

TARSUS.

XXII. ROMAN METAPHORS.

It has been pointed out in the preceding section that St. Paul's favourite metaphors and comparisons, intended to explain the intensity of devotion required for the proper living of the Christian life, are drawn from the stadium and the racecourse. The careful preparatory training for a great race, the self-denial and self-restraint in training, the strict rules of the competition, the concentration of the entire energy and powers of mind and body on the one ultimate aim, the eagerness to win a reward whose value lay entirely in the mental estimate which the initiated placed upon it, and not in external monetary value—all these conditions corresponded to his conception of the divine life and the spirit in which it must be led. But such constantly recurring comparisons could not have been made, if the Apostle had regarded the whole circle of athletics, the palaestra and the stadium, with the abhorrence that the narrow Jews of Palestine felt. We inferred that this department of his vocabulary and his thought originates in his early experiences as a child brought up amid the surroundings of a Hellenistic city, familiarized with the conduct of the racecourse. The spirit of the competitors in the course was, on the whole, one of the best and healthiest facts of Greek city life. Paul had learned this from participating in the life of a Hellenic city as a boy; there is no other way in which the lesson can be learned so thoroughly as to sink into the man's nature and dominate his thought and language as this topic dominates Paul's.

When Ignatius compares the Christian life to a religious procession, with a long train of rejoicing devotees clad in the appropriate garments, bearing their religious symbols

and holy things through the public streets, we see that he was at times ruled insensibly by old ideas and scenes familiar to him in earlier life. As a general rule, he regarded his old pagan life with shame as a cause of humiliation ; yet thoughts and associations connected with it directed his mind and his expression.¹ No Jew brought up from the beginning to regard pagan ceremonial as simply hateful could have used the comparison.

But it is easy to carry this method to an extreme which lands it in absurdity. Dean Howson, in his *Metaphors of St. Paul*, the last chapter of which we praised and freely used in the preceding Section, devotes two chapters to the military metaphors and the architectural metaphors in the Apostle's letters. If his estimate of these is as reasonable as we consider his account of the athletic metaphors to be, then, by the same] train of argument, Paul must have been as familiar with and interested in Roman military methods and Greek architectural details as with the spirit and eagerness of the victorious athlete ; which is absurd. But, when you look at the military metaphors, there is hardly one which is not of quite a vague and general kind. Wherever Dean Howson finds the word "fight" or "build," he detects an allusion to a Roman army or a Greek temple. But there were soldiers before Rome was heard of, and houses were built before the form of the Greek temple had been evolved. The most pacific and unmilitary of mortals will often use the word "fight." Persons absolutely ignorant of the shape of a Greek temple may be specially given to using the word "build."

These words have passed into the universal language of mankind, and are constantly used without any distinct thought of the original department of life from which they are adopted. They are not peculiar to St. Paul in the New

¹ *Letters to the Seven Churches*, p. 159 ff.

Testament : the verb " to build " occurs there thirty-one times outside of his writings and ten times in them. The word " builder " once outside, while he never uses it. The noun " building " is not so unfavourable to the Dean's view : it is found four times outside the Pauline letters, and fifteen times in them ; moreover Paul shows a marked tendency to employ the word in the moral sphere to describe the building up of character and holiness. But this peculiarity is not favourable to the supposition of architectural experience and training, for in comparison with other writers in the New Testament he displays less familiarity with the original process and inclines to use the word only in the transferred sense, which implies that he was not consciously thinking of the metaphor, nor making the metaphor for the first time, but was adopting a previously existing mode of expressing the moral fact.

It is quite different in the case of the athletic metaphors. In many of them it is quite clear from the passage that Paul was consciously and deliberately using the metaphor as such ; and it is highly probable that he was the first to strike out this use of the words. The Greek language of Christian theology was created by him, and never lost the character he had impressed on it : so Tertullian was mainly influential in devising a Latin expression for the Greek Christian theology.

The whole of Dean Howson's discussion of architectural Pauline metaphors comes to practically nothing, so far as concerns his thesis that the Apostle was thinking in them of the classical Greek temple. In so far as he was conscious of his architectural metaphors—and in some places he was clearly conscious—he was thinking of the house, not of the temple. It is a necessary rule in estimating the nature of metaphor that it must be presumed (apart from any special reason) to be drawn from the realm that is most familiar

to the writer. Now Paul was certainly quite familiar with the process of building a house ; but he may never actually have seen a Greek temple in building. Yet Dean Howson is convinced that it was the Classical temple, resting on columns and splendidly decorated, that floated always before Paul's mind and determined his expression.

The degree to which the Dean presses his statistics is shown by the following : on page 47 he says that the verb "edify" and its substantive "edification" occur about twenty times in the New Testament, and are with one exception used by St. Paul alone, and the one exception is in Acts, a book "written almost certainly under his superintendence." The passage of Acts is ix. 31, and it is straining facts to rely on this as an example of Pauline metaphor. Moreover, the very words "being edified and walking in the fear of the Lord" prove that the writer had no sense of the original realm from which the metaphor was derived, but was using a word which had passed into the language of Christian moral philosophy (quite possibly and even probably through the influence of Paul, who in his turn used it rather philosophically than with conscious metaphor). Such statistics from the English Version are misleading. We have stated the facts regarding the Greek words for building, and they are not favourable to the Dean's view.

Throughout the military metaphors, some of which are clearly conscious and intended, there are none which even in the slightest degree suggest any real interest in or familiarity with military matters ; they are all quite popular ; and there are only two which are certainly Roman in character. All the rest are simply military in general, they are not Roman any more than they are Greek : they relate to the popular conception of the soldier *in genere*. Even the allusion in 2 Tim. ii. 3, 4, which probably implies a professional soldier, who "does not entangle himself with the

common affairs of life," would be quite well satisfied by the mercenaries who were a common feature of the later Greek or Graeco-Asiatic kingdoms and armies. The two exceptions are the two striking allusions to the triumph, which are resonant of the dignity and majesty of Rome.

The first is in Colossians ii. 15 (14) : " the bond (consisting in ordinances) which was opposed to us he hath taken out of the way, nailing it to the cross : (15) having stripped off from himself the principalities and the powers, he made a show of them openly, celebrating a triumph over them in his crucifixion."

The other passage is a more detailed picture of the long train of the Roman triumph, with incense and spices perfuming the streets, when the chiefs of the defeated people were taken into the Mamertine prison on the side of the Capitol, and there strangled, as the procession was ascending the slope of the Capitoline hill. " Thanks be to God, who always leads us (his soldiers) in the train of His triumph,¹ and makes manifest through us the fragrance of His knowledge in every place : for we are a fragrance of Christ unto God, in them that are being saved and in them that are perishing."

In these passages speaks the Roman ; and they are the only two passages in all the letters of Paul in which I fancy that one can catch the tone of the Roman citizen. Nothing is sufficient to express the completeness and absoluteness of the Divine victory except a Roman triumph. How different is this from the way in which the writer of the Apocalypse strives to find expression for the same idea.

There is in these two Pauline passages a striking analogy to the passage just cited from Ignatius, who found

¹ Lightfoot on Col. ii. 14 seems to take this in the sense " celebrates his triumph over us as his conquered foes." I think the meaning taken above is better : " we are the soldiers who march behind him in his triumph," as the soldiers of the victorious army always did.

nothing so suited to describe the Christian life as a religious procession through the streets of a city. As in the one passage you recognize the pagan and probably the priest, so in the other you recognize the Roman citizen. It would be a perfectly legitimate inference to deduce from these passages that Paul was a Roman ; but, had he himself not mentioned his standing in the Empire, the inference would have been derided by the critics as fanciful and incredible.

XXIII. UNIVERSITY TEACHING AT TARSUS.

It is convenient to use the term University in speaking of educational facilities in Hellenic cities ; but the name must not be taken to indicate such strictly organized and incorporated institutions as the Universities in our country at the present day. But there were in the chief Hellenic cities real Universities, for the intention was to provide in them public instruction by qualified lecturers in all the branches of science and literature¹ recognized at the time. In accordance with the Greek ideal of city life, the sole ultimate authority in the University lay in the hands of the people. All teaching in the city was for the benefit of the people, and the popular assembly alone had the right to dictate the manner and the terms according to which it should be given. This authority was similar to that which Parliament exercises in the last resort in our country, but more direct and practically effective ; and the state was then much less willing to permit a University corporation to regulate its own affairs in ordinary course. Such regulation as did then exist was to a much greater degree exercised by the municipal authority than is now the case. Edinburgh University, in its close subordination to the Town Council—as was the rule until about the middle of the nineteenth century—showed more resemblance to the old Greek system than any other of our Universities.

¹ ἐγκύκλιος παιδεία, Strab., p. 675.

How the authority was exercised in Tarsus we have no means of determining. The story of Athenodorus, who was undoubtedly authoritative in the University and in the city alike, shows that there was a real connexion between them ; but it was only under exceptional conditions that a man who ranked primarily as the leading man in the University could exercise such influence in the city. When he returned to settle in Tarsus he tried the experiment of relying on the natural influence which a man of his standing and experience enjoyed in a free community ; and this experiment was a failure. He then had recourse to the exceptional and unconstitutional powers which the Emperor had entrusted to him.

In the Greek cities generally, to a much greater extent than with us, the lecturers in the University looked directly to the city authority, so far as they looked to any controlling power. To a much greater extent than with us they attained their position by a sort of natural selection and survival of the fittest. A lecturer was permitted to enter any city as a wandering scholar, and might begin publicly to dispute and to lecture (as Paul did in Athens and in Ephesus and elsewhere), if he could attract an audience. The city could, if it thought fit, interfere to take cognizance of his lecturing, and either stop him, if it seemed advisable, or give him formal permission to continue. Apparently there was no definite or uniform rule in the matter, but each individual case was determined on its own merits. Any person was free to call attention in the public interest to a new lecturer : that was a practically universal rule in ancient cities : the state depended on individuals to invoke its intervention. When thus called upon, the state authority decided whether there was any need to take cognizance of the matter : the decision would depend on the information laid before it and on the weight which the informer

carried with him. All that is a universal and necessary feature of Greek city government ; and it implies that there was some public board or council or individual magistrate before whom information could be laid. In Athens it seems certain that the Court of Areopagus was the authoritative body. In Ephesus it may possibly have been a court of Asiarchs. As to Tarsus we have no information.

If the new lecturer, when attention was called to him, was found suitable and approved, this must have given him a regular and legal standing. If disapproval were expressed, he would probably find that it was advisable to try his fortune in another city. Paul apparently did so even when his case was adjourned for further consideration ; and possibly in such cases that verdict may have been understood as one of mild disapproval. In cases where grave disapproval was felt the city had always the right to send away any person whose presence in it was for its disadvantage ; though, under Roman rule, such right of expulsion was certainly liable to revision at the hands of the Imperial officials, if the expelled person was sufficiently influential to be able to appeal to a high Roman officer.

As to the position of a lecturer who had been approved, we have very little information ; and practice doubtless varied in different cities. In some cases he enjoyed a salary from the state. How far he was allowed to charge fees is uncertain ; probably there was no uniform rule ; Paul charged no fees, and his practice was probably not unique, but he certainly makes rather a merit of the fact that neither individuals nor communities were put to expense by him, and he distinctly states it as a general rule, that the labourer was worthy of his hire and that payment for instruction was deserved. It is however in accordance with the spirit of ancient life that the lecturers

depended for their livelihood more on special gifts from grateful individuals than on fees charged universally for the privilege of listening.

Strabo, who is practically our sole authority, gives a very sympathetic and favourable picture of the University of Tarsus. He was perhaps biassed to some extent by his friendship for Athenodorus; but he was an eye-witness and an authority of the highest value. His account has sometimes, however, been misunderstood, and quoted in the sense that the three Universities of Tarsus, Athens, and Alexandria were the outstanding Universities of the world, and that of the three Tarsus was the best.

On the contrary, when Strabo is read carefully it is quite evident that the Tarsian school of philosophy was a provincial place, which had no reputation outside the city and attracted no students from the rest of the world. But there was in the city and the district around such enthusiasm for philosophy and for education generally that Tarsian students crowded the lectures; and in this respect Tarsus outshone the two great Universities, Athens and Alexandria, not to mention any of the others. In Athens and in the mass of the Universities the lectures were attended mainly by strangers, while few people of the country swelled the audience. In Alexandria there were both many natives and many strangers in attendance. Tarsus was able to crowd its own lecture-halls and to send numbers of its natives to complete their education abroad, and few of those who went abroad ever returned to their native place. Rome in particular was full of Tarsians; and, as we have seen, some of these exercised real influence on Roman history through their personal influence with the Imperial family.

While Strabo shows clearly that Tarsus was not one of the great Universities in general estimation, he shows also

that it was rich in what constitutes the true excellence and strength of a University, intense enthusiasm and desire for knowledge among the students and great ability and experience among some at least of the teachers. The collision between Athenodorus and the gang of Boëthos (as already described) may be taken to some extent as a struggle for mastery between the University and the uneducated rabble, which had attained power partly through exceptional circumstances and partly through the deep-seated faults of the Greek democratic system. The coarseness and vulgarity of the latter ought not to be quoted (as they have been quoted by Dean Farrar) as an example of University conduct and life in Tarsus. Philostratus, writing at the beginning of the third century, gives a very unfavourable picture of the University of Tarsus in the reign of Tiberius about the year that Strabo was writing, and mentions that Apollonius of Tyana, when he went to study there, was so offended with the manners of the citizens, their love of pleasure, their insolence, and their fondness for fine clothing, that he left the University and went to continue his studies at Aegae, on the Cilician coast farther to the east. But the work of Philostratus is unhistorical; in some degree he may be expressing the opinion entertained about the wealthy Tarsus in his own country and time (about A.D. 200), but to a large extent he was guided, I think, by the criticisms which Dion Chrysostom freely uttered in his two Orations to the Tarsians; and cannot be seriously weighed against Strabo's authority.

XXIV. ST. PAUL'S THEORY OF PAGAN RELIGION.

The view which St. Paul entertained, and states clearly in his letter to the Romans, is that there existed originally in the world a certain degree of knowledge about God and His character and His relation to mankind; but the de-

liberate action of man had vitiated this fair beginning ; and the reason lay in idolatry. This cause obscures the first good ideas as to the nature of God ; and thus the Divine Being is assimilated to and represented by images in the shape of man who is mortal, and birds and quadrupeds and reptiles. In idolatrous worship a necessary and invariable accompaniment was immorality, which goes on increasing from bad to worse in physical passions, and thus corrupts the whole nature and character of man (Rom. i. 19 ff.).

But men are never so utterly corrupt that a return to truth is impossible. If they only wish it, they can choose the good and refuse the evil (Rom. ii. 14 f.). The Gentiles have not the Law revealed to the Jews, but some of them through their better nature act naturally according to the Law, and are a Law unto themselves : the practical effect of the Law is seen in their life because it has been by nature written in their hearts and they have a natural sense of the distinction between right and wrong, between good and evil ; and their conscience works in harmony with this natural Law in their hearts, prompting them to choose the right action and making them conscious of wrong if they choose wrong action. This beginning of right never fails utterly in human nature, but it is made faint and obscure by wrong doing, when men deliberately choose the evil and will not listen to the voice of God in their hearts.

Yet even at the worst there remains in the most corrupted man a sense that out of this evil good will come. We all are in some degree aware that evil is wrong, because it is painful, and the pain is the preparation for the birth of better things (Rom. viii. 19-22). The eager watching expectancy of the universe [man and nature alike, as of a runner with his eye fixed on the goal], waiteth for the revealing of the sons of God: For the creation was subjected to vanity, not of its own will, but by reason of man

who subjected it, and in this subjection there arises a hope that the creation itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption so as to attain unto the liberty of the glory of the children of God. For we know that the whole creation in all its parts is groaning in the birth-pangs from which shall emerge a better condition, and we also who are Christians and have already within ourselves the first practical effects of the Spirit's action, are still in the pain and hope of the nascent redemption.

This remarkable philosophic theory of Paul's bursts the bonds of the narrower Judaism. It is not inconsistent with the best side of Hebrew thought and prophecy ; but it was utterly and absolutely inconsistent with the practical facts of the narrower Judaism in his time. The man who thought thus could not remain in permanent harmony with the party in Jerusalem which was inexorably opposed to the early followers of Christ. It was only in maturer years that Paul became fully and clearly conscious of this truth ; but as he became able to express it clearly to himself and to others, he also became conscious that it had been implicit from the beginning in his early thought. He had it in his nature from birth. It was fostered and kept alive by the circumstances of his childhood. He had come in contact with pagans, and knew that they were not monsters (as they seemed to the Palestinian zealots), but human beings. He had been in such relations with them, that he felt it a duty to go and tell them of the truth which had been revealed (Rom. i. 14). He had learned by experience of the promptings to good, of the preference for the right, of self-blame for wrong-doing, which were clearly manifest in their nature. He had also been aware of that deep and eager longing for the coming of something better, of a new era, of a Saviour, of God incarnate in human form on the earth, which was so remarkable a feature in Roman life before and after his birth.

For our present purpose the important aspect of this philosophic view is that it was inherited and learned in Tarsus. It was in the Tarsian religion that Paul detected the fundamental ideas of good amid the vast accretion of abomination and evil which had been built up over and round those initial ideas. It was through the mouth of some of the teachers in its University, expounding the ideas of Athenodorus, that he had heard a distinct and noble expression of the distinction between right and wrong, and a philosophic demonstration (in words, not in power) of the existence in man of an inborn ineradicable faculty to recognize the right. It was among the men who moved in the society of Tarsus that he had seen some who, "knowing not the Law, were a law unto themselves," who were living examples of the power and the truth of conscience. It was in the philosophy of Athenodorus that he had heard or read the complaint against the state to which the world had been reduced by evil and the belief expressed in the possibility of a better state of society.

What then was the religion of Tarsus? We are not here concerned to describe the evil, the vice and the deception involved in it as a practical working factor in the life of the city, but to investigate the fundamental ideas of wisdom and right which Paul describes in the passages just quoted from *Romans*.

XXV. THE RELIGION OF TARSUS.

The Religion of Tarsus is an extremely complicated subject, and the information which has been preserved is far too scanty to permit anything like a satisfactory account of it. Several steps in its development can be distinguished with certainty: others are probable: but many are quite obscure.

No religious fact was lost in the growth of an ancient city.

When a new people settled in an ancient city, they brought their religion with them, but they did not destroy the previously existing religion any more than they exterminated the older population. A certain amalgamation of the religions of the old and the new race was formed ; as e.g. at Athens when a race of Poseidon worshippers settled beside and among the older worshippers of Athena, a certain male figure, named Erechtheus, who formed part of the divine group in the Athena religion, was in the state cultus identified with Poseidon, and thus Athena and Poseidon-Erechtheus were associated in a joint worship and a common temple.

In Tarsus we can say with certainty that the early Ionian immigrants found an older population and an older religion already in possession. Certain elements in the later Tarsian religion can be distinguished as being in all probability pre-Ionian, others as Ionian. The Assyrian domination doubtless affected the religion of the country. The Persian period left unmistakable traces, which appear on the coins. The new foundation of the Hellenic Tarsus about 170 B.C. must inevitably have given a distinctly more Hellenized aspect to the state cultus, though it is very doubtful whether it had much effect on its real nature. Only the Jewish element remained separate, and did not affect the state religion, though it certainly must have affected strongly the character and views of many individuals, and produced that circle of believing or devout persons of pagan origin who in every city surrounded the Synagogue. It was precisely because the Jewish religion was so incapable of amalgamation with the others that the Hellenes of those cities complained ; the Jews really stood outside of the city union. In Tarsus the Jews seem to have been in a less degree an alien element than elsewhere, so far as the scanty evidence justifies an opinion.

The principal deity in Tarsus was the one who is styled on coins with Aramaic legends of the Persian and early Seleucid period, Baal-Tarz, the Lord of Tarsus. He also appears frequently on coins of the Hellenic Tarsus, and sometimes in the Roman Imperial time. He is represented in the character and position appropriated to Zeus in Greek art, sitting on a chair, resting his raised left hand on a long upright sceptre, and holding out in his right hand objects varying on different coins and at different periods, but most frequently either an ear of corn and a bunch of grapes, or a figure of Victory. The latter, which is more Hellenic, is more frequent in the Roman time, the corn and grapes are commonest in the earlier period, and mark this god as the old Anatolian deity, the giver of corn and wine. On the top of the sceptre sits often the sacred bird, the eagle.

These same symbols are carried in the hands of the god, who is sculptured of colossal size on the rocks above the great springs at Ibriz, on the north side of Tarsus. He is there represented as the peasant-god, dressed simply in short tunic, high boots, and tall pointed head-dress with horns in front, bearing in his hand the gifts which he has bestowed on mankind by his toil, the corn and the grapes. Sculptured there long before the Hellenic period of Anatolian history, he shows only the native character, without a trace of Greek influence, but with strong Assyrian influence. This god of Ibriz is the embodiment of the toiling agriculturist, who by the work of his hands has redeemed the soil for tillage, gathered out the stones from it, conducted the water to it, ploughed it and sowed in it the corn, or planted it with trees and tended them and cleaned them till they bear their fruit.

But that is not the Lord of Tarsus. The deity who sits on a chair, wearing simply the loose himation, which could only impede active exertion, and holding the sceptre, is not

the peasant-god, who by the labour of his hands has produced the corn and the wine, but the supreme god who gives rain and fruitful seasons and their gifts, who without exertion by the simple word of his power bestows his benefits on mankind.

This distinction between the supreme deity and the working god was one that lay deep in the Anatolian religion. It was expressed by the rude people of Lystra when they saluted Barnabas and Paul as gods. Paul was to them Hermes, and Barnabas was the supreme god and father Zeus: such at least are the names in the Greek translation, for we unfortunately are denied the names that were employed in the Lycaonian language. I cannot illustrate the distinction better than by quoting a few lines written in 1895.¹ "The same qualities which mark out Paul to us as the leader, marked him out to the populace of Lycaonia as the agent and subordinate. The western mind regards the leader as the active and energetic partner; but the Oriental mind considers the leader to be the person who sits still and does nothing, while his subordinates speak and work for him. Hence in the truly Oriental religions the chief god sits apart from the world, communicating with it through his messenger and subordinate. The more statuesque figure of Barnabas was therefore taken by the Orientals as the chief god, and the active orator, Paul, as his messenger, communicating his wishes to men. Incidentally, we may notice both the diametrical antithesis of this conception of the Divine nature to the Christian conception, and also the absolute negation of the Oriental conception in Christ's words to His disciples, 'whosoever would become great among you shall be your minister; and whosoever would be first among you shall be your servant'" (Matt. xx. 26).

This distinction was evident to the Greeks in their ex-

¹ *St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen*, p. 84.

pression of the Anatolian religion. The supreme god is usually called by the name of their supreme deity Zeus. The working god is in the south-eastern cities of Asia Minor most frequently identified with Heracles, the hero labouring under a cruel taskmaster, who slays monsters, drains marshes, and gives fertile land to agriculture ; but he is also envisaged under other aspects, especially as Apollo the seer of the Divine will, or Hermes the messenger who intimates the Divine purpose to men.

But it is never the case that those envisagements of the Divine nature are fixed and stereotyped. On the contrary they are fluid, shifting, often in a way interchangeable, even though they are so strongly distinguished. Thus the supreme god in Anatolia is the giver of signs and revealer of his will as Zeus Semanticus, and the giver of corn and wine and the fruits of the earth and all things good and beautiful, as Zeus Karpodotes and Kalokagathios. So the Lord of Tarsus holds in his hands the corn and the grapes, which at Ibriz the Peasant God bestows upon his votaries.

The working god, the subordinate, was as a rule conceived as the son, the supreme god as the father. But in the cycle of the life of the gods, the father is the son, and the son the father. "The bull is the father of the serpent, and the serpent of the bull" : such was the expression in the Phrygian mysteries ; and it well illustrates the element abominated by St. Paul as the cause of the degradation and hatefulness of the popular religion. But, in spite of the fluid character of these Divine ideas, it is possible in a certain degree to separate them and to contemplate each by itself in the Tarsian religion and the religion of south-western Anatolia generally.

We distinguish the young and active deity in a figure of thoroughly Oriental type, common on Tarsian coins throughout Greek and Roman times : he stands on a winged

and horned lion, wearing a tall pointed headdress, with bow-case on his shoulder and sword girt at his side : he holds up in front of him his right hand, often with a branch or a flower in it, while with his left he grasps a double-headed battle-axe. The branch marks him out as the god of purification, who teaches the ceremonies and rules for the expiation of guilt and the cleansing of impurity. The flower is perhaps the symbol of curative power, as Mr. J. G. Frazer points out.¹

This god is often shown on coins within a curious structure, which most probably represents a portable shrine. It is a pyramidal structure resting on a broad pedestal, and the god on his lion stands upon the pedestal inside the pyramidal covering. On the top of the pyramid often perches the divine eagle. Sometimes the pyramid is shaded by a semicircular canopy supported by two young beardless men wearing tunics : the men stand on the pedestal on which the pyramidal structure rests.

This quaint representation must probably be regarded as an attempt to show in the small space of a coin a large erection, which was a feature in an annual procession in honour of the god. Some of the coins attempt, and some do not attempt, to show the human beings, doubtless young men chosen from the city, who bore a canopy over the holy structure. The whole was carried through the streets on a great platform ; and we must presume that it was drawn by animals or by a train of devotees.

Now there was a festival at Tarsus, in which the burning of a pyre was one of the chief ceremonies ; and this took place in honour of a god, whom Dion Chrysostom calls Heracles. We are therefore forced to the conclusion that this pyre, the centre of one of the greatest Tarsian religious

¹ He kindly sent me an early copy of his *Adonis Attis Osiris*, which reached me just in time to aid in the correction of the proof sheets of these pages.

festivals, was the object so often represented on the coins of the city. It was constructed for the occasion, and the god was burned in it as the crowning scene of the ceremonial. The periodic burning of the god represented his translation to heaven.¹ The eagle which bore the Trojan Ganymede to heaven perched on the apex of the pyramid in the Tarsian rite.

The character of this deity, the weapons which he carries, and his death on a funeral pyre, all combined to force on the Greeks the identification with their own Heracles. This they could not possibly avoid. The Tarsian deity is on the coins generally draped in a long tunic reaching to the feet, but sometimes nude. The former appearance may be taken as true to the actual religious presentation; the latter is a Greek touch, helping to make out the analogy with Heracles.

These two figures we take as primitive Anatolian, part of the oldest Tarsian religion, which lasted through all stages of the city's history with little or no alteration.

The great number and variety of representations of Heracles on coins of Tarsus and other cities of south-eastern Anatolia may all be interpreted through the play of Greek artistic fancy with the type of the young Anatolian deity. The young toiling god, however, lent himself readily to other assimilations besides that with Heracles. It is a common thing in the transforming fancy of Greek religious myth to connect with the god a hero, who is really a sort of repetition of the god on a lower plane nearer the level of human nature: so e.g. Heracles varies in the Greek conception between a god and a hero. All the numerous representations of the hero Perseus on coins of the south-eastern region of Asia Minor are probably to be taken in association with this young god. Perseus is the immigrant

¹ I take this from Frazer *loc. cit.* p. 99, but am inclined to distinguish the branch from the flower as religious symbols: he identifies them.

hero, who is connected artificially with the older religion of the country. He represents a new people and a new power. In him probably are united features both of Persian and of Greek character; but the Greek element seems to predominate strongly. He comes from the side of the sea; he is specially connected with Argive legend; but he comes also as the horseman, who crosses the sea by flying over it. It may be supposed that a religious envisagement which gave mythical justification to the Persian rule by connecting a Persian hero with the native religion, was caught up by the later Greek colonists in the Seleucid period and Hellenized so far that little was left of the Persian idea.

We recognize a god of the early Ionian settlers in an Apollo of archaic character, who often appears on coins of the Imperial time, a nude figure grasping in his hands two dogs (or wolves, perhaps), one by the forelegs, and one by the ears, which hang down to the ground on each side of him. Representations of Artemis and Apollo of this type were common in archaic Greek times. They are rather pre-Hellenic and Oriental than Hellenic in character, and are peculiarly suitable to a really pre-Hellenic people such as the old Ionians were. Some Tarsian coins show Perseus adoring the archaic Apollo: the new Greek colonists naturally recognized the early Ionian god.

The Persian deity Ahura-mazda appears on Tarsian coins struck under the satrap Tiribazus about 386-380 B.C. He has the body of a man terminating below in the broad-winged solar disk; he carries a wreath in the right hand, and a flower in the left. This deity had no traceable lasting influence on Tarsian religion, and in general the Persian rule and religion left little permanent mark on the history and religion of Asia Minor, though the Persian Artemis was familiar in later Lydian religion, and Cappadocia was strongly affected by Persian influence.

W. M. RAMSAY.