth at least a passing scrutiny in this connection—that, namely, of the origins of the heretical quasi-Christian sect of Manichæans. The Christian tradition runs that one Scythianos, a Saracen, husband of an Egyptian woman, “introduced the doctrine of Empedocles and Pythagoras into Christianity”; that he had a disciple “Buddas, formerly named Terebinthus,” who travelled in Persia, where he alleged that he had been born of a virgin, and afterwards wrote four books, one Of Mysteries, a second The Gospel, a third The Treasure, and a fourth Heads. While performing some mystic rites, he was hurled down a precipice by a daimon, and killed. A woman at whose house he lodged buried him, took over his property, and bought a boy of seven, named Cubricus. This boy she freed and educated, leaving him the property and books of Buddas-Terebinthus. Cubricus then travelled into Persia, where he took the name of Manes and gave forth the doctrines of Buddas Terebinthus as his own. The king of Persia [not named], hearing that he worked miracles, sent for him to heal his sick son, and on the child’s dying put Manes in prison. Thence he escaped,

flying into Mesopotamia, but was traced, captured, and flayed alive by the Persian king's orders, the skin being then stuffed with chaff and hung up before the gate of the city.<sup>1</sup>

For this narrative, the historian Socrates, writing in the fifth century, gives as his authority "The Disputation [with Manes] of Archelaus bishop of Caschar," a work either unknown to or disregarded by Eusebius, who in his *History* briefly vilifies Manes<sup>2</sup> without giving any of the above details. In the *Chronicon* of Eusebius the origin of the sect is placed in the second year of Probus, c.E. 277; but this passage is probably from the hand of Jerome.<sup>3</sup> According to Jerome, Archelaus wrote his account of his Disputation with "Manichæus" in Syriac, whence it was translated into Greek. The Greek is lost, and the work, apart from extracts, subsists only in a Latin translation from the Greek, of doubtful age and fidelity,<sup>4</sup> probably made after the fifth century. By Photius it is stated that Heracleian, bishop of Chalcedon, in his book against the Manichæans, said the [Greek] Disputation of Archelaus was written by one Hegemonius—an author not otherwise traceable, and of unknown date.

In the Latin narrative, "Manes" is said to have come, after his flight from court, from Arabion, a frontier fortress, to Caschar or Carchar, a town said to be in Roman Mesopotamia, in the hope of converting an eminent Christian there, named Marcellus, to whom he had sent a letter beginning: "Manichæus apostle of Jesus Christ, and all the saints and virgins with me, send peace to Marcellus." In his train he brought twenty-two [or twelve] youths and virgins. At the request of Marcellus, he debated on religion with bishop Archelaus, by whom he was vanquished; whereupon he set out to return to Persia. On his way he proposed to debate with a priest at the town of Diodorides;

<sup>1</sup> Socrates, *Hist. Eccles.* i, 22.

<sup>2</sup> Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* vii, 31.

<sup>3</sup> So Tillemont and Lardner (*Works*, ed. 1835, iii, 256, 261. Beausobre, *Hist. de Manichée et du Manichéisme*, 1734, i. 122) held it to be by Eusebius.

<sup>4</sup> Cp. Neander, *Gen. Hist. of Christ. Church*, Eng. tr. (Bohn) ii, 166, note, as to the evidence for embellishment in the Greek and Latin versions.

but Archelaus came to take the priest's place, and again defeated him; whereupon, fearing to be given up to the Persians by the Christians, he returned to Arabion. At this stage Archelaus introduces in a discourse to the people his history of "this Manes," very much to the effect of the recapitulation in Socrates. Among the further details are these: (1) that Scythianus lived "in the time of the Apostles"; (2) that Terebinthus said the name of Buddas had been imposed on him; (3) that in the mountains he had been brought up by an angel; (4) that he had been convicted of imposture by a Persian prophet named Parcus, and by Labdacus, son<sup>1</sup> of Mithra; (5) that in disputation he taught concerning the sphere, the two luminaries, the transmigration of souls, and the war of the "Principia" against God; (6) that "Corbicius" or Corbicus, about the age of sixty, translated the books of Terebinthus; (7) that he made three chief disciples, Thomas, Addas, and Hermas, of whom he sent the first to Egypt, and the second to Scythia, keeping the third with him; (8) that the two former returned when he was in prison, and that he sent them to procure for him the books of the Christians, which he then studied. According to the Latin narrative, finally, Manes on his return to Arabion was seized and taken to the Persian king, by whose orders he was flayed, his body being left to the birds, and his skin, filled with *air*, hung at the city gate.

That this narrative is historically worthless is admitted by all critical students since Beausobre; and recent historians turn from the Christian to the oriental accounts of the heresiarch for a credible view. There "Mani" is described as a painter,<sup>2</sup> who set up a sectarian movement in opposition to Zoroastrianism, then in renewed favour in

<sup>1</sup> Epiphanius, citing the Greek version, has *neokoros*, "temple officer."

<sup>2</sup> Dr. Marcus Dods, in his preface to Mr. Stothert's translation of the writings of Augustine against the Manichæans, writes: "Hyde... tells us that in Persian *mani* means painter, and that he was so called from his profession." This is a careless repetition of an old blunder of two good scholars, Fabricius and Wolff, exposed by Beausobre (ed. 1734, i, 71), from whose work Dr. Dods quotes a passage (cited by him as on i, 79) which occurs only two pages later. Hyde simply wrote: "Manes Persa, in eorum libris dictus Mani pictor, nam talis fuit professione sua" (c. 21, p. 280).

Persia, in the reign of Shapur I. Being proceeded against, he fled to Turkestan, where he made disciples and embellished with paintings a Tchighil [Chinese name for a temple or *Picturarum Domus*] and another temple called Ghalbita. Provisioning in advance a cave which had a spring, he told his disciples he was going to heaven, and would not return for a year, after which time they were to seek him in the cave in question. They then and there found him, whereupon he showed them an illustrated book, called Ergenk, or Estenk, which he said he had brought from heaven: whereafter he had many followers, with whom he returned to Persia at the death of Shapur. The new king, Hormisdas, joined and protected the sect; and built Mani a castle. The next king, Baharam or Varanes, at first favoured Mani; but, after getting him to debate with certain Zoroastrian teachers, caused him to be flayed alive, and the skin to be stuffed and hung up as alleged by the Christians.<sup>1</sup> Thereupon most of his followers fled to India, and some even to China, those remaining being reduced to slavery.

In yet another Mohammedan account we have the details that Mani's mother was named Meis, or Utachin, or Mar Marjam (Sancta Maria); and that he was supernaturally born.<sup>2</sup> At the behest of an angel he began his public career, with two companions, at the age of twenty-four, on a Sunday, the first day of Nisan, when the sun was in Aries. He travelled for about forty years; wrote *six* books, and was raised to Paradise after being slain under Bahram "son of Shapur." Some say he was crucified "in two halves" and so hung up at two gates, afterwards called High-Mani and Low-Mani; others that he was imprisoned

<sup>1</sup> D'Herbelot, *Bibliothèque Orientale*, s.v. *Mani*, following the Persian historian Khondemir and others. Hyde (*De relig. vet. Persar.* c. 21), also following Khondemir, gives the detail as to temple-painting; reads "Ertengh" as the name of Mani's book; has no mention of Hormisdas, making "Behrem" reign when Mani returns to Persia; and states that Mani was crucified.

<sup>2</sup> Gustav Flügel, *Mani, seine Lekre und seine Schriften*, 1862 (trans. from the Fihrist of Muhammad ben Ishak al Nurrák, with commentary), pp. 83-4. Meis is a name of the lotos or pepper-tree. *Id.* p. 117.

by Shapur and freed by Bahram; others that he died in prison. "But he was certainly crucified."<sup>1</sup>

Thus the sole detail which the Mohammedan and Christian writers have in common is that of the execution with its exemplary sequel.

Both accounts, it will be observed, make Mani an innovating heretic; but the Persian treats him as inventing his doctrine, while the Christian makes it traditive. The Persian story, however, makes him compose and illustrate his book in Turkestan, with the possible implication that such a book was a novelty in Persia, despite Mani's profession. Baur and Neander, accordingly, combining the Christian clue of the name Buddas with the Persian clue to Turkestan, infer that in that territory Mani acquired a knowledge of Buddhism.<sup>2</sup> To this solution, however, there are several objections. In the first place, there are in Manichæism only shadowy analogies to Buddhism; and in the second, the name *Buddas* is plausibly interpreted as being merely a Greek corruption of *Butm* or *Budm*, the Chaldaic name of the terebinth tree—a simple translation of *Terebinthus*.<sup>3</sup> On the other hand, Ritter has conjectured that "Terebinthus" may be a corruption of Buddha's title "Tere Hintu," Lord of the Hindus. Finally, it has to be noted that Herodotus repeatedly mentions a people called the *Budini*,<sup>4</sup> among whom were settled the Neuri, who "seem to be magicians"; so that "Buddas" might be a reminiscence of *their* repute. We have thus a pleasing variety of choices!

### § 15.—*The Solution.*

Seeking for a solution, we may assume that whatever tradition the Christians had concerning Manes they got from the east; and it is conceivable that from the datum

<sup>1</sup> *Id.* pp. 84, 97, 99-100, 102-3; Beausobre, i, 206.

<sup>2</sup> Neander, as cited, ii, 170, regards the cave in Turkestan as a "Buddhist grotte."

<sup>3</sup> Beausobre, i, 54-55; Hyde and Bochart as there cited; Neander, as cited, p. 166, *note*.

<sup>4</sup> Herod. iv, 105-9.

of Turkestan they evolved the ideas of "Scythianus" and "Buddas," with or without the help of the knowledge that "Budh" might stand for "Terebinthus" in Chaldea.<sup>1</sup> But the Persian tradition in itself has little weight, being merely a way of saying that Mani's doctrine had associations with other lands. On the face of the story, he was heretical before he left Persia; and the medley of theosophic doctrines associated with Manichæism can be traced on the one hand to the general storehouse of Babylonian lore, whence came the lore of Christian Gnosticism, and on the other hand to Mazdeism. Such an amalgamation could very well take place on the frontiers of the Persian and Roman empires, early in the Christian era. But it has to be asked how and why Manichæism, which at so many points resembles the Gnostic systems so-called, should have held its ground as a cult while they were suppressed. Its Jesus and Christ were as far as theirs from conforming to the doctrines of the Church, and it was furiously persecuted for centuries. The explanation apparently lies in the element of cultus, the exaltation of the Founder. Was this then a case in which an abnormal Teacher really founded a religion by his doctrine and the force of his personality?

In order to form an opinion we have first to note two outstanding features of Manichæism—the doctrine that Manichæus was "the Paraclete"; and the fact that his quasi-crucifixion was devoutly commemorated by his devotees in the *Bema* festival at the season of the Christian Easter.<sup>2</sup> Concerning the first datum, the most significant consideration is that the equivalence of the names Mani or Manes and Manichæus is to be explained only on Usher's

<sup>1</sup> Beausobre decides (i, 191-4) that the Christian story of the debate at Carchar or Caschar in Roman Mesopotamia is an error founded on a real debate at Cascar in Turkestan, where there was a Christian church and bishop, whereas there was no Caschar in Roman Mesopotamia, and the only other Cascar was in the heart of the Persian empire. But the whole story is unhistorical.

<sup>2</sup> Augustine declares that while he was a Manichæan he found the Christian paschal feast languidly celebrated, with no fasting or special ceremony, while "great honour was paid to the Bema," which was "held during Pascha" (*De Epist. Fundamenti*, c. 8).

theory that they are both variants of an eastern name equivalent to the Hebrew name *Menahem*, which has in part the same meaning as Paraclete.<sup>1</sup> Seeing that Manes is declared to have called himself the Paraclete promised in the Christian Gospel, the question arises whether he was in Syria called Menahem = *Manichaios* on this account, or whether Mani was for Persians, as was Manes or Mane for Greeks and Romans, a passable equivalent for *Menahem*, in which the third consonant was a guttural. And seeing that the same name is Græcised as Manaen in the book of Acts, this appears to be the fact. Now, the name Menahem, being framed from the root *nahem*, often translated in the Septuagint by *μενοβοόω*, strictly signifies only "the comforter," and has not in Hebrew the various senses of advocate, mediator, messenger, and intercessor, conveyed by *paraklêtos*; but there are some reasons for surmising that in post-Biblical use it may have had a similar significance with the Greek term. In particular, we find it in late Judaic lore practically identified with the title of Messiah, the Messiah ben David being called the Menakhem ben Ammiel, while the Messiah ben Joseph is named Nehemia ben Uziel.<sup>2</sup> Jesus, it will be remembered, becomes the *paraklêtos* in the sense of an intercessor, being yet at the same time an atonement.<sup>3</sup> And if there is reason to refer the doctrine of the two Messiahs to an extra-Judaic source,<sup>4</sup> a similar surmise is permissible as to the two Menahems.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Annales*, T. i, an. 3032, p.m. 82, cited by Beausobre, i, 71. Usher was led to his conjecture by noticing that Sulpicius Severus gives MANE as equivalent to MENAHEM (2 Kings, xv, 14, 16).

<sup>2</sup> Bousset, *The Antichrist Legend*, Eng. tr. p. 108, following Jellinek and Wünsche; Spiegel, *Avesta*, i. (1852) Einleit. p. 35, citing Abqat-Rocel and Bertholdt. Spiegel reads "Nehemia ben Chosiel." Cp. Reichardt, *Relation of the Jewish Christians to the Jews*, 1884, p. 32.

<sup>3</sup> 1 John, ii, 1.

<sup>4</sup> Bousset, p. 104.

<sup>5</sup> Spiegel (as cited) pronounces that "die Eschatologie der späteren Juden hat nun mit der persischen die auffallendsten Aehnlichkeiten," and cites the lore under notice as a parallel to the Persian "lore of the last things." When we note that in the Judaic writings in question the Messiah ben Joseph (=Nehemia ben Uziel) is slain, that his soul is carried to heaven by an angel, and that after a time of trial the Messiah ben David appears in triumph with Elias, we have a fairly decisive light on the doctrine that "the Messiah must needs suffer."

In this connection we have next to note, as did Baur long ago,<sup>1</sup> that the story of Mani's concealment in the cave is a strikingly close parallel to the old story in Herodotus concerning the reputed Thracian God Zalmoxis or Zamolxis, of whom "some think that he is the same with Gebelezeis."

"Every fifth year they despatch one of themselves, taken by lot, to Zalmoxis, with orders to let him know on each occasion what they want. Their mode of sending him is this. Some of them are appointed to hold three javelins; whilst others, having taken up the man.....by the hands and feet, swing him round, and throw him into the air upon the points. If he should die, being transfixed, they think the God is propitious to them; if he should not die, they blame the messenger himself, saying that he is a bad man; and having blamed him they despatch another."<sup>2</sup>

According to the Greeks of the Hellespont and Pontus, Zalmoxis was a man who had been a slave, at Samos, to Pythagoras, son of Mnesarchus, who was freed, became rich, and retired to his own country, Thrace, where he taught the doctrine of immortality. While teaching this in a dwelling he caused to be built, "he in the meantime had an underground dwelling made, and when the building was finished he vanished from among the Thracians; and having gone down to the underground dwelling he abode there three years." In the fourth year he reappeared to the Thracians, who had deemed him dead, and thus his teaching became credible to them.<sup>3</sup> The good Herodotus, "neither disbelieving nor entirely believing" the legend, was "of opinion that this Zalmoxis lived many years before Pythagoras"; and we in turn, seeing in the story of the three years' stay underground a remote form of the myth of the God-man's three days in the grave, pronounce that the legends of the freed slave Mani and his concealment in

<sup>1</sup> *Das manichäische Religionssystem*, pp. 455-6.

<sup>2</sup> Herodotus, iv, 94. Gebelezeis may be the Babylonian Fire-God Gibil, identified with Nusku. In that case the sacrifice to him of a messenger is one more instance of sacrificing the God to himself, as Gibil-Nusku was the messenger of all the Gods. Jastrow, *Relig. of Bab. and Ass.* p. 279.

<sup>3</sup> *Id.* iv, 95.

the cave are of similar antiquity.<sup>1</sup> He is inferribly the *Menahem* or messenger of the cult of the Thracian Getæ; and in another "Scythian" record we have a clue to the legend of his death, as well as to the myth of "Scythianus." The flaying of slain enemies was a Scythian usage; and "many, having flayed men whole, and stretched the skin on wood, carry it about on horseback."<sup>2</sup> As with the enemy, so with the "messenger,"<sup>3</sup> whose function is a recognised one in barbaric sacrifice. At the death of a king, they strangled and buried one of his concubines, a cup-bearer, a cook, a groom, a page, a courier, and horses, "and firstlings of everything else." A year later they strangled fifty of his young men-servants and fifty of the finest horses, and having disembowelled them, *stuffed them with chaff* and sewed them up. The bodies of the horses were then transfixed lengthwise with beams and placed in the curves of half-wheels to support them; the bodies of the fifty young men were similarly transfixed and mounted on the horses; and the whole ghastly cavalcade was placed around the "high-place" made over the king's grave.<sup>4</sup> An evolution of such funeral sacrifices into sacrifices to the Gods is in the normal way of religious history.

The Thracian Getæ, who carried on the cult of Zalmoxis and the ritually slain messenger, were subdued by Darius, and embodied in his empire,<sup>5</sup> with other Scythian tribes; and in that vast aggregate their sacrificial rites had the usual chance of being adopted by their conquerors—if indeed they were not already associated with the worship of Gibil-Nusku the Babylonian Fire-God, and so known to the Persian fire-worshippers. And, whether or not by way of such an adoption, we find that after the death of the captive emperor Valerian his skin was *dyed red and stuffed with straw*, and was so preserved for centuries

<sup>1</sup> In Arab tradition, Salih, the pre-Abrahamic "messenger" of Allah, is born in a cave, and later sleeps in one for twenty years. Weil, *The Biblical Legends of the Mussulmans*, Eng. tr. 1846, pp. 38-40.

<sup>2</sup> *Id.* iv, 64.

<sup>3</sup> See above, p. 108, *note*, as to this principle in the human sacrifices of the Khonds.

<sup>4</sup> Herod. iv, 71-72.

<sup>5</sup> *Id.* iv, 96.